

SIX NOTES.

I

S. LUKE XIX 21: *αἴρεις ὃ οὐκ ἔθηκας.*

My colleague Dr J. A. Smith has called my attention to a paper of Jac. Bernays (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ed. Usener, Berlin, 1885, i pp. 272 sq.) in which are collected a number of passages illustrating what Plummer (*S. Luke* p. 441) describes as 'perhaps a current proverbial expression for a grasping person'. This note of Plummer's suggests that this paper, or the matter collected in it, is not well known and has not been used in commentaries on the Parable, at any rate in England. It will perhaps be worth while, therefore, to reprint the passages here.

1. Philo *Hypothetica* (ap. Eus. *P. E.* viii 7 [358]) *μυρία δὲ ἄλλα ἐπὶ τοῖσιν ὅσα καὶ ἐπὶ ἀγράφων ἔθων καὶ νομίμων κἂν τοῖς νόμοις αὐτοῖς· ἃ τις παθεῖν ἐχθαίρει μὴ ποιεῖν αὐτόν· ἃ μὴ κατέθηκεν μὴδ' ἀναιρεῖσθαι μὴδ' ἐκ πρασιάς μὴδ' ἐκ ληνοῦ μὴδ' ἐξ ἄλωνος.*

2. Josephus *c. Apion*. ii 27 *ὃ μὴ κατέθηκε τις οὐκ ἀναιρήσεται: ἰβ. 30 κἂν ἐφέληται τις ἀλλότριον κἂν ὃ μὴ κατέθηκεν ἀνέληται.*

3. Diog. Laert. i 57 *ἃ μὴ ἔθου μὴ ἀνέλη* (traced to Solon).

4. Plato *Laws* xi 913 C *κάλλιστον νόμων . . . καὶ ἀπλουστάτον καὶ οὐδαμῆ ἀγενοῦς ἀνδρὸς νομοθέτημα ὃς εἶπεν ὅτι Ἄ μὴ κατέθου μὴ ἀνέλη.*

5. Aelian *Var. hist.* iii 46 *Σταγειριτῶν ἱεροσύτος καὶ πάντη Ἑλληνικός· ὅ μὴ κατέθου, φησί, μὴ λάμβανε: ἰβ. iv 1 Βύβλιος ἀνὴρ ἐν ὀδῷ περιτυχῶν οὐδὲν ὧν μὴ κατέθετο ἀναιρεῖται· οὐ γὰρ ἡγείται τὸ τοιοῦτον εὔρημα ἀλλὰ ἀδίκημα.*

Dr Smith himself adds the following two passages.

6. Plato *Laws* viii 844 E *ὃς δ' ἂν τὴν γενναίαν νῦν λεγομένην σταφυλὴν ἢ τὰ γενναῖα σῦκα ἐπονομαζόμενα ὀπωρίζειν βούληται, εἰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν οἰκείων λαμβάνῃ ὅπως ἂν ἐθέλῃ καὶ ὅπου ταν βούληται καρπούσθω, εἰ δ' ἐξ ἄλλων μὴ πείσας ἐπομένως τῷ νόμῳ τῷ μὴ κινεῖν ὅτι μὴ κατέθετο, ἐκείνως αἰεὶ ζημιούσθω.*

7. *ib.* xii 941 C *εἰ μὲν τις τι κλέπτῃ δημόσιον μέγα ἢ καὶ σμικρὸν τῆς αὐτῆς δίκης δεῖ· σμικρὸν τε γὰρ ὃ κλέπτων ἔρωτι μὲν ταυτῷ, δυνάμει δὲ ἐλάττονι κέκλοφεν, ὃ τε τὸ μείζον κινῶν οὐ καταθέμενος ὄλον ἀδικεῖ.*

Erasmus in the *Adagia* (*Opera*, ed. Leclerc, Leyden 1703, ii c. 813) has *Quae non posuisti ne tollas*, referring for it to passages 3 and 4 above; his editor in a foot-note refers to his own note on Lev. vi 3 (Jo. Clericus *Mosis Prophetarum libri v* ii p. 225), where he cites 3, 4 and 5. Neither of them mentions S. Luke xix 21.

