

FENROSE MEMORIAL LIBRARY  
WHITMAN COLLEGE  
WALLA WALLA, WASHINGTON 99362

CYRIL  
OF  
ALEXANDRIA

*Norman Russell*

*Explanation of the 12  
Chapters*

THE EARLY CHURCH FATHERS  
Edited by Carol Harrison  
*University of Durham*

The Greek and Latin fathers of the Church are central to the creation of Christian doctrine, yet often unapproachable because of the sheer volume of their writings and the relative paucity of accessible translations. This series makes available translations of key selected texts by the major Fathers to all students of the early church.

*Already published:*

MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR  
*Andrew Louth*

IRENÆUS OF LYONS  
*Robert M. Grant*

AMBROSE  
*Boniface Ramsey*

ORIGEN  
*Joseph W. Trigg*

GREGORY OF NYSSA  
*Anthony Meredith*

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM  
*Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen*



London and New York

think, who would dare to say that the Word of God has been transformed into the nature of the body, one could very reasonably object that when he gave his body he did not say, 'Take, eat; this is my Godhead which is broken for you, and this is not my blood but rather the Godhead which is poured out for you.' Since the Word, being God, made the body born from a woman his own body without undergoing change or alteration in any way, how could he not say to us without any dissimulation, 'take, eat; this is my body'? For being life in virtue of being God, he rendered the body life and life-giving.

Having opened your eyes a little to the truth, you will yourself, I think, condemn yourself for the emptiness of your arguments, as you drivel on, foolishly opposing the doctrines of piety with this counterfeit and joyless discourse of yours.

## AN EXPLANATION OF THE TWELVE CHAPTERS

### INTRODUCTION

The Twelve Chapters are twelve propositions which Cyril had drawn up and appended to his Third Letter to Nestorius.<sup>1</sup> The letter was handed to Nestorius by an Egyptian delegation at his residence in Constantinople after the liturgy on Sunday, 30 November 430, and immediately provoked a furore. The propositions were deliberately phrased in uncompromising terms. Cyril's intention was to force Nestorius to abandon the provisos and nuances he had expressed hitherto and either accept the christological position set out in the chapters and thus bring an end to the controversy or else reject it and prove himself a heretic.

The plan misfired badly. Nestorius, outraged by what he read, at once sent the letter to John of Antioch, who reacted with similar indignation. The Easterners closed ranks, perceiving Cyril's *démarche* as an attack on the Antiochene christological tradition as such. What had begun as an exchange of letters between Cyril and Nestorius now became a pamphlet war between Antioch and Alexandria. Responses to the Twelve Chapters were written by Andrew of Samosata and Theodoret of Cyrthus, to each of which Cyril replied in detail.<sup>2</sup> Accusations of heresy flew backwards and forwards with the result that it was two deeply divided sides to the dispute that met at Ephesus in June 431.

The late arrival at Ephesus of the delegation from Antioch enabled Cyril to have the Twelve Chapters minuted and then rush through the condemnation of Nestorius with very little opposition. When John of Antioch's party finally arrived, they immediately held a rival session with the minority of bishops who sympathized with Nestorius and pronounced Cyril deposed. In consequence, both Cyril and Nestorius were put under house arrest by the authorities.<sup>3</sup>

It was at this juncture that Cyril composed his *Explanation of the Twelve Chapters*. While intense lobbying was being conducted on his behalf in government circles at Constantinople, Cyril used his enforced leisure to compose a clarification for the bishops, apparently at their request, of precisely what errors he meant to exclude by the Twelve Chapters. The Eastern bishops wanted the chapters rescinded. Cyril could not do this without destroying the basis upon which Nestorius had been condemned, but he needed as much support among the Eastern bishops as he could muster. Although he does not shift his theological position, he is more conciliatory than in his previous two commentaries on the Twelve Chapters in that he tries to restrict the scope of the anathemas to positions which the Antiochenes could more readily concede to be heretical.<sup>4</sup> The essential points for Cyril were first that there was only a single subject of all the words and actions attributed to Christ, namely, the Word made flesh, and secondly that in relation to the inspired figures of sacred history Christ was different in kind, not merely in degree, otherwise he could not have effected our salvation.

