

GRIGOR GRIGORYAN  
(MLU, GERMANY)

FIVE FRAGMENTS QUOTED UNDER THE NAME OF  
ST. GREGORY THAUMATURGUS IN THE POLEMICAL WORK  
*CONTRA EOS QUI DICUNT DUAS NATURAS* (CPG 5475)  
BY TIMOTHY AELURUS, THE PATRIARCH OF ALEXANDRIA  
(457-477)

In the introductory patristic florilegium with which Timothy Aelurus begins his extensive refutation of *Tomus Leonis* and the definition of faith of the Council of Chalcedon (known as *Contra eos qui dicunt duas naturas*) we find ten fragments under the name of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (the Wonderworker: ca. 213 – ca. 270/275 AD)<sup>1</sup>. The first five fragments are quoted under the general lemma: *Of blessed Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bishop of Neocaesarea, from the Discourse on the Resurrection*<sup>2</sup>. The first four fragments belong originally to the *Apology for Origen* by Pamphilus of Caesarea (d. 310)<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> See Ter-Mekerttschian K. and Ter-Minassiantz E., *Timotheus Aelurus' des Patriarchen von Alexandrien: Widerlegung der auf der Synode zu Chalcedon festgesetzter Lehre*, Leipzig, 1908, p. 19, 4-21, 12 (further referred to as *Widerlegung*). On Gregory Thaumaturgus, see Schneider H., "Gregor der Wundertäter", in *LACL*, Freiburg, Basel, Wien, 1998, p. 273-274.

<sup>2</sup> *Widerlegung*, p. 19, 4-5: Երանելոյ Գրիգորի Մթանչելագործի եպիսկոպոսի Նեոկեսարեայ ի բանին որ յաղագս յարութեան (Τοῦ μακαρίου Γρηγορίου θαυματουργοῦ ἐπισκόπου Νεοκαισαρείας, ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ περὶ ἀναστάσεως; cf. also Schwartz E., *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431: Eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos* (ABAW.PH XXXII 6), Munich, 1927, p. 100, Nos. 35-39).

<sup>3</sup> The *Apology for Origen* was composed in Caesarea between 307 and 309/10 by a Christian martyr Pamphilus of Caesarea (d. 310) with the collaboration of Eusebius of Caesarea (d. 339) in order to reply to criticism addressed by various groups against the theology of Origen. The original work, consisting of six books written by Pamphilus and Eusebius, of which the last one may have been the work of Eusebius, is lost. Only the first book is extant today in a Latin translation by a church historian and theologian Rufinus of Aquileia. For the critical edition of the *Apology*

The four fragments which are found in Pamphilus of Caesarea's *Apology for Origen* and the not identified fifth fragment are cited also in the Syriac manuscript Br. L. Add. 12156, fol. 2r, col. 1-2<sup>4</sup>, in the patristic florilegium of the Syriac epitome of the extensive Armenian version of the above-mentioned Timothy Aelurus' extensive anti-Chalcedonian work. The Syriac fragments were edited for the first time by P. de Lagarde<sup>5</sup> and then by J. B. Pitra<sup>6</sup>. It is V. Ryssel who first discovered that the first four Syriac fragments edited by Lagarde correspond with passages *apol. Orig. 113* in the edition of the *Apology for Origen* by Lommatzsch (Origenis opera, T XXIV, pp. 366, 7-367, 4; p. 368, 1-3, p. 368, 6-19 and pp. 369, 1-370, 5)<sup>7</sup>.

In the *Apology for Origen* the passage *apol. Orig. 113*<sup>8</sup>, in which the above mentioned four fragments are found, is quoted by Pamphilus from a not indicated work by Origen as an answer to the fourth accusation of Origen's adversaries that he asserts that all deeds of the Saviour were not real (δοκῆσαι), that is they happened only in appearance (seemingly). They are to

---

of Origen by Pamphilus of Caesarea, cf. Pamphile et Eusèbe de Césarée, *Apologie pour Origène suivi de Rufin d'Aquilée Sur la Falsification des Livres d'Origène*, éd. par R. Amacker et É. Junod, T. 1, SCh. N° 464, Paris, 2002; T. 2, SCh. N° 465, Paris, 2002. For historical, philological and doctrinal background and German translation of the *Apology for Origen*, cf. especially Pamphilus von Caesarea, *Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, FC 80, Turnhout, 2005.

<sup>4</sup> Under the lemma: Τοῦ μακαρίου Γρηγορίου θαυματουργοῦ ἐπισκόπου Νεοκαισαρείας ἐκ τοῦ λόγου περὶ ἀναστάσεως; cf. Schwartz E., *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, p. 117; De Lagarde P., *Analecta syriaca*, Leipzig, 1858, p. 64; Pitra J. B., *Analecta sacra*, T. IV, Paris, 1883, p. 120.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. De Lagarde P., *Analecta syriaca*, p. 64-66.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Pitra J. B., *Analecta sacra*, T. IV, Syriac: p. 120-122, Latin translation, p. 376-377.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Ryssel V., *Gregorius Thaumaturgus. Sein Leben und seine Schriften*, Leipzig, 1880, p. 47 and p. 48-51. Cf. also *Apologie pour Origène*, éd. Amacker / Junod, T. 1, SCh. N° 464, p. 329, n. 1.

