

NOTES AND STUDIES

THE SAYINGS OF PAUL OF SAMOSATA.

THE earliest writer who deals with the subject of Paul of Samosata and his heresy is Eusebius of Caesarea. But it must be confessed that his treatment of the subject is far from satisfactory to the student of the history of Christian doctrine. In his *Ecclesiastical History*, indeed, he devotes a greater amount of space to Paul than to any other heresiarch.¹ He gives a fairly long, though somewhat confused, account of the proceedings taken against him; and he makes copious extracts from the encyclical Epistle of the 'final' Synod at Antioch, which condemned him. But of his teaching he tells us no more than that he espoused 'low and earthly' (ταπεινὰ καὶ χαμαιπετῆ) opinions about the Christ, esteeming Him to be 'by nature an ordinary man' (ὡς κοινοῦ τὴν φύσιν ἀνθρώπου γενομένου), and that he revived the heresy of Artemon.² From the Epistle he quotes part of the preamble, a lengthy and interesting description of Paul's character and conduct as bishop, which makes no more than passing allusions to his doctrine, and the conclusion; but of that portion of it which set forth his 'perverse heterodoxy' he transcribed not a word. He mentions also two other contemporary documents, a letter of Dionysius of Alexandria directed to the Church of Antioch against Paul, and the Acts of a Disputation between Paul and the presbyter Malchion which preceded his condemnation, both of which were transmitted with the Epistle.³ But from these he culls no extracts.

These *Acta Disputationis* would have been of supreme value, inasmuch as they contained the *ipsissima verba* of the heretic, defining and defending his opinions. They were extant and easily procurable as late as the seventh century.⁴ But that Eusebius had not read them is implied by his words, 'we know that they are still in circulation'.⁵

¹ *H. E.* v 28. 1; vii 27-30. 21; 32. 5, 21.

² This he no doubt took from the Epistle (*H. E.* vii 30. 16 f), where, however, the earlier heretic is called Artemas, as also in the letter of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria (in Theodoret *H. E.* i 4). Later writers follow Eusebius (e.g. Epiph. *Haer.* 65. 1; Hieron. *de Vir.* Ill. 71; Aug. *Haer.* 44; Theodoret *Haer. Fab.* ii 8).

³ *H. E.* 27. 2; 29. 2; 30. 3, 11.

⁴ Leontius Byzant. *c. Nest. et Eutych.* (*P. G.* lxxxvi 1. 1391).

⁵ *H. E.* vii 29. 2 ἦν καὶ εἰς δεῦρο φερομένην ἴσμεν.

It is not surprising, therefore, that he does not quote them; though this fact is a curious instance of his limitations as a historian. A similar explanation may be given of the failure of Eusebius to quote the letter of Dionysius. It is not mentioned in the lists which he gives of the epistles of that writer, which apparently include all that had come into his hands.¹ But his method of dealing with the Epistle of the Synod cannot be accounted for thus. It must be regarded as an example of his interest in historical episodes, and his comparative indifference to doctrinal discussions. It may be added here that Eusebius betrays no knowledge that Paul of Samosata was a writer of books. Vincentius Lirinensis speaks of *opuscula* attributed to him as extant²; and we shall see that fragments of a tract of Paul against (or addressed to) a certain Sabinus are still preserved.

The purpose of this paper is to bring together as many as possible of the sayings of Paul, and from them to ascertain what can be known of his theological system as he himself stated it. The greater part of the material available for a study of Paul of Samosata will be found in Routh's *Reliquiae Sacrae* vol. iii pp. 287-367 (1846). But Routh does not present it in the most convenient form, and he has made no use of the information given by Epiphanius, although he quotes much later writers.

In the following pages, for the sake of brevity, I refer to the Letter of the 'final' Synod of Antioch as the Epistle; and to the Acts of the Disputation between Paul of Samosata and Malchion as the *Acta*. Reported sayings, or parts of sayings, which cannot be regarded as giving the *ipsissima verba* of Paul, are enclosed in round brackets. Square brackets indicate additions to the sayings made by the writers who preserve them.

FRAGMENT I.

συνῆλθεν ὁ λόγος τῷ ἐκ Δαυὶδ γεγενημένῳ ὃς ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ τοῦτον μὲν ἤνεγκεν ἡ παρθένος διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου. ἐκείνον δὲ τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησεν ὁ θεὸς ἄνευ παρθένου, καὶ ἄνευ τινὸς οὐδενὸς ὄντος πλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ οὕτως ὑπέστη ὁ λόγος.

From Justinian, *contra Monophysitas*, in Mai, *Nova Collectio* vii 299.

This, the first of three extracts from Paul of Samosata, has the heading λέγει γοῦν ὁ ἀσεβὴς Παῦλος ἐν τοῖς περὶ αὐτοῦ πεπραγμένοις. Thus it appears that it, and probably the two extracts which follow it, were taken from the *Acta*. In them it probably preceded frag. ii, which includes the second and third of Justinian's extracts; for Justinian seems to follow the order of his source.

¹ *H. E.* vi 44-46; vii 2-9, 20-23, 26. Compare my *Eusebiana*, pp. 154-166.

² *Common.* 25.

FRAGMENT II.

ἄνθρωπος χρίεται· ὁ λόγος οὐ χρίεται. ὁ ναζωραῖος χρίεται· (οὐχ)
ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν. καὶ γὰρ ὁ λόγος μείζων ἦν τοῦ χριστοῦ. ὁ χριστὸς γὰρ ^a
διὰ σοφίας ^b μέγας ^c ἐγένετο· τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς σοφίας μὴ κατέλωμεν.^d λόγος
μὲν γὰρ ἄνωθεν· Ἰησοῦς δὲ Χριστὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐντεῦθεν. Μαρία τὸν λόγον
5 οὐκ ἔτεκεν, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν πρὸ αἰώνων. ἡ ^e Μαρία τὸν λόγον ὑπεδέξατο ^f καὶ ^g
οὐκ ἐστὶ πρεσβυτέρα τοῦ λόγου Μαρία, ἀλλὰ ^h ἄνθρωπον ἡμῖν ἴσον ἔτεκεν ⁱ
κρείττονα δὲ κατὰ πάντα, ἐπειδὴ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἐξ ἐπαγγελιῶν καὶ
ἐκ τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ἐπ' αὐτῷ χάρις ἵνα ^k μήτε ὁ ἐκ Δαυιδ χρισθεὶς
ἀλλότριος ἢ τῆς σοφίας, μήτε ἡ σοφία ἐν ἄλλῳ οὕτως οἰκῆ· καὶ γὰρ ἐν
10 τοῖς ^l προφήταις ἦν, μᾶλλον δὲ ^m ἐν Μωσεί καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς κυρίοις ⁿ, μᾶλλον
δὲ ^o ἐν Χριστῷ ὡς ἐν ναῶ ^p. (ἔνθεν καὶ δύο φύσεις διηρημένως ἐχούσας καὶ
ἀκοινωνήτους πρὸς εαυτὰς εἶναι παντάπασι ἐν τῷ χριστῷ.) ἄλλος γὰρ
ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ ἄλλος ὁ λόγος ^q . . . τὸν λόγον ἀπέστειλε τοῖς
15 πάντων κύριος [Act. x 36] . . . ὡς τοῦ λόγου διὰ Χριστοῦ λαλήσαντος,
ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προφητῶν, τὰδε λέγει κύριος· ἄλλος μὲν ἦν ὁ προφήτης,
ἄλλος δὲ ὁ κύριος . . . ὁ φαινόμενος οὐκ ἦν σοφία, οὐ γὰρ ἠδύνατο ἐν
σχῆματι εὐρίσκεισθαι, οὐδὲ ἐν θέᾳ ἀνδρός· μείζων γὰρ τῶν ὁρωμένων ἐστίν.

^a om. Just. ^b σοφίαν Just. ^c μείζων Just. ^d τὸ ἀξίωμα . . . κατέλωμεν om.
Leont. ^e om. Cont. ^f Routh (p. 327) suggests that οὐχ should be inserted
before ὑπέδεξ. ^g τὸν . . . καὶ om. Leont. ^h om. Cont. ⁱ ἐτ. ἀνθ. ἡμ. ἴσ. Cont.
^k + δὲ Cont. ^l om. Just. ^m + καὶ Just. ⁿ κύριος Just. ^o + καὶ Just.
^p + θεοῦ Cont. (Mansi). ^q ἄλλος γὰρ . . . λόγος paraphrased in Ath., Cont.,
Ephraim Antioch. ap. Phot. cod. 229; Epistle ap. Leont. (frag. viii, below) has
ἄλλο μὲν ἡ σοφία ἄλλο δὲ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.

This passage has been reconstructed from a number of short extracts from Paul, quoted by the following writers:—

Leontius of Byzantium *c. Nestorianos et Eutychianos* iii, App., *P. G.* lxxvii i. 1393 (cited below as Leontius).

The author¹ of the *Contestatio publice proposita a clericis Constantinopolitanis*, included among the documents of the first Council of Ephesus, Mansi *Concilia* iv 1008, and quoted in full by Leontius, *op. cit.*, *P. G.* lxxxvi i. 1389 (cited as *Contestatio*).

Justinian *c. Monophysit.*, Mai *Nova Collectio* vii 299 (cited as Justinian).

Theodorus, presbyter of Raithu, *P. G.* xci 1485 (cited as Theodorus).
Athanasius *Orationes c. Arianos* iv 30, *P. G.* xxvi 513 (cited as Athanasius).

It is necessary to explain at some length the argument which has led

¹ Eusebius of Dorylaeum, according to Leontius, *l. c.*

me to regard all these extracts as belonging to a single fragment, and to justify the reconstruction of it which is here printed.

