

The Letters Of Saint Athanasius Concerning The Holy Spirit to Bishop Serapion

From the translation with introduction and notes by C.R.B. Shapland, originally published Epworth Press, 1951.

A Note On This Edition

This is an electronic edition of CRB Shapland's original translation of the Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit. Shapland's translation is currently out of print, but his family have kindly given permission for it to be released for free online without charge. The copyright remains with the Shapland family.

There is only one major change in this electronic edition to Shapland's original translation. Unfortunately in the process of scanning and cleaning up this book for publication, Shapland's footnotes did not make it. This is something of a tragedy as the footnotes were useful in explaining the details of the text. Hopefully at some point I will update this edition to contain the footnotes. In the meantime you can see them in the original in a scan here: <https://archive.org/details/TheLettersOfSaintAthanasiusConcerningTheHolySpirit>.

The preface and introductory notes that Shapland informatively put in his edition remain in this one. The only minor change I've introduced to the body of the text is splitting Epistles II and III. In Shapland's version he joins these two together (for reasons which he explains in his introductory notes). For ease of reading and for ease of eBook use, I've split them into two separate epistles. For any corrections or errors or queries, please contact mark@iamsparticus.com

Mark Walley - 7th July 2014

Original Dedication

To the
Memory of
MY FATHER
R. H. B. Shapland

PREFACE

It is strange and sad that these letters of Athanasius on the Holy Spirit have had to wait so long for translation into English. They are indeed only the first and most important of a whole series of Patristic writings on the same subject which require the same service. I am very grateful to the Trustees of the Hort Memorial Fund for a generous grant which has helped to make possible this small contribution in a neglected field of study. I had hoped to prepare a text to go with the translation, but the task proved too great for my resources both in time and skill. It would indeed have been impertinent for me to try to anticipate a further stage in the great edition of the text of Athanasius which is being made under the sponsorship of the Kirchengvater-Kommission of the Prussian Academy. All students of Athanasius are looking forward to the completion of this work; and all will desire to pay homage to Hans Georg Opitz, upon whose brilliant critical studies it is based and whose death in 1941 deprived the editors of a most zealous and learned collaborator. The present work was completed and in the hands of the printers before the excellent French translation of these letters, by Professor Jules Lebon of Louvain University, appeared. It is gratifying to find my opinion on a number of points confirmed by so distinguished an authority. I cannot, however, agree with him when he maintains the unity of the fourth letter as it is contained in the Paris MSS. R and S. The arguments of Stuelcken and Opitz seem to me to be conclusive on this point. My indebtedness to those who have gone before me, notably to Newman and Robertson, will be obvious on every page of the introduction and commentary. Thanks are due to the authorities at many libraries both in this country and on the Continent who have readily and courteously granted whatever facilities were asked of them. The Rev. H. G. Meecham, D.D., Principal of Hartley-Victoria College, Manchester, and other friends have helped with advice and suggestions. But, above all, two debts are outstanding. The first is to the Rev. R. Newton Flew, D.D., Principal of Wesley House, Cambridge, who first suggested this subject to me, without whose encouragement and criticism I could never have carried it through. The second I owe to the Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge, the Rev. W. Telfer, D.D., who read the work upon its completion and made many helpful suggestions and criticisms.

C. R. B. Shapland

INTRODUCTION

THE LETTERS

In the Benedictine edition of Montfaucon, the correspondence of Athanasius with Serapion concerning the Holy Spirit is arranged in four letters. There is every reason to believe that this is not the original form of the material. To begin with, the fourth letter, as Montfaucon gives it, clearly falls into two parts: 1—7, which is the final letter of this correspondence, and 8-23, which is an exposition of Matthew 12:32 and has no connexion with it at all. In uniting them, Montfaucon follows his usual authorities, the Paris MSS.R and S. But the collection of twenty-eight works, found in the BKA and UWL groups, preserves IV. 8-23 as a separate treatise; while 1—7 is not found in the collection at all. Even in RS a marginal note preserves what appears originally to have been a title to 8-23. Moreover, internal evidence confirms the independence of these chapters. No reference is found there to the controversy with the Tropicci. It is the Arian blasphemy against the Son that forms the target for Athanasius's exposition. Indeed, *nvev/ia dyiov* in Matthew 12:32 is taken to refer not to the Holy Spirit at all, but to the Godhead of Christ as opposed to His humanity. This is the more striking inasmuch as he has already, in 1.33 and III. 7, taken the words in the usual sense and applied the passage to the Tropicci. We may safely conclude, therefore, that IV. 8-23 belongs to an earlier period in Athanasius's ministry. RS show abundant traces of literary editing; and no doubt the redactor responsible was led by the citation of Matthew 1 232 in these letters, together with the likeness between the opening of Ep. I and IV.8, to tack on 8-23 as a sort of appendix to the correspondence.

A further problem arises with regard to the relation of I, II, and III. In the collection of twenty-eight works referred to above, I and II stand together, but III and IV are not included. These letters reach us through another collection, which Opitz calls the 'middle corpus'. As these collections can be traced back to the sixth and seventh centuries, and as the edition represented by RS is ultimately derived from them, it is obvious that this division is very ancient. There is other evidence to show that I and II were, at an early date, closely connected. Severus of Antioch, c. *Impium Grammaticum*, fr.168b, quotes from II.8 as though it belonged to the first letter; and the two are counted as one work in the Armenian corpus. Moreover, the title of II in RS is found in the margin of B, which would suggest that it existed first as a marginal gloss. But when we come to examine the contents of the letters, it is obvious that II is far more closely connected with III than with I. In answer to a request from Serapion, Athanasius promises (II.I) that he will abridge the contents of I. Instead, however, he goes on to give a statement of the doctrine of the Son. Now the explicit reference to the Spirit in II.I makes it certain that Athanasius is referring to the preceding letter, and not, as Felckmann supposed, to c. *Arianos*, I— III. In any case, II is not a summary of that work or of any other. In III.1 he explains why he has begun by giving an account of the Son, and goes on to make the promised abridgement of Ep. I. Thus III.I takes up the promise made at the beginning of II. The conclusion of II, moreover, is very abrupt, and there is no doxology. As Montfaucon saw, this makes it very probable that originally II and III were one letter containing a brief statement of Athanasius's teaching on the Trinity. But as II formed by itself a short and self-contained exposition of the *ὁμοούσιον* it was detached from III (which adds

nothing at all to the contents of I) and incorporated with I in the collection of twenty-eight works.

Thus the correspondence originally consisted of three letters. In the first, Athanasius takes cognisance of the new heresy and answers its arguments as Serapion has described them. He deals firstly with the passages of Scripture to which they appeal, notably Amos 4:13 and 1 Timothy 5:21 (3—14). He then turns to an argument based on the relationship of the three divine Persons. If the Spirit proceeds from the Father, He must be the Son's brother. If He belongs to the Son, the Father is His grandfather. Turning to the alternative, that the Spirit is a creature, he shows that the ministry and operation of the Godhead is one, hence the Godhead Himself must be one (15-21). There follows an examination of Scripture to show that the Spirit belongs to God and not to the creatures (21-7). The letter ends with an appeal to tradition (28), a discussion of the consequences for faith of regarding God as dyad rather than as Triad (29-30), and further texts.

II—III is designed for a wider purpose than that suggested to Athanasius by Serapion. II. 1—9 contains a summary of the doctrine of the Son, using the same arguments applied in I to the Spirit, and with an exposition of the *ὁμοούσιον* (3), and of Proverbs 8:22 and of Mark 13:32. III. 1-7 is a summary of 1.22-33.

In III, Athanasius makes no allusion to the argument of the Tropici outlined and answered in I.15-21. Serapion, in announcing the persistence of the heresy, draws his attention to this omission, and Athanasius remedies it by writing IV. 1-7, which is, however, an independent work rather than a summary of the corresponding section in I. The authenticity of these letters has not been disputed by any modern student of Athanasius. Erasmus, however, in his translation, treats III and IV only as genuine. He adds a version of I as a kind of appendix to the other works, with the following comment:

“Salvo et integro doctorum iudicio, ego censeo hoc opus esse hominis otiosi, nulloque ingenio praediti, qui voluerit imitari divi Athanasii libellos ad Serapionem. Hie mira congeries locorum et rationum confusio, molestissimaque semel dictorum iteratio”.

He adds a further note at the conclusion to the effect that I is followed in the MS. by another *“libellus: i eiusdem phraseos, quern piguit vertere.”* Such hasty and subjective criticism was characteristic of Erasmus. We may compare his rejection of the conclusion of Basil's *de Spiritu Sancto*. In this case he receives a merited castigation from Montfaucon. That the style of these letters is heavier and less attractive than that of Athanasius's best works will readily be admitted. But it must be remembered that it was written under very difficult circumstances, and that the writer himself regards it as needing correction and polish. Parts of it are little more than a series of Scriptural quotations. As Montfaucon says, to complain of a stiff and heavy style in the handling of such material, *“I idipsum sit quod nodum in scirpo quaerere”* If further proof is needed, the reader is referred to the notes, which illustrate at many points the close connexion in thought and language between these letters and the other works of Athanasius.

Apart from isolated references in later works, we cannot be certain that Athanasius ever wrote anything further on the doctrine of the Spirit. Few genuine works survive from the last decade of his ministry. Had we, for instance, his correspondence with Basil, the story might be different. As it is, two works which Montfaucon thinks genuine and dates after 362 fall to be considered. The *de Incarnatione et contra Arianos* deals with the Godhead of the Spirit, 9-10 and 13-19; and the *de Trinitate et Spiritu Sancto*, which survives only in Latin, is chiefly a series of proof texts in support of that doctrine. The two works are closely connected; without being a transcript, one of them is clearly dependent upon the other. 8 The *de Incarnatione et contra Arianos* is attested by Theodoret, *Dialogus* II, and by Gelasius, *de Duabus Naturis*, but there are serious objections to its authenticity. The external evidence for *de Trinitate et Spiritu Sancto* is not good. It is found in two Paris MSS., tacked on to a Latin confession of faith which is itself an appendix to eight *Libelli de Trinitate*, bearing the name of Athanasius, but being in fact Latin works credited by Montfaucon to one Ilatius, and by others to Vigilius Tapsensis. On the other hand, it is certainly from the Greek, and it must be earlier than 380. The opening section is very close to the beginning of *ad Ser.* I, as far as language goes, and 2-5 have affinities with I.13-14. As far as we can judge from the indifferent rendering, the style has something of Athanasius's vigour, and some characteristic turns of phrase are to be found. But the impression made by a study of both the works is that their exegesis of passages relating to the Spirit belongs with that of Didymus rather than with the exegesis we find in these letters. It is not merely that we find passages such as Acts 5:3-4, 13:1-4, Matthew 12:28 and Luke 11:20 used as they are used in his *de Spiritu Sancto*. The characteristic Athanasian approach to the doctrine of the Spirit through that of the Son is abandoned, and we have an exposition that correlates in great detail the attributes and activities of all three Persons. It is, of course, not impossible that Athanasius should have anticipated these later developments; not impossible that he should have advanced to the use of πρόσωπον in a sense approximate to that of the Latin *persona*. The question can only be settled after a thorough study of the work. Until then the verdict of Robertson 17 and Stuelcken must stand and the *de Trin. et Sp. S.* be regarded as one of the 'dubtia'.

DATE OF THE LETTERS

The beginning, at least, of this correspondence falls within the third exile of Athanasius, between February 356 and the death of Constantius, November 361. If, as is almost certain, Patrophilus is referred to in IV.7, then that letter was probably written not much later than the spring of 361

From Epiphanius, *Haer.* lxxiii.26, we learn that one Ptolemaeus was present at Seleucia in 359 as bishop of Thmuis. Were we entitled to assume from this that Serapion was by this time dead, the problem of dating these letters would be easier. But it is no less likely that he had been exiled or merely deprived. Moreover, there is some evidence to show that he was alive after this date. In *ps.* Leontius, *adv. Fraudes Apollinaristarum*, there is a fragment of a letter from Apollinarius to Serapion commending a communication sent by Athanasius to Corinth on the Christological question. This can only refer to *ad Epictetum*. Unfortunately the date of this work is doubtful. Raven puts it as early as 360 or 361, Robertson in 364, and

Lietzmann in 370. But even if Raven be right, and the statements in *ad Epictetum* answer to the account of the Council of Ariminum given in *de Syn.*, Serapion cannot have been dead by the autumn of 359. As it is, the evidence we have points to a later rather than an earlier date in the exile.

(i) Athanasius was in the desert, eagerly sought for by his enemies (I.1). Apparently Athanasius did not really retire from Alexandria until late in 358. The Festal Index speaks of him as concealed in the city during 357-8. In the late summer of the latter year feeling was running so high against the Arians that George was ejected, and the Orthodox actually regained possession of the churches for a few weeks. Then the attitude of the authorities stiffened, and in December Sebastian entered Alexandria. The *Fest. Ind.* (xxxii) speaks of a search for Athanasius conducted by Artemius in 359-60. We know that his inquiries extended as far as Tabenne. It seems most likely that Athanasius is here referring to his activities.

(ii) Athanasius does not need to add anything to what he has already written against the Arians (1.2). This must mean that c. *Ar.* I— III had already been written and circulated. If this work is to be assigned to the third exile, as the older commentators thought, we have an additional reason for putting back the date of these letters. But Stuelcken (pp. 46-50) has given very cogent reasons for putting their composition much earlier, and Loofs would put it back perhaps as far as 338. But, even so, the literary output of the first two years of the exile, bearing in mind the circumstances, was very considerable, and makes it less likely that these letters were started before the second half of 358.

(iii) The letters are written against certain persons who had left the Arians. It is not stated when this defection occurred, and changes of side were frequent throughout the whole period. But it is at least plausible to assume that it had taken place no long time before Serapion wrote to Athanasius. Such a movement away from Arianism is best connected with the reaction against George's misrule in September-October 358.

(iv) The mention of the 'Eunomii' in IV.5 points in the same direction. During his visit to Alexandria, 356-8, Eunomius appears to have occupied a very subordinate position as Aetius' secretary. It was only later, after his departure to Antioch, that he came to the front as an Anomoean leader.

(v) Finally, we have to consider the relation between these letters and the *de Synodis*. The emphasis upon the personal subsistence of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in I.28; the stringent qualification of *ὁμοιουσ* in II.3 *init.*; and the interpretation given to the *ὁμοούσιον* there, suggesting the equality rather than the unity of the three Persons: these points suggest that the mind of Athanasius was already responding to the impulse that inspired the *de Synodis*. The reference to Eudoxius Acacius and Patrophilus in IV.6 and 7 also suggests a parallel with that work, for these three names are equally prominent there. This does not, of course, mean that these letters necessarily follow the *de Synodis*. Nor can we be certain at what

date Athanasius became aware of the possibility of a rapprochement with Basil of Ancyra and the rest. But it certainly suggests that no long time separates them.

We therefore conclude that the letters can scarcely have been begun before the summer of 358; that much of the evidence leads us to put them several months later in 359 or early in 360. It is less likely that they were written at any later date. It does not seem possible to reach a more definite conclusion.

WHO WERE THE TROPICI?

As Athanasius observes at the beginning of these letters (I.2), the Arian doctrine of the Son necessarily involves that the Spirit is a creature. If the Son differs in essence from the Father, so likewise must the Spirit. If the Second Person in the Trinity had a beginning, how much more the Third! If the Son is capable of moral progress and declension, then the Spirit also is holy, not by nature and essence, but by grace.

Yet the issue was not debated in the earlier stages of the controversy. The Creed of Nicaea stopped abruptly at the words: 'and in the Holy Spirit.' How far Arius himself took account of the Spirit in his doctrine is doubtful. The indications are that he only treated the subject incidentally. His silence, if silence it was, need not be attributed to policy. Arianism only followed the line of development taken by Monarchianism. It was inevitable that the new heresy should first be formulated in terms of the Son of God, and that the controversy should spend its first strength about that centre.

But the issue could not indefinitely be avoided. Moreover, the first half of the fourth century saw a revival of interest in the office and work of the Spirit, which, under the influence of asceticism, began to recover from the neglect into which the development of the Logos doctrine in the second century had brought it. The first stirrings of this revival can already be noticed in Methodius; further evidence comes later in the synodal pronouncements of the period and in the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem. Both creeds and lectures were predominantly the work of Conservatives, and we observe in them a clear and deliberate attempt to avoid any inquiry into the Spirit's Person and origin. But the emphasis laid upon His teaching and sanctifying ministry must have stimulated more interest in His Person than Cyril's admonitions suppressed. How soon Arian propaganda turned its attention to the subject we cannot say. There are some indications that Asterius touched on it. Certainly, when writing these letters, Athanasius takes it for granted that both Homoeans and Anomoeans call the Spirit a creature.

But it may well have been that the first shots in the engagement were fired from the Nicene camp. Marcellus not only brought the Spirit within the scope of his theological system, but developed a doctrine of His double procession, from the Son as well as from the Father; and used it to prove that the Father and the Word cannot eternally be two hypostases. Eusebius tries to refute him by showing: firstly, that John 15:26 etc. refer only to the mission and not to the procession of the Spirit; secondly, that the same Gospel clearly asserts the hypostasis of the Spirit; thirdly, that the Spirit is in fact the creature of the Son. For this last point he

reproduces Origen's exegesis of John 1:3 from his Commentary (11.10). It was perhaps inevitable that this particular exposition should be brought out at some stage of the controversy. But it was none the less disastrous, and it is an indication of the mediocrity of Eusebius's mind. Not only does he ignore the hesitation and reserve with which Origen offers this interpretation, he wrenches it out of its proper context in the subtly balanced theology of that great thinker, wherein the Word — and, by implication, the Spirit — mediates between God and His creation. Worst of all, he hurls it into a controversy which could never have arisen at all had not the system of Origen been thrown over and a line drawn between God and the creature such as he never drew. To him *γενητόν*, as applied to the Spirit, indicates origination, dependence, distinction. To Arius and Athanasius it signifies 'otherness'.

What consequences had this passage of arms in the subsequent course of events? It may well explain Athanasius's bitter reference to 'the Eusebii' in IV.6 He probably knew the *Ecc. Theol*; and personal considerations disposed him to see Eusebius as an angel of darkness rather than as a muddle-headed old man. Hereafter, we shall discover reasons for thinking that the theology of Marcellus influenced him, albeit negatively. Conservative opinion in the East must have been scandalized and alarmed by Marcellus's views upon the Spirit scarcely less than by his doctrine of the Son. But probably the incident is significant as symptom rather than as cause. After all, there is no reason to think that the generality of the bishops were theologically less obtuse than Eusebius. Loofs, indeed, fails to make sufficient allowance for the complexities of the case when he speaks of the Macedonian doctrine as 'the old tradition unaffected by Nicaea'. By 'tradition' he can only mean the doctrine of Origen; and this, as we have seen already, was really a tension of opposites only capable of reconciliation within its own theological framework. There are signs that Theognostus and Pierius modified it in the direction afterwards taken by the Macedonians. But it is no less probable, as far as the scanty evidence goes, that (as with the doctrine of the Son) other impulses were drawing it in an opposite direction. At any rate, the insistence on the eternity and uncreatedness of the Spirit in the Confession of Gregory Thaumaturgus and in the Origenistic tract *de Recta Fide* is of interest. Significant too in this connexion is the fact that Basil, self-confessed disciple of Gregory, writing in 360, at a time when he could hardly have been influenced by these letters, finds no difficulty in extending the *ὁμοούσιον* to the Spirit. But, none the less, as the hypostasis of the Spirit gained universal and conscious acceptance, and men were forced to think of Him as a Person in personal relation with the Father and the Son, there must have been many who found it easier to regard Him as a creature possessed of unique dignity and power, or as an intermediate being, neither God nor creature. And, no doubt, there were many more who preferred to shelve the whole business and say nothing at all. All three strands of opinion were probably represented in 'Macedonianism'.

That movement itself is something of a mystery. In 358 there emerges, in opposition to the avowed Arianism of Ursacius and Valens at Sirmium, a group of Conservative bishops headed by Basil of Ancyra, which includes Macedonius of Constantinople and Eustathius of Sebaste. Successful at first in securing general support both from the Eastern bishops and

from the Court, they obtain the exile of Homoean and Anomoean leaders. Both Athanasius and Hilary greet this new development with sympathy. But in the following year Basil shows himself incapable of offering any real opposition to the intrigues of the Homoeans. He and his friends compromise themselves at Sirmium and are outmanoeuvred at Seleucia. In January 360, the triumphant Acacius and Eudoxius secured the deposition of all the leaders by a Council held at Constantinople. The theological characteristic of this group was the use of the term *ὁμοιούσιος*, to describe the relation of the Father and the Son. Epiphanius credits them with an open and avowed denial of the Godhead of the Spirit, but the documents he cites nowhere bear this out.