Cyril carried the day at Ephesus yet he could not dispel the impression that his chapters propounded an Apollinarian Christ who was neither God nor man but a hybrid being. The Council of Chalcedon, whilst approving Cyril's Third Letter to Nestorius, did not include the Twelve Chapters in its list of documents which were to be regarded as providing a standard of orthodoxy. Their christology was not compatible with that of the Tome of Leo, which made them a potential source of embarrassment. It was not until the Fifth Ecumenical Council of 553, when Theodore of Mopsuestia's writings were condemned, that the Twelve Chapters received authoritative status.<sup>5</sup>

## TEXT

ACO I, 1, 5, pp. 15.16–25.28

[15] An explanation of the twelve chapters given in Ephesus by Cyril, archbishop of Alexandria, when the holy council asked him to provide them with an elucidation of their meaning.

1. 'All things,' as Scripture says, 'are evident to those who understand and right to those who find knowledge' (Prov. 8:9 LXX). For there are some who approach the sacred words of

the inspired Scriptures with the eye of their understanding sharp and clear, and derive from them benefit for their souls like some divine and heavenly treasure. But there are others whose minds are inclined towards falsehood. Enthralled by the garrulity of certain people and enamoured of profane knowledge, they will share the lot of those about whom blessed Paul writes: 'In their case the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the glory of Christ' (2 Cor. 4:4). For they are blind and are guides of the blind, and for that very reason they will fall into the pits of destruction. As the Saviour himself says somewhere, 'If a blind man leads a blind man, both will fall into a pit' (Mt. 15:14). For certain people have conducted a campaign of gossip against the doctrines of truth and indeed, having filled their minds with a diabolical perversity, are intent on debasing the mystery of the orthodox faith and make no small criticism of the incarnate dispensation of the only-begotten Son, 'without understanding either what they are saying or the things about which they make assertions,' as Scripture says (1 Tim. 1:7).

2. In earlier times there were many different inventors of such impiety, but now Nestorius and his adherents have not fallen short of their wickedness, opposing Christ like those ancient Pharisees and crying out without restraint: 'Why do you, being a man, make yourself God?' (Jn. 10:33). It was therefore necessary that we ourselves should take issue with their words and condemn their polluted and profane doctrines, mindful of what God has said by the mouth of the prophet: 'Hear O priests and testify to the house of Jacob, says the Lord the Almighty' (Amos 3:13 LXX); and in another place: 'Go through my gates and clear the stones off the road' (Is. 62:10 LXX). For it is incumbent on us who strive on behalf of the doctrines of truth to clear away the stumbling-blocks, so that people should not run any risk of falling over them but travel on a smooth path towards the sacred and divine courts, all but saying with regard to each of them, 'This is the gate of the Lord; the righteous shall enter through it' (Ps. 118:20).

3. Since Nestorius has put into his own books a host of novel and profane blasphemies, we have in our concern for the

salvation of those who read them been compelled to draw up a list of anathemas. We are not dealing with a purely theoretical matter which we could have put into a letter of admonition to him, but as I have just said we are demonstrating that these inventions of his deranged mind are foreign and alien to the doctrines of orthodox faith. Some people are perhaps indignant at my words, either because they have not really understood the significance of what has been written, or because they have become supporters of Nestorius' foul heresy and share in his impiety and think the way he does. The truth, at any rate, cannot fail to be seen by anyone who is accustomed to thinking correctly. But since it is likely that those who have been misled by their specious arguments do not understand how and by what means these things have come about, I have thought it necessary to interpret each of the anathemas briefly and explain its significance in the best way I can. In my opinion this will not be without benefit for the reader.

### Anathema 1

4. If anyone does not acknowledge Emmanuel to be truly God and therefore the holy Virgin to be *Theotokos* (for she gave birth according to the flesh to the Word of God made flesh), let him be anathema.

