

THE BOOK OF SAINT BASIL ¹

ON THE SPIRIT

DE SPIRITU SANCTO

Editor's Preface.

The HERESY OF ARIUS lowered the dignity of the Holy Spirit as well as that of the Son. He taught that the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity are wholly unlike one another both in essence and in glory. "There is a triad, not in equal glories;" "one more glorious than the other in their glories to an infinite degree." So says the *Thalia*,² quoted in *Ath. de Syn.* #15. But the Nicene definition, while it was precise in regard to the Son, left the doctrine of the Holy Spirit comparatively open,³ not from hesitation or doubt, but because this side of Arian speculation was not prominent.⁴ It was the expulsion of Macedonius from the see of Constantinople in 360 which brought "Macedonianism" to a head. He was put there *by Arians* as an Arian. Theodoret⁵ explains how disagreement arose. He was an upholder, if not the author, of the watchword ὁμοιούσιν (*omoioudin*);⁶ but many supporters of the ὁμοιούσιν (e.g., Eustathius of Sebasteia) shrank from calling the Holy Spirit a *creature*. So the Pneumatomachi⁷ began to be clearly marked off. The various creeds of the Arians and semi-Arians did not directly attack the Godhead of the Holy Spirit, though they did not accept the doctrine of the essential unity of the Three Persons.⁸ But their individual teaching went far beyond their confessions. The Catholic theologians were roused to the danger. On the return of Athanasius from his third exile, a council was held at Alexandria, which resulted in the first formal ecclesiastical condemnation of the depravers of the Holy Spirit, in the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*.⁹

In the next ten years, the Pneumatomachi, Macedonians, or Marathonians — so called from Marathonius, bishop of Nicomedia, whose support to the party was perhaps rather pecuniary than intellectual¹⁰ — made headway, and were largely identified with the *Homoiousians*. In 374, the *Ancoratus* of St. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus was published. It was written in 373, and contained two creeds,¹¹ the former of which is nearly identical with the *Confession of Constantinople*. It expresses belief in the Spirit thus:

¹ Basil the Great, Bishop of Caesarea (329-379). He examines the Trinity as a whole, not just the Spirit. He describes the "Monarchy" of the Godhead, and the nature of their "community" as one (see espec. par. 45). – WHG

² Ref. to Gr. mythology: *Thalia* was one of the three Graces; *the one who blossoms*.

³ Πιστεύομεν εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα – *Pisteuomen eis to Agion Pneuma*, "We believe in the Holy Spirit."

⁴ Cf. Basil, Letters cxxv. and ccxxvi (125 and 226). and Dr. Swete in D.C.B. in. 121.

⁵ *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 5.

⁶ "the same," Soc. ii.45.

⁷ Also known as Macedonians or Semi-Arians in Constantinople, and the *Tropici* in Alexandria. They denied the godhood of the Holy Spirit, hence the Greek name *Pneumatomachi* or 'Combators against the Spirit.'

⁸ Cf. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbolc*, pp. 148-174, quoted by Swete.

⁹ q.v. with the preface on p. 481 of *Ath.* in the edition of this series. Cf. also *Ath. ad Serap.* i. 2, 10.

¹⁰ Nicephorus H.E. ix. 47.

¹¹ *vide* Heurtley de F. et Symb. pp. 14-18.

τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, Κύριον, καὶ Ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, εκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσον διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.¹²

In this same year, 374, Amphilochius, the first cousin of Gregory of Nazianzus, and friend and spiritual son of Basil, paid the first of his annual autumn visits to Caesarea.¹³ There he urged St. Basil to clear up all doubt as to the true doctrine of the Holy Spirit by writing a treatise on the subject. St. Basil complied, and on completion of the work, he had it engrossed on parchment,¹⁴ and sent it to Amphilochius, to whom he dedicated it.