Twenty years later, at the Council of Constantinople, we find a party of thirty-six recalcitrant bishops who refused to reaffirm the Creed of Nicaea and the Godhead of the Spirit. Their leader was Eleusius, who had been appointed bishop of Cyzicus by Macedonius and shared in 360 the latter's fate. The Council anathematized them as 'Semiarians or Pneumatomachi'. Damasus of Rome, in an almost contemporary pronouncement, refers to them as 'Macedonians'. Under that name they continued to exist as a separate sect, at least up to the middle of the next century, in Constantinople and Pontus. What connexion is there between this Macedonian sect and the group of Conservatives assembled round Basil in 358—60? There must be a connexion. Epiphanius calls Basil and the rest 'Semiarians', and, as we have seen, it was under this name that the thirty-six were condemned at Constantinople. Again, it is clear that these Macedonians confessed the *ὁμοιούσιον* in preference to the *ὁμόουσιον*. Socrates and Sozomen also link the two movements together through Macedonius. They assert that, following his deposition, he organized the supporters of the displaced bishops into a party whose doctrinal differentiae were : the Lucianic Creed, the *ὁμοιούσιον*, and a refusal to acknowledge the Godhead of the Spirit. According to these writers, previous to his deposition Macedonius had been associated with Acacius and Eudoxius. These statements are open to grave objections. All the evidence suggests that from 358 Macedonius had been a supporter of Basil of Ancyra. Although Sozomen says that the term 'Macedonian' came into general use during the reign of Julian, we find no record of it before 380, and then chiefly in Constantinopolitan writers or in writers who are likely to depend for their information upon Constantinopolitan sources. Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, who both wrote against the Pneumatomachi, never use it; and neither does Epiphanius. The evidence of Didymus is of particular significance. In his earlier work, *de Spiritu Sancto*, which falls between 370 and 380, he never uses the term. But in the *de Trinitate*, dated circa 392, he expressly writes against the Macedonians, and makes many references to them and to their opinions. It is indeed these references which constitute the only cogent evidence in support of the statements of Socrates and Sozomen. But it is by no means certain that Didymus had any authoritative information about the genesis of Macedonianism. He certainly had before him a Macedonian dialogue, perhaps the same as that known to the author of *ps. Athanasius, c. Macedonianum*, I. But there is little to show that he was able to supplement it from any other source than hearsay. He does indeed know that Macedonius owed his appointment at Constantinople to Arian influence. But in II. 620c he certainly gives a wrong impression of the relation of these Pneumatomachi to Arius, and in 632a he seems to think that Marathonius was advanced by the Arians as Macedonius' successor. While he

has heard that the Macedonians confess the *ὁμοιόουσιον*, not the *ὁμοούσιον*, of the Son, he elsewhere repeats the error found commonly in Western Fathers that their heterodoxy was limited to the Spirit.

Further evidence is forthcoming from Socrates himself who makes frequent references to a Macedonian writer, Sabinus of Heraclea, but tells us that his writings contain no mention of Macedonius himself. Almost equal importance in the movement is attached by both Socrates and Sozomen to the Homoiousian bishop of Nicomedia, Marathionius, who is credited by the former historian with having introduced the *ὁμοιόουσιον*, and by the latter with having given such help, both spiritual and financial, as saved the new body from premature extinction. From him the name 'Marathonians' was also in use. Taken together, these facts suggest that Macedonius, who apparently died soon after his deposition, had very little to do with 'Macedonianism'. Loofs is probably right in conjecturing that the name originally attached itself to those Christians in Constantinople who refused to recognize the intrusion of Eudoxius; just as there were Meletians at Antioch and Athanasians at Alexandria. Later the scope of the term was extended to cover those representatives of the old Conservative tradition who survived the drift to Nicene orthodoxy. This would be all the easier inasmuch as these die-hards were chiefly concentrated in Pontus and Thrace.

To the student of these letters all this is of importance because it discredits the statement that Macedonius called in question the Godhead of the Spirit. Apart from the writings of Athanasius, there is no evidence of anything analogous to Tropicism before 368, when we may perhaps discover the first reference to the Pneumatomachi in Basil. Such evidence as we have points in the opposite direction. During the reign of Julian, the deposed Homoiousian bishops began an agitation in the hope of recovering the churches they had lost. Upon the accession of Jovian they petitioned the new emperor, who, however, dismissed them with the comment that he did not like contention. This hint was reinforced, after Valens had succeeded, by his co-emperor in the West, Valentinian. Accordingly, in 365 a number of them, under the leadership of Eustathius of Sebaste, opened negotiations with Liberius of Rome and were by him received into communion upon confession of the Nicene faith. But the question of their orthodoxy upon the Spirit was not raised. It is, of course, possible to attribute this to bad faith upon their part. But not only is the charge beyond proof; it is difficult to believe that Liberius would have been ignorant of the fact, had they really made a stand against the decisions taken at Alexandria in 362.

But what of the evidence of these letters and of the Alexandrian 'tome' itself? These documents presuppose a body of opinion which, while substantially orthodox as to the Son, denies the Godhead of the Spirit. If the Semiarians did not put forward views of their own upon that subject for several years after these letters were written, how are we to account for Athanasius's opponents here? Not only is their doctrinal position generally similar to that of the Macedonians; it is supported by an appeal to the same Scriptures and by the use of the same arguments. If what has been said above be correct, we may dismiss the suggestion that Serapion had intercepted a communication from Macedonius to some of his friends. Not only does it depend upon the statements of Socrates and Sozomen to which we have

discovered grave objections. It does not harmonize with the indications offered by the letters themselves. To begin with, it means that *Ep. I* was not written before 361; a possible, but unlikely, date. If it be accepted, these letters will come after the *de Synodis*. The difference between the tone of Athanasius's references to the Semiarians in that work and the way in which he speaks of the Tropicists presents a very real difficulty. Even granting the change of context, it is not easy to believe that the 'beloved' of *de Syn.* and the *ἀνόητοι χαι πάντα τολμηοι* of I.18 are the same people. The epithet 'Tropicist' is itself worthy of consideration in this connexion. From the abrupt way in which Athanasius introduces it, it seems that he did not invent it, but that it was already in circulation when Serapion wrote to him. Were these letters directed against the Semiarians, we might reasonably expect to find traces of it in the later stages of the controversy. But there is nothing to show that Basil or Didymus or any of the later Catholic writers ever knew their antagonists under this name. Again, what of the habitat of the new heresy? Athanasius never explicitly says that it belongs to Egypt. But he does write as though, through Serapion, he were addressing a body of teachers and pastors toward whom he had special responsibilities, and who naturally looked to him for guidance and instruction, in short, the clergy of his diocese. Serapion is not only the channel through which information as to the new heresy reaches Athanasius. He is to be the mouthpiece, and even the editor and interpreter, of the latter's reply. This would be natural enough if Athanasius were dealing with a matter domestic to his own diocese, but not so natural if he were trying to intervene in the affairs of Asia or Pontus. Nor do we get the impression that these letters were written in answer to a more or less private document, but to an opinion that had already obtained public expression and which required to be met with propaganda.

Moreover, when we come to compare the doctrine of the Tropicists with that of later Pneumatomachi, we find, side by side with important similarities, certain subtle but significant differences. The teaching of the Macedonians as to the Spirit was hesitant, confused, and contradictory. The Spirit is not to be called lord nor to be glorified with the Father. He is not God's *συνεργός*, for He does not create or bestow life. Like the angels, He is a minister and instrument of God. Yet He is not to be regarded as an angel nor as a creature of any kind. He is not unlike the Father and the Son. He is *Θειον* but not *Θεοσ*, *γενητόν* but not *χτιστόν*, *μοναδικόν*, of a *μέση φύσις*. The Tropicist doctrine, by comparison, appears clear cut and consistent. The Spirit is a creature differing from the angels only in degree. He is, in fact, an angel and a creature, and unlike the Son. It is of course possible that Athanasius and Serapion have sharpened the edges and intensified the colour of Tropicism. But even more significant than the description of the new heresy in these letters is the tone Athanasius takes in dealing with it. The insistence in I.17 that he will be satisfied with the acknowledgement that the Spirit is not a creature; his assertion, in IV.1, that all he asked for from his opponents was silence; the persistent refutation of the one thesis, that the Spirit is a creature; the negative line taken in the argument of I.16 — all this would be largely ineffective and inapposite against the Macedonians, who asked for nothing better than to fall back on comfortable question-begging formulae.

We find the Macedonians defending their doctrine by the argument to which the Tropicists also gave prominence, that no relationship is conceivable within the Godhead other than that of

Father and Son, and that the existence of a second originated Person is precluded by the fact that the Son is only-begotten. The credit for introducing this argument, however, must go to Eunomius who uses it in his *Apology*; and, indeed, ultimately to Origen. The Macedonians also laid emphasis, in the baptismal formula, etc., upon the order in which the divine Persons are enumerated, holding such enumeration to be a subordination of the Spirit to the Father and the Son, rather than a coordination of the Three. Some of them insisted, in the doxology, upon the form *εω Πνεύματι άγιω*, making the Spirit the instrument of the praise offered to God. Neither of these points is noticed by Athanasius.

But both Tropicists and Macedonians claimed to establish their case from the Scriptures. Whereas, however, Athanasius only alludes to three texts as cited by the former, the exegesis of the latter was very comprehensive and elaborate. They pressed into service a series of passages which suggested His inferiority to the Father and Son, or which, by their silence, seemed to imply that He has no place in the divine life and activity. This battery of texts was, no doubt, built up in the course of the controversy. But in view of the large number of lections they employ, the fact that we find them using the three that are quoted as from the Tropicists is not so surprising as Loofs thought it. Their chief appeal is always to the silence of Scripture as to the Godhead of the Spirit; and Athanasius never suggests that the Tropicists had recourse to this or found it a difficulty. The lack of any explicit Scriptural authority for calling the Spirit *Φεός* naturally counted for everything with these conservatives. But it would count for a good deal less with quondam disciples of Eunomius who were concerned, not that the Spirit should not be called God, but that He should be acknowledged as a creature.

But let us examine the three passages to which the Tropicists appealed. As to Amos 4:13, it is quite uncertain how far the Macedonians made use of it. It is, indeed, discussed by Gregory of Nyssa in his *de Fide*, but this work is not expressly directed against them. The most positive evidence we have is that of Didymus. But from the way in which he introduces his discussion of the passages which relate to the Spirit, *de Trinitate*, III.949B, it is clear that he makes no effort here to distinguish the argument of the Macedonians from that of the Eunomians. There remains his treatment of the text in *de Spiritu Sancto*, 14-15. But against whom is it directed? Primarily, the *de Spiritu Sancto* is an exposition of Didymus's own doctrine and not a refutation of another's. References to heretical opinions are few and incidental, and do not suggest that the writer had any written evidence in front of him. The distinctive Macedonian arguments are not touched. It is at least a plausible theory that these scanty references reflect the character of local, Egyptian, Pneumatism, Tropicist rather than Macedonian. On the other hand, we have the silence of Basil in his *de Spiritu Sancto* and of Gregory of Nyssa in the section of his *adv. Macedonianos* which has come down to us, of Gregory of Nazianzus in his Oration on the Spirit and of the writer of *ps. Athanasius, c. Mac.* I. The manner in which the passage is cited in *dial. III de Trinitate* only confirms this.

For their use of 1 Timothy 5:21 we have the evidence of Didymus, *de Trin.* II. 548c, and Basil, *de Sp. S.*, 29—30. Didymus expressly attributes it to the Macedonians, but the value of his attestation is diminished by the fact that at this point he is markedly dependent on

Athanasius. The significance given to the passage by Basil's opponents is not the same as that discovered in it by the Tropicists. The latter held that the absence of any reference to the Spirit means that He is included with the angels. The former used it to weaken the force of such passages as Matthew 28:19, by showing that angels, as well as the Spirit, are enumerated with the Godhead. But, either way, no great importance can be attached to its appearance in Macedonian propaganda. We know that they made much of passages such as John 17:3; and 1 Timothy 5:21 was obvious ammunition for the same target. Didymus likewise attributes to the Macedonians the use of Zechariah 1:9. Here again, he is indebted to Athanasius for the answer he makes to them. But the context in *de Trin.* II.628b, is not that in which it is introduced in *Ep.* I. 11. The Macedonians seem to have laid the emphasis on the fact that the angel delivered a divine message, seeking to invalidate the argument which deduced the Godhead of the Spirit from His function in the inspiration of prophecy. The point of the citation in *Ep.* I is not altogether clear, but it seems that the Tropicists rather stressed the words *εν εμοι* to prove that the angels, no less truly than the Spirit, may be said to dwell in believers. Athanasius's answer, at any rate, seems to imply this.

Finally, it is contended by Loofs that 'the mockery poured by Athanasius upon the tropes recognized by his adversaries recalls the Macedonian practice of resorting to *ὁμωνυμίας, συνωνυμιας* etc' But, as Loofs states it, this reference is liable to mislead. What the Macedonians actually said, according to Didymus, *de Trin.* II. 476a, was this: 'Attention ought not to be paid to homonyms and synonyms and equivocal expressions.' Thus they would argue that no significance attaches to the term 'good' as applied to the Spirit in Scripture. It is indeed said, in Mark 10:18, to belong to God alone, but it is none the less equivocal because we also find it applied to men and things. In other words, when confronted with any term or expression which suggested the unity or coequality of the Spirit with the Father and Son, they searched the Scriptures until they found the same words used of creatures, albeit in a different context, dubbed them homonymous or equivocal, and dismissed them. There was nothing original about this. They were simply reviving the technique of Arius and Eusebius at Nicaea, where they were prepared to confess the Son to be the Power and Image and Glory of God inasmuch as they could find Scriptural authority for applying these terms to men and even to locusts! It may have been quibbling of this kind which led Epiphanius to criticize the Arians as favouring 'tropical' exegesis. They played off one meaning of a word against another. It is very hard to see why this innuendo should have attached itself peculiarly to Athanasius's opponents in these letters. Certainly, in the exegesis of Amos 4:13, it is not the Tropicists but their adversaries who raise the question of the equivocal meaning of *πνευμα*. Indeed, Didymus expressly uses the term 'homonymous' to characterize it, *de Sp.* S. 58. It would seem, therefore, that the charge of 'Tropicism' or 'Trope-mongering' wider and more indefinite than that of 'resorting to homonyms and synonyms', which Loofs brings against the Macedonians. As a matter of fact, all parties in the great controversy played with 'tropical' interpretations of Scripture when the literal interpretation was unfavourable to their own opinions, and none more so than the orthodox in their exegesis of Proverbs 8:22.

We are now in a position to state the conclusions to which these considerations seem to point. The Macedonians were essentially conservatives. They did not understand the character of the theological crisis which had overtaken them, and they thought it could be resolved by repeating the watchwords and formulas of a previous age. They sought to preserve a fragment of Origenism in a theological vacuum. In 358 their precursors reacted against the brutal clarity of Anomoeanism and produced the inconclusive *ὁμοιούσιον*. Fifteen or twenty years later, when the younger Nicenes were growing more precise and dogmatic in their definition of the Spirit's nature and Godhead, they themselves took refuge in the untenable and contradictory opinions that bear their name. The reaction of 358 carried them towards Athanasius. That of 373-80 carried them away from Athanasius' spiritual successor, Basil. But both were really inspired by a dislike of clarity and sharpness of definition. They never faced the question, and consequently resented any answer that really was an answer.

The doctrine of the Tropicists developed in the same general direction, but it sprang" from different roots. In the opinion of the present writer, Tropicism was, above all, a local Egyptian movement. Egypt was not Asia or Pontus. The prestige of Athanasius and the authority which had been concentrated in his hands had destroyed the materials for a conservative reaction. The Tropicists had rallied to the Arians after the expulsion of Athanasius and came under the influence of Aetius and Eunomius during their sojourn in Alexandria in 356. From them they learned a form of Arianism more thorough and comprehensive than that previously current in Egypt, which taught that the Spirit was the creature of the Son. Later, perhaps in the autumn of 358, when the stupidity and brutality of George had clearly ruined whatever chances Arianism had of rehabilitating itself in Egypt, they returned to the Church. But while they were prepared to confess the *ὁμοούσιον* of the Son, they would not give up the doctrine of the Spirit which they had learned from the Anomoeans. No council, whether general or provincial, had pronounced upon it. The subject itself was one which their own 'pope' had never treated except in the most general and incidental way. So, while claiming to be in communion with the orthodox, they circulated this Anomoean doctrine and gave publicity to the arguments of Aetius.

Such a situation would, at any rate, adequately account for these letters. It explains why Athanasius links Tropicism not with Homoiousianism but with Arianism pure and undefiled; and why he combines the abridgement of his arguments against the Tropicists, in Ep. III, with an exposition of the Godhead of the Son, in Ep. II, not materially different from that in the *de Synodis*, which was specifically written to conciliate the Homoiousians. It helps us to understand why he so persistently labours to show that, by their doctrine of the Spirit, the Tropicists compromise their orthodoxy upon the Son. Not merely strategically, but tactically, this was the weak point in their position. It brought them into collision with an undisputed canon of orthodoxy. In such circumstances and from such opponents Athanasius might well be content with a bare denial that the Spirit is a creature or even with silent acquiescence. It is very doubtful whether Athanasius would, at this juncture, have taken up the cudgels against so cautious and limited an expression of opinion as that attributed by Socrates to Macedonius and Eustathius. But, had he done so, he would have been obliged to ask for a

much more definite assurance of the Spirit's Godhead. Moreover, the hypothesis does justice to the close affinity the doctrine of the Tropicists has, on the one hand, with that of Eunomius, and, on the other, with that of the Pneumatomachi in Didymus's *de Spiritu Sancto*. Eunomius taught that the Spirit is a creature existing by the will of the Father and the activity of the Son, subordinated to the Father and the Son in a third degree of being, and excluded from the creative power of the Son. He argues that the only alternative to calling Him a creature is to call Him a son." The only texts the Eunomians are known to have cited upon this subject are John 1:3 and Amos 4:13." In the *de Spiritu Sancto* Didymus deals with heretics who, apparently without qualification, call the Spirit a creature and an angel; who deny that He is creator; who argue that the Catholic doctrine must make Him a son; and whose exposition of Scripture appears to be confined to John 1:3 and Amos 4:13. If we may assume that these heretics are Egyptian Pneumatomachi, then their dependence upon the Anomoeans seems to have been far closer than any we can attribute to the Macedonians, though the latter borrowed arguments and expositions from Eunomius and his disciples. This conclusion is confirmed by the account given of the Tropicists in these letters. It is true that Athanasius does not discuss John 13; that there is nothing to suggest that the Tropicists gave publicity to the notion of *ὑπαριθμησις*; and, at least in *Ep. I*, little to suggest that they denied the Spirit His part in creation. But allowance must be made for the information at Athanasius's disposal. He had not met these people face to face, nor had he anything of theirs in writing. He was entirely dependent upon the letters Serapion sent him. Moreover, it is probable that the *Ἀριστοτελικὴ δεινότης* of Aetius and Eunomius suffered a little in transmission through the Tropicists. There is nothing to suggest that the new movement boasted intellectual substance. Its supporters were probably confined to parish clergy and laymen. They certainly failed to found a school or a sect, and their very name would have perished but for these letters.

ATHANASIUS'S DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

For Athanasius, the doctrine of the Spirit stands in the closest possible relation to that of the Son. We have already seen the immediate practical advantages he obtained from insisting upon that relationship. It enabled him to maintain that Tropicism was inconsistent with the formulated doctrine of the Church. But this co-ordination was not merely a tactical device to outflank his adversaries. It was strategically sound. In the context of the Arian controversy, the relationship between the two doctrines was exactly as he held it to be. The question of the Spirit arose out of the question of the Son. It was a crisis within a crisis. The Christian doctrine of God depended, in its entirety, upon this issue. To have yielded to the Tropicists or to have acquiesced in the inclusion of the Spirit with the creatures would have been to surrender everything Athanasius had contended for. How clearly he realized this connexion can be understood from the references to the Spirit in c. *Arianos*, I — III. They are not numerous. They are all incidental to the main argument, and not one of them is introduced for the sake of the Spirit. Yet, were these letters and all the later works lost, we should have little difficulty in determining where Athanasius stood in regard to this subject and what he believed.

These considerations should be sufficient to dispose of the notion that faith in the Spirit's essential Godhead was something that Athanasius had picked up on his travels in Rome and the West. It is not an addendum artificially stitched on to his confession of the Son. The one doctrine springs naturally and inevitably from the other. They are entirely integrated. But by insisting that it is from our knowledge of the Son that we must derive our knowledge of the Spirit, Athanasius reveals, not only an exact appreciation of the contemporary situation for theology, but also a vigorous and profound apprehension of his subject. Here we recover once again the New Testament conception of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of the Son, not only inasmuch as the Son gives and sends Him, but because He is the principle of Christ's life within us. His ministry is the ministry of the Son; and all the activity of the Son is accomplished in Him. We may justly say of Athanasius what Lebreton says of Paul: 'behind his conception of the Spirit stands Christ.' But we can scarcely say it of any of his contemporaries or predecessors. Origen, indeed, brought the Spirit and the Son into close relationship at one important point, by teaching that the former is originated through the latter; and Dr. Prestige does well to remind us of the significance of this for the doctrine of the double procession. But the subordinationism which, even here, is clearly marked in Origen's approach, led him to distinguish the activity of the Spirit by assigning to Him a limited sphere of action. The majority of early Fathers would probably have been willing to say with Irenaeus that the Word and the Spirit are the two hands of God; with the implication that what one hand does not perform is left for the other. But inasmuch as the activity of the Word was gradually correlated with the whole activity of God, it became harder and harder to think of the Spirit at all, and faith in Him became largely a matter of reaffirming the baptismal tradition.' The very fact that a final distinction of function cannot be drawn within the Godhead, which embarrassed Justin and Irenaeus, is the very substance of Athanasius's case. 'There is nothing which is not originated and actuated through the Word in the Spirit.' This formula, 'through the Word in the Spirit', based on 1 Corinthians 8:6 and 1:23, etc., occurs over and over again in these letters; and Athanasius obviously attaches a more definite significance to the prepositions than Basil does. For Athanasius, the co-activity of the Three Persons does not simply mean — as it does for Basil and Didymus — that they work together in one activity. The action of the Godhead, as he understands it, derives from the Father and is accomplished through the agency of the Son in the Spirit. It must be admitted that he does not make altogether clear what he means by 'in the Spirit'. But two statements are suggestive. Firstly, the Spirit is the *ενεργεια* of the Son; secondly, 'The things created through the Word have their vital strength out of the Spirit from the Word.'" We may add what he says in c. Ar. III.15, that the Trinity is 'sun and radiance, and one is the light which is from the sun in the radiance'. We must beware of reading into these statements a more precise significance than they are well able to bear. But, taken together, they seem to imply that Athanasius conceives of the Spirit as realising and giving actuality to the power of God. 'Radiance' suggests that which the sun diffuses; 'light' suggests that which the eye receives and which justifies and fulfils the whole process of illumination in the enlightened activity of the recipient. This line of thought is most easily related to the work of the Spirit in the sanctification of the creature, and it was probably suggested by reflection upon this theme. It is true that, for Athanasius, the formula, 'The Son creates and the Spirit sanctifies', is too simple. It suggests that there is a work of God from which the Spirit is excluded. Rather, he

thinks of creation and sanctification as one single work. Thus, in his review of the Spirit's ministry in I.22-4, he deals with His creativeness not independently but, as it were, in the context of His sanctifying operation. This was all the easier for him because of his doctrine of creation itself. God cannot create without imparting to His creatures something of His own character; and the continuance of His works is only secured by His presence within them. It is true that in *contra Gentes and de Incarnatione* he does not relate this to the Spirit, but only to the Son. When writing these letters, however, he is forced to reconsider and reinterpret both creation and 'deification' in order to do justice to the work of the Spirit. So in 1.29 he insists, from Ephesians 4:6, that by denying the Spirit the Trojans virtually deny the immanence of God.

