

ATHENAGORAS
LEGATIO PRO CHRISTIANIS



PATRISTISCHE TEXTE UND STUDIEN

IM AUFTRAG DER
PATRISTISCHEN KOMMISSION
DER AKADEMIEN DER WISSENSCHAFTEN
IN DER BUNDESREPUBLIK DEUTSCHLAND

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON
K. ALAND UND E. MÜHLENBERG

BAND 31

WALTER DE GRUYTER · BERLIN · NEW YORK

1990

ATHENAGORAS
LEGATIO PRO CHRISTIANIS

EDITED BY
MIROSLAV MARCOVICH

WALTER DE GRUYTER · BERLIN · NEW YORK

1990

Published with the support of the University of Illinois/USA

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Athenagoras, 2nd cent.
[Apologia pro Christianis]
Legatio pro Christianis / Athenagoras ; edited by Miroslav Marcovich.
p. cm. — (Patristische Texte und Studien, ISSN 0553-4003 ; Bd. 31)
Text in Greek; notes in English.
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN 0-89925-689-9 (U.S.) : \$ 72.00 (est.)
1. Apologetics—Early church, ca. 30-600. I. Marcovich, Miroslav, II. Title, III. Series.
BR65.A3883A74 1990
239'.1—dc20 89-77139
CIP

Deutsche Bibliothek Cataloguing in Publication Data

Athenagoras (Atheniensis):
Legatio pro christianis / Athenagoras. Ed. by Miroslav Marcovich. — Berlin ; New York : de Gruyter, 1990
(Patristische Texte und Studien ; Bd. 31)
Einheitssacht.: Apologia pro christianis
ISBN 3-11-011881-5
NE: Marcovich, Miroslav [Hrsg.]; GT

ISSN 0553-4003

© Copyright 1990 by Walter de Gruyter & Co., D-1000 Berlin 30

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in Germany

Typesetting and printing: Arthur Collignon GmbH, Berlin
Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer, Berlin

CURTO ALAND

DDD

PREFACE

Athenagoras' learned and eloquent *Plea for Christians* (ca. A.D. 177) stands apart from the rest of Greek and Latin Christian apologies. Doubtless, it is the most philosophical and, at the same time, the most controversial one. For example, Athenagoras' Athenian platonism drove him to claim that Plato had recognized the Judeo-Christian God under the name of "the almighty Zeus" (c. 23.46, ἔστι γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ ὄνομα τῷ ποιητῇ τῶν ὄλων). And Athenagoras' zeal to come to terms with the Roman Empire forced him to compare the corulership of Marcus Aurelius and his boy-son Commodus to the heavenly kingdom of God the Father and God the Son (c. 18.10–14). The key tenet of Christian doctrine, the incarnation of the Word, is being hinted at incidentally only (c. 21.41–43) — "for tactical reasons."

However, Athenagoras' *Plea* is of great apologetic significance, and his Atticistic style¹ is in line with "the Second Sophistic." And nevertheless, the treatise has not yet found a satisfactory critical edition. Apparently, there are three reasons for such a situation. First, Athenagoras' trend of ideas is not always clear and easy to follow. His exposition is ill-organized, and he is fond of showing off his rhetorical skill by introducing parenthetical sentences miles long. No wonder then that uneducated medieval scribes had misunderstood and mishandled his text.

Second, the *Plea* is preserved in a single manuscript — the Parisinus gr. 451 (= *A*) —, copied in A.D. 914 by Baanes for Arethas (= *a*), the archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. In this codex, the text of the *Plea* is very lacunose and corrupt. And third, on top of that, the owner of this expensive codex, Arethas, had engaged in extensive erasure of the text copied by Baanes, in order to introduce (*in rasura*) his own emendations, which however in most cases prove to be unfounded. Now, the hands of Baanes (*A*) and Arethas (*a*) are very similar, and they both use the same brown ink, so that sometimes it becomes extremely difficult to distinguish between their hands. Such a distinction, however, is crucial for a genuine critical edition.

