Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Contents Word 2

Prologue, or preliminary consideration

<75.9>

Your word encourages us to strive for great deeds, O hardworking brother Nemesin. For what could be so inaccessible and difficult to comprehend and not very clear to interpret, as about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity, an unpretentious contemplation and reasoning that cannot be desecrated from anywhere? For in some respects the human thought is weak, or rather even to a lesser extent, the tongue is powerless and is barely able to bear even what is in the hands, and the beauty of truth is difficult to detect, and it is not accustomed to reveal itself to many, but only to those who good thoughts and an unselfish mind explores it and unearths it, like some kind of heavenly treasure, so that they may be worthy to hear: *your eyes are blessed* <75.12> *for they see, and your ears for they hear* [34]. However, we should not hesitate in this matter, but let us take on labors that exceed our strength, placing our hope in Christ Himself, who will come to our aid and with the light of the Spirit [35] will guide us, undoubted believers, to the acquisition of truth. For [our] goal is *the decrees of the Lord Jesus.* Let us say everything by *the Holy Spirit,* for this is what Paul says *: no one can speak of the Lord Jesus except by the Holy Spirit* . [36] Since some about *Beelzebub* [37] are not ashamed *to say the anathema of Jesus* [38], perverting the divine Scriptures in relation to their ideas and offering from their own will a shift [of the meanings] of the utterances of the Spirit, *and the Lord who redeemed them is swept away* [39], as it is written, we considered it necessary, useful and appropriate - in accordance with your, brother, reminder and admonition - to compose a word for the children of the Church as a pledge of help for the future and to speak briefly about each of the [issues] being studied and touched upon by them, that , I believe, will serve to the considerable benefit of readers. For the charm of the Ariev and Eunomius dogmas is very ramified and, so to speak, many-sided, and takes on the appearance of truth in a variety of ways. After all, as among women, those who are hetaeras (τὰ ἐν τοῖς γυναίοις [40] ἑταιριζόμενα), they think to cover up the ugliness [inherent in them] from [their] work with skillful tricks, they decorate and anoint themselves, and with the help of other false decorations they present to those looking at [them] destruction more beautiful, in the same way, I believe, the destructive speeches of those of other wisdom

(ἑτεροδοξούν των) [41] they take on the appearance of the beauty of piety and try to adorn themselves with the words of truth, not at all giving birth to the truth, but having within [themselves] the most godless wickedness [derived] from lies. But by abstinence, according to experience based on reasoning, those who have protected their minds are not captivated by their words, firmly holding on to a truly sound faith, and sing within themselves, saying: *Blessed be the Lord, Who did not let us be caught between their teeth* [42]. So, it seemed expedient to us to collect together what we found on the paths of the love of knowledge and not to confuse everything in our word, but rather [on the contrary] - to give in it an extremely clear and separate proof for each of the points, for in this way the knowledge contained in it [subjects] will become digestible and clearer for those who like to listen carefully. The name of the book is "Treasury", for it contains in itself a great variety of divine contemplations, although we have average abilities in words and are not very quick in understanding anything.

Let gratitude be attributed to Christ, who generously gives everything to everyone. It is appropriate for those who will read this book to know that the chapters in it are compiled according to the program below, and that each contains a lot of [particulars], directed towards the same goal of contemplation and in a circle ascending to the meaning of the encompassing [this is a particular part of the general concept]. Of [all] the chapters, only those containing [essential concepts] are assigned the order of numbers, and those accompanying them are placed in a row [of chapters according to their] inscriptions, but do not have numbers, like the thoughts of the first ones required for [explanation] and rushing towards them goals.

Here's what's in this book

WORD 1. About the uncreated (ἀγενήτου) and created (γενητοῦ) [43], in which [it is said] that it is better and more correct to call the Father God than the Uncreated.

WORD 2. That uncreatedness (τὸ ἀγένητον) is not an essence, but a designation of essence.

WORD 3. That uncreatedness is not an essence, but only an indication that God is not created.

WORD 4. To those who dare to say that there once was [a time] when the Son was not. Collections of syllogisms and constructions of thoughts (νοημάτων κατασκευαὶ) [44] coupled with evidence. The conclusion from all this is that God's Word is everlasting. Moreover, it is convincing kataskeva that the saying that says: " *His invisible being, from the creation of the world by the creation of the mind, is visible, His essence, and His ever-present power and divinity.*" [45], points to the Son. Other evidence that the Son is ever-present. Proof from evidence that the divine Scriptures [words] " *brъ* " (ἦν), " *syy* " (ὁ ὢν and ὑπάρχων), " *byh* " (ἤμην), " *am* " (εἰμὶ), " *is* " (ἔστιν) applies

exclusively to the Word, and never to the created, but rather [uses in relation to them the expressions] " *sometimes* " (ποτὲ), " *before* " (πρὶν and πρὸ τοῦ) and " *was* " (γὲγονε), and the like. Another [one] cataskeva that the Son is ever-present, by contradiction. And another syllogism about the ever-present, connected with a certain difficulty (ἐπαπορήσεως) and leading to the confession that the Son must be understood as born from the essence of the Father, and not from the outside, and if so, then it is obvious that he is also co-essential with the Father. More about the ever-present Son. <75.16> A question filled with absurdity from the Arians, in addition to which there is an even more absurd counter-question, teaching that one must not ask ignorantly (μὴ ἀπαιδεύτως). To those who ask: "Or did you have a son before you gave birth?", and to those who say: "So God did not have a Son; until I gave birth."

WORD 5. That the Father does not preexist the Son, even if He were unborn (ἀγέννητος), but the begotten Son (γεννητός) was co-essential with Him.

WORD 6. That the Father indivisibly and imperviously begot the Son from Himself.

WORD 7. To those who propose [question]: "Did the Father beget the Son involuntarily (ἀβουλήτως) or by will (κατὰ βούλησιν)?"

WORD 8. To those who say that the Son is not like the Father, but His purpose.

WORD 9. About the fact that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, about which the [corresponding] sayings [of Scripture] are given: " *Why do you say that I am good? No one is good, only God alone* " [46] and " *I ascend to My Father and your Father, and My God and your God* " [47], and just as accurately: " *Father My* is greater than Me " [48].

WORD 10. About the fact that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, which [word contains] a convincing answer to the questioner: " *Why do you say that I am good?* " » [49], and the interpretation of [this] saying.

WORD 11. About the fact that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, with the presented saying: " *Father My* is greater than Me " [50]. Another [reasoning] teaches that with all that [the words] "greater" and "lesser" are proposed, [the heretics] ignorantly introduce an inequality that is foreign, according to the art of [logic] of Aristotle. Another, bearing [in itself] proof that through what is called the greater Father, the Son is undoubtedly included. And He is no less than Him. Another is that the Son is equal to the Father, with the sentence of the saying: " *Amen I say to you, for those born of women have not risen above John the Baptist.* " [51] etc.

WORD 12. On [sentence] " *I in the Father, and the Father in Me* " [52] and " *I and the Father are one* " [53], in which [the word] further proves that God was the deliverer of the patriarch Jacob from all evils. Another proof is that the Word of God is a form of Him. Another, indicating that the Word is called the form of God. Another thing that teaches with strong evidence that what is likened to something is not necessarily

likened by nature to what it is in, but as a certain image inherent in something by nature, it becomes [an image] of our voluntary movements. <75.17> Another, showing that when something becomes in God, this does not mean a transformation of nature, but that through Him or by Him [it acquires new properties] [54]. Another thing, through which we learn how to understand what has been said, i.e.: " *Even as I and You are one, so they too will be one in Us." "I am in them, and You are in Me, that they may be perfect in one* ." [55]. Another, precisely showing that we are not transformed, leaving our nature, into the Divine [nature], when it is said about us that we become one with God, but that, having become partakers of Him [56], that's our name.

WORD 13. About the likeness of the Son to the Father, and that the Son is not of a changeable nature, and did not exist from the outside, but from His essence came into being as the Son. Another thing is that the Son is similar to the Father not from a change from worse to better, but by nature. Another, indicating that the Son is from the essence of the Father, and not from the outside, as the anti-Christians say, and since it is not from the outside, then, therefore, similar. Proof from divine Scripture that by communion with the Divine we are formed in His image. For for the constitution of man - in order for [him] to appear and be the image of Him who created [him] - it was not enough that such a word about Him should lie in [the area of] mental concepts alone.

WORD 14. More about similarity with the quotation of the saying: " *For as the Father had life in Himself so did the Sons have life in Himself* " [57]; The conclusion from the syllogisms is that the Son is Life by nature, like the Father.

WORD 15. In response to what is said in Proverbs: " *The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways for His work.* " [58], that "created" is not applied to the essence of the Word, and that the Son is not a creature or creature. Proof from observations of Scripture that none of the creatures accepts worship like God , nor, being nevertheless worshiped, endures [divine] worship or praise. Anitiese from the Aryan dogmas, containing in itself the true reason, as they think, for the Son to be created, and then refuting [this statement of theirs] with the help of convincing syllogisms. Also on [the words] " *The Lord created Me* ." That the Son is not a creature. Another [objection] of the Orthodox, who say: "If the Son is a creature, then how is it natural for Him to be the Creator? For this is by no means a property of the creature." The heretics responded [to this] with the following [arguments], of which a refutation follows. In the same way, observation from which we learn that both angels and St. prophets usually ask questions regarding <75.20> what is prescribed by God, [since] it sometimes happens that they do not know what is prescribed. But the Word of God showed itself not to act like that. Other, on [words] " *Whenever you prepare the sky, you run with Him* " [59].

WORD 16. About the ever-present nature of the Son, and that He came indivisibly

from the essence of the Father.

WORD 17. That nothing inherent in creation is inherent in the Son; and therefore the Son is not a creation.

WORD 18. About the fact that creation and generation are not the same thing, and also [not the same thing] in relation to God - to create and give birth.

WORD 19. To those who say that the Son is not the true Word of the Father, but by nature is in relation to Him something different and alien. The conclusion drawn from this is that [the Son] is consubstantial with the Father, and not from the outside, but from His essence.

WORD 20. At [the words] " *I endured the cross, I was careless about shame* [60], *and God also exalted Him, and gave Him a name above every name.*" [61], which [contains] remarks about the incarnation, carrying the same idea. On [the words] " *given to Him* " and " *exalt Him* ," and the like, spoken of Christ. To the apostolic saying, which reads: " *I sit at the right hand of the Majesty on high, only the best of the angels.*" [62]. A comparison of sayings showing that the divine Scripture uses [the word] " *best* " about [subjects] very distant [from each other] either in the logos of nature, or in dignity, or in the measure of grace. Another, telling that [the expression] " *the best being of angels* " does not introduce a comparison of entities, but rather ministries. It is also said differently. Comparing the sayings about the humanity of Christ and then resolving [difficulties]. Another proof [derived] from the same [sayings] is that the comparison of the ministries, the angels and the Son, is good and extremely useful, explaining the power of the "best," for from them we learn in what way He is better than the angels and by how much.

WORD 21. In response to the saying of the Apostle: " *Keep in mind the messenger and saint of our confession, Jesus Christ, who is faithful to Him who created Him* ." [63]. The conclusion is that the Son is neither a creature nor a creature.

WORD 22. On [words] " *Of that day and hour no one has news, not even the angels of heaven, but My Father alone.* " [64].

WORD 23. On [words] " *The Father loves the Son, and all things* <75.21> *have given in His hands* [65] *and on "All things have been betrayed to Me by My Father* " [66], and on " *I can't do anything about myself* but *as I hear, I judge*" [67], and other similar sayings.

WORD 24. On what the evangelists said about the Savior in human terms, on " *crying* " [68], " *Today my soul is troubled* " [69], on " *Even if it is possible, let pass from Me* " *this cup* [70] and " *my soul is sorrowful* " [71], and similar sayings. There are convincing examples from the Divine Scriptures that refute the evil-mindedness of those who oppose Christ.

WORD 25. On [the words] " *the firstborn of all creation* " [72], [that] the Son is not a creature.

WORD 26. In response to what was said about the sons of Zebedee: " *Whoever sits on the right hand and on the left is not My authority.* " [73].

WORD 27. On [words] " *Let them know thee, the one true God, and whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ .*" [74].

WORD 28. On the saying found in Luke: " *Jesus abounded in wisdom and stature and favor with God and man.* " [75].

WORD 29. On [words]: " *When all things are put in subjection to Him, then the Son Himself will be subject to him who puts all things under Him.* " [76].

WORD 30. On [words] " *Father, glorify Me with you had with the glory that you before the world was not.* " [77].

WORD 31. To those who say that God knows no more about His own essence than we do, but what He could know about Himself, we do exactly the same.

WORD 32. Selections of sayings with syllogisms from the New Testament that the Son is God by nature. And if so, then He is not a creature or a creature.

WORD 33. That the Spirit is God by nature, and [comes] from the essence of the Father, and through the Son is given to the creation.

WORD 34. A further comparison of sayings in which the attentive can see that the Spirit is God , and everywhere has the same effect as the Son, and is not alienated from His essence. At the same time, [the mentioned sayings] also teach that when God is said to dwell in us, then it is the Spirit who dwells.

WORD 35. Testimonies from divine Scripture, by which it can be seen that the Son is begotten of the Father, and not made.

<75.24>

* * *

[34] Matthew 13:16

[35] Literally "carrying torches."

[36] 1 Cor. 12:3

[37] Luke 11:15, 19 .

[38] 1 Cor. 12:3

[39] 2 Pet. 2:1 .

[40] "Τὸ γύναιον" - literally: "wife", "woman". Compare: 2 Timothy 3:6 .

[41] Здесь игра слов: "the compatible - of the heterodox".

[42] Psalm 123:6 .

[43] It should be noted that ante-Nicene authors often confused the concepts "γενητὸς / ἀγένητος" and "γεννητὸς / ἀγέννητος", which probably served as one of the reasons for the misconception about the Son, Who was γενν ητὸς (born), but ἀγένητος.

[44] "Kataskeva" (κατασκευή) – in logic "preparation": "Suppose you say: "I say this, but you, the enemy, do not agree with me. So let's try to identify this provable on the basis of the laws of analytics." And when [the enemy's position] is revealed on the basis of syllogistic necessity and rejected, the enemy will retreat, he will return to the first premise and say: "That's it [correct]." As you saw here, the first and the final are one and the same. The first begins with "problem," and the middle begins with "kataskeva," which means "preparation," for through preparation everything that can be proven is proven. The same thing happens in other areas, for if the doctor does not first identify the disease, how will he prepare the medicine? So, the definition [should] be called a problem, and the preparation - cataskeva, which means "composing and obtaining everything needed." The third is called "sumierasma", which means "conclusion"" (From the treatise by Ioane Petritsi "Consideration of Platonic philosophy and Proclus Diadochos ." M., 1984. P. 32)

[45] Romans 1:20 .

[46] Matthew 19:17 ; Mark 10:18 ; Luke 18:19 .

[47] This. 20:17 .

[48] This. 14:28 .

[49] Mark 10:18 .

[50] This. 14:28 .

[51] Matthew 11:11 .

[52] This. 14:10 .

[53] This is 10:30 .

[54] In all probability, the phrase is distorted or torn: "Otherwise it shows that what happens in God does not mean a change in nature, but because of him or because of him."

[55] This. 10:30, 17:21, 23 .

[56] 2 Pet. 1:4 .

[57] This. 5:26 .

[58] Proverbs 8:22 .

[59] Proverbs 8:27 .

[60] Hebrews 12:2 .

[61] Phil.2:9 .

[62] Hebrews 1:3 .

[63] Hebrews 3:1 .

[64] Matthew 24:36 .

[65] This. 3:35 .

[66] Matthew 11:27 .

[67] This. 5:30 .

[68] Luke 19:40 .

[69] This. 12:27 .

[70] Matthew 26:39 .

[71] Matthew 26:38 .

[72] Col. 1:15 .

[73] Matthew 20:23 .

[74] This. 17:3 .

[75] Luke 2:52 .

[76] 1 Cor. 15:28 .

[77] This. 17:5 .

Contents Word 2

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 1 Word 3

Word 1. About created and uncreated

If the Arians tried to ask us whether the uncreated (τὸ ἀγένητον) is one or two, so that we, by saying "one" and attributing it to the Father, would [thereby] number the Son among the created, then we should answer like this: firstly, the question itself is ignorant and illiterate, for "τὸ ἀγένητον" is understood in several meanings. "Ἀγένητον" is something that has not yet been created, but can be created, like [for example] a ship made of wood, or a statue made of copper. And also "ἀγένητον" is called something that has never arisen and cannot arise. For example, the triangular shape has never become quadrangular, and never will: because as soon as the shape of the triangle is abolished, it becomes something different from what it was [before]. "ἀγένητον" is also called something that exists and has come into existence (ὑπαρχων καὶ ὑφεστικὸς), but has not been created by anyone (μὴ γεγενημένον ὑπό τι νος). And now, given that "ἀγένητον" is understood in a variety of ways, what will this mean in relation to God? But they will probably say: "was not created" (μὴ γεγενῆσθαι), having first agreed that the question was asked ignorantly.

Let us also say, however, that one is uncreated. If they say to this that it is then necessary to simultaneously admit that the Son was created, since the uncreated is one, and this is the Father, then they will again hear in response: " *If Wisdom and Power* [78], and the Word of the Father is the Son, and in the Father the Word and Wisdom and Power were ever present, then, therefore, the Son, who is and is called [all] these, did not arise subsequently (οὐκ ἐπιγέγονεν). But as from God God, and from the Light the Light shone [79], and from the Uncreated - Uncreated. For such befits the Word, as He who begat Him also is. Indeed, in this way the authenticity of the essence of the Father would be confirmed by those born of Him. So, nothing prevents, despite the fact that one is the uncreated Father, the Word being uncreated from Him, as understood as something [existing] with the Father and in the Father, due to the indistinguishability of nature (διὰ τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀπαράλλακτον), as He Himself said about Himself: " *I and the Father are one* ." [80], with the word " *one* " denoting the identity of essence, and with the word " *esma* " <75.25> – cutting the conceivable into two and again collecting it into a single Divinity.

OTHER . If the Son is the unchanging image (εἰκὼν ἀπαράλλακτος) of the Father, so that He reveals Him in Himself, according to what was said: " *He who sees Me, sees the Father also* " [81], then it is necessary to say that the uncreated is the one who came from the uncreated Father, for how could the uncreated be visible in the created? After all, if the archetype appears in similarity, then, of course, the second will be consistent with the first. At the time when we call the Father created, in accordance with Whom the Image was formed. If this is inappropriate, then [the Son] will be in every uncreated way in an uncreated way.

OTHER . Blessed Moses, explaining the structure of man, quotes the [words] of God saying: " *Let us make man in our image and likeness* ." [82], and by what he says "to ours", the duality is again designated - with the Holy Spirit co-abiding, of course, and together with it the theologized. If in one person the same image of the Father and the Son appears, then this is due to [Their] similarity to each other. The unmade is not like the created: therefore the Son was not made, lest he appear unlike [the Father].

OTHER. In the Divine Scriptures the Father is called Almighty and Lord (παντοκράτωρ καὶ Κύριος), but is not understood as one of the things that he contains or dominates (ἕν τι τῶν κρατουμένων ἢ κυριευομένων), also the Son, because He [Himself] contains everything and dominates everything. For He [contains] everything and rules together with the Father, being Himself Almighty and Lord. So, just as in these [things] the son is not one of all, but the meaning of the words ["Almighty" and "Lord"] refers to the nature of [beings] created, so regarding the uncreatedness, the comparison is not with the Son, but with the creature, even though it is said that there is [only] one uncreated, for the reason that everything was created (γεγονέναι), excluding God.

That it is better and more correct to call the Father God rather than the Uncreated

The name "father" in every way contains the concept of a son, for such [concepts] are designated through each other. And the name "uncreated" contrasts the fact that God did not arise [from non-existence] with the mention of the created. It is necessary for those who wish to believe to have the right knowledge of the Holy Trinity. Therefore, if he who calls [God] Father looks at the Son, because of Whom He is Father, and he who calls [Him] Uncreate looks at the created ones, to whom He who was not created is rightly opposed, then it is much better by those [names] from which the knowledge of the Son is born, to designate God for oneself, rather than by those from which the memory of creation arises, which does not in the least contribute to the knowledge of the Holy Trinity. And he who calls God Father designates Him, starting from what He is, and he who says "Uncreated" - from what He is not. After all, He is the Father of the Son, but He is not created. And what would be more appropriate to

designate God based on what He is, rather than on what He is not, will become clear to everyone from here. <75.28> For if someone calls this ineffable and incomprehensible nature God, then [he] correctly names [it, starting] from what [it] is, and by saying "God", he undoubtedly designated it; and if someone tries to designate it, [borrowing names] from what it is not, calling it good-natured and without guile for the reason that there is no malice or guile in it, then [such a person] will, of course, say the truth, but will not fully reveal God , since among people there are those who are good-natured and unkind. The same, we believe, are St. angels. Therefore, it is truer and better that [God] will be designated [by names borrowed] from what He [unconditionally] is, rather than from what He is not [i.e. i.e. is only relative].

OTHER . Blessed David sings and says to the Son: " *For this reason of Thy anointing, O God, Thy God is more than Thy partaker of the oil of joy.* " [83]. So, if that which participates is something other in relation to that which participates - for one is to be understood in the other - and the creature participates in the Son, then He will be different in relation to the creature participating in Him, and therefore - not created. And if the Son is not different in relation to her and is by nature separated from her, then what is the need for communion, or how can anyone partake of what he himself is?

* * *

[78] 1 Cor. 1:24 .

[79] Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed .

[80] This is 10:30 .

[81] This. 14:9 .

[82] Gen.1:26 .

[83] Psalm 44:8 .

Word 1 Word 3

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 2 Word 4

Word 2. That uncreatedness is not an essence, but a designation of essence

Uncreatedness is and is understood as the beginning and the cause. No beginning, since it is a beginning, points to anything similar or dissimilar to itself. The word "Uncreated" refers to the created thing, which is not like Him, for it [i.e. e. created] – the opposite [of that]. So uncreatedness is not an essence, but a designation for the fact that [a given] essence does not exist in the same exact way as that [i.e. e. created], to which it is [logically] opposed.

OTHER . That uncreatedness is not an essence has already been shown. But perhaps someone will say that even though it is not an essence, but a difference, it is such, it will be exposed that he is speaking ignorantly. After all, if any difference arises around essences, then it would be necessary to look for an essence whose difference would be uncreatedness. For example, [someone] might say that an animal is defined as: "an entity that is animate [and] sentient. Around this essence a difference arises. For one is a rational animal, mortal, endowed with intelligence and knowledge, like man; and the other is a dumb animal, like [for example] a horse. Consequently, essence [logically] precedes, and [then] differences are mentally added to it. So, if uncreatedness is a difference, then let a [corresponding] essence be found, of which it will be a difference, for it is impossible for a difference to bear [in itself] the logos of the essence.

OTHER . If uncreatedness is an essence, and not an indication that [that to which this epithet is attached] did not arise [from non-existence], then how will the Son be not like the Father, being born from Him? For if the names do not introduce some kind of opposition to each other <75.29>, and what is designated by both does not contradict one another, then nothing prevents the Son from being essentially similar to the Father, even if uncreatedness is understood as an essence, like creation. After all, essence in relation to essence will not be opposite, since both of them are essences.

OTHER . If every uncreated thing is not like every created thing, then he will be right when he says that every created thing is like every born thing. The Son, being born, does not have the slightest similarity in relation to beings through birth (πρὸς τὰ ὄντα

γεννητῶς), for He is above all creation. Thus, the Son, being begotten of the Father, will not be unlike him in essence due to the fact that the Father is uncreated. For just as, being born, He surpassed the likeness (ὁμοίωσιν) of the created, so He did not depart from the likeness (ἐμφερείας) of the uncreated, although He remains begotten.

Antipophora [84] *as if on behalf of heretics* . In relation to God, they argue, we say that ungeneracy is the essence, and this will be the defining name (ὄνομα ὁρικόν), as if someone defined the essence of man, saying: "a rational animal, mortal, endowed with intelligence and knowledge."

Refuting this. They will be exposed in the fact that this [reasoning] is also proposed ignorantly: after all, if the name "Uncreated" were determinative, it would consist of genus and difference - that is, differences - for without them the definition is never made. And such uncreatedness, not relating to any kind of essence, cannot be a definition. And besides, we see that genera are defined philosophically by philosophers not with one single word, but with more numerous ones, such as [for example] "an entity animate sensually" or "a rational animal, mortal." And if the affirmation of the name alone is not enough to reveal the essence, then, therefore, [the name] "uncreated" is not determinative.

OTHER . If the definition is the name "Uncreated", i.e. the word (φονή), then it will, of course, allow, according to the nature (σχήμα) of definitions, reversibility, as if someone, defining a person as a "reasonable animal, mortal," reversed this in the opposite direction, he will say: "If any animal is rational, mortal, endowed with intelligence and knowledge, then this is, of course, a person." If, therefore, "uncreatedness," as we have already said, is a definition, then let not the reversibility be rejected: if uncreatedness is essence, then essence is uncreatedness. But [this provision] is not addressed. For not every essence is necessarily uncreated, but this belongs exclusively to God alone. So uncreatedness cannot be a definition, but only indicates that [God] is not created.

* * *

[84] A rhetorical figure, a response to an anticipated objection.

Word 2 Word 4

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 3 Word 5

Word 3. An unequivocal answer that uncreatedness is not an essence, but only an indication that God is not created

If uncreatedness is an essence, and there is nothing contrary to essence, then there will be nothing contrary to uncreatedness. If there is the opposite of uncreatedness, createdness, and nothing is opposite to essence, then uncreatedness will not be essence.

OTHER . If uncreatedness is an essence, then creation will necessarily be an essence, and if both are essences, then createdness will not be the opposite of uncreatedness, but identical. For essence is not the opposite of essence.

OTHER . If uncreatedness means the essence of God, then createdness in justice [will mean] the essence, and not that it was created. And when both of them denote essence, then how can anyone recognize that one is creative, and the other is arising [in the process of creation], since names do not reveal anything, except perhaps essence?

OTHER . If uncreatedness is an essence, and [the word] "essence" is said synonymously in relation to everything, then [the term] "uncreatedness" will be said in relation to all essences or all their subspecies (ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν ὑπ᾽ αὐταῖς). If uncreatedness is not affirmed in relation to everything, but essence is [affirmed] in relation to everything, then how can essence and uncreatedness be one and the same?

OTHER . If uncreatedness is an essence, and an essence is not better or worse than [another] essence, then, in accordance with this, uncreatedness will not be better, and nothing will be worse than it. If uncreatedness surpasses everything, then it is not an essence; <75.33> and if not, then everything will surpass everything; so that uncreatedness will not be an essence.

OTHER . If uncreatedness means the essence of God, and not that [this essence] was not created, then there is a need for other names for Him, capable of showing that God did not arise from another cause, since the uncreatedness of God does not mean anything other than one only the essence of God.

OTHER . If the essence of God is something one, and not many in number, but uncreatedness and kinglessness (ἀβασίλευτον) [85], and other [negative characteristics]

are many in number, and not one, then the essence will not be identical to uncreatedness or kinglessness.

OTHER . If uncreatedness and createdness, and so on, are the essence of God, while they are distinguished [from each other] by the words [naming them], then this essence must be composed according to different words, so that these words would be properly spoken in relation to it; and if it is not composed [of different parts], then, consequently, these [names] are designations of the [properties] inherent in the essence, and not the essence [named] by them.

OTHER . If the essence of God is not spoken for the sake of anything (for it is not for the reason of anything), and the word "Uncreated" is for the sake of the fact that He is the best of all and surpasses everything, then the not spoken for the sake of anything [essence] will not be identical] that which is said for the reason [of something].

OTHER . If the uncreated (τὸ ἀγένητον) is raised to the uncreated (τὴν ἀγενησίαν), and the essence of God has no relation to anything, then how can something having a relation to something be identical to an essence that has no relation to anything?

OTHER . If nothing is opposed to God's essence, and creation is opposed to uncreatedness, then how can essence and uncreatedness be one and the same?

OTHER . If every essence that is called different in relation to another [essence] does not reveal its superiority until the name of superiority is added, and uncreatedness, being named, immediately shows a difference, then how could those who say that essence and uncreatedness are one not be the most insane? and also?

OTHER . If uncreatedness is an essence, then every essence will be uncreated, which is unholy.

OTHER . If uncreatedness is an essence, and it is characteristic of essence to admit opposites, then the uncreated will be the one containing opposites. If this is characteristic of essence (after all, "to create" (δημιουργεῖν) is the opposite of "not to create" (μὴ δημιουργεῖν), and not <75.36> uncreated (ἀγενήτῳ), for it did not happen to arise (γεγ ονέναι)), then uncreatedness will not be the essence .

OTHER . If, when they say "essence" in relation to God, they follow the opinion of philosophers, then God will tend to admit opposites. If, wanting to designate that God exists (εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν σημᾶναι βουλόμενοι), they use the name of essence in the same way as we do, and uncreatedness is identical with essence, then "uncreatedness" will be a name denoting the existence of God, and not the essence itself .

OTHER . If everything that fits the definition of genus and species without accidental properties [i.e. e. accidents], is in the proper sense of the word an essence, and God is not any of this, then God is not called in the proper sense of the word an essence. If "uncreatedness" is said in relation to Him in the proper sense (for He was not formed),

then "essence" will no longer [also be said], [for] how can an exact [expression] be identical to an incorrectly used one?

OTHER . If the first and most important thing is called "essence" because it lies at the basis of all random properties, and that which is the basis of God is not a random property, then "essence" in relation to God is not said in the proper sense of the word. For God is the all-essential (ὑπερούσιος). If "uncreatedness" is said to apply to Him in the proper sense (for He is not created), and not also "essence," then essence and uncreatedness are not the same thing.

OTHER . If "uncreatedness," "kinglessness," and similar [concepts] simultaneously designate essence, and the designated [things] are not identical with the designating ones, then the essence and uncreatedness will not be the same, just as the signified is not identical to the signified.

OTHER . If "uncreatedness" was called [so] not because it did not arise, but because the essence of God exists, then each of the essences would be uncreated. If there are many essences, but they are not uncreated, then it is not the essence that represents the uncreatedness, but the superiority of [one specific] essence.

OTHER . If only, as applied to God, as they say, uncreatedness is an essence, then it would be the definition of that whose only characteristic feature is uncreatedness. If there is not a single definition to which the essence of God would fall, then, therefore, in relation to God, "uncreatedness" is not a proper name (ὄνομα κύριον), as nothing else that reveals, but only the essence of God.

* * *

[85] That is, not subject to any king. Compare: Proverbs 30:26 .

Word 3 Word 5

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 4 Word 6

Word 4. To those who dare to say that there once was [a time] when the Son was not. Collections of syllogisms and thought structures coupled with evidence. The conclusion from all this is that the Word of God is everlasting

Those who fight against God foolishly speak about the Son, as if <75.37> "there was [a time] when He did not exist." For if the Word Itself applied, they say, [the saying] " *be* " [86], then there will be no place at *all* . " in relation to time *If anyone understands* " *be* and definitely says that there was a time when the Son was not, then he will be exposed as an ignoramus and a fool who says that there was a time before the existence of the Son, about whom Paul says that *by Him they* were created *eyelids* [87].

Evidence that God's Word is Everlasting

" *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was to God, and God was the Word* " [88]. In the Revelation of John this is what he says: *"Who is here, and who is like him, and who is to come"* [89]that *He who is coming* is the Word, and in relation to Whom the definitions " *this* " and " *who are like* " are assigned. For [the Scripture] says: "Behold , *I will come and dwell in your midst, says the Lord* ." [90]. Definitely, John also posits " *be* " in relation to the Word. After all, " *be* ," he says, " *the Word to God* ." Everything must be characteristic of the One in relation to Whom the words " *sy* " and " *be* " are posited.

Evidence . Paul [says] about the Jews: " *Whose are the fathers, and from whom is Christ in the flesh, who is blessed above all by God forever Amen* " [91]. He speaks of the Word: " *For His invisible being from the creation of the world was conceived by created things, His essence and ever-present power and Divinity are visible."* [92]. If what was said applied to the Father, it would be translated into the Word in a different way. For who is the power of God - Paul cries: " *Christ , the power of God and the wisdom of God* " [93]. The same is true for the psalmist: " *This is the commandment , O God, by Thy power: strengthen, O God, this which thou hast done in us* ." [94]. Who

strengthened this perfect thing for us, if not the Word of God, who delivered us from corruption and restored us to incorruption?

OTHER . Concerning the same thing, there is a convincing kataskeva that the saying that reads: " *What is invisible to Him from the creation of the world is conceived by created things, visible is the essence, and His ever-present power and Divinity"* [95], - denotes the Son. The position of [this] cataskeva is as follows. It is written: " *No one knows the Father except the Son, and ıf the Son reveals* him " [96]. If the Father is known only to the Son, and only through Him alone is revealed to others, then the Father is contemplated not through creation, and not being understood by creatures. But the creature is its Creator, God's Word, and the Son shows the Father in Himself. And therefore to Philip, who said: " *Show us the Father* " [97], He commands Him *not to be known comparatively from the beauty of creatures* [98], but points to Himself, saying: " *Whoever sees Me, sees the Father* " [99].

Other evidence that the Son is eternal

The Psalmist calls Him: " *He who was before the world* " [100], and not "made" (γενόμενος); Isaiah – " *Eternal God , God who formed the ends of the earth* " [101]. If the Word is *the one who formed the ends of the earth* " [epithet] also applies to Him , *then the " eternal* , and it is obvious that He was everlasting, and was not made (οὐκ ἐγένετο).

OTHER . Paul writes about the Word: " *Who is the radiance of glory and His image"* [102]. And David sings: " *And be the Lord our God upon us* ." [103]. And again: " *In Your light we will see light"* [104]. So, when was the Father without His *radiance* ? not in God *When was His Lordship* ? And again: if the Son is *Light from Light* [105]Why, when there was no light in the Father? For just as the ability to shine is inseparable from fire, so from the Father is the Light born from Him.

ANDHOE . David sings: " *Thy kingdom, the kingdom of all ages* " [106]. If all time is measured in centuries, and the Word reigns in them, then, therefore, there was no time when the Son did not exist.

OTHER . Proof on the basis of evidence that the divine Scriptures [words] "be" (ἦν), "sy" (ὁ ὢν and ὑπάρχων), "byh" (ἤμην), "am" (εἰμὶ), "is" (ἔστιν) applies exclusively to the Word, and never to the created, but rather [uses in relation to them the expressions] "sometimes" (ποτὲ), "before" (πρὶν and πρὸ τοῦ) and "was" (γέγονε), and the like.

The Savior, showing His eternal hypostasis, said: " *I am the truth* " [107], " *I am the world* " [108]and " *I am the shepherd* " [109]. And he also said to the disciples: " *You speak of Me, the Teacher and the Lord, and say well: I am.* " [110]; and the psalmist about Him: " *Before the mountains could be raised* [111]and *the earth and the universe were created* ,

and from everlasting to everlasting you art ." [112]. He himself about himself: " *I am the way* " [113]and " *I am the door* " [114]. And the Father about Him: " *You are My beloved Son"* [115]; and again: " *The Lord spoke to Me: Thou art My Son .*" [116]. Everywhere here " *you* " and " *be* " are used, and nowhere – " *to be* " (γέγονεν). And regarding the created (γενητῶν): " *The Spirit of God, who created (ποιῆσαν) me* " [117]. Moses, narrating the creation (γενέσεως) of the world, [writes]: " *And every herb of the herb, before even being (γενέσθαι) on the earth, and every grass of the herb, before even vegetating: God forbid rain on the earth, and man shall not do anything Yu* " [118].

That "when" (ὅτε) always means time. In Deuteronomy: " *whenever a* (ὅτε) *divided the tongues above* " [119].

About what "before" (prò τοῦ) [is said] about the created . Solomon has Wisdom about Herself: " *Before you could create the earth, before you could fill the depths, before you brought forth a source of water, before you could set up the mountains, before you brought Me forth* " [120]. Savior: " *Amen, I say to you: before even Abraham was not, I am .*" [121]. Jeremiah God: " *Before I created you in the womb, I knew you"* [122] . In the book of Daniel, Susanna: *"God is eternal and the witness of the hidden, knowing all things before their being (γενέσεως)* " [123].

Another [one] cataskeva that the Son is ever-present, by contradiction

Antithesis of the heterodox. If [in your opinion] there was no time [time] when He did not exist, but the Son is eternal and coexists with the Father, then you [thus] say that He is no longer a son, but a brother.

Rebuttal to this. Saying that He is co-essential with [the Father], we [at the same time] call Him Son. If He were simply co-existent and not the Son, then your suspicion would have taken place, but since we, in addition to co-existence, confess Him to be the Son, then how will the Son be the brother of the One who begat [Him]?

OTHER . If our faith is in the Father and the Son, and thus [by confessing] we are baptized, then what kind of brotherhood is shown here, or how can the Word be the brother of Him whose Word it is?

OTHER . The Father and the Son were not born from some pre-existing principle in order to be considered brothers. But the Father is the beginning of the Son, and begets the Son, and remains the Father, and is not called anyone's son; and the Son is the Son, and remains what He is, and is not called by nature anyone's brother. What place will brotherhood have here?

More about the ever-present. If the Father is perfect, that which is from Him will also be perfect. And if He, moreover, also possesses ever-present things, then that which is

from the ever-present Father will also be ever-present, not coming to the essence of the One who gave birth, but ever coexisting with it; and not imperfect because of creation in time, but perfect because of what exists before all time.

OTHER . Another difficulty [arising] due to reduction to absurdity in this way . If the Word is not the Son of God, but was formed as a creature from non-existent things, then let at least someone show [this] first. Then let him bring [the expression] "it was when it was not" [used] in relation to creation. If the divine Scriptures call Him the Son, and so the Father calls Him, then the name "Son" means birth from the Father: therefore, He is not a Creation and not a creature, for what is created is not identical to what is born (κτιζόμενον). If this is true, then there will be no place in relation to the Son [the expression] "there was when he was not," which in the proper sense of the word is used in relation to creations alone.

OTHER . If the Son was born from the Father, and what was born from the Father is His Word and Wisdom and Radiance, then those who say that "it happened when the Son was not" directly say that there was [a time] when the Father was dumb, unwise and devoid of Of your radiance. If this is inappropriate, then the "was not" will not apply to the Son. So He will be co-essential with the Father.

ANDHOE . The antithesis is untrue, pretending to refute the immateriality of the Son . If the Divine nature, they say, does not admit of division (τομὴν) due to the fact that it is not subject to suffering (for those who suffer by nature belong to be divided), then it should not be said that the Son is from the essence of the Father, so as not a certain suffering and division appeared in simple nature. For if something that has come from something else is different in number in relation to that from which it came, then a certain division and dissection is seen in the Divine nature, if we admit that the Son did not come from without, but actually from it. And if He is from outside, then, therefore, He came and is not co-essential with the Father.

Rebuttal to this . Badly and ignorantly, some apply what is characteristic of bodies to an incorporeal essence. For in relation to bodies it is proper to say that suffering, dissection and division arise [in them], but in relation to incorporeal nature none of these exist. If God is incorporeal, then he gives birth (τίκτει) without dividing, and gives birth (γεννᾷ) without being cut. Because fire also generates light from itself, without experiencing the slightest separation, although it may be mentally imagined that in some way what happened was separated from it. And if anyone subordinates the incorporeal to bodily necessity, then let him blame it on the weakness of his mind, which is incapable of conceiving what is proper to the incorporeal nature. And again: if some are weak [mentally to be able to] conceive the birth of the ever-present Son from the ever-present Father, and therefore subject the incorporeal to bodily orders, then let them, since they do not find [the answer to the question] what the Father is and what He is by nature, His is also denied. But if by faith we perceive what is above us, and

above us is the birth of the Son, *for no one can confess His generation* [124], as the prophet says, then one must accept this by faith and discard the "it was not" brought in from weak human reasoning.

OTHER. About the ever-present. A syllogism associated with a certain aporia and leading to the recognition that it is proper to understand the Son as [existing] from the essence of the Father, and not as having come from outside, and if so, then it is obvious that he is also co-essential with the Father. <75.45> If, according to your assumption, O God-fighters, the Son is one of those who do not exist and did not exist before He was born, then it is obvious that He, like other rational [creatures], by communion with God is called God, Son and Wisdom. For this belongs to rational creatures, in whom the beauty of the Divine is not confirmed by [their] nature, but is delivered by the grace of the Giver, as [for example] when He says: " *Az rekh: you are gods, and all are sons of the Most High* ." [125]. For we, adopted through [our] relationship with God, are deified by Him. So, if, having communed with God by grace, we are called sons of God, then why will we give communion to the Word so that he can become the Son or God? For we [partake] of the Holy Spirit, but to think such a thing about the Word is illiterate. After all, He Himself speaks of the Spirit: " *He will receive of Mine* ." [126]. What then does He partake of? All that remains is to say "Father." And what is the image of the sacrament? For example, how warmth [comes] from fire [observed] in a [heated] body, or from a certain flower - a fragrance, or, better said, how the Spirit comes to our [souls], about which Scripture says that He is " *from the Father." proceed* » [127]. What is it that comes from the Father and arises in the Word? Then, will this received [by the Word] be from the Father's essence, or from somewhere outside? If, therefore, it is from outside, then the Son will not be a partaker of the Father, but by participating in something else he is sanctified, which is even ungodly to imagine. If you agree to consider what He gives to the Word in communion as coming from the essence of the Father, then you have either allowed that a certain dissection, division and suffering can occur in God's nature, or, saying that in God such things happen dispassionately and indivisibly, - in vain you ruin the Son's birth by introducing division and passion into it. If God gives birth indivisibly, and dispassionately gives birth from Himself, then nothing prevents us from confessing what is born of the living Word of the Father. And he who has come from the ever-present Father will in every way be [Himself] ever-present, for, thus, having and preserving the Fatherly nobility in Himself, He will be true, saying, " *He who has seen Me, has seen the Father* ." For the ever-present is not revealed in created things.

ANDHOE . If he who partakes of *the divine Son is a partaker of nature* [128], according to the word of Peter, and if those in which the Word dwells are called temples of God [129], then it is necessary to say that the Son is from the essence of God. And if there is nothing inherent in God (for He is perfect and needs nothing), then the Son did not come, but was co-essential with the Father.

More about the ever-present Son

We call the Father God, and the Son Word and God, not because we think of one as pre-existing and the other as having arisen after Him, according to the order [observed] among people <75.48> - for God is above all time - but in order to worship one as the One who gave birth, which is the peculiarity of the Father, and the other - as the true Son, who received an ineffable birth from the essence of the Father. So, [one is called] "Father" - because He gave birth; and [the other] "Son" - because he was born; and for this alone [serves] the use of words and that which is designated through likening us. So, if, as applied to God, the name "Father" is an indication only of the fact that He gives birth, then nothing forces the timelessly begetting God to pre-exist in relation to His own Generation. And if there was no time between the One who gave birth and the One who was born, then the Son did not come, but was always co-essential with the Father.

OTHER . If God by nature is the Creator (ποιητής), and the ability from non-existence *into being is not inherent to Him* [130] to produce beings, and He creates and accomplishes all things through the Son, then how would it not be wicked to say: "It was when He was not"? After all, this is the same as saying: "there was [a time] when there was no God," if later the Word, the Creator of everything, arose; After all, *without Worthless there would be nothing* [131], according to John. If God and the Father was always the Creator by nature, then, therefore, He through Whom He revealed Himself to be the Creator, that is, His Word, was also with Him. For just as everything inherent in him by nature is inseparable from man, so everything that is in Him and from Him is inseparable from God. And the Word is in the Father and from the Father, so that It is inseparable and co-essential.

OTHER, through reduction to absurdity . If the Son is not co-essential with the Father, but "was when He was not," as you say, then it is necessary to confess at the same time that the Holy Trinity was once imperfect. For before the [appearance of] the Son She was naturally a Unity, and subsequently became a Trinity when what was missing was brought. Since everything that happens can have a reverse course (πᾶν ὅπερ ἂν συμβῇ, καὶ ἀποσυμβῆναι δύναται), I am afraid that something might force us to admit that the Holy Trinity can again return to Unity. If you say or think like this, beyond all wickedness, then the fullness of the Holy Trinity has always been with the Father.

OTHER, similar things . If the Son is not the own generation of the Father's essence, but arose from non-existents, then the Holy Trinity will not be similar to Itself, having a composition (σύστασιν) from non-existents. And, it turns out, the creature is numbered together with the Creator (τῷ Κτίστη συναριθμεῖται), and the creation is glorified together with the Creator (τῷ ποιητῇ συνδοξάζεται). If this is ungodly, because there is one Divinity of the Holy Trinity, one doxology, one and the same

dominion, then it is not fair that She is dissected [by you] into different essences. How would it not be inappropriate, given that the Father is ever-present, to dare to say that the Son who is adjacent to Him and co-reigns did not once exist, but came later and was only introduced to us as God? ? <75.49>

OTHER . is called and is the source of wisdom and life God . For through Jeremiah He says: " *You have forsaken me the fountain of living waters* ." [132]. And again: " *The throne of glory is exalted, the place of our holiness, the hope of Israel, Lord. Let all those who forsake You be ashamed, retreating to the earth. Let them write that they have forsaken the fountain of living waters, the Lord* ." [133]. And through Baruch: " *They left to nature the Fountain of wisdom* " [134]. So, when God appears and is called like this, it follows that the Source of wisdom must coexist with that which [flows] from Him, since there is no source that does not issue anything. Therefore, when they say that "there was, when there was no" the Son, who says [about Himself]: " *I am the life* " [135]and " *Az, wisdom, all the advice* " [136], then we must at the same time clearly confess that the Source was once dry and barren. If this is impious, for the Divine nature is ever fruitful, and there is nothing new in it, then the true Word [emanating] from Him was co-essential with Him, as if pouring out from some source of the Fatherly essence.

OTHER, convincing of the same thing . God promises to make (ποιήσειν) those who work for Him [137], *like a source, it never runs out of water* . So He says through the prophet Isaiah: " *And you will be satisfied as your soul desires, and your bones will become fat, and they will be like a mountain of water, and like a spring, its water will not fail.* " [138]. When God promises to do this to men, how will those who say that this divine and unalloyed source once became dry not be guilty of all wickedness, so that God would seem worse [even] than men? If this is absurd, then there was in the Source the water of life and the wisdom [flowing] from Him, that is, the Son.

AndHOE, through reductio ad absurdum . It is written: " *There is one God the Father, from Whom are all things, and we are with Him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, Who is all things, and we are Him.* " [139]. But if anyone is the one *who everything made* [140]will call one of all, then nothing will prevent him from subjecting the One *from whom everything is* worthless to the same syllogisms. If this is wicked, then the Son will not be one of all, *in whom all things were* . Therefore, He is ever-present. For having completely escaped being His creature and creature, being not among [the number of] all [beings], He will be thought of [as existing] above all and *above all God* [141].

OTHER simple and absolute [truths]. If God and the Father is the light, then His radiance has always been in Him. If the Son is *the mark* (χαρακτὴρ) *of postasis* [142] Whose Father, according to the word of Paul, may those who dare say to refer to Him "was not," when the hypostasis of the Father was without a mark? For simultaneously

with the hypostasis its outline is introduced. If the Son is truth and wisdom, then when was He not in the Father? After all, truth and wisdom are always in the Father.

OTHER . If the Father is contemplated in the Son, and [the Son] is the unchangeable image of the essence of the One who gave birth ς) [143], according to what He said: " *having seen Me and the Father* ," then it is necessary that by nature the same thing as the Father should be inherent in Him. For, in this way, the mark will be accurate. And the Father is ever-present, immortal, King, Creator, Almighty, God, Creator; so is the Son. And how is the ever-present seen in the created, or the perfect in the once non-existent, or the Creator in the creation? For images always have a resemblance (ἐμφέρειαν) to the prototype.

A question from heretics, as if addressed to foolish women . "Did you," they say, "have you had a son before you gave birth to [him]? Just as you did not have it, so did God." What [will we answer] to this? If, for the sake of denying the ever-present Son, they are not ashamed to add to the Divine nature what is characteristic of humanity, then let them ask at least one of the architects whether they can build without material. If those, confessing the truth, answer them negatively, that they cannot, then let them say that God also had a need for matter for the organization of everything, like man, so that He would no longer be thought of as the Creator, who brought existing things from non-existence into existence, but , rather, would be considered a processor (μετασκευαστὴς) or creator from some existing principle and substance, like a person. If they say that this is absurdity, then let them run away from it; or let them name the reason why, with regard to birth, they want God to be no better than man, but with regard to creation they do not attach anything human to Him? And if He is the Creator, as befits God, then He will be the Parent in the same way.

The question of the Arians is filled with absurdity, in addition to which there is an even more absurd counter question, teaching that one should not ask ignorantly . "He who exists," they say, "did God create the existing Son (ἐποίησεν), or the one who does not exist?"

To this refutation, i.e. the answer to the anticipated objection (ἀνθ υπ οφορά). Did the Existing God become the Existent, or was He the Existent before He became? [144] And did He create Himself, or did He exist out of nothing? And despite the fact that nothing existed before (μηδενὸς ὄντος πρότερον), He suddenly appeared Himself? Any answer to these [questions] contains [something] offensive; therefore, it is appropriate for those who ask such questions not to answer the question posed, but it is better to piously tell them that the Father is ever-present. So, since the Father is ever-present, then the Son is also an ever-present Being. For just as light can never be seen without its radiance, so there will be no father if there is no son, thanks to whom he reveals himself to be a father. And God has always been the Father, so, undoubtedly, there has always been the One whose Father He is.

<75.53> *OTHER* . If, as the Arians dare to say, the Father made the Son His instrument, able to be used for the creation of beings, and for this reason brought Him from non-existence into being, then let them tell us, did the Existing One really have need of the non-existent? What then will be greater: one that needs something or one that can fill what is missing? But it is quite obvious that in each the deprivation [of something necessary] is replenished through the other, and each is in itself imperfect. If the ever-present Father, in their opinion, found himself in a state of need for the Son who came a little later, then the created nature of the Son became the fulfillment (πλήρωμα) of the Father's ever-present, and, therefore, the unmixed was mixed. If it is wicked to say and think like this, then the Son did not come to the Father, *by Him He created all things*. [145], and was not, like an instrument, prepared for this, but was co-essential with Him, being His Power and Wisdom.

To those who ask: "Or did you have a son before you gave birth?" and to those who say: "So God did not have a Son until He gave birth."

Those who ask women: "Or did you have a son before you gave birth?", and let those who, in our custom, examine the supremely Divine things, ask in the same way fathers and mothers: "If you give birth to a son, will he be like you in nature? Or will he also partake of the same nature as you? Or will it be alien and alienated?" And having learned the truth, let them think the same way according to God. And let them not grasp at time as useful for their wickedness, but note [that] truth [that follows] from natural sequence (τὸ ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν διαδοχῆς γνήσιον). And again, when they learn from the parents they asked that the children they will produce will be in every way similar to those who gave birth and will not differ from them in any way in terms of essence, let them also be disposed to [think] about God's Word. And henceforth confessing that He was born from the essence of the Father, let them ask about time alone, and let them tell us what prevents God from always being the Father, unless someone says that He is subject to human necessity and the limitations of our nature, which is in the highest degree unholy. So, when concluding about time, let them investigate not about what is characteristic of humans, for these are things very far from the Divine nature. But let them ask the sun, if they want, whether the light it gives birth to has always been with it. Let them learn from fire whether it was always inherent in it to warm. If with these things that [comes] from them shows itself to be concomitant and always coinciding, then how much more [is this true] in relation to the ever-present God? So, if the Son is by nature from the Father, and there is no need for God to give birth in time, then, therefore, the Word that came from Him is co-essential with the Father, through which the transition [from non-existence] to being was accomplished for those who do not exist.

OTHER . Those who want to think correctly should know that God gave birth indivisibly or fluidly (ογέννησε Θεὸς) [146] so that we might think that some kind of change took place in Him (πάθος); after all, cutting and flowing can only be characteristic of corporeal nature, and in relation to the incorporeal and Divine essence, neither change, nor division, nor anything from such [will ever] happen. So the Son will not be, as it were, a certain part (ὥσπερ τι μέρος) of the Father, but from Him and in Him [dwells], certifying through what is called the Son, [His origin] from Him, and through what is called Wisdom and the Word , – [Your abiding] in Him. For no one who is accustomed to philosophize well will say that the Father ever became dumb and unwise [147].

OTHER . If the human mind indivisibly generates from itself the spoken word and no change arises in it from this, but one can see the word in the mind, and the mind in the word, and each of them is depicted by the other, and none of the prudent will say that the mind when -or it can become wordless, for it will no longer be a mind, not having [in itself] words. We mean a word not necessarily spoken publicly by the tongue, but also performed mentally in the mind. Thus, no one can say that in God His own Word is completely absent, having a complete image from the complete Father (ὅλην ἐξ ὅλου τοῦ Πατρὸς ἔχοντα τὴν εἰκόνα) and in the Father is contemplated for no reason distinguishability of essence.

OTHER . If we want to glorify [God] correctly (δοξάζειν ὀρθῶς), then it is necessary to say that [the property of] being a Father did not appear to God as coming, but was always there. For otherwise He would have turned out to be changeable by nature, subsequently becoming what He was not [before], according to the madness of the heretics. For if the fact that He is the Father seems to be something good, and it was not always so, then there was a time when there was no good in God. If this [sounds] offensive, then it means that He was always the Father, and the Son, of course, coexists with Him, for He would not be the Father if there were no Son. If anyone objects, saying: “Consequently, since God is by nature also the Creator, there have always been creatures; for we are forced to say this so that it would not seem that [the property of] being the Creator arose in God later, and someone might think that a change arose in the Divine nature (τροπὴ): after all, we said this in relation to the Son.” Or in another way: “Since it is good to create and create, there have always been creatures, so that it would not seem that there was once no good in God.”

This should be answered in this way: “The Son and the creature are very far removed from communion with each other, and nothing in them is the same: after all, one, having arisen from the essence [of the Father], directly showed the Father who begat [Him] (even if it be [our] word, as about people); and the other is from outside the essence, at the same time, undoubtedly, showing the Creator to work [on it], when it arises. For in Him there was the ability (τέχνη) to create, there was also a necessity for

it to be before those [things] that were [created] through Him, for anyone first becomes a craftsman, and then a creator. So, when there is such a difference between them, and when the Son is simultaneously [and inextricably] thought of with the name of the Father, so that as soon as the Father [is thought of], there is the Son, and as soon as the Son, there is the Father, and the creation and after the existence of the creator can appear (for it is not from the nature <75.57> of the creator, but the invention of art (τέχνης), and art is not nature, but one of the inherent [properties] of nature), then how then do some, in relation to God, propose [consider] as one and the same creation and generation, saying that He can be called Father, even if there is no Son, since He was the Creator before creatures?

This is the same as if someone who masters the craft (τέχνην) of shipbuilding calls a father when he does not have a son, since he is a shipbuilder only by craft and has the ability to create, even if he has not yet built a ship. But such a one, because of [his] craft, will be a shipbuilder even before [building] a ship, but not yet a father, until the one for whom he will be a father appears. And creatures, even without appearing, do not take away the opportunity to be a creator, and a son who has not yet appeared in every way takes away [the property] of being a father. So the creation and the Son will not be equal; and God is the Creator by His nature even before the [appearance of] creatures, but not the Father if there is no Son.

* * *

[86] This. 1:1 .

[87] Hebrews 1:2 .

[88] This. 1:1 .

[89] Rev.1:8 .

[90] Zechariah 2:10 .

[91] Rom. 9:5 .

[92] Romans 1:20 .

[93] 1 Cor. 1:24 .

[94] Psalm 67:29 .

[95] Romans 1:20 .

[96] Matthew 11:27 .

[97] This. 14:8 .

[98] Prem. 13:5 .

[99] This. 14:9 .

[100] Psalm 54:20 .

[101] Isaiah 40:28 .

[102] Hebrews 1:3 .

[103] Psalm 89:17 .

[104] Psalm 35:10 .

[105] Symbol of faith.

[106] Psalm 144:13 .

[107] This. 14:6 .

[108] This. 8:12 .

[109] This. 10:11 .

[110] This. 13:13 .

[111] Proverbs 8:25 .

[112] Psalm 89:2 .

[113] This. 14:6 .

[114] This. 10:7,9 .

[115] Mark 1:11 ; Luke 3:22 .

[116] Psalm 2:7 .

[117] Job. 33:4 .

[118] Gen.2:5 .

[119] Deut. 32:8 .

[120] Proverbs 8:23–25 .

[121] This. 8:58 .

[122] Jer.1:5 .

[123] Dan.13:42 .

[124] Isaiah 53:8 .

[125] Psalm 81:6 .

[126] This. 16:14 .

[127] This. 15:26 .

[128] 2 Pet. 1:4 .

[129] 1 Cor. 3:16-17 .

[130] Prem. 1:14 .

[131] This. 1:3 .

[132] Jer.2:13 .

[133] Jeremiah 14:12–13 .

[134] Baruch. 3:12 .

[135] This. 14:6 .

[136] Proverbs 8:12 .

[137] Ps. 2:11. 99:2 .

[138] Psalm 58:11 .

[139] 1 Cor. 8:6 .

[140] This. 1:3 .

[141] Rom. 9:5 .

[142] Hebrews 1:3 .

[143] Wed. at St. Athanasius of Alexandria : “τὴς δὲ ὑποστάσεως ἐστιν εἰκών ἀπαράλλακτος ὁ Υἱός” - “the hypostases [of the Father] are the unchanging image Son" (Dialogues on the Holy Trinity//PG 28. Col. 1121D).

[144] In PG the sentence ends with a period, but in the context of subsequent question words this appears to us to be a typo.

[145] Contamination of the 2nd article of the Creed and Hebrews 1:2 .

[146] That is, the Born did not separate from the One who gave birth, as happens with people, and no changes occurred in God.

[147] If, then, the Word and Wisdom were separated from Him.

Word 4 Word 6

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 5 Word 7

Word 5. That the Father does not preexist the Son, even if He were unborn [148], but the begotten Son was co-essential with Him

The antithesis seems to be from among the Eunomievs. If the Father always exists without beginning and uncreated, as He does [in fact], and the Son is born, then how will it not be absolutely necessary that what is born (το γεννηθὲν) be limited to the beginning?

Rebuttal to this . Nothing forces what is born [149] was certainly non-existent (ἀνύπαρκτον) before creation (γενήσεως), or it would have been limited to the beginning, even if the one giving birth was uncreated. For we are not talking about any of our kind, - oh, man! - so that what is born appears in time, and - as if coming from non-existence into being - is limited to the beginning, but about the Divine and incomprehensible nature, which makes everything indescribable and divine. So it will surpass our knowledge and image of the Divine birth, and it will not be subject to human laws, but to the extent that the Divine nature is separated from our wretchedness (σμικροπρεπείας), so much that which relates to it surpasses [everything] ours. So, let them stop limiting the beginning and necessity of the Highest necessity and rejecting [for Himself] the beginning in time, but saying to the wise Moses: " *I am He* " [150]. And to what is always existing (for this means " *Sy* "), what beginning can be given in time? However, not everything that seems opposite to the properties of the One who gave birth appears to be inherent in the One who was born. This is God, and what is opposite and antagonistic to Him is not God . But the Son is also God, although the Father is God; in the same way, despite the fact that the King is the Father, the King is also the Son. The same applies to incorruptibility, invisibility, incorporeality and everything like that that is inherent in the Divine nature. So, if the opposite of what is said to be inherent in the Father is inherent in the Son, then the birth of the Son will not cause any harm to the essence of the Son, even if the Father were unborn. One will be co-essential with Him who possesses qualities that are not completely opposite to His natural characteristics.

Further proof that in some way [things] opposite to each other in name often have in

common some of their natural [properties].

It is not necessary that something that, according to the [meaning] of ordinary speech - that is, according to the meaning of a word - is opposite to one another, would also in some way have nothing in common with each other in what is inherent [to each] in essence. And in fact, living is the opposite of non-living, but both living and non-living things are capable of growth, like [for example] a horse and a plant. If these, although they do not have similar species, have a certain commonality in relation to a certain thing, then what reason will cause God and the Father to have nothing in common with the Son and God, due to the fact that one exists unbegotten, and the other - born, and [from this] it seems that Their names are opposite [to each other]? For the fact that the Son exists in this way - even if the Father does not exist - does not negate the truth of His essence (τὸ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ γνήσιον). Birth only signifies the way in which He exists, without in any way harming His ever-present being in the Father.

IN *OE, proving by contradiction that the Son is without beginning in time* . If everything that is born from the mortal and corruptible will be similar to the one who brought [him] into the world - that is, created and corruptible - then with every necessity [it follows from this] the opposite: that which is born from the uncreated and incorruptible , then it is certainly incorruptible and uncreated. Consequently, the Son will have the same nature as He who begat Him. But the Father did not arise; This means that the Son also did not arise, and what will be the beginning of existence for the one who does not arise? Therefore, He was co-essential with the Father.

OTHER, in narrative form . Those who think that God began to give birth from a certain beginning are greatly *dishonoring their souls* [151], without giving Him anything beyond us. For man, since he began to be, of necessity begins to give birth, and [what is born] from him is created; and God, being uncreated, does not give birth in time and has uncreated things that come from Him, but just as He Himself is beginningless and uncreated, so the Word that came from His essence will be beginningless, timeless and uncreated, like the One who begat Him.

The question seems to be on behalf of the followers of Eunomius . “Let them tell us,” they say, “who call the Son co-essential with the Father, has the Father ceased to beget? - Stopped. This means that the Son has the beginning of His existence at the moment when the Father ceased to give birth.”

Rebuttal to this . If the essence of God is above all time, beginning and distance <75.61>, then birth will also be above these, and in any case it will not deprive the Divine nature of the ability to give birth if it does this outside of time. After all, the image of Divine birth is different compared to human birth. For at the same time as being God, the Son is conceived in relation to Him and [the property of] begetting, and the Son was in Him in the image of birth (ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ γεννητῶς), not having a birth

prior to being, but together [with the Father] always existing in the image of birth.

OTHER . Anyone who dares to say that "therefore the Father has ceased to give birth" rightly falls under the inevitable charge of blasphemy. For he introduces three changes into the Divine nature. After all, for the temporary (διαστηματικῇ) [152] birth, with all necessity, it will be necessary to allow three times: one - before birth, another - in which to give birth, the third - after birth. If in these [times] God became the one who began to give birth, who gave birth, and who ceased to give birth, then how did He not change? How will He be the Creator of the ages? Or how right Paul will be when he speaks of Christ, *that by Him all things were* [153], if time interferes with His birth and [thereby] turns out to be above Him, according to the insane wisdom of the Christ-fighters?

OTHER . God, who has a nature higher than time, does not give birth in time; He who surpasses all is not subject to any necessity. And not necessarily having the natural property of giving birth (τὸ τίκτειν πεφυκὸς) comes to this from a state in which it does not give birth, and also not necessarily if it is capable of giving birth (τίκτειν οἶδε), then it ceases. For example, fire gives birth from itself by nature the warmth and glow inherent in it, and did not come to this from a state in which it was not warm, and will not cease to give birth to what is inherent in it by nature, but at the same time as it became fire, it had it and its [derivatives]. So, if in relation to the [entities] created by God such an image of birth is observed, then how would it not be wicked not to allow Him more, although the human mind is not sufficient to comprehend His great nature?

OTHER . The created is far removed from the uncreated, and the created - from it, the given, for they appear to be opposite to one another. So, if everything that is born from the created certainly follows its nature and is created because it has existence from such, then the opposite will necessarily happen, and everything that is born from the uncreated will be uncreated. The Son was born from the uncreated Father: therefore, He Himself is uncreated and co-essential with the One who gave birth, preserving in Himself the dignity of the Father's nature.

Antithesis as if on behalf of heretics . According to this, we ourselves say that the Son is co-essential with the Father - not in the sense that He was always with Him, but that the Father had in Himself the eternal desire of the Son (τὸ θέλειν ἀεὶ τὸν Υἱὸν).

Rebuttal to this . But this is great nonsense and an obvious demonstration of incomparable madness. For who does not understand that there was a desire in God for each of those created? For having willed, the Creator created everything, and what He created was not unwanted. What [then] is the difference between the Son and the creature, between the creature and the generation, if desire in God is present regarding both? Will not one of those who think so wisely be justly accused of trying to honor

those who are so far apart in the logos of nature in equal measure, believing that they lie in the same foreknowledge of God, and not allowing that what happened from Of what essence did the Word possess something greater than the created things?

OTHER . If the Son, who is from Him and co-essential, did not always coexist with the Father, but [once] He happened to be, then it is obvious that He who gave birth to Him also happened [once] to become the Father. And [then] it turns out that some transformation and change took place in Him. For what, in your opinion, He was not before, He became later. The divine nature does not admit of any change or alteration. So it did not happen to God [once] to become the Father, but the Word that came from Him was always co-essential with Him, like heat in fire, coming from it in the manner of birth and always coexisting [with it], and [as coming from] light the glow around external [in relation to objects].

OTHER, as if from the objection of heretics . If the Father, they say, is perfect in His greatness, and nothing lacks His nature for this, then it is unnecessary to introduce the Son as *the fulfillment of divinity* [154] His.

Rebuttal to this. The Father is perfect in His greatness, and none of those who think well will deny this; perfect not only because He is God, but also because He is the Father. If you take away from God the ability to be His Father, you will also take away the fertility of the Divine nature, so that it will no longer have perfection in the absence of the ability to give birth. So, the sign of perfection is fertility, and the seal [155] for the Father, [certifying] that He is perfect is the Son, timelessly issued from Him.

OTHER . If fertility is not inherent in the Father's essence, and He is perfect even without the ability to give birth, then this means that this ability has become something redundant and incidental, or even He lacked it. And how can one who lacks anything be perfect? How is it not inappropriate to introduce anything into the Divine nature, as if it does not possess the perfection [arising] from itself? So it is natural for the Father to be fertile, and therefore He is perfect because He gave birth, not lacking in any of the good things.

<75.65> *OTHER, in an even more narrative form* . If the Father is perfect in His greatness, even though He did not have, in your opinion, any fruit, then the Son, like [all] creations, came from outside and not from His essence, and His coming into the world is equally redundant and not at all necessary. being, as well as [the coming into being] of people, and perhaps of other creatures. For even before we came into being, God was the same as He is now, and after our coming into existence remains identical [with Himself]. For we added nothing to Him, being called from non-being into being; and they would not take anything away from His Divine nature, not at all worthy of being. Therefore, just as we are grateful to the Creator for being created, so should the Son also confess [gratitude]; and He will again be similar to us in this, having arisen

from without, just like us. But this is an abyss of blasphemy! So, it is appropriate to flee from this and preserve for the generation [its] existence and essence of the one who gave birth, for, in this way, it will be the generation. The essence of the Father is uncreated; therefore, that which came from her, that is, the Son, was uncreated.

OTHER, as if from the objection of heretics . It is not necessary, says [the heretic], that God is perfect because he has fertility. But, being God and therefore perfect, He also became the Father.

Rebuttal to this . So, tell us, you who do not refuse to reach such wickedness: if it [once] happened to God to become a Father, then what was He before he became a Father? For beings in general (τὸ ὅλως ὂν) are something in every way. Or you, saying that God was not once the Father, will find yourself at odds with all the Scriptures; or, if you yourself agree that the name Father has always been with God, you will, of necessity, bring in with it what [comes from] it. For He would not be called Father if He did not have a Son.

OTHER . If those who oppose Christ think to give something great to God, not confessing Him as Father from the beginning, but agreeing that He is God, then let them hear that they are very much blaspheming, depriving the Divine nature of the most important thing. For He is God in relation to servants and those who have a created essence, and the Father is in relation to the Son. So, by saying that He was God from the beginning, but not yet the Father, the relation to slaves is applied to God, depriving Him at the same time of more; for it is more to be the Father of Generation, and as much [more] as the Son is distinguished from the creation. For it is said of us: " *We are the people of His pasture, and the sheep of His hand* ." [156], and about the Son: " *Who is in the image of God, cannot be equal to God by admiration* " [157], and again to Him: " *Sit right at My* hand " [158]. What, then, is the difference between the creature and the Son, we will see from here.

<75.68> *OTHER* . Just as [the name] "Father" is understood in relation to the Son, so "God" is understood in relation to slaves and to those who do not have the same nature as He. Consequently, it is necessary to understand the Parent of the Word as both God and Father; or, if He became the Father in time, later begetting the Son, then in time He also became God, when through the Word He brought into being all [creatures], of which He is God. And if it is obvious that everything came into being after the Son (for *He came into being*), for [in Scripture] it is shown that after the Son there is a creature of which He is God, and in relation to which the name of the Godhead is properly understood.

OTHER. Apodictically. On the fact that it is preferable to call God Father than simply God

If the name "Father" in relation to God is in some sense more accurate and important than the name "God" itself, then why, when sending His disciples to baptize, did the Savior not command to baptize the nations in the name of God and the Son and the Holy Spirit, but, denoting the truest dignity of the Divine nature, he says: " *In* [the name of] *the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit* " [159]? And Philip, philosophizing, so to speak, about the Divine nature, said to Him: " *Show us the Father* ." [160]. Do you see how he also does not call Him God, but calls Him Father? And the Savior Himself, moreover, says: " *I have been with you so long, and have you not known Me, Philip? Seeing Me Seeing the Father* » [161]. Again He did not say: " *seeing God* ," but " *the Father* ," giving Him more, not less. For when He is called the Father, it is designated [based on] something greater and more significant, that is, the Son; and when by God, then from the creatures that is the least, and as much [lesser] as there is [the difference] between the slave and the master, the creator and the creature.

OTHER. With obvious proof that first there is the Father, then the Son, although both together

When, having fulfilled [His] dispensation for us, the Savior ascended into heaven after the Cross, He said to His disciples: " *I will ascend to My Father and your Father, and My God and your God* ." [162]. Do you see this as an obvious difference between the names? Do you see that as Father He is thought of in relation to the Son, and as God in relation to slaves and created things? Therefore, if creation is secondary in comparison with the birth of the Son, then He first has the existence of the Father, and after that, at the same time, the existence of God. The power of thought will be more clearly visible from here. After all, giving us, because of his great love for mankind, the dignity inherent in Him by nature, He added: " *and to your Father* ," for through Him we were called into sonship <75.69>, and His Father by nature became our Father by grace. Taking upon Himself ours and, like *a slave who bore the ghost* [163], assimilating to Himself what is characteristic of servants, He says: " *both to My God and to your God* ." So, He calls Him Father to Himself, and God to us. And since, as I said above, we were created through the Son, then first there will be the Father, and then the Son, although together they are united (συνημμένως).

OTHER, as if from the objection of Eunomius . We ourselves, he says, confess that the Son is co-essential with the Father, since He had the potential power to beget Him [164]and before [actually] giving birth.

Rebuttal to this . If it is the potential power of the Father to beget that makes the Son co-existent with Him, and not that [the Son] co-existed with Him in the manner of birth (ὅτι συνῆν αὐτῷ γεννητῶς), then what will prevent us from saying that creatures are also co-existent, since the power to create [them has always] been God? After all, if ability alone produces a real result, then it follows that there were creatures before they

came into existence. For the Creator had the ability to create them. If this is absurd, and God being able to create is not the same thing as creatures being able to come into being, then, therefore, it is not that the Father can give birth that is the existence of the Son, but that He exists by the image of birth, [being] both from Him by nature, and at the same time co-essential: like warmth from fire, or fragrance from a flower.

ANDHOE . Being able to give birth does not mean doing so. For when someone gives birth, then he does [this]. Consequently, it is not the ability of the Father to give birth that is the existence of the Son, but from the fact that God is the Father, the conclusion is also drawn about what [came from] Him, why He is the Father. If [He] is both Father and God, then at the same time there [exists] the Son, accompanying the Father and being coexistent, so that the property of being the Father may be preserved in the One who gave birth.

OTHER, as if from the objection of the followers of Eunomius . If, says [Eunomian], according to you, who claim that you are right, the Son is co-essential with the Father, and, it turns out, never became active (ἐνεργὸς) the Father in relation to the birth of the Son, but is always idle, then how was [the Son] born?

Rebuttal to this . If we were talking about anything created, O Eunomians, then you would rightly present to us God as a worker (ἐργάτην), and not as a parent. Since we do not confess the Son as some kind of product (ἐργασίαν) produced from the Father (for we say that He was born from the essence, and not created from without), then how is it not obvious [that] you fall into blasphemy when you say , as if the Father once became active in relation to the birth of the Son, when even among us birth does not have such a law [in relation to itself]? For we do what is from without, but we give birth to what is from ourselves. Therefore, <75.72> since the Son is not a product, but rather a product of the ever-present Father, He will have the nobility of the Begotten, being ever-present, like Him.

OTHER . So that it does not seem that we are some kind of inveterate debaters, [conditionally] we agree with the Christ-fighters who call the birth of the Son active, since the Father did not give birth through suffering (μὴ ἐκ πάθους). But to the extent that it is active, it is also natural, essential, and inseparable from hypostasis. So, it is necessary, even if the Father actively begot the Son, that the Son be co-essential in every way, since it is said above that the Father has the property of begetting inseparable from His hypostasis. And since His hypostasis exists forever, then everything that came from it must exist, being a fruit of nature. How then will the Son not be coexistent?

OTHER . In the things created by God, we see that those who have the ability to give birth from time to time (for such is the law of bodies), when they reach an obvious measure of age, then they actually have [the ability] to actually give birth, like man,

dumb animals and plants. For these, being immature, cannot give birth, but when they come to perfection [of age], they do this too. What prevented the existing perfect essence of the Father from giving birth to that which [comes] from it, as co-essential with it? After all, no one, I believe, would say that in time the essence of the Father acquired perfection, always remaining the same and not requiring any addition, nor being able to endure any decrease. So, they should have been very surprised if that which was from Him were not co-essential with God, and not, on the contrary, ask: "When was the Son born?" For it is most fitting for an always perfect Father to beget timelessly.

OTHER . Those curiously asking when exactly the Father gave birth to the Son should, in turn, say: "And when did the fire begin to burn?" But they will not be able to show the beginning of it; after all, as soon as the fire arose, there was a burning sensation. So, if for the [entities] created by God there simultaneously exists both being [in general] and being in a certain way (καὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ τοιῶσδε εἶναι), then what will prevent one from confessing the Father as greater than His own works, having at the same time both being and the Son, [existing] according to the image of birth from Him?

* * *

[148] Here in the original there is "ἀγένητος" - "uncreated", but this must be a typo, because above, in the table of contents, we read "ἀγέννητος", which corresponds much better to the meaning.

[149] And here, too, we read "γεννηθέν", as in the paragraph above, instead of "γενηθέν" in the original.

[150] Exodus 3:14 .

[151] Proverbs 8:35 .

[152] That is, characterized by a certain time interval (διάστημα).

[153] Rom.11:36 ; Wed: John 1:3 .

[154] Col. 2:9 .

[155] The original says "σφαγὶς" – "sacrificial knife", but we consider this a typo and read: "σφραγίς".

[156] Psalm 94:7 .

[157] Phil.2:6 .

[158] Psalm 109:1 ; Hebrews 1:13 .

[159] Matthew 28:19 .

[160] This. 14:8 .

[161] This. 14:8 .

[162] This. 20:17 .

[163] Phil.2:7 .

[164] Literally: "власть мочь родить Его" - "of the power to give birth to him".

Word 5 Word 7

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 6 Word 8

Word 6. That the Father indivisibly and imperviously begat the Son from Himself

The antithesis is, as it were, from among the Eunomievs . And how, says [the Eunomian], is it not necessary to confess that the essence of the Father has diminished, if, in fact, the Son came from it, as if being some part of it? If you want the Father to remain immutable and to be above diminution, then you will not refuse to philosophize that the Son cannot be a part of His essence, nor <75.73> from Him [cannot come], but [only] from without, and that He is potentially , in will alone (κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἐν βουλήσει μόνῃ) has coexistence [with the Father].

Rebuttal to this . Rise a little, my dear, above bodies and what it is natural for bodies to endure (τῶν περὶ τὰ σώματα παθῶν); It's about God after all. For if you think that God, like people, when giving birth, is in some way diminished by the outflows and cannot do this without some harm [to Himself], being divided, as it were, into [Himself and] the Word that came from Him, then what will prevent the same blasphemy and everything else that is inherent in Him? After all, if He, like a man, gives birth fluidly, then He will create, like a man, with difficulty. If this is absurd (for God does not create like a man), then it means that He does not give birth like a man, but in this, again, He surpasses human nature, giving birth indivisibly.

OTHER . If God gives birth like a man, then He works like a man. And since we, from any existing matter, with the movement of our hands, make something of what we want to create, then so does God . If He, without hands and matter, brings everything from non-existence into being through the Word, being above human nature, then He will be above it in every way in terms of the method of birth.

OTHER . The one who contains something must, as if in a circle, encircle what it contains. But stretching into a circle is a property of bodies. How, then, does everything contain God, Who is incorporeal and Who therefore cannot even be thought of in space? However, it contains, surpassing, like God, the order [observed] in these [things] (τὴν ἐν τούτοις ἀκολουθίαν). So He is not subject to bodily laws; therefore, not as a body [i.e. that is, not as a bodily nature] He will give birth.

OTHER . Being in everything and penetrating through everything is necessarily mixed with everything. This would be the case with everything. But we confess that the essence of God is not mixed with all the diversity of bodies [found] in the world; after all, it remains on its own, pure and from communication with [anything] else, not naturally mixed; [God] penetrates through everything wonderfully and ineffably. So He is not subject to the orders of bodies. And therefore it does not give birth in accordance with the nature of bodies.

OTHER . If God appears and is thought to be simple and uncomplicated, then how does He have various and varied actions, producing many types of creatures at different times? If, however, it does not in the least harm His being simple, that He acts differently in each of the existing ones, since He does not exist through the body, then He will be higher than bodies in the matter of generation.

The antithesis is, as it were, from among the Eunomievs . If you wish, he says, to call the Son proceeding from the essence of the Father, then you must first admit <75.76> that He was previously placed in Him. For in this way He would appear to those who came from Him. And if the Father begat the Son, and will not beget any other after Him (for He is the Only Begotten), then we will have to say that He also lost his parental power, and that He partially diminished, having once begotten the Son and no longer being the same as before .

Rebuttal to this . Again, without blushing, do you apply the distinctive properties of bodies to the nature of God? After all, it is not fair to understand the Son as placed in the Father, like a body within a body. And it is also not decent to believe that just as those born from us are embraced by the thighs of those giving birth, so one should think about the Divine birth. For if someone reaches such a degree of insolence as to reduce the ineffable nature of God to bodily suffering, then what will prevent him from saying that the Father did not give birth at all, because it is more appropriate for a mother than a man to give birth? But since God is not a body, he does not have [observable] differences in bodies (after all, the male and female sexes are revealed only in the form of bodies), but is simple and incorporeal, and in general [is] a spirit, the purest of all. For this reason, I think, those who want to experience His birth should think about the fruitfulness [arising] from the mind, and they should strive to liken the birth of the Word, and not say that God is more barren than bodies, since He does not give birth like a body. After all, we could agree that the human mind also gives birth to good thoughts. For *from the heart of a good man* , as the Savior says, *he wears out good* [165]. So, if it is impious to say that the human mind has no fruit, when the Lord speaks [thus] and the deed itself cries out, then how absurd would it be to call the One who is above all understanding unfruitful and deprive Him of the fruitfulness due to Him, or - if it is said , that He gives birth - to believe that He is subject to the laws of bodies and, thus, how does the body give birth, when even the indwelling mind in us

does not give birth according to the law of bodies? And above all, God, exalted and surpassing everything, how will he not give birth above the mind, not enduring the eruption or outflow of something previously placed, but having indivisibly shone forth from Himself as the Son, according to the ineffable and ineffable image of the Divine birth?

OTHER . Everything that is created in the likeness of something will not have equality with the prototype, and will be secondary in comparison with its glory. So that by the power of God the created nature is directed towards fertility, being formed by grace in accordance with that truly and truly fertile divine nature]. Consequently, it will in every way be deprived of the truth inherent in it [the Divine nature] in relation to the image of birth, and will give birth differently from that on the model of which it is formed. If this is true, then God will give birth <75.77> not as a creature who has received by grace and in this likeness to him, but above all created things.

INOE. The question seems to be from [the person] Eunomius . The Father begot the Son from Himself, as you say, exalting yourself with the very great correctness of dogmas; but pay attention to this too. The Father was perfect before the birth of the Son, but if, having given birth, He was divided into Duality, then how else will He possess perfection, unless plurality arose in His essence, as if making up for the deprivation? After all, what is divided from one into two will necessarily seem smaller than itself, unless some imperceptibly invading increment (αὔξη παρεισδραμοῦσα) does not add what is lost. If nothing of the kind can happen to the Divine essence, then, therefore, the Father did not beget the Son from Himself, so that He would not be divided into parts, but existed (ὑπέστησε) Him similar to Himself in everything.

Rebuttal to this . You can see in other examples that those who oppose Christ suffer from a complete lack of intelligence, and no less so here. For they are truly in error, *not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God* [166]. For how will it be in everything like the uncreated and ever-present God and Father, brought to [separate] existence (εἰς ὑπόστασιν) from those that do not exist? For if it was realized at all (ὑπέστη), then it is obvious that it once did not exist. How are they not ashamed when they introduce divisions and cuts in relation to the Divine birth and subject the ineffable essence to the laws of created nature? After all, God, of course, will not be equal to His own creatures in anything, and will not give birth in the same way as they do, but just as He surpasses them in everything, so He will surpass them in this too. And if God and the Father is above every created being, then He will also be above it in the way of giving birth, doing this in an ineffable and divine way.

OTHER . To endure division and diminution, increase and multiplication, as well as flows during childbirth is a characteristic feature of bodies and, in general, of that which belongs to the created essence. So, if God gives birth in the same way as bodies, and if the same law is in force over Him as is [observed] in created [bodies], then He

will create in the same way as bodies, i.e. that is, using tools and hands. If, while the corporeal and created nature can create [only] one way and no other, God makes everything through the Word, and beings are composed according to His will, then isn't it ridiculous [to believe] that in more important and most important, God will not be above the passions, and will not jump beyond (ἐξάλλεσθαι) what usually [has] to happen to bodies in the process of birth, but, as if by necessity, remain in relation to birth in the same position as bodies ? Therefore, just as He does not create like a man, He also gives birth, not subject to the customs of bodies.

<75.80> *OTHER, in narrative form* . The Father radiated (ἐξέλαμψεν) from Himself the Son indivisibly and unextended, just as the sun [radiates] the radiance sent from it. But the latter is not independent (οὐκ ἰδιοσύστατον), nor is it perfect in essence in itself, for it has [its] existence in the sun; The Divine generation, having from [this] example only the fact that It came from the Father indivisibly and unextended, has Its own existence, not separated from the Father, but in the Father and with the Father, conceived and existing. And to say that at His birth there was a dissection and separation is a sign of immeasurable madness. For since the Divinity is not contained in [any] place, then what is from Him is not in such a place. And what does not exist in [any] place, or even cannot exist [in it], how will division [into parts] be allowed? For where will what is cut off go, or from what to what? After all, this is characteristic of bodies, but completely alien to incorporeal nature. For the [Divine] nature is higher than passion, division and dissection, and will not allow into itself what is characteristic of bodies. But just as it creates paradoxically, not according to the law of the custom that prevails in us, so what [comes] from it will be born in a strange way, and not in our own way.

Examples showing in part how the Son came indivisibly from the Father

The spoken word that we use is born in the mind and from the mind, and seems different from the one rotating in the heart, since it becomes emitted from the mouth, as if from the depths to the light. But it also abides in him and is like him in everything. For in the word itself (λόγῳ) one can see the thought (λογισμόν) hiding in the heart, and, in turn, in the mind - the word [still] silent. So the Son of God, who came indivisibly from the Father, is the image and likeness of His individual personality (ἰδιότητος), being the hypostatic and living Word from the living Father.

OTHER . Thus, the Father indivisibly begat from Himself the Son, by whom a sage would give birth to a wise thought: the art of mechanics, for example, or geometry, or something else from such. For such things seem to be in some way the fruit of wisdom and are of the same nature; but the art she invented is not separate from wisdom, but exists from it and in it, visually depicting the wisdom that gave birth [to him], and

indivisibly appearing as something different in comparison with it. Likewise, the birth of the Son, indivisibly existing from the Father, is preserved in its own hypostasis, surpassing the power of the [given] example.

OTHER . Those who seek precision in Divine dogmas do not pay too much attention to human logic [of cause and effect] (ταῖς ἀνθρωπίναις ἀκολουθίαις). Because the Father begat the Son, they do not say <75.81> that He diminished, as if divided into two (after all, such is the speech of the Christ-fighters), nor do they think of any outflow in relation to His essence. For this is logical to think in relation to us, but in relation to God it is very wicked. So, it is appropriate to flee from absurdity in such [questions] and think that this is how the Son was born from the Father, as wisdom from the mind, which seems to have somehow become outside the mind that gave birth [to it] in its manifestation, and again remains in it, having arisen without separation (οὐ μεμερισμένως) and also without causing any outflow in the mind that gave birth to it, and visually representing it all in itself, and being, in turn, contemplated in it.

OTHER . Such will be the giving [beginning] of God (τὸ γεννητικὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ), which can also be imagined as creative (τὸ δημιουργικόν). For just as, while creating many and varied things, He is not divided in essence into each of the emerging [creations], but, even acting diversely in each, He creates everything with a single and ineffable power, so He gives birth without dividing, as they say. And again: just as the Holy Spirit does not undergo division in essence, sending various modes of action in gifts (τρόπους) and giving to those worthy according to the measure of each [of them], but remains one and the same, acting diversely and dispassionately in all, so it is about the giving birth of the essence of God, none of those who think well will say that it was damaged or experienced some kind of separation or outflow, emitting from itself the one and only Son.

OTHER. The antithesis is, as it were, from among the Eunomievs . If the Father, he says [i.e. e. Eunomian], begot the Son from Himself and is different from Him, being in any hypostasis and thought of as the Father of the Son, then all [the properties] of the Father are divided, and do not remain in Him alone, but turn out to be transferred to the Son. Therefore, either the Father no longer possesses perfect glory, since it is also divided with the Son, or, if it has [His] perfect glory, he deprives [it] of the Son, as if immediately returning what was given back to Himself; and the Deity, which was formerly in one, possessing perfect glory, now, having become in two, has no perfection. With difficulty, [the Divinity] collects this [perfection] from itself, when the Father in some way lends to the Son His own [glory], and again takes back from Him the debt [previously] given to Him.

Rebuttal to this . Again they are not ashamed, giving to incorporeal nature the distinctive properties of bodies, divisions into parts and cuttings, distances and separations, ignorantly introducing in relation to the Divine essence; not understanding

that they greatly dishonor the essence of the Father, saying that it is divided into parts in a bodily image, [and thereby] claiming that He has changed or transformed, and from [a state of] perfection has come to imperfection. For those who consider the Son to have completely departed from the Father's essence, [understanding this emergence] <75.84> spatially and in the sense of division (διαστατῶς τε καὶ κεχωρισμένως), and therefore say that everything pertaining to Him is divided, and that He came into His half glory, since the rest was transferred to the Son, they do not understand what nonsense they are falling into. After all, since, as they say, the Father, who formerly existed in one and had creative power in Himself, put the Son in front and through Him creates everything, then [it turns out that] He sent power outside of His essence so that it could create, and what he was not before, he later became, and now [as if] empty of creative power. But to think or speak like this is immeasurable impiety. After all " *The Father still works, and I work* » [167], says Christ. So just as the creative [beginning] of the Father is not divided into parts, and He is not now imperfect in His essence, so His glory is perfect, despite the fact that the Son, in turn, has the perfection of glory. For, being in everything like the One who gave birth, He possesses perfect glory because He was born from the Father possessing perfect glory.

* * *

[165] Luke 6:45 .

[166] Matthew 22:29 .

[167] This. 5:17 .

Word 6 Word 8

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 7 Word 9

Word 7. To those who propose [question]: "Did the Father beget the Son involuntarily or by will?"

The question seems to be on behalf of heretics

So, did the Father involuntarily (ἀβουλήτως), and at random (ἀσκέπτως) beget, that is, create, the Son, or according to His will? If, therefore, He involuntarily gave birth to Him, then He suffered something of what [happens] against the will (παρὰ γνώμην); and if by will (κατὰ βούλησιν), then it is necessary that the thought of them preexist in relation to the emerging [creations of the Lord], [and] this means that the Father was before the Son, and the birth was mediated by the will of Him.

The answer to this

Where did you, oh heretics, learn to say that the Son was born "willingly or involuntarily," and in general, to ask those you meet such questions, from what Scripture? Which of the saints said that He came from the Father either by will or involuntarily? Who exactly are these words from? For we learned from divine Scripture that He was and is God's Word. And what is involuntary or not - we only heard from you. The Father reveals the Son from heaven and says: " *This is My beloved Son* ." [168]; and through David he says: " *My heart will vomit out the good word.* " [169]; and the wisest John says: " *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was to God, and God was the Word* ." [170]. The psalmist, as if [addressing] the Father, again says: " *With You is the fountain of life; in Your light we will see light* ." [171]. Paul calls [the Son] *with radiance* [172] and *the image of the invisible God* [173]. And not one of them is found saying that the Son was born "involuntarily" or "by will." But, having said " *be* " and " *is* ," they do not give any beginning in time to the Creator of times. Where do you <75.85> say such [things]? *Speaking from your heart* , as the prophet says, *and not from the mouth of the Lord* [174].

OTHER . If you say that the Son was begotten by will, and insist that the will for Him pre-exists in relation to His birth, then why does Scripture not say the same about Him as it does about other creatures? For as for those things created by God, the will (θέλησις) precedes them, as in [the words]: " *Let us make man* ." [175] and " *do whatever*

you please " [176]. And as for God the Word, the will (θέλησις), that is, the will (βούλησις), is nowhere shown to be prior, but we only hear that He " *be* " and " *is* ." And, so to speak, his natural place is the Father. So, if in relation to all creatures the Scripture says that the will precedes them, but in relation to the Son we do not find anything like that in him, then, therefore, He is not one of all, and was not created by will, like all [beings]. , [but], came from the Father and from the essence of the One who gave birth, existing pre-eternally.

OTHER . Paul says nowhere about our Savior Christ that He is *God's wisdom and God's power* [177]. So, if the Word that exists from Him and in Him is the Wisdom and Power of the Father, then It is That in Which [the Father] wills, and through which He does everything. How, then, was He created by will, in whom the will of the Father abides? For we will have to invent for ourselves another wisdom, in which, having willed, [the Father] created the Son, as you say; otherwise, if the two are not the other, but He alone is the Wisdom of the Father, He, therefore, is also the will. After all, all things in wisdom [are] willed by God. And [therefore] your word is absurd, and your conclusion is unfounded.

OTHER, about the same thing. God's will is not seen to be fulfilled in the created ones (οὐσιωμένη φαίνεται), but there is something different in relation to what is created through it. Therefore we say that the heavens were created by the will of [God], and not that they themselves are the will. So, if God willed in wisdom, and since He, as you say, wanted to beget the Son, and the Son is the Wisdom of the Father, then it is necessary that the Father should have another wisdom, in which He willed to beget the Son. If it is ungodly to say so (since God has one Son, and not two, [and this] is God's Word, which is the Wisdom of the Father), then He is the One through whom the will is accomplished (γίνεται) for all [beings].

OTHER . Everything that is created in time is preceded by something being willed about them. So, if, in your opinion, the Son was created by will, then He [i.e. e. Father] has a preliminary will regarding Him, as well as about creatures. And at one time [it happened that He, that is, the Son] was not. And John lies, saying about Him: " *In the beginning was the Word* " [178]. For if He [once] was not, then how can the words of the evangelist, who attributed " *be* " to Him, be true? But not you, but him <75.88>, I believe, must be believed. Be means, according to his words, the Son, and [the words] "was not" in relation to Him are empty and false.

OTHER . If the created things are preceded by the will of the time in which the thought of them arose, even if we consider it something small and insignificant, then how will the Son be the Creator of times if the will precedes His birth? But He is the Creator of times. *Be* means [the essence of truth], and nothing exists before His birth.

OTHER . If the Son is the Wisdom of the Father, as He actually is, then what time

was there when there was no wisdom in Him? If [the Son] is ever present in the Father (for the Father is ever wise), then how will anything precede the ever existing? How will the will enter between [the Father and the Son], introducing the once non-existent Son, co-essential with the Father as His Wisdom?

OTHER . If the will precedes the Son, and it is necessary that the thought of Him arise in time, even if it is small and very brief, then how will [the Son] be the Creator of all [times]? Or how should we believe the Scripture, which says that *all that was* [179] When does the time appear before Him in which the will for Him was accomplished, whereas [from Scripture it follows that] there were no times before Him?

OTHER, as if from the objection of heretics . If, says [the heretic], the Son of God was not created by will, then, therefore, out of necessity and without wanting [it], the Father had a Son. And who is this greater than Him and who assigned this necessity to Him? For what happens without intention (παρὰ γνώμην) happens out of necessity.

Rebuttal to this . We should answer the question of the anti-Christ fighters, and through those [arguments] that they ignorantly offer us, we should object to them, bringing an equal counterargument. Tell us: is God good and generous, merciful and holy by will, or apart from will? If from will - and will in every way precedes what it is about - then there was a time when God was not like that, even [only] thinking about it. If He is involuntarily good and merciful apart from [His] intention, then this will be out of necessity. And who is it who assigned this necessity to Him, in your opinion? So, your question turns out to be full of stupidity and does not carry any positive meaning.

OTHER, in narrative form . In relation to what is by nature, will does not precede, but is directed only towards what is outside the essence of the will. For example, does someone plant a vineyard or build a ship, having previously deigned about them; and a child is born from a person by nature without any previous will. <75.89> If someone suddenly says about one of the people that he, without his will, had a son, then let him not immediately rush to [the conclusion that this happened] out of necessity, - after all, [the one who gave birth] was not from someone had a need - but it is better to let him see that what is by nature is not preceded by will. For they give birth voluntarily, without any prior consent. So, voluntarily and involuntarily (θελητώς καὶ ἀβουλήτως) the Word also dwells in the Father, just as in a person the child [born] from him.

OTHER . If by nature God and the Father is good, it is not by will, lest there be a time when He was not such, in which [the time] there was will. He does not beget the Son by will, but by nature. For this is more fitting for Him.

OTHER . The Christ-fighters should be asked: does the Father of the Word Himself exist by will, or apart from his own will? If from will - and will must necessarily precede existence - then I am silent about the offensiveness [for God of such an

assumption]; if, apart from will, then it means that He is of necessity that by which He exists. And who assigned this necessity to Him? If the Father exists neither from will nor apart from will, then the same must be artlessly adhered to in relation to the Son. For it is not in accordance with [the nature of the human mind] to investigate such things rashly. Rather, it is appropriate, when hearing about God, to know that *is He* [180] having accepted a certain beginning of being, but Himself becoming the beginning of being for others.

OTHER, in narrative form . It is very inappropriate and dangerous to say in relation to the Son: "So was He born by will, after all, or apart from will?" For He who abides by God is not by [any external] will, nor does the Word come from His essence by will, but by nature. Because that's exactly how it will be [181] His image and mark are not false.

OTHER . If will and thought (σκέψις) precede the existence of the Son, and the Son is the Wisdom and Word of the Father, then how do you think God willed, being dumb and unwise? After all, the Son did not yet exist when the thought of Him was made. How absurd would it be to introduce the Father, who decides about Himself (βουλευόμενον) whether He should generally have Wisdom and the Word or not? Therefore, it is necessary to reject the ignorant questions of Christ-fighters and not try too hard to object to them.

OTHER, in narrative form . It has already been shown in many words that creation was preceded by will. From one thing everything is known. Regarding the creation of man, " *let us make man* " [182], [as] and " *let there be firmament* " [183], and « *to be* » so-so and so-so [184] [in relation to other things], <75.92> could be an indication of God's advice regarding each of the creatures, although the matter seems to follow immediately [after the word]. So, if the will precedes creation, and everything came into being through the Son, then outside of everything is He, *in Whom all things were* [185]. And if He is different from those [of those that exist] to whom purpose precedes, then [the Son] will not be created by purpose, as they are. For He is the living Will (βουλὴ) of the Father, in Which He creates all things (ἐργάζεται). The Psalmist also calls Him the Will of the Father, saying: " *Thou hast instructed me in Thy will* ." [186].

OTHER . If the Will and Desire (βουλὴ καί θέλημα) of the Father is the Son, as in reality it is, then how will desire (θέλησις) precede His existence? For He will [then] be the one who created Himself. And having not yet arisen, He, according to the Christ-fighters, turns out to be willing for Himself. If it is absurd to say so, then it means that He was not brought into being by will, like all creations, but as the Will of the Father was in Him, being a genuine property (αὐτὸ τὸ ἴδιον) of the essence of the One who gave birth.

OTHER . Christ says somewhere: " *I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me* ." [187],

pointing only to the Father, as if to some place containing Himself, and also [to Himself], as if the Father were only in Him. So, if His will in the Father is something different in relation to the Son, then how will he who affirms this speak the truth? For before the existence of the Son, according to the madness of those who oppose Christ, the will of the Father is found, according to which [the Son] was created, as they say. If [Christ] speaks the truth when he says that He is in the Father, and also that the Father is in Him alone, then where will the will be, when there is no place in the middle? If so, then He was not created by will, but He Himself is the Father's Will.

OTHER . If both the creations were preceded by will and the existence of Christ, then why are those who have the same beginning of becoming and those created by the same will so different in nature from each other that One is Lord and God, and the others are slaves and creatures? But it is obvious that the Son, united by nature with the Divinity of the Father, is called and is the Lord, and the creation is a slave, because it is outside the essence of the Creator and outside the natural connection with the Father. So it is necessary that what has such a difference in relation to each other should not have the same beginning. But some, like creatures, arose from will. And the Son, as Himself being the Will, was always in the Father.

OTHER, in narrative form . It was necessary for the Christ-fighters, who dared to ask whether the Father begot the Son by will, to say this: in reason (φρονήσει) [188] Did the Father beget the Son? After all, will and reason seem to be one and the same. Since everything that anyone wills, he <75.93> understands [189] [do]; and also vice versa - what he intends, he wills. After all, we find the Savior binding them in relation to Himself [together] as equivalent and saying: " *My advice* [190] *and affirmation, My mind, My fortress* " [191]. For just as *affirmation* and *strength* are one and the same, so are *advice* and *reason* . So if they believe that the Father begot unreasonably, then let them ask whether He begot the Son in reason. If they tremble even to hear this, then how would it not be wicked to ask and say in relation to the Son: "He was born by will, or not?" – causing such a great insult to the Word?

OTHER . Blessed Paul, showing the immutable likeness that the Son has in relation to His Father, writes about Him: " *Who is the radiance of His glory and the image of His hypostasis* ." [192]. So, if the Son is the image and mark of the One who gave birth, and He was born, in your opinion, with a will that preceded Him, then it is absolutely necessary that the Father should be the same as His image and radiance, so that He also had a will that preceded Him. If this is wicked (for the Father's essence and hypostasis do not exist by will), then it is absolutely necessary to philosophize about the Son and say that He is not of will.

OTHER, as if from the objection of heretics . And how, says [the heretic], it will not be necessary to agree that the Son is unwanted by the Father, that is, involuntary, if He did not arise from will and desire?

Rebuttal to this . May the Savior, who speaks of Himself: " *The Father loves the Son* ," put to shame the insolent tongue of the Christ-fighters. [193]. After all, as has already been said, by goodness and mercy He [i.e. e. The Father] possesses, but not from will, and yet these [qualities] exist [in Him] not involuntarily. So He begot the Son, although He did not by will, but He did not have Him involuntarily. For [the Father] desires the Son and loves him, as it is written. And just as the Father is the desirer of His own hypostasis, not being what He is by anyone's will, so the Son, who came from the essence of the Father, is not unwanted by Him, although the will is by no means prior to birth.

OTHER . If the Son is the radiance and image of the Father, but was produced by desire, in your opinion, then there was a time when He was not, during which [the time] the desire for Him was brought into action by the Father. Consequently, there was once [a time] when God was without radiance and without image. And if the distinctive property (τὸ ἴδιον) of the essence of the Father is the Son, and He once, in your opinion, did not exist, then this is the same as saying that the essence of the Father was not once fertile, but as if from <75.96> some change came to this by giving birth to the Son. If this is wicked to think and say, then let not some ask about the Son: "Will it be or not?" For just as the Father is good by nature, so is he who begets by nature.

OTHER, in narrative form . If every will that arises in someone does not arise without a word (for will is a word that invisibly turns to the heart), and the Son is the Word of the Father, then He, of course, is His will. Then, how is will formed within will? Or is the Word in the Word? So, the Son is everything to the Father—Will, Word, and Wisdom—and there is nothing in the Father before Him.

OTHER, similar . Man by nature has the ability to become the father of children, and not just as he [becomes] good or evil by choice, so also [is] a father. But this is by nature, otherwise it is by will. And we have power over one, and nature has the other as an immutable law. So, just as we do not have by will to be fathers [of children born] of us, but by nature, so God the Father is not Father by will, but by nature. And just as those who are born of us are in every way similar to us in essence, so the Son, who was not united to the Father from outside, but truly came from His essence, is in everything similar to the One who gave birth. And just as He is not the Father by will, so the Son does not exist by will, but being by nature the radiance and image of Him who begat Him.

OTHER. The objection seems to be from [the person] Eunomius . One should ask, he says, those who believe that they are rightly philosophizing, whether the Father begot the Son by will, or involuntarily? For if the Son was in the essence of the Father, being different in relation to him, then [the Father] did not give birth by will (προαιρέσει). For there was a need to give birth to what was in nature. If [the Son] was not in the

Father, and was born when the Father willed, then it is necessary that His will preexist. Therefore, He was not co-essential with the Father.

