

ceive how grace is indeed the very end for which these heavenly mysteries were instituted, and besides sundry other properties observed in them, the matter whereof they consist is such as signifieth, figureth, and representeth their end. But still their efficacy resteth obscure to our understanding, except we search somewhat more distinctly what grace in particular that is whereunto they are referred, and what manner of operation they have towards it.

The use of Sacraments is but only in this life, yet so that here they concern a far better life than this, and are for that cause accompanied with "grace which worketh Salvation." Sacraments are the powerful instruments of God to eternal life. For as our natural life consisteth in the union of the body with the soul; so our life supernatural in the union of the soul with God. And forasmuch as there is no union of God with man¹ without that mean between both which is both, it seemeth requisite that we first consider how God is in Christ, then how Christ is in us, and how the Sacraments do serve to make us partakers of Christ. In other things we may be more brief, but the weight of these requireth largeness.

LI. "The Lord our God is but one God." In which indivisible unity notwithstanding we adore the Father as being altogether of himself, we glorify that consubstantial Word which is the Son, we bless and magnify that co-essential Spirit eternally proceeding from both which is the Holy Ghost. Seeing therefore the Father is of none, the Son is of the Father and the Spirit is of both, they are by these their several properties really distinguishable each from other. For the substance of God with this property *to be of none* doth make the Person of the Father; the very selfsame substance in number with this property *to be of the Father* maketh the Person of the Son; the same substance having added unto it the property of *proceeding from the other two* maketh the Person of the Holy Ghost. So that in every Person there is implied both the substance of God which is one, and

¹ Tertull. [Novatian.] de Trinit. [c. 18. ad calc. Tertull. ed. Pamel. p. 1246.] "Oportebat Deum carnem fieri, ut in semetipso concordiam confabularet terrenorum pariter atque cælestium, dum utriusque

"partis in se connectens pignora, et Deum pariter homini et hominem Deo copularet."

² Isai. ix. 6; Jer. xxiii. 6; Rom. ix. 5; John xvi. 15. v. 21; Col. ii. 9; 1 John v. 20.

also that property which causeth the same person really and truly to differ from the other two. Every person hath his own subsistence which no other besides hath¹, although there be others besides that are of the same substance. As no man but Peter can be the person which Peter is, yet Paul hath the selfsame nature which Peter hath. Again, angels have every of them the nature of pure and invisible spirits, but every angel is not that angel which appeared in a dream to Joseph.

[2.] Now when God became man, lest we should err in applying this to the Person of the Father, or of the Spirit, St. Peter's confession unto Christ was, "Thou art *the Son* of the "living God²," and St. John's exposition thereof was plain, that it is *the Word*³ which was made Flesh. "The Father "and the Holy Ghost (saith Damascen) have no communion "with the incarnation of the Word otherwise than only by "approbation and assent."

Notwithstanding, forasmuch as the Word and Deity are one subject, we must beware we exclude not the nature of God from incarnation, and so make the Son of God incarnate not to be very God. For undoubtedly⁵ even the nature of God itself in the only person of the Son is incarnate, and hath taken to itself flesh. Wherefore incarnation may neither be granted to any person but only one, nor yet denied to that nature which is common unto all three.

[3.] Concerning the cause of which incomprehensible mystery, forasmuch as it seemeth a thing unconsonant that the world should honour any other as the Saviour but him whom it honoureth as the Creator of the world, and in the wisdom of God it hath not been thought convenient to admit any way of

¹ Πρόσωπον ἕχον ὑπόστασις ἐστὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἁγίους πατέρας, τὸ ἰδικὸν παρὰ τὸ κοινόν. Κοινοῦτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ φύσις ἐκάστου πράγματος, ἴδιαι δὲ εἰσὶν αἱ ὑποστάσεις. Suid. [sub voc. Ὑπόστασις.] Ἡ οὐσία καθ' ἑαυτὴν οὐχ ὑφίσταται, ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς ὑποστάσεσι θεωρεῖται: τὸ δὲ κοινὸν μετὰ τοῦ ἰδιάζοντος ἔχει ἡ ὑπόστασις καὶ τὸ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ὑπάρχει. Damasc. († 760. Hooker has transposed the two clauses from Damasc.) de Orthod. Fide, lib. iii. cap. 6. [p. 67. ed. Veron. 1531.]