In his exposition of the Spirit's work in sanctification, Athanasius once again takes us back to the New Testament. It is true that he falls far short of the great Pauline and Johannine doctrine. He has little to say of the ethical fruits of the Spirit or of His witness with the spirit of the believer. Nor is he concerned, as his contemporary, Cyril of Jerusalem, is concerned, with the illumination of the mind and conscience by the Spirit. To His prophetic ministry he does indeed give prominence; but it is for him a ministry exhausted in the inspiration of Scripture. This limitation is partly due to the purpose with which he writes. He does not set out to describe the work of the Spirit but to establish His propriety to God. In his treatment he necessarily selects such points as most directly bear on his main subject. But, more fundamentally, his apprehension is limited by his conception of sanctification, which is metaphysical rather than ethical. Although the term *θεοποίησις*, and its cognates are not as prominent in these Epistles as they are in c. *Arianos* I— III, the idea dominates his thought. By sanctification he means the elevation of human nature to a state of divine incorruption so that it is enabled, as far as its creatureliness permits, to partake the blessedness of God. This concept did not, of course, originate with Athanasius. Origen taught that human nature can, in fact, be transmuted into something divine; that this has actually happened to the particular humanity assumed by our Lord, and, in a lesser degree, happens to all believers. But whereas Origen (and, even more pronouncedly, his predecessor, Clement) interprets this transformation, at any rate at its highest level, in terms of enlightenment, Athanasius relates it more directly to the fallen condition of mankind and our consequent loss of immortality. The purpose of the Incarnation is not only to enlighten, but also to recreate our humanity by reuniting it with God and thus staying the process of death. In this insistence upon *αψθαρσία* as the characteristic quality in the divine life as it is bestowed upon men he takes up the teaching of Irenaeus. Beyond Irenaeus, it may be traced back to Ignatius, and thence to the Fourth Gospel.

Athanasius's treatment of this subject in these letters is important, not because it modifies or enlarges the concept of sanctification found in *de Incarnatione*, but because it relates it to the Holy Spirit. The very fact that sanctification, so conceived, was an extension to 'all creation' of that which the Word had accomplished, by His Incarnation, Passion and Resurrection, in His own humanity, tended to obscure and to minimise the operation of the Spirit therein as a fuller and more ethical interpretation would not have done. This development is not a mere expeditious device to meet a new situation. The teaching of I.

22-4 is to be found 'in nuce' in *c. Ar.* 1.47, where the principal Scripture passages he makes use of are already cited. The attribution of *θεοποιησις* to the Spirit in *de Dec.* 14 is also significant. Here again, the thought of Athanasius is close to that of Irenaeus, who, more than any other writer of the second and third centuries, lays emphasis, in his account of sanctification, on the work of the Spirit. Nor is the resemblance confined to the general idea. The symbols and terms under which it is expressed and the texts from which it is established are largely common to them both. Athanasius may well be directly indebted to his predecessor here. But, even if he borrows his materials, he adapts them to his own use and makes them serve his conception of the Spirit's propriety to the Son. For example, both Origen and Irenaeus make use of the symbol of unction. For the former, it expresses, from Psalm 44:8, the permeation of Christ's human soul by the Word and Wisdom of God, so that its fragrance extends to those that partake of Him. Irenaeus relates it, from Isaiah 61:1, to the descent of the Spirit upon Christ: 'It is the Father who anoints, but the Son who is anointed by the Spirit who is the unction.' And, as He receives, so the Lord transmits the gift to those who partake of Himself. Athanasius, as is clear from *c. Ar.* 1.46-7, also starts from Isaiah 61:1 and the baptism of Christ. But, from the beginning, the Spirit is the Spirit of the Son: 'I, being the Father's Word, give to myself, when becoming man, the Spirit.' That the anointing is from the Father is, for the moment, disregarded. So in 1.23 the emphasis is again laid upon Christ as the anointer; and, no less, upon the fact that the characteristic quality imparted by the Spirit is that of Christ. Here he takes up the point Origen has made. Being anointed with the Spirit, 'we are the fragrance of Christ'. So likewise, Irenaeus regards the Spirit as conveying to man the image of the Father and of the Son, or, in other words, the similitude of God. Athanasius, in speaking of the Spirit as seal and image, limits the metaphor to His relation with the Son. Similarly, in Irenaeus the Spirit is generally the Spirit of God, occasionally the Spirit of the Father, never the Spirit of the Son. In Athanasius the last is the most usual designation.

In all this there is, of course, no intention on the part of Athanasius to alienate the Spirit from the Father. Perhaps it was because he felt that what he says in 1.22, etc., is capable of such misinterpretation that he insists explicitly in III.1 that 'the Holy Spirit, which is said to belong to the Son, belongs to the Father'. The Son forms, as it were, the link between them. It is from the Spirit's propriety to the Son that we apprehend His procession from the Father. Can we go on from this to assert that Athanasius teaches a doctrine of double procession, from the Son as well as from the Father, or, as the Eastern Fathers put it, from the Father through the Son? It must be confessed that Athanasius's explicit teaching on this point is far less clear and conclusive than Montfaucon supposed it to be. It is made plain that the Spirit proceeds from the Father. *εχπορευεσθαι* has already acquired a technical meaning in this connexion. His relation to the Son is set forth by saying that He is sent or given from Him. The preposition *παρα* is generally preferred here. Athanasius also says, from John 16h, that the Spirit receives *εχ του Υιου*. A close examination of the passages in which these and analogous expressions occur suggests that, in using them, he thinks primarily, if not exclusively, in terms of the Spirit's mission in the world. Indeed, the interpretation given to John 20:22 in III.1, that by breathing upon the disciples Christ gave them the Spirit 'out of Himself', might lead us to conclude that, even in his own thinking, he has not clearly

distinguished procession and mission. On the other side, in 1.15, when he speaks clearly and unequivocally of the Spirit's being, he confines himself to the statement that the Spirit is 'of the Son', no preposition being used. This is the more significant in that it follows a direct assertion of the Spirit's procession from the Father.

It is not difficult to account for Athanasius's hesitation. The notion of a double procession was not a novelty. As we have already seen, both Eusebius and Marcellus approached it, the former in insisting that the Spirit is originated by the Son, the latter by setting His procession from the Son side by side with His procession from the Father. In each case the conclusion finally reached was heretical. Eusebius dismissed the whole notion of procession and refused to regard the Spirit as anything more than one of the *γεννητα* of John 13. Marcellus found here a new argument against the drawing of any final distinction between the Person of the Father and that of the Son. Confronted thus with the Scylla of Arianism and the Charybdis of Sabellianism, Athanasius might well be reluctant to pursue the subject. For his purpose it was sufficient to establish that the Spirit derives His existence from the Father as truly as the Son, and that He stands in as close and unitive relation to the Son as the Son to the Father. He might well be content to leave to others the final correlation and adjustment of the two statements.

This was all the easier for him because he had attained to a fuller and more satisfying conception of the divine unity than his predecessors had known. Earlier theology found the ground of that unity in the one Father from whom the Son and the Spirit derive their being. Origen had conceived that derivation at once as an eternal fact and as the first link in the chain of creation. The Lucianic tradition, as represented by Asterius, with a sharper and juster sense of the distinction between God and His creatures, regarded the generation of the Son as an act, beyond time indeed, but by its very nature temporal and contingent; while, at the same time, it strove to preserve the uniqueness of the Son by insisting upon the immediacy of His generation. He is *μονογενης*; in the sense that He is the sole direct work of the Father. For persons in this tradition, the question of the Spirit's Godhead resolved itself into the question of the mode of His derivation. How is He from God? *γεννητον* He must be, if the unity of God is to be maintained. But any attempt to distinguish His *γενεσις* from that of the creatures seemed to sacrifice the reality of Christ's Sonship. Athanasius, on the other hand, starts from different premises. The Father is, indeed, *πηγη θεοτητος*. But the Godhead of which He is the source is not something transmitted to and partaken by His Son and His Spirit. Each person is God and Lord, and the divine unity is maintained by the coinherence of each Person in the rest. The decisive formula for his Trinitarian doctrine is clearly given in III.5: *ου γαρ εχτος εστι του Λογου το Πνευμα, αλλα εν τω Λογω ον εν τω Θεω δι'αυτου εστιν*. Thus for Asterius and his Anomoean successors the significant preposition is *εχ*, for Athanasius it is *εν*. If the Spirit is fully understood to be in God, how He comes from God is a secondary question into which we need not proceed. Indeed, to speculate upon it is impertinent and dangerous.

Yet if we regard what is implicit, rather than what is explicit, in these letters, we are justified in claiming that the procession of the Spirit through the Son is a necessary corollary of his

whole argument. If, as he argues in *c. Ar.* III.3-6, the fact that the Son is in the Father involves that the Son is from the Father, must it not be equally true that the Spirit, being in the Son, must be from the Son? If it is lawful to argue from unity of operation to unity of essence, must we not acknowledge that He from whom the Spirit receives the things of the Father no less bestows upon Him that divine life of which the Father is the unique source? Must not the temporal mission rest on an eternal relationship? By reaffirming the propriety of the Spirit to the Son, Athanasius not only secured, at a decisive hour, the Church's faith in the one Godhead; he fixed the line upon which its Pneumatic doctrine was to develop.

THE TEXT

In preparing the *editio princeps*, *Commeliniana*, Felckmann used a collection of MSS. from Geneva, fifteenth—sixteenth centuries (b), and the great Basle codex B (thirteenth century), which is a copy of a recension of Athanasian *corpora* made by Doxopater at the beginning of the twelfth century. The text of *ad Ser.* I and 11 was reproduced from the first fascicle of the Genevan collection (b¹), which still bears marks of the ruthless handling it received, with occasional emendations and variants from B and a MS. now in the British Museum (Harley 5579), *Codex Goblerianus*, a copy of the Paris MS. S. For *Ep.* III and IV, which are lacking in b¹, he made use of B. Montfaucon, for the Benedictine edition, took over Felckmann's apparatus, such as it was, without further examination of the MSS., but constructed a new text based on the Paris MSS., R (eleventh century) and S (twelfth century). These two supplement each other, the first nine works in R being the last in S. It is clear that the former MS. originally contained also S 1—20. They have a similar type of text.

Both RS and B represent the work of editors who have combined various *corpora* of Athanasian works to form complete editions. Thus we can identify an '*apologia corpus*', composed of historical writings, which is contained in B 45-88 and R 10-26. By comparing B with Opitz's 'W Group' — U(N), WLQ, etc. 2 — we discover a collection of dogmatic writings contained, to a greater or lesser extent, in all these MSS. and found in its entirety in B 1-28. Finally, there is what Opitz calls the '*middle corpus*', the source of B 29-44. By contrast, the dogmatic section of the RS collection (S 1-29) differs considerably from B, both in the works it contains and the order in which they are given. With the exception of a small group, ZDN^W 1 and K 52-7, which preserves fragments of an independent Antiochene corpus, all our MSS. can be related either to the B or RS collections, or else to both.

Earlier critics, misled by the date of R and S, assumed that the Doxopater edition could be regarded as dependent on the RS collection. But Opitz has shown conclusively that this is not the case. On the contrary that collection is itself dependent on the sources of the Doxopater edition. It is 'the result of a ruthless redaction of Athanasian writings'. Eighteen works from the 'W collection' (B 1—28) have been carefully edited and their text revised from a MS. of Z type. 3 To these have been added twelve works from the '*middle corpus*', the *Quic. dix.* (B 17) having been joined to *ad Ser. IV* (B 31) to form one work. These contents have been arranged in a 'literary' order. Thus *de Inc. Verbi Dei* and *de Inc. et c. Ar.* immediately follow the *de Inc.* itself, *c. Ar. IV* and *ad Episc.* have been put with *c. Ar. I—III* to form the *πενταβιβλος* of antiarian works which was familiar to Photius. *Ad Ser. III* and *IV*

were taken from the 'middle corpus' and added to I and II. Finally, to the collection of dogmatic works thus formed there was appended the 'apologia corpus'. Opitz thinks that this edition was made in Constantinople between 600 and 750. The sources he traces back farther, the 'apologia corpus' to the fifth century, and the 'W collection' to the middle of the sixth. Less satisfactory conclusions can be reached for the 'middle corpus' but it is certainly not later than the RS edition.

Doxopater, on the other hand, uses the same sources in good exemplars and quite mechanically. Examination of the text *oiad*Episc. in B reveals no such traces of the influence of RS text as can be discovered in U, for which a MS. of W type has been worked over with one of S type. The Doxopater edition was, however, re-edited at the beginning of the thirteenth century by a redactor who, at any rate in the *πενταβιβλος*, introduced readings from a MS. of S type. This revised edition is represented by the Vatopedi codex K (fourteenth century) and the Milan codex Ambrosianus (thirteenth century). The latter MS. is more faithful to it than the former, which is really a new edition in itself.

In preparing this translation of the Epistles, the writer has been able to consult B, R, S, and A, and also L, M, N, and P. Any conclusion based on so partial and inadequate a survey of the evidence must necessarily be tentative. No attempt has been made minutely to revise the Benedictine text; but here and there emendations have been introduced from BA or, more rarely, from RS where Montfaucon prefers to follow B. A complete collation of MS. evidence would, no doubt, lead to a far more drastic revision. In all, there are some sixty places where the translation is based upon correction or emendation of the text as it stands in Migne. The more important emendations are mentioned in the notes, and many of the others can be followed from Montfaucon's apparatus.

In Ep. I and II we discover two text types, represented respectively by RS and BALNM. In the first group, R and S stand very close together, and there is nothing to show that either of them approximates more nearly to the B text than the other. The literary character of this type of text is indicated by its smoothness and amplitude; by the quotations from the New Testament, where the text is often assimilated to the *Textus Receptus*; and by a few instances in which the language of Athanasius has been modified so as to conform to later usage— e.g. the insertion of *και συνδοξαζειν* in I.9, the excision of *αγεν[ν]ητω* ; in I.21, the substitution of *ανθρωποτητα* for *ανθρωπον* in II.9. To these examples we may perhaps add the reading *μονογενης* in S, I.20, for *γεννημα μονογενες*. But it is doubtful if S represents the recension here.

In the second group, each MS. represents a separate strand in the tradition. They all clearly go back to a common ancestor, a MS. embodying a good text but very carelessly written. Omissions due to homoioteleuton are especially noticeable. Members of the group mostly reproduce this exemplar faithfully without attempt at correction. For the greater part of the two letters (I.1-14, 30 to II. 9) B is the best representative of the group, with A in close support. The latter MS. shows few, if any, traces of being influenced by RS text. It has, however, suffered fairly extensive correction, and a proportion — but not all — of these

emendations come from this direction. Collation of L with b 1 shows .agreement, in 1.1—14, 30 to II. 9, in fifty-seven places against RSB. In the same sections, they are at thirty-four points supported by A.

In 1.15-29 the relation of MSS. is very different. B is much closer to RS and correspondingly farther from A and L. BA agree against RS only thirty times; AL agree against BRS nearly 150 times. M, which elsewhere is very close to B, deserts it in this section for AL at many points; and the same holds good of N, except insofar as it is affected by RS influence. In a number of passages, e.g. in 20, 22, 24, there are strong suggestions in B of a conflation of the two types of text. Though it never entirely loses its character, it is hard to resist the conclusion that in this section B has come under the influence of the RS recension. If Opitz is right in assuming that KAYF are dependent upon the Doxopater edition, then the influence must have been exercised between the preparation of the edition and the copying of B; for there are no traces of it in A. The readings of A, therefore, assume a greater importance here; though A is never as good a representative of the group as B in the rest of the work. In order adequately to evaluate the tradition it will be necessary to have the evidence of other representatives, notably W and K.

Examination of N fully bears out the conclusion of Opitz, that in its exemplar, U, a text of B type has been modified in the light of the RS recension. It is a mixed text. In 1.1-14, 30-33 there are seventy readings in which the influence of RS text can be observed. In 15-29 we find N in agreement with RS against BA only eight times; but twenty-eight times in agreement with RSB against AL.

For III and IV our authorities are RSBP and A 3 . These two letters are to be found in the 'middle corpus' of B and have not received the attention paid by editors to the works in the 'W collection'. All our MSS. contain the same type of text with few and unimportant variants. There is no evidence, from these letters, to show that A 8 is independent of S, as Opitz thinks it to be. P is very closely connected with R. There are only five points at which their disagreement can have any significance. B has twenty-five readings which are independent of RS. Elsewhere, it is slightly closer to RP than to S. On the whole it is the best representative.

TABLE OF MANUSCRIPTS

to which reference is made in the Introduction

A. CODEX AMBROSIANUS, Milan, Bib. Amb., 464 (1.59), chart., cent, xiii-xiv, 490 ff. It has been badly damaged and extensively restored. The final sections, from 431a, known as A 2 , were written by the restorer of the MS. They contain the residue of the contents of S after the works in the first part, B 1-2, 4-26, have been disregarded. From this fact, Stegmann, *Die pseudoAthanasianische IVte Rede gegen die Arianer*, p. 32, concludes that A 2 was actually taken from S. From examination of the text, Opitz rejects this view. Ad Ser. I and II are numbered 9 and 10, ff. 295b-325b; III and IV, 36 and 37, ff. 485a-90a.

- B. CODEX BASILIENSIS, Basle, Universitätsbibliothek, gr. A. III. 4, chart., cent, xiii, 595 ff. The contents of this MS. have been sufficiently described above. Ep. I and II are 10 and 11, ff. 170a-85b; III and IV, 30 and 31, ff. 259a-64a.
- C. Codex Vatopedi, Vatopedi 5-6, membr., cent. xiv. Ep. I and II are 9 and 10, III and IV, 35 and 36. This MS. represents a revision of the Doxopater edition, and includes most of the contents of B, including the Apologia corpus.
- D. Codex Burneianus, London, B.M., Burney 46, membr., cent. xiii. Contents : B 1-21. 282 ff. Ep. I and II are included as nos. 10 and 11.
- E. Codex Marcianus, Venice, Bib. Marc, gr. XLIX, chart., cent. xiii. In two parts, the first of which contains B 1— 21 ; the second von der Goltz — De Virginitate[^] pp. 15-16 — traces back to S. Ep. I and II, nos. 10 and 11, ff. 188a, etc.
- F. Codex Marcianus, Venice, Bib. Marc, gr. L. In two parts, the first, ff. 1—95, chart., cent, xv, has affinities with D and Z. The second, ff. 96-415, membr., cent, xi, is a copy of the Patmos MS. U. For Ep. 1.1-6 it is sole representative of the group, U being lacking. Ep. I and II are nos. 3 and 4, ff. 112a-38b.
- G. Codex Parmensis, Parma, gr. 10, membr., cent, xii, 269 ff. Very much damaged. Contains the contents of R in disorder, with six works missing. Ep. III and IV are nos. 4 and 5, ff. 70b-8a. 48-49
- H. Codex Riccardianus, Florence, Bib. Laur., gr. 4, chart., cent, xv, 231 ff. Contents : B 1-18.
- I. Codex Parisinus, Bib. Nat., gr. 474, membr., cent, xi, 457 ff. Ep. I-IV are nos. 6-9, ff. 83b-125b.
- J. Codex Parisinus, Bib. Nat., Cois. gr. 45, membr., cent, xii, 434 ff. Ep. I-IV are nos. 26-29, ff. 387a-426a.
- K. Codex Patmiacus, Mon. of S. John, Patmos, A 3, membr., cent, xi, 304 ff. Contents: B 10-14, 16, 15, 17-20. The first part of BIO, Ep. I, 1-6, is missing.
- L. Codex Vatopedi, Vatopedi 7, membr., dated 1052-3. Two vols, bound together. The first has associations with N 1 etc. and occupies ff. 1-99a. The rest contains B 1—20.

SYNOPSIS OF THE EPISTLES

EPISTLE I

1. *Introduction. The Character of the new heresy.*

2. *Trophism destroys the unity of the Triad and involves that the Son, as well as the Spirit, is a creature.*

3—10. *Refutation of the Tropicist exegesis of Amos 4:13.*

3. The Tropici appeal to the words 'createth spirit' in Amos 4:13. But 'spirit' has not the article here.

4—6. The Holy Spirit is not designated in Scripture without the article. Examples.