The first portion of the reconstructed fragment (*ἄνθρωπος χρίεται . . . ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου*), with the exception of a clause which he omits,¹ forms the first of three extracts in Leontius. It is immediately followed by a second extract, consisting of the clause *ἵνα μήτε . . . οἰκῆ*. Now in the *Contestatio* the following series of sayings of Paul is quoted :—

1. *Μαρία τὸν λόγον οὐκ ἔτεκεν.*
2. *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν πρὸ αἰώνων.*
3. *Μαρία τὸν λόγον ὑπεδέξατο καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ πρεσβυτέρα τοῦ λόγου.*
4. *Μαρία ἔτεκεν ἄνθρωπον ἡμῖν ἴσον.*
5. *κρείττονα δὲ κατὰ πάντα, ἐπειδὴ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἐξ ἐπαγγελιῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ἐπ' αὐτῷ χάρις.*
6. *ἵνα δὲ² μήτε ὁ ἐκ Δαυὶδ χρισθεὶς ἀλλότριος ἢ τῆς σοφίας, μήτε ἡ σοφία ἐν ἄλλῳ οὕτως οἰκῆ. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις ἦν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν Μωσεί καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς κυρίως, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ ὡς ἐν ναφ̄ θεοῦ.³*
7. *καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ λέγει ἄλλον εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ ἄλλον τὸν⁴ λόγον.*

Each of these, with the exception of the sixth, is followed by a parallel saying of Nestorius. There is no explicit indication that they are all from the same context, or even from the same writing. But the word *ἀλλαχοῦ* prefixed to the seventh implies at least that the first six were taken from a single tract. And that in that tract they were consecutive clauses can scarcely be doubted. For they follow one another naturally, without any break in the construction. Moreover, the first five of them are actually the conclusion of Leontius's first extract, with some variants and an addition at the end which completes a sentence obviously cut short by Leontius; while the sixth includes Leontius's second extract. We may therefore conclude that the first six are a single extract from Paul. Since this extract overlaps the two extracts of Leontius it is evident that our reconstructed fragment from the beginning down to the words *ἐν ναφ̄* is also a single extract.⁵

What then of the seventh saying of the *Contestatio*? The word *ἀλλαχοῦ* may have been intended to mark it as an excerpt from a different work. But, on the other hand, it may mean no more than that in the source it was separated from the sixth by a considerable interval. The following considerations appear to be decisive in favour

¹ τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς σοφίας μὴ καθέλωμεν. See below, p. 25.

² *om.* Mansi.

³ *om.* Leont.

⁴ + θεοῦ Leont.

⁵ It will be noted that on this hypothesis Leontius's second extract follows the first almost immediately. Between them there are only the words *καὶ ἐξ ἐπαγγελιῶν . . . χάρις*.

of the second of these two possible interpretations. Justinian has three quotations from Paul of Samosata, derived, it would seem, from the *Acta*.¹ The first of them is our frag. i. The second will be discussed later on. The third quotation includes two sentences. The first is part of the sixth saying in the *Contestatio*, καὶ γὰρ ἐν . . . ναῶ; the second runs ἄλλος γὰρ ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ ἄλλος ὁ λόγος. The latter is the seventh saying of the *Contestatio*, expressed in the *oratio recta*, and therefore probably in its original form. From Justinian the inference might have been plausibly drawn that the two sentences were consecutive in the document from which he took them. The word ἀλλαγῶν in the *Contestatio* negatives that conclusion; but we can safely affirm nevertheless that they were derived from the same source, in which the second occurred at some distance after the first. Justinian, in fact, after the manner of other authors, ancient² and modern, here leaves uncopied a portion of the passage which lay before him—the very same portion which the writer of the *Contestatio*, using the same document, also omitted. Can we bridge the chasm?

Let us turn to Theodorus. He speaks as follows:—

Παῦλος . . . φιλὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι τὸν κύριον ἐδυσφήμησεν ὥσπερ δὲ εἰς ἕκαστον τῶν προφητῶν οὕτω καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γενέσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου τὴν οἰκησιν· ἔνθεν καὶ δύο φύσεις διηρημένως ἐχούσας καὶ ἀκοινωνήτους πρὸς ἑαυτὰς εἶναι παντάπασιν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἄλλου ὄντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἄλλου τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικοῦντος θεοῦ λόγου.

This statement of Paul's doctrine is clearly in part based on sayings which we know. The first phrase recalls the assertion that Mary 'brought forth a man equal unto us'; the succeeding clause has an evident connexion with the sentences which say that the wisdom was in the prophets and in Christ; and the closing words are not less obviously a paraphrase of ἄλλος γὰρ ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ ἄλλος ὁ λόγος. And it has been shewn that the three sayings of Paul, to which I have referred, followed one another in the document underlying Leontius, the *Contestatio*, and Justinian, and in the same order as the corresponding clauses in Theodorus. It is a reasonable inference that Theodorus's ἔνθεν καὶ δύο φύσεις κτλ. had a similar relation to the passage which, as we have seen, lay between the second and third in the same document. That this clause may be a fairly accurate paraphrase of words used by Paul is shewn by its parallelism to another *dictum* of his (frag. vi 3); and it serves as a suitable link between the two sentences which, following Theodorus, we suppose that it connected. Moreover, that some such statement was made by Paul in the debate

¹ See under frag. i.

² See my *Eusebiana*, p. 96 f.

which preceded his condemnation is proved by a saying of Malchion reported by Leontius from the *Acta*¹:—

οὔτε δὲ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων προηγουμένως παθῶν ἀμέτοχος ἦν ὁ φορέσας καὶ ἐνδυσάμενος τὸ ἀνθρώπινον θεός· οὔτε τῶν θείων προηγουμένως ἔργων ἀμοιρον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, ἐν ᾧ ἦν, καὶ δι' οὗ ταῦτα ἐποίηε· ἐπλάσθη προηγουμένως ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐν γαστρὶ· καὶ κατὰ δεύτερον λόγον θεὸς ἦν ἐν γαστρὶ συνουσιωμένος τῷ ἀνθρώπινῳ.

This definition is evidently aimed at a statement that the two 'natures' in Christ were *διηρημέναι καὶ ἀκoinώνητοι*. It is, of course, open to question whether the words of Theodorus faithfully reproduce those of Paul; in particular whether he would have applied the term *φύσις* to the Logos in Christ, as he certainly applies it to the man in whom the Logos resided (frag. xii). But in our reconstruction we place them, without hesitation, before the clause *ἄλλος γάρ ἐστιν κτλ.*, as representing in substance the sentence which led up to it.

We are now in a position to deal with the second quotation of Justinian. It runs thus:—

ὁ λόγος μείζων ἦν τοῦ χριστοῦ. Χριστὸς διὰ σοφίαν μείζων ἐγένετο· τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς σοφίας μὴ καθέλωμεν.

The first two of these three clauses we have already found in Leontius. We have therefore been able to assign them their proper place in the reconstructed fragment (l. 2 f). In the third clause we are introduced to a saying of Paul not hitherto met with. That its source is the *Acta* we are assured, not only by Justinian but by a statement of the Epistle, reported by Leontius,² *φησὶ τοίνυν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν*³ . . . *τηρεῖν τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς σοφίας*. What was its position therein? From Justinian we learn that it followed, though perhaps not immediately,⁴ the words *Χριστὸς γὰρ διὰ σοφίας μέγας ἐγένετο* (l. 2), and that it preceded the beginning of his third quotation *ἵνα μήτε ὁ ἐκ Δαυὶδ* (l. 8). Again, it is unlikely that it belongs to that portion of our restored fragment which is common to Leontius and the *Contestatio*, for in that case it must have been omitted by two writers copying independently. Thus it preceded *Μαρία τὸν λόγον οὐκ* (l. 5). So we must put it either immediately before or immediately after *λόγος μὲν γὰρ ἄνωθεν Ἰησοῦς δὲ Χριστὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐντέυθεν* (l. 3 f). In the former of these possible positions I have printed it, as the one in which it suits the context better. Leontius omitted it designedly or by accident, just as he omitted *ἡ Μαρία τὸν λόγον ὑπεδέξατο* in l. 5 f.

¹ P. G. lxxxvi 1. 1393. ² *Ibid.* ³ The *Acta*. See Eus. *H. E.* vii 30. 11.

⁴ Justinian may have omitted one or more clauses in his second quotation, as he did in the third.

For justification of the portion of the reconstructed fragment which immediately follows ἄλλος γὰρ ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ ἄλλος ὁ λόγος we appeal to Athanasius. He writes:—

τινὲς τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Σαμοσατέως, διαιροῦντες τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ, φάσκουσι τὸν μὲν υἱὸν εἶναι τὸν χριστόν, τὸν δὲ λόγον ἄλλον εἶναι.

This saying of the Paulianists is simply the dictum of Paul just quoted, with the substitution of υἱός for ἄλλος. But Athanasius proceeds:—

καὶ τούτου πρόφασιν λαμβάνουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν Πράξεων, ὃ καλῶς μὲν ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν, αὐτοὶ δὲ κακῶς ἐκδέχονται. ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο· τὸν λόγον κτλ. (Acts x 36). φασὶ γὰρ ὡς τοῦ λόγου διὰ Χριστοῦ λαλήσαντος, ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προφητῶν, τάδε λέγει κύριος· ἄλλος μὲν ἦν ὁ προφήτης, ἄλλος δὲ ὁ κύριος.