<sup>8</sup> For the entire passage *apol. Orig. 113*, cf. Pamphile et Eusèbe de Césarée, *Apologie pour Origène*, éd. par R. Amacker et É. Junod, T. 1, SCh. N° 464, p. 178, 1-190, 90; French translation: p. 179-191; *Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, p. 328, 9-334, 17; German translation: pp. 329-335.

be understood allegorically and not also in the historical sense<sup>9</sup>. In order to reply to this accusation Pamphilus quotes the passage *apol. Orig.* 113 from Origen<sup>10</sup>, probably from his work *De Resurrectione*. As one can see from the

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *apol. Orig.* 87 in Pamphile et Eusebe de Césarée, *Apologie pour Origène*, éd. par R. Amacker et É. Junod, T. 1, SCh. N° 464, p. 156. "Post ista est quae istis omnibus aduersatur – caeca enim est malitia – quod dicunt eum dicere δοκῆσαι, id est putatiue tantum, ed per allegoriam, non etiam secundum ea quae per historiam referuntur, gesta esse omnia quae a Salvatore gesta sunt"; for French translation cf. Ibid., p. 157, n. 1. Cf. also *apol. Orig.* 112 in Ibid., p. 178, 4-5: "Aduersum eos qui dicunt eum per allegorias adimere omnia quae a Salvatore gesta sunt corpolariter facta", for French translation cf. Ibid. p. 179.

<sup>10</sup> The passage *apol. Orig.* 113 is an answer to the accusation that through his allegorical interpretation of the New Testament Origen rejected that all the deeds of the Saviour happened really (the fourth accusation presented in the *Apology*). We shall analyze briefly the theological contents of *apol. Orig.* 113. For the analysis we made use also of the observations of G. Rowekamp concerning the fourth accusation against Origen (cf. *Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, pp. 143-148). According to the fourth accusation of Origen's adversaries, to which the passage *apol. Orig.* 113 is a reply, Origen asserted that all deeds of the Saviour took place only seemingly, δοκῆσαι. They should be interpreted only allegorically and not also in the historical sense. Here, as the passage *apol. Orig.* 113 quoted from Origen clearly shows, one accuses Origen of docetism that he denies the real inhumanation of Christ. As, for example, 1 John 4.2 shows, already certain passages in the New Testament had to deal with docetic opinions behind which one finds a naive belief in the Godhead of Christ present in not-Jewish circles which could not connect a God with a human body. It is in the Gnosticism that the systematic repudiation of a human body developed. Since the matter is evil, the flesh of Christ cannot be real. Docetic views were especially typical of the Valentinian school of Gnosticism, according to which the Logos has assumed only a spiritual humanity, a spiritual flesh, a pneumatic body. Those assertions which concern the humanity of Christ must be interpreted allegorically. Origen rejected such a kind of Gnostic-docetic Christology in his works. We see this clearly in the text which is quoted in this respect from Origen in the *Apology* (*apol. Orig.* 113). At the beginning of the passage Origen states very clearly: "Corpus Christi non erat alienum a terrena substantia secundum hoc quod filius est Dauid et filius Abraham" (SCh. N° 464, pp. 178, 7-180, 2). He refers to Mt.1.1, Gal.3.16 and Rom.1.3 to stress the reality of Christ's human body through scriptural arguments. In a long passage Origen lists as



further arguments for the reality of Christ's humanity those scriptural assertions which concern the human weaknesses of the Saviour: hunger, thirst, weariness. He emphasizes very resolutely the reality of the mentioned aspects of Christ's humanity. The Saviour was often invited to eat and drink and did it in front of all. Origen even intensifies this aspect of Christ's humanity: "Maxime cum ita sumeret cibum ac potum ut a quibusdam etiam quasi pro praesumptione nimia culparetur uelut cibum ac potum propensius adpetens" (SCh. № 464, p. 182, 24-26). And he stresses very plainly that the Saviour did not eat and drink merely seemingly by referring to Mt.11.18-19. The taking of food and wine took place in all reality: "Si autem manducabat et bibebat et substantia uini atque escae in carne eius efficiebatur, sine dubio per omnes corporis eius compages ac membrorum perplexiones diffundebatur; spiritalem enim naturam – sicut quidam de eius corpore sentiunt, quod imperite satis et absurde faciunt – impossibile est uini atque escae recipere substantiam" (SCh. № 464, pp. 182, 36-184, 41). Origen states that even digestion was proper to the body of Christ. The reality of Christ's humanity is stressed in such a detailed way in *apol. Orig.* 113 that Timothy Aelurus found in this text strong arguments for his Christology to demonstrate that it is the divine Logos himself and no ordinary human being just accidentally conjoined to him who underwent the human weaknesses described in the New Testament. As Amacker / Junod and G. Rowekamp note, Origen's description of the Saviour's humanity in *apol. Orig.* 113 is not very typical of the Alexandrian church's understanding of this theme before Origen (Clement of Alexandria considered it impossible that the Saviour suffered hunger, ate or had pains, since he was filled by the divine power; cf. *str.* 6, 9, 71, 1 f (GCS 67), the reference is according to Amacker / Junod, SCh. № 464, p. 178-179, n. 2; and *Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, p. 145, n. 513). G. Rowekamp (cf. *Apologia pro Origene*, p. 145; also Amacker / Junod in SCh. № 464, p. 178-179, n. 2) notes that even in other writings of Origen it is not possible to find passages in which he speaks so exclusively of the humanity of Christ without stressing his Godhead at the same time. Perhaps such a clear assertion of the human reality of Christ was necessary with respect to a question concerning the bodily resurrection of the Saviour (cf. Amacker / Junod in SCh. № 464, pp. 178-179, n. 2; *Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, p. 145, n. 514). Even the account on the circumcision of Jesus Christ (cf. Lk.2.21) was no argument for Origen to deny the reality of Christ's humanity. As G. Rowekamp notes (cf. *Apologia pro Origene*, pp. 145-146), the fact that Origen mentions also the circumcision of Christ shows that the New Testament passage concerning the circumcision of Jesus was one of arguments of some Gnostics which they applied against the reality of the humanity of the Saviour. Since such a kind of circumcision which had to do with gender was