From *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2nd series, vol. 8., *Philip Schaff, ed.*

The CCEL digital edition is available here:
<https://ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf208/npnf208.vii.i.html>

Formatted, lightly modernized, and annotated by
William H. Gross www.onthewing.org Sept. 2024

NOTE: Dr. Schaff used the King James translation for many of the scriptures, including spellings, rather than translating Basil's words directly. On occasion, he inserted [A.V.] to mark substantive differences with the King James; verses have been modernized with the rest of the text. Holy *Ghost* has been changed to Holy *Spirit*; *hell* is corrected to *sheol* (OT), or to *Hades* (NT), for the scriptures alluded to. Christ did not descend into hell (*Gehenna*). Bezaleel (KJV) has been changed to Bezalel. Other archaic spellings have been updated and Americanized; they were, of course, Schaff's spellings and not Basil's. – WHG

¹² Roughly translated, "The Holy Spirit, life-giving and proceeding from the Father, proceeding from You through the Father, and worshipped by the people, those being saved, who worship You, through the Prophet." – WHG

¹³ Bishop Lightfoot, D.C.B. I. 105.

¹⁴ Letter ccxxxi. (231)

CHAPTER 1

Prefatory remarks on the need of exact investigation of the most minute portions of theology.

1. Your desire for information, my right well-beloved and most deeply respected brother Amphilochius, I highly commend, and I no less commend your industrious energy. I have been exceedingly delighted at the care and watchfulness shown in the expression of your opinion that, of all the terms concerning God in every mode of speech, not one ought to be left without exact investigation. You have turned to good account your reading of the exhortation of the Lord, “Everyone who asks receives, and whoever seeks finds” and by your diligence in asking, you might, I think, stir even the most reluctant to give you a share of what they possess. And this in you yet further moves my admiration: that you do not, according to the manners of most men of our time, propose your questions by way of mere test, but with the honest desire to arrive at the actual truth. There is no lack these days of captious listeners and questioners; but to find a character desirous of information, and seeking the truth as a remedy for ignorance, is very difficult. Just as in the hunter’s snare, or in the soldier’s ambush, the trick is generally ingeniously concealed, so it is with the inquiries of the majority of the questioners who advance arguments. It is done not so much with the view of getting any good out of them, as in order that, in the event of their failing to elicit answers which chime in with their own desires, they may seem to have fair ground for controversy.

2. If “To the fool upon his asking for wisdom, wisdom shall be reckoned,” at how high a price shall we value “the wise hearer” who is quoted by the Prophet in the same verse with “the admirable counselor”? ^{Isa 3:3 LXX} It is right, I think, to hold him worthy of all approbation, and to urge him on to further progress, sharing his enthusiasm, and in all things toiling at his side as he presses onwards to perfection. To count the terms used in theology as of primary importance, and to endeavor to trace out the hidden meaning in every phrase and in every syllable, is a characteristic lacking in those who are idle in the pursuit of true religion, but distinguishing all who get knowledge of “the mark” “of our calling.” ^{Phi 3:14} For what is set before us, so far as is possible with human nature, is to be made like God. Now, without knowledge there can be no “making like;” and knowledge is not gotten without lessons. The beginning of teaching is speech; and syllables and words are *parts* of speech. It follows, then, that to investigate syllables is not to shoot wide of the mark. Nor, because the questions raised might seem insignificant to some, are they to be held unworthy of heed on that account. Truth is always a quarry that is hard to hunt; and therefore we must look everywhere for its tracks. The acquisition of true religion is just like that of crafts. Both grow bit by bit; apprentices must despise nothing. If a man despises the first elements as small and insignificant, he will never reach the perfection of wisdom. Yes and No are but two syllables; yet there is often involved in these little words, at once, the best of all good things (*Truth*), and that beyond which wickedness cannot go (*a Lie*). But why mention Yes and No? Before now, a martyr bearing witness for Christ has been judged to have paid in full the claim of true religion by merely nodding his head. If this is so, then what term in theology is so small that the effect of its weight in the scales, according to how it is rightly or wrongly used, is not great?

