

ON THE TRANSFIGURATION OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST

St Anastasius I Patriarch of Antioch

OUR BENEFactor JESUS,¹ the good teacher who appeared in the world although he is also ¶11
God, said to his disciples, “If anyone wants to come after me, let him deny himself, and
lift up his cross, and follow me. For whoever would wish to save his life will lose it; but
whoever loses his life for my sake will find it. For how will a person profit, if he gains the
whole world, but loses his soul? Or what will a person give in exchange for his soul? For the Son of
Man will come in the glory of his Father with his holy angels; then he will repay each one according
to his works.”²

“IF ANYONE WISHES TO COME AFTER ME, let him deny himself.” That means: let him deny ¶12
every human concern; and not only that, but, like me, “Let him take up his cross, and
follow me.” We understand from his own words that Paul did this; not only was he
“crucified to the world, and crucified the world to himself,”³ but he changed the very
form of his life, no longer living as himself, moving and acting as a private agent. Rather, he had
Christ living and acting in himself. He disregarded himself completely, and putting his own will to
death, he subjected himself completely to the will of God. So that, if I might apply titles boldly, Paul
would rather be said to be Christ than to be a living being; for “his life was Christ.”⁴ So it is necessary
that those who want to belong to Christ walk behind him, and follow him. But since most of the
time two opposing wills exist in us, the godly and the human, and it is impossible to live without
them—or at least without one of them—it is clear that the person who is attached to one of them is
distant from the other, and vice versa. Anyone, then who wishes to make his way behind the Lord
will hate all human forms of willing; changing the former way of life he practiced, let him follow
[Christ] in this way, leaving himself behind, in a certain sense, and transforming all his soul’s powers.
For if a person truly wants to find his own soul, when it has been wandering among attractions to
the foolish things of life and the dream-like fantasies it promotes, he should first lose it, with regard
to the life by which he was involved in these things,⁵ and he will then find it as a wonderful discovery.
To the degree that he has an inclination towards the material world, however, he will not be able to
recognize the destructive state in which he exists.

Clearly, he will not need to seek that soul that has been lost, nor will he find it. For as there are
two forms of life, there are also two forms of death: one conformed to God, the other conformed
to the world. Paul says this clearly, speaking of “living for sin” and “living for righteousness.”⁶ So
there are two ways to lose one’s life: one that is reprehensible, the other praiseworthy. And as the

¹ The Greek text on which this translation is based, along with its chapter divisions, is that of the French Dominican, François Combéfis (1605–1679), as reprinted in PG 89.1361–1376. ² Matt 16.24–27. ³ Gal 6.14. ⁴ See Phil 1.21.

⁵ The Greek text of this phrase seems to be slightly incomplete. ⁶ See Rom 6.2.

person who lives for sin is dead as regards righteousness, so the opposite is true: the one who lives for righteousness is dead towards sin. So the person who follows the inclinations of the flesh walks in the way of flesh, and is lost as far as walking the way of the Lord is concerned. But the one who hates the flesh—the life which is really destruction—and who says powerfully, “I shall walk behind my God!” has turned from the way of destruction, gaining the praiseworthy life in place of what is reprehensible. For to be lost as far as the world is concerned is to be found for God, and to be found for the world is to be lost for God.

And what a foolish plan it is to find or gain the whole world, and to have it as one’s own possession, but to forfeit or lose one’s soul! For what can one give in exchange for one’s soul? Or what will a person give as a price to ransom it?⁷ No material thing is of equal value with the soul. Only the soul can be considered of equal value with itself—nothing else can ever be thought so. “For the Son is going to come,” receiving the power of judgment from the Father, “to give to each person recompense according to his works.”⁸ Then none of the circumstances of our lives will be able to do us any good; for we will all stand naked before the seat of judgment, deserted by what does not belong to us (and none of what surrounds us here is properly ours!). Books will then be opened to document the investigation, making clear, from what has been imprinted in our consciences, which it is that each of us has preferred to follow: the flesh or the spirit, Christ or the world—and also which form of losing our life we have chosen: that which comes from God, or that which comes from the world.

