This article identifies a set of Slavonic passages from Athanasius’ *Orations against the Arians* quoted by Joseph Volotsky and Metropolitan Daniil in opposition to the heresy of Judaizers. These writers are two of the three men (the third one being Zinoviy Otenskiy who is examined in a separate study) that cited Athanasius’ work as originally written in Greek and translated to Slavonic in 907 (today preserved in ten manuscripts of Russian origin). This study represents research funded by the Czech Science Foundation as the project GACR 22-08389S “Pseudo-Athanasius of Alexandria, *Oration on the Celebration of Easter*: Critical Edition of the Old Slavonic Version”, and by the Charles University Research Centre program No. UNCE/HUM/016.
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study is aimed at exploring the significance of this fact, and it also provides a transcription and analysis of all the quotations by comparing them with the text of the Orations in all known manuscripts.
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Résumé
Настоящая статья рассматривает выявленные у Иосифа Волоцкого и митрополита Даниила цитаты из Афанасиевых «Слов против ариан». Их сочинения являются двумя из трех источников русского Средневековья (к третьему относится Зиновий Отенский, анализируемый в отдельной работе), в которых цитируется данный текст, переведенный с греческого на славянский в 907 г. и сохранившийся в десяти русских списках. В статье показано, что взятые из него цитаты были использованы в полемике с ересью жидовствующих. Главной целью настоящего исследования является рассмотреть значение этого факта, а также представить непосредственный текст цитат и сопоставительный анализ по всем известным нам спискам, содержащим «Слова против ариан».
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It is commonly recognized that the Slavonic translation of Athanasius’ Orations against the Arians in our possession today was first copied to counter the so-called heresy of the Judaizers active in Veliky Novgorod and Moscow in the late 15th and early 16th centuries. It is much less known, however, that there seem to be only three people who cited this writing around that time: Joseph Volotsky (1439–1515), Metropolitan of Moscow Daniil (1492–1522), and Zinovi Otenskiy (d. 1571/2). Today, Athanasius’ Orations are preserved in ten MS witnesses ranging from the late 15th to the mid-17th centuries, and this study is aimed at exploring the issue of reception of this writing in Joseph Volotsky’s and Metropolitan Daniil’s own works. For the reception of Orations in Zinovi Otenskiy, I would like to refer the readers to my other work in co-authorship with Mikhail Shpakovskiy. In the present article, I will examine the context in which Joseph and Daniil used the Orations and the purpose for which they quoted this work. In the Appendix, I provide the extensive quotations cited by Daniil next to the Greek text of Orations and the specific MS from which he quoted Athanasius.

1 [Lytvynenko, Shpakovskiy (forthcoming)].
1. Orations against the Arians and the Heresy of the Judaizers

Among the many works of Athanasius of Alexandria (ca. 296/298–373), by far the largest and most significant theological work is the Orations against the Arians, CPG 2093 (written between 339–345; henceforth CA I, II, III [Metzler, Savvidis 1998; Idem 2000]). In the year 906, this writing, along with Athanasius’ Epistle to the Bishops of Egypt and Libya, CPG 2092 (written around 356; henceforth Ep. Aeg. Lib. [Metzler, Hansen, Savvidis 1996]), was translated from Greek to Slavonic by Constantine of Preslav in Eastern Bulgaria. Since then these texts circulated in the form of a single corpus and under the same title Orations against the Arians, in which Ep. Aeg. Lib. was given the name of the Fourth Oration.

Originally, Athanasius’ Orations were written to combat the so-called Arian heresy that appeared in Alexandria in the early 4th century. Very soon, that teaching spread throughout the Eastern part of the Roman Empire, denying Christ’s divine nature and the Trinity [Behr 2004: 61–122]. In medieval Russia, the same doctrines were rejected by the heretical movement known in the church terminology as the heresy of the Judaizers. According to Alexeyev:

Во-первых, жидовствующие отрицали божественность Сына и Святого Духа и догмат о Святой Троице («Едино господство, едино божество в Троице»), но при этом признавали Бога-Отца («да не последуешь тем, иже во Отца веруют, а в Сына не веруют»). Во-вторых, еретики отрицали догмат о боговоплощении Христа в человеческий образ и, следовательно, возможность изображения и почитания иконного образа («и покланяемся иконе Спасове, во плоти написаному человеколюбцу Богу нашему, ни привидением, ни мечтанием, но истинным вочеловечением подобен нам по всему, разве греха») [Алексеев 2012: 285–286].