We are told of the law, that “not one jot nor one tittle shall pass away.” How then could it be safe for us to leave even the least unnoticed? The very points which you yourself have sought to have thoroughly sired by us, are at the same time both small and great. Their use is the matter of a moment, and perhaps they are therefore made of small account. But when we reckon the force of their *meaning*, they are great. They may be likened to the mustard plant which, though it is the least of shrub-seeds, yet when properly cultivated, and the forces latent in its germs are unfolded, it rises to its own sufficient height. If anyone laughs when he sees our subtlety about syllables, to use the Psalmist’s words, let him know that he reaps laughter’s fruitless fruit. ^{Psa 119.85 LXX} And let us continue our investigation, neither giving in to men’s reproaches, nor yet vanquished by their disparagement. Indeed, I am so far from feeling ashamed of these things because they are small, that even if I could attain to ever so minute a fraction of their dignity, I would both congratulate myself on having won high honor, and I would tell my brother and fellow-investigator that no small gain had accrued to him from it.

While, then, I am aware that the controversy contained in little words is a very great one, in hope of the prize I do not shrink from toil, with the conviction that the discussion will both prove profitable to myself, and that my hearers will be rewarded with no small benefit. Therefore, now with the help, if I may so say, of the Holy Spirit Himself, I will approach the exposition of the subject. And if you will, so that I may be put in the way of the discussion, I will for a moment revert to the origin of the question before us.

3. Lately when praying with the people, and using the full doxology to God the Father in both forms — at one time “*with the Son together with the Holy Spirit,*” and at another “*through the Son in the Holy Spirit*” — I was attacked by some of those present, on the ground that I was introducing novel and at the same time mutually contradictory terms. However, chiefly with the view of benefiting them, or if they are wholly incurable, for the security of those who may fall in with them, you have expressed the opinion that some clear instruction ought to be published concerning the force underlying the syllables employed. I will therefore write as concisely as possible, in the endeavor to lay down some admitted principle for the discussion.

CHAPTER 2

The origin of the heretics’ close observation of all syllables.

4. The petty exactitude of these men about syllables and words is not, as might be supposed, simple and straightforward; nor is the mischief to which it tends a small one. There is involved a deep and covert design against true religion. Their pertinacious contention is to show that the mention of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is *unlike*, as though from there they will find it easy to demonstrate that there is a variation in nature. They have an old sophism, invented by Aetius, the champion of this heresy, in one of whose Letters there is a passage to the effect that things which are naturally unlike are expressed in unlike terms; and conversely, that things expressed in unlike terms are naturally unlike. In proof of this statement, he drags in the words of the Apostle, “One God and Father of whom are all things ... and one Lord Jesus Christ by whom are all things.”

“Whatever, then,” he goes on, “is the relation of these terms to one another, such will be the relation of the natures indicated by them; and as the term ‘*of whom*’ is unlike the term ‘*by whom,*’ so the Father is unlike the Son.”

On this heresy depends the idle subtlety of these men about the phrases in question. They accordingly assign to God the Father, as though it were His distinctive portion and lot, the phrase “*of Whom;*” to God the Son they confine the phrase “*by Whom;*” to the Holy Spirit that of “*in Whom;*” and they say that this use of the syllables is never interchanged, in order that — as I have already said — the variation of *language* may indicate the variation of *nature*. Truly, it is sufficiently obvious that in their quibbling about the words, they are endeavoring to maintain the force of their impious argument. By the term “*of whom*” they wish to indicate the Creator; by the term “*through whom,*” the subordinate agent or instrument; by the term “*in whom,*” or “*in which,*” they mean to show the time or place. The object of all this is that the Creator of the universe (the Son) may be regarded as of no higher dignity than an instrument, and that the Holy Spirit may appear to be adding to existing things nothing more than the contribution derived from time or place.

CHAPTER 3

The systematic discussion of syllables is derived from heathen philosophy.

5. They have, however, been led into this error by their close study of heathen writers, who have respectively applied the terms “*of whom*” and “*through whom*” to things which are by nature distinct. These writers suppose that by the term “*of whom*” or “*of which*” the *matter* is indicated; while the term “*through whom*” or “*through which*” represents the *instrument*, or generally speaking, *subordinate* agency. Or rather, the students of vain philosophy, while expounding the manifold nature of cause, and distinguishing its peculiar significations, define some causes as principal, some as cooperative or con-causal, while others are of the character of “*sine qua non,*” or indispensable. Thus, there seems to be no reason why we should not take up their whole argument, and briefly expose at once its incompatibility with the truth, and its inconsistency with their own teaching.