7-8. Various meanings of 'spirit' in Scripture. Here it refers to the wind.

9. The Tropici reinforce their argument from the fact that the passage also speaks of Christ. If the force of this be conceded, we may take 'spirit' here to refer to the human spirit which is renewed by His Incarnation.

10. The rest of the passage can be accommodated to this interpretation.

10-14. *Refutation of the Tropicist exegesis of 1 Timothy 5:21.* The Tropici argue from the silence of Paul as to the Holy Spirit in 1 Timothy 5:21 that He is to be numbered with the creatures.

11-12. The Spirit is never called an angel in Scripture. Zechariah 1:9 no exception. The Spirit is always carefully distinguished from the angels; as can be seen from Exodus 33 and other passages.

13-14. The absence of any reference to the Spirit in 1 Timothy 5:21 justified and paralleled. True explanation of the passage.

15-21. *Refutation of the argument that the Spirit, if not a creature, must be a son.*

15. The argument stated. Athanasius shows its absurdity by applying it to the Father.

16. Generation in God is not as it is in man. Both Father and Son are unique.

17. We know that the Spirit is one with God in the Triad and that He is not a creature. Further speculation is futile and impertinent.

18. We do not understand the universe, let alone God.

19-20. The Scriptural illustrations of fountain and stream, light and radiance, show us that the Spirit is active in every activity of the Son. That the Son is in the Spirit as the Father is in the Son proved from Scripture. 21. Therefore, if the Spirit is a creature, the Son must be a creature also.

22—27. *Proof from Scripture that the Spirit pertains to the Son, and has no likeness to the creatures.*

22. He is from God; they are from nothing. He is Spirit of holiness and renewal; they are sanctified and renewed.

23. He bestows life; they receive it. He is unction and seal; they are sealed and anointed.

24. In Him we partake of God; He is creator; and the Image of the Son.

25. Though not a son, He is none the less in God and from God.

26. The Spirit is incapable of change and alteration; the creatures change. He is omnipresent; they are circumscribed.

27. He is partaken; they partake. He is one; they are many.
- 28-31. *Appeal to the tradition and life of the Church.*
28. The Church confesses God to be indivisible and co-active Triad
- 29-30. By asserting that God is not Triad but dyad, the Tropici confess the creature with the Creator, and thus invalidate their own baptism.
- 30-31. Proof of the unity of the divine activity from the Apostolic Benediction. Other passages of Scripture, notably illustrating the unity of the Spirit and the Word in the inspiration of prophecy, and in the Incarnation.
- 32—33. *Conclusion. Exposition of John 4:21, etc.*

EPISTLE II-III

II 1—9. *Against the doctrine that the Son is a creature.*

1. Introduction. Athanasius promises to abridge the first letter. The scepticism of the Arians.
2. That God is fountain, light, and Father involves that His Son is coeternal and coequal. Proofs of this from Scripture.
- 3-4. Unity of essence involves likeness and identity of nature. Can this be discovered between the creatures and the Son? Relevant illustrations.
5. Having no likeness to the creatures but possessing all the qualities of the Father, the Son was confessed at Nicaea to be one in essence with Him.
6. The fact that God is Father implies that the Son is coessential.
- 7—8. Discussion of Proverbs 8:22.
9. Discussion of Mark 13:32. Conclusion.

III. 1—7. *Against the doctrine that the Spirit is a creature.*

1. Why Athanasius has begun his abridgement by writing against the Arians. We must derive our knowledge of the Spirit from our knowledge of the Son. He is proper to the Son as the Son to the Father. Thus He is proper also to the Father.
- 2-4. Considerations which show that the Son is not a creature show the same of the Spirit. He comes from God; He is unction and seal; one, not many; omnipresent; creator.
- 5—6. The indivisibility of Son and Spirit shown from their coactivity in the inspiration of prophecy and in the Incarnation. This is the faith of the Church which is rooted and grounded in the Triad.
7. If God is Triad, then the Spirit is eternal. If the Spirit is a creature, then God is a dyad expanding into a triad; and thus His existence is contingent. Therefore God is eternally Triad. Conclusion.

EPISTLE IV

1. The obstinacy of the Tropici in insisting that if the Spirit is not a creature, He must be son either to the Father or to the Son.
2. Athanasius retorts their question upon them. Is the Spirit a son ? If so, why is Scripture silent ? If not, why is He said to be from God?

- 3—4. Similar questions to expose the impertinence of such speculation. We must keep to what Scripture says. The Son is Son and the Spirit, Spirit.
5. Yet they are not to be divided. Nor may we invert the names, for that would be Sabellianism.
6. To rely on the analogy of human generation is to be led back to paganism. Men do not beget as God begets.
7. Conclusion.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Text

H. G. Opitz, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, Bd. 23) (Berlin, 1935).

R. P. Casey, Article, 'Greek Manuscripts of Athanasian Corpora', in *Zeitschrift für neueste Wissenschaft.*, XXX. 49ff. (1931).

K. Lake and R. P. Casey, Articles, 'The Text of the *de Incarnatione*' and 'The Text of the *de Virginitate*', in *Harvard Review of Theological Studies*, XIX. 25ff. and 173ff.

R. P. Casey, Article, 'The Athens Text of *Contra Gentes* and *de Incarnatione*' in *Harvard Review of Theological Studies*, XXIII. 51ff.

E. Schwartz, *Sermo Maior de Fide des Athanasius* (Munich, 1925).

A. Stegmann, *Die pseudoAthanasianische IVte Rede gegen die Arianer* (Tübingen, 1917).

C. M. G. Ludwig, *Epistola ad Epictetum* (Jena, 1911).

E. von der Goltz, *De Virginitate; eine echte Schrift des Athanasius* (Leipzig, 1905).

In the edition of Athanasius prepared by the Kirchenvater-Kommission of the Prussian Academy under the editorship of H. Lietzmann and R. P. Casey, and published by W. de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, the following works have already appeared:

Documents relating to the Arian Controversy, 318-28 (1934—5).

De Decretis Nicaenis (1935).

De Sententia Dionysii (1936).

Apologia de Fuga (1936).

The text of Athanasius is in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, 25-28, with the translation, apparatus, notes, etc., of Montfaucon.

An English Translation of selected works of Athanasius forms Volume IV of the Library of Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers (New Series), edited with an Introduction by A. Robertson, and with Newman's notes (Oxford 1892).

A translation of a number of other works is included in W. Bright's *Later Treatises of Athanasius* (Oxford, 1887).

General Works

A. Harnack, *History of Dogma* (English Translation) (London, 1896-8) (cited as H.D.).

J. Tixeront, *Histoire des Dogmes*, Vol. II, Ninth Edition (Paris, 1921).

J. Lebreton, *Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité* Vols. I and II (Paris, 1919).

O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, Third Edition (Freiburg, 1910).

H. B. Swete, *On the Early History of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Cambridge, 1873).

H. B. Swete, *On the History of the Doctrine of the Procession* (Cambridge, 1876).

H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church* (London, 1912) (cited as H.S.A.C.).

T. Schermann, Die Gottheit des heiligen Geistes nach den griechischen Vätern des Vierten Jahrhunderts (Freiburg, 1901).

H. M. Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism (Cambridge, 1900) (cited as S.A.).

R. M. Woolley, The Liturgy of the Primitive Church (Cambridge, 1910).

C. E. Raven, Apollinarianism (Cambridge, 1923).

G. L. Prestige, God in Patristic Thought (London, 1936) (cited as G.P.T.). G. L. Prestige, Fathers and Heretics (London, 1940).

R. V. Sellers, Two Ancient Christologies (London, 1940).

E. A. Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, Memorial Edition (Cambridge, Mass., 1914).

J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (Edinburgh, 1920-6) (cited as V.G.T.).

Liddell and Scott's Lexicon is cited from the New Edition (1925—40).

F. Blass, Grammar of New Testament Greek (English Translation) (London, 1905).

Athanasius

W. Bright, Article, Dictionary of Christian Biography, I. 179ff.

H. Straeter, Erlösungslehre (Freiburg, 1894).

F. Lauchert, Die Lehre des hl. Athanasius (Leipzig, 1895).

C. Hoss, Studien über das Schrifttum und die Theologie des Athanasius (Freiburg, 1899).

A. Stuelcken, Athanasiana (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Gesch. der altchr. Literatur, T.IV, N.F.) (Leipzig, 1899).

E. Weigl, Untersuchungen zur Christologie des heiligen Athanasius (Paderborn, 1914).

F. Loofs, Article, Herzog Realencyclopädie, II. 202ff., Third Edition.

X. le Bachelet, Article, Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, I. 2143, etc., Third Edition (Paris, 1923) (cited as D.T.C.). Earlier works on Athanasius are referred to by Robertson in his Introduction, pp. xii and xiii.

Macedonianism

A. M. Merenda, Prolegomena to his edition of the works of Damasus (Rome, 1754). (Migne, Pat. Lat. 13.109-442).

F. Loofs, Eustathius von Sebaste (Halle, 1898).

K. Holl, Über die Gregor von Nyssa zugeschriebene Schrift, *adv. Arium et Sabellum* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXV, 1904), republished in *I Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, I II. 298ff. (Tübingen, 1928).

F. Loofs, Zwei Makedonische Dialoge (Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie, XIX. 526-51) (1914).

F. Loofs, Article, *I Makedonius*, Herzog Realencyclopädie, Third Edition, XII. 41ff.

F. Loofs, Article, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, VIII. 225ff.

B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A.D. 461*, Volume II (Oxford, 1922).

The *de Principiis* of Origen is quoted according to the arrangement of chapters and fragments in the edition of P. Koetschau (Leipzig, 1913).

The *Comm. in Johannem* of the same author is quoted according to the edition of A. E. Brooke (Cambridge, 1896).

References to the *de Trinitate* I—III of Didymus, to the *adv. Eunomium* of Gregory of Nyssa, to the *adv. Eunomium* IV and V of ps. Basil, to the *de Trinitate* (ad Hermiam) VII of Cyril of

Alexandria, and to the *de Fide Orthodoxa* I— III of John of Damascus, are made according to the pages of Migne. Passages from other works of Athanasius are usually cited in the translations, by Newman, etc, in Volume IV of the Library of Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers. Passages from Cyril of Jerusalem and Basil are usually taken from Volumes VII and VIII in the same series, prepared respectively by E. H. Gifford and Blomfield Jackson. In the notes occasional reference is made to C. F. H. Johnston's Edition of the *de Spiritu Sancto* of Basil.

EPISTLE ONE

1/ Your sacred Kindness's letter was delivered to me in the desert. Though the persecution directed against us was indeed bitter, and a great search made by those who sought to slay us, yet 'the Father of mercies and God of all comfort' used even this to comfort us. As I remembered your Kindness and all my friends, I imagined that you were with me at that moment. I was indeed very glad to have your letter. But when I read it, I began again to be despondent because of those who once before set themselves to make war against the truth. You write, beloved and truly longed for, yourself also in distress, that certain persons, having forsaken the Arians on account of their blasphemy against the Son of God, yet oppose the Holy Spirit, saying that He is not only a creature, but actually one of the ministering spirits, and differs from the angels only in degree. In this they pretend to be fighting against the Arians; in reality they are controverting the holy faith. For as the Arians in denying the Son deny also the Father, so also these men in speaking evil of the Holy Spirit speak evil also of the Son. The two parties have divided between them the offensive against the truth; so that, with the one opposing the Son and the other the Spirit, they both maintain the same blasphemy against the holy Triad. As I regarded these things and reflected deeply upon them, I grew despondent because the devil had got another chance to make game of those who are acting his folly ; and I had decided to keep silence at this juncture. But because of your Holiness's entreaty, and on account of the spirit of innovation and the diabolical impetuosity displayed by these people, I write this letter in brief, though I am scarce able to do this much; only that you, making these facts your excuse, may supply what it lacks in the light of your own understanding, and the argument against this unholy heresy may be complete.

2/ To the Arians indeed this way of thinking is not strange. Having once denied the Word of God, they naturally say the same evil things against his Spirit. Therefore it is not necessary to say anything more in reply to them ; what has previously been said against them is sufficient. But it is right that, in some way (as they themselves would say !) we should make a careful reply to those who have been deceived about the Spirit. We might well wonder at their folly, inasmuch as they will not have the Son of God to be a creature — indeed, their views on this are quite sound! How then have they endured so much as to hear the Spirit of the Son called a creature ? Because of the oneness of the Word with the Father, they will not have the Son belong to things originated, but rightly regard him as Creator of things that are made. Why then do they say that the Holy Spirit is a creature, who has the same oneness with the Son as the Son with the Father ? Why have they not understood that, just as by not dividing the Son from the Father they ensure that God is one, so by dividing the Spirit from the Word they no longer ensure that the Godhead in the Triad is one, for they tear it asunder, and mix with it a nature foreign to it and of a different kind, and put it on a level with the creatures? On this showing, once again the Triad is no longer one but is compounded of two differing natures ; for the Spirit, as they have imagined, is essentially different. What doctrine of God is this, which compounds him out of creator and creature ? Either he is not a Triad, but a dyad, ' with the creature left over. Or, if he be Triad — as

indeed he is ! — then how do they class the Spirit who belongs to the Triad with the creatures which come after the Triad ? For this, once more, is to divide and dissolve the Triad. Therefore, while thinking falsely of the Holy Spirit, they do not think truly even of the Son. For if they thought correctly of the Word, they would think soundly of the Spirit also, who proceeds from the Father, and, belonging to the Son, is from him given to the disciples and all who believe in him. Nor, erring thus, do they so much as keep sound their faith in the Father. For those who 'resist the Spirit', as the great martyr Stephen said, deny also the Son. But those who deny the Son have not the Father.

3/ Where then do you find excuse for such audacity, so that you do not fear that which was spoken by the Lord, 'Whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath no forgiveness, neither in this present age nor in the age to come' ? The Arians, having misunderstood the incarnate presence of the Word and the things which were said in consequence thereof, took from them an excuse for their heresy and were condemned as enemies of God and as speaking things which are in truth idle and earthly. But whence were you deceived ? From whom did you hear such error? In what way did you fall into it? 'We read', they say, 'in the prophet Amos, where God says: "I am he that establisheth thunder and createth spirit and declareth unto men his Christ, that maketh dawn and mist, that ascendeth unto the high places of the earth. The Lord God omnipotent is his name". Hence we believed the Arians when they said that the Holy Spirit is a creature.' So you read the passage in Amos. But that which is spoken in Proverbs, 'The Lord created me as a beginning of his ways for his works' — did you not read that? Or did you read it? You explain this passage in accordance with the truth, so that you do not call the Word a creature. But the passage in the prophet you do not explain. Simply hearing the word 'spirit', you supposed that the Holy Spirit is called a creature. Although in Proverbs it is clearly Wisdom who says 'created', yet you do well enough. You explain the text so as not to put the Artificer Wisdom among the creatures. But the text in the prophet gives no indication of the Holy Spirit; it only speaks of spirit. Why then, although there is in Scripture a great difference in the use of the word 'spirit', and although the text can properly be interpreted in an orthodox sense, do you — either out of love of contention or because you have been poisoned by the Arian serpent's sting — suppose that it is the Holy Spirit who is referred to in Amos ? Only that you may not forget to regard him as a creature

4/ Tell us, then, is there any passage in the divine Scripture where the Holy Spirit is found simply referred to as 'spirit' without the addition of 'of God', or 'of the Father', or 'my', or 'of Christ' himself, and 'of the Son', or 'from me' (that is, from God), or with the article so that he is called not simply 'spirit' but 'the Spirit', or the very term 'Holy Spirit' or 'Paraclete' or 'of Truth' (that is, of the Son who says, 'I am the Truth'), — that, just because you heard the word 'spirit', you take it to be the Holy Spirit ? Leave out of account for the moment cases in which people who have already received the Holy Spirit are mentioned again, and places where the readers, having previously learned of him, are not ignorant of whom they are hearing when he is referred to again, by way of repetition and reminder, merely as 'the Spirit'. In these cases too it is generally used with the article. To sum up, unless the article is present or the above-mentioned addition, it cannot refer to the Holy Spirit. Take, for example,

what Paul writes to the Galatians, 'This only would I learn from you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?' What had they received but the Holy Spirit who is given to those who believe and are being born again 'through the laver of regeneration'? When he wrote to the Thessalonians, 'Quench not the Spirit', he was speaking to those who themselves knew what they had received ; lest through lack of care they should quench the grace of the Spirit which had been kindled within them. When, in the Gospels, the evangelists, for the sake of the flesh he took, use human terms of the Saviour and say, 'Jesus, full of Spirit, returned from the Jordan', and, 'Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness', it has the same sense. For Luke has already said: 'But when all the people had been baptised, and Jesus also had been baptised and was praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily form, as a dove, upon him.' This made it clear that, in the mention of 'the Spirit', the Holy Spirit was intended. So likewise where the Holy Spirit is with men, even if he is mentioned without addition to his name, there is no doubt that it is the Holy Spirit who is intended; especially when it has the article.

5/ But do you answer the question which has been put to you whether anywhere in the divine Scripture you have found the Holy Spirit called simply 'spirit', without the above-mentioned addition and apart from the qualification we have recorded. You cannot answer it ! For you will not find it so in Scripture. But it is written in Genesis, 'And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.' And a little later, 'My Spirit shall not abide among these men, for they are flesh.' In Numbers, Moses says to the son of Nun, 'Be not jealous for me. Would that all the Lord's people were prophets, when the Lord bestows his Spirit upon them !' In Judges it is said of Gideon: 'And the Spirit of the Lord came upon him and he judged Israel.' And again: 'The Spirit of the Lord came upon Jephthah.' And concerning Samson: 'The child grew', it says, 'and the Lord blessed him, and the Spirit of the Lord began to accompany him,' and, 'The Spirit of the Lord came upon him mightily.' David sings: 'Take not thy Holy Spirit from me'; and again, in the one hundred and forty-second Psalm: 'Thy good Spirit shall lead me in a plain country, for thy name's sake, O Lord.' In Isaiah it is written: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me.' And before this it was said : 'Woe to you, rebellious children! Thus saith the Lord : You took counsel, but not from me, and made covenants, but not through my Spirit, to add sins to sins.' And again: 'Hear these things. From the beginning, I have not spoken in secret. When it was, I was there. And now the Lord hath sent me, and his Spirit.' A little later he speaks thus: 'And this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord, My Spirit which is upon thee*'; and again in what follows he adds: 'Neither envoy nor angel, but the Lord himself saved them, because he loved them and had mercy on them ; he himself redeemed them and took them up and exalted them all the days of the age. But they were disobedient and provoked his Holy Spirit, and he was turned to enmity toward them.' And Ezekiel speaks thus: 'And the Spirit took me up and brought me to the land of the Chaldeans, to the Captivity, in a vision, by the Spirit of God.' In Daniel: 'God raised up the Holy Spirit of a young man whose name was Daniel, and he cried with a loud voice, I am clear from the blood of this woman.' Micah says: 'The house of Jacob provoked the Spirit of the Lord'; and by Joel, God says : 'And it shall be after these things that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.' Again, through Zechariah the voice of God says: 'But receive my words and my commandments which I charge by my Spirit to my

servants the prophets' ;and when the prophet rebukes the people a little farther on, he says: 'They make their hearts disobedient, lest they should hear my law and the words which the Lord of hosts has sent by his Spirit in the hands of the prophets of old.' These few examples we have collected and set down from the Old Testament.

6/ But inquire also about the contents of the Gospels and the writings of the Apostles, and you will hear how there also, inasmuch as there is a great difference between spirits, the Holy Spirit is not particularised simply as 'spirit', but by the addition we have mentioned above. As already stated, when our Lord was baptised in human fashion because of the flesh he was wearing, the Holy Spirit is said to have descended upon him. In giving him to his disciples he said : ' Receive the Holy Spirit' I ; and he taught them : "The Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things.' And a little later, concerning the same : 'When the Paraclete is come, whom I shall send unto you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me.' Again : 'For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you'; and a little farther on: 'But if I, by the Spirit of God, cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you.' And in him perfecting all our knowledge of God and the initiation whereby he joined us to himself and, through himself, to the Father, he charged the disciples: 'Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptising them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.' When he promised to send him to them, 'he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem';and, after a few days, 'when the day of Pentecost was now come, they were all together in one place. And suddenly there came from heaven the sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.' Hence also, through the laying on of the Apostles' hands, the Holy Spirit was given to those who were being born again. One Agabus prophesied by him, saying: 'Thus saith the Holy Spirit.' Paul said: '...in the which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops to feed the Church of God which he purchased with his own blood.' When the eunuch was baptised, 'the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip'.And Peter wrote: 'Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and examined diligently, who prophesied of the grace which should come unto us, searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto, when he testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glories which should follow them.'* And John wrote: 'Hereby know we that we abide in him and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.' Paul writes to the Romans: 'But ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. But if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through His Spirit that dwelleth in you.' To the Corinthians: 'For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For who knoweth the things of man save the spirit of the man which is in him ? And so the things of God none knoweth save the Spirit of God. But we received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God ; that

we might see the things that are freely given us by God.' And a little later: 'Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?' And again: 'But ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.' And again: 'But all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each severally, even as he will.' And again: 'Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' See how he writes to the Galatians also: 'That the blessing of Abraham might come in Christ Jesus, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.' And again: 'Because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.' To the Ephesians he speaks thus: 'And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, in whom ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.' And once more: 'Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.' To the Philippians he writes very confidently: 'What then? Only that in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice. For I know that this shall turn to my salvation, through your supplication and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ, according to my earnest expectation and hope, that in nothing shall I be put to shame.' And again: 'For we are the circumcision, who worship by the Spirit of God, and glory in Christ Jesus.' To the Thessalonians he testifies: 'Therefore he that rejecteth rejecteth not man but God who giveth his Holy Spirit unto you.' And to the Hebrews thus: '... the Holy Spirit signifying that the way unto the holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while the first tabernacle is yet standing.' And again: 'Of how much sorer punishment, think you, shall he be judged worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?' Again: 'For if the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse our conscience from dead works?' To the Thessalonians: 'Then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the Spirit of his mouth and bring to naught by the manifestation of his glory.'