² Κατ' οὐδένα λόγον κεκοινωνήκει ὁ Πατήρ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τῇ σαρκώσει τοῦ Λόγου, εἰ μὴ κατ' εὐδοκίαν καὶ βούλησιν. Damasc. [de Orthod. Fid. lib. iii. c. 11. fin. p. 75.]

³ Aug. Epist. 57. [al. 187. § 20. t. ii. 684.] "In illo Divinitas est "Unigeniti facta particeps mortalitatis nostræ, ut et nos participes ejus immortalitatis essemus."

⁴ Matt. xvi. 16.

⁵ John i. 14. "Ὁς ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ

saving man but by man himself, though nothing should be spoken of the love and mercy of God towards man, which this way are become such a spectacle as neither men nor angels can behold without a kind of heavenly astonishment, we may hereby perceive there is cause sufficient why divine nature should assume human, that so God might be in Christ reconciling to himself the world¹. And if some cause be likewise required why rather to this end and purpose the Son than either the Father or the Holy Ghost should be made man, could we which are born the children of wrath be adopted the sons of God through grace, any other than the natural Son of God being Mediator between God and us? It² became therefore him by whom all things are to be the way of salvation to all, that the institution and restitution of the world might be both wrought by one hand. The world's salvation was without the incarnation of the Son of God a thing impossible, not simply impossible, but impossible it being presupposed that the will of God was no otherwise to have it saved than by the death of his own Son. Wherefore taking to himself our flesh, and by his incarnation making it his own flesh, he had now of his own although from us what to offer unto God for us.

And as Christ took manhood that by it he might be capable of death whereunto he humbled himself, so because manhood is the proper subject of compassion and feeling pity, which maketh the sceptre of Christ's regency even in the kingdom of heaven amiable, he which without our nature could not on earth suffer for the sins of the world, doth now also³ by means thereof both make intercession to God for sinners and exercise dominion over all men with a true, a natural, and a sensible touch of mercy.

LII. It is not in man's ability either to express perfectly or conceive the manner how this was brought to pass. But the strength of our faith is tried by those things wherein our wits and capacities are not strong. Howbeit because this divine mystery is more true than plain, divers having framed the same to their own conceits and fancies are found in their expositions thereof more plain than true. Insomuch that by the space of five hundred years after Christ, the Church was almost

¹ 2 Cor. v. 19.² Heb. ii. 10. [See also Coloss. i. 15-18.]³ Heb. iv. 15.

troubled with nothing else saving only with care and travail to preserve this article from the sinister construction of heretics. Whose first mists when the light of the Nicene council¹ had dispelled, it was not long ere Macedonius transferred unto God's most Holy Spirit the same blasphemy wherewith Arius had already dishonoured his co-eternally begotten Son; not long ere Apollinarius² began to pare away from Christ's humanity. In refutation of which impieties when the Fathers of the Church, Athanasius, Basil, and the two Gregories, had by their painful travails sufficiently cleared the truth, no less for the Deity of the Holy Ghost than for the complete humanity of Christ, there followed hereupon a final conclusion, whereby those controversies, as also the rest which Paulus Samosatenus, Sabellius, Photinus, Aëtius, Eunomius, together with the whole swarm of pestilent Demi-Arians had from time to time stirred up sithence the council of Nice, were both privately first at Rome in a smaller synod³, and then at Constantinople⁴, in a general famous assembly brought to a peaceable and quiet end, seven-score bishops and ten agreeing in that confession which by them set down remaineth at this present hour a part of our church liturgy, a memorial of their fidelity and zeal, a sovereign preservative of God's people from the venomous infection of heresy.