For every one of these they have a distinct and peculiar use of terms, so that the maker is indicated in a different way from the instrument. For the maker they think the proper expression is “*by whom,*” maintaining that the bench is produced “*by*” the carpenter. And for the instrument, it is “*through which,*” in that it is produced “*through*” or by means of adze and gimlet and the rest.¹⁵ Similarly, they apply “*of which*” to the material, in that the tiring is made “*of*” wood; while “*according to which*” shows the design or pattern put before the craftsman. For he either first makes a mental sketch, and so brings his fancy to bear upon what he is doing, or else he looks at a pattern previously put before him, and arranges his work accordingly. The phrase “*on account of which*” they wish to be confined to the end or purpose, the bench, as they say, being produced for, or on account of, the use of man. “*In which*” is supposed to indicate time and place. When was it produced? *In this time.* And where? *In this place.* And though time and place contribute nothing to what is being produced, yet without these, the production of anything is impossible; for efficient agents must have both time and place. It is these careful distinctions, derived from unpractical philosophy and vain delusion, which our opponents have first studied and admired, and then

¹⁵ An *adze* is an edge tool used to cut and shape wood; a *gimlet* is a hand tool for boring holes. *Tiring* (next sentence) refers to the molding, trim, or inlay applied around the edges of woodwork to give it a “dressed” look. — WHG

transferred to the simple and unsophisticated doctrine of the Spirit — to the belittling of God the Word, and the setting at naught of the Divine Spirit. Even the phrase that is set apart by non-Christian writers for the case of lifeless instruments or of manual service of the meanest kind — I mean the expression “*through* or *by means of* which” — they do not shrink from transferring to the Lord of all. And Christians feel no shame in applying to the Creator of the universe, language belonging to a hammer or a saw.

CHAPTER 4

That there is no distinction in the scriptural use of these syllables.

6. We acknowledge that the word of truth has in many places made use of these expressions. Yet we absolutely deny that the freedom of the Spirit is in bondage to the pettiness of Paganism. On the contrary, we maintain that Scripture varies its expressions as occasion requires, according to the circumstances of the case. For instance, the phrase “*of which*” does not always and absolutely (as they suppose) indicate the *material*; but it is more in accordance with the usage of Scripture to apply this term in the case of the Supreme Cause, as in the words “One God, of whom are all things;” and again, “All things of God.” The word of truth has, however, frequently used this term in the case of the material, as when it says “You shall make an ark of incorruptible wood;” and “You shall make the candlestick of pure gold;” and “The first man is of the earth, *earthy*;” ^{1COR 15.47} and “You are formed out of clay as I am.” ^{JOB 33.6} But these men have laid down the law that this phrase befits the Father alone, to the end that, as we have already remarked, they may establish the difference of *nature*. They derived this distinction from heathen authorities originally; but here they have shown no faithful accuracy of limitation. In conformity with the teaching of their masters, they have given to the Son the title of *instrument*; and to the Spirit the title of *place* — for they say *through* the Son, and *in* the Spirit. But when they apply “of whom” to God, they no longer follow the heathen example, but “go over,” as they say, “to apostolic usage.” As it is said, “But of him you are in Christ Jesus,” ^{1COR 1.30} and “All things of God.” ^{1COR 11.12} What, then, is the result of this systematic discussion? There is one nature of *Cause*; another of *Instrument*; another of *Place*. So the Son is by nature distinct from the Father, as the tool is distinct from the craftsman; and the Spirit is distinct in so far as time or place is distinguished from the nature of tools, or from the nature of those who handle them.