And when that dreadful, exact investigation takes place, “the one who receives authority to hold judgment because he is Son of Man,”⁹ will give appropriate recompense to everyone. “For he will come in the glory of his Father with the holy angels,”¹⁰ the spirits who minister to him; he will no longer be “without form or beauty,”¹¹ as he now appears in the world, but “more beautiful in appearance than other men,”¹² having changed his own body into a state of incorruptibility, and revealing it as substantially transformed into a spiritual and heavenly body at the time of resurrection. In this we already have a pledge of our own transformation, and of the reshaping of our own bodies. And that we might hold firmly to this invisible hope, he wishes to reveal even now, to a select group of disciples, the transformation that will then occur, “in a moment,” as Paul says, “and in the twinkling of an eye!”¹³ Therefore he says, “Amen, I say to you: there are some of those standing here who will not taste death until they see the Son of Man coming in his royal power.”¹⁴ And how this will happen, we learn from what follows.

“**A**ND IT HAPPENED THAT, after six days, Jesus took Peter and James, and John his brother, and led them up a high mountain by themselves; and Jesus was transfigured before them. His face shone like the sun, and his garments became white as snow. And behold Moses and Elijah appeared, speaking with him.”¹⁵ This should not be heard in a frivolous way, nor should the story be taken simply in what its words tell us, as if it revealed its meaning simply by its language; on the contrary, it signifies a carefully articulated introduction to the Mysteries,¹⁶ and a taste of the blessings that are going to exist for us after this life—or rather, not for us, but for the saints. Therefore, six days after making the promise, he fulfills what he had proclaimed to the disciples. The promise was that “there are some among those standing here, who will not taste death until they see the royal power of God,”¹⁷ the power destined to be revealed after

⁷ See Matt 16.26. ⁸ Matt 16.27. ⁹ John 5.27. ¹⁰ Matt 16.27. ¹¹ Is 53.2 (LXX). ¹² Ps 44 (45).3 (LXX). ¹³ I Cor 15.52. ¹⁴ Matt 16.28. ¹⁵ Matt 17.1–3. ¹⁶ The Greek word here is *mystagogia*. ¹⁷ Matt 16.28.

the consummation of this coarse material world. Therefore it was “after six days” that he took those who were to know the divine mysteries of the Kingdom before tasting death. After the six days comes the seventh, the holy day of rest, in which it is not possible to work, since God created heaven and earth in six days, and rested on the seventh, and made it holy.¹⁸ So that the promise was made on the first day, and the fulfillment of promise was realized, once again, on the first day.¹⁹ The number six, then, corresponds to this coarse present world, which is put together and made complete from its own days; [the number] is a sign of the process of birth, and has in itself male and female, whose combination brings about bodily birth.²⁰ But after them comes the seventh day, in due order, “in which they neither marry nor arrange marriage, but are like God’s angels in heaven.”²¹ Therefore the number seven is said to be virginal, like the Sabbath: holy, putting an end to all servile labor, and making everyone remain where they are, each in his own place.

AFTER THAT DAY HAD COME, he therefore took with him his three chosen disciples. It would not have made sense, after all, that Judas should become a visual sharer in these mysteries. Nor would it, on the other hand, have been right if he alone was left out of the vision, that this might not serve him as a justification of his betrayal, if he were to judge that the others had been chosen before him.²² Therefore, taking along only the three, “he led them up a high mountain.”²³ But what is higher than his glory? And he led them “by themselves.”²⁴ The life apart from material things is a solitary one. And “he led them” upwards from below; this is said not so much in a spatial sense, as in divine one: that is, he made them able to receive the shining of his light in a way far above their powers.²⁵ Then “he was transfigured before them.”²⁶ Once before, Jesus the Savior was transfigured, not before human beings but before his own Father, when “the one who was in the form of God did not consider being equal to God something to cling to, and he emptied himself, taking on the form of a servant.”²⁷ At that time, then, he concealed the divine form, being changed by the form of a servant; but now he restores the form of the servant to its natural appearance—not putting aside the substance of the servant, but making it radiant with divine characteristics. “He was transfigured before them,” then, showing them that in this way “he will someday transfigure the body of our lowliness, making it conform to the body of his glory.”²⁸ “And his face shone,” it says, “like the sun. And his garments became white as snow.” This is written, not because he is to be compared with the sun or with snow—for how can the incomparable be compared?—but because among material things nothing is more brilliant than the sun, or whiter than snow; so the author, wishing to establish, in a modest way, the matchless quality of his light and his whiteness, made this comparison by means of things familiar to us. And the radiance of his garments reveals the change that will take place in our bodies. For we became a covering for him, when he wrapped himself in our flesh. Perhaps the phrase “his face shone like the sun” hints, in a symbolic way, at the body that belonged peculiarly to him; but “his garments were as white as snow” refers to those who have been purified through him, by his transforming and life-altering power. For this reason, his spiritual garment is likened to snow, since snow itself is something transformed and vaporized—it becomes snow from water. And [to realize] that our nature will be, in the end, what his