Back in 1891, Eduard Schwartz had made a great effort to distinguish between the hands of Baanes and Arethas. As a result, his edition of the *Plea* offers the best critical text so far. But it is far from being satisfactory. For one thing, Schwartz stood under the spell of the great Ulrich von

¹ Compare J. Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten* (Leipzig und Berlin, 1907) 163–167.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "*quem et Athenagorae alterum editorem dicere de-beo.*"² As a result, Schwartz too readily accepted some radical (and even violent) emendations suggested by Wilamowitz. However, all subsequent editions of the *Plea* relied on Schwartz's collations of *A*, and on his judgment — notably, those prepared by Johannes Geffcken (Leipzig, 1907), Paolo Ubaldi (Turin, 1920; 1933²; 1947³), William R. Schoedel (Oxford, 1972).³

The present edition makes a fresh start by offering a reasonably critical text of the *Plea*. It tries to achieve this, (1) through a more careful and meticulous study of the Arethas codex (especially the distinction between the hands of Baanes and Arethas); (2) through a *Quellenforschung* on the *Plea* (going beyond Geffcken's monumental work); (3) finally, through a more sensitive and cautious textual criticism.

The edition is dedicated to PROFESSOR KURT ALAND in gratitude and admiration, as a small token of my appreciation of his enormous scholarly merits, resulting particularly in a better understanding of the history of text of the New Testament.

Urbana, October 1987

M. M.

² *Athenagorae Libellus pro Christianis ...* rec. Ed. Schwartz (T.U. IV. 2, Leipzig, 1891), *Praefatio*, p. XXX.

³ Schoedel honestly states: "The present edition is based on photographs of the Arethas codex." *Athenagoras, Legatio and De Resurrectione* (Oxford, 1972), Introduction, p. XXXV.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	VII
Abbreviations	XI
Introduction	1
<i>Legatio pro Christianis</i>	21
Codicis A Scholia in <i>Legationem</i>	114
Indices	
Index locorum	117
Index nominum	120
Index verborum	124

ABBREVIATIONES

SIGLA

A	Arethae codicis Parisini gr. 451, a. D. 914 a Baane exarati, fol. 322 ^v –348 ^r <i>codicis A apographa</i>
n	cod. Mutinensis Misc. gr. 126: α.S.5.9 (olim III D 7), saec. XI, fol. 238 ^v –265 ^v
p	cod. Parisini gr. 174, saec. XII, fol. 132 ^r –153 ^v
s	cod. Argenteratensis gr. 9, saec. XIII vel XIV, nunc perditus

BREVIATA

A	manus Baanis
A ^{a.c.}	Baanes ante correctionem
A ^{p.c.}	Baanes post correctionem
a	manus Arethae
A ^{m.r.}	quaevis manus post aetatem Baanis et Arethae
.	rasura unius litterae in A
α	littera in rasura scripta, sive a Baane (A), sive ab Aretha (a)
*	textus periit: lacuna in A
< * >	lacunam in textu coniecere viri docti
† αβγ †	vox corrupta
[αβγ]	vox delenda
< αβγ >	vox addenda

EDITIONUM ABBREVIATIONES

Dechair	<i>Sancti Athenagorae ... Legatio pro Christianis ... Eiusdem De resurrectione mortuorum ... cura et studio Eduardi Dechair, Oxoniae, e theatro Sheldoniano [impensis S. et J. Sprint], 1706</i>
Ducaeus	<i>Bibliotheca veterum Patrum, seu Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum, tomus I, Auctarium Graecolatinum, cum notis Frontonis Ducae (Le Duc), Parisiis (per Sonnius fratres et Hieronymum Drovardum), 1624. [Legatio pp. 50–80; De resurrectione pp. 81–104; Ducae Notae pp. 38 s.]</i>
Geffcken	Johannes Geffcken, <i>Zwei griechische Apologeten</i> , Leipzig und Berlin, Teubner, 1907 [Aristides; Athenagorae <i>Legatio</i>]
Gesner	v. Stephanum et Conradi Gesneri <i>Annotationes in Apologiam</i> ap. Stephanum, Parisiis, 1557, pp. 131–154

