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. 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’ (ταπεινά καὶ χαμάμερη) opinions about the Christ, esteeming Him to be ‘by nature an ordinary man’ (ὅς κοινός ἐστὶν φύσιν ἄνθρωπον γενομένον), and that he revived the heresy of Artemon. 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. 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. But that Eusebius had not read them is implied by his words, ‘we know that they are still in circulation’.

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.
5 H. E. vii 29. 2 ἢν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ φερομένην ἵσμεν.
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.**

συνήλθεν δ’ λόγος τῷ Ἐκ Δαβίδ γεγενημένῳ δ έστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ πνεύματος ἅγιον, καὶ τούτων μὲν ἣγεγκεν ἡ παρθένος διὰ πνεύματος ἅγιον. ἐκεῖνον δὲ τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησεν ὁ θεὸς ἄνευ παρθένου, καὶ ἄνευ τινὸς οὐδενὸς ὑπὸ 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 γοὺν ὁ ἀσεβὴς Παῦλος ἐν τοῖς περὶ αὐτὸν τεπραγμένως. 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.

---


2 *Common.* 25.
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Fragment II.

ἀνθρωπος χρηται: ὁ λόγος οὖ χρηται. ὁ ναζωραῖος χρηται: (οὐχ) ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν. καὶ γὰρ ὁ λόγος μεῖζων ἦν τοῦ χριστοῦ. ὁ χριστὸς γὰρ διὰ σοφίας ἀπέτυχε τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς σοφίας μὴ καθέλωμεν.1 λόγος μὲν γὰρ ἀνώθεν Ἡσυχὸς δὲ Χριστὸς ἀνθρωπος ἐντεθεὶ. Μαρία τὸν λόγον ὅπερ ἄρχε, ὦτη γὰρ ἦν πρὸ αἰώνων. ἤ Μαρία τὸν λόγον ὑπεδέξατο καὶ ὅ ὅκ ἐστὶ προσβυτέρα τοῦ λόγου Μαρία, ἄλλα ἐνεργειαν ἡμῶν ἦπει αὐτῷ χάρις ἢκ1 μὴ ὁ ἐκ Δαυὶδ χριστεὶ ο力还是 τῆς σοφίας, μὴ ὁ σοφία ἐν ἅλυ ὅτι ὁσὶ καὶ γὰρ ἐν 10 τοῖς ἰδαλφίταις ὥς, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν Ἰωσ. καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς κύριοις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ ὥς ἐν ναοὶ. (ἔθεν καὶ δύο φύσεις διηρημένους ἔχουσας καὶ ἄκουσην ἔτοι ἔστιν ἐν παντάπασιν ἐν τῷ χριστῷ.) ἄλλος γὰρ ἤσπερ Ἰσχοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ ἄλλος ὁ λόγος ὃς τῶν ἀντίστηλε τοὺς νεώτερος Ισχαίλ εὐαγγελεζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἡσυχοῦ Χριστοῦ ὕστε ἐστὶ 15 πάνων κύριοι [Act. x 36] ... ὡς τοῦ λόγου διὰ Χριστοῦ λαλησάμας, ὅσ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν προφητῶν, τάδε λέγει κύριος: ἄλλος μὲν ἦν ὁ προφήτης, ἄλλος δὲ ὁ κύριος . . . ὁ φανερός ὁ ὁσὶ σοφία, ὃς γὰρ ἤδυνατο ἐν σχήματι εὑρήσκεσθαι, οὐδὲ ἐν θέρ ἀνδρός· μεῖζων γὰρ τῶν ὁρωμένων ἑτέρων.

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. lxxxvi 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).


Theodorus, presbyter of Raithu, P. G. xci 1485 (cited as Theodorus).