for them inconceivable, on the one hand, one had to search, according to them, rather for a metaphorical, allegoric meaning in this New Testament passage, and on the other, it became in this way clear for them, that one has to understand all bodily actions of Christ figuratively. Origen, on the contrary, asserts: "Sed et circumcisionis eius ratio nobis quidem non generabit angustiam dicentibus eum consequenter humano corpori et circumcisum esse et praeputium eius terrae mandatum, fortassis usque ad tempus..." (SCh. № 464, p. 184, 49-52). Origen rejects in this way the assertion of the Valentinian Gnosticism that the New Testament account on the circumcision of Christ is a further proof against the reality of his human body and for the allegorical interpretation of the New Testament (for an analysis of the circumcision of Jesus in the Gnostic systems, cf. M. van Esbroeck, "Col. 2, 11 'Dans la circoncision du Christ'" in *Gnosticisme et monde hellénistique (Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, 27)*, ed. J. Ries, 1982, pp. 229-235; the reference is according to Amacker / Junod in SCh. №464, p. 186-187, n. 2; and *Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, p. 146, n. 515). To prove that it is the divine Logos himself who became really human Timothy Aelurus refers also to the passage in which the circumcision of Jesus is discussed. Origen's assertion of the reality of the Saviour's circumcision serves Timothy as a patristic Christological argument for the identity of the divine Logos with the man Jesus. That the text quoted from Origen by Pamphilus criticizes the Valentinian Gnosticism again one can see from the fact that in the text quoted Origen opposes those who assert that the body of Christ was a "psychic body": *Corpus animale* is a technical term especially of the western Valentinian Gnostics. While the oriental Valentinian Gnostics attributed to Christ only a "spiritual body", the western Valentinian Gnostics attributed to Christ after all also a "psychic body". In the background of these doctrines lied the controversy concerning the question of what in a human being can be saved. If not only the  $\piνεῦμα$  but also the  $\psiυχη$  of a human being can be saved, the Saviour had necessarily assumed also a psychic body, because the Valentinian axiom (which also the Christians adopted) reads as follows: Only that can be saved, which the Saviour assumed. Therefore also Origen stressed, as G. Rowekamp notes (cf. *Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, p. 146-147), that Christ assumed a perfect human being (composed of  $\piνεῦμα$ ,  $\psiυχη$  and  $σῶμα$ ) (cf. Origen, *dial.* 6 (SCh 67, 68) and also *Io.* 32, 18 (GCS 456); the reference is according to G. Rowekamp; cf. *Ibid.* p. 147, n. 517), even if he evaluated the matter in some respects negatively, he preserved the Christian hope concerning the salvation of the body by emphasizing that Christ assumed a perfect humanity. In the text quoted by Pamphilus also the account on the sufferings and wounds of Christ confirms even more, according to Origen, that Christ had a real human, an earthly flesh, assumed from a human nature: "Sed et de

sanguine eius et aqua quae processit de latere eius hasta compuncto a milite eadem sentienda sunt. Sed his qui sciunt quid audiant, per hoc quod dicitur quia figurae clauorum erant in eius corpore manifeste declaratur quia caro erat terrena, id est humanae naturae; quae utique non erat talis ut recipiendorum uulnorum subterfugeret qualitatem" (SCh. № 464, p. 186, 60-65). The New Testament accounts on the fleshly sufferings and wounds of the Saviour are further arguments for Origen to defend the reality of Christ's humanity and reject any docetic and allegorical interpretations of the human body of the Saviour. A further proof for the real and perfect humanity of the Saviour is for Origen, according to the text quoted in the *Apology*, the New Testament assertion of the troubled and very sorrowful soul of Christ of which Jn.12.27 and Mk.14.34 speak: "Quod si non etiam multa humanae infirmitatis in ipsa morte sensisset, cur anima ipsus perturbatur et tristis est pro ea usque ad mortem? Quae omnia euidenter ostendunt quod non falso sed quasi homo dixerit: *Spiritus quidem promptus est, caro autem infirma* (cf. Mk.14.38)" (SCh. № 464, p. 188, 66-70). Origen refers also to the account of Markus on sleeping Jesus (Mk.4.38) as an argument for the latter's perfect humanity. In this respect he agrees that, as Gnostics do, also an allegorical interpretation of this account, which has also a spiritual meaning, is possible, but the spiritual meaning has only an additional but not a primary importance. The primary importance is to accept this account in its real historical sense (cf. SCh. № 464, p. 188, 71-84). At the end of the text (the final passage is also quoted by Timothy Aelurus) Origen opposes with a quotation from Gal.4.4 the assertion that Christ was born "through Mary" but not "from Mary". Also this argumentation was against Gnostic theologians who preferred the phrase "through Mary", because they assumed that Christ received nothing from Mary. She was accordingly only a kind of "channel" for Christ, but not the mother of a human being. What concerns the adversaries of Origen, who are the authors of this and also of the first three accusations refuted in the *Apology*, G. Rowekamp supposes that the accusations stem from adversaries who saw a similarity between the theological system of Origen and that of the Gnostics (cf. *Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, pp. 142-143). Concerning the fourth accusation and its connection with the third one in the *Apology for Origen* G. Rowekamp writes: "Woher aber stammte der Vorwurf des Dokerismus gegenüber Origenes, wenn er diese Lehre ausdrücklich abgelehnt hatte? Anscheinend hat man später in der „Trennungschristologie“ des Origenes die Gefahr gesehen, dass in ihr der Logos die Menschheit nur vorübergehend oder nicht wirklich angenommen hat. Dieses Gefühl konnte verstärkt werden durch die Tatsache, dass Origenes in der Christologie ganz „von oben“ denkt. Hinzu kam die Bedeutung der Allegorese in seinen Schriften. Zusammen genommen konnte ihn diese Theologie für manche in



accusation the context in which passage 113 from Origen in the *Apology* is quoted is Christological and the aim of the passage quoted from Origen's not indicated work is to demonstrate in reply to the accusation that Origen taught a real historical humanity and human acts of the incarnate Logos and did not reject their reality through his allegorical interpretation of the holy Scripture.