¹⁸ See Gen 2.3. ¹⁹ Anastasius seems to mean that the fulfillment of God’s promise of life, made at the beginning of creation, was realized in the resurrection of Christ, which took place on the first day of the week, and was the beginning of a new creation. ²⁰ It is unclear how Anastasius finds a symbolic allusion to the differentiation of the sexes and to procreation in the number six. ²¹ Matt 22.30. ²² For this same argument justifying the choice of Peter, James, and John to be the sole witnesses of the transfiguration, see the homilies of Proclus of Constantinople, pp. 90–91, and Leontius the Presbyter of Constantinople, p. 125. ²³ Matt 17.1. ²⁴ Ibid. ²⁵ The vocabulary in this sentence reminds the reader of the Pseudo-Dionysius. ²⁶ Matt 17.2. ²⁷ Phil 2.6–7. ²⁸ Phil 3.21.

garment became, let us listen to Isaiah speaking to him by God's inspiration: "I am alive, says the Lord; for you will clothe yourself in all of them, and wrap them around you like a bride's veil."²⁹

“**H**E WAS TRANSFIGURED,” then, “and his face shone like the sun, and his garments became white as snow. And there appeared to them Moses and Elijah, speaking with him.”³⁰ The Apostles became more clear-sighted, since they had been led with Jesus up the mountain, and gradually recognized that Moses and Elijah were then talking with Jesus, having been transfigured along with him. For if they had not been transfigured with him, they would not be talking to him. But “they were speaking with Jesus,” according to Luke, “about the exodus that he was to accomplish in Jerusalem.”³¹ And the disciples heard from them things that they had failed to understand, when Jesus had formerly told them—as when Peter, thinking in a human way, rebuked Jesus for saying that he was going to be killed by men, and on the third day be raised from the dead. Moses and Elijah, then, as I have said, were speaking with Jesus: that is, the Law and the Prophets! When their words come to be transfigured, and the shadows of the Law are removed, then Moses will be believed as the faithful servant who wrote all of this about Christ, and he will present [Christ's] exodus clearly on the basis of his own words—the exodus that he was to fulfill in Jerusalem. But that some people inquire on what grounds, or how and from what signs, the disciples recognized the prophets,³² does not seem to me to be an appropriate question, or one worthy of investigation. For if they had advanced to such a height as to be thought worthy of a vision like this—a vision that the one who revealed himself to them, transfigured with the prophets, called the Kingdom of heaven—how could they be unable to recognize those who shared that Kingdom with him? Surely, too, the Apostles were prophets; and when prophets associate with prophets, they share one and the same knowledge—especially when Jesus is there, and enlightens the guiding core of their intellects, and forms their minds according to his own divine form.

“And Peter answered Jesus, and said, ‘Lord, it is good for us to be here. If you will, let us make three tabernacles here—one for you, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah.’”³³ Peter perceived what a difference lies between intelligible and sensible things, and he chose the better over the worse. Still, his knowledge of what he saw had not yet become perfect; otherwise he would not have thought about tabernacles in the intelligible world. And perhaps he was still worrying about his teacher, because of the death he had predicted, and the fact that those who had appeared were speaking about it with Jesus. For with one voice they spoke of that “exodus that was to occur in Jerusalem.”³⁴ Perhaps for this reason, [Peter] begged the teacher to remain there instead, and never to give himself to the Pharisees and Scribes who harbored envious thoughts against him. For perhaps he thought that no one who was plotting against him would come up to them on the mountain, and in any case it was impossible to be both in Jerusalem and somewhere else. “It is good, then, for us to be here with Moses and Elijah, rather than to go towards the unholy priests, the murderers of God.” But that he was unaware that by sparing the master he would become a block for the salvation of the world, Luke recognizes when he says, “He did not know what he was saying.”³⁵ And Mark says, “For

²⁹ Is 49.18 (LXX). ³⁰ Matt 17.2–3. ³¹ Luke 9.31. ³² One preacher who raises precisely this question is Timothy of Antioch, in the homily also translated in this collection. If Anastasius is thinking of Timothy here, this would be the only piece of strong evidence we have for dating Timothy to the mid-sixth century. See Krausmüller (n.1) 1–2 and n.3.