- Lindner *Sancti Athenagorae Atheniensis philosophi Deprecationem (vulgo Legationem) pro Christianis* edidit M. Io. Gottlieb Lindner ..., Longosalisae (sumptibus Io. Chr. Martini), 1774
- Maran in *Iustini Opera quae exstant omnia*, opera et studio unius ex monachis Congregationis S. Mauri [i. e. Prudentii Marani], Parisiis (sumptibus Caroli Osmont), 1742 = *P. G.* VI, Parisiis, 1857 = 1884, pp. 889–972
- Otto *Athenagorae philosophi Atheniensis Opera*, rec. Ioann. Carol. Theod. Otto (Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi, VII), Ienae, 1857 [Reprint 1969]
- Paul *Athenagorae Atheniensis ... Supplicatio pro Christianis*, cura et studio Ludwig Paul, Halis, 1856
- Petri *Athenagorae Atheniensis philosophi Apologia vel Legatio, vel potius Supplicatio pro Christianis ...* a Suffridio Petro [i. e. Sjurd Peeters] Leovardiense Frisio in Latinum ex Graeco translata ..., Coloniae (apud heredes Arnoldi Birckmanni), 1567, pp. 393 [14.5 × 9 cm]
- Schoedel *Athenagoras Legatio and De Resurrectione*. Edited and translated by William R. Schoedel (Oxford Early Christian Texts), Oxford, 1972
- Schwartz *Athenagorae Libellus pro Christianis, Oratio de resurrectione cadaverum*, recensuit Eduardus Schwartz (T. U. IV.2), Leipzig, 1891
- Stephanus *Athenagorae Atheniensis philosophi Christiani apologia pro Christianis, ad imperatores Antoninum et Commodum. Eiusdem, de resurrectione mortuorum*. Ex antiquis exemplaribus libellus ille nunc primum profertur, hic autem castigatior quam antea editur. Uterque graece et latine. Ex officina H. Stephani [Henri Estienne], [Parisiis], 1557, pp. 208 [15.5 × 9.5 cm]. [*Apologia* graece pp. 3–44; *De resurr.* graece iuxta Nannii editionem [Lovanii, 1541], pp. 45–77; *Apologia* latine Gesnero interprete, pp. 81–129; Gesneri *Annotationes in Apologiam*, pp. 131–154; *De resurr.* latine Petro Nannio interprete, pp. 157–189; Henrici Stephani *Annotationes* in utrumque Athenagorae librum, pp. 191–208]
- Ubaldi *Athenagora, La Supplica per i Cristiani*. Testo critico e commento di Paolo Ubaldi, Torino, [1920]. 2nd ed., Torino, 1933; 3rd ed. by Michele Pellegrino, Torino (Corona Patrum Salesiana, ser. Gr. 15), 1947
- Wilamowitz Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff ap. Ed. Schwartz

INTRODUCTION

1. THE DATE OF THE *PLEA*

Athenagoras' *Plea for Christians* is addressed to the *emperors* Marcus Aurelius and his son Lucius Aurelius Commodus (inscription). Commodus was officially proclaimed *imperator* on 27 November 176. Consequently, the *Plea* must have been composed after that date. On the other hand, Athenagoras states (1.19–20) that at present “the entire Empire is enjoying a profound *peace* thanks to your wisdom.” And the Roman Empire enjoyed such a brief period of peace between 176 and 3 August 178, when Marcus Aurelius and Commodus left Rome to embark on the Second Germanic expedition. That would leave the year 177 — with *pax aeterna* inscribed on the coins issued during that year — as the most likely date for the composition of the *Plea*, as it had been seen already in 1639.¹

Recently, T. D. Barnes,² followed by R. M. Grant,³ advanced the suggestion that Athenagoras “either delivered or intended to deliver his apology before the emperors when they were in Athens. The date will be September 176.” As a matter of fact, Marcus and Commodus (then fourteen) had visited Athens in the late summer of 176 and were initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries by L. Memmius in September of that year.⁴ But the point is that Commodus was promoted to *imperator* only in November of 176. We would have then to assume that Athenagoras “had anticipated” this promotion taking place in Rome some three months later, an assumption not likely to me when dealing with an obscure teacher of philosophy living at Athens. Hence my preference for the year 177.

The fact that Athenagoras' *Plea* was composed around 177 is of historical significance. First, it coincides with a second wave of persecutions of the Christians during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, witnessed to both by Celsus (writing his *Ἀληθῆς λόγος* around 178) and by the martyrdoms of

¹ Aub. Miraëus, *Bibl. ecclesiastica* (Antwerp, 1639) 180; esp. Io. Laur. Mosheim, “Dissertatio de vera aetate Apologetici Athenagorae pro Christianis,” *Bibl. Bremensis* Cl. II, Fasc. 1 (Bremen, 1718) 853 ff.; Karl Otto, *Athenagorae Opera* (C. A. C., VII, Jena, 1857; Reprint, 1969), pp. LXVI n. 2; LXXIV and nn. 2–3; Adolf Harnack, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten* usw. (T. U. I.1–2, Leipzig, 1882) 182 (leaving the possibility for the first half of 178 as well); and many others.

² “The Embassy of Athenagoras,” *J. T. S. N. S.* 26 (1975) 111–114.

³ “Four Apologists and Marcus Aurelius,” paper presented at the Tenth Internat. Conference on Patristic Studies (Oxford, 27 August 1987).

