SEERI CORRESPONDENCE COURSE (S C C)

ON SYRIAN CHRISTIAN HERITAGE

9

SEBASTIAN BROCK
M. A. MATHAI REMBAN
et ALII

Philoxenus of Mabbug



ST. EPHREM ECUMENICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE (SEERI)
BAKER HILL, KOTTAYAM-686 001
KERALA, INDIA

The SCC is organized by the SEERI

Director of the SCC: Rev. Dr. Geevarghese Panicker

Copyright: Director (S C C), SEERI, Baker Hill, Kottayam Kerala, India-686 001

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or translated without the written permission of the Director (S C C) SEERI, Baker Hill, Kottayam 686001, Kerala India

Published by: Director SCC, SEERI, Baker Hill, Kottayam, Kerala India 686 001
Tel: (0481) 564333

Printed at: Prima Printers, Changanacherry

PHILOXENUS OF MABBUG

By

SEBASTIAN BROCK

M. A. MATHAI REMBAN

ET ALII

Philoxenus of Mabbug

1. Introduction — Sebastian Brock
2. The Life of Philoxenus — E. A. "Wallis Budge
3. The Creed of Philoxenus — ,,
4. The Works of Philoxenus — ,,
5. The Christology of Philoxenus — M. A. Mathai Remban

Appendix:

Selected passages from his Spiritual and Ascetical writing

1. On the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit
2. On Prayer: Three Excepts
3. On Poverty
4. On Fornication

CERTAIN TECHNICAL WORDS USED BY PHILOXENUS

Abohuto	Fatherhood
Agen	to dwell, abide
Alohuto	Godhead
Asiron	United, bound together
Badmuto	in the likeness
Bar Kyono	co-natural
Barnoso	man, (son of man)
Besro	flesh, a man
Boruto	Sonship
B-parsupo	representing
B-taybuto	by grace
Bulbolo	confusion, disorder
Estahlap	being changed
Estaraq	emptied Himself
Etdmi	became like, resembled
Etgasam	embodied, incarnated
Ethlet	commingled, took part with, united
Etmazag	to be united, to unite oneself
Galyono	revelation, appearance, manifestation
Gusmo	a body
Haye Pagronoye	corporeal life
Hosuso	Subject to suffering, passible
Hultono	commingling, union, participation
Hwo	became

Hwoyo	becoming
Ihidoyo	unique, only
Ituto	The Divine Essence
Ityo	The Being (God)
Kyono	nature
Muzogo	union (of Godhead and Manhood)
Pagrono	bodily, of body
Pagronuto	Embodiment, Incarnation
Parsupo	face, mask, persona
Pursono	separation, distinction
Qnumo	an individual, a concrete person
Qnumoyuto	individuality
Rozo, roze (pl)	mystery, pl. indicates also Baptism and Eucharist or Body and Blood of Christ (Eucharist)
Ruhono	spiritual
Ruhonuto	spiritual existence, spirituality
Šawtoputo	participation
Šawyuto	equality
Šawyuto d~kyono	equality of nature
Taybuto	Grace (of God)
Titoyuto	The Trinity
Trayonuto	duality
Tubonuto	state of blessedness

I

INTRODUCTION

PROF. DR. S. P. BROCK

PHILOXENUS is a major Syriac writer and theologian of ıe fifth/sixth century. He happens to be best known as an ardent ɔponent of the christological definition of faith laid down at the ıouncil of Chalcedon (he considered that its wording obscured, ı a dangerous way, the full reality of the incarnation). But hiloxenus was not just a fiery and zealous controversialist, ıking a front-line position in the ecclesiastical politics of his time; ɛ was also a creative theologian of considerable stature, fusing ıgether in a remarkable way elements drawn from both his ıtive Syriac and from Greek tradition.

Philoxenus was born outside the Roman Empire, somewhere ı the vicinity of modern Kirkuk (Iraq) and studied at the famous ıeological school in Edessa known as the 'Persian School'. In ıe doctrinal controversies of the midfifth century the teachers T the School, followed the Antiochene theological tradition, in ɛrticular that of Theodore of Mopsuestia, but it is clear that ɔme students, Philoxenus among them, reacted against this and ıded with the Alexandrine tradition of Cyril. According to some ɔurces it was this that led to his expulsion. Befriended by Peter ıe Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch, Philoxenus soon became a pro-ıinent figure in ecclesiastical circles in Syria and in 485 he was ppointed bishop of Mabbug (to the north-east of Antioch). Among ıis many activities as bishop he sponsored a revision of the Syriac ranslation of the New Testament, bringing it closer into line with ıe current Greek text. After the death of the emperor Anasta-ıus in 518, his successor Justin introduced a change in imperial ɔligious policy and enforced on all bishops acceptance of the ıouncil of Chalcedon and its controversial Definition of Faith; hiloxenus' refusal to do so resulted in his deposition and exile. Ie died five years later in Paphlagonia.

Philoxenus' writings fall into three main categories: exegetical, dogmatic, and ascetic. From the first two categories his extensive Commentary on the Prologue of John (only recently published) and the Three Tractates on the Trinity and the Incarnation (also known as the Book of Sentences) deserve to be singled out for special mention. The third category of works shows up a quite different aspect of Philoxenus' character, pointing to his deep concern for, and interest in, the religious life. Best known, and long available in an English translation by E. A. W. Budge, are his thirteen Discourses. Their range of topics is best indicated by listing their titles: prologue (1), the first commandment that a person should seize upon (2), faith (3—4), serenity (sbafyuta; 5), the fear of God (6—7), selfemptying (msarrquta; 8), greed (9), abstinence (10), fornication (of the mind; 12—13). Among the various letters which fall into the third category is the first text translated here, on the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and the long letter to a solitary, Patricius of Edessa. This second letter, on the passions of the soul and the commandments of Christ, somehow came to be translated into Greek where, most remarkably, it is published among the works of Isaac of Nineveh.

Fundamental to Philoxenus' way of thinking is the concept of a dual mode of existence which characterizes, in complementary gashion, both the life of Christ and that of the Christian. These two modes of existence he designates the mode of the body (pagranuta) and the mode of the spirit (rubanuta). Before the incarnation the Logos exists, by nature, in the mode of the spirit; but after the incarnation he also exists, by miracle, in the mode of the body. Conversely, the Christian before baptism exists, by nature, in the mode of the body; but after baptism he or she also exists, by miracle, in the mode of the spirit. Such a pattern of the Christian, and at the same time it brings out the parallelism between the incarnate life of Christ and the baptized life of the Christian, a parallelism which has important implications for an understanding of what is involved in any 'imitation of Christ'.

Philoxenus was evidently borrowing from the Book of Steps when he speaks of two ways of life open to the baptized Christian, the way of righteousness and the way of perfection. The way of

ghteousness he sees as corresponding to the time in Christ's life fore his baptism, when he was fullfilling all the requirements righteousness (i. e. the Law); by contrast, the way of perfection seen as corresponding to Christ's life after his baptism. Elsenere Philoxenus compares the way righteousness to the growth an embryo in the womb; birth, on this model, corresponds to try into the way of perfection. This second spiritual birth which kes place subsequently to baptism is called by Philoxenus 'the perception of our first birth' i. e. baptism; (Letter to Patricius,). In another place he even speaks of 'two baptisms', the first ing 'that of Grace, from the Font, and the second that of your vn will, when you are baptized out of the world in the love God' (Discourse IX).

In the baptized life, whether the Christian is following the ay of righteousness or has chosen to advance on to the way of rfection, the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit is of urse of prime importance. At baptism the Christian 'puts on e spirit', and the Spirit becomes 'the soul of souls', indwelling rmanently in the Christian. The problem of what effect postptismal sin has on the presence of the Holy Spirit in the baptiz- was one which Aphrahat had already discussed in his Sixth emonstration. The same question was posed by a correspondent Philoxenus, who asked whether the Spirit actually departs hen a baptized person sins. Philoxenus' interesting letter of ply—in the negative: the Holy Spirit departs only on apostasy is to be found in the first of the four texts translated below. The her three are short pieces specifically on prayer which had en excepted at an early date from longer works which cannot w be identified.

○○

II

THE LIFE OF PHILOXENUS

Akhsenaya, later named Philoxenus, was born in the third quarter of the Vth century at a village called Tahal, which was situated in Beth Garmai, probably on the confines of Persia; of his parents and their rank and condition we know nothing, but as he was baptized it may be assumed that they were Christians or, at any rate, that they had leanings towards Christianity. His brother Addai is mentioned together with him by Simon of Beth Arsham, who says that they opposed Ibas at Edessa. Making his way westwards Philoxenus came to Edessa, probably in his early manhood, where he studied at the time when Ibas was engaged in translating the works of those who held the Nestorian doctrines into Syriac. Of the history of his life at this period we know nothing, but it seems to have been imprudent to send a young man of his ardent and religious temperament into a city which, though the chief seat of ecclesiastical learning in that part of the country, was at the same time a source of the religious polemics of the time, for there is little doubt that at a comparatively early age Philoxenus was already known as a willing and zealous teacher and disputant. Such a man was no doubt of great value to the Monophysite Church when the doctrines of Nestorius, which were gaining ground on all sides, were to be fought against, but his ability soon brought him into unenviable notoriety, and between the years 481 and 485 he was expelled from the diocese of Antioch by Calandio the Patriarch as a preacher of the views of Cyril of Alexandria and an advocate of the Henoticon of Zeno. The views of Philoxenus were, however, identical with those of Peter the Fuller, by whom immediately after the banishment of Galandio in 485, he was ordained Bishop of Mabbogh or Hierapolis. In an anonymous life of Philoxenus from which Assemani gives extracts in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (ii. p. 13), it is said that "Philoxenus, being abundantly learned in all the

doctrine of the Syrians, and having received the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, became Bishop of Mabbogh in the year [of the Greeks] 800, in the time of Zeno, that is to say 488 years after the coming of our Lord". The writer of this statement has made a mistake, for several circumstances show that Philoxenus was recalled from exile by Peter the Fuller in 485, and that he was ordained bishop in the same year, and it is said that his name was then changed from Akhsenaya to Philoxenus.

Soon after Philoxenus had become Bishop of Mabbogh some Persian bishops visited his city, and in the new bishop they are said to have recognized a slave who had fled from his master, and a man who had never been baptized; this statement is made both by Theodore the Reader and by Theophanes, and most writers upon the much-abused Philoxenus have gravely repeated it. The narrative of the scandal goes on to say that the Persian bishops made representations as to the impropriety of a man with such antecedents being Bishop of Mabbogh to Peter the Fuller, who answered that the service of ordination was sufficient to take the place of baptism, and he took no further steps in the matter. Whether Philoxenus was actually a slave, or only the son of a family who paid tribute to the Persian nobility or landed proprietors, is a matter of no consequence, but it can be proved from his own writings that he was baptized, and that he regarded baptism as a thing of no small importance. Thus in his treatise on the Incarnation of Christ he says:- "Now we will keep and preserve always the sign of belief and the seal of baptism and we will not destroy either by any manner of means". And in his letter to Zeno he says:- "The only begotten Son was One of the Trinity, even as His words to His disciples testify, Go ye forth and convert all nations and baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. For I was baptized in the name of Him that died, and I confess that He in Whose name I was baptized died for me, and I believe that I have put on in baptism Him in Whose name and in Whose death I was baptized": The report that Philoxenus was unbaptized is thus shown to be without foundation.

Of the period of the life of Philoxenus which immediately followed his ordination we know nothing, but we may be certain

that he ceased not to preach and to teach the doctrines which were approved by Peter the Fuller, and it is possible that during the first thirteen years of his episcopate he wrote parts or all of many of the works which have made his name so famous among Monophysite writers. In the year of the Greeks 809 (A. D. 497-8) we learn from Joshua the Stylite that Philoxenus was present at Edessa during the celebration of some heathen festival. For seven days before the appointed day arrived the people of Edessa went up to the theatre each evening in crowds; they were dressed in gorgeous apparel, and they burned incense, and danced through the whole of each night. In consequence of these things no man went to prayer, and the people became bolder and wickeder, for there was none in the city to rebuke them, and Joshua complains that, "although Xenaias, the Bishop of Mabbogh, was in Edessa at the time,—of whom beynod all others it was thought that he had taken upon him to labour in teaching,—yet he did not speak with them on this subject more than one day".