Evidently Plummer's 'perhaps' is unnecessary.

It will be noticed that 1 and 6 also illustrate *καὶ θερίζεις ὃ οὐκ ἔσπειρας* of the Parable and its relation to the 'proverbial expression'.

II

'SOUL, BODY, SPIRIT.'

IN a Note under this heading in *J. T. S.* ii pp. 273 sq. I was able to cite only two instances of this curious order, or the reverse of it, in Latin writers. I have since noticed three more instances.

De Sacramentis v 8 'Iam tunc ergo Salomon inducit nuptias vel Christi et Ecclesiae, vel spiritus et carnis et animae.'

Etherius and Beatus *Ep. ad Elipand.* i 100 'denique homo perfectus ex tribus constat, id est anima et corpore et spiritu.' And again *ib.* 102.

III

S. JULIUS *Ep. ad Eusebian.* AP. S. ATH. *Apol. c. Arian.* 35.

*Ὡ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι τοῦτο ἔθος ἦν πρότερον γράφεσθαι ἡμῖν καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν ὀρίζεσθαι τὰ δίκαια ;

Everywhere, from Baronius, the Benedictine *S. Athanasii Opera*, and Mansi, down to Mgr. Batiffol's *La paix constantiniennne* and Dr Kidd's *History of the Church*, I observe that ἔνθεν in this passage is uniformly rendered *hinc*, d'ici, 'from here', i. e. from Rome; and the same is implied in the paraphrases in the French version (Leclercq) of Hefele and in Duchesne's *Histoire ancienne de l'église*. But surely ἔνθεν does not mean 'from here', but either 'from there', or 'whence', or 'then', 'after that'. Whether S. Julius himself or his chancery was responsible for the language of the two letters included in the *Apologia c. Arianos*, the one to the Eusebians (21-35), the other to the Alexandrines (52 sq.), it is clear, as is natural enough, that they were not written by any one who thought in Greek or habitually spoke it. The letter to the Alexandrines contains three flagrant Latinisms: ἴν' οὕτως εἶπω, *ut ita dicam*; εὐφραίνει, used impersonally, *iuvat*; and even συνέστηκεν, *constat*, 'it is evident'; and possibly the uncommon construction of the aorist participle with the auxiliary verb, which occurs five times in the letter to the Eusebians (22 προτρεψάμενος ἤμην: 23 ἦσαν ἀμαρτήσαντες: 30 ἦν εὐρεθείς: 34 ἦσαν καταγνωσθέντες: 35 ἦν ἰποπτευθέν) or such a phrase as ἔχειν αὐτὸν, ὥσπερ καὶ εἶχομεν, ἐπίσκοπον (32), is not unaffected by Latin. Consequently I conclude that καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν simply renders *et sic deinde*.

IV

S. GREG. NYSSEN. *Antirrheticus* 12.

Προϋπάρχει, φησὶν [ὁ Ἀπολλινάριος], ὁ ἄνθρωπος Χριστός, οὐχ ὡς ἑτέρον ὄντος παρ' αὐτὸν τοῦ πνεύματος, τουτέστι τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς τοῦ κυρίου ἐν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσει θείου πνεύματος ὄντος.