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

---

1 Eusebius of Dorylaeum, according to Leontius, l. e.
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 χρήσαται... ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου), with the exception of a clause which he omits, forms the first of three extracts in Leontius. It is immediately followed by a second extract, consisting of the clause ονα μήτε... οἰκῇ. Now in the Contestatio the following series of sayings of Paul is quoted:—

1. Μαρία τῶν λόγων οὐκ ἔτεκεν.
2. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν πρὸ αἰώνων.
3. Μαρία τῶν λόγων ὑπεδέξατο καὶ οὐκ ἑστὶ πρεσβυτέρα τοῦ λόγου.
4. Μαρία ἔτεκεν ἄνθρωπον ἡμῖν Ιωάν.
5. κρέιττονα δὲ κατὰ πάντα, ἐπειδὴ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἐς ἐπαγγελίων καὶ ἐς τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶ χάρις.
6. ἢνα δὲ μήτε δ ἐκ Δαβίδ χρισθεῖς ἀλλότρως ἢ τῆς σοφίας, μήτε ἡ σοφία ἐν ἀλλῷ οὕτως οἰκῇ. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς προφηταῖς ἦν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν Μωσεῖ καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς κυρίοις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ ὡς ἐν ναῷ θεοῦ. ⁵
7. καὶ ἀλλαχῶν λέγει ἄλλον εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ ἄλλον τὸν ἁγίον.

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 ἀλλαχῶ of 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 ναῷ is also a single extract.⁵

What then of the seventh saying of the Contestatio? The word ἀλλαχῶ 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 καθλομεν. 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 ἐς ἐπαγγελίων... 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 ... ναζ.; the second runs ἄλλος γὰρ ἐστιν 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 ἄλλαχος 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, ancient ² 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 . . . ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι τὸν κόσμον ἐδυσφήμησεν ὅσπερ δὲ εἰς ἐκαστὸν τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἦν καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γενέσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου τὴν ἀκηθίν ἐνθέν καὶ δύο φύσεις διηρημένως ἔχουσα καὶ ἀκοινωνήτους πρὸς ἐαυτὰς 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 ἐστιν 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 ἐνθέν 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:\footnote{P. G. lxxxvi 1. 1393.}:

\begin{quote}
o\`{e}te de t\`{o}n \\'an\`{e}ropi\={n}ovn pro\`{o}gou\`{m}i\={n}ovs pa\`{a}h\`{o}n \`{a}m\`{e}tophos \`{h}n \`{o} f\`{o}r\`{e}t\`{o}s kai 
\`{e}v\`{i}\`{o}p\`{e}menos t\`{o} \`{a}n\`{e}ropi\={n}o\`{v}n the\`{o}s: o\`{e}te t\`{o}n the\`{e}ion pro\`{o}gou\`{m}i\={n}ov\`{o}n \`{e}r\`{g}\`{o}n \`{a}m\`{o}roun 
\`{t}\`{o} \`{a}n\`{e}ropi\={n}ovn, \`{e}n \`{o} \`{e} \`{h}n, kai di o\`{u} ta\`{u}ta \`{e}p\`{o}\`{e}i\`{e} \`{e}\`{p}l\`{a}\`{s}\`{e}t\`{h} pro\`{o}gou\`{m}i\={n}ov\`{o}n \`{o}s \`{a}n\`{e}ropi\={n}os \`{e}n \`{a}\`{s}t\`{e}ri: kai kat\`{a} d\`{e}\`{u}t\`{e}r\`{o}n l\`{o}\`{g}\`{o}n the\`{o}s \`{h}n \`{e}n \`{a}\`{s}t\`{e}ri \`{s}e\`{n}ou\`{s}e\`{m}i\={n}ovs 
\`{t}\`{o} \`{a}n\`{e}ropi\={n}ovf.\end{quote}