Rebuttal to this . Those who rush uncontrollably towards any kind of blasphemy deserve, first of all, surprise, as well as reproach for their great ignorance. For they are not ashamed to subordinate God Himself to necessity, and, as if we were talking about bodies, to say that something is contained in the essence of the Father, or that the Son is in the Father, like a vessel within a vessel. We, those who try to philosophize rightly and fairly, say that the essence of God is above all necessity; and also - that the Son abides in the Father, not as a body encompassed by [another] body, but as inseparable from His essence and originating from it according to the law of [Divine] nature. If they think to offer something wise, saying: "Was He created by will or <75.97> involuntarily?" - then let them hear from us: "Does fire give birth to warmth [derived] from it by will, or involuntarily?" But they will have nothing to say to this. For what comes from nature admits neither volition nor involuntariness. And in relation to the external and that over which we have power, volition and involuntariness have power. So just as we do something by will, but we give birth from ourselves, and there is no place for volition or involuntary here at all, so God creates external things by will, and He begot the Son from Himself timelessly, without there being any place here. volition or involuntary, although He is not weak-willed (ἀθέλητος). For " *The Father loves the Son* " [194], as written.

OTHER. As if from an objection [on behalf of] Eunomius . If, he says, the Father did not beget the Son by will, but has Him by nature, then, of course, not having knowledge of Him Himself, he also has Him by nature. Therefore, He learned that He would also have a Son, and that He would do everything with Him; and [thus] the knowledge of the Son came to the Father, which His own nature had taught. If this is absurd, then by will, knowing that [the Son] would be, [the Father] brought Him into being (προέβαλεν αὐτὸν), and [thus] will in every way precedes birth.

Rebuttal to this. As if we confessed that the Father first learned what the Son would be, and then begot Him in this way, this man, skilled in such [questions], constructs a [logical] position, not knowing that since there is no gap in the middle dividing the existence of the Father and the birth of the Son, there is no room for foreknowledge of Him. After all, if He first willed and learned beforehand, and all this happened in time, then the Son is below time. If He is the creator of times, then why does [this man] chatter in vain about the Divine nature, introducing [the opinion] that it learns from [created] nature, as he says, [things] to come, and without learning anything else [distinctive] to man in comparison with God who is above all? So, when the birth of the Son lies above centuries and times, it would indeed be irreverent and ignorant to say that the Father previously willed something about Him or learned something. For the Father is perfect in knowing everything, and before the Son there is no place at all

for the will of Him.

OTHER . If the Father recognized Himself as the ever-existing Father, then He in every way has the knowledge of the Son in Himself. For in that He knows what He Himself is, He also bears the knowledge of Sonship: for He is Father and is called in relation to the Son. And also vice versa: the Son knows the Father [195], knowing what Himself is. For from Sonship is implied Fatherhood; and vice versa: from Fatherhood - Sonship. Indeed, [if] God was always the Father; [then] there was also a Son. It is offensive [towards God] to say that the Father does not know the Son from Himself, but learned from nature, whereas it is obvious that Each of Them, from what He Himself is, has knowledge of the Other. However, the nature of God would not be [something] different in comparison with Himself, because He is simple and uncomplicated.

<75.100> *OTHER . As if from an objection [on behalf of] Eunomius.* So, by will, he says, that is, by judgment (κρίσει), did the Father beget the Son, or by nature? If only by nature, and not also by will or judgment, then [the Son] will be born reluctantly and recklessly (ἀκρίτως). If both (τὸ συναμφότερον), then you make God complex by attributing to Him both nature and judgment. For how can the one put together of these [two] be simple?

Rebuttal to this . The birth of the Son is beyond judgment and will. For to will and to judge are all related to time, and the Son is the Creator of times. How will creation be before the Creator? And if you think that God becomes complex due to the fact that he has nature and judgment, that is, will, then pay attention to this: [the property of] giving birth to the Father naturally (φυσικῶς), he also has [also] [property] to create (τὸ κτίζειν) through the Son creatively (δημιουργικῶς), and, despite this, is not complex, for such [properties] are the fruit of one nature. The same applies to goodness, incorruptibility and invisibility, and everything that is inherent in the Divine nature.

OTHER. As if from an objection [on behalf of] Eunomius . Tell us, he says, what do you mean by calling the Son the radiance of the Father? The nature of the question is this: light, that is, fire - say, abiding in a lamp - illuminates the external, but does not fill everything with itself, but resides in a [certain] place, and in the external, as we said, illumination arises from it (φωτισμὸς). So, if you call the Father the light, and the Son the radiance from the light, then it is necessary to say that the essence of the Father cannot fill everything, so that the radiance He emits from Himself has a place and can be directed somewhere. And if the Father fills everything, then where will the essence of Generation go?

Rebuttal to this . If he places the Father in [a certain] place and wants Him, like some body, to be contained by [it], then the Generation will also need a place. If the essence

of the Father is not in [any] place - for the Divine is not contained in [any] place - then he examines in vain what does not contain any problem, and dares to say: “Where will the essence of Generation go if does the Father fill everything [with Himself]?” The Father shows Himself and abides in the Son, and the Son in the Father, not as being one and the same, and not as one in number. For the Father exists in His individual particularity, and the Son exists in His own individual particularity (ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ἰδιότητι), having it as its only difference in relation to the One who gave birth; after all, the Father exists in Himself, and is not the Son; and the Son exists by Himself, and is not the Father. But, only in this, having a difference in relation to the Father, He bears [in Himself] the same property (ἰδίωμα) of the Fatherly nature and, again, abides in the Father, just as the radiance emitted from the sun comes out of it and is what - different in comparison with him, being one by nature. For this is the sun, and this is the radiance. So, being the Father, He emitted [from Himself, like a ray] <75.101> the Son - the most accurate imprint and image of His nature.

* * *

[168] Matthew 17:5 .

[169] Psalm 44:2

[170] This. 1:1 .

[171] Psalm 35:10 .

[172] Hebrews 1:3 .

[173] 2 Cor.4:4 ; Col. 1:15 ; Phil.2:6 . St. Cyril uses two words, “καὶ μορφὴν, καὶ εἰκόνα,” which are both translated “image.”

[174] Jer.23:16 .

[175] Gen.1:26 .

[176] Psalm 113:11 .

[177] 1 Cor. 1:24 .

[178] This. 1:1 .

[179] This. 1:3 .

[180] Exodus 3:14 .

[181] We assume there is a typo in the original text and instead of “εἶη” we read “εἴη”.

[182] Gen.1:26 .

[183] Gen.1:6 .

[184] Gen.1:3–15 .

185 This. 1:3 .

186 Ps.73:24 . In the Slavic Bible, “Εν τῇ βουλῇ σου” is translated as “by *Your* advice .”

187 This. 14:11

188 In the present context, it would be more logical to choose the meaning of "intention" for "φρόνῃσις", but we translate it as "mind", referring to the following quotation from Scripture.

189 Intends.

190 Воля (parliament).

191 Proverbs 8:14

192 Hebrews 1:3 .

193 This is 3:35, 5:20 .

194 This. 3:35; 5:20 .

195 Wed.: Matthew 11:27 ; Luke 10:22 .

Word 7 Word 9

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 8 Word 10

Sermon 8. To those who say that the Son is not like the Father, but His purpose

With sufficient grounds, one who believes in those who call the Son similar (ὅμοιον) to the will of the Father, and not to the Father Himself, would be found guilty of the great recklessness (ἀβουλίαν) of the anti-Christ fighters, or rightly considered to be maddened, although the Divine Scripture does not make such a determination about Him, and He Himself The Savior did not say: " *He who has seen Me, has seen* the Father's will." [196]. Really, it was necessary for Christ, who said: " *I am the Truth* ." [197], not to liken Himself to the Father by nature, but rather to His will, if things really are as they say. But, not mentioning will anywhere, but calling Himself the image of the Father, He clearly refutes their fiction.

OTHER . One should ask the Christ-fighters: is this the will of the Father, about which you say that the Son is like him, is there a certain essence, and does it exist in itself or not? For if you admit that it is essential and hypostatic, then how will the Son be the Only Begotten, being the third from the Father? After all, it turns out that a certain hypostatic and living will mediates in His birth, according to your position. If, rejecting this, you agree that will is not understood according to hypostasis and is not an essence living and existing like the Son, then do not look - very ignorantly and rudely - for the likeness without offering two essences. For how the hypostatic will be similar to what is not such, or as having not received essence (τὸ μὴ εἰς οὐσίαν ἐνεχθὲν) [198]will be compared with [hypostatically] existing (τῷ ὑφεστηκότι) for similarity?

OTHER . And who, having intelligence, would not agree that the living is similar to the living, and the non-living is similar to the non-living? For what is heterogeneous and naturally completely devoid of connection with each other, no one of good wisdom will compare with each other, and neither this is similar to this, nor can this be called by that. Let's say, let's say [we have] a person or any other existing thing that falls under the definition of living; let there be knowledge or wisdom, or will, or something

else from what in itself is not hypostatic, but exists in some of the existing ones: for example, in people or angels. So, if someone begins to say that a person or some other living [creature] is similar to knowledge or wisdom, or will, then will he not justly incur ridicule and reproaches for stupidity, trying not to check [objects] similar to each other [for similarity] and compare them? Consequently, being hypostatic, the Son of God will in no way be similar to the non-hypostatic will. Or let them then decisively say that He is not like the Father, <75.104> and be hated as obviously blasphemous; or, if it is really necessary to recognize the likeness of the Son in relation to the Father, then it is absolutely necessary that He should not be like the will, but rather like Him who gave birth. For it has been proven that [those contemplated] in essence and hypostasis in relation to those realized and hypostatic (τὰ ἐνούσιά τε καὶ ἐνυπόστατα) retain a similarity according to this [sign], and not to a foreign one (τὰ ἑτερ ογενῆ) and having existence in others, such as, for example , wisdom is in the wise, and counsel is in the willing.

OTHER, through reduction to absurdity . If, in your opinion, the Son is similar to the will of the Father, and is not like the One who gave birth, then in every possible way it is necessary to say that the will is not at all like God and the Father, being the image of which, the Son, in your opinion, is not like the Father. Then the Father will not be like his own will. For this wickedness is deduced from [your] speech. And if you say that will is something hypostatized, then there will always be something in the essence of God that is not like Him. For the logic [of your words] will force you to agree with this too. But here it is necessary to examine the image of dissimilarity that the will has in relation to the Father. After all, if it, as something less than Him, has no similarity in relation to Him, then what came from the essence of the Father will be worse than Him and lesser; For the will of the Father was not from without, nor did it come, but from Him and in Him. It is not common even for those who have a created nature to give birth to the worst [of themselves]. After all, neither man will give birth to anything other than what he himself is, nor any other dumb animal. If, which is not permissible to say, having striven to have something greater than the Father, His will in this sense carries [in itself] dissimilarity in relation to Him, as less or in something worse, then how Is it not impious to say that it is something greater and better than the Father? If you do not agree to either this or that, and confess the will to be unhypostatic and understood in the same way as [it is understood] among us, then how will you then consider the will to be not similar to the Father? After all, if this is so, then He will have willed [something] not befitting Himself, which is extremely absurd to even imagine.

OTHER . Logic will force those who listen to you to recognize the similarity of the Son in relation to the Father. For it is [clearly] shown that it is very absurd to believe that God willed [something] not befitting Himself, since in every possible way it is necessary to call His will befitting Him. So if the will is like the Father, and the Son

like the will; then every Third will be similar to the First. For the will that is in the middle, having received in itself a natural likeness (φυσικὴν ἐμφέρειαν) with Him who begat Him, [transferred] it to the Son, according to your words. Thus, the Son, even against your will, will turn out to be similar to the Father. Since there is nothing between the Father and the Son, then everything said about the will will not matter, and since nothing else mediates [between Them], the Son will be immediately (προσεχῶς) by nature similar to the Father.

OTHER . It is written: " *Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God* " [199]. <75.105> So, if the will of the Father characterizes His power and wisdom, that is, the Son, then it is in every possible way necessary to call him not dissimilar to the Father, so that the Father does not appear to have power and wisdom dissimilar to Himself. If so, then let the Christ-fighters realize the scale of their folly (ἀβουλίας). For, refusing to call one Son like the Father, they agreed to speak of two [like sons], if only they really affirm that will is something hypostatic. If it is non-hypostatic, then it will not be an image of the [hypostatically] existing (τοῦ ὑφεστῶτος) not existing (τὸ μὴ ὑφεστηκὸς) for the very reason that it did not exist [hypostatically]. For none of the beings in relation to the foreign and other-essential will be endowed with exactly the same powers and actions, but those who have received one nature as their lot will enjoy only equal distinctive properties; and those who have one commonality in essence will, as a result of this, be given the ability to resemble each other in everything. So, if the Father and the Son have one action, and the same power [is] seen in everything, then the Duo is not alien to itself. If so, then the Son will in every way bear in Himself the likeness of the Father, as one in essence, and will not be an image of will.

OTHER. If what God and the Father wills, the Son also wills, for there will never be any opposition or disagreement in the one and most pure Trinity, then what place will the hypostatic will find for itself, showing the third Son, closely adjacent to the Father, in why is He [precisely] the Son, having nothing mediating in His birth? Therefore, He Himself is the living and essential will of the One who gave birth.

OTHER. They lie about the Son, that He is the image and likeness of the will of the Father, and not the Father Himself. Therefore, we should again ask those who oppose Christ: is the Father consistent with His will or not? After all, if he is not like, then he has a will not like Himself, and I will remain silent about this blasphemy; and if He has a will similar to Himself, of which [will], as you say, the Son is the mark and image, then, therefore, [the Son] is, thanks to this, similar to the Father. How then will [the Son] be not like Him in essence, being - through likeness to will - His image? After all, if this is so, in your opinion, then the Son will be composed of similar and dissimilar, in one way resembling the Father, and in another way - alienated from similarity in relation to Him. Then, what logic will allow something that is one in essence and

number, as, for example, Paul or Peter, to become at the same time two, opposite in essence? For no one can say: "I am verbal and dumb"; nor, again, will fire be called hot and cold, for it is necessary, if [in something] one of the designated [properties] is present, to deny the other. So, it is impossible for the Son to have both likeness and unlikeness. Since the divine Scripture certifies His likeness to the Father, He Himself says: " *seeing Me, seeing the Father* " [200], then we do not accept dissimilarity, being guided by these [evidences] to the most true and proper [understanding]. Again, since He did not say: " *He who has seen Me has seen* the will *of My Father* ," we will confess the Son not in the image of the will, but [in the image] of the Father Himself [we consider Him] as the Son.

OTHER . That which has departed from mutual contact with each other (συναφείας) or natural similarity and is isolated, in the sense of an essential quality, is distant [one from the other], being separated either by space or by mental ideas alone (ἐπινοίαις). So, those having a bodily composition are separated by space from contact with each other, and some of them are also separated by verbal definition (λόγῳ), according to the essential difference, like [for example] a man from a horse. And those that have a different manifestation (δήλωσιν) and the result [resulting] from them (τὸ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποτελούμενον) turn out to be separated by only one word and thought, like [for example] health and illness. And among those who are separated by one word and the opposite result [arising from] them, some things are called immediate (ἄμεσα) [201] those who practice philosophical sciences, while others practice indirect (ἔμμεσα) [202]. Non-mediated ones are, as I already said, health and illness, since there is nothing in between them. For if any of them suddenly happens to a person, then it will be all one in him. After all, one is either healthy or sick, and there is nothing in between being sick and not being sick. Righteousness and unrighteousness are called mediated, because not every person is either completely righteous or unrighteous. For it is possible to find, as it were, some kind of intermediate region, when someone is partly righteous and not completely unrighteous. So, when these [things] have been carefully examined by us in this way, and the dissimilarity in them has been examined in relation to every thing, let us see in which of the listed senses the Son departed from the likeness of the Father. After all, no one will say that He is separated by space, since He is not the body; After all, it is common for bodies to be separated by spatial distance. What remains, then, is the division according to logos: I mean, according to logos according to nature. But since the Father is by nature God, and the Son by nature is God, what is His Logos [i.e. e. the Son] separates [from the Father]? Who will not agree that that which belongs to the same essence also has a similarity in relation to each other? And besides, the Father will not possess anything as opposed to the Son, as the so-called immediate ones. For [the properties of the Father and the Son are not opposite to each other, like health and illness, and not as in people, where the logic of things requires that one of all of the above be preserved, so in relation to the Father and

the Son. For the Father dwells in someone, and the Son also dwells [at the same time]. And not like those [i.e. e. health and illness], incompatible and not co-present in the same thing - so are the Father and the Son; for behold, says Christ: "We will look in - I and the Father - *and* we will create an abode with him" [203]. But even in this way it will not be a mediated thing <75.109> in relation to the Son, such as, for example, righteousness. For the Father will not be less than the Father, and the Son will not be less than the Son, so that some intermediate place arises that contains the diminution (ὑπόβασιν) of the essence, as was said about righteousness and unrighteousness. Consequently, since there is no space separating the Son from the likeness in relation to God the Father, it is unnecessary to say that He is rather likened to the will, and not to the Father Himself who emitted Him.

OTHER. Those who have the same logos must, of course, be of the same species (ὁμοειδῆ) and similar to each other in nature. As, for example, the definition (λόγος) of a person, being such, is " *a rational animal, mortal, capable of thought and science* " [204]– in relation to whomever it is used, shows them to belong to the same essence. And those in relation to whom this will be true - I mean what is said in the definition (τὰ ἐν τῷ ὅρῳ) - it shows in every way as people. For if there is *a rational animal, mortal, capable of thought and science* , then what else will be designated [by these words] if not human? So, if the name "God", "Lord", "Imcorruptible", "King", and if anything else besides this is said about the Father, will be true when applied to the Son, and if He does not only have words such glory, but is actually such by nature, then what logos will separate the Son from natural likeness in relation to the Father? After all, they have one definition (ὅρος) of essence, and everything that is inherent in the One who gave birth will be true in relation to the One who was born. If anyone dares to say that the Son is a false God and has nothing more in comparison with those who by grace are called to divinity and sonship, having fallen into the [false] teaching of Paul of Samosata, then, in justice, he will hear from us: " *If you don't believe it, you can't understand it below* ." [205]. For it is impossible for those who do not believe that Christ is by nature God to understand the similarity that He has with the Father by nature. So, being like the Father, not contained in anything else (ἐνυπάρκτου) will, the Son, who existed before the ages, bears the image.

* * *

[196] Wed: John 14:9 .

[197] This. 14:6 .

[198] Lit.: "not brought to essence."

[199] 1 Cor. 1:24 .

[200] This. 14:9 .

[201] Those. not having a middle term with another.

[202] Those. having a middle term with another.

[203] John 14:23 . Цитата привестена не дословно: "let us pray, I and the Father, and pray for him alone", while in Евегалии: "let us pray and pray for him alone".

[204] Sextus Empiricus. Pyrrhoniae hypotyposes, 2, 26. A definition that became classic in patristic writing; also found in Nemesius of Emesa , Athanasius of Alexandria , Basil the Great , John Chrysostom , Gregory the Theologian and later authors.

[205] Isaiah 7:9 .

Word 8 Word 10

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 9 Word 11

Word 9. About the fact that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, about which the [corresponding] sayings [of Scripture] are given: “Why do you say that I am good? “No one is good except God alone.” [206] and “I ascend to My Father and your Father, and My God and your God” [207], and just as accurately: “My Father is greater than Me” [208]

If the Father began to give birth to the Son and stopped, as the anti-Christians say, then [the Son] at a later time joined Him. This means that before He was born, the Divinity (τό Θεῖον) was, in their opinion, in Unity; then It became in Duality when the Son was born, and it turned out to be a kind of addition and increment of the Divinity (θεότητος) from the original Unit into the subsequent Duality. As if the Father, tired of being alone, invented the Son, a partaker of [His] Divinity and works. In addition to this, many [other] blasphemous and absurd [conclusions] will come from such a way of thinking, which carries so much blasphemy that is unacceptable for everyone. So, if it is good to reject the absurdity in what has been said, then, accordingly, it is [good] to believe that the Son did not [subsequently] join the Father, but was always co-essential with Him. And just as, if He had been joined, He would not have been of the same essence, since this is not so, but He was always with Him, then everything will be of the same essence.

OTHER . And even if the Son has a certain difference in relation to the Father, according to which the Father is the beginning, and the Son is from the beginning, but because of this He will not be torn away from identity and consubstantiality with Him. For there is nothing of the same essence with the Father that is not from Him by nature, so as not to say that what is inherent in the Divine nature alone is inherent in creation. Therefore, even if the Son has His Father as a beginning, but since He exists from the beginning, having an existence simultaneous with the beginning, He will not be different from him in essence. After all, since He exists from the beginning, He is consubstantial with the beginning. And what is consubstantial with the Father is not arrived, so that it does not turn out that He Himself is like that.

OTHER. As if from the objection of the followers of Eunomius . The essence of the Father does not allow, says [the Eunomian], birth, but the Son was born. How then will the Begotten be consubstantial with the Father, who does not allow birth?

Rebuttal to this . Let those who ignorantly propose such [questions] tell us: if the consubstantial being is violated by birth, then by what means will it be preserved? And again: if what is born is not of the same essence to the one who gave birth, then what will be of the same essence? Perhaps unborn and alien to the essence, or taken from something that is next to the essences? But this is impossible. You will, of course, say that the unborn is of the same essence as the unborn, and the born is similar to the unborn. Therefore, since Adam was not born, and Abel was born from a woman, he will not be consubstantial with Adam . And if, although he was born, he has the identity of nature in relation to Adam, albeit unborn, then what prevents the Son, who exists from the unborn Father, from being born and consubstantial?

OTHER, in narrative form . Those who oppose Christ will also agree that the Son was born from the Father, and no one, I believe, would reach such baseness as to dare to place Him, like creatures, outside the Divine essence according to the logos of nature. If the Father begot the Son from Himself, then why is He not consubstantial? Tell us, accusers of God the Word, does He give birth to Him weakly, or unwillingly? And if they say that, having become weak, then let them be ashamed, who blaspheme the essence of the Father, because they dared to attribute to it <75.113> weakness (τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι). If they switch to something else and say that He did not want to beget a Son consubstantial with Himself, then they blaspheme in a different way, attributing to Him the evil and most shameful of all things - fear of the best. For if the consubstantial was better than what was not, then how can it not be beyond any [conceivable] blasphemy to say that the Divine essence was afraid of what was best and most appropriate for [it], and did not desire what was better (κάλλιον) more than that which was What is not? But the Father can do all things, and rather desires the best; so that nothing prevents the Son from being consubstantial.

OTHER. Objections seem to come from among the Eunomievs . What exists because of something, or what is born, he says, is necessarily secondary in relation to this, which precisely became the cause of existence for him. Consequently, the Son will be secondary in relation to the Father, having Him as the cause; and therefore He is not consubstantial. Either the one who says that He is consubstantial will show himself to be the most contentious, or then one Divinity, having allowed a certain division in Himself, turned into a Two: for otherwise it is impossible for Him to be consubstantial. Therefore, it is necessary to say that the Son is not consubstantial.

Rebuttal to this . Again, the intoxicated fighter against Christ and chattering in vain about the Divine essence does not feel [his madness]. For dividing and allowing the possibility of some intermediate distance in relation to each other is characteristic of

bodies. And the Divine Father's essence, being incorporeal, does not allow section and division within itself; and not staying in some place, nor being contained by anything, but resting in some ineffable and inexpressible state, she emitted the Son from herself without extension. Otherwise, she could not have been perfect if she had not given birth to a Son and shown herself to be fertile; and again, otherwise she would not be creative if she did not give birth from herself indivisibly to the Son, by whom she creates everything. So, the Son is born from the Father: not by some division or flow, as you imagine, but - like heat from fire - indivisibly originating from the essence of the One who gave birth.

OTHER. As if from the objection of the followers of Eunomius . If, says [Eunomian], the Son is consubstantial with the Father, then why is He not as good as the Father? For nowhere does Christ say to a certain [person]: " *Why do you say good things to me? No one is good, only God alone* " [209]. Having said " *one* ," He placed Himself outside, as also, of course, good, but not as good as the Father.

Rebuttal to this . When the Divine Scripture calls the Son Lord, will you agree that He is also Lord, and truly, or will you deny this too? If you say that He is not the Lord, then you are thinking contrary to the Divine Scriptures and the Spirit who spoke this. <75.116> Having agreed and said that He is the Lord, you will expose yourself to wickedness, since you call Him Lord and worship Him Whom you do not consider consubstantial with God and the Father, and rather serve the creature than God by nature. After all, that which is of a different essence than the Existing God will not be God by nature. And to this is witness the divine Scripture, which reads: " *The Lord our God, there is one Lord* " [210] for there is one nature of the Godhead. And about the fact that she alone should be worshiped, listen again: " *Worship the Lord your God and serve Him alone* ." [211]. So, if because God and the Father are called "the only good", the Son falls away from being as good as the Father, then because the Father is called the only God and Lord, the Son falls away from being God and Lord, according to the logic of thought. How then do you worship Him who is neither God nor Lord? If, despite the fact that the Father is God and Lord, the Son is brought with Him, having hence the distinctive property of being from Him by nature, and appears together with the Father as Lord and God, then He will have everything in order to be good, as the Father, since the distinctive attribute of the Father is also present in Him as in Him.

OTHER . The Divine Scriptures say a lot about both the Father and the Son, and the difference in names does not necessarily lead to the fact that the logos of their essence is also divided between them, so that through this there is room for any dissimilarity between them. For there is one Deity of the Father and the Son, even if each of Them is designated by various names, not as having something special in itself that is not inherent in the Other, but in such a way that everything that is said regarding one can be understood in relation to both [from Them], with the exception of only the naming

of the Father and the Son and the work [corresponding to this naming]. For the Father is always the Father, and He will never become the Son; and the Son is always the Son, and will never be the Father. If anyone wants to say that any name that can be applied to one cannot be understood in relation to both, he will find himself in great trouble. For what will he do when he hears Paul saying: " *There is one God the Father, of whom all things are worthless; and there is one Lord Jesus Christ, in whom are all things* " [212]. For behold, he learned from the Father that he was God and the One; and for the Son to be Lord and One. Does it mean that now the Son will not be God because the Father is called God and One, and the Father will not be Lord, since the Son is called Lord and One? But this is not so, let it not be! For since the Father is God, so is the Son; and vice versa, while the Son is the Lord, the Father is the Lord. But if there were some difference that delimits the duality and does not allow [it] to be united by nature in identity, I think the name of one would not be inherent in the other in the proper sense. But since everything that belongs to the Father appears in the Son, and everything that belongs to the Son, in turn, appears in the Father, so that no logos breaks the identity, then He will also be good, like the Father, and therefore consubstantial.

<75.117> *OTHER* . Those who are deprived of natural communication and identity in relation to each other are, of course, separated from their natural connection with each other by a certain [mutual] alienness of distinctive features (ξενισμός τις ἰδιοτήτων). For a person has alien properties in relation to a horse; and the horse, in turn, - in relation to man - is not the same in a special way. So, if a certain natural distance separates the Son and shows Him to be alien to the Father's essence, then how will He appear to bear the properties of the Father? How does the Father, if He is truly alien to the Son by nature, carry within Himself His properties? For the Savior truly says in relation to the Father that " *all of Mine is Thine, and all of Thine is Mine* ." [213]. So, if " *all* ", and one of all, is perfect goodness, then the Son will also possess it, which is a distinctive property of the Father's essence, as having come from Him. And he who possesses the properties of the Father's essence will be of the same essence.

About the fact that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, with the saying: "I ascend to My Father and your Father, and My God and your God" [214]

When the Word of God took upon Himself the image of man, and - for the sake of the salvation of us all - *He who was in the image of God* , as it is written, *humbled Himself* [215], then it happens that and how a person talks, without suffering any harm because of this in relation to God's glory. For if He truly became a man, and because of this did not retreat from being God, then if, as having become a man, He speaks [speeches] befitting a man, then [His] magnificent dignity will not suffer from this, but

He will continue to be the same, showing humility in words for the purposes of economy. And that He economically, as a man, says such things, kindly preserving in word and deed the image that He accepted, we will see from here. For He nowhere says to the Samaritan woman, taking upon Himself the face of a Jew: " *You bow down, whom you do not know: we bow down, whom we know* ." [216], although the Son is from among those who receive worship, and not from those who worship. For the Scripture says: " *Let all the angels of God worship Him* ." [217]. And nothing like this is given in the Divine Scriptures about angels or any other order of them. For no one accepts the command to worship angels, but only God. It is written: " *Worship the Lord your God and serve Him alone* ." [218]. Therefore, just as, being worshiped, the Son " *we bow down* " speaks economically, like a man, and when, being by nature God, He calls the Father His God - again, like a man, economically - He will not cease to be because of this. God, but as by nature the Son will be consubstantial.

OTHER. If the Son, *in the image of God* and in equality [219](for so says Paul), God by nature has God and the Father, then the Divine <75.120> nature may fall under such [definitions], [and] will have God and the Father, if [only this] has not already happened. For what can happen, even if it has not yet happened, is in potentiality that which allows for the possibility. If this is blasphemous, then the Father is not called God of the Son by nature, but because [the Son] economically became man.

OTHER. If the Son, *who is in the image of God* and in equality, as it is written, *humbled Himself, I will take on the form of a servant, and be found in the image of a man* [220], then the words of humility befitting a servant will not be related to His essence, but will clothe the face of His incarnation. And just as from the height of the Divinity we come to know [His] humility in the humanity [perceived by Him], and vice versa - from the humility in humanity the greatness and height of the essence of the Son [rooted] in the Divinity will be known.

* * *

[206] Matthew 19:17 ; Mark 10:18; Luke 18:19 .

[207] This. 20:17 .

[208] This. 14:28 .

[209] Matthew 19:17 ; Mark 10:18 ; Luke 18:19 .

[210] Deuteronomy 6:4 ; Mk. 12:29 .

[211] Matthew 4:10 .

[212] 1 Cor. 8:6 .

[213] This. 17:10 .

214 This. 20:17 .

215 Phil.2:6,8 .

216 This. 4:22 .

217 Hebrews 1:6 ; Tue. 32:43 ; Ps. 96:7 .

218 Deuteronomy 6:5 ; Matthew 4:10 ; Luke 4:8 .

219 Phil.2:6 .

220 Phil.2:6–8 .

Word 9 Word 11

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 10 Word 12

Word 10. That the Son is consubstantial with the Father

It is not reasonable (οὐκ εὐλόγως) that Christ-fighters, when discussing what concerns the Divinity of the Son, and examining the relationship that He by nature has with His Father, use the humanly spoken words that the Lord said when He took on our flesh. For it is not that He, as a man, economically speaks that characterizes the incorporeal essence, but one should know and believe that the Word, being God and in all things consubstantial with the Father, put on human nature and became man, so that even as a man he could sometimes speak, for the reason [Its own, carried out] with the help of the flesh of the economy. He also speaks as God that which is higher than man, as being such by nature, and when the moment demands it. But if someone wanted to bring what was said rather humanly and economically, as I have already said, in relation to His Divinity, and, conversely, to relate what was divinely spoken to the time in which He became man, then such a person would sin against the nature of things and abolish the economy . After all, sometimes He, like God, says: " *Amen, I say to you, before even Abraham was not, I am* ." [221]. And again: " *Down from heaven* " [222]. If anyone wanted Him to retain only divine dignity, then such a person would in every way deny that He became a man in recent times. For according to humanity He was not, *before even Abraham was not* , and not as a man *came down from heaven* . And again, if anyone wants to apply the words and deeds of [His] humanity to the naked God Word before His incarnation, then this will be extremely wicked. For what will he do when Christ says: " *Today my soul is troubled?* [223] and *it is regrettable* [224] "? Will he agree to believe that sadness and confusion arose in the area of God's nature, and she was dominated by the fear of death? What, then, when he sees Him crucified, will he also agree that in this way the Divinity of the Son suffers like a man? Or <75.121> [still] reject the blasphemy? So, for each time and matter, let what is appropriate for [him] be observed, and let the meaning of theology be examined (τῆς θεολογίας ὁ λόγος), [based] not at all on those [sayings] that He obviously pronounces as a man, but on those from which [it appears that] He is [born] from the Father, as the Son and God. And in relation to the economy [carried out] with the help of the flesh (τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ τῇ μετὰ σαρκὸς) let it be admitted that He sometimes says things that do not befit the naked and self-existent Divinity [225]. So, when, as a man, He says that He is

not as good as the Father, then this should rather be attributed to the economy with the flesh and not connected with the essence of the Son and God.

A convincing answer to the questioner: "What good do you say?" [226], and the interpretation of [this] saying

It is fitting that we fully examine the meaning of the above, and then we will clearly understand what Christ wanted to teach when he said [the following when] the lawyer approached [him] (for so it is written) [227], seeking to learn how to be saved. Then he offers, having previously called Him "teacher" and "good," [question]: " *What have I done, will I inherit eternal life?* » [228]To this Christ says: " *Why do you say good things to me? No one is good except God* [229]. *Go, sell what you have and give to the poor, and have treasure in heaven* ." [230]. But, not bearing the burden of the commandment and weakening in virtue, [the lawyer] does not find within himself the strength to fulfill the commandment. " *Otis* ," says [Scripture], " *grieving* " [231]. Was this the right moment for theology? After all, for the one who asked " *what did he do ...*", He Himself will be among those saved. After all, he asked *that having done* , he himself would be numbered among those being saved. What is the reason to first reveal to him not what he sought to know, but to say something other than what he passionately desired? How was it possible for someone who was unable to bear the burden of one Gospel commandment to teach the sacrament that surpasses all, when he was so weakened in [his] striving for good that he could not contain it in words? For he was saddened, as it is written. So, since, seeing a person, the lawyer approaches [Christ] as a person and asks as a simple person, testing [Him] as illiterate, especially since he cared to give the impression of wisdom, appearing to know the law, [by no means] shames him by saying : "God alone is truly good. Therefore, why do you, having approached [Me] as a person, attribute to Me that which is inherent in God alone by nature, calling [Me] good? For there is [only] one Who is good by nature, and this, of course, is God. "If you," He says, "knew Me as God and therefore good, then why did you approach me as a simple person?" And if you do not believe that I am God, but consider Me a simple man, then why do you attach to man the dignity due only to God?" So what has been said is a denunciation of ignorance, and not a theological axiom.

OTHER . If, simply because it is said that God alone is by nature <75.124> good, the Son is excluded from similarity in this and likeness in relation to the Father, and will be less good, and therefore not consubstantial, then let someone one of those who are accustomed to fighting Christ told us what he will do when we offer them [something] similar. For nowhere does one of the saints say about God and the Father that " *God is light* " [232]; He also says about the Son that " *he is the true light* " [233]. Behold, look, the light is the Father, the light and the Son. And to the one Son the "true" is also added. This means that the Father will be deprived of being truly light, since John refers this

word to the Son alone. But no one, I think, will reach such madness as to agree with this wickedness. So, if, despite the fact that only the Son truly appears and is called light, the Father truly is also light, then despite the fact that the Father is good by nature, and " *one* " is attached to Him, the Son will also be good by nature , [just] like the Father. And where there is identity of nature, there will undoubtedly be consubstantial ones.

OTHER . If the fact that the Son differs in some way from His Father does not allow Him to have the same nature [as the Father], but makes Him foreign (ἑτερογενῆ) and, as it were, alien (ἔκφυλον), then what He in what does not differ, shows Him to be of one essence. So, when the divine Scripture says of the Father that He *" light is* ," and again calls the Son light, so that there is nothing here that would break the likeness (for the expression " *light true* " is applied to both), that which prevents Should the Son be consubstantial with the Father?

OTHER. If the Son is of another substance in relation to the Father, then how does the Father appear in Him, and He in the Father? After all, He says: " *Whoever sees Me, sees the Father* ." [234]. After all, we will not see the image of a person in a horse; and vice versa - no one will see her image in human form. For like appears in like, but those that are different (ἑτεροειδῆ) and separated from their natural likeness will never appear one in the other. And the Son appears in the Father, and the Father in the Son. Therefore, He is not of another essence, [as it will be], in your opinion, but of one essence, like the mark and image of the Father.

About the fact that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, with the saying: "I ascend to My Father and your Father, and My God and your God" [235]

The objection seems to be from among the Eunomievs . And how, says [the Christ fighter], can the Son be consubstantial with the Father, having Him as God? After all, these are His words, it seems: " *I will ascend to My Father and your Father, and My God and your God* ." [236]; and also: " *My God, my God, have you forsaken me?"* » [237]If [the Father] is His God, then how is He consubstantial? After all, those belonging to the same essence cannot be one in relation to another Gods by nature, just as [for example] neither a soul can become a god for another soul, nor an angel for an angel.

<75.125> *Rebuttal to this* . Again the opponent of Christ does not notice the creature, and not the Son, offering as Lord, a slave instead of the Master, and a servant (λάτριν) instead of God. For if he imagines that by nature the Father is God of the Son, and does not see the economy [performed] in others, then [the Son for him] will be neither consubstantial, nor Master, nor God. After all, he insists on this very much. Let him then clearly deprive the Son of Godhead and Lordship and number Him among the

creatures, so that their blasphemy, becoming obvious, will prompt everyone [238] says: " *You are fooling yourself , you do not know the Scriptures* " [239]. For it is appropriate to examine the hidden meaning of the word [240] δύναμιν). They imprudently blaspheme, no longer considering the Son to be God, but the temple of God, as each of the saints was, about whom [God] says: " *I will dwell in them and walk like them .*" [241]. So, according to their madness, He will be one of those who, by grace, are called sons and gods, to whom it is said: " *I am gods, and all are sons of the Most High.* " [242]. Christ clearly teaches in the Gospel that He is completely different from them and immeasurably superior in nature to them, saying: " *You are of the lower ones. I am from the highest* " [243], calling "lower" the bestowed (βασιλευομένην) and subordinate nature, and "higher" the reigning and superior (ἐποχουμένην) Deity. So, while Christ truly said that He is from above, this [i.e. e. Eunomian] claims that He is *from below* . , obviously slandering the essence of the Son

That the Son is consubstantial with the Father

The objection seems to be from among the Eunomievs . And how, he says, will the Son be consubstantial with the Father, having Him as the author of [His] existence, which is not inherent in the Father? For [the Father has existence] not from any cause, which, I think, everyone recognizes as the truth.

Rebuttal to this . Anyone who dares to say this can rightly be accused of great ignorance. For, speaking about the Son, they call Him not consubstantial, probably not realizing what madness they are falling into. After all, if He is the Son - as He truly is - then everything will be the same in essence as the One who gave birth. If, in your opinion, He is not the Son, then openly show your blasphemy, and say [directly] that He is a creature, and may not be consubstantial. And then you will show yourself to be opposed to all the divine Scriptures, for they call Him Son, and not a creature.

OTHER . You say that the Father became the author of the existence of the Son - and how, O Christ-fighters? If you are the Creator, then you imagine some kind of creature, and not the Son, and you are definitely fighting with the Father, who speaks of his own generation: " *From the womb before the star gave birth to Thee .*" [244] If you really confess the Son and believe that He is such, then it is in every possible way necessary to say that not as the Creator <75.128> the Father became the author of existence for the Son, but as a Parent by nature. And nothing prevents—indeed, it is absolutely necessary—that by nature what has come from something is essentially similar to it, even if it has it as the author of [its] existence.

OTHER . If everything that arises because of something will certainly be in relation to this and not consubstantial, then how was Abel, born because of Adam, similar to him in essence? Consequently, it is necessary that every generally fertile nature has something similar to itself that is [born] from it, even if the thing that gives birth is the

cause [of being] for that which is born of it.

OTHER . If the Son will not be essentially similar to the Father, nor consubstantial, due to the fact that the Father does not exist because of anyone, but the Son has Him as the cause [of His existence], then what prevents us from saying that Cain was not consubstantial [to your] father? After all, Adam was not born from anyone, since he was the first man. And Cain was his cause, for he came from him. If everyone who says this is a liar (for Cain is consubstantial with Adam), then everyone will be consubstantial with the Father, the Son, even if He had Him as the author of [His] existence, having come from Him timelessly and ever remaining with Him.

The objection seems to be from among the Eunomievs . And how will it be, he says, that the unborn is consubstantial with the born? After all, there is a big difference between them.

Rebuttal to this . [This] wise questioning of the Christ-fighters will not refute [the fact] that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, since the Father is unbegotten, and the Son is begotten. For if difference in something necessarily produces a different nature in beings and cuts off those who are related from mutual communication and natural similarity, then let them distinguish, for example, Paul from Peter according to the logos of essence, since they have a certain partial and individual difference one in relation to another, according to which one is Peter, and the other is Paul. But we see that often in some other way entities that are very distant from similarity in relation to each other have communication in the logos. For a black person, perhaps, has a great difference in relation to a white person, but this does not cut into their essence. So, if in ourselves the difference in some way does not destroy belonging to one and the same essence, to which those from whom we differ also belong, then what prevents the Son from being consubstantial with the Father, when they are different in that the Father not begotten, but the Son begotten? For in Them there is one Divinity, from the unbegotten Father naturally passing on to Generation.

<75.129> *OTHER. The objection seems to be from among the Eunomievs* . It cannot be perfect, he says, if it has not completely emerged from a certain beginning. Therefore, if the Father stopped begetting the Son, and stopping [doing something] means the end [of the process], then it means that [the Son] has a beginning of being. How can such a one be consubstantial with the Father who exists not from any beginning?

Rebuttal to this . If, in your opinion, oh, Christ-fighters, the Father stopped begetting the Son, and [the Son] began from a certain beginning (for this contains a question), then it means that He came to the Father. And what has arrived and has the beginning of being will certainly and necessarily be new (πρόσφατον). How then do you consider the Son to be God, when the divine Scripture does not allow this, if this is the case, as

you say? For it says: " *There will be no new god for you* ." [245]. But divine Scripture knows Him both as Son and as God. Therefore, He is not new and has not begun to be born, as you assert, but begotten, and at the same time co-existent, as the Son who is in the Father. And if being new does not allow the Son to be of the same essence with the Father, then the fact that He is not new is proved by consubstantiality.

OTHER . If by nature God alone is due worship from us and the angels, and to no one else, and about us it is proclaimed: " *Worship the Lord thy God and serve Him alone* ." [246], and the Spirit commands the angels to worship the Son, according to what was said: " *When he brings the Firstborn into the universe, he says: and let all the angels of God worship Him.* " [247], then the worshiped Son is God. How can there be one Godhead if [the Son] is not consubstantial with the Father? After all, if He has some discrepancy, that is, difference, according to the logos of essence, then the Son will be different from God, and different from the Father, and, according to this, it is necessary to speak of two Gods, which is impious [not only to say, but] even to hear – even that is unacceptable. But there is one Deity, and this is how the divine Scriptures proclaim: so that the Son is consubstantial with the Father. For in this way the unity of the Divine will be maintained.

OTHER . If the Father began to give birth to the Son and stopped, according to the madness of the Christ-fighters, then a certain change and transformation took place in Him. For what He was not before He was born, He became after He gave birth. If the Divinity (τὸ θεῖον) is above such [things] and does not allow change and change, then [the Father] did not begin to give birth and did not cease, as they say, but the Creator of ages and times, the Son, was timeless in the Father. And since He is co-essential, then therefore He is consubstantial.

OTHER . If the Father began to give birth to the Son, then this [property] was added to His essence, and what He did not have at the beginning, He received later. And allowing some addition will be imperfect, not perfect. But this is absurd, for the essence of the Father is perfect. This means that [property| to give birth, but it had not begun in her. If [the Divine Essence] did not begin to give birth, then it means that the Son born from Him is co-essential with the Father. And just as, if He received the beginning of being, He would not be consubstantial, so, since He did not receive a beginning in time, then everything will be consubstantial.

OTHER, in narrative form. Just as those who fight against the truth, who attribute a beginning and an end to the birth of the Son, tear Him away from likeness in relation to the One who gave birth, so we, who do not admit either a beginning or an end in relation to the birth of the Son, introduce Him into immutable likeness in relation to the Father. And in everything it is similar and consubstantial.

That the Son is consubstantial with the Father

The situation seems to be from among the Aetievs . And how, he says, could the identity of essence be preserved between the Father and the Son, if the Father is unbegotten and the Son begotten? For [then] it is in every possible way necessary to say that the unborn is in no way different in relation to the born. If so, then nothing prevents us from calling the Father begotten and the Son unbegotten, and everything would be confused.

Rebuttal to this . He who ignorantly proposes these [arguments] will hear in response from us: and how could the identity of essence between the Father and the Son not be preserved, if the image of the Father is the Son and shows the Father in Himself? For it is self-evident and recognized by everyone that no one will see another in one nature, and no one could, seeing a horse, say that he saw one of the people. After all, [it is] in those of one nature [that there is] a demonstration of similarities, and not in those that are separated from each other according to the logos of qualitative being (κατὰ τὸν τοῦ πῶς εἶναι λόγον) [248]. So, if Christ points to Himself to Philip, who seeks to see the Father, saying: " *Whoever sees Me, sees the Father* " [249], then it is absolutely necessary to say that the Son is of one essence with the Father, as an unchangeable image and *outline of His hypostasis* [250].

OTHER . The Lord is seen everywhere teaching that He is consubstantial with the Father, although He is born, for how does He say about Himself that He is the Son? To this, the opponents of Christ, [as a counterargument] citing weakness [borrowed] from their own thoughts, say that He cannot, since He is born, be of one essence with the unborn Father. Therefore, when Christ says one thing about Himself, and those who oppose Christ say another, who will reach such a degree of madness as to think that it is proper to believe a person more than <75.133> God, and not repeat this beautiful saying of the apostles, speaking to the wicked (ἀνοσίους) to heretics: " *It is fitting to obey God rather than man* " [251]? For if they are weak in comprehending the truth, this will not cancel their inherent recklessness.

OTHER . You yourselves undoubtedly confess that the Son was born from the Father; after all, not as one of the creations He will be outside the essence of the One who gave birth. And how can He not be entirely consubstantial with the One who gave birth (τεκόντι), if he really is a generation, being, as it were, some natural fruit of the One who gave birth (γεννήσαντος)? If you allow [Him] to have this tropos [of existence], then He will be in every way and consubstantial; if, down to the service word (διακόνου φωνῆς) and the name devoid of content (προσηγορίας ψιλῆς), then let Him then be called by you "creature", so that your blasphemy may be more clearly manifested.

The objection seems to be from among the Aetievs . If God, he says, is indivisible in essence, then what was born was not born by division of essence, but existed by power [252][God to create His own children] [253]. And how could the nature that existed be of

the same essence as the nature that existed? [254]?

Rebuttal to this . Why does this great and deep sophism, as [allegedly] seems, - that the essence of God is not divided - not allow that for those who are accustomed to correctly examining things, the Son should be of the same essence with the Father? Let these menacing and picky [people] tell us. After all, it is not because God is indivisible in essence that He will, in your opinion, be deprived of reproductive power. If they think to honor God by preserving for Him not to share in any way, but depriving Him of the ability to beget, so that the Son therefore existed by power [to create], then let them hear that the grace of natural action is much greater and better than the radiance of power .

OTHER . If by power, as you say, the Father existed the Son, then in vain He is called the Son. For what has not come from the essence of the Father, how can it be called the Son? And what comes from someone by nature has the name of generation certifying [this natural origin]. So, the Son was born, and is consubstantial with the Father. And those who are born have one nature in relation to those who give birth.

OTHER . If, as you think, *we are deceiving and* <75.136> *seduced* [255], - the Son did not come from the essence of the Father, but existed autocratically (ἐξουσιαστικῶς), and He [at the same time] is *the wisdom and power* of the Father, then the Father is neither wise by nature nor strong. If, according to your most ignorant assumption, He externally existed the Son, who is His *wisdom and power* , but [nevertheless] is by nature wise and strong, then it is in every possible way necessary to say about the Son that He is from the essence of the Father, and if so - then it is consubstantial.

OTHER . It is necessary to ask those who say that the Son came into existence through the power of the Father [to create], and was not born from Himself, what, in your ignorant opinion, prompted the Father to bring the Son into existence? So, was He forced to do this, or having wanted to give the Son what He also brings into being (εἰς ὑπόστασιν), like us? If forced (ἀναγκαίως), then you will agree that God is subject to necessity (ἀνάγκῃ [256]); if not so, then with the fact that, having wished to bestow [existence] on the Son, he turns out to be bestowing upon Himself that He might be the Creator and strong and wise, since all this is in the Son. For the Scripture says: " *All this was , and without Him there was nothing .*" [257]. And again: *"Christ is God's power and God's wisdom* " [258]. However, we do not say that God and the Father granted this to Himself, but that He is by nature good and strong. This means that He did not independently (ἐξουσιαστικῶς) exist the Son, as you say, but has Him as the fruit of His own nature; and if so, then He [i.e. e. Son] and consubstantial. For by nature what comes from God is not alien to Him.

That the Son is consubstantial with God and the Father

If because of *the image* that He took *in the image of God* [259] He is consubstantial with us, since He [took flesh] from us, and the Son is the image of God, which means He is consubstantial with Him whose image He is.

OTHER . If the light we are accustomed to is consubstantial with its radiance, and the Son is the radiance of the ever-essential Light, then He is also consubstantial with the Light of Whose radiance, since for the sake of comparison examples of a partially related nature are given.

OTHER . If equality in intelligible [things] is not measured by quantity, and thus the equal will of necessity be both equal and consubstantial, and the Son is equal and coequal with the Father, according to the divine Sayings, then He will of necessity also be consubstantial, since equality is not in relation to quantity is observed in incorporeal nature, but rather in the identity of essence.

OTHER . If it is recognized that it is true, and not by adoption (θέσει), those who are born are consubstantial with those who truly give birth to them, and the Son belongs to the number of those who are truly born, and not <75.137> by adoption, then it means that He is truly consubstantial, and not by adoption, with the one who begat His God.

OTHER . If the essence (οὐσιωδῶς) of the begotten inherits the essence of the one who gave birth, having it in himself, and the Son has everything that belongs to the Father [260], then, therefore, He was born essentially.

OTHER . If nothing that comes after the Son realizes (ὑφίστησιν) essence from non-existents, but the Son does, then it means that He will not be akin to what comes after Him, but will be consubstantial with the One who realizes from non-existent. For those who have one action are recognized as belonging to one essence.

OTHER . If those who indistinguishably have the same action are recognized as belonging to the same essence, and if the Son is of the same action with the Father, creating in a similar [Paternal] way everything that the [Father] creates, then, by general recognition, [He] will be of the same essence [with Him], because it has the same effect.

OTHER . If the Father is God by nature, and not by sacrament, then the Son is God by nature. If He really surpasses those who [are gods] by communion, then it means that He will be of the same nature with the Father, and not with those who are by communion.

OTHER . If the Son is God by communion, and not by nature, and there are many gods by participation, then He is in no way superfluous in comparison with many to the superiority of [His] essence. If He is not God by communion, since He is the Creator of those who are gods by participation, then He will be of the same essence with the Father, and not with those who are by participation.

OTHER . If every rational being creates, not only desiring, but also acting and suffering, and only the uncreated [261] essence is willing and without suffering, and the Son creates, willing and without suffering, then He belongs to the essence that creates only by desire, and not to the essence that acts with suffering (ἐνεργούσης κατὰ πάθος).

OTHER . If every [creature] that gave birth to a person who was not a bastard gave birth to a consubstantial [offspring], and God gave birth to the Only Begotten, who was not a bastard, then, therefore, He gave birth to a consubstantial one to Himself. If He gives birth, then the one who gave birth to a bastard did not give birth.

OTHER . If God and the Father, who gave birth to the Only Begotten, gave birth better than us, and we, when giving birth, pre-exist in relation to those born [by us], then God, therefore, when giving birth, does not pre-exist. If He gave birth like us <75.140> (after all, no one will say which is worse), and we give birth from our essence, then God, therefore, gave birth from His essence. And therefore it is imperative and necessary that [what is born] from Him be considered consubstantial with Him.

OTHER . If the whole world of created [entities] is, as it were, a certain genus, and the particular in relation to the genus is a species, and the Son is created, then, therefore. He is a species [being part of] the genus, that is, the world. If He is not a species of the world, because He preexists it, whereas it is impossible for a species to exist before the genus, then He is not from the world at all. If so, then He will necessarily be consubstantial with the Creator of the world (τοῦ κοσμοποιοῦ), and not with the world.

OTHER . If of those that exist one is God, and the other is the world, then the Son, by necessity or for the world, will be his own (ἴδιος) by origin (γένεσιν) [262]; or for God - in essence. Since He is not one of his own to the world, because his own (τὸ ἴδιον) in no way allows to be created from his own (ὑπὸ ἰδίου) [263], - then, therefore, He is consubstantial with the Creator of the world, God.

* * *

[221] This. 8:58 .

[222] This. 6:38 .

[223] This. 12:27 .

[224] Matthew 26:37 ; Mark 14:34 .

[225] Here, the distinction traditional for Greek patristic thought between the concepts "θεολογία" and "οἰκονομία" is made, when the first denotes the doctrine of the inner life of the Divine, essence, hypostases, etc., and the second - relating to the incarnation

of Christ and His work of saving man. According to some researchers, the absence of such a distinction in the West led to the transposition of the "economic" order of the appearance of the divine Hypostases into Their intra-Trinitarian relationships, which found expression in the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit "and from the Son."

226 Mark 10:18 .

227 Luke 10:25 .

228 Luke 10:25 .

229 Mark 10:18 .

230 Matthew 19:21 .

231 Matthew 19:22 ; Mark 10:22 .

232 This. 1:5 .

233 This. 1:9 .

234 This. 14:9 .

235 This. 20:17 .

236 This. 20:17 .

237 Matthew 27:46 ; Psalm 21:2 .

238 There is probably a typo in the text, and instead of "ἀναπείσης" you should read "ἀναπείσῃ".

239 Matthew 22:29 .

240 The original says "Λὸγου", but we believe the capital letter is an error here.

241 2 Corinthians 16:16 ; Lev.26:12 .

242 Psalm 91:6 .

243 This. 8:23 .

244 Psalm 102:3 .

245 Psalm 80:10 .

246 Matthew 4:10 .

247 Hebrews 1:6 .

248 "As-being" (τὸ πῶς εἶναι) – being in one way or another, i.e. "like a person", "like a horse", etc.

249 This. 14:9 .

250 Hebrews 1:3 .

251 Acts 5:29 .

252 Compare: Athanasius the Great . De sancta Trinitate (dialogues 2 and 4). [Sp J: Volume M28, race 1177, line 32–34/Ed. C. Bizer//Studien zu pseudathanasianischen Dialogen der Orthodoxos und Aetios [Diss. Bonn (1970)].

253 In the Latin translation, placed in the Patrology of Min, "κατ' ἐξουσίαν" is given as "ex voluntate," that is, "by will, desire," but in the "Dialogues on the Trinity" of St. Athanasius this phrase, which St. Cyril borrowed it from there, slightly modifying it, putting it in the context of the Gospel words: " *He gave them the realm* (ἐξουσίαν) *to be children of God* " (John 1:12). Therefore, we considered it best to retain the meaning of "power," which required explanatory words. We believe that this not entirely clear expression was used for the sake of a play on words "οὐσία – ἐξουσία", based, perhaps, on one of the meanings of the prefix "ἐκ–": "separation", "removal"; that is, it was not the essence, according to the opinion of his opponents cited by the saint, that was divided between two subjects, but the Son produced "according to power" became outside the essence of the Father.

254 We suggest reading here "αὐτὴν" instead of "αυτόν" in the text, which also corresponds to the Latin translation.

255 2 Tim. 3:13 .

256 Ananke (ἀνάγκη) is a philosophical term introduced by Democritus. He used it to describe the theory of the structure of the world, according to which the world consists of atoms and emptiness. There is no chance in the world, there is only the eternal Ananke - a program that sets the course of all events, the movement of every atom. In mythology, she is the goddess of necessity, inevitability, the personification of rock, fate and predestination from above, to whom not only people, but even gods obey.

257 This. 1:3 .

258 1 Cor. 1:24 .

259 Phil.2:6–7 .

260 See: John 17:10 .

261 The Greek text says "ἀγέννητος" - "unborn", but the general meaning of the phrase requires "ἀγένητος".

262 That is, it will be created, like the world.

263 That is, from the same origin.

Word 10 Word 12

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 11 Word 13

Sermon 11. About the fact that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, with the presented saying: "My sick Father is with me" [264]

The objection seems to be from among the Eunomievs . Those who have received the same nature as their inheritance and are of the same nature (ὁμοφυῆ) have in relation to themselves neither greater in nature, nor less. For neither man is greater than [another] man according to the logos of essence, nor is a horse greater than horses. So, if the Son says that *Father* His *is* greater , and the consubstantial one would not be greater than the consubstantial one according to the logos of essence, then, therefore, He is not consubstantial with Him.

Rebuttal to this . It was necessary for Christ-fighters from everywhere to try to acquire the truth [contained] in the divine Scriptures by examining what pertains to the Father and the Son, and not for their own pleasure to compose syllogisms for themselves and invent weaves of perverted meanings. For if they are offended by the fact that the Son says: " *My Father is greater than I am* ." [265] then it will be useful for them to hear about Him: " *Whoever is in the image of God cannot be equal with God by admiration.* " [266]. This is also what John most obviously asserts, [saying] that [Jesus] *"who said His Father was God, He was equal in His creation with God."* [267]. So, if, according to the word of the saints, [the Son] is in equality with the Father, then how will He be of another substance in relation to Him (ἑτεροούσιος)? For we will also tell them that by nature those who are located in relation to each other on the principles of equality (τὰ ἰσότητι πρὸς ἄλληλα φυσικῶς κείμενα) will in every way be of the same essence, as [for example] man is to man, or a horse is to horses.

OTHER . In relation to incorporeal things, "more" and "lesser" differ not in size - for this is characteristic of bodies - but <75.141> they are experienced only by mental ideas (μόναις ἐννοίαις). Let us take as an example what Paul said: " *To everyone* ," he says, " *the word of wisdom is given by the Spirit; to another - the gift of healing* " [268], and, adding a lot to this, he continues: " *All this is acted by one and the same Spirit* ." [269]. Then again he says: " *Be jealous of great gifts* ." [270]. So, will they say that the Spirit differs in relation to Himself, or that He is not similar to Himself in essence,

since He appears small in small ones and large in large ones, filling [Him] with those who receive [Him, according to their] abilities? But, I believe, no one will reach such a degree of madness as to dare to say this. Therefore, since the incorporeal nature does not allow greater and lesser things in relation to itself, then when Christ calls the Father greater than Himself, then this word will also refer to humanity, and not a designation (κατηγόρημα) of His Divine essence, as lying below than that in which He who gave birth to Him abides.

OTHER, in narrative form, to the saying [of the Lord]. Christ says somewhere: " *Father , who sent me , [271] pain I have [272]* " The Divine Scripture again testifies about Him that He *is not equal to God by admiration. [273]*. It is appropriate to consider exactly how He will be equal, and [at the same time] will have a greater Father [Himself]; After all, these are the essence of things opposite one another. Since it is necessary to piously examine the sayings [of the Scriptures], we *" equal* will not discard *" for the sake of " more ,"* nor *" more* will we abolish *" for the sake of " equal ,"* for contemplation allows us to piously preserve both [these definitions] at the same time.

So, being something simple and not complex, the nature of the Divinity would never be divided into a binary, Father and Son, unless we admit that there is some difference - I do not mean [a difference] in essence, but imagined from without , thanks to which the face of Each is understood to be in a special hypostasis, but closed in the unity of the Divine thanks to the identity of nature, so that there would not be any spilling and, as it were, confusion (φυρμὸς) of the Father and the Son, when the hypostasis would rush to one unit, because of this , that excessive similarity would not allow the appearance of a duality, so that from this some would already assume that the Father and the Son Himself are by no means divided into a duality. Since it was fitting to know both the nature that gave birth and the one born from it, the divine Scripture established the names of the Father and the Son, so that *Light from Light could be thought of [274]*, and each of Them is in a special hypostasis, despite the fact that Both retain identity in relation to the Other. Following again our custom, [Scripture] assigns to the Father [the name of] the "greater," so that from everywhere the duality and that from whom [the Son was born] would be revealed; also testifies to equality, so that they do not think about any dissimilarity in the essence of the Father and the Son. So, the Son, being equal to the Father in the logos of essence and similar in everything, calls Him greater as without beginning, having [His] beginning only in the sense of [origin] from Him, although He has an existence accompanying Him. <75.144>

OTHER . Those beings that belong to the same essence and nature also admit of legitimate comparison with each other; and those that are not such, but are of a different nature and therefore are divided due to foreignness, cannot be compared with each other, for this is ignorance. For no one, having intelligence, will call a bull greater

than a man, examining the nature of man; nor, on the contrary, wanting to study the nature of the bull, will he say that man is greater than him. For those of the same nature and of the same kind, as has been said, admit of a corresponding and fitting comparison with each other. So, if, in your opinion, the Son is compared with the Father in terms of "greater" and "lesser," then He is consubstantial with Him and not alien. And what is consubstantial is not greater or less than what is consubstantial according to the logos of essence: after all, man is not greater than man by virtue of the fact that he is man. So the Son is equal to the Father and consubstantial, and we believe that He said *"greater"* about the Father . For when He reveals Himself as man, then He speaks as a man.

OTHER . Those [beings] that really admit of comparison with each other are in every way also consubstantial; for man is compared to man, and horse to horse. The difference between [individuals] of the same species lies in the area of accidents; and these [accidents], for the most part, arise from suffering (πάθους) [275] or from any other reason, not relating to the logos of the essence, in relation to which one or another of the accidents can be detected. As, for example, [one] person is larger than [another] person in body size or strength, firmness of soul, sharpness of mind; but for all of them [there is] one logos of essence, and not separately in each - different. Accidents have their root in suffering: after all, the weak are weak from suffering, and [also] sluggish in mind, and carrying timidity in their soul. So, if those who actually admit of comparison with each other have the same nature and the same logos of essence, and what exists around the essences arises from suffering or from the absence of suffering, and if the Son, when it comes to talking about Him, is compared with the Father in [parameters] "more" and "less" and remains alien to suffering (after all, He is impassive, like God), then the Father in no way surpasses the Son, who has the same essence and is by no means able to suffer. It is called "great" as the Beginning of co-essential Generation.

On [words]: "Father, who sent Me [276], there is pain [277]»

Objection from among the Eunomievs . The Savior Himself does not covertly, but extremely clearly calls the Father greater than Himself when He says: " *The Father who sent Me is greater than Me* ." So, if you agree that the truth is true, and the Truth is Christ [278], - then He has a greater Father. And if so, then He will be different and not like that. And if not similar, then not consubstantial.

<75.145> *Rebuttal to this* . We need to ask you, Christ-fighters, this time: when did the Father either become or show himself greater than the Son, or what else did you want to say? After all, if you start determining time, who will tolerate it? For the Son is the Creator of times and exists *before all ages.* [279], according to the not false words of the saints. And if we exclude time, then everything remains to be said, according to

your statement, that the Father is eternally and without beginning *greater than* the Son. But, dear ones, remember, having come to your senses a little, that what differs from something in that it is or is called greater, has next to it a smaller one introduced by itself, in comparison with which it is greater. After all, when we want to know more, then, rushing to perceive the lesser, we see the superiority of the first. So, if the Father is always *greater than* the Son, then He was always greater, and the Son was always with Him, about whom it is said, in your opinion, that [the Father] is greater than Him. And how will the ever-present be different from the ever-present? How great [will it be] when the Begetter is accompanied by the existence of a Generation, possessing by nature everything that is inherent in the Father?

OTHER . Excited by the lessons of Aristotle [taught to all of us] and abusing the power of the wisdom of this world, they hurl a thunder of empty words, not knowing that in relation to this [worldly wisdom] they will be exposed as ignoramuses. For it is truly worthy of surprise that, exploring the question of greater and less, they jumped to the question of like and not like, not knowing that, according to the Aristotelian art, which they are in the habit of bragging about, like and not are considered to be of the same genus. similar to both the greater and the lesser. For the greater and the lesser are called by them to belong to the number *of related ones* (τῶν πρός τι ἐχόντων) [280]. And similar or [also] and not similar belongs to another category, i.e., section. Where then do you get the jump from more to like? And from the lesser (meaning [lesser] of the greater), making a premise (πρότασιν), deduce a conclusion (συμπέρασμα) relating to a different genus (ἑτερογενές), saying: “If the Son is less than the Father, then it is not like.” For it was better to say: “not equal, therefore” or “not so great, therefore,” so that you would not again be exposed as ignorant, bringing in more and less quantity (τὸ ποσὸν) [281]. For it was not for certain correlated [characteristics] (τὰ πρός τί πως ἔχοντα) that Aristotelian art laid down that they should be subject to [determining] quantity, but for more or less. [Aristotle] posits seven types of it: number, word, line, surface, body, time and place. [282].

So, since only those listed above tend to admit the concept of quantity in relation to themselves, then how do you, O Christ-fighters, [into the discussion of similarity and dissimilarity] introduce quantity through the greater and the lesser, when Aristotle placed them in a different genus? So, because, exploring the question of greater and less, you ignorantly deviated from comparing like and unlike, saying: “If the Son is less than the Father, then it is not like,” you [now] again fall under an even more serious charge <75.148> in ignorance when you say: “If the Son is less than the Father, then he is not equal, therefore, and not so great.” And since your word does not live on any side, then the premise is vain and frivolous.

OTHER, teaching that, in the presence of greater and lesser, what is ignorantly introduced is not like, which is foreign, according to Aristotelian art

Having clearly established those of the names that are correlated, and which are so called by them, Aristotle, the inventor of this art, makes the following definition: "Those [things] are called correlated, of which it is said that what they are, they are in connection with another, or being in some other relation to another, as the greater is said to be what it is in relation to the other. And of the double it is said that what it is, it appears in relation to another; because it's called double against something." [283].

So, since this is the definition of related, then let those who spew out Aristotelian art show us with the help of [borrowed] lessons from there, and not boasting [lessons] from the divine Scripture, whether it is also said about the like that what it is, it is according to in relation to another, like big and double. For like is not opposed to like, just as to greater is less, but not in the same way and not in the same way. For the greater is spoken of as the greater of the lesser. But you can never say about something like that which is more not like it, nor, just as if it is said about something more that it is what it is because of superiority or the opposite, you will not think that something similar is like that, because it is no longer similar. Therefore, those who do not admit [to themselves] the same classification (διαίρεσιν) and definition will be all different.

OTHER . Names that are correlated or otherwise named in relation to something else exist simultaneously for both thinking and nature, such as, for example, double and large. For the double certainly brings with it something of which it is twice as great; and everything big will bring along with it the small, in relation to which it is called big. For there cannot be a double if there is no half, nor a large if something small is not thought of. So, related things have such a definition, and like is not necessarily thought of simultaneously with unlike, just as justice [is not necessarily thought of] simultaneously with injustice, and virtue with vice. For such [i.e. e. injustice and vice] are rather deprivation and deviation from what belongs to a stable state (ἕξει) [284], and do not necessarily have to be correlated in the same way as [concepts] opposite to correlated ones. For a certain deviation from similarity is dissimilarity, and a deviation from justice is injustice. Since, according to their art, privation is secondary in relation to possession (ἕξεων), then dissimilarity will not be among the conceivable at the same time, being privation and deviation from similarity.

OTHER . Names related as if in each other have existence, and with the abolition of one [of them] the second does not exist. For example, if the greater is abolished, then along with it everything smaller will be abolished; for something will not be less if there is no greater, of which it is less. So, if you say that like is homogeneous (ὁμογενὲς) [285] for those related <75.149>, then let it, being abolished, abolish along with itself the like, and, in turn, let it be co-abolished by it. But it neither co-abolishes nor abolishes; after all, if there is a certain person, and there is, let's say, something not like him, then with the abolition of what is not like, the existing thing is not co-abolished, that is, man, to whom the abolished thing was not like. Therefore, like and

not like are not among those [names] that are spoken in relation to each other.

OTHER . In relation to the like and virtue and their opposites, the [concept] "more" and "less" will be appropriate. For it is possible to say, without slandering [the one about whom we are talking], that such and such, for example, is similar to such and such, and that he is more or less similar, and that he is more righteous, and that he is less righteous. And in relation to the greater and the lesser, the double and the half, no one will say: "more greater" or "less greater", or "more double", or "more half". For many examples prove that types of quality (τὰ τῆς ποιότητος εἴδη) do not allow [the concept of] quantity. So, if [the concept] "similar" includes quantity and allows [in relation to itself] "more" and "less" - while "half" and "double" do not allow this - then it means it is not of the same kind (οὐχ ὁμογενὲς) with the related ones.

OTHER . "More" or "greater" is an intensification (ἐπίτασίς) and excess (ὑπερβολή) of a certain thing, which does not carry within itself an indication of anything not similar to [it] and opposite. But "like" is not like that. For it brings an indication of something different. In addition, from "not like" follows deprivation. For the loss of likeness creates dissimilarity. And "more" and "more", being an intensification of something, what kind of loss will there be, or how will there be deprivation in relation to it, just as [this happens] in relation to "not like"? But no one can say this. This means that "more" is of a different kind (ἑτερογενὲς) with "similar".

OTHER, bearing in itself the proof that by the fact that the Father is called living, the Son is also introduced in every way, and that He is no less than Him

If someone names [something] as greater, then he will certainly and necessarily mean at the same time something else, of which [this greater] is greater. When this is the meaning of [this name], let us examine the Divine birth in accordance with it and practice our reasoning about the Father and the Son.

So, when the Father is called greater, then [this] in every way introduces that which is in [a certain] relation to Him (τὸ ἐν σχέσει τῇ πρὸς αὐτὸν): I mean an indication of the Son, by whom the Christ-fighters understand "lesser." Therefore, since the Son is necessarily introduced along with the Father, let us examine how the Father will have "greatness." After all, if the Son is by nature God, like the Father, by nature Good, by nature Creator, by nature King, then what will be the "greatness" of the Father, when the Son also possesses [all] these [properties] perfectly? For if [the Son] does not possess [them] perfectly, how can he be God who lacks any of the goods? For one who is deprived of the necessarily inherent perfection of God will not be God by nature, and the Son is God by nature. This means that He is perfect, just like the Father. Since the Son is perfect [286], then, of course, He is no less. But economically He calls the Father greater than Himself: either because He became man, allowing the nature of the Divinity to surpass [the nature of beings] created, or by granting "greaterness" as the

Father, without being in any way less than Him according to the logos of essence. For thus He will be both the true generation and truly the image of the One who gave birth, not in any way deteriorated, but retaining full similarity with Him (ἐμφέρειαν), - solely for the sake of decency (διὰ δὲ μόνον τὸ πρέπον) giving back as the Son, honor " most."

To those who say that the Father hurts the Son

The objection seems to be on behalf of heretics . The Father, they say, was always there, but the Son was not always there; How then will he who abides ever be greater than he who is not? How then is he who is not less than the one who abides ever and ever? If the Father *is greater than* the Son, then that means he is also non-existent (ἑτεροούσιος) in relation to Him.

Rebuttal to this. It was necessary, my dears, that this truly wise question, befitting your ignorance, should not be proposed so badly and unskillfully. For, offering us foreign substances (τὸ ἑτεροούσιον) in relation to the Father and the Son, you ignorantly strive to produce a proof from “majority” and “minority,” as if those who tend to admit these [definitions] in relation to themselves would necessarily possess alienness (ἑτεροουσιότητα) in relation to each other. After all, every tree in relation to a tree, and a stone in relation to a stone, and a person in relation to a person, has the same logos of essence. However, both “greaterness” and “lesserness” are inherent in them: for a tree turns out to be somehow larger than [another] tree, and in the same way smaller. So, since in relation to consubstantial beings the [use of the concepts] “greater” and “lesser” is fixed, then in vain you give such proof in favor of the other essence of the Father and the Son, and through this you turn out to be no less empty talkers. For, being equal with the Father, the Son economically takes upon himself “lessness,” as has been shown.

OTHER. About those deprived of natural similarity in relation to each other and differing in the logos of how they exist (κατὰ τὸν τῆς φύσεως λόγον) [287], are judged rather in the categories of “similar” and “not similar”, and not at all “more” and “smaller”. If, therefore, the Father is one with the Son according to the logos of nature, then let would-be researchers tell us how the “greater” and “lesser” will take place in relation to Them? If [you] introduce a Son who is completely distant and separated from the Father’s essence, and you consider Him to be of a different nature, then how can those who are completely different in the logos of how they exist allow comparison with each other? For one cannot avoid ridicule by comparing things that have nothing in common and saying [for example] that the sun is brighter than a tree. So, if heterogeneous [objects] turn out to not allow comparison with each other, then the position that introduces [the definitions] “more” and “lesser” in relation to the Father and the Son is ignorant - if indeed they, in your opinion, are not one and the

same the same essence, - <75.153> and bringing such proof of the other-existent, which [Christ-fighters] take from nowhere in relation to the Essence that surpasses all, which on no side leaves room for "lesser", but demands the perfection appropriate to it, since there is nothing lower [288] or imperfect in God by nature, which is what the Son is.

OTHER . Those who oppose Christ call the Father greater than the Son, recklessly blaspheming and *not understanding* , as it is written, *neither what they say nor about them. what they affirm* [289]. Therefore, we again, countering their nonsense with the right word, ask them: "Tell us again, O such, was the Father always, as you say, greater than the Son, or did he become greater later? For if at some point He appeared greater than the Son, then it means that something has arrived to God and the Father, and He now appears to have something that He did not have before. How then was He perfect without having it from the very beginning? But He was always perfect, therefore He was not lacking in more, but was always like that, in your opinion. But, my dears, you probably yourself notice that because of "more" and "less" you are rightly endangered and your premise will finally seem meaningless. For what is called greater than something would not be greater if there were not something else and lesser present, with which, being compared, it would appear greater in relation to it. So, if the Father has always been greater than the Son, then in every possible way it is necessary to introduce the Son along with the Father, in relation to Whom, as, in your opinion, to the lesser, He would appear greater. So, if, according to your premise, the Father is greater than the Son because He was ever present, and the Son was not so, then, since [the Son] is shown to be coexistent and coexistent with the Father, He will be no less and not alien to To him. For by virtue of which, if He did not coexist, He would be deprived of equality, by virtue of the same, on the contrary, since He coexists, He would in no way be deprived of it. And in relation to each other, similar in nature and not measured in size, what will be the case for "more" and "less"?

OTHER . If the Father *is sick of* the Son, according to your premise, O Christ-fighters, then how does Paul assimilate His equality, saying: " *He who was in the image of God was not equal to God by the admiration of God, but He humbled Himself in the form of a servant, receiving Him and being found like a man, He humbled Himself* » [290]? So, if the image of incarnation (ὁ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τρόπος) carries within itself humility and the humiliation mentioned here, then it is in every possible way necessary that the Son, before becoming man, maintain equality in relation to God and the Father. For from here we can see humility. After all, if He Himself was lesser and before humility, then where will He appear to descend, and what [will be] the image of humility for us?

<75.156> *OTHER* . for accepting death *If we see Jesus diminished* [291], according to Pavlov, then before suffering, it means that there was no less in Him. And since [Paul]

said so, it necessarily follows that He is perfect. Being perfect and being equal in perfection with the Father, the Son, of course, will not accept into Himself fewer [creatures] that are not like [the Father].

OTHER . Paul, testifying to the equality that the Son has in relation to the Father, clearly says nowhere: " *Whoever is in the image of God does not need to be equal with God by admiration.* " [292]. He also says that He humbled himself *for accepting death* [293] . Therefore, since it is impossible for one and the same thing to simultaneously exhibit both greater and lesser nature, we must examine how we can observe both in relation to God the Word and relate both [these definitions] to the one and only [Son].]. So, since He is by nature God, He will be equal to the God who begat [Him]; and since he became a man, it is said about Him that He diminished. If someone takes away equality from His natural existence (φυσικῆς ὑπάρξεως) and says that it is not preserved in this, then where will he place it? Or what place will there be for the exclusivity (τὸ ἐξαίρετον) of the Son, if only derogation is shown in relation to the tropos of incarnation?

Again about the same thing - that the Son is equal in everything to God and the Father - with the application and study of the saying: "Amen I say to you, for there is no rise in those born of women of more than John the Baptist." [294] *and subsequent [words]*

The objection seems to be on behalf of opponents . And how would it be, says [our opponent], either equal or similar to the all-perfect Father Christ, that is, the Son, who nowhere clearly says that " *in those born of women there has risen no one greater than John the Baptist, but I am greater than him in the Kingdom of Heaven." There is* " [295]? For He Himself, being lesser in time of birth from the Holy Virgin, confesses that He will then only exceed the measure of [the righteous] who have reached the limit of virtue, when the Kingdom of Heaven comes, as if receiving some kind of reward for [His] service to us. And if this is the case with His nature, then how would He be similar, even if shown to be equal in relation to God and the Father?

The rebuttal to this is in order. Those who have considered what pertains to it [i.e. That is, nature, the Christ-fighters] very madly and ignorantly perceived the meaning of what was said by our Savior Christ. For He does not say this in order to define what pertains to His own nature, and not as some kind of great and enviable praise does He attach to Himself superiority over the measure of John. He who boasts of the virtues of God and the Father and has in Himself everything that belongs to Him. nature, for which reason he cries out: " *Everything that the Father has is Mine.* " [296]. The Father has all-perfection (τὸ παντέλειον); therefore, the Son born from Him is self-sufficient and perfect. And if this is the case with His nature, according to their words, then how would He not then be similar and equal in everything to the Creator (τῷ φύσαντι)?

OTHER, through reduction to the point of absurdity, leading to the recognition that the view of [our] opponents is false (κίβδηλον) , and that it is ignorant to think like that

Christ says somewhere: " *There is no rise in those born of wives greater than John the Baptist, but I am greater than him in the Kingdom of Heaven.* " [297]. " given in relation to Christ *But if the " my* really means the amount of age, then the same will apply to the holy Baptist himself, in accordance with the principles [of the interpretation of this passage]. [This means] in a similar way indicates age [and the phrase] " *don't grow up anymore* ." But we will not call this word true, since the Divine Scripture seems to expose them, saying that the number of all the years that Adam, the founder of our race, lived was 950 [298], and also offering [examples] of others close to him in the number of years born of women, according to the word of the Savior, while the preaching [His] Baptist departed from this life very young [299].

Therefore, [the word] " *more* " [said] in relation to him does not indicate age, but rather the fact that he has reached heights in virtue and ascended to the very heights of righteousness possible for a person. Accordingly, in relation to our Savior Christ, the opposite " *painful* " will not be perceived as an indication of age. After all, it would be senseless and worthy of laughter to imply that the magnitude of age can be greater than the heights of virtue. For how can such things be compared with each other? Rather, it will be forced to indicate a lesser degree of sanctification (τὸ ἐν ἁγιασμῷ μειονέκτημα), so that in relation to John's residence the Son will appear second. Since this blasphemy itself carries its own exposure, we refuse to think so.

[The argument] seems to be on behalf of opponents. Bringing, they say, a simple and most ingenuous consideration of what the Savior said, we believe that He gracefully said that the one who is less in age by birth with the flesh [Christ] will be in the Kingdom of Heaven greater [even] and perfect in relation to virtue [contemplated] in men [Baptist]. Therefore, [the word] " *mniy* " points us to the Lord's face, and that St. The Baptist achieved the perfection befitting a person in piety, as evidenced by the words: " *there is no resurrection for those born of sick women* ." But even so great will Christ surpass. What's so ridiculous about this?

Rebuttal to this. If there is nothing absurd in this, then it is necessary not only to say [it], but to examine it; for, I believe, we need to zealously fight for the divine words, and not at all from the simplest considerations to collect discernment, since [negligence] seems to cause us extremely great harm α τὴν ζημίαν ὁρᾶται) [300]. So that we understand what was said the way you say and advise [to understand], let the word " *my* " gracefully designate the Savior. So, He will in some way <75.160> surpass St. Baptist in the Kingdom of Heaven. Or how will He be greater than him? After all, no one who is reasonable, I believe, would think that by the amount of time from birth. For how could anyone get ahead of His eternal precedence, always accompanying and coextensive with [all] periods of time? After all, just as [points] located on rotating

circles always rush forward, moving away from the place that catches up with [them] and is behind, so those moving along the time scale (οἱ τὸ ἐν χρόνῳ τρίβοντες μέτρον) forever acquired in themselves more in relation to subsequent. Therefore, this is not where Christ will surpass St. Baptist. It will therefore be necessary to say that [He will surpass him] in holiness. For how is it possible to understand the greaterness in them otherwise?

But if [only] then, that is, during the [Heavenly] Kingdom, He is seen as greater, then it means that now He is equal or lesser. Since it goes without saying that [only] the wicked would think of Christ as less than John, they attribute equality to [Him]. But let them see that this thought of theirs is not sound either. For what equality in holiness can be maintained between them? How can Christ not win with incomparable advantage when you see blessed John saying to Him: " *I demand to be baptized by You* " [301]? *Without any contradiction, the lesser of the greater is blessed* [302]and is sanctified.

OTHER. The blessed Forerunner proclaimed to the Jews: " *I baptized you with water* [303]. *My husband is coming for me* [304], *He is not worthy to bow down to let the thong of His boot: He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire, and He will put a shovel in His hand, and will cut off His threshing floor, and will gather the wheat into His barn, and will burn the chaff with unquenchable fire.* [305]" What will those who put the Lord in equal measure [of holiness] with John say to this? For not yet *more* , even if it ever becomes [such] [306], according to their opinion, why does he claim that he himself baptizes with water, and He will be the giver of the Spirit? And that he himself, as a servant, does not even dare to untie the strap [of His shoes], but about Him he says that He is the Master. For this is what the phrase means: " *to cut off His threshing floor* ." And He says that He will appear as a distributor and, as it were, a steward of what is due to everyone, so that He will place the righteous and good in the heavenly courts in the image of wheat, and He will make those who turn out to be unrighteous - in the image of the tares - the food of the fire. But if he really was in equal measure with the One who a little later was to become great, then why does he himself not baptize with the Holy Spirit, does not cleanse his threshing floor and, invested with Sovereign dignity, does not *judge the universe in righteousness?* [307]? Since the blessed Baptist does not find any of this by doing, but Christ does [all this] with the authority appropriate to God, it means that John is not equal to the Lord who is so superior and towering above him.

<75.161> *OTHER.* Promising us forgiveness [of sins] through faith, God's Word also says through the prophet Isaiah: " *I am the one who blots out your iniquities, and I will not remember them* ." [308]. And since He had already come and was born of the Holy Virgin, and *appeared on earth* , as it is written, *and lived with men* [309], then [as if] the preacher and Forerunner seals [this prophecy] for those who see Him, and the blessed

Baptist just says: " *Behold the Lamb of God, take away the sin of the world* ." [310]. So, if indeed Christ, according to some, will be greater than John in the Kingdom of Heaven and hopes for this as an honorable reward, then it means that in all fairness He was not less, but equal. Further, how are those who are equally so separated from each other that one can take away the sin of the world and do it autocratically, while the other becomes demanding of the cleansing and sanctifying? For " *I ,"* he says , *"I demand to be baptized by You* ." [311]. Since the greater is seen not in those who need something, but in those who give [it], and one, like God, [gives] the cleansing of sins, and the other is by no means able to do this, then he [i.e. e. John the Baptist], therefore, is not equal to something so different [from himself].

OTHER, as if briefly and simply . If, according to some, the Savior will be a great saint. Forerunners [only] in the Kingdom of Heaven, then He is either equal or lesser at the time of His incarnation. However, nothing less. This means an equal state - after all, this, in some way, is more befitting [of Him]. But if indeed the definition of equality is preserved in relation to both, then let John also be called *wisdom and power* [312]Father, let him be proclaimed *in the image* [313]and *the mark and radiance of His posture* . Let him also *carry all the verb of his strength* [314]; let him hear from the Father: " *Son Thou art my* , this day I begot Thee ." [315]and " *Sit at my right hand , until I will make your enemies your footstool* " [316]. him too *worship* Let him also be introduced as the firstborn into the universe, let the holy *angels* [317], let him speak impeccably about himself: " *I and the Father are one* [318]. *Seeing Me, seeing the Father* " [319]»; and also: " *I am the resurrection and the life* " [320]; and " *I am the living bread that came down from heaven* [321]*and give life peace* [322]" If Christ is all this, then they are no longer called ignorantly into equality with Him [the Baptist]. How then will it not seem to everyone that it is very ignorant to think that one day the One who always remains such as God will become greater than him?

OTHER . If the amazing (ἀξιάγαστος) Christ is seen to have once surpassed the virtue of John, then there is nothing great in Him, because the angels are better than him in the logos of their nature and in the superiority of their reverence for God. Then, where should we place the wisest Paul, <75.164> who placed Christ as much higher than the angels as the Divine nature is superior to the created? " *To whom* ," he said, " *the angel say when did : sit at My right hand?" Aren't all the souls of service that we send into service* ?" [323]How is it that the Son, superior to the angels so great by John, so that He can sit on the seat of the Father, as if something great and trustworthy says about Himself that He will be greater than him during the Kingdom, although He always has greaterness? Isn't this the one who is equal with God and the Father?

OTHER . If the blessed Baptist was *a lamp* [324], and Christ is *holy* [325], then how will the light be placed in an equal position with the lamp, and that which is accustomed to shine with that which needs light? And what is always so superior, how, being in

diminution, will ascend to the greater?

OTHER . If *you have a bride, the groom is* , that is, Christ, *and the friend of the grooms, standing and listening,* that is, the blessed Baptist [326], is different in comparison with Him, not only differing in number, but also not having equality in dignity and honor. If one is truly sitting at the head of the festive table, then the other is a participant in another holiday, and therefore [the first] is more brilliant.

OTHER . The blessed Baptist himself nowhere speaks of our Savior, Christ, " *He who comes from above is above all* ." [327]. Then, revealing his own measure, he says: " *He who is from the earth, speaks from the earth* ." [328]. So, if the Savior remains in equality with him, as having not yet received more, then nothing, naturally, prevents us from transferring what is inherent in each of them in the proper sense of the word to the other, so as to understand St. the Baptist [to those who are] *from above* and [to those who are] *above all* , and the Lord *from the earth* . But this is absurd. For one, as being God by nature, *is above all* , and the other, being generated by a lower and lower nature in relation to God, *from the earth is* [329]. So, he is not equal [the Baptist to the Savior], but rather yields victory to Christ with incomparable superiority. How will He who is always so superior ever hope to become greater?

OTHER . After the resurrection (ἀναβιωσιν) from the dead, the Savior, renewing in us the initial grace of the Spirit, breathed on the disciples, saying: " *Receive the Holy Spirit* ." [330]. And again, nowhere does He speak about the Spirit: " *What He will receive from Mine* " [331]. But the Holy Spirit is also called the Spirit of Christ in the divine Scriptures, according to the passage found in the Acts of the Apostles: "And *having passed through Asia* [332] *and the Galatian country, I will try to drink in Revelation,* <75.165> *and the Spirit of Jesus did not leave them* » [333]. So, if, like the one who has one day to become greater than John, Christ will remain in equality with him until then, then let the Baptist renew the grace of the Spirit in us, let him also give [It], as Christ did, let him also [by the Spirit] is called the Spirit who is in God and the Father, let him also cry out about the Spirit: " *As he will receive from Mine* " [334]. But even to even think about it is wicked. Therefore, he is not equal to Christ, and it is not later that he will concede greaterness to [Him], always being less, and conceding as much as a person is [less than] God.

OTHER . Showing Himself to be God by nature, the Son contrasts [Himself] with creation and says: " *I am from the highest, you are from the lower* ." [335]. Therefore, let the blessed Baptist say so, as he has not yet conceded to Christ that He should be in the greater ones, if only this will ever happen, according to some. However, he himself says about himself that he is from the earth, and is not mistaken about his own measure. So, *the greater* Christ, not having to ever become such, but always possessing the advantage as God from God [336], for this is what the words mean: " *I am from the highest* ."

OTHER . The blessed evangelist John, accurately interpreting the inherent dignity of the Son and showing the measure of John [the Baptist] as a servant, says: " *There was a man sent from God, his name was John; this one will come as a testimony, let him testify of the light. Be the true light, which enlightens every person coming into the world* ." [337]. So, how far then will Christ advance, being compared with John's measure? Or how will that which tends to enlighten not always be great, that which needs enlightenment, and requires alms [light] from the one who shines?

OTHER . While talking once with the Jews, Christ said: " *You sent to John, and testified to the truth. But I do not accept testimony from man* ." [338]. But if the Savior is higher than John's testimony, then it means that He is not equal, but always greater and more significant (ἀξιολογώτερος). And He Who is such, where will he advance or how will he ascend to something even greater?

OTHER. Blessed Zechariah, father according to the flesh of St. The Baptist, when he gave thanks for him with words mixed from prophecy, exclaimed: " *And you, as a child, were called the prophet of the Most High: you will go before the face of the Lord to prepare* [339] *People are perfect for him* [340] " <75.168> And he himself, having once been asked by the Jews who he was, said: " *I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness: prepare* (ἑτοιμάσατε) [341] *the way of the Lord* " [342]. So, tell us, those who ignorantly assume that Christ will one day come to greater things and only in the Kingdom of Heaven will surpass the measure of John, when the prophet could not be rightly considered less than *the Most High* ? When does the preacher and the forerunner and the performer of the servant's service rise to equal measure with the nature of the Lord? But I think everyone understands this word. So, how will the ever-*greater one* be so at times, if Christ [in your opinion] is greater than John [only] as having to become [such] in the future (ὡς ἐσόμενος)? " *But for me ,"* He says, *"there is more of him in the Kingdom of Heaven* ." [343].

A pious interpretation of the entire chapter, soon revealing the purpose of speculation

Having already, in our understanding, experienced the meaning of the previous [their arguments] and examined each of the provisions with due accuracy, and exposed the opponents' goal as unkind, we decided that it was time to contrast them with provisions [coming] from the truth, and reveal the thought [contained] in the presented speech. For I think that those who believe that Christ will become greater than John at some point must not only be condemned as not thinking in the best way, but also, by the very proposal of truer concepts, they should be persuaded to refrain from thinking improperly.

Let us finally proceed to the reading and, having summarized the reasons for what

our Savior, Christ, said, let us teach those who listen what the purpose of the word could be. So, - let's start right here, - *John , having heard the work of Christ in prison, sent two ambassadors from his disciples, and said to Him: Are you the one who is coming , or someone else?* [344] To this Christ replied: " *She came and told John what he had heard and seen .*" [345], and listed great signs. When the disciples returned again to the blessed Forerunner, the Savior said to His multitude of Jews: " *Why are you tired of seeing the desert? Is it a reed shaken by the wind? Is it a human being, dressed in soft robes? Is it a prophet? To her, I tell you, and more than a prophet. This one is, about whom it is written: Behold, I send My angel before Thy face, who will prepare Thy way before Thee .*" [346]. Then he adds to this the saying we are studying: " *Those born of the wives of John the Baptist are not born, but I am his greater in the Kingdom of Heaven.* " [347]" And not until now [only His] word continues. For He immediately continues: " *From the days of John the Baptist until the Kingdom of Heaven has been in need, and the needy women have taken it away.* " [348]. In these words, as it should be noted, the entire [given] passage has its completion.

It is necessary, I think, having briefly examined each thought, to say about the reason for which I became a prisoner of St. The Forerunner, because of which he asked Christ through his disciples whether He really is the One who *is coming* , and what and why Christ's answer to the people was. Or what prompted [Christ] to say that *no one is born from the wives of John the Baptist* , and that *I* will be *in the Kingdom of Heaven more than* such a great [husband]? So, we must move on to the interpretation of the proposed [sayings].

The blessed Baptist, who indulged in some incredible and strange life and pursued a path of life unusual for others, inaccessible to ordinary people, was the subject of surprise (and quite rightly!) for the Jews; preaching Christ, who is about to come, or better yet, already approaching, he almost stretches out his hand, [pointing to Him and] saying: " *Behold the Lamb of God, take away the sin of the world.* " [349]. Since the Lord, testified by him, seemed to disdain the service [following] from [given] through the Law of Moses, introducing instead the evangelical life, and especially what [was in the Law] in the form of an image and a canopy, transforming it into truth, then the blessed Baptist was not free from censure, as he fell into the temptation to speak in concert with those who subverted legal education, according to the word of foolish [people]. "If this man were from God," they said, "he would not have destroyed the Sabbath [350]. What else is He up to besides this?" Not completely refuting the thoughts of the Jews, but, so to speak, ridiculing them, he pretends to defend the Law and strive for the Mosaic precepts (προσταγμάτων). For then, as many at that time committed lawlessness in the most varied ways, he comes out with a denunciation of Herod alone and with desperate courage cries out about Herodias: " *You are not worthy to have her* " [351]; for he did not attach any importance at all to the fact that he might suffer until the state of affairs was explained to him, according to the proposed purpose. So, the

righteous man became a prisoner by tyrannical command, and this incident shamed the blaming Jewish people. For this made them love [the Baptist] as one who suffered for the Law, and made them more inclined to believe what he proclaimed to them.

So, the Baptist, with his suffering, sought, as it were, to buy the favor of the Jews and the disobedience of the most stubborn [of them] ων ἀπείθειαν ἀγοράζειν ὥσπερ) [352]. And since, being a partaker of the Holy Spirit and even from his mother's womb filled with prophetic grace, he saw the tyrant's sword already drawn and radiating bodily death, he took care that his disciples would be confirmed in the faith in Christ the Savior, and wanted them to know - and, moreover, very accurately and without any doubt - that He is the one expected to come to the salvation of all. So it is he who, economically, pretends not to know, so that for the one who believes, [his] disciples would again be companions on the path to faith. For the way of thinking of [a person] suffering from no small amount of arrogance is characteristic of being guided not by the advice of a teacher, but by his own opinions.

So, he, economically and, I will even say, <75.172> putting on himself, as if on stage, a mask of the ignorant, sends those of his disciples who were the most sensible, and also commands them to question and find out from the Savior's own lips whether He there is the desired [Messiah]. When those sent had already come to Jesus, He, realizing this, since He is the true God, showed even greater honor to those who worked and then turned out to be the creator of extraordinary [things] even more than before: for He did just that economically, especially in that time - which the prophets announced that He would do when He came to us. So, being asked, He does not answer directly and says: " *I am* ." [353], but, in the words of a prophetic sermon , presenting the greatness of the deeds accomplished, he says: " *Go and tell John what you have seen and heard.* [354]. *Hear* – through the prophets; and *you see* [the prophecies] fulfilled by Me." But " *the same issue* ," as the same Evangelist says, " *Jesus began to say to the people about John: Why have you seen so much?* » [355]and further in the text. And Christ spoke about this, again, out of necessity. For, since the multitude of listeners surrounding Him learned that those who asked the question were from among John's disciples, and that they came not as those seeking to get rid of their own ignorance, but that it was he who sent them and persuaded them to ask, then he understood [Christ - as a knower and knower of the heart what *'s in a person* [356]- what will some people say and think to themselves: "If blessed John still does not know Jesus, then how did he point us to Him, saying: " *Behold the Lamb of God, take away the sin of the world* "? [357]And this would be of great harm to the people. Consequently, healing the illness that befell them and eliminating the harm from temptation, He says to them: " *Why are you tired of seeing the desert? Is it a reed shaken by the wind?* » [358] "You marveled," He [seems to] say, "at the blessed Baptist and even repeatedly undertook the labor of traveling to him, overcoming such a long journey through the desert, and then acquiring benefits [arising] from this for many. And so, it means that

you thoughtlessly and hastily, He says, marveled, if you really think that he had such a frivolous mind that he was like a reed, always ready to bend where the wind blows. For how can he be otherwise if he truly confesses that he does not know Him whom he [actually] knows, out of some extreme frivolity? But if not *a cane* , then what are you *tired of seeing* ? *Is it a human being , dressed in soft robes? Behold, those who wear soft things in the royal houses are* [359]. "It would be more suitable for them," He says, "to adhere to a frivolous way of thinking." For why would such a strict ascetic, firm and skilled in warfare against the very passions of the flesh, come to such ignorance? After all, to remain in such lightness of thought would be characteristic of a soul that enjoys not the strictures, but <75.173> the pleasures of this world. If you are surprised at him not as [a person] in soft [clothes], then yield to asceticism the reliability due to it (ἀσφάλειαν). If there is no advantage in living in the best way (ἀριστα), and you place in equal rank the one who strives (τὸν πονοῦντα) and the enjoyer, then why, leaving the glorification of those who are in soft clothes and in the courts of kings, marvel? life in the desert, poor rags, and especially camel hair [360]? But I think that the absurdity contained in this will put you to shame, and you will say that the blessed Baptist is truly worthy of imitation. So you consider him a prophet? Yes, a prophet and even more than a prophet. For the prophets foretold that [the Messiah] would come without yet seeing [Him] come, but this one is both." So, the Savior expresses in all respects an amazing judgment about the Forerunner, in order to reveal him to those who preached the truth, and He Himself testifies, elevating him to high dignity and assuring that [this] man rose above the prophets. And then he shows how next to His words He placed the speech of the Father, so that [His] testimony about him would be in some way sealed and confirmed by the Law (νομικοῦ δικαιώματος). " *For this is* ," He says, " *about whom it is written: Behold, I send My angel before Thy face, who will prepare Thy way before Thee.* " [361]. Then what does He say about him beyond this? " *Amen I say to you, for there is no joy in those born of wives of the greater John the Baptist, but there is more of him in the Kingdom of Heaven.* " [362]. Pay attention again to what kind of economy the Savior made. He spoke an extensive and lengthy word about St. Baptist. Namely, He refuted an opinion from which he probably could have suffered harm. Having said that he is *less than a prophet* [363], [Christ] already deserving of wonder and love (ἀξιοθαύμαστον καὶ ἀξιεραστότατον) showed him to those listening. Then, in addition to this, He says that *there is no pain in those born of women* . So, having placed him as the image of the maximum possible virtue for those born of women, He contrasts [him] with a greater good, that is, one who has just reached the Kingdom and has been regenerated by the Spirit into the son of God, so that from what is the object of wonder, he who has the less [dignity], it was clear that the participants of the Kingdom are extremely remarkable (ἀξιολογώτατοι), and [thus] some would willingly begin to *admire her* [364], assessing the superiority of his beauty, based on [the Savior's] assessment of John. For it is not something that competes with the small in terms of quantity that will receive the head of the great, but if something is

compared with the great [with its still] greater measure, it conquers and surpasses. We call the Kingdom of Heaven the giving of the Spirit, according to what Christ said: " *The Kingdom of Heaven is within you* ." [365]. Therefore, *more than* anyone born of a woman is worthy of rebirth [from] the Spirit. For those are still called children of the flesh, but these, declaring [their] Father to be the God of all, pray, saying: " *Abba, Father* ." [366]. So, even if, He says, it is inherent in the one born of a wife to be exceptional in <75.176> deeds [of virtue], then [all the same] the one called into the Heavenly Kingdom will be great in that he will no longer be called the son of a wife, but will become *a partaker of the divine nature* [367], to be called *a child of God* [368], and if [even] he is less [than he] perfect in the skill [of virtue], then he can still be considered a small child and a newborn.

And the fact that regeneration by the Spirit is not a little distant from the measure of John, or of everyone born of women, is not an external witness for us, but he who says to Jesus himself will not be ashamed to testify to this: " *I demand that I be baptized by You* ." [369]. For behold, even though he possesses perfection in virtue, he asks for the grace of regeneration by the Spirit, as having, thanks to it, become greater than himself and no longer be born of a woman, but transformed in the direction of Divine nobility (πρὸς τὴν θείαν εὐγένειαν μενος). And the Savior strengthens the confidence in this even more: "You, O Baptist, [He says] possess perfection in good things," without saying that, they say, even without sanctification by baptism, but as if very much agreeing in its necessity, however, economically saving grace for another time. For this, I think, is what the words " *leave for now* " mean. [370].

And the fact that He calls the Kingdom of Heaven the giving of the Divine Spirit and through Him the rebirth of those who believe in God does not require much work from us for the most obvious proof, but we will see this from the very words of the Savior: " *From the days of John the Baptist until now* , - He says, " *The Kingdom of Heaven is in need, and the needy women delight it* ." [371]. For when John cried: " *Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths upright* " [372], - then many of those listening, leaving an ugly life in sins and striving for the better with compulsion [themselves] and exerting [all their strength] changing their disposition (τρόπον) towards virtue, showed themselves born of God through the Spirit, enlightened by the mind and purified thanks to St. baptism And if it seems to those who hold a different opinion that this is said incorrectly and forcedly, then let them study why " *from the days of John* ," says [the Savior], " *the kingdom of heaven has been in need* ." [373], as if no one had ever admired the Kingdom of Heaven before him. Where then will the hope of the prophets disappear? What will such a great number of saints do if they find themselves outside the Kingdom of Heaven, which then only began to be admired when, after much time, the Baptist finally appeared, saying: " *Repent , the Kingdom of Heaven is approaching* ." [374]? But it is clear that the saints were destined to abide in the Kingdom even before, as being conformed to the image of His Son and therefore *foreknown* [375] God and

Father. And in the time of John and later, the giving of the Spirit and rebirth in God, [achieved] through St. baptism, admires faith.

So, when this position is confirmed from everywhere, it is clear that it is unnecessary to assume that John will ever be greater than the Savior. If this is true, then the bewilderment of opponents is resolved.

* * *

[264] This. 14:28 .

[265] This. 14:28 .

[266] Phil.2:6 .

[267] This. 5:18 .

[268] 1 Cor. 12:8-9 .

[269] 1 Cor. 12:11 .

[270] 1 Cor. 12:31 .

[271] This. 8:16 .

[272] This. 14:28 .

[273] Phil.2:6 .

[274] Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed .

[275] In the broad sense of the impact experienced.

[276] This. 8:16

[277] This. 14:28 .

[278] This. 14:6 .

[279] Psalm 54:20 .