[2.] Thus in Christ the verity of God and the complete substance of man were with full agreement established throughout the world, till such time as the heresy of Nestorius broached itself, "⁵ dividing Christ into two persons the Son of God and

¹ An. Dom. 325.² Μηδέ γάρ δεηθῆναι φησὶ τὴν σάρκα ἐκείνην ἀνθρωπίνου νοός ἡγεμονευομένην ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτῆν ἐνθεδύκωτος θεοῦ. Suid. [sub voc. Ἀπολλινάριος.]³ [A. D. 378, a synod of ninety-three bishops was held at Rome, in which Damasus presided; by authority of which a Synodical Epistle, probably the document known by the name of τόμος τῶν δυτικῶν, and adopted in the fifth canon of Constantinople, was sent to a council then sitting at Antioch under Meletius, and approved there. See Theodoret, E. H. v. 10. p. 211 A. and c. ii. p. 213-16. and Valesius' Notes, p. 41, 44; Conc. ii. 899-904, 908,

9, 10; Cave, Hist. Lit. ii. 123, 127; Bevereg. Synod. ii. 89; Routh, Opusc. 449.]

⁴ An. Dom. 381.⁵ Οὐκ ἔτι τὴν ἑνωσιν ὁμολογεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν. Cyril. (Alex. † 444.) Epist. ad Eulog. [p. 133 A. ed. Par. 1638. t. vi.] Οὐκ ἔλεγε γὰρ ἑνωσιν τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ δύο ὑποστάσεις ἔλεγε καὶ διαίρεσιν . . . Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἄνθρωπον καὶ Θεὸν ἀπεκάλει τὸν Χριστὸν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔτι ὡς ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ τῇ σχέσει καὶ τῇ οικειώσει . . . κατὰ τὰ ταῦτά ἀλλήλοις ἀρέσκειν διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς φιλίας. Leont. (Byzant. c. 610-620.) de Sect. [Act. 4. p. 508. t. i. Biblioth. Patr. Gr. ed. Par. 1624.]

“ the Son of man, the one a person begotten of God before all worlds, the other also a person born of the Virgin Mary, and in special favour chosen to be made entire to the Son of God above all men, so that whosoever will honour God must together honour Christ, with whose person God hath vouchsafed to join himself in so high a degree of gracious respect and favour.” But that the selfsame person which verily is man should properly be God also, and that, by reason not of two persons linked in amity but of two natures human and divine conjoined in one and the same person, the God of glory may be said as well to have suffered death as to have raised the dead from their graves, the Son of man as well to have made as to have redeemed the world, Nestorius in no case would admit.

[3.] That which deceived him was want of heed to the first beginning of that admirable combination of God with man. “ The Word (saith St. John) was made flesh and dwelt *in us* ¹.” The Evangelist useth the plural number, men for manhood, *us* for the nature whereof we consist, even as the Apostle denying the assumption of *angelical nature*, saith likewise in the plural number, “ He took not *Angels* but the seed of “ Abraham².” It pleased not the Word or Wisdom of God to take to itself some one person amongst men, for then should that one have been advanced which was assumed and no more, but Wisdom to the end she might save many built her house of that *nature* which is common unto all, she made not *this or that man* her habitation, but dwelt *in us*. The seeds of herbs and plants at the first are not in act but in possibility that which they afterwards grow to be. If the Son of God had taken to himself a man now made and already perfected, it would of necessity follow that there are in Christ two persons, the one assuming and the other assumed; whereas the Son of God did not assume a man’s person unto his own, but a man’s nature to his own Person, and therefore took *semen*, the seed of Abraham, the very first original element of our nature³, before it was come to have any personal human subsistence. The flesh and the conjunction of the flesh with God began both at one

¹ John i. 14.² Heb. ii. 16.³ Ἡ ληφθεῖσα φύσις οὐ προῦπήρχε

τῆς λήψεως. Theod. Dial. “Ατρειτος.

[Dial. ii. p. 101. t. iv. pars i. ed.

Schulze.]

instant; his making and taking to himself our flesh, was but one act, so that in Christ there is no personal subsistence but one, and that from everlasting. By taking only the nature of man he still continueth one person, and changeth but the manner of his subsisting, which was before in the mere glory of the Son of God, and is now in the habit of our flesh.