In the year 498 Flavian II ascended the episcopal throne of Antioch, and by suddenly declaring himself to be in favour of the decisions arrived at by the Council of Chalcedon—now hitherto he had denounced them—he made Philoxenus a bitter and implacable enemy who gave him no rest until he succeeded in effecting his deposition in 512. The first step taken by Philoxenus was to denounce Flavian II for secretly holding Nestorian doctrines, and when Flavian anathematized Nestorius and all his works, Philoxenus turned his attention to Dioscorus and Theodore, Theodoret Ibas, Cyrus, Eleutherius, and John, some of whom held the views of Nestorius, but the others having been accused of favouring him secretly had anathematized him, and he next insisted that unless Flavian anathematized all these he would hold him to be a Nestorian, notwithstanding his denial and anathema of Nestorius. He also tried to make the friends of Dioscorus and Eutyches unite with him against Flavian, and being joined by Eleusinus, a bishop of Cappadocia Secunda, and by Nicias of Laodicea in Syria, he succeeded in making him anathematize in writing Dioscorus and all who held views similar to his; this document Philoxenus sent at once to the Emperor Anastasius, whom he had been able to imbue with a belief in the

Nestorianising tendencies of Flavian. This took place A. D 507, and as a result Philoxenus was summoned to Constantinople by the Emperor, and the Church in that city was much disturbed at his arrival. In response to the wish of Anastasius Flavian modified his views, and with the help of some of his clergy, attempted to set them forth in a writing, which he sent to the Emperor. With this, however, Philoxenus was still dissatisfied, and he further insisted that Flavian should anathematize both the Council of Chalcedon and those who maintained two natures in our Lord's Person; but this Flavian declined to do, and was, in consequence, denounced afresh to the Emperor as a Nestorian. Shortly afterwards Flavian admitted publicly that although he approved of the Council of Chalcedon for deposing Nestorius and Eutyches, he did not consider its definitions of faith satisfactory. In answer to this statement Philoxenus, having persuaded the Bishops of Isauria to join him, drew up a creed in which they anathematized all who maintained two natures in our Lord's Person, and submitted it for signature to Flavian and to Macedonius of Constantinople; these prelates refused to sign the document and were in consequence excommunicated. In 512 a Council of eighty bishops met at Sidon by the Emperor's command to define the true faith; the presidents were Philoxenus and Soterichus of Caesarea, both of whom yearned for the downfall of Flavian and of his friend and ally Elias, Bishop of Jerusalem. The behaviour of the two parties was such that Anastasius dismissed the Council without recording his decision on the matters under dispute, and for a breathing space the opponents of Philoxenus had the advantage; but since it subsequently transpired that both Flavian and Elias had acted with duplicity the imperial protection was finally withdrawn from the former prelate and he was at once deposed and banished to Petra, and the famous Monophysite teacher Severus was appointed Patriarch of Antioch in his stead. Before this took place, however, the monks of the district of Cynegica in Syria, and those of the whole of Syria Prima had been stirred up or bribed by Philoxenus, and they rushed into the city of Antioch in a body, with great noise and tumult, and endeavoured to make Flavian anathematize the Council of Chalcedon and the document of Leo; but the people of the city rose in arms against them, and slew many of

them, and cast their bodies into the Orontes. Evagrius' description of the behaviour of Philoxenus on this occasion does not place him in a favourable light, but though admitting that zeal for his opinions would, no doubt, lead him to overstep all bounds to secure their acceptance in the Church, it is probable that we must make some allowance for the hostility of those to whose lot it has fallen to describe his life.

Flavian being removed from his seat Philoxenus seems to have rested content and to have devoted himself to writing his works and letters, the main object of which was to promote the Monophysite doctrines, until the year 518, when the orthodox Emperor Justin ascended the throne; soon after this event the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon were ratified by imperial command, and all the bishops who had been banished by Anastasius were restored to their sees. In the following year some fifty-four bishops who refused to accept the decrees of Chalcedon were banished, and among them were Severus of Antioch, Peter of Apamea, John of Tella and Philoxenus of Mabbogh. The Edessene Chronicle says:— "In the second year of the reign of Justin, that is the eight hundred and thirtieth year [of the Greeks = A. D. 518—519] he expelled Severus from Antioch, and Akhsenaya from Mabbogh, and all those who would not accept the four Synods" From a letter which Philoxenus wrote to the monks of the monastery of Senun near Edessa in 522 we learn that his first place of banishment was Philippopolis in Thrace; in the following year he was "sent into exile in Gangra [in Paphlagonia], and they shut him up in a room over the kitchen of a public inn, and there he was suffocated by smoke". In a life of Philoxenus quoted by Assemani the account of the manner in which he was murdered is more fully detailed, and the writer says:— "And having filled the Church with divine doctrines, and expounded the Scriptures, and laid open to disgrace the faith of the Nestorians by means of his writings against them, they cast him forth into exile in the city of Gangra, and they suffocated him with smoke. Now they shut him up in an upper chamber, and made smoke in the room below its and they shut the doors: in this way was he crowned, and he was suffocated by them in the true faith". Thus ended the life of this remarkable man.

It is evident from the few facts known concerning the life of Philoxenus that he was "energetic and fiery" in disposition, and a merciless and relentless opponent of all such as differed from him in their opinions on the natures of Christ; but the hatred of him as a man and the misrepresentation of his views which are found reflected in the writings of his biographers—who are generally his enemies—show that a final decision as to his behaviour and character cannot be arrived at until the case is stated from the point of view of Philoxenus. Theophanes describes him as an unbaptized and runaway slave who pretended to be a cleric, and in another place he calls him the "impious Xenaias"; and both Theophanes and Cedrenus speak of him as the "servant of Satan", and accuse him of holding the opinions of Manes. Evagrius, punning on the name Xenaias, says that he was "truly a stranger to God"; the just Tillemont accuses him of "corrupting the faith"; and Assemani says that "he would have wasted the Church of God like a wild boar". But if he made his opponents suffer he did not escape tribulation himself, and this we learn from a letter of his to the monks of the monastery of Senun wherein he says:— "What things I suffered from Flavian and Macedonius, who were archbishops in Antioch and Constantinople, and before them from Calandion, are known and spoken of in every place. But I keep silence concerning the things which were prepared to injure me in the time of the Persian war by the nobles through the care of him that is called Flavian the heretic, and also concerning the things which happened to me in Edessa, and in the country of the Apameans, and in that of the people of Antioch when I was in the monastety of Mar Bassus, and also in Antioch itself. And when I went up to Constantinople on two occasions the like things were done unto me by the Nestorian heretics": Before we pass from the subject of the accusation brought against him by his theological opponents, it must be mentioned that he was charged with being the author of the heresy of the breakers of the images of saints and angels, and it is asserted that as he would not venture to destroy those of Christ he hid them. Whatever may be the faults of Philoxenus all the known facts of this life, and the whole series of his writings from first to last testify to a tenacity of will, and a steadfastness of purpose, and a fixity of belief, and an energy in word and

deed which were exceedingly rare in the troubled times in which he lived. And when we consider the multitudinous affairs in which he was engaged, and the unflinching strife which he urged against Flavian between the years 498 and 512, and the labour of his first journey to Constantinople in 507, it seems little short of marvellous that he should have been able to find time to make a new translation of the four Gospels from Greek into Syriac; this work, however, he effected, and his translation appeared at Mabbogh in the year 508.

When we turn from the accounts of Theophanes, Cedrenus, Theodore Lector and others to the doctors of his own creed, we find that Philoxenus was esteemed by them a very learned man, and that his works were held in veneration by the greatest authors of the Monophysite Church. If we examine some ten MSS, in the British Museum only we see from the statements of the authors of the works contained in them that the authority of Philoxenus, on matters of doctrine, is considered equal to that of Severus of Antioch, Isaac of Antioch, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostem, Ephraim the Syrian, *etc.*, and Brit. Mus. MS. Rich, No. 7183, fol. 124, mentions the name of Philoxenus together with the name of Ephraim the Syrian, Jacob of Edessa, and Isaac [of Antioch] as writers from whose works it was necessary to cull Syriac words and expressions. The famous Dionysius bar-Salibhi, whom Wright calls the star among the Jacobites of the XIIth century, and who was himself a famous writer, says in the title to one of his commentaries that he gives in his work the opinions of the "true and orthodox doctors and holy fathers like Severus the Great, and Hippolytus of Rome, and Epiphanius of Cyprus and Philoxenus of Mabbogh, and Militus, and Evagrius, and Moses bar-Kepha, and Jacob of Edessa, and John of Constantinople, and John of Dara, and Mar Ephraim". But the final seal of approval is set upon the works of Philoxenus by Abu'l-Faraj Gregory, better known as Bar-Hebraeus, "one of the most learned and versatile men that Syria ever produced", who thus speaks: And Peter [the Fuller] appointed Saint Philoxenus to Mabbogh, a most eloquent man, and a marvellous teacher, who mightily routed those who maintained two natures [in Christ]; and he set forth healthy doctrines concerning the holy path of the monastic life. And he composed some discourses

n the holy festivals, and works of admonition of all kinds". The same writer mentions the Mabbogh translation of the Bible, which Philoxenus finished in 508, and the revision of parts thereof y Thomas of Harkel, and with this tacit admission of the value f perhaps the greatest of all his works by the greatest doctor of is Church we take leave of Philoxenus. O O

III

THE CREED OF PHILOXENUS

Apart from the evidence which may be derived from the great work of Philoxenus upon the Subject of how "one Person of the Holy Trinity became incarnate and suffered for us"-a work which supplies us with the reasons for the faith which he held, we are able to from a tolerably exact opinion of what he believed in respect of the Trinity from two short but remarkable tracts of which copies have come down to us; in the first he states definitely what reply a man is to make when questioned concerning his belief, and in the second he anathematizes the Council of Chalcedon and the creed promulgated thereby. The first document reads:-

"I believe in a Trinity,a Trinity which can neither be reduced nor diminished to Two [Persons], nor added unto so that it becometh Four [Persons]. Nothing from the fulness thereof can be deminished, neither can it receive any other person from without. Everything which is outside this Trinity hath been created, but whatsoever is contained therein hath been from everlasting. And it is adorable; nothing outside of it is to be worshipped, and within it there is nothing which worshippeth. Outside of it there is no other God at all, neither inside of it is there a man that hath been made. It diminisheth not in its Person, neither doth it add thereunto. In it, which hath existed for ever, there never began [to exist] a Person, and there doth not pass away therefrom a Person who hath come to an end.

"Now therefore, one of the Persons of this Trinity came down by the mystery of depletion, and of the Holy Virgin became man. Inasmuch as He was God, His nature was not changed in its being, and no addition to His Person took place, but He remained the Only-begotten, even after He had taken upon himself a body. For the act of comming into being did

introduce into the Only-begotten another first born, but
wed that the firstborn of the Virgin was the Only-begotten
the Father; for He, Who was the Only-begotten through His
th from the Eternal, Himself became the firstborn by His
th of the Virgin. And since God the Word, Who is of the
gin, is the Only-begotten, and since because He became man
the Virgin He is the firstborn, the Only-begotten is the
tborn, and the firstborn is the Only-begotten. And being
mself God, He is Son of God [and] Son of man; and Son of
n [and Son of] God; Son of the Eternal [and] Son of the
gin; Son of the Virgin [and] Son of the Eternal; the concealed
ealed, and the revealed concealed; a spiritual corporeal
ng, and a corporeal spiritual Being; a finite infinity;
no was upon the throne and was in the womb; Who
s in the womb and was upon the throne; Son of God Son
man; Son of man Son of God; the visible invisible; the
ncealed and invisible visible; the passible impassible;
impassible passible; the dead living, and the living dead;
no being in heaven was in Sheol, and Who being in Sheol
s in heaven. The Only-begotten is One Who hath no
mber among those who belong to heaven or among those
o belong to earth, for the attributes of the Only-begotten
long to the Only-begotten, and not unto various others, as those
o are in error say. For do not exalted things belong to the
alted? and lowly things to the humble? and divine qualities
God? and human attributes to man? But to the exalted one
o hath been abased belong lowly things; and of the God
ho became man we must belive human things; of the hidden
e who became revealed must we believe all contemptible
ings; and to the infinite God Who of His own will became
rtal man, and Who yet remained immortal God in His
ture, belong suffering and death. One of the Trinity became
e Only-begotten of the Father, the Word god became the
n of man by the Virgin by taking upon Himself, the body of our
ature, the nature, of the Word remaining unchanged, and He
imself, One God, Who was of God, suffered and died for us!
nd because He became the Son of Man, and remained [so]
His life and also in His death even as He continued in His
changing and eternal Being, He was also man in His Being.

The second document reads:—

I "We anathematize the Council of Chalcedon because it anathematized the true Council of three hundred and eighteen holy Fathers.

II "We anathematize the Council of Chalcedon because it hath acted hypocritically, and because it hath exceeded all men in wickedness—the ancients, those who come next, and those who have been in these last days; the ancients with Cyril in Ephesus, those who come next with Dioscorus in Ephesus, and those who have been in these last days in Chalcedon.

III "And we anathematize it also because it testified concerning itself and said that the canon of the Fathers commanded that anathema should be laid upon everyone who composed another faith.

IV "And we anathematize the Council of Chalcedon also because it anathematized Nestorius, although agreeing with him and with his doctrine.

V "And we anathematize the Concil of Chalcedon also because it received Leo the wicked, of Rome, and because it anathematized Dioscorus the confessor of the orthodox faith, who had anathematized Leo the wicked, and would not agree with him.

VI "And we anathematize the Council of Chalcedon also because it received Ibas and Theodoret as orthodox,

VII "And we anathematize the Council of Chalcedon also because it renewed the wicked tract and called it the true belief.

VIII "And we anathematize the Council of Chalcedon also because it distinguisheth in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, natures, and attributes, and functions, and celestial and terrestrial qualities, and Divine and human properties. And it considereth Him [to be] Two, and it introduceth an idea of Four, and it worshippeth an ordinary man, and in every particular it findeth Him to be creature, even as do the Jews and heathen, and

it agreeth with the wicked Nestorious who is accursed and doomed to perdition. For all these and for many other similar reasons we have anathematized and we will [always] anathematize the Council of Chalcedon.

"And it shall be anathematized, and heaven, and earth. and all the Church which hath been redeemed by the Blood and Resurrection of God shall say

"that there shall be a curse upon the Council of Chalcedon, and upon every one who hath agreed or agreeth therewith—except he hath already repented, or shall repent—for ever, Amen.

"Now the wicked Council of Chalcedon met in the days of e heathen Emperor Marcian, in the year seven hundred and ty-three (A. D. 451)".

To those who "divide our Lord" Philoxenus propounded the following questions:—

"If it be a demonstrable thing that Christ hath two natures to which of them did the Virgin gave birth?

"If the Son Who was born of the Virgin was called 'Emmanuel', which of the two natures carried off that name?

"If two natures be defined in Christ, which of the two did the Magi worship?

"When the Holy Spirit descended upon Christ in the Jordan which nature received Him?