S. Gregory understood τοῦ κυρίου to be the genitive of ὁ Κύριος: for in c. 13 he says φησὶ γὰρ ὅτι ὁ Κύριος ἐν τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου κτλ. Similarly Gallandi *Bibl. Patr.* vi p. 526 translates 'ac si Dominus'; Dorner (*Entwicklungsgesch.* i p. 1002) prints Κυρίου, with a capital; and Dr Voisin *L'Apollinarisme* p. 299 translates 'en ce sens que le Seigneur'—all without comment. The result is that the sentence, to say the least of it, is not lucid: 'The Man Christ pre-exists . . . in the sense that the Lord is divine spirit in the nature of the God-Man.' But, as Dr Lietzmann (*Apollinaris* p. 211 n. 27) has already pointed out, it is clear that τοῦ κυρίου is the genitive, not of ὁ Κύριος, but of τὸ κύριον, what is elsewhere called τὸ κυριώτατον or τὸ ὑπερέχον (*Antirrhēt.* 23, 24), the ruling or decisive factor, viz. the νοῦς or πνεῦμα, what makes the humanity to be a humanity (in the Apollinarian sense) and not merely σάρξ and ψυχή. (Cp. Ar. *Eth. Nic.* x 7 § 9 εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῷ ὄγκῳ μικρόν ἐστι [ὁ νοῦς], δυνάμει καὶ τιμότητι πολὺν μᾶλλον πάντων ὑπερέχει' δόξειε δ' ἂν καὶ εἶναι ἕκαστος τοῦτο, εἴπερ τὸ κύριον καὶ ἄμεινον.) The meaning of the clause thus becomes clear: 'in the sense that the ruling factor in the nature of the God-Man is divine spirit'.

The intermediate clause, οὐχ ὡς ἐτέρου ὄντος κτλ., is to me quite unintelligible as it stands: it seems in fact to say the opposite of what Apollinarius means. I cannot but think that we ought to read, not οὐχ ὡς; but ὡς οὐχ, and then the whole becomes clear: 'The Man Christ pre-exists in the sense that the spirit, i. e. God, is none other than [the Man] Himself', his νοῦς,—'but that the ruling factor in the nature of the God-Man is divine spirit'. And this is just what Apollinarius says elsewhere (*Antirrhēt.* 18): αὐτὸς ὁ ἄνθρωπος . . . Θεὸς ἐστι . . . ἅτε δὴ τῷ ἰδίῳ πνεύματι Θεὸς ὢν καὶ οὐ Θεὸν ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἕτερον παρ' αὐτόν.

This passage, or rather the first words of it, appear to be the only authentic text of Apollinarius which may seem to supply a basis for the view, first I imagine propounded by Dorner, that he 'ascribed an eternal humanity to the Word', or that ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ Ἄνθρωπος or ὁ ἐπουράνιος Ἄνθρωπος means for him a pre-existent Heavenly Man. For the other passages quoted either represent Gregory's misconception of Apollinarius's doctrine, or do not necessarily imply what Dorner takes them to imply. It is clear enough what Apollinarius means by the pre-existence of the Man. It is only his general doctrine expressed more or less paradoxically. The Man can be said to be pre-existent because that in virtue of which He is man, and not merely animal, His νοῦς, is the Eternal Word. And as to 'the Man from heaven', he defines quite clearly what he means by it: Τοῦτον δὲ φησιν [ὁ Ἀπολλινάριος] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ διὰ τοῦτο καλεῖσθαι, διότι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ οὐράνιον ἐσαρκώθη (*Antirrhēt.* 14).

It could be wished therefore that Dr Gore (*Belief in Christ* p. 230) would not only have 'deprecated' Dr Relton's 'attempt to revive the idea of Apollinarius', but would have dismissed this interpretation of Apollinarian doctrine as a phantasy.

V

S. GREG. M. *Epp.* ix 26.

ORATIONEM autem Dominicam idcirco mox post precem dicimus quia mos apostolorum fuit ut ad ipsam solummodo orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent: et valde mihi inconueniens visum est ut precem quam scholasticus composuerat super oblationem diceremus et ipsam traditionem quam Redemptor noster composuit non diceremus.