The fact that both Arians and the Judaizers rejected the same fundamental doctrines led scholars to believe that the initial copying of Slavonic Orations in medieval Russia was related to the rise of the heresy of the Judaizers (e. g. [Сморгунова 2001; Горина 2012]). Several facts substantiate this point. First, Athanasius’ name figures in the letter of the Novgorodian Archbishop Gennady (1410–1505), in which he inquired of the former Archbishop of

---

2 The First Oration (based on two MSS) is published by [Vaillant 1954]. The Second and the Third Orations (based on two MSS) are published by [Пенкова 2015; Eadem 2016]. The Second Oration (based on all known MSS) is published by [Lytvynenko 2019]. One later ms [Sin994] is published by [Weiher et al. 2007].

3 In addition to the four Orations, the Old Slavonic corpus includes a pseudo-Athanasian text Epistle on the Celebration of Easter, published by [Penkova 2008: 279–303]. This writing is a translation of the Homily on Easter VII (CPG 4612) attributed to John Chrysostom. The Greek edition is available in [Floéri, Nautin 1957: 111–73].

4 Not to be confused with the disputed Greek Oration IV in CPG 2230.
Rostov and Jaroslavl’ Ioasaf (died in 1514) about whether he had “Athanasius of Alexandria” among his books. The letter (sent in the year 1489) expresses his concern over the increasing growth of the Judaizers, and in the frequently-quoted passage Athanasius comes second in the list of twelve other books:

While the passage does not mention the *Orations* (referring only to the name “Athanasius of Alexandria”), it is quite likely that Gennady meant precisely this work, for he had it copied by Dmitry Gerasimov (preserved in *Pog968*) in the same year as he wrote his letter to Ioasaf. The letter states that “heretics have all these books” (за тѣ книги, огъ еретико о), which probably implied that having the same titles among the faithful was all the more important.

Second, we have an important piece of information recorded in the colophon of the scribe Timofey Veniaminov, who made another copy of the *Orations* in Novgorod in the same year, 1489 (preserved in *Vol437*). It says that the work of copying was occasioned by the rise of heretics that attacked the doctrines related to Christ’s deity and the Trinity:

---

5. This passage has been published multiple times (e.g. [Tomelleri 1999]). Since no answer from Ioasaf has survived, scholars dispute whether Gennady’s letter was intended to request these twelve books from Ioasaf, or rather to provide them to him if he lacked any [Ibid.]. In my view, the second of these options looks more likely: instead of requesting the books, Gennady wanted to check which of them Ioasaf already had, so that he could provide those that were lacking. This can be supported from the fact that Gennady commissioned his scribes to make copies of different writings and then sent them to the main monastic centers in Russia.

6. В лѣто ѕевра нѣ, къ, къ, преписахь сїе посланїе.

7. The letter is published with a brief introduction and ms description in [Казакова, Лурье 1955: 315–320; the passage in question is on p. 320]. The dating of this letter to the year 1489 is based on the only surviving MS that contains this letter [*Tro730: 252v*], stating: В лѣто ѕевра нѣ, къ, къ, преписахь сїе посланїе.

8. This MS is often inaccurately dated to the year 1488 based on the colophon in [Vol437: 217v], stating that the scribe “wrote it on October 16th in the year 6997” (писа послѣднего ста 30. кѣ, дѣ въ октябрѣ вѣ.). However, since besides the year (6997), there is a clear indication of the month (October), our starting point should be the year 5008 = 1489, not 5009 = 1488. On this system of chronology, see: [Бережков 1963: 28–41].
The passage ends by stating that the heresy was exposed by Gennady who set out to confront it:

Нѣ влекопромѣнник въ бѣжить бѣдѣ, дѣла преобряды прѣщенны архіепископу генадию; вѣнчался и еретическому злодѣю вѣрѣ православной, что запечатлѣшѧ сѣтѣ [Vol437: 237v].

2. Orations against the Arians in Joseph Volotsky’s Writings

After Gennady’s death, his cause against the Judaizers was taken up by Joseph Volotsky, who is also our main source of information on this movement [Алексеев 2012: 292–382]. He clearly recognized that they considered Christ to be less than God (содѣлахꙋ хꙋленї і оуничиженї на Ха҃ Бгѯ) and rejected the equality of the persons of the Trinity (самопроизволнѣ ѿвергшасѧ Стѣѧ единосꙋщныѧ Трѧцы) [Просветитель 1896: 516, Слово 15]. Apparently, based on this fact he treated the heretics as new Arians (Арїе новыи) [Просветитель 1896: 42, Сказание], complaining that they brought back the old heresy. Taking support from the Life of St. Anthony (another major text composed by Athanasius and available in Slavonic as early as the 9th century) [Литвиненко 2017], Iosif sought to condemn the heretics in the same way as Anthony did the Arians in his own time:

Иако аще не подобаетъ инокѡ�猃 осꙋжати ни еретика ниже ѿстꙋпника, то како великиї локтїи осꙋжаше ихъ; глаше бо о еретициⷯ, иако словеса ихъ лютѣиша ида зміина: оуꙋния же свѧла всѧгда наказѧ, иако да ни коего же пр במידєїїя имѧть съ мелетїаны и со арїаны и съ прочныї еретици [Просветитель 1896: 498, Слово 15].