### Explanation

5. The blessed fathers who gathered some time ago in the city of Nicaea and set forth the definition of our orthodox and unexceptionable faith said that they believed in one God, the Father almighty, maker of all that is, both visible and invisible, and in one Lord Jesus Christ his Son, and in the Holy Spirit. They declared that the Word begotten by God the Father was the same through whom all things were made, light from light, true God from true God, who became incarnate and was made man, suffered and rose again. For since he was God by nature, the only-begotten Word of God took to himself the seed of Abraham, as blessed Paul says (cf. Heb. 2:16), and partook of blood and flesh like us. For he was born according to the flesh from the holy Virgin and became a man like us, not slipping away from being God (God

forbid), but remaining what he was and abiding in the nature and glory of the Godhead. We therefore say that he became man, not undergoing change or alteration into what he was not previously (for he is always the same and he is not susceptible to any 'shadow of change' (Jas 1:17)), and we declare that there was no confusion or mingling or blending of his essence with the flesh. But we say that the Word was united with flesh endowed with a rational soul in a manner that is transcendent and ineffable and known only to himself. Therefore he remained God even in the assumption of flesh and is the one Son of God the Father, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same before all ages and time in that he is regarded as Word and reflection of his being (cf. Heb. 1:3), and in these last days has become man by divine dispensation for our sake.<sup>6</sup>

6. Some people deny his birth according to the flesh that took place from the holy Virgin for the salvation of all, a birth that did not call him into a beginning of being, but he became like us in order to deliver us from death and corruption. It was for that reason that my first anathema inveighed against their erroneous belief and confesses what is correctly held, saying that Emmanuel is truly God and consequently that the holy Virgin is *Theotokos*.<sup>7</sup>

### Anathema 2

7. If anyone does not acknowledge the Word of God the Father to be united hypostatically with the flesh and to be one Christ together with his own flesh, that is, the same subject as at once both God and man, let him be anathema.

### Explanation

8. The holy Paul, the priest of the divine mysteries, writes: 'Great indeed, we confess, is the mystery of our religion: He was manifested in the flesh, vindicated in the Spirit, seen by angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, taken up in glory' (1 Tim. 3:16). What then does 'manifested in the flesh' mean? It means that the Word of God the Father became flesh, not by a change or alteration of his own nature, as we have already said, but because having made the flesh taken from the holy Virgin his own, one and

the same subject is called Son, before the Incarnation as the Word still incorporeal and after the Incarnation as the same Word now embodied. That is why we say that the same subject is simultaneously both God and man, not dividing him conceptually into a human being with a separate individual identity and God the Word also with a separate identity, that we may exclude any idea of two Sons, but acknowledging that one and the same subject is Christ and Son and Lord.

9. Those who do not hold such a view, or do not wish to believe it, but divide the one Son into two and separate from each other those elements which in reality are united, saying that man has been brought into a conjunction with God only in terms of rank or supreme authority, those we say are alien to our orthodox and irreproachable faith. Consequently, even if he is called an apostle (cf. Heb. 3:1), even if he is said to have been anointed and to have been designated Son of God (cf. Rom. 1:4), that does not cause us any embarrassment with regard to the dispensation of the Incarnation. We say of the Word of God the Father that it was when he became a man like us that he was also called an apostle and was anointed with us on the human level. For having become like us, even though he remained what he was, he will not repudiate what belongs to us, but instead accepts what is human along with the limitations that belong to the human condition, for the sake of the dispensation of the Incarnation, without thereby compromising in any way his glory or his nature. For even in this state he is God and Lord of all.<sup>8</sup>

### Anathema 3

10. If anyone with regard to the one Christ divides the hypostases after the union, connecting them only by a conjunction in terms of rank or supreme authority, and not rather by a combination in terms of natural union, let him be anathema.<sup>9</sup>

### Explanation

11. Having investigated carefully the mystery of the Only-begotten's dispensation of the Incarnation, we say that the Word of God the Father has been united in a miraculous and

ineffable manner with a holy body endowed with a rational soul and that is how we conceive of the one Son, just as indeed in our own case it is possible to see that soul and body are of different natures and yet together they make up a single living being. There are some, however, who do not consider this to be so. They set the human nature apart for us as a separate individual and say that he was joined to the Word begotten by God the Father only in terms of rank or authority, and not in terms of a natural union, that is a real union, as we ourselves believe. This is also the teaching of the divine Scriptures, which say somewhere: 'we were by nature children of wrath, like the rest of mankind' (Eph. 2:3), taking 'by nature' as equivalent to 'in reality'. Those, then, who divide the hypostases after the union and set each apart separately, that is, man and God, and invent the idea of a 'conjunction' between them only in terms of rank, inevitably set up two sons. And yet the divinely inspired Scriptures say that there is one Son and Lord. Accordingly, if after the ineffable union you call Emmanuel 'God', we understand him to be the Word of God the Father who has become incarnate and been made man, and if you call him 'man', we acknowledge him to be no less God who has by divine dispensation accommodated himself to the limitations of the human state. We say that the intangible has become tangible, the invisible visible. For the body that was united to him, which we say was capable of being touched and seen, was not something alien to him. Those who do not believe this but, as I have said, separate the hypostases after the union, and consider them united by a mere conjunction simply in terms of rank or supreme authority, are excluded by this anathema from those who hold orthodox opinions.<sup>10</sup>