The questions arise why fragments, which originate from Origen (possibly from his treatise *De resurrectione*, as the lemma in Timothy's *Refutation* suggests), were quoted by Timothy Aelurus (Origen was condemned in Alexandria in 400 by Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria (385-412)<sup>11</sup>, whom also Timothy quotes in *Contra eos qui dicunt duas naturas* as an orthodox authority), and why they are ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus. R. Amacker and É. Junod mention in their French edition of the *Apology for Origen* the occurrence of the four fragments only in the Syriac manuscript Br. L. Add. 12156<sup>12</sup>. They say nothing of the occurrence of these fragments in the Armenian version of Timothy Aelurus' *Refutation*. They mention the conclusion of V. Ryssel that these fragments originate from the *Apology for Origen* and reject it, noting that there are probably no Syriac fragments of the *Apology for Origen* but of the *Treatise on the Resurrection*, as the title of the fragments prove<sup>13</sup>. They explain the attribution of these fragments to St.

---

die Nähe der Gnostiker rücken. Wenn dem so ist, besteht auch zwischen dem dritten und vierten Vorwurf kein Widerspruch, wie Pamphilus annahm: Wenn Origenes im dritten Vorwurf nicht Ebionismus beziehungsweise eine Lehre nach Art des Paul von Samosata vorgeworfen wird, sondern die Nähe zu bestimmten gnostischen Vorstellungen, dann sind beide Vorwürfe nur Spielarten ein und derselben Haltung" (*Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, p. 148; concerning the adversaries of Origen and the origin of the accusations against him cf. also *Ibid.*, pp. 109-201; *Apologie pour Origène*, ed. Amacker/Junod, T. 1, SCh. N° 464, pp. 85-98; and Williams R., "Damnosa haereditas: Pamphilus' Apology and the Reputation of Origen", in *Logos. FS L. Abramowski (BZNW 67)*, ed. C. Brennecke, Berlin-New York, 1993, pp. 151-169).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, p. 70, n. 266.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Apologie pour Origène*, éd. Amacker/Junod, T. 1, SCh. N° 464, p. 183, n. 1, p. 184, n. 1, p. 185, n. 2, p. 190, n. 1 and p. 329, n. 1.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 329, n. 1.

Gregory Thaumaturgus in two possible ways: 1) either Gregory has cited them in one of his works, 2) or a compiler has considered it appropriate to attribute them to an author less susceptible than Origen<sup>14</sup>. Also G. Rowekamp mentions in his German edition of the *Apology* only the Syriac manuscript in which the four fragments are quoted<sup>15</sup>. Like R. Amacker and É. Junod, he, too, expresses the opinion that the passage *apol. Orig.* 113, the source of which in the *Apology* is not mentioned, originates from Origen's work *De resurrectione*<sup>16</sup>. As an argument for his opinion he refers to the Syriac manuscript Br. L. Add. 12156 in which the four fragments are quoted under the lemma: τοῦ μακαρίου Γρηγορίου θαυματουργῦ ἐπισκόπου Νεοκαισαρείας ἐκ τοῦ λόγου περὶ ἀναστάσεως<sup>17</sup>. According to his supposition concerning the attribution of these fragments to Gregory Thaumaturgus, the author of the Syriac florilegium has probably taken them from a Syriac version (or excerpts?) of Origen's work *De resurrectione* and indicated it as Gregory's work, because either the latter had quoted these excerpts in one of his works, or the attribution to an another author seemed to the author of the Syriac florilegium less dangerous<sup>18</sup>. These are the suppositions of R. Amacker (É. Junod and G. Rowekamp. As mentioned above, neither R. Amacker) É. Junod nor G. Rowekamp mention the occurrence of the fragments in question in the more extensive Armenian version of Timothy Aelurus' work *Contra eos qui dicunt duas naturas*. It is not any compiler or any author of the florilegium in the Syriac manuscript Br. L. Add. 12156 who quoted these fragments from a Syriac version or from Syriac excerpts of Origen's *De resurrectione* under the name of Gregory Thaumaturgus, but it is Timothy Aelurus himself who quoted them under the name of Gregory Thaumaturgus in his above-mentioned anti-Chalcedonain work which is preserved in an Armenian translation (dating from the fifth-sixth centuries) in its complete and original form. The Syriac version of *Contra eos qui dicunt duas naturas* in the manuscript Br. L. Add. 12156 (folios

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Ibid., p. 329, n. 1.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, pp. 144-145, n. 512.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Ibid., p. 144.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Ibid., p. 144. For the Greek lemma, see E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, p. 117.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Ibid., p. 145.



1-29) is a sixth century epitome (562) or an abbreviation of the Greek original of Timothy's mentioned work<sup>19</sup>. And since the old Armenian version, which represents the original and the complete form of Timothy's work *Contra eos qui dicunt duas naturas*, is a literal translation from the Greek original, this means that the fragments in question were quoted by Timothy Aelurus himself from a Greek source in the middle of the fifth century. The question is what kind of source it was. Could it be that version of *Apology for Origen* to which also the Gregory Thaumaturgus' *Oratio Panegyrica* in honour of Origen was appended? In this respect we have the report of the church historian Socrates that Pamphilus (and Eusebius) have mentioned the name of Gregory Thaumaturgus in the books written by them about Origen and to which Gregory's *Oratio Panegyrica* addressed to Origen was appended<sup>20</sup>. It