Naturally, Athanasius’ Orations would have perfectly fit the occasion if Joseph felt the need to use this work as a prooftext against the Judaizers. For what it is worth, he quotes Athanasius fourteen times (of which half is from his genuine texts and half from the pseudographia), and he mentions the name “Athanasius” over thirty times [Lytvynenko 2015–2016]. Yet, he makes only two references to the Orations. The first one is rather indirect, retelling the account of Arius’ death of which Athanasius writes in his Fourth Oration (= Ep. Aeg. Lib. 19):

---

9 See the photographs of this colophon in [Фонкич 1977: 32].
10 See the photographs of this colophon in [Ibid.].
From the above table, it is clear that Joseph's account is lacking the fact that the story took place on Saturday and that Alexander was threatened by the Eusebians who intended to force Arius back into the church. On the other hand, Joseph’s version adds a few elements that are missing in the Oration: it says that the event took place immediately after the Council’s condemnation and that Arius repented (though not sincerely), pleading to the Emperor Constantine to restore him. The motif of repentance is also missing in the classical patristic descriptions of Arius’ death: Athanasius’ Epistle to Serapion on the Death of Arius [Opitz 1940: 178–180], Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis [Holl 1933: 146–147], and Rufinus’ Church History [Schwartz 1908, 1.13–14]. Nothing is said of Arius’ repentance in the two Lives of Athanasius, of which at least one was familiar to Joseph, who directly mentions it [Просветитель 1896: 442, Слово 11]. The one
text that does refer to Arius’ repentance is the Chronicle of George Hamartolos [Истрин 1920: 344] (available in Slavonic since the 11th century), but there is no evidence that Joseph used it for his account of Arius’ death.

Another reference to the Orations comes when Joseph considers the issues of biblical interpretation. This time, Joseph clearly refers to the statement from the First Oration 1.54, but instead of giving a direct quote, he paraphrases it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Питрееси оуєро есті, ике божественала пикаіа ражкъети хоатаіа, глъты великий афонйййе, истазати съ многъйййъ мыхтстомъ плоды и лица и оумъ гдйио.ого гдй гдй екѣтвнны аўлъ, иако пикаів ымъръывла.</td>
<td>гдъелет же іакоіе, о всъ ббіа книгъ. лъбо д ткетгны. и нъкъ і э. такъеіе і в съ мѣстъ в неже врежа рѣ аўлъ, і лице и притгъя. еаже ръ напикъа д върбо ражкъетати.</td>
<td>δεі δε, ως ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς θείας γραφῆς προσήκει ποιεῖν καὶ ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν, οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα καθ᾽ ὃν εἶπεν ὁ ἀπόστολος κερον καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα διόπερ ἐγραψε πιστῶς ἐκλαμβάνειν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joseph modifies Athanasius’ triplet времѧ и лице и притгѧ (καιρός, πρᾶγμα, πρόσωπον) by changing the first and the third words to his own: плоды и лица и оумъ. Whether deliberately adjusting this passage or borrowing an already revised version from elsewhere, it is evident that Joseph had the same concern as Athanasius: ignoring these three aspects could lead one to heresy.

While the evidence that Joseph used the Orations is quite scarce, we do know that one of the ten mss containing this text (i. e. Vol437, copied in 1489)11 used to belong at some point to the Iosifo-Volokolamsky Monastery directed by Joseph from 1479 to 1515. Written initially in Novgorod, this very ms was later used by Joseph’s disciple and successor in the Iosifo-Volokolamsky Monastery, Daniil, who later became the Metropolitan of Russia (1522–1539).