CHAPTER 5

*That “through whom” is also said in the case of the Father,
and “of whom” in the case of the Son and of the Spirit.*

7. After thus describing the outcome of our adversaries’ arguments, we shall now proceed to show, as we have proposed, that the Father does not first take “of whom” and then relegate “through whom” to the Son; and that there is no truth in these men’s ruling that the Son refuses to admit the Holy Spirit to a share in “of whom” or in “through whom,” according to the limitation of their new-fangled allotment of phrases. “There is one God and Father of

whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ *through whom* are all things.” Yes; but these are the words of a writer not laying down a rule, but carefully distinguishing the hypostases.¹⁶

The object of the apostle in thus writing was not to introduce the diversity of nature, but to exhibit the notion of Father and of Son as *unconfounded*. It is perfectly plain from the passage in question, that the phrases are not opposed to one another; and they do not, like squadrons marshaled one against another in war, bring the natures to which they are applied into mutual conflict. The blessed Paul brings both phrases to bear upon one and the same subject, in these words: “of him and through him and to him are all things.” It will be admitted that this plainly refers to the Lord, even by a reader paying but small attention to the meaning of the words. The apostle has just quoted from the prophecy of Isaiah, “Who has known the mind of the Lord, or who has been his counselor? And then it goes on, “For of him and from him and to him are all things.” It may be learned that the prophet is speaking about God the Word, the Maker of all creation, from what immediately precedes: “Who has measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance? Who has directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counselor, has taught him?” Now the word “who” in this passage does not mean absolute impossibility, but *rarity*, as in the passage “Who will rise up for me against the evil doers?” and “What man is he that desires life?” and “Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord?”

So it is in the passage in question, “Who has directed [LXX., *known*] the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counselor has known him?” “For the Father loves the Son and shows him all things.” This is the one who holds the earth, and has grasped it with His hand; who brought all things to order and adornment; who poised the hills in their places, and measured the waters, and gave to all things in the universe their proper rank; who encompasses the whole of heaven with but a small portion of His power” — in a figure, the prophet calls this a *span*. Well, then, the apostle added “Of him and through him and to him are all things.” For of Him, to whom all things are, comes the *cause* of their being, according to the will of God the Father. Through Him all things have their continuance and constitution, for He created all things, and metes out to each severally what is necessary for its health and preservation. Therefore, all things are turned to Him, looking with irresistible longing and unspeakable affection to “the author” and maintainer of their life. As it is written “The eyes of all wait upon you,” and again, “These all wait upon you,” and “You open your hand, and satisfy the desire of every living thing.”

8. But if our adversaries oppose our interpretation, what argument will save them from being caught in their own trap? For if they will not grant that the three expressions “of him” and “through him” and “to him” are spoken of the Lord, they cannot be applied but to God *the Father*. Then without question their rule will fall through; for we find not only “of whom,” but also “through whom” also applied to the Father. And if this latter phrase indicates nothing derogatory, then why in the world should it be confined to the Son, as though conveying the sense of inferiority? If it always and everywhere implies *ministry*, then let them tell us to what superior the God of glory and Father of the Christ is subordinate. They are thus overthrown

¹⁶ *Hypostasis*: the essential nature or underlying reality of something. Here it refers to any of the three persons of the Godhead constituting the Trinity, as the essential nature of God. – WHG

by themselves, while our position will be made sure on both sides. Suppose it proved that the passage refers to the Son; then “of whom” will be found applicable to the Son. Suppose on the other hand it is insisted that the prophet’s words relate to God; then it will be granted that “through whom” is properly used of God. Thus both phrases have equal value, in that both are used with equal force, of God. Under either alternative, both terms being employed of one and the same Person, they will be shown to be equivalent. But let us revert to our subject.

9. In his Epistle to the Ephesians the apostle says, “But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ, from whom the whole body fully joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplies, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, makes increase of the body.” Eph 4.15-16

And again in the Epistle to the Colossians, to those who do not have the knowledge of the Only Begotten, there is mention of him who holds “the head,” that is, Christ, “from whom all the body, by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered, increases with the increase of God.” And we have learned in another passage, that Christ is the head of the Church, when the apostle says, “gave him to be the head over all things to the Church,” and “of his fullness we have all received.” And the Lord Himself says “He shall take of mine, and shall show it to you.” In a word, the diligent reader will perceive that “of whom” is used in various ways. For instance, the Lord says, “I perceive that power has gone out of me.” Luk 8.46 Similarly, we have frequently observed “of whom” used of the Spirit. “He that sows to the spirit,” it is said, “shall reap life everlasting of the spirit.” John too writes, “Hereby we know that he abides in us by (ἐκ) the spirit which he has given us.” “That which is conceived in her,” the angel says, “is of the Holy Spirit.” And the Lord says, “that which is born of the spirit is spirit.” Such then is the case so far.