This definition is evidently aimed at a statement that the two ‘natures’ in Christ were \`{d}i\`{e}r\`{e}m\`{e}nai kai \`{a}k\`{o}i\`{n}\`{o}n\`{e}tai. 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 \`{f}i\`{o}\`{m}\`{e} 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 \`{a}l\`{o}\`{s} \`{g}\`{a}r i\`{o}t\`{e}v \kappa\`{t}\`{a}, 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:

\begin{quote}
d \`{o} l\`{o}\`{g}oi \`{m}e\`{i}zoi\`{o}n \`{h}n \`{t}ou \`{h}r\`{i}stou. \`{X}r\`{i}\`{s}tou\`{d} \`{d}i\`{a} \`{s}o\`{f}i\`{a}n \`{m}e\`{i}zoi\`{o}n \`{e}\`{g}\`{e}n\`{e}to\`{i} \`{t}\`{o} a\`{x}i\`{o}\`{m}a \`{t}\`{h}s \`{s}o\`{f}i\`{a}s \`{m}\`{u} \`{k}a\`{b}e\`{l}\`{o}\`{m}e\`{n}. \end{quote}

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,\footnote{Ibid.} \`{f}i\`{o}\`{m}\`{e} to\`{i}n\`{o}n \`{e}n to\`{i}s \`{u}p\`{o}m\`{i}\`{e}ma\`{n}\`{e}n\footnote{The Acta. See Eus. H. E. vii 30. 11.} \`{t}\`{h}\`{r}e\`{i}n \`{t}\`{o} a\`{x}i\`{o}\`{m}a \`{t}\`{h}s \`{s}o\`{f}i\`{a}s. What was its position therein? From Justinian we learn that it followed, though perhaps not immediately,\footnote{Justinian may have omitted one or more clauses in his second quotation, as he did in the third.} the words \`{X}r\`{i}\`{s}tou\`{d} \`{g}\`{a}r \`{d}i\`{a} \`{s}o\`{f}i\`{a}s \`{m}e\`{g}as \`{e}\`{g}\`{e}n\`{e}tou (l. 2), and that it preceded the beginning of his third quotation \`{i}n\`{a} \`{m}\`{e}\`{t}e \`{d}\`{e}k \`{D}a\`{u}\`{i}d (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 \`{M}a\`{r}i\`{a} \`{t}\`{o}n \`{l}\`{o}\`{g}\`{o}n \`{o}\`{d} (l. 5). So we must put it either immediately before or immediately after \`{l}\`{o}\`{g}oi \`{m}e\`{i}zoi\`{o}n \`{g}\`{a}r \`{a}\`{n}\`{o}\`{t}h\`{e}n \`{I}\`{s}\`{e}o\`{i}s \`{d}e \`{X}r\`{i}\`{s}tou\`{d} \`{a}n\`{e}ropi\`{o}\`{s} \`{e}n\`{t}e\`{i}\`{e}n (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 \`{h} \`{M}a\`{r}i\`{a} \`{t}\`{o}n \`{l}\`{o}\`{g}\`{o}n \`{u}p\`{e}\`{d}\`{e}\`{x}a\`{t}o in l. 5 f.
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 Σαμωσατέως, διαμονέτες τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τοῦ νιῶ, φάσκοντι τὸν μὲν νιῶν εἶναι τὸν χριστῶν, τὸν δὲ λόγον ἄλλον εἶναι.