"Saint Paul said, 'The weakness of God is stronger than men', and if Christ hath two natures what weakness did God acquire?

"If the Cross of our Redeemer be the cleansing of our sins, and our redemption from death—that is, if we ascribe these things to the human nature of Christ—how can Isaiah be right in saying, 'Not a messenger, and not an angel, but the Lord Himself bath redeemed us'?

"When God said, 'This is My beloved Son', which nature did He indicate as being that upon which it is right for us to call?

VIII "When Christ took Peter, and James, and John up into a mountain and was transfigured before their eyes which nature appeared in this glory?

IX "When the only son of the widow died and was taken to burial, which nature of Christ raised him to life again?

X "If He Who was crucified in the days of Pontius Pilate is to be worshipped rightly, not only by us, but also by the celestial hosts, doth He not receive this worship as God?"

And of his uncompromising opposition to Nestorius and his followers the following brief extracts from a short tract of Philoxenus supply evidence.

I "We should anathematize Nestorius, and his doctrine, and his books, and everything which hath been composed by him, and every person who hath been or is of his opinions.

II "We should anathematize the book of the heretics his children, and those who hold the same opinion as Nestorius and Diodorus who became Bishop of Tarsus. Now Diodorus was originally a Macedonian, but when he had embraced the true faith and had come into the orthodox Church, he fell into the heresy of Paul of Samosata.

III "And we should anathematize Diodorus who became a disciple of this man, and also Theodoret who became Bishop of Cyrrhus.

IV "We should accept the Henoticon which expelled all the additions and the novelties which arose against the faith of the three hundred and eighteen and of the one hundred and fifty Fathers.

V "We should accept the Twelve Chapters which Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, wrote against all the blasphemies of Nestorius, and which are also written in the Henoticon; and we should anathematize every one who agreeth with them, and also every solution of them (written by) the heretics.

VI "We should anathematize every one who would divide One Christ into two natures.

II "We should not mingle with heretics by any manner of means, by communion, or by the desire for salutation, or by the gifts which the churches are wont to make to each other, until we have truly anathematized by the Book all their doctrine, and all the works which have been made by man thereupon".

In another tract, which is divided into twenty short chapters, hiloxenus summarizes his objections to the Nestorian doctrines, ie following being the chief points of dispute:—

"If God the Word be One, and His Nature [One], and no other God and no other Nature exist, why when thou comest to the word 'God' dost thou say, 'One God Who hath put on a body'? and when thou comest to the word 'natures' dost not say, 'One Nature Who hath put on a body' instead of 'two natures'?

"If God Who hath put on a body be One, His Person Who hath put on the body is also One; and if the Person of the Word Who hath put on a body be One, the Nature of the Word Who hath put on a body must also be One. Now if the Nature of the Word Who hath put on the body be One, the Word then is not two Natures, but One-Nature Who hath put on a body. If He is not One Nature Who hath put on a body, neither is He One Person Who hath put on a body; and if He is not One Person of the Word who hath put on a body, neither is He God the Word Who hath put on a body.

I "If God the Word became man in His own Person, He also became man in His Nature, and His Nature Who became man is One.

"If His own flesh, [that is] the Word, is not like unto all [other] created things, but it existeth in its own Person, then it must exist in its own Nature, and if in its own Nature, no other natural thing can be reckoned [with] His flesh, but the Nature of the Word which is incarnate is One·

"If two natures of Christ exist, a Divine Nature, and a human nature, there should not be one worship for both· For if the human nature be accounted to be outside the

Divine Nature, when thou worshippest the Divine Nature thou dost not worship the human nature, and if thou dost not worship it, it must be another thing, and if it be another thing it must be a created thing.

VI "If Christ be two natures then both must be composite. And if composite, then simple; and if simple, then incarnate; and if incarnate, then one is incarnate, and the other simple. What then are they?

VII "If the Word, having become incarnate, be two Natures, the Word having become incarnate must also be two Persons; but if the Person of the incarnate Word be One, the Nature of the incarnate Word must also be One, because the Person of the Word is not inferior to His Nature, for as the Nature of the Word is Godhead, even so also is the Person of the Word Godhead.

VIII "If there be a Nature Who hath individual attributes which the Person thereof hath not, or if there be a Person Who hath individual attributes, which His Nature hath not, then the attributes of the Nature belong to His Person, and the attributes of the Person belong to His Nature. If a Person existed Whose attributes did not belong to His nature, then His Nature could not exist; and again if a Nature existed Whose attributes did not belong to His Person, then His Person could not exist. If the attributes of the Person belong to the Nature, and the attributes of the Nature belong to the Person thereof, how canst thou say that Christ is two natures?

IX "If thou sayest that Christ is two natures, a Divine Nature, and a human Nature, and One Person, and thou attributest to the Divine Person the attributes of the Divine Nature and the attributes of the human nature, how canst thou attribute terrestrial and celestial qualities to the Divine Person and yet put them away from the Divine Nature? Is the Divine Person iuferior to its Divine Nature? and what His Person is not that also His Nature?

X "And how canst thou expect me to accept that which thou sayest, 'One Person', since thou speakest also of 'two natures which run with their individual qualities and attributes and operations'; for if there be two natures how can there be One Person? Tell me: He must be either Divine or human, or the two make One Person. The Natures must be perfect or imperfect, and they have either Persons or they have not. Which nature of the two is without Person? the Divine or the human? Either one half of the Person worketh each Nature or they have two Persons like two Natures.

XI "There is not a nature without a Person, neither is there a Person without a nature. For if there are two natures then there must also be two Persons and two Sons; for if the Person is One, then the nature is One, even as the Person is One.

XII Tell me now: If thou dost attribute to God the Word after His Incarnation a Divine nature and a human nature which one is the Person of flesh, and which of Godhead?

XIII "Tell me: Dost thou say that the Word of God, the Son of God, was perfect before the Incarnation of nature and Person, or not?

XIV "In the Person which hath two natures, which redeemed, and which was redeemed? Which suffered and which did not suffer? Which died and which did not die?

XV "Tell me: How canst thou say that the Word after His Incarnation is two natures and One Person? Is it a Divine Person or a human Person? Or is it a Divine and human Person? If the Person be human how is it that the nature of the Word is without a Person? And if the Person be One, Divine and human, how is that He is not One nature, even as He is One Person?

XVI "When thou confessest two natures and One Person, how can confusion be avoided? Tell me now: Is this One Person composed of two Natures or of One? If of two, then each nature constitutes one half of the Person, and

if of one then it is either a Divine nature without a Person or a human Nature. If He be Divine and human it is One Person, and therefore Divine and human are One nature. If He be not One nature, then He is not One Person, and if He be not One Person the matter is answered.

XVII "Can a nature exist which hath attributes which attributes do not belong to His Person? or can a Person exist which hath attributes that do not belong to His nature? Either the attributes of the Person belong to His Nature, or the attributes of His Nature belong to His Person.

XVIII "If the Virgin was the God-bearer then He that was born is God. Who then is He that was born of the Virgin, Jesus Christ? If Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin and the Virgin was the God-bearer, then Jesus Christ is God, and not a man in whom God dwelt.

XIX "Since thou confessest that the Holy Virgin is the God-bearer, and that God was born of the Virgin, why dost thou seek to show that Jesus Christ is not God? For if Jesus Christ is not God then the Virgin is not the God-bearer, and how canst thou deny and at the same time say that the Virgin is the God-bearer whilst thou sayest that He that is born of her is man and not God?

XX "If she who gave birth be the God-bearer, how can He that was born be a man? But if He that was born be a man, how can she that gave birth be the God-bearer? If He that was born be another, then the mother must have served unto another, and this is ridiculous."

The writings of Philoxenus against the Nestorian creed do not however, indicate in any way the utter abomination with which he regarded the beliefs of many other sects and their leaders who lived about his own time, and although a thorough supporter of the Monophysite doctrine would have no difficulty in scenting heresy, however carefully concealed, and wherever found, there were certainly many weak-kneed brethren who could be easily led out of the path which the zealous Philoxenus would have

them tread. For the guidance of these and of newly made converts, he found it necessary to draw up a short statement of the principal tenets of the most famous heretics, and by good fortune a copy of this most interesting document has been preserved unto our times. As in the case of many other tracts of Philoxenus which are extant in a single MS. only, and which were copied a century or two after their author's death, the text, in all places, does not appear to be free from corruptions; but as to the general meaning of the composition there is no doubt whatever. The translation is as follows:—

Mani, and Marcion, and Eutyches deny the Incarnation of the Word God of the holy Virgn Mary, and they consider the mysteries of Divine dispensation to be vain imaginations and idle fancies, and they say that the Word passed through the Virgin as through a tube taking nothing at all from her. Lantinos (?) and Bar-daisan say that the Word brought down a body from heaven, and that the Incarnation of the Word did not take place of Mary. Apollinaris considered the Incarnation of God the Word in an ignorant manner, and Ennomius said, 'The Word received the body only from Mary, and not the soul', but said he 'divinity took the place of a soul'.

Now Diodorus, and Theodorus, and Theodoret, and Nestorius, and Irenaeus, and Eutherius, and Alexander, and Andrew, and Ibas, and Put (Photius?), and Cyr, and John, and Acacius, and Barsauma say, 'Christ is an ordinary man, and One who shone by reason of His good works; and God loved Him, and delivered by Him the children of men.' And they say, 'He died, and he who dwelt in Him raised Him up again'. And they divide Him into two sons, and two natures, and two persons—one of God the Creator, and one of man, one made and the other the Maker. Arius said, 'The Son of God is a created thing', and Paul of Samosata said, 'Christ is an ordinary man, like one of the Prophets and [other] righteous men'. And that addition, which took place at Chalcedon, proclaimeth a fourth Person in the Trinity, and it bringeth in Christ after the Trinity. Now the Jews say, 'This Christ Who came, and Whom the Christians worship, was a deceiver and a liar, and being a man He made Himself out to be God, that is to say, the true Christ; and while

looking for the lying Christ, that is Antichrist, they will say that He is about to come.

Orthodox Christians, the children of the Holy Church, confess One Nature of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. And they believe that one of the Persons of this Trinity—the second Person of the Trinity—Himself came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary, and He took from her a body, but the incarnation made no addition to His Person, for as it was a Trinity, so it remained, even after one of the Trinity, God the Word, had become incarnate. And He in very truth was born and was made manifest in the world, and He ate, and drank, and was aweary, and rested, and tasted sufferings in truth, and He was crucified, and was buried, and rose on the third day, as it is written. And by the Will of His Father, and by the Will of the Holy Spirit, He sitteth upon the everlasting throne at the right hand of His Father, and He will come to judge the dead and the living, to whom, and to His Holy Spirit be glory, always and for ever and ever, Amen. ○○

IV

THE WORKS OF PHILOXENUS

The following is a list of the works of Philoxenus preserved in London, Paris, Rome, and Oxford.

1. A literal translation of the Old and New Testaments which was completed about A. D. 508 Saint Luke are preserved in Add. 17, 126, fol. 35.

iii An Order of Holy Baptism.

iv A lesser Order of the Consecration of Water for Baptism to be used in the case of a child who will certainly die, and cometh to be baptized.

v Eucharistic prayers:
a) "When a man wisheth to draw nigh to the "Holy Mysteries let him pray thus.

vi Anaphoras

vii An exposition on the parable of the ten talents.

viii A treatise showing that one Person of the Holy Trinity became incarnate and suffered for us.

ix Three Discourses on the Trinity and on the Incarnation.

x Thirteen Discourses on the Christian life and character.

xi A tract on various heresies (Manes, Marcoin, Eutyches, Diodorus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Nestorius, etc.), and a profession of faith:

xii Twelve Chapters against those who maintain two natures in Christ and one Person.

xiv Seven Chapters against Nestorius, Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and those who hold the doctrine of two natures, and accepting the Henoticon and the twelve Chapters of Cyril.

xv	Five Chapters against the Nestorians.
xvi	A Discourse against the Nestorians and Eutychians.
xvii	A Disputation with a Nestorian scribe concerning Jesus Christ.
xviii	Ten Chapters against those who divide our Lord after His indivisible union.
xix	Seven chapters against those who say that what is bad in the doctrine of heretics should be cursed, but not the heretics, themselves and their whole doctrine.
xx	Three additional Chapters against heresies.
xxi	On the Union of the two Natures.
xxii	A confession of Faith
xxiii	A confession of Faith
xxiv	The Faith of Philoxenus
xxv	A Confession of faith, in ten sections, directed against the Council of Chalcedon.
xxvi	A Confession of Faith
xxvii	A Discourse on Faith
xxviii	A Discourse on Faith
xxix	A Reply to be made by anyone, when questioned as to his belief.
xxx	A Declaration of the One Nature in Christ
xxxi	On the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin
xxxii	A Discourse addressed to one who asked him, whether the Holy Ghost departs from a man when he sins, or returns to him when he repents.
xxxiii	A paraenetic discourse
xxxiv	A Funeral Sermon
xxxvi	A penitential Prayer
xxxvii	A prayer to be said whenever a man pleaseth
xxxviii	A prayer
xxxix	A Prayer of Supplication
xl	Prayers for the seven canonical Hours

xli Morning Prayer

xlii Terce

xliii Compline

xliv Letter to the Monks of Senun, concerning the Incarnation and Faith, etc., written during his second exile at Philippopolis.

xlv Two Letters to the Monks of Teleda

xlvi Letter to Patricius, the Edessene monk, on purity of the soul and how it may be acquired.

xlvii Letter to the Monks of Amid on zeal

xlviii Letter to Abraham and Orestes, Priests of Edessa, concerning Stephen bar Sudh-aile.

xlix Letter to Abu Nafir of al-Hira on Nestorius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Eutyches, and others.

l Letter to the Emperor Zeno on the Incarnation of God the Word.

li Letter to John II. of Alexandria

lii Two Letters to the Monks of Beth Gogal

liii Letter to a monk who had recently become converted

liv Letter to a disciple, on the forsaking of the world and on the monastic life.

lv Letter to the Christians at Arzon

lvi Letter to a convert from Judaism

lvii Letter to Maron the lector, of Anazarba

lviii Letter to one of his disciples

lix Letter to the Recluses

lx Letter on the duties of the ascetic life

lxi Letter to a lawyer who had become a monk

lxii Letter against Habib

lxiii Letter to Simon, the Archimandrite of Teleda a fragment

lxiv Letter to the Orthodox monks in the East

lxv Tract on Chastity – a fragment

lxvi The Book of Sentences

lxvii On the tranquillity of the convent life
lxviii Rules for the Monastic Life
lxix On the Fear of God
lxx On Humility
lxxi On Repentance
lxxii On Prayer
lxxiii On Prayer
lxxiv On Prayer
lxxv Against passions in the soul
lxxvi On the tonsure
lxxvii On Virginity
lxxviii On the Quotations in the Epistles of Saint Paul
lxxix On the man who wilfully transgresseth the prohibition of the priests.
lxxx A hymn on the Nativity.