7/ See how the Holy Spirit is denoted in all divine Scripture! Did you, then, notice anything of this kind in the prophet? The 'spirit' of which the prophet is now speaking has not even the article, to give you an excuse. But out of sheer audacity you have invented 'tropes' for yourselves and identified the spirit which is said to be created with the Holy Spirit himself; though even from students of language you could have learned of the difference between spirits. For Scripture speaks of the spirit of man, as David in the Psalm: 'I communed with my heart and was troubled in my spirit.' Baruch says in prayer: 'The soul in anguish, the spirit of the troubled, crieth unto thee.' And in the Song of the Three Children: 'Bless the Lord, ye spirits and souls of the righteous.' The Apostle writes: 'The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God; and if children, then heirs.' And again: 'No man knoweth the things of man save the spirit of the man which is in him.' In the Epistle to the Thessalonians he prays: 'May your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.' It speaks too of spirits of the wind, as in Genesis: 'And God made a spirit to pass over the earth, and the waters assuaged.' And of

Jonah: 'And the Lord aroused a spirit upon the sea, and a great wave rose in the sea, and the ship was in danger of being broken.' And in the one hundred and sixth Psalm it is written : 'He spoke, and a spirit of storm arose, and its waves were lifted up.' And in the one hundred and forty-eighth Psalm: 'Praise the Lord from the earth, ye dragons and all deeps, fire, hail, snow, ice, spirit of storm, fulfilling his word.' And in Ezekiel, in the Lament for Tyre: 'In the heart of the sea, in much water, thy rowers have brought thee; the spirit of the south wind hath broken thee.'

8/ Read the sacred Scriptures, and you will find 'spirit' used of the meaning which is in the divine words, as Paul writes: 'Who also made us sufficient ministers of a new covenant, not of letter but of spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.' For that which is expressed is inscribed by letter, but the meaning which is in it is called spirit. Thus too, 'the law is spiritual'; so that, as he says again, we may serve not 'in oldness of letter' but 'in newness of spirit'. The same writer says, when giving thanks: 'So then I myself with the mind serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin. There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin.' Philip, desiring to turn the Ethiopian from the letter to the spirit, said: 'Understandest thou what thou readest?' Such a spirit as Caleb is, in Numbers, declared to have had, when God says: 'But my servant Caleb, because he had another spirit in him and he followed me, him will I bring into the land whereunto he went.' For he pleased God, because he spoke with a different mind from the rest. Such a heart God enjoined his people to keep, when he said through Ezekiel: 'Make yourselves a new heart and a new spirit.' In view of these facts, and as we have demonstrated so great a difference between spirits, you would have done better, upon hearing of 'created spirit', had you thought of one of the foregoing. Such a spirit was that of which it is written in Isaiah: 'Syria is confederate with Ephraim, and his heart was moved and the heart of his people, as in a forest a tree is shaken by the wind.' Such too was the spirit which the Lord 'aroused upon the sea', because of Jonah. For the spirits of the wind do follow the thunder, as with the rain that fell against Ahab, when it is written : 'And it came to pass in a little while that the heavens grew black with clouds and wind.'

9/ 'But', say they, 'since the text makes mention of Christ, to be consistent we must take the spirit it speaks of to be none other than the Holy Spirit.' So you observed that the Holy Spirit is named together with Christ ! But when did you find him distinguished in nature and separated from the Son, that, while you say that Christ is not a creature, you say that the Holy Spirit is a creature? It is absurd to name together things which are by nature unlike. For what community or what likeness is there between creature and Creator? At this rate you will number and join together with the Son, as well as with the Spirit, the creatures originated through his agency. It would therefore be satisfactory, as we have said, to understand what is written of the spirit of the winds. But since you plead the fact that Christ is mentioned in the text, we shall have to look at the passage carefully, lest haply we find a more suitable interpretation of this spirit which is said to be created. What is meant by 'declare unto men his Christ' but that he himself becomes man ? It is equivalent to the saying, 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel', and the other

references to his coming. But if it is .the incarnate presence of the Word that is declared, what spirit must we understand to be created, but the spirit of man which is recreated and renewed ? For this God promised by Ezekiel, saying : 'A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you ; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh, and I will put my Spirit within you.' When has this been fulfilled, save when the Lord came and renewed all things by grace? See how in this text too the distinction between spirits is made clear. Our spirit is renewed; but the Holy Spirit is not simply spirit, but God says it is his Spirit, whereby ours is renewed. As the Psalmist says in the one hundred and third Psalm: 'Thou shalt take away their spirit, and they shall die and return to their dust. Thou shalt put forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth.' But if it is by the Spirit of God that we are renewed, then the spirit here said to be created is not the Holy Spirit but our spirit. And if, because all things come into being through the Word, you think correctly that the Son is not a creature: then is it not blasphemy for you to say that the Spirit is a creature, in whom the Father, through the Word, perfects and renews all things? And if, because of the simple statement that spirit is created, they have imagined that this means the Holy Spirit, let them know that the Holy Spirit is not created, but that it is our spirit which is renewed in him. Of this spirit David also prayed in the Psalm: 'Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me.' Here he is said to create it, but aforetime, as Zechariah says, he formed it: 'Stretching forth the heavens and laying the foundations of the earth, and forming the spirit of man within him.' For when that which he formed aforetime had fallen he remade it, coming himself in the creature, when the Word became flesh; so that, in the words of the Apostle 'He might create in himself of the twain one new man, who after God had been created in righteousness and holiness of truth'. For it was not as if another man had been created, other than he who from the beginning was made in God's image. But he was counselling them to receive the mind that was remade and renewed in Christ; as is once more made clear through Ezekiel, when he says: 'Make yourselves a new heart and a new spirit. For why will ye die, O house of Israel ? For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God.'

10/ Accordingly, if created spirit bears this meaning, we can appropriately take the thunders which is established to be the sure word and unshakable law of the Spirit. It was of this word that our Lord wished James and John to be ministers when he called them Boanerges, which is, Sons of thunder. Wherefore John cries aloud, veritably from heaven: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. 'For aforetime the law had 'a shadow of good things to come'. But when Christ was declared to men, and came saying, 'I that speak unto thee am he', then, in the words of Paul' : 'his voice shook the earth, as he promised of old, Yet once more will I make to tremble not the earth only, but also the heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifies the removing of the things that are shaken, that the things which are not shaken may remain. Wherefore, receiving a kingdom which cannot be shaken, we have grace whereby we offer service well pleasing to God.' But that kingdom which he calls unshakable, David in the Psalms declares to be established. 'The Lord reigneth, he hath clothed himself with majesty. The Lord hath clothed and girded himself with strength. He hath also established the world, that it shall not be shaken.' So then this text in the prophet signifies the coming of the Saviour, whereby we are renewed

and the law of the Spirit remains unshaken. But these Tropici, true to their name, having made a compact with the Arians and portioned out with them the blasphemy against the Godhead, so that these may call the Son a creature and those the Spirit — the Tropici, in their own words, have dared to devise for themselves tropes and to pervert also the saying of the Apostle which he blamelessly wrote to Timothy, saying: 'I charge thee in the sight of God and Christ Jesus and the elect angels that thou observe these things without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality.' But they say that, because he mentions God and Christ and then the angels, the Spirit must be counted with the angels, and belong himself to their category, and be an angel greater than the others. This discovery first proceeded from the impiety of Valentinus, and they have not been able to conceal the fact that they are expressing his sentiments. For he said that, when the Paraclete was sent, his contemporaries among the angels were sent with him. Yet they have not realised that, by reducing the Spirit to the level of the angels, they are ranking the angels with the Triad. For if, as they say, after the Father and the Son come the angels, then clearly the angels belong to the Triad and are no longer 'ministering spirits sent forth to do service', nor are they sanctified, but rather themselves sanctify others.

11/ What is this mighty folly of theirs? Once again, where in the Scriptures have they found the Spirit referred to as an angel? I am obliged to repeat what I have said before. He is called Paraclete, Spirit of adoption, Spirit of sanctification, Spirit of God, and Spirit of Christ; but never angel or archangel, or ministering spirit, as are the angels. Rather he is himself ministered unto with the Son by Gabriel when he says to Mary, 'The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.*' But if the Scriptures do not speak of the Spirit as an angel, what excuse have they for so great and absurd an audacity? For even Valentinus, who implanted this evil-mindedness in them, called him Paraclete and them angels; though at the same time he very foolishly ranks the Spirit as coeval with the angels. 'But see,' they say, 'it is written in the prophet Zechariah, "These things saith the angel that spake j within me". Clearly, he means that the Spirit who spake within him was an angel.' They would not say this if they gave heed to their reading. For Zechariah himself, upon seeing the vision of the candlestick, says: 'And the angel that spake within me answered and said, Knowest thou not what these things be? And I said, No, my lord. Then he answered and spake unto me, saying, This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel, Not by great might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord Almighty.' It is therefore clear that the angel who spoke to the prophet was not the Holy Spirit but an angel, while the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Almighty, to whom an angel ministers, who is inseparable from the Godhead and might of the Word. But as they make the words of the Apostle the basis of their plea, because after Christ he mentions the elect angels, let them tell us which of all these 'is the one who is ranked with the Triad. They do not all amount to one ! Which of them is he who descended to the Jordan in the form of a dove ? For 'thousand thousand' and 'ten thousand times ten thousand' are they that minister. Why, again, when the heavens were opened, is it not written, 'One of the elect angels came down', but, 'the Holy Spirit'? Why did the Lord himself, when conversing with the disciples concerning the End, distinguish them by saying, 'The Son of Man shall send forth his angels'? And before this it says : 'The angels ministered unto him.' He himself says again :

'The angels shall come forth.' But in giving the Spirit to the disciples, he said: 'Receive ye the Holy Spirit.' And, when sending them out, he said: 'Go ye and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.' He did not rank an angel with the Godhead; nor was it by a creature that he linked us to himself and to the Father, but by the Holy Spirit. And when he promised him, he did not say that he would send an angel, but 'the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father', and from him receives and gives.

12/ Moses too knew that the angels are creatures and that the Holy Spirit is united with the Son and the Father. For when God said to him, 'Depart, go up hence, thou and thy people which thou hast led up out of the land of Egypt, unto the land of which I swore unto Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob, saying, To your seed will I give it. And I will send my angel before thy face, and he will drive out the Canaanites', he refused him, saying: 'If thou goest not with us thyself, carry me not up hence.' For he did not desire a creature to lead the people, lest they should learn to worship the creature beyond God who created all things. So, of course, he refused the angel, and besought God himself to lead them. But after God had given him a promise, saying to him, 'I will do this thing also that thou hast spoken; for thou hast found grace in my sight, and I know thee beyond all men', it is written in Isaiah: 'He that raised up from the earth the shepherd of the sheep, where is he that put the Holy Spirit in the midst of them, that led up Moses by his right hand?' And a little farther on he says: 'The Spirit came down from the Lord and led them. So didst thou lead thy people to make thyself a glorious name.' Who cannot from these things perceive the truth? When God promised to lead them, lo! he promises no longer to send an angel, but the Spirit who is above the angels, and he leads the people. He shows that the Spirit does not belong to the creatures nor is he an angel, but is above the creation, united to the Godhead of the Father. For it was God himself who, through the Word, in the Spirit, led the people. Hence through all Scripture he says: 'I brought you up out of the land of Egypt. You are witnesses if there was a strange God among you but me.' The saints also say to God, 'Thou leddest thy people like a flock', and, 'He led them in hope, and they did not fear'. To him also they offer up the hymn which says: 'To him who led his people through the wilderness, for his mercy endureth for ever.' And the mighty Moses unceasingly declares: 'The Lord your God who goeth before you.' Thus the Spirit of God is neither angel nor creature, but belongs to his Godhead. For when the Spirit was with the people, God, through the Son in the Spirit, was with them.

13/ 'But granting this,' they say, 'why did the Apostle after Christ make mention not of the Holy Spirit but of the elect angels?' In like manner we might ask them: Why was it not archangels or cherubim or seraphim or dominions or thrones or some other, but only elect angels that Paul mentioned? Because he makes no mention of them, are the angels archangels, or are there only angels, and no seraphim or cherubim or archangels or dominions or thrones or principalities or any other? But this is to put the Apostle to the question, why he wrote thus and not thus, and to be ignorant of the divine Scriptures, and therefore to err in judgement of the truth. For behold! it is written in Isaiah: 'Come ye near unto me, and hear ye these things. From the beginning I have not spoken in secret; where it was, there was I. And now the Lord hath sent me, and his Spirit.' And in Haggai: 'Yet now be

strong, O Zerubbabel, saith the Lord; and be strong, O Joshua, son of Josedech, the High Priest, saith the Lord; and be strong all ye people of the land, saith the Lord, and work; for I am with you, saith the Lord of hosts... and my Spirit abode among you.' In both these prophets mention is made only of the Lord and the Spirit. What will they say about this? Because Paul, after mentioning Christ, passed over the Spirit and made mention of the elect angels, they, for this reason, rank the Spirit among the angels. But when they read these prophecies, they must, to be consistent, speak yet more rashly concerning him who is passed over. If they are going to say that the Lord is the Son, what will they say about the Father? If they say he is the Father, what will they say about the Son? The blasphemy which, according to them, must follow, does not even bear thinking about. For either they must say of the one passed over that he does not exist, or they must number him among the creatures.

14/ What will they say if they hear also the Lord saying : 'There was in a certain place a judge who feared not God and regarded not man'? Because, after God, he spoke of man, is the Son that man whom the unjust judge did not regard? Or because after God he spoke of man, does the Son take third place, after man, and the Holy Spirit fourth? What if they hear the Apostle saying once again in the same epistle: 'I charge thee in the sight of God who quickeneth all things, and of Jesus Christ who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession, that thou keep the commandment without spot, without reproach'? Because he here says nothing about angels and Spirit, are they in doubt concerning the Spirit, whether he exists, and concerning the angels, whether they exist? Yes, they are in doubt, until practice has made them perfect in this evil-speaking against the Spirit! If they hear Scripture saying in the book of Exodus, 'And the people feared the Lord, and believed in God and in Moses, his servant', are they going to include Moses with God and think only of Moses, and not of the Son, as coming after God? What if they hear also the patriarch Jacob blessing Joseph and saying: 'The God who hath nourished me from my youth unto this day, the angel who hath delivered me from all evil, bless these lads'? Because after God he mentions an angel, is the angel before the Son, or is the Son included among the angels? Yes! Once again, they will think so, for their heart is corrupted! But the Apostolic faith is not thus, nor can a Christian endure these things for a moment. For the holy and blessed Triad is indivisible and one in itself. When mention is made of the Father, who is in the Son. If the Son is named, the Father is in the Son, and the Spirit is not outside the Word. For there is from the Father one grace which is fulfilled through the Son in the Holy Spirit; and there is one divine nature, and one God 'who is over all and through all and in all'. Thus Paul also, when he said, 'I charge thee before God and Jesus Christ',* realised that the Spirit had not been divided from the Son, but was himself in Christ, as the Son is in the Father. But with them he appropriately introduced the elect angels; so that the disciple to whom he was speaking a charge should obey his teacher's injunctions, inasmuch as the guardians were there to witness what was said. For the disciple knew, not only that what is spoken from God is said through Christ in the Spirit, but also that the angels minister to our affairs, overseeing the deeds of each one. Or perhaps he here invokes angels to witness, because of those who always look upon 'the face of the Father who is in heaven', for the sake of the little ones

in the Church; that the disciple, recognizing the people's guardians, should not neglect the injunctions of the Apostle.

15/ Such, it seems to me, is the meaning of the divine oracles; and it refutes the evil which these irrational men speak against the Spirit. But they, persevering in their antagonism to the truth, as you write, speak again, no longer out of the Scriptures — they find nothing there — but proclaiming out of the abundance of their own heart: 'If he is not a creature nor one of the angels, but proceeds from the Father, then he is himself also a son, and he and the Word are two brothers. And if he is a brother, how is the Word only begotten? How is it then that they are not equal, but the one is named after the Father, and the other after the Son? How, if he is from the Father, is he not also said to be begotten or called son, but just Holy Spirit? But if the Spirit is of the Son, then the Father is the Spirit's grandfather.' Thus the wretches make mock, like busybodies desiring to 'search the deep things of God' which 'no one knows but the Spirit of God', against whom they speak evil. We ought therefore to answer them no more, but, in accordance with the Apostle's precept, after the warning they have had from what has been said already, to shun them as heretics; or else to ask them questions on a level with those they ask, and to demand an answer from them such as they demand from us. u Let them tell us then : whether the Father is from a Father; whether another has been begotten with him, so that they are brothers from the one father ; what are the names of these; who is the father and the grandfather of this father ; and who are their ancestors. But they will say there are none. How then, let them tell us, is he a Father who is not himself begotten of a father? Or how could he have a Son who was not first begotten a son ? I know the interrogation is impious. But when they make mock of such things, it is right to make mock of them, that even from such absurd and impious interrogation they may be able to perceive their own folly. For it is not so. God forbid ! Nor is it fitting to ask such questions about the Godhead. For God is not as man, that we should dare to ask human questions about him.

16/ We ought therefore, as I said before, to be silent on these matters and to disregard I these people. But lest our silence should furnish an excuse for their effrontery, let them listen. Just as we cannot ascribe a father to the Father, so neither can we ascribe a brother to the Son. Other than the Father, as we have written already, there is no God; there is no other Son than the Son, for he is only begotten. Hence the Father, being One and Only, is Father of a Son who is One and Only, and in the Godhead alone* the term 'Father' and the term 'Son' keep to their meaning and are ever thus. For with men, if a man is called a father, he is, notwithstanding, another man's son; and if he is called a son, he is, notwithstanding, another man's father. So that with men the names 'father' and 'son' are not kept to their strict meaning. Abraham, for example, being Nahor's son, is Isaac's father; and Isaac, being Abraham's son, is Jacob's father. And so it is by the nature of men. For they are parts of one another; and each, when he is begotten, receives a part of his father, that he may himself become father of another. But with the Godhead it is not so. For God is not as man, nor is his nature divided. Hence he does not, by division of himself, beget a son, so that he may himself become father to another ; for he himself is not from a father. Nor is the Son a part of the Father. Hence he does not beget as he himself has been begotten, but is whole image

and radiance of the whole. And in the Godhead alone, the Father is a father in the strict sense, and the Son a son in the strict sense; and of these it holds good that the Father is ever Father and the Son ever Son. As the Father could never be son, so neither could the Son be a father. As the Father will never cease to be Only Father, so the Son will never cease to be Only Son. By all accounts then, it is madness to envisage a brother to the Son, or to ascribe to the Father the name of grandfather. For the Spirit is not given the name of son in the Scriptures, lest he be taken for a brother; nor son of the Son, lest the Father be thought to be a grandfather. But the Son is called Son of the Father, and the Spirit of the Father is called Spirit of the Son. Thus the Godhead of the Holy Triad and faith therein is one.

17/ For this reason it is madness to call him a creature. If he were a creature, he would not be ranked with the Triad. For the whole Triad is one God. It is enough to know that the Spirit is not a creature, nor is he numbered with the things that are made. For nothing foreign is mixed with the Triad; it is indivisible and consistent. These things are sufficient for the faithful. Thus far human knowledge goes. Here the cherubim spread the covering of their wings. He who seeks and would inquire into what lies beyond these things disobeys him who said: 'Be not wise in many things, lest thou be confounded.' For the things that have been handed down by faith ought not to be measured by human wisdom, but by the hearing of faith. What speech shall be able worthily to interpret the things that surpass originated nature? Or what hearing is able to understand things it is not lawful for men either to hear or to utter? For that is how Paul spoke of what he heard; but of God himself, 'How are his ways past tracing out!', and, 'Who hath known the mind of the Lord and who hath been his counsellor?' Abraham was not a busybody, nor did he question him who spoke, but believed and 'it was counted to him for righteousness'. Thus Moses was called 'a faithful servant'. But if the disciples of Arius, because wisdom will not enter their deceitful hearts, are not able intelligently to believe in the indivisible and holy Triad, let them not on that account pervert the truth as well, neither let them say that what they cannot understand cannot be true. They have put themselves in an absurd position. Because they cannot understand how the holy Triad is indivisible, the Arians make the Son one with the creation, and the Tropici, for their part, number the Spirit with the creatures. It would be better for them either to say nothing at all in their incomprehension, the Arians not ranking the Son with the creatures nor the Tropici the Spirit; or else to acknowledge what is written, and join the Son to the Father and not divide the Spirit from the Son — so that the Holy Triad may still be rightly characterised as indivisible and of one nature. Having learned these truths, they ought not to be so bold as to ask doubting, how these things could be; lest, even if he whom they question be at a loss for words, of their own accord they think out false notions for themselves. For all created beings, and especially we who are men, find it impossible to speak adequately concerning the things that are ineffable. All the more presumptuous, then, if, when we cannot speak, we devise for these subjects strange forms of expression other than those in the Scriptures. Above all is this present attempt madness, both on the part of him who asks and of him who so much as thinks of answering. For he who asked such questions even about originated things would not be regarded as of sound mind.