³³ Matt 17.4. ³⁴ Luke 9.31. ³⁵ Luke 9.33.

he did not know what he was saying,”³⁶ nor what he was thinking. Those who had gone up with Jesus took their stand in that high place.³⁷

¶16
“AND WHILE HE WAS STILL SPEAKING, behold, a luminous cloud overshadowed them, and a voice came out of the cloud, saying, ‘This is my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased. Listen to him.’ And when the disciples heard, they fell on their face and were much afraid. And Jesus came forward and touched them, saying, ‘Awake, and do not be afraid.’ And when they opened their eyes, they saw no one, except only Jesus.”³⁸ While Peter was still speaking words of affection towards his teacher, a luminous cloud from above overshadowed them, and a voice came out of the cloud, correcting Peter, and perhaps also his fellow disciples, who wanted the same thing as he did, and were asking to remain on the mountain, that they might not think any thoughts opposed to the beloved Son, but might listen to him and follow his will. For that is what works the salvation of all people. But we must investigate from similar sayings in Scripture how we must understand this cloud. For we find Moses, too, entering into the cloud, when it covered the mountain in the desert of Horeb; and it is attested that he entered into the darkness where God was.³⁹ Then also, at various times, when the cloud again covered the tent of meeting, God was heard speaking to Moses also there. And further, a pillar of cloud went ahead of the people, dewy by day and lit by fire at night. Isaiah, too, prophesies that the Lord would come to Egypt on a light cloud.⁴⁰ Again, we hear also of Solomon that when he had built the temple and consecrated it, a cloud filled the building, and the priests were unable to enter and carry out their sacred ministries, because of the appearance of the cloud.⁴¹ It is possible to gather these texts and more from the whole Scripture, to establish and clarify this idea before us, and to know what the cloud was that overshadowed those who had appeared, along with the visionaries, when the voice was heard that said, “This is my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased. Listen to him!”

¶17
WE ARE TO UNDERSTAND THAT THESE CLOUDS mentioned in Scripture are related to each other—or rather, we must not hesitate to say that they are all one thing. We should not think that the cloud is some vaporous exhalation from the earth, or an evaporation of water, or some condensation from the air, or anything airy at all, which is produced from bodily substance; rather, we should think of it as a knowledge of the divine nature, made accessible to us and reaching down to us, which it is more appropriate to call, as David does, [God’s] “splendor.”⁴² For since a grasp of the divine substance is beyond the power of those creatures who come to be and decay, it appears to us in ways that are possible, and in things that are less than divine but are close to it, just as God has spoken to us also through the prophets. So when we hear⁴³ a man saying, “I am the Lord your God,” we do not believe that the man—let us say, Isaiah—is God, but that the one speaking in him is God. Therefore, even if the voice, when it was heard, was the sound of a cloud, still it is clear that it was principally the Father’s voice, who was bearing witness to [Jesus’] sonship, through a rational nature that was close to him, and that had sounded out like

³⁶ Mark 9.6 (Anastasius uses the word *eipen* here; the Gospel manuscripts give a number of alternatives, but do not employ this word.) ³⁷ Reading *hypsēloterō*, rather than *hypsēloteron*, as in the printed text. It is hard to understand what Anastasius intends to add to the narrative by this sentence, unless he means “they took their stand” in a moral or psychological sense: they refused to move with Jesus towards the cross. ³⁸ Matt 17.5–8. ³⁹ Exod 24.18; Num 16.43–45. ⁴⁰ Is 19.1 (LXX). ⁴¹ II Chron 5.13–14. ⁴² E.g., Ps 144.3f. The word here is parallel to “glory”. ⁴³ Along with the original editor, Combéfis, we read here *akouontes*, “hearing,” for *akouontos*, which would have to be taken as modifying “a man saying.”

thunder.⁴⁴ For there are also clouds of a lower kind, which put forth a sound and are willing speakers of the Word, as in the text, “The clouds gave forth a voice.”⁴⁵ And they are enjoined not to pour rain down on the vines bearing clusters of grapes—the bodily house of Israel.⁴⁶ I say these clouds are the prophets, who rain down the word, and who water those who need something to drink. But this cloud surpasses all of them, and puts them all in its shadow—we might almost say, it takes provident care of them all.