### Anathema 4

12. If anyone takes the terms used in the Gospels and apostolic writings, whether referred to Christ by the saints, or applied to himself by himself, and allocates them to two *prosôpa* or hypostases, attributing some to a man conceived of as separate from the Word of God and some, as more appropriate to God, only to the Word of God the Father, let him be anathema.

*Explanation*

13. Although the Word of God is in the form of God the Father and equal to him, he 'did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped', as Scripture says (Phil. 2:6). On the contrary, he lowered himself to a voluntary self-emptying and willingly condescended to enter into our condition, not abandoning what he is but remaining God even in this state while not disdaining the limitations of the human condition. Therefore everything relating to his divinity and everything relating to his humanity all belong to him. Why did he empty himself if he was ashamed of the limitations of human nature? And if he disdained what was human, who compelled him by necessity and force to become like us?

20 14. All the sayings in the Gospels, both those with a human colouring and indeed those appropriate to God, we therefore assign to a single *prosōpon*, because we believe that Christ Jesus, that is, the Word of God incarnate and made man, is a single Son. Consequently, if he should say something consonant with the human condition we take these human utterances to have been accommodated to the limitations of his humanity (for after all the human utterance is his also). And if he should speak as God, we likewise allocate the sayings that transcend human nature to the one Christ and Son, since we believe that he who became man was God. Those who divide him into two *prosōpa* inevitably conceive of him as two sons. A human being like ourselves cannot properly be divided into two *prosōpa*, even though he is regarded as consisting of a soul and a body, but in a single human being with a single identity. The same is also true with regard to Emmanuel. Since the incarnate Word of God made man is a single Son and Lord, his *prosōpon* is also necessarily single, and we allocate to it both the human characteristics on account of the dispensation of the Incarnation and the divine on account of his ineffable generation from God the Father. Those who divide him and set apart a distinct human being, who is a different son from the Word of God, and as a distinct God, who is another Son, saying that there are two sons, rightly incur the consequences of this anathema.<sup>11</sup>

*Anathema 5*

15. If anyone has the temerity to say that Christ is a divinely inspired man instead of saying that he is truly God since he is by nature a single Son, in that the Word became flesh and shared in flesh and blood like us (cf. Heb. 2:14), let him be anathema.

*Explanation*

16. John the divine Evangelist said that the Word of God became flesh (Jn 1:14) not by some change or alteration transforming his own nature into flesh, as we have already said (for as God he possesses immutability), but because he partook of blood and flesh like us (cf. Heb. 2:14) and became man. For the inspired Scriptures habitually refer to the human being as flesh. They say, for example, that 'all flesh shall see the salvation of God' (Lk. 3:6). But those who devise profane new doctrines, Nestorius and his followers, or those who think like them, pretend to hold this belief and acknowledge the expression 'became incarnate' but do not go on to say that the Word of God became incarnate in reality, that is, became a man like ourselves while remaining what he was. They maintain that the only-begotten Word of God dwelt in someone who was born of the holy Virgin like one of the saints, with the result that it is no longer acknowledged that Christ is One and Son and Lord and to be worshipped. Instead he is regarded as a man set apart on his own and honoured only by a conjunction in terms of a unity of rank and thus is the recipient of joint worship and joint glorification.

17. For the God of all things dwells in us through the Holy Spirit. Indeed he said long ago through one of the holy prophets: 'I will live in them and move among them, and I will be their God and they shall be my people' (2 Cor. 6:16; cf. Lev. 26:12; Ez. 37:27). And blessed Paul writes: 'Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you?' (1 Cor. 3:16). Christ himself said about the holy prophets or the righteous who preceded him: 'If he called them gods to whom the Word of God came, do you say of him whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world, "You are blaspheming," because I said, "I am the Son of God"?' (Jn 10:35, 36). But God does not dwell in Christ in the same way

as he does in us. For Christ was God by nature, who became like us. He was the one and only Son even when he became flesh. Those who have the temerity to say that he was a God-bearing man instead of saying that he was God made man inevitably incur this anathema.