3. Orations against the Arians in Metropolitan Daniil’s Writings

Sometime either in the 1520s12 or 1530s,13 Daniil composed the so-called Sobornik in which he placed five extensive quotations from Athanasius’ Third Oration (see Appendix, col. 3). In the year 1531, he used the same quotations to draw up a polemical writing, conventionally called Sudnoe Delo Vassiana Patrikeyeva (see Appendix, col. 4). The context in which Daniil quoted Athanasius was his polemic with Vassian Patrikeyev (ca. 1470—after 1531), whom

---

11 First described by [Иером. Иосиф, 1882: 73–74], and later by [Фонкич 1977: 26–37].
12 This date is suggested by [Журова 2020:145].
13 This date is suggested by [Стариков 2014а: 12, n. 13] and [Жмакин 1881: 321].
he accused of teaching a heresy that believed Christ’s body to be immortal before his resurrection (ересь нетленномнимого). According to Daniil, that heresy undermined the reality of Christ’s Incarnation, and he argued for a doctrine that recognized Christ as fully God and man: да никто буѓде еретикъ, и да никто прїиме глоую и пагоубноую ересь, нетлѣнномнимоую. но да всѧкъ вѣроує и исповѣдает, съвершена ту вѣ, и съвершена ту вѣка [Sob197: 121v].

Today, Daniil’s Sobornik is preserved in nine MSS, of which the best one is Sob197, and it is available in the edition by Zhurova [Журова 2020: 471–836]. The text of Sudnoe Delo was published by Kazakova from Sud17 [Казакова 1960: 285–318], and it is our only source that contains this text. Even though Daniil’s quotations are too fragmentary for a thorough collation, they have given me enough evidence to establish the fact that he cited them from Vol437.

As it is shown in the first set of examples marked with the MSS sigla for the twelve witnesses that contain Athanasius’ Orations, Daniil’s quotations (MN) follow the group DEFGHKL, in which D is the MS from the Iosifo-Volokolamsky Monastery:

Whenever D offers readings that are different from EFGHKL, Daniil’s quotations keep following D:

| Quot. 1 | к томꙋ бестрктна | ABCDMN, кто бестрктна EFGHKL, λοιπόν ἀπαθῆς |
| Quot. 1 | по своемѫ ἐκτενετε[ις] | ABCEFGHKL, по своемѣ οὕτως DMN, κατά τὴν ἑαυτῆς φύσιν |
| Quot. 3 | γινώσκετε | ABC, γινωσκετε EFGHKL, ἐμοὶ η μὴ πιστεύητε |
| Quot. 4 | видите | A, видите BHL, видите CDMN, видѣ ЕГК, видіт F, γινωσκετε |
| Quot. 5 | гласа | ABCDMN, γάλα EFGHKL, τὸ ποτήριον γινωσκετε |

---

14 Pog968 (A); Ovč791 (B); Nik59 (C); Vol437 (D); Sin20 (E); Sol63 (F); Sof1321 (G); Tsa180 (H); Sin994 (K); Ovč99 (L); Sob197 (M); Sud17 (N).
This situation reflects the results of my fuller collation of the entire Third Oration, from which Daniil borrows the quotes. First of all, my collation shows that ABCD were independently copied from the now lost Old Bulgarian protograph, and second—of these four, D is the protograph for E, and E is the ms that forms the group of five other witnesses that ascend from it: FGHKL (Lytvynenko 2019: 37–48). When we add Daniil’s quotations to the picture, we find the material that is of secondary importance for establishing the protograph (due to it being a descendant of D), but of vast importance as a witness to the history of the text. To appreciate Daniil’s quotations as this type of witness, we should briefly look into the way they function in his Sobornik and Sudnoe Delo.

In Sobornik, the quotations appear within the Oration on the Incarnation of Christ (ѡ вѣсплосѣнѣ гѧ нашего ічѧ хѧ), which is the fifth and largest Oration out of the other sixteen in that writing (ff. 119–204). According to Starikov, this Oration can be divided into three major sections [Стариков 2014a: 10–16]. It begins with the idea that Christ assumed true human nature as opposed to a belief that he only seemed to be human. This point is supported with biblical and patristic texts that speak about Christ having a true human soul and the fact that his body was mortal before he was raised from the dead, yet immortal immediately after. This is followed by the second section, where Daniil offers a detailed analysis of various heretical movements, in particular, Gnostics, Marcionites, Manicheans, Arians, and Monophysites. They are said to have distorted the doctrine of Christ’s Incarnation and for that were condemned by the conciliar decisions of the Church. In the concluding section, Daniil discusses the so-called hypostatic union (a Christological formula concerning Christ’s two natures united in one person from the Chalcedonian Definition in 451), as well as the Incarnation, with relevant support from the Church Fathers.