It may be supposed that, since the Paulianists began by quoting in a modified form a dictum of their master, they quoted also the argument by which he supported it. And the use of Scripture to establish his doctrine is in Paul's manner. Vincentius Lirinensis (*Com.* 25), who knew his writings, tells us that it was his habit; and it is certain that for a similar purpose he referred to such passages as Deut. vi 4¹; Joh. v 27²; xiv 10, 12 (?)³; Phil. ii 7-9⁴; Rom. ix 5 (?)⁵ and probably many more.⁶

This conclusion becomes more probable when we observe two facts. The first is that the text quoted does not confirm the Paulianist view that Christ is Son; for the word υἱός does not occur in it. What it does shew, granting the soundness of the exegesis, is that Jesus Christ is different from the Logos, which is Paul's own statement, not that of his followers. Again, the argument of the Paulianists ends with the words ἄλλος μὲν ἦν ὁ προφήτης, ἄλλος δὲ ὁ κύριος. This is obviously intended to be a parallel to the saying with which it began. But in fact it is parallel to Paul's statement, not to their modification of it. We are almost forced to believe that the argument, as a whole, was not theirs but his.

It may be asked, indeed, if Athanasius was really quoting Paul's argument, why did he attribute it to certain of his followers in the fourth century? The answer is twofold. In the first place, at the moment Athanasius was engaged in refuting the theory which identified the Son with the Christ, but refused to identify Him with the Logos. This was the teaching of some Paulianists, as we learn from him, but apparently not of Paul himself.⁷ And secondly, Athanasius had little direct knowledge of Paul. He had not read the Epistle, and he

¹ Frag. ix 1.

² Cramer *Catena* ii 235.

³ Frag. ix 1, 3.

⁴ Frags. ii l. 17 f; vi 2; xiii.

⁵ Frag. ix 4

⁶ Frags. ix 1; x 3 (see notes).

⁷ See notes on frag. viii.

probably knew of the *Acta* only a few excerpts.¹ In regard of matters about which they did not supply information he could only testify to the beliefs and practices of contemporary Paulianists.² In such cases we cannot assume an implication on his part that they differed from the founder of the sect. In the instance before us he was possibly ignorant of the ultimate source of the argument which he criticized.

Leontius gives three extracts from Paul, the first two of which have been discussed above. The third is the concluding portion of the reconstructed fragment—ὁ φαινόμενος κτλ. (l. 17 f). We have seen that the second was separated by no more than a few words (καὶ ἐξ ἐπαγγελιῶν . . . χάρις, l. 7 f) from the first. It may be expected, therefore, that the third was a somewhat later sentence in the same context. It is for that reason that I regard it as part of our fragment. Its closing words connect it with καὶ γὰρ λόγος μείζων ἦν τοῦ χριστοῦ (l. 2). It will be noticed that it refers to Phil. ii 7.

Assuming then that the unity of our fragment has been established, we must enquire, where did it come from? The answer is not doubtful. It is a portion of the *Acta*. Evidence has been given incidentally that several parts of it are derived from that source. One or two facts which point to the same conclusion may be added here. The second extract of Leontius is headed ἐκ τοῦ πρὸς Μαλχίωνα διαλόγου. And a fragment of the Epistle, preserved by the same writer, tells of a saying of Paul (uttered no doubt in the disputation), that wisdom dwelt in Christ as in no other³—evidently referring to our fragment, ll. 9–11, μήτε ἡ σοφία κτλ. In the portions of the Epistle transcribed by Eusebius there is another allusion to words of Paul in the disputation—Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς κάτωθεν⁴—which might seem to be satisfied by Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐντεῦθεν (l. 4, cp. the use of ἐντεῦθεν in Joh. xviii 26). If so, we have a further indication of the source of the fragment. But the reference is more probably to frag. x 3, where Paul speaks of ὁ ἄνθρωπος κάτωθεν. In the present passage ἐντεῦθεν is perhaps equivalent to ἐκ παρθένου, or ἐκ Ναζαρέτ, as in Athan. c. *Apoll.* ii 3, quoted under frag. ix 4. It may point back to frag. i, or a sentence which followed it.

It may be well to point out that in the reconstructed fragment Paul uses λόγος and σοφία as almost convertible terms. If there is any difference between them it may be that σοφία is applied rather to the Logos in Christ or the Prophets, λόγος to the Logos in God.

¹ See notes on frag. vii.

² e.g. *Orat.* ii 43.

³ καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα, ἡ τὸ ἐνοικῆσαι ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν σοφίαν λέγειν ὡς ἐν οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ. *P. G.* lxxxvi i. 1393. See under frag. v. Theodoret *Haer. Fab.* ii 8 (*P. G.* lxxxiii 393) refers to ll. 6–11 of this fragment, apparently as part of the *Acta*: ἐφωράθη τὸν χριστὸν ἄνθρωπον λέγον, θείας χάριτος διαφερόντως ἡξιωμένον.

⁴ *Eus. H. E.* vii 30. 11.

FRAGMENT III.

εἰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν σύστασιν καὶ γένεσιν συνῆπτο τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτο (συμβαίνειν).

This is the second of a series of extracts from the Epistle preserved by Leontius (*P. G.* lxxxvi i. 1393). The first has been quoted above (p. 25 : φησὶ τοίνυν κτλ.). The two are perhaps to be read continuously, the words καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα, which precede the second, being taken, not as a note of Leontius, but as copied by him from the Epistle. If so, it followed frag. ii l. 3 (καθέλωμεν) in the *Acta*, after an interval. It depends on φησὶ in the previous extract, and from it σοφία is to be supplied as the subject of συνῆπτο. The first part seems to be a quotation of words used by an orthodox speaker, to which Paul replies, for both σύστασις and συνάπτομαι, in such a connexion, are apparently orthodox words.¹ We may paraphrase, 'If, as you say, Wisdom was united to Christ in the womb, this is consistent with the view that it was united to a human person.'

FRAGMENT IV.

(οὐ γὰρ συγγεγενῆσθαι τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ τὴν σοφίαν² οὐσιωδῶς ἀλλὰ κατὰ ποιότητα.)

The third extract from the Epistle of the same series. Like frag. iii it depends on a previous φησὶ. The words καὶ πάλιν, which introduce it, indicate that it came from a different (probably, but not necessarily, later) part either of the Letter or of the *Acta*, according as we ascribe them to Leontius or to the Epistle itself.

FRAGMENT V.

(ἕτεροίαν τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἡμετέρας.)

From Leontius's fourth extract from the Epistle; which it may be well to quote in its entirety, with part of the fifth:—

τί δὲ βούλεται, καὶ τὸ ἕτεροίαν φάσκει τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἡμετέρας; ἡμῶν ἐν³ μεγίστῳ δὴ⁴ τούτῳ διαφέρει αὐτοῦ τὴν σύστασιν ἀξιούντων τῷ⁵ τὸν θεὸν λόγον ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι, ὅπερ ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ ἔσω ἀνθρώπος; καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα, ἢ⁶ τὸ ἐνοικῆσαι ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν σοφίαν λέγειν ὡς ἐν οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ; τοῦτο γὰρ τὸν μὲν τρόπον τῆς ἐνοικήσεως τὸν αὐτὸν δηλοῖ μέτρῳ δὲ καὶ πλήθει ὑπερφέρει,⁷ οἷον διπλάσιον ἢ καὶ ὀπωσδήποτε πλείον ἢ ἔλασσον τοῦ διπλασίου γινώσκοντος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς σοφίας ἢ οἱ ἄλλοι.

¹ For the first see under frags. v, vi, and for the second frags. xiii, xv.

² The Epistle inserts here ὡς ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν.

³ ἐν (οἱ. ἡμῶν) Routh, p. 311, from Bodleian MS.

⁴ δὲ Routh.

⁵ So Routh, τὸ Migne.

⁶ So Routh, εἰ Migne.

⁷ ὑπερφέρειν Routh.

Here the Epistle as usual quotes from the *Acta*. But the phrase *καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα* is obviously an insertion of Leontius, indicating that he has omitted a portion of the Epistle. Hence, though the second saying of Paul here reported (a free quotation of frag. ii ll. 9-11) followed the first in the letter, we cannot form any opinion as to their relative positions in the *Acta*. The general sense of the passage from which both extracts come seems to be, Of what avail is it that Paul insists so strongly on the difference between the *κατασκευή* of Christ and that of other men, seeing that we go so far beyond him, maintaining that the divine Word is part of His being? Why does he talk of the uniqueness of the indwelling of the Wisdom in Him, while he makes the difference between Him and others in this respect merely quantitative, not qualitative? Paul had spoken of what he here calls the *ἑτεροία κατασκευή* in frags. i, ii. It is worthy of note that the Synod substitutes *σύστασις* for his *κατασκευή*. Cp. frag. iii.

FRAGMENT VI.

1. Ex simplicibus fit¹ compositum.
2. (quia) sapientia dispendium (patiatur) et ideo composita esse non (possit).
3. (quod) sapientia (habitaret) in eo sicut habitamus et nos in domibus ut alter in altero sed neque pars domus nos sumus nec nostri pars domus est.

These sayings of Paul are extracted from a fragment of Malchion preserved by Petrus Diaconus, *de Incarnatione et Gratia Christi* iii (*P. L.* lxii 85), who prefaces it with the words, '(Malchion presbyterus) summum disputationis certamen a concilio memorato suscipiens ita eundem haeticum inter caetera redarguit, dicens.' Its source is therefore the *Acta*: but it must be borne in mind that Peter does not give us the *ipsissima verba* of Paul; we have the sayings only as Malchion quoted or summarized them. The first of them is not expressly ascribed to Paul, but the word *certe*, which is inserted after *fit*, seems to imply that it is a postulate of his which his adversary accepts.