Forasmuch therefore as Christ hath no personal subsistence but one whereby we acknowledge him to have been eternally the Son of God, we must of necessity apply to the person of the Son of God even that which is spoken of Christ according to his human nature. For example, according to the flesh he was born of the Virgin Mary, baptized of John in the river Jordan, by Pilate adjudged to die, and executed by the Jews. We cannot say properly that the Virgin bore, or John did baptize, or Pilate condemn, or the Jews crucify the Nature of man, because these all are personal attributes; his Person is the subject which receiveth them, his Nature that which maketh his person capable or apt to receive. If we should say that the person of a man in our Saviour Christ was the subject of these things, this were plainly to entrap ourselves in the very snare of the Nestorians’ heresy, between whom and the Church of God there was no difference, saving only that Nestorius imagined in Christ as well a personal human subsistence as a divine, the Church acknowledging a substance both divine and human, but no other personal subsistence than divine, because the Son of God took not to himself a man’s person, but the nature only of a man.

Christ is a Person both divine and human, howbeit not therefore two persons in one, neither both these in one sense, but a person divine, because he is *personally* the Son of God, human, because *he hath really the nature* of the children of men. In Christ therefore God and man “ There is (saith Paschasius¹) a twofold substance, not a twofold person, “ because one person extinguisheth another, whereas one “ nature cannot in another become extinct.” For the personal being which the Son of God already had, suffered not the sub-

¹ Paschas. (786–865.) lib. de Spir. Sanct. [lib. ii. c. 4. “ In Deo et ho-

mine, gemina quidem substantia,

“ sed non gemina persona est, quia

“ persona personam consumere potest, substantia vero substantiam consumere non potest.” In Biblioth. Patr. Colon. viii. 331.]

stance to be personal which he took, although together with the nature which he had the nature also which he took continueth. Whereupon it followeth against Nestorius, that no person was born of the Virgin but the Son of God, no person but the Son of God baptized, the Son of God condemned, the Son of God and no other person crucified; which one only point of Christian belief, *the infinite worth of the Son of God*, is the very ground of all things believed concerning life and salvation by that which Christ either did or suffered as man in our behalf.

[4.] But forasmuch as St. Cyril, the chiefest of those two hundred bishops assembled in the council of Ephesus¹, where the heresy of Nestorius was condemned, had in his writings² against the Arians avouched that the Word or Wisdom of God hath *but one nature* which is eternal, and whereunto he assumed flesh (for the Arians were of opinion³ that besides God's own eternal wisdom, there is a wisdom which God created before all things, to the end he might thereby create all things else, and that this created wisdom was the Word which took flesh :) again, forasmuch as the same Cyril⁴ had given instance in the body and the soul of man no farther than only to enforce by example against Nestorius, that a visible and an invisible, a mortal and an immortal substance may united make *one person*: the words of Cyril were in process of time so taken as though it had been his drift to teach, that even as in us the body and the soul, so in Christ God and man make *but one nature*. Of which error, six hundred and thirty fathers in the council of Chalcedon condemned Eutyches⁵. For as Nestorius teaching rightly that God and man are distinct natures, did thereupon misinfer that in Christ those natures can by no conjunction make one person; so Eutyches, of sound belief as touching their true personal copulation, became unsound by denying the difference which still continueth between the one and the other Nature. We must therefore keep warily a middle course, shunning both that distraction of Persons wherein Nestorius went awry, and also this later confusion of Natures which deceived Eutyches.

¹ An. Dom. 431.

² [Vid. Cyril. de Recta Fide, t. vi. 48. (ex Athanas.) et Ep. ad Eulog. vi. 133.]

³ [Vid. e.g. Alexand. Alexandrin. ap. Socr. i. 6. p. 11. A. ed. Vales.]

⁴ [Cyr. t. vi. Epist. p. 8, 133.]

⁵ An. Dom. 451.

These natures from the moment of their first combination have been and are for ever inseparable¹. For even when his soul forsook the tabernacle of his body, his Deity forsook neither body nor soul. If it had, then could we not truly hold either that the person of Christ was buried, or that the person of Christ did raise up itself from the dead. For the body separated from the Word can in no true sense be termed the person of Christ; nor is it true to say that the Son of God in raising up that body did raise up himself, if the body were not both with him and of him even during the time it lay in the sepulchre. The like is also to be said of the soul, otherwise we are plainly and inevitably Nestorians. The very person of Christ therefore for ever one and the selfsame was only touching bodily substance concluded within the grave, his soul only from thence severed, but by personal union his Deity still unseparably joined with both.