V

CHRISTOLOGY OF PHILOXENOS

REV. DR. M. A. MATHAI—RAMBAN

Philoxenos of Mabbug was one among the main protagonists of the fifth and sixth century Christological controversy in the Christian Church. The life, works and theological views of this bishop of the Antiochian Church were all influenced by the struggles of that controversial period. The Christology of Philoxenos reflects his untiring efforts to save the faith of the Church from all the wrong Christological perspectives which existed at his time.

He was born in the village of Tahl in the region of Beth Garmai, in Persia, between 430 and 440 AD in an Aramaic Christian family. After receiving baptism, he took the monastic profession of 'Aksenoyuto' which existed in Persia at that time due to the persecutions. Thus he was called 'Aksenoyo' in the sense of an itinerant monk. He travelled and stayed in different monasteries in the confines of Roman territories in the East and taught in the monastic schools.

Aksenoyo studied in the School of the Persians at Edessa when it was dominated by the theological thought of the Antiochian Christologians Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret of Cyrrus. This was during the second episcopate of Iba at Edessa and the directorate of Narsai at the School of Edessa (451—457). Aksenoyo was trained in the school in philosophical and theological speculation, knowledge of the writings of the Fathers of the Church, the Antiochian exegetical method and Christian spirituality. He became a supporter of the Alexandrian Christology which was opposed to that of the Antiochians. In the school the Alexandrian group was a minority. Since both the bishop Iba and the director of the school Narsai were supporters of the Antiochian Christology,

they expelled from the school (c. 457 AD) the group of students who 'disobeyed Iba'. Aksenoyo was one among this group of the Alexandrian minority.

Then he visited the monasteries in the vicinity of Edessa and taught the faith of the Church for a long time. During this period he must have received the name 'Philoxenos', a Greek equivalent to his Aramaic name 'Aksenoyo'. Philoxenos came to the diocese of Antioch during the patriarchate of Calendion (c. 479 AD) and soon became actively involved in the controversy of the Trisagion there. Philoxenos defended the developed Trisagion introduced by his friend Peter the Fuller, the predecessor of Calendion, but then in exile. Calendion opposed it. Being a Cyrillian Christologian, Philoxenos supported also the Henotikon of Zeno, issued in 482 AD, which was more non-Chalcedonian than Chalcedonian in its Christological emphasis. Calendion, because of his aversion towards the Henotikon, expelled Philoxenos from the diocese of Antioch (c. 484 AD) as a 'preacher of Cyrillian Christology, supporter of the developed Trisagion and the Henotikon'.

In 484 AD the Emperor Zeno deposed Patriarch Calendion from Antioch and bishop Cyrus from Hierapolis (Mabbug) because they disagreed to sign the Henotikon. He re-called Peter the Fuller who returned with his friend Philoxenos to Antioch. Emperor Zeno reinstated Peter the Fuller on the throne of the Antiochian see after signing the Henotikon. Peter the Fuller ordained Philoxenos bishop of Mabbug in 485 AD. During the peaceful early period of his episcopate (485—498 AD) Philoxenos could fulfil his duty as a pastor of souls writing doctrinal and spiritual treatises and making contact with the Christians in Persia while propagating his Alexandrian Christological views.

The time of the Patriarchate of Flavian II at Antioch (498—512 AD) was a troubled period for Philoxenos. The latter opposed the former because of his adherence to the Antiochian Christologians and the council of Chalcedon both of which were condemned by a synod in Constantinople in 499 AD and at which both Patriarch Flavian II and Philoxenos participated. Because of his free access to the Emperor Anastasius, Philoxenos was able to persuade the latter to summon synods at Antioch (509 AD)

and at Sidon (512 AD) in order to force Flavian to condemn the council of Chalcedon and all those who accepted 'two natures in Christ' or otherwise be expelled from the throne. Philoxenos achieved this end in 512 AD at a synod in Laodicea. The synod deposed Flavian and consecrated Severus Patriarch of Antioch.

Philoxenos together with the Patriarch Severus (512—519 AD) reunified the Syrian East in the Empire against Chalcedon and established unity with the Patriarchs Timotheos of Constantinople and John of Alexandria. But in 518 the Emperor Justin, who succeeded Anastasius, re-established unity between bishop Hormisdas of Rome and the Patriarch John of Constantinople and commanded strict obedience to the council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo as the criterion of faith in the Empire. Severus, Philoxenos and all the other bishops who were against were expelled in 519 AD. Philoxenos was first exiled to Gangra, then to Philippopolis and again back to Gangra. He wrote four letters from his exile of which three are extant. Those letters describe also the persecution that he had undergone in the exile. He died at Gangra, possibly of suffocation, on 10th December, 523 AD. He is considered one of the Fathers of the Church in the Syrian Orthodox Tradition, which commemorates his feast on December 10th.

The works of Philoxenos reflect the best Syriac scholarship, doctrinal convictions and spiritual upbringing of the author. In his exegetical method he follows the Antiochian literal method though in his doctrinal views he is purely Alexandrian. His ascetical works have a Pauline trichotomical view (1 Cor. 2. 14, 15; 3. 3—sarkikos, psochikos, pneumatikos). The influence of the fourth-century Evagrius Ponticus on Philoxenos' ascetic works is also considerable. His published works are 37 out of which 30 are authentic and 7 are of dubious authenticity. The un-published works are 31 out of which 21 are authentic and 10 are of dubious authenticity. Two nonextant works are his 'Letter to Stephen Bar Sudaily' on spirituality and the Letter to Beronicianus concerning persecutions in his exile.

A study on the 21 Christological works of Philoxenos, other than his Dogmatic Letter and the Ten Discourses against Habib will show that, although his main Christological views remained

the same before and after those two works, his arguments in other works are characterised by the historical circumstances in which they were composed, such as the controversy of the Trisagion, the conflict with Flavian II over the question of Chalcedon and the Antiochian Christologians, the exile, persecution and the like. The main concern of his works between 476 and 485 AD was the question of the developed Trisagion. His Christology was developed in its defence. There was no attack against Chalcedon or mention of the Henotikon in these works. In his later works from 500 to 522 AD Philoxenos attacked the council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo while describing the Henotikon as the 'unifier of the churches everywhere'. This silence on chalcedon during this period is probably because the Henotikon was considered by Philoxenos in its Christological affirmations to condemn the council of Chalcedon, though we know that it does not condemn either, the council of Chalcedon or the Tome of Leo, but only the teachings of Eutyches and Nestorius. We think that the adherence of Flavian II to Chalcedon provoked him to write against it.

From the study of the Dogmatic Letter of Philoxenos, the Treatise of Habib against it and the Ten Discourses of Philoxenos against Habib we see that Philoxenos and Habib knew each other. Habib was a simple Syrian monk, probably from Persia. He had a basic knowledge of Scripture, Philosophy and the Tradition of the Church. His Christological opinions much resembled the Christology of the Antiochian Christologians Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius as well as that of Paul of Samosata. But it is difficult to identify him conclusively as a 'Nestorian' or 'Chalcedonian'. There was no docetic Christology in him. He was also a learned debater like Philoxenos. We think that the insufficient explanation of doctrinal affirmations in the Dogmatic Letter of Philoxenos caused Habib to misunderstand Philoxenos. We cannot blame Philoxenos either for this because he wrote for monks who knew well Philoxenos and his teachings. This is why Habib interpreted Philoxenos in ways different from the intention of the author.

The answers of Philoxenos to the objections and arguments of Habib in the Ten Discourses reflect the main Christological affirmations of Philoxenos. They reveal that Philoxenos knew

well the Platonic, Aristotelian and Stoic Philosophical systems. Most of his theological ideas are nothing but a developed presentation of the theology of Ephrem the Syrian joined to Alexandrian and Cappadocian theological perspectives. This helped Philoxenos maintain and defend his personal findings and developments in theology. Habib lacked a really thorough knowledge of the writings of the Fathers which caused him to contradict even basic patristic affirmations. A very clear example is his use of the examples of 'the temple and its indweller' and the 'lamb of Egypt', to support his dualistic Christology while the Fathers used them differently for representing the reality of the Manhood of Christ and His death for others, in a Christology of unity.

Is there anything in which Philoxenos and Habib were in agreement? Both for Habib and Philoxenos the prime interest was soteriology, and this lay under their Christological arguments. Unfortunately, in their urge to defend each one's own position both of them became polemical which resulted sometimes even in false accusations and illogical arguments. Both of them had the idea that the word 'kyono' represents a concrete being or reality. Both Philoxenos and Habib used the words 'flesh', 'body' and 'man' as synonymous, meaning a man with true body, soul and intelligence. Both of them emphasized the reality of Christ's manhood which was the central point of dispute. Both of them did not hold a docetic Christology though they accused each other of such. We could not find in either of them the heresies of Arius, Eunomius, Marcion, Mani, Bardaisan, Valentinius, Eutyches and Apollinarius because both of them denied them as false teachings though they accused each other and tried to prove that the other held those heresies.

While both of them agreed that the Manhood of Christ was a real manhood with true human needs an extreme emphasis on this point in the system of Habib resulted in his assigning to Christ two self-sufficient centres of actions or subjects, while through a balanced explanation of the Godhead and Manhood of the Incarnate Word of God, Philoxenos safeguarded the radical unity of the subject and the recognition of both the divine and human properties which were made common in the one united

kyono of Godhead and Manhood in Christ. Both Habib and Philoxenos are found in agreement also on the fact that the word 'Ityo' in its proper sense is applicable only to God. But the latter distinctly explained of the possibility of the word 'Ityo' being used also concerning creation in the sense that there exist created ityo different from the uncreated ityo, God. This idea of Philoxenos is an adaptation from the Greek Philosophical and Patristic traditions.

A Chronologic and spatial limitation or movement of God because of His omnipresence was inconceivable to both Habib and Philoxenos. Both of them considered Christ as One Son, One Lord, One Christ, but Habib abstained from saying One God and One Word because the point of dispute there was the union. We find from their explanations that both of them considered that Christ's body was a real body capable of undergoing suffering and death while the use of the terms 'impassible, passible, immortal, mortal, corruptible, incorruptible' were misunderstood by each. The words 'passibility, corruptibility and mortality' concerning Christ, used by Habib in the sense of a capacity to suffer, to be corrupted and to die of the man taken by the Word, were misunderstood by Philoxenos as the inevitable passibility, corruptibility and mortality of that man Christ. The words 'Impassibility, Incorruptibility and Immortality of Christ which Philoxenos used concerning the qnumo the Son of God unconditionally and concerning the Manhood of Christ as the absence of the inevitability of suffering, decomposition of body and soul (corruption) and death were misunderstood by Habib concerning the Manhood of Christ as its unconditional Impassibility, Incorruptibility and Immortality. Both Philoxenos and Habib admitted that in the death of Christ there was no ceasing of God's existence.

Now, in what do they differ from each other? The real difference between the systems of Habib and Philoxenos started from their different notions on the doctrine of the Trinity. While the word 'kyono' signifies for both a concrete being, for Philoxenos it signified such both in the generic sense and in the sense of an individual or a concrete being. In this Philoxenos is in line with Ephrem, Athanasius and Cyrill of Alexandria. Con-

cerning 'qnumo' there is a big difference between Habib and Philoxenos. Habib never considered 'qnumo' an individual but an impersonal yet distinct attribute of power. This resulted in Habib's explaining the Trinity in a modalistic way. Philoxenos explained the qnumo as a concrete individual with distinctive and particular characteristics. This helped him to explain the Trinity following the Alexandrian and Cappadocian Fathers as 'one kyono in three qnume and three qnume in one kyono.'

A sound Trinitarian theology is indispensable for a sound Christology. The above understanding of Habib concerning 'qnumo' prevented him from accepting a personal descent of the Son of God in the Incarnation. Philoxenos understood this difficulty of Habib and insisted on the concept of the personal descent of the Qnumo of the Son of God in the Incarnation. Since Habib did not find the three Father, Son and Holy Spirit as three qnume, personal existence in the sense of a concrete being was according to him the 'divine kyono' of God. So in Habib's system the descent of God is not personal descent but the eternal kyono (eternal qnumo) took a man and dwelt in him. Is it a personal dwelling? Habib is not clear. But because of his insistence on the existence of Christ in two kyone and two qnume, in that man taken, he accepts two individualities in Christ.