10. It must now be pointed out that the phrase “through whom” is admitted by scripture, in the case of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit alike. It would indeed be tedious to bring forward evidence of this in the case of the Son, not only because it is perfectly well known, but because this very point is made by our opponents. We now show that “through whom” is also used in the case of the Father. “God is faithful,” it is said, “by whom (δι’ οὗ) you were called to the fellowship of his Son;” and “Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ by (διὰ) the will of God;” and again, “Therefore you are no longer a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God.” And “just as Christ was raised up from the dead by (διὰ) the glory of God the Father.” Isaiah, moreover, says, “Woe to those who make deep counsel and not through the Lord.” Many more proofs of the use of this phrase in the case of the Spirit might be adduced. “God has revealed him to us,” it is said, “by (διὰ) the spirit;” and in another place, “That good thing which was committed to you, keep by (διὰ) the Holy Spirit;” and again, “To one is given the word of wisdom by (διὰ) the spirit.”

11. In the same manner, it may also be said of the word “in,” that Scripture admits its use in the case of God the Father. In the Old Testament it is said through (ἐν) God we shall do valiantly, and “My praise shall be continually of (ἐν) you;” and again, “In your name I will rejoice.” In Paul’s letters we read, “In God who created all things,” and “Paul, Silvanus, and Timotheus to the church of the Thessalonians in God our Father;” and “if now at length I might have a prosperous journey by (ἐν) the will of God to come to you;” and “You make your boast of (ἐν) God.” Instances are indeed too numerous to reckon. But what we want is not so

much to exhibit an abundance of evidence, as to prove that the conclusions of our opponents are unsound. I will therefore omit any proof of this usage in the case of our Lord and of the Holy Spirit, in that it is well known. But I cannot forbear to remark that “the wise hearer” will find sufficient proof of the proposition before him, by following the method of *contraries*. For if the difference of language indicates, as we are told, that the *nature* has been changed, then let the identity of language compel our adversaries to confess with shame that the *essence* is unchanged.

12. And it is not only in the case of the theology that the use of the terms varies. But whenever one of the terms takes the meaning of the other, we frequently find them transferred from the one subject to the other. For instance, [Eve] says, “I have gotten a man *through* God,” [LXX, δία] meaning to say the same as *from* God; and in another passage “Moses commanded ... Israel *through* the word of the Lord;” ^{Jos 21.2} and again, “Is not the interpretation *through* God?” ^{Gen 40.8} Joseph, discoursing about dreams to the prisoners, instead of saying “*from* God” says plainly “*through* God” (LXX δία). Inversely, Paul uses the term “*from* whom” instead of “*through* whom,” when he says “made *from* a woman” [A.V., “*of*” (ἐκ) instead of “*through* a woman”]. ^{Gal 4.4} And he has plainly distinguished this in another passage, where he says that it is proper to a woman to be made *of* the man, and to a man to be made *through* the woman, in the words “For as the woman is *from* [*of*, A.V.] the man, even so is the man also *through* [*by*, A.V.] the woman.” ^{1Cor 11.12} Nevertheless, in the passage in question, while illustrating the variety of usage, the apostle at the same time corrects [the Latin] *obiter*, the error of those who supposed that the body of the Lord was a spiritual body. And to show that the God-bearing flesh was formed out of the common lump of human nature, he gave precedence to the more emphatic preposition. ¹⁷

The phrase “*through* a woman” would be likely to give rise to the suspicion of mere transit in the generation, while the phrase “*of* the woman” would satisfactorily indicate that the nature was shared by the mother and the offspring. The apostle was in no way contradicting himself, but he showed that the words can be interchanged without difficulty. Therefore, since the term “*from* whom” is transferred to the identical subjects, in the case of which “*through* whom” is decided to be properly used, with what consistency can these phrases be invariably distinguished one from the other, in order that fault may be falsely found with true religion?