18/ Let them presume to tell us, as they have a glib answer to everything, how the heavens were formed, and from what material, and what is their composition; and likewise of the sun and each of the stars. Small wonder if we expose their folly by referring to the things above us, when we do not understand the 'how' of the nature of the trees here below, of 'the gathering together of the waters', and of the fashioning and forming of living things. But they could not tell us. For even Solomon, who had a far greater share of wisdom than any, saw that it was impossible for men to find out about these things, and said: 'He hath set eternity within their heart, yet so that man cannot find out the work that God hath done from the beginning even to the end.' Because they cannot find out, do they admit that these things do not exist? Yes, they will admit it, for their understanding is corrupted. Wherefore we might reasonably ask them: 'You who are without sense and in all things reckless, why do you not rather cease your impertinent inquiries about the holy Triad, and only believe that it exists? You have the Apostle as your teacher for this, when he says: "It is necessary first to believe on God that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him." He did not say, "how he is," but only, "that he is".' But if they are not overwhelmed by this, let them say how the Father is, that so they may learn how his Word is. But it is absurd, they will say, to ask such questions about the Father. Let them hear, then, that it is also absurd to ask them concerning his Word.

19/ Since, therefore, such an attempt is futile madness, nay, more than madness!, let no one ask such questions any more, or else let him learn only that which is in the Scriptures.* For the illustrations they contain which bear upon this subject are sufficient and suitable. The Father is called fountain and light: 'They have forsaken me,' it says, 'the fountain of living water'; and again in Baruch, 'Why, O Israel, art thou in the land of thine enemies? Thou hast forsaken the fountain of wisdom'; and, according to John: 'Our God is light.' But the Son, in contrast with the fountain, is called river: 'The river of God is full of water.' In contrast with the light, he is called radiance— as Paul says: 'Who, being the radiance of his glory and the image of his essence.' As then the Father is light and the Son is his radiance— we must not shrink from saying the same things about them many times— we may see in the Son the Spirit also by whom we are enlightened. 'That he may give you', it says, 'the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him, having the eyes of your heart enlightened'. But when we are enlightened by the Spirit, it is Christ who in him enlightens us. For it says: 'There was the true light which lighteth every man coming into the world.' Again, as the Father is fountain and the Son is called river, we are said to drink of the Spirit. For it is written: 'We are all made to drink of one Spirit.' But when we are made to drink of the Spirit, we drink of Christ. For 'they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Christ'. Again, as Christ is true Son, so we, when we receive the Spirit, are made sons. 'For you have not received', it says, 'the spirit of bondage again to fear; but you have received the Spirit of adoption.' But if by the Spirit we are made sons, it is clear that it is in Christ we are called children of God. For: 'So many as received him, to them gave he the power to become children of God.' Then, as the Father, in Paul's words, is the 'only wise', the Son is his Wisdom: 'Christ the Power of God and the Wisdom of God.' But as the Son is Wisdom, so we, receiving the Spirit of Wisdom, have the Son and are made wise in him. For thus it is written in the one hundred and forty-fifth psalm: 'The Lord looseth the prisoners, the Lord

maketh wise the blind.' When the Holy Spirit is given to us ('Receive the Holy Spirit,' said the Saviour), God is in us; for so John wrote: 'If we love one another, God abideth in us ; hereby know we that we abide in him and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.' But when God is in us, the Son also is in us. For the Son himself said: 'The Father and I will come and make our abode with him.' Furthermore, as the Son is life — for he says 'I am the life'— we are said to be quickened by the Spirit. For it says: 'He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies, through his Spirit that dwelleth in you.' But when we are quickened by the Spirit, Christ himself is said to live in us; for it says: 'I have been crucified with Christ. I live, and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me.' Again, the Son declared that the Father worked the works that he did — for he says: 'The Father abiding in me doeth his works. Believe me, that I am in the Father and the Father in me; or else believe me for his works' sake.' So Paul declared that the works he worked by the power of the Spirit were the works of Christ: 'For I will not dare to speak of any things save those which Christ wrought through me, for the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and deed, in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Holy Spirit.'

20/ But if there is such co-ordination and unity within the holy Triad, who can separate either the Son from the Father, or the Spirit from the Son or from the Father himself? Who would be so audacious as to say that the Triad is unlike itself and diverse in nature, or that the Son is in essence foreign from the Father, or the Spirit alien from the Son? But how are these things ? If one should make inquiry and ask again: How, when the Spirit is in us, the Son is said to be in us ? How, when the Son is in us, the Father is said to be in us ? Or how, when it is truly a Triad, the Triad is described as one ? Or why, when the One is in us, the Triad is said to be in us ? — let him first divide the radiance from the light, or wisdom from the wise, or let him tell how these things are. But if this is not to be done, much more is it the audacity of madmen to make such inquiries concerning God. For tradition, as we have said, does not declare the Godhead to us by demonstration in words, but by faith and by a pious and reverent use of reason. For if Paul proclaimed the saving Gospel of the Cross, 'not in words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power'; and if in Paradise he heard 'unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter': who can declare the holy Triad itself? Nevertheless, we can meet this difficulty, primarily by faith and then by using the illustrations mentioned above, I mean the image and the radiance, fountain and river, essence and expression. As the Son is in the Spirit as in his own image, so also the Father is in the Son. For divine Scripture, by way of relieving the impossibility of explaining and apprehending these matters in words, has given us illustrations of this kind; that it may be lawful, because of the unbelief of presumptuous men, to speak more plainly, and to speak without danger, and to think legitimately, and to believe that there is one sanctification, which is derived from the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit. As the Son is an only-begotten offspring, so also the Spirit, being given and sent from the Son, is himself one and not many, nor one from among many, but Only Spirit. As the Son, the living Word, is one, so must the vital activity and gift whereby he sanctifies and enlightens be one perfect and complete; which is said to proceed from the Father, because it is from the Word, who is confessed to be from the Father, that it shines forth and is sent and is given. The Son is sent from the Father; for he says, 'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son.' The Son sends the

Spirit; 'If I go away,' he says, 'I will send the Paraclete.' The Son glorifies the Father, saying: 'Father, I have glorified thee.' The Spirit glorifies the Son; for he says: 'He shall glorify me.' The Son says: 'The things I heard from the Father speak I unto the world.' The Spirit takes of the Son; 'He shall take of mine,' he says, 'and shall declare it unto you.' The Son came in the name of the Father. 'The Holy Spirit,' says the Son, 'whom the Father will send in my name.'

21/ But if, in regard to order and nature, the Spirit bears the same relation to the Son as the Son to the Father, will not he who calls the Spirit a creature necessarily hold the same to be true also of the Son? For if the Spirit is a creature of the Son, it will be consistent for them to say that the Word is a creature of the Father. By holding such opinions the Arians have fallen into the Judaism of Caiaphas. But if those who say such things about the Spirit claim that they do not hold the opinions of Arius, let them avoid his words and keep from impiety toward the Spirit. For as the Son, who is in the Father and the Father in him, is not a creature but pertains to the essence of the Father (for this you also profess to say); so also it is not lawful to rank with the creatures the Spirit who is in the Son, and the Son in him, nor to divide him from the Word and reduce the Triad to imperfection. As regards the sayings both of the Prophet and the Apostle, by perverting whose meaning these men have deceived themselves, these considerations are sufficient to refute the evil speech to which the ignorance of the Tropici gives rise. But finally let us look, one by one, at the references to the Holy Spirit in the divine Scriptures, and, like good bankers, let us judge whether he has anything in common with the creatures, or whether he pertains to God; that we may call him either a creature or else other than the creatures, pertaining to and one with the Godhead which is in the unoriginated Triad. Perhaps they may be put to shame when they realise how far the blasphemous words they have devised are out of harmony with the divine oracles.

22/ The creatures came from nothing, having a beginning from which they came into being. For, 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth' and all that is in them. The Holy Spirit is said to be from God. For no one, it says, 'knoweth the things of man save the spirit of the man which is in him. Even so, the things of God none knoweth save the Spirit of God. But we received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God.' What kinship could there be, judging by the above, between the Spirit and the creatures? For the creatures were not; but God has being, and the Spirit is from him. That which is from God could not be from that which is not, nor could it be a creature; lest, by their judgement, he also from whom the Spirit is should be considered a creature. Who will endure such fools? For they say also in their hearts that 'there is no God'. For if, as no one knows the things of man save the spirit within him, so no one knows the things of God save the Spirit who is in him: would it not be evil speech to call the Spirit who is in God a creature, him who searches even the deep things of God? For from this the speaker will learn to say that the spirit of man is outside the man himself, and that the Word of God, who is in the Father, is a creature. Again, the Spirit is, and is called, Spirit of holiness and renewal. For Paul writes: 'Declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead; even Jesus Christ our Lord.' Again he says: 'But ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.' And when writing to Titus, he said: 'But when the kindness of God our Saviour and his love toward men appeared, not by

works done in righteousness which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit which he poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being justified by his grace, we might be made heirs, according to the hope of eternal life.' But the creatures are sanctified and renewed. 'Thou shalt send forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth.' And Paul says: 'It is impossible for those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit....'

23/ He, therefore, who is not sanctified by another, nor a partaker of sanctification, but who is himself partaken, and in whom all the creatures are sanctified, how can he be one from among all things or pertain to those who partake of him? For those who say this must say that the Son, through whom all things came to be, is one from among all things. He is called a quickening Spirit. For it says: 'He that raised up Christ from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you.' The Lord is the very life, and 'author of life', as Peter put it. And as the Lord said himself: 'The water that I shall give him shall become in him a well of water springing up into eternal life. ... But this spake he concerning the Spirit which they that believed in him were to receive.' But the creatures, as has been said, are quickened through him. He that does not partake of life, but who is himself partaken and quickens the creatures, what kinship can he have with things originated? How can he belong to the creatures which in him are quickened from the Word? The Spirit is called unction and he is seal. For John writes: 'As for you, the unction which ye received of him abideth in you, and you need not that anyone teach you, but his unction' — his Spirit — 'teacheth you concerning all things.' In the prophet Isaiah it is written: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me.' Paul says: 'In whom having also believed, ye were sealed unto the day of redemption.' But the creatures are by him sealed and anointed and instructed in all things. But if the Spirit is the unction and seal with which the Word anoints and seals all things, what likeness or propriety could the unction and the seal have to the things that are anointed and sealed? Thus by this consideration also he could not belong to the 'all things'. The seal could not be from among the things that are sealed, nor the unction from among the things that are anointed; it pertains to the Word who anoints and seals. For the unction has the fragrance and odour of him who anoints; and those who are anointed say, when they receive thereof: 'We are the fragrance of Christ.' The seal has the form of Christ who seals, and those who are sealed partake of it, being conformed to it; as the Apostle says: 'My little children, for whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you.' Being thus sealed, we are duly made, as Peter put it, 'sharers in the divine nature'; and thus all creation partakes of the Word in the Spirit.

24/ Further it is through the Spirit that we are all said to be partakers of God. For it says: 'Know ye not that ye are a temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.' If the Holy Spirit were a creature, we should have no participation of God in him. If indeed we were joined to a creature, we should be strangers to the divine nature inasmuch as we did not partake therein. But, as it is, the fact of our being called partakers of Christ and partakers of God shows that the unction and seal that is in us

belongs, not to the nature of things originate, but to the nature of the Son who, through the Spirit who is in him, joins us to the Father. This John taught us, as is said above, when he wrote: 'Hereby know we that we abide in God and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.' But if, by participation in the Spirit, we are made 'sharers in the divine nature', we should be mad to say that the Spirit has a created nature and not the nature of God. For it is on this account that those in whom he is are made divine. If he makes men divine, it is not to be doubted that his nature is of God.

Yet more clearly, for the destruction of this heresy, the Psalmist sings, as we have said before, in the one hundred and third psalm: 'Thou shalt take away thy Spirit, and they shall die and return to their dust. Thou shalt put forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth.' And Paul wrote to Titus: 'Through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ 'But if the Father, through the Word, in the Holy Spirit, creates and renews all things, what likeness or kinship is there between the Creator and the creatures ? How could he possibly be a creature, in whom all things are created ? Such evil speech leads on to blasphemy against the Son ; so that those who say the Spirit is a creature say also that the Word is a creature, through whom all things are created.

The Spirit is said to be, and is, the image of the Son. For 'Whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son'. If then they admit that the Son is not a creature, neither may his image be a creature. For as is the image, so also must he be whose image it is. Hence the Word is justly and fitly confessed not to be a creature, because he is the image of the Father. He therefore who numbers the Spirit with the creatures will surely number the Son among them also, and thereby will speak evil of the Father as well, by speaking evil against his image.

25/ The Spirit, therefore, is distinct from the creatures, and is shown rather to be proper to the Son and not alien from God. As for that wise question of theirs, 'If the Spirit is from God, why is he not himself called son ?', already, in what precedes, we have shown it rash and presumptuous, and we show it not less so now. Even though he is not called Son in the Scriptures, but Spirit of God, he is said to be in God himself and from God himself, as the Apostle wrote. And if the Son, because he is of the Father, is proper to his essence, it must be that the Spirit, who is said to be from God, is in essence proper to the Son. And so, as the Lord is Son, the Spirit is called Spirit of sonship. Again, as the Son is Wisdom and Truth, the Spirit is described as Spirit of Wisdom and Truth. Again the Son is the Power of God and Lord of Glory, and the Spirit is called Spirit of Power and of Glory. So Scripture refers to each of them. Paul wrote to the Corinthians: 'Had they known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.' And, elsewhere: 'For ye received not the Spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye received the Spirit of adoption. ' s Again: 'God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts crying, Abba Father.' Peter wrote: 'If ye are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are ye; because the Spirit of glory and of power resteth upon you.' The Lord called the Spirit 'Spirit of truth' and 'Paraclete'; whence he shows that the Triad is in him complete. In him the Word makes glorious the creation, and, by bestowing upon it divine life and sonship, draws it to the Father. But that which joins creation to the Word cannot belong to the creatures; and that which bestows sonship upon the creation could not be alien from the Son. For we

should have otherwise to seek another spirit,' so that by him this Spirit might be joined to the Word. But that would be absurd. The Spirit, therefore, does not belong to things originated; he pertains to the Godhead of the Father, and in him the Word makes things originated divine. But he in whom creation is made divine cannot be outside the Godhead of the Father.

26/ That the Spirit is above the creation, distinct in nature from things originated, and proper to the Godhead, can be seen from the following consideration also. The Holy Spirit is incapable of change and alteration. For it says, (continued) both are collateral points in a controversy whose crisis is past, and which he can, therefore, see as a whole.' The Holy Spirit of discipline will flee deceit and will start away from thoughts that are without understanding.' And Peter says: 'In the incorruptibility of the meek and quiet Spirit.' Again, in Wisdom: 'Thine incorruptible Spirit is in all things.' And if 'none knoweth the things of God save the Spirit of God which is in him', and, as James said, in God 'there is no variation nor shadow that is cast by turning'— the Holy Spirit, being in God, must be incapable of change, variation, and corruption. But the nature of things originated and of things created is capable of change, inasmuch as it is outside the essence of God, and came into existence from that which is not. For it says: 'Every man is a liar,' and, 'All have sinned and come short of the glory of God.' And angels which kept not their own principality, but left their proper habitation, he hath kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgement of the great day.' In Job : 'If he putteth no trust in his holy angels ... and against his angels he imputeth evil ... and the stars are not pure in his sight.' Paul writes: 'Know ye not that we shall judge angels ? How much more things that pertain to this life ?' We have heard too that the devil, who was 'between the cherubim', and was 'the seal of the likeness', fell 'as lightning from heaven'. But if, while creatures are by nature capable of change, and such things are written about angels, the Spirit is the same and unalterable; if he shares the immutability of the Son, with him abiding ever unchangeable — what likeness can there be between the unchangeable and the things that change ? It will be clear that he is not a creature, nor does he belong in essence to the angels, for they are changeable, but he is the image of the Word and pertains to the Father.

Again, the Spirit of the Lord fills the universe. Thus David sings: 'Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?' Again, in Wisdom it is written : 'Thine incorruptible Spirit is in all things.' But things originated are all in places apportioned to them : sun, moon, and stars in the firmament, clouds in the air. For men he has 'set the bounds of the peoples'. The angels are 'sent forth' for ministries. 'And the angels came to stand before the face of the Lord,' as it is written in Job. And Jacob the patriarch dreamed : 'And behold ! a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven ; and the angels of God ascended and descended upon it.' But if the Spirit fills all things, and in the Word is present in the midst of all things ; and if the angels, being his inferiors, are circumscribed, and where they are sent forth, there are they present : it is not to be doubted that the Spirit does not belong to things originated, nor is he an angel at all, as you say, but by nature is above the angels.

27/ From what follows, also, we may see how the Holy Spirit is partaken and does not partake. (We must not mind repeating ourselves.) For, 'It is impossible', it says, 'for those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy

Spirit, and tasted the good Word of God...' The angels and the other creatures partake of the Spirit himself; hence they can fall away from him whom they partake. But the Spirit is always the same; he does not belong to those who partake, but all things partake of him. But if he is always the same and always partaken; and if the creatures partake of him — the Holy Spirit can neither be an angel nor a creature of any kind, but proper to the Word. And being given by the Word, he is partaken by the creatures. For they would have to say that the Son is a creature, of whom we are all made partakers in the Spirit.

Again, the Holy Spirit is one, but the creatures are many. For the angels are 'thousand thousand' and 'ten thousand times ten thousand', and there are many lights and thrones and lordships and heavens and cherubim and seraphim and many archangels. In a word, creatures are not one but, taking all together, many and diverse. But if the Holy Spirit is one, and the creatures many and angels many — what likeness can there be between the Spirit and things originate? It is obvious that the Spirit does not belong to the many nor is he an angel. But because he is one, and, still more, because he is proper to the Word who is one, he is proper to God who is one, and one in essence with him.

These sayings concerning the Holy Spirit, by themselves alone, show that in nature and essence he has nothing in common with or proper to creatures, but is distinct from things originate, proper to, and not alien from, the Godhead and essence of the Son; in virtue of which essence and nature he is of the Holy Triad, and puts their stupidity to shame.

28/ But, beyond these sayings, let us look at the very tradition, teaching, and faith of the Catholic Church from the beginning, which the Lord gave, the Apostles preached, and the Fathers kept. Upon this the Church is founded, and he who should fall away from it would not be a Christian, and should no longer be so called. There is, then, a Triad, holy and complete, confessed to be God in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, having nothing foreign or external mixed with it, not composed of one that creates and one that is originated, but all creative; and it is consistent and in nature indivisible, and its activity is one. The Father does all things through the Word in the Holy Spirit. Thus the unity of the holy Triad is preserved. Thus one God is preached in the Church, 'who is over all, and through all, and in all' — 'over all', as Father, as beginning, as fountain; 'through all', through the Word; 'in all', in the Holy Spirit. It is a Triad not only in name and form of speech, but in truth and actuality. For as the Father is he that is, so also his Word is one that is and God over all. And the Holy Spirit is not without actual existence, but exists and has true being. Less than these (Persons) the Catholic Church does not hold, lest she sink to the level of the modern Jews, imitators of Caiaphas, and to the level of Sabellius. Nor does she add to them by speculation, lest she be carried into the polytheism of the heathen. And that they may know this to be the faith of the Church, let them learn how the Lord, when sending forth the Apostles, ordered them to lay this foundation for the Church, saying: 'Go and make disciples of all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.' The Apostles went, and thus they taught; and this is the preaching that extends to the whole Church which is under heaven.

29/ Since then the Church has this foundation of faith, let these men tell us once again and let them make answer, Is God triad or dyad? If he is dyad, then you are welcome to count the

Spirit with the creatures. In that case, however, the faith which you hold is not in one God, 'Who is over all, and through all, and in all'. If you divide and alienate the Spirit from the Godhead, you have not that which is 'in all' ; and, if you think like this, the rite of initiation which you reckon to perform is not entirely into the Godhead. For with the Godhead there is mixed a creature; and, like the Arians and the heathen, you too confess creation to be divine together with God who made it through his own Word. If this is your attitude, what hope have you? Who will unite you to God, if you have not the Spirit of God, but the spirit which belongs to creation ? How rash and careless on your part to reduce the Father and his Word to the level of creatures, and yet to set the creatures on a level with God ! For that is what you are doing when you imagine the Spirit as a creature and rank him with the Triad. What madness too on your part to impute injustice to God, in that not all angels nor all creatures, but one from among them, is numbered with God and his Word ! For if, as you say, the Spirit were at once an angel and a creature and ranked with the Triad, then it would be necessary not for one, but for all the angels that have been created to be ranked with the Godhead, and for there to be no longer a Triad but an unnumbered multitude therein. So that the initiation therein, which, to repeat, appears to be yours, is divided this way and that; and, by reason of its variegation, is without guarantee. Such are your rites and those of the Arians, who dispute about the Godhead and serve creatures before the God who created all things.