“This,” then, the voice says, “is my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased. Listen to him!” It does not say, “my Son, who is well loved,”⁴⁷ but rather: “the Beloved.”⁴⁸ The one who is the Beloved is also loved; for the Beloved, surely, is this way by nature, but what is [simply] loved, is not so by nature, it seems, but in virtue of someone’s good pleasure.⁴⁹ The Son, then, being one individual, is both: Beloved Son and (if I may put it this way) a son loved by good pleasure, since he took on himself something of a different substance from what he was, and that which was not of the same substance was taken up in order to reveal a single hypostasis. The Father, then, revealed the otherness of the Son to us in his testimony: not separating what had been united (for how shall what God has unified be split apart?), but teaching the union of things that are different in nature, and pointing to him who is composed into one from these—his Son Christ the Lord, one Beloved Son, whom all creation finds pleasure in worshipping, and to whom [it delights] to listen.

WHEN THE APOSTLES HEARD THIS MAGNIFICENT SOUND, “they fell on their faces,” submitting to the voice that had sounded from on high, “and they were extremely afraid.”⁵⁰ Perhaps it was because of their previous unbelief, when they realized that they were thinking in a way opposed to the good pleasure of the Father, by trying to prevent the death of the Son, through which salvation was being prepared for all people, according to the ancient plan of the Father. But when they had become terrified, and were lying on the ground, “Jesus drew near, touched them, and said: ‘Get up, and do not be afraid.’”⁵¹ For it belonged to no one else to put that panic and fear to flight, but only to the Son, who always commands those who draw near to him to take courage.

IN OBEDIENCE TO HIS WORD, they raised their eyes, which had been bleared, perhaps, by fear. “And raising their eyes, they saw only Jesus.”⁵² This was as far as the mysterious revelation of the Kingdom of Heaven had advanced. “And as they were coming down the mountain, Jesus commanded them, saying, ‘Do not tell the vision to anyone, until the Son of Man has risen.’”⁵³ But why did he prevent them from disclosing what they had seen, and tell them not to reveal the mystery of the resurrection to anyone? Because it was necessary, first, that “the firstborn from the dead”⁵⁴ should rise, making the resurrection credible by his action; after that, the common resurrection of all would be made known through witnesses. For who would have believed what was said, if those recognized as Apostles did not believe it? Peter, after all, thought what was being said about the death of the Savior to be blasphemy, until he heard the voice sounding from above, bearing

⁴⁴ Anastasius’ idea seems to be that God had spoken here, testifying to Jesus’ sonship, by the medium of an angel, who was himself using the cloud as a material instrument. This same idea is proposed by St Augustine in *De Trinitate* III to explain the theophanies of the Old Testament. ⁴⁵ Ps 76.18 (LXX). ⁴⁶ Is 5.6. ⁴⁷ Greek: *ēgapēmenon*: “one who is loved.” ⁴⁸ Greek: *agapēton*: “one who is loveable”—i.e., who should be loved, the Beloved one. ⁴⁹ I.e., the one who loves another takes pleasure in that person, whether or not that pleasure is justly derived. Anastasius is playing here on the distinction between the quality of being “loveable” or “dear,” which is signified by the same Greek word—*agapētos*—as the English word “Beloved,” and the fact of being the object of someone’s choice. This distinction is not easily captured in modern English. ⁵⁰ Matt 17.6. ⁵¹ Matt 17.7. ⁵² Matt 17.8. ⁵³ Matt 17.9. ⁵⁴ Col 1.18.

witness to the “Beloved Son” and commanding obedience to him. For the voice said “Listen to him”—consider everything said by him to be a firm law! It was necessary, then, for him to command the disciples to keep what they had seen to themselves, until the time when he should go ahead of them to defeat death in hand-to-hand combat, so that those who heard might not form a habit of disbelieving what was told them [by the Apostles]. For after the resurrection of the first-born [from the dead], they spoke out boldly, making public the resurrection of all people, and their transformation from clumsy bodies into spiritual ones: teaching everyone that just as “Christ, risen from the dead, will not die again, and death has no power over him,”⁵⁵ so he will configure us to his glory, and transform our bodies into something spiritual and incorruptible.⁵⁶ And if “we walk in newness of life,”⁵⁷ “we shall be taken up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and thus we shall always be with the Lord,”⁵⁸ to whom be glory and strength, unto the ages of ages. Amen.