[280] This refers to Aristotle's fourth category, "relation" (see: Aristotle. Categories, Chapter 7). "Τὸ πρὸς τί" – "that in relation to which" is the way in which one thing can be correlated with another.

[281] "Quantity" is Aristotle's second category.

[282] See: Categories, ch. 6.

[283] Aristotle. Categories, ch. 6 (See: Ed. Minio–Paluello, L. Bekker. Oxford, Clarendon l'n 1949 (reprint: 1966), p. 6a, 36–6b, 1).

[284] "Ἕξις" is an important and polysemantic term in Aristotle's philosophical system. Translated as "possession", "state", "property", "skill", etc.

285 That is, belonging to the same genus or category.

286 The original says “ὁ Πατὴρ”, but this is an obvious typo, since the meaning of the phrase clearly requires “Son” here. Alternatively, we can assume that this phrase is a development of the previous one, and the typo is the omission of the conjunction “ὥσπερ”. Then it will turn out: “Since [the Son] is perfect like the Father, then...” One way or another, but in any case we are talking about the Son.

287 “Τὸ πως είναι” – qualityd being, i.e. created or uncreated, rational, vegetable, etc.

288 “Τὸ ἔλαττον” is not only “lesser”, but also “inferior, weaker, worse, inferior.”

289 1Tim.1:7 .

290 Phil.2:6–8 .

291 Hebrews 2:9 .

292 Phil.2:6 .

293 Hebrews 2:9 .

294 Matthew 11:11 .

295 Matthew 11:11 .

296 This is 16:15 .

297 Matthew 11:11 .

298 In fact, 930. See: Gen.5:5 .

299 "...καίτοι τοῦ προκηρύττοντος Βαπτιστοῦ κομιδῇ νέον τὸν καθ" ἡμᾶς ἀ ναλύσαντος βίου.” This part of the phrase is not grammatically consistent, and we assume here typos in Minh’s edition and read: “...κομιδῇ νέου τὸν καθ” ἡμᾶς ἀναλύσαντος βίον.” The Latin translation, placed here, also corresponds to this reading: “cum praecursor Christi Baptista juvenis admodum e vivis excesserit.”

300 There's obviously a missing subject here, so we had to fill it in at our discretion.

301 Matthew 3:14 .

302 Hebrews 7:7 .

303 Mark 1:8 .

304 This. 1:30 .

305 Luke 3:16-17 .

306 According to the logic of the entire context, this part of the phrase should refer to Christ, but grammatically it refers to John the Baptist. Therefore, we assume here damage to the text.

307 Psalm 95:13 .

308 Isaiah 43:25 .

309 Var. 3:38 .

310 This. 1:29 .

311 Matthew 3:14 .

312 1 Cor. 1:24 .

313 2 Cor. 4:4 ; Col. 1:14 .

314 Hebrews 1:3 .

315 Psalm 2:8 .

316 Psalm 109.1 .

317 Hebrews 1:6 .

318 This is 10:30 .

319 This. 14:9 .

320 This. 11:25 .

321 This. 6:51 .

322 This. 6:33 .

323 Hebrews 1:13–14 .

324 This. 5:35 .

325 This. 1:9 .

326 This. 3:29 .

327 This. 3:31 .

328 This. 3:31 .

329 This. 3:31 .

330 This. 20:22 .

331 This. 16:14 .

332 In the text of Acts - “Phrigia”.

333 Acts 16:6–7 . The Slavic text does not contain the word “Iesusov”.

334 This. 16:14 .

335 This. 8:23 .

[336] Symbol of faith.

[337] This. 1:6-7,9 .

[338] This. 5:33-34 .

[339] Luke 1:76 .

[340] Luke 1:17 .

[341] In John: “correct” (εύθύνατε); “prepare” – in Isaiah 40:3 and Matthew 1:3 .

[342] This. 1:23 .

[343] Matthew 11:11 .

[344] Matthew 11:2–3 .

[345] Matthew 11:4 .

[346] Matthew 11:7–10 .

[347] Matthew 11:11 .

[348] Matthew 11:12 .

[349] This. 1:29 .

[350] Wed: John 9:16,33;5:18 .

[351] Matthew 14:4 .

[352] The meaning of the phrase is not entirely clear: it would be more logical to “buy obedience.”

[353] This. 4:26 .

[354] Matthew 11:4 . In the text of the Gospel, the last words are in the present tense: “ *even she hears and sees* .”

[355] Matthew 11:7 .

[356] This. 2:25 .

[357] This. 1:29

[358] Matthew 11:7 .

[359] Matthew 11:7–8 .

[360] Matthew 3:4 ; Mark 1:6 .

[361] Matthew 11:10 .

[362] Matthew 11:11 .

[363] Matthew 11:9 .

[364] Matthew 11:12 .

[365] Luke 17:21 . The text of the Gospel reads " *The Kingdom of God* ."

[366] Rom.8:15 ; Gal.4 : b.

[367] 2 Pet. 1:4 .

[368] This. 1:12 .

[369] Matthew 3:14 .

[370] Matthew 3:15 .

[371] Matthew 11:12 .

[372] Matthew 1:3 .

[373] Matthew 11:12 .

[374] Matthew 3:2 .

[375] Rom. 8:29 .

Word 11 Word 13

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 12 Word 14

Word 12. On [sentence] "I in the Father, and the Father in Me" [376] and "I and the Father are one" [377]

The objection seems to be on behalf of heretics . There is nothing surprising, they say, if the Father abides in the Son, and the Son in the Father, when the Divine Scriptures say about us that we “ *live and move in Him, and are* ” [378]. So, just as we *live and move in Him, and are* , as it is said, so the Son abides in the Father. For how is it possible for the Son to contain within Himself the Father, Who is greater than Him? Or how can the Son, being much smaller than the Father, be able to contain and fill more with Himself?

Rebuttal to this . If you think that the Son is contained in the Father as a body within a body, then I think you would naturally prefer to examine their interchangeability. For in relation to a vessel - clay, for example, or from some other substance - it will not be inappropriate to say that the greater cannot be contained by the smaller, or that the smaller, in turn, cannot fill the larger. Regarding the incorporeal and those whose nature does not consist of any substance, what meaning will this sentence have? And we say this for now, condescending to your ignorant assumption, just as you yourself, being misled, believed that it should be said that the Father is greater than the Son; but the word of truth is not like that. For [the Son] is equal to the Father in everything. Then, I think that it is not for you to use these words at all, even if you knew that there is a true Father and a true Son, and that there is an invisible and ever-present light, and its radiance, and that, again, there is an incorporeal hypostasis and disembodied outline. For if you kept in your mind the memory of such [objects], according to an accurate understanding [of them], meaning, of course, the nature of God, then you would not fantasize, as if about bodies, but, following what has been said, you would find out exactly how The Son is in the Father, and how the Father is in the Son. After all, as the mark, image, radiance and likeness of This One appears in Him, and He is This One.

Since you say that there is nothing surprising if the Son also abides in the Father, because we also *in live and move* Him , then it is necessary to show that you are very mistaken in this too and have crossed the boundary of truth. For not just as God dwells

in each of the saints, sanctifying them, He also dwells in Christ. But the Son Himself is the Power and Wisdom of the Father, sanctifying everything that is part of Him in the Father, and He Himself is not by some kind of sacrament being holy, like us, and not by grace being called the Son, but always being a product of the Father's essence <75.180>. And again: the Son is not in the Father just as we are; for in God we *live and move and are* , and the Son by nature, having come from the Father's essence, as if from some living source, is by nature life, quickening everything, and not by the participation of life, like us, being quickened. Otherwise He would not be by nature life. For what comes and is delivered from without cannot be thought of as inherent in the nature of the one who acquired it. And the Son says: " *I am the belly"* [379]. Therefore, not as we are quickened in God, in this way He also lives and is, but truly being what He calls Himself, that is, life, and by nature being in the Father, being one with Him due to the identity of essence, which is Divinity.

OTHER . As if from the objection of heretics . [The Lord] says that He is in the Father and the Father in Him, for the reason that neither the word that He addresses to everyone, nor the deeds, are His own, but the Father's, who commanded such [words] to be spoken and gave the power to do them. affairs [380].

Rebuttal to this . So, in your opinion, oh heretics, let each of the saints be allowed to utter such words, since they too have become servants of the word and have received from above the power to become creators of wonderful deeds. For blessed David says: " *I will hear what the Lord God says about me* ." [381]. And the wisest Solomon [said]: " *My words came from God* ." [382]. And blessed Moses became a faithful servant of the Divine verbs, and in general each of the prophets did not use his own words, but always had in his mouth: " *This is what the Lord says* ...". So, from here you can see that many others turn out to be ministers of words [spoken] from God; [in addition], they performed wonderful [deeds] and they, from God, as it is said, received *hedgehog relics* [383]. And, of course, Savior's disciples, marveling at the deeds they had accomplished, said: " *Men and brethren, why do you hearken to us that it was by our own strength or piety that we made the lame walk?* » [384]Let, therefore, each of them be allowed to use the Lord's utterance and say: " *I am in the Father, and the Father in me* ," since each of them, as has already been said, used divine words and created powers, receiving from God hedgehog of power. And thus, there is nothing outstanding in the Son, but He will also be one of all, in vain, as it seems, being called the Son, since there is nothing special in Him. But this is absurd, [so] another [understanding] will prevail.

OTHER . If it were possible for all the saints, or indeed anyone else of created nature, to say: " *I am in the Father, and the Father in me* ," then the Savior, knowledgeable in this, would have said: " *And I am in the Father, and the Father in me* ." *I am* ," in order to seem to teach that just as in others there is [the Father], so also in Me; and as

some others are in Him, so also I am. Now, without adding any of the others, but knowing that this is inherent in Him alone because He is from <75.181> the essence of the Father, He says with great circumspection: " *I am in the Father, and the Father in Me* ." So, He does not have a common dignity with everyone, but one that distinguishes [Him from others] and is exclusive, like the Son and the Word and God.

OTHER, teaching how the proposed speech should be understood . [The words] "The Son is in the Father, and the Father in the Son" should be understood as follows. From the essence of the Father the Son came, not coming, like creatures, from non-existence into being, or having composition from somewhere outside, but He is a characteristic feature (τὸ ἴδιον) of the essence of the One who gave birth, just as radiance [comes] from light, and from a certain source comes flow. Therefore, it is possible for those who see the Son to see the essence of the Father and, thanks to Him, to understand the characteristic feature of the One who gave birth. That since the whole being of the Son proceeds from the essence of the Father, He is thus in the Father; and vice versa, the Father is in the Son, since what He is by nature, the same is God the Word who came from Him. And [the Father] appears and is in the Son, just as the sun is in the radiance that comes from it, and as the mind is in the word, and as the source that pours it out is in the stream. For the characteristic property of the Father's essence, which resides in the Son, and, so to speak, the "form of the Godhead" (τῆς θεότητος τὸ εἶδος) shows Him to everyone in Him. However, one must keep in mind and firmly know that it was not because of the dispensation that happened that the Savior uttered this phrase. For, since He, wanting to show the identity of nature that He has in relation to the One who gave birth, said: " *I and the Father are one* » [385], so that no one would think that the Father and the Son are One and the Same, and by names alone they are divided into a binary, but in hypostasis they are not so [i.e. that is, without dividing], then, of necessity, again detailing what He said, and making it even clearer for those who listen, he adds: " *I am in the Father, and the Father in Me* ," so that by means of the fact that He appears in Him, and He is in This, to show the identity of the Divinity and the essence, and because [it is said that] One is in the Other, it would not be considered that there is one thing in number, which is sometimes called the Father, and sometimes the Son, but in order to more clearly show the truly [hypostatically] realized (ὑφεστῶτα) Father and the [hypostatically] realized Son.

OTHER . The Father and the Son are one by nature, and two by number, not as if one thing were divided into two parts that no longer have communication and connection with each other, and not as if one and the same thing were called two names, so that in the name alone the property (δύναμις) of binary would be manifested; and not as if one and the same thing were called either Father or Son (for this is the teaching of Sabellius), but they are two in number, for the Father is always the Father, never transformed into the Son, and also the Son, never transformed into Father. And since this is the case, then even though the number is determined by two, both have one

nature and the same Divinity, since the generation is always similar in nature to the one who gave birth. For the Son is the image, mark and radiance of the hypostasis <75.184> of the Father’s essence. Thus, we say that God is one because of the identity of nature in the Father with the Son and in the Son with the Father.

OTHER . As for the radiance sent from the sun, no one will say that it is a different light in nature compared to it [the sun], or that it becomes such by some kind of participation or connection with it, but that it truly is by nature emanating from it, and that these are seen [only] speculatively by two lights, but by nature they are one; So it would not be correct if anyone said, even if the Father and the Son were divided into two by number, that the Son is something different in relation to the Father as regards the Divinity and the identity of essence. But just as the sun is present in the radiance that comes from it, and the radiance is in the sun from which it came, so the Father is present in the Son, and the Son in the Father, being divided into two by number and thus existing in hypostases, and united by the identity of nature in one Deity.

OTHER . If anyone examines the Divine Scripture exactly, he will find that the Son is called [in it] by as many names as the Father, with the only exception being that He is called Father; and, in the opposite direction, the Father Himself is called by as many names as the Son, with the sole exception of being called the Son. Almighty Father; [the same] is also applied in relation to the Son: “So and so *says He who is, He who is to come , The Almighty* ” [386]. Lord the Father; and " *One Lord Jesus Christ* " [387]. Light Father; The Son also says: “ *I am the light of the world* ” [388]. The Father leaves sins; The Son also does this: “ *Let us know* ,” He says, “ *that the Son of man has power on earth to forgive sins* .” [389]. So, since everything that is in the Father is present in the Son, He rightly says: “ *Everything that the Father has is Mine.* ” [390]. And again, turning to His Father, He says: “ *All of Mine is Yours, and all of Yours is Mine* .” [391]. So, if what is inherent in the Father is also inherent in the Son, and, conversely, what is inherent in the Son is also in the Father, then he who says: “ *I am in the Father, and the Father in Me* ” is not lying. [392], since the identity of their inherent properties invariably appears in the Dual. Since this is true, it is possible for the Son to be the Father’s own offspring, for He would not have carried [in Himself] by nature [the properties] belonging to the Begotten, if He had not been from Him; and the Father would not have had the properties of Generation if that which was generated were not proper to His essence.

[The same thing, shown] differently, as if by example. As if someone looked at a beautifully drawn image (εἰκόνα) and admired the image (σχήμα) of the king, and, being able to discern in the drawing (γραφῇ) those [features] that appear in it, would desire to see the king himself, and said If only he had a drawing: “He who has seen me has seen the king”; and again: “I and the king <75.185> are one in terms of similarity and the most exact resemblance”; and also: “I am in the king, and the king is in me

according to the image of appearance (κατὰ τὸ τῆς μορφῆς σχῆμα)” - for every drawing bears its appearance (εἶδος), and the appearance of the drawing is preserved in it, - so is the Son, saying: “ *Whoever sees Me, sees the Father* ” [393] and " *I and the Father are one* " [394], “ *I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me* ” [395]. For the Son, invariably possessing the essence of the Father, is an exact image (εἰκών) of the Father and an image (μορφὴ) of the Parent, showing in Himself the whole of Him who gave birth. For in this way you will [correctly] understand what Paul said: “ *Whoever is in the image of God does not need to be equal with God by admiration.* ” [396]. For He was equal with God, being entirely God, just as the Father was; so *God is in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself* [397], so what the Son does is the work of the Father. For, since there is no difference between Them as regards Divinity and nature, then nothing prevents the works of the Son from being called the works of the Father, and vice versa.

OTHER . If everything that is exclusively inherent in the Father turns out to be *inherent* in the Son, not being given to Him by grace, and not by some kind of participation, but by nature, like the One who gave birth, and there is nothing [between Them] mediating or dividing [Them] into dissimilarity, then [from here] it will be clear and obvious to everyone that the Son, being the very property of the Father’s essence (αὐτὸ τῆς πατρικῆς οὐσίας τὸ ἴδιον), bears in Himself the whole Father, and [He] is all in the Father by the identity of the essence, and for this reason it is beautiful and accordingly says: “ *I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me* .” [398] and " *I and the Father are one* " [399]. For since He lacks nothing that belongs to the Father, He will be exactly the same as the One who begat Him.

OTHER . God is called Father because at the same time the existence of the Son is introduced with Him, for He would not be the Father if He did not have the Word originating from Himself. And conversely, the name of the Son in every way introduces simultaneously the existence of the Father. For one is designated in relation to the other. So, if one is necessarily contained in the other, and the Father is designated together with His Generation, and the Son in every way - together with the One who begat Him, then truly testifies (προσαληθεύει [400]) saying: “ *I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me* .”

OTHER . If everyone who believes in the Son believes in the Father, and whoever honors the Son honors the Father, and, conversely, whoever worships the Father worships the Son, then how is it possible that He is not in Him, and He is in This by the indistinguishability of essence? After all, this is why there is one worship in the Father and the Son with the Holy Spirit, and one God is confessed and is by all, that there is no difference between Them, but They remain in the identity of <75.188> essence and have nothing that would cut off the Other from the natural distinctiveness properties (τῆς φυσικῆς ἰδιότητος).

OTHER. The teaching [follows] as if from the objection of the Christ-fighters . The Father, they say, is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father, according to the following scheme. Since They in no way disagree in judgments or in plans (νοήμασιν), but what the Father wills, so does the Son, and, conversely, what the Son wills, so does the Father, and there is a certain agreement and identity of wills and thoughts (θελημάτων καὶ γνώμης) is seen in Them, then in this sense the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father.

Rebuttal to this . But then it is also possible for angels, or other intelligent forces, about which the Psalms say: " *Bless the Lord, all His angels, all His servants who do His will.* " [401] use the Savior's verbs so that each of them says: " *I am in the Father, and the Father in Me* " and " *He who sees Me, sees the Father* ." After all, it is obvious to everyone that everything that God wills is undoubtedly also willed by angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, and powers, and none of them is found to be inconsistent with the Divine will. For he would not have remained in his rank if he had not adhered to this goal. For he who sought something other than God's will heard: " *Now you will go down to hell and to the foundations of the earth* ." [402]. So, if each of those listed desires the same thing that God wills, is established in this and retains his leadership, and is by no means using [in relation to himself] the words of the Son, then it is not the agreement of thought (συμφωνία τῆς γνώμης), nor that he willed the same thing shows the Son [being] in the Father, and the Father, in turn, [being] in the Son, but an unchanging similarity of essence and identity of natural property.

OTHER . Since angels, archangels and their highest intelligent powers remain in an unshakable state (στάσιν) and retain their leadership, then, of course, it is obvious that they do not rebel against the will of God, but submit and submit to the laws of the Creator [them], and have agreement with God thought (γνώμην), so that everyone pleases and does what seems appropriate to Him. Since this is how things are, which everyone agrees with, then why is the Son alone the Only Begotten of both Word and Wisdom? After all, it would be fitting, if in order to desire the same thing that the Father wills, he actually makes it so that [the one who desires this] is called the Only Begotten, the Word and Wisdom, - and other rational creatures should be [all] these and the same names, as is the Son. If none of them is either the Only Begotten Son, nor the Word, nor Wisdom, nor light, nor radiance, nor the image, nor the mark of the Father, then it is necessary, therefore, to admit that it is not that he wills the same as the Father, <75.189> not having the same thought with Him gives the Son the opportunity to say: " *"I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me* ," and also: " *I and the Father are one* ," but that, being the true offspring of the Father's essence, He carries the Father in Himself and Himself appears in the Father. The same can be said in relation to holy people, whose goal is to follow Divine commands, and who [nevertheless] cannot say: " *I am in the Father, and the Father in Me* ."

OTHER. As if from the objection of heretics . If, they say, being called the Son and the image of the Father makes the one who boasts of such names one with Him by nature, then what prevents us, being people - since we are both called sons and created in the image of God - from being by nature like Him?

Rebuttal to this . But for us, dear ones, this exists by grace, and for God’s Word - by nature. And it is said about Him: “ *Who is like You in God, O Lord?* » [403]- since He has not a dignity that came [to Him from outside], but a natural dignity. And about us: “ *Az rekh: you are gods by nature and sons of the Most High; “But you, like men, are dying, and like you alone are falling from princes* .” [404]. So if we do not make every effort to avoid vice, then we can easily fall away from the [dignity] that we have received. We have received this by grace to be called sons and gods, which [names] by nature belong to the Son. And we are the image of God, since we accepted the true Image of His Son, and He dwelt among us, and in recent times became man for the sake of our salvation. [405]. So great and immeasurable is the difference between us, who are called sons by grace, and who are by nature and truly existing [Son]. And your position turned out to be more nonsense than a sensible idea.

OTHER . If for that one reason you call the Son like the Father. - Oh, Christ-fighters, - that everything that the Father wills is the same as He, then He will be like not the Father, but rather the wills of the Father. And the Father, in your opinion, will be such only in name, and the Son will be neither the Son nor the immutable image of the Father, but only an imitator of His wills. Since Paul, being an imitator of Christ and similar to Him in willing all that He willed, and also in the word of teaching, has [in itself] the image of His will, but is not by nature the same as the Son of God . If this is absurd and at the same time impious, then it is necessary to understand the similarity by the essence and distinctive features of nature alone (τοὺς τῆς φύσεως χαρακτῆρας). For, in this way, the Son will truly appear to be the truest image of the Father, so that he can rightfully say: “ *I am in the Father, and the Father in Me* ,” and also: “ *He who sees Me, sees the Father* .”

OTHER [said! narratively . Thus, the Father and the Son are one, and thus [the Son] is similar to Him, just as with us a son in relation to his father is considered [similar] according to the logos of essence, and if, as someone imagines, in relation to the sun the radiance emanating from him. That is why and because in such a relationship the Son is with the Father, when the Son does [something, then the same] does the Father, and when He, again, comes to the saints, then the Father appears [and] coming, as He Himself said: “ *will come I* and the Father , *and we will make an abode with him* .” [406]. For all things, as has already been said, come from the Father through the Son; and if only one of the saints is given grace, then the Father turns out to have given it through the Son. And Paul is a witness to this, writing to someone: “ *Grace to you and peace from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ* .” [407]. Again he turns to others: “ *Let*

our God and Father and our Lord Jesus Christ straighten our path to you. ” [408]. But if there had not been some kind of unity between the Father and the Son, he would have said: “may they correct our way,” to designate the two. Now he does not do this, but, clearly observing the unity of the Father and the Son, he put [the verb] “correct” in the singular, so that it would not turn out that the Father gives separately and the Son gives separately, but that the Father [gives everything] through the Son in the Holy Spirit, [and] from the one Godhead gifts are sent to the saints.

OTHER . If the Son were by nature separated from the essence of the Father, and if there were not something indivisible in Them (ἀδιάστατος) [409]unity, which radiance has in relation to the sun, then the Father alone would be enough to give gifts to the saints - without the Son being involved in this. For if He is a created essence and is something other than God, then what is the reason - given that none of the other creations has fellowship with God in the donation of Divine gifts - to Him alone be involved [in this matter]? For no one will tolerate if someone says [to him]: “May God the Father and an angel, say, give you what you pray for,” but even if he calls something more than an angel. For it is fitting for God alone to give [us what we ask of Him]. If he gives not with any other of the creations, but only together with the Son, and through the Son - in the Holy Spirit, then from here it will be obvious and known to everyone that [the Son] is the own generation of the essence of the Father and, having the Father in Himself and He Himself, in the same way, abiding in the Father, does and does everything, and gives gifts to the saints. And Paul is a witness to this, saying: “ *I thank my God always for you, for the grace of God given to you in Christ Jesus.”* » [410].

OTHER. As if from the objection of heretics . You said, they say, that not one of the creatures is attracted <75.193> along with God to the alms of gifts. What will you do then, having discovered in the divine Scriptures the Patriarch Jacob blessing [those born] of Joseph, that is, Ephraim and Manasseh, and saying: “ *The God who has nourished me from my youth even to this day, and the angel who delivers me?” from all evils, may he bless these children* " [411]. Behold, they say, having named God, he also added an angel, as one who could bless with Him.

Rebuttal to this . If the Christ-fighters agree (ἐνομολογοῦσιν) [412], that the prophetic spirit was inherent in the one who says this and they believe that Jacob was truly a holy man, then why are they not ashamed to attribute to him such a great delusion, as if he attaches an angel to everyone with God and thinks that he can [and an angel] bless along with the Creator what came into being thanks to Him? If it is absurd, then let them hear from us: if you believe that Jacob was truly holy, then stop slandering him, but rather investigate the true meaning of what he said. If he was not a saint, then, along with everything else, have the courage to say this too! - then why do you cite the words of a non-holy man to overthrow, as it seems to you, such and such [evidence]?

So, leaving aside your ignorance, let us explain how the words of the patriarch should be understood. For, as a holy man and guided by the Divine Spirit to the knowledge of the dogmas of piety, he, firstly, said: “ *God , who has nourished me from my youth even to this day, bless these children.* ” [413]. Then he says: “ *And the angel who delivers me from all evils* ” [414], in order to say “ *God* ” to designate the Father; and having said “ *and the angel* ” - [thus pointing to the Word born] from Him. For he knew that his name was called: great is the angel of counsel [415]. And what he is talking about here about the Son, and not about such an angel as is usually meant, will be clear from here: after all, having said “angel,” he did not stop speaking there, but added: “ *Who delivers me from all evils* .” So, let us consider from these words whether it was really not God who delivered the patriarch Jacob *from all evils* , but one of the created angels.

Further proof that God was the One who " delivers from all evils" of the patriarch Jacob . It is said that an angel fought with the patriarch Jacob, and this is contained in divine Scripture. But, grabbing him, the saint said: “ *I won't let you go unless you bless me* .” [416]. And this was God. The same patriarch is quoted as saying: “ *I saw God face to face* .” [417]. He prays to this one, who appeared to him as an Angel, to send down a blessing on his grandchildren.

OTHER, from the same series . The Lord God appeared to the patriarch, as it is written, and said to him: “ *Behold, I am with you, keep* <75.196> *you on every path, even if you go* .” [418]. So, it was God who delivers, and not an angel. And again, when Laban pursued Jacob and overtook him, then again God prevented the reproach of [the patriarch], not allowing Laban to say [bad] words to Jacob [419]. And that God did this for him, let [the patriarch] himself be a witness, saying to his wives: “ *God will not allow Laban to do evil to me* .” [420]. And another time, when Esau plotted against him, he did not call on an angel, but prayed to God, crying: “ *Take me, O Lord, from the hand of my brother Esau, for I am afraid of him.* ” [421].

OTHER, [said] apodictically that the Word of God is a “vision” (τὸ εἶδος) of Him [422] . The Savior says somewhere to the Jews, who are very disobedient: “ *The Father who sent Me, Himself testified about Me. You have neither heard His voice anywhere, nor seen His vision εἶδος αὐτοῦ) (, nor have His word abiding in you, the one who is His ambassador, in which you do not have faith* ." [423]. So, it is said that for those who do not believe the Word sent from the Father, it is impossible to hear the voice of God, nor *vision* to ever see a of Him, nor even to have His word abiding within themselves. So, it is obvious and clear to everyone that if they had accepted the Messenger, they would have heard the voice of God, and *vision* they would have seen His , and they would have had the Word dwelling [in them]. This means that all this is the Son - the voice, *vision* and Word of the Father. If He is *a vision* (εἶδος), then it is clear that He is both an image (εἰκὼν) and a mark (χαρακτήρ). Consequently, as a mark, by nature having in

Himself the Prototype, of which He is the mark, He rightly says: “ *I am in the Father, and the Father in Me.* ” [424] and " *I and the Father are one* " [425].

OTHER, showing that the Word is called the “vision” of God. Patriarch Jacob was renamed by God and was once nicknamed Israel, when, as the divine Scripture says, “ *the sun rose up to him when the sight (εἶδος) of God* had passed away .” [426]. What else would the sight of God be if not for Him who cried out with boldness: “ *He who has seen Me, has seen the Father .*” [427], “ *I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me* ” [428] and " *I and the Father are one* " [429]?

The objection seems to be on behalf of Christ's opponents, filled with wickedness. The Savior, they say, is found [nowhere in Scripture] asking His Father for His disciples and for all those who have believed in Him, and saying thus: “ *Holy Father, keep them in Thy name, which Thou hast given Me, that they may be one, even as We are .*” [430]. And then: “ *I pray not only for these, but also for those who believe their words for their sake in Me: that they may all be one, as You, Father, are in Me, and I in You, and they also in* <75.197> *We may be one: Yes, and the world has faith, because you sent Me. And I have given the glory to Me, to them, that they may be one, just as We are one. “I am in them, and You are in Me, that they may be perfect in one: that the world may understand that You sent Me.* ” [431]. Therefore, just as we, who are human by nature, are in the Father, so the Son Himself is one with the Father. And the Father Himself, in turn, is one with the Son in the same way as with us. And just as nothing forces us to be similar in nature due to the fact that we are called one with Him, so there is no need to [once again] say that the Son is from the essence of the Father, since He is one with God. Or, if we remain human, although we become one with the Father, then it is fair to think the same about the Son. For He remains with His own nature, without ascending to the essence of the Father, although it is said that He is one with Him.

Further rebuttal . Having said this, the devil - the father of Christ-fighters and the leader (χορηγὸς) of their idle talk - heard: “ *Now you will descend to hell and to the foundations of the earth.* ” [432]. For how he dared to say: “ *I will ascend above the clouds and be like the Most High .*” [433], - in the same way, these too, far surpassing the limits of human nature and trampling the measure of essence, are not afraid, saying: “Let us be like the Most High.” So, just as God's Word speaks the truth, crying out: “ *I and the Father are one* ,” because of the indistinguishability of essence, so Christ's fighters could rightly say: “We and our father, the devil, are one,” because of the indistinguishability of mentality (γνώμης). They have already reached such a degree of madness that they believe that those who are called gods by grace can be by nature similar to Him who gave [them this] grace. And those who are called sons by being likened to [their] Son by nature, believe that they are equal to him who raises them to sonship and with His own [inherent] dignity by nature, who clothes them by grace,

great for the sake of [His] love for mankind.

The objection seems to be on behalf of heretics . Even though the Son will say, they say: “ *I and the Father are one,* ” yet everything will not be of the same essence as the Father, since we, being human by nature, become one with God, and the Son Himself is a witness to this, speaking : “ *Father, I want* [434] *Yes, as I and You are one* [435]*, so that they are in our only future* [436]».

Rebuttal to this . If in the same way the Father and the Son are one, just as we are [one] with the Father, and the Father is with us, then there is no distance between God the Word and us, but He will be identical with us by nature, and will differ only <75.200> in time , since He also exists before all [creations]. But even if it takes precedence in time, it will still be identical to us in essence. For how will Adam be prevented from being similar in nature to, say, Paul, or anyone else from among those who were born after him, the fact that he was created by God before all of them? So, if time does not give anything in this sense, then what prevents the Son, who arose before us, from being of the same essence with us, if nothing else stands between Him and us? And if this, in your opinion, is true, then why is He alone called the Creator when we are deprived of this? And through Him we came into being, and He is clothed with the glory of the Creator. It would be truly logical - if we are by nature the same as He - that each of us would be called the Only Begotten, and the Word, and the Wisdom of the Father. For those who have one nature will have a common name; and what is inherent in one by nature will certainly be in [others] who participate in the same essence. If this is absurd, and we are not and are not called either Creators, or Wisdom, or the Word or radiance, but the Son alone is all this, then, therefore, He will not be identical in nature with us, but has a special birth from the Father and in this [precisely] way there is one with His Father, and not as we, through a [certain] relationship to Him, assimilate unity through participation (μετοχικῶς τε καὶ μεταληπτικῶς), just as iron, having come into contact with fire, gets hot from it.

OTHER, teaching with quick proof that what is likened to something is not necessarily and by nature contained in that to which it is likened, but that what is inherent in some [*creatures*] *by nature is made, as it were, in a certain way of our voluntary movements* . The Divine Scripture says to some [people]: “ *Do not be like a horse and a horse that has no understanding* .” [437]. And again [speaks] about some: “ *Horses of misogyny have been created* .” [438]. And the Savior also says to His disciples: " *Be wise as serpents, and wise as doves* ." [439]. And again: “ *Be merciful, as your Father is merciful* ” [440]. So, if the fact that some are likened to dumb animals, because they suffered from the same thing as them, unreason (ἀβουλίαν), makes them the same in nature as those [animals]; and vice versa, if the fact that the disciples imitate the wisdom of the snake and the purity of the dove, and the readiness *of the Father in heaven* to have mercy on everyone - and the snakes and doves themselves - makes

them similar in nature to God, then when it is said that we become one with God, nothing prevents us from saying that it is by the logos of essence that we have become one with God, just as the Son did in relation to His Father. And if our likeness to those with whom we are compared extends only to thought or deed, then, therefore, we are not essentially identical with God, when it is said that we become one with Him. But as He Himself is one by nature [441] with His Word, so we become one with each other - a state of mind (γνώμη), like-mindedness (ὁμονοίᾳ) and in such a way that we are in no way at enmity with each other, but are, as it were, compressed into identity by a single bond of holy love.

OTHER . It is the custom of the Savior Christ to always reveal the goods inherent in Him by nature and command us to become like them, as if transforming us into conformity with the Divine image (εἰκόνα), according to which we were created. Therefore, when He wants to teach us [to be] meek, He says: “ *Learn from Me, for I am meek and lowly in heart* .” [442]. And when we, having learned from Him, become meek, we do not necessarily become like Him by nature, but only in terms of meekness. Therefore, when He says about us: “ *That they may be one, even as We are one* ” [443]- taking from Himself an example [for us], this does not mean that He says this so that we would become by nature one with God, but so that just as He by nature is one with the Father, so we would be in unanimity and thus, in order to think alike, we would become one with each other, taking the natural identity of the Father and the Son as an example of a non-contentious state of mind (ἀδιαστάτου γνώμης), which can make us, as it were, one body and soul. For this is what is written about those who believed: “ *But the multitude of those who believed had one heart and one soul* .” [444].

OTHER . By nature, the properties inherent in some [creatures] become, as it were, unchangeable images (εἰκόνες ἀμετάβλητοι) for those who want to change, in accordance with them, their will, as is the case, for example, in [the saying]: “ *Be like a serpent and like a dove* .” Consequently, even now the Son offers the natural identity that He has in relation to the Father, as a kind of image, an example of the unity that must be voluntarily formed in us. So, when He says about us “ *That they may be one, just as we are one* ,” this does not mean that we, leaving our own nature, will be transformed into the nature of the Son (for this is impossible), but that, as already It was said that we would, according to consciousness (κατά γνώμην), become that in relation to each other, what He Himself by nature is in relation to the Father, that is, one.

If anyone believes that what has been said is not an image and an example, but that everything will be some kind of natural change, then he deceives himself by not seeing the truth. For if the Son wanted us to become by nature what He Himself is in relation to the Father, then he would have to say: “So that as I am one in relation to You, Father, so are they.” However, He did not say this, but, using the plural, says: “ *Yes,*

just as I and You are one." [445], *as well as those in our only future* [446]", clearly teaching that he does not want those who believe in Him to be transformed into the nature of the Divine (for this is incredible), but taking what is inherent in Him by nature as an image of unity at will, so that they would become according to [their] consciousness (κατὰ γνώμην) , what He Himself by nature is in relation to the One who gave birth.

OTHER, showing that to become in God does not mean a change of nature, but that [*it is given] through Him and by Him.* We find that nowhere does the Psalmist say: " *In You we are our enemies, let us rip our horns .*" [447]. And again: " *In my God I will cross the wall* " [448]. But it is obvious that not by nature becoming in God, he will be able to *overcome the wall* and *gore the horns* , but in the name of God (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Θεοῦ) [449]and in His power he will do it. Consequently, when the Son says: " *That these also may be one in Us* ," He does not say that believers should become by nature one with God, but that in the name of the Father and the Son they may have one mind-set (γνώμην) and may they converge in the unity of love (φιλίας). Since He adds " *as we also are one* ," it is obvious that He does not grant a natural change to believers, but exposes what is inherent in Him by nature as an image and example of our arbitrary unity. For " *as* " does not necessarily mean truth, but some kind of likeness.

OTHER, through which we learn how to understand what has been said, i.e.: "Even as I and Thou art one, so also these also shall be one in Us: I am in them, and Thou art in Me, that they may be perfect in one." [450]. Desiring to offer some great and supernatural grace for the human race, God's Word draws everyone to unity with Himself. After all, having put on a human body, He began to [dwell] among us. But He has the Father in Himself, as His Word and radiance. "So," He says, " *just as I am in them* , because I bear the same flesh with them , *and You, Father, are in Me* , because I am a part of Your essence, so I desire that they too, having come together in some kind of unity , dissolved in each other, and, as if becoming one body, they would all be in Me, as in the one who bears [them] all through one temple [body] received by [Me], and so *let* be and appear *the perfections* . For I am also perfect and have become a man."

OTHER, precisely showing that, without abandoning our own nature, we are transformed into the Divine, when it is said that we become one with God, but that having become partakers of Him, we are so called . Blessed John says: " *We understand this, because we abide in God, and He is in us , because He has given us of His Spirit to eat.* " [451]. So, if, thanks to the fact that we partake of the Spirit, we become one with God, and it is said that "we are in Him, *and He is in us* ," and the Word of God is not among those who partake of the Spirit, but rather is the giver of the Spirit, then it is clear that not in the same way as He abides in God and the Father, do we [abide in Him]. But He abides in Him by nature who gave birth to [Him], as His Word <75.205> and radiance, and about us, who are honored through Him with the

communion of the Spirit, it is said that we become one with God.

OTHER, carrying the same thought. Blessed John again says nowhere: " *Whoever confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, God abides in him, and he also in God* ." [452]. So, if, by confessing that Jesus is the Son of God, we become in God, and He in the same way is in us, but the Son is not in the same way in the Father, for He does not have as a gift for [His] confession that He should be in German It is obvious and clear to everyone that people are called by grace to unity with God, and have this as a reward for their confession and faith. But the Word of God, without anything of the kind, is by nature in the Father, and bears the Father in Himself, and is truly one with Him.

OTHER . According to the word of John, he who confesses that *Jesus is the Son of God* has God abiding in himself, and he himself becomes in God. Someone confessed, suppose, and, having received the Spirit as a reward for confession, he accepted God into himself and himself became in God. But it happened by some devilish trick that he changed his mind about what he had previously decided correctly, and retreated from confession, and therefore lost grace and became alien to the Divine Spirit, for He does not live in those who slander the Son. He also destroyed that he might be in God and have God in himself. He was a man both when he confessed and when he retreated from confession. So, we are not transformed by nature into the Divine essence, when it is said that we become one with God, but grace and virtue unites us [with Him], and vice, in turn, removes us, and if, confessing *that Jesus is the Son of God* , We become one with God, then, by rejecting, we are alienated in every way. But the Son is not presented as a reward for this virtue. Therefore, He is not in the Father in the same way as we are, but He is by nature and invariably born of Him; we are by grace and communion. Consequently, just as He is by nature Son and God, so we, in His likeness, are called both sons and gods.

* * *

[376] This. 14:10 .

[377] This is 10:30 .

[378] Acts 17:28 .

[379] This. 14:6 .

[380] This. 14:10,21 .

[381] Psalm 84:9 .

[382] Proverbs 31:1 .

[383] Prem. 31:18 .

384 Acts 3:12 (quotation not given correctly).

385 This is 10:30 .

386 Rev.1:8 .

387 1 Cor. 8:6 .

388 This. 8:2 .

389 Matthew 9:6 .

390 This is 16:15 .

391 This. 17:10 .

392 This. 14:11 .

393 This. 14:9 .

394 This is 10:30 .

395 This. 14:11 .

396 Phil.2:6 .

397 2 Cor.5:19 .

398 This. 14:11 .

399 This is 10:30 .

400 Gapax: the only, according to TLG, use of the verb "αληθεύω" with the prefix "προς-".

401 Psalm 102:20-21 .

402 Isaiah 14:15 .

403 Psalm 85:8 .

404 Ps. 81:6–7 .

405 Words from the Creed .

406 This. 14:23 .

407 2 Sol. 1:2 .

408 1 Sol. 3:11 .

409 That is, not allowing any distance.

410 1 Cor. 1:4 .

411 Gen.48:15–16 .

412 Gapax.

413 Gen.48:15 .

414 Gen.48:16 .

415 Isaiah 9:6 .

416 Gen.32:26 .

417 Gen.32:30 .

418 Gen.28:15 .

419 Gen.31:23–25 .

420 Gen.31:7 .

421 Gen.32:11 .

422 This. 5:37 .

423 This. 5:37-38 .

424 This. 14:11 .

425 This is 10:30 .

426 Gen.32:31 .

427 This. 14:9 .

428 This. 14:11 .

429 This is 10:30 .

430 This. 17:11 .

431 This. 17:20-23 .

432 Isaiah 14:15 .

433 Isaiah 14:14 .

434 This. 17:24 .

435 This. 17:22 .

436 This. 17:21 .

437 Psalm 31:9 .

438 Jer.5:8 .

439 Matthew 10:16 .

440 Luke 6:36 .

[441] The original says “ῥύσει”, but we assume a typo here and read “φύσει”.

[442] Matthew 11:29 .

[443] This. 17:22 .

[444] Acts 4:32 . In the Slavic Bible : “ *To the people who believed* ...”.

[445] This. 17:22 .

[446] This. 17:21 .

[447] Ps.43:6 . In the Slavic Bible : " *About You* ...".

[448] Ps.17:30 . In the Slavic Bible: " *By God* ...".

[449] The Greek “ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Θεοῦ” in meaning does not quite correspond to the Russian “in the name”, which is usually translated. If the second has the meaning “for the sake of” (cf.: “in the name of love for God”), then the first means that someone “abides in the name of God,” “endowed with the power of the name of God,” with which he performs miraculous deeds. We have translated “ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι” as close to this meaning as possible, but it should be borne in mind that here we are contrasting “ἐν τῷ Θεῷ φυσικῶς” and “ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Θεοῦ" - i.e. " to be in God physically, by nature" and "to be in the name and power of God."

[450] This. 10:30; 17:21,23 .

[451] 1 John 4:13 .

[452] 1 John 4:17 .

Word 12 Word 14

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 13 Word 15

Word 13. About the likeness of the Son to the Father, and that the Son is not of a changeable nature, and did not exist from the outside, but from His essence came into existence as Son and Generation

The objection seems to be on behalf of the atheists . If, they say, the Son is in no way different (ἀπαράλλακτος) the image of the Father, and is in every way similar to the One who gave birth, then let He also beget and be the Father of the Son, for [only] in this way will He exactly reproduce (μιμήσεται) Him. And if He does not give birth, then how is the thing that gives birth shown in the non-begetting? Therefore, in this He will not be like the Father.

<75.208> *Rebuttal to this* . If there is no difference between God and people, then demand that He give birth in the same way as man. If the nature of God is exclusive, then it will in every way be free from our similar necessity. For God did not give birth as a man, so that the Begotten One, following our natural order, gave birth, but He has a certain Divine and ineffable birth from the Father. If it is necessary for the Begotten One to give birth according to our natural custom, and what is characteristic of the Divine is subject to human laws, then what prevents the Father from attributing [another] Father? For this is how our [fathers] were born. If the Father is not from some beginning, and, like God, surpasses our custom, then nothing will force the Son to give birth. For He will already be very similar to the Father, being - like God - above all necessity.

OTHER. No one with intelligence will say that the Son turns out to be different from the Father, because He Himself did not give birth to and become the Father of the Son. But rather, thanks to this, he will see in the Son some wonderful and most accurate image of the Father. After all, just as the Father, being immutable and unchangeable, always remains the Father and does not turn into the Son, so the Son-Word who came from Him remains what He is, demonstrating in Himself the immutability of the Father. So He is like the Father in this too.

The question of the Arians, by which they seem to show the Son to be unlike the

Father . Is the Son autocratic (αὐτεξούσιος), they say, or not? If He is autocratic, then naturally He will appear good (καλός) by [free] will (προαιρέσει). But what is held by will, and not by nature, can change to something else, and whatever the inclination of will is, there, without a doubt, there will be something controlled by will. For this is a proposal [453] and the impact undergone (Τροπὴ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ πάθος). And how will he who undergoes transformation and influence be the image and likeness of the immutable impassive (ἀτρέπτου καὶ ἀπαθοῦς)? If He is immutable, incapable of deviating to anything else, always remaining what He is, then He, like a stone or a tree, stopped in Himself (ἔστηκεν ἐφ" ἑαυτῷ), being certain natural and indestructible bonds we hold in that, that He exists, and without possessing autocracy (τὸ αὐτεξούσιον).

Rebuttal to this . It would be necessary not to answer such ignorantly posed questions at all. For where the answer in any case carries blasphemy, silence is preferable. After all, if I call the Son autocratic, then immediately, along with autocracy, transformation (μεταβολὴ) will be introduced. For autocracy is followed by the admission of transformation, even if He never experienced this, because He did not want to experience it. If, leaving this aside, I say something else, that is, that the Word is immutable, then they immediately present to us the immobility of a tree, not realizing that they dare to express things that are even dangerous to hold in thought. . For what would [those] who easily dare anything say if someone asked the same question about the Father? Would they not be as afraid as we are, and would they not approve of silence on these subjects? Or what will they say to this? I have nothing to say, and [it would be] good and useful if they didn't even think [about it]. And that God's Word, being immutable, like Him who gave birth to Him, is in everything like the Father, let it be clear from the following. If [the Word] is an indistinguishable image of the Father, he speaks the truth when he asserts: " *Seeing Me, seeing the Father* " [454], and " *I and the Father are one* " [455], then It will always be immutable and unchangeable, like the Father. For how would it be an image of everlasting and unchangeable existence that which admits of change? Or how could they say [about themselves] " *one Esma* " [creatures] that are so different from each other and, thus, carrying within themselves great dissimilarity? Since it is impossible for the Truth to lie, that is, the Son, who calls himself like the Father, then it is in every possible way necessary to believe that the Son by nature is the same as the Father. Therefore, [the Son] is immutable, just as He is and is like Him in everything.

The same thing [said] differently . If the Son, being a changeable (τρεπτῆς) nature, [and at the same time], according to them, spontaneous (αὐτοπροαίρετος) and autocratic, by striving for good has come to such a state that he has no difference in relation to the Father, but can speak : " *He who sees Me, sees the Father* ," then there is nothing great in God, since those with a changeable nature can, if desired, be what He is. If, however, the properties of the Divine are completely inaccessible to another nature, and all of them are manifested by nature in the Son, then He is like the Father

in everything, not from some progress or change towards good, being from something other than what He is, but having come perfect from perfect and immutable from the immutable Father. For how could one not be perfect, *Who could not be equal to God by admiration?* [456]? And how is He not immutable, Who, as He Himself said, is one with the Father?

OTHER. If the tree is known from the fruit , and the fruit of the Father's essence is the Word that came from Him, that is, the Son, then either they will create the Tree of evil, saying that It is of a changeable nature (for that is what they deign to call the Fruit), *or,* if *they create the Tree good* [457], then let them believe that such is the Fruit that came from Him, recognizing that He is not of a changeable, but immutable nature, like the Tree.

OTHER . Philip, who asks Him and says: " *Show us the Father* " [458], Christ answers: " *I have been with you for only* <75.212> *time, and have you not known Me Philippe? Seeing Me, seeing the Father* " [459]. So, if knowledge of the Son is knowledge of the Father, then it is in every possible way necessary to believe that the Son is the same as the Father is. If so, and the Father is [truly] immutable, then the Son will be the same. For in this way He will be known and revealed in Him.

Evidence from Scripture that the Son is immutable, and the inference [derived] from them (συλλογισμὸς) , turning [thought] to this. Paul says: "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today, the same and forever." [460]. Psalmist: " *In the beginning, O Lord, You founded the earth, and the works of Your hand are the heavens. They will perish, but You abided: and all the garments will be discarded, and all the garments will be changed, and they will be changed. You are the same, and Your years will not become scanty* ." [461]. The Savior about Himself: " *You see Me, you see that I am* [462], *and I don't change* [463]" Jeremiah: " *For You endure forever, but we are perishing forever* " [464]. For here the prophet, pointing to the constancy, steadfastness and eternal identity of the Divine nature, says: " *Thou art abiding forever* "; and explaining the changeability of created [entities] at all times, he adds: " *we are perishing forever* ." So, if the divine Scripture, speaking in relation to created things about transformation, change, destruction and deviation, removes the Son from participation in these [properties], saying: "But you are the same," then, therefore, He is not of a changeable nature. For He would not be " *the same* " if He could transform into something other than what He is.

OTHER . If by nature the Son is not immutable, but He happened to be what He is, and He has acquired likeness in relation to the Father, then there was a time when He [already] was the Son, but [not yet] like the Father ? And how then will He be thought of as a Son who is not attested by likeness by nature? Or how can one who has it [something] that comes with it be established in bliss (ἐπισυμβεβηκὸς)? For if it happened, then it may go away. If Divine Scripture says that the Son abides in identity,

and in Him by nature there are all the properties of the Divinity, to which changeability is alien, then, therefore, He is immutable and unchangeable.

OTHER . That which transforms and can change would not say of Itself: " *I am the truth* ." [465]. After all, if He either is this or is not, then He is lying about Himself. And the Son says about Himself: " *I am the truth* ." This means that He is not one of those who change or change, but [in everything] like the Father, being immutable and unchangeable.

OTHER, [said] narratively . Trying to show the Son as one of <75.213> changing ones, so that He would therefore be thought of as created, and therefore not like the Father, they cite some [statements] from among those found in the divine Scriptures as proof of their madness and say that the Apostle said: " *Therefore God also exalted Him, and gave Him a name above every name: that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow.* " [466]. And the Psalmist, again, writes: " *Because of Thy anointing, O God, Thy God is more than Thy partaker of the oil of joy.* " [467]. Then they say, juggling with words, that " *also* " and " *for this reason* " signify some reason why He is exalted, and He is given a name *above every other name* , and He is anointed *with the oil of joy* . If some reason provided Him with all this, then, of course, He changed and transformed, becoming what He was not before; and if there is dignity given in Him, then it will also be taken away. And what will be in such a state, how will it be similar in nature to the Immutable and the image of the ever-identical [Itself]?

Rebuttal to this . If, in your opinion, there was some reason why He was exalted, made worthy of a name, and anointed with *the oil of joy* , then He was not what He is now until this reason appeared. Therefore, the Son is not by nature God, if He, due to [some] reason, is God by grace; and not the Son by [His] nature, if [again] He is, by [some] cause, the Son by grace; both sonship and the name of the Divine are for Him, of course, a reward for virtue, just as they are for us. So there will be no gap between Him and us. For it is possible for us, thanks to the purity of life, to receive the same thing, if we are called gods and sons and are anointed with *the oil of joy* when we present ourselves [to God] as worthy of these [gifts]. If it is inappropriate to either say or think, then the Son will be above us and not like us. For He, being by nature from the Father, is the true Son; just as man [is he who is born] of man, [so] he who is born of God is God. But we, to whom this is not inherent by nature, instead of true [sonship] received - having received [from without] - grace, being called sons and gods according to the love of mankind who gave [this grace to us]; for it is only by name that the property of those who are above us is assimilated to us, especially the [property] of the Son, natural and essential.

OTHER. The Divine Apostle nowhere says about the Son: " *Who was in the image of God, not by admiration to be equal with God, but made Himself lesser, received the form of a servant.* " [468], and then: *"In the same way God exalted Him, and gave Him a*

name above every name. " [469]. So, when He became man, taking on the form of a servant, He was given *a name, more than any other name* , and He was exalted. Consequently, before coming in the flesh and *the form of a servant* , He neither had a name nor was He the Most High, according to the words of the Arians. After all, if He was like this even before He lived with us, then the word that He received something is completely unnecessary. If He did not have [any of these], then He became what He was not before. What do you think He was before He accepted <75.216> this [grace]? And again: if He then [only] when *He humbled Himself* [470], turns out to have received those [virtues] in which he now remains - and He is the Word, Wisdom, Power, Truth, Light, Life, Resurrection, Image of the Father - then He was none of these before [His] humiliation. Let them look to what abyss of blasphemy their word is directed: after all, if He has all this from the Father as a reward and payment for humility - and He did not humble Himself at another time, but when He became a man - then we see an inverted order of things . For the divine Scriptures say that the coming [to us] of God the Word took place for the sake of the improvement (ἐπὶ βελτιώσει) of the flesh and the whole nature of man. And if He became God, the Son and the Most High at the moment of [taking on] flesh, then we see Him improved rather than improved; benefited rather than benefited. Therefore, God's Word did not come for our sake, but for His own sake; He did not put on flesh for our salvation, but to improve [himself]. How then do the prophets and apostles call Him Savior? After all, if so, then it would be more worthwhile to call Him "the improver of Himself." How did He die for us, of whom it is said that He received as a reward being God and the Son? If to think this way is extremely impious, then nothing came to the Son as a result of transformation or change, but He by nature, as the Son, is the same as the Father. Therefore He is like [Him].

OTHER . If, in their opinion, there was no Son, or He existed, but subsequently improved, having experienced a change for the better, when He *received the image of a servant* [471], *humbled Himself* [472](for *God also exalted Him, and gave Him a name above every name* [473]), and this happened in the last times of the century, when His coming in the flesh took place, then how *did all that happen?* [474]; How did the Father rejoice over Him, who was not yet perfect? For that which still requires [some] addition is imperfect. How, again, did He in the last times accept worship, and seem to have it from the beginning? For Abraham worships Him under the oak of Mamre, and Moses also worships under the bush, saying: " *I am He* ." [475]. How, as Daniel said, " *thousands of thousands serve Him* " [476]? How, again, He is seen sitting *on a throne, high and exalted* [477]and from the seraphim to those who are praised and praised? What about the powers of heaven, hearing in the Spirit: " *Take up the gates, O princes, yours* " [478]and saying: " *Who is this King of Glory* ?" [479]- they hear in response: " *The Lord of hosts, He is the King of Glory* " [480]? Not " *He* was *the King of Glory* ," but " *He was* from ancient times *the King of Glory* ." If, even before the time of His coming, He

turns out to be what He is now, then it is unnecessary - and even very dangerous - to say that the Son is subject to change, or that He, as a reward for good will <75.217> received sonship and that He could be Wisdom, Word and God. After all, He, being immutable and unchangeable, is in everything like the One who gave birth.

OTHER, [showing] that not from a change from worse to better, the Son is like the Father, but by [His] nature . If *He has diminished Himself in the image of God, I will take on the form of a servant* [481], then He can be considered to have stepped out of His natural dignity to the extent that the [distance] lying between God and man is seen to be great. For He was not first a man and later became God, but, being God, He became a man. Consequently, the Word of God received nothing from this for improvement. If it is said that He was exalted and received a name as a gift , *which is above any name* , then He is with flesh and then returns to what He was in even without flesh. And He Himself says nowhere: " *Father, glorify Me with glory, even though before you there was no peace* ." [482]. What was the glory of the Son before the world was? To be in the image of the Father. So there is nothing that would be given to the Son by change and transformation for the better, but the glory and exaltation now given to Him as a gift is the resolution of the dishonor [taken by Him along with] the flesh, completely destroying the dishonor from the form of a slave. It is said that these things are given from the Father. For it is in the highest degree characteristic of God to arrange everything that is higher than humanity, despite the fact that the Son, according to the unity of the Divinity, does not exist outside the dispensation of these [things], although He is the Son in a special way in relation to the Father.

OTHER, about the same thing . If, in your opinion, He was exalted when *He humbled Himself* , and therefore He was given *a name above every name,* that is, He was called God, and therefore He was anointed and called Son, then it is necessary to say that before humiliation God's Word was nothing of this, for no one can accept what he already has, just as without having received it. And if, even before the time of humility [of the Son], God is found speaking to certain [people]: " *Az rekh: you are gods by nature and sons of the Most High* ." [483], then many before Him turn out to become sons and gods. How then will it be true that *all that was* [484]How then will He be before all, having many before Himself? Just like *the firstborn of all creation* [485]? And if, by imitation of the Son, those who are by grace are made [sons] by nature, how will they be before Him who is by nature? And if, by participating in the Son, we are adopted as sons through Him, then how will that which participates be prior to that which participates and that by which it becomes? How can the first one worthy of this not be better than the one who many generations later? But this is all very absurd. Consequently, the Son is immutable and unchangeable, not by grace nor by addition possessing likeness in relation to the Father, but in an essential and natural way. <75.220>

OTHER, about the same thing . If, as a kind of reward for virtue, humility or obedience, God's Word has the existence of the Son, then in some way, before the time of [His] humility, some [people] knew the Father, while the Son says: " *No one knows the Father except the Son, and if the Son opens it* " [486]. After all, if, according to their opinion, there was no Son, then how could the Father be known by anyone? If the Father is always known, then, of course, there was always the Son who reveals [His]. Therefore, not from some transformation, nor as an addition, He turns out to have received what He is, but has always been this by nature, being like the Father both in the absence of lack of anything, and in perfection, and in immutability.

OTHER, indicating that the Son is from the essence of the Father, and not from the outside, as the Christ-fighters say, and since not from the outside, then, of course, he is similar

The message seems to be on behalf of heretics . And what [then] beyond this, they say, is in God? How can He not be like us, if He also gives birth to the Son from His essence in the same way as we do? Since He is as much higher than human nature as He is superior to created beings, He does not imitate our [properties]; and not from his own essence, as if one of us, [the Father] produced the Son, but He existed from without. If so, then [the Son], of course, is not similar.

Rebuttal to this . I could, in fairness, ask the anti-Christists whether God completely rejects likeness in relation to us and in no way carries in Himself what is inherent in man? After all, if they say that the Divine essence is not completely removed from our [customs], then their premise will seem outdated, having their own admission as a refutation. If they ignorantly insist on what they propose, resisting us, then let them say whether man is not an essence. And again, since man is verbal, then let God be dumb among them, so that He may reject [everything] human. If, despite the fact that we abide in these [properties], God also abides in the same ones, then He will not refuse to give birth to the Son from Himself [only] because this is how we give birth. It would be more appropriate to think that by imitation of the Divine nature, we, created in her image, received this, along with other things. Since [God] begot the Son from Himself, and did not exist from without, it is necessary to recognize the likeness in Him.

As if from the objection of the Christ-fighters . We, they say, as if using some kind of matter that is supplied from bodily nature, give birth to [our] creations from ourselves; and even if we wanted to create something from the outside, then, taking matter, we create it. God, being completely incorporeal, does not have in Himself the source of any matter to give birth to the Son, but creates [Him] from non-existent things. Consequently, having rejected everything that is ours, He neither produced the Son from Himself <75.221>, nor does He make anything that exists from the matter that preceded it, but from without calls everything into being together with the Son. If so, then [the Son], of course, is not like [the Father].

Rebuttal to this . And how, most respected ones, will our Son turn out to be the Only Begotten, if He is from the outside, like everyone else? How can anyone be a Son who is not from the essence of the One who gave birth? If, therefore, it is allowed that those who arose from non-existents, that is, from the outside, are called and were sons by nature, then nothing, of course, will prevent everything created from being called creations. And the Son will no longer be the only begotten, having many brothers by nature. If it is not allowed, that is, only one Only Begotten, Who, of course, has a completely different existence, not like those called into being, but as the Son, who came from the Father according to nature, and therefore similar.

OTHER . If everything is from non-existent things, and together with everything is the Son, then for what reason is one Lord by nature, while others are slaves by nature? After all, it is fair that either everything should be endowed with dominion, as having the same nature as the Son, or He, along with everything, should be and be called a slave. However, we do not see the divine Scripture proclaiming this. But it knows the Son to be Lord by nature, and the creatures to be slaves, saying: " *For all things are Your work* ." [487]. And, again, the Son [Scripture] offers to be sung together with the Father and to be the object of close attention for Him (καὶ σπουδαζόμενον αὐτῷ) [488], and the creature is glorifying. This means that He is not equal to all [beings], and was not [formed] from outside, like them, but He is the Son by nature, and they are slaves and creatures. And in this case, what prevents the Son from being like the Father?

OTHER . Relying, apparently, on incomprehensible reasoning and boasting [rather] of the noise of empty sayings than of the accuracy of speculation, they lose sight of the fact that what truly exists (τὸ ὄντως ὂν) and is capable of giving birth is the Divinity (τὸ θεῖόν). After all, It says about Itself: " *Am I* " [489], since all others are not existing before [their] emergence, but are brought into being by Divine will. Therefore, truly existing, for which "being" (τὸ εἶναι) is the most important name, is also the only one that in essence gives birth. After all, other creatures - for example, people - are rather called by the will of God to the ability to give birth, although they do this in accordance with their essence. For some Divine law forces something to be born that is natural not to be born. For since the Creator wished it so, it became so. After all, if, in the proper sense of the word, by their essence [their] creations have [the ability] to give birth, then why can't everyone give birth? Since some give birth, that is, those who are commanded to do so, then, of course, it is obvious that it is not so much by nature that it is inherent in the creations <75.224> to give birth, but rather from the law commanding and forcing [them to do this], which the Creator laid down for each of them. existing. So, in the proper sense of the word, what gives birth from itself is Divinity; we [give birth] in imitation of Him. Then, how is it not absurd that what exists by imitation should give birth from itself, but the Archetype, according to which it is formed, should not give birth from itself, but rather from the outside? So, since the truth has become clear from here, nothing will prevent the Father from begetting the

Son from Himself. If so, then the Son will be similar to the Father in everything, since the distinctive property of the Father passes to Him.

OTHER, about the likeness of the Son in relation to the Father .

The objection seems to be on behalf of opponents . If *no one* , they say, *is good , there is only one God* , according to the word of the Savior Himself, but it turns out that He places His own person outside of goodness by nature, saying to the scribe: " *Why do you say that I am good* ?" [490], then how can a Son who is not good in nature be similar to the Father who is good by nature?

Rebuttal to this . Those who oppose Christ say that the Son is not like the Father, not at all seeing the danger associated with this word, or seeing it, but rather playing with such great objects rather than being researchers of the truth. For if the Son, in their opinion, is not like the Father, then let them tell us who they will call good by nature: the Father or the Son? If they give their voice to the Father in this, then of all necessity the Son who is not like the Father will not be good. If they refuse to say this, but transfer the essential goodness to the Son (τὸ οὐσιωδῶς ἀγαθὸν), then again they will inevitably be faced with the need to say that the Father is not good if He is deprived of likeness in relation to the Son. Since it is highly inappropriate to utter such blasphemy, either against the Father or against the Son (for since the Father is good, the Son who came from His essence will also be good), then [the Son] will not be in any way dissimilar to the Father, if indeed it is in every possible way necessary that the good be similar to the good [491].

Antipophora [492] *as if on behalf of the Christ-fighters* . In this, they say, we confess the Son to be similar to the Father: not, of course, in the sense that He has an essential and natural likeness in relation to Him, but that only thanks to the desire of the Father to make the Son such, He has a likeness in relation to Him. Just as, of course, a dwelling, transformed into a certain form and form (εἶδός τι καὶ σχῆμα), is, as it were, an image of the plan of the one who created [it]: because of matter, it is different in relation to it; and because it is made as he intended, it is similar to his [creative] thought.

Rebuttal to this . This logical <75.225> construction is worthy of laughter - or, rather, regret. Who among the prudent would not rightly be saddened by those who have fallen into such great ignorance? Who would not weep for those who have fallen into such recklessness? After all, if in essence the Son is not similar to the Father, but similar in appearance, then, first of all, it will be necessary to say that the Son was formed from different [parts], and, moreover, very opposing and opposite to each other; I mean - from similarity and dissimilarity, which, in relation to one subject, are not mixed and do not converge with each other. And if [the Son is only] similar in some way, then He is not all Light, not all Truth, and not God by nature. Then, in addition to this, the burden of blasphemy passes on to Him Who gave birth. After all,

the Father Himself will be complex for us - both from essence and thinking (νοήματος), - if indeed in the logos of essence He is not similar to the Son, but in thought (ἔννοιαν.) - similar. How then will the Father be considered the beginning of everything, being, in your opinion, complex and not simple? After all, nothing can be conceived before the cause. If nothing can be conceived before the cause, then complexity cannot come from anywhere. Because complex [things] are made from some combination of simple ones. So, since the absurdity in these [arguments] is visible from everywhere, the premise of the Christ-fighters will be extremely vulnerable. And as soon as the blasphemy contained in these words is abolished, then the Son will be essentially similar to the Father, without in any way being deprived of natural similarity in relation to Him.

OTHER . If the Son is not similar to the Father in essence, but is His mere thought as a kind of outline and image, then He cannot have a perfect likeness in relation to Him; because we, being created in the image of the Creator, are then predominantly shown to preserve this when, becoming partakers of His Divinity through the indwelling Holy Spirit, we are formed in accordance with the Divine nature (πρὸς τὴν θείαν μορφούμεθα φύσιν). And therefore those who are not yet involved in Him have by no means become *conformed to the image of His Son* [493]. So, if in the Son there is no natural likeness to the Father, but only the outlines of His thoughts are revealed, then He will not have a perfect likeness, which is impossible even to imagine. For how is He [then] *equal to God?* [494]? If this is absurd, then another [position] will be valid - which is also the truest - that the Son, being precisely the distinctive property of the Father's essence, will be similar to Him in essence.

Proof from divine Scripture that by communion with the Divine we are formed in His image. For for the constitution of man - in order for [him] to appear and be the image of Him who created [him] - it was not enough that in the [area] of mental concepts alone there lay a word about Him .

Paul says somewhere: " *If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he has no gods* ." [495]. But if indeed, even without the participation of the Spirit, man were able to appear [as existing] in the image <75.228> of God, then we would all be Christ's, even if we did not participate in the Spirit. Likewise, Blessed John says nowhere: " *He who keeps His commandments abides in Him, and He in him." And of this we understand that it abides in us from the Spirit, which He gave us to eat* ." [496]. Consequently, if the keeping of this commandment turns out to be the reason for us to partake of the Spirit, and having become partakers of the Spirit, we are formed in accordance with the image of the Creator, then, of course, it is obvious that it is impossible for someone to have likeness in relation to God who does not partake in some way of His essence. And again, renewing man into [a state of being] in [His] image, the Savior *breathed* on the disciples, saying: " *Receive the Holy Spirit* ." [497]. And what is characteristic of

renewal, then, of course, it is decent to think about what was in antiquity. Therefore, the communion of the Spirit gives a person the perfection of likeness to the Divine essence, and not just becoming in thoughts alone what He is. If, by receiving the Spirit of the Son, we are formed according to God, then how will the Son be different from the Father, giving through Himself to us also to be formed in accordance with Him?

The message seems to be on behalf of the opponents . The Father Himself is not participatory or participatory for us because of the excessiveness and extremeness of the communion of the Divine, as if inconceivable for human nature. It is contained and becomes [living] in us through the Son, as through the least, of course. How will this one be like the Father when He is contained within us, who are unable to contain Him?

To this there is an antipophora, i.e. a refutation . The atheists are again intoxicated with recklessness, *not understanding* , as can be seen, *neither the same words nor about them. the same things are asserted* [498]. For if, as you say, everything that is in the Father is great and supernatural, then it is necessary to recognize His inherent goodness as such. How then will the Extremely Good be inconceivable for those who need goodness? How can He be wholly good, Who, by virtue of His excessive superiority over creation, prevents everyone from being partakers of Him? For, of course, it is fitting - as can be seen in fact - that the Once-and-Forever-Good (τὸν ἅπαξ ἀγαθὸν) offer the goodness corresponding to Him to everyone and distribute it prepared for consumption by those in need of it. But He is already shown doing this too, which is why *He promises to dwell in us* and *become like us* , and proclaims us to be sons [499]. Therefore, the atheists have a worthless package. For God does not appear to be inclined toward cruelty (εἰς αγριότητα) because of superiority and greatness, but rather as gentle (ὑπάρχων εἰς ἡμερότητα) as His properties are great. One of them, and the best, is goodness, reaching through the Son, as He himself said, to *the evil and the good.* [500], and absolutely not prohibiting anyone from receiving communion. The communion with the Father through the Son in the Spirit is genuine <75.229> and is properly accomplished. Like the sun, we commune through the radiance born from it, not devoid of warmth, which bears the image of the energy of the Spirit. And just as no one would call the light or warmth sent down from him different from the sun, for the reason that through them it participates, so the fact that through Him we are partakers of the Father does not in the least force the Son to be different from the Father. Rather, [on the contrary, it] shows Him to be like [the Father] in everything. For if, by participating in the Son, we are not deprived of the participation of the Father, then how can there not be an identity of the essence of the Father and the Son? And where there is identity of essence, what place will dissimilarity have? Let the Christ-fighters tell [us].

The objection seems to be on behalf of heretics . And how, they say, would the Son be, according to the logos of essence, similar to the Father, Who turns out to be so

much lesser that he does not even see Him? For even this He Himself testified nowhere, saying: " *No one has seen God anywhere: the Only Begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He confessed.* " [501]. So, if the Son calls the Father invisible to everyone, and He Himself among everyone, then how will He who is so diminished [in comparison with the Father] be similar in essence?

Rebuttal to this . And how can you not immediately appear fighting against the truth itself, and at the same time - opposing all the divine Scriptures, when you say that the Father is not visible to the Son Himself, but hides His face from the sight of the Only Begotten, despite the fact that He Himself loudly proclaims; " *It is not because anyone has seen the Father, but He who is from God has seen the Father* ." [502]? How, if the Father is incomprehensible to the Son, the Son shows Him to us, saying: " *He who sees Me, sees the Father* ." [503]? How His Spirit *tests everything, and the depths of God* [504], like *the spirit of man - even in man* [505]? Just as, again, the angels of heaven are described as beholding His face [506], if this, in your opinion, is not characteristic of the Son? Or how He will speak the truth, saying: " *As the Father knows Me, and I know the Father.* " [507]? And also: " *No one knows the Son except the Father; no one knows the Father except the Son, and to whom the Son wills to be revealed* ." [508]? So, He who not only knows, but can also reveal the Father to others, how does [Himself] not see Him? How can he not know from what He Himself is, He who knows the Father and says to Him: " *All that is mine is Thine, and Thine is Mine* ." [509]? This means that, just as [if] He really were invisible to Him, as you say, the Father [the Son] would not be essentially similar to Him, so, since He sees and knows the Father, He will be similar in every way to Nim, and your slanderous speech will again turn out to be false.

Antipophora , as it were, on behalf of the heretics . Only in so far, they say, do we recognize <75.232> the Son as similar to the Father, inasmuch as He, having abundantly partook of Him, became in a certain way and was formed according to Him. Like us, as far as it is accessible to people, *we are communities of the divine nature.* [510]as written, *is obtained the heavenly image* [511]and we are formed as if in accordance with Divine outlines.

Rebuttal to this. And who, tell me, of those who read the divine Scriptures would tolerate such nonsense of yours? For the divine words proclaim, *let there be no new God for us* [512], and you, desperately resisting those who spoke from the Spirit, do not be ashamed, offering us the Son as a new and, so to speak, recently born (ἀρτιγενῆ) God. For that which, from communion and communion with the Divine, has become, as it were, formed according to Him, acquired and added to will have all that is inherent in it thanks to communion. And what has received something as an increase must be recognized as having passed from a state where it initially did not have this to something else. And this is an accident (συμβεβηκός). And how can one not [perhaps] easily discard what one receives as an increase? After all, in general [everything] given

is taken away; and what is acquired, of course, will allow for the possibility of loss. So, let them either say that the Son can fall out of being God, Lord and Son; or, if they do not dare to say this, but rather agree to place the nature of the Son in unconditional beatitude, let them refuse to think of Him as formed according to the Father from the sacrament, but rather preserve for the Word, which originated from the Father's essence, a natural and essential likeness [to the Father] .

OTHER . [Those] who are called to sanctification, [which comes] from communion with God, Whose nature is to sanctify, through sobriety retain within themselves what is given [to them], but they cannot transfer to another the holiness invested in them. For no one, having received the Spirit from communion, will ever give It to another, since he himself received it from God, but it is fitting for the Source of holiness alone to bestow sanctification from Himself to all whom He wishes. After all, the angels who are in heaven are holy from communion and communion with the Holy God, and they are never shown to give holiness to people. In the same way, blessed Moses, when the seventy elders were nominated for the necessary needs of the meeting, did not himself give them the Spirit, but God, as it is written, *fed on the Spirit who was in him* [513], and invested in the favorites. So, it is possible for saints to carry this grace within themselves from communion, but not to give it to others. The Son is not so: after all, He, as the source of holiness, sanctifies the disciples, saying: " *Receive the Holy Spirit* ." [514]. It is also the Father who is shown to create; and he who has equal power and authority <75.233> to sanctify with the Father, how will he not have true likeness in relation to Him?

* * *

[453] See: James 1:17 .

[454] This. 14:9 .

[455] This is 10:30 .

[456] Phil.2:6 .

[457] Matthew 12:33 .

[458] This. 14:8 .

[459] This. 14:9 .

[460] Hebrews 13:8 .

[461] Ps. 101:25–28 .

[462] Tue. 32:39 .

[463] Mai. 3:6 .

[464] Var. 3:3 .

[465] This. 14:6 .

[466] Phil.2:9–10 .

[467] Psalm 44:8 .

[468] Phil.2:6–7 .

[469] Phil.2:9 .

[470] Phil.2:8 .

[471] Phil.2:6 .

[472] Phil.2:8 .

[473] Phil.2:9 .

[474] This. 1:3 .

[475] Exodus 3:14 .

[476] Dan. 7:10 .

[477] Isaiah 6:1 .

[478] Psalm 23:7 .

[479] Ps. 23:8,10 .

[480] Psalm 23:10 .

[481] Phil.2:6–7 .

[482] This. 17:5 .

[483] Psalm 81:6 .

[484] This. 1:3 .

[485] Col. 1:15 .

[486] Matthew 11:27 .

[487] Psalm 118:91 .

[488] Most likely, there is a typo here, and it should be read: “καὶ συσπουδαζόμενον αὐτῷ” - “and considered together with Him.”

[489] Exodus 3:14 .

[490] Mark 10:18 .

[491] Translation option: “...so that the good befits the Good.”

[492] In rhetoric, it is a response to an anticipated objection.

493 Rom. 8:29 .

494 Phil.2:6 .

495 Romans 8:9 .

496 1 John 3:24 .

497 This. 20:22 .

498 1Tim.1:7 .

499 2 Corinthians 6:16 .

500 Matthew 22:10 .

501 This. 1:18 .

502 This. 6:46 .

503 This. 14:9 .

504 1 Cor. 2:10 .

505 1 Cor. 2:11 .

506 Matthew 18:10 .

507 This is 10:15 .

508 This. 17:10 .

509 This. 17:10 .

510 2 Pet. 1:4 .

511 1 Cor. 15:49 .

512 Psalm 80:10 .

513 Numbers 11:25 .

514 This. 20:22 .

Word 13 Word 15

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 14 Word 16

Homily 14. More about similarity with the quotation of the saying: “For as the Father had life in Himself, so He gave the Son also life in Himself.” [515]; the conclusion from the syllogisms is that the Son is life by nature, like the Father

The premise seems to be on behalf of the Arians. And how, they say, could the Son be essentially like the Father? Or how will there not be someone after Him who receives something from Him, as He Himself says: “ *For as the Father had life in Himself so He gave the Son also to have life in Himself* ”?

Rebuttal to this . The nature of the Son will not suffer any damage, O most precious ones, from the fact that He receives something from the Father. For He does not have being in [itself] acceptance, but, having first been and existing (ὢν καὶ ὑπάρχων πρότερον) [then] accepts something. And because He is naturally begotten from the Father, [the Son] is endowed with all the attributes of the Father. Just as with the light that came from the sun, we can say that it received something from it, since everything that is in it belongs to the sun that gave birth to [it], and the fact that what comes from it does not force the sun to be before its radiance. the glow, as having come from it, indivisibly carries [within itself everything] belonging to it by nature. Consequently, the fact that the Son received something from the Father does not necessarily force Him to be second in time. After all, [the Father] will give something to the existing and [hypostatically] existing, and not to the non-existent and not yet appeared at all.

OTHER . If we believe that the definition of the existence of beings is to accept something, and this, affirmed about something, is sufficient to reveal the essence, then what prevents those who blaspheme from saying that the Father then also has a beginning of being when it is said that He accepts something from us ? After all, we can hear the Psalmist saying: “ *Give glory to God* ” [516]. So, if the Father does not exist in the fact that He received glory from us (for He, being and existing (ὢν καὶ ὑπάρχων), receives praise [from us] from servants), then the existence of the Son will not [consist] is to receive something from the Father. For about Him, who is and exists without beginning and has ever come from the Father, it is said that He accepted what

was inherent in Him by nature, just as a son descended from a man would turn out to bear in himself all the [properties] of the one who gave birth to [him], having from him together with with all its [properties] and being. And the Divine and ineffable birth, moreover, surpasses the power of the example we have given, and must be understood in a God-appropriate manner.

Antithesis, as it were, on behalf of the anti-Christ fighters . They will say that it is more fitting for those who already exist and have come into existence to accept something than for those who do not exist, and we ourselves will agree. But now it must be said that he who receives something from someone receives [it] as if he does not have it. So, if the Father has something to be Life in essence, and gives it to the Son - that is, as if he does not have it - then how will he be essentially like Him who receives from Him what He Himself does not have?

Rebuttal to this . It is necessary, O most precious ones, to accurately examine the thought of the above statement, and then we will see the meaning of the word. For in response you will hear from us that if the Son *has life* like the Father, that is, *in Himself* , through which the essential [possession] of life is signified, then what will prevent one who has the same [properties] from being the same essence? For if the Father *has life in Himself* , and, in turn, the Son *has* it *in Himself* not as a [certain] application, as you say, then He will be equal to the Father in essence, the same as He, having in the same way life, not others.

OTHER . If the Son is not life by nature, then how true will be what He said: " *Believe in Me to have eternal life* ?" [517]? And again: " *My sheep hear My voice, and I will give them eternal life* ." [518]. And also: " *Believe in Me, and you shall never taste death* ." [519]. After all, [then] it would be fitting for [Him] to say: "Whoever believes in Me will receive from Me the life that the Father has given Me. And again: "The Father will not allow anyone who believes in Me to taste death." If He does not reveal Himself as saying this, but as inherent in Himself by nature and as essentially abiding in Himself promises to give life to those who believe in Him, then how is it permissible to think that the Son, [previously] not having it, receives it from the Father? After all, this would, of course, be completely outrageous blasphemy. But, as has already been said, He, having come from the Father, is by nature endowed with all His properties, and as having received it is therefore thought of, being both His radiance and image. And one of the inherent [properties] of the Father is life.

OTHER . If the Son of God is not life by nature, but a partaker of life, as the Christ-fighters say, then He is in essence something other than what He participates in. How then does He Himself openly show itself to us, saying: " *I am the living bread that came down from heaven: if anyone eats of this bread, he will live forever* " [520]? After all, it would be fitting for Him to say, if He Himself were not by nature life: "In Me is the bread that came down from heaven. If anyone eats of this bread that is in Me, he

will live forever." Now, saying " *I am* ," He defines Himself [as this bread], and not one of the properties that have arrived or are inherent in Him. So, if He Himself <75.237> is bread that can immortalize those who partake, then He does not have the ability to give life from the outside and not acquired, but, being by nature life, He truly promises to give life to those who partake.

OTHER . If the Word of God does not by nature have [the property] to be the life of God, but having acquired it acquired from the outside, as you say, can give life, then what prevents us from saying that angels, who have truly become partakers of life, can give life? But this is unacceptable, for only the Son can give life, like the Father. Therefore, the life-giving power is not acquired from the outside in the Son, but is by nature and essentially inherent in Him, as well as in the Father.

OTHER . The Son, saying: " *Just as the Father had life in Himself so the Son also had life in Himself* " [521], - clearly shows the unchangeable similarity that it has in relation to the One who gave birth. For He has life in the same way as the Father, that is, natural and essential. And by adding " *dade* ," He indicates [His] natural and essential emergence from Him (πρόοδον). For the Father, of course, did not give as having taken away something from what was inherent to Him and added it to the Son who did not have [it before], in the image of bodily cutting off or division from some other to another, understood either spatially or in the sense of logical distinction (διαιρετικῶς) . But just as a plant gives the fruit that comes from it to bear within itself the quality inherent in it by nature, so the Son is understood to have received from the Father what is inherent in Him, being everything that is the same as the Father, with the exception of being the Father.

OTHER. The objection seems to be on behalf of Christ-fighters . If life by nature, they say, is the Son, as you, very curiously insisting, say, then how truthful will Paul be when he says about the Father: " *He alone has immortality* ." [522]? After all, if the Son also has [immortality], then the Father is not the only one who has it; and if He alone has [it], then, of course, the Son will not have it either.

Rebuttal to this . Many things are said to be characteristic of the Son alone, although the Son is not deprived of all this. Because it is written that *the One true God* [523] – Father, then let us assume that the Son will not be true, as if he were someone false and falsely named, having been acquired by God. And how then, being such by nature, He accepts worship from us and the angels, as the Divine Law clearly prescribes: " *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and serve Him alone.* " [524]? How can we keep [the commandment]: " *There shall be no new god for you* " [525]? After all, if the Father alone is by nature God, and [if], since it is said so, the Son is deprived of being by [His] nature <75.240> God, then He, like some new and young [god], is introduced by the beings of the beginning and by nature [by God]. But this is absurd. Therefore, because it is said that the Father alone has immortality, the Son will not be subject to

the opposite, but, since the Fatherly peculiarity naturally passes on to generation, He will be thought to be the same as the One who begat Him.

OTHER . The Father is said to have many excellent qualities (πλεονεκτήματα). But if the Son does not have them, and Paul says nowhere: " *To the incorruptible , invisible, only wise God* " [526], - then, in your opinion, He will not be incorruptible, nor invisible, nor wise. How then will the Giver of incorruption be corruptible? Or how will God's nature be seen? Or how can we not think of the Son as wise, of whom it is written that He is *the power of God and the wisdom of God?* [527]? For it is time for you to call *the wisdom of God* not wise . Consequently, it will not deprive the Son of being by nature all the same as the Father can be called, even if "one" is applied to Him. For the Word that came from Him will also include everything that is natural and necessary for Him.

OTHER . If the Father is life by nature, as He is, then the Son also possesses all these [qualities]. For He speaks the truth, affirming: " *All that the Father has is Mine.* " [528].

OTHER. Same thing on the reverse side . If the Father is life by nature, but the Son is not, then how will He speak the truth, affirming: " *All that the Father has is Mine* "? But Truth cannot lie, and the Son, of course, will be life by nature, like the Father.

Otherwise about the same thing . If the Father is life by nature, and the Son is not so, but [the property] of being this for Him came from outside, then how will He speak the truth, turning to the Father: " *All that is mine is Thine, and all that is mine is mine* ." [529] ? For either He will by nature have to be life, which is [the property of] the Father, or, if not so, and His [properties] are the Father's, - since He is not by nature life, neither will He be the Father. But this is absurd. For by nature the Father is life. The Son also will be the same, so that the likeness will not be broken.

OTHER . If the Son is an indistinguishable mark (χαρακτὴρ ἀπαράλλακτος) of the Fatherly hypostasis, then He will naturally carry within Himself also [the property of] being life, so that the image of the Father is not distorted.

OTHER . Christ says nowhere to His disciples: <75.241> " *He who has seen Me, has seen the Father* " [530]. Therefore, if the Father appears in the Son, being life by nature, then the Son will also be the same, so that the likeness is not destroyed.

OTHER [evidence deduced] from the same [words] by means of reductio ad absurdum . Christ says somewhere: " *He who has seen Me, has seen the Father* ." This means that if He has this [property] of being life coming from outside, that is, He has it by participation, and not by essence, then the Father will be the same. Avoiding such absurdity, you necessarily confess the opposite, namely, that the Son is life by nature.

OTHER . If it is said of the Son that He, without the slightest difference, outlines (ἀπαραλλάκτως χαρακτηρίζειν) the essence of the Father, and [He Himself] is not life by nature, but receives this as an application, then the Father will also be thought of in

the same way. The absurdity contained in this will entail the opposite [statement], which will be true.

OTHER . No one of common sense will agree that heterogeneous and heterogeneous [subjects] have the same effect. For fire will not produce the same effect with water, but just as they are differentiated by the name of the logos of essence, i.e., qualities, so the actions will also show different ones. So, if, despite the fact that the Father is life by nature, the Son will not be this by [His] nature, as it seems to the anti-Christians, then how will He have the same effect as the Father? After all, Christ says nowhere: " *Just as their Father wants to live, so their Son also wants to live.* " [531]. For they do not say that those who received it from the Father are quickened in a different way, and those who received it from the Son are quickened in a different way. For He said that the Father gives life just as the Son would give life, defining Himself in everything to have the same effect as the Father. Therefore, He will not be dissimilar in relation to the One who gave birth, but just as He is and is called life by nature, so is the Son.

OTHER . If we accept the words of John as true, then we agree that the Father does all things through the Son. If so, and one of the works of the Father is to give life to someone, then the Son will also be life by nature, through whom [the Father] gives life to everything, so that by introducing an alien mediator he would not show those who are not involved with God that which is quickened by connection with Him.

OTHER . If the Son is a mediator between God and people, as one who connects ends [532] into natural unity, then it must be said that He was both united with people by nature, becoming a man, and also connected with the Divine nature, being God by nature. If so, then since the Father has the [property] of being life in essence and not from the outside, it means that the Son, who adjoins Him and is from Him by nature, will also be so.

<75.244> *OTHER* . The Divine Scriptures everywhere call the Son Truth, and He Himself speaks of both, saying: " *I am the Truth* ." [533]. So, if this life in Him is false and neither essential nor true, then how will He not be a liar, saying about Himself that He is the Truth? But He does not lie - for this is wicked to even contemplate - but is the Truth. Therefore, He does not have the property of being life.

OTHER, through reduction to absurdity . " *Just as the Father* ," He says, " *has life in Himself. so will the Sons have life in Himself.* " [534]. Here, those who do not want to think right are in danger of falling into great blasphemy. For if it is said that the Father has life in Himself, then He will be something different from the life that is in Him. If so, then a certain duality and complexity will be thought of in relation to Him; How then can God [be at the same time] simple and complex in essence? But this is absurd. Therefore, the life that the Father has in Himself is nothing other than the Son; and vice versa, the life [being] in the Son is nothing other than the Father, and he who says

the truth says: " *I am in the Father, and the Father in Me.* " [535].

OTHER . Naming the natural and essential distinctive features inherent in God and the Father, Paul nowhere says: " *He alone has immortality* ." [536]. So, if nothing else, he defines, saying "immortality," as life, and this is the Son, who says: " *I am Life* ." [537], then *the Father has life in Himself* , that is, the Son, and nothing else but Him. And He Himself, in the same way being life, *gave Himself to the Sons* , not as a body placed in a body, and not as having ceded His own hypostasis to the Son and henceforth having existence in Him, but remaining in what He is ever - God and Father, being inexpressibly connected by the identity of essence and unity of nature with the Word that came from Him.

OTHER . Everything that is called the natural and essential image of the Father is the Son. God the Father is called the only true one, because He alone has a Son who says: " *I am the Truth* ." [538]. Wise and Strong, because *Christ is God's power and God's wisdom* [539]. It is said that He *alone in the world lives unapproachable* [540], for it has in Itself the verb: " *I am the Light* " [541]. He is called the only one who has immortality, for he has in Himself a Son who says: " *I am Life* ." [542]. So, if all that distinguishes the Father is the Son, then when it is said that <75.245> *the Father has life in Himself* , this means the Son and nothing else but Him. And being Himself in the Son by the indistinguishability of nature and being life by nature, He gave Himself to Him.

OTHER . Being life by nature, the Son says that he received it from the Father, but insofar as He is the Word, or [since the Father's] Radiance naturally has [in Itself] the properties of the Father, but because He became a man for whom everything is God-given . He makes this clear in the following [words], explaining the reason for giving. For, as He says, [the Father] *gave Him the domain to execute judgment, for the Son of Man is* [543]. If, since He *is the Son of Man* , it is said that He received the power to judge, then, turning the same word, we say: "Since He became the Son of Man, clothed in the likeness of those to whom it is natural to receive everything from God, then it is said that He accepted into life, preserving for the naked Divine nature alone both the unacceptability of communion with anything and the ability to give everything to everyone."

* * *

[515] This. 5:26 .

[516] Psalm 67:35 .

[517] This. 5:36 .

[518] This. 10:27-28 .

[519] This. 11:26; 8:52 .

[520] This. 6:51 .

[521] This. 5:26 .

[522] 1 Tim. 6:16 .

[523] This. 17:3 .

[524] Deut. 6:13 ; Matthew 4:10 ; Luke 4:8 .

[525] Psalm 80:10 .

[526] 1Tim.1:17 .

[527] 1 Cor. 1:24 .

[528] This is 16:15 .

[529] This. 17:10 .

[530] This. 14:9 .

[531] This. 5:21 .

[532] That is, located at different poles of Divine and human nature.

[533] This. 14:6 .

[534] This. 5:26 .

[535] This. 14:10 .

[536] 1 Tim. 6:16 .

[537] This. 14:6 .

[538] This. 14:6 .

[539] 1 Cor. 1:24 .

[540] 1 Tim. 6:16 .

[541] This. 8:12 .

[542] This. 14:6 .

[543] This. 5:27

Word 14 Word 16

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 15 Word 17

Word 15. On what is said in Proverbs: “The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways, for His work” [544], that “created” is not applied to the essence of the Word, and that the Son is not a creature or creature

The defenders of Aryan madness, embellishing their wickedness with what seems to them convincing words, say: “The Son is a creation, but not as one of the creations; He is a creature, but not as one of the creatures; generation, but not as one of the generation."

Various rebuttals to this . If the Son is a creature, how is it that He is not one of the creatures? And in general, if He is a creation, then why not one of the creations? To think so is extremely ridiculous. For if the Son is not counted among creatures or creatures at all, then He will be neither a creature nor a creature. If, in your opinion, He was created or created, then how could He not necessarily be one of the creations that arose [in time]?

OTHER . They say that the Son is a creature, but not as one of the creatures. And they think that by this they give Him special honor, since they confess that although He is a creature, He is not like one of the [other] creatures. However, there is nothing special about this, but He also turns out to be one of the others. For as long as the concept of “createdness” (τὸ πεποιῆσθαι) continues to be [applied to Him] and it is believed that He is a creation, He will not differ in any way from others in this respect, even if He differed in nature or in some other way. After all, one can see the [entities] created by God as such by comparing them with each other. For you will often find <75.248> them superior to others in [various] advantages, and differing in nature, so that it is possible to say of each of them that it is a creature, but not as one of the creatures. For example, the sun is a creature, but not as one of the creatures, since there is no other sun. In the same way, the moon, the sky, the stars, the earth: all of these are creatures, and each of them is not like one of the creatures. For the mere fact that they arose is common to all creatures, but the form and nature of each is special. So there will be nothing more important in the Son, who is called created, even if He were

something great and exceptional in comparison with other creatures. For how can it help the sun not to be a creature if it is very superior to the stars? The same will apply to the intelligent [angelic] powers existing in heaven, for whom collusion is also common. And the logos of everyone's existence is special.

OTHER . If the Son, in your opinion, is a creature, and, being such, has the ability to create, because He is not like one of the other creatures, then let other creatures also have the ability to create, since the nature in them is varied, and each of them - not like one of the others. After all, there is one sky, one sun, one moon, one nature of the stars, one man - as far as essence is concerned; and none of these communicate with each other according to the logos of nature, although they all have in common that they are created. But among creations, not one is represented by the [Word] of the Creator, but rather [all] worship the creative Word of God and sing the glory of the Creator: " *The heavens tell the glory of God, and the firmament proclaims His handiwork* ." [545]. And as Ezra says: " *The whole earth calls for the truth, and the sky blesses it, and all things shake and tremble* ." [546]. And the Son says about Himself: " *I am the Truth* " [547]. Therefore, He is neither a creature nor a creation, because He is able to create, because He is not as one of the creatures, but because, being the own generation of the essence of the Father, and showing all of Him in Himself, He also has the ability to create, as and Father.

OTHER . If the Son is a creation, but accepts worship from other creatures for the reason that He is something different from them, and not as one of the creations, then it would be fitting for [all] of them to accept worship from each other for the reason that they [all] have a different nature from each other. For there is great difference in creatures, and each of them can be seen in a special nature, that is, quality, and not everything that the other is. But not one among them accepts worship, but they all worship the edifying Word of God. Therefore, the Son is not one of them, and not a creation, as you think. After all, how can one in any way be among those who worship, one who receives worship, and one who is praised among those who praise? For there is great distance and difference here, and clearly the distinction appropriate to each.

OTHER . If the Son is a creation, and the Father does everything through Him, then it means that He creates and creates Himself; but to think so is the highest degree of absurdity. For how will something that you think does not yet exist create itself? Therefore, He is neither a creature nor a creature, but rather a fruit of the Father's essence, possessing, like God, the ability to create and create.

OTHER . If the Son is a creation, then how will the ability to create and bring creatures from non-existence into being be found in Him? After all, if we generally assume that created nature can bring from non-existence into being, then other creatures will also be potentially creative, even if we have not yet seen them in such an actual way, just as, of course, a youth who is still in childhood , is potentially capable

of producing seed (σπερματιστὴς), like the husband, although not yet actual. But that which is natural to possess something cannot be said to not have [it], even if it still appears so, since the natural action is still hidden due to certain circumstances or time. Consequently, other creatures will also be constructive, and there is nothing extraordinary in God. But this is absurd. For none of the creatures creates. Therefore, the Son is not a creation, *in Whom all things were* [548], - so that the creator and the created, the creator and the created, are not one and the same, but rather God, as [coming] from God and the Father.

OTHER, with the addition of another syllogism . If the Son is a creation, then why does He alone reveal the Father, while other creatures cannot do this? Why does the Son alone know the Father, while other creatures do not know what [the Father] is? " *No one* ," He says, " *knows who the Father is: only the Son, and whoever the Son wills to reveal* ." [549]. What about God, Whom *no one has seen anywhere?* [550], as the evangelist says, only the Son sees? For it is written: " *No one has seen the Father, but He who is from God has seen the Father* ." [551]. Consequently, if the Son alone sees and knows the Father, and reveals Him, then it means that He is not a creation, but His own Word, and what He Himself is by nature, the abiding one knows the Father from Whom He sprang, and reveals Him in Himself, even though other creatures are not capable of doing this. For in the creatures the likeness of the Creator is not preserved, nor in the created will the Unborn be seen. [552], nor in those brought from non-existence into being - Existing ever and [always] in the same way (ὁ ἀεὶ καὶ ὡσαύτως ὢν) [553]. He is shown in the Son, for [the Son] is His unchangeable image. So He is essentially like the Father, and not a creature or a creature. Because none of them is the Father according to Whom He was formed.

<75.252> *Proof from observations of Scripture that none of the creatures accepts worship like God, nor, being nevertheless worshiped, endures [decent] worship or praise.* Blessed Peter prevented Cornelius from worshiping him, saying: "Do not do [this], *for I am also a man* (καὶ γάρ ἐγὼ ἀνθρωπός εἰμι)." [554]. The angel prevented the worshiper of John in his Apocalypse, saying: " *See , neither: for I am thine slander and thy brethren the prophets, and them that keep the words of this book.* " [555]. Manoah, Sampson's father, was prevented from making a sacrifice by an angel, saying: " *And ıf you make* [the sacrifice] *a goat, you will make it for the Lord.* " [556]. And about the Son it is written: " *Let all the angels of God worship Him* ." [557]. And in [the book of the prophet] Isaiah it is also written: " *They will worship in You, and they will pray in You. For you are God, and you do not know, the God of Israel who Savior* " [558]. It is fair when such words come from the mouths of those called from the [pagan] nations, who then came to know God. If, having known the Son, they knew God and worshiped [Him] as God, then, therefore, He is not a creation, so that it would not happen that these peoples again serve creatures instead of the Creator.

OTHER . Christ says to His disciples: " *You speak of Me as teacher and Lord: and you speak well, for I am* ." [559]. Then Thomas says to Him: " *My Lord and my God* " [560] , and He did not prevent the disciple from saying this, as the angels prevented the saints. And the Psalmist: " *Thy throne , O God, is for ever and ever* ." [561]. But if He really were a creation, He would not be worshiped, would not be called Lord, would not tolerate anyone saying to Him: " *You are my God* ." Since He is by nature this, possessing that which belongs to the Father, as the Son and the true Generation, He listens favorably to those who say such things, as those who confess the truth.

An antithesis of the Aryan dogmas, containing what they think is the true reason for the creation of the Son, and then refuting [this their statement] with the help of convincing syllogisms. The God of all, they say, wishing to establish the nature of the created (γενητῶν), since it could not contain His irresistible (ἄκρατον) power, creates first the Son, whom He calls the Word, so that through Him, who became a mediator, others could be created that could contain only His strength. In particular, it would be absurd if the ineffable power of God extended to such insignificant [creatures] and dealt with such small [subjects].

Rebuttal to this . If God's power was unbearable for the nature of created things, then how did the Son bear it, being, in your opinion, Himself created and from non-existent? How did He endure this uncontrollable action of His own (αὐτουργίαν) of the Father, being, as you say, a creation? For it is necessary that either the whole creation could [endure it], since He <75.253> was able; or, if other creatures are weak, then He should also be weak along with it, since He is of created nature. If the Son, being, in your opinion, a creation, included the Father's own action, then other creations will also include, and the birth, that is, the creation [in your opinion], of the Son will seem unnecessary in order for other [creations] to be created. , and the blasphemous wisdom [of heretics], giving the Son the highest place among creatures, will weaken, and thanks to what they think to honor [God], they will rather [on the contrary] be condemned as blasphemers. For what is generally ranked among creatures will be of created nature, even if it seems better than others due to its immeasurable advantages. If they say that it is inappropriate for the ineffable power of God to extend even to the most insignificant [creatures], then let them be ashamed when they hear Christ saying: " *Are not two birds valued by one Assar? And not one of them will fall on the earth without your Father* ." [562]. And again: " *Behold the birds of the air, for they neither sow nor reap, and your heavenly Father feeds them.* " [563]. And again: " *If the hay from the village is swept into the oven today and in the morning, God clothes it like this, isn't it much more than you?"* » [564]What will be more insignificant than grass and small birds, for which God, in [His] goodness, provides? How can the Creator not honor those to whom He does not deny Providence with existence? But these, without noticing it themselves, attribute arrogance to God, saying that He does not deign to be their Creator. So, if He is the Creator of all, and extends down to the most

insignificant, being, because of His love for mankind, capable of containing everyone, then the premise of the heretics is unnecessary, saying that the Son was made for the sake of the smallest of creations.

Also on [the words] "The Lord created Me" [565]. *That the Son is not a creature* . If, in your opinion, - oh, God-fighters! - due to the fact that the nature of the created cannot accommodate the uncontrollable own action of God and the Father, the need for a mediator arose - and then the Father created the Son, then how did the Son, being, in your opinion, created, accommodate the power of the Father? After all, it is necessary to give Him a mediator; but that, in turn, if it is created, requires a mediator, and thus logic will lead to an endless crowd of mediators. So, [their] sophism about this is in vain, which at once turns the whole creation upside down. For if a mediator is not found, much less sought, then the created things would not come into existence.

Another [objection] of the Orthodox, who say: "If the Son is a creature, then how is it natural for Him to be the Creator? For this is by no means a property of the creature."

Antipophora , as it were, on behalf of the heretics . The Son, they say, is a creation and is one of those created; but, having learned to create, as from a teacher and master, He helped God who taught Him in [His] affairs.

<75.256> *Further rebuttal* . If everything that would seem to be an accident (συμβεβηκὸς) of something and not rooted in nature, but somehow acquired, can someday become absent (ἀποσυμβῆναι), for such is always the nature of accident, then someday it will be taken away (ἀποσυμβή σετα) from The Son is to be His Creator. And He will be alien to [this] dignity, having lost what He has learned. For he who is called from a state where He does not know something at all, to knowledge [of it], may someday experience oblivion [of what He knew].

OTHER . Bringing creations from non-existence into being is not a matter of art, but of creative power. After all, art transforms existing things into something else, and creative power calls non-existent things into being. So, if through art and teaching the Son can be the Creator, then let them see what they will say about the Father, if someone says the same in relation to Him; "But you will say that the Father [creates] by nature, and the Son by learning." This means that it is possible through learning to acquire the natural action of God and, having learned to create, to become what He is by nature. Therefore, there is no distance between God and the creatures, except for the excess knowledge [of the former], and we do not differ in nature from Him, and we lack only knowledge, which, if applied, then we will all become gods by nature. How then is there one God, if only in learning [to create] is [a necessary condition for] becoming gods? If these considerations contain some great absurdity, then, therefore, the Son is by nature a Creator, and not by teaching, like us.

OTHER . Another thing is wisdom, and another thing is wise. For wisdom is the thing that makes wise, and the wise is the one who contains within himself that which makes him wise. So, if the Son says about Himself that He is wisdom, then how could He become wise? After all, if He needed teaching at all, He was not Wisdom. And if wisdom came to Him, then He will someday not be so, since what happened may be absent. What then was He before? For He was not Wisdom, being devoid of prudence (λειπόμενος φρονήσεως). But the Son was always Wisdom. For this is what the divine Scriptures declare. Therefore, it is erroneous and ignorant to say that He gained something from His teaching.

OTHER . If the fruit of learning is the ability to create, and thus the Son became the Creator, then [those who assert this] attribute to the Father the passion of envy, since He, being able to teach many, taught only One. After all, what would hinder Him if many around Him were creators, just as He has many archangels and angels? However, the Son alone does what the Father does. Therefore, [the ability] to create in Him is natural, and not as a result of teaching, so that the Father would seem superior to envy, not having taught, but rather having generated from Himself one Creator, through Whom He creates.