LIII. The sequel of which conjunction of natures in the person of Christ is no abolishment of natural properties appertaining to either substance, no transition or transmigration thereof out of one substance into another, finally no such mutual infusion as really causeth the same natural operations or properties to be made common unto both substances; but whatsoever is natural to Deity the same remaineth in Christ uncommunicated unto his manhood, and whatsoever natural to manhood his Deity thereof is incapable. The true properties and operations of his Deity are to know that which is not possible for created natures to comprehend; to be simply the highest cause of all things, the wellspring of immortality and life; to have neither end nor beginning of days; to be every where present, and enclosed no where; to be subject to no alteration nor passion; to produce of itself those effects which cannot proceed but from infinite majesty and power. The true properties and operations of his manhood are such as Irenæus reckoneth up²: "If Christ," saith he, "had not taken flesh

That by the union of the one with the other nature in Christ there groweth neither gain nor loss of essential properties to either.

¹ Ἀχώριστον προσήκει τῆς σαρκὸς εἶναι τὴν θεϊαν φύσιν ὁμολογεῖν, κἀν τῷ σταυρῷ κἀν τῷ τάφῳ. Theod. Dial. Ἀπαθῆς. [Dial. iii. t. iv. p. 227.]

² [Ἐὶ μὲν εὐλόγηται παρὰ τῆς Μαρίας, οὐκ αὐτὰς ἀπὸ γῆς εὐλημένας προσείετο τροφὰς, δι' ἧν τὸ ἀπὸ γῆς ληφθῆναι τρέφεται σῶμα· οὐδ' ἂν εἰς

τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας, ὁμοίως ὡς Μαυρῆς καὶ Ἥλιος, νηστεύσας ἐπέεινε, τοῦ σώματος ἐπιζητούντος τὴν ἰδίαν τροφήν· οὐδ' ἂν Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς αὐτοῦ περὶ αὐτοῦ γράφων εἶρηκε· Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς κεκοπιτικῶς ἐκ τῆς ὀδοιπορίας, ἐκαθέζετο· . . . οὐδ' ἂν ἐδάκρυσεν ἐπὶ τοῦ Λαζάρου, οὐδ' ἂν ἰδρωσε θρόμ-

“from the very earth, he would not have coveted those earthly nourishments, wherewith bodies which be taken from thence are fed. This was the nature which felt hunger after long fasting, was desirous of rest after travail, testified compassion and love by tears, groaned in heaviness, and with extremity of grief even melted away itself into bloody sweats.” To Christ we ascribe both working of wonders and suffering of pains, we use concerning him speeches as well of humility as of divine glory, but the one we apply unto that nature which he took of the Virgin Mary, the other to that which was in the beginning.

[2.] We may not therefore imagine that the properties of the weaker nature have vanished with the presence of the more glorious, and have been therein swallowed up as in a gulf. We dare not in this point give ear to them who over boldly affirm ¹ that “the nature which Christ took weak and feeble from us by being mingled with Deity became the same which Deity is, that the assumption of our substance unto his was like the blending of a drop of vinegar with the huge ocean, wherein although it continue still, yet not with those properties which severed it hath, because sithence the instant of their conjunction, all distinction and difference of the one from the other is extinct, and whatsoever we can now conceive of the Son of God, is nothing else but mere Deity,” which words are so plain and direct for Eutyches, that I stand in doubt they are not his whose name they carry. Sure I am they are far from truth, and must of necessity give place to

βους αϊματος· οὐδ' ἂν εἰρήκει, ὅτι περιλυτός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου· οὐδ' ἂν νυγείσης αὐτοῦ τῆς πλευρᾶς, ἐξῆλθεν αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ.] Ταῦτα [γὰρ] πάντα σύμβολα σαρκὸς τῆς ἀπὸ γῆς εἰλημμένης. Iren. lib. iii. advers. Hæres. [c. 32.] Christ did all these ἀνθρωπίνου σώματος νόμῳ. Theod. Dial. Ἀσύγχυτος. [iv. 1. 148. from Greg. Naz. Orat. xxxviii. t. i. 621. D. Ἀπεστάλη μὲν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄνθρωπος διπλοῦς γὰρ ἦν· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐκοπίασε, καὶ ἐπέιψε, καὶ ἐδίψησε, καὶ ἠγωνίασε, καὶ ἐδάκρυσε νόμῳ σώματος.]