⁴ Cf., e. g., A. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* (Boston, 1966) 267 f.; Barnes, o. c., 114 n. 1.

Lyons of 177 (Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 5 Introduction and 5.1.1–5.4.3). The latter were most probably caused by Marcus' unfortunate legislation from the beginning of 177 – the *senatus consultum de pretiis gladiatorum minuendis* –, granting the councils of the *Tres Galliae* the right to purchase criminals condemned to death for use as gladiators, “on the cheap.”⁵ There is, however, no evidence that Athenagoras knew of these events in Gaul when writing his *Plea*.⁶

Secondly, the *Plea* coincides in time with the apologies of Melito of Sardis and Apollinaris of Hierapolis, both being addressed to Marcus Aurelius and both being composed around 175.⁷ Add to this Miltiades' lost “Apology for Christian Philosophy to the Cosmic Rulers” (Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* 5.17.5), where the cosmic rulers (cf. Jo 12:31) are either Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (161–169) or Marcus and Commodus (176–180), and the extant apology of Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycum*, composed probably around 181 A. D. (cf. 3.28).

In brief, this increased apologetic activity around the year 177 seems to be a direct consequence of the intensified persecutions of the Christians at the end of the reign of Marcus Aurelius. In this respect, Athenagoras' learned and eloquent *Plea* stands unique among the extant Greek and Latin apologies. For our “Philosopher and Christian” employs the full range of his philosophical (Platonic, Middle-Platonic, Stoic) erudition and Christian education, and the full force of his rhetorical skill to convince

⁵ Cf. J. H. Oliver and R. E. A. Palmer, “Minutes of an Act of the Roman Senate,” *Hesperia* 24 (1955) 320–349; M. Sordi, “I nuovi decreti di Marco Aurelio contro i cristiani,” *Studi Romani* 9 (1961) 365–378; Birley, o. c., 276–278; 328–331; P. Keresztes, “The Massacre at Lugdunum in 177 A. D.,” *Historia* 16 (1967) 75–86; Idem, “Marcus Aurelius a Persecutor?,” *Harvard Theol. Review* 61 (1968) 321–341.

⁶ The recurrence of the picturesque expression, Θυέστεια δείπνα καὶ Οἰδιπόδειοι μίξεις, “the Thyestean banquets and Oedipean intercourses,” as referring to the charges of cannibalism and incest often brought against the Christians, at *Legatio* 3.1–2 and Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 5.1.14, is best explained as deriving independently from the same source: compare the same expression at Tertullian *Ad nat.* 1.7.27, and Pliny may well have had in mind the charge of “Thyestean banquets” when defending the Christian *agape* as “food of an ordinary and innocent kind” (*Letters* 10.96.7, *ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innocuum*). Compare A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford, 1966) 707 f. — In addition, the Letter of the churches at Lyons and Vienne in Gaul to the Christian communities in Asia and Phrygia (Euseb. 5.1.14) agrees with Justin (2 *Apol.* 12.4) in asserting that slaves sometimes did indeed bring witness against their Christian masters, while Athenagoras categorically denies such cases (*Leg.* 35.6–7), ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτων οὐδεὶς καθ' ἡμῶν τὰ τηλικαῦτα οὐδὲ κατεφύεσται. Compare also R. M. Grant, “The Chronology of the Greek Apologists,” *Vig. Christ.* 9 (1955) 25–33 (esp. 29); L. W. Barnard, *Vig. Christ.* 21 (1967) 88–92; *Latomus* 31 (1972) 413–432.

⁷ Cf. Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* 4.26.1–10, as for Melito (esp. 4.26.7, οὐ σὺ διάδοχος εὐκαταῖος γέγονάς τε καὶ ἔση μετὰ τοῦ παιδός), and 4.26.1; 4.27.1, as for Apollinaris; Grant, o. c., 26 f.

by reasoning his imperial fellow-philosopher Marcus Aurelius. Needless to say, his effort was wasted: in referring to the “sheer fanaticism, partisanship or obstinacy” of the Christians in his *Meditations* (11.3, κατὰ φιλήν παράταξιν), Marcus only followed the traditional trend established by Pliny (*Letters* 10.96.3, *pertinacia et inflexibilis obstinatio*) and others.