Within this structure, Athanasius is quoted twice, and all the passages come from the Third Oration (see Appendix, col. 3). First, we have a passage from CA III.57.30–58.1-8 (ff. 129r–129v) in the first section of Daniil’s writing. Here, he uses Athanasius to argue that resurrection rendered Christ’s human body immortal. The next place where Daniil quotes Athanasius is in the third section. This time, he cites a set of passages placed one after another in the following sequence: CA III.56.1–11 (ff. 176r–176v); CA III.55.11–16 (ff. 176v–177r); CA III.32.1–19 (ff. 177r–177v); CA III.34.1–14 (ff. 177v–178v). These quotes are employed to explain how Christ, being God, could experience bodily passions and undergo sufferings necessary for the salvation of man. In this scheme, Daniil appropriates the Athanasian texts with a twofold purpose: first, to affirm the traditional doctrine of Christ’s two natures united in one person; and second, to explain how this relates to the doctrine of salvation. In short, Daniil wanted his opponents to realize that incorrect Christology (first quotation block) inevitably led to an incorrect soteriology, making the salvation of man impossible (second quotation block).
In a simplified form, the same motifs that we find in Daniil’s *Oration on the Incarnation of Christ* are reiterated in his *Sudnoe Delo*. He changes the order of his arguments and shortens the quotations from the Scriptures and Church Fathers, though not from Athanasius. It is possible that such modifications had to do with the nature of this work written as a type of stenographical record from the court trial against Daniil’s opponent Vassian Patrikeyev [Стариков 2014a: 19–21]. He cites the same passages as in his *Sobornik* but arranges them differently (see Appendix, col. 4). The first set of quotations appears in the midst of other patristic texts directed against the heresy of monophysitism: *CA III.*56.1–11 (ff. 355v–356v); *CA III.*55.11–16 (f. 356v); *CA III.*32.1–19 (ff. 356v–357v); *CA III.*34.1–14 (ff. 357v–358v). The second passage quoted from Athanasius is *CA III.*57.30–58.1-8 (f. 423v). It comes in the very last folio of the codex and ends abruptly, preserving only part of the text. Daniil uses this passage to support his claim that Christ possessed two natures united in one person.

It is worth noting that Daniil consistently selects the quotations from Athanasius’ *Third Oration*, and not from either the *First* or the *Second Orations*. In contrast to the first two *Orations*, whose emphasis is distinctly Trinitarian, the *Third Oration* is much more focused on the issues of Christ’s Incarnation. During the Christological controversies in the 5th and 7th centuries, chapters 25–56 of the *Third Oration* circulated in Byzantium as a separate writing [Mereschini, Norelli 2005: 34]. Therefore, the fact that Daniil drew from the same chapters for his own Christology should not be surprising. Rather, in citing these passages, Daniil followed a well-established tradition that saw Athanasius as a helpful resource for resolving the Christological issues.

In conclusion, both Joseph Volotsky and Metropolitan Daniil provide some beautiful examples of the reception of Athanasius’ *Orations against the Arians* in medieval Russia. Their careful selection of quotes from the *Orations* shows that a 4th-century text was able to serve the purposes of the new context, in which the heresy of the Judaizers undermined the same doctrines that were denied by the Arians. My collation of Daniil’s quotations has shown that he drew them from the Volokolamsky ms, which was probably available to him during the time he served as abbot at the Iosifo-Volokolamsky Monastery. Be it as it may, the fact that both Joseph and Daniil found it helpful to employ the *Orations* shows that Gennady’s desire to make Athanasius available in the first place proved to be highly effective.

Appendix

The table below offers five quotations from Athanasius’ third *Oration* in two works of Metropolitan Daniil: *Sobornik* and *Sudnoe Delo*. They are placed in col. 3 for *Sobornik* (marked as M) and in col. 4 for *Sudnoe Delo* (marked as N). For comparison, the same passages are also given from the Metzler–Savvidis
Greek edition in col. 1, and from Vol 437 in col. 2, which I believe to have been the codex from which Daniil copied his quotations. Unlike Zhurova [Журова 2020: 571–572, 603–605] and Kazakova [Казакова 1960: 302–304, 318], who published Daniil’s texts in modern Russian script, I transcribed Daniil’s quotations in Slavonic, keeping them exactly as they appear in the manuscripts.

**Quotation 1**

CA III.57.30–58.1-8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol 437 (D): 185v–186r</th>
<th>Sob197 (M): 129r–129v</th>
<th>Sud17 (N): 423v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Пері тóтou кai Δαβίδ ψάλειν: “ουκ ἐγκαταλείφει τὴν ψυχήν μου εἰς θάνατον οὐδὲ δώσεις τῶν δαίμων σου ἵδειν διαφθοράν”  
“Επετει γάρ, φάθαρθν οὕσαν τὴν σάρκα, μικήτι κατὰ τὴν ἐσωτήριον φύσιν μένειν θυγήθη, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ἐνδυσάμενον αὐτήν Λόγον ἀφράτου- 

tοῦν διοικεῖν. Ὅς γὰρ 

Περὶ τούτου καὶ Δαβὶδ ψάλει· “οὐκ ἐγκατάλειψεν τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ᾅδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν”. Ἔπρεπε γὰρ, φθαρτὴν οὖσαν τὴν σάρκα, μηκέτι κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῆς φύσιν μένειν θνητὴν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ἐνδυσάμενον αὐτὴν Λόγον ἄφθαρτον διαμένειν. Ὡς γὰρ αὐτὸς, γενόμενος ἐν τῷ ἡμῶν σώματι τὰ ἡμῶν ἐμιμῆσατο, οὕτως ἡμεῖς δεξάμενοι τοῦτον τῆς παρ' ἐκείνου μεταλαμβάνομεν ἀθανασίας.