The comment of Malchion is instructive. After quoting the first saying, he proceeds: 'Sicut in Christo Iesu qui ex Deo uerbo et humano corpore, quod est ex semine Daud, unus factus est, nequaquam ulterius diuisione aliqua sed unitate subsistens. Tu uero uideris mihi secundum hoc nolle compositionem fateri, ut non substantia sit in eo filius Dei sed sapientia secundum participationem. Hoc enim dixisti', &c. Here the words 'nequaquam', &c. seem to refer to frag. ii ll. 11-14. To the second sentence the following, quoted by Leontius

¹ Petrus Diac. inserts *certe* after *fit*.

(l. c.)—his seventh extract from the Letter of the Synod—is so closely parallel that we might almost regard the Latin as a translation of it: τὴν δὲ συνάφειαν ἐτέρως πρὸς τὴν σοφίαν νοεῖ κατὰ μάθησιν καὶ μετουσίαν, οὐχὶ οὐσίαν οὐσιωμένην ἐν σώματι. Ἐτέρως is no doubt equivalent to a phrase which Peter might have rendered ‘non secundum compositionem’. The Greek would have been οὐ κατὰ σύστασιν (cp. frags. iii, v). The words *compositum* and *composita* in the sayings are probably renderings of cognates of *σύστασις*. *Μετουσίαν* is rendered *participationem*; perhaps wrongly, for it is patient of a translation which brings it into closer connexion with *μάθησις*, here coupled with it, and with the *κατὰ ποιότητα* of frag. iv, to which the sentence appears to refer. Οὐχὶ οὐσίαν οὐσιωμένην is evidently represented by ‘non substantia sit’. The words ἐν σώματι have their parallel not in the ‘in eo’ of the corresponding Latin, but in the ‘humano corpore’ of the previous sentence. The resemblance between this Latin version of Malchion’s speech and the Greek of the Letter gives support to the statement of St Jerome¹ that the latter was written by Malchion himself. With this saying of Malchion we may compare another, in which he seems to refer to it (Leontius, l. c.): οὐ πάλαι τοῦτο ἔλεγον, ὅτι οὐ διδῶς οὐσιῶσθαι ἐν τῷ ὄλω σωτῆρι τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν πρὸ πάσης κτίσεως αἰδίως ὑπάρχοντα;

From Malchion’s comment on the second saying of Paul we learn that at this point the debate turned on the interpretation of Phil. ii 7: cp. frags. ii l. 17 f; xiii. It runs: ‘Nec cogitas quod diuina sapientia, sicut antequam se exinanisset, indiminuta permansit; ita et in hac exinanitione . . . indiminuta atque indemutabilis exstitit.’ Thus we can understand Paul’s statement that the Wisdom ‘suffered loss’: it is his interpretation of *ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν*.

FRAGMENT VII.

1. εἰ μὴ ἐξ ἀνθρώπου² γέγονεν ὁ χριστὸς θεός, οὐκοῦν ὁμοουσίος ἐστὶ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ἀνάγκη τρεῖς οὐσίας εἶναι, μίαν μὲν προηγουμένην, τὰς δὲ δύο ἐξ ἐκείνης.

2. (‘Per hanc unius essentiae nuncupationem solitarium atque unicum sibi Patrem et Filium praedicabat.’)

The former of these two sayings is given by Athanasius *de Synodis* 45 (*P.G.* xxvi 772), the latter by Hilary of Poitiers *de Synodis* 81 (*P.L.* x 534).

Athanasius had not read the Epistle of the Synod of Antioch³; it was from certain brethren who disliked the word *ὁμοουσίον* that he learned that it had been condemned therein.⁴ But he quotes the

¹ *De Vir. Ill.* 71.

² Lower down Athanasius, in a second reference to this clause, has ἀνθρώπων.

³ *De Syn.* 43 τὴν γὰρ ἐπιστολὴν οὐκ ἔσχον ἐγώ.

⁴ *Ibid.* εἰρήκασι μὴ εἶναι ὁμοουσίον τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρὶ. Similarly in c. 45, where τὸν χριστὸν takes the place of τὸν υἱόν. Dr Strong has argued that the rejection of

argument of Paul, apparently *verbatim*, and with no expression of doubt. We may conclude that he states it in the form in which it appears in the *Acta*, a copy of at least some portions of which was no doubt in his hands. In the context he gives us to understand that the Fathers of the Synod failed to perceive the fallacy of the reasoning, and that being unable to accept the conclusion, they resorted to the expedient of denying one of the premisses on which it rested, the homoousian formula. This statement of Athanasius may have been based on mere conjecture, or it may have been stated by those on whom he relied for information about the Epistle.

Hilary seems to have depended for his knowledge of what the Fathers of Antioch had written on the letter of the Gaulish bishops which he was criticizing. He says: 'Id addidistis quod patres nostri, cum Paulus Samosatenus haereticus pronuntiatus est, etiam homoousion repudiarint: quia per hanc' &c. This amounts to a statement that in the Epistle the word *ὁμοούσιον* was rejected, and that a specific reason for its rejection was given. There is no direct allusion to the *Acta*, though of course the argument which Paul used must have appeared in them.

There is no *a priori* reason to suppose that the information given us by either of these two writers as to the proceedings of the Synod is erroneous, though it might be expected that it would be fragmentary. They are in fact supported by a third witness, who adds to our knowledge. St. Basil assures us that the word *ὁμοούσιον* was condemned in the Epistle; and he further tells us that in the same document a reason for its rejection was set forth, which is very similar to the argument of Paul reported by Athanasius. Here are his words (*Ep.* 52, *P. G.* xxxii 393): καὶ γὰρ τῷ ὄντι οἱ ἐπὶ Παύλῳ τῷ Σαμοσατέϊ συνελθόντες διέβαλον τὴν λέξιν [ὁμοούσιον] ὡς οὐκ εὔηχον. ἔφασαν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι τὴν τοῦ ὁμοουσίου φωνὴν παριστᾶν ἔννοιαν οὐσίας τε καὶ τῶν ἀπ' αὐτῆς, ὥστε καταμερισθεῖσαν τὴν οὐσίαν παρέχειν τοῦ ὁμοουσίου τὴν προσηγορίαν τοῖς εἰς ἃ διηρέθη.

Now let us return to Hilary. He also knew the argument attributed to Paul by Athanasius and stated by Basil to have been used in the Antiochene Epistle. But he puts it into the mouth of the semi-Arian bishops: 'Idcirco respuendum (homoousion) pronuntiastis quia per uerbi huius enuntiationem substantia prior intelligeretur quam duo inter

ὁμοούσιον at Antioch is not proved (*Journal of Theol. Studies* iii 292), laying stress on the indirectness of the testimony of Athanasius and Hilary. This scarcely affects our argument. But it may be noted that he does not refer to the evidence of Basil, and that he makes use of a singularly hazardous argument *e silentio*—'the absence of any such condemnation in the extant documents of the Council'. The argument from the absence of any correction of the statement of Athanasius and Hilary by other writers is more impressive.

se partiti essent.' The words of Athanasius and Basil suggest that this came ultimately from the documents of the Synod of Antioch. And it is quite probable that if the semi-Arians borrowed one argument from the Council, as they professed to have done, they should have borrowed another also. Against this conclusion, of course, no argument can be based on the silence of Hilary. In the form in which the argument is expressed Hilary approaches nearer to Basil than to Athanasius. That is as it should be; for the Gaulish bishops and Basil, as we have seen, quote the Epistle, while Athanasius quotes the *Acta*.

Thus the evidence, so far as it has been investigated, points to the conclusion that Paul based two arguments on the word *ἁμοούσιον*, both of which were incorporated in the Epistle, as reasons for rejecting that term. But it has been held that this conclusion cannot be maintained. The testimony of Hilary and the testimony of Athanasius, it is said, are inconsistent with each other. We must therefore make our choice between them. Hilary declares that Paul accepted the term, Athanasius that he rejected it.¹

I cannot see that Athanasius states, or implies, anything of the kind. I take it that the saying which he attributes to Paul may be paraphrased thus: 'On your theory (cp. frag. iii), not only the Word but the Christ—the composite Being made up of the hypostatic Word and body (see frag. vi)—is co-essential with the Father²: this implies an essence prior to the Father and the Christ, of which both partake.' So interpreted the reasoning is of the nature of an *argumentum ad hominem*: it is an attempt to reduce the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation to an absurdity. The term *ἁμοούσιον* is not objected against but assumed.³

We may perhaps believe that the word was at first accepted by both parties. On the one hand Paul would have no difficulty in affirming that the Logos was *ἁμοούσιος τῷ θεῷ (πατρὶ)*. The opponents of Paul, like Dionysius of Alexandria, may have admitted the orthodoxy of the statement that Christ was *ἁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ*, while forbearing to insist upon it. But as the controversy proceeded it would seem that the heresiarch propounded a double argument. On the one hand he contended that the term was fatal to the Christology of his adversaries; on the other he claimed that it was consistent with, or implied, his own view, which recognized but one Person in the Godhead, and

¹ So Gwatkin *Studies of Arianism*, 2nd ed. (1900), p. 47.

² This is the formula which Dionysius of Rome accused his namesake of Alexandria of rejecting: *ὡς οὐ λέγοντος τὸν χριστὸν (not υἱὸν or λόγον) ἁμοούσιον εἶναι τῷ θεῷ* (C. L. Feltoe *Dionysius of Alexandria* p. 188).