### Anathema 6

18. If anyone says that the Word of God the Father is Christ's God or Master, instead of acknowledging the same Christ as simultaneously God and man, since according to the Scriptures the Word became flesh (Jn 1:14), let him be anathema.

### *Explanation*

19. Our Lord Jesus Christ, being the one and only and true Son of God the Father, became flesh. He is the Word and together with his own begetter has sovereignty over all things. 'To him every knee bows, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confesses that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father' (Phil. 2:10, 11). He is therefore Lord of all things insofar as he is thought of as God and actually is God, even though he is not without flesh after the Incarnation, and is not God or Master of himself. For it is truly most absurd, or rather the height of impiety, to think or speak in this fashion. This anathema is therefore rightly directed against anyone who holds such a view.

### Anathema 7

20. If anyone says that Jesus is a man controlled by the Word of God and that the glory of the Only-begotten is to be attributed to another existing apart from him, let him be anathema.

### *Explanation*

21. When blessed Gabriel brought the annunciation of the birth according to the flesh of the only-begotten Son of God to the Holy Virgin, he said: 'You will bear a son and you shall call his name Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins'

(Mt. 1:21; cf. Lk. 1:31). He is also called Christ because he was anointed with us in a human fashion, in accordance with the verse of the Psalms: 'You have loved righteousness and hated wickedness; therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness above your fellows' (Ps. 45:7). Even though he himself bestows the Holy Spirit and it is not by measure that he gives it to those who are worthy (Jn 3:34) (for he is filled with it and 'from his fulness have we all received', as Scripture says (Jn 1:16)), nevertheless in view of the dispensation of the Incarnation he is said to have been anointed as a man in a spiritual sense when the Holy Spirit descended upon him, that the Spirit might also abide in us even though it had withdrawn from us in primeval times because of Adam's transgression. Therefore it is the same only-begotten Word of God who became flesh who was called Christ and, possessing the authority appropriate to God as his own, was able to work miracles. Those who say with regard to the authority of Christ that he was endowed with the glory of the Only-begotten, as if the Only-begotten was different from Christ, conceive of two sons, the one controlling and the other being controlled as a man just like ourselves, and therefore incur the consequences of this anathema.

### Anathema 8

22. If anyone has the temerity to say that the assumed man should be worshipped along with God the Word and should be glorified and called God along with him as if they were two different entities [for the addition of the expression 'along with' will always necessarily imply this interpretation]<sup>12</sup> instead of honouring Emmanuel with a single act of worship and ascribing to him a single act of praise in view of the Word having become flesh, let him be anathema.

### *Explanation*

23. We have been baptized into one God the Father almighty and into one Son and indeed into one Holy Spirit. Do you not then know, says blessed Paul, 'that all of us who have been baptized into Christ were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the

Father, we too might walk in newness of life' (Rom. 6:3, 4). We have therefore believed in one Son, as I have said, our Lord Jesus Christ, that is, the Word of God the Father who became incarnate and was made man, and were baptized into him. We have been taught to worship him as someone who is one being and truly God and likewise the heavenly powers along with us. For it is written, 'When he brings the first-born into the world, he says, "Let all God's angels worship him"' (Heb. 1:6). The Only-begotten became the first-born when he appeared as a man like us, for then he was also called a brother of those who love him (cf. Rom. 8:29). If anyone therefore says that he worships a man along with but separately from a different being who is the Word of God, instead of bringing them together by a true union into a single Christ and Son and Lord and honouring him with a single worship, he rightly incurs the consequences of this anathema.

#### Anathema 9

24. If anyone says that the one Lord Jesus Christ has been glorified by the Spirit, in the sense that Christ used the power that came through the Spirit as something alien to himself and received from him the power to operate against unclean spirits and work miracles in human beings, instead of saying that the Spirit by which he also performed the miracles is his own, let him be anathema.