Περὶ τούτου καὶ Δαβὶδ ψάλει· “οὐκ ἐγκατάλειψεν τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ᾅδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν”. Ἔπρεπε γὰρ, φθαρτὴν οὖσαν τὴν σάρκα, μηκέτι κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῆς φύσιν μένειν θνητὴν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ἐνδυσάμενον αὐτὴν Λόγον ἄφθαρτον διαμένειν. Ὡς γὰρ αὐτὸς, γενόμενος ἐν τῷ ἡμῶν σώματι τὰ ἡμῶν ἐμιμῆσατο, οὕτως ἡμεῖς δεξάμενοι τοῦτον τῆς παρ' ἐκείνου μεταλαμβάνομεν ἀθανασίας.

Περὶ τούτου καὶ Δαβὶδ ψάλει· “οὐκ ἐγκατάλειψεν τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ᾅδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν”. Ἔπρεπε γὰρ, φθαρτὴν οὖσαν τὴν σάρκα, μηκέτι κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῆς φύσιν μένειν θνητὴν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ἐνδυσάμενον αὐτὴν Λόγον ἄφθαρτον διαμένειν. Ὡς γὰρ αὐτὸς, γενόμενος ἐν τῷ ἡμῶν σώματι τὰ ἡμῶν ἐμιμῆσατο, οὕτως ἡμεῖς δεξάμενοι τοῦτον τῆς παρ' ἐκείνου μεταλαμβάνομεν ἀθανασίας.
|---|---|---|---|