CHAPTER 6

*Issue joined with those who assert that the Son is not “with the Father,”
but “after the Father.” Also concerning the equal glory.*

13. Our opponents, while they thus artfully and perversely encounter our argument, cannot even have recourse to the plea of ignorance. It is obvious that they are annoyed with us for completing the doxology, *to the Only Begotten together with the Father*, and for not separating the Holy Spirit from the Son. On this account they style us innovators,

¹⁷ 1Cor 15.44-45. ‘It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, “The first man Adam became a living being.” The last Adam *became* a life-giving spirit.’

In his letter, Paul cites Gen. 2.7. Now, Basil died before Jerome’s *Latin Vulgate* was published, so what he refers to here must be an earlier Latin translation of Gen 2.7, which contained *obiter*, meaning *incidentally*. – WHG

revolutionizers, phrase-coiners, and every other possible name of insult. But I am so far from being irritated at their abuse, that were it not for the fact that their loss causes me “heaviness and continual sorrow,” I could almost have said that I was grateful to them for the blasphemy, as though they were agents for providing me with blessing. For “blessed are you,” it is said, “when men shall revile you for my sake.” The grounds of their indignation are these: The Son, according to them, is not together *with* the Father, but *after* the Father. Hence it follows that glory should be ascribed to the Father “*through* him,” but not “*with* him” — inasmuch as “*with* him” expresses **equality** of dignity, while “*through* him” denotes **subordination**. They further assert that the Spirit is not to be ranked along *with* the Father and the Son, but *under* the Son and the Father — not coordinated, but subordinated; not *con-numerated*, but *sub-numerated*.

With technical terminology of this kind, they pervert the simplicity and artlessness of the faith. And thus by their ingenuity, allowing *no one else* to remain in ignorance, they cut off from themselves the plea that *their own* ignorance might demand.

14. Let us first ask them this question: In what sense do they say that the Son is “after the Father”? Is it later in *time*, or in *order*, or in *dignity*?

As to time, no one is so devoid of sense as to assert that the Maker of the ages holds a second place, when no interval intervenes in the natural conjunction of the Father with the Son. And indeed, so far as our conception of human relations goes, it is impossible to think of the Son as being later than the Father, not only from the fact that Father and Son are mutually conceived of in accordance with the relationship subsisting between them, but also because *posteriority in time* is predicated of subjects separated by a lesser interval from the present; and *priority of subjects* is farther off. For instance, what happened in Noah’s time is prior to what happened to the men of Sodom, inasmuch as Noah is more remote from our own day. And again, the events of the history of the men of Sodom are posterior, because they seem in a sense to approach nearer to our own day. But in addition to its being a breach of true religion, isn’t it really the most extreme folly to measure the existence of the life which *transcends* all time and all the ages, by its distance from the present? Is it not as though God the Father could be compared with, and made superior to, God the Son (who exists before the ages) ^{Joh 17.24} — in precisely the same way in which things that have a beginning, and are liable to corruption, are described as *prior* to one another?

The superior remoteness of the Father is really inconceivable, in that thought and intelligence are wholly impotent to go beyond the generation of the Lord. St. John has admirably confined the concept within circumscribed boundaries by two words, “In the *beginning* was the Word.” For thought cannot travel outside “was,” nor can imagination travel beyond “*beginning*.” Let your thought travel ever so far backward, you cannot get beyond the “*was*.” And however you may strain and strive to see what is beyond the Son, you will find it impossible to get further than the “*beginning*.” True religion, therefore, thus teaches us to think of the Son *together with* the Father.