1. The first clause of this notorious passage has generally been understood in the sense 'we say the Lord's Prayer directly after the Canon for the reason that it was the custom of the apostles to consecrate the host of the oblation with the [Lord's] Prayer itself alone'. Thus Amalarius, in the first edition of *de Officiis* i 15 (Hittorp, ed. 1591, p. 704), evidently on the authority of this passage, says that in the Mass of the Presanctified the apostolic consecration, which recited only the Lord's Prayer over the Lord's body and blood, is reproduced; and, were it not for the direction of the *Ordo Romanus*, that one kind be reserved on Maundy Thursday for use on Good Friday, it would be unnecessary to reserve, since the Lord's Prayer would suffice for the consecration of the bread, as it already suffices for that of the chalice. Similarly, Walafrid Strabo *de Exordiis* 23 has: 'relatio maiorum est ita primis temporibus missas fieri solitas sicut modo in Pasceve Paschae . . . communicationem facere solemus: id est, praemissa Oratione Dominica et, sicut ipse Dominus noster praecepit, commemoratione Passionis adhibita, eos corpori dominico communicasse et sanguini quos ratio permittebat.' (Is the *commemoratio* here the veneration of the cross? Cp. *Sacr. Gel.* I xli *Et venit sacerdos ante altare, adorans crucem Domini et osculans. Et dicit Oremus. Et sequitur Praeceptis salutaribus moniti et oratio Dominica. Inde Libera nos Domine quaesumus. Haec omnia expleta adorant omnes sanctam crucem et communicant.*) Martène (*de ant. Eccl. Rit.* I iii 1 § 3) is no doubt right in seeing an allusion to Gregory in Ratherius of Verona (*de Contemptu Canonum* 1) where he says 'illa specialissima oratione consecratur oblatio populo porrigenda ubi Deo dicitur *Pater noster qui es in caelis*'. Leo VII (*Ep.* iii *ad Gallos et Germanos*) deprecates the use of the *Paternoster* as an ordinary grace before meat 'quia in sancti-

ficatione corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi hanc *solummodo orationem* sancti apostoli decantabant'. Berno of Reichenau (*de quibusdam* 1) quotes Gregory as describing the mass as it was 'in exordio nascentis ecclesiae', without indicating in what precise sense he understood him. Bernold of Constance (*Micrologus* 12), in partly quoting, partly paraphrasing Gregory, makes him say no more than that the apostles were believed to have used the Lord's Prayer 'in confectione eorundem sacramentorum', so leaving it possible to suppose that in his view Gregory's meaning was at most that, while the *Paternoster* was the only *prayer* in the apostolic consecration, this did not exclude the use of a further formula which was not strictly prayer. Anyhow, this is the view of Sicard of Cremona (*Mitræ* iii 1, vi 13), who assuming that the Words of Institution had always been essential, and not regarding the recitation of them as prayer, took Gregory to mean that the apostolic form was the Words of Institution followed by the *Paternoster*. Durandus (*Rationale* IV i 4, VI lxxvii 26) reproduces Sicard almost verbally; and this interpretation was revived by Bona (*Rer. lit.* I v 3) and Le Brun (*Explication* tome ii, diss. ii 2 § 7). But the older interpretation—that S. Gregory makes the Lord's Prayer to be the exclusive apostolic form of consecration—has been if not *the* common one, at least *a* common one, among modern writers, including e.g. Martène (*ubi supra*), Bingham (*Antt.* XV iii 28), Duchesne (*Origines*, ed. 1, p. 176), and J. Wordsworth (*Ministry of Grace* p. 382).

Now all these writers, from Amalarius onwards, with the possible exception of Berno who is not explicit, have assumed that *oblationis* depends on *hostiam*. But as long ago as 1870 Probst (*Lit. d. drei ersten Jahrb.* p. 356) pointed out—what, when it is once pointed out, is obvious enough, and the only wonder is that it was not perceived before—that *oblationis* depends, not on *hostiam*, but on *orationem*; and Dom Cabrol (*Dict. d'arch. et lit.* ii (2) c. 1852) and Mgr Batiffol (*Leçons sur la messe*, 1919, p. 278: *L'eucharistie*, ed. 1920, p. 352) have lately insisted upon it anew. Consequently S. Gregory in fact says the exact opposite of what he has been supposed to say: viz. that 'it was the custom of the apostles to consecrate the host with the Prayer of Oblation itself alone'. And, as Mgr Batiffol has noticed, in Victorinus Afer *adv. Arian.* i 30, *oratio oblationis* means the Canon, while the title of Sarapion's anaphora is Εὐχὴ προσφόρου. What, therefore, S. Gregory says is that the apostolic custom was to consecrate only with the εὐχαριστία or anaphora or canon, without any *Paternoster* following it. It will be remembered that by a similar re-sorting of the words Dom Connolly cleared up the difficulty in S. Innocent I's letter to Decentius (*J. T. S.* xx pp. 215 sqq., xxiii p. 410).