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

καὶ τούτον πρόφασιν λαμβάνοντι ἀπὸ τῶν Πράξεων, δὲ καλὸς μὲν ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν, αὐτὸι δὲ κακῶς ἐκδέχοντα. ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο τὸν λόγον κτλ. (Acts x 36). φασὶ γὰρ ὃς τοῦ λόγου διὰ Χριστοῦ λαλῆσαιν, ὡς καὶ ἕπὶ τῶν προφητῶν, τάδε λέγει κύριος· ἄλλος μὲν ἦν ὁ προφητὴς, 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 (?); 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 νίῶς 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 προφητὴς, 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.
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probably knew of the Acta only a few excerpts. In regard of matters about which they did not supply information he could only testify to the beliefs and practices of contemporary Paulianists. 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—ἐναπάμενος κτλ. (l. 17 f). We have seen that the second was separated by no more than a few words (καὶ ἐπαγγελίων . . . 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 πρῶς Μαλχίανα διαλόγων. 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 other—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—Ὑπνοῦς Χριστὸς κάτωθεν—which might seem to be satisfied by Υπνοῦς Χριστὸς ἀνθρωπός ἐντέθη (l. 4, cp. the use of ἐντέθη 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 ἀνθρωπός κάτωθεν. In the present passage ἐντέθη is perhaps equivalent to ἐκ παρθένου, or ἐκ Ναζαρέτ, as in Athan. c. Ἀρω. 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' ἵπτα, ἦ τὸ ἐνοικησαι ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν σοφίαν λέγειν ὡς ἐν οὐδενὶ ἄλλῃ. P. G. lxxxvi 1. 1393. See under frag. v. Theodoret Haer. Fab. ii 8 (P. G. Ixxxiii 393) refers to ll. 6–11 of this fragment, apparently as part of the Acta: ἱπρατεία τῶν χριστῶν ἀνθρωπῶν λέγειν, θέλω χάριτος διαφερόντως ἤξιωμένον.
4 Eus. H. E. vii 30. 11.
This is the second of a series of extracts from the Epistle preserved by Leontius (P. G. lxxxvi 1. 1393). The first has been quoted above (p. 25: φησι τοῖς καλ. The two are perhaps to be read continuously, the words καὶ μεθ’ άτερα, 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 1. 3 (καθελώμεν) in the Acta, after an interval. It depends on φησί in the previous extract, and from it σοφία is to be supplied as the subject of συνήπτο. 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. 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.'

The third extract from the Epistle of the same series. Like frag. iii it depends on a previous φησί. 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.

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

1 For the first see under frags. v, vi, and for the second frags. xiii, xv.
2 The Epistle inserts here ὲδὲ ημείς πανεύρημεν.
3 ἐν (οτι άκο) Routh, p. 311, from Bodleian MS.
4 δι Routh.
5 So Routh, τὸ Migne.
6 So Routh, κει Migne.
7 υπέφερεν Routh.
Here the Epistle as usual quotes from the *Acta*. But the phrase καὶ μεθ’ ἑτερα 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 fit 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 prefices it with the words, ‘(Malchion presbyterus) summum disputationis certamen a concilio memorato suscipiens ita eundem haereticum 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 verbo et humano corpore, quod est ex semine Dauid, unus factus est, nequaquam ulterius divisione aliqua sed unitate subsistens. Tu vero 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.
The Greek would have been οὐ κατὰ σύντασιν (cp. frags. iii, v). The words compositum and composita in the sayings are probably renderings of cognates of σύντασις. Metωσίαν is rendered participationem; perhaps wrongly, for it is a 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. Όχισταν οὖσωμένην is evidently represented by οὐν substantia sit. The words έν 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 Jerome 1 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 τούτο ἐλεγον, ὅτι οὐ διδόσ οὐσίωσθαι εἰ τῷ ὅλῳ σωτηρί τοῦ οἴνῳ τὸν μονογενή, τὸν πρὸ πάσης κτίσεως αἰώνων 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 έαυτόν έκένωσεν.

### Fragment VII.

1. εἰ μὴ εξ ἀνθρώπου ἡ χριστὸς θεός, οὐκοῦν διομοιοτός ἐστι τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ἀνάγκη τρεῖς οὐσίας εἶναι, μιᾷ μὲν προηγομένην, τὰς δὲ δυὸ ἐξ ἕκεινης.