³ In reply to Paul's argument Athanasius is content to say, *μη οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσωμάτων, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ θεοῦ, τὸ ἁμοούσιον σημαίνεσθαι*. But the Christ incarnate was not *ἀσώματος*.

distinguished between the divine Logos and the human Christ. Malchion and his adherents accepted the reasoning in both cases, and on both grounds abandoned the formula. In this they may have received countenance from Dionysius of Alexandria, whose letter to the Church of Antioch they treated with such respect.¹ If, as is likely, he dwelt in it on the Monarchianist tendencies of Paul, it is equally likely that, as in earlier epistles on a similar subject, he did not employ the term *ὁμοούσιον*.²

If the word had not at the beginning been accepted by Paul's opponents, it is difficult to see how either of the arguments attributed to him could have had real force; if it had been in common use among them Malchion would surely have been able to vindicate its orthodoxy. On the other hand, if the word was used by the orthodox, and not by Paul, why should they repudiate it? They might simply have disused it. The case was different if he not only derided its use by the orthodox, but himself used it to support his own heresy. It may be added that the employment of such a term as this—traditionally orthodox, but seldom heard—was perhaps one of the means by which Paul contrived to veil his heterodoxy in the earlier stages of the controversy.³

It must further be remarked that Hilary, Athanasius, and Basil are not the only witnesses whose testimony on this matter is available. Epiphanius, as I hope to shew later on, is largely indebted for his account of the Samosatene heresy to the *Acta*. Now he writes,⁴ *μία θεότης ἢ τριάς, πατήρ υἱὸς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ὁμοούσιος οὐσα. ὅταν γὰρ εἴπῃς*⁵ *ὁμοούσιον οὐ συναλοιφὴν σημαίνει. τὸ γὰρ ὁμοούσιον οὐχ ἐνός ἐστι σημαντικόν.* And again, *οὔτε πάλιν λέγομεν αὐτὸν μὴ εἶναι ταῦτὸν τῆ οὐσία τῷ πατρί.* Here we have the word *ὁμοούσιον*, and a repudiation at once of a Monarchianist inference from it, and of the charge that those who used it denied the identity in essence of Father and Son. The inference according to Hilary, and the charge according to Athanasius, came from Paul. If the words of Epiphanius are derived from Malchion, as is much in the context, they lead us to three conclusions: first, that the statements of both Athanasius and Hilary are in harmony with the facts; secondly, that the party of Malchion, at least at the beginning of the discussion, accepted the word *ὁμοούσιον*; and thirdly, that for a time they resisted Paul's deductions from it.

The opening words of the first saying imply Paul's belief that from being man Christ came to be God. This sufficiently explains the words

¹ Eus. *H. E.* vii 27; 30. 3.

² Feltoe, p. 171.

³ Eus. *H. E.* vii 28. 2.

⁴ *Haer.* 65. 8 (Dindorf iii 13).

⁵ This word should be noted. It seems to indicate that Epiphanius was quoting a speech addressed to an individual opponent.

of the Macrostich¹: οὔτε . . . ἀρνούμεθα καὶ τὸν χριστὸν θεὸν εἶναι πρὸ αἰώνων· ὁποῖοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀπὸ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως, ὕστερον αὐτὸν μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ἐκ προκοπῆς τεθεοποιῆσθαι λέγοντες, τῷ τὴν φύσιν ψιλὸν ἀνθρώπων γεγενῆναι, and the words of the Epistle reported by Gregory of Nyssa,² ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἀποτεθεωῶσθαι τὸν κύριον. Athanasius may refer to this 'deification' of the Christ when he says that Paul confessed 'God born of a virgin'. His words are given in the note on frag. ix 4. For Paul's fuller exposition of the doctrine see frags. xi, xiii, xv. It is evident that he did not acknowledge the divinity of Christ in any sense which would permit worship to be rendered to Him.³

FRAGMENT VIII.

(μὴ δύο ὑφίστασθαι υἱούς.)

From Leontius (*P. G.* lxxxvi i. 1393).

This saying stands at the head of Leontius's sixth extract from the Epistle, and it is introduced by the word *φησὶ*, indicating that it was taken from the *Acta*. Doubtless it was a repudiation of teaching imputed to Paul by Malchion. The Epistle confutes the heretic out of his own mouth: εἰ δὲ υἱὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, υἱὸς δὲ καὶ σοφία, καὶ ἄλλο μὲν ἢ σοφία ἄλλο δὲ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δύο ὑφίστανται υἱοί. This reply has the appearance of quoting three sayings of Paul, and ἄλλο μὲν κτλ. actually represents frag. ii l. 12 f. But it is doubtful whether the preceding clauses reproduce explicit statements. Υἱὸς καὶ σοφία is sufficiently justified as a summary of Paul's teaching by the latter part of frag. i, though the word *υἱός* does not occur there; and by the fact that he perhaps occasionally uses *υἱός* as a synonym of *λόγος* (frag. ix 1; x 3), though in general he seems to avoid the word. On the other hand, in his extant sayings there is no implication that Jesus Christ is the Son of God: indeed the early part of frag. i and frag. x 3 seem to indicate the contrary. But we know that while the Paulianists of a later generation, as a body, used the 'three Names' in baptism,⁴ which surely involves belief in the sonship of the Logos, yet some of the sect, at the same period, gave the title of son to Christ, but denied it to the eternal Word.⁵ This divergence points to some indecision or inconsistency in the language of the founder. Malchion may have laid hold of some ill-considered utterances, let fall in the course of debate, in order to fasten on him the charge of self-contradiction. All that can be

¹ See Athan. *de Syn.* 26.

² *Antirrheticus adv. Apollinarium* (*P. G.* xlv 1139).

³ See Eus. *H. E.* vii 30. 10.

⁴ Athan. *Orat.* ii 43 Μανιχαῖοι καὶ Φρύγες καὶ οἱ τοῦ Σαμοσατέως μαθηταί, τὰ ὀνόματα λέγοντες, οὐδὲν ἡττὸν εἰσιν αἰρετικοί.

⁵ *Ibid.* iv 30, quoted above under frag. ii p. 26.

affirmed is that Paul must have said something in which an adversary might have detected an admission of the sonship of Christ, as he certainly did, in effect, acknowledge the sonship of the Word.

FRAGMENT IX.

1. (Θεὸν [πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα] ἕνα θεόν, ἐν θεῷ δὲ αἰεὶ ὄντα τὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον [καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ] ὡς περ ἐν ἀνθρώπου καρδίᾳ ὁ ἴδιος λόγος. μὴ εἶναι δὲ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐννύστατον, ἀλλὰ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ θεῷ. ἐλθόντα δὲ τὸν λόγον καὶ ἐνοικήσαντα ἐν Ἰησοῦ ἀνθρώπῳ ὄντι). καὶ οὕτως εἰς ἔσται ὁ θεός. . . . ἀπὸ τῶν μαρτυριῶν τούτων . . . κύριος ὁ θεός σου, κύριος εἰς ἔσται [Deut. vi 4] . . . εἶπεν ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἐμοί [Joh. xiv 10 f] . . . ἐλθὼν ὁ λόγος ἐνήργησε μόνος καὶ ἀνῆλθε πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.

2. (αὐτὸν τὸν πατέρα ἕνα θεόν.)

3. (μετὰ τὸ γεγενῆσθαι ὀφθέντα ἐν αὐτῷ τὸν λόγον καὶ πάλιν ἐν θεῷ ὑπάρχοντα ἄνω, ὡς ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀνθρώπου λόγος.)

From Epiphanius *Haer.* 65, 1, 2, 3, 8 (Dindorf, iii 5, 6, 15).

4. (λόγον ἐνεργὸν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ σοφίαν ἐν αὐτῷ, τῷ μὲν προορισμῷ πρὸ αἰώνων ὄντα τῇ δὲ ὑπάρξει ἐκ Ναζαρετ ἀναδειχθέντα) ἕνα εἰς εἶη ὁ ἐπὶ πάντα θεὸς ὁ πατήρ.

From Athanasius *c. Apollinar.* ii 3 (*P.G.* xxvi 1136).

The first of these extracts is attributed by Epiphanius to Paul himself. But the clauses enclosed in square brackets are probably glosses; for the formula in which they occur is repeated many times in the context with variants, but nowhere else does it contain a reference to the Holy Spirit; and from extracts 2, 4 it appears that, according to Paul, the One God was the Father. In the second sentence, *μὴ εἶναι κτλ.*, it is not unlikely that *υἱόν* has been substituted for *λόγον* by Epiphanius. That Epiphanius had a document before him when he wrote, and that in the latter part of the extract he gives the *ipsissima verba* of Paul, as reported in it, is highly probable. The words 'from these testimonies' lead us to expect several texts; but in § 1 only one 'testimony' is quoted (Deut. iv 6). That Paul cited Joh. xiv 10 f in this connexion is inferred from § 2, in which his interpretation of that passage is challenged. The words *ἐλθὼν κτλ.*, which conclude the extract from Paul, are in § 1. Thus Epiphanius seems here to have transcribed Paul's argument, omitting part of it. That the document which lay before him was the *Acta* we may gather from *ἐλθόντα κτλ.*, which is a condensation of frag. ii ll. 3-11. The next section, which criticizes Paul's exegesis of Joh. xiv 10 f., is probably based on Malchion's refutation of it, recorded in the *Acta*. The words *ἐνήργησε μόνος* in the final clause are of doubtful meaning. They may be interpreted as stating that the Logos in Christ acted either independently of the human personality (cp. frag. ii l. 11 f) or apart from God. In view of extracts 3, 4

of this fragment (see below) the latter explanation seems more probable. But possibly *μόνος* includes both significations—apart from Christ and apart from God. The words *καὶ ἀνῆλθε κτλ.* are obviously based on Joh. xiv 12, 28; xvi 17, 28; xvii 11, 13. They are further developed in extract 3.

The second extract, like the first, purports to represent a statement of Paul. It is said, in the context, to involve the absurdity of a *πατήρ ἄγονος υἱοῦ*.