**QUOTATION 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ καὶ τὸ σῶμα παθητὸν δεικνύς ἐν τῷ ἄφιέναι κλαίειν καὶ πεκρον οὗτοι καὶ τὰ ἰδιὰ τοῦ σώματος ἐν αὐτῷ φαίνεσθαι. ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τῶν τοιούτων ἐγνώριζεν, ὅτι Θεὸς ὢν ἀπαθὴς σάρκα παθητὴν ἔλαβεν, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐργῶν ἐδείκνυεν ἑαυτὸν Λόγον ὄντα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί.</td>
<td>ἐξ ὁλίγα</td>
<td>καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὰ ἰδιὰ τοῦ σώματος ἐν αὐτῷ φαίνεσθαι. ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τῶν τοιούτων ἐγνώριζεν, ὅτι Θεὸς ὢν ἀπαθὴς σάρκα παθητὴν ἔλαβεν, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐργῶν ἐδείκνυεν ἑαυτὸν Λόγον ὄντα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί.</td>
<td>ὁ καὶ τὸ σῶμα παθητὸν δεικνύς ἐν τῷ ἄφιέναι κλαίειν καὶ πεκρον οὗτοι καὶ τὰ ἰδιὰ τοῦ σώματος ἐν αὐτῷ φαίνεσθαι. ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τῶν τοιούτων ἐγνώριζεν, ὅτι Θεὸς ὢν ἀπαθὴς σάρκα παθητὴν ἔλαβεν, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐργῶν ἐδείκνυεν ἑαυτὸν Λόγον ὄντα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῆς σαρκὸς πασχόσας οὐκ ἦν ἔκτος ταύτης ὁ Λάζαρος διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ κύριον λέγεται καὶ τὸ πάθος καὶ θείος διὰ παθόντος αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐκ ἦν ἐξεδεχθὲν αὐτῷ ἢ σάρξ, ἀλλὰ ἐν αὐτῷ τῆς σώματος ταύτα πάλιν ὁ Κύριος ἐποίει. Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἀνθρώπινος γενόμενος ἔλεγεν: “εἰ οὐ ποιῶ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Πατρὸς μοι, μὴ πιστεύετε μοι” εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύετε, τότε ἔργος μοι πιστεύετε καὶ γινώσκετε, ὅτι ἐν ἑμοί ὁ Πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τοῖς ἐργοῖς μου πιστεύετε.</td>
<td>[165τ] πλοτι στραφῆται, η εἰ δὲ κράτης η σῶμα· τοῦ μαχείως καὶ εὐξηκτεῖς τε καὶ ξένους της θείους διὰ τοῦτο. Πάντως ὀφθαλμοὺς ἤνοικε διὰ πτύσμα, θείους δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς ἐξέτεινε χεῖρα, θείους δὲ Πέτρου πυρέσσουσαν. ὕποι εἰς τὸν κράτης αὐτῆς καὶ θείους, θείους δὲ τοὺς ἐμοὶ ὁ Πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τοῖς ἐργοῖς μου πιστεύετε, πιστεύετέ μοι· εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, ἐργά τοῦ Πατρός μου, μὴ πιστεύετε μοι.</td>
<td>[177τ] Τοῦτο πλοτι οὐχ ἕτερον στραφῆται, η εἰ δὲ κράτης ἔτερον ἔθετε, τοῦ μαχείως καὶ εὐξηκτεῖς τε καὶ ξένους της θείους διὰ τοῦτο. Πάντως ὀφθαλμοὺς ἤνοικε διὰ πτύσμα, θείους δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς ἐξέτεινε χεῖρα, θείους δὲ Πέτρου πυρέσσουσαν. ὕποι εἰς τὸν κράτης αὐτῆς καὶ θείους, θείους δὲ τοὺς ἐμοὶ ὁ Πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τοῖς ἐργοῖς μου πιστεύετε, πιστεύετέ μοι· εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, ἐργά τοῦ Πατρός μου, μὴ πιστεύετε μοι.</td>
<td>[356v] Τοῦτο πλοτι οὐχ ἕτερον στραφῆται, η εἰ δὲ κράτης ἔτερον ἔθετε, τοῦ μαχείως καὶ εὐξηκτεῖς τε καὶ ξένους της θείους διὰ τοῦτο. Πάντως ὀφθαλμοὺς ἤνοικε διὰ πτύσμα, θείους δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς ἐξέτεινε χεῖρα, θείους δὲ Πέτρου πυρέσσουσαν. ὕποι εἰς τὸν κράτης αὐτῆς καὶ θείους, θείους δὲ τοὺς ἐμοὶ ὁ Πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τοῖς ἐργοῖς μου πιστεύετε, πιστεύετέ μοι· εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, ἐργά τοῦ Πατρός μου, μὴ πιστεύετε μοι.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Οὐκοῦν καὶ ὅταν λέγηται ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί· ἐν τῇ Ἐπιστολῇ λέγων· Σωτῆρος· γράφει τοίνυν ἂν μάρτυς περὶ τοῦ Πέτρου· ἀξιόπιστο ἀκριβέστερον ἔχῃ, καλὸν αὐτοῦ γινώσκει τις λεγομένας ἀσθενείας θάνατος καὶ ἄλλαι τοῦ καὶ ὁ σταυρὸς καὶ τὸ κατακριθῆναι, τὸ ἐστίν. Οὗ δὲ λέγεται τὰ ἀνάγκη καὶ τὰ τῆς Ἰ. "Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο", – καὶ τὰ πάθη· εἰ δὲ τοῦ σῶμα, ἐκεῖνον ἄν λέγοιτο καὶ τὰ πάθη· εἰ δὲ τοῦ Λόγου ή σάρξ – "ὁ σαρξ σαρξ ἐγένετο", – ἀνάγκη καὶ τὰ τῆς σαρκος πάθη λέγεσθαι αὐτῶν, οὐ καὶ ή σάρξ ἔστιν. Οὐ δὲ λέγεται τὰ πάθη, οὐδὲ ἄστατα τὸ κατακριθῆναι, τὸ μαστίγωθηναι, τὸ διψάναι καὶ ὁ θάνατος καὶ οἱ ἄλλαι τοῦ σῶματος ἀσθενείας.