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 Antioch 5; it was from certain brethren who disliked the word διομοιοτόν 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 ἐπιστολήν οὐκ ἐγένον ἐγώ.
4 Ibid. εἰρήσασι μὴ εἶναι διομοιοτόν τῶν υἱῶν τῷ πατρί. Similarly in c. 45, where τῶν χριστῶν takes the place of τῶν υἱῶν. 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 repudierint: quia per hanc' &c. This amounts to a statement that in the Epistle the word *δμοουσιον* 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 *δμοουσιον* 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 (*Επ. 52, Ρ. G. xxxii 393*): καὶ γὰρ τῷ ὄντι οἱ ἐπὶ Παύλῳ τῷ Σαμοσατεῖ συνελθόντες διεβάλον τὴν λέξιν [δμοουσιον] ὡς οίκον ἐγγεγράμμον. ἔφασαν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι τὴν τοῦ δμοουσιον φωνὴν παραστῆσαι ἐννοιαν οὐσίας τα καὶ τῶν ἀπ' αὐτῆς, ὦστε καταμερισθέναι τὴν οὐσίαν παρέχειν τοῦ δμοουσιον τὴν προσηγορίαν τῶν εἰς ἀ 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 *δμοουσιον* 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 ὄμοούσιον, 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 ὄμοούσιον 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 ὄμοούσιος τῷ θεῷ (πατρί). The opponents of Paul, like Dionysius of Alexandria, may have admitted the orthodoxy of the statement that Christ was ὄμοούσιος τῷ πατρί, 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: ὅποιον λέγοντος τῶν χριστῶν (not ὅποιον or λέγον) ὄμοούσιον εἶναι τῷ θεῷ (C. L. Feltoe Dionysius of Alexandria p. 188).
³ In reply to Paul's argument Athanasius is content to say, μὴ σύμμαχοι καὶ εἰπὶ τῶν ἀσωμάτων, καὶ μάλιστα εἰπὶ θεῷ, τὸ ὄμοούσιον σημαίνεσθαι. But the Christ incarnate was not ἀσωμάτος.
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 δυνούσιον.\(^2\)

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 ἡ τριάς, πατὴρ υἱὸς καὶ ἄγιον πνεῦμα, ὁμοούσιος οὖσα. ἰσαν γὰρ ἐκτῆς ὁμοούσιον οὐ συναλλοιφθην σημαίνει. τὸ γὰρ ὁμοούσιον ὅχι ἐνός ἐστι σημαντικόν. And again, οὗτα πάλαν λέγομεν αὐτῶν μὴ εἶναι ταύτων τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός. 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 Macrostich 1: οὕτω... ἀφονεύει καὶ τὸν χριστὸν θεόν εἶναι πρὸ ἀιώνων. ἄποιος εἶναι οἱ ἀπὸ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμωσατέως, υστερὸν αὐτὸν μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ἐκ προκοπῆς τεθεοποιηθαι λέγοντες, τῷ τῷν φύσιν ψυλὸν ἀνθρώπων γεγονέναι, and the words of the Epistle reported by Gregory of Nyssa, 2 εἰς οὐρανοῦ ἀποτελεσθαι 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 υφίστασθαι νιῶσ.)

From Leontius (P. G. lxxvi 1. 1393).

This saying stands at the head of Leontius's sixth extract from the Epistle, and it is introduced by the word φησί, indicating that it was taken from the Αcta. Doubtless it was a repudiation of teaching imputed to Paul by Malchion. The Epistle confutes the heretic out of his own mouth: εἰ δὲ νιῶσ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, νιῶς δὲ καὶ σοφία, καὶ ἄλλο μὲν ἡ σοφία ἄλλο δὲ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δύο υφίσταναι νιῶ. This reply has the appearance of quoting three sayings of Paul, and ἄλλο μὲν κτλ. actually represents frag. ii 1 12 f. But it is doubtful whether the preceding clauses reproduce explicit statements. Νιῶς καὶ σοφία is sufficiently justified as a summary of Paul's teaching by the latter part of frag. i, though the word νιῶσ does not occur there; and by the fact that he perhaps occasionally uses νιῶσ 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 Μανχαίοι καί Φρύγες καί οί τοῦ Σαμωσατέως μαθηταί, τὰ ὁμοῦτα λέγοντες, οὐδὲν ἤττον εἶναι αἱρετικοί.
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.**


2. (αὐτὸν τὸν πατέρα ἕνα θεόν.)

3. (μετὰ τὸ γεγεννησθαι ὄφθεντα ἐν αὐτῷ τὸν λόγον καὶ πάλιν ἐν θεῷ ἐπάρχοντα ἄνω, ὡς ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀνθρώπου λόγος.)