OTHER, having a convincing appearance . If, in your opinion, the Father created the Son so that the creator of created nature could be found, then it would be fitting for Him to cease to act once and for all upon the emergence of the Son. What does He do after the Son? For the Savior Himself says nowhere: " *Father My works hitherto, and I work* ." [566]. So, if He does things after the Son, then the Son, in your opinion, will be superfluous. But this is absurd to think and say. Therefore, the Son was not brought into being as a created being in order to become the Creator of others, but, having originated from the ineffable essence of the Father, together with the Father *he does* everything that is characteristic of the Father, being by nature what He is, that is, God, and therefore - Creator.

OTHER . If, according to divine Scripture, *no one can resist the Divine will* [567], but she alone is sufficient to form everything, according to the Psalmist, who says: " *Do whatever you please* ." [568], then what was the need for a mediator? In vain, then, the Son appeared. But to say so is extremely absurd. For He is the endowed with essence (ἐνούσιος) and living will of the Father, through which He calls everything into being. How, then, was she herself created? How can they say that it [once] did not exist at all?

DIFFERENT and witty . If they say that the Son was created for this reason, so that God could create us through Him, then let them see to what impiety this word of theirs reaches. For it turns out that it was He who arose for our sake, and not we for His sake. And we are a creation, and He is an instrument of creation. Then let Him express gratitude to us, for for our sake He came into being. Let Him then be our glory, just as a wife is *the glory of her husband* . For *the woman* ," says [the apostle], " *to her*

husband is glory [569], and then gives the reason: " *For the husband was not created for the sake of the wife, but the wife for the sake of the husband* ." [570]. So, if the Son was created for our sake, and not we for His sake, then we will be in every way more perfect than Him, just as Adam is more perfect than the wife created for his sake. But this is absurd. Therefore, the Son was not a creation, and He did not arise for our sake, but, being by nature God, like the Father, He brought us into being by His own power.

DIFFERENT and witty . If the Son was created for our sake, as they say, then He is not before us with God, since, not having Him in mind, He subsequently creates us for His sake, but, thinking about us, creates Him for our sake.

OTHER . If for our sake the Father created the Son, then He does not do this out of free will, but out of necessity, <75.260> for our sake. Consequently, the Son would not have existed at all if there had not been a reason in us, and, perhaps, the Father would not have wanted to create the Son, but barely moved Him to want [to create the Son], need, and became [thus] among them God is subject to necessity (ὑπὸ ἀνάγκην Θεός.) [571]. Run away from such absurdity!

OTHER . If for our sake the Father created the Son, and He arose and fulfilled the work for which He was created, then the Son is no longer needed, just as an instrument is not needed when the work for which it was done is completed.

Other convincing speculations . If the Father created the Son for our sake, then we are the first for whom He planned. If we are the first about whom the Father thought, then why is He created before us, Who is the last in plans? Why, having created Him first, did [the Father] not design Him first? Why, again, having us first in His plan, He calls Him Son and heir, and us – slaves and property? [572]created for our sake? After all, it would be fitting, on the contrary, for us to be sons and heirs, and the instrument of our creation - which appeared for our sake - to be a slave and subordinate. Run away from such absurdity!

An explanation, finally, of the right faith . The Son was not created for our sake, but He was not created at all. For even if the created were not supposed to bring glory to the Father, then *the Word is* in God , *and God is the Word* [573], as written. Of course, what was created had to come into being through Him. For just as light will not shine except through its own radiance, so the Father will not create anything that exists except through His Word. For [the Scripture] says: " *Everything came into being , and without Him there was nothing* ." [574]. Therefore He is called both the Hand and the Arm of God [575].

An Observation from Divine Scripture, Good and Helpful . " *Speech* ," it is said, " *God : let there be light; let there be firmament; let there be luminaries, and so be it. Speech: let us create man; and God created man* " [576]. However, among all this, nowhere is speech found, as if [addressed] to the Father from the Son, who wanted to

learn something that is necessary for the appearance of created [beings], but the word [of God immediately] becomes deed. If, by the word, deeds are accomplished according to the will (βουλὴν) of the Father, then the Word, therefore, is the will of the Father, living and endowed with essence (ἐνούσιος), Itself existing in the Father and having Him in Itself.

In a similar way, an observation from which we learn that both angels and holy prophets usually, when receiving commands from God, sometimes ask questions without understanding what was commanded. But the Word of God is not shown [by Scripture] to do so

God promised Abraham a son, and he <75.261> said: " *Why do I understand this* ?" [577] Moses was sent, and behold, he says: " *If they ask me, what is His name, that I bring the river to them* ?" [578] And the angel in Zechariah asks God, saying: " *Lord Almighty, how long will you have mercy on Jerusalem* ?" [579] And he continues until he hears kind and comforting words. And Habakkuk says: " *I will stand on my watch, and I will mount the stone, and I will see what God says to me.* " [580]. For they, as slaves and creatures in need of the mediation of the Word, were honored by It to learn from Him the will of the Father. But the Son does not seek to know [the will of the Father], [Himself] being the Word of the Father and the Will endowed with essence. Therefore, it is not by teaching that He possesses the property of being the Creator, but essentially and by [His] nature.

Also on [words]: "The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways" [581]*. That the Son is not a creature, but is co-essential with the Father* . And how we need to understand [the words] " *The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways* ," we will see from the following. Firstly, it must be said that what is spoken in parables (τὰ παροιμιωδῶς λεγόμενα) although it seems at first glance to mean something, is [in reality] not understood as it is said, but contains a different thought. That is why the Savior said to His disciples: " *These things are spoken to you in parables: but the hour will come when I will not speak to anyone in parables, but will manifestly* (παῤῥησίᾳ)." [582] since the parable does not have straightness (παῤῥησίαν). So, Wisdom, which directly says: " *she created Me* ," then offers some words like this: " *Wisdom created a house for herself* ." [583]. So, if Wisdom is God's Word, and She creates a home for Herself, then perhaps one should ask the question, where is the place for " *creating Me* "? So, [Wisdom] is Christ, who says this as having already been born and become a man, to whom " *creating Me* " can be attributed without losing weight, since he is a man. It became the house of Wisdom, created by Her, this common body [for Christ with all people], born of the Holy Virgin, in which *was pleased to live every fulfillment of the physical deity* [584], according to Pavlov. Therefore, since *the Word became flesh* [585], then the divine Scripture appends to It [the words] " *creating Me* ," since It became flesh; and this is how it is appropriate to understand what has been said.

OTHER, that this "creation of Me" does not necessarily mean the cause [of being], but the transformation from a certain dispensation or thing into something else. Let, if you like, this " *creature* " be related to Christ in an indefinite manner. " *The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways* "; if anyone wants to accurately understand what is written, he will find that " *created* " here does not mean the created essence of the Word, but some other correct meaning. For the word "to be created" (κτίζεσθαι) is spoken of both those that already exist and those that have not yet arisen. And how it can be said about something that already exists that it is "created" and accepts a different beginning, we will now see. For when it is said " *created* " about things that do not yet exist, then this will rightly <75.264> mean bringing from non-existence into being; and in relation to those that already exist and do not allow themselves to be created in the sense of being, this word no longer denotes essence, but a transformation from something one into something else. As, for example, when David says: " *And the people of the land will praise the Lord* ." [586]. And again: " *Create a pure heart in me, O God* " [587]. And Paul nowhere says about Christ: " *Having abolished the law of commandments by teaching, so that he might create both into one new man* ." [588]. And again: " *Put on the new man, created by God in truth and in the glory of truth* ." [589]. And, of course, David is not pointing to some essentially created people, but he is talking about people moving from error to the knowledge of God. And within himself he wished that no other heart would be created than the one he had, but prayed that it would change [from impurity] to purity. And the wisest Paul does not say that two certain people are transformed into natural unity thanks to Christ, as if accepting the beginning of being, but says that those who [came] from Israel, and those who from the Gentiles, are transformed [by their minds] into a new consciousness (εἰς καινότητα γνώμης), forgetting some - service according to the [old] Law, and others - the delusion instilled in them from childhood. And, again, He commands us all *to put on the new man created according to God* . And it is obvious that He is not talking about some essentially created man in whom one must put on, but about a virtuous life and renewal of will. Thus, if "to be created" does not necessarily indicate the essence, then what reason will there be, or what foolishness will it be to correctly understand what is written in relation to truly created things, but in relation to God the Word, in relation to Whom this should especially be observed? - turn out to be thinking evil? For [Wisdom] says: " *The Lord created Me* ," and not within the limits of " *creating Me* " he supplies the power of the word, but adds that " *the beginning of His ways, He created His works* ," and not bringing into being, as you understood, but *creating the beginning of His ways into your own affairs* . Living according to the Law was revered by the Jews, but life in truth was not at all known to the pagans. So, it became, that is, became (ἐκτίσθη), the Word of God, flesh, - that is, man, - so that *the beginning of the ways* of the Lord and *works His* could be found by everyone. For in Christ the life of the Gospel shone forth first. By the ways and deeds of the Lord, something else should be understood, if not His commandments, which, fulfilling and working in which, we

seem to go to Him in many and different ways. And what " *works* " mean is virtuous living and the commandments of God - listen to what the divine Scripture says: " *Alas for those who do the work of the Lord with negligence.* " [590]. And blessed David, calling the commandments paths, proclaims: " *Tell me Your ways, O Lord, and teach me Your paths* ." [591]

OTHERWISE about the same thing . " *The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways, for His work* ." " *Created* " should not be applied to the essence <75.265> of the Word: after all, it is truly blasphemous and impious to say about the One who always exists in the same way with the Father that He has now been created. Understand it in this more reliable way: " *creating Me* ," He says, " *was the beginning of His ways* ." Here He calls the lawgiver Moses and the prophets "paths," above whom, like a certain principle and power, stands Christ, transforming what they said into the novelty of the gospel sermon , and, moreover, with authority. For the Law says: " *You shall not commit adultery* " [592], and Christ - " *I say to you: do not lust* " [593]. He calls the saints paths, as being able to lead [us] to God through instruction. So understand what Jeremiah said: " *Stand on the path and see, and ask the eternal paths of the Lord and see which is the good way, and walk in it and you will find purification for your souls.* " [594]. And it is obvious that he did not speak about the ways that are usually understood. For how to question them? How to learn from them? And if anyone applies this word to the saints, he will benefit from such an understanding. For if anyone, as if to certain paths, turns his mind to St. prophets, not getting acquainted with them in passing, but extracting the exact meaning from what they wrote, then he recognizes *the Good Way* , that is, Christ, who says: " *I am the Way* " [595]through whom he will be cleansed, receiving remission of sins [596]. So, He says: " *creating Me* ," that is, He made Me the beginning, that is, the power over the Law and the Prophets, not, of course, their representative (τυπικὰ) words to affirm, but to lay down the best [commandments] in His deeds. And enough has already been said about the fact that " *created* " does not necessarily indicate an essence.

OTHERWISE about the same thing . [The expression] " *The Lord created Me* " is the same as if He said: " *The Father made the body;* [597], and as a man *I created Me* for the salvation of men." For, as when John says that " *the Word became flesh* " [598], and Paul writes about Christ that He " *was a curse upon us* " [599], and also that " *he who knew no sin, sin commit* for us " [600], we do not consider the Word to be transformed into flesh, nor do we say that Christ truly became a curse and sin, but - even though it is said so in the Divine Scripture - we understand this piously; in the same way, although God's Word says: " *He created Me* ," we must nevertheless think [that this is said] instead of "He made me a man," and we do not understand what was said in the sense of His essence.

OTHER, that God the Word is not a creation . If God's Word is the generation of the

Father and is so called divine Scripture, then how will It be a creation? For He [i.e. e. Son] will necessarily be one of two things: either, being a generation, He will escape being a creation; or, being, in your opinion, <75.268> a creation and creation, it will not be a generation. After all, no one ever calls his creation both a offspring and a son. Since the Son is a generation, it follows that he is thought of as the Son, and not as a creature.

OTHER, about the same thing. The Divine Scriptures call the Word of God the Only Begotten. If so, then how can it be understood that He was essentially created at the beginning of others, which the Influx calls *paths* ? After all, if He is generally numbered with others and for some [of them] is the beginning, then He will be part of the whole totality (σώματος) and will not be the only begotten, having many subsequent ones, of whom He was created by the beginning, as He Himself says. For even though He was created before others, He will not be the only one because of this. After all, the beginning of something, although it takes precedence in relation to those that are after it, but time will still be related to their number and related to them. Behold, Reuben became the beginning of the children of Jacob, but he is not the only begotten, and therefore is not alien to the essence of those who come after him. So, if the Word was created by the beginning of certain (creatures), then he will be neither the Only Begotten, nor alienated by the logos of nature from those whose beginning he is, and, thus, will be numbered among the creatures. And the Father will be a liar, who calls Him Son. A liar and blessed John will also appear, saying: " *In the beginning was the Word* » [601]. For what about " *be* " (ἦν) if " *be* " (γέγονε)? What about " *God is the Word* " if It is created? How can he also be Lord who, together with others, was created as a slave and is part of the whole creation? But this is absurd. This means that " *created* " will not be attached to the essence.

OTHER . If the Son, in your opinion, was created in essence, being the beginning of the creations that followed [Him], as it is written, then how does He have the ability to create, how did He become the Creator of others? After all, it is necessary that the existing beginning of something be of the same essence with everything of which it is the beginning. So, if the Son, being a creation, also has creative power, then the other creations will be the same, even if they came into being thanks to the Son, [i.e. e.] having a creative nature themselves. And then there is no advantage in God compared to creatures. If He is not the beginning of other creatures in the sense that He Himself is a creation, then, therefore, He is the Son and the Only Begotten.

OTHER, about the same thing by means of reductio ad absurdum . " *The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways, for His work* ." If someone wants to explore what has been said even more curiously, then he will maliciously (κακοτρόπως) say: "If He was the first to be created and became, in your opinion, the beginning, then how is He created into action? After all, He did not say: " *The Lord created Me, that I should do*

His works ," but " *for His own work* ." As if the works were already accomplished, He says that He was created "in them." If so, how will the second after them be first? How will the beginning of others be the one who arose for their sake? Like *all Im* <75.269> *was* [602], if He is after them? If it is not permissible to think this way, then " *created* " will not be applied to the essence of God the Word, but will be understood by us piously, so that the meaning [of this word] refers to the concept of incarnation.

OTHER. As if from the objection of heretics. Lord, they say, He calls the Father: so that He recognized Himself as existing in created nature. For all created things are slaves of God who created them.

Rebuttal to this. But He calls Him both Lord and Father. And if through this He recognized Himself as a slave, then, therefore, through this He recognized Himself as a Son. If He is the Son, then He should not justly be called the creation of the One who gave birth, but should be recognized as having originated from His essence. So He is the Son by nature; When, for our sake, did He take on *the form of a servant ?* [603], became a man, then he calls the Father Lord. For just as, being a Son by nature, He speaks the truth when He calls God Father, so when He did not refuse to take on *the form of a servant* , He rightly and well calls the Father Lord. And He Himself is aware of this difference when He says: " *Confess , Father, Lord of heaven and earth* ." [604]. Behold, He says here that for Himself God is the Father, and for those in heaven and on earth – Lord. But if He, like them, had been created, He would not have reserved for Himself, as if in the form of an exclusive lot, the rank of the Son, subjecting all others to the yoke of slavery. For by saying: " *Lord of heaven and earth* ," He left no one free, except Himself, as the Son, who calls God Father.

OTHER. As if from the objection of the same [heretics]. They say that He calls His Father His Lord. But if He were a Son by nature, He would not call Him Lord.

Rebuttal to this . How then can we, being by nature slaves (for we are men), call God Father? After all, if, because the Son called Him Lord, He, in your opinion, will not be a generation, then we will not be creatures by nature, calling the Creator Father. If grace does not place us outside of creation, allowing us to call the Lord Father, then the Son will not fall away from being Son by nature, calling Him who gave birth Lord for the sake of benefit and what was appropriate for the economy of our [salvation]. For the Word of God came [to us] so that, having taken into Himself what was human, He might bestow what belongs to Him by nature. And He shows this by saying: " *I go to My Father and your Father, and My God and your God* ." [605]. For He gives to human nature what is His, allowing it to call God Father. And he himself accepts what is characteristic of humanity, calling the Father His God. But neither <75.272> do we deny slavery by nature by calling God Father, nor does He lose His natural dignity by likening Himself to us for [our] benefit.

OTHER . " *The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways, for His work* ." Because of this, the Son will not have a created nature, nor will he be thought of as a creature by nature, since He does not simply say that He was created, but " *into works* " and " *at the beginning of His ways* ." And when there is a reason why He says that He was created, then it is clear that He is not indicating His movement from non-existence to being, but a certain transition from something one thing to something else. For He *was in the beginning the Word* , and having become flesh, according to the word of John, He became for us the beginning of every good path. So, ever being the Word, He, since He became man, says of Himself that He was created *for the work* of the Father.

Observations from divine Scripture that when the Son indicates His birth from the Father, or any other saint [speaks] about it, he does not add a reason. For God does not exist for the sake of anything, or [the Son is not for an external reason] born from the Father. When the Scriptures indicate the likeness to us and the birth from the Virgin, they immediately add a reason, so that we learn that the ever-present Word of God for the sake of some benefit became man, not having then received the beginning of being, but then being transformed into the " *form of a servant", and, according to this, being conceivably created and created.*

[The saying] " *In the beginning was the Word* " does not carry a reason; and " *The Word is to God* " does not carry a reason; and " *God is the Word* " [606] does not carry a reason. " *I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me* " [607]; " *I and the Father are one* " [608]; " *You have seen Me, you have seen your Father* " [609]; " *I am holy* " [610]; " *I am truth* " [611]; " *Whose glory is and the image of His posture* " [612] all these [sayings] pointing to the essence of the Son do not carry within themselves the reason why this is so. As for carnal birth, Scripture gives reasons connected with it. After all, the Savior Himself says: " *I came down from heaven, not to do My will, but the will of the Father who sent Me.* " [613]. And again: " *I, the Holy One, have come in peace, so that everyone who believes in Me will not remain in darkness.* " [614]. And again: " *To all I was born and to all I came in peace, to bear witness to the truth* " [615]. And Blessed Paul, setting out in the clearest way the reason for His coming to us, writes: " *Since the children have partaken of flesh and blood, they have sincerely partaken of the same.* " [616]. And again: " *Because death [was] by man, and by man the resurrection of the dead* " [617]. And again: " *For the weak of the law, in whom was weak* <75.273> *in the flesh , God sent His Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin, and for sin, judge sin in the flesh, so that the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in us, who walk not in the flesh, but in the Spirit .*" [618]. And again: " *God did not send His Son into the world to judge the world, but may the world be saved by Him.* " [619]. And again the Savior about Himself: " *I have come to judgment in this peace, so that the blind may see, and the seeing may become blind.* " [620]. So, when He became a man in order to accomplish these *works* and become the beginning of these *paths* , He rightly speaks of Himself: " *The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways for His works* ." For He was not created by being

brought into being, but by ever being and existing (ὢν ἀεὶ καὶ ὑπάρχων), He was created flesh for the reasons given.

Also on [the words]: "The Lord created Me," about the fact that the Son is not a creation. Paul says nowhere about our Savior, Christ: "For this is our peace, having made both one, and destroying the middle wall of the fence, destroying enmity through His flesh, having abolished the law of commandments by teaching, so that He may build both into one new man. " [621]. So, if Christ creates two in Himself, and *transforms into one new man* , that is, into a virtuous life, - for we were the ones who were created in Him when He accepted the likeness to us, and in Him first we had the beginning of the godly lives, being recreated for a better life - then even now, as if he was creating us for the sake *of one person* , he can say with sufficient grounds: " *The Lord created Me* ."

OTHER . It is written nowhere about our Savior, Christ, that *that infirmity* (ἀσθενείας) *is ours to take away* (αἴρει) [622]. And again: " *There will be an oath for us* " [623]. And again: " *He who knew no sin, commit sin for us* ." [624]. So, as it is said that He was weak (ἠσθενηκέναι), although He was never weak (for He is *the power of God* [625]), because he bore our infirmities [626]; as divine Scripture says that He became a curse, not precisely meaning that He became a curse, but that He suffered a curse for us; and how, again, it is said that He became sin, not as having lost His nature and not as having turned into sin , which He did not know, but because He bore our sins *as* it is written, , *in His body on the tree* [627], so when we are created in Him *into one new man* , it is said that He is also created. And therefore He says: " *The Lord created Me* ," Himself not being a creation, but the own creation of the Father's essence.

OTHER . If, in your opinion, God's Word Itself is a created essence, and It says about Itself: " *The Lord created Me,* " then, therefore, He who <75.276> is much earlier than us did not become a man for our sake. If anyone agrees to hold fast to this, then neither we were created in Him, nor He had us in Himself; How then are we created in Christ *into one new man* ? For Paul will put you to shame, even if you did not want it, when he says: " *For of this we are creatures created in Christ Jesus.* " [628]. If we were created in Christ, then, therefore, the Word of God is not of created nature. But when He became man, we are created in Him, and in some way, thanks to us, He appears to say: " *The Lord created Me* ." After all, it is not because He is the Word that it becomes Him to speak such words, but for the sake of our salvation He, although being the Creator, became [man] in the flesh, so that, having us created in Himself, He could say: " *The Lord created Me* ." And how, explaining His eternal and [co-existence] with the Father, He says: " *And when I rejoiced in it , rejoice in His presence every day.* " [629]; and also: " *Before all the hills does He give birth to Me* " [630]; So, when for the sake of saving us all He put on *the form of a servant* , then as a person rightly says: " *The Lord created Me* ."

OTHER . If we believe that Christ truly became a man, then how can we not [consider that] it is necessary for Him to speak words befitting a man? After all, He had to say: " *not in the beginning* I was *a man, for "to be in the beginning* " befits the Divine nature alone," but [He also had to] preserve what is proper to the essence of the created, for man is a created being. That is why He says: " *The Lord created Me* ," that He became man, so that ever-beginning existence would be preserved by God alone.

OTHER. "The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways ." If because of these words you think that every created thing is the essence of the Son, then, when it then turns out that He says: " *Before all the hills He begat Me* ," let Him avoid [your] accusation of creation by saying about Himself that He was born. For generation is something different from creation. For one naturally comes from the essence of the one who gives birth, and the other is from the outside, as alien.

So, if, being God, the Word became a man, then let him say as a man: " *The Lord created Me* ." And let him point to His eternal existence, crying out: " *Before all the hills He gives birth to Me* ."

Antithesis, as it were, on behalf of opponents. [The word] "begot," they say, does not necessarily show the Son as existing from the essence of the Father. For divine Scripture is indifferent to words. After all, it also applies to those who are truly creatures and does not dispute this in any way [the expression] "gave birth," as, for example, when it says: "I *begot sons and raised them up* ." [631]. And again: " *God, who gave birth to her, left her alone* " [632]. And [also]: " *Who is the one who gave birth to drops of dew* ?" [633]After all, because of this <75.277> we will not say that God by nature became the father of dew, Therefore, "begat" and "created" are the same thing in relation to the Son.

Further rebuttal . We can often see divine Scripture indifferent to words, however, not ignorant of the meaning of each [of them], but sometimes only using them in a different sense. After all, in relation to creations, when it wants to show them related to created nature, it says: " *In the beginning God created heaven and earth* ." [634]. Or: " *God create man* " [635]. Not "gave birth", but [namely] "created". And explaining the birth (of the whole Word, God says: " *My heart will vomit the Word of Good* " [636]. And, defining the beginning of being for creatures, the divine Scripture again says: " *In the beginning created* "; and regarding God the Word - " *In the beginning was the Word* " [637]. So, for creatures the beginning is time, and before the ages the existing Word of God had only one beginningless Father as its beginning, being everlasting in Him. Therefore, just as when the word "gave birth" is used in relation to true creatures, it should not be understood in its own sense and not in the meaning of nature, so when "created" or "created" is used in relation to the truly Born, it should not be understood in the proper sense, but in such a way that His natural nobility is preserved. After all, grace is given to creatures by the fact that the word "begot" is used in relation to them,

and the benefit of humanity gives the uncreated and uncreated Word [the basis] to speak of Himself: "created." And creatures are called to adoption by the word and counsel of God. And the Son, revealing His ineffable and natural birth from the Father, says: " *I have departed from God and come again* ." [638]. And again, showing Himself to be different from those of created nature, He says: " *You are from below, but I am from above* ." [639]. No one who is prudent will say that the Word of God boasts of height in the spatial dimension, but that by the word "lower" He denotes the humility of the created essence, and by "higher" He understands the height of the Divine and all-surpassing nature.

So, given that such a difference lies between the created and the Generation, let the words be indifferent when the [concepts] designated by them do not suffer any harm.

OTHER, spoken narratively, on [the words]: "The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways"; and further [to the words]: "Before all the hills He gives birth to Me." If He says of Himself that He was born before all, then [this means that] He will not be one of all, but different in relation to them. For [the set] " everything" also has its own beginning in itself, since it will not be "everything" if anything belonging to it turns out to be outside it. Consequently, if the Son is born before all, then "all" are considered in their number, and the birth of the Son is thought of outside of them. And not being counted among the created things, He will be of a different nature in comparison with them. So, since He is the Word, He was born from the Father, and was created as a man, and became *the beginning of ways* . Just as, therefore, we, when we take into ourselves <75.280> the Word of God, are called sons for His sake, being by nature creatures, so He, when He takes [onto Himself] our flesh, is called creation and creation, being by nature nature by the Son. And again: just as, being our Creator, God becomes [for us] also a Father, so, being by nature the Father of God the Word, [God the Father] becomes [for Him] and Creator, when [the Son] for our sake is likened to creatures. So, if we are sons by nature, then He will be by nature a creature and a creature. If we are called to sonship by position and grace (θέσει καὶ χάριτι), then He will also be a creature by position (θέσει) [640] for the sake of the economy of our salvation, without losing [his inherent] nature (ἐκ φύσεως) dignity.

ANOTHER, clear teaching, how one should piously understand [the saying] "The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways." The first man, Adam, was born, and the way of salvation was given to him by God. He lost it, breaking the Divine commandment, fell into corruption, rushed to sin, and descended into death. It was necessary that we should again be shown another way by which we could ascend to that original state [in which Adam remained before the Fall]. Since none of the people turned out to be sufficient for this, then, of necessity, the humane Word of God Himself, being uncreated by nature, is created for us as man, clothed with the will of the Father in our flesh, so that, as Paul says, he might *renew for us a new and living*

way. [641] and do *the works of* the Father [642], renewing the body into incorruption, and the one who holds death in his power, [arising] from sin, overthrowing [643], and *sin itself condemning* [644], и иное все благое делая, что по природове быть чрез Него (everything else of whom whatever is in nature was good through him) [645].

So, if He became a man in order to become for us the path of good things (ὁδὸς τῶν ἀγαθῶν,) and to fulfill those works that are accomplished by the Father through Him, then rightly He says: " *The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways for His works* ." Then He speaks again, pointing to His pre-eternal birth: " *Formerly was the foundation of Me* ." [646]. If He is both born and created, then He gives a suitable explanation to both. For, as the Word, He is born from the Father before the ages, as He speaks, and is created - as a man - when He *became flesh for us* [647]: So says the evangelist.

OTHER . David says nowhere about God the Word: " *He was before the world* " [648]. So, if the Son exists before the ages and at the same time says about Himself that He is created *into the works* of the Father, then it is in every possible way necessary to think that He is created when *the works have* already been formed. For after the creations came into being, in the last times of this age, He became man, when He says – properly and very opportunely – " *He created Me* ." How could He Himself be the Creator of these [deeds], if He is created after them? If, before works, there is their Creator, the Word of God, and is created "in them," then this " *creation* " will not be an indication of the essence, but properly means incarnation, when for the benefit of the works of the Father [the Word] *flesh became* . And that is why He says: " *The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways for His work* ."

OTHER, as if in abbreviation. He says about Himself that He was created *at the beginning of paths* . And which ones exactly - you will find out from what follows. Firstly, enumerating the virtues which, having created them at first Himself, He taught us, He says: " *Be ye therefore merciful* ." [649] and also: " *If someone hits you on the right side of your cheek, turn to him the other one too.* " [650]. *From him who takes yours, do not torture* [651]. The law says: *You shall not commit adultery. I say to you: do not lust* [652] ", and so on, which is contained in the gospel sermon . For this first began in Christ, and then came to us. Therefore He says: " *I am the door* " [653], " *I am the way* " [654]. So, He, having become for us the beginning of such works, when for the sake of this He took on our flesh and became a man, He can rightly say: " *The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways for His works* ." The same applies to the resurrection from the dead, and to the transformation of the flesh into incorruption, and to the ascension into heaven. After all, He became the beginning of all this for us, and for this reason He was created.

OTHER . Christ died for us and for us. And just as when [His] body died, it is said that He endured it, although He is immortal by nature, so when the body is created, He says of Himself that He is being created, although He is essentially uncreated. For

since the flesh is His, and no one else's, then He assimilates to Himself what happens to it.

OTHER . The best thing on earth is a person who, being created perfect, turned out to be imperfect due to a crime, falling from immortality into death and from incorruption into corruption. So, since this seemed like one of the most absurd things, and it would be truly shameful for the work of God to remain imperfect forever, then, of necessity, the perfect Word of God clothed itself in an imperfect man, and for this purpose, as He says, it was created *into works* , in order to complete them, in order to clothe them again in perfection, making up for the insufficiency of man with Himself. And so He says to His Father in the Gospels: " *I have glorified You on earth, having accomplished the work that You gave Me to do.* " [655]. And again: " *The works that the Father has given me to do, those works testify about Me.* " [656]. So, if then, when He became man, He performs works, and is created for them, then, of course, it is obvious that " *creating* " will not be an indication of the essence, but rather shows the time of coming, in which, having become flesh, He is created. For then, having completely completed the works of the Father and restored human nature to its original state, He *presented to Himself a glorious church , not having filthiness, or vice, or anything from such, but holy and blameless* [657] and we became *a new creation in Him* [658], no longer carrying imperfection due to transgression and death from sin, but having finally received perfection due to the obedience of Christ and [His] resurrection from the dead. This means, having become a man for this reason, He can rightly say: " *The Lord created Me, the beginning of His ways into His work* ."

OTHER, on [the words]: "The Lord created Me," that the Son of God is not a creature and not a creature, and on [the words]: "Before the ages was the foundation of Me." If, in your opinion, - oh, inventors of all kinds of wickedness! – The Word of God is a creature, then how do we cleave to God and become deified, united with Him? How then is Christ *the intercessor of God and men?* [659]? After all, He is in connection with us, since He became a man. If He is a creature and not God, then how will He be related to God? What tropos [of existence] will connect Him with Him? After all, things that are not similar in essence cannot be connected with each other in a natural way. How can we, if He is a creature, be saved through Him, according to the word of Scripture: " *Not an intercessor, less than an angel, but the Lord Himself saved them.* " [660]? How, by believing in Him, are we justified? [661], if He is a creature? How about [curse] - *you are earth, and you will go to earth* ." [662] loses strength through Him? After all, it was not a proper thing for a creature to abrogate the determination given by God. How, again, if He is a creature, He *will take away sin* [663] as the prophet says about Him: " *Who is God like You, taking away iniquity and leaving iniquity* " [664]? How, if He is a creature, could He say: " *If not the Son you will set free* " [665]? And He really liberated, as the heir of the Father, and not a creature [as He appears] according to the madness of the atheists.

OTHER . If, by imitation of the Son by nature, those who are by adoption are called sons, then it is in every possible way necessary that [the Son] by nature be different and different in essence compared to them. So, if sons by position are creatures, then [the Son] by nature will not be a creature or creation, so that He would not be the same as [sons] by position.

OTHER . If, in your opinion, O Arians, the Son of God is a creature, then what kind of creature was He created by wisdom? What kind of hand is this that created Him along with all the others? For it is written: " *He created all things with wisdom* ." [666]. And God Himself says nowhere: " *My hand has created all this* ." [667]. And if everything was created by the wisdom and hand of God, and the divine Scriptures cry out about God the Word, that *everything was the same , and without* Him <75.285> *there was nothing* [668], then the Son cannot be the work of the wisdom of God, but rather He Himself is Wisdom and the Hand with which God does everything. Therefore, He is neither a creature nor a creation.

Observations from divine Scripture that the Son is not one of the creatures, but rather is called and is their Creator . The youths in Babylon, one might say, numbered all creation, sorted out in order what is in heaven and what is on earth, and said that God should be praised by all, but nowhere did they place the Son in the category of those who should be blessed [God] and did not say: "Let the Word, or the Wisdom of God, bless the Lord." [669]. But knowing that He, together with the Father, accepts worship, they, having mentioned all creation in general, passed over Him in silence as the Lord and as the one being praised. And the blessed Psalmist, no less commanding to sing praises to God and naming all creation - servants and angels, powers and heavens of heavens, moon and sun [670], - saying that they, like slaves, owe worship to God, does not place the Son anywhere among them, but, on the contrary, orders them to worship Him, crying: " *And let all the angels of God worship Him.* " [671]If all creation worships, and the Son accepts worship, then, therefore, He is not a creation, but the true Son, worshiped with the Father.

OTHER, that the Son, in comparison with creatures, is different, and not one of all. Divine Scripture, indicating that everything was created through God the Word, says this: " *all this was* ." [672]. And again: " *One Lord Jesus Christ, Lord of all* " [673]. And Paul, revealing Him more clearly than anyone, says: " *For the Word of God is living and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and there is no creation that is not manifest before Him, but all naked and declared before His eyes* ." [674]. So, if He is the Creator of everything, and *everything is declared before Him* , then the Creator of these [all] will not be one of all. And for Him, for Whom *everything is naked and declared* , it is not suitable to be thought of as one of the "naked and declared." After all, by saying " *all* ," he did not leave a single person outside [of this definition]; and if this "all" is filled with creatures alone, then He who is not numbered among them will be

different from them. This is how Blessed Paul understands the meaning of this "all." For, explaining [what he said]: " *You have subdued everything under His nose* ." [675], he unequivocally adds: " *Whenever you submit everything to Him, leave nothing unsubdued to Him* ." [676]. So, if [the word] " *all* " (πάντα) embraces everyone (τῶν ὅλων), and the Son creates *everything* , and *everything is declared before Him* , then He cannot be one of all, but is different in relation to them.

OTHER . It is written that " *In the name of Jesus every knee will bow, those in heaven and on earth and under the earth* " [677]. <75.288> If *every tribe worships the Son* , then He will not be one of those who worship, but different from them.

And again it is written: " *For all creation sighs and suffers with us even to this day, longing for redemption* (ἀπολύτρωσιν) [678] *test God's* » [679]. If *the creation sighs* and *longs for* the redemption and freedom *of the sons of God* , and the Son does not appear anywhere to those who sigh, does not accept adoption or liberation, but Himself is the one who fulfills the hope of the creation and calls those who sigh to adoption, and the giver of freedom, then it means that He is not among "all," and is not counted among the creation, but is different in relation to it, since [all], as creatures, groan, having a need for someone who helps, and He, as the Son, frees all those held in the bonds of slavery.

On [the words] "First of all was the foundation of Me" [680]. It is written: " *God founded the earth with wisdom* " [681]. So, if Wisdom founds the earth, and She is the affirmation of all (for everything remains stable thanks to her), then we must examine how the founder is founded by God? This will also be said in a form befitting parables, [i.e.] an indirect hint that has the innermost true meaning, for this is always the form of a parable.

So, Wisdom, that is, the Son of God, is founded, not because He is the Word, receiving the beginning of being, but because, having become man and clothed in our likeness, He becomes the beginning and foundation for us, who are taught to piety through faith into Him and transformed into *a new creation* [682], as written. And so, He says not simply: "God created Me as the Word or the Son," so that for dissenters (ἑτεροδοξοῦσιν) there would be no loophole allowing them to slander His essence as created, but absolutely: " *the basis of Me* ." For what He said above - [i.e. e.] " *The Lord made Me the beginning of His ways, for His work* ," - this is what this [speech] means. After all, there He says about Himself that He was created as the beginning of ways, and here He claims that the foundation of those built on Him was laid. [683], speaking about the same thing in different ways and completing the circle of words with the same meanings. After all, it's the same whether you say "beginning" or "foundation." For just as in those He becomes the beginning, so here He becomes the foundation of those who build on Him through faith.

OTHER . The wisest Paul says nowhere in his Epistles: " *For no one can lay another foundation than he who lies down, even Jesus Christ.* " [684]. So, if Christ lies at the foundation, then it is necessary that what is built should be such as the one lying under it [the foundation], for, thus, *the creation is composed* (συναρμολογουμένη) *grows* , - *as it* is written, - *into church* <75.289> *the holy* [685]. It is obvious, of course, that He does not speak of Himself as the Word, that He was founded, since there is nothing by nature similar to the Word, and none of the existing ones will naturally approach Him: after all, He is the Creator, and they are creatures . But since He became man and like us in everything except sin, He says of Himself that He laid down the foundation of those built on Him, capable of being compared (συναρμολογεῖσθαι) with Him. For since He also became man, He has a great affinity with us due to the nature of the flesh. Therefore, this [saying] must also be attributed to the incarnation of the Savior, so that we can avoid blasphemy, saying that it was the Wisdom of God that arose and received the beginning of being. For, as in another place He says of Himself that He is *the vine, we are the birth* [686], showing the rods not alien and not alien to the vine, but existing from it by nature, so here He speaks of Himself, which is our foundation, in order to show the natural relationship with Himself of those who are built on Him, [appearing] when He became man . After all, then we are united with Him by nature, and, holding on to our affinity with Him, like rods [the only begotten] of a vine, we bear fruit that *brings piety to God.* [687]. Therefore, at the foundation lies the Word of God made man, and we are built on Him, like some holy stones, so that we may be *a temple of the Holy Spirit living in us* [688].

OTHER . " *Before the Age is the Basis of Me* " [689]. It is reasonable, I think, and [even] necessary, to separate the insane false teachings of heretics from the examples themselves observed [in Scripture]; Perhaps, at least in this way, fearing the truth, they will refrain from blasphemy. So, that which is founded and taken for some such use does not necessarily turn out to have the beginning of its being when it is sent to the foundation. Let's say, let there be a stone appointed [for the foundation of a building] and hidden in the ground: it must first be cut off from some rock or mountain in order to be put to such use. And it, of course, first exists, and then becomes the foundation, being hidden in the depths of the earth. But if someone gives such a stone laid down a voice and a mind befitting a person, then he would say, explaining what concerns himself: "I was a stone lying in a rock or mountain, and now I have become a foundation, being surrounded on all sides by the earth that contains me." Approximately this is how you understand piously and regarding God's Wisdom, that is, the Son, for He *in the beginning it was with God, and God was* [690], as written. When He, like a certain stone, cut off *from a mountain without hands* [691], that is, who came from the essence of the Father, clothed himself, as if with some kind of earth, with our flesh, then he says about Himself that He was founded, almost saying: "Me, who is the Word and the true Son, the Father clothed with earthly body, so that I

become the foundation and beginning of those who are built on <75.292> Me by faith, and, having appeared co-corporeal with them, I will accept them, naturally composed and associated with Me [together] due to affinity in the flesh.

OTHER . As if from the objection of heretics . And how is it possible, they say, to attribute [the words] " *the foundation of Me* " to the coming of the Word with the flesh, when It Itself says that it was founded *before the ages, before He created the earth?* [692] before *the mountains can rise* [693]*?* After all, it is clear that long after everything then came into being, the carnal dispensation of the Word took place.

Rebuttal to this . It is not at all difficult to answer such questions of heretics, but it requires reverence from those listening. For that at the end of the present age the coming of the Word with the flesh happened - no one who is prudent can deny. For this is clearly declared in the divine Scriptures. But God, who knows the future even when things are not yet done, and before the " *composition of the world* " [694] He also knew what was going to happen in the last times. That is why, doing what is fitting for Him, He did not first think about us when we appeared, but even before the creation of the earth and centuries He had in Himself knowledge of what concerns us, and founded His Son in advance in His foreknowledge, so that we, who through disobedience fell into corruption, might, resting on Him, arise again into incorruption. For He knew that we would be dead because of sin, that we would lie *in the dust of the earth* . [695], as it is written, having heard for your listening: " *Thou art the earth, and unto the earth shalt thou go* " [696]. Since the Creator and Maker of us all had previously planned good things for us, He foresaw and predestined the One who would be man for us and for us, that is, His Word, so that it would be *the beginning of the ways* and *the foundation* when human nature would be renewed in Him into incorruption, and will be called *the firstborn of many brethren* [697] and will rise as *the firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep* [698]. For what the all-wise Solomon says in Proverbs, " *Forever was the foundation of Me* ," and so on, Paul in the Epistle to his disciple Timothy explains this way: " *Suffer the gospel according to the power of God, who saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to* " _ [699]. So, if before the age, that is, when we did not yet exist, we were called with a holy calling by grace and the good will of God, who foreknew all things, and were called in Christ Jesus, <75.293> then it will be clear and obvious to everyone that not when God's Word was founded, and receives the beginning of being, but what He explains through these words about His coming in the flesh, and says that He was founded before the ages and before all creatures, to the extent that [all this was predetermined] in the foreknowledge of the Father.

OTHER. Also on [the words]: "The Lord created Me" and on "Before the ages was the foundation of Me . " Nowhere in the Epistle to the Ephesians does Paul say: " *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us with every spiritual blessing in heavenly things in Christ, because He chose us in Him before the*

foundation of the world, that we should be holy and blameless before Him in love, He first ordained (προορίσας) *us in adoption by Jesus Christ into Him* » [700]. So, if we, not yet having appeared, are predestinated (προοριζόμεθα) to be adopted as sons by Him through Jesus Christ, and are blessed *blessing with a spiritual in the heavenly* [701], then how can anyone, having heard the Son of God saying: " *First of all the world was the foundation of Me* ," will not understand that He says this, meaning the foreknowledge of the Father, according to which, being foreknown, we are called in Him and are counted worthy any blessing, not yet brought into existence at all, but appearing after a long time? Clearly teaching us the same thing, the Lord Himself says: " *Come , you blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world* ." [702]. If the Kingdom is prepared by the Father for those who have not yet appeared before the foundation of the world, and everything is prepared in Christ, then He can with sufficient grounds say about Himself: " *Before the age was the foundation of Me, before the mountains were raised, before they became a source of water* ." [703]. For all this means bringing the creature from non-existence into existence.

OTHER, [said] narratively, from which we seem to learn the reason why we are predestined in Christ and destined for adoption according to the love of God and the Father God and the Father, having provided for what is beneficial for human nature and knowing that it will always fall into decay, and having found for it a way of renewal and return to incorruption, laid for it, as it were, the roots of such hope in His own Generation, and predestines us to adoption through Him , and is worthy of every spiritual blessing, when we have not yet even arisen [from non-existence], so that when [she] happens to fall into death due to a crime, she, as if from an ancient root, again grows into life, and, as before blessed, would not be entirely under an oath when she hears: " *Thou art the earth, and thou shalt go to the earth* ." [704]. So, Christ is founded before us, and on Him we all are based, and moreover, *before the foundation of the world* , according to the foreknowledge of God who knows everything, so that, as we have already said, the blessing was ancient <75.296> curses; and the promise of life is [ancient] condemnation to death; and freedom of adoption is slavery from the devil. Nature returns to its original [state], having overcome what happened in the interval [between the fall and the uprising] by the grace of Him who founded it in good [properties] in Christ, and again becomes what it was in the foreknowledge of God, being predestined out of love through the Son to all the best.

OTHER, as if by way of example. It is necessary to consider how God's wisdom was pre-founded for us before the age. As if some *wise architect* [705]Having begun the construction of the house and thinking, in all likelihood, that no matter what would happen to it after a while, what usually happens with all buildings, he laid a solid foundation and came up with a kind of unshakable root for [his] affairs, so that, if anything happens to them, they, having their beginning intact, could immediately be restored to it; in the same way, the Creator of all [beings] placed Christ in advance as

the foundation of our salvation, even before the foundation of the world, so that, if we happen to fall through a crime, we could immediately be recreated on Him. Thus, as far as the Father's counsel and will are concerned, Christ was founded before the ages; and the matter itself happened at its own time, because the benefit of the matter required it. After all, we are renewed in Christ at the time of [His] coming, even if we previously had Him as the basis of [our] salvation.

* * *

544 Proverbs 8:22 .

545 Psalm 18:1 .

546 2 Esdras 4:36 .

547 This. 14:6 .

548 This. 1:3 .

549 See: Matthew 11:27 . The quotation is somewhat different from the Gospel text known to us, but in exactly the same form it is found in St. Athanasius of Alexandria in words to words: *All* essence is devoted to Me"//PG. T. 25. Col. 217C.

550 This. 1:18 .

551 This. 6:46 .

552 Perhaps it is more correct to read: "ὁ ἀγένητος."

553 Wed. in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom : " *He who is ever present and likewise likewise* " (ἀεὶ ὢν ὡσαύτως ὤν).

554 Luke 7:8 . In fact, what is meant is Acts 10:26 : " *and I myself* am man" (καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπός εἰμι).

555 Rev.22:9 .

556 Judg. 13:15–16 . The quote is not accurate.

557 Hebrews 1:6 .

558 Isa.45:14–15 . The quote is not given accurately.

559 This. 13:13 .

560 This. 20:28 .

561 Psalm 44:7 .

562 Matthew 10:29 .

563 Matthew 6:26 .

564 Matthew 6:30 .

565 Proverbs 8:22 .

566 This. 5:17 .

567 Rom. 9:19 .

568 Psalm 113:11 .

569 1 Cor. 11:7 .

570 1 Cor. 11:8 .

571 An allusion to the belief of the ancient Greeks, according to which all gods were subject to Ananka, i.e. Fate.

572 Psalm 2:8 .

573 This. 1:1 .

574 This. 1:3 .

575 Ps.43:4; 88:14; 97:1 ; Isa.62:8 ; Wisdom 5:16 , etc.

576 Gen.1:3,6,14–15,26–27 .

577 Luke 1:18 . St. Cyril cites here the words spoken in a similar situation by Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, but means Gen. 17:17 : “ *And Abraham fell on his face, and laughed, and spoke in his mind, saying: A son will be born to a man who is a hundred years old. ? food and Sarah will bear life for ninety years* ?”

578 Exodus 3:13 .

579 Zechariah 1:12 .

580 Acts 1:2 .

581 Proverbs 8:22 .

582 This. 16:25 .

583 Proverbs 9:1 .

584 Col. 2:9 .

585 This. 1:14 .

586 Psalm 101:19 .

587 Psalm 50:12 .

588 Eph. 2:15 .

589 Eph. 4:24 .

590 Jer.31:10 (in the Slavic Bible - 48:10). The quote is given with distortion: the original contains a stronger expression: “ *Cursed is he who does the Lord's work with negligence* .”

591 Psalm 24:4 .

592 Exodus 20:14 .

593 Matthew 5:28 .

594 Jer.6:16 . In the Slavic Bible the words: “ἐρωτήσατε τρίβους Κυρίου αἰωνίους” are translated as “ *ask about the eternal paths of the Lord* ,” but St. Cyril here, for the purposes of his exegesis, interprets the accusative case differently (τρίβους αἰωνίους), so that he gets: “ask the paths of the Lord.”

595 This. 14:6 .

596 The end of the phrase - in the original this is a separate sentence: "Δι" ος,” we translated based on the general meaning, since a literal translation is impossible due, probably, to the corruption of the text. The Latin translation in PG also departs from the letter of the original and reads: "...per hanc mundabitur, remissionem peccatorum consequens."

597 Hebrews 10:5 .

598 This. 1:14 .

599 Gal. 3:13 .

600 2 Cor.5:21 .

601 This. 1:1 .

602 This. 1:3 .

603 Phil.2:7 .

604 Luke 10:21 .

605 This. 20:17 .

606 This. 1:1 .

607 This. 14:10 .

608 This is 10:30 .

609 This. 14:9 .

610 This. 8:12 .

611 This. 14:6 .

612 Hebrews 1:3 .

613 This. 6; 38 .

614 This. 12:46 .

615 This. 18:37 .

616 Hebrews 2:14 .

617 1 Cor. 15:21 .

618 Romans 8:3–4 .

619 This. 3:17 .

620 This. 9:39 .

621 Eph. 2:14–15 .

622 Matthew 8:17 . In the original: “ἔλαβεν” – “ *welcome* ”. “Τὰς ἀσθενείας” in the Slavic Bible is translated as “illnesses,” but we chose the “infirmity” option for the sake of better coherence of the text.

623 Gal. 3:13 .

624 2 Cor.5:21 .

625 1 Cor. 1:24 .

626 Possibly a quote from Isaiah 53:4 . In the Septuagint this passage is read as “τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει” (*bears our sins*), but in the Masoretic text it is “carried infirmities” (in the modern Greek translation the phrase looks almost identical to that given by the saint: “τὰς ἀσθεν είας ἡμῶν ἐβάστασε"). It can therefore be assumed that this is how this place looked in the list of Scripture used by St. Kirill.

627 1 Pet. 2:24 .

628 Eph. 2:10 .

629 Proverbs 8:30 .

630 Proverbs 8:25 .

631 Isaiah 1:2 .

632 Tue. 32:18 .

633 Job. 38:7 .

634 Gen.1:1 .

635 Gen.1:27 .

636 Psalm 44:2 .

637 This. 1:1 .

638 This. 8:42 .

639 This. 8:23 .

640 T. that is, according to some conditional establishment. The contrast between “φύσει” and “θέσει” goes back to Plato, who in the dialogue “Cratylus” uses these terms when discussing the connection of a name with the named object: whether a name is a name by the nature of the thing named, or whether the name is established by some mutual agreement of people.

641 Hebrews 10:19–20 . St. Cyril uses “μένουσαν” instead of “ζῶσαν” in the apostle.

642 In. 5:20,36; 14:10,11 .

643 Wed.: Hebrews 2:14 .

644 Romans 8:3 .

645 Cp.: Ин.1:3 : "it was always through him".

646 Proverbs 8:23 .

647 This. 1:14 .

648 Psalm 54:20 .

649 Luke 6:36 .

650 Matthew 5:39 .

651 Luke 6:30 .

652 Matthew 5:27–28 .

653 This. 10:7,9 .

654 This. 14:6 .

655 This. 17:4 .

656 This. 5:36 .

657 Eph. 5:27 .

658 1 Cor. 5:17 .

659 1 Tim. 2:5 .

660 Is.63:9 .

661 Wed: Acts 13:39 ; Rom.3:26,28; 4:5; 5:1 ; Gal.2:16; 3:24

662 Gen.3:19 .

663 Hymn “Glory to God in the highest” (Great Doxology). The use of the song “Glory to God in the highest” at Matins is mentioned in the essay “On Virginity,” attributed to St. Athanasius the Great , one of the predecessors of St. Cyril at the See of Alexandria.

664 Mich. 7:18 .

665 This. 8:36 .

666 Psalm 103:24 .

667 Is.66:2 .

668 This. 1:3 .

669 Sm.: Dan.3:52–90 .

670 Psalm 102:20-21; 148:2–4 .

671 Heb.1:6 ; Ps.96:7 . St. Cyril here quotes an allusion from St. Paul on the psalm of David, while in the text of the psalm itself we read: “ *Worship Him, all His angels* .”

672 This. 1:3 .

673 1 Cor. 8:6 .

674 Hebrews 4:12–13 .

675 Hebrews 2:8 . The end of the phrase – “ *under His nose* ” (ὑπό τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ) – corresponds to Eph.1:22, while in Hebrews 2:8 it reads: “ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτ οῦ". In the Slavic Bible, both versions are translated identically.

676 Hebrews 2:8 .

677 Phil. 2:10 .

678 In the text of Scripture: " *revelations* " (ἀποκάλυψιν).

679 Rom. 8:19,22 .

680 Proverbs 8:23 .

681 Proverbs 3:19 .

682 2 Cor.5:17 .

683 1 Cor. 3:12,10 .

684 1 Cor. 3:11 .

685 Eph. 2:21 .

[686] This. 15:5 .

[687] 4Macc 12:14. The 4th Book of Maccabees was not included in the Slavic and Russian Bibles.

[688] 1 Cor. 6:19 .

[689] Proverbs 8:23 .

[690] This. 1:1 .

[691] Dan. 2:34 .

[692] Proverbs 8:23 .

[693] Proverbs 8:25 .

[694] 1Pet.1:20 , Eph.1:4.

[695] Dan. 12:2 .

[696] Gen.3:19 .

[697] Rom. 8:29 .

[698] 1 Cor. 15:20 .

[699] 2 Tim. 1:8–11 .

[700] Eph. 1:3–5 .

[701] Eph. 1:3 .

[702] Matthew 25:34 .

[703] Proverbs 8:23–25 .

[704] Gen.3:19 .

[705] 1 Cor. 3:10 .

Word 15 Word 17

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 16 Word 18

Word 16. About the eternal existence of the Son, and that He came indivisibly from the essence of the Father

The antithesis of the Arians, which is then followed by a refutation. And how is it possible, they say, for the Son to be ever-present? How, having come from the Father, was He not completely separated from Him? After all, what comes from something will be part of the essence from which it came. And once the separated will no longer be thought of as a whole.

Refutation with an example . What then will they say about what happens to the sun when it gives off its radiance? What do they think about what happens to fire - when it emits heat? Is it supposed that in these entities there is a division and cutting off [of a certain part]? And the sun does not shine without being diminished in any way? No one can spatially separate the radiance from it. And we see heat flowing from fire not in the sense of separation, but it is the fruit of the essence of fire, indivisibly arising from it, just like the radiance of light [is the same fruit of it]. And there can be neither light without radiance, nor fire without the property of warming. For such entities always accompany what is born from them. Also understand the Son, who comes from the essence of the Father, ever existing in Him and understood in a special hypostasis, and in no way diminishing the Father's essence, and not separating Himself from it, but [thought] that He exists in the Father and has the Father in To himself, so that he speaks the truth, affirming: " *I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me.* " » [706]; and that, due to the indistinguishability of essence, He is in the Father, and the Father appears in Him, so that He can say: " *I and the Father are one.* " [707]. *Seeing Me, seeing the Father* " [708]».

OTHER . Those who say that the Son was torn away from the Father's essence because he came from it and is therefore a part and not a whole, let them say that the radiance was torn away from the light, and the heat that comes from it from the fire, and the word from the mind; and let them show that these individually are parts of the essences from which they come, or that light was ever without radiance, fire without warmth, and mind without words. And then let them imagine something similar about God's Word. And if these [all] always coexist with the essences from which they

originate, and do this indivisibly and not separately (since they do not cause them suffering or truncation), then how will those who attribute to the Divine nature that which no one will agree to recognize what happens even with the nature of created [entities], if, of course, he has a mind and thinks correctly?

OTHER, as if from the objection of heretics. And how, they say, can the Son be ever-present with the Father? After all, the sons of men are born after their fathers and are born after a long time, not existing until they are born. How, again, can the Son be the Word or Image of God? After all, the human word is not hypostatic, nor is it preserved after it is spoken, but immediately dissolves into non-existence, denoting what is contained in the thoughts of the speaker, and revealing thoughts hidden in the depths of the heart.

Rebuttal to this. If God is the same as man, and there is nothing in Him beyond what is in us, then let human [orders] be observed in relation to Him, and let Him then pre-exist in relation to His Generation, just like us; and let that which came from Him be out of non-existence. If the Divinity is far removed from our [properties], and He has nothing in common with us as far as the logos of essence is concerned, then how do they impose human shortcomings on Him and are not ashamed, subordinating Him to our necessity? After all, as much as He differs from human nature, I believe He will be better than our customs and natural laws. So, we are perishable, but God is <75,300> imperishable. We are brought from non-existence into being, but God always was and will be. And as he who gives birth is, so must he be who is born from him. God and the Father is ever-present; ever-present, therefore, the Light [born] from Him was and is. And that means that the Light and Radiance coexisted. But the word that comes from man dissolves into nothingness, and is neither living nor effective. After all, the person who gave birth to him is from non-existence and is subject to decay. But the Word of God is alive, and, having come from the Living, has always been and is. For God never was and never will be without the Word. Well, Paul also says about Him: " *Living Word of God and effective* » [709]. After all, He is the Creator, and *everything was the same , and without Him nothing would have happened.* [710].

OTHER. As if from the objection of heretics . Christ, they say, is not the power and wisdom rooted (ἔμφυτος) in God and existing in Him, but something else - that about which Paul writes, and which is *His ever-present power and divinity* [711]; and another in comparison with it is Christ; and [also] many others, together with Him are called powers and wisdom. And one is the truly rooted and true power of God - the creator of all [beings], and others are created by it, although Christ is some kind of special power of God in comparison with others, created in order to strengthen what requires strength, to make wise what is in need and with wisdom, to justify having no righteousness. So there is, they say, a power rooted in God, beginningless and uncreated; and Christ was created - for the reasons mentioned. If some believe that

Christ Himself is the power rooted in God, since it is written in Paul: " *Christ , the power of God and the wisdom of God* " [712], what they will say when they hear God speaking about the caterpillars: " *My great power* " [713]? What will they do when the Psalmist points to the many powers of God, about which he says: " *Bless the Lord with all His might* " [714]?

Rebuttal to this. If Christ was created for this purpose, in order to make wise that which needs wisdom, to strengthen that which requires strength, then we, therefore, became the culprits of His existence, and He would not have become like us if God had not intended to create the created. And if He is this because of our need, then it means that He is the instrument of our creation, not being such from Himself, but becoming such for our sake. Therefore, just as He is called strength for the sake of those who are strengthened, and wisdom for the sake of those who become wise, so He is called the Son for the sake of those who are adopted, and He is nothing in the proper sense of the word for His own sake, but all this for our sake. How, then, will what is sung in the Psalms be preserved [untouched]: " *He created us, and not we* " [715]. – if we gave Him the reasons for being? For although He appeared <75.301> a self-maker (αὐτουργὸς) [716] our creation, but we became seeds of being for Him (τοῦ εἶναι τὰ σπέρματα), and for our need He was created, according to you. Just as, of course, the sky [was created] to cover those who are on earth, and the sun to give light to those who need light, and the earth, in like manner, to nourish those who need food. And the Son has no advantage over the creatures if He, like them, has a service rank. Run away from such absurdity!

OTHER, from the same ones. And without wanting it, you, heretic, confess that the Wisdom and Power rooted in God exist uncreated in Him; so when you hear that the Son is not created, do not say again: "Then there are two not created." For we believe that this very Wisdom and Power, existing uncreatedly and timelessly in God, is the Son, who created all things and became flesh for our sake, according to the word of John.

OTHER, [said] as if in the form of a question, [but] having the power of proof Why does the Father do everything through the Son? Or, on the other hand, why in St. In baptism, is the Son named together with the Father? Why is He, being, in your opinion, a created nature, and is numbered with the Creator? What need is there for the perfection and sanctification of all things created? How do we call Him to be our helper? After all, although many other creatures are created, not one of them is taken for the above-mentioned needs, but only the Son, who ever coexists with the Father. What is the point, if He is not God either, to preach faith in the Creator and the creation? Why then is He called the Creator, if He is not one by nature, like the Father? And didn't the Son Himself say: " *Everything that the Father has is Mine?* " [717]? The Father has the ability to create; this [therefore] is preserved in the Son. In the same

way, [the ability to] sanctify, save, and [everything else] that is fitting [to do] for God, all through the Son. For He ever coexists with the Father, as radiance coexists with light. Therefore, the Son is God: not created, as they falsely say, but originating from the essence of the Father as a true generation.

* * *

706 This. 14:10 .

707 This is 10:30 .

708 This. 14:9 .

709 Hebrews 4:12 .

710 This. 1:3 .

711 Romans 1:20 .

712 1 Cor. 1:24 .

713 Joel. 2:25 .

714 Psalm 102:21 .

715 Psalm 99:3 .

716 Those. who did it with his own hands.

717 This is 16:15 .

Word 16 Word 18

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 17 Word 19

Word 17. That nothing inherent in the Son is inherent in creature nature, but it bears in itself all [such properties only] by communion or by likeness to Him who gave [them to it]; but the Son is not so. Therefore, He is different compared to her. And if so, then it follows that He is not a creature.

Apology literally. If all creation is in a state of ignorance of the Father, since *no one knows the Father* , but only *the Son knows Him* [718], then, therefore, He is not a creature.

OTHER . If nothing created is by nature God, but the Son is God by nature, then, therefore, He is not [one of] the created. Our former life was ridiculous <75.304>, when we served gods that did not exist by nature, and even more pitiful do we now find ourselves, bringing worship to a god that is not by nature. Away with such absurdity!

OTHER . If every created thing is [something] absolutely different in nature in comparison with the uncreated, then it cannot equally participate in its glory. For God says: " *My glory I will not give to another* ." [719]. If the coming Son participates in the glory of the Father, then, therefore, he is not a creature clothed with the glory of the Uncreated.

OTHER . The Divine Scriptures call the Son true God, and so we believe. If everything created is new in comparison with the uncreated, and it is unworthy that we should have *God a new* [720], then the Son, who is the uncreated (ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ ἀγένητον), will not be the new God.

OTHER . If every created thing is completely different from the uncreated, then it should not be worshiped. For this is forbidden by Divine utterance. And since we are commanded to worship the Son, and not [some] other god who is created, then the Son is not created.

OTHER . If everything created is in slavery to the one who made it, then it is not able to provide another with freedom, which it itself did not receive. If the Son gives [freedom], then this means that [He does this] not as a slave, but rather as Lord and God.

OTHER . If all creation, existing under the power of nature (ὑπὸ φύσιν), is enslaved to nature, subordinate to which it was created, and the Divinity is absolutely free and above natural necessity, then it is clear that God is not enslaved to nature. And since the Son is God, He will not be under the power of nature, as is characteristic of the created. And what is by nature removed from the affinity with the creature, how will it not be foreign to it and alien?

OTHER . If nothing in creation exactly corresponds to the likeness of God and the Father, but the Son is like [Him], so that he who sees Him sees the Father, then, therefore, it is not a creation that bears [in Himself] an exact likeness to Him.

OTHER . If all creatures are servants of God, and not masters of glory, but the Son is not so, for He is *the Lord of Glory* [721], then it means He is not a creature.

OTHER . If everything brought from non-existence into being allows for a return back into non-existence, but in relation to the Son this <75.305> is not permissible, since He truly is God, then, therefore, the Son is not from non-existence, but is born of the true Father.

OTHER . If creatures have the capacity to sin, but the Son does not, then He is not a creature.

OTHER . If nothing created has ever been shown to create essences from non-existence, but the Son creates, then how will He be one of the created?

OTHER . If every created thing is similar to itself according to the logos of creation, and not one differs from any other, since each is created, [and if also] the Son is created, then, therefore, He will not differ from any [of the creatures], if He also arose [like them]. If He differs in everything from all created things, then it is obvious that according to the tropos of emergence (κατὰ τὸν τῆς γενέσεως τρόπον,), which consists in the fact that He [and] did not arise [from non-existence, like the created ones], for, thus Thus, He will be different from the created ones. And if so, then how is He not God?

OTHER . If all creation came into being in an interval, that is, in time, and none of this preceded the birth of the Son, then, therefore, He did not come into being [like the created ones]. And if He is preceded by a time and a created interval, then how will the Creator of everything be preceded by a created interval? If there is no sign (ῥοπή), no interval, or anything else before the Son, then on what basis do they say that the Father pre-exists [in relation to Him], when nothing is found that would indicate this pre-

existence?

OTHER . If none of the created things is called and is not God *above all* [722], and the Son is [precisely what] is [existent] *God above all* , then, therefore, He is not one of the created ones. If the Son, being *God over all* , is also created, and the Father is also *God over all* , then He too will be like the created, which is wicked to even think.

OTHER . If not one of the created things can do the same as God, but everything *that* the Father *creates, the Son* [*does*] in the same way. [723], then, therefore, the Son is not among the created.

OTHER . If all created things have their being from something else, then how much more [from something else do they have] that they should be called gods. If, by communion, they have being gods (that is, created, of course, not by nature gods), and not by nature gods (οὐ φύσει θεοῖς) [724]worship is prohibited; and if, while these [the worship of gods] is prohibited, the Son is not prohibited, then, therefore, [worshiping Him is considered] not as [worshiping] not by nature a god, which are [those] created things [who happen to be called gods according to communion].

OTHER . If we assume that the One Who Existed from non-existence <75.308> Himself was created by another, and the Father creates from non-existent things, then, in their opinion, it follows that He also arose from non-existent things. And if it is obscene and impossible to think that the Creator of other natures is Himself created by another nature, then it is even more absurd to assume that the Maker of every nature can be created by another nature. After all, [then it turns out that] both that which creates arose [from nothingness], and that which comes into being creates, - if, in their opinion, the Son who arises [from nothing] creates, - which is extremely absurd, since it is proper for the Divine nature alone to be preserved its advantages, of which one and the first is the ability to create [entities] from nothingness.

* * *

[718] Matthew 11:27 .

[719] Isaiah 42:8 .

[720] Psalm 80:10 .

[721] James 2:1 ; 1 Corinthians 2:8 .

[722] Rom. 9:5 .

[723] This. 5:19-20 .

[724] Sr.: Gal. 4:8 .

Word 17 Word 19

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 18 Word 20

Word 18. About the fact that creation and generation are not the same thing; and also [not the same thing] in relation to God - to create and give birth

Apology verbatim . If God's Generation were identical with creation, then [God's] voice would not have been addressed to the Only Begotten: " *This is My beloved Son* ." [725]; since even soulless [creatures] would be by nature sons of God, if only the creation is truly identical with the generation.

OTHER . If both "creation" is said to apply to us in the proper sense, and "generation", and in the same way [both are said to be said in the proper sense] to the Son, then He will have no advantage over us. , being in the proper sense of the word a creation and generation.

OTHER . If creation and generation are the same thing, and the Holy Spirit, in their opinion, is a creation, then it is obvious that He will also be a generation. If the Spirit is generation, and the Son is generation, and all are generation, then how can the Son be the Only Begotten when He has many brothers?

OTHER . If a creature of God is a begetter, then none of the created things is without adoption. And if so, then God promised us adoption in vain, for even [creatures] who do not have a soul are such by nature, if indeed everything that is a creation is, in the proper sense of the word, a generation.

OTHER . If creation and generation are one and the same, and what arises [from non-existence] (τὸ γενόμενον) is God's creation by [its] nature, then it is obvious that God's creation and God's generation by nature are one and the same. If, by nature, and not by adoption, what is begotten is consubstantial with God, then everything that arises [from non-existence] will be by nature [consubstantial with Him], if the creation is indeed also generated by nature, and not by communion.

OTHER . If something is a creation, it would also be a generation in the proper sense of the word, then <75.309> all the more, first of all, the angels would be in the proper sense sons [of God]. If the much better [of other creatures] are not sons in the proper

sense of the word (*not a single one said when the angel said: My son, you and* [726]), then it will not be a creation in the proper sense and a generation.

OTHER . If creation and generation are one and the same, then the creator will also be the father. If the Son creates, then He will also be the Father. And if so, then the Uncreated One will be the Father of the Father, not having in His God-birth (θεογονίᾳ) anything beyond the usual work for us (τῆς καθ» ἡμάς πραγματείας), if only the generation is really that which is also creation.

OTHER . If the creation is truly a generation, [the same as] the Son, then the Son will be a brother to everyone, and not the Lord God. And if He is Lord and God, then, therefore, not a brother. So, if to the Son, who is the Only Begotten, none of the existing ones is a brother, and the rest are not creations in the proper sense of the word, but are creatures in the proper sense of the word, then how are creation and generation one and the same?

OTHER . If the creation is [at the same time] a generation, then the creator will [also] be a parent. And he who produces everything from himself as a parent will create the same from outside as a creator. If he creates from the outside that which he can generate from himself, since both have the same tropos, then how will what comes together in one thing have the names of two things, unless one of them is false?

OTHER . If something is a creation, then it is also a generation, and the Spirit, as they say, is a creation, then it is obvious that He is also a generation. But if [He is the offspring of] the Father, then the Son is no longer the Only Begotten. And if the Son, then He will be the son of the Son; if indeed what is a creation, then He will also be a generation. If giving birth and creating are one and the same thing for God, and He gives birth to the Son without the mediation of [anyone or anything], then it is obvious that He gives birth or creates everything without mediation. If He does not give birth through someone, but no longer creates everything directly, then how can giving birth and creating be one and the same with God? He creates an earthquake, a pestilence, a flood; [means], He will give birth to what He creates, if indeed giving birth to Him means the same thing as creating.

OTHER . If from where God gives birth, from the same place he creates, then He will be nothing, but in their opinion, different from a spider, which gives birth [to its young] and creates [the web] in different ways. But this one, being guided by the law of nature, from where he gives birth, from there he creates, and God, who is not under the power of nature, is humiliated by them as [supposedly] subject to natural necessity.

OTHER . If, due to the fact that the Divinity is not complex, it is one and the same thing for Him to give birth <75.312> and to create, then foreseeing (προγινώσκειν) for Him will be the same as creating, so that in this respect He would not be complex. If so, then He will create the evil that He foresees, if He and things are identical for Him,

because It is not complex.

OTHER . If giving birth and creating are one and the same for God, since He is not complex, then seeing and creating will be one and the same with Him, so that in all respects uncomplexity will be preserved in Him. If, from the fact that these are not indistinguishable things for Him (for not everything that He sees, it certainly gives birth), His simplicity is not violated, then what He gives birth to in a different way and creates in a different way does not produce deprivation in Him. simplicity.

OTHER . If for those for whom giving birth is something other than creating, it is characteristic to give birth from themselves, and to create from without, then for those for whom giving birth and creating are one and the same, it is impossible to create from the outside, just as it is impossible to give birth from oneself. If they allow Him only what is external, that is, to create, but do not want to allow Him to give birth, then the Creator by nature will be [their] Father by position.

OTHER . If giving birth and creating are the same thing for God, since He is not complex, but not for us, since we are not like that, then providing will be the same for Him as giving birth. For for us it is not the same thing, because we are complex; if His simplicity and uncomplicatedness, the inherent difference in us, forced us to be no different before Him, then what He gives birth to in a different way, and creates in a different way, does not produce in Him a deprivation of uncomplicatedness.

OTHER . If creating is the same as giving birth, then the one who gives birth will be the creator of what is born and the one who gives birth to what is created. But to create is a property of activity, and to give birth is a property of nature. But nature and activity are not the same thing. Therefore, creating is not the same as giving birth.

OTHER . If, by creating, one is a creator, and by giving birth, one is a father, then creating and giving birth are not the same thing, since one is a father, and another is a creator. If creating is the same thing as giving birth, then the creator is also the father. But if the Son, together with the Father, is the Creator, and the creator is [at the same time] the Father, then He will also be [i.e. e. Son] by the Father, which is absurd.

OTHER . If the father and the creator are one and the same, since creating is the same as giving birth, and "Creator" is the name of energy, then "Father" will rightly be the name of energy, and not of relationship. And if both are the names of energy, then God will at the same time be the begetter and the creator, since energy does not manifest itself in different ways in giving birth and creating.

* * *

[725] Matt. 3:17; 17:5 ; Mark 9:7 ; Luke 9:35 .

[726] Hebrews 1:5 .

Word 18 Word 20

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 19 Word 21

Word 19. To those who say that the Son is not the true Word of the Father, but by nature is in relation to Him something different and alien. The conclusion drawn from this is that [the Son] is consubstantial with the Father, and not from the outside, but from His essence

The antithesis is, as it were, from among the Eunomievs . If, they tell [us], there is a Son, and you say that It [i.e. e. The Word of the Father] is consubstantial with the Father, then let It not differ in anything in relation to Him, for [only] in this way will It be consubstantial. If so, then let the Father also be called and be the Word. But the intention of the Divine Scripture and the preaching of St. will not allow this. apostles For [Scripture] knows the Father as the Father, and not the Son, and, on the contrary, it contains the Son under only the name of the Son, not allowing Him to be called or to be the Father, for He is different and different in essence in relation to Him. So, he is neither the true Word, nor one who came from Him, who differs [from Him in His] nature.

Rebuttal to this. And where do you, my dear, put John, who calls the Son the Word and attaches this name to Him as the most appropriate and primarily indicating His essence? For he says: " *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was to God, and God was the Word* ." [727]. Do you see how this name represents the essence of the Son, and how the fact that He is called the Word signifies what He is by nature? For he says: " *God is the Word* ." If the name "Word" [used] in relation to the Son is not an indication of nature and essence, then it means something else. And then it is necessary to ask the question: how, being by nature, is the Son called the Word, if not His essence denotes this name? Just like the one who said: "carpenter", "stonecutter" or "cursive writer", defines [by this name] not what he denotes by nature, but indicates what his occupation is. So, if this name does not denote the essence of the Son, and the fact that He is called the Word does not show what He is by nature, but, so to speak, His occupation, then why do we marvel in vain at the Evangelist? Why is he called the Son of Thunder? [728]as someone who said something great and extremely important?

Although the Divine Scripture calls the Son by many other names, having said "Word," [John] spoke something extraordinary and supernatural, and did not add anything else to it, just as we see in relation to Paul, [when he is called] " *Paul.* " , *apostle* " [729]. But it was enough to say: "Word" to designate the essence of the Son. Therefore, He is the true Word of the Father, and no one else but Him.

OTHER . If for this reason the anti-Christists decided that the Son is not consubstantial with the Father, that neither the Father is the Word, nor the Word is the Father, and they believed that the unity of nature can be dissected <75.316> by the difference of names, then let them tell us like the forefather Adam will he be consubstantial with the sons who came from him, when neither he himself can be Abel, nor Abel will ever be Adam ? But the difference in names does not abolish the identity of the essence. And this applies to created and created nature. How could it not be impious to think this way about uncreated nature, which is superior to everything created? So, just as, if He were different in essence, He would not be the true Word, so, since He is consubstantial, He will be the true Word.

OTHER . Names are designations of essence (σημαντικὰ τῶν οὐσιῶν), especially the first and most important ones, but one can see a great difference in them. For some designate beings in the most general form and give a generic definition; others, dividing the designated common into units, make it so that many existents are shown. Like, say, the name "man", used simply and absolutely (ἀπολελυμένως) [730], denotes the entire human race or the essence itself; and [the names] "Paul," for example, or "Peter," "James," or "Cephas," dividing humanity into units, make it so that they are many people. So, the difference in names is accepted in relation to consubstantial ones, but does not separate those falling under the definition of the same species from natural similarity in relation to each other. Therefore, when the Father is called Father, and the Son is called Word, then this one will not be dissimilar in nature, or this one will be dissimilar to That, having a difference only in names. For it is shown that the difference in names does not violate the natural similarity of those of the same nature (τῶν ὁμοφυῶν) in relation to each other. This means that nothing prevents the Son from being consubstantial with the Father; although He is called the Son and not the Father, He is truly His Word. For, being simple, the essence of the Father does not allow anything else to mediate in the generation of the Word that came from Him by nature, truly one with Him, since He is God and shone alive from the living Father.

The antithesis is, as it were, from among the Eunomievs. In the Gospels, he says, we find the Son saying to the Father: " *Father, glorify Thy Son .*" [731], and to those who hear from Him in response: " *And I will glorify, and again I will glorify* " [732]. And how could the Son truly be the Word of the Father, when we see the Father conversing with Him, and conversation does not happen without a word? Consequently, either He will be conversing with Himself, or - if the Father truly says something to Him - He is

different from the inner and inherent word of God, which speaks to Him according to the will of the Father.

Rebuttal to this. You will never stop slandering an incorporeal entity, believing that from it arises the same word as a human one, sounding through the lips and tongue and affecting the hearing of those nearby, so that the will of the speaker becomes obvious. <75.317> For if I wanted to preserve for the incorporeal nature the word appropriate to it, I would not think of the voice of the Father in such a way that it reaches the ear in a corporeal way. After all, not only the Son heard the Father saying: " *And I will glorify, and again I will glorify* ," but also those who were [then] with Him. Christ clearly teaches that in the proper sense of the word and by nature it was not the voice of the Father, but a certain roar (κτύπος), similar to a voice, announced the will of the Father about the Son. And [showing] that He is highly valued by Him, [the Son] says to those listening: " *This voice was not made for My sake, but for your sake* ." [733]. Note carefully that He did not say: " *It was not for My sake that the Father spoke or cried* ," or anything else from such, but: " *It was not for My sake that the voice came, but for your sake* ." So, if a voice arose from some Divine action - not for the sake of Christ, as He Himself says, but for the sake of those who were with Him, for it was impossible for them, as humans, to know the will of the Father otherwise, if it were not for the human voice coming to them - then What is it that you again recklessly attribute to an incorporeal essence that is perfect economically and humanly arranged for our sake, befitting a created nature and fearlessly applying it to an uncreated one?

OTHER. The antithesis is, as it were, from among the Eunomievs. Nowhere [in the Scriptures], they say, is the Father shown saying to the Son: " *Let us make man* ." [734]. And the Savior Himself, in turn, talking with the Jews, said: " *I do not speak about myself* [735] *but what I have heard from My Father I declare to you* [736]" So, if someone were to ask you, who boast of the correctness of dogmas, how the Father speaks to the Son with one who knows about what should be discussed, or how with one who does not know, but what would you answer? After all, if He does not know [this] and finds out [only] when the word of the Father comes to Him about a certain object, then He is different in comparison with what exists by nature [word]; and if He [and so] knows, then wouldn't it be ignorant and crazy to speak to someone who knows as if he doesn't know? For even in relation to people this would not without reason be considered as such. If it is inappropriate to say that God is subject to something like this, then it is obvious that He speaks as if he does not know. Therefore, He Himself is not the inner word, nor does He know what God and the Father wills, unless there is a word from Him to Him.

Rebuttal to this. the prophets will be no different from the prophets of God. *Then the Word spoken by* [737] and the future that revealed to them, for they could not know this from themselves, since foreknowledge of the future belongs to God alone. And what

are we going to do with the fact that the Lord clearly separates Himself from equality with them by saying: " *If these gods speak, the word of God* <75.320> *comes to them , and the Scripture cannot be destroyed: whose Father is holy and envoyed to "Peace, you say, as if you were speaking blasphemy, you say: I am the Son of God* " [738]? After all, if He had natural equality in relation to the prophets, then He would not compare them with Himself as less, citing them as an example. After all, having said: " *If these speak the gods, the word of God comes to them* ," He clearly showed that *the word of God did not come* to Him , as it did to them, but that He Himself is the Word of the Father, spoken to the prophets. How can one who is so far removed from the prophets and above them not have anything more than what they possess, according to your - oh, blasphemer - insolence [thought]?

OTHER . If the Son does not know the will of the Father, but receives, as those who oppose Christ believe, the word from Him in order to know, and [if] the Father speaks to Him as with one of the prophets, then He is equal to the prophets. Where, again, should we put St. The Psalmist saying in the Spirit: " *For whoever in the clouds will be equal to the Lord, and whoever will be like the Lord among the sons of God* " [739]? For behold, he clearly says here that none of the prophets, whom he figuratively calls clouds, or of those who by grace are counted among the sonship of God, will be equal to the Son by nature. How can David be truthful when he says such things in the Spirit, if the word of the Father comes to Him as it does to the saints, and He does not know the will of the Father, like them, but receives its revelation through hearing? If it is blasphemous to say that the Spirit is deluded - and this is every blasphemy and nothing else - then the Lord will surpass the prophets with incomparable superiority, Himself being the true Word and the Father's Will and Wisdom.

OTHER . If the God-Word inherent in the Father by nature is different from what is designated in the divine Scriptures, and one [of them] remains hidden in the Father, and another is the one who communicates what He says, about which John says that He is God the Word, how then will simplicity and uncomplexity be preserved with God and the Father, since he who has something hidden and [something] obvious will not necessarily be simple, but rather will be composed of two [parts]. But God is simple by nature, and there is nothing complicated in Him. Therefore, there is one natural Word and one internal Word in Him – the Son.

OTHER . If, as the Christ-fighters dare to say, being different from what is inherent in God, the Word preached to us in the Gospels does not know the hidden [secrets] of the Father, but recognizes them when [the Father] speaks to Him, then it means that It comes from ignorance to knowledge and from unreason to reason. And how will he speak the truth, asserting: <75.321> " *I and the Father are one* " [740]? How will there be an unchanging image of the One who gave birth if, like man, He is under the power of ignorance? For in every possible way it is necessary either to say about the Father

that He does not know something from the future, or - if He knows everything and has the Son in the image of His ever-present - it is impossible for the Son not to have the same knowledge as the Father, Whom He and there is a mark and an unchanging image.

The objection seems to be on behalf of Eunomius. And who, he says, is so ignorant as to assert that the names assigned to objects are nothing other than them? For, let's say, the sky is a visible thing, and the name assigned to it is not subject to sight, but is only audible. Therefore, from the fact that the Son is called the Word, it does not necessarily follow that He is what some people think He is; but He is called the Word, but is something else by nature.

Rebuttal to this. One should remain silent and not respond to such a meaningless logical construction. However, it is worth asking those who say this, do not the names assigned to things denote their essences, although they are different from them? Indeed, the name "man" denotes the nature of man, but there is something other than it. For man is a visible object, but his name is only audible. Consequently, if someone names a person, then - since he is not at all what this name means, according to their syllogism - he will have to think something else, and not at all what this name means. If this is full of madness, then one should neither reject the literal meaning of names (τάς τῶν ὀνομάτων κυριολογίας), nor think of them as something other than what they denote; for in this way the madness of the heretics will be stopped. Let him who is skilled in logic show us that the "Word" is not proper (κύριον) [741] name for the Son of God, and let him oppose the divine Scriptures and the blessed Evangelist John, who recognized the most appropriate and proper (πρεπωδεστάτην καὶ κυριαιτάτην) name of the Son, calling Him the Word. After all, he says: " *In the beginning was the Word* " [742] .

The antithesis is, as it were, from among the Eunomievs . And how, he says, could the Son be the Word and Wisdom of the Father, if wisdom is reliable knowledge (ἐπιστήμη), and the word is a simple utterance of a speech? And reliable knowledge is not something non-existent, but also not living. Likewise the word. And the Son is alive; therefore, He is not knowledge, nor wisdom, nor word. Moreover, how would a word arise within a word, when it is impossible for like to arise within like? After all, color cannot arise in color. So, if truly the word were <75.324> the Son of the Father by nature, then how would the word be addressed to Him, for example, in [the saying] " *let us make man* "?

Rebuttal to this. Again you are tempted, not rising above the human, but, as if forgetting that you are talking about the Divine essence, based on what is characteristic of us, you define what pertains to it. Or don't you know that the Divine is called by names common to us, but in everything there is something other than us? After all, it is not that since the human word is unhypostatic and is a vibration of the tongue sent into

the air, then the situation will be the same with the Divine Word, but It is living from the living, and hypostatically existing from the hypostatically existing [Father]. And again, it is not that since the wisdom and knowledge existing in us (ἐπιστήμη) do not exist in themselves in hypostasis, then the Wisdom existing in God will therefore suffer harm in relation to Its existence in hypostasis. But if you agree that God is not like us, then, obviously, in some way you agree with the fact that His properties are not ours, but are as much superior to ours as He is different from us in the logos of essence.

OTHER [refutation] to the same thing . This seemingly wise and sharp-minded [man] did not notice how he fell into immeasurable blasphemy. For he calls the Lord alive, not knowing that a living being (τὸ ζῶον) is something different in relation to life, just as knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) [is something] different in relation to an expert (ἐπιστήμονα). After all, if someone says "life," then he means [with this word] the very thing that arises in certain [beings] and vivifies them; and when he says "living," he is talking about the life-giving [principle] involved. But the Lord is seen not calling Himself that way, but rather calling [Himself| Life. If, being Life, He is also a living [being], according to the extravagance of this person, then let the Father also be called a living [being], since he is found saying: " *As I live, says the Lord* ." [743]. But, having said goodbye to his nonsense and added the apostolic: " *Let your thoughts be with you to destruction* ." [744], let us hasten to the right dogmas and not "living", like them, but let us call the Lord Life, who gives life to everything, so that it *moves about Him and is* [745], according to Pavlov.

OTHER, about the same thing . This one, quick to be foolish and stubborn in not thinking right about the Divine Mysteries, imagines that the Divine Scripture calls the Son the Word and the utterance of such sayings as are human, not knowing that the Divine Scriptures preach Him, thus, according to our custom . The Father speaks ineffably with the Son, Who by nature knows the will of Him who begat [Him], not waiting for a word that can reveal [to Him] the hidden, since He Himself is the Word. So, when something is said about God that is more befitting of man , then the listener must rise [with his mind] above what is characteristic of us and strive towards <75.325> spiritual and [rooted] in divine speculation (νοήσει) understanding [of what is said].

The objection seems to be from among the Eunomievs . But it is not enough, he says, to designate the Son the name "Word", and His essence will not become obvious through such a naming, for it is also used in relation to many other sayings, vain and non-existent hypostatically.

Rebuttal to this . Therefore, the name "God" will not be sufficient to indicate God's essence. For it is also used in relation to those who are not gods by nature, according to what has been said: " *Az rekh: gods by nature* ." [746]. What will prevent us from saying

that since the names “righteous”, “good”, “holy” are also used in relation to people - for there are many of them in communion with Him Who is truly and essentially Good and Righteous - then each of the named [names] are not applied to God in the proper sense? If we have common names with Him, but He alone by nature truly assimilates the essence, then nothing will prevent the Son from being called the Word in the proper sense (κυρίως), and having this name representing His essence, even if there were many other words , so called in a non-proper sense (καταχρηστικῶς) and in imitation of the One who is so called according to [the] truth itself. For for this reason the Son says of Himself: “ *I am the truth* .” [747]. Therefore, no matter what anyone says about Him, who is magnificent and worthy of Divine birth, this will be said about Him in the proper sense of the word, but about others - not so, but rather, in a non-proper sense, as has already been said.

The objection seems to be from among the Eunomievs . By His word, he says, the divine Scriptures are called, not as by nature of being from the Father, or as if He Himself were an internal word, but because, having heard the word of the Father, He proclaims it to us, just as He is called sanctification, since He sanctifies, and truth - because it justifies.

Rebuttal to this. If, according to your dearest blasphemy, He is called the Word, not because He is this by nature, having come from the Father and revealing [in Himself] the essence of the One who gave birth, but because, having heard the word of the Father, He proclaims to us, then observe also regarding the rest [of His names] use the same logic in order to disgrace himself even more. After all, if He is the Word because He heard the Word, then it will have to be said that He appears both in truth and in sanctification as a partaker of truth and sanctification, and not as being it by nature. And that which is not inherent in someone by nature, but came from outside, easily leaves him. And when, in your opinion, is the Word of God shown without truth and sanctification, saying: “ *He who has seen Me, has seen the Father* ” [748]? So, when the madness of the Christians has reached the point of blaspheming the Father Himself, we must [finally] leave it.

<75.328> *OTHER* . Do not, O Christ-fighter, install additional icons for the Divine Scriptures; and let no one be so mad that - when the Divine Spirit speaks differently about the Son - he would rather listen to your false sophisms than listen to Him. So, the Holy Spirit calls the Son the Word, but you consider Him not the Word, but partaker of the word. For if you say that He is called the Word because, having heard the word from the Father, He proclaimed it to us, then how can you not turn out to be idle? For such is no longer the Word, but a partaker of the Word, since that which participates in something cannot in itself be identical with that which participates. Just as, for example, wisdom is not the same as the wise man who partakes of it, nor is grammar the same as the grammarian who partakes in it. Because these are different things. So it

is necessary either to confess Him as the Word, or, if He only participates in the word, to no longer call Him the Word [by nature]. For this cancels this, and this fights with that, and everything fits for the Son to be one of these, and not both. And since the Divine Scripture calls Him the Word, we willingly say goodbye to those who consider Him not to be the Word, but only a partaker of the word.

* * *

727 This. 1:1 .

728 Matthew 3:17 .

729 Gal. 1:1 ; 1 Tim. 1:1 .

730 That is, without connection with any specific person.

731 This. 17:1 .

732 This. 12:28 .

733 John 12:30 . In the Slavic and Russian translations we read: "... but for the sake of the people," but in the Greek text of the Gospel it is exactly like this: "οὐ δι' ἐμὲ ἡ φωνὴ αὕτη γέγονεν ἀλλὰ δι' ὑμᾶς."

734 Gen.1:26 .

735 This. 14:10 .

736 This. 15:15 .

737 Hebrews 1:1 .

738 This. 10:35-36 .

739 Psalm 88:10 .

740 This is 10:30 .

741 Also: "main", "legal", "used in the main or direct (rather than figurative) meaning", etc.

742 This. 1:1 .

743 Numbers 14:28 ; Isa.49:18 ; Ezek.5:11; 14:16,18,20; 16:48; 17:16,19; 18:3; 20:3,31, 33; 33:11.27; 34:8; 35:6,11 ; Zeph.2:9 ; 3 Esdras 2:14 ; Rom.14:11 .

744 Acts 8:20 .

745 Acts 17:28 .

746 Psalm 81:6 .

[747] This. 14:6 .

[748] This. 14:9 .

Word 19 Word 21

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 20 Word 22

Word 20. On [words]: “you endured the cross, you were careless about your shame [749], in the same way God exalted Him, and gave Him a name that is above every name [750]»

The objection seems to be on behalf of our opponents. It is written, they say, “ *Let each of these things be wise in you, even in Christ Jesus, Who, in the image of God, was not equal to God by admiration* , and so on, up to: *In the same way God also exalted Him and gave Him a name, more than any name* " [751]. So, if He is exalted by God and glorified, and received as a gift *a name, which is above any name* , because *He humbled Himself even to the point of death* [752], then He has honor and *a name as a reward for humility, more than anyone else* , not by nature being God, but becoming such by giving (προσθήκης) [Divinity to Him from the Father]. And something that needs application (προσθήκης) [of something] is imperfect and defective by nature. And what is elevated somewhere is certainly raised from below to this level; and he who received the gift was all deprived of what he had received; and about the one who requires that honor be given to him (τὸ τιμᾶσθαι ζητοῦν,), there is no need to say that it is customary for him to be created. So, if *He was given a name, more than any name* , then by nature He was not what this name means, but later became this by grace. And that which is such cannot be God, for it is new.

A brief refutation of [all] this in order . And what was the added honor *to those who were in the image of God?* [753] and clothed with *the image of a servant* [754]? Wouldn't he who abandoned the greater and accepted the less be rather considered to have diminished? For what reward did He, being God, <75.329> become man? Or how did one descend from Glory to dishonor become famous? How did he who disdained the dignity of the Divine rise and descend into humanity? How did the one who came down become above? What improvement does He have who has gone from being the best to being the worst? If about the One who is *God the Most High* [755], *on high alive* [756], it is said that He ascended, then where else after the nature of God will the ascended ascend? How humiliated was he who was in the bosom of the Most High Father [757]? What addition did God need ? If He descended in order to then ascend, then

what was the need for the descent? If for this purpose He *humbled Himself* in order to then become glorified, then what was the need for humility? How could he not be unwise who seeks with difficulty what he could possess without difficulty? How did he receive *a name, more than any other name* , who constantly receives worship about him (ἐν αὐτῷ προσκυνούμενος)?

Saying that the Son is God. "God, in Your name save me " [758]; “Let them worship Your great name, O Lord” [759]; “ *abides before the sun His name* ” [760]; " *Give glory to His name* " [761]; “ *These on chariots and these on horses, we will be magnified in the name of our God* ” [762]. How did He accept what ever appears to be?

Another rebuttal. If *in the beginning there was a Word and God was a Word, and* it *in the beginning was to God* [763], and subsequently *salvation for the sake of for our* [764] *humbled Himself* , and therefore it is said that It was exalted, then how will it not be obvious to everyone that this happened not in the nature of the Word, but in the mystery of [His] humanity? For whatever humility corresponds to, then it is appropriate to exalt. And the humble is humanity, in relation to which, therefore, exaltation must also be understood. For we will not find Scripture saying anything similar about the Word of God than [the Word] “ *became flesh and dwelt in us* .” [765]. So, if in relation to the taking on of the flesh it is said that humility took place, then exaltation will also apply to the same.

OTHER, about the same thing. Paul says in the letter that “ *Jesus is the Forerunner of us.” [766], not in the opposite image of the true, but in heaven itself now let the face of God appear about us* [767]" So, just as, being always in heaven and in the person of the Father, He now ascends into heaven for our sake and appears to the Father, so, again, for our sake He is now exalted and glorified, and accepts *the name, which is more than any name* , so that just as we ascended into heaven in Him and appeared to the Father, so, again in Him, being glorified and exalted, we would be called sons of God.

<75.332> *OTHER* . The psalmist, explaining the ascension of our Savior into heaven, says by the Spirit: “ *Lift up the gates, O princes, and be lifted up, O eternal gates: and the King of glory will come in.* ” [768]. Here the Spirit commands the holy powers in heaven to open the gates to the incoming Christ. But as God, He was within the gates and in heaven before His ascension. Why then were these commands of the Spirit needed? Or how is it said of that which is within that He enters? So, how not because He is God, but because man, for our sake and for us, He enters the heavenly gates, leading us into them through Himself, and for us He *renewed has* this *path* [769]; so, being the Most High, He exalts us for our sake as man, so that we may be exalted in Him, bearing our likeness, in order to thus transform [us] into the likeness of the Creator, renewing [human] nature, [so that it again becomes such], as it was from the beginning.

Scholium on the Incarnation, having the same meaning

On [the words] "given to Him" and "exalt Him," and the like, spoken of Christ . As God, the Word of God is ever Supreme, but it is exalted as a man. Without lacking anything, like God, like man, It is called receiving [something from the Father]. Always worshiped by everyone as God, It now accepts worship as a person. If [Christ] died as a man, and this does not bring any censure on the Word of God, then it will not harm Him in any way that it is said about Him that He accepts [something]. For just as this took place in relation to humanity, so, in the same way, does this. If, being immortal, like God, He is called dead, like man, then, being Most High, like God, He is called exalted, like man.

About how Jesus Christ is to the glory (εἰς δόξαν) of God the Father [770]. [In such a way] that thanks to the incarnation *of man the lost* is saved [771], *the broken* is bandaged, *the lost* is returned [772], and this leads *to the glory* (εἰς δόξαν) *of God the Father* .

OTHER . If He, being God, became a man, and decided to endure this by deed, then let no one be offended if He also bears on Himself what is fitting for humanity and official position (τῷ σχήματι τῷ οἰκετικῷ), for this is what is said about Him as a man. that He accepts and exalts. And humanity itself will not rightly reproach Him who bore Himself for the fact that He did not refuse to bear what is characteristic of humanity. It is human nature to accept from God, according to the saying that says: " *What have ? you received* " [773] So, as a man, He received by grace what He had by nature as God.

OTHER . If the Father does everything through the Son, and *without Him there would be nothing* [774] then it must be said that He was for Himself the giver of exaltation and the servant of grace [received] from <75.333> the Father. For He received [grace], since the temple [of the body] which He received was deified, and [at the same time] was by nature God, being the Word of the Father; He was also ascended because he became a man, and, appearing in *the form of a servant* , he received worship, having this from the beginning together with the Father. So, grace and exaltation will be related to humanity, since God the Word appropriates to Himself what happens to His own temple. For it is not someone else's, but His [own] body, and therefore it is considered as Himself. For there is one Christ, mixed from humanity and God the Word, not as a result of the fact that He turned into something that He was not, but because He received the temple [body] from the Virgin.

OTHER . David sings somewhere: " *Thy throne , O God, is for ever and ever .*" [775]. Then he says: " *For this reason of Your anointing, O God, Your God, the oil of joy* " [776] . But even before the anointing, the Word reigned with the Father. How then is He who is ever King and Holy One anointed and sanctified? So, just as, having always been such, He is said to have reigned in the last times, so being the Most High, He is said to have ascended because of [His] dispensation in the flesh. He is exalted and anointed

and sanctified for our sake, so that through Him grace may finally pass to all, as has already been given to [human] nature and will henceforth be preserved for the entire race. So the Savior said in the Gospel of John: " *For these I am sacred to myself that they also may be holy.* " [777]. For whatever is in Christ is also in us. After all, He did not accept sanctification for His own sake (for He Himself was the sanctifier), but in order through Himself to give it to [human] nature, becoming, as it were, the path and beginning of good things in us. That is why He says: " *I am the way* " [778], according to which, as it were, Divine grace descended to us, elevating, sanctifying, glorifying and deifying [our| nature in the first [of all people] – Christ.

OTHER . If, being God, He became man, and not, being man, became God, and is anointed as man in order to be glorified, then it is obvious that grace [of the anointing] refers to humanity.

OTHER . If He Himself is the giver of the Spirit, according to what was said about Him: " *Receive the Holy Spirit* " [779], then "receiving the Spirit" is spoken of humanity, and likewise "giving" and "receiving."

OTHER . Christ says somewhere, talking with the Father: " *For them I sanctify Myself* ." [780]. He who is able to sanctify Himself, and not asking this from another, is the Lord of sanctification. If He Himself has no need for sanctification, then it is performed in relation to the one in need. Human nature is sanctified. And, of course, in Christ this <75.336> was fulfilled, so that we might be sanctified in Him.

OTHER . As if from the objection of heretics . It is written, they say: " *Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity: therefore for the sake of Thy anointing, O God, Thy God* ." [781]. So, we would not at all agree to the Lord being anointed if He did not love righteousness and hate untruth. For the causal conjunction, that is, " *for this sake* ," standing in the middle [of the sentence], shows anointing as a reward for virtue. If He is anointed for the sake of loving righteousness and hating untruth, then He has sanctification as a gift. And the one who needs to add something is imperfect and not like the perfect Father.

Rebuttal to this. Arise , sleep, and rise from the dead [782], and listen again, heretic. Since, as [Scripture] says, *hated you* unrighteousness and *loved righteousness, for this reason God anointed You* ; [he says this] not so that anyone would think that the anointing was given as a reward for virtue, but so that we understand what was said in this way. The forefather Adam was of a changeable nature, and it was usual for him to either love the truth and hate untruth, or, on the contrary, fall into the opposite and love untruth and hate the truth (for this is characteristic of those with a changeable nature), [and therefore] he was defeated by the devil. And since, in order to get rid of such an illness, he needed the immutable Word of God to oppose Himself for us to the evil one, so that just as we would be defeated because of him [i.e. e. Adam] pliability, so, thanks

to the immutability of the Word, they would gain victory, then *for this reason* [Christ] is anointed as ever and immutably loving truth and hating untruth and unable to change. So, when [Scripture] says: " *Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity: for this reason God anointed Thee* ", you understand it something like this: "Since none of the created things, having a changeable nature, is able to fight the devil, but You, God the Word, being immutable from the immutable Father, always love truth and hate untruth, then God has anointed you so that in You first, human nature was seen as victorious."

OTHER, deduced from the same syllogism . In divine Scripture we find many such passages relating to God and the Father. " *For the Lord is righteous and loves righteousness* " [783]. Also: " *Thou hast hated all the workers of iniquity* ." [784]. And also: " *I am the Lord, love righteousness and hate the spoils of unrighteousness* ." [785]. So, perhaps, because of this, someone will say that *our great Lord* [786], because He loves truth and hates untruth, and that [the name] " *great* " is His reward and reward for virtue, since He loves but also hates it? But it's unlikely that anyone would be that crazy. So, just as in relation <75.337> to the Father such expressions are understood piously, so they, in fairness, should be understood in relation to the Son. For the image [refers] to the prototype, and the prototype to the image.

To the apostolic saying: "I sit at the right hand of the Majesty on high, only the best of the angels." [787]

Those who dare to condemn the essence of God the Word and strive to classify the Son among the created ones say, perverting the truth: "If the Son became better than the angels, then, to be sure, He has this change for the better, for He became what He was not [before]. In general, that which is capable of changing (μεταποιεῖσθαι) and passing from one [state] to another will [certainly] be of a changeable nature. And if it is changeable, then it is obvious that it is also created, for it is variability that is characteristic of it (ἡ τροπή)."

Rebuttal to this . One who begins to study the divine Scriptures, first of all, should pay attention to the time at which this or that saying is said, and to the person by whom or for whose sake, or about whom it is spoken, for [only] in this way is it possible for those who want the right to think to accurately retain the meaning [said]. So, we learn the benefits of [observing] time by hearing St. the apostles saying to Christ: " *When will these things be, and what is the sign of Your coming* ?" [788]Those with Hymenaeus and Alexander suffered harm from ignorance of time [789], who thought that the resurrection had already happened, and these were the ones who spoke. And that knowledge of persons is necessary and useful - we will see, in turn, when the eunuch says to Philip: " *I pray thee, about whom the prophet says this: about himself or about someone else* ?" [790]Or when blessed Paul, wanting to introduce [into his narrative] the

face of the Savior, says: " *Of him for whom these words are spoken, another tribe shall receive communion, from whom no one else shall come to the altar: for it is manifest that from the tribe of Judah the Lord hath sprung.* " [791]. And that circumstances (πράγμα) should not be neglected will be obvious from the following. For when the prophets foretell things concerning the Savior, and one of them says: " *Behold, the virgin will receive with child* " [792]; and in another place again: " *Like a sheep led to the slaughter* " [793], and if such [sayings] are not understood in their proper sense in relation to Christ, then the mind will go somewhere far [to the side] from the truth and fly away from pious thoughts. So, careful consideration (ἐπιτήρησις) of what has been said is necessary. So, upon careful consideration of the time, the person and the circumstances, it will be discovered that Paul said that for our sake the Word of God was made man, [and] when, having accomplished the cleansing of our sins, *he sat at the right hand of the Majesty on high* , then he became better than the angels, not changing his nature into anything -something else, or subsequently becoming something that was not before, for Paul is not talking about the nature of the Son, but about the circumstances that happened during the incarnation ρωπήσεως). Therefore, not wanting to compare the nature of the Son with the nature of angels, [Paul] says that He became better than the angels, but <75.340> makes a comparison of circumstances and in this sense says that the Son became better.