2. THE CONTENT OF THE *PLEA*⁸

Introduction (1.1—2.40)

	<i>Point</i>	<i>Possible Source</i> ⁹
1.1—11:	The Roman Empire honors traditional religious practices of every city or people of the Empire, however ridiculous they may be (examples follow).	Apollodorus, Περὶ θεῶν, through a Hellenistic intermediary
1.12—15:	Only Atheism is not permitted, and rightly so. For, first, it is impious, and, second, it leads men to committing crimes out of a lack of fear for the divine.	Cf. Cicero <i>N. D.</i> 1.77; 1.118
1.17—20:	As a consequence, every individual and city of the Roman Empire enjoys equality before the law and a profound peace — thanks to the gentleness, love of peace, philanthropy, and political wisdom of your majesties.	

⁸ The following introductory and synoptic Outline of the *Plea* tries to ascertain probable or possible sources of inspiration for Athenagoras. It much owes to Geffcken's pioneering *Quellenforschung* on the *Legatio — Zwei griechische Apologeten* (Leipzig, 1907). For social and philosophical background of the *Plea* compare also: V. Monachino, “Intento pratico e propagandistico nell' apologetica Greca del II secolo,” *Gregorianum* 32 (1951) 3—49; A. J. Malherbe, “The Structure of Athenagoras, *Supplicatio pro Christianis*,” *Vig. Christ.* 23 (1969) 1—20; Idem, “Athenagoras on the Poets and Philosophers,” in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, I (Münster, 1970), 214—225; R. L. Wilken, “Toward a Social Interpretation of Early Christian Apologetics,” *Church History* 39 (1970) 437—458; L. W. Barnard, *Athenagoras: A Study in Second Century Christian Apologetic* (Théologie Historique, 18; Paris, 1972); Idem, “The Philosophical and Biblical Background of Athenagoras,” *Epektasis: Mélanges Jean Daniélou* (Paris, 1972) 3—16; W. R. Schoedel, *Athenagoras: Legatio and De Resurrectione* (Oxford, 1972) XI—XXV; Idem, “Christian ‘Atheism’ and the Peace of the Roman Empire,” *Church History* 42 (1973) 309—319; Idem, “In Praise of the King: Athenagoras,” in *Disciplina nostra: Essays in Memory of R. F. Evans*, ed. D. F. Winslow (Patristic Monogr. Series, 6; Cambridge, Mass., 1979) 69—93. — Still of great value is Aimé Puech, *Les apologistes grecs du II^e siècle de notre ère* (Paris, 1912) 172—206.

⁹ Space allows only for a selection of sources. Authors posterior to Athenagoras' *Plea* (A.D. 177) are mentioned to indicate either that both Athenagoras and the given passage may well derive from the same (lost) source or that the later author is dependent on Athenagoras.

- 1.21–40: Alas! With the only exception of us, the Christians. Out of all people we are the most pious and righteous both toward the divine and toward your rulership. And nevertheless, we are being abused, robbed, persecuted and slaughtered by the crowds — because of our name alone.
- 2.1–9: Yes, the unfounded rumors of the populace charge our *name alone*, for no Christian has yet been convicted of any crime. Therefore, it is your imperial duty to bring to an end by law false informations against us alone. Cf. 1 *Pt* 4:15–16; Pliny *Ep.* 10.96.2; Justin 1 *Apol.* 4.1–4
- 2.10–16: Your sense of justice must no longer tolerate your judges, who do not inquire whether a Christian is guilty of any crime. No, his mere name is sufficient for conviction. But no name is to be judged good or bad in and of itself, only good or bad deeds committed under that name.
- 2.17–27: Your wisdom and justice are well known to everyone, particularly to those who are defendants before you. Apply the same equity of yours to us, the Christians. Judge us on the ground of our deeds, not our name.
- 2.28–34: Take the lawsuits against philosophers. Their philosophy is blameless, it is their deeds that is to be judged. Accordingly, examine our conduct and leave our name alone.
- 2.35–40: As I begin my defense, greatest emperors, I must ask you to be impartial and not prejudiced by the unfounded rumors of the crowds. Cf. Justin 1 *Apol.* 3.1
- 3.1–15: They bring three charges against us: Atheism, “Thyestean banquets, Oedipean intercourses.” Who would believe this? Even the animals do not behave this way. But just examine our way of life, our teachings, our deep esteem for and obedience to your family and the Empire! Grant us the same favor which is enjoyed by our persecutors! And we shall win. Cf. Justin 1 *Apol.* 6.1 and 26.7; Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* 5.1.14

Christians are not guilty of Atheism (4.1–30.38)

- 4.1–11: What is Atheism? Diagoras was justly called atheist, for he openly declared that there is no God at all. But how can we be called atheists when we make a clear distinction between God