2. The prayer 'quam scholasticus composuerat' was understood by Bernold to be the Canon, and he remarks that S. Gregory has given us all the information we possess concerning the authorship of it. Berno also, though less explicit, evidently understands the Canon to be meant, but corrects the Pope; 'Attamen ipsum canonem non unus solus totum composuit, sed per tempora aliud alius interposuit et adiecit': and he adds the partly legendary account of the development of the Roman Liturgy collected out of the *Liber Pontificalis*. And modern writers have, I suppose, almost universally taken the same view of Gregory's words. Dom Cabrol and Mgr Batiffol, so understanding them, remark that he speaks 'assez dédaigneusement', 'un peu dédaigneusement' of the Canon. This sounds unlikely. And there are exceptions. Le Brun quotes from Maldonatus an argument, unconvincing enough, to the effect that it is not the whole Canon, but only the paragraph *Hanc igitur* which is attributed to the *scholasticus*. Grisar and Thalhofer (see Thalhofer *Handbuch*, ed. 1883-1890, ii p. 261) both understand the prayer to be the Prayer of the Fraction, *Credimus Domine*, intervening between the Canon and the *Paternoster* in the Stowe Missal, which they suppose to have stood here in the Roman Sacramentary of S. Gregory's day until he abolished it and so made the Lord's Prayer to follow immediately after the Canon. I should like to propose for consideration another interpretation.

S. Gregory's argument, in recalling that the apostles consecrated 'ad ipsam solummodo Orationem Oblationis', implies that something has since been added: and my suggestion is that this addition is the prayer 'quam scholasticus composuerat', and that, when this prayer is described as said 'super oblationem', it is almost expressly named, being in fact the Roman *Super oblata* or *Secreta*, the Ambrosian *Super oblatam*, the Offertory Prayer. So that what S. Gregory says is this: 'It was the apostolic usage to consecrate with an Anaphora only; but seeing that a *Super oblata* of purely human composition has since been added, to be said over the unconsecrated oblation, it seemed to me only congruous to say the Lord's own Prayer over the consecrated oblation.' This seems to satisfy the language, to make the argument, such as it is, rather more intelligible, and to relieve the Pope of any suspicion of 'speaking disdainfully' of the Canon or of claiming to improve upon apostolic usage.

3. Where then did Gregory find the record of the supposed 'mos apostolorum'? There are two obvious sources from either or both of which, assumed to be authentic records of apostolic usage and precept, he might have drawn his information: viz. the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus. Both of these satisfy the required conditions, for in neither of them is the

Anaphora either preceded by an Offertory Prayer or followed by the Lord's Prayer (*Ap. Constt.* viii 12 § 3, 13 : *Hauer Fragmenta Veronensia* pp. 106, 112). It is true that Gregory knew no Greek : but the existing MS of the Latin version of the *Apostolic Tradition* is older than his day and the version itself older still ; and if there was no Latin translation of the *Constitutions*, yet during the six years of his residence in Constantinople, though he failed to learn Greek, he must have had every opportunity of getting a sufficient knowledge of the 'Clementine Liturgy'.

VI

THE DEFINITION OF CHALCEDON.

THE books seem seldom to have anything to say about the sources of the Definition, and I have never seen them set out at length. It will, therefore, perhaps be of use to tabulate them here.