So, the meaning of what has been said is this: Paul, talking with the Jews and with all frankness wanting to show that Christ's ministry is better than both the prophetic preaching and the Law taught through the ministry of angels, makes a comparison, starting from the dignity of persons, and says: " *Of old times the God spoken by the Father prophet, in the last days of these words he spoke to us in the Son, whom he set as heir to all, in whom also created the worlds. Who is the radiance of glory and the image of His hypostasis, bearing all things with the word of His power, having created the cleansing of our sins, sits at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty on high* " [794] .

So, having clothed the Son with such glory and attributed to Him the qualities inherent in the nature of the Father, he then says that He became [so much] better than the angels, insofar as the name of the angels is greater than them. [795], as the Son, the Heir, the Radiance and the Image, and the Mark [of the Father], and He who sits on the same throne with Him (ὁμόθρονος), and the Creator. If therefore He is thought to be much better and *more glorious* [796]angels, then His service is better than that of angels. So "became" here can with good reason mean not bringing from non-existence into being (for *in the beginning the Word* [797]), nor a change from something less into something more (for the Son was perfect from the perfect Father), but, as if from a comparison of glory and dignity, the lesser and the greater were discerned. It is as if a man were compared to a horse, and those who judge him in this way would say that he has become better than it because he is intelligent. For the fact that "to become" (τὸ

γενέσθαι) does not necessarily mean a change in nature is clear from what [David] says to God: " *Be (γένου) my protector God* ." [798]; and again: " *The Lord be my refuge* " [799]; and " *The Lord be unto my salvation* " [800]. So, the comparison with the angels of the Son is in relation to ministry and glory, and not to nature.

A comparison of sayings showing that the Divine Scripture uses [the word] "best" about [subjects] very distant [from each other] either in the logos of nature, or in dignity, or in the measure of grace

As for grace: " *Better is one day in Your courts than a thousand* " [801]; for what will be equal to the courts that are in heaven?

Regarding the dissimilarity of nature: " *Accept punishment, not silver: the wisdom of precious stones is better* " [802]. Isaiah quotes God saying about the eunuchs: " *The best name of sons and daughters will I give them forever* " [803].

So, [the definition of] "best" is often used not [only] in relation to an insignificant difference, but also in relation to a great and incomparable superiority.

OTHER, about the same thing. Explaining his own words and showing more clearly what it means to be " *better than the angels* ," blessed Paul adds <75.341> to what was said: " *To whom then did the angel say: Sit right hand at my* ?" [804]; and that it is written about the Son: " *All the angels of God will worship him.* " [805]. If, in comparison, one appears sitting [on the throne] with the Father and being worshiped, and the others are standing and obligated to worship, then the epithet " *best* " will not refer to the essence, but to the virtues that are next to the essence, and external ones. honors towards nature. Consequently, the Son is not one of the created things, but something other than them, that is, the Father's own Word.

OTHER, about the same thing . [The word] " *to be* " (τόγέγονεν), when said one thing and by itself, has many meanings, and does not necessarily serve as an indication of hypostasis; and when something is attached to it, then it will mean the power of that to which it is attached, as, for example, [the phrase] "someone became (γέγονε) a carpenter or a stonemason" [means] not that [he] generally [became] a man, in order to [be] a carpenter, but that, since he is [already] a man, he became a carpenter, being able to perceive this art, and [the word] "became" here will refer only to the profession, and not at all to the hypostasis or cast into existence. So, if it is said of Christ that He became (γεγενήσθαι) better than the angels, then this comparison does not refer to nature, but to honor and dignity.

OTHER, about the same thing . " *Only the best former* (γενόμενος) *angels* " [806]. The word " *was* " (τὸ γέγονεν), even if it is applied to the essence of the Son, its meaning

will not harm it in any way, since it is often used in relation to those who are born (γεννωμένων). After all, in relation to those that actually arise [from non-existence] and are created, no one would use the word "to be born" in its own sense and by nature, since even if [something of such] appears to be born, then it is [still] preceded by a fact creation by the Creator. Like, for example, a person, although born, is created, and this is a more fundamental [definition] for him than another. If some are called born of the Spirit, then they too are in imitation of the Word of God truly begotten of the Father, and are not alien to creation, so that the name born of the created will belong, rather, not in the proper sense than in nature. And what is born (γεννηθέν), even if it is said " *to be* " (γενέσθαι), does not suffer any harm from this, since Divine Scripture is indifferent to this. For it says of Job: " *Bysha* (έγένοντο) *he had seven sons and three daughters* " [807]. : " *Abraham was* And again *a hundred years old when* became *Isaac his son* him ." [808]. If people also say " *came* " about what is being born, then when you hear this about the Son, you don't need to pay attention. And in relation to the created (γενητών) this is not indifferent for the reasons stated earlier.

OTHER, about the same thing, as if on behalf of our opponents. It is written, they say, about the Son that He " *was far better than* the *angels* ." [809]. Since comparisons are usually made in relation to subjects of the same type (for it is impossible to legitimately compare a person with a horse, or a dog with a sheep, but a person [should be compared] with people, and a sheep with a sheep), then it is in every way necessary to recognize the created Son, Who is compared with angels having a created nature.

Rebuttal to this. Of course, comparisons usually occur in relation to subjects of the same kind. But when these are compared with each other, the word "better" is rarely spoken and is not taken literally, but [in this case] "more" and "less" (τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ ἧττον) will be suitable, "to the highest degree" "(τὸ διαφερόντως) and, sometimes, "over" (τὸ πλέον), which more accurately indicate comparison. So, Joseph was more handsome than his brothers. Again, a star is not better than a star, but *differs in glory* [810]. So the Savior, when, as a man, is compared with people, he is not called "better in kindness," but it is said: " *Worse in kindness than the sons of men* ." [811]. When those belonging to different species are compared with each other, then it is more appropriate to say "better." So it is written: " *Better is the wisdom of precious stones* ." [812]. What is the common nature of wisdom and stones?

So, if another image has a comparison between those belonging to the same species, and "better" is used in relation to those who are not similar in nature, then the Son will neither be like the angels, nor created like them, but comparing Him with them is a hyperbole. And the fact that He is called "the best" rather [shows that] He is of a different species than of the same.

OTHER, about the same thing. If because the Scripture says: " *Only the best were the angels* " [813]. The son will [be considered] belonging to the same species as them, as

compared to them, then let them look where their word risks [going]. For it is time [for them] to confess that angels can sit with God [on the throne] and reign with Him, and that the Son has nothing beyond what they have. For those who belong to the same species, even if they differ in relation to each other, belong to the same nature. For, in this way, they will be of the same type. Therefore, since it is said about angels: " *make Angels* your spirits ." [814], and about the Son: " *Thy throne , O God, is for ever and ever* ." [815], and the angels and the Son, in their opinion, are of the same species, since He has a comparison with them through what is called "best," then nothing prevents the angels from having the [potential] opportunity to sit [on the throne] with God , even though none of them actually deserved it. And Paul must have said in vain: "To whom *then did the angel say, Sit right hand at my* ?" [816]Or why does He give this exclusively to the Son, when the angelic nature also claims this, if they are of the same species as Him? For all representatives of the same species have in common those properties belonging to a given nature. Moreover, the advantages inherent in some [representatives of this species] do not belong to the essence. Just as, for example, [all] people have one nature, but not all are rich and not all reign, although [all are potentially] capable of perceiving <75.345> this too. But no one will allow the angels to be clothed with the glory of the Son, for He is the Master, and they are slaves. Therefore, he who reigns with the Father and sits next to Him [on the throne] is not of the same kind as the angels.

OTHER. That the Son is not one-natural (ὁμοφυὴς) *to the angels* . The creation and the creator will never be of the same nature. After all, something else is creative, and something else is created. For if not so, then what is the difference in the nature of God from the created ones? So, when God and the Father does everything through the Son, and one of all is the angelic nature, then, therefore, it also arose and was created through the Son. From this it is already clear that He is not of the same kind as those who arose [from non-existence] thanks to Him, but that He is invested with the dignity of the Creator, and they have the status of slaves by the fact of their creation. " *For all things* ," says the Divine Scripture, " *work for You* ." [817].

OTHER. That the Son is not of the same kind (ὁμογενὴς) *with the angels because it is said that He "was* (γεγενὴσθαι) *better* " than them. Everything that essentially appears to have come into being (γεγονός) can someday turn back into non-existence if the Creator wants it; and that which has a nature susceptible of suffering will suffer, even if it has not yet suffered. But that which is not characteristic of suffering will never suffer in any way and is something different from the first; and what always exists in the same way (τὸ ἀεὶ ὡσαύτως ὂν) did not begin to be, and does not move towards the end, like those that began to be. But no one with intelligence will say that those who are so opposite to each other and so different in nature are of the same nature and belong to the same essence. So, if about creatures, as being subject to corruption, it is said: " *They will perish* ," and about the Son: " *But you remain* ," and they *promise* as

having a created nature, and *the years* of the Son *will not fail* [818], then how will the Son be of the same nature with the angels, the Creator with the creatures, the Uncreated with the created, the Ever-present with the potentially transitory? For although an angel is something immortal by the will and grace of the Creator, since he has a beginning of existence, he can also come to the end [of it]. The advantages of nature are solid (ἰσχυρὰ,) for those who possess them, and not for God who created them. Just as, for example, fire is burning, but not for God; so an angel is immortal, but not for God. For He alone is immortal in the proper sense of the word, possessing immutability by nature, and not from grace, like created things.

OTHER, with proof that the angels are slaves, and the Son is the Master If no one *can forsake sins, only God alone* [819], and the Son leaves, then it means that He is God and is not counted among the creatures. For the angels pray, <75.348> saying: " *Lord Almighty, how long will you have mercy on Jerusalem and the cities of Judah* ?" [820] And the Son [speaks] with authority: " *Man , your sins are forgiven* ." [821]. So, a slave [being] is not of the same kind with the Master, and one who asks in order to receive is [not of the same kind] with the Giver.

OTHER, similar to this: that the Son is not among the slaves . God sends prophets to reclaim the fruits of the vineyard; not only were they unable to receive anything, but they themselves perished. The Savior, as the Lord, forgives debts and transfers the vineyard *to another worker* [822], as Lord and Master. And the angels are those who contributed to the ministry of the Law and did not create anything that the Son created. Consequently, He is not of the same kind as the angels, but the Master and Lord.

OTHER, in narrative form, telling that [the saying] "the best being of angels" does not introduce a comparison of entities, but rather of ministries . " *Only the best being of the angels* " Paul speaks of the Son, not wanting to compare the nature of God the Word with the nature of angels, and, likewise, not making a study of unlike essences (for the Divinity is an incomparable and incomparable subject), but introducing a difference of ministries, so that from this , what is entrusted to each one and what he is in charge of, it would become obvious what he is. And the fact that [the epithet] " *best* " means a comparison with the ministry of angels will be obvious from the following. Paul's goal was to show the commandments proclaimed by Christ to be better than those of the Old Testament (νομικῶν). On what does he base his evidence? He addresses the ministers [of both Testaments] and evaluates what they serve according to their differences. So, angels serve the Law, and it is spoken through them; and the Son proclaims the knowledge that is given through the Gospels. But he says that the Son is the best of the angels; because He is the best because He became the servant of the best. For the great are served by the great, and the small by the small. And the Son is great as *radiance* and *image* ; That's why he hears: " *Sit right at My* hand " [823], because He is the firstborn and receives worship from the angels themselves, but the

Angels are nothing like that, but as servants they stand, as servants they worship, as servants they run *for those who want to inherit salvation* [824]. Therefore, the ministry of the Savior is as much better than the ministry of angels as He is in these, and they in those. For this reason, therefore, Paul, wanting to compare ministries, says: " *Better were the angels* ." And when he proceeds to compare the essences, he says: " *The name of the inheritance is more glorious than theirs* ." [825]. It is no longer "the best," but "the most glorious," which makes a significant difference.

<75.349> *Comparison of sayings about the humanity of Christ and further resolution of [perplexity] about [the words]: "Only the best were angels"*

That the word "best," when used here, introduces a comparison pertaining to service (τῶν διακονικῶν), we learn when we hear Paul say: " *If the word spoken by the angels be known, and every transgression and righteous disobedience shall be accepted as a reward, How will we escape, so careless of salvation, that the word of the Lord has begun to be spoken to us by those who have heard it announced to us* ?" [826]And again: " *Whoever rejects the law of Moses dies without mercy in the presence of two or three witnesses; How much do you think the mountain will be worthy of torment for the one who trampled upon the Son of God* ?" [827]Although, if, due to the fact that He is called the best of the angels, He would certainly have to be of one nature with them (for comparisons are usually made in relation to [objects] similar to each other), then why *the one who tramples on the Son* should *be rewarded with torment* ? and not the same as the one who trampled down the angels through the transgression of the Law spoken through them? After all, he who commits a crime against equals and belonging to the same species should in fairness receive equal punishment, and where there is no difference between the offended, it is natural for there to be equal punishments. However, he who sins against the *most bitter Son will be rewarded with torment* , and he who sins against the Law spoken by the angels will be rewarded with less. Therefore, He is not of the same kind as the angels, to sin against Whom is a greater [crime], and the measure of punishment increases in accordance with the superiority of the one trampled upon.

OTHER, as if out of an objection to the same thing. Worship , they say, *is awarded torment* for those who sin against the Son, as against the greater angels. However, this does not necessarily place Him outside the kinship (ὁμογενείας) with the angels. For blasphemy against each is measured according to the honor due to each. So, since the Son became better than the angels, whoever sins against Him is worthy of a more severe punishment.

The refutation to this is from the same place. It would then be necessary, in the event of a violation of the commandments, not to determine the punishment in accordance with the transgression and, of course, not to proportion the punishment to the severity of the sin, but rather to determine it in accordance with the dignity of the messenger

(ἀγγέλου) who served [teaching the criminal commandment]. If we do not see this, but one Law, despite the fact that there are many messengers, and it punishes sins with the same punishments, then what is said is not true, that *the one who sins against Christ will be rewarded with* greater torment, as against the “best of the angels.” , but as against One who is of a different nature and very different. For they are created things, but this is the true God, not one of the created things and not allowing comparison with them. But to the extent that He appears to be more significant than [them], the greater <75.352> and gravest torment is the one who transgresses His [commandments].

OTHER, [derived] from the same [sayings, proof that] the comparison of the ministries, the angels and the Son, is good and extremely useful, explaining the meaning of the epithet “better,” for from them we learn how He is “better than the angels.” "and how much

The angels spoke the Law, but the Law did nothing. And the Son completed the Father's work. For he who is guided by His laws is perfect in virtue. *Royal death* : *from Adam also in the time of the Law* , says [Paul], *even to Moses* [828]. And death is abolished thanks to Christ, for we *no longer die in Adam, but are made alive in Christ* [829]. *From Dana to Virsavíi* [830]alone *legal commandments were proclaimed, and in Judea* was *known God* [831]; now *his message has gone out into all the earth* [832], and *they all became learned by God* [833], - not by angels, but by God. After all, the Law is God’s, but [given] through angels, and the Son says: “ *say* I Himself *that I am* .” [834]. So, according to the word of Paul, how much more glorious was He worthy of ministry, and how much *better was He the holder of the covenant?* [835], is so superior to the angels - not as being compared with them by nature, but as towering above them as far as God is removed from the created ones according to the logos of essence. Therefore, [the word] “ *best* ,” referring to the service, insofar as it shows it to be greater and higher [the services of] these [angels], in the same way it removes the Son from the nature of the created. And the angels, as slaves, receive lesser service, but the Son receives that which is due to the Son and Master. For He, he says, *was established on the best promises* [836].

OTHER, [showing] that the ministry of God the Word is better than the angelic also in other senses; how much better it is, so is the One who made it

Paul says that “ *what was weak in the law, which was weak in the flesh, God sent His Son in the likeness of sin, and condemned sin in the flesh.* ” [837]. If the Law was unable *to condemn sin in the flesh* , but Christ condemned it, showing it capable of receiving

the Holy Spirit, so we can say: " *We are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit.* " [838], then in this too He became better than the angels through whom the Law was spoken. And again, the world was condemned by the Law because of sin, but the Son came *not to judge the world, but to save the world* [839], not demanding any punishment, but to grant [forgiveness] to everyone. He who justifies is better than he who condemns; and the giver is better than the demander; and better than the Son who is unable to *condemn sin in the flesh* of the law is the Son, who fulfilled this too. So, in this respect too <75.353> [the Son] is better than the angels who spoke the weak and condemning Law.

OTHER, that the Son is not of one nature with creatures or angels . If the Son is a creation and of one nature with the angels, then let them, like Him, be called sons of the Father, or He, like them, an angel. *But the angel said to no one when: You are my son* [840], according to Pavlov, neither [the Son] Himself is truly called an angel. Let them then sit at the right hand of the Father, like the Son. But none of the angels sits with the Father, but rather they stand, serving Him. Let the angels then speak, commanding, like the Son: " *I say unto you* ." [841]. But they don't say that, but rather: " *I am sent to speak to you* ." [842]. And some serve, and the other accepts the service: " *And behold* ," says [Scripture], " *the angels came and served Him* ." [843]. And One is the Creator, and others arose [from non-existence] thanks to Him; and they worship, and He accepts worship. And the angels accept the command to raise the gates of heaven, and He enters as *the Lord of Hosts* , as *the King of Glory* [844]. And they participate in life from God, and this One is the giver of life, Himself being Life for everyone. And He says: " *I and the Father are one* " [845]; and " *Seeing Me, seeing the Father* " [846] "; " *Everything that the Father has, is My essence* " [847]; " *I am the world of measure* " [848]; " *I am the resurrection and the life* " [849], and angels do not dare to pronounce such verbs. And if we pray in the name of the Son, then whatever we ask, we will receive; and no one would pray in the name of angels. And to the Son and the Father be glory [befitting] [850], whereas the angels are not glorified, but rather glorify the Son with the Father. How, given such a difference between the angels and the Son, will they be considered [belonging to] the same essence, when this is not allowed by any logic? For in accordance with the dignity of persons, the difference of nature will also be determined.

OTHER, that in relation to the Father [in Scripture] the [word] "became" (ἐγένετο) is found. The psalmist says: " *Be* (γένου) *my protector God* " [851], and again: " *May we be saved* " [852]. If they say that this is said about the Son, then they will reluctantly testify about Him that He who saves the saints and is a refuge and cover for them is not of the same nature as creatures. After all, this too will befit only God.

OTHER, on [the words]: "Only the best being (γενόμενος) of the angels," about the fact that "being" [here] should be understood not in relation to the essence. If the

word " *having been* " certainly means the transition of something from non-existence to being and is always <75.356> used in relation to essence, then to whom did the Savior say: " *Be ye* (γίνεσθε) *merciful , just as your Father in Heaven is merciful* " [853]? After all, if those to whom the word was [addressed] already existed, then how will "becoming" (γίνεσθαι) certainly mean the transition [from non-existence] to being? After all, of course, something that does not already exist can be brought into being, but something that does not exist. And if "to become" (γίνεσθαι), being used in relation to [already] existing things, does not mean some beginning of their existence, but the transformation from something [one] into something [another], then there is no reason that would force [consider] that [the word] " *having been* " (γενόμενος), used in relation to the Son of God, serves as an indication of [His] existence.

* * *

[749] Hebrews 12:2 .

[750] Phil.2:9 .

[751] Phil.2:5–9 . In the Slavic and Russian translations of Scripture, " *kiyzhdo* " (έκαστοι) refers to the previous verse and sentence: " *Look not at your own and every one, but also at your friends* " (μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος σκοπ οῦντες ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἑτέρων ἕκαστοι), and the real verse begins: " *Let this be wisdom in you, as well as in Christ and Jesus* ." But St. Cyril quotes this passage as follows: "Ἕκαστοι τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ." It should also be noted that the verb "to philosophize" appears in the original text of the Epistle {according to the Byzantine tradition and the main text of the critical edition of the Greek New Testament, 27th edition of Nestlé-Åland - *hereinafter in curly brackets a note from the electronic edition; this edition will be called NA27 }* in the 2nd person plural, in the active voice (φρονείτε), and not in the 3rd {in the original erroneously - 1st} person singular medial, as in the Slavic translation. {Form 3 l. units the medial passive voice, φρονείσθω, is presented in the critical apparatus NA-27, as present in some authoritative manuscripts. If we accept the reading of φρονεῖτε and some other textual options, then verses 5:4 and 5:5 can be combined into one sentence: " *Don't be friends with everyone, but be friendly, let everyone be wise in you, as in Christ Jesus.* }

[752] Phil.2:8 .

[753] Phil.2:6 .

[754] Phil.2:7 .

[755] Dan. 5:18 .

[756] Psalm 112:5 .

[757] Ср.: Ин.1:18 – "He entered the bosom of the Father".

[758] Psalm 53:3 .

[759] We do not find exactly such a phrase in Scripture. Closest quotes – Ps.98:1 “ *Let them confess to Your great name* ”; and Hebrews 1:6 : “ *And let all the angels of God worship Him* .”

[760] Psalm 71:17 .

[761] Ps.65:2 . The exact text of the verse is: " *Sing to His name, give glory to His praise* ."

[762] Psalm 19:8 .

[763] This.161 .

[764] Nicene–Constantinopolitan Creed .

[765] This. 1:14 .

[766] Hebrews 6:20 .

[767] Hebrews 9:24 .

[768] Psalm 23:7 .

[769] Hebrews 10:20 .

[770] Phil.2:11 .

[771] Matthew 18:11 ; Luke 19:10 .

[772] Ezek.34:4 .

[773] 1 Cor. 4:7 .

[774] This. 1:3 .

[775] Psalm 44:7 .

[776] Psalm 44:8 .

[777] This. 17:19 .

[778] This. 14:6 .

[779] This. 20:22 .

[780] This. 17:19 .

[781] Psalm 44:8 .

[782] Eph. 5:14 .

[783] Psalm 10:7 .

784 Psalm 5:6 .

785 Isaiah 61:8 .

786 Psalm 146:5 .

787 Hebrews 1:3 .

788 Matthew 24:3 .

789 1Tim.1:20 .

790 Acts 8:34 .

791 Hebrews 7:13–14 .

792 Isaiah 7:14 .

793 Isaiah 53:7 .

794 Hebrews 1:3 .

795 Hebrews 1:4 .

796 Hebrews 1:4 .

797 This. 1:1 .

798 Psalm 30:3 .

799 Psalm 93:22 .

800 Psalm 117:14 .

801 Psalm 83:11 .

802 Proverbs 8:10–11 .

803 Isaiah 56:5 .

804 Hebrews 1:5,13 .

805 Hebrews 1:6 .

806 Hebrews 1:3 .

807 Job 1:2 .

808 Gen.21:5 .

809 Hebrews 1:3 .

810 1 Cor. 15:41 .

811 Psalm 44:3 .

812 Proverbs 8:11 .

[813] Hebrews 1:3 .

[814] Psalm 103:4 ; Hebrews 1:7 .

[815] Ps. 44:7 ; Hebrews 1:8 .

[816] Hebrews 1:13 .

[817] Psalm 118:91 .

[818] Ps. 101:27–28 ; Hebrews 1:11–12 .

[819] Luke 5:21 .

[820] Zechariah 1:12 .

[821] Luke 5:20 .

[822] Matthew 21:41 .

[823] Eur.1 :1Z.

[824] Hebrews 1:14 .

[825] Hebrews 1:4 .

[826] Hebrews 2:2–3 .

[827] Hebrews 10:28–29 .

[828] Romans 5:14 .

[829] 1 Cor. 15:22 .

[830] Judges 20:1 ; 1 Samuel 3:20 ; 2 Samuel 6:19 ; 2 Samuel 17:11 ; 2 Samuel 24:2 ; 1 Kings 4:25 .

[831] Psalm 75:2 .

[832] Psalm 18:3 .

[833] John 6:45 ; Isa.54:13 .

[834] Isaiah 52:6 .

[835] Hebrews 7:22 .

[836] Hebrews 8:6 .

[837] Romans 8:3 .

[838] Romans 8:9 .

[839] This. 12:47 .

[840] Hebrews 1:5 .

[841] Matthew 5:22,28,32,34,39,44 .

[842] Luke 1:19 .

[843] Matthew 4:11 .

[844] Ps. 23:7-10 .

[845] This is 10:30 .

[846] This. 14:9 .

[847] This is 16:15 .

[848] This. 8:12 .

[849] This. 11:25 .

[850] In the original Greek: “τῷ μὲν Υἱῷ σὺν τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ μετὰ Πατρὸς ἡ δόξα”, but in Russian both of these prepositions are “σὺν” and “ μετὰ" - translated as "with", although the Liddell-Scott dictionary says that “μετὰ” – “implying a closer union than σύν.” In the Latin translation of the PG, the second preposition is also omitted: "Et Filio quidem una cum Patre gloria debetur."

[851] Psalm 30:3 .

[852] Psalm 117:14 .

[853] Luke 6:36 .

Word 20 Word 22

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 21 Word 23

Word 21. On the saying of the Apostle: “Keep in mind the messenger and saint of our confession, Jesus Christ, who is faithful to Him who created Him.” [854]. The conclusion is that the Son is neither a creature nor a creature

If the Son is a creation, then it is necessary to recognize Him as one of all things, not possessing the exclusivity of the Divine, i.e., ever-being. If this is true, and *all things came into being* through the Son, and *without Worth nothing would have come into being.* [855], then [it turns out that] the Word creates Itself. And how can it be that something that does not yet exist brings itself into being? If this is impossible, then the Son, therefore, is not one of all, so that, being numbered among all, He would not seem to be His own creation.

OTHER . If the Son is a creation, and at the same time is called and is the Wisdom of the Father, Who *created all things with wisdom* [856]then it turns out that Wisdom creates Herself. If this is absurd, then the Son, that is, the Wisdom of the Father, is not a creation, so that it does not turn out that She makes Herself.

OTHER . If the Son arose (γέγονεν), and at the same time He is called and is *God's Power and God's Wisdom* [857], then, then, there was a time when God was unwise and powerless, since [He did not yet] have a Son. For every creation arises from non-existence (γίνεται). But the Father was always wise and strong. There was, therefore, a Son, who by this [i.e. e. Wisdom and Power] is for Him.

OTHER . If the Son is a creation, and at the same time speaks the truth, asserting: “ *He who sees Me, sees the Father* ” [858], then the image of the Father appears in creation, having similarity with the prototype. And if so, then there is no difference between the creation and God, but He will also be a creation. If He is not a creation, and appears entirely in the Son, then it means that the Son, Who is the image of the Father, is not a creation.

OTHER . If the Son is a creation, despite the fact that the Father is not created, and

He says about Himself: “ *He who has seen Me, has seen the Father* ,” then how in the created does the uncreated appear without change (ἀπαραλλάκτως)? And if, being a creation, <75.357> He says: “ *He who has seen Me, has seen the Father* ,” then what prevents us from saying the same words, if the Son is nothing other than us, since He is a creation, just like us ? But this is absurd, for it is not in the creation that the likeness (ἡ ὁμοιότης) of the uncreated [is revealed]. Therefore, the Son, [who is] the unchangeable image of the Father, is not a creation.

OTHER . If the Son is a creation, and at the same time speaks the truth, asserting: “ *All that the Father has is Mine* ” [859], - then God has no advantage over creatures, if they also have the same things as the Father. If this is absurd (for the Divinity is very distant from the creatures), then it means that the Son is not a creation, Who by nature has all the distinctive and exclusive [properties] of the Father.

OTHER. If the Son is a creation, then let God not be called His Father, but, most likely, Creator and Creator. For the son reveals the father, and the creation reveals the creator. If God is called and is the Father, then, therefore, the Son is not a creation, but a generation, revealing God not as the Creator, but as the Father.

OTHER. If the Son is a creation, then let Him not be called Word, nor Wisdom, nor Power, nor Radiance; or these [names] will be common to other creatures, if at all the Son, who is, in your opinion, a creation, is allowed to bear them. For even if you say that He has something greater than others, it will still be no less of [their] creation. If this is not said about any of the others, but truly befits only the Son, then, therefore, He is not one of the creatures, but the fruit of the Father’s essence.

OTHER . that *all If divine Scripture says* [860] through the Son, and you confess the Word to be a creature and not a Son, then God [in your opinion] does not have a Son. If this is true, then how will He be the Creator without Him through Whom He does everything? But God does and creates everything; therefore, the Son, who is everything, like God, avoids being a creation.

OTHER . *As if from the objection of our opponents* . By will, they say, having brought the Son into existence, the Father thus made Him the Creator. However, we do not say that He exists from the Father’s essence, so that in relation to this ineffable essence some kind of dissection and flow would not be thought.

Rebuttal to this . But this is nonsense and a fair amount of nonsense. For flow and dissection, and similar sufferings must be thought of <75.360> in relation to bodies, which are characteristic of suffering; and he who has escaped being a body will also escape the suffering inherent in bodies. So, he is incorporeal and gives birth indivisibly and dispassionately. For what kind of suffering is seen happening to the sun when it gives birth to light? What division occurs with fire when it emits the glow [born] from it? If they give birth indivisibly and dispassionately emit what [comes] from them, then

how will their Creator not much more [dispassionately] emit the radiance of His nature? When was the mark separated from the image? After all, it is always fused with it and exists in it. If, in their opinion, God's nature is dry and barren, then what is it - the effective will emanating from Him, which, in their opinion, even the Son existed, - which is something creative and constructive for those who did not exist before? ? For, avoiding saying that from the essence of the Father His creative Word was born, they are forced to do so by the truth. For the Son is the living and essential Will of the Father and His Word, by whom He accomplishes all things.

It is an observation from the divine Scripture that even in relation to sons by nature [the words] "born" and "were created" are used indifferently. Words do no harm when things are different. After all, even if the name slaves is used in relation to sons by nature, this does not abolish the dignity of their natural nobility. And if we say about a person who is born that he was created, then as long as he retains a more true [name], he does not suffer any harm from this word. For it is nature that is tested, and, of course, not the word. So, when it is said about God's begotten Word: " *faithful He who created Him is* ." [861], then one must not in vain build up the genuine [nobility] of His existence (τὸ γνήσιον τῆς ὑπάρξεως αὐτοῦ), but either think about the incarnation, or admit that the indifferent use of the word does not harm the truth. Bathsheba called Solomon a servant of David, saying: " *Your servant Solomon* " [862]. And fathers often call those born to them slaves, and servants sons. But words do not change nature, but rather indicate the power of those who choose to call [their sons or slaves] that way. For behold, Hezekiah says: " *From this day I will make children* ." [863]. it is written: " *He had* And about Job *seven sons and three daughters* ." [864]. So, if, in regard to people, we understand what has been said, paying attention not to the accuracy of words, but to the nature of things, then how will it not be necessary to adhere to the same way [of thought] in relation to the divine Generation?

OTHER . The name "son" means birth from the father, and "creation" means [something] formed from the outside. So, if He is the Son, then let him not be called a creature, and if he is a creature, then let him not be called a falsely named Son. But He is called and is the Son, and therefore is not a creature.

OTHER. A persuasive word showing that the Son is not a creature . The wisest Solomon said somewhere: " *For God will bring all creation into judgment* ." [865]. So, if the Son is one of the creatures, then He will also be brought to judgment. And how then will He be true, saying about Himself that " *The Father judges no one, but all judgment is given to the Sons* " [866]? Or how Daniel will not lie when he says that *He was given* [867]court? However, it is true: for He is *the one who comes to judge the living and the dead.* [868]. Therefore, He is not a creation and not one of all, so that He too would not be brought to judgment.

OTHER, [said] in narrative form, in response to the words: "Consider the messenger

and archpriest of our confession, Jesus Christ, who is faithful to him who created him. " [869], *and then [explaining] the meaning of the speech.*

The apostle does not say this in explaining the nature of the Word, but [His] economy in the flesh. After all, when He became the bishop of our confession; when - a messenger; when He was faithful to Him who created Him, if not when for our sake and for us He became man, and, according to the verb of John, " *The Word became flesh* " [870]? Then He, as a man, became faithful to Him who created Him, completing His work [871]as He Himself said; when he became a messenger, being sent for us and for our sake; then he became the bishop of our confession, bringing to the Father the confession of our faith and bringing His body [to slaughter], as if it were some kind of immaculate sacrifice, in order to cleanse us all with it. So, if it is said about the Son that He became faithful, that He became a messenger, that He became a bishop, then this statement must be attributed not to His essence, but to the quality of [His earthly] affairs (τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ποιότητος). Because Paul, being a man and already existing, became an apostle; and Moses in the same way became faithful *throughout all His house* [872]; and Aaron in the same way became a bishop, representing the Savior in ancient times. For just as Aaron was not born a high priest, but became one many years later, having put on the subir and ephod [873], and in other items of bishop's vestments that were made by women, so did Christ. For *in the beginning He is the Word* [874]and a long time later he became a high priest for us, like a kind of subiron, taking from a man's wife, that is, a temple [body], in order to cleanse people with His blood, like a blameless lamb, offering Himself [as a sacrifice] to God. For He *did not commit sin ; flattery would be found in His mouth.* [875].

That [the word] 'faithful" does not mean anything other than that He is true and unchangeable. The Savior is rightly called faithful, as having made one sacrifice for all, which is the same forever and does not change. For having once died for us, He will never see death again. And again, the Apostle [Paul], addressing certain people in the Epistle, says: " *God is faithful , who was called quickly into the fellowship of His Son .*" [876]. In the same way, Peter: " *Likewise those who suffer according to the will of God, for I will be faithful to the Creator and surrender their souls .*" [877]. The Apostle [Paul writes] to the Thessalonians: " *He who called you is faithful, and He will do it .*" [878]. In the same way, [in the Epistle] to others: " *Even though we do not believe, He remains faithful: for He cannot deny Himself* " [879]. So, Christ is faithful, since, even having become a man, he remained *the same - yesterday and today, and forever.* [880]. And He is faithful, just as it is said about the Father in the divine Scriptures that He is faithful.

To the words: "Let all the house of Israel understand that God created both the Lord and His Christ, even this Jesus, whom you crucified." [881]

Here, too, the word "created" must not be attributed to the essence of the Word, and one should not argue against the [eternal] existence of the Son on the basis of this word. But if you want to [understand] the word "created" in the sense of nature (φυσικῶς), then perceive it [as said] in relation to the temple created by Mary; and if in a practical sense (πραγματικῶς), then there is nothing in it that relates to the Word. It is as if to say: "Someone, being formerly poor, became the master of material goods" (χρημάτων γέγονε κύριος) or "not being originally a prophet, he was elevated by God to prophets." But in such [sentences] the word "became" (ἐγένετο) does not mean the beginning of being, but the fact that the subject has passed into a certain state from some other. Therefore, we must reverently examine how God made Jesus Lord and how Christ. For since, being God the Word and the Lord of all, He, having become man, became *in the form of a servant* , He is anointed, or called anointed, as befits a man. And He enters into the rights of dominion, again, as a man, although as God He is already the Lord. After all, the Word of God did not come [to earth] to bury God's free nature under *the image of a slave* , or so that, having left Ours, we be held by what is characteristic of humanity, but in order to elevate the slave to the honor of domination and transform the humiliated into our own nobility. For how are we called brothers of Christ, how are we called sons, if God's Word did not benefit us in anything when we became human? And if you hear how the Divine Scripture says that God created Him both as Lord and Christ, and you attribute the name God to the person of the Father, then in this way you agree that the Father also favors the wills of the Son. And He knows Him as the Lord even when He became *in the form of a servant* : however, the Son will not be alien to do this either. For whatever the Father does, it will all be the work of the Son; and whatever the Son does, the Father does it in every way. That is why the Savior says: " *I do nothing about myself* " [882], *The Father* in Me <75.365> *abide* , *He does the works* [883]" So, He becomes (γίνεται) Lord and Christ when He, having become a man and therefore called a servant, was called Jesus. For not just as the holy disciple said: " *God created His Lord and Christ* ," but he added: " *This Jesus, whom you crucified* ." You should also pay attention to the accuracy of what is written. After all, it is not said that [God] "created for himself the Word or the Son," but *the Lord and Christ* , which does not mean the beginning of being, but the transformation from something [one] into something else. And how He became Lord and Christ is stated above.

Otherwise about the same thing . " *God created His Lord and Christ* ," without bringing him from non-existence into being, - for the Word of God always existed even before the incarnation, - and none of the prudent here will understand "created" in

relation to the essence, so as not to fall into wickedness, claiming that it was only then that the Word of God began to exist for the first time when it became man. But “created” must be understood [as said] instead of “showed.” So Peter himself, talking with the Jews, said: “ *Jesus of Nazareth, a man from God, was known in you with miracles and signs and wonders, even as God did in your midst, even as you yourself knew.* ” [884]. So, by deeds showing His inherent dignity as a Father, He becomes the Lord of those who believe in Him, and also shows that He Himself is Christ. Therefore, He said to the rebellious Jews: “ *Even if you do not believe Me, believe by My works: that you may understand and believe that the Father is in Me, and I am in Him.* ” [885]·, and again: “ *Unless I do the work of My Father, do not have faith in Me* ” [886]. If, by the fact that He can do the works of the Father and have the Father in Himself, and likewise be in the Father, He is revealed to be the true God, then He has thus become the Lord of those who believe in Him and has shown that He is Christ; and if it is said that God made Him Lord, then that is also good. For, being recognized by works as the genuine and true generation of God, He rules over those who were once disobedient, testified as God by His own dignity and the nobility of [His origin] from the Father. After all, since He was fully known as the Son of God, He also became Lord, not only when He first began to be Lord (for He was always God and Lord), but when He was known by those who believed, then He became Lord over them.

Proof from divine Scripture that the Word was ever Lord and King. Abraham worshiped Him, calling Him Lord. In the same way, Moses says: “ *And the Lord will rain down from the Lord a bogey and fire on Sodom and Gomorrah.* ” [887]. Also the Psalmist: “ *The Lord said to my Lord: Sit right at my* hand .” [888]. And again: “ *Thy throne , O God, is for ever and ever.” For this sake of Thy anointing, the rod of righteousness is the rod* <75.368> *kingdom of Thy* ." [889]. And again: “ *Your kingdom is the kingdom of all ages* ” [890]. So, if even before the incarnation the Word of God was King and Lord, then how will he not be guilty of blasphemy who relates the expression “ *he created is* ” to essence? For He became Lord for us, who recognized Him as our Lord, when, having redeemed everyone with His blood, He showed Himself to be Christ and Lord.

Otherwise, about the same thing, using ourselves as an example . If it is said about a person, for example: “So-and-so became the master of such-and-such an estate,” then who would be so crazy as to think that his essence was created then, when he seemed to be the master of something? After all, he “became” (γέγονεν), not by himself then coming into a state of being, but by independently doing something (ὑφ" ἑαυτῷ τι ποιησάμενος). Think the same way about Christ. We once *served not by nature as a real god* [891] fell into corruption, but the Word of God became man by the good pleasure of the Father, so that, having freed us from error, he might become the Lord of all. And the Father anointed Him, so that through Him the power of the Anointed One might

spread to us. For in Christ the first arose (γέγονε) the good [qualities] of our nature, and the firstfruits of the Divine gifts to us [first appeared] in Him as in man, and through Him [was given to us] from God: for He was God in the flesh.

Otherwise, about the same thing. Blessed David sings somewhere and says: " *Be* (Γενοῦ) *my protector God* ." [892]; and also: " *And* poor *the Lord became a refuge for the* " [893]. But at the same time, no one will say that God was called into existence when he became a refuge for the poor. For He, having always been (ὢν) this and saving the oppressed, became (γέγονε) a protector for David, and a refuge for the poor. Just as He, therefore, what He always was, becomes again for the one who asks and prays, so Christ, being ever Lord and King, like God, became Lord for us when we, having hated the tyranny of the devil who kept us [in his power] , cried out to the Father: " *Send Thy light and Thy truth* " [894]. And the divine work is imputed by Scripture to God. For everything that surpasses human nature is rightly called the works of God.

* * *

[854] Hebrews 3:1 .

[855] This. 1:3 .

[856] Psalm 103:24 .

[857] 1 Cor. 1:24 .

[858] This. 14:9 .

[859] This is 16:15 .

[860] This. 1:3 .

[861] Hebrews 3:2 .

[862] 3 Emperor. 1:19 .

[863] Isaiah 38:19 .

[864] Job 1:2 .

[865] Eccl. 12:14 .

[866] This. 5:22 .

[867] Dan. 7:14 .

[868] Nicene–Constantinopolitan Creed .

[869] Hebrews 3:1–2 .

[870] This. 1:14 .

[871] This. 17:4 .

872 Hebrews 3:2 .

873 Ex.28:4 .

874 This. 1:1 .

875 1Pet.2:22 ; Isaiah 53:9 .

876 1 Cor. 1:9 .

877 1 Pet. 4:19 .

878 1 Thess. 5:24 .

879 2 Tim. 2:13 .

880 Hebrews 13:8 .

881 Acts 2:36 .

882 This. 8:28 .

883 This. 14:10 .

884 Acts 2:22 .

885 This. 10:38 .

886 This. 10:37 .

887 Gen.19:24 .

888 Psalm 109:1 .

889 Ps. 44:7–8 .

890 Psalm 144:13 .

891 Gal. 4:8 .

892 Psalm 70:3 .

893 Psalm 9:10 .

894 Psalm 42:3 .

Word 21 Word 23

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 22 Word 24

Homily 22. On [words] “No one has news of that day and hour, not even the angels of heaven, but only My Father.”

895

—

Objection from Christ-fighters. And how, they say, will the Son be essentially like the Father when He says that He does not know the day *of the end of the age?* [896], whereas the Father knows, as He Himself recognizes? After all, this shows a fair amount of dissimilarity and some natural difference.

Rebuttal to this. If He Himself is the Creator of centuries, years and <75.369> times - and He really is - then how is He considered by you not to know one day and one hour? So, we need to examine what He said to the disciples. And one can clearly see from this that, as God, He knows both the day and the hour, although, showing in Himself what is characteristic of man, He says that He does not know. After all, if He accurately describes everything that has to happen before this day and hour and says that, they say, this will happen, this will happen, and then the end, then it is clear that, knowing what is before him, He knows this day itself. For after what He has enumerated, He declares that [then] *the end* [897]. *What* else is the end, if not the last day, about which He economically said that He does not know it, once again preserving for humanity its due rank? After all, it is human nature not to know the future.

OTHER, in narrative form. In the words of the Savior it is necessary to examine the time when they were spoken by Him, for in this way we will avoid error. So, if before the incarnation of God the Word is found saying something humble about Himself, then let this be attached to His Divinity, and let [such] sayings apply to Him. And if then, when He *became flesh* [898], He used human expressions to truly show Himself to be also a man, then wouldn’t it be logical to apply what was said in a human way to humanity? For this means to perceive the tropos of economy. After all, if He did not become a man, then let him speak as God; and if he became a man, then let Him be allowed to speak like a man, despite the fact that the economy according to humanity does not harm Him in the least in relation to the Divinity. For this means what Paul said: “ *Captivating every mind to the obedience of Christ* .” [899]. So, the property of the Word, since He is the Word, is to know the beginning and the end of what He has

created; and one of the creations is time, and He who created it knows in every way how and for what time it was given to exist.

OTHER . [Christ] nowhere says, turning to the Father: " *Father, the hour has come: glorify Thy Son* ." [900]. So, if He knows exactly the hour about which He says that it *will come* . what prevents Him from knowing and the one about whom He, as a man, says that He does not know him, for the sake of what is proper to humanity (ignorance), but which He knows in every way as God ? And we must not condemn God the Word for this statement and not foolishly attribute to Him some kind of ignorance, but rather marvel at His love for mankind, according to which, out of love for us, He does not refuse to lower Himself into such humility in order to bear all our [infirmities] alone of which is ignorance.

OTHER. It is necessary to ask the anti-Christ fighters, why did the Savior, after listing the angels and the Son, not <75.372> mention the Spirit? After all, He did not say: "The Spirit does not know," but "the angels do not know, and the Son does not know." And He said "Son" simply, without adding "God." So, it is clear that about the angels He said that they do not know how to be created. Not wanting, for some secret economic reason, to say to the disciples: " *Who has understood the mind of the Lord, and who will be His counselor* ?" [901], so as not to appear to be hiding [something] from them, and thereby not upset them. He also called the Son ignorant, saying about Himself something extremely human. as about a person, but retaining for Himself, on the other hand, [the ability] to know everything. like God. That's why He didn't say it. that even the Spirit does not know. After all, if *the Spirit tests everything, even the depths of God* [902], - as it is written, it is obvious that He knows everything that is in Him. And if the Spirit, who knows everything and is able to explore everything, receives [this ability] from the Son, for *He* , says [the Savior], *will receive from Mine* [903], then how can one not know the Word, which gives [it] to the Spirit who knows everything?

OTHER . If the Father does everything through the Son, according to what Scripture says: " *without the Worthless thing there would be nothing* " [904], and one of all is to appoint the day and hour at which the world will come to an end, then this too is determined and sealed through the Son. How is it possible that He does not know certain things through Him? Therefore, He knows as God, although He says that He does not know, since He *was flesh* [905] and philosophizes as befits a man.

OTHER . If *all that the Father has is* the Son, as He Himself says, and the Father has knowledge of the day and hour, then it is obvious that the Son also has it. Because in this way. He will speak the truth, affirming: " *All that the Father has is Mine.* " [906].

OTHER . If the one who says the truth says: " *I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me* " [907], and the Father knows that day and hour, then the Son, who exists in the

Father and knows everything that is in Him, and has in Himself the knowing Father, also knows.

OTHER . The Son is called and is the unchanging image of the Father. If the Father knows the day and the hour, but the Son does not know, then how can one who does not know bear the image of one who knows? But He is the image of the Father, even if this was not pleasing to the Christ-fighters. Therefore, He is like the Father in this too, and as He knows, so does He.

OTHER . He who says that the Son, because He is the Word, does not know this day and hour, will not be free from accusations of blasphemy. After all, if He *knows the Father* [908] - as He Himself says, - what prevents Him from knowing the end of creation? If they say <75.373> that knowing the end of creation is more than knowing the Father, then they will be punished for blasphemy. If, then, to know the Father surpasses all knowledge, how can he who knows more not know less?

OTHER, in narrative form . Not [actually] not knowing, the Word - since He is the Word and Wisdom of the Father - says: “I do not know,” but showing in Himself human [nature], to which ignorance is most appropriate, for this is characteristic of humanity. So, since He took on our flesh, He pretended to have our ignorance (τὴν ἡμῶν ἄγνοιαν ἔχειν ἐσχηματίζετο). For the fact that He attributes ignorance to humanity, and not to His own nature, can be understood from here. After all, citing the history of the people who were in the time of Noah and saying: “ *Yadyahu , piyahu. I married, I encroached, until the flood came and took everything away* " [909], He immediately added: “ *Be on guard, for you also do not know at what time your Lord will come.* ” [910]; and again: “ *For at this hour, do not forget, the Son of Man will come* ” [911]. It would be fitting for Him - if indeed He, as the Word, were ignorant - to say: “I do not know on what day I will come, and at what hour I do not think I will be sent.” Since He attributed ignorance to the listeners of the time or day of His coming, it is obvious that He Himself, as the Word, knew it. And what He does not know, He speaks, because He has clothed itself in the likeness of those who tend not to know, that is, men.

OTHER . If, using the example of Noah, He wants to show the time of His second coming, when He will come, *judge the universe* [912], and is shown to those who did not know the day of the flood (after all, He said this to Noah: “ *Go you and your sons into the ark; for yet another seven days I will bring rain on the earth.* ” [913]), then, therefore, He knows the day and hour of His coming, so that the likeness of things may be preserved, and the image contained in them would point to this [His second coming].

OTHER, again on the same [words]: “Of that day and hour no one has news, not even the angels of heaven, but only My Father. ” [914]. When the Divine Scripture speaks of our Savior, Christ, that He hungered and thirsted, and was weary from the journey,

and slept in a boat, then what will the anti-Christ fighters do? Will they dare to say that this also refers to God the Word, or will they attribute this, as characteristic of humanity, to the flesh, and confess the Word of God to be free from this, since He is the Word? So, just as He allowed Himself, as having become a man, to hunger and thirst with men and endure other things that were said about Him, in the same way one should not be tempted, and if He, as a man, says that together with men knows, since he put on the same flesh as us. For He knows how Wisdom and the Word are in the Father, but He speaks “I do not know” for our sake and with us, as a man.

OTHER, by which it is clearly shown that the Savior knows some things, but due to dispensation he pretends not to know. The Savior says nowhere to His disciples: “ *Lazarus our friend was successful* ” [915]. Although no one told Him about this, [He speaks] as God, who knows everything. Then, having traveled a long way together with his disciples, He comes to the sisters of the aforementioned [Lazarus] and asks: “ *Where will you lay him* ?” [916]He who knew that he was dead, how could he not know the place where the body lay? But [of course He] knew. For it is incredible to know one thing and not the other. So, just as because of a certain dispensation He said that He did not know where Lazarus lay, so also about the day and hour - although He says that He does not know, [however] He does this, arranging something [for us] useful and good; for He knows as God does.

OTHER, carrying the same thought . Having arrived *in the countries of Caesarea Philippi,* the Savior *asked His disciples, saying: “Whom do men say I am, the Son of Man* ?” [917]; and when Peter, *having answered , said: “You are the Christ, the Son of the living God* ” [918], immediately added: " *Blessed are you, Simon, son of Jonah, as the Father revealed to you, Who is in heaven* " [919]. For *no one knows the Son except the Father* [920], - according to the words of the Savior Himself. And if the Father does everything through the Son, and one of the works is revelation, then the Word Itself turns out to have revealed to Peter what [was revealed to him] from the Father. How then does the opener ask as if he doesn’t know what people are saying? Of course, the appearance of ignorance often serves a purpose. Namely, knowing [in advance] what the disciples had to say, He asks a question in order to confirm faith by accepting their answer.

OTHER, in narrative form . The Son does not know the day and hour of His coming, since He is the Word and Wisdom, but, so as not to create sadness in the disciples by His reluctance to answer the question they asked, as a person says: “I don’t know,” having the right to say so, since He , as it is written, became flesh and took upon Himself the infirmities of the flesh. For what He said precisely for this reason that He did not know, we will understand from here. Indeed, after the resurrection from the dead, intending to finally ascend to heaven, when the disciples asked Him when the end would be and when He would come again, He answered, saying: “ *You cannot*

understand the times and years which the Father has laid down in His power .” [921]. But if He did not know, then He should have clearly said: “I already told you that I don’t know.” However, He denounces them as having asked unreasonably, and chastises them <75.377> as investigating something that is beyond their measure. So, it is obvious that even then He, although knowing everything like God, said in a human way that he did not know that day and hour, since this knowledge was above [the level of] the disciples.

OTHER . When we see God saying to Adam in paradise: “ *Where are you* ?” [922]; or to Cain: “ *Where is your brother Abel* ?” [923], - what do you say to this? If you say that He asks a question without knowing, then you will be clearly blasphemous. And if you admit that this introduces a certain image of economy, then do not be surprised if the Word of God, through which even then God asked questions to Adam and Cain, arranging something [for us] useful, says as a person that he does not know that day and hours, although he knows everything like the Wisdom of the Father.

OTHER, by which it is clearly shown that the Savior sometimes, economically, takes upon Himself the appearance of ignorance . When in the desert the Savior wanted to feed those who followed Him, He said to Philip: “ *How much bread do you have* ?” [924] And this question is asked as if by someone who doesn’t know. However, the evangelist immediately testifies, saying: “ *This is what he said, tempting Philip: He himself knows what he wants to do.* ” [925]. So, if He, knowing what He wants to do, asks as if he does not know, then what prevents Him from now, for the sake of some benefit, allowing Himself to say that He does not know the day and hour? And He does not lie when he says this, for, knowing as God the Word, He may not know as a man, but *in everything he will be like the brethren* [926], according to Pavlov.

Also on [the words]: “No one has news of that day and hour, not even the angels of heaven, except the Father alone.” [927]

The argument seems to be on behalf of heretics . Everything, they say, is known by the Father, but not everything by the Son, according to His own words; after all, they are best used for proof. So, if the Father knows this hour, but the Son does not know, then how can one who is not of the same nature be of the same nature as the omniscient?

Rebuttal to this. If the Son, in your opinion, does not know everything, oh, Christ-fighters! - then it is necessary to say that the divine Scriptures lie, and boldly confront the saints who speak about Him: “ *Who is all holy before their being* γενέσεως) *(* ” [928]. After all, one of the “all” is the day of the end [of the age], for nothing can be outside of “everything.” If the Son does not know this [day], then how does He know everything? But the verbs of the saints deserve to be true in every way. And the Son

knows everything. If the end must be considered one of all, then your sophism turns out to be in vain. For, of course, according to the economy, Christ says that he does not know the hour, and not in fact he does not know.

<75.380> *OTHER* . If Paul speaks the truth when he says that *everyone is naked and declared before Him* [929], - that is, before the Son, he means, - and this hour is one of all, then how does He not know it, *before whose eyes everything is declared* [930]?

OTHER . If you do not consider it blasphemous to say that the Son does not know anything that exists, then so be it, in your opinion. However, let us see if you are not mistaken in thinking this way about Him. From the thing itself we can conclude whether you are relying on the most rotten opinions, as if on a reed rod. The son said that he did not know just one day. So, if He does not know only this day, then He knows the others, and among the others is the one preceding this one. And how does one who knows the [day] preceding this one not know that the [day] that He knows is immediately followed by this one, which, in your opinion, is unknown to Him? After all, it is as if someone said that they do not know the number “ten” - what position it occupies - those who know [the number] “nine”. After all, it is obvious that a ten comes after a nine. So, if [the Son] knows [the day] before this, how will he not know it? How can he who says that He knows so many signs that precede the end not know that behind the signs is the end? So you appear crazy from everywhere, daring to lie about the truth. For the Son knows everything, although economically he says that he does not know something.

* * *

[895] Matthew 24:36

[896] Matthew 28:20 .

[897] Matthew 24:14 .

[898] This. 1:14 .

[899] 2 Corinthians 10:5 .

[900] This. 17:1 .

[901] Isaiah 40:13 .

[902] 1 Cor. 2:10 .

[903] This. 16:11 .

[904] This. 1:3 .

[905] This. 1:14 .

[906] This is 16:15 .

907 This . 14.10 .

908 Matthew 11:27 .

909 Lk.17:27 : Mt.24:39 .

910 Matthew 24:42 .

911 Matthew 24:44 .

912 Acts 17:31 .

913 Gen.7:1, 4, 7 .

914 Matthew 24:36 .

915 This. 11:11 .

916 This. 11:34 .

917 Matthew 16:13 .

918 Matthew 16:16 .

919 Matthew 16:17 .

920 Matthew 11:27 .

921 Acts 1:7 .

922 Gen.3:9 .

923 Gen.4:9 .

924 Matthew 15:34 ; Mark 6:38 .

925 This. 6:6 .

926 Hebrews 2:17 .

927 Matthew 24:36 .

928 Dan.13:42 .

929 Hebrews 4:13 .

930 Hebrews 4:13 .

Word 22 Word 24

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 23 Word 25

Homily 23. On [the words] “The Father loves the Son, and has given all things in His hand” [931] and to “All things have been handed over to Me by My Father” [932], and to “I can’t do anything about myself, but as I hear, I judge” [933], and other similar sayings

Objection from Heretics . And how is it possible, they say, for the Son to be essentially like the Father, saying about Himself that He received everything from the Father. For, having had, He would not have accepted. Since He is the one who has accepted, as He Himself says, it is obvious that He has nothing from Himself.

Rebuttal to this . So, when you hear the Son saying: “ *All that the Father has, they are Mine.”* [934], *and all of Mine are* the Father’s *essence* [935] "What are you going to do, heretic? After all, if the Son, in your opinion, has nothing of Himself, then neither does the Father; and if the Father by nature has everything, then the Son also has the same. So, it is necessary either, when saying that the Son has nothing, to refer this also to the Father, so that He appears to have what belongs to the Son, or - if this should be avoided - it is necessary to agree that the Son owns the same things as the Father. After all, He said that all of Him is the Father, and He Himself has everything that belongs to the Father.

<75.381> *OTHER, in narrative form* . It is not because the Son had nothing, it is said about Him that He received [everything] from the Father. For He by nature has, being His own Word and Radiance, everything that belongs to Him, except this alone to be and be called Father. He says that he received it from the Father, refuting in advance, like God, the [future] inventions of heretics. So that no one, seeing the Son having everything that belongs to the Father, from the very great similarity and unchangeable identity, would conclude that the Father and the Son are one and the same, and would not fall into the error of Sabellius, He, having all this by nature, he is forced to say that, he says, he received it from the Father, so that the word, introducing one giver and the other receiver, would show the Two in special hypostases, and not distinguished by names alone. And being the Father's own Word and originating from His essence, He

ever has everything that belongs to the Father. And what He received from Him, He says, because He came from Him, naturally possessing all His properties.

OTHER . What the Son says: “ *All things have been handed over to Me by My Father* ” [936], does not in any way harm Him in terms of Divinity, but rather clearly shows that He is by nature a Son. After all, if *the whole* to Him *essence is devoted* - and having said “ *all* ”, He left nothing outside [of this definition] - then, therefore, He is not one of all of whom He says that He accepted them, but has a special birth from the Father. Being the Son by nature, He possesses all the properties of the One who gave birth. The property of the One who gave birth is to have everything; therefore, the Son does not lack anything.

OTHER . If *everything* to Him *is given over* , as He Himself says, *and everything* is given *in His hands* [937], then He not only is not one of all, but also turns out to be the only heir, like the Son, for if He were one of all, then He would be numbered among all, and would not be an heir. Since He is the one who has received everything by nature and essence, it is obvious that, thanks to the authority and dominion of the One who gave birth to Him, He is necessarily different in relation to everyone, and the only Son of the Father.

OTHER, in narrative form . The Savior is nowhere found saying: “ *As the Father has life in Himself so will the Son have life in Himself* ” [938], which should be understood as follows. By saying “ *dade* ,” He signifies that which naturally has [everything] from the Father, and [at the same time] shows Himself by hypostasis to others in relation to the Giver; “to others,” I mean, only by count (μόνον τῷ ἀριθμῷ). And by saying: “ *As the Father has, so* also the Son has,” He obviously teaches that just as the Father always *has life in Himself* , so the Son always *has life in Himself* . So, if anyone dares to say that there was a time when the Father did not have life in Himself, then it is necessary to adhere to this <75.384> in relation to the Son. And if this is wicked, and we agree that the Father always has life in Himself, then the same will apply to the Son, for [precisely] this is what [the words] mean, that He *has such a thing, just as the Father does* . If, having always had it, He says that He accepted, then these words serve something wise and do not in the least harm the Son in the sense of nature.

OTHER . If you were to give a voice to the radiance [emanating] from the light, it would say: “The light has given me everything, for I am a candle like it.” Is it reasonable to say that the radiance might not have the power to shine at all? And how would it be then a radiance? If, however, being capable of shining, because it has everything that belongs to the light, and also born from it, it says that it has received everything from it, then how absurd would it be not to think of something more than in the example? in relation to God the Word? For, having by nature everything from the Father, He says that He received it from Him, since He was born from Him - with all that He has.

OTHER, on [words]: “To Me is given all power” [939] *and "Glorify Thy Son"* [940]*, and, more generally, about all those sayings where it is said that the Son was glorified or accepted something* . It is not from lack of glory or anything else that the Son, who is the Word, asks the Father or is called one who has received, but does this economically. For He accepts in a human way, for the sake of the appearance of likeness to us. But He is complete, like God. Since, being on his own, a person, even if he accepts any of the benefits from God, easily loses it (as happened with Adam , so that due to disobedience he became naked from the grace given to him), it was necessary - so that we do not fall into the same thing again - so that the immutable Word of God, having become man, would ask the Father for gifts [derived] from Him, so that the firmness of our nature would be preserved thanks to Him, the immutable and unchangeable. For grace, having received its beginning, abides unshakably in Christ, and He also gives us likeness [to Himself], since we are all in Him, since He became man and put on the same flesh with us. For, in this way, we are also called brothers, and it is said that we have become one [whole] in relation to God. So, for our sake He asks and receives from the Father what He has by nature as God. And since He accepted the flesh, which had a need for glorification, and it became His, and not someone else’s [flesh], then He justly appropriates to Himself what happens to it or next to it and, like a person who does not have it, accepts from the Father who by nature is both Son and God.

OTHER . If God's Word became man - and He did, and I think no one will object to this - then what prompts some not to allow Him to use human expressions? For he who did not deviate from the thing itself, but <75.385> brought Himself down into such humility, would not avoid appearing even more modest in words than He really is. So, if He did not become a man, then let some add humble words to the Word and say that He does not know, and needs glory, and receives something from the Father. And if He became a man, then let these sayings be related to humanity, and let no one slander God’s Word as not possessing [the same] perfection as the Father, and let no one blaspheme God’s true Generation.

OTHER . It is not God’s Word, since He is the Word, that is glorified and receives something from the Father, or is sanctified, but we are in Him. And for our sake, He Himself uses such expressions, and the Divine Scripture says something like this about Him. For if, as some think, it is appropriate to attribute such things to the Word of God, then they must take care lest the image of His coming be made vain, and our nature not be shown to be deprived of the grace [given] from God. After all, if the Word is glorified and sanctified according to the Divinity, then what is the benefit to people from the fact that He became a man? For it is He who has risen from the dead, not us. What prompted Him to become flesh? If it is to benefit human nature, then, according to their thought, it will be a futile undertaking, for it is not the flesh that is seen to have received any benefit, but rather He Himself.

And if He, when He became man, then [only] appears to have acquired glory, sanctification and power, and everything like that that relates to Him, then it is obvious that, in their opinion, being, in their opinion, a stranger before [His coming to us] all this, He receives it at the moment of coming. This means that He must express gratitude to the flesh by being better when He put on it, and not by improving it. But to think and speak like this is extremely wicked. For He came to glorify man and to sanctify. Therefore, it is not the Word that has accepted anything, for He is perfect, just like He who gave birth to Him, but we accept Him in Him when He has taken on our flesh. For just as with His rebellion we also rose, and also when He ascended and the ascension into heaven was renewed for us, so when it is said of Him that He was glorified and sanctified, [in fact] it is we who benefit from these [benefits] .

OTHER, by which it is clearly shown that He had [everything] as God, asking for our sake [it] as a man. Christ nowhere says: “ *Father, glorify Thy Son* ” [941]. And again: “ *Everything is devoted to Me by the Father* ” [942]. And after the resurrection he says: “ *has been given All authority in heaven and on earth* to Me .” [943]. But even before everything was handed over to Him, He is shown to be the Lord of all. For *the whole thing was* [944], and the Psalmist, recognizing their servile position in relation to the Creator, says: “ *For all things are Your work* .” [945]. However, [Christ] is shown asking for glory, although He is the Lord of Glory. For this is what Paul said about some: “ *Even though they* [75.388] *understood , they crucified the Lord of glory* .” [946]. And that even before He asked the Father for glory, He had it as the Son—He Himself clearly teaches this, saying: “ *Father, glorify Your Son with glory, even though before You there was no peace.* ” [947]. If, on the one hand, He confesses that before the [emergence of] the world he had glory, and on the other hand, now asks for it as if he did not have it, then it means that He is doing this for our sake, and our request has been fulfilled in Him. calling glory upon human nature. Saying after the resurrection: “ *has been given All power* to Me ” [948], He is shown to have it even before the resurrection. For if He did not have it, then how, reproaching the devil, says: “ *Follow Me, Satan* ” [949]? How He gave His disciples power over demons [950]? Like *Abraham's daughter* [951]bound, as it is written, by the devil, did He resolve, as having authority? Or how he gave health to the paralytic [952]? How he absolved a sinful wife of her sins [953]? How he raised the dead [954]? How he opened the eyes of the blind [955]? So, from here it is clear that He speaks words befitting a man, not when the Word was outside the flesh before His coming, but when He became a man, calling upon us gifts from the Father. For thus it is said that we *will be partakers of the divine nature* [956], since the Word clothed itself in our humility in order to raise us to His height, and not Himself to remain down, like us. That is why, being human by nature, we are called gods, as we are also in Christ, for Christ is the [true] God.

OTHER . If some try to apply humble words of the flesh to the Divinity of the Word, what will they say when they see Christ working miracles through the flesh? For,

having spat and made clay, He healed the blind; stretching out his hand and touching the coffin, he raised up the widow's only begotten son; Having made a sound through [the tongue, which is an organ of] the body, he called Lazarus out of the tomb. After all, He did all this through the flesh, but these were not works of the flesh. And as those who look at the nature of things, we attribute to the power of the Divine the achievement of the result, even if [the work] was accomplished through the flesh, so when He, because of the flesh, says something human, we do not apply it to God's Word, but, considering it as alien to the Divinity , we relate to the flesh. For, in this way, each of the things He has done or spoken, as if putting them in their place, we find ourselves having an unmistakable knowledge of our Savior.

OTHER, in narrative form . The Divine Scriptures proclaim one Christ, for *there is one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ* [957]. After all, God is known from works that belong only to God. Since it is fitting for the Word who became flesh, as it is written, to reveal Himself as a man, <75.389> and this could in no way be seen except from the impeccable passions and words of the flesh, then He, of necessity, speaks and does those things befitting men, so that in this way show yourself as a human being. Therefore, one can see both in Him. For He humanly asked where Lazarus lay, and raised him up as God. And [Her] Mother, who said: " *They have no wine* " [958], He, as a man, reproached, but immediately [as God] turned water into wine. For He was true God in the flesh, and the flesh was truly in God. So, from which it was necessary to know God, He does it in a divine way; and that from which He is necessarily seen as truly human, He does and says, imparting truth to the mystery [of His incarnation]. So let it be given to God what is due to God, and to humanity what is due and due to him, and thus the one who believes in Him will be beyond all temptation and error.

OTHER. As if out of objection . They say: [The Savior said] " *All things have been handed over to Me by My Father* ." [959]. And he who has accepted everything from another obviously has nothing of himself; and how will such a one be in essence similar to the possessing God and Father?

The refutation of this is, as it were, by reductio ad absurdum. If the Son, who accepted everything, seems to have nothing of Himself, then the Father, who gave everything, now has nothing in Himself. But this is absurd! For how can the Father be empty of what is inherent in Him by nature? But He has everything, even giving it to the Son; It is obvious that although the Son says that He received, there was no time when He was empty of this. For He accepts humanly, but by [Divine] nature He has all this, just like the Father.

OTHER . Christ says somewhere: " *The Father loves the Son* [960]*, and the realm was given to Him to execute judgment, for the Son of Man is* [961]" So, if He receives the power to judge for no other reason, but solely *because He is the Son of Man* , then He receives it not because He is the Word and God, but because He became man. So, it is

necessary to ascribe to humanity the receipt, and to the Divinity of the Son, the natural possession of everything that belongs to Him who gave birth to Him. For, thus, He will also be the unchanging Image of the Father.

* * *

931 This. 3:35 .

932 Matthew 11:27 .

933 This. 5:30 .

934 This is 16:15 .

935 This. 17:10 .

936 Matthew 11:27 .

937 This. 3:35 .

938 This. 5:26 .

939 Matthew 28:18 .

940 This. 17:1 .

941 This. 17:1 .

942 Matthew 11:27 .

943 Matthew 28:18 .

944 This. 1:3 .

945 Psalm 118:91 .

946 1 Cor. 2:8 .

947 This. 17:1,5

948 Matthew 28:18 .

949 Luke 4:8 .

950 Matthew 10:1 ; Mark 6:7 .

951 Luke 13:16 .

952 Matthew 9:2-7 ; Mark 2:3-12 ; Luke 5:18–25 .

953 This. 8:3-11 .

954 Mark 5:41–42 ; Luke 7:14–15; 8:54–55 ; John 11:43–44 .

955 Matthew 9:29–30; 12:22; 15:30; 20:30; 21:14 ; Mark 8:23–25; 10:51–52 ;

Luke 7:21; 18:42 ; John 9:6–7 .

956 2 Pet. 1:4 .

957 1 Cor. 8:6 .

958 This. 2:3 .

959 Matthew 11:27 .

960 This. 3:35 .

961 This. 5:27 .

Word 23 Word 25

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 24 Word 26

Word 24. On what the evangelists said about the Savior in human terms, on "crying" [962], "Today my soul is troubled" [963], on "even if it is possible, let this cup pass from Me" [964] and "my soul is sorrowful" [965], and similar sayings. There are convincing examples from the Divine Scriptures that refute the evil-mindedness of those who oppose Christ.

If we believe that these words were uttered by someone from ordinary people or just <75.392> a person, then let him cry like a person, fear and fear death, be sad and embarrassed, and endure everything that human nature usually endures. If He was God in the flesh - and He was Him, and nothing else - then what is God afraid of ? If He was truthful when He said: " *I am life* " [966], then how is Life afraid of death? If He saved others from death, then how He Himself feared death, Who exhorted the disciples to think boldly and said: " *Do not be afraid of those who kill the body but are not able to kill the soul.* " [967]? How He Himself was afraid to endure this, if He encourages Abraham, saying: " *Do not be afraid, for I am with you* ." [968]? If He made Moses formidable for Pharaoh, and said to Joshua: " *Be strong and take courage* ." [969], then how will He Himself be subject to fear? Or how He feared people, Who advises others not to be afraid and, convincing them, cries out: " *The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear: what can man do to me* ?" [970]How did He who came to slay death Himself fear that which He came [to fight] against? And how is it not beyond the bounds of all wickedness to call Him fearing hell, Whom his *gatekeepers* , as soon as *they saw* , *were afraid* [971]and, opening the gates through which no one could escape (τὰς ἀφύκτους πύλας), they released the spirits imprisoned [in hell] (τὰ ἐναποκλεισθέντα πνεύματα) [972]so that many saints rose up and entered the city [973], as it is written, and were seen by some? How afraid of death was He who said to those who came to look for Him: *I am* " " [974]? How he was afraid of death when he said: " *The region of the Imam has laid down My soul, and the region of the Imam has again accepted it* ." [975]and also: " *No one will take it from Me, but I take it for Myself* ." [976]? Therefore, it was not the Word itself that feared death, but there was in it a human [nature], which always tends to experience this [feeling].

OTHER, in narrative form . Those who wish to correctly understand what is said in the Divine Scriptures about our Savior Christ must in every possible way examine the time and moment at which either He Himself appears to be saying something about Himself, or the Divine Scriptures [speak] about Him. So, if before the Word of God became flesh, He was ever seen crying or afraid of death, or suffering any other human [suffering], then He must now assimilate all of the above. And if, when He became a man, then the divine Scriptures spoke such words about Him, then why don't we better say that these were spoken humanly, in order to avoid the evil that comes from blasphemy?

OTHER. As if from the objection of the Christ-fighters . He who wept, they say, became frightened and became sad, how will he be God by nature? For such things are characteristic of people.

<75.393> *Rebuttal to this.* Who raised Lazarus from the dead and turned water into wine, and gave sight to a man blind from birth, who said? " *I and the Father are one* " [977], - how could he not be God by nature? For what is perfect is seen as the works of God. And if you are tempted by what was said and done humanly, then why did not what He did and said in a Godly manner bring you any benefit? And again: if thanks to these [statements] you descend to the point of thinking something derogatory about the Son of God, then why don't you rise through these to think great and sublime things? For he who humbly said and endured this, said and did this sublimely, like God. Therefore, the incarnation and dispensation of [His] coming in the flesh was a necessary reason for something human to happen [to Him].

OTHER . May the economy of [Christ's] coming in the flesh and the image (ὁ τρόπος) of His incarnation be examined, and may some of those who hear what the divine Scriptures speak very humanly about the Savior be far from any temptation. So, the purpose of the Word incarnate was to clearly show that He truly took on flesh and became man, without ceasing to be God (for it was impossible to save the human race otherwise); but so that no one who hears that He *was flesh* would think that the immutable Word of God was transformed (μεταπεποιῆσθαι) and became something different from what It was from the beginning, He, of necessity, pronounces words befitting a person, then it shows the deeds that we can owe to the Divine alone (πράγματα θεότητι μόνη χρεωστούμενα), so that both are considered together. So, when He needed to clearly show that He is truly a man and not a ghost, He hastens to show this with the help of the former. For He, as sinless and unable to sin, rightly rejects sin, but allows the body and humanity to suffer what is natural to Him, as proof that He really and truly took on flesh and became man, *according to the Scriptures* [978]. Since, as we have already said above, it became Him who began to reveal Himself as God in the flesh, He from time to time performs the deeds befitting God and says to those who see Him: " *If you do not believe Me* , because, therefore, you see Me as a

man, *believe in My deeds .” “That you may understand and believe that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me .”* [979]. So, what was said and done magnificently shows the Savior as God. Conversely, what was said and done humanly shows Him to be truly human. For this is the meaning of the sacrament.

OTHER . Opponents of Christ from everywhere appear to be shameless and aiming to vainly swear at the Son of God. For, hearing Him say: “ *I and the Father are one* ” [980], they recklessly do not believe [Him] and try to interpret what was said in a different sense, not allowing the Son to be one with the Father, but trying to distort what was well and truly said. On the other hand, finding in the Gospels what He suffered or said as a man - such as, for example, that He cried, was sad, and the like - do not attribute this to humanity, but, applying it directly to the Word, lead as proof that the one who suffers this is not God, so that He, who is its Creator, is also counted among the creation. So, either allow the Son to be one with the Father, and then you will not find the Word, being in identity with the Father, in Himself - since He is the Word - weeping or grieving, or giving in to fear; or - if you do not believe Him, who said that He is one with His Father, - do not believe when He says that He was saddened. And then you will be with the unbelieving Jews, not accepting at all anything that the Savior said.

OTHER . Paul says nowhere about the Son of God: “ *He who was in the image of God was not equal to God by admiration, but He diminished the form of a servant and received Himself in the likeness of a man.* ” [981]. So, the Word of God became man; It did not come into man, as [it was] in the prophets, but truly it became the same as we are, except for sin alone. Consequently, on the one hand, He is God, since He is the Word of the Father and the Property of His nature, and on the other hand, He is a man, since *there is flesh* , as it is written, and He put on our flesh. So, since this is the nature of faith regarding our Savior Christ, then we should distinguish the sayings spoken about Him according to the meaning appropriate to [them]. And when you hear: “ *I and the Father are one* ,” contemplate [mentally] the one Divinity of the Father and the Son and think of the Son as God, existing from the essence of the Father. And when, on the other hand, you hear about Him that He cried, became sad or was afraid, or *began to grieve* [982], think - after the fact that He is God - that He is a man, and apply to humanity what applies to him. After all, since He received a mortal and corruptible body, subject to such passions, He, of necessity, along with the flesh, assimilates to Himself its passions, and when it endures them, He Himself is called the one who endures. Thus, we say that He was crucified and died, although this happened to the flesh, and not to the Word Himself, for It is impassive and immortal. Therefore, let us Orthodoxy understand what has been said, referring to the Divinity what is fitting for God, and to the flesh - that which is said for its sake or, as it were, on its behalf, due to the natural movements existing in us, which the mind, possessing feeling, extracts from the implicit and silent whisper from depths outwards.

OTHER, in narrative form . God's Word became man for no other reason, but in order to somehow mix and co-dissolve all of His own with our weaknesses, to give strength to human nature and transform it according to His strength. So, when He appears to those who fear death and says: " *If it is possible, let this cup pass from Me* " [983], you also think that the flesh that fears death, being carried by the Word, has learned to no longer experience this [fear]. After all, He said to the Father: " *Not as I will, but as You will* ." [984]. For He Himself, since He is the Word and God, feared death, but sought to complete the economy. For this was the will of the Father. He also has a reluctance to die, since the flesh naturally resists death. So, teaching humanity no longer to think about what is inherent to it, but to seek the will of God, He, as a man, says: " *Not as I will, but as You will* ." That's why he adds: " *The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak* ." [985].

OTHER . If we find the saints so contemptuous of death that they seem rather to pass into life when certain circumstances call them to suffer, and they are truly courageous because they have within them Christ, who dwells, as it is written, in the inner man [986], then how does [Himself] fear death when he teaches others to despise death? Isn't it absurd to marvel at the courage of those who have the Word within them, but to think about the Word Itself that It is so weak and not courageous that it is overcome by fear and the disease of cowardice?

OTHER . By His own death the Savior abolished death. And just as death would not have been abolished if He had not died, so [the situation is] in relation to each of the passions of the flesh. For if He had not been afraid, then [our] nature would not have become free from timidity; if she had not been saddened, she would never have gotten rid of sadness; If I hadn't been embarrassed, I would never have gotten out of this. And, applying this logic to each case in which Christ behaved as a human being, you will find that the carnal passions in Him were set in motion not to gain the upper hand, as in us, but so that, having set in motion, they would be abolished by the power of the indwelling in the flesh of the Word, while nature is transformed into the best.

OTHER, on [words]: "My God, My God " [987]. We boast in the cross of our Savior Christ and believe that we are saved thanks to the fact that God's Word became man for our sake and was crucified for us, in order to abolish the death that is in us, and to raise us again with Himself, translating us from corruption into incorruption. So, it was fitting for Him, even in the very hour of suffering, to show that He had truly become a man, and not only imagined as a man. And for this reason He uttered the words befitting a man: " *My God, My God, have you forsaken Me forever* ?" [988]; and « *Let a cup pass by* <75.400> *Me* » [989]. By His deeds, He who was crucified for us and endured so much on the cross for the salvation of us all showed that He is God. For He hid the rays of the sun and clothed the sky in darkness, tore apart the stones and the earth, and the veil of the temple, and besides this He performed other great [signs] in

order to reveal Himself as God incarnate. And so, those who crucified Him and had previously laughed at Him, seeing what was accomplished in a divine way, say: " *Truly this is the Son of God* ." [990].

OTHER . God's Word became man not in order to again do everything and speak as God before becoming man, but so that often and for the benefit of the economy [performed] with the flesh, he could say something like a man. And since this is the meaning of the sacrament [of the Incarnation], is it not absurd to be tempted by hearing Him sometimes speak humanly? For He speaks as a man, but He also speaks as God, having the power to do both. So, humanly He says: " *Today My soul is troubled* ." [991]; and, on the other hand, in a divine way: " *The imam will lay down the region, and the imam will again accept the region.* " [992]. To be embarrassed is the own passion of the flesh, but to have *an area to put and an area to accept again* is a matter of the power of the Word. So, when He says something in a divine way, although He appears to be a man, we are not tempted, realizing that for our sake He became a man and speaks in a manner befitting a man.

OTHER . Because of His great and immeasurable love for mankind, God's Word mixed Himself with us: not in order to transform Himself into our [state], for He is immutable and does not know change, but in order to mix us with Himself and transform us into His. For just as we, having received Him because of His dwelling in the flesh, henceforth have all of Him, - after all, we are called both sons and gods, although not by nature, like Him, but by grace - so He, when mixed with us Having become a man, he bore our infirmities [993], and how the victim himself is considered to have taken upon himself, together with the received temple [of the body], and what is in it, so that carnal passions may also be mortified in us, striving for the likeness of Christ, who for our sake took into himself.

OTHER . God says nowhere through St. prophets, reproaching certain sins of those from among the [sons of] Israel, that they " *have led their children through the fire that I did not command them, but have thought lower in My heart.* " [994]. And again, as if [addressing] Jerusalem: " *And she made me sad in all of these* ." [995]. And also, regarding other vices: " *Eat* <75.401> *? Am I not angry because of these," says the Lord, "or will my soul not take revenge on such people* » [996]So, what will the anti-Christ fighters do when it is obvious to everyone that it was the Word of God who spoke such things in the prophets? Will they attribute soul and heart to Him, will they say that He is possessed by the passion of sorrow and anger, so that the Word of God, which exists above all created nature and is as great as the Father, does not seem to have any advantage over man? But perhaps they will still shy away from this, and will say that this is spoken by the Word figuratively (τροπικώς) and out of condescension [to the level of perception of those who hear]. So, if in the case when the Son of God says such things before His coming, we preserve for Him the dignity due to Him,

affirming that He is above sorrow, and anger, and in general all passion, at least for the sake of [people's] benefit and assumed the appearance of one undergoing such things, is it not absurd, when He became a man and descended [to earth] in the flesh undergoing these passions, to deny Him that, while saying such things, He remains impassive, while the flesh which He took on for our sakes together with everything inherent in it by nature, endowed with it by nature? It is common for humanity to cry, be embarrassed, be upset, be disgusted by death and similar experiences.

* * *

962 Luke 19:40 .

963 This. 12:27 .

964 Matthew 26:39 .

965 Matthew 26:38 .

966 This. 14:6 .

967 Matthew 10:28 .

968 Isa.43:5 . We do not find the words "Μὴ φοβοῦ, ὅτι μετὰ σοῦ εἰμι" or similar ones addressed to Abraham in the Bible. Similar words (μὴ φοβοῦ μετὰ σοῦ γάρ εἰμι) are addressed in Genesis 26:24 to Isaac *: " And the Lord appeared to him that night and said: I am the God of Abraham thy father; fear not, for I am with thee ."*

969 Nov. 1:6 .

970 Psalm 117:6 .

971 Job. 38:17 .

972 Sr.: 1Pet.3:19 .

973 Matthew 27:52–53 .

974 This. 18:5,8 .

975 This. 18:5,8 .

976 This. 10:17 .

977 This is 10:30 .

978 1 Corinthians 15:14 . Words from the Creed .

979 This. 10:38; 14:10 .

980 This is 10:30 .

981 Phil.2:6–7 .

[982] Mt. 26:37 ; Mark 14:33.

[983] Matthew 26:39 .

[984] Matthew 26:39 .

[985] Matthew 26:41 .

[986] Eph. 3:16–17 .

[987] Matthew 27:46 ; Psalm 21:2 .

[988] Matthew 27:46 ; Psalm 21:2 .

[989] Matthew 26:39 .

[990] Matthew 27:54 .

[991] This. 12:27 .

[992] This. 10:17 .

[993] Compare: Isa.53:4 ; Matthew 8:17 .

[994] Jer.7:31 . The first part of the sentence is different in the original text of this verse, but the expression “to pass through the fire” is found many times elsewhere in Scripture. These words are also present in the Russian Synodal translation of the almost identical verse of Jer. 32:35 (corresponds to Jer. 39:35 of the Septuagint): “They built temples for Baal in the valley of the sons of Hinnom, to bring their sons and daughters through the fire in honor of Molech, which I did not command them, and it did not occur to Me.” Perhaps St. Cyril, like the Russian translators, used the version of Scripture in which they were, and, as can be observed with him in other cases, he mixed two similar verses.

[995] Ezek.16:43 .

[996] Isa.57:6 ; Jer.9:9 .

Word 24 Word 26

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 25 Word 27

Word 25. On [words]: “The firstborn of all creation” [997], [that] the Son is not a creature

Objection from Christ-fighters . If, they say, the Son is not a creature, He would not be called “ *the firstborn of all creation* ”; for, as having a great affinity [998] with the created ones - even though He was the first of them, and exists before all - They are called by this name.

Rebuttal to this. It is not difficult to object to such attacks by heretics. If the name “First-born” ranks the Son among the creatures, then the name “Only Begotten” in every way removes Him [from among creation]. For just as no one would be called “firstborn” unless he had many brothers, among whom he is the firstborn, so he would not be the only begotten if he were not the only one who is not numbered among the others. How is He both the firstborn and the only begotten? After all, both this and this [definition] must be preserved. Since the divine Scripture calls Him by both names, it is necessary to ask those who accurately understand the divine Scriptures how He is the firstborn, and [at the same time] in some way also the only begotten. So, He is the Only Begotten - since He is the Word [born] from the Father, having no brothers by nature and not being ranked with anyone else; for the Son of God is one and only. And He is the firstborn not simply and not absolutely, but *in many brethren* [999], as written. And when did He become our brother, if not when He took on our flesh? Consequently, He then <75.404> became the firstborn when He revealed many sons of God by grace.

OTHER. “The firstborn of all creation” He is called not as being the first in time from it, nor as one who is of the same essence with creation, but, as has already been said, because of [His] condescension to creation and likening us. However, it would be good to observe [how] He is called the Only Begotten, and [how] the First-Born. So, when He is called the Only Begotten, no reason is added to this why He is the only begotten. He is called that way, but he is called absolutely: “ *The Only Begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father* .” [1000]. When the divine Scriptures call Him the Firstborn, they immediately bring those among whom He is the firstborn: “ *Firstborn in many brethren* .” [1001], and " *Firstborn from the Dead* " [1002]. After all, since it was

fitting for the Son of God, Who by nature belongs to primacy, not to lose it even when He became man, He, in justice, and having accepted the likeness to us, takes primacy in relation to all creation. For due to the fact that He became a man, He will not be less than anyone in terms of the dignity due to the Divine nature, but even so He will take precedence and lead all creation in general, since He is its Creator and Lord. So the evangelist says: “ *We have seen his glory, the glory of the Only Begotten from the Father* .” [1003].

OTHER. If, according to Pavlov’s words, *were created things all kinds of* [1004], then He will be different in relation to everyone. For, having said “all kinds,” he left nothing outside [this definition], no matter what came into being thanks to Him. Therefore, the Son will not be a creature, but rather the Creator of all things, as it is written. After all, the Divine Scripture did not say that He is the firstborn from other creations, so that He would not really be thought of as existing from among them, but says that He is *the Firstborn of all creation* , so that thanks to this, when all scattered creation, so to speak, is put together , – He would be considered different in relation to her. And that which exists outside all creation cannot be a created essence, but will be different in comparison with it. And that is why the divine Scripture, well aware of this observation, did not call Reuben the firstborn of all the children of Jacob, so that he would not be thought of as different from them, but says with all accuracy that he is the firstborn of Jacob and his brothers [1005].

OTHER . If some, because the Son is called *the firstborn of all creation* , try to number Him among the creation, then He will also be among them all. If we agree to this, then He will be the firstborn of Himself, since, being *the firstborn of all creation* , <75.405> He Himself [in their opinion] is among all. This means that He will be both first and second in relation to Himself. If, because He is the firstborn of all creation, we think of Him as being outside of everything, then He will be before all (πρῶτος τῶν πάντων) [1006]. And if He is counted among “everyone,” then He will be second in time in relation to Himself: this way – first, and that way – second.

OTHER . If, due to the fact that He is called the firstborn of all creation, He will also be one of the creations, and [at the same time] everything will be [1007], then He will, in your opinion, be the creator of Himself, and the creator is created, moreover, by Himself. After all, if He is among everyone, and everything is through Him, then what is said will be true. And if all creation *is complete in Him* [1008], then how can the One who makes everything happen be one of all?

OTHER, said narratively, according to pious speculation, according to which He is thought to be the First-Born . " *Firstborn in many brothers* " [1009], since He became like us in everything except sin, and since He took on our flesh, calling ourselves our brother, it is rightly so called.

" *Firstborn* and *from the dead* " [1010], for He was the first to resurrect His flesh into incorruption and the first to exalt it into heaven. That’s why he says: “ *I am the way* ” [1011], and “ *I am the door* ” [1012]. For through Him human nature learns to follow a new path of resurrection, and, as if through a certain door, enters the same heaven.

OTHER, about how to piously understand [the expression]: “ *The firstborn of all creation* ” [1013].

Because of the Father’s love for mankind, which He has for all His creations, the Son called Himself *the firstborn of all creation* , and by condescension [1014] He does not even refuse to count Himself among the created ones, so that, since He is called the firstborn of them, for His sake even that which comes after Him would be saved. For if in every way it is fitting for Him to be the firstborn, then in every way those of whom He is the firstborn remain. So He is the Only Begotten by nature, since He alone is from the Father, *God from God, Light from Light* [1015] shining forth, and the Firstborn - for our sake, so that all creation would be, as it were, grafted into an immortal root and grown from the Ever-Bearing One. For *everything was the same* , and *took place* forever, and is preserved by Him.

OTHER . If, because He is called *the firstborn of all creation* , we number the Son among the creation, as being by nature a creation, then He will be the first of it in time, but akin to it by nature and, since He is a creation, similar [to all] other things. Consequently, He will be akin to dumb animals, birds and fish. For these, although small, are nevertheless parts of the whole creation. But this is absurd. Therefore, it will be pious to think of Him as *the firstborn among many brothers* , because [many] by grace were called to adoption. <75.408> *And* He will be supreme of all creation, as existing before it and bringing it into being, Himself not being a created essence.

OTHER. He is called the *firstborn in many brethren* because those saved by Him are called to adoption as sons of God; and also the firstborn or the firstfruits from the dead - because He first rose [from death] into incorruption; so also that He *was created* as *the beginning of paths* [1016], it is said because through Him all can strive towards salvation.

That for no other reason is He called the Only Begotten than because He is the only one truly begotten

Apology literally. If He is the Only Begotten because He was created without the mediation of [anyone], then He was created involuntarily (ἀβουλήτως γέγονεν); and if there is not one of those created for whom the will of God does not serve as a mediator, then He is not the Only Begotten because He was created without mediation, but because He alone is the fruit of the Father.

OTHER . If He is the Only Begotten because, in your opinion, He alone was created by Him, then He who created only Him, and not all, will not be the Creator of all. If the Father is the Creator of everything in general - for *from Him is everything* - then the Son, therefore, is the Only Begotten, not as the only one who existed, but as the only one born by nature.

OTHER . If He is the Only Begotten because He alone was created by one [only the Father], and just as the sun alone creates the day, then the day will be called the only begotten [child] of the sun. And if someone became the inventor of one [any] art or the author of one painting, then his only children will be the only [works] that he created. If no one has ever called the work [of this same author] the only begotten [to the author], then how will the Son be thought of by the Only Begotten as created, and not as begotten?

OTHER . If not as the only begotten, and not created, He is called the Only Begotten, and the daughter of Jephthah is also called the only begotten [1017], then she too will be his only business, and not his creation. Or, if we recognize her as the only begotten because she alone was born from her father, then the Son, obviously, will be the Only Begotten because He alone from birth is the heir of the Father’s essence.

OTHER . If He is the only begotten because He is the only one created as such, and the sun is the only one created as it is, then it will also be the only begotten. If, although many creatures are created in the singular, they are not called the only begotten, then, therefore, the Only Begotten [is also called so] not as the only one created as such, but as the only one begotten.

<75.409> *OTHER* . If He is the Only Begotten because He alone prevails over all, and the Father also prevails over all, then He [i.e. e. Father] can be called the Only Begotten. If He is not the Only Begotten, although He is superior to everyone, then the Son is the Only Begotten, not because of superiority over the created ones, but because of His birth from the Father.

OTHER . If He is the Only Begotten because He alone is the messenger of the Father’s wills, and our (that is, rooted within us) word is the only thing that proclaims the wills of [our] mind, then He too can be called the only begotten son of the mind. If from all eternity no one has called the word that reveals the secret thoughts of the mind the only begotten, then how is the Son the Only Begotten, as a proclaimer, and not, rather, as begotten?

OTHER . If He is the Only Begotten because He alone is the Creator of those who come after Him, then He will have no one creating with Him, no one who has created anything, except the Father alone. If everything was created by Him, as by Wisdom, and by Him *the heavens were established, and by the Spirit* of God *all their power* [1018], then it is unnecessary to call Him the Only Begotten, as being the Creator of those who

come after Him, and not as the only Creator, born by nature from God.

OTHER . If the only thing created, and not the only thing truly begotten, is the only begotten, then Sarah's son is not the only begotten, since he was not created by her, but begotten.

OTHER. If He is the Only Begotten because His Father alone existed, then He Himself will no longer be the firstborn, since the rest of the brothers are not from the Father. If He truly is the firstborn, *preeminent in all* [1019], then He, therefore, is not only the Only Begotten as the one who existed, but as the only good Fruit born of the good Father.

OTHER. If the First-Born (πρωτότοκος) from God, as born the first of many, is also the first-born of the Virgin, then He must also be from Her, as it were, the first of the rest. If He, being the only one, and not before others, born of Mary, is called Her *firstborn* (πρωτότοκος) [1020], then, therefore, He is firstborn from God, not as the first of many, but as the only one born.

OTHER. If He is the Firstborn because He was born first of all others, and what is born first does not differ from those born after Him from the same [parent], then the Son, therefore, will not be better than those who come after Him. If what creates differs in everything from what is created, and the Son creates, then He must differ from everyone; and how then <75.412> will He be the firstborn of His creations, Who first became for them the name "son"?

OTHER . If the first are recognized as the culprits of the second, and first there was God and the Son of God, then it means that the Son is also the culprit of those [sons] about whom we are speaking, as [being] from Him. Therefore, the author of the second sons, if he is called the Firstborn, is not as one who began to exist before them, but as the One who first became for them the author of the name "son."

OTHER . If He is the First-born because He was created first, and the one who created something first, and not the only one, usually creates others after the first [work], then the Son, then, did not create anything. Since He created, it is not because He was created that He is the firstborn, but because He *created all things, even in heaven and on earth.* [1021].

OTHER . If He came into being for the sake of bringing creation into being, then He should be grateful to them, since they became the cause of His emergence.

OTHER . If the Son creates because the creation could not withstand the own action of the Uncreated, then the Son would be a kind of mediating force, and He Himself would not be either uncreated - for the creation would not have endured Him - nor, again, from among the created, for [then] He Himself would not have withstood the Uncreated. And since He is neither one nor the other, then it remains to confess that He

is a product of unborn nature.

OTHER . The objection seems to be from among the Eunomievs . If the Son, he says, is the true God, then how does the divine Scripture, which says: “ *The Firstborn of all creation* ,” classify Him among created things? [1022]? After all, it is in every possible way necessary for Him to be by nature the same as those of whom He is the first.

Rebuttal to this. Profane speech and fraught with great absurdity. After all, if the Son, of necessity, will be like those created after Him, since he is also called the firstborn of them, and not only man was created, but also many and various animals, then it is time for you, Christ-fighters, who without fear indulge in wickedness, to [directly] say that the Son by nature is the same as dumb animals. Consequently, He will not necessarily be akin to those whom He is called the firstborn. He is called so because the divine Scripture thereby shows us that we are all in the Son and through the Son are called to an equal position with Him (σχῆμα), being by grace proclaimed sons of God. And He is the Firstfruits of the grace given to us, out of love for mankind, likening to Himself <75.413> those created by Him. And the very fact that He is the first shows Him as the true image of the Father. For just as the Father says that He is the first, so the Son, being the exact image and likeness of the first Father, is called and is the first. For in Him abides the first Father, and He likewise abides in the first Father, and thanks to Him *all Bysha* , and intelligent [creations] are called to adoption.

OTHER . If the fact that the Son is called “the first-born [of all] creation” (πρῶτον τῆς κτίσεως), certainly forces Him to be akin to those who arose after Him, and to be such by nature, what are those who are second in time , what will you say when the Father speaks about Himself: “ *I am the first, and I am hereafter* ” [1023]? Is it possible that you will also attribute to Him a created essence, having conceded to Him only in time the primacy over created things, and rank Him among the created? But I think no one will reach such madness as to dare to even imagine this. Therefore, just as the fact that the Father is called first does not make Him considered akin to all that comes after Him, so the Son, even though He is called “the first-born [of all] creation,” will not necessarily be one of the creatures . But just as the Father, showing Himself to be the beginning of everything, says: “ *I* am *the first* ,” so the Son is called the first-born of all creation. For *this is all that was* , and He is the beginning of all creatures, as the Creator and Creator.

* * *

[997] Col. 1:15 .

[998] The Greek text says "εὐγένειαν" - "nobility", but the general meaning of the phrase encourages us to read here "συγγένειαν", as in the Latin PG translation this word corresponds to "affinitatem".

[999] Rom. 8:29 .

[1000] John 1:18 . {In the original - *the Only Begotten* God , *who is in the bosom of the Father* - the word “God” is not italicized, since in the Church Slavonic and Synodal translations it is “Only Begotten Son”. However, the compilers of the critical edition of the Greek text NA27 chose as the main option the “Only Begotten God”, as attested in the best manuscripts, as well as in the holy fathers, including in this place by Cyril.}

[1001] Rom. 8:29 .

[1002] Col. 1:18 .

[1003] This. 1:14 .

[1004] Col. 1:16 .

[1005] Gen.35:23; 49:3 ; Ex.6:14 ; Numbers 1:20; 26:25 ; 1 Par. 5:1,3 .

[1006] In Russian it is possible to say only “the first of all,” but the preposition “from” seems to place this first inside the set, so we had to deviate from the literal translation, replacing the ordinal number “first” with the adverb “before.”

[1007] This. 1:3 .

[1008] Col. 1:17 .

[1009] Rom. 8:29 .

[1010] Col. 1:18 .

[1011] This. 14:6 .

[1012] This. 10:7,9 .

[1013] Col. 1:15 .

[1014] The original text says “συγκαταβᾶσα”, but this is an obvious typo, and we read this place: “τῇ πρὸς τὰ πεποιημένα συγκαταβάσει”.

[1015] Symbol of faith.

[1016] Proverbs 8:22 .

[1017] Judgment. 11:34 .

[1018] Psalm 32:6 .

[1019] Col. 1:18 .

[1020] Luke 2:7 .

[1021] Col. 1:16 .

[1022] Col. 1:15 .

[1023] Isaiah 44:6 .

Word 25 Word 27

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 26 Word 28

Homily 26. In response to what was said about the sons of Zebedee: "If I sit on the right hand and on the left side, I will not obey." [1024]

The objection seems to be from among the Eunomievs . And how, if He was in equal dignity with the Father, did He [in response] to the request of [the sons of] Zebedee say: " *I have not given* "? After all, this, which is obvious, is the answer of one who has no power and cannot give what they asked for. Therefore, He is not equal to the Father, who has power over everything.

Rebuttal to this . And in this - oh, Christ-fighters! – you appear to be very unenlightened. For you ought in every way to accurately examine the words of the Savior, and not recklessly make what was well said a reason for accusation. The children of Zebedee came [to Christ], asking for the highest honors. But it was incredible - not to expect a good deed from the giver, but, as it were, to steal for oneself a gift that by duty belonged to others. So, to this truly absurd request, the Savior rightly answered: " *I have no money* ," not because He was unable to give, but because those who labor should receive a reward <75.416> according to what they do. As if someone, having established prizes for those invited to a competition, said to them: "It is not mine that has the right to choose the largest [prize] and give it to whomever I want, for I did not determine the conditions of the competition for that purpose, but the one who wins will receive it." He will justly give the highest honor to everyone." So the Savior says that it would not be reasonable to simply give more to the one asking, removing the one who should have received it in justice. But it is most likely fitting for those to whom the foreknowledge of the Father has prepared this because of their superiority in exploits. So these words are proof not of powerlessness, but of economic [as if] powerlessness ς).

OTHER . If, in your opinion, oh, Christ-fighters! - the opinion is that He is not able to fulfill the request of the sons of Zebedee, and therefore says: " *not My love is* given ," then how in other cases does He appear to all the disciples who give this, when He says: " *Amen, amen, I say to you, that when the Son of Man sits on the throne of His glory, you also will sit on the throne* ." [1025]? For this is the essence of the word, not

prophesying about the future, but giving grace to [the disciples], as having labored together with Him. So, if He is truthful in saying this, then how will the one who gives to everyone be unable [to fulfill the request] when only two ask? And if you dare to say that this promise is not true, then this is enough to accuse you of all vices. For you say that Truth lies. Therefore, just as He would not be equal to the Father if He could not give [what was asked] to the sons of Zebedee, so, since He is shown to give to everyone, He will be equal to the One who gave birth.

OTHER . If the Savior speaks the truth when he declares: " *All things have been delivered to Me by My Father* ." [1026], and among all this is to give grace to whomever He wants, it was not out of powerlessness that He said: " *There is no gift for me* ," but this phrase has an economic meaning.

OTHER . The Prophet Isaiah, speaking about the Savior, clearly says somewhere: " *For this sake many will rule* (κυριεύσει πολλῶν) [1027] *And He divided the mighty for gain, His soul was given over to death* ." [1028]. So, if He distributes honors to the saints, then how can we say that He cannot give anyone whatever He wants? And if the Father does everything through the Son, and one of all things is the distribution of rewards to the saints, then [the Son] Himself will be a giver, having the Father in Himself.

Resolution of the saying: "There is no date of mine," and a clear teaching on how it should be understood

When our Savior, Christ, exhorted the disciples not to desire to acquire anything at all in this life, but rather to be non-covetous and unceasingly <75.417> be devoted to God and devote all of themselves entirely to serving Him, and promised to reward for this great honor to those who keep [this] commandment , they approached Him, saying: " *Behold, we have left everything and died after You: what then will happen to us?* » [1029] Christ answers this question of theirs: " *You who have walked after Me, in the end of life, when the Son of Man sits on the throne of His glory, you also will sit on the two-tenth throne, judging the two-tenth tribes of Israel* ." [1030]. Hearing this promise, the sons of Zebedee came to a desire that was inappropriate for them. For what was offered to all the disciples as a reward for their goodwill towards Christ, they wanted to receive alone, but, fearing that they might seem overcome by the desire for empty glory, they themselves are silent, but incite their mother to help them in this. And so she, approaching [Christ], says: " *Tsy, may these two sons of mine sit, one on Your right hand , and one on Your left.* " [1031]. Thus, this woman is shown to delight only her children with what was intended for everyone. For if this is not so, then what is the point of starting to ask for something that has already been given to everyone? After all, they were also among those who heard: " *You who have walked after Me will sit on twelve thrones* ." The Savior is like God, knowing *what is in men* [1032], calls the sons of Zebedee, but does not harshly rebuke them, being kind (φιλάγαθος), but convincingly

says: " *is not My gift* mine," and, of course, does not condemn [thus] His nature as not being able to give [what is asked] - for it is truly absurd and very naive to think so, but it seems to say that [they say, I refuse you], because you are seeking to receive what you unjustly asked for and a reward that is not appropriate for Me [to] give. For I am *the righteous Judge* [1033], and I give rewards according to merit, according to the labors of each, as if in the course of duty. Moreover, you think it is empty glory to sit *at My right hand and left* , but *am not able I* to grant this. For the one who teaches not to get sick cannot himself transmit the disease, just as fire would say to someone who wants to cool down and asks for it: " *It is not mine* to give you what you are looking for, since I am of a different nature." So, being a just worker, I must not just give [rewards] to those who ask, but give each one what is due in accordance with his achievements. For those have [the right] to receive [this reward] to whom it has been justly prepared by the Father [1034]who exist in Me and create everything through Me.