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

4. (λόγον ἐνεργύν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ σοφίαν ἐν αὐτῷ, τῷ μὲν προφητικῷ πρὸ ἀλώνων ὑπατα τῷ ἐπὶ ὑπάρξει ἐκ Ναζαρέτ ἀναδειχθέντα) ἑνα εἰς εἰς ὁ ἐπὶ πάντα θεός 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 νῦν 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 ἀνθρώπου 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 νῦν.

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 ὦ πάντω ὡς λόγος ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ πατέρα ἐνδομεν νοστόν σὺν νῦν καὶ νῦν ἀπὸ πατρὸς γεγενημένον. καὶ ὦ πάντω ὡς ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀληθῶν εἰς οἰκήτηριον ὁ θεός λόγος· καὶ μετὰ κτλ. Here allusion is obviously made to extract 1 (ὡς λόγος ἐν καρδίᾳ) and to frag. vi 3 (εἰς οἰκήτηριον), 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 born 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 Σαμοσατηνός, he writes, θεὸν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου ὑμελογεῖ, θεὸν ἐκ Ναζαρετ ὄφθεντα, καὶ ἐνευθέν τῆς ὑπάρχεις τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐξουροῦσα, καὶ ἀρχὴν βασιλείας παρειληφότα. Then he proceeds, as in extract 4, λόγον δὲ ἐνεργὸν κτλ., explaining, apparently, the sense in which Paul made the admission. Note the words ὄφθεντα (see extract 3), ἐνεργῶν (cp. ἐνέργησε, extract 1), ὑπάρχεις, ὑπάρχει (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 ὃ προσορίσμω, not ἐφ᾽ ὑπάρχει. The Logos was essentially

1 γεγενηθῆσαι. 2 For this statement see under frag. vii p. 34.
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loγος ἐνεργός, existing therefore in the true sense only when active. For the loγος ἐνεργός compare Marius Mercator, Nest. Blasph. Cap. App. 19 (P. L. xlviii 929) 'Paulus uerbum dei προφορικὸν καὶ πρακτικὸν λόγον καὶ ἐνεργητικὸν, id est, prolatiyum et potestatis effectium uerbum sensit, non substantium, quod Graeci oσσιώδεs dicunt.' It may be added that Athanasius seems to imply that Paul used Rom. ix 5, ὃ ἐν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εἰλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἱώνας, 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 Anacephalaesosis (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 ὄλγον δεῖν διαβεβαιώσει (cp. extract 1), λόγον προφορικὸν αὐτὸν σχηματίσας (cp. frag. x 2), ἀπὸ δὲ Μαρίας καὶ δεώρο εἶναι προαγγελτικὸς μὲν τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς εἰρημένα ἔχοντος (cp. frag. ii l. 7 f.), μὴ οὗτος δὲ, ἄλλ' ἀπὸ Μαρίας καὶ δεώρο διὰ τῆς ἐνσάρκου παρουσίας. Cp. Eus. H. E. vi 33 (cp. 20). Compare also Athanasius De Syn. 45 (P. G. xxvi 773) ὁ Σαμοσατεὺς ἐφρώνει μὴ εἶναι πρὸ Μαρίας τὸν οὐν, ἄλλ' ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἀρχὴν ἐσχηκέναι.

Fragment X.

1. (πρόσωπων ἐν τὸν θεόν ἀμα τῷ λόγῳ ὡς ἀνθρωπον ἑνα καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον.)

2. τὸ δὲ εἶναι (τοῦ λόγου) κατὰ τὴν προφορὰν ἐστι.