In Habib's explanation this kind of an indwelling results in two distinct properties acting sometimes particularly and sometimes commonly. Because of this 'union' Christ is called by the names one Son, one Jesus, one Lord, one Glory, one worship but not one kyono, one qnumo, one God or one Word. All the operations of Christ beginning from His birth to death are attributed by Habib separately between the two kyone or two qnume. This is really the weak part of his Christology because it lacks the oneness of the subject of operations in Christ, the cardinal point of soteriology.

The same insistence on the duality of operations in the one Christ is seen in the Antiochian Christologians Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius. Both they and Habib insisted on the 'one son' and not two sons. This helps us understand how this conjunction, rather than union, which the son of David had with the Son of God in the sharing of the 'sonship'

of the latter by the former is common in the systems of the Antiochian Christologians and in that of Habib. This prosopic union and the lack of union of the kyono and qnumo raise here the question of salvation. By whom was it effected? If by the human operations of a man then none is saved. The difficulty of understanding the mystery of God's union with the human kyono in becoming a perfect man without change to the kyono of God led them to this 'easier' solution. While recognizing this a mystery incomprehensible to the human mind, Philoxenos insisted on the subject of the Incarnation as the Son of God, one of the Trinity, who united His Manhood to His Godhead to become one.

The difference here between Habib and Philoxenos is that for the former the subjects in Christ are two whereas for the latter the subject of all the operations, both divine and human, is the Incarnate Son of God who is the origin of both His divine and human properties revealed in a real union and resulting in one and the same Incarnate kyono and qnumo. The united kyono of the Godhead and Manhood of the Incarnate Word of God has united divine-human properties, existing or expressed not particularly but commonly. So Philoxenos could attribute all human predicates like birth, growth, needs, sufferings and death to the one Incarnate Son of God. A lack of this kind of view even caused Habib to refrain from calling the Holy Virgin Mary Mother of God. Failure to recognize the fact of the oneness of the subject of all the operations in Christ is the real error in Habib. According to Philoxenos the Manhood of the Incarnate Son of God served Him for accomplishing the salvation of the whole human race. This is the Patristic Christological tradition. The personal death of a man taken by God would result only in his own salvation. The intention and concern of Habib for soteriology is laudable and we are sorry for him that he failed in his aim because of his wrong way of understanding the salvific acts of Christ. Even though Habib did not either praise or deny the Antiochian Christologians Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius he held a similar Christology.

Now, what can we say of the Christology of Philoxenos? His Christology is closely related to his Trinitarian theology. The central emphasis of his Christology is the oneness and the same-

ness of the subject of Economy in the Incarnation who is the Incarnate Son of God. The place of this qnumo of the Son of God in the Trinity as one qnumo of the Trinity and His descent are traditional ideas found in the earlier Fathers of the Church which are contextually developed by Philoxenos in his discourses against Habib. He developed a 'Theology of Becoming' comparing the 'Son of God's becoming man with becoming spirituals or sons of God by baptized Christians and with many other examples. The Theology of Becoming is the dynamic centre of his Christological views concerning the human birth, growth, operations, needs, suffering, death and resurrection of the Incarnate Son of God.

The perfect Word of God became perfect Man with a true body endowed with a rational soul and mind. He united to Himself the Manhood of our kyono. In this union neither the Godhead was changed into Manhood nor His Manhood was changed into His Godhead. He is bar-kyono with His Father in His Godhead and bar-kyono with us in His Manhood. The manner of this union is an ineffable mystery known only to God but is recognised by us through faith. Thus 'faith' and 'mystery' found their important place in the Christology of Philoxenos. In this united kyono of the Godhead and Manhood of the One Incarnate Word his divine and human properties are united to become common in everything to the One Incarnate qnumo who became the origin of both.

After the Incarnation Christ does not exist 'in two kyono but 'in One Incarnate kyono' because of unity. Since for Philoxenos 'one kyono' meant 'one concrete and individual being' he correctly used the expression 'One Incarnate kyono' in order to avoid the concept of two concrete beings or subjects in the one Christ. In its meaning it was the same 'One Incarnate nature of God the Word' the greatest formula of Cyrillian Christology.

We find that since the phrase 'humanly natural or naturally' are used in the sense of fallen human nature by Philoxenos, birth, growth, operations and death of the Incarnate Son are not understood by him as 'naturally' or 'humanly natural'. According to him, in that sense all operations of the fallen human nature are

inevitably mixed with lust in which he concurs with Gregory of Nyssa. At the same time Philoxenos affirmed that the birth, growth, needs, suffering and death of Christ are really human in their characteristics, in the sense of a pure human nature without its defects from sin. For this he used the phrases 'according to the human kyono, from the human kyono transcending the human kyono, voluntarily and miraculously'. This represents an important development in his Christology. A further development and explanation of these terms is found in his 'Mathew–Luke commentary' and in his 'Letter to the Monks of Senoun'.

Another appreciable development in his Christology in his concept of the 'voluntary and living death' of the Incarnate Son of God which we find in almost all his Christological works. Christ, being born 'transcending the human kyono' from the Holy Virgin Mary, was in His Manhood free from the inevitable mortality and corruption of the body, the separation of body from soul that makes both lifeless, all of which are the after-effects of the Adamic sin added as defects to 'true Manhood'. Thus the death that He fulfilled undergoing the corruption of His body was not His personal death, but the death of the whole human race of which He also *became* a member by His Manhood. In this voluntary death for others His body and soul were separated, ending His earthly life, whereas both of them remained living through the living Word of God whose were that body and soul. Excellent Christological explanation of this type we see beginning from his first letter to the monks of Teleda.

Philoxenos' special way of considering the oneness of knoyo, qnumo and parsopo in Christ is important. For this reason he made the following affirmations. 'In the One Incarnated qnumo of the Son of God: everything of man is of God and everything of God is of man; the particular properties of Godhead and Manhood became in everything common; all attributes of the Son of God are also said of the Son of Man and vice versa. In this manner the Son of Man descended from heaven and the Son of God is from the descendance of David; His Manhood is of His Godhead and His Godhead is of His Manhood; *pagronuto* is of the *Ruhono* and *ruhonuto* is of the *Pagrono*; body of the non-corporal and non-corporeity of the Corporal.' We find here

the traditional idea of 'Communicatio idiomatum' (Christological). However, philoxenos never used this phrase though he held an idea similar to it. We think that he may have avoided it because of its limitations in giving a wrong slant to 'the humanizing of the Godhead' just as 'the divinizing of the Manhood' by mutual compenetration.

The doctrinal affirmations of the councils of Nicea, Constantinople, and Ephesus are Philoxenos' bases for the authority of faith. Although absent in his 'Ten Discourses against Habib', the main objection of Philoxenos against the council of Chalcedon put forth in his later works is centred on the phrase 'in two natures' in the definition of faith of Chalcedon. But both Chalcedon and Philoxenos condemned Nestorianism and Eutychianism as they were known to them. So from a careful study of the terminology of the definition of faith of Chalcedon compared with the Christology of Philoxenos we can say that the underlying faith of the Chalcedonian definition and the Christology of Philoxenos is the same, because it is the already existing Christology of the earlier Fathers of the Church up to Chalcedon. How can it be explained that the newly added phrase 'Christ is made known in two natures' does not imply two centres of operation resulting in two subjects, though it affirms Him as 'one hypostasis'? Philoxenos rejected the phrase 'in two natures' in the definition of Chalcedon because of its absence in the writings of the earlier Fathers and since kyono meant a concrete being for him. We find the same objection to the phrase as the 'impedimentum dirimens' concerning Chalcedon by all the later non-Chalcedonians, while all of them agree on the same faith. This is evident also from the agreed statements of faith in the recent 'Non-official consultations between the Chalcedonians, both Byzantine[1] and Roman Catholic[2], and the non-Chalcedonians.

---

1 For the documents, see GOTR, 1964: 10; 1968: 13, 14; 1970—71: 15, 16.

2 For the documents, see 'Wort und Warheit, Pro-Oriente, Vienna, Supplement 1, 2, 3, 4 (1972, 1974, 1976, 1978).

The influence of the Christology of Philoxenos in the non-Chalcedonian traditions of the Church, especially in the Syrian Orthodox Church, is remarkable. Severus of Antioch, 'his contemporary and co-worker developed the same Christological tradition though with a rational method of approach. Jacob of Saroug, their contemporary had the same Christological views. The expression 'one Incarnate kyono or qnumo' is seen in both of them. The 'one united nature' in the system of Philoxenos is the same 'one composite nature' in the system of Severus because both expressions signify Christ 'one Incarnate qnumo of Godhead and Manhood'. The later theologians of the non-Chalcedonian Tradition, especially in the Syrian Orthodox Church like Jacob of Edessa, Mose Bar Kepa, Michael the Syrian, Dionesius Bar-Slibi and Bar Hebreus followed the methods of both Philoxenos and Severus. A careful study of the liturgical texts of the Syrian Orthodox Church reveals to us the immense use of Philoxenian and Severian theological perspectives both on the mystery of the Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God. Finally we are concerned here with the unity of the Church. For more than fifteen centuries the Churches which accept and those which reject the council of Chalcedon remain separated from the Eucharistic Communion, though both of them preserve the same faith in Christ. Historical facts and terminological difference rather than real differences of Christology keep them aloof to each other. This fact was stressed by Pope Paul VI, Patriarch-Pope Shenouda and Patriarch Ignatius Jacob III in their mutually agreed declarations. We are conscious that the use of correct terminologies is necessary to articulate a right faith. Analysis of Philoxenos' Christology seems to us to suggest a formula 'Christ is made known in the One United Nature of His Godhead and Manhood' instead of 'Christ is made known in two natures' that at the same time might satisfy both sides and help them discover their deeper unity of faith in the oneness of Christ and the salvation that He accomplished through His Manhood. We hope that the Holy Spirit will unite us in the one faith which is in the Incarnate Son of God. ○○

APPENDIX

I PHILOXENUS

On the indwelling of the Holy Spirit

A memra by the blessed Mar Philoxenus in answer to someone who asked him whether the Holy Spirit departs from a man when he sins and returns to him again when he repents.

WE SHOULD MAKE ANSWER to enquiries of this sort, relying not on our own opinion, but rather on the teaching of the holy Scriptures, for there will be found the solution of every problem that is posed in real faith. Further we may not ask and put to each other (just) any question that arises, but only those that it is proper to ask, and which are profitably posed. For what is the purpose of a disciple asking this question: 'Does the Holy Spirit depart from a man during the time that he sins, and return to him at the moment of his repentance?', if it is not to ask and enquire how one cannot sin, or if one happens to sin, how one can most quickly feel revulsion for that sin, and turn to penitence.

Now there are many subtle questions one can ask on the subject of how not to sin, and there are just as many subtle traps laid by the devil who causes us to sin, whose first objective is to ensnare us, and once he has done this he devises means of preventing us from escaping from our bonds, And just as the idea of our being caught, and then our not being released once we are caught, are both the objectives of our Enemy, so too the idea of our not sinning, and of repenting after we have sinned, are both the helpful promptings of grace.

I turn then briefly to the question of whether or not the Holy Spirit departs from us during the time that we commit sin, for the benefit of those who have discussed the point, or of any others who need to learn about it.

At the time of our baptism through God's grace we received the Holy Spirit from the baptismal waters, but the purpose of our receiving him was not that he should sometimes remain with us and sometimes leave us, but that we should be temples for him, and that he should dwell within us continually; as Paul said: You are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwells within you; (1 Cor 3:16) and again, Do you not recognize that your bodies are the temples of the Holy Spirit who dwells within you, whom you received from God? For you were bought for a great price, and consequently you should be praising God with your bodies and with your spirit, which all belong to God. (1 Cor 6:19–20)

If then you are temples and shrines of God by reason of the Spirit of God dwelling within us, then no sin, whether it be by deed or by thought, can destroy the temple of God. For sin that is committed by some action is quite different from the denial of God. If then we sin through something we do, our faith in God remains unshaken, and we do not thereby lose our sonship to God, just as in the case of a natural son, however much he wrongs and sins against his father, the fact of his having sinned against his father does not stop him being called his son; for however much a son sins and does wrong, he does not destroy his honourable title of 'son', provided his father does not want to disinherit him.

It was the same with the younger son who squandered his property and dissipated his father's property living among prostitutes. (Lk 15:1) despite all this he did not lose the honourable title of son that was his. Rather while he was still in the land of captivity, having rejected his father, he recalled to himself how many hired servants there are at this moment in my father's house who have more than enough bread, whereas here am I perishing from hunger. (Lk 15,17) And while he was still a sinner and though he had sinned to such a great extent that he had thrown to the winds with his misdeeds the entire inheritance he had received from his father, even so he still called God his 'father'. And this indicates that the grace of the Spirit, which authorizes him to call God 'Father', did not depart from him.

Indeed we are quite unable to employ this term of address and call God 'Father'; except through the authority of the Holy

Spirit who is within us, for it is well known that those who have not yet become God's children by the holy rebirth of baptism are not authorized to use this term, and they are not permitted to say 'Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name'. The manifest reason for this is that the Holy Spirit is not yet within them, to give them this authorization, and it is well known to all that, when they approach the Holy Mysteries, the newly baptized all repeat this prayer with confidence in accordance with the tradition handed down by our Lord, and then they proceed to the Holy Mysteries. It is also obvious that we have all sinned in some way, be it small or great, in thought or in deed, and there is no one among us who is not guilty of sin. If then we are all guilty of sin, then the Holy Spirit has departed from us all, and how do we have the audacity to cry out 'Our Father,who art in heaven' when we approach the Holy Mysteries? For if the Holy Spirit has left us because we have sinned, by what authority do we call God 'Father'? And if we do this not having within us the Spirit of God which permits us to do so, then it is an enormous crime and rebellion against God, and we would resemble the men who built the Tower of Babel (cf Gen 11:9) so as to ascend to heaven, or him who audaciously made himself God (cf Dan. 3) and wanted to grab for himself an honour that had not been given him; who, as a result of this, destroyed that honour which he had.