And let no one think that because He Himself is not able to give [the request], He mentions the name of the Father and says that He has prepared honors for the saints. But He speaks thus economically, for it is His custom to impute everything that exceeds human nature <75.420> to the Father as to God. Being both God Himself and one with the Father, He will not be powerless in what is imputed to the Divine nature, but He Himself will be the doer of everything.

So, He finds the sons of Zebedee suffering from a certain covetousness and vanity and convincingly turns them away, and leads them away from evil, and teaches them to better think humbly about themselves - and we will see this from what follows. For the other disciples are indignant, seeing in this request and approach of the woman that what was offered and due to everyone is stolen by only two. Having called everyone, as it is written, the Savior teaches the sons of Zebedee and speaks abstractly, so that this does not apply to them alone: " *The princes of the tongue rule over them, and the great ones rule over them: it will not be the same in you: but whoever wants to be great in you may he be your servant* " [1035]. And he cites himself as an example, saying: " *Just as the Son of man did not come and be served, but serve.* " [1036]. And as if to capture what was said and show them the goal even more clearly, he adds a parable, through which he again advises those who are called to do the best - not to strive to take the first place themselves, but to expect honor from the one who invited them to the feast. For it is better, as He says, being in the last place, to be invited by the host to the first, than, having boldly settled down to the first, to be sent to the last, when another comes, who, in the opinion of the leader of the feast, deserves to be in the first [1037].

Thus, throughout the entire chapter, proper proof is given that the Savior, not being unable to give a reward, but due to the above-stated dispensation, says: " *have nothing I* to give "; and it means that the fury of idle talkers [heretics] is useless.

* * *

1024 Matthew 20:23 .

1025 Matthew 19:28 .

1026 Matthew 11:27 .

1027 In the original text of Scripture: "κληρονομήσει πολλοὺς" – " *shall inherit many* ." {According to the Hebrew text "I will give Him an inheritance with the great," trans. RBO.}

1028 Isaiah 53:12 .

1029 Matthew 19:27 .

1030 Matthew 19:28 .

1031 Matthew 20:21 .

1032 This. 2:25 .

1033 Ps.7:12;9:5 ; Jeremiah 11:20 ; 2 Timothy 4:8 .

1034 Cp.: Мф.20:23 – "one who is prepared by the father".

1035 Matthew 20:25–26 .

1036 Matthew 20:28 .

1037 Luke 14:8-10 .

Word 26 Word 28

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 27 Word 29

Homily 27. On [words] “Let them know the one true God, and whom Jesus Christ hath sent.” [1038]

The objection seems to be on behalf of heretics. Behold, they say, the Son Himself confesses that the Father alone is the true God, and we find the Father Himself saying: “ *I am God first, I am hereafter, and besides Me there is no God.* ” [1039]. How then do you add the Son to the first and only and truly existing God and Father, as if He were by nature God?

Rebuttal to this. First of all, you should know that the Father does not say this to eliminate the Son. For what could motivate Him to do this? After all, if He, like a man, competed with those born from Him, like David when his own children fought against him, then perhaps such a fable would have some meaning. And if the Divine nature does not know discord with itself, but rather the Son appears as the ever-giving glory to the Father, then what is the point of the Father saying such things to eliminate the Son? Therefore, we are most likely to assume that He says <75.421> this to crush the false gods. Then, the Savior, saying: “ *Let them know you, the only true God* ,” immediately adds Himself: “ *And whom Jesus Christ sent* .” [1040], since He is inseparable from the essence of the Father as far as the Divinity is concerned, and is always thought of together with the Father.

OTHER . If the Son is the Word of the Father - which He is and admits - then who is so crazy as to think that for the sake of eliminating His own Word, with which He creates everything, the Father called Himself the only true God? Since this is absurd, the power of the statement is most likely directed at the false gods, even if the anti-Christ fighters did not like this.

OTHER, [said] on the basis of a hypothesis . Let us now imagine that some deluded people from among those who are deprived of true wisdom would set up an image for themselves, and, having drawn on it the image of some person or other animal, would call it “light,” actually thinking that from there a light is born for them; and if you then imagine that the sun has a voice, and that it would then say to them: “People, you are mistaken: only I am the light, and there is no other [light] besides me,” then, crying out

for the sake of eliminating it false light, will it thereby deprive its own radiance of being light? But there is no reason to think so. Therefore, when the Father says: “ *I am one, and there is nothing besides Me* ,” He does not exclude from the Divinity the Property of His own essence, that is, the Word that came from Him, but in the identity of nature He has Him preserved with Himself and in one Deity co-confessed and co-glorified.

OTHER, showing that although the Father is called the only God, the Son, in every way, is thought of together with Him . One of the prophets says nowhere to God: “ *is The sky* one and the same .” [1041] The voice of God is also quoted: “ *I have spread out the sky alone* .” [1042]. And again His other words about the Son: “ *By the Word of the Lord the heavens were established* ” [1043]. So, if, despite the fact that God and the Father said that He alone created heaven, the Son is found by him who created him, then it is clear to everyone that even though the Father alone was called the true God, but in every way the Son is also implied with Him, by whom He is all He does and speaks, and truly by nature abides in the One and Only, and the First, and the True, just as his radiance abides in light.

* * *

[1038] This. 17:3 .

[1039] Isaiah 44:6 .

[1040] This. 17:3 .

[1041] Job. 9:8 .

[1042] Isaiah 44:24 .

[1043] Psalm 32:6 .

Word 27 Word 29

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 28 Word 30

Word 28. On the saying found in Luke: "Jesus abounded in wisdom and stature and grace with God and man." [1044]

The objection seems to be from among the Eunomievs . And how could he, he says, be equal in essence to the Father who is not perfect? For behold, He is shown <75.424> to advance in wisdom. And the Father, being in need of nothing, does not allow [himself] prosperity.

Rebuttal to this. One should ask the anti-Christ fighters about whom they think it is said: " *You abound in wisdom and grace* "? But they, of course, will say that it is about Jesus Christ. Then - oh, the craziest of all! - who or where do you think Christ is from, about whom Luke is now talking? If you believe that He is an ordinary man and think that He has no advantage over others, then may He also prosper as a man. If He is God made man and the Word made flesh, as it is written, then what kind of success does He allow? Or how *He who is imperfect will be equal to God* [1045]? After all, then it is necessary that He to whom He is equal should also be imperfect, if this is how things stand in your opinion. If it already seems to you that it is evil to say and think like this (for you agreed that the Father is perfect), then you must believe that the Son, equal to Him, is also perfect. Therefore, He is not called prosperous as the Word, but because He put on a nature that allows prosperity.

OTHER . Paul says nowhere about God the Word, that He *is both in the image of God* and *equal to God* [1046]. So, if He, being in equality with God, allows success, and in fact succeeded, then [He] is something greater than the Father, and the Word who succeeded surpassed the Father, if so it turns out, in your opinion. But this is extremely absurd. Consequently, He did not succeed as the Word, for He is perfect, like the Father, but this is also said about Him because of the dispensation of the incarnation.

OTHER . If the Word succeeded when it became man and took on our flesh, then He did not bring us benefit by becoming human, but, most likely, the flesh became for Him an accomplice of perfection. After all, if He really succeeded when He became flesh, then, therefore, He was imperfect before He came, and is now perfected, in your opinion. How then do we thank Him as for us for the sake of Him who became man,

when in fact it is Him who should show [us] gratitude? But this is absurd. Therefore He did not succeed as the Word, but this is said of Him because of [His] dispensation in the flesh.

OTHER . The Word of God is called by many names in the divine Scripture. For He is called and is the Son; also called Wisdom; called both God, and Power, and the Image of the Father [1047]. If, being all these, He succeeds, what can they name greater than the Son, Wisdom, Power, God and all the rest, so as not to list each separately? But <75.425> to think so is evil. For there is nothing greater than God. Therefore, it is not said of the Word that He prospered.

OTHER . Principalities, Thrones, Dominions, Angels and Archangels, and every rational power, and in addition to these people, are and become perfect in all piety by communion with the Word. How can someone who bestows perfection on others be imperfect Himself, so that He desires to improve and achieve some kind of growth? How, if He is truly Wisdom, can He advance in wisdom? Or how will he who gives grace to others himself succeed in grace as if he does not have it? Unless they say that Paul lied when he called the Son Wisdom and the Giver of grace? But the servant of truth does not lie. Therefore, he did not prosper as the Word, but as a man this is said about Him, who accepted everything that is ours for our sake.

OTHER . The imperfect always strives for perfection, neglecting [that] first place in which it [now] is, as if always seeking [for itself a place] among the larger and better. Just as, for example, we humans succeed in wisdom and, being gradually improved by other virtues, thus strive towards the perfection of life. But where else can the Word of God, existing entirely in the Father, go? What increase will It allow, being so perfect that it has the whole Father in Itself and, in turn, abides entirely in the Father? For if he who fills the Father (let's say, for the sake of example, more bodily) received some kind of increase or success, then he became outside the Father, becoming greater than that in which He abides. But He did not go beyond the Father, but is always in Him, being perfect in the perfect, and having the perfect in Himself. Therefore, He, as the Word, has not succeeded, but is perfect, remaining the same and not changing.

OTHER . Paul nowhere says about the Son that He *made Himself of no reputation and took on the form of a servant.* [1048]. So, if no one is tempted by this, and hearing: " *Humbled Himself*" [1049], does not think anything low about God, but rather marvels at His love for mankind, then how would it not be amiss to be tempted when hearing that He succeeded? After all, if He did not suffer at all from belittlement as far as the Divinity is concerned, then He will not suffer from this either. for our sake *And just as He humbled Himself* , so He accepts prosperity for our sake, so that again we, who were once sentenced to death for sin, would excel in wisdom in Him, and, once hated for [our] transgression in Adam , would excel in grace. For Christ took everything that is ours into Himself for our sake, in order to transform everything into the best and

become for created people the beginning of all good.

<75.428> *ANOTHER , plausible interpretation of the same saying* . A certain natural law does not allow a person to have a thinking much beyond his age, but the mind that exists in us in some way correlates and keeps pace with the development of the body. Now, the Word was made flesh, becoming man, as it is written; and was perfect, being the Wisdom and Power of the Father. Since He had to to some extent yield to the custom of our nature, so that those who saw Him would not seem something alien, like a man, He gradually, as his body matured, revealed Himself and from day to day showed himself to those who saw and heard Him more and more wise, being [in fact] perfect in everything, as has already been said, but following the general custom of [human] nature.

So, when you hear: " *He abounded in wisdom and grace* ," then do not think that any increase in wisdom happened to Him, for God's Word lacks nothing, but since in the eyes of those who saw [Him] He became increasingly wise and grace-filled, then it is said about prosperity, so here it is [most likely, visible] the prosperity of the people marveling [at Him], rather than His own.

OTHER . What succeeds in something is different from that in which it succeeds. So, if it is said: " *abounding in wisdom* ," then it is not wisdom that prospers, but mankind that prospers in it. For, since from day to day the Divinity was revealed and revealed in Him, He all the time became more and more amazing to those who saw. This is precisely what the expression " *abounding in wisdom* " means.

OTHER. You excelled in human wisdom in the following way: Wisdom, clothed in human nature, that is, the Word of God, little by little deified through deeds and miraculous accomplishments in the face of those who saw the received temple, brought Him success in this. Thus, humanity, deified by Her, prospered in Wisdom. Therefore, in the likeness of the Word made flesh for us, we are called sons of God and gods. So, our nature has advanced in wisdom, striving from corruption to incorruption, and from humanity to the dignity of the Divinity in Christ.

The objection seems to be on behalf of opponents . I heard, says [the Christian fighter], that the Word of God, having become man, was called Jesus. It, therefore, is the successful one. For you will not share the one Christ with me when Paul preaches Him thus. And if He turns out to allow success, then, therefore, He is imperfect. And how will such one be equal to the perfect Father?

Rebuttal to this . You will not harm the Son in the least in regard to [His] Divinity and you will not be able to diminish [His] natural dignity, even if you persist in saying this, and are most likely to be defeated by what you think to win. After all, if <75.429> you know the Son to be completely made flesh and born man, as the Divine Scripture says, then why do you not allow Him to endure the things befitting a man, with the

exception of sin? Since it is natural for the flesh to prosper, let it also be said about Him that He prospered, since He stood in it and assimilated to Himself its blameless passions. For it was the flesh of no one else, but of the Word Himself. And how do we say that He suffered in the flesh [1050], - although only the flesh suffered, since although He did not suffer as God, the suffering body was His own - so when we say that He prospered, He, as God, does not allow any success, but this is said because His own flesh prospered in Him.

OTHER . And you yourself - oh, fighter of Christ! - you confess the Word of God made flesh, which cannot be understood in any other way except that He took on flesh and truly became man. So, as when you hear something great about the Word and that which befits Him naked and not yet clothed with flesh, as, for example, when He is called the Light, Radiance and Wisdom of the Father, you will not think about the flesh, but about the indwelling in the flesh of the Word, so also when the divine Scriptures say anything that befits only the flesh, or also the human form (τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ σχήματι), do not trace it back to the Word, but attribute to the nature of the flesh what is due to it . Therefore, when it is said that He succeeds, it is not Wisdom itself *that succeeds* , to the extent that it is Wisdom, but the human [*succeeds*] in Wisdom, gradually shining forth and appearing through It. So it was also an instrument of the Divinity contained within it, little by little serving its manifestation with [its] deeds. Note, however, that [the evangelist] did not say that the Word prospered, but Jesus, so that you do not think about the naked Word, but [about the time] when It *the flesh will become* [1051]. And if prosperity is spoken of because [the Word] took on that which is characteristic of prosperity, that is, humanity, then [this] will be the prosperity of humanity, and to it it should rightly be attributed. For, in this way, each of the spoken [natures] will remain in its own order, when neither what befits the naked Word is transferred to humanity, nor human [properties] are attributed to the Divinity.

* * *

[1044] Luke 2:52 .

[1045] Phil.2:6 .

[1046] Phil.2:6 .

[1047] In the original, two words are used: "and form, and image of the Father."

[1048] Phil.2:7 .

[1049] Phil.2:8 .

[1050] 1 Pet. 4:1 .

[1051] This. 1:14 .

Word 28 Word 30

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 29 Word 31

Word 29. On [words]: “When all things are put in subjection to Him, then the Son Himself will submit all things to him who put all things under Him.” [1052]

The objection seems to be on behalf of heretics . And how, they say, will the Son be equal to the Father, if Paul says the truth that the Son Himself will submit to the Father? For in every possible way it is necessary to recognize that the conquered is less than the conqueror, just as, undoubtedly, the conquered is [less than] the conqueror.

<75.432> *Rebuttal to this* . Those who fight against Christ do not understand that they contradict their own wickedness with these words. For if he who believes that the Son is lesser than the Father hastens to arm himself with this [saying], then why is He not already subdued? After all, Paul, saying that He *will then submit* , and defining the time of this event as the future, does not yet show Him to be subdued. Then, does it not go beyond any blasphemy to say that the Son is now not submissive to the Father, as if He were fighting and rebelling against Him who gave birth? After all, the rebellious, [reasoning] logically, will be self-willed. What shall we say when Christ says: “ *I have not come, but do My will, but the will of Him who sent Me* ?” [1053]? Let those who are famous for their ability to understand the sacred Scriptures tell us, does not submission mean doing the will of the Father? How then is it said of the one who submits now that He will then submit? So, they will rightly hear: “ *You are deceived , not knowing the Scripture* .” [1054].

OTHER . If you believe that the Son is a creature and a creature, and if you number Him among the created, then tell me, according to your, O heretic, folly, He, being a slave essence, does not now submit to the Father of all, when the Psalmist speaks of created: “ *For all work is for You* ” [1055]? For it is necessary either to say that the Father is unable to subdue the Son and against His will, and then the One who, in your opinion, is less, will be greater; or, if it is good to submit, but the Son does not now submit, since it is said that He will submit later, you will have to accuse Him of sin. And how then to keep what was said about Him? [1056]: “ *Thou shalt not commit sin* ” [1057]? Away with such absurdity!

OTHER. The objection seems to be on behalf of the same people . And how, they say, will it not be obvious to everyone that the Son, who submits to Him, is less than the Father?

Rebuttal to this . And how will it not be obvious to everyone - let’s use your own words - that the equal often subordinates the equal to the equal? After all, do we admit that there is not one and the same Spirit in the prophets? And how then does Paul say: “ *And the souls obey the prophecies of the prophet* ” [1058]? How does the name of submission deprive the Son of equality with the Father? After all, do not our sons also obey and submit to [their] fathers, having the same essence with them and being partakers of the same nature? For neither in those who submit is the logos of nature found less, nor in those who conquer is greater or superior. For, given that the logos of essence is the same in all people, many useful [things] are achieved through the subordination of <75.433> some. If this is well established in relation to us, and in no way leads beyond the commonality of nature, then why don’t you reject this absurd blasphemy, maintaining equality [with the Father] with God the Word?

OTHER . Where do you come from - oh, heretics! – did it occur to you to say that because of the so-called subordination the Son is lesser than the Father? For it is not in subordination that we find the logos of His essence, nor in subordination is the existence of the Son, but He who exists and abides in a special way is called subject. Consequently, if the name of subordination is not a definition of His essence, then because of it He will not be less than the Father. If you think that “subjection” is a definition of the essence of the Son, then look to what depths of wickedness you fall. For then it will be necessary to say that the Son will then be called into being when the time of submission comes, since Paul represents Him as having to submit [in the future], and not as having already submitted.

OTHER, containing a convincing interpretation of the saying . The Father does everything through the Son, and this is an image of submission (τὸ τῆς ὑποταγῆς σχῆμα) - that He seems to be submitting to the will of the Father. As, for example, when the Father says: “ *create Let us man* ” [1059], The son magnificently takes *dust from the ground* [1060] and fulfills his plans. For *the whole thing was* [1061]. So, Paul, teaching that in the age to come the Father will bring all things to life in us again through the Son, very wisely says: “ *When all things are put in subjection to Him, then the Son Himself will subject Him to Him who put all things in subjection, so that God may have all things in all.* ” [1062]. For this is as if he had said: “Let no one think that in the age to come you will be partakers of the Father in any other way than again through the Son.” And this “through the Son” means subordination, which in no way harms the Son in terms of essence, but shows the unity and usual unchanging state of the Holy Trinity. For then She will not rebel against Herself, and that which is always the same will not be confused by disorderly changes, but even at that time *will be* the Father through the

Son *all things in all* , [will be] life, and incorruptibility, and joy, and holiness, and power, and all that is promised to the saints. After all, look at the kind of economy this word carries with it! For since [Paul] said that through the Father all things are subject to the Son, so that they would not think that the Father was out of dominion over all things, since all things are subject to the Son, he shows the Son not to be disobedient to the Father, so that the Father also had the full power of dominion over all things. , with the natural participation of the Son, since one Divinity reigns: the Father through the Son with the Holy Spirit.

OTHER . If the name of subordination deprives the Son of equality <75.436> with the Father, then it is time for you, for whom there is nothing that you would not dare to say, to say that at present the Father is less than the Son, serving the image of subordination (τῷ τῆς ὑποταγῆς διακονούμενος τ ρόπῳ) and saying to Him: “ *Sit at My right hand , until I will make Your enemies Your footstool* .” [1063]. If the Father, serving the subordination of all to the Son, is not less because of this, then the Son will not be less than the Father because of the subordination. For what the Father has already created, in some way he himself receives back from the Son.

OTHER . How is it said of Him who is now subject to the Father that He will submit in the last times or even in the age to come? Or is He not subordinate now, fulfilling the will of the Father and humbled Himself, as it is written, taking on the form and image of a servant? [1064]to complete His work [1065], as He Himself says? But I think that this is obvious to everyone and, being true, is revealed by examining things. So, how does the divine Paul show us those who are already subject to those who will submit later? Let them examine the speech thoroughly. “ *When* ,” he says, “ *all things are subjected to Him, then the Son Himself will submit all things to Him, that all things may be in all.* ” [1066]. What does he mean by this? Christ is still submissive to the Father, not for the sake of everyone, but only for the sake of those who believe in Him; and for them He offered Himself, like a blameless lamb, to the Father, *careless about the cross and shame* [1067], so that, having freed them from all sin, they might be brought pure and blameless to the Creator. So, when all error is [thrown away] far away, and those in all the sun come to know the true God and confess Christ as King and Lord, submitting to His saving commandments, then, when everyone is already submissive, He will submit for the sake of all, finding Himself God and Lord , and the Bishop of all, and through Himself, giving everyone the opportunity to be partakers of the Father who exists in Him. For, thus, *God will be all in all* , dwelling in all through the mediation of the Son and being contained in each of those called to salvation.

OTHER . Let every pious person pay attention to the power of what is said and let him carefully consider the precise meaning of the saying, for [in this way] he will in some way overcome the evil that comes from ignorance. So, Paul says that “ *whenever all things are put in subjection to Him, then the Son Himself also will subject all things*

to Him, that God may be all things in all .” First of all, it is worth noting with what thought Paul ends this phrase. For he did not say that the Son would submit to the Father in order to become less than Him in essence, but *that God might be all in all* . Do you see that he <75.437> presents the mediation of the Son in relation to us as [mediation] in relation to the Father? For He will again dwell with the saints, giving Himself according to the grace of each [of them], so that through Him they may become partakers of the Father. And this is the tropos of submission: for He, as it were, serves the blessing [given] from the Father, naturally through Himself transmitting [it] to those called to eternal life. And this will not force the Son to become outside [His] natural dignity; but, being what He is, He, by condescension towards us, will then serve the Father, giving us knowledge of the Divine, as far as we can assimilate it. Further, in addition to this, we must also understand that as the Father, by subordinating us to the Son, he does not essentially create anything else, and we do not turn out to be someone else, due to subordination, in comparison with what we were created from the beginning, but does submission through a change in [our] state of mind (γνώμης), way of life (τρὸπου) and knowledge, so the Son, without going beyond the limits of his own nature (since God does not tend to pretend), submits to the Father, but [this] will be a certain way of action (τρὸπος πράγματος), and at that time showing Him to those who submit - and [then] the action of submission (τὸ τῆς ὑποταγῆς πρᾶγμα.) will be found only in the will, and, of course, not in the transformation of the essence.

OTHER . If the Son is less than the Father and different in nature, submitting to Him at a certain moment, according to Paul’s word, but has not yet submitted, then it means that at the present time He has equality in relation to Him. And what is now equal in nature to the one who gave birth, how will it be less in time? After all, either there will be some kind of corruption and diminishment in Him, and then the Divinity will be subjected to this (τὸ Θεῖον), or, if it is impious and illogical to say so, let them themselves explain the image of the diminishment. Since, if the Son does not suffer any damage in relation to the essence, then the image of submission will not harm Him in any way.

* * *

[1052] 1 Cor. 15:28 .

[1053] This. 6:38 .

[1054] Matthew 22:29 .

[1055] Psalm 118:91 .

[1056] В оригинале описание опечатка: "And where is the so-called Father saved". Instead of "Patri", we read "per", in accordance with the Latin translation: "quod de ipso dicitur".

1057 1 Pet. 2:22 .

1058 1 Cor. 14:32 .

1059 Gen.1:26 .

1060 Gen.2:7 .

1061 This. 1:3 .

1062 1 Cor. 15:28 .

1063 Psalm 109:1 .

1064 Phil.2:6–7 .

1065 This. 17:4 .

1066 1 Cor. 15:28 .

1067 Hebrews 12:2 .

Word 29 Word 31

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 30 Word 32

Word 30. On [words]: “Father, glorify Me with you with Myself, since before you there was no peace.” [1068]

The objection seems to be on behalf of Christ-fighters . And how, they say, is it not absurd to say that the Son is like the Father in essence, Who is found by asking Him for glory? After all, He says: “ *Father, glorify Me with you with Myself even though you had no peace before* .” For if He asks, [already] having, then He does it in vain, and if He does not have, then from this it is obvious that He is not the same as the One from whom He asks.

Rebuttal to this. And how did the Lord of Glory need glory? What, tell me, is the flaw seen in the perfect? For no one will allow you to say that the Son of God is not perfect in anything. However, even then it is very absurd to think that the Son of God is thus asking glory from the Father, <75.440> like a certain person who thirsts for glory and does it out of passion. But there is a certain deep meaning and way of house-building in this.

OTHER . We ourselves will agree with the statement you cited, O Christ-fighters. After all, it is generally accepted that the Savior said: “ *Father, glorify Thy Son* ” [1069]. But the Father also responded to these words of His, saying: “ *And I will glorify, and again I will glorify* .” [1070]. So, if the Son asked for such glory, as you think, as being deprived of glory, and the Father promised to glorify Him, then why is the request followed by insults and strangulation from the Jews, and *a crown of thorns?* [1071], and spitting? For from this the Father is seen not to have glorified Him, but to have surpassed everything contrary to what He wanted and desired to receive, according to you. Therefore, the Son does not ask for glory from the Father for Himself (for He does not lack glory, since He is by nature God), but through Himself He attracts glory from the Father to the human race. For in Him and through Him we have been enriched with all good things.

OTHER, having in itself the interpretation of the saying . Those who test the exact meaning of names and carefully consider what each of them signifies, understand the name “δόξα” in two ways. For sometimes they believe that it should be understood in

the sense of honor, and sometimes they refer to it as knowledge. As if someone said: “What can anyone think (τί ἄν τις δοξάσαι) about the sun, for example, or about some other element? Are they created or uncreated? Anyone who thinks right will say in every way that they are created.” Therefore, the knowledge of anything from among those who are wise in these things [people] is called “δόξα”. So, when the Son is shown saying: “ *Father, glorify* (δόξασόν) *Me with you with glory* (τῇ δόξῃ), *even though before you there was no world* ,” then one should understand what was said this way: “Since, Father, having become by reason of the economy man, I am considered only what they see Me, and not many know that I am the eternal Son, then *glorify Me* (δόξασόν με), - [this He says] instead of “reveal Me” (φανέρωσόν με), - by investing in people such knowledge about Me as they would have received by hearing that I existed before the creation of the world, i.e., that I am God by nature, *Light from Light* , truly coming from the true Father." We will understand this even better through inference. For “ *glorify Me* (δόξασόν με)” He says instead of “make Me manifest, for I also have made Your name *known by man.”* [1072] " So, if He wants to become what He created, and He glorified the Father by revealing Him to people, then He Himself wants to be glorified by being revealed by the Father to people. And the words of those who oppose Christ are useless, representing the Son as deprived of honor, that is, glory.

OTHER . If you say that the Son lacks glory and honor, and therefore He seeks to be glorified by the Father, and <75.441> on the basis of this you invent an accusation of dissimilarity, then tell us again how the Father is contemplated in the Son? After all, if the Son lacks glory, but the Father does not, then how do you think that what does not need glory will be seen in one who does?

OTHER . If the Son speaks the truth, saying: “ *He who has seen Me, has seen the Father* ” [1073], then He has perfect glory, just like the Father, so that the Father could appear in Him. For He cannot indistinguishably manifest the Father in Himself, without being in glory the same as He.

OTHER . If the Son needs glory, then He is shown to be something different from the Father. For that which needs something is not identical with the all-perfect. If the Son speaks the truth, asserting: “ *I and the Father are one* ” [1074], - then He is perfect, like the Father, with whom He is one. And if so, then He has perfect glory, just like He who gave birth to Him.

* * *

[1068] This. 17:5 .

[1069] This. 17:1 .

[1070] This. 12:28 .

[1071] Matthew 27:29 .

[1072] This. 17:6 .

[1073] This. 14:9 .

[1074] This is 10:30 .

Word 30 Word 32

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 31 Word 33

Word 31. To those who say that God knows no more about His own essence than we do, but what He could know about Himself, we also [know] exactly the same

The objection seems to be on behalf of our opponents . Unborn, they say, is God's Wisdom, and this is Her being. Therefore, he who knows that this is God will know Him in every way. He also knows Himself as unborn. So, there is no difference between when He thinks this about Himself (δοξάζει), and when we, for our part, believe that He is like that.

Rebuttal to this . This is truly funny and very stupid, or rather, the minds of those who are so inclined are beyond any insanity. For, being human and being as inferior to the Divine essence as it is superior to them, they imagine that they have the same mind with it, if one can say so about God; for they must not have heard Isaiah saying: " *Who will measure the water with a handful and the sky with a span?" Who has understood the mind of the Lord* ? [1075] So, let those who try to measure with human thoughts the immeasurable and incomprehensible Divine nature, like *the sky an inch* , tell us that they will say, being asked in response by us: is God unborn, according to their conclusion, and does this itself [the concept of ungeneracy] indicate an ineffable essence, or not? For if they answer in the negative, then their whole structure collapses, and their ingenious premise will be useless if they refuse to say what they proclaimed. If they think that they need to cling to this construction, then even then they will be exposed as delusional. For the fact that God must be unborn does not mean that His being necessarily consists in ungeneracy. For this is the same as if someone said that since every <75.444> number is either even or odd, then this is its existence. And also: since every number is necessarily composed of units, it has its existence in them. And one more thing: since every person is a rational animal, mortal, endowed with intelligence and knowledge, then man does not exist in himself, but has existence in these [definitions]. And again: since every person is wingless, his existence lies in winglessness. But this is ridiculous to even imagine. For since he is a man, he is also a rational animal, mortal; and since he is a man, he is also wingless; and since it is a number, it can be even or odd. Consequently, when there is an essence, [then] it is said

that everything affirmed in relation to it, provided that the essence itself is not canceled, is understood as its additional determinations. So, if the word “unborn” is used in relation to God’s essence, then as one of the number of [definitions] relating to Him, and not being [His essence] itself, for it means [only that] He is not was born, and not that God will have existence in unbornness; but, being and existing, He is unborn.

OTHER . If everything that is inherent only in God will certainly be His essence, then for us He will be composed of many essences. For there are many things that are inherent only to Him by nature, and to no other of those who exist. And “King”, and “Lord”, and “imperishable”, and “invisible”, and in addition to this, many other [exalted words] are spoken of by the divine Scriptures about Him. So, if each of His inherent properties is elevated to the rank of essence, then how will the Simple not become complex? And to think so is extremely absurd. Therefore, the word “unborn,” meaning one of His inherent properties, will not be [His] essence, and there is no need to say that the existence of God lies in ungeneration.

OTHER . If every essence designates what it defines is, and not what it is not (after all, no one of common sense, when defining the nature of man, would say: “wingless, not four-legged,” but, most likely, [name those signs] , by which he is designated more specifically, and from which he consists, i.e. “a rational animal, mortal”), and the concept “unborn” shows not what God is by nature, but what He is not (after all, it means that He is unborn), then it will not be the essence, and the existence of God will not lie in it.

OTHER . Whatever is asserted of something as denoting what it undoubtedly is, will [denote] either a genus, or a species, or a specific distinction, or a definition. For everything fits for it to be one of the things listed. So, how will the concept of “unborn” point us to the Divine essence? Let those who bring ignorant premises tell [us]. After all, this is not a genus or a species, according to the Aristotelian art [of logic]. For the concepts of genus and species are used in relation to many, differing either in kind or in number. And the name “unborn” cannot be attributed to anyone else, but belongs to God alone, which is why it is used only <75.445> in relation to Him. Therefore, that which cannot be divided into species, species differences and [a certain] number [of individuals] will not be a genus. But perhaps someone will call unbornness a definition. Here, too, we will expose this as a lie. For every definition is a word that explains what it signifies in essence, and “unborn” is represented not by a word, but by a name. Consequently, unbornness will be a difference, and an essential difference, since [only] this remains. But let's see if there is any reason that allows us to not be mistaken in thinking this way. We will then see that everything that admits of difference is complex and not simple. Since absolutely every person confesses that God is simple and not complex, then unbornness will not be a difference. If it is not

any of the above, then the existence of God is not in ungeneracy. For the concept "unbornness" does not designate an essence, but is an indication that it exists in such a way.

OTHER . If the name "unborn," meaning unborn, is an indication of the essence of God, then what prevents the sense of humor (τὸ γελαστικόν), inherent in human nature, from being his essence; or in general to say that everything that is privately inherent in beings is their essence? If the property of each [being] in itself is not its essence, but is inherent in the essence, as, for example, a person has a sense of humor, and a horse neighs, then ungeneracy will not be an essence, not denoting what God is in [His] way. nature, but that He exists in such and such a way, and that - along with other things - is His property.

OTHER . Ungeneracy should be considered as [something] inseparable from the essence of God, just as color is [inseparable] from any body. However, essences are understood not from their inseparably inherent [properties], but from what they are from. Just as you will not know a swan or snow - what they are by nature - if you only know that they are white. After all, whiteness will not be considered [their] essence, but something inherent in the essence.

So, the word "unborn", meaning one of the inseparably inherent properties of the essence of God, will not, as you believe, be an essence. And if so, then he who knows that God is ungenerate does not yet know what He is by nature, but [only] that ungeneracy is inherent in His essence.

The objection is made by those who say that they know God as He knows Himself. The name "unborn," they say, is either understood as a designation of the essence of God, or means some of its accidents. But the Divine essence has no accidents, for it is perfect from itself. Therefore, unbornness will be a sign of essence. And if so, then God knows Himself as unborn. And if anyone else knows this, he will know God in every way, just as He knows Himself.

Rebuttal to this . It is wise to say that the essence of God has no accidents, because it is from itself <75.448> perfect. But we see that many things force us to think of such [things] as accidents with God, although they are not entirely accidents (καὶ εἰ μὴ πάντως συνέβη). For what shall we say, bearing in mind that before the creation of this universe He was in essence the Creator, but in reality He was not yet, since nothing that exists had yet been brought into being? And when He created everything, it was as if He also became the Creator, and this was in some way added to Him (τρόπον τινὰ συμβέβηκε τοῦτο αὐτῷ) due to the fact that He actually appeared to be such. So, if some things are thought of as coming (ἐπισυμβεβηκότα) to God, then you insist in vain that it is not proper to say that ungeneracy is an accident for God, when some [other properties] inherent in Him by nature are shown in the same form [i.e. e. as accidents]?

OTHER . answer us. *Let those who try to measure the sky by a span* [1076] and those who claim to know the Divine essence as it is by nature, what will they say about the name "Father" applied to God? Is it an indication of His essence, or of some accident of it? But those who say that the essence of God has no accidents will not agree that this is an accident. It remains, then, to say that this is an indication of the essence. One and the same, therefore, "Father" and "unborn," so as not to think of God as complex and composed of two essences. And if so, then, since, in your opinion, the "unborn" and the "Father" are one and the same thing, then He neither began to be, nor [did not begin to be] a Father, but was always such, i.e. it is meant that at the same time the Generation is thought of with Him, for [only] in this way will He be the Father. And in addition to this [it must be said that] if the words "unbegotten" and "Father" as applied to God signify essence, then what is to prevent us from saying that these names are completely interchangeable, so that if anyone is a father, then he is also unborn , and if something is unborn, then it is also the father? Then, of course, what is inherent only in God, as His own and exclusive, [the name of] "unborn" will disappear and will pass on to everyone. So, you see what absurdity your words lead to.

OTHER . Without thinking in God any contrived (κατ" ἐπίνοιαν) accidents and not allowing anyone to think like that, you will undoubtedly fall into many difficulties, and we will be surrounded by a countless swarm of lawless thoughts. After all, in fact, if someone asks you: [here, there are words] "Father", "unborn", "incorruptible", "immortal", "invisible" and the like, inherent in God by nature and in relation to affirmed by His essence alone; [so] how many entities will you allow to be, or rather, does each of these [words] mean an entity or not? – what answer will you give? If, indeed, each signifies an essence, then your simple God will be composed of as many essences as can be seen to be inherent in Him by nature [properties]. In addition to this, [you] will certainly have to be true that the opposite of what is named - that is, created, corruptible, visible - will all be of the same essence, or, better said, will designate one essence. And if so, then nothing will prevent you from saying that the tree and the Son, the stone and the Generation are one and the same, for these are created things, both perishable and visible. And then [it turns out that] the order of things is disrupted.

<75.449> So, if those [properties] that are said to be inherent in God by nature are not necessarily His essence, then it remains to be said that they are accidents of the essence, considered such only in words. For it is impossible for human nature to say anything about God that exceeds itself. That is why we use our own customs in relation to Him, citing what is characteristic of us as an example for that which is higher than us, as if we were depicting the vault of heaven on a small tablet.

Objection from the same [heretics] through reductio ad absurdum . God, they say, accurately and truly knows His own nature and knows with certainty what He is in essence. If we do not know as He knows [Himself], then, therefore, we will be

condemned as having an erroneous and distorted opinion about Him. For he who knows not like the one who truly knows [God] will not know truly, but such a one will be deceived in every way.

Rebuttal to this . Again, these people, amazing in their boldness, do not notice into what abyss of wickedness they are falling. For they were probably afraid to appear to know less than God; they are afraid to be considered not as refined in knowledge as the Divine Essence, not realizing that in this too it is so superior to the created ones, as much as it is different from them in nature. Then, in addition to this, is it not extremely absurd to say that someone who does not know something in exactly the same way as someone who has perfect knowledge of a certain subject, which is what we are talking about, does not truly know? After all, one can know [albeit] less - and be inferior in this to the one who knows perfectly - but [still] not completely perverted. Like, for example, someone knows that the moon has an eclipse, but does not know how and in what way; but let's say there is someone else who knows this too. Is it really because one, being wiser, knows both, and the other, inferior to him in the ability to understand, knows [only] one thing, he will falsely think about the moon, saying that it has eclipses? ? But that's not true. So, if it is allowed that some have great knowledge about the same subject, and others have less, and [at the same time] both have a correct opinion, then what prevents us, being human beings, from knowing God worse than He knows about Himself what He is in essence, but, nevertheless, [to know Him] is not false and perverted?

OTHER . We come to the meaning, that is, comprehension, of beings through many and various reflections. And it is not necessary that someone will think falsely and pervertedly in comparison with another due to the fact that he rushes towards what he is looking for, not with the same thoughts, but with some other thoughts. For example, let us have two people who are asked whether a horse is the same thing as a person, and one will answer that it is not the same thing, since every person is endowed with a sense of humor, but a horse is not, and the other will say: “Man - is not the same as a horse, since the property of neighing is not found in its essence.” Will not both speak the truth <75.452>, and give the wrong answer, even if they do not use the same reasoning? So, since it is possible to think differently about any of the existing things, but [at the same time] not falsely or pervertedly, then what prevents God from knowing perfectly what He is in essence, and us, being people who understand worse than Him, – to have [still] not entirely false opinions?

OTHER . If in every rational [being] we see the knowledge inherent in him commensurate with his generic difference, so that we believe that the angels have a different knowledge, greater knowledge in the archangels, and even more superior knowledge in the higher [incorporeal] powers, then it is proportionate [with the race] and the knowledge of man, being less than those of the listed [spiritual beings]. How

then will one who is not of the same mind as an angel think in the same way as God, when it is generally accepted that the knowledge of God surpasses all understanding and goes beyond all comprehension?

OTHER . Many of the names we see applied to God, but each of them seems to signify not what God is by nature, but either indicates what He is not, or means some kind of relation to something different from Him.]. As, for example, "incorruptibility" and "immortality" indicate what [God] is not, and "Father" or "uncreated" - that He is the Parent in relation to the Son, which is opposed [to Him in this respect] , and that He was not created; however, each of these [names] is not a designation of the essence, as we said above, but means something from what is around the essence (τι τῶν περὶ τὴν οὐσίαν). So, if from such names, that is, indications, we are directed to the knowledge of God, then how do we know His essence, recognizing only what is around it, and not being taught what He is by nature? For this is similar to someone saying that he has reliably recognized the human soul - what it is in essence - since he knows that it is qualityless, quantityless and formless; or, saying that he has learned what the human body is by nature, he will say that it is white or black. So, essences are not known from what is around the essences, but from what they are in themselves.

OTHER . God, being simple and uncomplicated, is confessed [as such] by everyone. This means that it is absurd to say that He has the same knowledge about Himself as we do. For if He is something else, and if the knowledge that exists in Him is something other than Him, then He will be complex and not simple. Since He, as is recognized by all, is simple, then the knowledge existing in Him is nothing other than in relation to Him. But with us it's not like that. After all, in our essence we exist separately, but we have knowledge contained in the essence, just as color [is contained] in the body. Therefore, we will not know anything in the same way as God, who are not what He is like. But He, Himself being the Mind, which is above everything [that exists], will divinely contemplate both those who exist and Himself. But we, not being able to exceed the measure given to us, *as in* <75.453> *the mirror and in fortune-telling* [1077] we see the incomprehensible God.

* * *

[1075] Is. 40:12–13 .

[1076] Isaiah 40:12 .

[1077] 1 Cor. 13:12 .

Word 31 Word 33

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 32 Word 34

Word 32. Selections of sayings with syllogisms from the New Testament that the Son is God by nature. And if so, then He is neither a creature nor a creature.

From the Epistle to the Romans

Addressing the Romans, Paul says that he is *a servant of Jesus Christ, called an apostle, chosen for the gospel of God* [1078]. And again in the same Epistle he says about the Son: " *To whom came grace and apostleship for the obedience of faith among all nations, about His name.* " [1079]. Saying that he *was chosen for the gospel of God* , he immediately adds that he was sent to preach *to all nations about the name of* our Lord Jesus Christ [1080], so that on the basis of this it is necessary to undoubtedly confess that Christ is God. How then will He be a creature or creation, since it cannot be assumed that the essence of Him who is by nature God is a created one?

OTHER . " *Grace to you and peace* ," says [Paul], " *from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ* ." [1081]. If Christ, along with God the Father, is included in the giving of Divine gifts and, together with Him, distributes gifts to the saints, then how is it not God who is placed in the rank of God and can easily do everything that He who gave birth to Him? After all, we, of course, do not agree that God and creation can have one natural action, so that neither the created is raised to [the height of] the Divine essence, nor the exclusivity of the Divine nature is introduced to the place appropriate for the created. For those who have invariably the same energy and strength, it is necessary for them that the unity of the species be preserved. Moreover, when the prophet Isaiah says: " *O Lord our God, give us peace* ." [1082], then [and with him] the Son turns out to be the giver of this [world] together with the Father. So, God and the true Son are the One who is in God the Father and does everything together with the Father.

OTHER, about the same thing . Christ, saying goodbye to His disciples and just about to ascend to [His] saving suffering, says: " *My peace I give to you, My peace I leave with you.* " [1083]. So, if He calls the world His own, as [His] own good and inherent in Him, then how not. Will it be obvious to everyone that the exclusive

[properties] of the Father are transferred to the Son not by communion, as is the case with rational creatures, but the logos of the essence transfers to the Begotten the properties of the One who gave birth? That is why He is naturally and inseparably attracted as a co-giver and co-giver, and together with the Father distributes lyres to the saints. And He Who is of such essence, how can He not be God by nature? And if He is God by nature, then He is not a creation.

<75.456> *OTHER* . " *For* ," says [Paul], *"the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; for the knowledge of God is manifest in them, for God has shown it to them. For His invisible, from the creation of the world, has been conceived by creatures, His essence, and His ever-present power and divinity* (θειότης) are visible." [1084]. So, if from the great deeds (μεγαλουργίας) in the creations the divinity of the One who performed them is seen accordingly (ἡ τοῦ μεγαλουργήσαντος θειότης), then the Son will not be included among the created ones. And since He, again, is the Creator of all [beings], then His, of course, divinity is seen through [viewing] created things; How then can He be a creature or creature, whom the nature of the created by the very fact of [their] creation shows to be by nature God?

OTHER . Blessed Paul speaks of those among the creatures who are able to appropriately perceive the divinity of the Creator, *as if they were irresponsible, without understanding God, without having glorified or thanked God.* [1085]. Therefore, if those who see the Creator of creation know God, and *by the Word of the Lord the heavens are established* [1086], then it means God, and not creation, the Son, who called everything into being, Whom, refusing to glorify, those we are talking about remain unrequited. Doxology is due and befits God alone, but is not fitting for created nature, which is what the Savior teaches us, saying to His disciples: " *Let your light be enlightened before men, so that they may see your good deeds and glorify your Father who is in heaven.* " [1087]. For He did not consider it necessary to attribute glory to the disciples for what they are famous for, but to God, to whom it is due. If it behooves Christ to be glorified, as is shown and as the witness of the truth says, then how can He who is clothed with the glory due to God not be God?

OTHER . Blessed Paul says that they are given over *to an unskilled mind* [1088] and *in dishonorable passions* [1089] those who *exchange the truth of God for lies and falsehood and serve the creature more than the Creator, Who is blessed forever. Amen* [1090]. So, if *exchanges the truth for a lie* he who *serves the creature more than the Creator* , then, of course, he preserves the truth who does not do this, but, in contrast to those who are deceived, serves the Creator and Creator. The Creator and Creator is the Son, and we serve Him as the God of all. For we are no longer deceived *by exchanging* the truth. Consequently, He is not a creation, Who, in contrast to creatures, together with the Father is thought of as the Creator, Who *is blessed forever. Amen* .

OTHER . To those who do not know how to repent of their mistakes, but seem to have imposed on themselves indissoluble bonds of depravity (φαυλότητος), Paul says: " *According to your cruelty and unrepentant heart, you are storing up wrath for yourself on the day of wrath and the revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will reward everyone according to his business* " [1091]. Then also to others [he says]: " *For it is fitting for us all to appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that everyone may receive what he has done with his body, either good or evil.* " [1092]. So, if we all appear before the judgment seat of Christ (*for the Father does not judge anyone, but all judgment is given to the Sons)* [1093]), and He *will reward everyone according to their deeds* , then how can He not be God by nature, when Paul says that this will be *a revelation of the righteous judgment of God* , when a sentence will be passed on each of those judged by Him, so that the wicked will be told: " *Go from Me, curse, into everlasting fire* " [1094], and to workers of piety: " *Come , you blessed of My Father* " [1095] , and so on.

OTHER . It is also written: " *Unless by the works of the law all flesh will not be justified in His sight. By the law was the knowledge of sin, but now, besides the law, the righteousness of God has been revealed, and the prophet also bears witness from the law. The truth of God through the faith of Jesus Christ is in all and on all who believe* ." [1096]. So, when we, believing in Christ, are justified as having known God who is by nature and in truth (for this is also confirmed by Paul himself, when he writes to those who are from the tongues: " *Now having come to know God, even more so having been known by God* ." [1097]), then how can the Son be a creature or creature, and not God, according to the sayings of the saints?

OTHER . Encouraging those who are justified by faith in Christ, Paul says: " *We therefore think that a man will be justified by faith, without the works of the law. Or is the God of the Jews only, and not of the tongues? She, and tongues. For there is only one God, who will justify circumcision by faith and uncircumcision by faith* ." [1098]. [But in Scripture] we find Christ performing this [justification]. For, promising to justify those who believe in Him, He says: " *Amen, I say to you: he who believes in Me will* not be condemned, but *will have eternal life* ." [1099]. If it befits God alone to justify, and Christ justifies, then how can He not be God by nature? And if so, then He is not a creation.

OTHER . Paul says nowhere about our forefather Abraham: " *Who is the father of us all, as it is written: As with many tongues he laid you down as a father, directly to God, in whom is faith, who gives life to the dead* ." [1100]. So, when God is called the one who gives life to the dead, and when the Son then says: " *I am life* " [1101], and also: " *Believe in Me to have an eternal life, and I <75.460> will raise him up on the last day* " [1102]; and also: " *I am the resurrection and the life* " [1103], - who would not agree - if, of course, he has intelligence - that He is the genuine and truest offspring of the Father's

essence, bearing in Himself all the properties of the one who gave birth? And if so, then what exists from God is God, and not a creation or creature.

OTHER . Addressing those who are of the tongues, Paul says: " *Remember, you Gentiles , the verbs* (καλούμενοι) [1104] *uncircumcised , as it is in the time without Christ, alienated from the life of Israel and alien from the promise of the covenant, having no hope and ungodly in measure, now* [1105] those who know God." Then, explaining to them the image of knowledge, he says: " *There is a verb near you, in your mouth and in your heart, that is, the verb of faith, which we preach. For if you confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in your heart, that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved* ." [1106]. So, when someone who believes in Christ Jesus and confesses that He is Lord, as having known the true God, is justified, then how is the Son not God by nature? And being such, how can He be a creation?

OTHER . Showing himself to be a steward and minister of the Divine mysteries, Paul says: " *But I wrote boldly to you, my brethren, in part, as if I were remembering to you the grace given to me by God, when I was a minister of Jesus Christ among the nations, ministering the gospel of God so that it would be the offering of the tongue is acceptable and sanctified by the Holy Spirit* " [1107]. Here again he directly states that he received as a gift from God to be a servant of Jesus Christ. Then, explaining the image of the sacred rite, he says: " *in the gospel of God* ," although he preaches and evangelizes Christ Jesus. Thus he knows the Son to be God by nature. After all, he would not have called God someone who was not such by nature, and would not have boasted so much about himself, saying: " *God has been pleased to reveal His Son in me.* " [1108], if [the Son] were a creature and a creature.

From 1 Corinthians

Speaking about the princes of this age and their madness, [Paul] says: " *Even if they understood the Lord , they crucified the Lord of Glory* ." [1109]. Therefore, if the Lord of Glory is the Son who endured the cross, then how is He not God by nature? How can He, whom even the seraphim sing of, be a creature or a creation? For they say that both heaven and earth are full of His glory, and they call Him Lord of Hosts [1110]. It is understandable that they say such things about Him, since He is the Lord of Glory, according to the word of Paul.

<75.461> *OTHER* . " *So let man* not perceive us, " he says, " *as servants of Christ and builders of the mysteries of God* ." [1111]. So, if Paul calls the mystery relating to the Son the mystery of God, then how can He, Whom the Apostle serves, not be God by nature, or how will He be numbered among the creatures? How wrong would it be to call the Gospel of Christ a mystery of God, who said with great boldness: " *Neither have I come from man nor have I learned, but* [1112], of course, from God"? So, when he, having been taught by God, knows the Son as God, who will tolerate those who teach

otherwise?

OTHER . " *In the same way* ," he says, " *before the time, judge nothing, until the Lord comes, Who will bring the secret darkness into light and reveal the counsels of the heart, and then praise will come to everyone from God.* " [1113]. And in the Gospels, Christ promises to place the sheep on the right hand , and the goats on the left, during His second coming; and send the workers of iniquity into everlasting fire, and at the same time give rewards to those who occupy the place on the right hand , saying: " *Come , you blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world* ." [1114]. So, if, despite the fact that it is [precisely] God who has to praise the doer and experienced [ascetic] of virtue, and Christ is the one praising [him], then how can He be a creation, and not, most likely, God from God, completely bearing in Himself the property of the Father's essence and therefore being God by nature, like the One who gave birth to Him?

OTHER . " *I remember* ," he says, " *that we are God's messengers of the last manifestation, like death rowers* ." [1115]. Here again, despite the fact that God is called the one who revealed St. apostles, [in fact] Christ is the one who revealed. How is it that He is not God by nature, being and being called such? And He Who is such, how will He be created?

OTHER . " *I was* ," he says, " *lawless as I am lawless, not a lawless one to God, but a lawyer to Christ, so that I may gain the lawless* ." [1116]. Therefore, God is Christ, whose law we possess, we are not *lawless to God* . And that it is again characteristic of God alone to lay down laws is beyond doubt.

From Second Corinthians

[Paul] says: " *We do not want you, brothers, not to know about our sorrow that happened to us in Asia, for we were burdened much and more than strength, as if we had no hope of living. But we condemn death within ourselves, so that we do not put our trust in ourselves, but in God* <75.464> *who raises the dead* ." [1117]. Here again he clearly says that God raises the dead. And this is what Christ does, saying: " *I am the resurrection and the life* ." [1118], then: " *Believe in Me to have an eternal life, and I will raise it up on the last day* " [1119]. Therefore, God by nature is the Son, who can do what befits God alone. Therefore, He is neither a creature nor created.

OTHER . " *God is faithful , as our word came to you, never to be. For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by me and Silvanus and Timothy, neither was she nor was she, but in Himself she was.* " [1120]. So, when He is proclaimed as the Son by the Father, who says of Him: " *This is My Son* " [1121], and again: " *From the womb before the morning star gave birth to Thee* " [1122], and by some [at the same time] he is called creation and creation, then how can He not be " *she and neither* "?

For what is born by nature cannot be a creature; and what is created cannot become a child by nature. But since Christ is the truth, and *in Him it was* , as Paul says, then, being the Son and proclaimed as such, He cannot be a creature or creation.

OTHER . " *Thanks be to God* ," he says, "who *is always the conqueror of us in Christ Jesus and who shows us the aroma of His mind in every place, for the fragrance of Christ is God's in those who are being saved and in those who are perishing* ." [1123]. Therefore, if through St. God and the Father makes clear to the apostles the stench of the mind of Christ - that is, the word about the knowledge of Him - and those who accepted it are no longer mistaken and will not be counted among the godless and without hope, but *having come to know God* , - as Paul says, - *more but I knew the One from God* [1124], then truly God is Christ, who led the nations away from false gods and was therefore known by them, and, in turn, knew them thanks to [their] faith in Himself. But how can a truly existing God be a creature or a creature?

OTHER . " *For we are not , like many, preaching uncleanly* (καπηλεύον- τες) [1125] *word of God* » [1126]. Therefore, if the word of St. The apostles preach about the Savior, then God is the Son, whose word is not damaged by those who preach and refuse to call Him a creature or creation. So, the word about truth is pure, like undiluted wine, without any admixtures of heretical false wisdom.

OTHER, in response to the words: "Thanks be to God," he says, "who has always conquered us in Christ Jesus and shown us the stench of His mind." [1127]

Revealed through apostolic and evangelical preaching , who else is there if not <75.465> Christ? Therefore, He is *the stench of the mind* of God and the Father, according to what He said: " *No one will come to the Father except by Me.* " [1128]. And again: " *Whoever sees Me, sees the Father* " [1129]. So, being the fragrance of God and the Father, He cannot be other-than in relation to Him, but just as the smell, essentially and by nature, arising from a flower, is an indication of the species that gave birth to it [the plant], so the Son, being, as it were, a certain fragrance of the Fatherly the essence from which He is, points to the One who gave birth. Therefore, He is not a creation, since the Father is not one.

OTHER . " *We preach not to ourselves, but to Christ Jesus the Lord: for your own sake, servants* for Christ's *sake. For God has spoken from darkness to bring forth the light that is in our hearts, to enlighten the minds of His glory* ." [1130]. Behold, he calls the Son the glory of the Father. For when God and the Father has shone forth in our hearts, we are enlightened to the knowledge of Christ, just as He Himself says nowhere: " *No one can come to Me unless the Father who sent Me draws him.* " [1131]. [The Father] draws us to the knowledge of the Son, enlightening the heart of everyone.

So, being the glory of the Father, as He will be a creature, and not, better to say, the Son and God from God, preparing, through His inherent natural greatness, the glorification of Him who begat Him, revealing Himself in the Son, as in an image, according to what He said: " *He who has seen Me, seeing the Father* " [1132]?

OTHER, to the same thing . If the Son, being the glory of the Father, is a creature and a creature, then let each of those created be called the glory of God and the Father. For if it is generally accepted that a created and created entity can rise to this [level], then nothing prevents this dignity from passing on to the whole creation. After all, that which has the natural potential to become something can someday become [that], although it has not yet become. If nothing like this is said in relation to others, but this is inherent only in the Son, then He is not one of all. And if so, then He is not a creation; for that which exists outside of everything is not among all, but is something other than all, which is what God is.

OTHER . " *It is fitting for us all to appear* ," says [Paul], " *before the judgment seat of Christ, so that everyone may receive either good or evil whatever he has done with the body.* " [1133]. Therefore, if we appear before Christ, and He is *the judge of the earth* [1134] and *repay each one according to his deeds* [1135], as the Psalmist says, then the Son is God, and not a creation. After all, the wise Solomon in Ecclesiastes says something similar: " *For God will bring all creation to judgment for every sin, whether good or evil* . " [1136].

<75.468> *OTHER* . " *We do not again praise ourselves before you, but we give you guilt in praising us, so that we may pay attention to those who boast to their faces, and not to their hearts. If we are maddened* (ἐξέστημεν), *God : ıf we are chaste, to you* " [1137]. Behold, again Paul calls Christ God, to whom, he says, *we were amazed* . And he explains exactly how he went into a frenzy (ἐξέστη), saying: " *Let me not boast except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world was crucified to me, and to the world.* " [1138]; and also in other places: " *Is the essence of the Jew? and az. Do you Israelite the essence? and az* [1139]. *A Jew from a Jew, according to the law a Pharisee, according to the truth of the law he was blameless. But even as I have gained, I have imputed Christ for futility, and I have imputed all the knowledge of being, so that I may gain Christ and be found in Him, not having my righteousness, not from the law, but from the faith of Jesus Christ.* [1140] " Do you see how he refused (ἐξέστη) all the praise [that belonged to him] according to the Law in order to gain Christ? This is what the Savior Himself advises us, as if under the guise of a parable, saying: " *The kingdom of heaven is like a merchant, looking for good beads, so that he may find one bead of great value, sell all that he has, and buy it* ." [1141]. Therefore, if [the apostle] went into a frenzy (ἐξέστη) for the sake of Christ, but says that he did it for God, then how is it that the Son is not God by nature? And if so, then He is not a creation. [1142] 0

OTHER . " *Ancient* ," he says, " *mimoidosha is , behold, Bysha all new. "But*

everything from God, who reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ and gave us the ministry of reconciliation, became God in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself not imputing their sins to them. " [1143]. Here we need to examine the image of our reconciliation with God. But it is obvious that having believed in Christ that He is the Son of God, and having accepted Him as the true God, through Him we approach the Father, just as He Himself says: " *No one will come to the Father except by Me.* " [1144]. However, the Savior Himself calls those who have retreated because of sin out of love for mankind to Himself and, reconciling with Himself, says: " *Come to Me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will give you rest.* " [1145]. Therefore, if, having come to Christ and being reconciled with Him, we are reconciled with God and receive remission of sins, then how will He who is in the Father and with the Father not be God from God, justifying the one who comes [to Him] and reconciling the world to Himself? If this is true, then He will not be created.

OTHER . " *We pray according to Christ, as we pray to God, we pray according to Christ: be reconciled to God. He who knew no sin, commit sin on us, so that we may be* <75.469> *God's righteousness about Him* ." [1146]. Therefore, as the only begotten Son of God, having become *in the likeness of the flesh of sin* [1147], Himself is called sin, and so about us, transformed by faith into Him, it is said that we have become the truth of God, which in the proper sense of the word is the Son. For we have been rewarded with the blessings inherent in Him by nature, having become partakers of Him through the medium of the Spirit; He, in turn, accepts the human into Himself, renewing [our] nature in Himself in the image of Divine beauty. So, when Christ is the Father's truth, then how will He be created, and not, rather, co-essential with Him who gave birth, since God and the Father was always righteous, and with Him, of course, was His truth, i.e. the Son?

From the Epistle to the Galatians

" *If anyone preaches the gospel to you more than he eats, let him be anathema. Nowadays, do I argue with people, or with God, or do I seek to please people? Even if he were still a human being, he would not be a servant of Christ* ." [1148]. He who argues with God, that is, who seeks for Him to fully approve of his ways as good, does not *seek to please man* , but rather to become a slave to Christ. So, God is by nature the Son, to whom we all report, offering, as to God and Master, slavish service [consisting] of good deeds. For this means to "dispute" Him. But He who is by nature God cannot be created.

OTHER . " *The same law is for us to be in Christ, that we may be justified by faith: but having come to faith, it is no longer under the commandment of us. For you are all sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus: if you were baptized into Christ, you put on Christ* ." [1149]. If, having put on Christ by faith, we were transformed into Him, and therefore

are called sons of God, by position (κατὰ θέσιν), of course; and what is by position always happens in imitation of what is by nature. Therefore, Christ is the Son by nature, and not by adoption. But by nature, what is born of God can be a creature or creation, when logic forces us all to admit that what is born from him has the same nature as the one who gave birth?

OTHER . " *I say: at all times there is a young heir, a servant who is no better than one, who is the Lord of all, but he is under masters and guardians even before the command of the father. Likewise, we, when we were young, under the elements of the world of enslavement. When the end of the year has come, God sent His only begotten Son, begotten of wife, to be under the law, so that He may redeem those under the law, and receive sonship .*" [1150]. If, working with the elements of the world as creatures, we were babies and fools, and the Son of God, in their opinion, is a creation and a creature, then we are still guilty of ancient crimes and are now babies <75.472> no less [than before], working again creatures instead of the Creator. And if, having come to know the true God and Lord of *the one who is born of a wife and is under the law* , we have left to serve the creature instead of the Creator, then it means that God and the true Son Christ, of whom we too, having appeared as partakers, have accepted adoption and are already declared free , as having put on the free Son Himself, so that the image of our [ancient] bondage might disappear.

OTHER . " *I tell you, brethren, the gospel preached from me is not according to man, for I did not receive it from man, nor did I learn it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.* " [1151]. So, let's see what the one who learned the secret about Him from Him says about the Son. " *Jesus Christ* ," he says, " *yesterday and today, the same and forever .*" [1152]. Behold, he clearly confesses that the Son abides in an immutable and untransformable nature, which is characteristic of God and the Father alone and is not inherent in anyone else among the created ones. Therefore, if only God and the Father is immutable, and the Son is in the identity of nature [with Him], always being the same as He who gave birth to Him, then how can the only one be one of the created, Who competes with the One who gave birth in relation to the ineffable logos essence, being by nature the same as the Father, with the exception of being the Father?

OTHER . " *For I died according to the law, but I will live by God; I have been crucified with Christ, but no one else lives, but Christ lives in me .*" [1153]. If, having accepted the new law of the Savior, we *live according to God* , and according to the Law [given] through Moses we die (for we no longer live by it), then it means that Christ is God and the true God. And if so, then He is not a creation. And that we live for Christ Himself is testified by the herald of truth himself, who says: " *For if one died for all, then all died, so that those who live live not for themselves, but for him who died and rose again for them.* " [1154]. If, by living for Christ, we are called those who live *God* , then how can He not be God? What is creation or creation?

OTHER . " *Now the Scripture foresaw that through faith God would justify the nations, first tell Abraham that all the nations* would be blessed because of you ." [1155]. If it is said that God justifies tongues, and Christ is the one who does this and *takes away the sin of the world* [1156], according to the word of John, this means that the Son is God, and the true God. For the Jews, being wicked, say only one thing truly, that *no one can forsake sins, except one God* [1157] as Lord of the Law.

OTHER . " *But then, since you do not know God, you serve* <75.473> *not by nature as a real God; Now, having come to know God, and, moreover, having been known from God, how do you return to the weak and evil elements, which you want to serve again* ?" [1158] If the elements of the world, which have a created nature, are contrasted with Christ - as if not the same as them - then, therefore. He does not turn out to be one of the created things, as far as they are not gods by nature, but He truly is such. For this distinction is introduced by Paul through the above chapter. And that the people knew Christ as God, this, I think, is obvious to everyone. After all, He frees those who believe in Him from the delusion of polytheism. And also that tongues knew Him, and that they *knew Him from* Him, hear from Him Himself saying: " *My sheep hear My voice." [1159], and I know My, and they know My Me* [1160]».

OTHER . " *Brothers , I pray. You have not offended me in any way, but you know that because of the weakness of the flesh, those who preached the good news to you first, and my temptations in my flesh, you did not despise or despise, but like an angel of God you embraced me, like Christ Jesus* ." [1161]. [Paul], rejoicing and greatly marveling at the reverence of the [Christians] living in Galatia for God and [also their] love for him, said: " *As an angel of God embraced me* ," and, extending [in his praise] even higher, added: " *like Christ Jesus* ." And what is the superiority of Christ over the angel - let him teach himself, saying: " *When he brings the Firstborn into the universe, he says: and let all the angels of God worship Him.* " [1162]. And again: " *To whom should the angel say: My Son art Thou, this day I have begotten Thee and sit at My right hand , Until I will make Your enemies Your footstool* ?" [1163] And it is also written about them: " *Make angels your spirits and make your servants scorching fire* ." [1164]. So, when there is such a difference between them - that the angels worship the Son and serve Him, and He sits [on the throne] in the rank of King, Son and Master, while they *are sent to serve* [1165], - how will He not be God, Whom even the angels recognize as such by nature? After all, if He, according to the unreasonable opinion of the heterodox, is a creation, then one can perhaps say that not only we, but also the heavenly powers themselves are seduced so that they serve the creature instead of the Creator. If this is absurd (for no one ever said that holy angels can be deceived, but rather they have true knowledge of God, and they worship the Son as being such by nature), then, therefore, He is not a creature and not a creation. For anything created cannot be God by nature.

OTHER . " *In the same way , brothers, we are not the children of a slave, but free,*

but *by the freedom by which Christ* <75.476> *set us free* ." [1166]. If [the right] to liberate belongs to the Master, and Christ liberates us and breaks the bonds of slavery, calling us to sonship, then, therefore, He is not a slave, but the Son and Master, by grace clothing the worthy with what He Himself is by nature.

From the Epistle to the Ephesians

" *Paul , the messenger of Jesus Christ by the will of God, to all the saints who are in Ephesus and to those who are faithful in Christ Jesus*" [1167]. By the will of God and the Father, ordained to the apostleship, as he himself affirms here, he calls the Son the radiance of the Father and the image of His hypostasis. [1168]. How then will the Son be the image of the uncreated and uncreated essence and hypostasis of the Father, if He, according to some, existed from non-existents? After all, it is in every possible way necessary that the image of something should have an exact likeness in relation to what it is the image of. If the Son is the image of the uncreated Father, then He too will be, like Him, uncreated and uncreated, and in general – the true God. And if so, then He is not a creation.

OTHER . " *Remember also that you, who are sometimes pagans in the flesh, are alienated from the life of Israel and alienated from the covenant of promise, having no hope and being godless. not in the world: now O Christ Jesus, you who were sometimes far away, were near by the quick blood of Christ* " [1169]. If at the time when the nations went astray, they were separated from Christ and therefore were alien to good hope and *ungodliness in the world* , then Christ, therefore, is the hope of all and God, having known Whom, the peoples will avoid continuing to abide in them in godlessness, as those who have known the true Lord. How can a creature or creation be recognized as God by those who are in error and save those who find Him, and lead them into good hope, according to what was said: " *Good , good and faithful servant: you were faithful for a few, I will set you over many: enter into the joy of the Lord yours* " [1170].

OTHER . " *For this is our world, who created both as one, and destroyed the middle wall of the fence, enmity with His flesh, abolishing the law of commandments by teachings* " [1171]. It is written nowhere about God's laws that one should neither add anything to them nor take anything away from them [1172]. So, despite the fact that God absolutely forbade this and said that no one is allowed to add anything to what He commanded or take away, Christ alone is found by those who do this. For He took away and *abolished the law of the commandments* , and added the teachings about faith in Him and piety. And <75.477> how can we count among the created One Who is invested with the power befitting God, and who alone does what belongs to God alone?

OTHER . " *Moreover , for one is not strangers and strangers, but is a companion*

with the saints and dreams of God ." [1173]. How then will the Son not be God if those who unite with Him through faith are called, thanks to this, members of God? And He Himself, explaining the image of kinship in spirit, says somewhere about His disciples: " *Whoever does the will of My Father who is in heaven, he is My brother, and My sister, and My mother.* " [1174].

OTHER . " *For this reason I bow my knee to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, from Whom is every fatherland in heaven and on earth called* " [1175]. What happens by position is always likened to what happens by nature. Likewise, what is described by imitation of something is distant from the truth of the prototypes. So, if from God's fatherhood the name of the fatherland passes to us, then how would it not be very wicked to say that it is fitting for us to be by nature the fathers of those who [descended] from us, although we became and are called such in imitation of the true [Father] , and the archetypal and first Father - God - to be deprived of genuine birth; and that it is appropriate to confess the Son not from Him and not essentially originated, but to imagine Him as something alien to the Fatherly essence and coming from outside? How, in general, will one who has not given birth to anything be a Father, if, of course, the name "father" is a designation of the ability consisting in the ability to give birth, and through birth, as the process of childbirth, connects the one who gave birth with the one born into a unity of essence? So, since the Father speaks the truth, turning to His Son: " *From the womb before the star I begat Thee* ." [1176], and truly begot Him from Himself (for this is what the words " *out of the womb* " mean), then He is not a creation, but rather God from God and the Son, as from the Father [born] by nature.

OTHER . " *One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in all of us* " [1177]. When one Lord is God and Father, how will the Son be Lord if He is a creature or a creature? After all, it is quite obvious that what was created has a slave nature. How then, given that there is only one faith, he who believes in the Son believes in the Father? [1178], if, according to the foolish opinion of some, [the Son] is cut off from natural communion with the Father? But, while God and the Father is Lord, the Son is also Lord, and whoever believes in Him believes in the Father. For it is obvious that the Son, who naturally exists from the Father and in the Father, and, in turn, having the Father in Himself, is recognized with Him by God and is glorified (συνθεολογεῖται καὶ συνδοξάζεται). And thus, the faith of those who approach [Him] ascends to the one Godhead. How <75.480> then [will there be] among creation the One Who has everything in common with the Father, as the true fruit of His essence, and not like us, adopted into sonship and grafted shoots?

OTHER . " *Be imitators of God, as beloved children, and walk in love, as Christ loved us, and gave Himself for us* ." [1179]. See again how he knows and calls Christ God. For, having said that we need to become imitators of God, he immediately

introduces Him and teaches us how we should imitate, saying: " *As Christ also loved us, and gave Himself for us* ." So, when Christ appears by nature and is called God, and moreover [is called] those to whom *is assured from God and the Father the gospel* [1180], - who will tolerate those who say otherwise? But will God be a creature or a creature by nature?

OTHER . " *For this you know, that every fornicator, or unclean person, or covetous person, who is an idolater, has no inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God.* " [1181]. Here, again, having named Christ, he immediately introduces God, since God and the Father reigns in Him, and He, in turn, in the Father, according to what He Himself said to the Father: " *For all that is mine is Thine, and Thine is Mine* ." [1182]. And one of all is the kingdom common between the Son and the Father, and common between the Father and the Son, while, of course, the Holy Spirit also reigns with Them, for thus the Holy and worshiped Trinity reveals the one nature of the Divinity . How then will God the Word, reigning in the Father and with the Father, be a creature?

OTHER . " *Let no one flatter you with vain words. For these sakes the wrath of God is coming upon the disobedient sons* ." [1183]. And who are these *disobedient* sons , if, undoubtedly, not those who, by sinning, departed from the laws of the Savior? If the Savior Himself is the one who brings wrath upon them, since He says: " *Depart from Me , you cursed ones, into eternal fire* ." [1184], and if blessed Paul knows Him by God and shows Him through these words, then who will tolerate those who call Him a creature?

OTHER . " *For this reason he says: Arise, sleep, and rise from the dead, and Christ will illuminate you.* " [1185]. The Lord's ability to enlighten is a matter of light, and Christ enlightens, then, therefore, He is Light, and *Light the true* [1186]. For *darkness cannot embrace Him* [1187]. The true Light and the Father; therefore, the Son *is Light from Light* , and *God from God* [1188]. If so, then He is not a creation.

OTHER, to the same words . That which has received the ability to shine from communion to another <75.481> has acquired grace, and is not itself called light in the proper sense. But the Son is not so, for He says: " *I am light* ." [1189]. This means that He is the true Light, like the Father. And being by nature indistinguishable from God and the Father, how will He be a creature or a creature? After all, then it's time to call the Father Himself that, which is the highest degree of absurdity and contains immeasurable blasphemy.

OTHER . " *Husband , love your wife, just as Christ loved the church , and gave her to Himself for her sake, that he might sanctify her, cleansing her with the washing of water in the verb* ." [1190]. If none of the advantages inherent in the Divine nature in any of the created things is found existing by nature and in the proper sense of the word, but rather [is] all-absorbed and imparted from the one who created them, as Paul

certainly did, putting something like this by the truest definition in relation to everyone, says: " *Why ? did you take it* " [1191]; then it is obvious that holiness rests in God alone, but not in others. But rather, they are sanctified from the Holy God, as if receiving sanctification from a source. But they themselves cannot sanctify. Therefore, if, despite the fact that nothing created has the power to sanctify, but Christ is found by those who create, then in comparison with them He will be different in nature. But whoever escapes being a creature and possesses the blessings of the Divine nature, how will he not be God by nature?

From the Epistle to the Philippians

" *Do everything without murmuring or hesitation, so that you may be blameless and innocent, a child of God without blame* " [1192]. If, as Blessed Paul himself asserts nowhere, it is Christ who says about us: " *Behold, I and the children, even as I have given is God .*" [1193], - then we, of course, thanks to sobriety (διὰ προσοχῆς) are His immaculate children. And if so, then how will He be a creation?

OTHER . " *Because our life is in heaven, from there we wait for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will transform the body of our humility, as if to be in conformity with the body of His glory, by His action He will be able to subdue all things to Himself* " [1194]. " *Sit right hand at my* ," the Father says nowhere to the Son, " *until I will make your enemies your footstool .*" [1195]. But Paul also testifies that *is able to* the Son *subdue all things to Himself* , and that it is easy for Him to do what only the Father can do. Since God is simple, the power existing in Him is not anything other than Him, but, of course, the Son Himself, who has one essence with Him and, thanks to the identity of nature, seems to be in the One who gave birth, even though He is *God from God* . and *the Light* that shone forth *from the Light* , being thought of as the Son, and not the Father. So, if [He is] all the energy and power of the <75.484>Father, by which the Father accomplishes all things, how will He be of the created nature? Therefore, the Son is not a creation, as some foolishly think of Him.

OTHER, about the same thing syllogistically . If everything that is created, as it were, in hypostasis, is brought from non-existence into being, and Christ, being the wisdom and power of God and the Father, belongs, according to some, to the nature of created things, then it is necessary to admit that God was once unwise and powerless, and then somehow became so [i.e. e. wise and strong], when the Son at a certain moment was called into being. For such is the nature of created things. But it is both blasphemous and ignorant to have such an opinion about God. Blasphemous - for the Father was never unwise and devoid of strength; ignorant - again, for this reason. After all, if the Son, in their opinion, was created, then He was created, of course, by the Father. But, being deprived of power and at the same time wisdom, the Father would not have been able to bring into existence such a Son that He would be called both the image and the

mark of His hypostasis. For how could the Son, who is above all creation, be created without wisdom and power, when the Divine Scripture says about such a creature, which is so lesser in comparison with Him, that it was created by the wisdom and power of God? And if small things required the wisdom of the Creator in order to be created well, then is not much more great? But these [people] have much more absurd thoughts. The Father was always wise and strong; Consequently, the Son, co-essential with the Father as His power and wisdom, does not belong to the number of created things.

OTHER . " *The Lord is near* ," says [Paul], " *do not worry about anything* ." [1196]. Notice again how this [speech] shows us that the Son is the true God. After all, when Paul says that Christ, as Lord, is near us, He Himself, through one of the prophets [cries out like this]: " *I am God , draw near, says the Lord, and not God from afar* " [1197]. So, when the Son Himself knows and calls Himself God, as we have heard, how can anyone think that by calling Him a creation, he will be right and will not sin?

OTHER . " *But in all things, by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be made to God, and may the peace of God, which surpasses all understanding, guard your hearts and your minds about Christ Jesus.* " [1198]. Talking somewhere with His disciples, the Savior says to them: " *My peace peace* I give to you, My *I leave with you* ." [1199]. So, when He calls the world His own, and Paul says that it is God's, then he obviously considers God the Son, who gives peace to the saints, to whom blessed Isaiah, moved by the prophetic spirit, as if on behalf of those who believed in Him, cries out: " *Lord Our God, give us peace* <75.485> *, for you have given us everything* ." [1200]. Therefore, if Paul knows and confesses the Son as God, then let the nonsense of those who teach otherwise go to hell.

OTHER . " *The rest, brethren, as much as is true, as much as is honest, as much as is righteous, as much as is most pure, as much as is most loving, as much as is worthy of good praise; if there is any virtue and if there is any praise, think on these things, and you will learn from them, and you will eat them, and the God of peace will be with you* ." [1201]. Behold, here he again calls the Son God, saying: " *peace My* I give unto you ." So apply the above reasoning to this as well.

From the Epistle to the Colossians

" *In every way* ," says [Paul], " *all works are fruitful and increase in the mind of God* ." [1202]. If we come to know our Lord Jesus Christ through apostolic and evangelical preaching, we come to know not one of the creatures, but Himself *above all* [1203]God, then how can the Son not be truly God, introducing with Himself the knowledge of the Father and, in turn, immediately being introduced as the Son thanks to the name "Father"? After all, one thing is contained in the other by necessity, since this is typical of names [defining what is named] in relation to something [1204]. And the Savior

Himself says somewhere to His Father: " *I have revealed Your name as a man .*" [1205], Having made Himself revealed to them. For as soon as someone knew that there is a Son, he also knew the definition of Him who gave birth, that is, what the Father is. So, since the Son is also God, how can He be created by Him, and not, rather, begotten [of Him] as from the Father, as in fact it is?

OTHER . " *Giving thanks to God and the Father, who has called you to participate in the inheritance of the saints in the light, who delivered us from the power of darkness and brought us into the kingdom of the Son of His love, for whom the imams delivered deliverance through His blood and the remission of sins* " [1206]. The Divine Scripture subordinates all the nature of created things to the rule of slavery to God, saying: " *For all things are Your work .*" [1207]. It retains the royal dignity of God alone, in extremely close connection [with the previous statement] crying: " *You yourself are my King and my God .*" [1208], - since the One who is by nature a King must also be God. Therefore, if, despite the fact that no other created person is invited to [share] the royal honor, the Son truly and by nature reigns with the Father, then how can He who by nature has in Himself its own and exclusive [properties] belong to the number of the created ones? Fatherly essence?

OTHER . " *this all things were created For by , even in heaven* <75.488> *and on earth, visible and invisible* " [1209]. If *was created by Him the Bysha* , then He cannot be fairly counted among everyone, but, most likely, He will be outside of everything. After all, having said " *every kind* ," [Paul] left nothing outside [the number of] those who seem to be brought into existence from non-existence. If all [they were created] thanks to Him, and He Himself is different in comparison with everyone, then how will He be a creature who avoided being among everyone because of the difference of [His] nature?

OTHER . " *I want to lead you, since the imam has fought for you and for those who are in Laodicea and Hierapolis, and those who have not seen my face in the flesh, may their hearts be comforted, dreaming of love and in all the riches of the knowledge of the mind, in the knowledge of the secrets of God and the Father and Christ, in Him are all the hidden treasures of wisdom and reason .*" [1210]. If the mystery of God exceeds the measure of all knowledge, and in the words about Him one sees the highest degree of wisdom and understanding, and in the mystery relating to Christ, *all the treasures of wisdom and understanding are hidden* , then how can there not be God who surpasses every measure of language and eludes all mind and wisdom, to comprehend Whom none of the created [beings] seems sufficient? For *generation who can confess His* ? [1211]- as the prophet says.

OTHER . " *If you are risen with Christ, seek those on high, where Christ is, sitting at the right hand of God .*" [1212]. If not one of the created [beings] is one-throne and does not neighbor with the King of all, to *whom should an angel say: sit right hand at My* ?

but all of them, rather, *are service souls* [1213], - and the Son is shown to be the only one with [royal] dignity and neighbors and co-reigns with the Father, then how will He be one of the created ones, Who, like God, is endowed with dignity above every creature and has common royal thrones with the One who gave birth?

OTHER . " *Be wise from above, not from earth. You have died, and your life is hidden with Christ. When Christ appears to you, then you will appear with Him in glory* ." [1214]. If by God we *live and move and are* [1215], then how will the Son, the Life of all, not be God? If the ability to generate life belongs only to God by nature, then none of the created things can be called life truly and in the proper sense of the word, being, most likely, involved in the life of the Giver [of life]. And if there is nothing false in Christ (for He is the Truth), then, therefore, He is by nature Life; and if so, then so is God.

OTHER . " *Do not lie to one another, having put* off *the old man with his deeds and put on the new, renewed in mind after the image of Him who created him* ." [1216]. We are transformed into Christ through faith. Paul teaches us this when he says: " *My children , in the image of your sickness, Christ will be imagined in you* ." [1217]. And again: " *As we have put on the image of the earthly, let us also be clothed in the image of the heavenly* ." [1218]. So, since, having perceived His likeness, we become in the image of the Creator, and God creates man, according to what was said: " *And God created man* ." [1219], - then, therefore, Christ is God, and, therefore, the Creator, and not a creature; The Creator, not the creation.

From 1 Thessalonians

" *For from you* ," says [Paul], " *the word of the Lord rushed not only into Macedonia and Achaia, but also into every place your faith went forth to God.* " [1220]. If those who believe in Christ believe not in any other being, but in God Himself, then how can Christ not be God? If so, then He will not be a creation.

OTHER . As if talking with someone, [Paul] says: " *For they proclaim about us* (ἀπαγγέλλουσιν) [1221] " *What is the entrance I have to you, and how have you turned to God from idols, to work for God living and in truth* ?" [1222]. If, having departed from the initial error, former pagans turn to God through faith in Christ, and if those who work for Christ by keeping the Gospel commandments work for the true God, then how can the Son not be God by nature? For it means "true." How will God be a creation by nature?

OTHER . " *For we know, brethren, that our coming to you was not in vain: but before the suffering and the troubles that happened, as we knew in Philippi, we boldly spoke to you the good news of our God* τὸ εὐαγγέλιον *) (with many feats* " [1223]. Behold, again he directly calls Christ God; This is his gospel.

OTHER, like this . " *But byhom tisi in the midst of you; Just as a milkmaid warms her children, so desiring you, with the grace of giving you not just the gospel of God, but also her souls .*" [1224]. And again, immediately after this: " *Remember, brethren, our labor and deed: we work night and day, so that we may not burden even one of you, preaching to you the gospel of God.* " [1225].

OTHER . " *For this reason, we thank God unceasingly, because we have received the word of God's hearing from us, not as the word of man, but as in truth it is the word of God, which is at work in you* <75.492> *believers .*" [1226]. If the blessed apostles were talking about faith in Christ, according to what Paul said: " *For I did not judge the things that were in you, even Jesus Christ was crucified.* " [1227], and they call preaching about Him the word of God, then who would be so bold as to dare to call Him creation whom the apostolic lips call God, and risk contradicting [the men] who speak by the Spirit?

From Second Thessalonians

" *But the Lord is faithful , He will establish you and keep you from the evil one* " [1228]. If the Savior is faithful, since He makes those who come to Him faithful, strengthening them through faith, then He will, of course, be God by nature, since He makes those who trust in Him gods. For it belongs to the Faithful to make faithful (πιστοποιεῖν), and to God, accordingly, to make alive (θεοποιεῖν); just as, of course, the job of light is to illuminate.

From the Epistle to the Hebrews

" *In many parts and in many ways of old, God spoke to the Father in the prophets, in the last days He spoke to us in the Son, whom He set as heir to all, in Whom also the worlds were created .*" [1229]. Showing the gospel teaching (παίδευσιν) as the best of the Covenant given through Moses and the prophetic preaching, [Paul] makes a distinction based on the difference of persons. So, in ancient times, as he argues, the word [of God] was proclaimed to the fathers through the prophets, and in recent times through the Son, who had such great superiority over them that the first, without rising above the level of the ministers, proclaimed: " *This saith the Lord ... .*"; and the second, being invested with the Sovereign dignity, speaks like the Son: " *Hear , as it was said to the ancients: not to commit adultery; I tell you ...*" [1230]and so on. How then will God be by nature among the creatures? or how will the Lord of all be placed among the slaves? And if He is *the heir of all* , then He is different in relation to everyone, of whom He is the heir. And if [God] *by Him created the worlds* cannot be created , *then He before the ages.* [1231], for not one of the creatures has an existence that is older than the age, but [they are all] created in time. The Son alone is inherent in timeless existence with the Father.

OTHER . " *If the word spoken by the angels is quickly known, and every crime and righteous disobedience is accepted as a reward, how will we escape from that careless salvation that began to be spoken from the Lord by those who heard it in us?* » [1232] Here he is obviously trying to show from the difference of persons what advantage the gospel preaching has over the shadow of the Law. [1233]. After all, if, as he says, the [laws] commanded through angels were characterized by such authority (τὸ ἀξιόπιστον) that those who dared to violate them were subject to the most severe <75.493> punishment, then does not he who is found to transgress what was commanded through the Son deserve to be punished so much more? How far does the Son surpass the angels in honor? If it is necessary to survey the measure of each, then some, standing before [the throne], sing and *are the servant souls sent into service* [1234]; and the other is sung together with the Father, being co-throne with Him and co-reigning, and receiving the service of angels, according to what is said in the Gospels: " *And behold, the angels came and served Him.* " [1235]. How can one so superior [to the angels] as the Only Begotten be found among those so inferior [to Him]? How he who sits [on the throne] together with the Father [will be] among those standing; he who receives service is among the servants; or among the subjects (ἐν τοῖς βασιλευομένοις) - endowed with royal dignity?

OTHER . Blessed Paul, referring to Christ what was said in the eighth psalm, says: "What is a man, because you remember him, or a son of man, because you visit him? [1236] *Thou hast made him a little less than an angel: Thou hast crowned him with glory and honor, and Thou hast placed Thy hand over his affairs; Thou hast subdued all things under his nose.* " [1237]. Then he adds: " *Let him subdue everything, leave nothing unsubdued to him .*" [1238]. So, shall we not confess Him as King and Lord, and clothed with divine glory, to Whom *all things are subject ?* [1239]? How is He not God? As among all He who *is above all* [1240], and Who is so above the nature of the created that they are subjugated and kept in the bonds of slavery, and He is clothed with the free dignity of dominion and has everything under His feet (His), just as He Himself says somewhere through one of the holy prophets: " *Heaven is My throne, earth a footstool for My feet* " [1241]?

OTHER . " *Also , holy brother, the title of heavenly partaker, understand the messenger and saint of our confession, Jesus Christ, who is faithful to Him who created Him, just as Moses was in all His house. For this greater glory was given to Moses than to Moses, to have greater honor than to the house that created it: every house is created from one: and he that created every thing is God.* " [1242]. It is obvious that, teaching that one should not equally honor the created and the one who created, he does not at all allow the Son to be placed on the same level with the creations, for *the greatest honor* , he says, *is to have more than the house that created him .* And whoever created everything then - let him [who spoke] say again about the Son: " *by Him was created For , visible and invisible, even thrones, if dominions, if beginnings,*

ıf powers: all things were created by Him and about Him, and He is before all ." [1243]. How then is there a Creator among creations? And if among all there is time itself, as one of all, and He is before all, then it is obvious that the Son is older than time. After all, *in Him* , - says [Scripture, - God] <75.496> *created the eyelids* [1244]. How then will He who was before the ages be counted among those who arose in time? After all, everything that is created in the act of creation will certainly begin to be in time, since the ever-present is reserved for the Divine and pure nature alone, as its exclusive property.

OTHER . " *And Moses was faithful in all His house, like a servant, as a witness to them that had spoken; Christ is like a Son in His house, whose house we are .*" [1245]. From the names and results [of actions] he makes a comparison of superiority and shows the difference in the essential, so to speak, quality that Christ has in comparison with Moses, and by his example - with all created things. For [his] rushes towards this conclusion. So, if one is *like a servant* , and the other *is like a Son* ; and one is as a faithful servant (οἰκέτης) in the house, and the other as an heir, and not in the house, but over His house, then how will He who is so different be of the same kind with him? But He who is not related to Moses, who has a created nature, and, moreover, is not his co-slave, and cannot be compared with anyone else according to the logos of nature as one in nature. For the comparison [is made here] with the created ones, and, of course, not with Moses, although in this case the person of Moses is considered.

OTHER, from the same area . If everything brought into existence remains in slavery to God who created [it], according to what is sung in the Psalter: " *For all things are Your work .*" [1246], and *the sons are free* [1247], according to the true word of the Savior, then how can we admit that the Son, free by reason of [His] ineffable birth from the Father, will be of the same nature with those who, by reason of [their] creation, are slaves?

OTHER, from the same region, to the words: "To whose house we are" [1248]. If it is God who speaks through the prophets: " *For I will dwell in them and walk around, and I will be their God, and they will be my people .*" [1249], - then how are we now *the house of* the Son, if He is not God by nature? But we pray, as Paul says, *that Christ may dwell in the inner man* [1250], and we are and are called the house of the Son. Therefore, Christ is God. And if so, then He is not a creation.

OTHER . " *Beware, brethren, lest any of you have a deceitful heart, [filled with] unbelief who will live to depart from God .*" [1251]. In Christ is [our] faith, and for it the saints are entitled to gifts and endless life. For teaching us this, He Himself says nowhere: " *Believe in Me to have eternal lıfe .*" [1252]. So, if he who renounces faith in Him and gains *a heart craftily departs from God is alive* , then how is it that the Son is not God by nature? <75.497> Or how, being the same as the Father, Whose He is the Son, He will be a creature or creation, bearing [in Himself] all the distinctive and

exclusive properties of Him who begat? For the Father is a living God, and likewise the Son is living.

OTHER . " *For the Word of God is living and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and passing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, members and brains, and judges by the mind and thought of the heart. And there is no creature that is not revealed before Him, but all naked and declared before His eyes .*" [1253]. Again one can see the Son bearing [in Himself] these distinctive properties of the Father and adorned with the same blessings as He who begat Him is seen [adorned]. So, when God and the Father obviously carries [within Himself] everything and sees everything without hindrance, and also sees *hearts and wombs* [1254], and therefore he says: " *Who is it that hides advice from Me?* » [1255], then: " *God draw near, I am," says the Lord, and not God from afar Who will hide* from Me *in hidden things?* » [1256]and Paul, by what he said, testifies that all this also belongs to the Son. Then the Word of the Father - Living, because He is [itself] Life - [Paul] calls Living, since He, too, is Life by nature. So, when everything that justly belongs to the Father by nature also by nature and essentially resides in the Son, then who, calling Him a creation, will not be guilty of the terrible crime of blasphemy? For how will those who belong to the same nature and possess the same essential energy not be of the same nature?

OTHER . " *By faith we understand to be perfected by the word of God, from those things which are not seen to come into being .*" [1257]. by the Divine verb, that is, by God the Word and the Son, and these centuries, as we believe, *If none of the creations has pre-eternal existence, but was accomplished* then it is necessary to confess that He exists before the ages. For, being in being and existing (ὢν καὶ ὑπάρχων) before them, He brings into being the ages that once did not exist. How will the Creator be among the creatures? How, again, among those who are under time, [will there be] the Creator of times and the bearer of the everlasting befitting God and Father alone?

OTHER . " *Don't forget about charity and fellowship: with such sacrifices God is pleased* " [1258]. Look again at how Paul here calls the Son God. For if He exists, *bring all creation to judgment* [1259]and *repay each one according to his deeds* [1260]and therefore accepts those who do good to [his] neighbor, saying [to them]: " *Come , blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Become hungry, and give Me food; be thirsty, and give Me something to drink .*" [1261], then how can he not be God, who is so called by the unfaithful words of the saints, and who accepts the sacrifices of <75,500> benefactors, and who gives to each his due reward, and who sends the face of the saints to the Heavenly Kingdom?

From 1 Timothy

" *Paul , the messenger of Jesus Christ at the commandment of God our Savior and the Lord Jesus Christ our hope, to Timothy, the child of the faith* " [1262]. Now, Paul

claims that he accepted the ministry of apostleship *at the command of God our Savior* . But let us examine, examining the divine Scripture, whether it was Christ who commanded him. So, when he, having persecuted the disciples, rushed, as it is written, from Jerusalem to Damascus and was in the middle of the road, Christ appeared to him, saying: " *Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting Me?* » [1263] And to Paul's question: " *Who are you, Lord?"* "said: " *I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting."* But *arise and go into the city, and it is said to you what you ought to do.* " [1264]. What else was said to him - we will find in the "Acts of the Apostles": " *And to those who serve the Lord and fast, the Holy Spirit said: Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for work, for whom I have called them.* " [1265]. Then again it is written about them: " *This one, being sent by the Holy Spirit, went down to Seleucia, from there sailed to Cyprus, and was in Salamis, proclaiming the word of God among the crowds of Judea.* " [1266]. Do you see how, *at the command of our Savior,* he is sent by the Holy Spirit to preach? So, when he calls Him God, and Savior, and our Hope, how would it not be very wicked to call the Son a creature? After all, if this is so, then we too will turn out to be serving the creation and saved by the creation, and having hope in the creation, and then we are no better than those serving the creation.

OTHER . " *No law lies with the righteous, but with the wicked and disobedient* ." [1267] . Then, adding to these other bad things, he concludes: " *And if anything else is contrary to sound teaching, according to the gospel of the glory of the blessed God, I am sure.* " [1268]. So, whose gospel was Paul entrusted with? Whose preacher and apostle is he, if not our Savior Christ, whom he, calling Him blessed God, does not allow anyone to call created? How, in fact, will [something] created and new by God be? After all, if everything that is created and has a created essence is called into being from non-existence, then how is it not new? But such is not God, for the Divine Scripture says: " *There will be no new God for you* ." [1269]. Since the Son is God, it means that He is not new. And if so, then it is not a creation. And that the gospel of our Savior was entrusted to blessed Paul by [Christ] Himself - this again he himself shows in <75.501> subsequent [lines], adding [to what was said earlier]: " *I thank Christ who strengthens me, for Nepschev was faithful in putting me in service , who sometimes became me a blasphemer and a persecutor and an annoyancer But I was shown mercy, because the unknown had committed unbelief* ." [1270].

OTHER . " *The word is true and worthy of all acceptance, for Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am the first." But for this reason I was pardoned, so that in me Jesus Christ would be the first to show all long-suffering, as an example of those who want to believe in Him for eternal life* ." [1271]. If by faith in Christ we are saved and become partakers of eternal life, being released from the yoke of death, then how is it not God by nature the Son, who gives life, as He Himself is Life by nature, and saves, as God, Who alone is able to do this and therefore he says: " *I am God who saves* you , *and there is no one except Me* ." [1272]. And in fact, truly , *not an intercessor,*

less than an angel, but the Lord Himself saved us [1273], who once promised to save through the prophets, and at the time of [His] coming he already shows Himself to those present, and therefore cries out: " *You yourself say that I am." How red are the feet of those who bring peace on the mountains* !" [1274]For He *has come to bring good news of peace to you, far and near.* [1275], according to Paul.

OTHER . " *To the King of the ages, the imperishable, the invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen* " [1276]. If the King of the ages is the Son, as he eternally and endlessly rules [everything] and created the ages themselves, then, therefore, [Paul] calls Him God - incorruptible and invisible. And having in Himself by nature and essence all the exclusive [properties] of the Father's essence, how can it be in relation to Him other than in nature and [existing] from Him, when there is no reason that would allow the distinctive properties of the Divinity to be inherent in creatures? And that the Son is the King of the ages - the Archangel Gabriel himself testifies to us about this, speaking about Him to the Holy Virgin: " *He will be great, and he will be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give Him the throne of His father David, and He will reign in the house of Jacob forever." and His kingdom will have no end* " [1277].

OTHER . Paul, commanding his disciple *to pray for everyone* [1278]and for the kings *who are in power* [1279], adds: " *This is good and pleasing in the sight of our Savior God, Who wants all mankind to be saved and to come into the understanding of truth.* " [1280]. Therefore, if God is the Savior of all, and we are saved by knowing the truth, <75.504> and the truth is Christ, then He, therefore, is God and Savior. And if so, then how is the Son not God by nature? How can He who is by nature the Son be numbered among the creatures? This is both absurd and blasphemous. Therefore, the Son is not a creation, but rather God and Savior from the Savior and God the Father.

OTHER . " *For there is one God, and one mediator* (μεσίτης) *of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself redemption for all* ." [1281]. If Jesus Christ is a mediator between God and men, not uniting essentially and by nature with God and men, but only reconciling and making friends those who have departed from mutual communication, that is, men and God, then why does the apostle say that He is alone [such]? After all, many other saints were honored with such service; and he himself is the first, crying out: " *We pray according to Christ: be reconciled to God* ." [1282], became a mediator (μεσίτης); and blessed Moses, who served to teach the children of Israel the law from God. The all-wise Jeremiah was also a mediator, speaking to God as if about those from the race of Israel: " *Remember me who stood before You, and speak for them.* " [1283]. But each of St. prophets are found by those who do this. How is *Christ the only intercessor* if there is not something unusual about Him? But He is *one* , as Paul rightly says [about Him]. This means that not in the usual way and not like others [Christ is a mediator], and it is necessary to say how [exactly He is one]. So,

since what lies in the middle (κατὰ μέσου κείμενον) between certain two [subjects], its edges are in contact with both, linking what is divided into unity, and *the intercessor* (μεσίτης) *of God and men* is *Christ* , then it is obvious that He is united by nature with God as God, and with people – as a person. *Because our world is* [1284], through likening us, he connected human nature into unity and communion with the Divine essence. For how else can we become *partakers of the divine nature?* [1285]? Therefore, if [the Son] is God by nature, co-natural and consubstantial with God and the Father, how can He be a creature or creature, when this would be very absurd?

OTHER . " *The word is true and worthy of all acceptance. For this reason we labor and reproach us, for we live by trust in God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of the faithful.* " [1286]. The blessed Psalmist, seeing the future by the Holy Spirit and learning from the grace of the coming of our Savior, exclaimed, as if calling to Him: " *The hope of all the ends of the earth and those who are in the far sea* ." [1287]. Therefore, since Christ is the hope of all, and in Him all of us who believe have hoped, and Paul calls Him the living God, knowing Him to be such by nature, how then will He also be one of those created, <75.505> and not, most likely, the living Son from the living Father, since the distinctive property of the One who gave birth naturally passes to Him?

OTHER . " *I charge you before God, who gives life to all things, and Christ Jesus, who testified under Pontius Pilate with a good confession: to keep you the commandment to be undefiled and undefiled, even until the appearance of our Lord Jesus Christ, who in due time will reveal the blessed one strong, King of kings and Lord of lords, alone have immortality and are unapproachable in the living light* " [1288]. Therefore, Christ Himself will reveal His coming in due time, or rather His Father will. So, if we call [the Father] Himself the one who reveals Christ, how will He, whose extreme glory is attested by such natural virtues, be considered created? After all, then, in the same way, that which befits only the Divine nature will potentially spread to each of the created ones. And then there will be nothing extraordinary left in it, if, in fact, those [qualities] that are distinctive features of it alone can be inherent in the created ones. e. Divine nature] alone. But the created have nothing in common with the Creator in terms of divinity, and the Lord has all the distinctive characteristics of the Father, and the nature of the Divinity in Him is described [by these properties], and, therefore, He will not be one of the creatures. And if the Father reveals the coming of the Son, and rather the herald of truth [i.e. e. Paul] list of divine virtues, then how, given that only the Father has immortality, does the Son also have it? After all, He says: " *I am life* » [1289]. But He is clearly not alien to the Father's essence, and did not go [beyond it], acquiring some alien and alien [in relation to God] distinctive feature, like with created things, but remains and is the unchanging image of the One who gave birth, and therefore He is not created, and *God is from God* , and *Light is from Light* [1290], and also Life from Life. Therefore, He is not a creature or a creature, as some say,

intemperate in their tongue.

From Second Epistle to Timothy

" *Be not ashamed of the testimony of our Lord Jesus Christ, nor of me as His servant: but suffer the gospel according to the power of God, who saved us and called us with a holy calling.* " [1291]. Here again he bluntly calls the Son God and Savior. For it is He who calls us, saying: " *Come to Me, all you who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.* " [1292]. How will He be created if He truly is both God and Saviors? For we are saved not by creation, but by God alone.

From the Epistle to Titus

" *For the saving grace of God has appeared to all people, punishing us, so that, having rejected wickedness and worldly lusts, we may live chastely and righteously and piously in this present age,* <75.508> *waiting for the blessed hope and manifestation glory of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ* " [1293]. If Christ is the hope of all, and also *the great God and Savior* , then how are they not very wicked and insane who call the Son a creation and dare to classify among the servants of Him Who possesses everything that befits the Divine nature alone, and thanks to which it is truly recognized as such?

OTHER . If, according to the word of the prophet, *blessed is the man who trusts in the Lord, and the Lord will be his hope* [1294], then the opposite will also be true: the one who does not have hope in God will be alien to all blessings. So, if the Son is a creature and a creation, then it means that He is a slave, and not a Lord by Nature. How then, according to St. To the Psalmist, *bless us of the Lord* [1295]Having hope in Him [1296]? How will Paul himself speak the truth when he affirms: " *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us with every spiritual blessing.* " [1297]? So, the Son is Lord by nature. And if so, then He is not a creation. After all, it is said about creation: " *For all work is Yours .*" [1298].

From the Acts of the Apostles

" *Having passed through Phrygia and the Galatian country, the Holy Spirit was forbidden to speak a word in Asia. Having come to Mysia, I tried to drink to Vithynia, and the Spirit of Jesus did not leave them .*" [1299]. Now, here again he directly called the Holy Spirit the Spirit of Jesus. So, since the Spirit of the Father is [at the same time] the Spirit of the Son, how can He not be God by nature who essentially possesses all the distinctive and exclusive properties of Him Who by nature is God and the Father? However, in addition to this, the following must be considered. If the Holy Spirit, existing by nature in God, was ever called [in Scripture] the spirit of an angel, for

example, or some other intelligent force, then let the Son also be placed on a par with creatures, as having no superiority over them, although His spirit would be called the Holy Spirit. If this applies to the Son alone, who is by nature, then how can He be related to the others, Who is so superior to them that He alone possesses the divine dignity of the Fatherly nature and has in common what is related to essence with His Parent?