<sup>19</sup> Lebon J., "Version arménienne et version syriaque de Timothée Elure", *Handes Amsorya: Zeitschrift für Armenische Philologie* 41, Vienna 1927, pp. 713-722.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Socrate de Constantinople, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, IV, XXVII, 6, ed. P. Périchon and P. Maraval, SCh. № 505, Paris, 2006, pp. 116-118: "Μέμνηται δὲ αὐτοῦ (= Gregory Thaumaturgus) καὶ Πάμφιλος ὁ μάρτυς < καὶ Εὐσέβιος ὁ τοῦτου ἐπώνυμος > ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ὡριγένους πονηθεῖσιν αὐτοῖς βιβλίοις, ἐν οἷς καὶ συντακτικὸς λόγος Γρηγορίου εἰς Ὡριγένην παρῴκεται." We find in the *Church History* of Socrates also another report concerning the composition of the *Apology for Origen* by Pamphilus and Eusebius; cf. Socrate de Constantinople, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, III, VII, 9-10, ed. P. Périchon and P. Maraval, SCh. № 493, Paris, 2005, p. 276: "Μάρτυρες τούτων ἀξιόπιστοι ὁ τε ἱερὸς Πάμφιλος καὶ ὁ ἐξ αὐτοῦ χρηματίζων Εὐσέβιος. Ἄμφω γὰρ κοινῇ τὸν Ὡριγένους παραπθέμενοι βίον καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐκ προλήψεως ἀπεχθανομένους πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα ἀπαντῶντες ἐν ὅλοις < ἐξ > βιβλίοις ἀπολογίαν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ποιούμενοι οὐ πρῶτον Ὡριγένην ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν πραγματείαν ἐλθεῖν φασιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας μυστικὴν ἐρμηνεύσαι παράδοσιν." Cf. also *Apologie pour Origène*, éd. par R. Amacker et É. Junod, T. 2, SCh. № 465, pp. 55-57. On the basis of passages III, VII, 5-10 and IV, 27, 3-6 of the *Church History* of Socrates P. van Nuffelen investigates if Socrates has disposed of the original version of the work by Pamphilus or of a version which was interpolated and adapted by a later Origenist. He expresses the point of view that Socrates probably borrowed an interpolated *Apology* from Origenist milieu which was designed to serve their needs in the fourth and fifth centuries; cf. P. van Nuffelen, "Two Fragments from the *Apology for Origen* in the *Church History* of Socrates Scholasticus", *JTS* 56 (2005), pp. 103-114.

could be that Timothy Aelurus had before him this version of *Apology for Origen* into which also Gregory's *Oratio Panegyrica* was included and quoted the fragments in question from it but attributed them to Gregory Thaumaturgus as an orthodox authority instead of a more suspectable personality of Origen, or he quoted them directly from Origen's *De resurrectione* but attributed them to Gregory Thaumaturgus. Or as R. Amacker and É. Junod (also G. Rowekamp) suppose, they were attributed to Gregory Thaumaturgus, because the latter had probably quoted these fragments from Origen's *De resurrectione* in one of his works, and it could be that Timothy found them already quoted by Gregory Thaumaturgus under the lemma *De resurrectione* in one of Gregory's works and borrowed them under Gregory's name. In each case, the reason for Timothy's quoting them is first of all Christological: it was the strong assertion in these fragments of the aspects of the human reality of the incarnate Logos and Timothy's intention to show through quotations cited under the name of an orthodox author that it the divine Logos alone to whom the aspects described in the fragments concerning the humanity of Christ are to be attributed<sup>21</sup>.

The first fragment in *Widerlegung*, p. 19, 6-20<sup>22</sup> corresponds very closely to the Latin text in SCh. № 464, p. 182, 24-36 (*sed et illud – doctrinae eius*). In the passage *apol. Orig.* 113 quoted by Pamphilus from Origen and from which the first and the following other three fragments we find quoted in the refutation of the dyophysite Christology of Pope Leo and the Council of Chalcedon by Timothy Aelurus one can observe an interesting change of the theological context in the period between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries. The original text written by Origen was intended to reject especially the docetic views of the Valentinian Gnostics that the humanity of Christ was not real but only spiritual and that all his human deeds (which happened just

<sup>21</sup> The main theological aim of the whole introductory patristic florilegium in Timothy's *Contra eos qui dicunt duas naturas*, as he himself indicates in the introduction to his polemical work, is to show that the Lord and God Jesus Christ along with his flesh is one and that to him all the divine and human things are to be attributed; cf. *Widerlegung*, p. 1, 1-4 and p. 1, 13-17 ff.

<sup>22</sup> № 35 in Schwartz E., *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, p. 100 = №. 5 in the list of the Syriac patristic quotations, cf. *ibid.*, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, p. 117 = Lagarde, *Analecta syriaca*, p. 64, 11- 22.

seemingly) are to be interpreted allegorically and not historically. At the beginning of the fourth century Pamphilus quotes the passage in question, in order to defend Origen himself against an accusation of similar views: that he rejected through his allegorical interpretation of the Scripture the reality of the human deeds of the Saviour<sup>23</sup>. And in the fifth century Timothy Aelurus quotes excerpts which are to find in the same passage *apol. Orig.* 113 as patristic testimonies against *Tomus Leonis* and the Council of Chalcedon to demonstrate the identity of God the Word with man Jesus: the divine Logos himself really became a human being and suffered all weaknesses of human nature described in the fragments.