The third extract comes from a passage in which Epiphanius speaks not of Paul but of the 'Samosatites'. Nevertheless, it appears to represent in substance an utterance of his. In fact it reproduces, in different language, and with an addition, the conclusion of extract 1. Moreover the irregularity of the construction points to the quotation and criticism of detached sentences of a single writer or speaker. The immediately preceding words are *ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ οὐχ ὡς λόγος ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ πατέρα οἶδαμεν νοητὸν σὺν υἱῷ καὶ υἱὸν ἀπὸ πατρὸς γεγεννημένον. καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ ἔλθων εἰς οἰκητήριον ὁ θεὸς λόγος· καὶ μετὰ κτλ.* Here allusion is obviously made to extract 1 (*ὡς λόγος ἐν καρδίᾳ*) and to frag. vi 3 (*εἰς οἰκητήριον*), the reference to extract 1 being continued in *καὶ πάλιν κτλ.* It would seem that Epiphanius is giving us further scraps of Malchion's remarks on Joh. xiv 10 f. At any rate the extract adds to our knowledge of what Paul actually said. For it implies a declaration by him that after its entry into the man Jesus it was 'seen' in him; that while it dwelt in him it was no longer in God as reason in the heart of a man, but had for the time, in some sense, a separate existence; and that finally it returned to its former state.

The fourth extract is part of a passage in which Athanasius states that Paul of Samosata, like other heretics, confessed that 'God was born¹ in Nazareth'. It presents some difficulties; but it has manifest points of contact with extracts 1-3, which warrant the belief that it is based on the document which underlies them: Παῦλος ὁ Σαμοσατεύς, he writes, *θεὸν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου ὁμολογεῖ, θεὸν ἐκ Ναζαρέτ ὀφθέντα, καὶ ἐντεῦθεν τῆς ὑπάρξεως τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐσχηκότα, καὶ ἀρχὴν βασιλείας παρεληφότα.*² Then he proceeds, as in extract 4, *λόγον δὲ ἐνεργόν κτλ.*, explaining, apparently, the sense in which Paul made the admission. Note the words *ὀφθέντα* (see extract 3), *ἐνεργόν* (cp. *ἐνήργησε*, extract 1), *ὑπάρξεως*, *ὑπάρξει* (cp. *ὑπάρχοντα*, extract 3), *πατήρ* (cp. extract 2); also the allusion to Deut. iv 6 (as in extract 1). If Athanasius is right, Paul actually dated the proper existence of the Logos from the 'Incarnation', from its entry into Jesus. No doubt the Logos was in being before the ages, but only *τῷ προορισμῷ*, not *τῇ ὑπάρξει*. The Logos was essentially

¹ *γεγενῆσθαι*.

² For this statement see under frag. vii p. 34.

λόγος ἐνεργός, existing therefore in the true sense only when active. For the λόγος ἐνεργός compare Marius Mercator, *Nest. Blasph. Cap.* App. 19 (*P. L.* xlviii 929) 'Paulus uerbum dei προφορικὸν καὶ πρακτικὸν λόγον καὶ ἐνεργητικόν, id est, prolatiuum et potestatis effectiuum uerbum sensit, non substantiuum, quod Graeci οὐσιῶδες dicunt'. It may be added that Athanasius seems to imply that Paul used Rom. ix 5, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, as one of the 'testimonies' to his view of the unity of God.

In confirmation of the inference here drawn from extracts 1, 3, 4, the summary of *Haer.* 65, given by Epiphanius in his *Anacephalaeosis* (Dindorf i 250; iii 3), may be quoted. It puts in brief what he conceived, after a study of the documents, to be the main points of Paul's teaching: οὗτος ἀνύπαρκτον τὸν Χριστὸν ὀλίγον δεῖν διαβεβαιούται (cp. extract 1), λόγον προφορικὸν αὐτὸν σχηματίσας (cp. frag. x 2), ἀπὸ δὲ Μαρίας καὶ δεῦρο εἶναι προαγγελτικῶς μὲν τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς εἰρημένα ἔχοντος (cp. frag. ii l. 7 f), μὴ ὄντος δέ, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ Μαρίας καὶ δεῦρο διὰ τῆς ἐνσάρκου παρουσίας. Cp. Eus. *H. E.* vi 33 (cp. 20). Compare also Athanasius *De Syn.* 45 (*P. G.* xxvi 773) ὁ Σαμουσαεὺς ἐφρόνει μὴ εἶναι πρὸ Μαρίας τὸν υἱόν, ἀλλ' ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἀρχὴν ἐσχηκένας.

FRAGMENT X.

1. (πρόσωπον ἐν τὸν θεὸν ἅμα τῷ λόγῳ ὡς ἄνθρωπον ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον.)

2. τὸ ὄν εἶναι (τοῦ λόγου) κατὰ τὴν προφορὰν ἔστι.

3. ἄνθρωπος ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπένευσεν ἄνωθεν ὁ λόγος. καὶ ταῦτα περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος λέγει· ὁ πατὴρ γὰρ ἅμα τῷ υἱῷ εἰς θεός, ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος κάτωθεν τὸ ἴδιον πρόσωπον ὑποφαίνει. καὶ οὕτως τὰ δύο πρόσωπα πληροῦνται.

From Epiphanius *Haer.* 65 (Dindorf iii 6, 7, 12).

These three sayings appear to have been closely connected with one another. All three are attributed by Epiphanius, not to Paul himself, but to his followers. The first two stand close together in an orthodox argument based on Joh. i 1; the first, though only a variant of the formula with which frag. ix 1 begins, expresses that formula in the precise form presupposed by extract 3, which is much further on in Epiphanius. We may conjecture that here as elsewhere (see frag. ix) Epiphanius has worked up into his argument a speech of Malchion in the *Acta*. Confirmation of the conjecture is found in words which immediately follow the sentence from which extract 2 is taken: εἰ γὰρ ἐν καρδίᾳ λόγον θεὸν (l. θεὸς?) ἔχει, καὶ οὐ γεγεννημένον, πῶς πληροῦνται τὸ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος; οὐ γὰρ ὁ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου λόγος ἄνθρωπος πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον· οὔτε γὰρ ζῆ οὔτε ὑπέστη. Here the words γεγεννημένον and ὑπέστη remind us of the second sentence of frag. i, where the same

verbs are used in successive clauses and applied to the Logos. It is hard to escape the impression that there is a connexion between the two passages. But what is the nature of the connexion? Here we are told in effect that since, according to Paul, the Logos is not begotten, it cannot in his view be hypostatic. In frag. i Paul himself says that the Logos *is* begotten, and so is hypostatic. No one could have written or uttered the passage before us with direct reference to frag. i. But there is no difficulty in believing that it contains the substance of an argument of Malchion, to which frag. i is Paul's answer: he denies both premiss and conclusion. If this supposition is correct it follows that our three extracts give the gist of sayings of Paul in the Disputation at Antioch, uttered before frag. i and supplemented by it. The fact, already noted, that they are ascribed by Epiphanius to the 'Samosatites' does not negative this conclusion. For though Paul and Malchion were the principal, if not the only, disputants at Antioch, each had a party behind him, and spoke in its name. It was to be expected that statements of Paul should be counted as expressing the mind of the Samosatene faction (cp. frag. ix 3).

The second saying of the group is not explicitly quoted by Epiphanius. But that Paul used words to the same effect is implied: *εἰ γὰρ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, τὸ ὄν εἶναι οὐ κατὰ τὴν προφορὰν μόνον ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν ὑπόστασιν*. This sentence supplies additional proof that Epiphanius is using, with little skill, an anti-Paulianist writing. For up to this point he has attributed to Paul no opinion against which it could be directed. For *κατὰ τὴν προφορὰν* compare *λόγος προφορικὸς* in the quotations from Marius Mercator and the *Anacephalaeosis* of Epiphanius, under frag. ix.

In the third extract we have what is evidently a mere scrap of a longer passage. The subject of *λέγει* is 'the man' Jesus, who is described in the previous clause as inspired by the Logos. The word *ταῦτα* must refer to sayings of Jesus mentioned in the document used by Epiphanius. They are said to have been spoken of 'the man' himself. Clearly the document quoted other sayings distinguished from these, in which, according to Paul, he spoke not concerning himself, but, presumably, concerning the Logos which dwelt in him. Some such clause as *ἐκεῖνα λέγει περὶ τοῦ λόγου* has been omitted. Now in the preceding section of Epiphanius (§ 6) a series of sayings of Jesus (Joh. v 43; viii 17 f, 28; xiv 9; xv 26; xvi 14 f; Matt. xi 25; Lk. x 22) is found, which in their obvious interpretation contradict Paul's doctrine of 'the man from below'. Even if we may not assume that Epiphanius took them from Malchion's speeches in the *Acta*, it was inevitable that Malchion should quote such sayings in the course of his argument against the heresiarch. How would Paul dispose of them?

It would seem that only one way was open to him. He would maintain that in such utterances 'the man' was the mere mouthpiece of the Logos (compare the exposition of Acts x 36 in frag. ii): that Christ spoke concerning the Logos, or rather that the Logos spoke through him concerning itself. This principle of exegesis could not be easily brushed aside, at least in regard of such of this type of sayings—the greater number—as are recorded in the Gospel of the Logos. And certainly some such principle is implied in Paul's quotation of Joh. xiv 10 in support of his doctrine (see frag. ix 1). On the other hand, he cited other sayings, such as Joh. v 27,¹ in which the manhood of Christ was made prominent. Most of them, no doubt, came from the Synoptic Gospels. Of them he would of necessity affirm, *ταῦτα περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος λέγει*. It may be observed that these words, as they appear in Epiphanius, are without relevance to the context; they follow a series of sayings of Christ, of which Paul could make no such statement—a further indication that Epiphanius was making a not very intelligent use of a written source. In the latter part of extract 3 Paul is apparently justifying the severance of the Logos from the human person of the Christ, which his exegesis implies. The Logos, he says, in fact belongs to a different personality. This is apparently the saying of Paul quoted in the letter of the Synod of Antioch from the *ὑπομνήματα* (i. e. the *Acta*), *ὅπου λέγει Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν κάτωθεν*.² In this extract the word *νιῶ*, after *λόγος* in a previous clause, is suspicious. It may have been written in place of *λόγῳ* by Epiphanius.