OTHER . " *At midnight Paul and Silas prayed to the belt of God: and the prisoners listened to them. Suddenly the coward became great, as if the foundations of the prison were shaken: every door was opened, and all the bonds were loosened. The prison guard got excited and, seeing the doors of the prison open, pulled out a knife, wanting to kill himself the prisoners escaped me. Exclaim with a great voice Paul, saying: Do no harm to yourself for all are here . Having asked for the candle, he jumped up, and was in trepidation, falling towards Paul and Silas, and leading them out, saying: Lord, what <75.509> should we do, so that I may be saved? This is the prayer: believe in the Lord Jesus, and you and your whole house will be saved. And he spoke the word of the Lord to him, and to all who were in his house. And I ate at the same hour of the night, exhausted from my wounds, and I was baptized myself and all my abiye: I brought him into my house, set a table, and rejoiced with all my house, believing God.* " [1300]. He who believed in the Lord Jesus according to the admonition of the apostles, as one who believed *in God, rejoiced with all his house, having believed* . But if the Son was in fact a creature and a creature, according to the wicked speeches of the heretics, then why was the jailer not directed by the apostles to true knowledge, having heard [from them]: "You did not believe in God, O man, but in something from the creatures and created ones"? But we do not see them saying this, but rather he was very pleasant to them, as being in the best position and having a true judgment about faith. And how is it not already clear to everyone that the Son is God by nature? And being such, how can He be a creature and a creature?

From the Epistle of James

" *Jacob , servant of God and the Lord Jesus Christ, of the tenth tribe , who were dispersing, rejoice .*" [1301]. Here the herald of truth calls Jesus Christ God and Lord, knowing Him to be such by nature. And how is the mind of the heterodox so impudent as to consider the Son, who by nature has this [dignity], to be created or created? For they believe that neither God nor the Father, who by nature is also the Lord, is free from reproach, as is the Son, if at all they admit that the true God can be a created being. But this is absurd and seems to carry with it naked wickedness [1302]. Therefore, the Son is not a creature, but rather He is essentially God and Lord, like the Father from whom He was born.

OTHER . " *My brother , do not just have the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ of glory .*"

[1303]. Somewhere near St. God says to the prophets: " *My glory I will not give to another* " [1304]. How then will the Son be the Lord of glory if He is in reality foreign and alien to the essence of the Father? For nothing will be invested with the glory due to God alone unless it is created. But the Son is the Lord of glory, for the Spirit of truth, who says these things in the saints, does not lie. Therefore, not a created thing, but rather the image and mark of the Father, who is the Lord of glory. And about the One who by nature has all the characteristic characteristics of the Father, it must justly be said, along with other things, that He is also the Lord of glory.

From the Epistle of Peter

" *I pray to the elders who are among you, as one who is an elder and a witness of the passion of Christ, who is also a fellow member of the glory that desires to appear:* <75.512> *feed the flock of God within you* ." [1305]. Here again Peter wisely calls the Son God, knowing Him to be such by nature, for He does not lie. After all, having heard from our Savior Christ: " *Simon Jonin, do you love Me? Feed my lambs* " [1306], and again: " *Feed My sheep* " [1307], he himself gives a similar commandment, calling the Savior [sheep] the flock of God, as from above - from the Father, and not from flesh and blood - having received knowledge of the Divine secret [1308]. And if the Son is God by nature, how will He be a creature or creation?

OTHER . Showing that the difference between the Creator and the creation is immeasurable and incomparable, the Psalmist exclaims: " *He created us, not we; We are His people and sheep of His pasture* ." [1309]. In the ability to create and create, the Divine and sovereign nature is recognized, and in the ability to be created and brought into being, the servile and created nature. Since the Son is the Creator of all, He will not be one of all, and He will not be placed in the ranks of the created, Whom the ability to create shows as alien to the creature, and Who has surpassed the measure of a slave, so that He remains within the limits of the ruling essence.

From the Epistle of John

" *I am writing to you," he says, 'fathers, because you know Him from the beginning* (τὸν απ' αρχῆς)." [1310]. If none of the creations [exists] *from the beginning* or *at the beginning* [1311], because everything in time is called to become, and the Son, whom those to whom the word is addressed, knew, was from the beginning, then how will there be one from among the creation who is not like them?

OTHER . Dismiss the Father and the Son is discarded , and *discard the Son, neither have the Father* [1312]. No one will discard the Son otherwise than by calling Him a creation and removing Him from His co-essence with the Father; and conversely, confesses [Him], preserving for him [His] true and true dignity of Sonship and not

depriving Him of natural likeness in relation to the Father. Consequently, everything that is said about the Father is also said about the Son, except perhaps that He is the Father. And whatever is determined about the Son will also be valid regarding the Father, again with the only exception that He is the Son. As the Father - God by nature, Almighty, Creator, Lord, King, Imperishable. Immortal, Life, having no beginning of being, but not brought into being from non-existence, so the Son is all the same [without any] difference. If you agree that this is inherent in the Father and confess Him as such, but reject the Son Himself, calling Him a creation and relegating the Creator to the ranks of creatures, then you will deprive the Father of all this, ignorantly condemning the Son and saying that the Image is alien to the divine dignity < 75.513> Who gave birth, looking at Whom we contemplate the nature of the Father, - according to what He Himself said to the disciples, " *He who has seen Me, has seen the Father* ." [1313]. Therefore, since the Father remains uncreated, the Son must also be uncreated. Uncreated (ἀγένητον) I call that which is not created (τὸ μὴ πεποιημένον).

OTHER . " *And we see, and we testify, and we proclaim to you the eternal life that was with the Father and was revealed to us.* " [1314]. Holy Scripture often applies the name "age" to God, as abolishing the emergence in time in relation to the Divine and unalloyed nature, which alone essentially has uncreatedness. So, if *the eternal life is* from God and the Father, that is, the Son, then how will He be created, according to the foolish opinion of some? After all, in general [everything] created is not eternal.

OTHER . " *We know that the Son of God has come and given us understanding, that we may know the true God and may we be in His true Son Jesus Christ: this is the true God and the eternal life.* " [1315]. What will I say again to the heretics who love to find fault with these untrue and precise words of the saint? If the Son is the true God, then it means that He is essentially such, and not by grace, like creatures. And if God was created by nature, in their opinion, then there is nothing exceptional about the Father at all, even if He was called God by nature. For once [something] is created or created, then it, even if it has not yet appeared created, will in no way escape the cause of creation, as long as it is inherent in its nature to be created. So it's time [for them] to "honor" the Father Himself [by naming what was created] [1316]. But the Divine and unalloyed nature does not allow the concept of "createdness"; and the Son is this [i.e. e. Divine nature]. Therefore, He is not created, but rather uncreated (οὐκ ἄρα ποιητὸς, ἀγένητος δὲ μᾶλλον), as by nature God is both *true and eternal life* .

From the Epistle of Jude

" *I want to remember you, who know you alone, how Jesus saved the people from the land of Egypt, after being destroyed by those who did not believe.* " [1317]. If, according to the proposed words of the saint, *Jesus saved the people from Egypt* , then it is He who says to the hierophant Moses: " *I am* [1318]; *hearing hearing* [1319] *the groaning of my*

people in Egypt, and they went down and took them away [1320]" So, if *He really is* , then how can He be [at the same time] created (γενητός)? For then He is no longer *He* , but created (πεποιημένος). But Christ does not lie. For He *is this* and ever-existing (Ὢν γάρ ἐστι καὶ ὑπάρχων ἀεὶ); Consequently, He is not found to be created (πεποιημένος), nor to have received the beginning of being in time, like creatures.

From the Gospel of Matthew

" *Joseph , son of David, do not be afraid to receive Mary your wife: what was born in her is holy from the Spirit. She will give birth to a Son, and you will call His name Jesus: He will save* <75.516> *His people from their sins* ." [1321]. If the Son saves His people and forsakes sins, like the Lord of the Law and God, then who will count among the creations the One who fits the definition of Divinity and is Himself by nature God? I think that anyone will say and agree that it belongs to God alone to rule over people, as the Lord and King.

OTHER . " *Now all this came to pass, that what was spoken of the Lord by the prophet might be fulfilled, saying: Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and give birth to a Son, and they shall call His name Immanuel, which is also said: God is with us.* " [1322]. If the Son were not God by nature, He would not have been called " *God with us* ," which is what happened when He was born of a Woman, taking on our likeness. And this is not an invention of an angel, nor of anyone else created, but the Father Himself named the Son that way, and this is testified by St. the prophet, speaking about the divine generation: " *And they will call on His new name, by which the Lord calls it* " [1323]. For truly a new name for the Son is "Emmanuel," that is, "God with us." After all, before His appearance in the world with the flesh, He was and was called simply God, and after His birth from the Virgin, He was no longer only God, but " *with us* ," that is, God incarnate. So, when the Father calls His Son God, let those who wickedly and ignorantly say that He was created be ashamed. For God by nature is not a creation.

OTHER . " *Hear what was said to the ancients: You shall not kill: whoever kills is guilty of judgment. "I say to you, that everyone who is angry with his brother is guilty of judgment in vain* ." [1324]. Listen to this further reasoning here and carefully consider from all sides, whether it seems to you that what I am saying is correct: since it is fitting only for the King to lay down laws, God does not allow any of those who exist to add anything to what He has prescribed through Moses. For He says: " *To these there is nothing to be added and from these there is nothing to be taken away* ." [1325]. If the Savior took away the lesser and added the greater and more perfect, then it means that He does this as God and the Lord of the Law, but otherwise, if this were not so, the one who dissolved the commandment would not be free from lawlessness. But what is truly written: " *For thou shalt not commit sin* " [1326]. This means that as God, He abolished the first commandment, and with authority introduced the second in its

place. This, apparently, is what the words mean: " *I say to you* ." How then will he who gives the law be created or created as God by nature and therefore cannot be new?

OTHER . " *If you forgive a person their sins, your Heavenly Father will also forgive* you . *If you do not forgive a person their sins, your Father will not forgive you your sins* ." [1327].

[So,] while it is God the Father who forgives sins and forgives those guilty of iniquities, the Son also has the power to grant and do this. After all, the Savior nowhere says to someone: " *Son, your sins are forgiven* ." [1328]. So, when we see the Son having received such power as the Father also has, how can we tolerate those wicked heretics who call Him foreign and alien, unable to demonstrate in any of the created things the power appropriate to God alone?

OTHER . " *A good tree cannot produce evil fruits, nor an evil tree produce good fruits* ." [1329]. This definition of our Savior, [derived] from one [example] in relation to all (ἐξ ἑνὸς κατὰ πάντων), is extremely true. Let us consider exactly the meaning of what has been said, and let the question be examined in relation to the Divine essence itself. So, what is inferior to something in some way of good, in comparison with this superior [it], is not good, because it is not similar and not equal to it. And since the uncreated is very good, the created is in a worse position, and in comparison with it is not good. How will there be created fruit from an uncreated plant, if only we believe that the Father is uncreated? After all, if *a good tree cannot produce evil fruits* , and God and the Father is *a good tree* , also because He is not created, then how and why the Fruit [that grows] from Him will be created, and therefore will be seen as bad, since it has distorted nobility Who gave birth to Him? But, of course, the Fruit is good, as, without a doubt, is the Plant. So the Son will not distort the nobility of the Father by appearing to be created from the uncreated. But He will be uncreated, like the Father. And if so, then how will He be a creature or a creature, how do the heretics foolishly think about Him?

OTHER . " *And behold, the leper came, bowing to Him, saying: Lord, if you will, you can cleanse me. And Jesus stretched out his hand and touched him, saying: I want you to be clean. And if his leprosy be cleansed* " [1330]. From [Divine] power [comes this] gift; [truly this is] the Sovereign command. How, then, among the slaves, as a created one, is the Son, who can accomplish everything with just one desire and therefore bears within Himself the Divine dignity and distinctive attribute of the One who gave birth? For it is written about God and the Father, that He *did whatever He pleased.* [1331], so that by Divine will the works [of His hands] are immediately carried out and with one wave are called into existence. And how can he who possesses the power and authority of His Father be alien in nature in relation to Him by being created by Him, whereas His nature is not such? For those who have the same energy always tend to be one and the same essence, and the other nature in them is incredible. Consequently, the

Son is of one nature with the Father, and is uncreated from the uncreated, as having the same power and strength, <75.520> rather Himself being the living and essential Energy, Power and Wisdom of the Father.

OTHER . " *Then, getting up, rebuked the wind and the sea, and there was great silence. People marveled, saying: "Who is this, for both the winds and the sea listen to him* ?" [1332] As proof of His inherent greatness, God nowhere says through one of the prophets to those who shamelessly sin: " *Will you not fear Me* ," says the Lord, " *or will you not be ashamed at My presence, Who made the sand the limit of the sea, an everlasting commandment, and will not exceed it* ?" [1333]. And again denoting the same thing, He says in the book of Job about the sea: " *I set limits to it, imposing* (ἐπιθεὶς) [1334] *shutters and gates: I told him: you will come to this and will not pass, but your waves will be broken within you* ." [1335]. And the blessed Psalmist, tuning the spiritual lyre to praise, says to God: " *You rule over the power of the sea; you calm the indignation of its waves.* " [1336]. So, when the ability to rule the sea and establish laws for the waters, and bring the most important of the elements of the world under the yoke of dominion characterizes the Divine nature, and the Son turns out to be doing this with great power, then how can He not be by nature God? How then will He be created who can easily fulfill what is due only to God and the Father? For if we say that there is nothing special about commanding the sea and putting shutters and gates on it, then why does God and the Father in vain boast of this as a very reliable proof of [His divinity]? And if divine power and glory alone are capable of doing this, then it is by no means permissible to cede to the essence of the created that which rightfully belongs to the Divine nature alone. Therefore, there cannot be a created Son who fits the definition of divinity in that he can by nature do those things which are its own and exclusive [powers].

OTHER . " *And pray to Him, saying: If you drive us out, command us to go into the swine herd. And* Jesus *spoke to them ; go. And they went out and went into the herd of swine: and behold, the herd all rushed along the shore into the sea, and were drowned in the waters* ." [1337]. It is also an exclusive property of the Divine essence to be able to contain everything and to extend the logoi of providence about each of them down to the most insignificant [creatures]. And the Savior Himself will be a witness to this, saying: " *Are not two birds worth to one Assar? And not one of them will fall to the earth without your Father who is in heaven* ." [1338]. So, if this is a great and godly dignity in the Father, and the Son also possesses it, not allowing the wicked demons to have power <75.521> even over pigs (for they ask, which is obvious, as if they do not have it), then what is the reason for in order to believe that God the Word came from God as alien and created things and who by nature possesses all the distinctive characteristics of the One who gave birth?

OTHER . " *And He called upon His disciples to give them authority over unclean*

spirits, to drive them out, and to heal every disease and every disease ." [1339]. Also here, notice the Divine power of the Son and not befitting of created nature. After all, it is one thing to be able to do something that rightly causes wonder, and which [before] was inherent in the saints, not by nature, but by the communion of the Holy Spirit and [as a gift] from God. And it's [quite] another thing to give grace to others for such [accomplishments], which is completely alien to their [own] strength and power. For how could created nature have dominion over the gifts of the Spirit? And our Lord Jesus Christ , as being by nature God and Son, heals with authority, not demonstrating the work of prayer, like those [former saints], but the result of His own and essential action. In the same way, He gives grace to those whom He wishes, not calling upon them an alien force, but investing it from Himself, just as fire imparts the [thermal] energy of its nature to [objects] approaching it. How then, who makes those in whom He is by the power of the Spirit partakers of the Divine essence, will be created and created, and not, most likely, God by nature?

OTHER . " *All things have been handed over to Me by My Father, and no one knows the Son except the Father; no one knows the Father, only the Son* " [1340]. Since the thought of the created is in no way capable of grasping the Divine essence, since this supernatural and pure beauty *surpasses all minds* [1341] and goes beyond all understanding, it only knows itself as a network by nature. So, [the Father], from being the Father, knows his own Son, and [the Son], in turn, from being the Son, knows his Father. And thus, he who says: " *I am in the Father, and the Father in Me* " turns out to be truthful. [1342] and " *Seeing Me, seeing the Father* " [1343]. So, when there is no difference between [Them] as regards the nature of the Divinity, how can the Son be created, when the Father is not like that, of whom He is the unchangeable at once and the mark?

OTHER . " *Come to Me, all you who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you* " [1344]. If every nature of the created [and so| is under the Divine yoke and is enslaved only by the One Who created it, bowing its neck before God, according to [the prophet] who says: " *For all things are Your work .*" [1345], and the Son brings us and places us under His yoke, then, therefore, He is <75.524> Master and Lord and Creator, like God. How can such a one [be] among creation? How, under the yoke and in slavery, is He who, like a driver of horses, rules and guides everyone as the Lord? For if He is not like that, then we find ourselves worshiping the creation and serving the creature instead of the Creator. But this is not the case with us, for the Son is the true God. Therefore, He is not a creature or creation.

OTHER . " *Or are they not in the law, because on the Sabbath the priests in the church defile the Sabbath and are innocent? I tell you that there is more church here .*" [1346]. And greater honor than a temple built of stones belongs to God, who dwells in it and sanctifies it, for whose glory the construction of the temple was completed. So,

how can Christ have greater honor than the temple, if He is not God, Who is worshiped in this very temple? But He has more [honor] and speaks the truth, for how could it be otherwise? Therefore, He is God, as the Son who rose from God the Father. And if so, then He is not a creation or a creation. For Israel did not err in serving and worshiping Him in the sanctuary, to whom it was nowhere said: " *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and serve Him alone.* " [1347].

OTHER . " *Either you make a good tree and its fruit good; or you make an evil tree and its fruit is evil; by the fruit the tree will be known.* " [1348]. But the fruit of the Father is the Son, so that He will be whatever is born of Him. Therefore, if the Son is a creature and a creation, then the Father will also be such. And if the Father is uncreated, then the Son will also be uncreated, since in some way *the tree will be known from the fruit* .

OTHER . The boat of the apostles once suffered disaster when there was a strong storm on the lake and an unbearable onslaught of winds, so that the waves crashed on them. *On the fourth watch* [1349] The Savior, walking on the waves as if on dry land, appears to the disciples in the middle of the lake. They, thinking that they saw a ghost, *out of fear* (ὑπὸ τοῦ δέους) *cried out* [1350]. When the Savior encouraged them, saying: " *I am, do not be afraid* " [1351], they, having barely overcome their fear, take Him into the boat, and immediately, says [the evangelist], " *ceases ." the wind* [1352]. *Those who were in the ships came to worship Him, saying: Truly you are the Son of God* [1353]. So, what will those who oppose the truth and follow their own will say this time, when they see the whole face of the apostles, jointly worshiping the Son as God and swearing that He *truly is the Son of God* ? Obviously, so is God. After all, if He, according to their ignorant opinion, is one of the creatures, then how can He *truly be the Son of God* ? For it is impossible for someone who has not descended from someone by nature and does not bear the distinctive characteristics of the essence of the one who gave birth to be truly a son. How, if the disciples were mistaken in saying this, did the Savior remain silent without shaming those who were mistaken? After all, He also said to Peter, who answered incorrectly: " *Follow me, Satan, you are the temptation of me: for you do not think the things of God, but those of men.* " [1354]. Since He remained silent, then He is truly the Son of God, because from the fact that He did not expose them as erring, it is clear that He accepts them as speaking correctly. So, when St. the apostles said that He is Son and [Son] in truth, and when Christ Himself confirmed this [by silence], who will tolerate those who continually repeat otherwise?

OTHER, [derived] from the same [speech] . And how will those who dare to call the Son of God a creation not turn out to be alien to all good thinking? After all, if He *truly is the Son* , then how can one who came from the Father's essence be created? For this signifies the title of sonship applied to someone by nature. Another thing is the image of sons by position. Since Christ is not like that, it means that He *truly is the Son* , so

for this reason he is opposed to us, sons by position; for [something] cannot exist in position and likeness without something being true before it, in relation to which that which is called to be likened to it through some art and grace is formed.

OTHER . " *When Jesus came to the countries of Caesarea Philippi, His disciples asked, saying: Who do men say I am, the Son of man? They decided: either John the Baptist, or Elijah, or Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. Verbs to them: who do you say Me to be? Simon Peter answered and said: You are the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said to him: Blessed are you, Simon, var Jonah, for flesh and blood have not been revealed to you, but My Father who is in heaven* " [1355]. From the above, one can see - and especially from the words of the Lord Himself - that it was the Father who revealed to Peter, and not from man he was taught to confess the Word of God as the Son of God, although he saw Him in flesh on earth living with men, and the most paradoxical thing is that he, confessing the Son, does not place Him among those who, by grace, received this dignity. After all, he did not say: "You are one of the sons of God," but says that He is the only and unique Christ, which, of course, is in the proper sense of the word the Son, who has arisen from the essence of the Father. And he is pleased with [the Savior] as one who speaks the truth and as one who has learned from God that which is beyond human understanding. How then do [the heretics] dare to call Him a creation or creature whom the Father knows as the Son and Himself reveals to be worthy?

OTHER . " *For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then he will reward each according to his deeds .*" [1356]. <75.528> If God and the Father speaks the truth when he declares: " *My glory I will not give to another .*" [1357], then how does he give it to the Son, if He really is, since He is created, alien in nature and deprived of a natural community with Him? But it is necessary to recognize that the Father is telling the truth. And He gave His glory to the Son, placing it not outside the one Godhead. For [only] in this way will He speak the truth. Therefore, by sharing [His] nature and the same essence, He knows the Son, [together with Whom the Holy Spirit is always mentioned] [1358]. For, thus, everything is looking at the one Divinity, finding fullness in the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity. How then will the Son be a creation or creature, identical in essence with the Father, as the true Son, [born] from the Father?

OTHER . " *And behold, a cloud of the lights of their autumn: and behold, a voice from the cloud saying: This is my beloved Son, in whom I have been well pleased.* " [1359] . If there is not a great difference between the creation and the Son - and some think so - then everything that is a creation will also be the Son. And if anything is the Son, then so is the creation. If we give birth to those who are born from ourselves, and create something from the outside, taking [for this] the substance of a nature alien to us, then how great is the difference between the Son and the creation? After all, what is

true in relation to us remains true in relation to God. After this, how can one consider the Son to be created or created, especially when God and the Father cries from above: " *This is My Son* "? Not one of the sons, but in the proper sense of the word and by nature the Son, in whose imitation [Christians] are sons by position, since they can in the Spirit call the Son: " *Abba, Father* ." [1360].

OTHER . " *Teacher, what good have I done, will I inherit an eternal life?* (Διδάσκαλε, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσας ζωήν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;) *He said to him: Why do you ask Me about the blas? No one is good except God alone* " [1361]. In the proper sense of the word, good is not such by participation or from anything else, but has virtue contained in its own nature and, as it were, flowing from it itself; better to say, it is by nature what we call good. So, when the Father [exists] in a special hypostasis, and the Son, and in turn, in a special hypostasis, to whom alone should we attribute the good? Or what would the good actually be? But perhaps someone will say that it is proper [to assimilate the good] of the Father. Well, so be it, for we [for now] will agree [with this], as we are still exploring this issue. Then, who dares to say that the Son by nature is not good, when he hears the speaker: " *I and the Father are one?* " [1362]*; seeing Me, seeing the Father* [1363]"? After all, if the Son is not good by nature, then how does He show us in Himself the Father who is good by nature? But in this too He is the image of the Father. Therefore, He is good, just like the Father. How then *there one good is* [1364], according to His words? It is clear that in the proper sense of the word good belongs to the Holy Trinity, which, due to the identity of the essence, is intertwined into one Divinity, so that <75.529> there is only one Divine essence. And by nature, united in such close unity with the Father, how will he be created or created?

OTHER . Being asked by the bishops under Pontius Pilate whether He is the Son of God, Christ does not deny, but says: " *Thou art the one* who declared ." Then He adds: " *Above all I say to you: from here you will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven.* " [1365]. What conclusion do we draw from this? - That when in relation to God it is said "to sit" and "throne", then this denotes superior, sovereign, royal and at the same time omnipotent dignity. For, of course, no one wise will say that God must be thought of according to what we see in pictures; We do not imagine any throne being set up, nor the Lord of all sitting on it, and in general we do not believe that in relation to the Divine and incomprehensible nature there is right and left. For the form, place, foundation and erection are the belonging of bodies. So, when these names and any words that denote such things have such a meaning in relation to God, how does the Son say that He will be seen *sitting at the right hand of power* , that is, as one of the thrones and not inferior in honor to the Father, as anyone could? something to think about? For this means [the word] " *at the right hand* " in the [images] familiar to us, depicting that which is above us. How can the Son be of equal honor and [sitting] on the same thrones with the Father, if He is not by nature the Son, possessing by nature the distinctive properties of the Father, but

rather is a creation, as they absurdly claim? For it is necessary either to recognize that not only the truly existing God reigns over creation, but that some other created and coming God also rules it, and we have more than one God, according to Scripture; or, if God is one, and the Son reigns with Him, being [Himself] God, He must truly be of the same essence as the Father. For, thus, there will be one God when the Holy Trinity strives as the identity of nature and the one divinity, although It, being understood in the establishment of individual names and in a special way - in a single existence, allows for a harmoniously [composed] trinity number. So, when the Son is of the same nature as the uncreated Father, how can He be understood as a creature according to the crazy opinion of heretics, and not, most likely, as a true generation, which He truly is?

From the Gospel of John

" *In the beginning was the Word* " [1366]. If It *was not in the beginning* , understood in the sense of time (for for now, according to economics, this is how we will present the present speech), then how did it arise after the beginning? After all, what is generally called into being through creation cannot in any way be thought of as existing in the beginning, and in general cannot be called a beginning that which is preceded by time, allowing something to appear <75.532> before it. So, either let nothing be said to exist before it, and thus the question will be resolved, or, if they claim that the beginning has some other beginning, and will ignorantly insist on this, then let them hear from us that this is about That beginning, which they agree to consider supreme, we say that *there is no Word* in it . As if we don't have enough of the word " *be* " to refute them who say that He was created? After all, if " *be* ", then it did not arise [from non-existence], and if it arose, then it did not " *be* ". Since He *was not* , He did not come into existence: for what exists and already exists, and, moreover, [that which exists] in the beginning, cannot at all be called created.

OTHER . " *And the Word is to God* " [1367]. Further on, the blessed evangelist appears to us as interpreting the concept of beginning even more clearly. For he clearly calls nothing else the beginning, but the Father Himself, from Whom the living Word shone, just as light shines from the sun, which, although thought to be different from it, is not outside the essence of the one emitting it. luminaries]. Therefore, the beginning of the Son is the Father. We do not mean a beginning that is measured by intervals of time, but rather one that is simultaneously thought of along with that which [comes] from it. Just as, for example, heat [arising] from fire has fire as its origin, but is thought at the same time from it, and in it, and inseparably; or the coolness from water begins with water, but, again, at the same time both from it and in it, inseparably. For it is impossible for any of the above to be or appear without the properties inherent in it by nature, unless, of course, it, having undergone violence from some other force, has not

lost its usual and related effect, like, for example, water forced by fire to be hot.

The divine and unalloyed nature, far exceeding the power of the above examples, will abide in itself in every way and will always remain the same, since it is free from all suffering. Therefore, as *in the beginning* in the Father *there was a Word* , so that you would think at the same time of the existing Father N from Him and the [existing] Word in Him, without any time separating His existence [from the Father]. For the word " *be* " forces us to understand it only this way.

OTHER . " *And God was the Word* " [1368]. This obviously refutes that the Son is the new God. For He was the real God, says St. evangelist. And what exists as such *in the beginning* , how can it be created? However, it would be good to know in addition to this that what is deified by grace and is not God by nature must in itself be something and exist in a special way, and then, thus, as if some kind of addition, take on a kind of shell [of the god-like] dignity, just as, of course, we, being by nature human, by grace are worthy to be called gods. So, let them either say what God the Word, who came from the Father, was before, and how <75.533> He was then called God; or - if they feel that they are immeasurably wicked by depriving the Son of divinity by nature - let them stop ignorantly calling the created being God by nature, when there is no reason for them to think so.

OTHER . " *This from* time immemorial (ἐν ἀρχῇ) *to God* " [1369]. [This saying] does not show the Son to exist outside the essence of the Father, but in Him and from Him by nature existing. And besides, he again says that He did not take on this dignity in time, but remains so from time immemorial. And how will the true fruit of the essence of the One who gave birth turn out to be of a foreign nature? like *thorns scratches* For no one *the grapes* [1370], it is also impossible for thorns to be born from the vine. Therefore, since He is God by nature, we will also have such a Son, so that God and the Father will not appear worse than His own creatures, since they do not produce alien fruit from themselves, but He is found to suffer this [misfortune] because He gives birth One who is not by nature God. For this is the meaning of the word "created," whatever it may refer to. After all, someone created by nature cannot be God.

OTHER . " *All the Darkness Was* (ἐγένετο), *and without Him there was nothing* (ἐγένετο)" [1371]. If, when pronouncing the word "everything," nothing is found at all that would not be included in the number of those that have arisen (τῶν γεγονότων), then it means that God the Word, who called everything into being, is different from everything else. But how can He be different if He is akin to them and created together with them? Since He is different, then, therefore, not related. Therefore, He is not a creature, but rather a Creator and Creator, like God.

OTHER . It is written: " *Worship the Lord your God and serve Him alone* ." [1372].

How then, if the Son, in their opinion, is a creation, He accepts worship from us and the Holy One. angels? And Paul will appear as a witness to this, saying: " *When He brought the Firstborn into the universe, He said: And let all the angels of God worship Him.* " [1373]. How, tell me, is some grave accusation brought against the servants of the creature instead of the Creator, if the Son, who, in their opinion, has such a nature and is a creation, is served as God by the purest heavenly powers, which are especially not prone to err in anything, since they even more intelligent than the [most] intelligent among us? But there is no reproach for those who serve Christ, but, on the contrary, there is a great reward. Therefore, He is not a creation, but rather God, Whom, without incurring any condemnation or guilt, all creation worships collectively.

OTHER, [derived] from the same . If, in their opinion, the Son is a creation and a creature, <75.536> and everything turns out to have come into being thanks to Him, then the creation creates itself, and in vain it boasts as the Creator, saying: " *My hand has created all these things* ." [1374]. But none of the created things is the Creator, and the creature proclaims God as the Creator. Therefore, the Son is neither a creature nor one of the creatures, as the erring ones think recklessly and at the same time wickedly.

OTHER . " *Be the true light* " [1375]. If, despite the fact that the Father is the true Light, the Son is also the true Light, then what difference will He have with Him in terms of nature, Who in this is placed with Him in equal rank? If, according to the wicked recklessness of the heretics, being alien in nature, He can be the true Light, then what is the observation of St. evangelists? Why do they, as something great and exceptional, assimilate to God and the Father being the True Light? For the Son, being, according to the opinion of these [heretics], created, turns out to be the true Light. If, however, Divine advantages are inaccessible to the created, and nothing of the created can at all essentially - that is, in the proper sense of the word - be what the *One above all can be by nature* [1376] God, for the creature is told: " *What did you accept, what did you carry?* " [1377], and in the Son the distinctive properties of the Father are found to exist by nature, then, therefore, He is consubstantial in relation to Him and as distant from affinity with the created ones as we see Him as such. That is why He possesses an unapproachable [for a creature] divine dignity, and moreover, not in part, but in its entirety.

OTHER . " *Be the true light, which enlightens every person coming into the world* " [1378]. If the light sent to the world from God and the Father is the Word that came from Him, according to what He Himself said: " *I have departed from the Father and come again* ." [1379]; and again: " *I, the Holy One, have come in peace* " [1380], then to Him, that means, the blessed Psalmist speaks, striking the spiritual lyre: " *For You have enlightened my lamp, O Lord my God, enlighten my darkness.* " [1381]. So, when, according to the Savior Himself, blessed *David , by the Spirit of His Lord, confessed God* [1382], how will He who is by nature God be created or in any way come into being?

OTHER . " *And the little ones received him, so that they might become children of God* " [1383]. Let the heretic who loves to argue consider this from all sides, and let him hear it now. For each of the existing things there is, as it were, its own place, a special logos of nature, or a measure of its inherent dignity. Like me, for example, in regard to the logos of nature, I am a man, and the other is an angel. As for dignity, one is slavish, and the other is not so, but free. But when something of these is connected with that which it is proper to improve, then [the thing being improved] becomes <75.537> something different from what it was originally, being in some way taken from its place and transferred to the position of the one who improves [it]. . So we too, having endured this, passed from slavery into sonship to God and the Father, going beyond the limits of our measure and jumping into the measure of Him who gives us this, although, of course, we are not by nature called *children of God* . Shall we say, then, that human nature has not benefited from this? But this is generally accepted. What then will be the image of benefit if there is no difference at all between the creation and the Son? What kind of change for the better is generally seen in us if there is no advantage in sonship over creation? Or how could we be called sons, having received into ourselves the Word of God, if He is not the Son of the Father by nature? If He is the Son by nature, then how can He also be a creation, while it is impossible to admit that what is begotten by someone is not entirely from the nature of the one who gave birth?

OTHER . " *For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came into being by Jesus Christ* " [1384]. If the Son is not God by nature, then it means that He is adopted and false (διεψευσμένος). But if He is the Truth and the worker of truth (τῆς ἀληθείας ἐργάτης), then how can He be [at the same time] false? Therefore, He is by nature God. And being such, how can He be created?

OTHER . " *Behold the Lamb of God , take away the sin of the world* " [1385]. The blessed prophet Isaiah says nowhere to the Lord of all: " *Who is God like You, who takes away iniquity and forsakes iniquity?* » [1386]So, when it is said about God that He does this, and Christ is the *one who takes away the sin of the world* , then how is He not God? And if God, then not creation.

OTHER . " *In the morning* ," says [the evangelist], " *you wanted to go out into Galilee, and you found Philip and said to him: Walk after Me.* " [1387]. With these words the Savior proclaims Philip a disciple. See, then, whether there is some wise reasoning hidden behind this, which encourages us to agree that the Son is God by nature. Despite the fact that there were always a lot of people next to the Savior, and that crowds of thousands surrounded the disciples, the Savior *lifted up His eyes* [1388]He said to them: " *The harvest is plentiful, but the laborers are few: pray therefore to the Lord of the harvest, that He may bring forth the laborers into His harvest* ." [1389], calling the harvest nothing other than those who, like ears of corn, grow in piety through faith in

Him. And who can be the Master of such, if not the God of all? Paul also begs to be united with Him through repentance by those who are still heirs [of the promises], crying: " *We pray according to Christ: be reconciled to God.* " [1390]. So, since God is the only *Lord of the harvest* , since He is <75.540> the Lord and Creator of all, the Savior said that it is fitting for Him alone to appoint workers; Having then done this Himself, He, from this power of His, is seen [by God]; for He commands Philip to follow Him. Therefore, He is the true God, since, obviously, He is also the Lord of the harvest, who revealed Himself thanks to this.

OTHER . " *Take this from here, and do not make My Father's house a purchased house* ." [1391]. If the Son is a creation, then it is obvious that by grace He is called God, and as an adopted son bears the name of the Son, like other rational creatures, to whom it is not their nature that gives them dignity, but the grace of the one who says: " *Az rekh: you are God, and all the sons of the Most High* " [1392]. So, if He is not essentially the Son, then, therefore, He is the brother of those called to sonship with God. How then, someone will rightly note, does He, having no advantage over us in the dignity of sonship, appropriate to Himself the Father common to all, saying: " *Do not do to My Father's house* "? After all, it would be fitting for a truly righteous and good person to say to the merchants: " *Do not do to your Father's house what has been bought* ." But we do not see Him saying this, but with some great power appropriating the name of the Father to Himself alone. Consequently, He knew Himself in the proper sense of the word and by nature to be the Son, in imitation of Whom we are called by God to do the same. And how can the Son, having such a nature, be created?

OTHER . " *What sign did you show us that you did this? Jesus answered and said to them: Destroy this church , and in three days I will raise it up* ." [1393]. The Evangelist himself directly says that Christ calls his own body a temple, adding immediately: " *He spoke about the church of His body. Whenever the dead rose again, I remembered the disciples, as if it had happened to them* ." [1394]. So, nothing can truly and properly be called a temple unless God dwells in it. As is true for us: the body cannot be called a temple of the soul living in it, but then we are called temples when the Holy Spirit dwells in us through faith in Christ. And the body of Christ is called a temple justly and truly, for in It *every fulfillment of the Divine body was pleased to dwell.* [1395] as Paul says. But it is obvious that the Dweller is God the Word. How then will He be created, Who, as God by nature, declared the holy body in which He was a temple?

OTHER . " *When I was in Jerusalem on the feast of Passover, many believed in His name, seeing His signs and doing them. Jesus Himself without committing Himself to their faith, He Himself knew everything, and as if He did not demand, but who bears witness* <75.541> *about men: He Himself knows what is in men* ." [1396]. The psalmist, immensely amazed at the Divine nature, exposes this as some great and most remarkable advantage, inherent in it alone in the proper sense of the word, saying to

the Lord of all: " *He who created their hearts in one, meant for all their deeds.* " [1397]. It seems obvious to me that he is talking about people. So, when it is characteristic of the true God alone to know the hearts and understand everything hidden in man, and the Son understands and knows this, how will He not be truly and by nature God? And if so, how can He be created?

OTHER . When our Savior, Christ, said to Nathanael: " *Philip did not even cry to you before, I saw you under the fig tree* ." [1398]- Nathanael himself, in turn, said, admiring Him as God from this one sign: " *Rabbi, You are the Son of God, You are the King of Israel.* " [1399]. So, if, according to the testimony of our Savior about him, Nathanael was *truly an Israelite, there was no flattery in him* [1400], then how can we admit that he lied about Christ, saying: " *Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel* "? After all, if he knows how to lie at all, then he wears cunning on his tongue. And if the words of the Savior are true, then he had no guile [in himself], being free from lies and deception. So, he is true, calling the Word of God Son and together with the flesh, and adding the dignity due to the Son by nature, for he calls Him the King of Israel. But He Who is the Son and therefore the King, how can at the same time be a slave and a created one?

OTHER . Christ is found nowhere speaking, trying to be ignorant, and asking [Him] to the Pharisees: " *You are deceived , not knowing the Scriptures* ." [1401]; after all, this, undoubtedly, was the most appropriate desire for a truly wise teacher to both [maliciously] correct those who ask, and show the best to those who do not lead [the truth]. Consequently, if Nathanael really deviated from the truth, calling Christ the Son of God and the King of Israel, then why did Christ not immediately guide him to true knowledge and tell him: "You are mistaken; for things are not as you thought. After all, if I am not the Son of God, but rather a creature, then I am by no means a King, but a servant – as if created"? For this would be much more useful to one who has recently been called to discipleship and is beginning to do so. In addition, the Teacher would have preserved the art appropriate to Him impeccably, teaching him, as the first and saving lesson, deliverance from untrue judgment. Since He usually did this on other occasions, and in the case of Nathanael's confession He is almost amazed, it is obvious from this that He highly evaluates him as having spoken wisely and skillfully. If He agrees that He is *the Son God and King* <75.544> *Israel* , how can He be created or created, since He is the Word? For what was created was not called either into sonship or into kingship by nature. For *everything is work* [1402]To the creator, and in general what is created cannot be born.

OTHER . " *For God loved the world, for He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish, but have eternal life.* " [1403]. If the fact that the Lord is the Son, who dared to be incarnate for the sake of the world and because of it, reveals the greatness and supernaturalism of the love of God and the Father, which

He has for the world, then in the event that what is given for the world is not the Son, but a creature, the matter [redemption] turns out to be something not great and without any value. Moreover, the name "Only Begotten" would be false and not true. After all, if the Son is from among the created, then how can He be considered the only begotten? Since the love of God and the Father is great and exclusive, the Son is the One given for the salvation of the world. For this dignity is truly present in Him. He is also the only begotten, since He is not one of the created, but the only one born from the Father. For [as is His name], such is reality (πρᾶγμα).

OTHER . " *God did not send His Son into the world to judge the world, but let the world be saved by Him.* " [1404]. Presenting to us the great face of the Lord of all, the prophet Isaiah says: " *I am God, and there is no one who saves me, a righteous one and a Savior* ." [1405]. If the Son is all this and saves the world, and it is said that for this purpose He was sent by the Father, then it is He who speaks through the prophet: " *I am God, and is there no Me* ." How then, being such, can He be considered created?

OTHER . John, the blessed Baptist, speaks of our Savior, Christ: " *It is fitting for Him to grow, but for me to diminish* ." [1406]. But, perhaps, someone who highly desires to think in the best way will say that increase and decrease here mean bodily growth. And how can he not seem like he is talking nonsense if he takes this into his head? After all, the nature of human bodies may still allow growth, but the dimensions [of the body] that befall [someone] and once created by nature cannot decrease by themselves and non-violently (for many misfortunes sometimes happen to our bodies). Consequently, it is completely incredible that " *It is fitting for him to grow, but for me to decrease* " was said about bodies, but one should conclude [about these words] something reliable and not alien to the thought of John. So, Christ is ever increasing, showing John to be lesser, not in the sense that he is superior to him as <75.545> a man of man or as a creature of creation (for the difference [between such] is small and does not amount to much), but in that one by works With His own He shows Himself to be God and always rises to this height, while the other, like a man, falls [down] - to the extent that the human race is inferior to the Divine essence. After this, how would it not be very wicked for someone who dares to disparage the [Son] endowed with such dignity by attributing creation to Him?

OTHER . " *He who comes from above is above all* " [1407]. " *Above* " here, I believe, means nothing more than "from an essence superior to all [other essences]." For neither we ourselves, of course, say that the Son boasts of bodily heights, so to speak, nor do we admit that St. The Baptist stated this. So, when "from above" is not understood as [moving] from [a certain] physical place, but in fact does not have some kind of movement from one to another, then what else can it be, except, as we said before, a higher essence, in [its] being [itself] having the height of dignity appropriate to God? As God the Word, who came from here, will renounce the nature of Him who

gave birth to Him and will appear to us foreign and alien [to the Father], a creature rather than a Son; a slave, not a Master? How then will He be considered the highest of all, Whom these [heretics] forcibly place in a subordinate position along with all [creations], since [in their opinion] He is related to all [of them]? After all, the Psalmist speaks the truth, turning to God the Father: " *For every work is Yours* ." [1408]. For this is the measure appropriate to creation, and the Son is above all. Therefore, He is not one of those who slavishly obey, but the situation is most likely the other way around - both in appearance and in essence.

OTHER, [derived] from the same . If the Son is *above all* , then He will not be placed among everyone, but will be different and above everyone in comparison, i.e. in some higher and ineffable nature, which is above likeness to created things. For this " *above* " again indicates to us the position of [the Son] with God, excluding the [understood] bodily place. If such is the Son by nature and by His own words about Himself, then how can He be considered created?

OTHER . The blessed Baptist says about the Savior that " *Accept His testimony and confirm that He is the true God* ." [1409]. If he who believes what Christ says and affirms *affirms that God is true* , then, consequently, Christ is God, in whom those who listen [to Him] believe as true. And since *there is no new God in us* [1410], then how can He be created?

OTHER . The Savior says, again, nowhere: " *I am life* " [1411]. And so one must believe in Him, unless God lies. But He certainly does not lie, for He is true. Son - Life by nature; Consequently, He is not created, <75.548> nor created, but rather Life from Life, essentially possessing being always, which is in the highest degree the opposite of createdness. After all, about created things (γεγονὸς) it is generally necessary to say that it does not always exist, but, most likely, in time is brought to becoming [in being] (εἰς γένεσιν).

OTHER . " *My Father is still working and I am working. And for this reason I seek Him all the more to kill the Jews, for not only did He destroy the Sabbath, but He also declared His Father to be God, making Him equal to God* ." [1412]. The Jews are indignant at our Savior, Christ, because He, looking like a man, calls God not the general Father, but His own [personal], saying: " *Father My* is still working ." From the fact that He calls God His own Father, moving on to a certain natural and true speculation, they also say that He admires equality with God, since by nature what comes from something is equal to what it came from, in the sense qualities of being (κατὰ τὸν τοῦ πῶς εἶναι λὸγον). So, when [even] the Jews had such guesses about Christ, who will say that those who also think that by calling God His own Father, [Christ] made Himself equal to Him who gave birth, have fallen away from rightness and truth? But the Savior Himself, although He is always the defender of the truth and through it guides those who approach Him to an infallible and pure judgment, does not

dispute this conjecture of the Jews. But, on the contrary, He seems to confirm what they assumed by what he says further: " *Whatever the Father does, the Son does likewise.* " [1413]. Therefore, He insists that God is His own Father, and He is equal to Him, having a natural likeness in everything. And how can such a Son be a creation?

OTHER . " *Just as the Father raises the dead and lives, so the Son also what lives* he wills ." [1414]. Where will the word of the Christ-fighters now rush? Or what will they say to these words of the Son? How does the Father raise the dead? Is it by borrowing life from another, or by Himself being life by nature? But, I think, about Him they will completely agree that He is Life, and thus can give life to those for whom He becomes a partaker. Therefore, since *the Son also* gives life to the dead, He is undoubtedly by nature Life from Life. And He Who is so indistinguishable from the Father, how can he be created if the Father is not like that? But He, of course, is not like that. For He always was and is Life. Therefore, the Son is not a creation, ever living and existing, like the Father.

OTHER . " *For the Father does not judge anyone, but all judgment is given to the Sons, so that everyone honors the Son as they honor the Father* " [1415]. It is generally accepted that the Father is God by nature. And the Son, due to <75.549> the madness of the heterodox, being a creature and creation, cannot be God by nature. How, perhaps someone will say, will we serve both God and creation with equal and equal reverence, and not sin? Or how God Himself commands us to do [this] and as if commands us to serve the creature more than the Creator, although [He Himself] said through Moses: " *Worship the Lord your God and serve Him alone.* " [1416]? But it seems to be extremely absurd to think that God and the Father wants us to serve the creature. However, He commands that the Son be honored as well as Himself. Therefore, He knows Him to be by nature God and the true fruit of His essence. After this, how can the Son be called created as such by nature, if we confess the Father, from whom He is, to be far from creation?

OTHER . " *As the Father hath life in Himself. so hath He given the Son to have life in Himself.* " [1417]. If the Son *has life in Himself. just as the Father does* , *then* , therefore, [He has life in Himself] essentially, and not by participation. For in the Father life is essential; better to say, the Father by nature is Life-in-Itself (αὐτοζωὴ). And let not those who hear the Son say that life was given to Him from the Father be embarrassed. For this is as if the heat that comes from fire said: "Just as fire has heat in itself, so it has given me to have it in itself." And, of course, this endowment [with properties] is understood not [as occurring] due to the participation of the recipient, or due to some division of a part or cutting off from the giver, but as if from an essential unity with the sender, the movement (φορά) of the sent occurs. Therefore, having life in Himself as the Father also has it, and being exactly as He is, how can the Son be created when He who begat Him is not like this?

OTHER . " *Even if I testify about Me, My testimony is not true: I also testify about Me, and I, because I testify about Me, is true. You send your message to John and bear witness to the truth. But I do not accept testimony from man* ." [1418]. The blessed Baptist also testified to the truth about the Savior, saying: " *Behold the Lamb of God, take away the sin of the world* ." [1419]. But if the Savior says that he does not want to accept *testimony from man* , and that *another bears witness to Him* , then who is this, whose testimony is more significant than the words of John? Of course, He is talking about the Father, who said to John: " *Behold the Spirit descending and abiding on Him, who baptizes with the Holy Spirit.* " [1420]when the voice of the Father came from above, saying: " *This is My beloved Son, in Him I am well pleased* ." [1421]. So, when God and the Father calls Him Son and confirms the truth of <75.552> such testimony about Him, who will call Him a creation and will not be clearly contradicted by the knowledge of the Almighty, which He has about His own Generation? How can such a person even be considered prudent?

OTHER . " *Az Imam bears a greater testimony than John: for the works which the Father hath given Me that I should do, the works which I do testify of me, that the Father hath sent Me.* " [1422]. If Christ claims that John's words are not enough to testify about Him, this is not because John's testimony is not trustworthy (for in some way he *came to bear witness and testify about the Light* [1423], and besides, being *sent from God* [1424]), but because the wicked Jews treated him as nothing, even though he was so great in virtue. However, He says that more significant is the proof from works that He is God, descended from God the Father. For He considers it worthy that from the greatness [manifested] in deeds, they should know, as He Himself says, that He *came from the Father Himself* . [1425], since He could not do anything that befits God alone if He were in fact of a different nature in relation to Him who gave birth to Him. Since He is shown to be able to do the same as the Father, how is it not necessary to believe that He is God from God, and not to blaspheme ignorantly and impiously, calling Him a creature?

OTHER . " *I came in the name of My Father, and you do not accept Me. If anyone comes in his own name, you will receive him* ." [1426]. How *did the Son come in the name of the Father* ? Obviously, as God, as Lord, as Life, as Almighty, as Light, as able to revive the dead. For [all] this is the Father. But if the Son by nature is the Truth - and He is in every way - then none of the things listed can be false in Him; and being by nature what the Father also is, except to be the Father, how can he be created when He who begot Him is not like that?

OTHER. " *As the living Father sent Me, and I live for the Father's sake; and the one who is poisoned by Me, will live for My sake* " [1427]. The Son says that He was sent by the Father in the sense of obedience and incarnation (for He *humbled Himself taking on the form of a servant and being obedient even to death* [1428]); or as from the sun -

light born and sent from the sun; or as from fire - warmth, without separation [from its source] spreading to the one who partakes [of it]. On the contrary, He calls Himself living for the Father's sake, not because He becomes, like us, a partaker of life, but because the distinctive property of the Father naturally passes on to Him, since He is the Son, and essentially came from Him. The distinctive property of the Father is to live. This is also the Son *of the Father for the sake of* . After all, <75.553> it is absolutely impossible for the One who [came] from the living Father not to live, if the Son is the unchangeable image of the Father. Consequently, just as He is from the living Father and He Himself is alive, so, preserving in everything the stamp of natural likeness, since He is from the uncreated Father, He Himself will be uncreated. And since He is truly from God, then [He Himself] will be true God, and not created or created, or new.

OTHER. " *Jesus answered : You know neither Me nor My Father: if they knew Me, they knew My Father* ." [1429]. From here it is again clear that the Son is the most accurate image of the Father. After all, since if anyone has known Him, then everyone also knows the Father, then how is it not obvious that in every possible way it is necessary to believe that He is such as the Father is by nature? So, when there is no difference between Them, and an unchangeable likeness remains, how can the Son be created when the Father is not like that?

OTHER . Those names that express a certain relationship to something are not understood by themselves and separately, like other [names], but they certainly introduce an indication of [something] else and also designate that with which they have a connection. Just as he who says "day" does not forget about the night, [and when he says "right," in the same way, [names it] in relation to the left, so he [names it] the Son in relation to the Father. Therefore, he who calls the Son a creation [1430] does not properly contrast Him with the Father. *And he who confesses the Son has also the Father* [1431]. For the Creator cannot be thought of as the father of creation, but rather as the Creator and Creator. Since we desire to know the Father by God, we will confess the Son by nature [born] of Him, otherwise we will certainly hear from Him, together with the ignorant Jews: " *If they knew Me, they knew My Father.* " [1432].

OTHER . " *The Jews answered* ," says [the evangelist], " *we are not born from fornication: one Father, Imams, God. Jesus said to them: If God were your Father, you would sooner love Me: For I went out from God and came back: I came not for Myself but for Me as an ambassador* " [1433]. How can it be that those who did not love the Son, who grew from God the Father, speak the truth when they claim to love the One from whom He is? And those who despise the fruit, what honor will they give to the tree? If the fruit of God and the Father is the Son, for this is what the words mean: " *From God I went forth and came again* ," then how can He be created? How can the ineffable nature of the Divine give rise to something alien and alien to itself, when even created

nature does not allow such a thing? For from a man is born a man, and from a bull is a bull. Therefore, it is necessary to confess that the Son of God was born God, so that the Father does not <75.556> appear worse than his own creations. And that He was sent by Him, the Son does not say in the sense of moving from place to place (for this is characteristic of bodies), but as its warmth [is sent down] from fire, or as from light – the radiance [arising] from it.

OTHER . " *My Father , who gave to me, is greater than all: and no one can snatch from the hand of my Father. "Az and the Father are one* " [1434]. If *the greatest of all is the Father* , having the superiority befitting God in relation to creatures, then He is both outside of all and above all. And being such by nature and dignity, He is *one* with the Son. How then will He be created who is identical with the Father in essence? Or how will He, who together with the Father *is more than all* , be considered as a creation among all [other creations] , and moreover , as God in relation to creations?

OTHER . " *Many good deeds have been revealed to you from My Father: why do you lay a stone on me for their deeds? The Jew answered Him, saying: We do not lay stones against You for a good deed, but for blasphemy, because You, this man, have created God for Yourself* " [1435]. When our Savior said in a conversation: " *I am one and the Father,* " the Jews became angry, not understanding who the speaker was, and looking at only the flesh, and then they wanted to stone Him and [even] made an attempt, having already accused Him of blasphemy. "For by what You said: " *I and the Father are one* ," You *created for Yourself* according to the nature *of God* [1436]", they say, having understood this alone correctly. Therefore, [even] the Jews, who claim that he who dares to say " *I am one and the Father* ," as if necessarily ascends to Divine dignity, [and that] is better than the wicked Arians. For how could He be *one* with God by nature, without being so Himself? Since He does not lie, it means that He Himself, being God by nature, is one with the Father. And how can such a one be created or created?

OTHER . " *Jesus answered them: Is it not written in your law: Az rekh: you are God? If these are the speech of the gods, to them the word of God comes, and the Scripture cannot be destroyed: Whose Father is holy and ambassador to the world, you say, as if you were speaking blasphemy, without saying: "Am I the Son of God* ?" [1437]Do you see how He most obviously contrasts Himself with the gods in position, as by nature being what is given to them as a gift? How can it be allowed that one who is essentially God does not entirely and completely avoid being a creation, if the Divine and incomprehensible nature is assumed to be the highest created thing?

OTHER . " *If I do not do the works of My Father, do not have faith. " If I do, and if you do not believe in Me, believe by deed* <75.557> *that you may understand and believe that the Father is in Me, and I am in the Father* ." [1438]. That those who are by nature separated from mutual affinities have different effects, the Savior most clearly

shows by what He said. “After all, if, looking at carnal wretchedness,” He says, “you do not believe in Me, but the greatness of [My] works and the highest degree is significant and sufficient to convince you that I am God, who came from God.” After all, equal to the Father in deeds, how will he be in second place after Him in nature? And invested with the same power and energy as Him, how can one become alien to Him? Moreover, how [may it be] not similar in everything and thus well prepared for essential similarity [with the Father], having in Himself by nature all the uniqueness of the One who gave birth, so that He abides *in the Father* and in the same way has the Father in Himself Who then, daring to call the Image of the Father a creation, will he not thereby blaspheme the Father Himself?

OTHER . “ *I am the resurrection and the life* ” [1439]. If the Son, being, according to some, a creation and creation, *is the resurrection and the life* , then we should not be surprised that the Father is the same. For what advantage does He have over the creatures? If, according to the logos of nature, He is so distant from creation, including due to the fact that He is life, then how can the Son be a creation, Who is also life by nature, like the One who begat Him? For in general none of the creatures is life, but rather they are partakers of the life [given] from the living God. Since in God we *both move and are* [1440] as Paul says.

OTHER . “ *He who believes in Me does not believe in Me, but in Him who sent Me* ” [1441]. If the Son in relation to His Father has such a likeness that in a certain sense he is mixed with Him in essence and His nature is shown as if in a picture, then how would it not be very wicked for someone who dares to call Him a creation if he does not admit that the Father Himself is created? For it is necessary that the Son be what the Father is by nature. Since the Father is not a creation, the Son, therefore, will not be a creation, but rather uncreated, like the One who begat Him. For, in this way, the Son will truly have existence, and we will be able to contemplate the Father in Him.

OTHER. “ *Everything that the Father has, is My essence* ” [1442]. If *everything that the Father has* belongs to the Son (it is quite obvious that He is proud (ἐναμβρύνεται) of the natural virtues of the One who gave birth), and the Father, along with other divine blessings, also has the property of being uncreated, then the Son will also possess this. For He is not created, but *in the beginning* [1443] with the Father and in the Father, being God the Word and having an ineffable and ineffable manner of birth (τὸν τῆς γεννησεως τρόπον).

<75.560> *ИНОЕ* . « *Изыдохъ отъ Отца* (from the Father) [1444], *and came into the world: [and] again I leave the world, and go to the Father. His disciples said to him: Behold, now you speak without hesitation, but you never speak parables. Now we know that you have everything and do not demand it, but whoever asks you: this we believe, because you came from God* .” [1445]. The testimony of St. is very remarkable. the apostles, saying that they were immediately and very quickly disposed to believe that

the Son shone forth from the essence of the Father. For I believe that it is precisely this, and nothing else, that the words mean: " *I died from the Father* ." It is worth, however, to examine why this faith came to them, and for some reason they were granted understanding. " *Now* ," they say, " *we have come from God believe that you* ." From the fact that the Son knows everything, the disciples concluded that He truly shone forth from God the Father. For truly the characteristic of the Godhead is the absence of ignorance of anything which was [observed] in the Son. Therefore, they believed that He is God, who shone in the image of birth (γεννητῶς) from the Father and by nature had His properties in Himself (τά ἐκείνου). How then will the created one shine with the properties of the Divine and not only possess omniscience (ἔχων τὸ πάντα εἰδέναι), but also say in a loud voice: " *All that the Father has, is my day* " [1446]?

OTHER . " *This is the eternal life, that they may know Thee, the one true God, and whom didst send Thou Jesus Christ* ." [1447]. If, in contrast to the falsely named pagan gods, the only true [God] is the Father, united, of course, by the identity of nature with the Son, then let those who call Him a creation see whether they do not go beyond all impiety by saying that He is the created one. Who truly belongs to be God together with Him who gave birth to Him?

OTHER . " *I have revealed Your name as a man* " [1448]. So what name of the Father is the Savior talking about, about which He claims to have made it obvious to people? Isn't this the same as saying: "I have proclaimed You as God before men"? What then are the words of the prophets? God or not God did they call the Lord of all so many years before his incarnation? What greater thing is [revealed] through Christ? After all, He equally calls [the Father] the Creator and the whole world the Creator and Artist. But the blessed Moses was the first to compile a book about the creation of the world, proclaiming Him both God and Creator, saying: " *In the beginning God created heaven and earth* ." [1449]. So what name does He say He revealed? Isn't it obvious that the Father? After all, since [the apostles] believed [in Him] as the Son, then, of course, at the same time they confessed that there is a Father, and they knew who the Father is and what He is like, from the natural beauty (ὡραιότητος) of the Son, being raised to beauty (κάλλος) of the One who gave birth, <75.561> and from the exact Image turning the [mental] gaze to the Prototype (ἀπό τῆς ἀκριβοῦς εἰκόνος τὸ ἀρχέτυπο ν βλέποντες). So what does this add up to? If the Son is a creation, then from this it is impossible to understand that God is the Father; after all, the creation is thought of in relation to the creator, and the son – to the father; for this is always the position of those who have one or another relationship with something. If one must think that God truly is the Father, both in action and in essence, then it is necessary to confess as the Son the One who [came] from Him. The same will apply to the Son. For if one believes that He is a Generation, and not a creation, then at the same time with Him the knowledge of the One who gave birth will undoubtedly be introduced; and thus the one who says the truth speaks: " *I have made Your name known as a man* ."

OTHER . The Savior nowhere says, turning to Mary after the resurrection from the dead: " *Touch me not, lest I sigh unto my Father: go therefore to my brethren, and say unto them: I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, and my God, and your God* ." [1450]. Notice again, after thinking a little about the meaning of what has been said, that the Word that shone forth from God and the Father appears truly to be the Son, and not a creature [as it appears] according to the madness and at the same time ignorance of the heretics. Let us analyze in a similar way the meaning of this statement: God the Word, having descended [from the heights and clothed] himself with the form and essence of humanity αβεβηκὼς), in order to save man, since [Himself] became what we We are by nature, assimilates to Himself the distinctive characteristics of humanity, and in return gives us His own, and thus raises to the honor appropriate to His nature a person who has fallen from this original glory through the crime of Adam . So, having mixed and co-dissolved us in some way with Himself, and back - Himself with us, He descends into our [state], and delights us into His, since we are human by nature, and He became human, descending into that through love for mankind. , which is not characteristic of [His] nature (τὸ παρὰ φύσιν). We are God's servants by nature, like creatures; He also called himself a slave, having come to a state unusual for [His] nature when he became a man. But also vice versa: He is God by nature, and we are gods, having ascended by grace into that which is not characteristic of [our] nature, for we are human beings. He is Son by nature, and we are sons by adoption (κατὰ θέσιν), as called to be His brothers. Therefore, if we are gods and sons by position (κατὰ θέσιν), then He, in turn, will be this in truth, in contrast to those who are by position. And he who is the true Son and God, how can he be created, when the Divine essence in no way allows him to be created?

OTHER . The Savior, turning to His disciples, says nowhere again: " *Peace be with you: just as the Father sent Me, I send you. And this he said, and breathed, and said unto them: Receive the Holy Spirit* ." [1451]. Knowing the Spirit to be creative (δημιουργικὸν) by nature, and the Psalmist says, addressing the Master of all, God and the Father: <75.564> " *Thou shalt follow Thy Spirit, and they shall be built up, and renew the face of the earth* ." [1452]. So, since the Holy Spirit both creates and renews everything, having such a nature, how can He be created, or how can the Son, the giver of the Spirit who can create, be thought of as a creature by nature?

OTHER . Thomas, the blessed disciple, when the other apostles announced to him " *Videhom* (τεθεὰμεθα) [1453] *Gentlemen* [1454], *risen from the dead* [1455]", not believing a little (ὀλίγον ἀπιστήσας), he said: " *Unless I put my hands* (τὰς χεῖρὰς μου) *into the wounds of the nails, I have no faith* ." [1456]. When the Savior came to assure him and offered to put his hands *into the wounds of the nails* , the disciple called to faith said to Him: " *My Lord and my God* ." [1457]. And having said this, he became an object of admiration not only for his contemporaries, but to this day we admire him as the one who rightly and truly spoke about the Savior. So, if He is both Lord and God, how can

He be one of the created things? After all, everything created by nature is a slave, and is not God by nature, but the Savior is by nature Lord and God. Therefore, He was not created to Whom the beauties of the Divine essence belong.

OTHER, [derived] from the same. If the Son, in their opinion, is a creature by nature, and Thomas said to Him, as such, " *My Lord and my God* ," and at the same time avoided the accusation of blasphemy, as if it were possible to say such things to a creature, then what prevents us should we say this to the angels and to any of the saints when we admire them on the occasion of something miraculous? But no one, being in his right mind, would say such words to any of those listed, since they befit only God. However, we say that the disciple was far from being mistaken. Therefore, he speaks the truth when he calls Him God and Lord. But he who is such by nature and so-called - how will he be created?

OTHER . " *And Jesus did many other signs before His disciples, which are not written in these books. this was written Now , that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God .*" [1458]. Let the Arians, who dare to fight against God with madness, tell us, calling Christ, as the Word, a creature, confess [1459]whether they are His Son of God and Father. But, I think, they [themselves] will strongly condemn their own recklessness, looking at the reasoning about these subjects and precisely considered "what is created and what is born [by someone] [1460]. For what is created is not taken from the essence of the creator, but what is born <75.565> steals (ἀποσυλᾷ) the nature of the one who gives birth. We say this as if in relation to bodies, while in relation to God the situation is different. Nevertheless, from our [properties] the truest image of [Divine birth] is deduced. So, when such a difference lies between the Son and creation, and their meaning is so different, for what reason the blessed evangelist, offering us the truths [received by him] from the Spirit, speaks of many and wonderful signs, *so that we may believe that Jesus Christ is* Himself *the Son God* , and not one of those created by God, if He really is created, as they say, idle talk [,..] [1461]. But he does not say this, but raises the minds of those listening to the understanding of sonship. Therefore, he wants to think of the Son not as created, [but] as [precisely] the Word.

* * *

[1078] Romans 1:1 .

[1079] Romans 1:5 .

[1080] Romans 1:4 .

[1081] 1 Cor. 1:3 .

[1082] Isaiah 26:12 .

[1083] This. 14:27 .

1084 Romans 1:18–20 .

1085 Romans 1:20–21 .

1086 Psalm 32:6 .

1087 Matthew 5:16 .

1088 Romans 1:28 .

1089 Romans 1:26 .

1090 Romans 1:25 .

1091 Romans 2:5–6 .

1092 2 Cor.5:10 .

1093 This. 5:22 .

1094 Matthew 25:41 .

1095 Matthew 25:34 .

1096 Romans 3:20–22 .

1097 Gal. 4:9 .

1098 Romans 3:28–30 .

1099 This. 6:47 .

1100 Romans 4:16–17 .

1101 This. 14:6 .

1102 This. 5:36 .

1103 This. 11:25 .

1104 В оригинале: "so-called".

1105 Eph. 2:11-13 .

1106 Romans 10:8–9 .

1107 Rom. 15:15–16 .

1108 Gal. 1:15–16 .

1109 1 Cor. 2:8 .

1110 Compare: “ *Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of Hosts , fill heaven and earth with Your glory* .” This hymn, usually called "Sanctus" by liturgists, was present both in the ancient liturgies of the Alexandrian tradition: in the liturgy of the Apostle Mark, used

by the Church of Alexandria in the first millennium, and in that attributed to St. Cyril liturgy, which is still used in the Coptic rite.

1111 1 Cor. 4:1 .

1112 Gal. 1:12 .

1113 1 Cor. 4:5 .

1114 Matthew 25:34 .

1115 1 Cor. 4:5 .

1116 1 Cor. 9:20-21 .

1117 2 Corinthians 1:8–9 .

1118 This. 11:25 .

1119 This. 5:36 .

1120 2 Corinthians 1:18–19 .

1121 Matthew 3:17; 17:5 ; Mark 9:7 ; Luke 9:35 .

1122 Psalm 102:3 .

1123 2Cop.2:14–15.

1124 Gal. 4:9 .

1125 Literally: “damaging.” Wed. Synodal translation: “For we do not corrupt the word of God, as many do.”

1126 2 Corinthians 2:17 .

1127 2Cor.2:14 .

1128 This. 14:6 .

1129 This. 14:9 .

1130 2 Cor.4:4–5 .

1131 This. 6:44 .

1132 This. 14:9 .

1133 2 Cor.5:10 .

1134 Psalm 93:2 .

1135 Psalm 61:11 .

1136 Eccl. 12:14 .

[1137] 2 Cor.5:12–13 .

[1138] Gal. 6:14 .

[1139] 2 Corinthians 11:22 .

[1140] Phil.3:5–9 .

[1141] Matthew 13:45–46 .

[1142] This chapter is based on a play on words. The verb “ἐξίστημι”, used by the Apostle in the meaning of “to go into a frenzy, to lose one’s mind, to be beside oneself,” St. Kirill then interprets it as “refuse, renounce.”

[1143] 2 Corinthians 5:17–19 .

[1144] This. 14:6 .

[1145] Matthew 11:28 .

[1146] 2 Cor.5:20–21 .

[1147] Romans 8:3 .

[1148] Gal. 1:9–10 .

[1149] Gal. 3:24–27 .

[1150] Gal. 4:1–5 .

[1151] Gal. 1:11–12 .

[1152] Hebrews 13:8 .

[1153] Gal. 2:19–20 .

[1154] 2 Cor.5:14–15 .

[1155] Gal. 3:8 .

[1156] This. 1:29 .

[1157] Luke 5:21 .

[1158] Gal. 4:8–9 .

[1159] This. 10:28 .

[1160] This. 10:14 .

[1161] Gal. 4:12–14 .

[1162] Hebrews 1:6 .

[1163] Hebrews 1:5,13 ; Psalm 2:8; 109:1 .

1164 Psalm 103:4 ; Hebrews 1:7 .

1165 Hebrews 1:14 .

1166 Gal. 4:31–5:1 .

1167 Eph. 1:1 .

1168 Hebrews 1:3 .

1169 Eph. 2:11-13 .

1170 Matthew 25:21 .

1171 Eph. 2:14–15 .

1172 Tuesday 12:32 .

1173 Eph. 2:19 .

1174 Matthew 12:50 .

1175 Eph. 3:14–15 .

1176 Psalm 102:3 .

1177 Eph. 4:5–6 .

1178 This. 12:44 .

1179 Eph. 5:1–2 .

1180 Gal. 2:7 ; 1 Tim. 1:11 .

1181 Eph. 5:5 .

1182 This. 17:10 .

1183 Eph. 5:6 .

1184 Matthew 25:41 .

1185 Eph. 5:14 .

1186 This. 1:9 .

1187 This. 1:5 .

1188 Symbol of faith.

1189 This. 8:12 .

1190 Eph. 5:25–26 .

1191 1 Cor. 4:7 .

1192 Phil.2:14–15 .

1193 Heb.2:13 ; Isa.8:18 .

1194 Phil.3:20–21 .

1195 Psalm 109:1 .

1196 Phil.4:5–6 .

1197 Jer.23:23 .

1198 Phil.4:6–7 .

1199 This. 14:27 .

1200 Isaiah 26:12 .

1201 Phil.4:8–9 .

1202 Col. 1:10 .

1203 Eph. 4:5 .

1204 That is, it is impossible to be just a father or a son, but someone is certainly called a father in relation to his son, as well as a son in relation to his father.

1205 This. 17:6 .

1206 Col. 1:12-14 .

1207 Psalm 118:91 .

1208 Psalm 43:5 .

1209 Col. 1:16 .

1210 Col. 2:1-3 .

1211 Isaiah 53:8 .

1212 Col. 3:1 .

1213 Hebrews 1:13–14 .

1214 Col, 3:2-4.

1215 Acts 17:28 .

1216 Col. 3:9-10 .

1217 Gal. 4:19 .

1218 1 Cor. 15:49 .

1219 Gen.1:27 .

1220 1 Thess. 1:8 .

[1221] The text says PG “ἐπαγγέλλουσιν” (promise), but this is apparently a typo.

[1222] 1 Thess. 1:9 .

[1223] 1 Thess. 2:1–2 .

[1224] 1 Thess. 2:7–8 .

[1225] 1 Thess. 2:9 .

[1226] 1 Thess. 2:13 .

[1227] 1 Cor. 2:2 .

[1228] 2 Thess. 3:3 .

[1229] Hebrews 1:1–2 .

[1230] Matthew 5:27–28 .

[1231] Ps. 54.20 .

[1232] Hebrews 2:2–3 .

[1233] Hebrews 10:1 .

[1234] Hebrews 1:14 .

[1235] Matthew 4:11 .

[1236] Psalm 8:5 .

[1237] Hebrews 2:6–8 .

[1238] Hebrews 2:8 .

[1239] Hebrews 2:8 .

[1240] Eph. 4:5 .

[1241] Is.66:2 .

[1242] Hebrews 3:1–4 .

[1243] Col. 1:16-17 .

[1244] Hebrews 1:1–2 .

[1245] Hebrews 3:5–6 .

[1246] Psalm 118:91 .

[1247] Matthew 17:26 .

[1248] Hebrews 3:6 .

[1249] 2 Corinthians 16:16 ; Lev.26:12 .

1250 Eph. 3:16–17 .

1251 Hebrews 3:12 .

1252 This. 5:36 .

1253 Hebrews 4:12–13 .

1254 Psalm 7:10 ; Rev. 2:23 .

1255 Job. 38:2 .

1256 Jeremiah 23:23–24 .

1257 Hebrews 11:3 .

1258 Hebrews 13:16 .

1259 Eccl. 12:14 .

1260 Psalm 61:11 .

1261 Matthew 25:34–35 .

1262 1Tim.1:1–2 .

1263 Acts 9:4 .

1264 Acts 9:5–6 .

1265 Acts 13:2 .

1266 Acts 13:4–5 .

1267 1Tim.1:9 .

1268 1Tim.1:10–11 .

1269 Psalm 80:10 .

1270 1Tim.1:12–13 .

1271 1Tim.1:15–16 .

1272 Isaiah 43:11 .

1273 Is.63:9 .

1274 Is.52:6–7 .

1275 Eph. 2:17 .

1276 1Tim.1:17 .

1277 Luke 1:32-33 .

1278 1 Tim. 2:1 .

[1279] 1Tim.2:2 .

[1280] 1 Tim. 2:3–4 .

[1281] 1 Tim. 2:5–6 .

[1282] 2 Cor.5:20 .

[1283] Jer.18.20 .

[1284] Eph. 2:14 .

[1285] 2 Pet. 1:4 .

[1286] 1 Tim. 4:9–10 .

[1287] Psalm 64:6 .

[1288] 1 Tim. 6:13–16 .

[1289] This. 11:25 .

[1290] Symbol of faith.

[1291] 2 Tim. 1:8–9 .

[1292] Matthew 11:28 .

[1293] Titus 2:11–13 .

[1294] Jer.17:7 .

[1295] Psalm 113:23 .

[1296] Sr.: Ps. 39:5; 77:7 .

[1297] Eph. 1:3 .

[1298] Psalm 118:91 .

[1299] Acts 16:6–7 . The Slavic and Russian translations of Acts do not contain the word "Iesusov". {This word is included in the main text of the critical edition NA 27, as it appears in many ancient manuscripts. There is also a reference to Cyril of Alexandria .}

[1300] Acts 16:25–34 .

[1301] Even 1:1 .

[1302] In the text: "καὶ γυμνὴν ἔχων φαίνεται τὴν εὐσέβειαν", however, we believe that there is a copyist error here, and instead of "εὐσέβειαν" you need to read "ἀσέβε ιαν," as in the Latin translation: "et meram impietatem in se habet."

[1303] Even. 2:1 .

1304 Isaiah 42:8 .

1305 1 Pet. 5:1-2 .

1306 This. 21:15 .

1307 This. 21:16-17 .

1308 Matthew 16:17

1309 Пс. 99:3.

1310 1 John 2:13 . In Slavic translation: " *Beginningless* ."

1311 This. 1:1 .

1312 1 John 2:22-23 .

1313 This. 14:9 .

1314 1 This. 1:2 .

1315 1 John 5:20 .

1316 In the Greek text we read: "ὥρα τοίνυν καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν εὐσεβεῖν* τὸν Πατέρα" (the word "εὐσεβεῖν" is highlighted by tel), but in terms of meaning the opposite of it is more suitable here - "ἀσεβεῖν", i.e. "to wickedly", as this place and reads in the Latin translation: "sequitur ergo, in ipsum Patrem impios esse." A similar substitution has already been encountered above (see note). [1302]). If we exclude the systematic error of the copyist, then we can only assume that St. Father ironically used the word in the opposite meaning, which we expressed in quotation marks and words added in parentheses.

1317 Jude 1:5 . In the text of Scripture, instead of "Ιησούς" there is "ὁ κύριος"; and in the Slavic translation, instead of "all" (πάντα) - " *siya* ".

1318 Exodus 3:14 .

1319 Jer.31:18

1320 Acts 7:34 .

1321 Matthew 1:20–21 .

1322 Matthew 1:22–23 .

1323 Isaiah 62:2 .

1324 Matthew 5:21–22 .

1325 Eccl. 3:14 .

1326 1 Pet. 2:22 .

1327 Matthew 6:14–15 .

1328 Matthew 9:2 ; Mark 2:5 .

1329 Matthew 7:18 .

1330 Matthew 8:2–3 .

1331 Psalm 113:11 .

1332 Matthew 8:26–27 .

1333 Jer.5:22 .

1334 In the text of Scripture - " *overlaying* " (περιθείς).

1335 Job. 38:10–11 .

1336 Psalm 88:10 .

1337 Matthew 8:31–32 .

1338 Matthew 10:29,32 .

1339 Matthew 10:1 .

1340 Matthew 11:27 .

1341 Phil.4:7 .

1342 This. 14:10 .

1343 This. 14:9 .

1344 Matthew 11:28–29 .

1345 Psalm 118:91 .

1346 Matthew 12:5–6 .

1347 Matthew 4:10 ; Luke 4:8 . In the Old Testament verse to which Christ refers in the Gospels, we read: " *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him* " (Deut. 6:13)

1348 Matthew 12:33 .

1349 Matthew 14:25 .

1350 Matthew 14:26 . In the Gospel not "under awe", but "out of fear".

1351 Matthew 14:28 .

1352 Matthew 14:32 ; Luke 6:51.

1353 Matthew 14:33 .

1354 Matthew 16:23 .

[1355] Matthew 16:13–17 .

[1356] Matthew 16:27 .

[1357] Isaiah 42:8 .

[1358] The words in brackets that are not in the Greek text are taken from the Latin translation.

[1359] Matthew 17:5 .

[1360] Rom.8:15 ; Gal.4:6 .

[1361] Matthew 19:16–17 . Quoting verse 16, St. Cyril confuses it with Luke 10:25 : “διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;”, whereas in the Gospel of Matthew: “τί ἀ γαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον;". The Slavic translation of this verse also contains the word “ *good* ”, which is absent in Greek; accordingly, in the next verse we read: “ *What do you say is good* ?”, although in the Greek text: “τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ;.” Further, in the Greek text: “εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθός” - “ *One is good* ”; but at St. Cyril we read: “Οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ Θεός.”, which exactly corresponds to the Slavic translation. {Text version presented in St. Cyril, is present in many ancient manuscripts and versions and is given in the critical apparatus NA27.}

[1362] This is 10:30 .

[1363] This. 14:9 .

[1364] Matthew 19:17 . See note [1327] .

[1365] Matthew 26:64 .

[1366] This. 1:1 .

[1367] This. 1:1 .

[1368] This. 1:1 .

[1369] This. 1:2 .

[1370] Luke 6:44 .

[1371] This. 1:3 .

[1372] Deuteronomy 6:5 ; Matthew 4:10 ; Luke 4:8 .

[1373] Hebrews 1:6 .

[1374] Is.66:2 .

[1375] This. 1:9 .

[1376] Eph. 4:5 .

[1377] 1 Cor. 4:7 .

[1378] This. 1:9 .

[1379] John 8:42 . In the text of the Gospel: "*from God* ."

[1380] This. 12:46 .

[1381] Psalm 17:29 .

[1382] Matthew 22:43 .

[1383] This. 1:12 .

[1384] This. 1:17 .

[1385] This. 1:29 .

[1386] Mich. 7:18 .

[1387] This. 1:43 .

[1388] John 6:5 . Most likely, there is a contamination here with John 4:35 .

[1389] Matthew 9:37-38 ; Luke 10:2 .

[1390] 2 Cor.5:20 .

[1391] This. 2:16 .

[1392] Psalm 81:6 .

[1393] This. 2:18-19 .

[1394] This. 2:21-22 .

[1395] Col. 2:9 .

[1396] This. 2:23-25 .

[1397] Psalm 32:15 .

[1398] This. 1:48 .

[1399] This. 1:49 .

[1400] This. 1:47 .

[1401] Matthew 22:29 ; Mark 12:24 .

[1402] Psalm 118:91 .

[1403] This. 3:16 .

[1404] This. 3:17 .

[1405] Isaiah 43:11; 45:21 .

1406 This. 3:30 .

1407 This. 3:31 .

1408 Psalm 118:91 .

1409 This. 3:33 .

1410 Psalm 80:10 .

1411 This. 14:6 .

1412 This. 5:17-18 .

1413 This. 5:19 .

1414 This. 5:21 .

1415 This. 5:22-23 .

1416 Matthew 4:10 .

1417 This. 5:26 .

1418 This. 5:31-34 .

1419 This. 1:29 .

1420 This. 1:33 .

1421 Matthew 17:5 .

1422 This. 5:36 .

1423 This. 1:7 .

1424 This. 1:6 .

1425 This. 8:42 .

1426 This.5 -4Z.

1427 This. 6:57 .

1428 Phil.2:7,8 .

1429 This. 8:19 .

1430 The original says “οὐ ποίημα λέγων τὸν Υἱὸν,” but the denial violates the logic of the phrase. In the Latin translation it is omitted: "qui creaturam vocat Filium."

1431 1 John 2:23 .

1432 This. 8:19 .

1433 This. 8; 39,41–42 .

1434 This. 10:29-30 .

1435 This. 10:32-33 .

1436 This. 10:33 .

1437 This. 10:34-36 .

1438 This. 10:37-38 .

1439 This. 11:25 .

1440 Acts 17:28 .

1441 This. 12:44 .

1442 This is 16:15 .

1443 This. 1:1 .

1444 In the Gospel: “παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς.” {The textual version presented here in Cyril is also present in some authoritative manuscripts and is reflected in the critical apparatus NA27.}

1445 This. 16:28-30 .

1446 This is 16:15 .

1447 This. 17:3 .

1448 This. 17:6 .

1449 Gen.1:1 .

1450 This. 20:17 .

1451 This. 20:21-22 .

1452 Psalm 103:30 .

1453 В Ин.20:25 – "heorakamen"? "tetheametha" – из 1Ин.4:14 .

1454 This. 20:25 .

1455 Sr:. 2 Tim. 2:8 .

1456 In. 20:25 . В оригинале: "I put my finger into the type of the serpent and I put my hand into his side" - " *вложу перста моего в язвы гвоздинный, и вложу руку мою в ребра Его* ". {Almost identical to the version presented by Kirill... my hands... *my hands* are also reflected in critical apparatus NA27.}

1457 This. 20:28 .

1458 This. 20:30-31 .

[1459] The original says “ὁμολογοῦμεν”, but in the note to the Latin translation we read: “Forte legendum ὁμολογοῦσιν”, which is the reading we are inclined to use.

[1460] В оригинальье фраза оиисание исиорчена: "But" I want to severely accuse them of their own indolence, in spite of this looking at the calculation, and what it was that was written, and what it was that was born under him considering accurately".

[1461] Apparently, this phrase has not been preserved in its entirety.

Word 32 Word 34

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 33 Word 35

Word 33. That the Spirit is God by nature, and [comes] from the essence of the Father, and through the Son is given to creation

Sending as if on behalf of opponents

If, they say, on the ground that the divine Scriptures say that the Spirit is from God, we agree that He is the Father's essence, and confess Him to be consubstantial with the superior nature [of God], then let everything else be in like manner , since the herald of the truth [Paul] confesses that all things are from God [1462]. What follows from this? We will have an infinite number of gods if the inherent origin of all (τὸ ἐξ οὗ) shows everyone to be consubstantial with the Father.

Rebuttal to this. Those who wish to understand the divine Scriptures must be willing to believe. For *if you do not believe, you cannot understand* [1463], says a prophetic word somewhere. Since our opponents ignorantly offer this [speech] [as an argument], we have to take up something by which the harm resulting from their ignorant blasphemy will be reflected. Not in the same way, dear ones, we say that *all things are from God* , just like the Spirit. For the Spirit by nature abides in Him and is essentially, so to speak, embedded (ἐμπεπηγὸς) in Him, and inseparably comes from Him. And the works of activity and creation (Τὰ δὲ τῆς ἐνεργείας ἔργα καὶ ποιήματα) through the Son in the Spirit were created (γεγονότα), and in this sense are thought to be [being] from God. If you are not convinced by these words of ours and believe that the Spirit is in the same order with the created (τοῖς πεποιημένοις), since it is said about Him that He is from God, as well as about them, then what prevents us from saying in response: "If *all They are from God* , like the Spirit, and there is nothing exclusive in Him compared to creation, then why is not each of the created things - since it is said about it that it is *from God - message 's God* [1464] and *a tester of the depths of God* [1465]! through everything *not reveal Why does God* alone? , *but through the Spirit* [1466]!" So, when other creations have revelation through the Spirit, and the Spirit Himself *experiences the depths of God* , as being from Him and in Him by nature, just as the human [spirit] is in man, <75.568> then, of course, it is obvious that God is the Spirit,

in the proper sense of the word and by nature having the source of [Its] existence (τὸ ἐξ οὗ) [1467] in God. And other creations - rather, not in the proper sense of the word, as having originated from the Creator and Creator.

Evidence confirming what has been said

Paul: " *We have received the Spirit of God, that we may receive that which has been given to us by God.* " [1468]. And again: " *Who knows this man, what is in a man, and the spirit of a man living in him?" Also, where God's message is not, so is the Spirit of God, living in Him* . [1469].

OTHER . " *to us God has revealed* by His Spirit: for the Spirit searches all things and the depths of God ." [1470].

OTHER . If the human spirit does not know from revelation from someone else what is in man, but, as by nature and in the proper sense of the word, being his [spirit], *the message* and *experiences* the depths of the heart, so in God and the Father is the Holy Spirit. So He will be of Divine nature, just as *the spirit of man* is human.

OTHER . Paul writes to someone: " *You are not in the flesh, but in spirit, because the Spirit of God dwells in you. If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not His. If Christ is in you, the flesh is dead because of sin, but the spirit lives because of righteousness* ." [1471]. Take from here also the correct concepts of the Holy Spirit, so that you may recognize the One who exists from the essence of the Savior and is not alien to the one and only Divinity. For [Paul], having revealed [to us] the Spirit of God Himself, immediately calls Him the Spirit of Christ, showing that all the distinctive properties of the Father are transferred to the Son born from Him by nature. And conversely, he immediately calls the Spirit Christ, saying: " *If Christ is in you* ," and showing Him not alien to the nature of the Word, but thus united - although He has an independent existence (ἔστιν ἰδιοσύστατον) - that He abides in the Son, and the Son is in Him, due to the identity of essence.

OTHER . We say that the Holy Spirit is *from God* , and we believe so. But those who show every readiness for blasphemy alone say that everything else arose from God, since Paul writes: " *There is one God the Father, of whom all things are worthless.* " [1472]. After this, they think that they can refute the existence of the Spirit from the essence of the Father, since " *from Unfitness* " is also attributed to creations [1473], which is attached to the Spirit, showing Him to exist by nature from essence (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας φυσικῶς ὑπάρχον). But to this we can answer that the word "son" is applied to the Son in the proper sense, and at the same time it is applied to people in a non-proper sense. And in no way does that which by assimilation and grace <75.569> is attached to someone take away from the one who has [it] by nature. Likewise, " *from Unfitness* ," used in relation to creatures, does not reduce the high and Divine [dignity] of the Spirit

to likeness to them and to the humility characteristic of them, but He is retained in the proper sense of the word " *from Unfitness* ," since He is from the essence Father. [This definition] also applies to them, since non-existents come into being from God. Through the Son, of course. And if the Spirit does not have any advantages over creatures for the reason that in relation to Him and others the expression "from the Unfit" is used, then let them tell us why, when the Father dwells in us [1474], Christ dwells in us, and when someone else from among creation - an angel, for example, or an archangel - speaks or acts in us, is it not still said that Christ and God dwell in us? And where such a difference exists, how is it not necessary to confess the nature itself is different, so that some are creatures, and the Other is a creative [Spirit], existing by nature in the Father and in Himself, in turn bearing the Creator due to identity nature and indistinguishability of essential qualities?

OTHER . Paul writes to certain people, thinking very correctly and saying: " *For those who are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God. We do not embrace the spirit of work or fear, but rather embrace the Spirit of sonhood; in Him we cry: Abba Father* ." [1475]. Therefore, if the Holy Spirit shows those in whom He dwells to be sons of God and makes them *partakers of the divine nature* [1476], so from now on we, united with *all God who is above* [1477], we boldly cry out: " *Abba Father* ," then He is not ranked among slaves and not among creatures, but, most likely, by nature is endowed with the dignity of the Divine essence, existing in it, and by it, through the Son, being given to the saints, and therefore He is idolizing and calling into sonship [God] those in whom He finds himself.

OTHER . It is written: " *The Spirit itself obeys our spirit, for we are children of God* ." [1478]. For as being from the essence of Him who gives Him to the saints, that is, Christ, and since we, when God's Word dwells in us by the Spirit and dwells in us, we ascend to the dignity of sonship, having within ourselves the Son Himself, in whose image we are transformed by the sacrament His Spirit, and, ascending to an equal image of boldness, we dare to say: " *Abba, Father* " [1479]. Therefore, the Spirit is God, since He makes those who receive Him gods.

OTHER . And again Paul writes to some people: " *As we have put on the image of the earthly, let us also be clothed with the image of the heavenly.* " [1480], calling the ancestor of the human race, Adam, earthy, in whose image we have clothed ourselves, having descended in the likeness of Adam's crime into death and corruption; heavenly - our Lord Jesus Christ, having accepted whose image - the life-giving and holy Spirit indwelling us - we are transformed into the image of the living Word of God, again ascending to incorruption and being renewed for eternal life. For *there is a Spirit who gives life* [1481], according to the word of the Savior Himself. Therefore, as having received the Son, since He is the most accurate image of the Father, *and having the Father* [1482], so, in the same way, he who took on the image of the Son, that is, the

Spirit, through Him in every way has both the Son and the Father who is in Him. How then will the Holy Spirit be numbered among creation if He is the unchanging image of the Son of God? Surely they will not reach such madness as to dare to say that among created things the unchanging image of the Creator can be seen, bearing within itself everything that is inherent in Him of Whose image it is? If the Spirit is called the image of the Son, then He is God, and nothing else.

OTHER . It is written: " *Let two or three prophets speak* " [1483]. Then [Paul] says: " *Even ıf everyone prophesies, one unfaithful or ignorant person comes in, is convicted by everyone, and is tortured by everyone, and the secret of his heart is revealed: and so he falls on his face and worships God, proclaiming that truly God is with us.* [1484] *There is* " [1485]. So, since those who receive the Holy Spirit prophesy, having God in themselves, and therefore serve as an object of wonder, how will He be a creation, and not, better said, a relative [1486]communion (μετάληψις σχετικὴ) of the highest essence of all [other entities], naturally (φυσικῶς) spreading from the Father through the Son to those capable of receiving Him, just as heat from fire would spread in [a certain physical] body?

OTHER . It is written: " *For tongues speak , not to man, but to God: no one hears, O Spirits."* [1487] *he speaks secrets* " [1488]. Look, here Paul clearly says that he who speaks in tongues converses with God (Θεῷ διαλέγεσθαι). Then, showing the Spirit as God, he immediately adds: " *But the Spirit speaks mysteries* ." How then will those who dare to classify the Spirit among creatures not be guilty of blasphemy?

OTHER . And again Paul writes to the Corinthians: " *For we are the churches of the living God, as God said: for I will dwell in them and walk, and I will be their God, and they will be my people.* " [1489]. And after that again: " *And do not offend the Holy Spirit of God, by Whom you are present on the day of deliverance* ." [1490]. And again: " *If anyone corrupts the temple of God, God will corrupt this one: for the temple of God is holy, just as you are* ." [1491]. Therefore, if, having received the Spirit, we are called both the temple, <75.573> and the house of God, as having God within us living and walking, as it is written, then how can God not be the Holy Spirit, even if some did not want to [acknowledge this] of our opponents, for whom disobeying the Divine Scripture is habitual and even pleasant?

OTHER. Blessed Paul, who calls himself " *a servant of Jesus Christ and is called an apostle,"* says that he *was chosen for the gospel of God* [1492]. Then, again pointing out the same thing, only in different words, he writes to someone about God, " *And the servants have pleased us to be a New Testament, not by writing, but by the Spirit.* " [1493] . So, if he, as a covenant of the Spirit, knows *the gospel of God* , for which he was chosen, then how can he not be God - the Holy Spirit?

OTHER . Again it is written: " *If the Spirit of Jesus who raised from the dead dwells*

in you, the raising of Christ from the dead will also give life to your dead body, through His living Spirit in you. " [1494]. But if the Holy Spirit were truly a creature and a creature, according to the madness of the heterodox, then how could He possess all the powers of God? For I do not think that anyone will deviate so much from the right way of thinking as to dare even to say that the Divine essence uses certain instruments brought into being from without for its action, which by nature extends from it to someone capable of him [i.e. e. action] perceive. But since the Son is by nature Life, and the Spirit given by Him gives life, it is necessary to confess Him [coming] from the essence of the Son and God and having all His power and action, just as the evaporation rises from water and by its cooling effect testifies to the very nature of the [substance] emitting it.

* * *

[1462] 2 Cor.5:18 .

[1463] Isaiah 7:9 .

[1464] 1 Cor. 2:11 .

[1465] 1 Cor. 2:10 .

[1466] 1 Cor. 2:10 .

[1467] In Plato and Aristotle, "τὸ ἐξ οὗ" usually denotes matter, "that from which something [is made or consists]," but St. Kirill, as can be seen from the context, uses the preposition "ἑκ" here in a causal sense.

[1468] 1 Cor. 2:12 .

[1469] 1 Cor. 2:11 .

[1470] 1 Cor. 2:10 .

[1471] Romans 8:9–10 .

[1472] 1 Cor. 8:6 .

[1473] " *Ot* " and " *iz* " convey the same Greek preposition "ἐκ".

[1474] The meaning here should be "Spirit".

[1475] Romans 8:14–15 .

[1476] 2 Pet. 1:4 .

[1477] Rom. 9:5 .

[1478] Romans 8:16 .

[1479] The phrase is not grammatically consistent in the original.

[1480] 1 Cor. 15:49 .

[1481] This. 6:64 .

[1482] 1 John 2:23 .

[1483] 1 Cor. 14:29 .

[1484] In the apostle: " *by you* ".

[1485] 1 Cor. 14:24-25 .

[1486] That is, “by grace,” “non-essential,” establishing a certain connection, relationship (σχέσις), and not essential unity or merging; see the entry "σχετικός" in the Lampe dictionary.

[1487] In the Slavic translation (as in others), the dative “Πνεύματι” is understood as instrumental and is translated in the instrumental case - “ *Spirit* ”, but St. Kirill, as can be seen from the context, interprets it differently.

[1488] 1 Cor. 14:2 .

[1489] 2 Corinthians 6:16 .

[1490] Eph. 4:30 .

[1491] 1 Cor. 3:17 .

[1492] Romans 1:1 .

[1493] 2Cor.3:8 .

[1494] Rom. 8:11 .

Word 33 Word 35

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 34 Word 36

Word 34. A further comparison of sayings in which the attentive [reader] can see that the Spirit is God, and everywhere has the same effect as the Son, and is not alienated from His essence. At the same time, [the said sayings] also teach that when God is said to dwell in us, it is the Spirit who dwells

Paul [writes in his Epistle] to Timothy: " *Keep the good testament through the Holy Spirit who dwells in us* ." [1495].

To the Romans: " *For I dare not say anything that Christ did not do with me, in the obedience of tongues, in word and deed, in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Spirit of God.* " [1496]. And again: " *I pray you, brothers, by our Lord Jesus Christ and by the love of the Spirit, assist us in our prayers* ." [1497].

To the Corinthians: " *the Holy Spirit living in you, which is* Or do you not know that your body is a temple of *from God?"* [1498] And again: " *Cling to the Lord, there is one Spirit* " [1499].

Now, here he clearly calls the Spirit Lord, and, clarifying this even more, he writes again about the Jews: " *Even to this day, the veil in the reading of the Old Testament does not remain openly, but the knowledge of Christ ceases. But even to this day, whenever Moses is venerated, a veil lies over their hearts. Whenever they turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away. The Lord is the Spirit. And where there is the Spirit of the Lord, there is freedom* ." [1500]. And again: " *But we, all of us beholding with revealed face the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from glory to glory, just as we are from the Spirit of the Lord.* " [1501]. So, since there is *one Lord Jesus Christ* [1502], according to Paul, and he calls the Spirit Lord, then, therefore, he does not see any natural difference between the Son and the Spirit, but calls Him by the name "Lord", as from Him and in Him.

OTHER . And again he writes: " *Who can understand the mind of the Lord, who can explain it? We are the mind of Christ imams* " [1503], - calling [the mind of the Lord] the

Spirit living in us. So, when He is called the mind of Christ, how can He be one of the created things, when it cannot be allowed that the Divine and purest nature essentially has in itself anything external [to it]?

OTHER . We find that it is written nowhere, that is, this is what the blessed Evangelist John says: " *We understand this, because we abide in Him, and He is in us, because He has given us of His Spirit to eat.* " [1504]. So, if, when the Spirit dwells in us through the sacrament, the indweller is God, and we become [dwelling] in Him, and He, in turn, in us, through the fact that we carry [in ourselves] the Spirit, then how will not the Spirit be God, essentially having in Himself all the distinctive properties of the Father and God, Whose He is the Spirit given to creation through the Son?

OTHER . Christ says somewhere, talking with the Jews: " *If through the finger of God I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God will come upon you.* " [1505]. And here He calls the finger the Holy Spirit, which in some way grew (ἐκπεφυκὸς) from the Divine essence and by nature suspended from it (φυσικῶς αὐτῆς ἐκκρεμάμενον), just like a finger [grows and hangs] from a human hand. For the Divine Scriptures call the Son the arm and right hand of God, according to what is said: " *His right hand and His holy arm saved him* ." [1506]. And again: " *Lord, Your arm is high, and without understanding, they will be ashamed.* " [1507]. Consequently, just as a muscle by nature fits into the whole body, doing whatever the mind pleases, and usually anoints it using a finger, so we understand the Word of God from Him and <75.577> in Him by nature harmoniously, so to speak, rooted, and in the Son - the Spirit naturally and essentially spreading from the Father, with which He anoints everyone and sanctifies. Thus, the Spirit is shown not to be alien and not removed from the Divine nature, but to exist from it and in it by nature, just as a bodily finger is in the hand, being of one nature with it; and the hand itself, again, is in the body, being not alien to it. So, since things are like this with us, then the Spirit is God, and nothing else.

OTHER . Blessed David speaks nowhere, chanting and turning his words to God: " *Where shall I go from Thy Spirit? and will I flee from Thy face? If I go up to heaven, you are there; ıf I go down to hell, there you are. If I take my wings early and dwell in the last seas, then Thy hand will guide me, and Thy right hand will hold me* ." [1508]. So, when he calls the Spirit the face of the Father, as depicting through God-appropriate activity the essence from which He is, he also calls Him a hand because of the omniactive power inherent in Him - how can He not be God, essentially united with the Father, from Whom and in whom He is, just as the hand is not separated from the human body, but rather is naturally connected with it and rooted in it?

OTHER . We learn that the Spirit is God from the following: the leader of the apostles, to whom *is not flesh and blood* , as the Savior says, *reveal* the Divine secret, *but the Father who is in heaven* [1509], says nowhere to Ananias, who offered *the price of the village* , but withheld a certain part from her: " *Ananias , why did Satan fill your*

heart to lie to the Holy Spirit and hide from the price of the village?" [1510] Then he adds to this the words: " *Thou hast lied not to man, but to God* ." [1511]. Consequently, if he who lies to the Holy Spirit lies to God, then the Spirit, therefore, is God and in God by nature.

OTHER . In the Epistle to the Galatians, Paul says: " *My children , in the image of my sickness, will Christ* be imagined in you ." [1512]. If Christ is imagined in us thanks to the action of the Spirit, through every virtue transforming us in His own likeness and making us spiritual, then, therefore, God is the Spirit of Christ, Who, like Him, is imagined in us.

OTHER . Preaching the good news of the good things [to come] from the coming of our Savior, God nowhere says about His flock: " *And I will appoint over them shepherds according to My heart, and I will shepherd them with understanding and doctrine.* " [1513]. And Paul, the herald of the truth, talking with the elders of the Ephesians, says: " *Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in whom the Holy Spirit has appointed bishops, to shepherd the church of the Lord and God, having acquired with His blood* ." [1514]. So, since the Spirit with authority fulfills what God promised to do and raises up shepherds according to the promise given through the prophets, it means that He is not alien to the Divine essence, but as a natural and essential and hypostatic action ς καὶ ἐνυπόστατος) , which comes from it and abides in it, accomplishes all God's [works].

OTHER . Christ nowhere says to His Father about us: " *Sanctify them in Thy truth* ." [1515]. And, in turn, God Himself says through the prophet Ezekiel: " *And I will be their God, and they will be My people. And the nations will know that I am the Lord who sanctifies* ." [1516]. So, if God promises to sanctify those devoted to Him, and the Spirit is the one who fulfills this word and sanctifies, then the Spirit, therefore, is God and is not alien to the highest [other entities] Essence.

OTHER . All divine Scripture affirms the incarnation of God's Word, and our opponents themselves will undoubtedly agree with this. Since it is written about Him that He *was led by the Spirit into the wilderness* [1517], or the fact that *Jesus went in the power of the Spirit into Galilee* [1518], - let those who separate the Spirit from the Divine essence and dare to classify Him among the creatures, as the Son, *Wisdom and Power, tell us* [1519] Desperate, by the power of the Spirit he was sent to Galilee, and how did He overcome and defeat the devil in the desert by the Spirit? Or will they dare to call Him lacking in strength or, rather, will they admit that He had reached such weakness that He needed help from the created and created, according to the heterodox, spirit? But to even imagine this is extremely absurd. This means that God is the Spirit, who by nature abides in the Son from the Father and possesses all His energy. The Word was capable of victory [over the devil] thanks to the Spirit, as being anointed with the same power and essentially having Him in Himself, resisting the devil in the wilderness, and

in Galilee doing signs. For all the attributes of the Father through the Son are in the Spirit.

OTHER . God says nowhere: " *Or am I not filling heaven and earth? - the Lord speaks* " [1520]. And He fills, of course, being everywhere with the Spirit. Realizing this, the Psalmist said: " *Where shall I go from Thy Spirit? and will I flee from Thy presence? If I go up to heaven, you are there; if I go down to hell, there you are .*" [1521]. So, if through the Spirit God fills everything and abides everywhere, then, therefore, God is the Spirit who fills everything (τὸ τὰ πάντα πληροῦν) [1522]like God.

OTHER . Paul, speaking to the Athenians about piety and proclaiming to them the true God, said: " *In Him we live and move, and we are.* " [1523]. And our Lord Jesus Christ attributes such an action that arises in us from God to the Holy Spirit, saying: " *There is a Spirit who gives life.* " [1524]. So, God, therefore, is the Spirit, *in whom we live and move and are* , according to the word of Paul and the testimony of our Savior.