But in fact the faithful who call God 'Father' at the time of the Mysteries do not do so of their own accord, but rather the Priest who stands at the head of the people permits them to say this; and not even he would have authority to call God 'Father' let along give permission to others to say this, if it were established that the Holy Spirit had left all who sin. For none of us, whether priest or people, is in a position to hope that he is completely free from sin, if what Paul says is true: There is only one high priest, Jesus Christ, who is without wickedness or stain, who is completely free from sins, and exalted above the heaven: (Heb. 7:26) and later he says: Every high priest who stands and makes offerings and sacrifices for sins should first offer sacrifices for himself, and only then for the people, (Heb. 7:27) it being recognized that it is because he is guilty of sin that he needs propitiation by means of offerings.

Just as with the former Law of Moses, every priest who offered sacrifices to God first of all offered them for himself, and only then for the people, so also in the dispensation of the New Testament, it is well known that all priests first of all offer a 'rational sacrifice' (Rom. 12:1) to God for themselves, and then for the people: in his prayer the priest asks in the first place for forgiveness of his own sins and a cleansing of his own soul and body from all sinful thoughts and actions; and each priest offers these prayers to God in accordance with the measure of his own purity of soul. And after he was completed the divine sacrifice, and accomplished the Mysteries with the descent of the Holy Spirit, he does not distribute the Sacrament to the others before he himself has received it, as being in need of it; and thus he proclaims before the entire church that he receives the Sacrament first of all so that he may receive propitiation by it. Only then does he distribute it to the others so that the prayer which was offered earlier, first for himself and then for the people, might be put into action. For if he had not offered prayer for himself first, he would not be the first to approach communion. Thus his offering testifies that he is a sinner, and it is as a sinner that he takes the Sacrament, to receive propitiation by it. And so he distributes it to every one who is in the same situation.

For this reason, when he distributes the Mysteries to them, he cries out 'the Body of God for the firgiveness of sins, and the Blood of the Son of God for the propitiation of wrongs', recalling by these words what our Lord said to his disciples when he distributed his Mysteries to them: This is my body which is broken for you for the forgiveness of sins, and this is my Blood which is shed for you for forgiveness (Mt 26:26—8). Thus it is that when we approach the Mysteries of our Saviour, we approach as needy sinners; for there is no need for medicine except in the case of an illness, or for healing except when someone is sick. For it is not the healthy who are in need of a doctor, but those who are ill. (Mt 9:12) It is evident, then, that everyone who approaches the Mysteries receives them for the forgiveness of his sins, whether it be the priest or the people. And if the Holy Spirit is not within us because we are sinners, by what authority does the priest invoke the spirit, or the people approach the Mysteries?

There is the further point,that if the Holy Spirit is not within us, then neither is baptism effective in us—and how can we approach the Sacrament without being baptized? For it is clear that if the Holy Spirit leaves us whenever we sin, our baptism also departs from us, for our baptism is the Holy Spirit. When our Lord said to his disciples John baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit after not many days, (Acts 1:5) he was speaking of the Holy Spirit who came down upon the disciples in the upper room in the form of tongues of fire. This descent of the Holy Spirit he calls 'baptism' because the apostles' baptism then was by the Spirit alone, for they had already been baptized in water by John.

It is the same now with us who are baptized: neither the wetness of the water in which we are baptized, nor the oiliness of the oil with which we are anointed, remain with us after our death, but the Holy Spirit, who is mingled in our souls and bodies through the oil and the water, does remain with us, both in this life and after our death. For he is our true baptism, and for this reason we remain always baptized, for the Holy Spirit is within us always, and no sin can strip us of our baptism—neither adultery, nor theft, nor fornication, nor false testimony nor any action of this sort: only the denial of God and consorting with demons can do this, for in such cases the Holy Spirit really does depart, for he does not consent to remain in a place where Satan dwells. For what fellowship does Christ have with Satan or the believer with the unbeliever, or God's temple with that of demons? (2 Cor 6:14)

If then we are permitted to say that the Holy Spirit leaves the soul that has received him at baptism, then it is as a result of these sins that he leaves; that is to say, he departs in the face of this depravity—for it is not right for such things to be called mere 'sins': denial of God is not just a sin; it is open revolt against his dominion; it is a state of hostility that wages open war with him.

However much the citizens of a city, or the inhabitants of a country that is subject to the emperor, do wrong and transgress his laws, whether openly or secretly, provided that his statues are not broken and his portraits are not burnt, it is not a case of

rebellion; but if this should take place as the result of disturbances among the populace, then the judges at once remedy the matter, and the instigators are punished by death. And if it so happen that an insurgent tyrant should appear in a city and the people or the district rebel with him, defacing and breaking up all the emperors' statues and portraits—whose visible presence is a symbol of his authority over that district or city—by this action they reject the emperor's authority over the city and show open rebellion against him Clearly the situation is similar with those who deny God after their baptismal confession of faith, either by sacrificing to demonic beings,or by consorting with people who practice magic.Because they have denied the rule of their former emperor and acknowledged that of an alien tyrant, the Holy Spirit, whom they received at baptism, departs from them-just as the imperial government with its laws disappears from that city in which a rebel tyrant has recently set himself up.

That what we have said is the case can be understood from exactly the opposite point of view.Among the pagans who worship idols and created objects, and among the philosophers who have made a name for themselves among the Greeks, there are various virtues that can be found; in some cases, that of justice, in others of integrity, while other men vanquished the lusts of the body, or scorned the love of money; among others again there was to be found a natural compassion. But all these things that were to found in them were things rejected by Satan, whom they otherwise served. Now Satan has no desire that any of his servitors should get known for any good virtue, yet these men did not because of these virtues, become rebels against him, and it cannot be said of them that they denied Satan and acknowledged God, simply because they possessed these virtues. Rather, despite these virtues that were to be found in them, they are still described as pagans and worshippers of demonic beings, because they did not actually deny Satan and acknowledge God.

Today, if an unbaptized pagan or Samaritan approaches Holy Baptism, even if such a person does not repent of his former bad conduct, yet the very fact of his denying Satan and acknowledging Christ numbers him among the righteous, and places him in the

realm of Christ's Kingdom. Precisely because he denies Satan and acknowledges God he comes to baptism and receives the Holy Spirit, and not because of any actions of his own. How can this take place, except it be a result of their belief in God alone, seeing that they may previously have conducted themselves in every kind of wickedness? If, then, it is solely as a result of their belief in God and their baptism in his name that they receive the Holy Spirit, then it is clear that it is solely through denial of his name and consorting with demonic powers that the Holy Spirit ever leaves us, for he does not consent to remain in a place where his authority is not effective, that is to say in the person who has denied him. For he does not consent to live as a sojourner in an alien country.

Suppose someone objects and says that the Holy Spirit leaves us as the result of other sins as well, and when we repent of them he returns to us. If he leaves us, who is it then who works in us so that we repent of our sins? Repentance does not take place without the Holy Spirit; it is accompanied by fastings and vigils, by almsgiving and prayer, by continual affliction of soul and continual shedding of tears and inexpressible groans, all of which are the result of the activity of the Spirit, just as Paul said: We do not know how to pray as is properly fitting, but it is the Spirit of God who prays for us with inexpresssible groans. He who searches out hearts knows what is the thought of the Spirit who prays for the saints in accordance with God's will. (Rom 8:26-7) You see that all the good promptings that bring us to repentance result from the activity of the Spirit; and pure prayer, which brings all these good promptings to completion, is also stirred up in our soul as the result of the Spirit's activity. He too in a hidden way initially arouses us to groans at the memory of our sins.

If the Spirit did leave us the moment we sin, who is it who arouses such feelings in us? Perhaps you may say that it is our own will. But who is it who stirs up our will to good, and who is it who helps it in the execution of that good? Is it not the Holy Spirit? Do you not hear what Paul says: God incites within you both the will, and the putting into action of your will? (Phil 2:13)

You see that it is he who stirs up our will towards the good, and it is he who accomplishes the carrying out of our will.

You may object that in that case there is no free will. There is indeed free will, for by this we are 'the likeness of God'. (cf Gen. 1:26) But free will is not under any compulsion; I did not say to you that the Spirit compels our soul to do good, he only entices it and allures it. One might ask where is the Spirit when someone sins, seeing that he has not held back the soul from sin. You can now clearly see what I meant when I said that the Spirit does not force the soul towards the good, nor does he use any restraint to hold it back from evil; rather in both cases he gives freedom to our will, acting simply as someone who urges for or against an action.

Neither does Satan lead us towards evil by force, nor does the Spirit of God draw us to good by compulsion. Rather, they are both spectators, each urging us on in the direction our own will inclines. Just as the grace of the Holy Spirit, which we have received from the water, is within us when we sin and however much a baptized person sins, he is still baptized-this grace does not restrain our will from sin by using any compulsion, but is simply angered against us and secretly rebukes us when it sees that we are inclined towards sin. And if the mind knows how to receive that rebuke, and if our deliberation consents to accept the warning, then it is restrained from sin, and grace immediately shines out and illuminates it, filling the mind straight-away with joy and happiness.

This is what normally happens to those who overcome sin at the time of their struggle with it. But if one's deliberation does not listen to the Spirit within, but brings the sin into effect, immediately the house of the soul becomes dark, and grows murky with the smoke of distress, and is filled with sorrow and compunction, and the soul's face is covered with shame, as it is written: 'and the Holy Spirit is grieved and turns his face from the soul'. (Hermas, Mandates x. 2.2)

Paul has this in mind when he gives the following advice: Do not grieve the Holy Spirit with whom you have been sealed

in readiness for the day of salvation. (Eph 4:30) You have heard how Paul instructs us on two matters: the Spirit is still in us when we sin, and is grieved because of our sin. 'Do not grieve the Spirit of God who is within you', he says. He is within us, then, and warns us not to sin and so grieve him lest we quench the hidden working of our soul, just as Paul says in another place: Do not quench the Spirit, (1 Th. 5:19) that is to say, do not grieve him by sin, otherwise his light will be quenched from your soul—a light which, when kindled within you, gives you possession of a power that is beyond expression and you will be able to contend with principalities and powers (Eph 6:12) and fight against the evil spirits under the heaven, and reject all the world with its pleasures and pains. All these things are effected by the fervour of the Spirit within us, and Paul, who knew the power of the working of the Spirit, warns us in his teaching: Be fervent in spirit, (Rom 12:11) and again those who allow themselves to be guided by the Spirit of God are God's children. (Rom 8:14)

While, then, the Holy Spirit is always within us—that is to say, in those baptized—he does not forcefully restrain the person who wants to sin, but simply instructs and urges him not to. The Spirit does not run away from the soul in which he is dwelling at the time of sin, returning to it when it repents, as the ignorant say; rather, he remains with us, not being put to use.

What reason is there for him to depart from us when we sin, my good sir? As if our sin could harm him, or as if his sanctity was thereby involved in some stain, or as if he could not prevent himself from getting injury from our sin while within us. In that case he too would be infirm, and subject to injuries just as we are. But this is not the case—far from it.

For the Spirit is within our soul, sometimes retracting from it, at others shining forth over it. But when he retracts himself, he does not depart, and when he shines forth, he does not come in from somewhere else.

For just as the natural light with which we are familiar is still inside the pupil of the eye when the eyes are closed and the

eyes do not then see with it because the eyelid is spread over it; but once the eye is opened, it sees with the light that was in it all the time, now joining with the light outside; in like manner the Spirit dwells in our soul,just as light in the pupil of the eye,and if a man overlay him with neglect—just like an eyelid over the pupil of the eye—although the Spirit is still in our soul,we do not see with him. But if we roll back the negligence from our mind's face, and direct the clear gase of our will towards the spiritual light that is within us, then at once light encounters light, just as in the case of the sun's light and the natural light within the eye, and by the combination of the two the vision is illumined.

It is not right, then, that we should speak of the Spirit departing at the time of sin and then returning with repentance, for we would thereby represent him to be both weak and ill-inclined, and a deserter, standing far off and watching for us to repent from our sin, and then, once we are in a state of justification again, returning to dwell within us. Indeed what benefit would I have if he dwells within me after I have already been justified? For if he is not to be found at the time of my fall, to give me a hand and put me back on my feet, how can I perceive his help? Does a doctor leave a patient the moment he sees that he has fallen into some illness and go off, only returning when he has recovered his health? No, rather when the patient is ill the doctor is assiduously in attendance, but when he was recovered he no longer needs the doctor, who then turns to some other task.

If the foolish opinion of these men were true and the Spirit did leave the soul, then at the time of recovery it would be suitable for him to depart even further than at the time of sickness, since, according to our Lord's testimony, the healthy have no need of a doctor. (Lk 5:31)

So much for this. A soul, therefore, both in time of sickness and in time of good health needs the close presence of the Spirit, the Spirit whom he put on once and for all from the water, he will never again put off, except through denial alone. For if it is through faith that he puts on the Spirit, it is only through denial that he can put him off, seeing that faith and denial are opposites, like darkness and light.

For the Holy Spirit that we receive from God is the Soul of our soul. For this reason he was given to the apostles by means of anointing, and through them, to all of us. For instead of our original soul we have received the Spirit with the intention that he should be a soul to our soul, just as our soul is a soul to our body. The original spirit that Adam received came from the insufflation from God, for it is written: He breathed on his face the breath of life, and Adam became a living being (lit. soul). (Gen 2:7) And in the New Testament it is written Jesus breathed on the faces of the disciples and said 'Receive the Holy Spirit; if you forgive any man's sins, they shall be forgiven him, and if you retain them, they shall be retained'. (Jn 20:22—3) How is it that the Spirit who forgives sins—as our Lord says—also runs away from sins? Thus it is not right to speak of the Spirit leaving in the face of sins; rather sins flee away from the Spirit's presence. For it is not darkness which can quench light, but it is light which can dissipate darkness. Likewise it is not the Spirit who runs away from sin, but sin which departs from the Spirit's presence.