3. ἀνθρωπὸς ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνέπνευσεν ἀνωθὲν ὁ λόγος. καὶ ταῦτα περὶ Ιαντοῦ ὁ ἀνθρωπὸς ἠλείμενος· ὁ πατὴρ γὰρ ἀμα τῷ νῷ εἰς θεόν, ὃ δὲ ἀνθρωπὸς κάτωθεν τὸ ἰδιον 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 θεόν (ἡ θεός;) ἐχει, καὶ οὐ γεγεννημένον, πῶς πληροῦται τὸ ἦν, καὶ ὁτι θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος; οὐ γὰρ ὁ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου λόγος ἀνθρωπος πρὸς τὸν ἀνθρωπον οὔτε γὰρ εὖ 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 ἀρχῆ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρῶς τῶν θεῶν, τὸ δὲ εἶναι οὐ κατὰ τὴν προφορὰν μόνον ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν υπόστασιν. 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 προφορικός 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 main­
tain 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. xii 46
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, ταύτα περὶ ἐαυτοῦ ὁ ἀν-
θρωπός 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 ἔπομνήματα (i.e. the
Ἀκτα), ἢπω λέγει Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν κάτωθεν.2 In this extract the word
νῦ, after λόγος in a previous clause, is suspicious. It may have been
written in place of λόγῳ by Epiphanius.

FRAGMENT XI.

τῷ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι χριστείς προσηγορεῖθη χριστός, πάσχων κατὰ φύσιν, θαυ-
ματουργῶν κατὰ χάριν. τῷ γὰρ ἄτρέπτω τῆς γνώμης ὁμοθείς τῷ θεῷ, καὶ
μείνας καθαρὸς ἁμαρτίας ἤνωθεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐνηργήθη παν ἔλεσθαι3 τὴν τῶν
θαυμάτων δυναστείαν, ἐξ δὲν μίαν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πρὸς τῇ θελήσει ἐνέρ-
γειαν ἔχειν4 δειχθείσι, λυτρώθης τοῦ γένους καὶ σωτὴρ ἐρημάτωσεν.

This and the four pieces which follow it are the surviving fragments
of a work of Paul entitled πρὸς Σαβῖνον 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 διάφοραι φύσεις καὶ τὰ διάφορα πρόσωπα ἐνα καὶ μόνον ἐνώσεως ἔχουσι

1 Cramer Catena iii 235. 2 Eus. H. E. vii 30. 11. See above, p. 27.
3 For παν ἔλεσθαι Harnack suggests ποιεῖσθαι. 4 MS ἔχειν.
5 Dogmengesch. (E. T.) iii 39; Chronol. der altchrist. Litt. ii 137.
τρόπον τὴν κατὰ τὴν θέλησιν σύμβασιν, εἰς ἣς ἴνα κατὰ ἐνέργειαν ἐπὶ τῶν οὕτως συμβασιοθέντων ἀλλήλων ἀναφαίνεται μονάς.

**Fragment XIII.**

ἀγίως καὶ δίκαιος γέγονεν ἡμῶν ὁ σωτὴρ, ἀγώνι καὶ τῶν οὗς τοῦ προπά-
toros ἡμῶν κρατήσας ἀμαρτίας: οὔς κατορθώσας τὴν ἀρετὴν, συνήψῃ τῷ θεῷ,
μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν βοήθησιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν ταῖς τῶν ἁγαθῶν προ-
κοπαίς ἄσχημως: ἦν ἀδιάφρατον φιλάξις τὸ ὄνομα κληροῦται τὸ ὑπὲρ πάν
ὸνομα, στοργὴς ἐπαθλὸν αὐτῷ χαρίσθην.

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

**Fragment XIV.**

μὴ βαθμίζῃς ὅτι μίαν μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν θέλησιν εἶχεν ὁ σωτῆρ: ὥσπερ ὑπὸ ἡ ἐγώς καὶ τῶν πολλῶν καὶ τῇ αὐτῇν ὑπάρχουσαν φανερὸν τὴν οὐσίαν
οὕτως ἡ σχέσεις τῆς ἁγάθους μίαν τῶν πολλῶν καὶ τῇ αὐτῇν ἐργάζεται θέλησιν
diὰ μιᾶς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς φανερομένης ἐδαρεστήσεως.