30/ Such absurdities meet you if you say God is dyad. But if he is triad, as indeed he is; and if the Triad has been shown to be indivisible and consistent — then its holiness must be one, and its eternity one, and its immutable nature. For as the faith in the Triad, which has been delivered to us, joins us to God ; and as he who takes anything away from the Triad, and is baptised in the name of the Father alone, or in the name of the Son alone, or in the Father and the Son without the Holy Spirit, receives nothing, but remains ineffective and uninitiated, both himself and he who is supposed to initiate him (for the rite of initiation is in the Triad) ; so he who divides the Son from the Father, or who reduces the Spirit to the level of the creatures, has neither the Son nor the Father, but is without God, worse than an unbeliever, and anything rather than a Christian. And justly so. For as baptism, which is given in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is one; and as there is one faith in the Triad (as the Apostle said) ; so the holy Triad, being identical with itself and united within itself, has in it nothing which belongs to things originate. This is the indivisible unity of the Triad; and faith therein is one. But if, from the new discovery you Tropicici have made, it is not so; if you have dreamed dreams of calling the Holy Spirit a creature — then you no longer have one faith and one baptism, but two, one in the Father and the Son, another in an angel who is a creature. There is no security or truth left you. For what communion can there be between that which is originate and that which creates ? What unity between the lower creatures and the Word who created them? Knowing this, the blessed Paul does not divide the Triad as you do ; but, teaching its unity, when he wrote to the Corinthians concerning things spiritual, he finds the source of all things in one God, the Father, saying: 'There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God who worketh all things in all.' The gifts which the Spirit divides to each are bestowed from the Father through the Word. For all things that are of the Father are of the Son also ; therefore those things which are given from the Son in the

Spirit are gifts of the Father. And when the Spirit is in us, the Word also, who gives the Spirit, is in us, and in the Word is the Father. So it is as it is said: 'We will come, I and the Father, and make our abode with him.' u For where the light is, there is also the radiance; and where the radiance is, there also is its activity and lambent grace. This again the Apostle teaches, when he wrote to the Corinthians, in the second letter as well, saying: 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all.' For this grace and gift that is given is given in the Triad, from the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit. As the grace given is from the Father through the Son, so we can have no communion in the gift except in the Holy Spirit. For it is when we partake of him that we have the love of the Father and the grace of the Son and the communion of the Spirit himself.

31/ This consideration also shows that the activity of the Triad is one. The Apostle does not mean that the things which are given are given differently and separately by each Person, but that what is given is given in the Triad, and that all are from the one God. Him therefore who is no creature but is one with the Son as the Son is one with the Father, who is glorified with the Father and the Son, who is confessed as God with the Word, who is active in the works which the Father works through the Son — is not the man who calls him a creature guilty of a direct impiety against the Son himself? For there is nothing that is not originated and actuated through the Word in the Spirit. Thus it is sung in the Psalms: 'By the Word of the Lord the heavens were established, and all their might by the Spirit of his mouth.' And in the one hundred and forty-seventh Psalm: 'He shall send out his Word and shall melt them; he shall breathe his Spirit and the waters shall flow.' We were justified, as the Apostle says: 'in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.' For the Spirit is indivisible from the Word. So when Christ says, 'We will come, the Father and I', the Spirit comes with them and shall dwell in us not otherwise than as the Son; as Paul writes to the Ephesians: 'That he would grant you according to the riches of his glory, that ye may be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man, that Christ may dwell ...' But if the Son is in us, the Father also is in us; as the Son says: 'I am in the Father, and the Father in me.' Therefore, when the Word is in the prophets, they prophesy in the Holy Spirit. When Scripture says 'The Word of the Lord came' to this particular prophet, it shows that he prophesied in the Holy Spirit. In Zechariah it is written: 'But receive my words and my commandments which I charge by my Spirit to my servants the prophets'; and, when the prophet rebuked the people a little farther on, he said: 'They made their hearts disobedient, lest they should hear my law and the words which the Lord of hosts has sent by his Spirit by the hands of the prophets of old.' Peter in Acts said: 'Brethren, it was needful that the Scripture should be fulfilled which the Holy Spirit spake before.' And the Apostles cried aloud together, 'O Lord, thou that didst make the heaven and the earth and the sea and all that in them is, who by the Holy Spirit, by the mouth of our father David thy servant, didst say ...' And Paul, when he was in Rome, spoke boldly to the Jews who came to him: 'Well spake the Holy Spirit by Isaiah the prophet unto your fathers.' And in writing to Timothy: 'The Spirit saith expressly that in later times some shall fall away from the sound faith, giving heed to spirits of seduction.' Thus when the Spirit is said to be in anyone, it means that the Word is in him, bestowing the Spirit. When the prophecy was being fulfilled, 'I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh', Paul said: 'According to the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ unto me.' And

to the Corinthians he wrote, 'If ye seek a proof of Christ that speaketh in me'. ...But if he who spoke in him was Christ, then clearly the Spirit that spoke in him was Christ's. For when Christ was speaking in him, he said once again in Acts: 'Now, behold, I go bound in the Spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there, save that the Holy Spirit testifieth to me in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me.' Hence, if the saints say, 'Thus saith the Lord', they speak not otherwise than in the Holy Spirit. And if they speak in the Holy Spirit, they speak the things of the Spirit in Christ. When Agabus says in Acts, 'Thus saith the Holy Spirit', it is not otherwise than by the Word coming to him that the Spirit too bestows upon him the power to speak and to testify to the things that were waiting for Paul at Jerusalem. So when the Spirit once again testified to Paul, Christ, as aforesaid, was speaking in him, so that the testimony which came from the Spirit belonged to the Word. So too when the Word visited the holy Virgin Mary, the Spirit came to her with him, and the Word in the Spirit moulded the body and conformed it to himself; desiring to join and present all creation to the Father through himself, and in it 'to reconcile all things ... having made peace ... whether things in the heavens or things upon the earth'.

32/ The divine Scriptures, then, consistently show that the Holy Spirit is not a creature, but is proper to the Word and to the Godhead of the Father. Thus the teaching of the saints joins in establishing the holy and indivisible Triad; and the Catholic Church has one faith, even this. But the irrational and fabulous invention of the Tropici conflicts with the Scriptures and concurs with the unreason of the Arian madmen. It is natural for them to pretend in this way, to deceive the simple. But, thanks be to God!, as you write, they have not succeeded in covering themselves by their pretended controversy with the Arians. They have indeed incurred their hatred, because they only call the Spirit a creature and not the Son as well ; and by all men they have been condemned, because they are in truth fighting against the Spirit, and are not far from dead, being destitute and void of the Spirit. In the words of the blessed Apostle, being 'natural men', they could not receive the things of the Spirit of God, because these things were spiritually judged. But those who mind the things that belong to truth judge all things, but are themselves judged of no man. For they have within them the Lord who in the Spirit reveals to them himself, and through himself the Father.

33/ Dwelling as I do in a desert place, yet, because of their effrontery who have turned away from the truth, I have not heeded those who will be glad to laugh at the feebleness and inadequacy of my exposition. But, having written briefly, I send it to your Piety, with many entreaties, that, when you read it, in part you will amend it, and, where it is feebly written, you will excuse it. In accordance with the Apostolic faith delivered to us by tradition from the Fathers, I have delivered the tradition, without inventing anything extraneous to it. What I learned, that have I inscribed conformably with the holy Scriptures; for it also conforms with those passages from the holy Scriptures which we have cited above by way of proof. It is no extraneous invention, but the Lord Jesus Christ himself, in his own Person, taught the woman of Samaria and us through her the perfection of the holy Triad, which is one Godhead indivisible. It is the Truth himself who bears witness, when he says to her: 'Believe me, woman ... the hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in truth; for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers. God is a

Spirit, and they that worship him must worship in Spirit and in truth.' From this passage it is clear that the Truth is the Lord himself; as he says, 'I am the truth', concerning whom the prophet David prayed, saying: 'Send out thy light and thy truth.' True worshippers, therefore, worship the Father, but in Spirit and Truth, confessing the Son and in him the Spirit. For the Spirit is inseparable from the Son, as the Son is inseparable from the Father. The Truth himself bears witness when he says, 'I will send you the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, whom the world cannot receive', that is, those who deny that he is from the Father in the Son. Therefore we ought, after the pattern of true worshippers, to confess and side with the Truth. And if after these things they still have neither the will to learn nor the power to understand, let them at least cease from evil speaking. Let them not divide the Triad, lest they be divided from life. Let them not number the Holy Spirit with the creatures, lest, like the Pharisees of old, who ascribed to Beelzeboul the works of the Spirit, they for like presumption incur with these men the punishment which is without hope of pardon both here and hereafter.

EPISTLE TWO

1/ I was of the opinion that, even as it was, I had written briefly; indeed, I taxed myself with great weakness, that I could not put into writing all that it is humanly possible to say against those who are guilty of impiety toward the Holy Spirit. But since, as you write, some of the brethren have actually asked that it should be abridged, so that they may have the means readily and briefly both to answer those who inquire concerning the faith that is in us, and to refute those who are impious, I am composing this as well, being confident that if here too there is anything lacking, you will not scruple to supply it. The Arians being engrossed in themselves, and thinking with the Sadducees that there is nothing greater or beyond themselves, have met the inspired Scripture with human arguments. When they hear that the Son is the Wisdom, Radiance, and Word of the Father, they are accustomed to rejoin, 'How can this be?', as though nothing can be unless they understand it. At that rate, they should occupy their minds with similar questions about the universe as well. How can creation, which once was not, come into being? How can dust of the earth be fashioned into a rational man? How can the corruptible become incorruptible? How has the earth been founded 'upon the seas', and how did God 'prepare it upon the floods'? Then, last of all, they ought to add to themselves, 'Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die': that it may be clear that, when they perish, their insane heresy will perish with them!

2/ This opinion of the Arians is indeed mortal and corruptible. But the argument of truth, which even they ought to ponder, runs like this: If God is Fountain and Light and Father, it is not lawful to say that the fountain is dry, or that the light has no ray, or that God has no Word; lest God be without wisdom, reason, and brightness. As, therefore, the Father is eternal, the Son also must be eternal; for whatsoever we see in the Father must without question also be in the Son. For the Lord himself says, 'All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine', and all 'mine' belong to the Father. The Father is eternal, the Son also is eternal; for through him the ages came into being. The Father is One that is; of necessity, the Son also is 'He that is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen', as the Apostle said. It is not lawful to say of the Father: 'There was once when he was not'; it is unlawful to say of the Son: 'There was once when he was not.' The Father is Almighty; the Son also is Almighty, as John says: 'These things saith he which is and which was and which is to come, the Almighty.' The Father is light; the Son is radiance and true light. The Father is true God; the Son is true God. For thus John wrote: 'We are in him that is true, in his Son, Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life.' To sum up, of that which the Father has, there is nothing which does not belong to the Son. Therefore the Son is in the Father, and the Father is in the Son; for the things that belong to the Father, these are in the Son, and again they are seen in the Father. Thus is understood the saying: 'I and the Father are one.' For there are not some things in the Father and others in the Son; but the things that are in the Father are in the Son also. And if you see in the Son those things which you see in the Father, you have a right understanding of the saying: 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'

3/ When these points are thus proved, he is impious who says that the Son is a creature. For he will be compelled also to give the name of creature to the Fountain which sends forth as its creature Wisdom, the Word, in whom are all the things of the Father.

Above all, from what follows can one observe how rotten is the heresy of the Arian madmen. Those to whom we are alike and whose identical nature we share, with these we are one in essence. For example, we men, because we are alike and share the same identical nature, are one in essence with each other. For it belongs to us all to be mortal, corruptible, capable of change, originated from nothing. So too are the angels among themselves, and all the rest in so far as they are one in nature with each other. Let these busybodies then examine whether the creatures have any likeness to the Son,* or whether they can find in things originate the things that are in the Son, that they dare to call God's Word a creature. But they will not find them there, these men who rush impetuously at everything and who go astray from true religion. Among the creatures none is almighty, and none is in subjection to another; for each belongs to God himself. 'The heavens declare the glory of God'; and, 'The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof'; 'The sea saw and fled'. All things are the servants of him who is their Maker, doing his word and obeying his decree. But the Son, like the Father, is Almighty; as we have shown from Scripture. Again, among the creatures there is none that is not by nature capable of change. Some of the angels 'kept not their own rank'; and, 'The stars are not pure in his sight'. The devil fell from heaven; Adam transgressed; and all things suffer alteration. So Paul reminds us from the hundred and first Psalm: 'Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou continuest; and they shall all wax old as doth a garment; and as a mantle shalt thou roll them up ... and they shall be changed. But thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.' And again he says: 'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, yea and for ever'.

4/ Again, all things originate were not and have come into being. For, 'He made the earth as nothing'; and, 'Who calleth the things that are not as though they were'; and they are also 'works' and 'creatures'. Therefore they have a beginning from which they come to be. For 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth', and all that in them is; and again: 'All these things hath mine hand made.' But the Son, like the Father, is 'One that is' and 'God over all things', as we have shown. He is not made, he makes; he is not created, but creates and makes the works of the Father. Through him 'the ages' came to be; and, 'All things have come to be through him, and without him has not anything come to be'. And, as the Apostle has expounded the contents of the Psalm, he himself at the beginning laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of his hands. Again, none of the creatures is by nature God. Each thing that comes into being has been called whatever it has come to be: one heaven, another earth; some planets, others stars; yet others seas, depths, four-footed things; and finally, man. And previous to these, angels and archangels, cherubim, virtues, principalities, powers, dominions, paradise. And so each remains. But if some have been called gods, they are not so by nature, but by participation in the Son. Thus he himself said, 'If he called them gods, unto whom the Word of God came ...'. Hence, because they are not gods by nature, there comes a time when some of them suffer a change and hear him say: 'I said, Ye are gods and sons of the Most High. Nevertheless, ye die like men.' Such

was he who heard God say: 'Thou art a man and not god.' But the Son, like the Father, is true God. For he is in him, and the Father in the Son. John wrote it, as we have shown; and David sings: 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever ; a sceptre of equity is the sceptre of thy kingdom.' And the prophet Isaiah cries: 'Egypt was overwhelmed and the commerce of the Ethiopians; and the Sabaeans, men of stature, shall come over to thee, and they shall follow behind thee bound with fetters, and they shall worship thee, because God is in thee. For thou art the God of Israel, and we knew thee not.' Who is this God in whom God is, except the Son who said: 'I am in the Father and the Father in me'.

5/ Since these things are true and are written in Scripture, who does not recognise that, inasmuch as the Son has no likeness to the creatures but has all that belongs to the Father, he must be one in essence with the father? He would be one in essence with the creatures, had he any likeness to them or any kinship with them. So likewise, being by essence foreign to things originate and being the Word who is proper to the Father, inasmuch as the Word is different from things originate and has as his own properties all that belongs to the Father, it follows that he will be one in essence with the Father. Thus the Fathers understood it, when at the Council of Nicaea they confessed that the Son is 'one in essence with the Father', and 'from the essence of the Father'. Well they realised that created essence could never say : 'All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine.' Because it has a beginning from which it came to be, we do not predicate of it that it 'has being' and that it 'was eternally'. Inasmuch, therefore, as the Son does receive these predicates, and as all the things mentioned above that belong to the Father belong to him, it must be that the essence of the Son is not created, but that he is one in essence with the Father. Created essence his cannot be, for this reason above all, that it can comprehend the properties of God. By his properties, I mean the things whereby he is recognised to be God: for example, that he is omnipotent, that he has being, that he is incapable of alteration, and the others aforementioned ; lest, by having what the creatures also can have, God himself should appear in the sight of fools to be one in essence with the creatures.

6/ In this way too we can refute the impiety of those who say that the Word of God is a creature. Our faith is in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as the Son himself said to the apostles: 'Go ye, and make disciples of all the nations, baptising them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.' He spoke thus that by means of things we know we may understand the matters of which we have been speaking. Just as we would not call our fathers makers, but begetters, and as no one would call us their creatures, but sons by nature and one in essence with them: so, if God be Father, he must be Father of one who is by nature a Son and one in essence with him. Abraham did not create Isaac, he begat him. Bezalel and Eliab did not beget but made all the works in the Tabernacle. The shipwright and the house-builder do not beget the things they make; they work, the one on the ship, the other on the house. Isaac does not make Jacob ; he begets him by nature, a son. And likewise Jacob, Judah and his brethren. Just as one would be mad to say that the house is one in essence with the builder, and the ship with the shipwright, so it is correct to say that every son is one in essence with his own father. If then there is Father and Son, the Son must be Son by nature and in truth. But this is to be one in essence with the Father, as we

have shown from many instances. Thus of the things that are made it is written : 'He spoke, and they came to be; he commanded and they were created.' But of the Son: 'My heart hath uttered a good Word.' Daniel knew the Son of God and he knew the works of God. The Son he saw quench the furnace; of the works he said, 'O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord', and then he enumerated each of the creatures. But he did not number the Son with them, for he knew that he is not a work. It is through him that the works came into being; while he in the Father is praised and exalted. As then through him God is revealed to them that know him, so through him, 'blessing and praise and glory and power' are ascribed to the Father — through him and in him, that this ascription may, in the words of Scripture, be 'acceptable'. From these sayings, therefore, among many, we have shown, and we now show, that he is impious who says that the Word of God is a creature.

7/ But as they plead the passage in Proverbs, 'The Lord created me, a beginning of his ways, for his works', adding, 'See, "He created" He is a creature !' : we must show from this passage too how greatly they err, not realising the scope of divine Scripture. If he is a Son, let him not be called creature; if a creature, let him not be called Son. For in what precedes we have shown how great is the difference between a creature and a son. And inasmuch as the baptismal initiation is not validly performed into Creator and creature but into Father and Son, the Lord must not be called creature but Son. 'But,' says the Arian, 'is it not written ?' Yes, it is written ! And it is necessary that it should be said. But what is well written is ill understood by heretics. If they had understood and grasped the terms in which Christianity is expressed, they would not have called the Lord of glory a creature nor stumbled over what is well written. They, therefore, 'knew not, neither did they understand'. Therefore, as it is written : 'They walk in darkness.' But as for us, speak we must, that in this matter also they may be shown up as fools, that we may not neglect to answer their impiety, and that they may perhaps even repent. These then are the terms in which we express our faith in Christ: the Son of God, being the Word of God ('in the beginning was the Word ... and the Word was God'), being the Wisdom and Power of the Father ('Christ the Power of God and the Wisdom of God'), at the 'end of the ages' became man for our salvation. For John, after he had said, 'In the beginning was the Word', after a little added, 'And the Word became flesh', that is to say, became man. And our Lord said concerning himself: 'Why seek ye to kill me ... a man that hath told you the truth ?' And Paul, having learned from him, said : 'One God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus.' Being made man, and having fulfilled his human economy, having overthrown and abolished death, the penalty we had incurred, he now sits at the right hand of the Father, being in the Father and the Father in him, as always was and for ever is.

8/ In these terms, derived from the Apostles through the Fathers, our faith is expressed. It remains that he who reads Scripture should examine and judge when it speaks of the Godhead of the Word, and when it speaks of his human life; lest, by understanding the one when the other is intended, we become victims of the same derangement as has befallen the Arians. Knowing him to be Word, we know that 'through him all things were made, and without him was not anything made', and, 'by the Word of the Lord the heavens were established', and, 'he sendeth his Word and healeth all things'. Knowing him to be Wisdom,

we know that 'God by Wisdom founded the earth', and the Father 'hath made all things in Wisdom'. Knowing him to be God, we have believed that he is the Christ; for, 'Thy throne, O God,' sings David, 'is for ever and ever; a sceptre of equity is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated unrighteousness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows'. In Isaiah he says concerning himself: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me.' Peter confessed: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' So likewise, knowing him to be made man, we do not repudiate those things which are spoken of him in his human nature, as, for example, that he hungered, thirsted, was smitten, wept, slept, and finally endured death in our behalf upon the Cross. For all these things are written concerning him. So Scripture has not suppressed, but employs the words, 'He created', though they are applicable to men. For we men have been created and made. But as, when we hear that he hungered, slept, was beaten, we do not deny his Godhead: so, when we hear the words, 'He created', we should be consistent and remember that, being God, he was created man. For it belongs to man to be created, as do the experiences mentioned above, hunger and the like.

9/ Then too there is that other saying, which is indeed well said, but by them ill understood — I mean: 'Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels, neither the Son.' It also has a true meaning. From the words 'neither the Son' they suppose that by his ignorance he makes it clear he is a creature. It is not so. God forbid! For as, when he said, 'he created me', he spoke as a man; so too he spoke as a man when he said, 'neither the Son'. And there is good reason why he spoke thus. For he was made man, as it is written, and it belongs to men to be ignorant, as it belongs to them to hunger and the rest. For they do not know unless they hear and learn. Therefore, inasmuch as he was made man, he displays the ignorance which belongs to men: firstly, to show that he really has a human body; secondly, that, having in his body the ignorance of men, he might redeem his humanity from all its imperfections * and cleanse it and offer it perfect and holy to the Father. What further excuse will the Arians discover? What else will they devise to chatter about? They have been convicted of ignorance as to 'The Lord created me for his works'. They have been shown to have no understanding of: 'Of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels, neither the Son.' By saying, 'He created' he signifies his human nature, that he became man and was created. But by saying, 'I and the Father are one', and, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father', and, 'I am in the Father and the Father in me', he signifies his eternity and that he is one in essence with the Father. So likewise when he says, '... knoweth no one ... neither the Son', once more he speaks as a man, for it belongs to men to be ignorant. But when he says, 'No man knoweth the Father save the Son', nor the Son save the Father, by how much more does he know things originate! In the Gospel according to John the disciples said to the Lord: 'Now know we that thou knowest all things.' So it is clear that there is nothing of which he is ignorant, for he is the Word through whom all things came to be. But as 'all things' includes 'that day', it will come to be through him — though in their ignorance the Arians explode ten thousand times over!