In the original text of the first fragment Origen rejects the docetic views of the Valentinian Gnostics that the body of Christ and his human deeds were not real. Origen teaches against such Gnostic views that Christ had a real human body and that his humanity was a real one. The biblical assertions of his being invited to eat and drink are to be understood in a real historical context. Jesus Christ ate and drank in reality and not seemingly, as Gnostics assert. He ate and drank even to such a degree that one thought him to be a glutton and a drunkard<sup>24</sup>. Origen refers to Mt.11.19 to show that Christ himself asserts that he "came eating and drinking"<sup>25</sup>. Timothy Aelurus quotes this fragments to stress both the reality of the humanity of the incarnate Logos (just as Origen does) and especially the sameness of God the Logos with the man Jesus against the Chalcedonian and Leonine division of Christ into two natures: the eating and drinking the Scripture asserts of Jesus Christ are to be attributed to God the Logos himself. He is it who really became incarnate and ate and drank in front of all and not an ordinary human being different from the Logos in whom the latter just dwelt (this Timothy believed Pope Leo asserted in his *Tomus ad Flavianum*<sup>26</sup>). This testimony which deals

<sup>23</sup> Cf. *Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, pp. 11-217, especially for the fourth accusation cf. pp. 143-148.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *Apologie pour Origène*, éd. Amacker/Junod, T. 1, Sch. № 464, p. 182, 21-26 = *Widerlegung*, p. 19, 6-10.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 182, 32-35 = *Widerlegung*, p. 19, 16-18 (MM №. 1958, fol. 15v).

<sup>26</sup> For a critical edition of the Tome of Pope Leo I of Rome (441-461), see Silva-Tarouca C., *S. Leonis Magni Tomus ad Flavianum Episc. Constantinopolitanum*, TD 9, Rome, 1959.



with the scriptural report concerning Jesus' eating and drinking and defends in its original theological context their historical reality against docetic views of the Gnostics becomes for Timothy in the half of the fifth century a patristic proof for the identity of God the Logos with man Jesus against the dyophysite Christology of Chalcedon.

The second fragment in *Widerlegung*, p. 19, 22-23<sup>27</sup> corresponds to the Latin text in SCh. № 464, p. 184, 49-51 (sed et circumcisionis – circumcismus esse). It asserted originally the reality of Jesus' circumcision against the allegorical interpretations of the Gnostics. For Timothy it is a testimony for the reality of Christ's human body and for the identity of God the Logos with the circumcised Jesus.

The third fragment in *Widerlegung*, p. 19, 25-20, 6<sup>28</sup> corresponds to the Latin text in SCh. № 464, p. 184, 53-186, 65 (Haec tamen - subterfugeret qualitatem). It deals in its original context with circumcision of Jesus again and asserts that it was a real human circumcision against the docetic interpretations of Gnostics which could not imagine that the spiritual body of Christ was really circumcised by an "earthly iron"<sup>29</sup>. Origen criticizes in it also the teaching of the Valentinian Gnostics that the body of Christ was psychic.<sup>30</sup> It was a real human body as the blood and water which flowed from his side and the piercing of Jesus' side by the soldier prove<sup>31</sup>. That the body of Christ was a real human one and not a divine body incapable of suffering wounds is demonstrated also by the fact that the marks of the nails were really in his human body<sup>32</sup>. Timothy quotes this fragment, because the above mentioned aspects (circumcision, the piercing of the side, the flowing

<sup>27</sup> № 36 in Schwartz E., *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, p. 100 = № 5<sup>2</sup> in the list of the Syriac patristic quotations, cf. ibid., *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, p. 117 = Lagarde, *Analecta syriaca*, p. 64, 22-24.

<sup>28</sup> № 37 in Schwartz E., *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, p. 100 = № 5<sup>3</sup> in the list of the Syriac patristic quotations, cf. ibid., *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, p. 117 = Lagarde, *Analecta syriaca*, pp. 64, 24-65, 4.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. *Apologie pour Origène*, éd. Amacker/Junod, T. 1, SCh. № 464, pp. 184, 53-186, 58 = *Widerlegung*, p. 19, 25-32.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Ibid., p. 186, 58-59 = *Widerlegung*, p. 19, 32-33.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Ibid., p. 186, 60-61 = *Widerlegung*, p. 19, 33-20, 2.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Ibid., p. 186, 61-65 = *Widerlegung*, p. 20, 3-6.

of blood and water and the marks of the nails) prove for him the reality of Christ's human body, that is, the reality of the human body of God the Word, to whom the mentioned human things must be attributed. He it is who truly suffered these things as a human being.

The fourth fragment in *Widerlegung*, p. 20, 8-13<sup>33</sup> corresponds to the Latin text in SCh. № 464, p. 190, 85-90 (*Nec oportet-ex muliere*). In it Origen rejects the assertion of the Gnostics that Christ was born through Mary but not from Mary<sup>34</sup>. The Gnostics who rejected the human reality of Jesus Christ taught accordingly that he was not born from Mary like a real human being but just passed through her like through a channel without receiving anything from her. Therefore they used the phrase "through May" instead of "from Mary", because the latter phrase indicated a real human birth which the Gnostics repudiated with respect to Christ<sup>35</sup>. With a reference to Gal. 4.4-5 Origen defends the phrase "from Mary" and thereby the real human birth of Jesus Christ from the Virgin<sup>36</sup>. Timothy Aelurus quotes this fragment for the same reasons as the previous three ones: He finds in it the orthodox patristic teaching that the birth of God the Word from Mary was a real human one. What Timothy really intends is the attribution of this real human birth to God the Word himself. The real human birth of the Logos is demonstrated by the phrases "from Mary" or "from a woman" that are confirmed both by the New Testament and by the orthodox authority of Gregory Thaumaturgus (to whom this fragment is ascribed) who himself refers to the Scripture in this respect.

If we sum up our analysis of these fragments in the work of Timothy Aelurus we can come to the following two main conclusions: 1) These

<sup>33</sup> № 38 in Schwartz E., *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, p. 100 = No. 54 in the list of the Syriac patristic quotations, cf. *ibid.*, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, p. 117 = Lagarde, *Analecta syriaca*, p. 65, 4-8.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *Apologie pour Origène*, éd. Amacker/Junod, T. 1, SCh. № 464, p. 190, 85-86 = *Widerlegung*, p. 20, 8-9 (MM No. 1958, fol. 16v).