**Fragment XV.**

tὰ κρατούμενα τῷ λόγῳ τῆς φύσεως οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἑπανον· τὰ δὲ σχέσει
φιλίας κρατοῦμεν ὑπεραίνεται, μιᾶς καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμης κρατοῦμεν, ὑπὸ μιᾶς
καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐνέργειας βεβαιούμενα, καὶ τῆς καὶ ἐπαύξεσθαι οἰδεπότε πανο-
μένης κινήσεως· καθ’ ἐν τῷ θεῷ συναφθεῖς ὁ σωτήρ οἰδεπότε δέχεται μερισμῶν
eἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, μίαν αὐτὸς καὶ τῆν αὐτὴν ἔχων θέλησιν καὶ ἑνέργειαν,
ἀπὶ κανομένην τῇ φανερώσει τῶν ἁγαθῶν.

**Fragment XVI.**

καὶ ἐπαγγελεῖαν μέγας καὶ ἐκλεκτὸς προφῆτης ἑστιν, ἰσως μετῆτης καὶ
νομοθέτης τῆς κριτίνης διαθήκης γενόμενος· ὥστε ἐαυτὸν ἱερουργήσας ὑπὲρ
πάντων μιᾶς ἐκάθεν καὶ θέλησιν καὶ ἑνέργειαν ἔχον πρὸς τὸν θεόν, θέλων
ὑπερ θεος πάντας ἀνθρώπους σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἔλθειν τῆς
d’ αὐτοῦ τῷ κόσμῳ δι’ ἐν εἰργάσατο φανερωθεῖσας.

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.**

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

---

1 MS συμβασιοθέντων. 
2 MS φανερομένη. 
3 MS αὐτῷ. 
4 MS ἵστ.
NOTES AND STUDIES

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 (αἰών) 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 ὑποστάσεις τῷ θεῷ (πατρὶ), inasmuch as its οὐσία or ὕποστασις 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 1. 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 εντύπωσεις (ix 1), almost ἀνύπαρκτος (p. 18), existed τῷ προφορικῷ; 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 1. 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 ἀντί.

2 Compare the Letter of the Bishops (Routh Rel. Sac. iii 290) πρὸ αἰώνων ὄντα, οὐ προγένεσθαι, ἀλλ’ οὐσία καὶ ὕποστάσει 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 (ἡμῶν ἵσον); 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 1. 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 (οὐνθλήθεν; ἡ συγγενεσθαι; iii συνήπτερον). 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 1. 8 ἔνα μὴτε . . . ἄλλοτρος Ἡ 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 1. 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 1. 9; ix 1). Thus dwelling in him the Logos inspired Christ (xiv 3 ἐν αὐτῷ εὐεργεσίαι), and through him proclaimed the Gospel of peace to the sons of Israel, as in former times God spoke through the prophets (ii 1. 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 1. 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 o ὁσιωδῶς). 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 ἰσαγωγαμένα διὸ 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 τας των ἀγαθῶν προκοπαῖς; cp. Macrostich, quoted under vii ἐκ προκοπῆς). 'By wisdom he became great' (ii 1. 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 (καταρθώσας τὴν ἀρετήν) (xiii). Finally he became God (vii 1), was deified (Epistle ap. Greg. Nyss. and Macrostich, 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 βέλην 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 Syntagma⁶ 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

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. 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 1. 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 1. 9 f).

But it was in the Christology of the Theodotians that Hippolytus detected heresy. Theodotus held that Jesus was a mere man, 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 Syntagma as preserved in the passages cited p. 43, note 6.

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 became\(^1\)) God. Thus he refused to allow that 'from man
he became God'. However some of his followers—apparently not
a large number\(^2\)—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 1. 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,\(^5\) and it
was therefore inevitable, if the heresy continued in being for a consider­
able 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 modi­
fication of the system of Artemon or some other Theodotian leader.

H. J. Lawlor.

---

\(^1\) Ref. vii 35 γεγονέναι with the addition ἐν τῇ καβοδῷ τοῦ πνεύματος; x 23 εἶναι.
\(^2\) They are mentioned in Ref. vii 35 only.
\(^5\) He quoted Joh. viii 40. See Epiph. Haer. 54. 1.