ANASTASIOS I OF ANTIOCH

This homily (CPG 6947) is one of several attributed to “Saint Anastasios,” who today is understood by most scholars to be Patriarch Anastasios I of Antioch. Originally from Palestine, he is said in some ancient sources to have been a monk of Sinai—probably through confusion with Anastasios of Sinai, the Chalcedonian theologian who lived half a century and more later. After having served as ambassador (apocrisiarius) of the Church of Alexandria in Antioch, he was appointed Patriarch of the latter Church by Justinian I in 558 or early 559, a time of political and military tension in Western Syria. Throughout his long reign, Justinian had promoted official adherence to the Christological decree of Chalcedon, but had sought for avenues of rapprochement with those who opposed it and clung to what seemed to be the more clearly unitive formulas of Cyril of Alexandria. Anastasios was a defender of the Chalcedonian synthesis proposed by the Council of Constantinople in 553, but was clearly uncomfortable with the position taken by Justinian towards the end of his life in his “Edict to the Romans,” in which he seemed to endorse the view that the human nature of Jesus was the perfect nature of Adam before the fall, free from both moral and physical corruptibility: the so-called “aphthartist” position, which prominent Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians alike had rejected.

In 570, however, five years after Justinian’s death, Anastasios was deposed by Emperor Justin II because of his suspected opposition to the Emperor’s policy of seeking reunion with those who rejected Chalcedonian Christology, and was brought to live in Constantinople. For a few years, he was not permitted access to any books, even to his own earlier writings. Things gradually eased for him, however, and, thanks to the intervention of the future Pope Gregory the Great, whom he came to know personally during the ensuing decade in the imperial capital when Gregory was the papal legate there, Anastasios was restored to his see in 593, and died in Antioch, still Patriarch, in 598. An opponent also of the tritheism of the Alexandrian John Philoponus, Anastasios is the probable author of a number of short treatises and fragments. (See the account of his life and works by Stergios N. Sakkos, *Περὶ Ἀναστασίων Σιναιτῶν* [Thessaloniki: University Press, 1964] 44–86.) He also is the author of a number of festal

⁵⁵ Rom 6.9. ⁵⁶ See Phil 3.21. ⁵⁷ Rom 6.4. ⁵⁸ I Thess 4.16.

homilies, some still unedited, which probably were given during one of his periods of patriarchal residency in Antioch. Although his authorship of this sermon (CPG 6947) has been questioned, G. Weiss, who has carefully studied the works attributed to Anastasius, concludes that he can find no conclusive argument against his authorship (*Studia Anastasiana* 1 [Munich, 1965] 91–94).

The homily on the Transfiguration is a straightforward piece of moral and narrative reflection on the Gospel passage in Matthew; there is little in it by way of rhetorical flourish or figural exegesis, and no reference to a festal liturgy celebrating the Transfiguration. It does, however, emphasize a classic Chalcedonian understanding of Christ in its exegesis of the words, “This is my Son, the Beloved, (c. 8). It also suggests that the resurrection of the body is, for all human beings, the fulfillment of God’s original plan of creation. The homily follows the text of Matthew’s account of the incident closely, generally giving simple explanations for the Gospel’s words. For an analysis of Anastasius’ understanding of the glorified human body in this sermon, see Dirk Krausmüller, “The Real and the Individual: Byzantine Concepts of the Resurrection (1),” *Golden Horn* 5.1 (1997).⁵⁹

⁵⁹ This Biography and sermon text are taken from: Daley, Brian E.: *Light on the Mountain: Greek Patristic and Byzantine Homilies on the Transfiguration of the Lord* (Popular Patristics Series Book 48) (pp. 113–125). Kindle Edition.