Τοὺς μὲν ταπεινοὺς λόγους τῷ ἐκ Μαρίας ἀνθρώπῳ, τοὺς δὲ ἀνηγμένους καὶ θεοπρεπεῖς τῷ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντι Λόγῳ.

Greg. Naz. Orat. II. de Filio. [§ 36. t. i. 577.]

¹ Greg. Nyss. Epist. ad Theophil. Alexandr. [contr. Apollin. t. ii. 697. Paris. 1615. πᾶν ὅσον ἀσθενῆς τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν καὶ ἐπικηρον, ἀνακραθὲν τῇ Θεότητι, ἐκείνο ἐγένετο, ὅπερ ἡ Θεότης ἐστὶ . . . ἡ δὲ προσληφθεῖσα τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως ἀπαρχὴ ὑπὸ τῆς παντοδυνάμου Θεότητος, ὡς ἂν εἶποι τις εἰκόμι χρώμενος, οἷον τις σταγῶν ὄξους ἀπέιρω πελάγει κατακραθείσα, ἔστι μὲν ἐν Θεότητι, οὐ μὴν ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις αὐτῆς ἰδιώμασιν' . . . ἐν οὐδενὶ καταλαμβάνεται ἢ διαφορά· ὅπερ γὰρ ἂν τις ἴδοι τοῦ υἱοῦ, Θεότης ἐστὶ . . .]

the better-advised sentences of other men. “¹ He which in himself was appointed,” saith Hilary, “a Mediator to save his Church, and for performance of that mystery of mediation between God and man, is become God and man, doth now being but one consist of both those natures united, neither hath he through the union of both incurred the damage or loss of either, lest by being born a man we should think he hath given over to be God, or that because he continueth God, therefore he cannot be man also, whereas the true belief which maketh a man happy proclaimeth jointly God and man, confesseth the Word and flesh together.” Cyril more plainly²; “His two natures have knit themselves the one to the other, and are in that nearness as incapable of confusion as of distraction. Their coherence hath not taken away the difference between them. Flesh is not become God, but doth still continue flesh, although it be now the flesh of God.” Yea, “of each substance,” saith Leo³, “the properties are all preserved and kept safe.”

[3.] These two natures are as causes and original grounds of all things which Christ hath done. Wherefore some things he doth as God, because his Deity alone is the wellspring from which they flow; some things as man, because they issue from his mere human nature; some things jointly as both God and man, because both natures concur as principles thereunto. For albeit the properties of each nature do cleave only to that nature whereof they are properties, and therefore Christ cannot *naturally be* as God the same which he *naturally is* as man; yet both natures may very well concur unto *one effect*, and Christ in that respect be truly said to *work*

¹ Hilar. de Trin. lib. ix. [§ 3. p. 148. ed. Paris. 1605. “Mediator ipse in se ad salutem Ecclesiæ constitutus, et illo ipso inter Deum et hominem mediatoris sacramento utrumque unus existens, dum ipse ex unitis in idipsum naturis, naturæ utriusque res eadem est, ita tamen ut neutro careret in utroque, ne forte Deus esse homo nascendo desineret, et homo rursum Deus manendo non esset. Hæc itaque humanæ beatitudinis fides vera est, Deum et hominem

prædicare, Verbum et carnem con-fiteri.”]

² Cyr. Epist. ad Nest. [ad Succensum. Epist. p. 137. D. t. v. pars ii. ed. 1638. Ὁρώμεν ὅτι δύο φύσεις συνήλθον ἀλλήλαις καθ' ἑνωσιν ἀδιάσπαστον ἀσυγχύτως, καὶ ἀτρέπτως· ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ σὰρξ ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐ θεότης, εἰ καὶ γέγονε Θεοῦ σὰρξ.]

³ “Salva proprietate utriusque naturæ suscepta est a majestate humilitas, a virtute infirmitas, ab æternitate mortalitas.” Leo Ep. ad Flav. [c. 3.]