- and matter, between the uncreated and eternal divine principle (which can be grasped by reason alone), and the created and perishable matter. Justin *Dial.* 3.7; Albinus *Didasc.* 10.4
- 4.12–19: Why, the perfect order and harmony of the universe witnesses to the existence of one eternal God, the Creator of this universe. Aetius 1.6.2; Aristot. Fr. 12 Rose; Cicero *N. D.* 1.100; 2.15–17; 2.95
- 5.1–21: Pagan poets too were not regarded as atheists when speaking of one God, who can be known by reason alone. As, for example, Euripides (Fr. 941 Nauck). He recognized God from His works, since “the visible phenomena are an aspect of what is invisible.” Anaxagoras B 21a; Ps. Aristot. *De mundo* 399 b 21; *Rm* 1:19–20
- 6.1–8: The same is true of pagan philosophers. Philolaus spoke of one God, superior to the matter. Lysis and Opsimus envisaged God as Monad.
- 6.9–24: Plato too understood one, uncreated and eternal God, the Creator of the universe (*Tim.* 28 c 3–5). And he was not called atheist.
- 6.25–30: Aristotle believed in one God, a living being consisting of body and soul. His body are the moving celestial bodies, his soul is the unmoved reason, the cause of the body’s motion. Cf. Aetius 1.7.32
- 6.31–38: The Stoics as well considered God to be one, whatever his name may be (Fire, Zeus, Hera, etc.).
- 7.1–7: In conclusion, if both pagan poets and philosophers, and we, the Christians, coincide in believing in one God, why is it that *they* enjoy the freedom of speaking and writing about the divine being as they want, while a law has been imposed upon *us*?
- 7.8–20: But pagan poets and philosophers have come to the idea of one God by guesswork and approximation only. We have been guided, however, by the *prophets*, inspired by the Spirit coming from God, who moved their mouths just like a musical instrument. Plut. *De def. orac.* 436 F; Philo *Quis rerum div. heres* 259; *De spec. legg.* 1.65
- 8.1–7: We can prove by reasoning that God is one from the beginning. For if there were two or more gods from the beginning, they either would be in one and the same category (place) or each of them would stand separately. But they could not belong to one and the same category, for, being uncreated, they of necessity must be dissimilar.

For only created things are similar to their paradigms (ideas), while the uncreated ones are not.

- 8.8–12: If, on the other hand, somebody would suggest that God is one but composite (just as the human body is, consisting of such parts as hand, eye, foot), that would be equally impossible. For, unlike mortal men, God is uncreated, not subject to any change, indivisible: He then does not consist of any parts.
- 8.13–27: If, however, each god were in a separate place, and assuming that the God Creator of this world is above and around His creation, where would the other god or gods be? Above this world and its God, in or around *another* world? If so, then (1) he does not concern us at all; and (2), he cannot be powerful (for he would be in a circumscribed place). It follows that he does not exist at all.
- 8.28–34: Can such a god create anything, can he exercise providence? He can neither. Therefore, God the Creator of this world is from the beginning one and alone.
- 9.1–17: What is more important, the voices of the inspired prophets confirm our reasoning about one and omnipotent God (Bar 3:36; Is 44:6; 43:10–11; 66:1).
- 10.1–5: In brief, we cannot be atheists, since we believe in one God, uncreated, eternal, invisible, unchangeable, incomprehensible, infinite (who can be apprehended by mind and reason alone). He is encompassed by light, beauty, spirit and an indescribable power. Through the Word that issues from Him, He has created the universe, and now rules over it.
- 10.6–13: We believe also in a Son of God. He is the Word of the Father — *in form and energy*. From Him and through Him all things came into being (Jo 1:3; 1:10; 1 Cor 8:6; Col 1:15–17), as the Father and the Son are one (Jo 10:30; 17:11). The Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son (Jo 10:38) through the unity and power of the Spirit, the Son of God being the mind and reason of the Father.
- Philo *Legum alleg.* 2.2;
Albinus *Didasc.* 10.4
- (1) A Stoic criticism of Epicurean theology: cf. Cicero *N. D.* 1.101; 1.115
(2) Philo *Quod deus sit immut.* 57
- Cf. Nemesius *De nat. hom.* p. 347 M.
- Cf. Aristid. *Apol.* 1.4
- Cf. 1 Cor 1:24; Sap 9:9; Prv 8:22–25; Justin *Dial.* 61.1; Theophil. *Ad Autol.* 2.10; 2.22; Clem. *Strom.* 7.7.7