FRAGMENT XI.

τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι χρισθεὶς προσηγορεύθη χριστός, πάσχων κατὰ φύσιν, θαυματουργῶν κατὰ χάριν. τῷ γὰρ ἀτρέπτῳ τῆς γνώμης ὁμοιωθεὶς τῷ θεῷ, καὶ μείνας καθαρὸς ἁμαρτίας ἠνώθη αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐνηργήθη πονεῖν ἐλεῖσθαι³ τὴν τῶν θαυμάτων δυναστείαν, ἐξ ὧν μίαν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πρὸς τῇ θελήσει ἐνεργεῖαν ἔχειν⁴ δειχθεὶς, λυτρωτὴς τοῦ γένους καὶ σωτὴρ ἐξηραμάτισεν.

This and the four pieces which follow it are the surviving fragments of a work of Paul entitled *πρὸς Σαβίνον λόγοι*. They were first printed by Mai (*Nova Collectio* vii 68), from a Vatican manuscript. It is not necessary to discuss the question of their genuineness. Harnack accepts them 'in spite of their standing in the very worst company'.⁵

FRAGMENT XII.

αἱ διάφοροι φύσεις καὶ τὰ διάφορα πρόσωπα ἓνα καὶ μόνον ἐνώσεως ἔχουσι

¹ Cramer *Catena* iii 235.

² Eus. *H. E.* vii 30. 11. See above, p. 27.

³ For *πον ἐλεῖσθαι* Harnack suggests *ποιεῖσθαι*.

⁴ MS *ἔχων*.

⁵ *Dogmengesch.* (E. T.) iii 39; *Chronol. der altchrist. Litt.* ii 137.

τρόπον τὴν κατὰ τὴν θέλησιν σύμβασιν, ἐξ ἧς ἡ κατὰ ἐνέργειαν ἐπὶ τῶν οὕτως συμβιβασθέντων¹ ἀλλήλοις ἀναφαίνεται μονάς.

FRAGMENT XIII.

ἄγιος καὶ δίκαιος γέγονεν ἡμῶν ὁ σωτήρ, ἀγωνίᾳ καὶ πόνῳ τὰς τοῦ προπάτορος ἡμῶν κρατήσας ἀμαρτίας· οἷς κατορθώσας τὴν ἀρετὴν, συνήφθη τῷ θεῷ, μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν βούλησιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν ταῖς τῶν ἀγαθῶν προκοπαῖς ἐσχηκώς· ἦν ἀδιαίρετον φυλάξας τὸ ὄνομα κληροῦται τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὄνομα, στοργῆς ἔπαθλον αὐτῷ χαρισθέν.

Note the reference to Phil. ii 9 in the last clause.

FRAGMENT XIV.

μὴ θαυμάσης ὅτι μίαν μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν θέλησιν εἶχεν ὁ σωτήρ· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ φύσις μίαν τῶν πολλῶν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπάρχουσαν φανεροῖ τὴν οὐσίαν· οὕτως ἡ σχέσις τῆς ἀγάπης μίαν τῶν πολλῶν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐργάζεται θέλησιν διὰ μιᾶς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς φανερομένης² εὐαρεστήσεως.

FRAGMENT XV.

τὰ κρατούμενα τῷ λόγῳ τῆς φύσεως οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἔπαινον· τὰ δὲ σχέσει φιλίας κρατούμενα ὑπεραίνεται, μιᾶ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ κρατούμενα, διὰ μιᾶς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐνεργείας βεβαιούμενα, καὶ τῆς κατ' ἐπαύξεισιν οὐδέποτε πανοιείνης κινήσεως· καθ' ἣν τῷ θεῷ συναφθεῖς ὁ σωτήρ οὐδέποτε δέχεται μερισμὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, μίαν αὐτὸς³ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχων θέλησιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν, ἀεὶ κινουμένην τῇ φανερώσει τῶν ἀγαθῶν.

FRAGMENT XVI.

κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν μέγας καὶ ἐκλεκτὸς προφήτης ἐστίν, ἴσως μεσίτης καὶ νομοθέτης τῆς κρείττονος διαθήκης γενόμενος· ὅστις ἑαυτὸν ἱερουργήσας ὑπὲρ πάντων μίαν ἐφάνη καὶ θέλησιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν ἔχων πρὸς τὸν θεόν, θέλων ὥσπερ θεὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἔλθειν⁴ τῆς δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ κόσμῳ δι' ὧν εἰργάσατο φανερωθείσης.

This and the two following fragments are printed in *Mai Nova Collectio* vii 68, from the same MS as frags. xi–xv, in which they are ascribed to Ebion. The reasons given by Harnack (*Dogmengesch.*, E. T. iii 44) for attributing them to Paul are scarcely convincing, though they certainly have points of contact with his teaching. I have thought it well, however, to include them in this collection.

FRAGMENT XVII.

σχέσει γὰρ τῇ κατὰ δικαιοσύνην καὶ πόθῳ τῷ κατὰ φιλανθρωπίαν συναφθεῖς τῷ θεῷ, οὐδὲν ἔσχεν μεμερισμένον πρὸς τὸν θεόν, διὰ τὸ μίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ

¹ MS συμβαθέντων.² MS φανερομένης.³ MS αὐτῷ.⁴ MS ἐστ.

θεοῦ γενέσθαι τὴν θέλησιν καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγαθῶν.

FRAGMENT XVIII.

εἰ γὰρ ἐθέλησεν αὐτὸν¹ θεὸς σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ κατεδέξατο λέγων, μὴ τὸ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γενέσθαι θέλημα, δῆλον ὅτι μίαν ἔσχεν μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν θέλησιν καὶ τὴν πράξιν, ἐκεῖνο θελήσας καὶ πράξας, ὅπερ ἔδοξε τῷ θεῷ.

We now proceed to set forth, so far as the foregoing collection of his *dicta* may enable us to do so, the main lines of the teaching of Paul of Samosata.

It is plain that he held a Monarchianist doctrine of the Godhead. He insisted strongly on the unity of God, relying mainly on Deut. vi 4, 'The Lord thy (*sic*) God is one Lord'; and this uni-personal God he identifies with the Father (ix 1, 2). But the Word or Wisdom was from eternity (*ἀεί*) in God, in the same manner as reason (*λόγος*) is in the heart of man, as an element of his personality (ix 1; x 1). Thus the Word is rightly described as *ὁμοούσιος τῷ θεῷ (πατρὶ)*, inasmuch as its *οὐσία* or *ὑπόστασις* is identical with that of the Father (vii 2). The Word was begotten by God, and so had a real existence (i). Paul does not directly state that it was begotten 'before the ages', but the general trend of his teaching seems to imply this; and it is pre-supposed in his argument that 'Mary was not the mother of the Word, for neither was she before the ages' (ii l. 4). The assertion that it was begotten obviously involves the admission that the Word though impersonal was in some sense the Son of God. But Paul seldom, if ever, uses that phrase (ix 1; x 3, with notes). The Word was essentially *λόγος προφορικός* (x 2), *λόγος ἐνεργός*, and therefore attained full existence only in activity. When not active it may be regarded as dormant in God: it was not *ἐνυπόστατος* (ix 1), almost *ἀνύπαρκτος* (p. 18), existed *τῷ προορισμῷ*²; when active it existed *τῇ ὑπάρξει* (ix 4).

The Holy Spirit is mentioned by Paul in connexion with the birth of Christ. He plainly held that the Spirit was distinct from, and indeed inferior to, the Word; for the Christ, begotten of the Spirit, was not in any sense divine (i; ii l. 6). When Epiphanius (see ix 1) places the Word and Holy Spirit on a level, and describes both as in God as reason is in the heart of a man, he is apparently putting his own gloss on the words of the Samosatene. It is quite possible that Paul had not elaborated a doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Paul's Christology was adoptionist. He accepts the Virgin Birth. Jesus Christ was 'begotten of the Holy Ghost' and born of 'the

¹ MS *αὐτός*.

² Compare the Letter of the Bishops (Routh *Rel. Sac.* iii 290) *πρὸ αἰώνων ὄντα, οὐ προγνώσει, ἀλλ' οὐσία καὶ ὑπόστασις θεῶν*.