If, then, the Holy Spirit is a Soul to our soul, and for this reason he has been given us by insufflation—as in the case of that first soul of Adam—then it is obvious that if that Spirit leaves us, our soul will at once die, in the same way as a body dies the moment the soul that dwells in it departs. And just as the body, once dead because of the departure of the soul, is not in need of medicine, seeing that it is no longer capable of being healed—the diseased eye it may have will not be healed, nor will a broken leg he bandaged up, nor a crippled hand be put right, nor indeed can any of its limbs that have something wrong with them any longer receive healing and adjustment, since the body has been deprived of life which alone is capable of receiving healing—it is exactly the same with the soul from which the Holy Spirit departs: it becomes henceforth like the body's corpse, unable any longer to receive healing for any of its sins, since it does not have within itself the vitality of the Holy Spirit. How can a medicine or a bandage be applied to something that has lost all sensory power? Have you ever seen a doctor healing a corpse, or bandaging a limb that has been cut off and separated from the rest of the body? It is same with the soul: if the vitality of the Holy Spirit, which it received at baptism, departs from it, then it has

no opportunity for healing, and cannot acquire penitence for its sins.

Before baptism, one is called the old person, (Eph 4:22) but after baptism the new person. (Eph 4:24) Now the Holy Spirit is the abiding Soul of the new person, and he remains, not only during the body's life, but also after its death, and in the case of the saints he performs miracles and works signs. For the bones of the just, that is to say, of the apostles and martyrs and all the saints, while they do not have any natural soul in them—for that left them at their death—still have the Holy Spirit abiding with and in them, and it is He who effects signs and wonders in them; and demonic spirits cry out bitterly at his power within them, for sickness are driven off and illness chased away.

At the time of the resurrection, when the souls return to their bodies they find the Holy Spirit in them, for he has not departed from them—and never will do so—from the time when they received him from the water. And our resurrection too will take place by the power of the Holy Spirit who is within us, and because the Holy Spirit is in the faithful when they die, their death cannot be called 'death', but only 'sleep'. Brethren, I want you to know, says Paul, about those who sleep: you must not grieve, like the rest of humanity, who have lost all hope. (1 Th. 4:13)

Thus it is only in pagans and Jews that there is no Holy Spirit, and for this reason when they die they really die, and are not just asleep. This is why no honour is given to the burial of their bodies, and there are no psalms or canticles when they are taken to the grave, seeing that they are truly dead, and not alive though asleep. Contrast (with this) the death of the believer who has been baptized even if he is a sinner, even if he has done ten thousand wrongs, provided he dies in faith, and has not undone his baptism by denial, and has not washed away his sacred baptismal washing by demonic rites of washing, then, when his soul leaves his body and he dies nature's death, we take his body to the grave treating him as alive, albeit asleep. And the reason for this is clearly because the Holy Spirit, whom he received from the rebirth from the womb of baptism, has not departed from him. For our Lord said: Unless a man be born

again from water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. (Jn 3:5) If sinners were without baptism, why should their bodies be escorted to the grave with honour; why would spiritual songs be sung, if the Holy Spirit were not there? Why does Paul call the sinner 'asleep' if he be really dead?

If you quote me the words of the prophet: I do not desire the death of a dead sinner, (Ez 33:11) and say that this refers to Jewish sinners, and for this reason too Ezekiel was told I have made you a watchman for the house of Israel, (Ez 3:17) I would reply that it is indeed clear that the words are addressed to the Jews, since it was to them that the prophet Ezekiel had been sent at that time; and today too, after the coming of our Saviour, the words apply to pagans and to Jews and to those who once believed, but then denied their faith. The prophet's words are applicable to those who sin without perceiving their sin, since a sinner who has received baptism, even though he may be dead towards his soul, because he does not perceive his sin, yet he is alive to God because of the grace of baptism that he possesses, in accordance with the words God is not of the dead but of the living, (Lk. 20:38) for they are all living in him.

How then should a sinner approach to receive the Holy Mysteries, if he does not have within himself the Holy Spirit who authorizes, him to do this? For just as someone who has not been baptized is not permitted to come to the Mysteries, the same would apply to a sinner if it were true that the Holy Spirit had left him, which is the foolish opinion of those who say 'he is not allowed to approach the Mysteries'. If a sinner cannot approach the Mysteries, who then may do so? And what about the words 'this is my Body which is broken for you for the forgiveness of sins', and 'this is my Blood which is shed for you for the forgiveness of sins?' (cf Mt 26:26—8) Is an unbaptized person allowed to approach the Mysteries? But if the Spirit departs the moment a man sins, then his baptism departs too, and if his baptism has departed and he has become unbaptised, then he is no longer permitted to approach the Mysteries. And if he does not approach the Mysteries, how will be receive propitiation, how can there be repentance if there is no for-

giveness? And if there is no repentance from sin, how can the Holy Spirit ever return, as they say he does? Our Lord openly refuted this foolish opinion when he said Everyone who eats my Body and drinks my Blood shall remain in me and I in him; I will establish him on the last day. (Jn 6:54) Now, in as much as a sinner receives our Lord's Body and Blood in faith, he is in our Lord, and our Lord is in him, as our Lord himself says; and where the Lord dwells, there is his Spirit too.

Had it been because of any justification on our own part that we received the Holy Spirit from the water, then the Spirit would simply be acting in justice, departing from us because of our sin. But if it is by grace that the Spirit has been given us, then his remaining with us is also a gift of grace. And inasmuch as we received him from the water in faith, and immediately he granted us forgiveness of sins, and justified us with sonship to God, so too, now, as long as we believe that he is within us, we receive admonition against sin, and if it so happen that we do sin, then we quickly repent, thanks to the help of his power.

For we were not given a grace that is taken away or altered, as was the case with the Jews, and what was said to them has no bearing on us, namely I have said 'You are gods, and all of you are children of the Most High; but henceforth you shall die as men, and fall as one of the warriors'. (Ps 82-6–7) The reason is that they received the grace of servitude (to God), while we received that of sonship, which is unalterable; as Paul teaches: You have not received the spirit of servitude to fear any longer, but you have received the Spirit of children, which cries out 'Abba, our Father'. (Rom 8:15) You see the fact that we cry out to God 'Our Father who art in heaven' at the time of the Holy Mysteries is due to the permission given us by the Spirit; we have received, as Paul says, the Spirit of sonship, which cries out 'Abba, our Father', (Rom 8:15) for it is the Spirit who authorizes us to cry out 'Our Father' to God at that moment; and those who cry out 'Our Father' then and expect to receive the Mysteries are all sinners. Because of the sins we have committed since baptism, we receive the Mysteries assiduously and we, who are sinners, call God 'Our Father' at

that time, and it is clear that it is because the Spirit is within us that he has given us authority to do this.

Thus it is manifest from every point of view that the Spirit of God does not depart from the baptized whenever they sin; rather, he remains with them even in their sinning, showing his grace in this way too, so that the end may be like the beginning, and Paul's words fulfilled: We have not received this as a result of any works, in order that no one might be proud. (Eph 2:9)

I have written all this briefly to refute those who hold an inept view of the workings of the grace of the Holy Spirit, and hold that he is weak and of no aid to men. But do you O disciple, believe that the Holy Spirit whom you received from the baptismal water is within you, and will never depart from you. The recalling of his presence will provide you with warning, and so flee from all the devices of sin, lest it insinuate itself into your thoughts and come to fruition by your committing it. Should sleep come upon you, arouse yourself at once, and if you lapse into fault, hastily right yourself from your fall, crying out to him who let fall this word of the prophet: Satan, the Lord rebuke thee. (Zech 3:2) He who justifies is close at hand, namely the Holy Spirit who has been given to me by my Lord once and for all for the preservation of my life. To Him be praise, along with the Father and Son, now and always Amen.

2 PHILOXENUS

Excerpt on Prayer

ANYONE WHO PRAYS Should pray having his heart in touch with his mouth and his mind with his lips. If, however, he bows down and stretches out his hands in prayer while his heart is day-dreaming somewhere else, then he is like the cedars which storms bend down and flatten out. Or if his lips are eagerly murmuring but his mind is somewhere outside the monastery, then this resembles the case of doors being buffetted by the winds, which no one can open or shut.

For anyone who stands in prayer a discerning compassion is required. Tears of compunction are also beneficial He also requires a recollected mind. If he has any grudge against any of his fellows, he should wash this away from his heart. And he should pray in silence, his lips murmuring with awareness. And when he puts the seal on his prayer, let him stop and remain still in silence. He should not occupy himself with empty talk or with unedifying chatter; rather, he should remain in silence and awareness. Then his prayer will be fully accepted by him who receives prayers and pure thoughts.

3. PHILOXENUS

Excerpt on Prayer

PURE PRAYER such as is worthy of God, O disciple of God, is not uttered by means of composite words. Prayer which is worthy of God consists in this: that one gather in one's mind from the entire world, and not let it be secretly bound to anything; that one place it entirely at God's disposal and forget, during the time of prayer, everything that is material, including one's own self and the place where one is standing. One should be secretly swallowed up in the spirit in God, and one should clothe oneself in God at the time of prayer both outwardly and inwardly, set on fire with ardent love for him, and entirely engulfed in all of him, entirely commingled in all of him, with the movements of one's thoughts suffused with wondrous recollection of God, while the soul has gone out in love to seek him whom she loves, just as David said, My soul has gone out after you. (ps 63:9)

It is with these inner movements that one should pray to God. But since vowels (lit. movements) have words as their shadow, I am indicating the shadow of these things for the disciple's instruction so that he may grasp the shadow and walk in it, thus arriving at the body (which casts the shadow).

4. PHILOXENUS
Excerpt on Prayer

THE SOUL'S STRENGTH consists in continuous prayer; this clothes the mind in the might which comes from the vision of God. One should read Sacripture until the mind has become recollected from wandering thoughts; then, on perceiving in the mind that it has returned to its proper place, having come back to itself from the distraction which is outside it, immediately one should put down the Book and revert to prayer. In this way the reading of Scripture will be for the purpose of prayer, and fasting for the purpose of purity of prayer, and the emptying of thoughts of all riches will be for the very purpose of prayer. In other words, let the mind do everything requisite in order that it may become worthy to speak with God in prayer.

The converse of the Holy Spirit (which dwells within us) with God is the aim of all ascetic labours, and the end of the path of righteousness: this is the ministry of the company of Gabriel and Michael. For prayer, I would say, is not psalmody consisting of verses, or songs and hymns: these just serve as the letters and syllables for prayer's authoritative form of reading. Until we become aware that within us there lives the 'spiritual person', (1 Cor 2:15) along with all his limbs—that is to say, what we become in baptism—battle against that 'old person', whom Christ put to death on his Cross, will not be stilled within us, (cf Eph 4:22 & Col. 3:9) ○○

(EXTRACT)

THE EIGHT DISCOURSE:

Which teacheth that a man cannot Become a perfect disciple of Christ, unless he first of all make himself destitute of all Human possessions, and go forth from the world openly with his inner man and with his outer man

The man who wisheth to travel along the open way of perfection hath need to make the beginning of his journey in the fair order which is becoming to that way, and he should not begin his discipleship in the law which seemeth good unto him, but in that defined law which was delivered by the word of Christ our God unto His disciples, even as He walked in this way of perfection. And He in His own Person became a law unto us, and He gave us a fair example that we might journey after His footsteps; for Jesus was not a teacher unto us in words only, but also in the works of perfection which He fulfilled in Himself, and therefore He is truly the good Teacher who taught, and practised, for His teaching was practice, and His practice was teaching. And thus also our Lord Himself depicted and shewed us in His own ministration, for after He had performed all the righteousness which justice required, and had kept the law of the commandments which are to be perfected in the world He then left the world, and went forth therefrom that He might teach perfection. For I do not say also that those who are in the world cannot be justified, but that it is not possible for them to arrive at perfection, for the world itself is an obstacle to perfection, that is to say, of righteousness also, and of the uprightness which is worked therein. And a man is not able to bear two labours and to be perfect in two virtues while he is in the world, and for this reason the commandments were defined and set apart for those who journey in the world in order that they might

possess their lives through them, and the other path of perfection which is above the world, was opened. For the Will of Christ ordained the law, that is, He required that all the children of men should journey along the path of angels, and that no man should turn aside from that mark which He placed in the midst, but because not every man was able to do this—now He wished that every man should live—He gave divers commandments to every man that he might live thereby. And He made measures and steps in His doctrine, not because these things exist in it, but because of those who were to receive it, and because they were in need (of them), and without them they were not able to live. To the path of the world the life of righteousness is united, and to the path which is outside the world is attached perfection, and the end of the path of righteousness and justice is absolute destitution of all possessions. For so long as a man possesseth human wealth, whether it be little, or whether it be much, he is unable to walk in the path of perfection, for in respect of every possession which existeth, according to the measure thereof doth it become a fetter to the mind, and a chain to the light wings of the understanding so that they cannot fly along the heavenly path. Whosoever hath riches must perforce mediate thereupon, and whosoever meditateth upon riches cannot meditate upon God, and if on an occasion the remembrance of God rise up in him, it is not lasting; for it is not possible that he should remember God when he is meditating upon (his) possessions, or if he imagine that he doth remember Him, the remembrance is borrowed and is not true, for it is not possible that these two remembrances should dwell together at one time in the soul, and if they dwell therein one of them must necessarily be borrowed, and the other be true. And if a man think truly that he meditateth upon God while he hath in his mind the anxious care of riches, (he doeth it) not with all the might of his soul, which it is seemly to us to give wholly to God; for we are obliged to serve God not with one of our members, and the world with another, but it is right that we should give all our might to the service of the commandments, and that always the seasons may be helpful to us to remember Him, that we may become temples to Him alone, having poured out from us every meditation of the mind which is outside Him.