Epistle Three

1/ Perhaps you will wonder why, when I was charged to abridge and briefly to explain the letter I had written concerning the Holy Spirit, you find me, as though I had laid aside my work on that subject, writing against those who are guilty of impiety toward the Son of God and who call him a creature. But you will not blame me, I know well, when you understand the cause. Indeed, when you see how reasonable it is, your Piety will welcome it. Our Lord himself said that the Paraclete 'shall not speak from himself, but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak ... for he shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you'; and, 'having breathed on them', he gave the Spirit to the disciples out of himself, and in this way the Father poured him out 'upon all flesh', as it is written. It is natural, therefore, that I should have spoken and written first concerning the Son, that from our knowledge of the Son we may be able to have true knowledge of the Spirit. For we shall find that the Spirit has to the Son the same proper relationship as we have known the Son to have to the Father. And as the Son says, 'All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine', so we shall find that through the Son all these things are in the Spirit also. And as the Father attested the Son, saying, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased', so the Spirit belongs to the Son; for the Apostle says: 'God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts crying, Abba, Father.' And, what is remarkable, as the Son said, 'What is mine belongs to the Father', so the Holy Spirit, which is said to belong to the Son, belongs to the Father. For the Son himself says: 'When the Paraclete is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me.' And Paul writes: 'No man knoweth the things of man save the spirit of man which is in him. Even so the things of God none knoweth save the Spirit of God which is in him. But we received not the spirit of the world but the Spirit which is of God, that we might see the things that are freely given to us by God.' And throughout divine Scripture you will find that the Holy Spirit, who is said to belong to the Son, is also said to belong to God. This I wrote in my previous letter. If therefore the Son, because of his proper relationship with the Father and because he is the proper offspring of his essence, is not a creature, but is one in essence with the Father: the Holy Spirit likewise, because of his proper relationship with the Son, through whom he is given to all men and whose is all that he has, cannot be a creature, and it is impious to call him so.

2/ These considerations are sufficient to dissuade anyone, be he never so contentious, from continuing to call the Spirit of God a creature, who is in God and searches the deep things of God and who is given from the Father through the Son; lest from this he shall be forced to call the Son also a creature, who is Word, Wisdom, Image, and Radiance, seeing whom we see the Father; and lest finally he should hear the words: 'Whosoever denieth the Son hath not the Father.' For such a man will soon be saying with the fool: 'There is no God.' None the less, so that our reply to the impious may be more fully established, it will be well to make use of those considerations which show that the Son is not a creature, to show that the Spirit is not a creature. The creatures come from nothing and their existence has a beginning; for, 'In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth', and what is in them.

The Holy Spirit is, and is said to be, from God (so said the Apostle). But if the Son cannot be a creature because he does not come from nothing, but from God, then of necessity the Spirit is not a creature, for we have confessed that he comes from God. It is creatures that come from nothing.

3/ Again, the Holy Spirit is called, and is, unction and seal. For John writes : 'And as for you, the unction which ye received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that anyone should teach you, but as his unction, his Spirit teacheth you concerning all things.' In the prophet Isaiah it is written : 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he hath anointed me.' Paul writes: 'In whom having also believed, ye were sealed,' and again, 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit ... in whom ye were sealed unto the day of redemption'. The creatures are anointed and sealed in him. But if the creatures are anointed and sealed in him, the Spirit cannot be a creature. For that which anoints is not like to those which are anointed. Moreover, this unction is a breath of the Son, so that he who has the Spirit says : 'We are a sweet savour of Christ.' The seal gives the impress of the Son, so that he who is sealed has the form of Christ; as the Apostle says : 'My little children, of whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you.' But if the Spirit is the sweet savour and form of the Son, it is clear that the Spirit cannot be a creature; for the Son also, 'being in the form' of the Father, is not a creature.

Moreover, as he who has seen the Son sees the Father, so he who has the Holy Spirit has the Son, and, having him, is a temple of God. For Paul writes, 'Know ye not that ye are a temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you ?' John says: 'Hereby know we that we abide in God and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.' But if we have confessed that the Son is not a creature, because he is in the Father and the Father in him, then the Spirit likewise cannot possibly be a creature ; for the Son is in him and he is in the Son. Wherefore, he who receives the Spirit is called a temple of God.

Furthermore, it will be well to look at it in the light of the following consideration. If the Son is the Word of God, he is one as the Father is one; for, 'There is one God, of whom are all things ... and one Lord Jesus Christ'. Hence both in our speech and in the Scriptures he is called 'only begotten Son'. But creatures are many and diverse: angels, archangels, cherubim, principalities, powers, and the rest, as we have said. But if the Son is not a creature because he does not belong to the many, but is one as the Father is one: then the Spirit likewise — for we must take our knowledge of the Spirit from the Son — cannot be a creature. For he does not belong to the many but is himself one.

4/ This the Apostle knows when he says : 'All these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally, even as he will'; and a little farther on: 'In one Spirit were we all baptised into one body ... and were all made to drink of one Spirit.'

Once more, if we must take our knowledge of the Spirit from the Son, then with propriety we may put forward proofs which derive from him. The Son is everywhere; for he is in the Father and the Father in him. He controls and contains all things; and it is written: 'In him all things consist, whether seen or unseen, and he is before all things.' But the creatures are in the places which have been assigned to them: sun, moon, and the other lights in the firmament, angels in heaven and men upon the earth. But if the Son is not a creature, because he is not

in places assigned to him, but is in the Father, and because he is everywhere even while he is outside all things; it follows that the Spirit cannot be a creature, for he is not in places assigned to him, but fills all things and yet is outside all things. Thus it is written : 'The Spirit of the Lord hath filled the world.' And David sings, 'Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?'; inasmuch as he is not in any place, but outside all things and in the Son, as the Son is in the Father. Therefore, as we have proved, he is not a creature. Over and above these things, the following considerations will confirm the condemnation of the Arian heresy, and once more make plain from the Son what we know concerning the Spirit. The Son, like the Father, is creator; for he says: 'What things I see the Father doing, these things I also do.' 'All things', indeed, 'were made through him, and without him was not anything made.' But if the Son, being, like the Father, creator, is not a creature ; and if, because all things were created through him, he does not belong to things created: then, clearly, neither is the Spirit a creature. For it is written concerning him in the one hundred and third Psalm : 'Thou shalt take away their spirit, and they shall die and return to their dust. Thou shalt put forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth.'

5/ As it is thus written, it is clear that the Spirit is not a creature, but takes part in the act of creation. The Father creates all things through the Word in the Spirit; for where the Word is, there is the Spirit also, and the things which are created through the Word have their vital strength out of the Spirit from the Word. Thus it is written in the thirty-second Psalm : 'By the Word of the Lord the heavens were established, and by the Spirit of his mouth is all their power.'

So clearly is the Spirit indivisible from the Son that what is now to be said leaves no room for doubt. When the Word came upon the prophet, it was in the Spirit that the prophet used to speak the things he received from the Word. Thus it is written in the Acts, when Peter says: 'Brethren, it was needful that the Scripture should be fulfilled which the Holy Spirit spake before.' In Zechariah it is written, when the Word comes upon him: 'But receive my words and my statutes, which I charge in my Spirit to the prophets.' And when, a little farther on, he rebuked the people, he said: 'They made their hearts to be disobedient, lest they should hear my law and the words which the Lord of hosts has sent by his Spirit in the hands of the prophets of old.' And when Christ spoke in Paul — as Paul himself said, 'Seeing that ye seek a proof of Christ that speaketh in me' — it was, none the less, the Spirit that he had bestowing upon him the power of speech. For he writes : 'according to the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ upon me.' Again, when Christ spoke in him, he said: 'Save that the Holy Spirit testifieth unto me in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me.' The Spirit is not outside the Word, but, being in the Word, through him is in God. And so the spiritual gifts are given in the Triad. For, as he writes to the Corinthians, in their distribution there is the same Spirit and the same Lord and the same God, 'Who worketh all things in all'. For the Father himself through the Word in the Spirit works and gives all things.

6/ Assuredly, when he prayed for the Corinthians, he prayed in the Triad, saying : 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all.' For inasmuch as we partake of the Spirit, we have the grace of the Word and, in the Word, the love of the Father. And as the grace of the Triad is one, so also the Triad is

indivisible. We can see this in regard to Saint Mary herself. The archangel Gabriel, when sent to announce the coming of the Word upon her, said, 'The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee', knowing that the Spirit was in the Word. Wherefore he straightway added: 'and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.' For Christ is 'the Power of God and the Wisdom of God'. But if the Spirit was in the Word, then it must be clear that the Spirit through the Word was also in God. Likewise, when the Spirit comes to us, the Son will come and the Father, and they will make their abode in us. For the Triad is indivisible, and its Godhead is one; and there is one God, 'over all and through all and in all'. This is the faith of the Catholic Church. For the Lord grounded and rooted it in the Triad, when he said to his disciples: 'Go ye and make disciples of all the nations, baptising them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.' Were the Spirit a creature, he would not have ranked him with the Father; lest, by reason of something strange and foreign being ranked therewith, the Triad should not be consistent. For what was lacking to God, that he should take to himself something foreign in essence and share his glory with it? God forbid! It is not so! He himself said: 'I am full.' Therefore the Lord ranked the Spirit with the name of the Father, to show that the Triad is not composed of diverse elements, I mean of creator and creature, but its Godhead is one. It was because he had learned this that Paul taught the oneness of the grace given in the Triad, saying: 'One Lord, one faith, one baptism'. As there is one baptism, so there is one faith. For he who believes in the Father, in the Father knows the Son; and it is not apart from the Son that he knows the Spirit. Therefore he believes also in the Son and in the Holy Spirit. For the Godhead of the Triad is one, as it is made known from one, even from the Father. In these terms the Catholic faith is expressed.

7/ But as for those who speak evil of the Spirit and call him a creature, if what we have said does not make them repent, then may what we are about to say overwhelm them with shame. If there is a Triad, and if the faith is faith in a Triad, let them tell us whether it was always a Triad, or whether there was once when it was not a Triad. If the Triad is eternal, the Spirit is not a creature, for he coexists eternally with the Word and is in him. As for the creatures, there was a time when they were not. If he is a creature, and the creatures are from nothing, it is clear that there was once when the Triad was not a Triad but a dyad. What greater impiety can man utter? They are saying that the Triad owes its existence to alteration and progress; that it was a dyad, and waited for the birth of a creature which should be ranked with the Father and the Son, and with them become the Triad. God forbid that such a notion should so much as enter the minds of Christian people! As the Son, because he always exists, is not a creature; so, because the Triad always exists, there is no creature in it. Therefore the Spirit is not a creature. As it always was, so it now is; as it now is, so it always was. It is the Triad, and therein Father, Son and Holy Spirit. And God is one, the Father, who is 'over all and through all and in all', who is 'blessed for ever. Amen'

I have written this in brief, as you directed, and am sending it. If anything is lacking therein, as a man of understanding, be kind enough to supply it. Read it 'to them that are of the household of faith', and refute those who love contention and evil speech. Perhaps, even by a late repentance, they may wash away from their souls the perversity which formerly was in them. It were well for them, as it is written, 'to turn aside and not to tarry'; lest, by delaying,

they should hear that which was spoken by the Lord: 'Whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this age, nor in the age to come.'

EPISTLE FOUR

1/ I have read the letter which your Piety has now written ; and the shamelessness of the heretics filled me with such amazement that I came to the conclusion nothing can so appropriately be said of them as what the Apostle enjoined: 'A man that is heretical after a first and second admonition refuse; knowing that such a one is perverted and sins self-condemned.' For, having a warped mind, he does not inquire that he may hear and be persuaded, or that he may learn and repent, but just because of those whom he has deceived; lest, keeping silent, he should be condemned by them also. What we have already said would have sufficed. It would have sufficed had they, after receiving such proofs, desisted from their evil speech against the Holy Spirit. But they were not satisfied. Once more they indulge their shamelessness, to show that, having trained themselves to fight with the Word, they are now fighting with the Spirit, and will soon be dead in unreason. For if we should answer their present questions, none the less will they be 'inventors of evil things'; only that seeking they may not find, and hearing they may not understand. Their wise questions run like this. If the Holy Spirit is not a creature, then, say they, he is a son, and the Word and he are two brothers. Then, as you write, they add, If the Spirit 'shall take of' the Son and is given from him, (for so it is written) — they go on directly, Then the Father is a grandfather and the Spirit is His grandson.

2/ Who, when he hears these things, will still regard them as Christians, and not rather as pagans ? For such things the pagans say against us in conversation among themselves. Who will be willing to answer this folly of theirs ? For my part, in my search for an appropriate answer to them, after much thought I find none except that which of old was given to the Pharisees. For as the Saviour, when the Pharisees maliciously questioned him, questioned them in return, that they might perceive their evil-mindedness ; so likewise, when they ask such questions, let them tell us, nay rather, let them answer us, being questioned as they question. If, when they speak, they do not understand their inventions, perhaps, when they listen, they may realise their folly. If the Holy Spirit is not a creature, as has been shown in our previous writings, but is in God and is given from God : then he is a son, and there are two brothers, he and the Word. And if the Spirit is of the Son, and the Spirit receives all things from the Son, as the Son himself said and inasmuch as it was he who gave him to the disciples by breathing upon them (for you too acknowledge these things): then the Father is a grandfather and the Spirit is his grandson. It is just that you should be questioned from the same Scriptures with the same questions to which you in your questioning ask answer from us. If you deny those things which are written, then you can no longer be called Christians, and it is just for us who are Christians to be questioned by you. But if you read the same Scriptures as we read, then must you likewise be questioned about the same by us. Tell us, therefore, and do not hesitate, whether the Spirit is a son and the Father a grandfather. But if, as did the Pharisees of old, you too reason and say among yourselves, If we say that he is a son, we shall hear the question, Where is it written ? If we say, he is not a son, we fear lest they say to us, How then is it written: 'We received not the spirit of the world but the Spirit which is of God'? But if, when you debate these things

among yourselves, you too say, We do not know : then must he of whom you ask these questions be silent also, in obedience to him who says : 'Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him. Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit.' Silence is the answer most appropriate to you, that you may realise your own ignorance.

3/ Once again, in the following way also, it is just for you to be questioned from the questions you ask. If the prophets speak in the Spirit of God, and the Holy Spirit prophesies in Isaiah, as has been shown in our previous writings, then the Spirit is a word of God, and there are two Words, the Spirit and the Son. For it was when the Word came upon them that the prophets used to prophesy. Furthermore, in addition to these things, if all things were made through the Word and 'without him was not anything made', and if 'the Lord by Wisdom founded the earth' and 'in Wisdom' made all things; and if it is written, as has been shown in our previous writings, 'Thou shalt send forth thy Spirit and they shall be created'— then either the Spirit is the Word, or God has made all things in two Persons, both in Wisdom and in the Spirit. How then does Paul say: 'One God ... of whom are all things, and one Lord through whom are all things'? Again, if the Son is an 'image of the invisible Father', and the Spirit is an image of the Son— for it is written, 'Whom he foreknew he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son'— then, according to this, the Father is a grandfather. And if the Son came in the name of the Father, and the Son says, 'The Holy Spirit whom the Father shall send in my name' — then thus also is the Father a grandfather. What have you to say to this, you who have a glib answer to everything ? What are you reasoning among yourselves ? Do you find fault with such questions, now that you see yourselves at a loss? First blame yourselves, for you were used to ask them, and harken to the Scriptures, and, if you are at a loss for words, become learners at last. In the Scriptures the Spirit is not called son but Holy Spirit and Spirit of God. As the Spirit is not called son, so neither is it written of the Son that he is the Holy Spirit. If then the Spirit is not called son, nor is it written that the Son is the Spirit, is the faith in contradiction to the truth ? God forbid ! It is rather that each of the above mentioned terms has its proper meaning. The Son is an offspring proper to the essence and nature of the Father; that is the sense the term bears. The Spirit, who is said to be of God and is in God, is not alien to the nature of the Son nor to the Godhead of the Father. Therefore there is in the Triad — in Father and in Son and in the Holy Spirit himself — one Godhead, and in the same Triad there is one baptism and one faith. Thus when the Father sends the Spirit, it is the Son who, by breathing upon them, gives him to the disciples. For 'all things whatsoever the Father hath' belong to the Son. When the Word came to the prophets, they used to prophesy by the Spirit, as it is written and we have shown. And : 'By the Word of the Lord the heavens were established, and by the Spirit of his mouth is all their power.'

4/ Thus the Spirit is not a creature but proper to the essence of the Word and proper to God in whom he is said to be. Once more, we must not shrink from repeating ourselves. Though the Holy Spirit is not called son, yet he is not outside the Son. For he is called 'Spirit of sonship'; and as Christ is 'the Power of God and the Wisdom of God', it is fitly said of the Spirit that he is 'Spirit of Wisdom' and 'Spirit of Power'. When we partake of the Spirit we

have the Son ; and when we have the Son, we have the Spirit, as Paul said, crying in our hearts: 'Abba Father !'But seeing that the Spirit is of God and is said by Scripture to be in him ('The things of God none knoweth save the Spirit of God which is in him') and that the Son has said, 'I am in the Father and the Father in me'— why have not these two the same name, but the one is Son and the other Spirit ? If anyone asks such a question,he must be mad. For he is searching the unsearchable and disobeying the Apostle when he says: 'For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counsellor?'Moreover, who shall dare to rename what God has named? Otherwise, let him bestow names on the things of creation ! Let them tell us, since creation came into being by one and the same fiat, why one thing is sun, another heaven, earth, sea, air. But if the fools find this impossible — for each thing remains as it was originated — much more have the things above the creation an eternal stability.And it is not otherwise than that the Father is Father and not grandfather, and the Son is Son of God and not father of the Spirit, and the Holy Spirit Holy Spirit and not grandson of the Father or brother of the Son.

5/ These things being thus proved, he must be mad who asks, Is the Spirit also a son ? But neither let any man, because this is not written, separate him from the nature of God and from that which is proper to God.As it is written, let him believe and not say, Why thus and not thus? Lest from reasoning about these things he take counsel and say, Where then is God? And lest finally he hear the words: 'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.' The traditions of the faith are not to be known by impertinent scrutiny.When the disciples heard the words, 'Baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit',they did not ask impertinently, why the Son comes second and the Spirit third, or why the whole is a Triad. But as they heard, so they believed. They did not ask, as do you, Is the Spirit then a son? Nor, when the Lord spoke of the Spirit after the Son, did they ask, Is the Father then a grandfather? For they did not hear 'into the name of the grandfather', but 'into the name of the Father'. They came to sound conclusions and preached this faith everywhere. For it was not to be put otherwise than as the Saviour put it, that he himself is the Son, and that the other is the Holy Spirit. Nor was it right to change the order in which they have been ranked together. This holds good of the Father also. As it is not lawful to speak of him in any other way than as Father, so it is impious to ask whether the Son is the Spirit or the Spirit a son. For this cause Sabellius was judged a stranger to the Church, because he dared to apply to the Father the title, Son, and to the Son the name of the Father. After this, will anyone still dare to say, when he hears the words son and spirit, Is the Father then a grandfather? Or, Is the Spirit then a son? Yes, they will dare, the Eunomii and the Eudoxii and the Eusebii! When once they affect the Arian heresy, they will not keep their tongues from impiety. Who delivered these things to them ? Who was their teacher? Certainly no one taught them out of the divine Scriptures. It was out of the abundance of their hearts this folly came.

6/ For if you ask, Is the Spirit then a son ?, since, by our showing, he is not a creature — so must you ask, Is the Son then a father ?, for you have learned that he is not a creature inasmuch as through him things originate were created.Or it may run thus : Is the Spirit then the Son and the Son himself the Holy Spirit? But if this be their opinion, they will be cut off

from the holy Triad and will be judged to be godless, inasmuch as they change the names of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, transposing them at will on the analogy of human generation, calling them grandchildren and grandfathers, and remaking for themselves the genealogies of the gods of the pagans. This is not the faith of the Church ; but, as the Saviour said, it is into Father, Son and Holy Spirit — Father who cannot be called grandfather, Son who cannot be called father, and Holy Spirit who is named by no other name than this. Of this faith it is not permissible to interchange the terms. The Father is always Father, and the Son always Son, and the Holy Spirit is and is called always Holy Spirit. In human relations it is not so, despite the Arians' delusions. As it is written, 'God is not as man', so we might say, Men are not as God. For in the case of men the father is not always a father nor the son always a son. The same man becomes father of a son, who was himself another's son ; and the son, being his father's son, becomes another's father. Abraham, for example, being son of Nahor, became father of Isaac; and Isaac, being son of Abraham, became father of Jacob. Each, being a part of his sire, is begotten a son, and becomes himself another's father. But with the Godhead it is not so; for, 'God is not as man'. Thus the Father is not from a father; wherefore he begets not one who should become another's father. Nor is the Son a part of the Father; wherefore he is not a thing begotten to beget a son. Hence in the Godhead alone the Father is and was and always is, because he is Father in the strict sense, and Only Father. The Son is Son in the strict sense, and Only Son. And of them it holds good that the Father is and is called always Father, and the Son, Son ; and the Holy Spirit is always Holy Spirit, whom we have believed to be of God and to be given from the Father through the Son. Thus the holy Triad remains incapable of alteration, and is known in one Godhead. Wherefore he who asks, Is the Spirit then a son ?, as though the name could be altered, is deluded and infects himself with madness. And he who asks, Is the Father then a grandfather ?, by inventing a new name for the Father, errs in his heart. It is not safe to make any further answer to the effrontery of the heretics, for that is to oppose the Apostle's injunction. It is good rather to give the counsel he commanded.

7/ These things are sufficient to refute your foolish speech. Mock no more at the Godhead. For it is the part of those who mock to ask the questions which are not written and to say, So the Spirit is a son and the Father a grandfather ? So scoffs he of Caesarea and he of Scythopolis. It is sufficient for you to believe that the Spirit is not a creature, but is Spirit of God; and that in God there is a Triad, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. There is no need to use the name Father of the Son ; nor is it lawful to say that the Spirit is the Son, nor that the Son is the Holy Spirit. But as we have said, so it is. The Godhead which is in this Triad is one; and there is one faith and one baptism given therein. And one is the initiation in Jesus Christ our Lord: through whom and with whom to the Father with the Holy Spirit be glory and power to all ages of ages. Amen.