Virgin through the Holy Ghost' (i). Yet he was a mere man. But 'the man' was anointed by the Holy Ghost, and for that reason was called Christ (i; xi). There is no express statement concerning the time or manner of this anointing. But inasmuch as Paul states that Jesus Christ (not merely Jesus) was begotten of the Holy Ghost, it may probably be inferred that it took place in the very act of conception. Thus Christ was a man like one of us (*ἡμῖν ἴσον*); yet superior to other men in all respects, 'since grace was upon him from the Holy Ghost and from the promises and from the things that are written' in the Scriptures (ii l. 7). Thus he had a special preparation (*κατασκευή*), such as was vouchsafed to none other, for the reception of the divine Logos (v). For the Logos or Wisdom went forth from God and was joined to him (i *συνῆλθεν*; iv *συγγεγενῆσθαι*; iii *συνῆπτο*¹). In virtue of his unique preparation the Logos entered into him, not as into a strange place, but as it were coming to its home (ii l. 8 *ἵνα μήτε . . . ἀλλότριος ἢ τῆς σοφίας*). That this coming of the Logos into Christ occurred before his birth seems to be implied by the statement that 'Mary received the Logos' (ii l. 5, but see iii). It was not without precedent, for Wisdom was in the prophets, and still more in Moses. But the Logos was in Christ in such a manner as it had never been in any other; it took up its abode in him as in a sanctuary (ii l. 9; ix 1). Thus dwelling in him the Logos inspired Christ (x 3 *ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπέπνευσεν*), and through him proclaimed the Gospel of peace to the sons of Israel, as in former times God spoke through the prophets (ii l. 15). The Logos was seen in him (ix 3). By this active indwelling in Christ the Logos attained its true existence, an existence in some sense apart from God (ix 1, 3, 4; see notes); so that it might be said that his being had its beginning from Nazareth (ix 4; see note). At length it returned to God and resumed its former state in God as reason is in the heart of man (ix 1, 3). So Paul seems to explain the significance of the Ascension.

But though the Logos was in Christ it did not invest him with divinity. He dwelt in Christ as we dwell in our houses, neither being part of the other (vi 3). The Logos and Christ were entirely separate from one another, each retaining its own nature (ii l. 11). They were not fused together (vi 2) in such a way as to be constituent parts of a single person (x 3), having a single essence (iv *οὐσιωδῶς*). Christ was a distinct human person, who possessed the Logos as an attribute (iv *κατὰ ποιότητα*; Malchion, quoted under vi, *κατὰ μάθησιν καὶ μετουσίαν*). As man, in virtue of his nature, he suffered; as man, in virtue of the grace bestowed upon him by the Holy Spirit, he worked miracles (xi; cp. ii).²

¹ Here Paul may be using the language of his opponents.

² Against this, it seems, the Letter of the Bishops protests (Routh iii 298): τὰ μὲν σημεῖα καὶ τὰ τέρατα τὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις ἀναγεγραμμένα ὁ θεὸς ἦν ἐπιτελέσας.

But by reason of the indwelling of the Logos the life of the human Christ was a continuous progress towards higher things (xiii *ταῖς τῶν ἀγαθῶν προκοπαῖς*; cp. Macrosthich, quoted under vii *ἐκ προκοπῆς*). 'By wisdom he became great' (ii l. 3). By the steadfastness of his purpose (*τῷ ἀτρέπτῳ τῆς γνώμης*) he was made like to God, and remained pure from sin (xi). By contest and labour he conquered the sins of our first parent and established virtue (*κατορθώσας τὴν ἀρετὴν*) (xiii). Finally he became God (vii 1), was deified (Epistle *ap. Greg. Nyss.* and Macrosthich, quoted under vii). In other words he was united (xi, xii *ἡνώθη*; xiii, xv *συνήφθη*) to God, in the only way in which unity between persons is possible (xii), by absolute harmony of will (*ἡ κατὰ θέλησιν σύμβασις*: cp. xiii-xv). So he attained the title of Redeemer and Saviour of the race (xi). The miracles which he was enabled to work manifested the harmony of his will with the will of God. Having preserved it inviolable he is granted the Name which is above every name (xiii). His union with God is eternal and will never be dissolved (xv).

Our fragments contain no statement as to the time of this deification of Christ. But as it seems to have followed the 'anointing' and the coming of the Logos, after a considerable interval, and to have preceded the laborious conquest of sin by Christ and his exhibition of miraculous power, it may probably be connected with the Baptism. It is clear that it did not entitle Christ to worship as God, since Paul prohibited 'the psalms which had been sung to our Lord Jesus Christ, as recent compositions of recent men' (Eus. *H. E.* vii 30. 10).

We learn from the Epistle of the Council of Antioch¹ that Paul revived the heresy of a certain Artemas, whom Eusebius,² Theodoret,³ and others identify with Artemon. Unfortunately we know nothing more of Artemon's system than that it was one of the later developments of the teaching of Theodotus the leather-cutter, who was excommunicated by Pope Victor (c. 190).⁴ It is possible that Artemon was still alive when Paul was condemned,⁵ and it is highly probable that he did not come into prominence till after Hippolytus had written his *Syntagma*⁶ and *Refutation of All Heresies*; for though these books give us the fullest existing account of the various Theodotian sects they do not mention him.

It may be well, however, to draw attention to some parallels between the teaching of Paul, as summarized above, and that of Theodotus and his followers as revealed by Hippolytus. The comparison may be found at once to corroborate the statement that Paul borrowed from

¹ Eus. *H. E.* vii 30. 16.

² *Ibid.* v 28. 1.

³ *H. F.* ii 4.

⁴ Little Labyrinth *ap. Eus. H. E.* v 28. 6.

⁵ Eus. *H. E.* vii 30. 17.

⁶ The part of this lost work which dealt with the Theodotians is the basis of Epiphanius *Haer.* 54 f, Ps.-Tert. *Haer.* 8, and Philastrius *Haer.* 50-52.

Artemon, and to test the accuracy of the account which I have given of Paul's system.

Hippolytus tells us that the doctrine of the Godhead and the creation held by the Theodotians was to some extent (ἐκ μέρους) in harmony with that of the Church.¹ From this we may infer that it did not differ greatly from his own, which in later times was by no means counted orthodox. It is, therefore, remarkable that we discover a good deal of resemblance between the teaching somewhat obscurely set forth in his tract *contra Noetianos*, and our account of the Samosatene theology. According to Hippolytus God was absolutely alone, having nothing contemporary with Him. But from eternity the Logos was in Him. When He willed He begat the Logos, in order that through it He might create the world. The Logos came forth from Him as His δύναμις (c. *Noet.* 10). But though begotten the Logos was not yet 'perfect son': it was called son by anticipation (*ib.* 15). The Logos became 'perfect son' through the Incarnation (*ib.* 4), by which he was manifested among men (*ib.* 10). Thus Hippolytus, and probably the Theodotians, like Paul, recognized three stages in the existence of the Logos. It is true that our fragments do not warrant the assertion that Paul connected the second stage with the creation. In fact they make no reference to the creation. But, on the other hand, that Paul denied that all things were made through the Logos (Joh. i 3) is improbable; and unless he did so, he would not come into conflict, on that subject, with his opponents at Antioch. Thus the silence of the fragments is easily explained. And the creation cannot have been the work of the Logos remaining immanent in God. We may safely assume that the creative work of the Logos was assigned to the second stage of its being. Hippolytus emphasizes the invisibility of the Logos in the pre-existent state (*ib.* 10), as does also Paul (frag. ii l. 18). And if Hippolytus says that the invisibility came to an end with the incarnation, Paul held a not dissimilar opinion (frag. ix 3). Hippolytus, with Paul, confessed that the Logos was in the prophets, acting as its own herald (c. *Noet.* 12; cp. frag. ii l. 9 f).

But it was in the Christology of the Theodotians that Hippolytus detected heresy.² Theodotus held that Jesus was a mere man,³ though he admitted the miraculous birth; and he maintained that he continued merely human after he became Christ, though subsequent to the

¹ *Ref.* vii 35; x 23. The remark was primarily made in reference to Theodotus the leather-cutter. But the context shows that it applied also to his successors.

² *Ref.* vii 35; x 23, and *Synlogma* as preserved in the passages cited p. 43, note 6.

³ Note the phrase: Hipp. *Ref.* vii 35 ἄνθρωπον . . . βιώσαντα κοινῶς πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις; x 23; κ[οιν]ὸν ἀνθρώπον πᾶσιν. Cp. Eus. *H. E.* vii 27. 2 ὡς κοινοῦ τῆν φύσιν ἀνθρώπου γενομένου.

baptism he had the power to work miracles. Apart from this he was distinguished from other men only by his piety and righteousness. In all this Theodotus agreed with Paul. But two points emerge in which he differed from him entirely. He denied that Jesus at any time was (or became¹) God. Thus he refused to allow that 'from man he became God'. However some of his followers—apparently not a large number²—took a different view. They seem to have said that Jesus became God after the resurrection. Taking this in connexion with the stress laid upon his holiness, as the characteristic which set him apart from other men, we may find in it the germ of Paul's doctrine of *προκοπή*.

But again, the Theodotians, as known to Hippolytus, taught that Jesus became Christ at his baptism, while Paul affirmed that Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin. But a sect of Theodotians, who separated from the main body under Theodotus the banker, known as the Melchisedekians, improved upon the original teaching by way of addition. They introduced Melchisedek into the scheme, to do for the angels in heaven what Christ did for men on earth, stating that he was 'a very great power of God', and 'superior to the Christ'. The latter phrase reminds us of Paul's 'The Logos is superior to the Christ' (ii l. 2). It would be an easy step for a later Theodotian to substitute the Logos for Melchisedek, or perhaps to identify the two powers. At any rate Theodotus the leather-cutter used the fourth Gospel,³ and it was therefore inevitable, if the heresy continued in being for a considerable time, that the Logos should in some way be connected with its Christology, and so probably assume a form more akin to that of Paul. This may well have been the work of Artemon.

On the whole it is probable that the Samosatene heresy was a modification of the system of Artemon or some other Theodotian leader.

H. J. LAWLOR.

¹ *Ref.* vii 35 *γεγονέναι* with the addition *ἐν τῇ καθόδῳ τοῦ πνεύματος*; x 23 *εἶναι*.

² They are mentioned in *Ref.* vii 35 only.

³ He quoted *Joh.* viii 40. See *Epiph. Haer.* 54. 1.