#### *Explanation*

25. When the only-begotten Word of God became man he nevertheless remained God, since he is everything that the Father is with the sole exception of being Father. He worked the miracles because he possesses the Holy Spirit, which is from him and essentially innate within him, as his own property. It follows that when he became man he nevertheless remained God, because he performed the miracles through the Spirit by a power that was his own. Those who say that he was glorified as a man like one of us or like one of the saints and that the power by which he operated through the Spirit was not his own but rather was one that was external and appropriate to God, and that he received his

ascension into heaven from the Spirit as a grace, rightly incurs the consequences of this anathema.<sup>13</sup>

#### Anathema 10

26. Divine Scripture says that Christ became high priest and apostle of our confession (cf. Heb. 3:1) and gave himself up for us, a fragrant offering to God the Father (cf. Eph. 5:2). Therefore if anyone says that it was not the Word of God himself who became our high priest and apostle when he became incarnate and a man like ourselves, but someone different from him who was a separate man born of a woman, or if someone says that he made the offering for himself too instead of for us alone (for he who knew no sin had no need of an offering), let him be anathema.

#### *Explanation*

27. Admittedly the things that pertain to human nature are paltry compared to the Word begotten of God, but he did not disdain them on account of the dispensation of the Incarnation. Although he was Lord of all by nature he brought himself down to our level and took the form of a servant. He was called our high priest and apostle because the limitations of the human condition called him to this too. He gave himself up for us as a fragrant offering to God the Father. 'For by a single offering he has perfected for all time those who are sanctified,' as Scripture says (Heb. 10:14). I do not know how those who think differently can maintain that it is not the incarnate Word of God himself who is called both apostle and high priest of our confession, but another human being apart from him. They say that he who was born of the holy Virgin was called both apostle and high priest and arrived at this by a process of development and gave himself up as a sacrifice to God the Father not only for us but also for himself, which is completely alien to our orthodox and irreproachable faith. For he did not commit any sin (cf. 1 Pet. 2:22), and since he is superior to transgression and has absolutely no share in sin, he had no need of sacrifice on his own behalf. But since those who think differently in all likelihood reject this and conceive instead of two sons, the anathema had necessarily to be drawn up, for it made their impiety obvious.

**Anathema 11**

28. If anyone does not acknowledge that the Lord's flesh is life-giving and belongs to the Word of God the Father himself, but says it belongs to someone else who is joined to him on the basis of rank or simply possesses a divine indwelling, instead of saying it is life-giving, as we have said, because it became the personal property of the Word who is able to endow all things with life, let him be anathema.

25

*Explanation*

29. We celebrate the holy and life-giving and bloodless sacrifice in the churches, not in the belief that the offering is the body of an ordinary man like ourselves, and similarly with the precious blood, but instead accepting that it has become the very own body and blood of the Word who endows all things with life. For ordinary flesh cannot endow with life. The Saviour himself testifies to this when he says: 'The flesh is of no avail; it is the spirit that gives life' (Jn 6:63). Because it became the Word's own flesh it is therefore regarded as life-giving and actually is so. As our Lord himself said, 'As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he who eats me will live because of me' (Jn 6:57). Since Nestorius and those who think like him ignorantly weaken the power of the mystery, that is why this anathema has rightly been drawn up.<sup>14</sup>

**Anathema 12**

30. If anyone does not acknowledge that the Word of God suffered in the flesh, and was crucified in the flesh, and experienced death in the flesh, and became the first-born from the dead, seeing that as God he is both Life and life-giving, let him be anathema.

*Explanation*

31. The Word of God the Father is impassible and immortal. For the divine and ineffable nature transcends suffering and it is this which endows all things with life and is superior to corruption and anything that normally causes us grief. Yet

even though the Word of God the Father is these things in his essential being, he made his own the flesh that is receptive of death, that by means of that which is accustomed to suffering he might take these sufferings to himself on our behalf and for our sake and deliver all of us from both corruption and death, having as God endowed his own body with life and become 'the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep' (1 Cor. 15:20) and the firstborn from the dead. He who endured the precious cross for our sake and experienced death was not an ordinary man to be regarded as separate and distinct from the Word of God the Father. On the contrary, the Lord of glory himself suffered in the flesh, according to the Scriptures (cf. 1 Pet. 4:1). Since those who wish to introduce vain and impious doctrines into the orthodox and irreproachable faith say that an ordinary man endured the cross for our sake, this anathema became necessary in order to make plain the degree of impiety existing amongst them.<sup>15</sup>