---

"Ἰνα δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀπαθēς τῆς τοῦ Λόγου φύσεως καὶ τὰς διὰ τὴν σάρκα λεγομένας ἀσθενείας αὐτοῦ γινώσκειν τις ἀκριβέστερον ἄγιον, καλὸν ἀκούσαι τοῦ μαγαρίου Πέτρου ἀξιόπιστος γὰρ οὗτος γένοιτο· ἀν μάρτυς περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος γράφη φθινόν ἐν τῇ Ἐπιστολῇ λέγουν· "Χριστὸν οὖν παθόντος ὡτὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί·" Οὔκοψιν καὶ οὕτως λέγηται...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πεινάν καὶ δυσφήμ, καὶ κάμνειν καὶ μή εἰδέναι καὶ καθεύδειν καὶ κλαίειν καὶ αίτείν καὶ ψέωνει καὶ γεννᾶstatt τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ ἀπλῶς πάντα τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς, λεγομενὴ δὲ ἀκολούθως ἐνερ' έκκλησιν Χριστοῦ οὐν πεινών οὐκ ἐφ' ἑκάστου· Χριστοῦ οὖν πεινῶντος καὶ διψῶντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί· καὶ μὴ εἰδέναι λέγοντος καὶ ῥαπιζομένου καὶ κάμνοντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί· καὶ ὑψουμένου πάλιν καὶ γεννῶμεν καὶ αὐξάνοντος καὶ φοβουμένου καὶ κρυπτομένου σαρκί· καὶ λέγοντος, Εἰ δυνατὸν, παρελθέτω τὸ ποτήριον καὶ τυπτομένου καὶ λαμβάνοντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί· καὶ ἀντιδιδόντος, ἀλλ' ἵνα αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου ἴδια κατὰ φύσιν, ἀλλ' αὐτῆς τῆς σαρκὸς ἴδια φύσει τὰ πάθη ἐπιγνωσθῇ.</td>
<td>Διὰ καὶ ψάχνει καὶ δενέι καὶ καλάθει καὶ μὴ εἰδεῖ καὶ κάτει καὶ φεύγει καὶ γεννᾶσθαι καὶ πάντα τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς, λεχθεῖ ἂν ἀκολούθως ἑφ' ἑκάστου· Χριστοῦ οὖν πεινῶντος καὶ διψῶντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί· καὶ μὴ εἰδεῖ λέγοντος καὶ ῥαπιζομένου καὶ κάμνοντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί· καὶ ὑψουμένου πάλιν καὶ γεννῶμεν καὶ αὐξάνοντος καὶ φοβουμένου καὶ κρυπτομένου σαρκί· καὶ λέγοντος, Εἰ δυνατὸν, παρελθέτω τὸ ποτήριον καὶ τυπτομένου καὶ λαμβάνοντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί· καὶ ἀντιδιδόντος, ἀλλ' ἵνα αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου ἴδια κατὰ φύσιν, ἀλλ' αὐτῆς τῆς σαρκὸς ἴδια φύσει τὰ πάθη ἐπιγνωσθῇ.</td>
<td>Δυσφήμ, καὶ κάμνειν καὶ μὴ εἰδέναι καὶ καθεύδειν καὶ κλαίειν καὶ αίτείν καὶ ψέωνει καὶ γεννᾶσθαι καὶ πάντα τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς, λεχθεῖ ἂν ἀκολούθως ἑφ' ἑκάστου· Χριστοῦ οὖν πεινῶντος καὶ διψῶντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί· καὶ μὴ εἰδέναι λέγοντος καὶ ῥαπιζομένου καὶ κάμνοντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί· καὶ ὑψουμένου πάλιν καὶ γεννῶμεν καὶ αὐξάνοντος καὶ φοβουμένου καὶ κρυπτομένου σαρκί· καὶ λέγοντος, Εἰ δυνατὸν, παρελθέτω τὸ ποτήριον καὶ τυπτομένου καὶ λαμβάνοντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί· καὶ ἀντιδιδόντος, ἀλλ' ἵνα αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου ἴδια κατὰ φύσιν, ἀλλ' αὐτῆς τῆς σαρκὸς ἴδια φύσει τὰ πάθη ἐπιγνωσθῇ.</td>
<td>Διὰ καὶ ψάχνει καὶ δενέι καὶ καλάθει καὶ μὴ εἰδεῖ καὶ κάτει καὶ φεύγει καὶ γεννᾶσθαι καὶ πάντα τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς, λεχθεῖ ἂν ἀκολούθως ἑφ' ἑκάστου· Χριστοῦ οὖν πεινῶντος καὶ διψῶντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί· καὶ μὴ εἰδεῖ λέγοντος καὶ ῥαπιζομένου καὶ κάμνοντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί· καὶ ὑψουμένου πάλιν καὶ γεννῶμεν καὶ αὐξάνοντος καὶ φοβουμένου καὶ κρυπτομένου σαρκί· καὶ λέγοντος, Εἰ δυνατὸν, παρελθέτω τὸ ποτήριον καὶ τυπτομένου καὶ λαμβάνοντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί· καὶ ἀντιδιδόντος, ἀλλ' ἵνα αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου ἴδια κατὰ φύσιν, ἀλλ' αὐτῆς τῆς σαρκὸς ἴδια φύσει τὰ πάθη ἐπιγνωσθῇ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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