

Fragments of a letter of Eusebius of Caesarea to Euphratius of Balanea (*Dok. 10*)

Reference	<i>Dok. 10; Urk. 3; CPG 3500</i>
Incipit	Τῷ δεσπότῃ μου κατὰ πάντα
Date	c. 320-323
Ancient sources	Par. 1-3: Second Council of Nicaea (787), Actiones 5-6 Par. 4-5: Eusebius, <i>Contra Marcellum</i> 1.4.40-41, 57.
Modern editions	Par. 1-3: ACO2 3:560-562, 736 Par. 4-5: GCS 14:26, 29 AW 3.1:4-6

During the Seventh Ecumenical Council of AD 787 (see intro to *Dok. 9*), the theology of Eusebius of Caesarea was questioned. During the fifth session (*actio*), two sections of Eusebius's otherwise lost letter to Euphratius were read out. In the sixth session, two shorter quotes were read. Opitz (without explanation) put the longer citation from the sixth session between the two quotes of session 5, and seemingly ignores the shorter one. AW 3.3.86-87 follows this. The latter also follows Opitz in adding a section from Eusebius's *Contra Marcellum* 1.4.40-41 in which Marcellus is quoting Eusebius, although the context does not mention Euphratius. There is no way to date this letter any more precisely than to say it comes from the middle of the controversy, Brennecke's "second phase" when the controversy had expanded outside Egypt.

The Greek texts below are taken from Lamberz's edition of the Second Council of Nicaea (ACO, Series 2, 3:560, 562 and 736), and Hansen and Klostermann's edition of *Gegen Marcell* (*Eusebius Werke* 4, GCS 14, 2nd edn. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972), 26 and 29. The FCC translation below is by Aaron West and Glen Thompson. See also the recent translations of R. Price *Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea (787)*, TTH 68, 403-404 and 513, and that of K. Spoerl, *Against Marcellus and On Ecclesiastical History* (FC 135; Washington: Cath. Univ. of America Press, 2017), 108-109, 114.

This work is licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

<i>Conc. Nicaenum II, Actio 5</i>	
1. [Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου πρὸς Εὐφρατίωνα οὗ ἡ ἀρχή·]	A letter of Eusebius of Pamphylia to Euphratius. It begins as follows:
Τῷ δεσπότῃ μου κατὰ πάντα <χάριν> ὁμολογῶ.	I confess to my lord by every grace.
[καὶ μεθ' ἑτέρα·]	[And it continues later:]
Οὐ γὰρ συνυπάρχειν φαμέν τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρί, προϋπάρχειν δὲ τὸν πατέρα τοῦ υἱοῦ. ἐὰν γὰρ συνυπάρχωσι, πῶς ἔσται ὁ πατήρ πατήρ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς	For we do not say that the Son is coexisting with the Father, but instead that the Father existed before the Son. For if they coexisted, how could

υιός; ἢ πῶς ὁ μὲν πρῶτος, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος, καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀγέννητος, ὁ δὲ γεννητός; δύο γὰρ ἐξ ἴσου ὁμοίως ἀλλήλοις συνυπάρχοντα ἰσότημα ἂν νοοῖντο καὶ ἥτοι ἄμφω, ὡς ἔφην, ἀγέννητα ἢ ἐκάτερα γεννητά. ἀλλ' οὐδέτερον τούτων ἀληθές· οὔτε γὰρ τὸ ἀγέννητον οὔτε τὸ γεννητὸν <ἀμφότερον> ἂν εἴη. ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν καὶ πρῶτον καὶ κρεῖττον καὶ τάξει καὶ τιμῇ τοῦ δευτέρου ἡγεῖται, ὡς ἂν καὶ τοῦ εἶναι καὶ τοῦ τοιῶσδε εἶναι τῷ δευτέρῳ αἴτιον γεγενημένον.	the Father be a father, and the Son be a son? Or how could one indeed be the first, and the other second? And how could one be unbegotten and the other begotten? For the two, if they are equal, likewise exist mutually and are honored equally, one must conclude that either they are both unbegotten or both begotten, as I have said, but it is clear that neither of these is true. For they are neither both unbegotten nor both begotten. For one is indeed the first and best and leads to/precedes the second, both in order and in honor, so that he is the occasion for the second's existing and for his existing in this particular way.
<i>Actio 6, p. 736</i>	
Οὐ γὰρ συνυπάρχειν φαμέν τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρί, προϋπάρχειν δὲ τὸν πατέρα τοῦ υἱοῦ. πλὴν αὐτὸς ὁ πάντων μᾶλλον ἀκριβῶς ἐπιστάμενος υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἕτερον ἑαυτὸν εἰδὼς τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μείω καὶ ὑποβεβηκότα, εἴ μάλα εὐσεβῶς τοῦτο καὶ ἡμᾶς διδάσκει λέγων· “ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με μείζων μου ἐστι.”	2. For the Son of God himself, who quite clearly knows all things, knows that he is different from, less, and inferior to the Father, and with full piety also teaches us this when he says, “The Father who sent me is greater than me” [John 14:28].
καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα· Ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς μὲν θεὸς ὁ υἱός, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀληθινὸς θεός.	
<i>Actio 5, p. 560-562</i>	
3. [Καὶ ἀνεγνώσθη ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπιστολῆς·]	3. [And it is also written in the same letter:]
Τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ καὶ μόνον ἀληθινὸν εἶναι διδάσκει δι' ὧν φησιν· ἵνα “γινώσκωσι σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν,” οὐχὶ ὡς ἐνὸς ὄντος μόνου τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐνὸς ὄντος μόνου ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ προσθήκης ἀναγκαιοτάτης τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ. ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς μὲν θεὸς ὁ υἱός, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀληθινὸς θεός· εἷς γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ μόνος ἀληθινὸς θεὸς διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ τινα. εἰ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ἀληθινός, ἀλλ' ὡς εἰκὼν τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ εἴη ἂν καὶ θεός· ἐπεὶ “καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος,” οὐ μὴν ὡς ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸς θεός.	But he teaches that that one [the Father] is alone true when he says, “that they may know you, the only true God” [John 17:3], not as if one only is God, but that one is the (only) true God, with the very necessary addition of ‘true.’ For also he himself is Son of God, but not true, as God is. For there is but one true God, the one before whom nothing existed. But if the Son himself is true, it is simply as an image of the true God, and he is God, for [Scripture says] “and the Word was God” [John 1:1], but not as the only true God.