<sup>35</sup> Cf. in this respect *Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, p. 147-148, n. 521, and *Apologie pour Origène*, éd. Amacker/Junod, T. 1, SCh. № 464, T. 1, SCh. № 464, p. 190-191, n. 2.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. *Apologie pour Origène*, éd. Amacker/Junod, T. 1, SCh. № 464, p. 190, 86-90 = *Widerlegung*, p. 20, 9-13.

fragments are for Timothy patristic testimonies which defend the reality of the humanity of Jesus Christ in its historical context which means that the Logos became really incarnate and suffered the human things, and 2) The fact that the divine Logos became really incarnate means that all the human weaknesses and events the discussed fragments deal with are to be attributed to the Logos himself: He is that Jesus who suffered the described human things: hunger, thirst, circumcision, a pierced side, nails and a real human birth from a woman.

As the lemma<sup>37</sup> of the fifth fragment<sup>38</sup> shows it also belongs to the four previous fragments quoted under the general lemma *De Resurrectione*, but it is not found in the *Apology for Origen* by Pamphilus. It is possible that it originally belonged to the lost work *De Resurrectione* by Origen, because one can see in it a criticism of the Gnostic views again: If he concerning whom one thinks he is a flesh and has appeared to all people in the likeness of flesh is not of a fleshly substance then he is nothing else but appearance<sup>39</sup>. This means if the Gnostics deprive Christ of his human reality (substance) then his appearing to human beings happened only seemingly. Anyway the origin of this fragment is obscure. It was for Timothy, as the above mentioned fragments, a further patristic testimony defending the human reality of the incarnate Logos.

**ԳՐԻԳՈՐՅԱՆ ԳՐԻԳՈՐ**  
(ՄԼԸ, ԳԵՐՄԱՆԻԱ)

**ԱԼԵՔՍԱՆԴՐԻԱՅԻ ՊԱՏՐԻԱՐԺ ՏԻՍՈԹԵՈՍ ԿՈՒԶԻ**  
**«ՀԱԿԱՃԱՌՈՒԹՅԱՆ» ՄԵՋ ՍԲ. ԳՐԻԳՈՐ ՍՔԱՆՉԵԼԱԳՈՐԾԻ ԱՆՎԱՆ**  
**ՆԵՐՔՈ ՄԵՋԲԵՐՎԱԾ ՀԻՆԳ ՊԻՏԱՌՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ ՇՈՒՐՋ**

Ալեքսանդրիայի Պատրիարք Տիմոթեոս Կուլը (457-477 թթ.)  
Քաղկեդոնի ժողովի դավանաբանական սահմանման և Հոռմի Լեոն

<sup>37</sup> Cf. *Widerlegung*, p. 20, 14: Եւ յես սակավուց (καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα).

<sup>38</sup> *Widerlegung*, p. 20, 15-18 = № 39 in E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, p. 100 = № 5<sup>5</sup> in the list of the Syriac patristic quotations, cf. *ibid.*, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, p. 117 = Lagarde, *Analecta syriaca*, p. 65, 9-12.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *Widerlegung*, p. 20, 15-18 = MM № 1958, fol. 16v.



պապի կողմից Կոստանդնուպոլսի Պատրիարք Փղաբիանոսին ուղղված տոմարի իր Հակաճառության մեջ Մբ. Գրիգոր Մքանչեղագործի անվան ներքո մեջ է բերում տաս պիտառություններ, որոնցից հինգը պատկանում են իրականում Ռրոգինեսի գրչին և հավանաբար մաս են կազմել վերջինիս «Յաղագս Յարութեան» երկի։ Նշյալ հինգ պիտառություններից չորսը կարելի է գտնել Պամփիլոս և Եվսեբիոս Կեսարացիների կողմից գրված Ռրիգինեսի ջատագովության մեջ, որը այսօր պահպանվել է Ռուֆինոսի լատիներեն թարգմանությամբ։ Հոդվածում քննության են առնվում այն աստվածաբանական հարցերը, թե՛ ինչու է Պամփիլոսը Ռրոգինեսի ջատագովության մեջ Ռրոգինեսի «Յաղագս Յարութեան» երկից մեջբերում այն ընդարձակ հատվածը, որից քաղված են Կուզի երկի մեջ առկա պիտառությունները Մքանչեղագործի անվան ներքո, և թե՛ ինչու է Տիմոթեոս Կուզը նշյալ հինգ պիտառությունները ներառել իր Հակաճառության մեջ։ Տիմոթեոսը նշյալ պիտառություններում գտնում է քրիստոսաբանական անհերքելի փաստարկ իր այն հիմնական ուսմունքի համար ընդդեմ Լևոնի տոմարի և Քաղկեդոնի ժողովի երկաբնակ քրիստոսաբանության, որի մեջ նա տեսնում էր Քրիստոսի բաժանում երկու տարբեր անձերի, որ Աստծո Բանը հենց ինքն է ճշմարտապես մարդեղացել ծնվելով կույս Մարիամից և որպես մարդ ճշմարտապես հենց ինքն է եղել այն *կերաւոն ու գինեճանը* և թվիատվողը, ում մասին խոսվում է ավետարաններում, և ոչ թե Աստծո Բանին սոսկ ունակաբար շարահարյալ, Աստծո Բանից տարբեր ոմն հասարակ մարդ, ում մասին, ըստ Տիմոթեոսի, իրենց երկաբնակ քրիստոսաբանությամբ ուսուցանում են Լևոն պապի տոմարը և Քաղկեդոնի ժողովի դավանաբանական սահմանումը։ Հոդվածում ցույց է տրվում և շտկվում Պամփիլոսի ջատագովության ֆրանսիացի երկու հրատարակիչներ՝ R. Amacker-ի և É. Junod-ի, ինչպես նաև գերմանացի հրատարակիչ G. Röwekamp-ի ոչ ճիշտ կարծիքը այն մասին, որ բրիտանական թանգարանի ասորական Add. 12156 ձեռագրում նույնպես Մբ. Գրիգոր Մքանչեղագործի անվան ներքո առկա նույն պիտառությունների մեջբերված և Մքանչեղագործին վերագրված լինելը արդյունք է նշյալ ձեռագրի ասորի հեղինակի կամ կազմողի կողմից դրանք հավանաբար Ռրոգինեսի «Յաղագս Յարութեան» երկի ասորերեն թարգմանությունից կամ ասորերեն քաղվածքներից մեջ