And that man is not able to serve God worthily while he is in the world, and while he is a possessor of riches, and the owner of wealth, the word of our Redeemer Himself testifieth, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon;" and forthwith the hearer thought that henceforth the door of righteousness was shut in the face of all the children of men, for they cannot be wholly free from the care of riches, and according to the decision of the word of Christ, whosoever careth for it cannot care for God. And it is necessary for us to understand the word as it was spoken, for according to the rule of those who are perfect, the man who careth for riches cannot care for God; but a man, being a possessor of wealth, is able to be justified by that other measure of righteousness which is worked in the world, if it be that he is not a servant who worshippeth his riches, but a master of the things which he possesseth. Some men are slaves of their possessions, and some are masters of their wealth, and one man is worshipped by his possessions, and another man worshippeth them. Now the word of our Lord was spoken concerning the man who is a slave of his possessions, and who is not able to be a servant of God; "For ye "cannot serve two masters." Thou seest that He shewed two masters in His discourse, and that in explaining who these were, He said, "Ye cannot serve "God and mammon' ".

Behold then whosoever hath made mammon his master cannot serve God, but he serveth that master whom he hath chosen of his own freewill, his service being especially dear unto him, and his dominion over him being beloved by him, because he hath become subject unto him of his own freewill. For the children of men are wont to love exceedingly that which they have chosen of their own freewill, and they love it much more than Him Who perforce and naturally is Master over them. And behold, if there were a few men who have pleased, or who please God, it is because they were and are masters of their wealth, and they sent if forth to (do) everything like a slave and subject, sometimes to feed the hungry, sometimes to clothe ne naked, sometimes to redeem the captive, sometimes (to pay) vows and offerings unto God, and sometimes to free those who were in the bandage of debts; and wheresoever the will desired to rule over it, there

it sent it like a servant, even as did Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and Job, and Joseph, and David, and Hezekiah. And of these men some were rich, and some were princes, and some were kings, and collectively they all were owners of great possessions and wealth; but they were masters of their riches, and their riches were not masters of them, their riches worked for them in all the good things which they wished (to do), and they did not serve them in all the wickedness which mammon demanded.

○○

THE TWELFTH DISCOURSE:

Which is against the passions of fornication, and which sheweth that not only the act of lust is accounted fornication when it is performed in the body, but also when it lingereth in the mind maketh the soul to commit fornication with some distant person.

Wise physicans, who desire to draw nigh with knowledge unto the healing of the diseases which happen in the bodies of the children of men, first of all learn the causes of these diseases, and having withdrawn them, bring healing unto their sicknesses without trouble. For when the cause from which the diceases and sicknesses arise is removed, the sicknesses to which it hath given birth are rooted out together with the cause thereof, for when the root (of the tree) is taken up out of the ground it is impossible for its branches or fruit to remain, and if it happen that plants and young trees (live) for a short time afterwards by reason of their natural moisture, yet they will soon dry up when once their roots are shaken free of the earth and are taken up. And thus also is it with the sicknesses and diseases which happen unto the children of men, for when the physicians first of all remove the causes from which the diseases are produced, little by little the disease dwindleth and cometh to an end as soon as that cause which hath produced it is cut off from the body. And it is meet that we should act in this way also with the passions of sins, which are produced either by the body, or by the soul, for we should first of all remove the causes which give birth unto these passions, that our life may be preserved in immunity from wickedness, and that our own rule and conduct may be free from iniquity. For the man who wisheth to be a free man in God must first of all be freed from the lusts which arise from him, and then let him draw nigh unto the life of freedom of Christ, because also the country of the children of the free will not allow him to enter therein so long as the foul mark of bondage is

apparent in this person. Therefore cosidering closely what we are, and what we shall be, and from what condition unto what condition we have been called, and for what life we shall exchange this life, let us be mindful of ourselves at all seasons, and let us take upon ourselves the knowledge of our rule and conduct continually, and let us learn first of all the causes of the passions of sins which molest our life perpetually by their goadings, for without labour we shall not find the healing of our souls. And let the natural healing which maketh whole human bodies be unto us an example of the healing of our souls, and like the physicians, let us first of all consider the causes by which the goadings of sins against our life are produced, that we may be able to arrive at spiritual healing. Now inasmuch as in the previous Discourse we have chidden the lust of the love of the belly, it is now meet that our speech should proceed systematically against this wicked passion of fornication, which is the prigin, and begetter, and nurse of the lust of the belly, and it is easily overcome when a man conquereth the first cause thereof. For through eating and drinking doth the passion of fornication grow strong and blaze in our members, and besides these things it ariseth through loose conversations and human discourse, and through the remembrance of faces of beautiful appearance which are depicted in our souls, and through the repetitions of stories of lust, when they are pleasantly told and listened to, and through the constant sight of faces by which the souls of the weak are straightway caught and held fast by the appearance of passion which is in them, for when once the lust of the body hath made to increase the fire of fornication in the body, corrupt conversations come and stir it into a blaze.

Now this lust hath been placed by the Creator in the members of our bodies by nature for the sake of the fruit of carnal intercourse and the continuation of the world, but by disciples it is to be kept not for this purpose, but that it may be unto them the cause of spiritual crowns, and the material for heavenly battles that having fought and conquered we may be numbered (among) the victors, and be inscribed as triumphant warriors in the heavenly Jerusalem through the noble deeds which are gained from the place of strife which is opposed thereto. And this lust for carnal intercourse doth not remain in disciples that they may

minister thereunto, but that through the heat of natural lust they may put to the test the power of the heat of the lust of the spirit, and that when the fire of the transgression of the law blazeth in their members, they may try with it the hot fire of Jesus which is mingled in our souls; that with the pleasure which is beyond nature they may taste the sweetness of the true nature, and that with the motion which was delivered unto them at the beginning thereof they may receive the taste of the sweetness of the living motion, which has begun to lust after the fair sight of the beauty of Christ, Who abideth without ending in the soul wherein He beginneth (to dwell), if it be purified so as to be His dwelling place.

Now the fire of this natural lust is hotter than that of all other lusts, and together with its heat is mingled also its corrupt sweetness, wherefrom two things may be learned, the pleasantness of the love of Christ, and the near end of the corrupt lust. The fire of the spirit which is mingled in us would have been able to put an end to and destroy this fire of natural lust, if the desire had been without fruit and the freedom which is in us without labours of fortitude; well then was the enemy set to do battle against freedom, that when he was overcome by patient endurance that freedom might become apparent, and the strength thereof might be known, and its power tried. Therefore let us not be slack in respect of this lust which is preserved in us as the cause of profit, and so let it become unto us the cause of loss, for he that from trafficking for gain doeth it for loss is an ignorant fool, and whosoever maketh to be the object of wickedness that which was given unto us as the material for that which is good, is a wicked man and the opponent of good.

Let us then be strong in the war against this evil lust, which although it be a good thing when coupled with marriage in the world, is accounted a vice if it be wrought by disciples; for not every thing is good for every man, even though it be very fair and good in its nature, for riches in the nature of their creation by their Maker are good, but if solitaries, who are commanded not to have two tunics, and not so take care for the morrow, acquire them, the possession thereof to them is a vice. And the eating of flesh and the drinking of wine is pure unto those who

devote themselves unto the life of the world, but for those who of their own will have given themselves unto the maintenance of the election of the discipleship of Christ, it is not right to make use of things, except for necessity's sake. And, moreover, good and fair also are the powers and dominion which is not from God" but for those who have separated themselves from human habitation, and have promised to do great and sublime things, to desire human grades of honour is (a subject) for rebuke and reproach. And dwelling in cities and villages, and the habitation in the world, and life and intercourse among the children of men are not blameworthy, but for those who have become destitute for the love of God, and who have once cast off the world of their own free—will, and have gone forth to become solitaries and ascetics outside it, the dwelling among and intercourse with the children of men are unto them subjects for reprehension and blame; and there are many things like these, the doing of which is blameless unto those who have not already bond themselves by a covenant against them, but if they be done by those who have promised to abstain from them they are blameworthy.

In this manner, then, is also the lust for carnal intercourse. And well was it implanted in (our) nature, for it establisheth the world, and is the root and fruit of human nature, and it bringeth back and giveth unto the race of the children of men that of which the death of the penalty despoiled them and took away. But consider well, disciple, that although it hath been implanted in our nature, yet was it stirred up by the transgression of the commandment, and by the eating of the fruit did its motion appear, that, as in a parable, it might be known beforehand that it had power only over carnal beings, being absolutely useless unto the world of spiritual beings. For the types of two kinds of life appeared in the heads of our race, the spiritual and the carnal, the world of the spirit and the world of the body, the first Adam and the last Adam. Before they ate the food of the transgresion of the law wherefrom was moved also the lust which was hidden in the members, their whole rule and conduct of life were spiritual, and in everything were they moved spiritually, in holy thoughts, and pure minds, in the knowledge which was worthy of God, in the understanding which was clean and pure

from the abominable motions of lust, and after the manner of the spiritual hosts was their dwelling in Paradise for they only appeared in the form of the body, because by the knowledge of the spirit they were secretly dwelling in heaven. And the Creator made Adam first of all to experience spiritual things, because He wished him to be the heir thereof, but the freedom of Adam lusted after the things of the world, although they came into existence and were established by the word of the Creator, and his will desired them, and he went forth after them; now this is evident from the eating of the fruit which took place by the transgression of the command. For the eating of that fruit was the beginning of all lusts, according to the word of our teacher the Apostle, who said "I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not lust, and "in this commandment I fould an occasion of "sin, and every lust was perfected in me".

So then the lust of the spirit precedeth the lust of the body in us, as the history of the head of our race sheweth, for Adam came down from a high to a low estate, and from the lust of the spirit he went forth to the lust of the body, and from the life of heavenly beings he abased himself unto that of earthly beings, and from the sight of the beauty of God with which he could never be sated, he turned to look upon the form of the beauty of his wife. For until Adam had turned himself unto that which was outside, the things which were outside did not appear unto him, and until he had turned himself unto the world, the lusts of the world were not set in array before his vision, of all of which the eating of the fruit became the cause and origin; and as in the one case all lusts are produced by the belly, even so also in the other from it all vices take their rise ○○

QUESTIONNAIRE

I What are the reasons for which Philoxenus of Mabbug did not agree with the teaching of the Council of Chalcedon.?

II "From a careful study of the terminology of the definition of faith of Chalcedon compared with the Christology of Philoxenus we can say that the underlying faith of the Chalcedonain definition and the Christology of Philoxenus is the same". Discuss

III Write short paragraphs on Philoxenus's view on the following:

1) On the indwelling of the Holy Spirit

2) On Prayer

ܟܬܒ ܚܙ

ܡܫܟܚܐ ܕܟܬܒ ܐܠܗ ܕܡܪܝ ܒܝܬ ܡܪܕܘܬܐ

Ex Libris

Beth Mardutho Library

The Malphono George Anton Kiraz Collection

ܠܐ ܐܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܒܥܐ ܠܗ ܠܡܩܪܐ ܐܘ ܠܡܟܬܒ ܐܘ
ܠܡܢܣܚ ܐܘ ܠܡܫܕܪ ܐܘ ܠܡܫܬܡܫ ܒܗ ܐܘ ܠܡܩܛܥ
ܡܢܗ ܡܕܡ ܠܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܐܠܐ ܕܢܬܝܗܒ ܠܗ ܕܝܢ
ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܡܪܝܐ ܟܕ ܓܒܪ ܕܓܢܒ ܡܩܕܫܐ ܢܗܘܐ
ܠܗ ܗܕܐ ܠܐ ܢܫܪܐ ܠܗ ܥܕ ܕܝܬܝܒ ܠܗ ܗܕܐ ܟܬܒ
ܐܡܝܢ ܘܟܠ ܡܢ ܕܡܫܟܚ ܗܠܝܢ ܚܪܡܐ ܒܓܘ ܐܘ
ܒܪܒܪ ܢܣܒ ܠܗ ܟܦܠ ܐܡܝܢ ܐܡܝܢ ܣܠܐ

Anyone who asks for this volume, to read, collate, or copy from it, and who appropriates it to himself or herself, or cuts anything out of it, should realize that s/he will have to give answer before God's awesome tribunal as if (s)he had robbed a sanctuary. Let such a person be held anathema and receive no forgiveness until the book is returned. So be it, Amen! And anyone who removes these anathemas, digitally or otherwise, shall himself receive them in double.

Other Courses to Follow

The Person and Message of Christ: a positive evaluation of the different Christologies.

[Rev. Dr. V. C. Samuel, Orthodox Theological Seminary, Kottayam]

"Sedre" as "Locus Theologicus" of the West Syriac Church

[Rev. Dr. Jacob Thekeparampil, SEERI, Kottayam]

"Anaphorae Characteristic of the Creative Genius of the Syriac Liturgy

[Rev. Dr. Thomas Panicker, Mar Ivanios College, Trivandrum]

THE SEERI CORRESPONDENCE COURSE (S C C)

- informs you reliably about the rich heritage of the Syrian Church
- deepens your understanding of the visions of the Fathers of the Syrian Church
- initiates you to the symbolic and spiritual insights which shaped the liturgy and spirituality of the Syrian Church
- motivates you to a conscious, intensive and effective participation in the liturgy of the Syrian Church