THE DEFINITION

Ἐπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἀγίοις πατράσιν

ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν

ὁμολογοῦμεν Υἱὸν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν
Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ συμφώνως ἅ-
παντες ἐκδιδάσκομεν τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν
ἐν θεότητι, καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν
ἀνθρωπότητι, Θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄν-
θρωπον ἀληθῶς τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ Ψυχῆς
λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον
τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεό-
τητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν
κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα·

κατὰ πάντα ὁμοῖον
ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας·

πρὸ αἰῶνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεν-
νηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχά-
των δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡ-

S. Cyr. *Ep.* iii *ad Nest.* 3

Ἐπόμενοι δὲ πανταχοῦ ταῖς τῶν
ἀγίων πατέρων ὁμολογίας.

S. Cyr. *Ep.* ii *ad Nest.*

ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν προσκυνῶντες.

Formula of Reunion A.D. 433¹

1 ὁμολογοῦμεν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν
Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν
μονογενῆ, Θεὸν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον
τέλειον [Cyr. *Ep.* *ad Io. Ant.* τέλειος
ὢν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειος ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν
ἀνθρωπότητι] ἐκ ψυχῆς
λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, 3 ὁμοούσιον
τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν θεό-
τητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν
κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα·

[Heb. iv 15 κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοί-
τητα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας].

2 πρὸ αἰῶνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεν-
νηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχά-
των δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡ-

¹ In S. Cyr. *Ep. ad Ioan. Antioch.* Identical with the confession of the Antiochenes in their letter to Theodosius II in 431 (*Mansi* v 783), adopted almost verbally by the Synod of 448 (*ib.* vi 678). The numbers in the text mark the order in which the clauses occur in the Formula itself. The Confession of S. Flavian cites the same clauses, in whole or in part, in the order 2, 1, 3, 4.

μᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρί-
αν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου κ αἰέο
τόκου¹ κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα,

ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν
Υἱὸν Κύριον μονογενῆ,

ἐν δύο φύσεσιν

ἀσυγχύτως ἀτρέπτως ἀδιαιρέ-
τως ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον·

οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀν-
ηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν,

σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ιδιότητος
ἐκατέρας φύσεως καὶ
εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν
συντρεχούσης·

οὐχ ὡς εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζό-
μενον ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ' ἓνα καὶ
τὸν αὐτὸν Υἱὸν μονογενῆ, Θεὸν Λό-
γον, Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

Thus the Council itself contributes practically nothing, and the Definition combines and represents Leo, Cyril, Theodoret, and Flavian — Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople.

F. E. BRIGHTMAN.

¹ The *Formula of Reunion* and the letter to Theodosius acknowledge the title θεοτόκος in a further paragraph.

² Mansi vii 32: the declaration of the Illyrian bishops, who had had misgivings as to the sufficiency of certain passages in the *Tomē* of S. Leo, to the effect that their doubts had been removed by the explanations of the Roman Legates: πάντα γὰρ ἀνθρωπον ἀναθεμάτισαν . . . μὴ τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρωποπρεπῆ αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ Κυρίου] εἶναι λέγοντα ἀσυγχύτως καὶ ἀτρέπτως καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως.

μᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρί-
αν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου
κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα·

4 δύο γὰρ φύσεων ἔνωσις γέγονε· διὸ
ἓνα Χριστόν,
ἓνα Υἱόν, ἓνα Κύριον ὁμολογοῦμεν.

Confessio Flavianī

ἐν δύο φύσεσι.

*Session IV of the Council.*²

ἀσυγχύτως καὶ ἀτρέπτως καὶ ἀδιαιρέ-
τως.

S. Cyr. *Ep.* ii *ad Nest.*

οὐχ ὡς τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀν-
ηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν.

S. Leo *Ep.* *ad Flavian.* 3

Salva igitur proprietate
utriusque naturae et substantiae et
in unam coeunte personam.

S. Cyr. *Ep.* ii *ad Nest.*

ἓνα μὴ . . . τέμνωμεν εἰς δυο
τὸν ἓνα Χριστόν,
τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ
Κύριον.