բերելու և Մքանչեղագործին որպես Որոգիենեսից առավել անվիճելի հեղինակության վերագրելու: Սույն կարծիքի դեմ հռչակաձևում ասվում է, որ Տիմոթեոս Կուզի Հակաճառության մեջ Մք. Գրիգոր Մքանչեղագործի անվան ներքո մեջբերված նշյալ պիտառությունների առկայության փաստը (որոնք գտնվում են նաև Պամփիլիոսի Որոգիենեսի ջատագովության լատիներեն տարբերակի մեջ) ինչպես վերոնշյալ ասորերեն ձեռագրում, որը պարունակում է ամբողջապես հայերենով պահպանված Հակաճառության համառոտ տարբերակը, այնպես էլ Հակաճառության հայերեն ամբողջական թարգմանության մեջ առյուծաբան է հենց իր՝ Տիմոթեոս Կուզի կողմից դրանք իր երկում անմիջականորեն նախնական աղբյուր հանդիսացած հունարեն մի բնագրից, որը սկզբնապես պարունակել է այդ պիտառությունների տեքստը, որպես աստվածաբանական փաստարկ ընդդեմ Քաղկեդոնի ժողովի մեջբերելու և ոչ թե ասորական ձեռագրի ինչ որ այլ կազմողի կամ հեղինակի աշխատանքի արդյունք: Նշյալ պիտառությունների առկայությունը Մք. Գրիգոր Մքանչեղագործի անվան ներքո վերոնշյալ ասորերեն ձեռագրում արդյունք է Կուզի երկի հունարեն բնագրի ասորերեն թարգմանության, որի ընթացքում ասորերենի են թարգմանվել նաև Կուզի Հակաճառության հետ միասին արդեն այդ Հակաճառության մեջ որպես քրիստոսաբանական պիտառություններ առկա Մք. Գրիգոր Մքանչեղագործին վերագրված հինգ հատվածները, որոնք իրապես պատկանում են Որոգիենեսի գրչին և հավանաբար նախապես մաս էին կազմել վերջինիս «*Յաղագս Յարութեան*» երկի:

#### Bibliography

- De Lagarde P., *Analecta syriaca*, Leipzig, 1858, p. 64-66.
- Lebon J., "Version arménienne et version syriaque de Timothée Elure", *Handes Amsorya: Zeitschrift für Armenische Philologie* 41, Vienna 1927, p. 713-722.
- Pamphile et Eusèbe de Césarée, *Apologie pour Origène suivi de Rufin d'Aquilée Sur la Falsification des Livres d'Origène*, éd. par R. Amacker et É. Junod, T. 1, SCH. № 464, Paris, 2002; T. 2, SCH. № 465, Paris, 2002.
- Pamphilus von Caesarea, *Apologia pro Origene*, ed. G. Rowekamp, FC 80, Turnhout, 2005.

Pitra J. B., *Analecta sacra*, T. IV, Paris, 1883, p. Syriac: p. 120-122, Latin translation, p. 376-377.

Ryssel V., *Gregorius Thaumaturgus. Sein Leben und seine Schriften*, Leipzig, 1880, p. 47-51.

Schneider H., "Gregor der Wundertater", in *LACL*, Freiburg, Basel, Wien, 1998, p. 273-274.

Schwartz E., *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431: Eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos* (ABAW.PH XXXII 6), Munich, 1927.

Silva-Tarouca C., *S. Leonis Magni Tomus ad Flavianum Episc. Constantinopolitanum*, TD 9, Rome, 1959.

Socrate de Constantinople, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, III, VII, 9-10, ed. P. Périchon and P. Maraval, Sch. № 493, Paris, 2005.

Socrate de Constantinople, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, IV, XXVII, 6, ed. P. Périchon and P. Maraval, Sch. № 505, Paris, 2006.

Ter-Mekerttschian K. and Ter-Minassiantz E., *Timotheus Aelurus' des Patriarchen von Alexandrien: Widerlegung der auf der Synode zu Chalcedon festgesetzter Lehre*, Leipzig, 1908, p. 19, 4-20, 18.

van Esbroeck M., "Col. 2, 11 'Dans la circoncision du Christ'" in *Gnosticisme et monde hellénistique* (*Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain*, 27), ed. J. Ries, 1982, p. 229-235.

van Nuffelen P., "Two Fragments from the *Apology for Origen* in the *Church History* of Socrates Scholasticus", *JTS* 56 (2005), p. 103-114.

Williams R., "Damnosa haereditas: Pamphilus' *Apology* and the Reputation of Origen", in *Logos* FS L. Abramowski (*BZNW*. 67), ed. C. Brennecke, Berlin-New York, 1993, p. 151-169.

#### Abbreviations

*ABAW.PH* – Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse.

*BZNW* – Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Berlin u. a., 1, 1923ff.

*FC* – Fontes Christiani, Freiburg u. a.: 1. und. 2. Reihe: 1991-2003, Turnhout: 3. Reihe 2002ff.

*JTS* – Journal of Theological Studies, Oxford u. a. 1, 1899ff., NS 1, 1950ff.



*LACL* – Lexikon der Antiken Christlichen Literatur, Freiburg, Basel,  
Wien, 1998.

*SCh.* – Sources Chrétiennes, Paris 1, 1944ff.

*TD* – Textus et Documenta (ser. theol.), Rome 1, 1932ff