OTHER . Christ says nowhere about those who are worthy to partake of the Divine: " *I and the Father will come and make my abode with him .*" [1525]. But it is obvious that [God] dwells in the saints through the Spirit. So, since the Holy Spirit complements the coming of the Father and, likewise, the Son, then how will it not be obvious that He is not separated from the Divine essence, but is by nature emitted from it, having [in Himself] all the energy of the Father and the Son? And the Savior Himself testifies that the Spirit is sent to the saints from the Father through the Son, saying: " *When the Comforter comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father, He testifies of Me .*" [1526]. And again, " *The Comforter , the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name, he will teach you everything, and he will remember everything that has been told to you.* " [1527].

OTHER . The Apostle in the Epistle to the Corinthians speaks about himself at the very beginning " *Paul , an apostle of Jesus Christ* " [1528]. Now, he obviously here claims that he received the title and office of an apostle from Christ and Jesus. And in the Acts of the Apostles something like this is written: "And *to those who serve the Lord and fast, the Holy Spirit said: Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for the work, for the same I have called them.* " [1529]. So, if, at the time he is called to preach by the Spirit, he says that Jesus Christ called him, then [by this] he clearly shows that the Holy Spirit is not alien to the essence of the Son, but [exists] in Him and from Him, and is like some kind of natural energy, capable of doing whatever it wants.

OTHER, that the Holy Spirit is perfect and there is nothing imperfect in Him, since, even if even in the divine Scriptures something was said about Him that would suggest something like that, we understand that this is said on house-building related to us

The message seems to be on behalf of our opponents . And how, they say, is it not absurd and not very ignorant to say that from the essence of God [comes] the Spirit, so

imperfect and having nothing of Himself, but from communion with Him is what He is? After all, this is the clearest statement about Him in the Gospels <75.584> the Savior, who says: " *For from Himself the verb is to have nothing, but if He hears , He will say to have.* " [1530]. After all, if He were able to have perfection from Himself, He would speak from Himself, without needing any reminder from anyone else.

Rebuttal to this . He who recognized the recklessness and madness of our opponents would be amazed - and quite rightly so; for from which one should rather learn the mystery of the Holy Spirit and understand that He is, as it were, a certain fruit of the Divine essence, existing in it and from it indivisibly and inseparably proceeding - [however], by this they are tempted, being, according to what is written, *captives we are burdened with our sins* [1531], and therefore unable to walk in the straight paths of learning. For it is not by showing the Spirit imperfectly that the Savior speaks this about Him, but rather to inform those who hear that, being His essence, [the Spirit] has nothing else *to say than* what He Himself wills. After all, being His mind, according to what blessed Paul said about the Spirit: " *But we are the mind of Christ imams* ." [1532], - He, of course, will think and command the same as He whose mind He is. That is why [Christ] affirms that *the Spirit has nothing to say from Himself* , and almost says: "This I speak again," just as the mind existing in man would say about the word emanating from Him: "I do not speak from Himself." will say nothing, but will say what he hears." And, of course, no one will call this ordinary oral human word imperfect because it is first formed in the mind and brings out the [meanings] taken from it. For natural unity instantly places in it what is [taken] from there. This is roughly how we should think about the Holy Spirit. For, being the Mind of Christ, [the Spirit] speaks to the disciples about everything that is in Him, not according to some will of its own or according to a will alien to Him in Whom and from Whom He speaks, but as by nature proceeding from His essence and having [in Himself] all His will, as well as action.

That the Holy Spirit is from the essence of the Father and the Son . Explaining the creation of man and his coming into existence, blessed Moses says that God took *dust from the earth* and by omniactive power (τῇ παντουργῷ δυνάμει) formed this visible form of body, *and breathed into his face the breath of life* , so that *man became a living soul* [1533]. So, we say that this divine inspiration (ἐμφύσημα) given to the created is not the soul itself (for otherwise it would not be subject to change (ἄτρεπτος), as originating from such a nature), but the communion of the Holy Spirit, originally implanted in the human soul. For all perfection [belongs] to that which is done by the Spirit; hence the living creature (τὸ ζῶον) prepared [by God from the earth] became in the image of God, since by the communion of the Spirit <75.585> a likeness to Him is formed in it. And about. renewing in us what, according to blessed Moses, was breathed into man by God, Christ, after His resurrection from the dead, breathed into His disciples, saying: " *Receive the Holy Spirit* ." [1534], so that we, once again transformed into the original image (εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰκόνα), would appear conformed

(σύμμορφοι) to the Creator through the communion of the Spirit. So, since the Holy Spirit, appearing in us, shows us conformed to God, and He comes (πρόεισι) from both the Father and the Son, then it is obvious that He is the Divine essence, essentially [being] in it and proceeding from it, as, of course, the breath emanating from the human body, although this example is insignificant and not worthy of the subject, for God surpasses everything.

OTHER . Paul, establishing the most useful laws for the Churches and giving instructions on how we should live in them and appear before the Most High God, says: " *A man must not eat to cover the head, the image and glory of God.* " [1535]. Then he also states that *the wife, glory to her husband, has* [1536]. And [explains] how it is necessary to consider both. First of all, let us take what has been said about the husband and consider how he is the image and glory of God. But, I believe, it is obvious to everyone that the husband is called so because he participates in the Divine Spirit, and through this he becomes *a partaker of the divine nature* [1537], so that from here it is fulfilled and glory from God. So, as having within him the Spirit, which is from the essence of God, and through communion with Him is transformed into the likeness of the Creator, he is called the image and glory of God. No less can we learn the meaning of what was said from the fact that the wife is named exactly as [as she is named]. Paul says that she *is the glory of a man* because she was created from his nature. For [Scripture] says that *took* [God] *one from his side* [1538]and made a woman. So, just as the wife is called the glory of the husband because a part of his members was taken to create her, so the husband is called the glory of God because he became a partaker of His essence (διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι μετέχων τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ) and Saint. So, when things are this way, it is in every possible way necessary to say that the Spirit is not created or created, but from the essence of God, that is, God, accepting worship with the Father and the Son because of the identity of nature.

OTHER . Someone comes in the Gospels and says to our Lord Jesus Christ: " *To the good Teacher* " [1539]. Christ answered him: " *Why do you say good things to me? No one is good, only God alone* " [1540]. So, although Christ says that one is truly and essentially Good, the Psalmist nowhere says: " *Spirit Your good* will guide me to the right land ." [1541]. So, if one is Good, and the Spirit is good, then it is obvious that He is of the Divine nature, in relation to which "good" will be true, [used] in its own and exclusive sense.

<75.588> *OTHER* . Paul writes this in his letter to some: " *I tell you that no one speaks by the Spirit of God the anathema of Jesus, and no one can speak of the Lord Jesus except by the Holy Spirit.* " [1542]. So, it is obvious that he who partakes of the Holy Spirit knows Jesus as Lord, but he who does not partake does not know. How did one who became a participant in the Spirit know that Jesus is Lord? Just as those who have tasted honey, because of its quality, know that honey is sweet, so do those who

partake of the Spirit. So from the essence of the Son is the Spirit, which is a certain, so to speak, quality of the God who rules over all. And if so, then it means that He is God, and not created or created, as it seems to heterodox people.

OTHER . Paul, attributing the divisions of Divine gifts to the action of the Holy Spirit, writes again: " *To one is given the word of wisdom by the Spirit, and to another the word of understanding, about the same Spirit; to another is faith, also by the Spirit; to others the granting of healings, O Tomzhe Dus; to another the operation of powers, to another prophecy, to another spiritual reasoning, to another the generation of tongues, to another the telling of tongues. But all this operates as one and the same Spirit, dividing power to each as he wishes* ." [1543]. But, knowing that the Spirit is God, he writes again in the same Epistle: " *And these God hath set in the church, first the apostles, second the prophets, third the teachers; then powers, also the gifts of healings, intercession, rule, birth of tongues* " [1544]. Why then, ready only to blaspheme, [the heretics] doubt whether the Spirit is God in essence, when Paul most clearly said that the Spirit divides, as He Himself wants, the types of Divine gifts, and then again said that it is their God in churches distributes to the worthy? How would it not be inappropriate for those who want the right to philosophize to listen not to Paul's words, but to the follies of others? So, the Spirit is God, even if the ignorant did not like it.

OTHER . Establishing the laws relating to women, Paul says: " *A wife is bound by law while her husband lives; but if her husband dies, she is free to eat, for what she wants, to commit violence, even in the Lord. The most blessed one is, if this continues, according to my advice: I imagine that I will have the Spirit of God* ." [1545]. What conclusion can we draw from this? If [the right] to lay down laws belongs only to God, and Paul also lays down laws, as having the Spirit of God, then, therefore, God is the Spirit who is in him and who prompts him to lay down laws.

OTHER . Again Paul writes to someone: " *If we bring you spiritual sowing, is it great if we reap your bodily food?* » [1546]But it is obvious that <75.589> he certainly calls divine [objects] spiritual, as well as, of course, carnal - those related to the flesh. So, if divine [things], that is, sacraments related to God, he, having done very well, called spiritual [1547].

OTHER . In the Gospels the Savior says nowhere about Himself: " *I am the truth* " [1548]. And blessed John, showing that the Spirit is from the essence of the Father and the Son, says in the Gospels: " *The Spirit of truth, which proceeds from the Father* " [1549]. And in the Message: " *The Spirit is truth* " [1550]. How then, coming from the Father and being the Spirit of Truth, having such similarity with the Son due to the identity of essence, that He Himself is also called Truth, how can He be created and created? After all, this is absurd. Therefore, the Spirit is God, if He really is the truth and comes from the Father.

OTHER . Blessed John, speaking about God the Word, says that He is *the True Light , Who enlightens every person coming into the world* [1551]. And the wisest Paul affirms that the Spirit *has risen in our hearts, to enlighten our minds to the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ* [1552]. So, since the Word is the True Light, and the Holy Spirit *shines* , then in every possible way it is necessary to recognize the Spirit as existing from the essence of the Word, with which It *enlightens every person* , extending, like a certain ray of its own nature, the radiance of the Spirit.

The objection seems to be on behalf of opponents . If, they say, you affirm that the souls of the saints are anointed by God with the Holy Spirit, then the Spirit will be in the order of peace. And how can the ointment be of the same essence as the Anointing One, when even our usual order of things does not allow this?

Rebuttal to this . Oh, reveling in all madness and filled with recklessness, more shameful than any [folly]! For it is not a little necessary for you to become sober and abandon the concepts related to bodies in order to ascend to the great heights of theology and to understand in a God-appropriate manner what is said about the Divine nature, even if it is expressed in human words and with the help of images common to us, since only in this way can those who listen to understand. But in order for us to say something that would [in its level] correspond to your ignorance, [let us express it this way]: if the Spirit, in your opinion, will be in the order of the world, and since the anointing must certainly be non-existent in relation to the anointing one, then it is necessary to say , that the Spirit is also non-existent in relation to the Father. And since the myrrh is composed of many [ingredients] by experienced people in this matter, it is necessary that the Holy Spirit also consists of many and different parts. And again, since the ointment is wordless, let the Holy Spirit <75.592> also be [wordless]. Such blasphemy will certainly come to their heads.

We will answer them: if the Holy Spirit is foreign in relation to God, who anoints the saints with Him, then how is it evident from the indwelling of the Spirit in us that Christ dwells in us, Who is in essence not different in relation to the Father? Knowing this, Paul writes: " *That He might grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened by His Spirit in the inner man, that Christ might dwell in your hearts through faith.* " [1553]. So, since through the Spirit Christ dwells *in the inner man* , then, of course, it is obvious that He through whom He dwells in the saints is not alien to His essence.

OTHER . Those who blaspheme God are subjected to inevitable punishment by the Mosaic Law. So God commands the son of an Egyptian woman in the desert to be stoned by everyone [the sons of Israel] because, as it is written, he remembered the name [of the Lord] and dared to say something forbidden [1554]. No less, our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, preserving the same honor for the Divine nature, says that he who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but he who blasphemes the

Holy Spirit *will not be forgiven either in this age or in the next.* [1555]. But if the Holy Spirit were a creation and were not of the Divine nature, serving as the subject of theology together with the Father and the Son, then why would blasphemy against Him entail such punishment as is determined by those who blaspheme God? But it is obvious that God is God, [being] from God and in God, the Spirit, revered by the divine Scriptures as God and abiding as such by nature.

OTHER . If, as the Savior says, *a spirit born of the Spirit there is* [1556], and such a one *was born not of blood, nor of carnal lust, nor of manly lust, but of God* [1557], then, it means that God by nature is the Spirit, who regenerates the saints to unity with God by indwelling them and making them partakers of His nature.

OTHER . If the Spirit deifies those in whom He is, and makes them partakers of the Divine nature [1558], then, it means that He is God, and from the Divine nature by nature, through the Son, given to creation and transforming it in His likeness (ἀναμορφοῦν αὐτὴν ὡς πρὸς ἑαυτό). For just as the proper work of light is to enlighten, and nothing can enlighten unless it itself is light, so the work of the Divine Spirit is to make those who receive Him gods. And He would not have made those who had Him [in themselves] partakers of the Divine nature if He Himself were not of the Divine essence.

<75.593> That the Spirit is not Holy by communion with the Father, but by nature and essentially from Him

The objection seems to be on behalf of opponents . We ourselves agree, they say, that the Spirit is sanctifying, not in itself being such by nature, but as a certain vessel - say, from iron or some other matter - partaking of the heat [emanating] from the fire, accomplishes its characteristic fire, so He, being filled with holiness from God, transmits sanctification to the creature. And the Savior Himself will not be a false witness to us in this, saying about Himself: " *As He will receive from Mine* ." [1559].

Rebuttal to this . This premise of theirs again turns out to be absurd on all sides and carries more blasphemy than truth. For they do not strive to understand the divine Scriptures as they should, but rather to distort them, each according to his own taste. So again they snatch the words of [the] Savior Himself to confirm their lies, without clearly revealing to those listening [their] the meaning of the speech, without citing further words, but arbitrarily cutting off verses [of Scripture] and slyly snatching only what seems useful to them to achieve the absurd goal they set. After all, the Savior does not say, " *You will receive of Mine and sanctify* ," although even if He had said so, He would not have caused any harm to those who listened correctly, but " *What of Mine you will receive and proclaim to you." It is not of Yourself to speak the verb "to have", but if He hears it , to say to "to have* " [1560]. For since He intended, having

fulfilled His dispensation in the flesh, to ascend to the Father, and promised to send the Comforter to His disciples, so that no one would suspect that the Holy Spirit could command anything not according to His will, He, clearly showing that [The Holy Spirit], being His Spirit, will offer His own words, says: "It *is not from Himself to speak to have, but ıf anyone hears , to say to have, he will receive from Mine* ." This is as if honey said of its inherent natural quality that it "will not give anything from itself to those who eat it, but will take from mine." After all, quality naturally passes from essences to what indivisibly comes from them, such as, for example (as we have already said before), sweetness from honey, warmth from fire, coolness from water. So, the Spirit is Holy not as a meteka (μετοικικῶς) [1561], as they say, but rather by nature and essence.

OTHER . The holy by communion, being, as it were, the receptacle of the sanctification that has arrived [to it], is first of itself posited in a special nature, such as, for example, a person or an angel, or some other rational nature. So, let those who dare to say that the Spirit is holy from communion with God and the Father, <75.596> and not according to [His] nature, tell us, what is He in Himself and taken separately (αὐτὸ καθ" ἑαυτὸ καὶ ἰδιαζόντως)? But we have heard nothing else [about Him] in the divine Scriptures except that He is "holy." Consequently, He is not holy by communion and not by the addition [of Him with God], but [is] the sanctifying essence and nature and, so to speak, the quality of the divinity of God and the Father ς), like the sweetness of honey, or the fragrance of a flower.

OTHER . What comes to certain [persons] through communion, as given [to them], can also be taken away. For only what is essentially inherent in those who have [this] is inseparably fused [with them]. So, if [the heretics] say that sanctification exists in the Spirit as an addition [to His essence] and accident, then they will all agree that it can also depart [from Him]. Then, according to their conclusion, it is appropriate to say that the Spirit can exist without holiness. But this is wicked. Therefore, the Spirit is holy not by communion, but as by nature [being] from God.

OTHER . We see that the Divine Scripture constantly calls the Spirit from God the Holy Spirit, and does not declare by any one of His accidents how crazy these [heretics] are, but designates what He is by nature, as if someone Defining man and denoting what he essentially is, he said that he is a rational, mortal animal. After this, how is it not extremely absurd that a person, since he is so defined, will certainly be what it is natural for him to be, and some imagine the Holy Spirit to be something other than He [in fact] is, when does the name attached to Him denote what He essentially is? For He is called Holy. So, if He is holy by nature, then He does not have such existence from the outside, but, most likely, He Himself, being a natural, living and hypostatic action of the Divine essence, constantly imparts perfection to the creature through sanctification and communion with Himself.

OTHER . The names established for each of the existing ones are either expressions of [their] essences, carrying within themselves the perfect definition of the subject, or designate a certain function and type of activity, as [this can be seen] in [the names] "man" and "prophet". For if I say "man," then I will express by this the essence of the defined or subject. And when I say "prophet," I mean a ministry or occupation given to a person. Therefore, if the Holy Spirit is holy by sacrament, then this name for Him will signify service rather than essence, and we learn from it not what He is by nature, but what He is appointed to do. Therefore, by nature He is something else, and has some other special effect, in addition to the sanctifying one, which He - as they blasphemely claim - has come to Him from outside and brought from God. Then, it means that the Holy Spirit is not perfect, needing to be replenished through sanctification. How then, being, according to them, such, He allows His partakers <75.597> to become perfect? Being imperfect in His own nature, how does He sanctify Principalities, Thrones, Dominions, Powers, Authorities, Angels and men? As they say that the Spirit is filled with sanctification from the Father, i.e. sanctifying power and action coming upon Him? For it is they who seem to be speaking blasphemously. What is the need for a long description and confusing thoughts? For this sanctifying power that comes by nature from the Father, giving perfection to the imperfect, we call the Holy Spirit. And it is unnecessary, as is obvious, to sanctify a creature through some mediator, not unworthy of God's love for mankind reaching down to the most insignificant and sanctifying them through the Holy Spirit, since all are His creations.

OTHER . " *The law was given by Moses* ," says the divine Scripture, " *but grace and truth were made by Jesus Christ* ." [1562]. Consequently, if a great difference is seen between the ministry of Moses and the mediator of God and man Jesus Christ, then it is necessary to recognize the Mosaic Law as imperfect, *having accomplished nothing* [1563] as Paul says; and the grace [given] through our Savior, as we believe, is true and perfect. What then is this grace, if not the outpouring of the Holy Spirit *that was in our hearts?* [1564], according to Pavlov? How then will the grace that is in us be revealed as true, if sanctification was given to us through creation, like the Law [given] through angels? For if the Holy Spirit in us does not act independently and is not by nature what we hear about Him, but, [Himself] being filled by communion with sanctification from the Divine essence, sends us the grace given to Him, then it is obvious that the grace of the Holy Spirit is given to us through creation. But this is not true. For the Law [came] through Moses, that is, through the angels [1565], and through our Savior - grace and truth. So, the Spirit in us is self-active (αὐτουργὸν), truly sanctifying and uniting us with Himself through our contact with Him and making us partakers of the Divine nature.

That the Holy Spirit is God by nature, and not a creature or a creature

From the Epistle to the Romans . Paul writes to the Romans about our Savior Jesus Christ, *called* , as he says, *the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, from the resurrection of Jesus Christ our Lord from the dead* [1566]. So, if, due to the fact that He rose from the dead, and that the bonds of death were broken by the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit, Christ is called the true Son of God and is thought of as such, then that through which the manifestation (ἐπίδειξις) of the Divine power is made cannot be a creature or creation. , that is, the Spirit, so that Christ would not <75,600> appear in some way to receive help from the creature, but rather [He should be thought of] using his own power, which [is accomplished] through the Spirit.

OTHER . And Paul also says: " *I desire to see you, so that I may give you some spiritual gift for your confirmation.*" [1567]. If the Spirit affirms with His gifts those in whom He is, then it should be clear to those who wish to think that He is not classified among creatures or slaves. It is written: " *The Lord establishes the righteous* ." [1568]. And what is placed in the place of natural dominion and is capable of affirmation is in every way invested with the dignity befitting the Lord. And what was created is in a servile rank, as [brought against one's own will] into existence. So, the Spirit is not a creation, for it appears as the Lord, and not a slave.

OTHER . Paul, explaining what kindness the Lord of all showed towards us, says: " *The love of God was poured out into our hearts through the Holy Spirit given to us.* " [1569]. So, if *there is a love God* [1570], according to the word of John, - and it is not that He is one thing, but that in Him there is something else, for He is simple and not complicated - and *is poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit who lives in us* [1571]then, to be sure, the Spirit is God, since He, as God, lives in us, and, so to speak, creeps out (ἐξέρπον) from the highest of all [entities] Essence and is thought of [being] in His [special] existence (ἐν ἰδίᾳ ὑπάρξει) and [also] from the Father, and is given to the creation through the Son.

OTHER , showing that the Law was laid down by the Spirit as God . " *We 're* [1572]"," says [Paul], " *for there is spiritual law* ." [1573]. Then, a little later, he adds: " *I delight in the law of God according to the inner man* ." [1574]. And again: " *The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus set me free from the law of sin and death* ." [1575]. Now, having called the Law spiritual, that is, given through the Spirit, he immediately calls it the law of God. He shows even more openly in the following [words] that the Spirit is God, crying out: " *the law of the Spirit of life* ," so that the Holy Spirit would appear not only as a legislator, but also as the Spirit of Life. And what kind of Life is this, if not Christ, who says: " *I am the resurrection and the life* " [1576]. So, when Christ lays the law, the Spirit Himself also lays the law, as being in Him and from Him by nature.

OTHER . Paul, condemning the carnal movement and showing how it rebels against the will of the Spirit, says: "The flesh is against the Spirit, and the Spirit is against the flesh. τῆς σαρκός): they <75.601> oppose each other" [1577]. Then, a little later, he

continues: " *Moreover , with my mind I work the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin.* " [1578], calling the movements in the flesh towards inappropriate pleasures the law of sin, and the will of the Spirit the law of God. So, it is clear that God is the Holy Spirit, who determines our own will as a law. For it is fitting for no one else to lay down the law, but God alone.

OTHER . " *vanity It 's* ," he says, " *the creature obeys not by will, but for him who obeyed in trust* ." [1579]. Consequently, if [the heretics] say that the Holy Spirit is created and created, then they must admit that He too has submitted to vanity and *is groaning and sick.* [1580], and now remains, as it were, in slavery, and *will be freed* only *in redemption* (εἰς τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν) [1581] *glory to the children of God* [1582]. Where then should we put Paul, who says: " *For we have not received the spirit of work or fear, but have received the Spirit of sonship; for Him we cry: Abba Father.* " [1583]? But He delivers from slavery those in whom He dwells, and, on the contrary, transforms them into a state of freedom and sonship, showing them to be partakers of His nature. Therefore, He is not a slave, and if so, then He is not a creature. And he who has escaped both being a creature and being numbered among slaves must, of course, be of the Divine essence.

OTHER . Having called the creation sighing, Paul adds: " *Not just* [the creature sighs], *but we ourselves, who have the firstfruits of the Spirit* ." [1584]. And what is the point here? A firstfruit is [always] the firstfruits of something, and, in every way, of the same type as that of which it is the firstfruits, just as the [firstfruits] of wine is wine, and, likewise, wheat is wheat. So, if the Holy Spirit is given to us, who in the future century will have the most perfect communion of the Divine, as a firstfruits, then in every possible way it is necessary to say that He is the Divine essence, of which He is the firstfruits. And if so, then He is neither a creature nor a creature, but rather God, as by nature existing from God and in God.

OTHER . And again Paul writes to the Romans: " *For by the grace that was given to me, I say that everyone who is in you should not philosophize any more than he ought to philosophize, but philosophize in sobriety, which, as God has divided among each, is the measure of faith* ." [1585]. Then, again, referring to the power of the Spirit the distribution of Divine gifts, he says that *one to* God *gives the Spirit of wisdom, to another faith* [1586](Many other types of gifts are also listed), and adds: " *All this operates through one and the same Spirit, dividing power to everyone as he wishes.* " [1587]. So, if, in addition to other benefits, the Spirit is also the giver of faith, determining, like God, <75.604> the measure sufficient for everyone, then how would it not be very wicked to number Him among the creatures, and not rather say that He shone (πεφηνέναι) from God?

OTHER . Paul, declaring that for the benefit of the pagans he boasts of the deeds accomplished through him by the Savior, says: " *I have therefore praise in Christ Jesus*

among those who come to God. For I dare not say anything that Christ did not make with me, in the obedience of tongues, in word and deed, in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Holy Spirit. " [1588]. Consequently, if Christ performs signs and wonders through Paul by the power of the Holy Spirit, then the Holy Spirit is a certain natural and living energy and, so to speak, a quality of the Divinity of the Son. If so, how will that which by nature [exists] in God and from God be a creation? How is all the power of the Son in creation? Even to say such a thing is wicked.

From 1 Corinthians

Paul, teaching that saving preaching is not revealed in verbal power, writes to the Corinthians: " *And I was in you in weakness and passion and trembling, and my word and my preaching were not in words beyond the wisdom of men, but in demonstration of the Spirit and power, Let your faith not be in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God* ." [1589]. Behold, he calls the manifestation of the Spirit, that is, deeds accomplished thanks to the Spirit, the power of God. For from Him and in Him by nature [dwells] His Spirit, who does all things. How can that be a creation or creature in which God is known by what He is by nature*, as far as this is possible for us, *in the mirror and in fortune-telling?* [1590].

OTHER . Having said that none of those who lead a shameful life will be an heir to the Kingdom of Heaven and having enumerated the fornicators, covetous and extortionists, [Paul] immediately adds: " *And these were not better, but were washed, but were sanctified, but were justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of God." ours* " [1591]. So, if we admit that only God can forgive sins, and the Spirit forgives [them] and justifies, showing as saints those in whom He is, then it means that He is God, having by nature the Divine action in Himself.

OTHER . " *Or you don't know* ," he says, " *that the filthy person who clings to one body has one body; Cling to the Lord, there is only one Spirit?* » [1592]For just as *a filthy person who cleaves to her* becomes one with her, so he who becomes a partaker of the Holy Spirit becomes one with the Lord. Consequently, God the Holy Spirit, through whom we cleave to God and become one with Him, and are *partakers of the divine nature* [1593]through <75.605> contact and union with the Spirit. And if the Spirit is God, then how will He be [at the same time] the creation?

OTHER . " *Or do you not know* ," he says, " *that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit living in you, which you have from God?" ***1594***]So, if we are called the temple of God when the Holy Spirit lives in us, then how can He not be of the Divine essence, but will be numbered among the created things, when it is completely obvious that nothing created or created is called living in the temple like God ? After all, this, along with other things, [constitutes] the exclusive [dignity] of the Divine nature.

OTHER . " *For he speaks with tongues, he speaks not to man, but to God: no one hears, O Spirits* [1595] *he speaks secrets* " [1596]. This means that the Spirit is God and from God if the one who speaks to Him converses with God.

From Second Corinthians

Paul, speaking about the resurrection of the dead, says: " *For we who are in this body groan heavily, because we do not want to be laid low, but to be naked, so that the life of death may be consumed with the belly. But it is God who created us into this present state, and who also gave us the betrothal of the Spirit* ." [1597]. He says that the Spirit is given as a betrothal to life, since He is this by nature; for *the Spirit gives life* [1598]. But we find [in Scripture] that to be life by nature belongs only to God the Father and the Word that came from Him. " *Just as the Father* ," says [Christ], " *has life in Himself so will the Son have life in Himself* " [1599]. And again: " *Just as their Father wants to live, so their Son also wants to live* ." [1600]. Therefore, since the Father gives life, the Son also creates life in the same way, and the Spirit also gives life, how can one be a creation who is like the Father and the Son and has the identity of essence?

OTHER, said about the same thing syllogistically . If the Spirit, being, according to crazy heretics, a creation and a creature, can revive those in whom He exists, then there is nothing exceptional in God when He also gives life, and we [thereby] recognize the absolutely identical action of the Creator and the creature. How then can equal and indistinguishable power be given from different and very different essential qualities? For those who have one action will also have one logos of how **they** exist (τὸν τοῦ πῶς ἐστι λόγον). So, it is time either to reduce God to the boundaries of creatures, or to attribute to the creation the logos befitting the Divinity, if, in their opinion, the Spirit, being a creation and creature, has an action equal to God. And then something that by nature is absolutely unmixable will be mixed. But this is absurd, and nothing <75.608> of what is essentially inherent in God is inherent in the creature in the same way as it is in Him. But the Spirit gives life, while God and the Father gives life. And how then will He be a creation, having in Himself by nature a special and exclusive property of the Divine essence? So, the Spirit is from God and God, and not a creature, as some of the madmen think, for whom the struggle against the truth is always sweet.

OTHER . " *Moreover , if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation: the ancient thing is past, behold , everything was new, and everything is from God* ." [1601]. So, since Christ renews us and transfers us into a new life, the Spirit is called renewing, according to what is said in the Psalms: " *Thou shalt follow Thy Spirit, and they shall be created, and renew the face of the earth.* " [1602], then it is necessary to confess that the Spirit is of the same essence as the Son, as existing from Him by nature and sent by Him to create [its] renewal, and being the fulfillment of the Holy Trinity. And if so, then it means that the Spirit is God and from God, and not a creation.

OTHER . " *Sweetly I will boast all the more* ," says [Paul], " *in my weaknesses, so that the power of Christ may dwell in me* ." [1603]. And if what indwells and dwells in us is the Spirit, and through Him is Christ, then the Holy Spirit is His power. If so, how will that which is inherent in the nature of the Son be a creation? For then it is appropriate to call the Word, which does not have any duality of God in Himself, complex, consisting of created nature and also of its own. And if this is absurd, then the Spirit is not created and not created, but [existing] from the incomprehensible and Divine essence, like its power and natural energy.

OTHER . " *Test yourselves, if you are in faith; tempt yourselves. Or do you not know that Jesus Christ is in you? Unless you are inexperienced by nature. I hope that we will understand, for we are not skillful* ." [1604]. So, since when the Spirit lives in the skilled, Christ is living [in them], it is necessary to say that the Spirit is of the Divine essence, with which He makes those who partake of Him partakers. For no one can say - unless, of course, he has the mind - that communion with God is accomplished in us through creation, if indeed the created and uncreated essence, and the great distance between them, are completely alien and dissimilar to each other.

OTHER . " *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God and the Father, and the communion of the Holy Spirit with all of you. Amen* " [1605]. Behold, here again the Holy Spirit is shown to be the completion (συμπληρωτικὸν) of the Holy Trinity. How one, how simple is God, if the Spirit Who is in Him, being created or created, turns out to be something different in comparison <75.609> with Him? But God is truly one, simple and uncomplicated, and without admixture of any foreign nature. And it is obvious that from Him and in Him the Spirit [exists] by nature, being His fruit, and that He was not brought into being from outside (εἰς ὑπόστασιν), and did not have what He is brought in, as the heterodox foolishly teach.

From the Epistle to the Galatians

" *Children* ," says [Paul], " *in the image of a sick person, until now , Christ will be imagined in you* ." [1606]. If through the Spirit alone Christ is imagined in us and, as it were, puts His features into us, rewriting (ἀναζωγραφῶν) human nature into the beauty of the Divine, then it means that God is the Spirit of Christ, Who is imagined in us, as He is, and is, undoubtedly , belonging to His essence [1607], and not having received existence from the outside.

OTHER . " *Walk in the Spirit , and do not commit carnal lust. For the flesh lusts against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: but these things oppose one another, so that you do these things no matter what you want. If you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law* ." [1608]. If, being guided by the desires of the Spirit towards piety and rightness of life, we are called into freedom, moving away from slavery to the Law, then it means that the Spirit is God, capable of liberation and possessing

Sovereign dignity. After all, that only God can liberate is clear from the fact that no one except Him can forgive sins. The Savior Himself will assure us of this no less, saying: " *Amen, amen, I say to you, that if it were not your Son who freed you,* you are a servant." [1609]. For the ability to do this is not inherent in the creature, but only in the Word who came from God and the Father, as [His] Son and Heir. If, then, the Son alone calls us to freedom, and the Spirit is found to do this, how can He not be His essence, doing everything as He does, with the power and authority becoming God? And if so, then the Spirit of Christ is neither a creature nor a creature. For this word carries with it great wickedness.

From the Epistle to the Ephesians

Speaking about our Savior Jesus Christ, [Paul] says: " *In Him also you, having heard the word of truth, the gospel of our salvation, and in Him also believed, were marked by the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the betrothal of our inheritance, for the redemption of provisions, for praise." His glory* » [1610]. If, sealed by the Holy Spirit, we are transformed into the likeness of God, then how will that be created, through which the image of the Divine essence is inscribed in us and the imprint of the uncreated nature remains? For, of course, it is not according to artistic custom that the Holy Spirit depicts the Divine essence in us, Himself being different in comparison with it, and not in this way leading us to the likeness of God, but, Himself being God and coming from God, as if into some kind of wax, < 75.612> into the hearts of those who receive Him, in the image of a seal, it is invisibly pressed, nature [of man], through communion and assimilation to Himself, rewritten into original beauty and again showing man as existing in the image of God. How then will creation be that through which nature is transformed, becoming like God, as having become a partaker of God?

OTHER . Discussing the coming of our Savior, [Paul] says: " *And having come to bring good news of peace to you, far and near, the Imams brought both in one Spirit to the Father.* " [1611]. If, having accepted the Spirit of Christ, we are brought through Him to God and the Father, appearing to be partakers of His Divine nature, then how can that be a creation, through which we, as a race, are already united with God?

OTHER . " *In the same way* ," he says, " *who are not strangers and strangers, but fellow saints and dreamers of Christ* [1612], *which was created on the basis of the apostle and prophet, which is the cornerstone of Jesus Christ himself in whom every creation is built to grow into church a holy* (ναὸν ἅγιον) *in the Lord: in whom you also are created into a habitation of God by the Spirit* " [1613]. If, thanks to the Holy Spirit, we are called a holy temple (ναὸν), so that God lives in us, then how come some do not go beyond the bounds of all wickedness, numbering the Spirit among created things, and not confessing instead that from the Divine nature exists That Which is from does it essentially occur and dwell in us as God?

OTHER . " *To me* ," he says, " *the least of all saints, this grace was given, to preach to the nations the unexplored riches of Christ and to enlighten everyone that there is a glimpse of the secrets hidden from centuries in God, who created all things.* " [1614]. Then again, a little higher, he says: " *As in the pre-written writings in the past: about him you can more reverently understand my mind in the mystery of Christ, even though in other times he was not said to be the son of man, as now he was revealed by His holy apostle and prophet in Dus.* " [1615]. So, if the prophet is truly true, exclaiming: " *Who has understood the mind of the Lord?* " ***[1616]***, then it is obvious that none of the created things knows the Divine will; after all, when this is said about people, everyone (πᾶς τις) [1617], I think he will agree. But let us, if you wish, look at the holy powers that exist in heaven, to see if they are not deprived of such honor. So, let us take the angel described in the book of Zechariah, praying and saying: " *Lord Almighty, how long wilt thou have mercy on Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, which thou hast despised, this seventieth year?* " » [1618]How, if he knew this, did he proceed, asking to find out? But obviously he doesn't know. Therefore, if - despite the fact that none of the others knows the Divine will - the Spirit *tests* and searches it, *and* knows *the depths of God* ***[1619]***, and what is hidden in Him reveals to the saints and makes manifest, then how can He be legally cut off from oneness with God? How will not that which by nature abides in Him, as His Spirit, and knows everything that is in Him, be completely [arising] from Him? And if so, then the Spirit is not a creature or a creation.

From the Epistle of James

" *Do not be flattered* ," says [Jacob], " *brother my beloved . Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of Lights* ." [1620]. If *from the Father of Lights* a manifold gift of Divine gifts is sent down, and Paul says that *all this is done by the Spirit, dividing power to each as he wills* ***[1621]***, then how is it that the Spirit is not God [being] from God and in God, when He does everything that befits God, and moreover with authority? Therefore, He is not a creature, as these [heretics] talk idle talk.

From the Epistle of Peter

" *Be wise* , " says [Peter], " *and be sober in your prayers. First of all, have diligent love for each other, because love covers a multitude of sins. Strangers towards each other, without murmur. Each gift, as it is accepted, serves among itself as a good builder of the various graces of God* ." [1622]. Pay your attention again to the fact that when the Holy Spirit, with authority and as He Himself wishes, distributes gifts and gives them to each of the saints, the wonderful Peter affirms that the giving and variety of such grace are from God, for he knows that the Spirit is not alien to the Divine

nature. So, when Peter calls the Spirit God, how would it not be wicked and at the same time insane to consider Him among creation and desperately dare to contradict the preaching of St. apostles?

From the Epistle of John

" *This* ," says [John], " *I write to you about those who flatter you. And you have received the anointing from Him, it abides in you, and you do not demand, but whoever teaches you: but because the anointing itself teaches you about everything, it is true and not false: and whatever it teaches you, abide in it.* " [1623]. A certain word is found among the prophets: " *And they will all be taught by God .*" [1624]. So, since those who believe in Christ and are anointed with the Holy Spirit learn all things from Him and have no need for human teaching, but rather find themselves taught by God, according to the prophetic word, then it is clear that the Spirit is God. And being such by nature, how can He be a creature?

OTHER . " *And he who keeps His commandments abides in Him, and He in him. And of this we understand that it abides in us from the Spirit, which he gave us to eat .*" [1625] . If, <75.616> when the Holy Spirit lives in us, it is God who lives, then how is it not God and not from God the Spirit, Whom if anyone has, he carries within himself the indwelling God, Who through the prophet says: " *For I will dwell in them." and I will go, and I will be their God* " [1626]? And if the Spirit is God and from God, then who, foolishly saying that He was created, will escape eternal torment?

OTHER . " *Who is he who overcomes the world, except he who believes that Jesus is the Son of God? This is Jesus Christ who came by water and blood and the Spirit, not by water, but by water and blood: and the Spirit bears witness, for the Spirit is the truth. For there are three who testify in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit: and these three are one. While human testimony is acceptable, God's testimony is greater .*" [1627]. Consider also that the herald of truth calls the Spirit God and by nature [being] from God. For, having said that *the Spirit is the witness* , he, a little later, adds: " *The testimony of God is more .*" How, then, will that creation be that which is theologized along with the Father of all, and which fulfills the Holy Trinity?

From the Gospel of Matthew

" *This is the Nativity of Jesus Christ: you will be betrothed to His Mother Maria Yosifova, before you even dream, you will be found with the Holy Spirit in your womb* " [1628]. If the ability to create belongs only to the Divine nature, and this, together with other things, constitutes its exclusive property, and the Divine Spirit creates a temple in the Virgin, then who, saying that He was created, will not turn out to be wicked and at the same time insane? After all, such a person, undoubtedly, slanderes the highest

essence of all, trying, as it were, to drag it [from the Divine heights] into the boundaries of creatures, so that it can be new, and not original. for us *There will be no new God* [1629], according to what is written in the Psalms. So, neither came into being nor was created, but rather *was in the beginning* [1630] Divine and immaculate nature. And if so, how can the divine and holy Spirit existing in God and the Father be conceived as created?

OTHER . " *If I* ," says [the Savior], " *I will cast out demons about Beelzebub, about whom will your sons cast out? For this reason there will be judges for you. If I, through the Spirit of God, cast out demons, then the kingdom of God will come upon you* ." [1631]. If God is glorified by casting out demons through the action of the Spirit, and the Holy Spirit, according to some ignorant people, is created and arisen, then it turns out that the power of God lies in created things. And how could that not be greater than Him in which He is glorified? But it is wicked to think and speak in general like this. So the Spirit was not created <75.617> in whom God through the Son accomplishes all things and is glorified through this.

From the Gospel of John

" *the little ones And* ," says [the evangelist], " *having received Him, He gave them the power to become children of God, believing in His name, who were born not of blood, nor of carnal lust, nor of manly lust, but of God.* " [1632]. If the Spirit, through faith in Christ, regenerates us to salvation, so that for His sake we are called born of God, then how can the Spirit not be God? And the fact that we believers are born of the Spirit is testified by the Savior, who says to Nicodemus: " *The Spirit breathes wherever He wills, and you hear His voice, but do not know where it comes from or where it goes: so is everyone who is born of the Spirit.* " [1633].

OTHER . " *When the Comforter comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father, He will testify about Me* ." [1634]. If the Holy Spirit proceeds from God and the Father and is, as it were, a certain fruit or quality of His essence, and the Father is uncreated and uncreated, then how can the Spirit pouring out from Him be created? How then are we called temples of God, receiving the Spirit into ourselves, if He is not God, as some madly think about Him?

* * *

[1495] 2 Tim. 1:14 .

[1496] Rom. 15:18–19 .

[1497] Rom. 15:30 .

[1498] 1 Cor. 6:19 .

1499 1 Cor. 6:17 .

1500 2 Corinthians 3:14–17 .

1501 2 Corinthians 3:18 .

1502 1 Cor. 8:6 .

1503 1 Cor. 2:16 .

1504 1 John 4:13 .

1505 Luke 11:20 .

1506 Psalm 97:1 .

1507 Isaiah 26:11 .

1508 Ps. 138:7–10 .

1509 Matthew 16:13–17 .

1510 Acts 5:2–3 .

1511 Acts 5:4 .

1512 Gal. 4:19 .

1513 Jer.23:4–3:15 .

1514 Acts 20:28 .

1515 This. 17:17 .

1516 Ezek.37:27–28 .

1517 Luke 4:1 .

1518 Luke 4:14 .

1519 1 Cor. 1:24 .

1520 Jer.23:24 .

1521 Ps. 138:7–9 .

1522 Wed: Prayer to the “Heavenly King.”

1523 Acts 17:28 .

1524 This. 6:64 .

1525 This. 14:23 .

1526 This. 15:26 .

1527 This. 14:26 .

[1528] 1Cor.1:1 .

[1529] Acts 13:2 .

[1530] This. 16:23 .

[1531] Proverbs 5:22 .

[1532] 1 Cor. 2:16 .

[1533] Gen.2:7 .

[1534] This. 20:22 .

[1535] 1 Cor. 11:7 .

[1536] 1 Cor. 11:7 .

[1537] 2 Pet. 1:4 .

[1538] Gen.2:21 .

[1539] Mark 10:17 .

[1540] Mark 10:18 .

[1541] Psalm 142:10 .

[1542] 1 Cor. 12:3 .

[1543] 1 Cor. 12:8-11 .

[1544] 1 Cor. 12:28 .

[1545] 1 Cor. 7:39-40 .

[1546] 1 Cor. 9:11 .

[1547] Apparently the sentence is broken. In the Latin translation, instead of “if” there is “therefore” (quocirca), and the phrase takes on a finished form, but the chapter, in our opinion, still looks incomplete.

[1548] This. 14:6 .

[1549] This. 15:26 .

[1550] 1 John 5:6 .

[1551] This. 1:9 .

[1552] 2 Cor.4:6 .

[1553] Eph. 3:16–17 .

[1554] See: Lev.24:10–14 . In the book of Leviticus, he is the son of an Israelite woman

and an Egyptian man.

1555 Matthew 12:32 .

1556 This. 3:6 .

1557 This. 1:13 .

1558 2 Pet. 1:4 .

1559 This. 16:14 .

1560 This. 16:14 .

1561 Meteki (μέτοικος), in ancient Athens, a class of partial residents, foreigners who were allowed to live in the city under certain conditions, but who did not enjoy the political rights of natural citizens.

1562 This. 1:17 .

1563 Hebrews 7:19 .

1564 2 Corinthians 1:22 .

1565 Gal. 3:19 .

1566 Romans 1:4 .

1567 Romans 1:11 .

1568 Psalm 36:17 .

1569 Romans 5:5 .

1570 1 John 4:16 .

1571 Rom. 5:5 ; 2 Tim. 1:14 .

1572 At St. Cyril, the beginning of the verse is given in the singular: "οἶδα μὲν," whereas in the modern text of Scripture there is a plural: "οἴδαμεν." {The first version is presented in the critical apparatus NA27.}

1573 Romans 7:14 .

1574 Rom. 7:22 .

1575 Romans 8:2 .

1576 This. 11:25 .

1577 Gal.5:17 . In the Slavic Bible in this verse we read: " *For the flesh lusts after the Spirit, and the Spirit after the flesh* ," but St. Cyril omits the verb "ἐπιθυμεῖ" (*lusts*), without which the Slavic text would lose meaning. Therefore, contrary to custom, we had to give this quote in Russian.

1578 Rom. 7:25 .

1579 Rom. 8:20 .

1580 Romans 8:22 .

1581 В оригиналье: « *в свободу* » (to freedom).

1582 Rom. 8:21 .

1583 Rom. 8:15 .

1584 Rom. 8:23 .

1585 Rom. 12:3 .

1586 1 Cor. 12:8-9 .

1587 1 Cor. 12:11 .

1588 Rom.15:17–19 . In Scripture - " *the Spirit of God* ". {The oldest manuscripts present both options.}

1589 1 Cor. 2:3-5 .

1590 1 Cor. 13:12 .

1591 1 Cor. 6:11 .

1592 1 Cor. 6:16-17 .

1593 2 Pet. 1:4 .

1594 1 Cor. 6:19 .

1595 In the Slavic translation (as in others), the dative "Πνεύματι" is understood as instrumental and is translated in the instrumental case, i.e. " *Spirit* ", but St. Kirill, as can be seen from the context, interprets it differently.

1596 1 Cor. 14:2 .

1597 2 Corinthians 5:4–5 .

1598 2Cor.3:6 .

1599 This. 5:26 .

1600 This. 5:21 .

1601 2 Cor.5:17–18 .

1602 Psalm 103:30 .

1603 2 Corinthians 12:10 .

1604 2 Corinthians 13:5–6 .

1605 2 Corinthians 13:13 .

1606 Gal. 4:19 .

1607 The original says: “ἴδιον δὲ πάντων τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ”, but we suggest instead of “πάντων”, with which there are no words that agree, to read “πάντως”. In the Latin translation, this word is simply omitted, and the passage reads: “et proprietas essentiae ipsius est.”

1608 Gal. 5:16–18 .

1609 This. 8:34,36 .

1610 Eph. 1:13–14 .

1611 Eph. 2:17–18 .

1612 In Scripture: " *To God* ."

1613 Eph. 2:19–22 .

1614 Eph. 3:8–9 .

1615 Eph. 3:3–5 .

1616 Isaiah 40:13 .

1617 The original reads "παῖς τις", but this is most likely a typo, although the Latin translation follows this reading: "puer aliquis" (a certain child).

1618 Zechariah 1:12 .

1619 1 Cor. 2:10 .

1620 James 1:16–17 .

1621 1 Cor. 12:11 .

1622 1 Pet. 4:7-10 .

1623 1 John 2:26-27 .

1624 John 6:45 ; Isa.54:13 .

1625 1 John 3:24 .

1626 2 Corinthians 16:16 ; Lev.26:12 .

1627 1 John 5:5-9 .

1628 Matthew 1:18 .

1629 Psalm 80:10 .

[1630] This. 1:1 .

[1631] Matthew 12:27–28 .

[1632] This. 1:12-13 .

[1633] This. 3:8 .

[1634] This. 15:26 .

Word 34 Word 36

Saint Cyril of Alexandria

Book of Treasures about the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity

Source

Word 35

Word 35. Evidence from the Divine Scriptures, by which it can be seen that the Son is begotten of the Father, and not created

Wisdom says: "Before the world was the foundation of Me, in the beginning, before I created the earth, before I formed the depths, before I became a source of water, before I became a source of water, before I became a source of water, before I became a source of water, before I gave birth to all the hills." Me" [1635].

Psalmist: "The Lord said to Me: Thou art My Son." [1636].

He: "The beginning was with you in the day of your power, in the brightness of your saints: from the womb before the morning star I gave birth to you." [1637].

About the fact that God the Son is ever present and before the ages, having an ineffable birth from the Father

John the Evangelist: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was to God, and God was the Word. This is from time immemorial (ἐν ἀρχῇ) *to God. Everything was the same , and without Him nothing would have happened."* [1638].

From the Epistle of John. "I was first, I heard, I saw with our eyes, I saw, and my hands felt, O Words of animals. And the Life appeared, <75.620> *and we have seen it, and we testify, and we proclaim to you the eternal Life, which was with the Father and appeared to us»* [1639].

The Savior in the Gospel: "All things were given to Me by My Father, and no one knows the Son except the Father; no one knows the Father except the Son, and whoever the Son wills to reveal." [1640].

John the Evangelist: "There is no one in the world: the only begotten Son, the gift of the Father, the Son of God" [1641]. For the Word was in the womb, that is, in the nature of the Father.

Isaiah: "Like a sheep that is led to the slaughter, and like a lamb that is silent before

its shearers, so it does not open its mouth. In His humility His judgment will be taken: who can confess His generation? [1642] For the Son ineffably shined forth from the Father.

Micah: " *And you, Bethlehem, the house of Ephrath, have little food to live among the thousands of Judah? From you will come an Elder from Me, who will be a prince in Israel, and He came forth from the beginning of the days of the world* (ἀπ" ἀρχῆς ἐξ ἡμερῶν αἰῶνος)" [1643]. For the Son came out and seemed to jump out (ἐξήλατο) from the essence of the Father, and not through some kind of separation or cutting off, but as a reflection from the light. In addition, " *from time immemorial* " (ἀπαρχῆς) and, so to speak, " *beyond* the days of the century" (ἔξω τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ αἰῶνος) [1644]. Therefore, He is from the Father and ever-present.

Paul: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for by Him all things were created , even in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether Thrones, whether Dominions, whether Beginnings, or Powers: all things were created by Him and about Him, and He is before all." [1645]. And " *everything* " includes both ages and times: therefore, the Son is ever-present and [exists] before them.

He also: "Of many times and in many ways, of old, God spoke to the Father as prophets; in the last days He spoke to us in the Son, whom He set as heir to all, in Whom also the worlds were created." [1646]. If the ages themselves were created through the Son, then how is He who exists before the ages not ever-present?

Psalmist: "Lord, you have been a refuge for us throughout our generation. Before even the mountains were not there, and the earth and the universe were created, and from everlasting to everlasting you art." [1647]. Behold, here he endows the Son with being before all creation. Undoubtedly, we will place the ages among the creation. Then how is it that the Son, Who is before all, is not ever-present?

Savior: "Behold, there is an eternal life, that they may know Thee, the one true God, and whom Jesus Christ sent. I have glorified You on earth, having accomplished the work that You gave Me to do. And now You, Father, glorify Me with glory, which before You there was no peace." [1648]. If the Son was in the Father even before the creation of the world, then how is it that He who exists before all is not ever present?

<75.621> That the Son of God is the Word

Jeremiah: "Thus says the Lord: If they are prophets and the word of the Lord is in them, let them answer Me." [1649]. For in the false prophets there was not the Word of God, that is, the Son.

He said: "Having been ashamed of wisdom, and having feared and seduced the Bysh , they have rejected the word of the Lord: what wisdom is in them ?" [1650] For the

Pharisees and scribes rejected the Son of God, saying: " *If this man were of God, he would not have destroyed the Sabbath.* " [1651]. Therefore, they were rightly *ashamed* .

Isaiah: "The same Wise One (σοφὸς) *will bring evil upon them, and His Word will not be rejected"* [1652]. For truly the all-wise Father of God the Word *brings evil* upon those who have rejected the Son.

Psalmist: "My heart will vomit out the good word [1653]. *– Forever, O Lord, Your Word remains in heaven* [1654]*».*

" *Sing a new song to the Lord, sing well to him with shouting. For the word of the Lord is right, and all his works are in faith.* " [1655].

"I sent my Word, and I was healed, and I delivered them from their corruption." [1656].

"Fill the earth with the mercies of the Lord. By the word of the Lord the heavens were established, and by the Spirit of His mouth was all their power " [1657].

"Thou art my helper and my intercessor: I have trusted in Thy Word" [1658].

"My soul perished in Your salvation, and I trusted in Your Word" [1659].

"Your righteousness is righteousness forever, and Your Word is truth" [1660].

Paul: "For the Word of God is living and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword." [1661].

"Every creation of God that is good, and nothing is notable, is accepted with thanksgiving, and is sanctified by the Word of God and prayer " [1662].

John the Evangelist: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was to God, and God was the Word. And the Word became flesh and dwelt in us." [1663].

Savior: "Father, sanctify them in Thy truth: Thy Word is truth." [1664].

Paul, [addressing] some: "And now I commend you, brethren, to God and to the Word of His grace, which is able to reward and give you an inheritance among those who are sanctified." [1665].

Jacob: "For He desired to give birth to us by the Word of truth, so that we might be the firstfruits of His creation." [1666].

Peter: "Love one another diligently, not from the seed of corruption, but from the Word of the living and abiding God." [1667].

John: "Even without first, without hearing, with our eyes, with our eyes, with our hands, with our hands, about the Word of the living creatures." [1668].

He: "If we say that we have not sinned, we commit Him a lie, and His Word is not in us." [1669].

He: "I write to you, young men, as you are strong by nature, and the Word of God abides in you, and you will overcome the evil one." [1670].

That the Son of God is light

Isaiah: "Shine, shine, O Jerusalem, for your light has come, and the glory of the Lord has come upon you." [1671].

He: "The land of Zebulun and the land of Nephalim, and the rest who live by the sea, and about it the land of the Jordan, Galilee of tongues. People walking in darkness see a great light." [1672].

He: "And now, in the house of Jacob, come, let us walk in the light of the Lord. Leave your people, Jacob's house." [1673].

He: "Behold, I gave You into the light with my tongue, opening the eyes of the blind." [1674].

Psalmist: "There is a light in darkness for the upright" [1675].

"Send Your holiness and Your truth" [1676].

"Blessed are the people who cry out: Lord, in the light of Your face they will walk" [1677].

"You will not inherit the earth with your sword, nor will their arm save them, but Your right hand and Your arm and the light of Your face." [1678].

Daniel: "For His wisdom and meaning and strength are, and He changes times and years, establishes kings and places, giving wisdom to the wise and understanding to those who lead understanding: He reveals the deep and hidden, the light that is in darkness and the light with Him is" [1679].

Paul speaking about God and the Father *: "Only you have immortality and are unapproachable in the light"* [1680].

He also: "Giving thanks to God and the Father, who has called you to partake of the inheritance of the saints in the light." [1681].

Peter: "Let him proclaim virtues out of darkness, who called you into His wonderful light."

He: "The day will light up, and the day will shine in your hearts." [1682].

John in the Epistle: "If we walk in the light, as He Himself is in the light, the imams have fellowship with each other." [1683]. For he who walks in the light lives in Christ.

He: "As darkness passes by and this true light is already shining" [1684], i.e. Christ.

He: "He who loves his brother abides in the light, and there is no temptation in him." [1685], for the one who acquires within himself the love dear to Him will not be outside of life in Christ .

<75.625> *Savior: "I am the Light that has come into the world, but whoever believes in Me will not remain in darkness."* [1686].

Also: "I am the light of the world: if you walk in Me, you will not have to walk in darkness, but you will have the light of the living." [1687].

Also: "This is judgment, because the light came into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." [1688].

Also: "Everyone who does evil hates the light and does not come to the light, lest his deeds be exposed." [1689].

John the Evangelist: "There was a man sent from God, his name was John: this one came as a witness, let him testify of the light. Be the true light" [1690].

He: "In Him was life, and life was holy to man" [1691].

Savior to the Jews: "As long as you have the light, believe in the light, that you may be sons of light." [1692].

He told them: "It's not yet a short time that there is light in you: walk, until you have light, but darkness has not you." [1693].

That the Son of God is the truth

Paul: "And presenting the truth to all the conscience of mankind" [1694].

He: "Now it's good: who can stop you from repenting to the truth?" [1695]

Peter: "Your souls have been purified by obedience to the truth" [1696].

Paul: "In Him also, having heard the word of truth, the gospel of our salvation, in Him also you believed were marked by the Holy Spirit of promise." [1697].

He: "God," he says, "wants all mankind to be saved and to come into the understanding of truth." [1698]. *"For God has chosen us from the beginning for salvation in the holiness of the Spirit and the true faith."* [1699].

He: "For it is the will of those who sin after we have received the mind of truth, for whose sins no sacrifice is found." [1700].

Savior: "Everyone who is of the truth will hear My voice." [1701].

Also: "And Az," He says, "I will pray (παρακα λ έσω) [1702] Father, may the Spirit of Truth be with you, which the world cannot accept." [1703].

"When the Comforter, the Spirit of Truth, comes, you will guide you into all truth." [1704].

"And for them I will sanctify myself that they may also be sanctified in truth" [1705].

"And the verb," says [the evangelist], *"Jesus: I am the way and the truth and the life." [1706].*

"And Jesus answered and said to them, that is, to the Jews: *father* You are of [your] *the devil* <75.628> *by nature, and you want to do the lusts of your father: he is a murderer from time immemorial, and does not stand in the truth, for there is no truth in him." [1707].*

Ezra: "And Zerubbabel said," says [Ezra], *" The truth is great and stronger than all. The whole earth calls for the truth, and the sky blesses it, and all things shake and tremble." [1708].*

He: "Truth abides and endures forever, and lives and possesses forever and ever And she doesn't have a pleasant face." [1709].

In the psalms: "The beginning of Your words is truth" [1710]. For the first and essential and embedded (ἔμφυτος) Word in God and the Father is Truth, that is, the Son.

"Thou art mighty, O Lord, and Thy truth is all around Thee" [1711].

"Living in the help of the Most High, and so on, up to: *His truth will bypass you with weapons" [1712].*

He says about the righteous: *"And I will overcome those who hate him, for My mercy and My truth are with him." [1713].*

"The path of truth is willing" [1714]. For a wise man loves living the gospel in God as much better than living according to the Law.

"Your righteousness is righteousness forever, and your word, O Lord, is truth." [1715].

Savior: "Father, sanctify them in Thy truth: Thy Word is truth." [1716].

John in the Epistle: "He says that he knew Him, but does not keep His commandments; he is a lie, and in this there is no truth." [1717].

Also: "I did not write to you because you do not know the truth, but because I do know that every lie is not from the truth." [1718].

"When we say that there is no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." [1719].

Paul about those who do not submit to Christ: "Because they did not accept the truth for love, so that they could be saved, for this reason God sent them the power of flattery." [1720], that is, the Antichrist, whom the Savior Himself designated, saying: *"I came in the name of my Father, and did not accept Me* (οὐκ ἐδέξασθέ με) [1721]*; If anyone comes in his own name, him you will receive."* [1722].

That the Son is the image and likeness of God and the Father and His Face

In the Psalter: "Blessed are the people who cry out: Lord, in the light of Your face they will go, and in Your name they will rejoice all the day long." [1723].

"You will not inherit the earth with your sword, nor will their arm save them, but Your right hand and Your arm and the light of Your face." [1724].

<75.629> *"We are marked by the light of Your face, O Lord. May you bring joy to my hearts"* [1725].

In the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Of many times and in many ways God spoke of the Father through the prophets, in these last days He spoke to us in the Son, whom He made heir to all, in Whom also the worlds were created, Who is the radiance of glory and the image of His person." [1726].

In the Epistle to the Colossians: "We give thanks to God and the Father, who has called you to share in the inheritance of the saints in the light, who delivered us from the power of darkness and brought us into the kingdom of the Son of your love, for whom imams deliverance through His blood and the remission of sins, who is the image of the invisible God, firstborn of all creation" [1727].

In the Epistle to the Philippians: "Let every one of these things be wise in you, even in Christ Jesus, who in the form of God is not equal to God by admiration." [1728].

John the Evangelist: "And in response Philip said to Jesus *: Lord, show us the Father, and it will be sufficient for us. Jesus said to him: I have been with you for so long, and you have not known Me, Philip? Seeing Me Seeing the Father"* [1729].

Solomon: "The radiance is the ever-present light and the immaculate mirror of God's actions, and the image of His goodness" [1730].

In the book of Genesis: "And bless Jacob who fought with him there. And Jacob called the name of that place the sight of God: for I saw God face to face, and my soul was saved. The sun rose to him when the sight of God passed away." [1731].

That the Son of God is truth (δικαιοσύνη)

In the book of Genesis: "And God said: Let us make man in our image and likeness" [1732].

Paul: "And it's no wonder: Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. It is no great thing ıf his servants are transformed into servants of righteousness." [1733].

He: "You are of evil in Christ Jesus, who gave us wisdom from God, righteousness and sanctification and deliverance." [1734].

He: "I testify to them that they have the zeal of God, but not according to reason. It is foolish to understand God's truth and seek to establish one's own truth, without obeying God's truth." [1735].

He: "Having been freed from sin, become enslaved to righteousness" [1736].

Apostle [Paul]: "The righteousness of God has been revealed, testified by the law and the prophet. The truth of God through the faith of Jesus Christ" [1737].

In the Acts of the Apostles: "God despising the age of ignorance, now He commands man everywhere to repent, having already established the day, in which He wants to judge the universe in righteousness." [1738].

In the Gospel: "John came to you in a righteous way (ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης) *, and you did not believe in him, but publicans and fornicators believed in him."* [1739].

In the Gospel of Matthew: "Seek first His righteousness and kingdom, and all these things will be added to you]" [1740].

"Blessedness was expelled for the sake of truth: for these are the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness: for they shall be satisfied." [1741].

In the Book of the Prophet Malachi: "And the Sun of righteousness and healing will shine on His wings to you who fear My name." [1742].

In the Book of the Prophet Amos: "The Lord execute judgment on high and place righteousness on the earth. Do everything and transform it, the Lord is His name." [1743]
.

In the Book of the Prophet Daniel: And Gabriel said to Daniel: *"Seventy weeks will be shortened for your people and for your holy city, that transgression will be promised, and sin will end, and sins will be sealed, and iniquities will be blotted out, and iniquity will be brought to echnaya: and the vision and the prophet will be sealed, and the holy of holies will be anointed. And you will understand and understand from the outcome the word that you will answer."* [1744].

In the Book of the Prophet Isaiah: "And the generations of righteousness will be called, the planting of the Lord for glory" [1745].

"My righteousness is quickly approaching, and My salvation will come forth like the light, and in My arm the nations will trust." [1746].

In the Psalter: "The beginning of Your words is truth, and the judgments of Your righteousness endure forever" [1747].

"Your righteousness is righteousness forever, and Your Word is truth" [1748].

"Even though we learn the judgments of Your righteousness, I will preserve Your justifications" [1749].

"The Lord has spoken His salvation; He has revealed His truth before the tongues." [1750].

"As long as the Lord does not reject His people, and does not forsake His property, until the truth turns to judgment, and those who hold it are all right in heart." [1751].

"Mercy and truth have met, truth and peace have met. Truth comes from the earth, and truth comes from heaven." [1752].

"In Thee, O Lord, have I trusted, that I may never be ashamed. By Thy righteousness deliver me and redeem me." [1753]

"And the heavens will proclaim His righteousness: for God is the judge" [1754].

"Through Your righteousness deliver me and redeem me" [1755].

"And the heavens will proclaim His righteousness: for God is the judge" [1756].

"I have preached great truth in the church; behold, I will not forbid my lips. Lord, You have understood my righteousness." [1757].

<75.633> *"My tongue will learn Thy righteousness, Thy praise all day long."* [1758].

"The Lord will proclaim the coming generation, and His righteousness will be proclaimed by the people who are born, even as the Lord has created." [1759].

"The throne is ready for judgment, and He will judge the universe in righteousness." [1760].

That the Son is called and is the Glory of the Father

In the Psalter: "But I will appear before Thy face in righteousness; [1761].

"The heavens proclaimed His righteousness, and all people saw His glory" [1762].

"O God, my God, I pray to You in the morning: my soul has thirsted for You, since my flesh is a multiplicity of You, in a land that is empty and impenetrable and without water. Thus I appeared to You in the Holy Place, to see Your power and Your glory." [1763].

"Proclaim His glory among the nations, His wonders among all people" [1764].

"Ascend into heaven, O God, and Thy glory be throughout all the earth." [1765].

Isaiah: "As if someone shakes off an olive tree, they will shake them off· and if there remains from the grasping of the grapes, they will cry with a voice: but those who are left on the earth will rejoice with the glory of the Lord." [1766].

In the Psalter: "And the nations shall fear thy name, O Lord, and all the kings of the earth shall fear thy glory." [1767].

In the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: "And the Spirit of the Lord took me, and I heard the voice of the great coward behind me, saying: Blessed is the glory of the Lord from where she is." [1768].

In the Book of the Prophet Isaiah: "From the night my spirit is drawn to You, O God, because of the light of Your commandments on the earth: you who dwell on the earth will learn righteousness. For the wicked cease not to learn the truth of the earth, and will not create the truth; let the wicked be lifted up, that he may not see the glory of the Lord." [1769].

"Shine, shine, Jerusalem, for your light has come, and the glory of the Lord has come upon you. Behold, darkness will cover the earth, and darkness will cover the tongues, but the Lord will appear on you, and His glory will be seen on you. And the king will go by your light, and the nations by your brightness." [1770].

His: "Rejoice, thirsty desert, may the desert rejoice and may it bloom like a tree. And the desert of Jordan will prosper and rejoice: and the glory of Lebanon will be given to it, and the honor of Carmel, and my people will see the glory of the Lord and the height of God." [1771].

In the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: "And the cherubs stood at the right hand of the house, and a man came in, and clouds filled the inner court. And the glory of the Lord rose up from the <75.636> *cherubim to cover the house, and clouds filled the house, and the courtyard was filled with the radiance of the glory of the Lord."* [1772].

In the Gospel: "How can you believe that you receive glory from one another, and do not seek glory from the one God?" [1773]

Peter: "Old men, I pray to you, as an old man and a witness of Christ's passion, who also wants to be a partaker of the glory" [1774].

In the Epistle of James: "Brethren, do not have the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ of glory only superficially." [1775].

In the Epistle of Peter: "If you are reproached in the name of Christ, you are blessed because of the glory and God's Spirit resting on you." [1776].

"For all His Divine powers have been given to us, even to life and piety, through the knowledge of Him who called us by glory and virtue." [1777].

From the Apostle [Paul]: "Let my God fulfill every need of yours according to His riches in glory in Christ Jesus." [1778].

"That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give you the Spirit of wisdom and revelation, so that the eyes of your heart may be enlightened in the knowledge of Him." [1779].

"With all power that is able according to the power of His glory" [1780].

"According to the gospel of the glory of the blessed God" [1781].

That the Son is the Hand and Muscle of the Father

In the Book of the Prophet Isaiah: "And I looked up, and was without a helper; and I thought, and no one intervened; and I have delivered My arm, and My wrath has broken down; and I was crushed under My wrath" [1782].

"Lord, who has faith in our hearing, and to whom has the arm of the Lord revealed itself? Proclaimed before Him" [1783].

"Listen to Me, My people, listen, and O king, command to Me: for the law will come from Me, and My judgment will be made a light by the tongue. My righteousness is soon approaching, and My salvation will come forth like the light, and the nations will trust in My arm: The islands will wait for Me, and they will trust in My arm." [1784].

In the Book of Exodus: "Then the rulers of Edom and the princes of Moab, with trembling, melted away all those who lived in Canaan. Let fear and trembling fall upon her, let Your greatness turn to stone, until Your people pass by, O Lord." [1785].

In the Book of the Prophet Isaiah: "Let them see and understand, and think and know together, how the hand of the Lord has done all this, and the Holy One of Israel has shown." [1786].

<75.637> *In the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: "And the hand of the Lord was upon me, and brought me out in the Spirit of the Lord, and set me in the midst of the field."* [1787].

In the Book of Exodus: "Israel saw the great hand that the Lord had done against the Egyptians, and the people feared the Lord and believed in God and in Moses, His saint." [1788].

In the Psalter: "And Thou hast laid down the bow of the copper for my arm, and Thou hast given me the protection of salvation, and Thy right hand shall receive me." [1789].

"And reh: now has begun, this is the betrayal of the right hand of the Most High" [1790].

"You will not inherit the earth with your sword, nor will their arm save them, but Your right hand and Your arm and the light of Your face." [1791].

"God of hosts, turn now, and look down from heaven and see, and visit this vineyard, and cultivate it, and plant what Thy right hand has planted." [1792].

"By Thy name, O God, is Thy praise to the ends of the earth: Thy right hand is filled with righteousness." [1793].

In the Book of Exodus: "The Lord spoke to Moses: Go down to Pharaoh and say to him: This says the Lord God of the Jews: Let My people go, that they may serve Me. If you are not willing to let My people go, but still hold them back, behold, the hand of the Lord will be upon your livestock in the fields." [1794].

In the Psalter: "Sing a new song to the Lord, for the Lord has done a wondrous thing: His right hand and His holy arm will save him." [1795].

"The right hand of the Lord create strength, the right hand of the Lord exalts me." [1796].

"Come, let us worship and fall down before Him, and let us mourn before the Lord who made us, for He is our God, and we are the people of His pasture and the sheep of His hand." [1797].

In the Book of Numbers: "Six hundred thousand people on foot, in whom I am, and You said: I will give them meat to eat, and they will eat for a month of days. Will they slaughter sheep and oxen for food, and will it be enough for them? And the Lord said to Moses: Will the hand of the Lord not be satisfied with food? Now you will understand, whether My word comprehends you, or not." [1798].

That the Son is the Power of God and the Father

From the Apostle [Paul]: "According to the effect of His power, this grace was given to me, the least of all saints." [1799].

"And my word and my preaching are not in words surpassing human wisdom, but in the manifestation of the Spirit and power" [1800].

<75.640> *"By Himself called a Jew and a Greek, Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God"* [1801].

In the Gospel: "And the power of the Lord healed them" [1802].

"You are deceived, neither the scripture nor the power of God" [1803].

In the Psalter: "Commandment, O God, by Thy power" [1804].

"God, in Your name save me and in Your power judge me" [1805].

"Thou art a God who works miracles: Thou hast spoken Thy power in men, Thou hast delivered Thy people with Thy arm, the sons of Jacob and Joseph." [1806].

"O God, my God, I pray to You in the morning: my soul thirsts for You, since my flesh is a multitude of You, in a land that is empty and impenetrable and without water. Thus I appeared to You in the Holy Place, to see Your power and Your glory." [1807].

"Be exalted, O Lord, in Thy strength: let us sing and sing of Thy strength." [1808].

"Lord, in Your power the king will rejoice, and the great rejoice in Your salvation" [1809].

In the book of the prophet Jeremiah: "The Lord, who created the earth in His strength, ordered the world in His wisdom." [1810].

In Deuteronomy: "Do not fear other gods, nor worship them, nor serve them, nor eat them, but only the Lord, who brought you out of the land of Egypt with great strength and with an outstretched arm." [1811].

<75.644> That the Son is called and is God

In the book of Genesis: "And God created man, in the image of God created he them" [1812]

From the Apostle [Paul]: "This is good and acceptable in the sight of our Savior God, who desires for all man to be saved and to come into the understanding of truth." [1813].

"To the Son: Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a scepter of righteousness, a scepter of Thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity: therefore for the sake of Thy anointing, O God, Thy God is more than Thy partaker with the oil of joy." [1814].

"When he again brings the firstborn into the universe, he says: And let the angels of God worship Him." [1815].

In the Gospel: "Then the verb to Thomas: bring your finger to this, and see my hands; and bring your hand and place it in my side; and do not be unfaithful, but faithful. And Thomas answered and said to Him: My Lord and my God." [1816].

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was to God, and God was the Word. Say no to God" [1817].

Isaiah: "Thus says the Lord of hosts: Egypt has labored and the purchases of Ethiopia, and the great men of Sheba will come to you and be your servants, and they will follow you, bound by hand, and they will come to you and worship you, and in you They will pray as if in you God exists, and they say: There is no God except You. For you are God, and you do not know, the God of Israel, the Savior" [1818].

He: "This says the Lord of hosts: go up to the high mountain, preach the good news to Zion, lift up your voice with strength, preach the good news to Jerusalem: lift it up, do not be afraid. Rtsy to the city of Judah: Behold, your God, behold, the Lord, the Lord comes with strength, and His arm with power, behold, His reward is with Him, and His work is before Him: just as a shepherd feeds His flock, and with His arm gathers the lambs, and He will comfort those who have in the womb" [1819].

He: "Be strong, weak hands and weakened knees. Be comforted, faint of heart, be strengthened, do not be afraid: behold, our God rewards judgment and will reward, He will come and save us." [1820].

"And they will say on that day: Behold, our God is the one who trusts and will save us: This is the Lord who suffered Him, and we rejoiced and rejoiced in our salvation, for God will give us rest on this mountain." [1821].

"Behold, a virgin will conceive in her womb and give birth to a Son, and you will call His name Immanuel: to eat butter and honey, before He knows what is evil, or to choose what is good, before He knows it, to reject good or evil, and to reject evil." [1822].

In the Psalter: "The God of vengeance, Lord, the God of vengeance did not stop eating. Ascend, judge of the earth, reward the proud." [1823].

"For it is he who lays down the law who gives blessing. They will go from strength to strength: the God of gods will appear in Zion. Lord God of hosts, hear my prayer" [1824].

OTHER: "God comes up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet" [1825].

"Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a scepter of righteousness, a scepter of thy kingdom." [1826].

In the Book of Genesis: "Jacob asked Him and said: Tell me Your name. And he said:

Do you ask this in My name, what a wonderful thing it is? And bless him there. And Jacob called the name of that place the sight of God: for I saw God face to face, and my soul was saved. The sun rose to him when the sight of God passed away." [1827].

"Shed the blood of a man, in its place it will be shed: for man was created in the image of God." [1828].

That the Son of God is Lord

In the Book of the Prophet Malachi: "And there will be ashes under your feet in the day that I will do them," says the Lord Almighty. And behold, I will send you Elijah the Thesbite, before the coming of the day of the Lord, great and enlightened, who will build the heart of a father towards a son and the heart of a man towards his sincere one, lest I come and smite the earth to the end." [1829].

In the Book of the Prophet Zechariah: "Beauty and rejoice, daughters of Zion, behold, I will come and dwell in your midst, says the Lord. And many nations will run to the Lord on that day and will be His people and will dwell in your midst, and you will understand that the Lord Almighty has sent Me to you." [1830].

In the Book of the Prophet Zephaniah: "At this time the Lord said to Jerusalem: Be of good cheer, O Zion, let not your hands fail. The Lord your God is in you, the mighty one will save you, bring joy to you and renew you in His love." [1831].

In the Book of the Prophet Micah: "Hear, all you people, the words, and give heed to the earth and everything on it, and the Lord God will be with you to obey, the Lord is from His holy house. Soon, behold, the Lord comes from His place, and will descend and step on the heights of the earth." [1832].

In the Book of the Prophet Isaiah: "The least of them will be thousands, and the least of them will be great: I, Lord, will gather them in due time." [1833].

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, for the sake of anointing me, to bring good news to the poor as my ambassador, to heal the brokenhearted, to preach release to the captives and restoration of sight to the blind, to call the year of the Lord pleasant and the day of recompense to our God." [1834].

"Shine, shine, Jerusalem, for your light has come, and the glory of the Lord has come upon you. Behold, darkness will cover the earth, and darkness will fall upon the tongues, but the Lord will appear on you, and His glory will be seen on you." [1835].

"The voice of one crying in the wilderness: prepare the way of the Lord, make right the paths of our God. Every wilderness will be filled, and every mountain and hill will be humbled, and all the rough will be in the right, and the rough will be smooth on the way. And the glory of the Lord will appear, and all flesh will see the salvation of God,

for He is the Lord of the word." [1836].

"Rejoice, thirsty desert, may the desert rejoice and may it bloom like a tree. And the desert of Jordan will prosper and rejoice, and the glory of Lebanon will be given to it, and the honor of Carmel, and my people will see the glory of the Lord and the height of God." [1837].

In the Psalter: "Oh, Lord, save, oh, Lord, hasten. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord." [1838]

"Then all the trees of the grove will rejoice at the presence of the Lord, for He is coming, for the judge of the earth is coming." [1839].

<75.645> *"Cry out with your tongue* (τοῖς ἔθνεσιν), *for the Lord reigns: for correct the world, which does not move."* [1840].

"Make a way for him who ascended to the west, the Lord is his name" [1841].

"Behold, God helps me, and the Lord is the protector of my soul" [1842].

"The Lord is mighty and mighty, the Lord is mighty in battle" [1843].

"This one will receive blessings from the Lord and alms from God his Savior" [1844].

In the Book of Genesis: "And Lot went down to Zoar. And the Lord rained down on Sodom and Gomorrah, and fire from the Lord came from heaven and transformed these cities." [1845].

That the Son of God is King

From the Apostle [Paul]: "I testify before God and our Lord Jesus Christ, who will judge the living and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom." [1846].

"The saying is true: if we die with Him, then we will live with Him; "If we endure, we will reign with Him." [1847].

"To the Son: Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a scepter of righteousness, a scepter of thy kingdom." [1848].

"Who deliver us from the power of darkness and place us in the kingdom of the Son of Your love, for whom the imams deliverance through His blood and the remission of sins, Who is the image of the invisible God" [1849].

"For this is known, that every fornicator, or unclean person, or covetous person, who is an idolater, shall have no inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God." [1850].

In the Gospel: "Jesus answered: My kingdom is not of this world; though My

kingdom were of this world, My servants fought , lest He should be delivered over to Judea." [1851].

"Jesus found a donkey, even as it is written: Fear not, daughter of Zion: behold, your King comes, riding on a foal." [1852].

"Nathanael answered and said to him: Rabbi, You are truly *the Son of God, You are the King of Israel."* [1853].

"And the thief crucified with Him *said: Remember me, Lord, when you come into the kingdom of Xi"* [1854].

"And the angel said to Her: Do not be afraid, Mariam: for you have found grace with God. And behold, you conceived in your womb, and gave birth to a Son, and called His name Jesus. He will be great, and he will be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give him the throne of his father David, and he will reign in the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there will be no end." [1855].

<75.648> *"When the Son of Man comes in His glory and all the holy angels with Him, then He will sit on the throne of His glory, and all the nations will be gathered before Him , and He will separate them from each other, as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats, and puts sheep at His right hand, and at the left of the goats. Then the King says to those on His right hand : Come, you blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."* [1856].

"Then the mother of the son of Zebedee and her son come to him, bowing and asking something from Him. He said to her: what do you want? The verb to Him: Lord, let these two sons of mine sit, one on Your right hand, and one on Your left, in Your kingdom." [1857].

In the book of the Prophet Ezra: "The truth is and is possible in the VEK, and lives and has in the Vyk, and the right -handed person, but the right -wing man, but the right -handed and the evil ones are flapping, and all are whitened, and there is nothing unjust in her judgment: and this is the fortress and the kingdom, and the power and majesty of all ages: blessed be the God of truth." [1858].

In the Book of the Prophet Daniel: "I saw in a dream at night, and behold, on the clouds of heaven, like the Son of Man, he walked and even reached the Old Day and came before Him; and to Him was given dominion and honor and a kingdom, and all people, nations and nations will work for Him: His power is everlasting power, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom shall not be destroyed." [1859].

In the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah: "Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, and I will raise up a righteous east for David, and a King will reign and will be wise and will do justice and righteousness on the earth." [1860].

In the Book of the Prophet Isaiah: "For my God is great: the Lord our judge will not pass me by, the Lord our prince, the Lord our King, the Lord who will save us." [1861].

"You will see the king with glory, and your eyes will see the earth from afar, your soul will learn fear" [1862].

"Blessed is he who has seed in Zion and saplings in Jerusalem. Behold, a righteous King will reign, and princes with judgment will begin to rule." [1863].

In the Book of the Prophet Zephaniah: "Rejoice, daughters of Zion, preach greatly, daughters of Jerusalem, rejoice and be adorned with all your heart, daughter of Jerusalem: the Lord will take away your iniquity, he has delivered you from the hand of your enemies: the Lord will reign in your midst, and you will not see evil to anyone" [1864].

In the Book of the Prophet Zechariah: "Rejoice greatly, daughters of Zion, <75.649> *preach, daughters of Jerusalem: Behold, your King is coming to you, righteous and to save, He is meek and is always on the yoke and the young stallion." [1865].*

In the Book of the Prophet Hosea: "After many days the children of Israel will sit; And therefore the children of Israel will return and seek the Lord their God and David their king, and will wonder about the Lord and about His goodness in the last days." [1866].

In the Psalter: "The Lord reigns, let the people be angry: he sits on the cherubim, let the earth move." [1867].

"Lord, in Your righteousness they will be exalted. For Thou art the praise of their strength, and in Thy favor shall our horn be exalted: for the intercession of the Lord is the intercession of the Holy One of Israel, our King." [1868].

"God, grant Thy judgment to the king, and Thy righteousness to the king's son." [1869].

"God comes up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet. Sing to our God, sing, sing to our King, sing; For God is the King of all the earth, sing wisely. God reign over all *languages" [1870].*

"The queen appears at your right hand, decked out in gilded vestments. Hear, O daughter, and see, and incline your ear, and forget your people and your father's house, for the King has desired your kindness." [1871].

"Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a scepter of righteousness, a scepter of thy kingdom." [1872].

"Lift up your gates, O princes, and lift up the everlasting gates, and the King of glory will come in." [1873].

"For this sake, let us confess to You in public, O Lord, and sing to Your name,

magnify the salvation of the king and show mercy to Your Christ David and his seed forever." [1874].

That the Son of God is Life by Nature

In the Gospel: "I am the way and the truth and the life" [1875].

And again: "Whoever walks on Me does not have to walk in darkness, but has animal light." [1876].

"There is a spirit that gives life, but the flesh has no use for anything: the verbs that I spoke to you are spirit and life." [1877].

"I am the resurrection and the life: he who believes in Me, even if he dies, he will live, and everyone who lives and believes in Me will never die." [1878].

"For it is the bread of God, come down from heaven and give life to the world" [1879].

"I am the living bread that came down from heaven: if anyone eats of this bread, he will live forever." [1880].

"I am the bread of animals" [1881].

<75.652> *"Just as the Father raises the dead and lives, so the Son also what he wills." lives* [1882].

"In Him was life, and life was holy to man" [1883].

According to the Apostle [Paul]: "The first man was Adam, a living soul; the last Adam, a life-giving Spirit." [1884].

"The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus set me free from the law of sin and death." [1885].

"In the same way, just as one sin brings condemnation to all people, so one single justification brings justification for life to all people." [1886].

In the Epistle of John: "Even though from the beginning, when we heard, when we saw, when we saw, and when we touched with our hands, the Word of the living things was revealed, and we saw, and we testified, and we proclaim to you the eternal life that is with the Father and appear to us" [1887].

"We know that the Son of God has come and given us understanding, so that we may know the true God and may we be in His true Son Jesus Christ: this is the true God and the eternal life." [1888].

"If you have the Son of God you will have life, but if you do not have the Son of God

you will not have life." [1889]

In Acts: "An angel brought them out, saying: Go and speak to the people in the church all the words of this life." [1890].

In Proverbs: "The tree of life is to all who hold on to it, and to those who worship it, as to the Lord, it is strong." [1891].

"As You are the source of life, in Your light we will see light" [1892].

In the Book of the Prophet Baruch: "Hear, O Israel, the commandments of life, inspire understanding" [1893].

That the Son is Will (βουλή) [1894] God and the Father.

In the Psalter: "You have guided me with Your advice, and You have welcomed me with glory." [1895].

In the Book of the Prophet Isaiah: "On that day God will rise in council with glory on the earth" [1896]. For He shone forth in the Son, [Who is called] *the great counsel* [Angel] [1897].

In the Psalms: "The counsel of the Lord endures forever" [1898].

"And the council of holy reason" [1899]. For the mind of the saints is the will (βουλή) of God and the Father, that is, the Son.

In the Psalter: "We glorify God in the council of saints" [1900]. For the Father is glorified in Christ, according to His own words: *"I have glorified Thee on earth."* [1901].

That the Holy Spirit is by nature and from the Father

In the Gospel: "The Spirit [is] God: and those who <75.653> bow to Him are worthy to bow in spirit and in truth." [1902].

"Baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" [1903].

In Acts: "Why did you agree to be tempted by the Spirit of the Lord? She lied not to man, but to God." [1904].

Pavel: "Separation is a gift, but the Spirit is the same; and separation is to the servant, and the Lord is the same; and there are divisions of actions, but God is the same, acting all in all. The whole seed works by one and the same Spirit, dividing the power to whomsoever it pleases. [1905].

"God has revealed to us by His Spirit: For the Spirit tests all things, even the depths of God. Who knows from people, even in a person, even the spirit of a person living in him? In the same way, no one knows God's message, but the Spirit of God." [1906].

Matthew: "All sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven by man: but blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven." [1907].

Job: "The Spirit of God created me, and the breath of the Almighty teaches me." [1908].

In the Psalter: "Thou shalt follow Thy Spirit, and thou shalt be created, and renew the face of the earth." [1909].

Thus says the Holy Spirit: *"By the Word of the Lord the heavens were established, and by the Spirit of His mouth was all their power."* [1910].

Paul: "And not as Moses put a veil on his face, for he was not strong enough to look upon the end of the passing of the Son of Israel. But their thoughts were blinded: even to this day, the veil in the reading of the Old Testament does not remain openly, but ceases to be about Christ. Whenever they turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away. The Lord is the Spirit, and where there is the Spirit of the Lord, there is freedom." [1911].

"Don't you know that you are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God lives in you?" [1912]

In the Gospel: "The Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot accept, because it does not see Him, knows Him less. You know it because it abides in you." [1913].

"We understand this, because we abide in Him, and He is in us, because He has given us of His Spirit to eat." [1914].

Paul: "It is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father who speaks in you." [1915]
.

"We do not partake of the spirit of this world, but of the Spirit who is from God." [1916]
.

In the Book of the Prophet Joel: "I will pour out My Spirit on all flesh, and your sons and your daughters will prophesy, and your old men will see dreams, and your young men will see visions." [1917].

<75.656> *Apostle [Paul]: "We do not speak in words taught by human wisdom, but in words taught by the Holy Spirit, spiritual by spiritual understanding. A spiritual person does not even accept the Spirit of God: for he has foolishness, and cannot understand, he strives beyond the spiritual. The spiritual one is vying for everything, but he himself is not vying for a single one. Who can understand the mind of the Lord and explain it? We are the mind of Christ imams"* [1918].

"And these are not things, but you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you

were justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God." [1919].

In Acts: "Now having passed through Phrygia and the Galatian country, the Holy Spirit was forbidden to speak a word in Asia. Having come to Musia, I tried to drink in Bethonia, and the Spirit did not forsake them." [1920].

Paul: "You are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, because the Spirit of God dwells in you. If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not His. If Christ is in you, the flesh is dead for sin's sake, but the spirit lives for righteousness' sake. If the Spirit of Jesus who raised from the dead dwells in you, He who raised Christ from the dead will also give life to your dead body through His living Spirit in you." [1921].

"Don't you know that you are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God lives in you?" [1922]

"Or do you not know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit living in you, which you have from God, and you do not have your own? Purchase at a natural price" [1923].

In Acts: "Ananias, why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit and hide the price of the village? "Thou hast lied not to man, but to God." [1924].

In the Gospel: "If I, through the Spirit of God, cast out demons, then the kingdom of God will come upon you." [1925].

In the Book of Genesis: "My Spirit shall not dwell in these men forever, for they are flesh." [1926].

Paul: "For the love of God is poured out into your hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to you." [1927].

[Isaiah:] "Do not make counsel by Me, and covenants not by My Spirit." [1928].

In the Book of the Prophet Haggai: "I am with you, says the Lord Almighty, and My Spirit is present in your midst." [1929].

In the Gospel: "Being born not of blood, nor of carnal lust, nor of manly lust, but of God" [1930].

* * *

1635 Proverbs 8:23–25 .

1636 Psalm 2:7 .

1637 Psalm 109:3 .

1638 This. 1:1-3 .

1639 1 John 1:1-2 .

1640 Matthew 11:27 .

1641 This. 1:18 .

1642 Is.53:7–8 .

1643 Mich. 5:2 .

1644 Here is a play on words based on some modification of the words of Scripture (cf. the Greek text above).

1645 Col. 1:15-17 .

1646 Hebrews 1:1–2 .

1647 Ps. 89:2–3 .

1648 This. 17:3-5 .

1649 Jer.27:18 . The verse is given according to the Septuagint; in the Slavic Bible it reads differently: " *If they are prophets and the word of the Lord is in them, let them appear before the Lord Almighty, so that the vessels that remain in the house of the Lord and in the house of the king in Udin and in Jerusalem do not go to Babylon* ."

1650 Jer.8:9 .

1651 Wed: John 9:33,16 .

1652 Isa.31:2 . In the Slavic Bible, instead of an adjective, there is an adverb: " *wise* ."

1653 Psalm 44:2 .

1654 Psalm 118:89 .

1655 Ps. 32:3–4 .

1656 Psalm 106:20 .

1657 Ps. 32:5–6 .

1658 Ps.119:114 . In the Slavic Bible: " *to Thy words* ."

1659 Ps.119:81 . In the Slavic Bible: " *to Thy words* ."

1660 Ps.119:142 . In the Septuagint and Slavic Bible: " *and Thy law is truth* ."

1661 Hebrews 4:12 .

1662 1 Tim. 4:4–5 .

1663 This. 1:1-2,14 .

1664 This. 17:1,17 .

1665 Acts 20:32 .

1666 Jak. 1:18 .

1667 1Pet.1:22-23 .

1668 1In. 1:1 .

1669 1 This. 1:10 .

1670 1 John 2:14 .

1671 Isaiah 60:1 .

1672 Isaiah 9:1-2 .

1673 Isaiah 2:5–6 .

1674 Is. 42:6–7 .

1675 Psalm 111:4 .

1676 Psalm 42:3 .

1677 Psalm 88:16 .

1678 Psalm 43:4 .

1679 Dan. 20:22 .

1680 1 Tim. 6:16 .

1681 Col. 1:12 .

1682 2 Pet. 1:19 .

1683 1 This. 1:7 .

1684 1 John 2:8 .

1685 1 This. 2:10 .

1686 This. 12:46 .

1687 This. 8:12 .

1688 This. 3:19 .

1689 This. 3:20 .

1690 This. 1:7,9 .

1691 This. 1:4 .

1692 This. 12:36 .

1693 This. 12:35 .

1694 2 Cor 4:2 .

[1695] Gal. 5:7 .

[1696] 1Pet.1:22 .

[1697] Eph. 1:13 .

[1698] 1 Tim. 2:4 .

[1699] 2 Thess. 2:13 .

[1700] Hebrews 10:26 .

[1701] This. 18:37 .

[1702] In the original Scripture there is “ἐρωτήσω”, and not “παρακαλέσω”, as in St. Kirill

[1703] This. 14:16-17 .

[1704] This. 15:26; 16:13 .

[1705] This. 17:19 .

[1706] This. 14:6 .

[1707] John 8:34,44 . In the Slavic Bible the preposition “ *from* ” is omitted.

[1708] 2 Esdras 4:35–36 .

[1709] 2 Esdras 4:38–39 .

[1710] Psalm 118:160 .

[1711] Psalm 88:9 .

[1712] Psalm 90:1,4 .

[1713] Ps. 88:24–25 .

[1714] Psalm 118:30 .

[1715] Ps.119:142 . In the Septuagint and Slavic Bible: “... *and Thy law is truth* .”

[1716] This. 17:17 .

[1717] 2 John 2:4 .

[1718] 1 John 2:21 .

[1719] 1 This. 1:8 .

[1720] 2 Thess. 2:11 .

[1721] In the Gospel: "don't accept me" - " *не приемлете Мене* ".

[1722] This. 5:43 .

[1723] Ps. 88:16–17 .

[1724] Psalm 43:4 .

[1725] Psalm 4:7-8 .

[1726] Hebrews 1:1–3 .

[1727] Col. 1:3,12-15 .

[1728] Phil.2:5–6 . In the Slavic and Russian translations of Scripture, " *kiyzhdo* " (ἕκαστοι) refers to the previous verse and sentence: " *Look not at your own and every one, but also at your friends* " (μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος σκοπ οῦντες ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἑτέρων ἕκαστοι), and the real verse begins: " *Let this be wisdom in you, as well as in Christ and Jesus* ." But St. Cyril quotes this passage as follows: "Ἕκαστοι τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ." It should also be noted that the verb "to be wise" appears in the original text of the Epistle {according to the Byzantine tradition and the main text of the critical edition of the Greek New Testament, NA27 *}* in the 2nd person plural, in the active voice (φρονείτε), and not in the 3rd {in the original erroneously – 1st} person singular medial, as in the Slavic translation. {Form 3 l. units the medial passive voice, φρονείσθω, is presented in the critical apparatus NA-27, as present in some authoritative manuscripts. If we accept the reading of φρονεῖτε and some other textual options, then verses 5:4 and 5:5 can be combined into one sentence: " *Don't be friends with everyone, but be friendly, let everyone be wise in you, as in Christ Jesus.* }

[1729] This. 14:8-9 .

[1730] Prem. 7:26 .

[1731] Gen.32:29–31 .

[1732] Gen.1:26 .

[1733] 2 Corinthians 11:14–15 .

[1734] 1 Cor. 1:30 .

[1735] Rom. 10:2–3 .

[1736] Romans 6:18 .

[1737] Romans 3:21–22 .

[1738] Acts 17:30–31 .

[1739] Matthew 21:32 .

[1740] Matthew 6:33 .

[1741] Matthew 5:10,6 .

1742 Mal. 4:2 .

1743 Am. 5:7–9 .

1744 Dan. 9:24–25 .

1745 Isaiah 61:3 .

1746 Isaiah 51:5 .

1747 Psalm 118:160 .

1748 Psalm 118:142 .

1749 Ps. 118:7–8 .

1750 Psalm 97:2 .

1751 Ps. 93:14–15 .

1752 Ps. 84:11–12 .

1753 Psalm 30:2 .

1754 Psalm 49:6 .

1755 Psalm 70:2 .

1756 Psalm 49:6 .

1757 Ps.39:10–11 . In the Septuagint: " *Thy righteousness* ." In the Slavic Bible, these words refer to the following sentence and verse: " *I have preached the great truth in the church, behold, I will not forbid my lips: Lord, you have understood. I have not hidden Your truth in my heart. ..*"

1758 Psalm 34:28 .

1759 Psalm 21:31-32 .

1760 Psalm 9:8–9 .

1761 Psalm 16:15 .

1762 Psalm 96:6 .

1763 Ps. 62:2–3 .

1764 Psalm 95:3 .

1765 Psalm 56:6 .

1766 Isaiah 24:13–14 .

1767 Psalm 101:16 .

1768 Ezek.3:12 . In the text of Scripture: " *from His place* ."

1769 Is.26:9–10 .

1770 Is. 60:1–3 .

1771 Is.35:1–2 .

1772 Ezek.10:3–4 .

1773 This. 5:44 .

1774 1 Pet. 5:1 .

1775 Even. 2:1 .

1776 1 Pet. 4:14 .

1777 1 Pet.1:3 .

1778 Phil.4:19 .

1779 Eph. 1:17–18 .

1780 Col. 1:11 .

1781 1Tim.1:11 .

1782 Is. 63:5–6 .

1783 Isaiah 53:12 .

1784 Is.51:4–5 .

1785 Exodus 15:15–16 .

1786 Isaiah 41:20 .

1787 Ezek.37:1 .

1788 Ex.14:31 .

1789 Psalm 17:35-36 .

1790 Psalm 76:11 .

1791 Psalm 43:4 .

1792 Ps. 79:15–16 .

1793 Psalm 47:11 .

1794 Exodus 9:1–3 .

1795 Psalm 97:1 .

1796 Psalm 117:16 .

1797 Ps. 94:6–7 .

1798 Numbers 11:21–23 .

1799 Eph. 3:7–8 .

1800 1 Cor. 2:4 .

1801 1 Cor. 1:24 .

1802 Luke 5:17 .

1803 Matthew 22:29 .

1804 Psalm 67:29 .

1805 Psalm 53:3 .

1806 Ps. 76:15–16 .

1807 Ps. 62:2–3 .

1808 Psalm 20:14 .

1809 Psalm 20:2 .

1810 Jer.10:12 .

1811 2 Kings 17:35–36 . Quote misidentified St. Cyril, obviously due to its similarity with Deut. 5:7,9 .

1812 Gen.1:27 .

1813 1 Tim. 2:3–4 .

1814 Hebrews 1:8–9 .

1815 Hebrews 1:6 .

1816 This. 29:27-28 .

1817 This. 1:1-2 .

1818 Is. 45:14–15 .

1819 Is. 40:9–11 .

1820 Isaiah 35:3–4 .

1821 Isaiah 25:9–10 .

1822 Isaiah 7:14-16 .

1823 Ps. 93:1–2 .

1824 Ps. 83:7–9 .

[1825] Psalm 46:6 .

[1826] Psalm 44:7 .

[1827] Gen.32:29–31 .

[1828] Gen.9:6 .

[1829] Mai. 4:3,5–6 .

[1830] Zechariah 2:10–11 .

[1831] Zeph. 3:16–17 .

[1832] Mix. 1:2–3.

[1833] Isaiah 60:22 .

[1834] Isa.61:1–2 . In the {Greek and Slavic} text of Scripture there are no words: " *To our God* ." {In Hebrew - "the day of vengeance of our God", trans. RBO.}

[1835] Is. 60:1–2 .

[1836] Is. 40:3–5 .

[1837] Is.35:1–2 .

[1838] Ps. 117:25–25 .

[1839] Psalm 95:12-13 .

[1840] Ps.95:10 . In the Septuagint {and Hebrew text}: "ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν" – " *in the heathen* ."

[1841] Psalm 67:5 .

[1842] Psalm 53:6 .

[1843] Psalm 23:8 .

[1844] Psalm 23:5 .

[1845] Gen. 19:23–25 .

[1846] 2 Tim 4:1 .

[1847] 2 Tim. 2:11–12 .

[1848] Hebrews 1:8 .

[1849] Col. 1:13-15 .

[1850] Eph. 5:5 .

[1851] This. 18:36 .

1852 This. 12:14 .

1853 This. 1:49 .

1854 Luke 23:42 .

1855 Luke 1:30-33 .

1856 Matthew 25:31–34 .

1857 Matthew 20:20–21 .

1858 2 Esdras 38–40 .

1859 Dan. 7:13–14 .

1860 Jer.23:3

1861 Isaiah 33:22 .

1862 Is.33:17–18 .

1863 Is.31:9–32:1

1864 Zeph. 3:14–15 .

1865 Zechariah 9:9 .

1866 Hosea 3:4–5 .

1867 Psalm 98:1 .

1868 Ps. 88:15,17–19 .

1869 Psalm 71:2 .

1870 Ps. 46:6–9 .

1871 Ps.44:10–12 . In the Slavic Bible there is a future tense: " *and will desire* " {, as in the Hebrew: "The king will desire your beauty", trans. RBO}, but in the Septuagint it is precisely the aorist: "ὅτι ἐπεθύμησεν".

1872 Psalm 44:7 .

1873 Psalm 23:9 .

1874 Psalm 17:50-51 .

1875 This. 14:6 .

1876 This. 8:12 .

1877 This. 6:63 .

1878 This. 11:25-26 .

[1879] This. 6:33 .

[1880] This. 6:51 .

[1881] This. 6:48 .

[1882] This. 5:21 .

[1883] This. 1:4 .

[1884] 1 Cor. 15:45 .

[1885] Romans 8:2 .

[1886] Rom. 5:18 .

[1887] 1 John 1:1-2 .

[1888] 1 John 5:20 .

[1889] 1 John 5:12 .

[1890] Acts 5:19–20 .

[1891] Proverbs 3:18 .

[1892] Psalm 35:10 .

[1893] Var. 3:9 .

[1894] The word "βουλή" has many meanings. Thus, the Butler's Dictionary gives the following: 1) will, desire, decision, plan; 2) opinion, intention; 3) advice, guidance; 4) reflection, discussion; 5) meeting, council, advisory body; 6) (in Athens) Council of Five Hundred, bule, state council; 7) Areopagus, the highest court (in Athens); 8) late (in Rome) senate. In this context, in relation to Christ, it is most logical to understand "βουλή" as "will", "desire", however, in all the places of Scripture that St. Kirill, this word is translated into Slavic and Russian as "advice". Although some of the verses can be read differently, we thought it best to leave them unchanged.

[1895] Psalm 72:24 .

[1896] Isaiah 4:2 .

[1897] Isaiah 9:6 .

[1898] Psalm 32:11 .

[1899] Proverbs 9:10

[1900] Psalm 88:8 .

[1901] This. 17:4 .

[1902] This. 4:24 .

[1903] Matthew 28:19 .

[1904] Acts 5:9,4 .

[1905] 1 Cor. 12:4-6,11 .

[1906] 1 Cor. 2:10-11 .

[1907] Matthew 12:31 .

[1908] Job. 33:4 .

[1909] Psalm 103:30 .

[1910] Psalm 32:6 .

[1911] 2 Cor. 3:13–17 .

[1912] 1 Cor. 3:16 .

[1913] This. 14:17 .

[1914] 1 John 4:13 . The quote is incorrectly attributed.

[1915] Matthew 10:20 . The quote is incorrectly attributed.

[1916] 1 Cor. 2:12 .

[1917] Joel. 2:28 .

[1918] 1 Cor. 2:13-16 .

[1919] 1 Cor. 6:11.

[1920] Acts 16:6–7 .

[1921] Romans 8:9–11 .

[1922] 1 Cor. 3:16 .

[1923] 1 Cor. 6:19-20 .

[1924] Acts 5:3–4 .

[1925] Matthew 12:28 .

[1926] Gen.6:3 .

[1927] Rom.5:5 . In the original: " *ours... to us* ."

[1928] Isaiah 30:1 .

[1929] Agg. 2:5,6 .

[1930] This. 1:13 .