15. If they really conceive of a kind of degradation of the Son in relation to the Father, as though He were in a lower place — so that the Father sits above, and the Son is pushed off to the next seat below — let them confess what they mean. We shall have no more to say. A plain statement of the view will at once expose its absurdity. Those who refuse to allow that the

Father pervades all things, do not so much as maintain the logical sequence of thought in their argument. The faith of the sound, is that God fills all things; but those who divide their up and down between the Father and the Son, do not remember even the word of the Prophet: "If I climb up into heaven you are there; if I go down to [sheol] you are there also." Now, to omit all proof of the ignorance of those who predicate the *place* of incorporeal things, what excuse can be found for their attack upon Scripture, shameless as their antagonism is, in the passages "Sit on my right hand " and "Sat down on the right hand of the majesty of God"? The expression "right hand" does not, as they contend, indicate the *lower* place, but *equality* of relation. It is not understood physically, in which case there might be something sinister about God. Rather, Scripture puts before us the magnificence of the dignity of the Son by the use of dignified language indicating *the seat of honor*. It is then left for our opponents to allege that this expression signifies *inferiority of rank*. Let them learn that "Christ is the power of God and wisdom of God," and that "He is the image of the invisible God," and the "brightness of his glory," and that "God the Father has sealed Him," ^{Joh 6.27} by engraving Himself on Him. Now, are we to call these passages, and others like them throughout the whole of Holy Scripture, proofs of humiliation? Or rather, are they public proclamations of the majesty of the Only Begotten, and of the equality of His glory with the Father? We ask them to listen to the Lord Himself, distinctly setting forth the equal dignity of His glory with the Father, in His words: "He that has seen me has seen the Father;" and again, "When the Son comes in the glory of his Father;" that they "should honor the Son even as they honor the Father;" and "We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father;" and "the only begotten God which is in the bosom of the Father." They take no account of all these passages, and then they assign to the Son the place set apart for His foes. A father's bosom is a fit and becoming seat for a son, but the place of the footstool is for those who have to be forced to fall.

We have only touched cursorily on these proofs, because our object is to pass on to other points. You can put together at your leisure, the items of the evidence, and then contemplate the height of the glory and the preeminence of the power of the Only Begotten. However, to the well-disposed bearer, even these are not insignificant, unless the terms "right hand" and "bosom" are accepted in a physical and derogatory sense. That would at once circumscribe God in local limits, and invent form, mold, and bodily position — all of which are totally distinct from the idea of the absolute, the infinite, and the incorporeal. Moreover, there is the fact that what is derogatory in the idea of it, is the same in the case both of the Father and the Son. So that, whoever repeats these arguments does not take away the dignity of the Son, but does incur the charge of blaspheming the Father. For whatever audacity a man is guilty of against the Son, he cannot but transfer it to the Father. If he assigns to the Father the upper place by way of precedence, and asserts that the only-begotten Son sits below, he will find that all the consequent conditions of body attach to the creature of his imagination.

And if these are the imaginations of drunken delusion and frenzied insanity, can it be consistent with true religion to refuse to worship and glorify with the Father, him who in nature, in glory, and in dignity, is conjoined with him? For men are taught by the Lord himself that, "He who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father." What shall we say? What just defense shall we have in the day of the awful universal judgment of all-creation, when the Lord clearly announces that He will come "in the glory of his Father;" when Stephen beheld Jesus standing at the right hand of God; when Paul testified in the spirit concerning Christ

“that he is at the right hand of God;” when the Father says, “Sit on my right hand;” when the Holy Spirit bears witness that he has sat down on “the right hand of the majesty” of God — if we then attempt to degrade him who shares the honor and the throne, from his condition of equality, to a lower state? Standing and sitting, I apprehend, indicate the fixity and entire stability of the nature. As Baruch says, when he wishes to exhibit the immutability and immobility of the Divine mode of existence, “For you sit forever and we perish utterly.” (Baruch 3:3-3) Moreover, in my judgment the place on the right hand indicates equality of *honor*. It is rash, then, to attempt to deprive the Son of participation in the doxology, as though worthy only to be ranked in a lower place of honor.

CHAPTER 7

Against those who assert that it is not proper for “with whom” to be said of the Son, and that the proper phrase is “through whom.”

16. But their contention is that to use the phrase “with him” is altogether strange and unusual, while “through him” is at once most familiar in Holy Scripture, and also very common in the language of the brotherhood. What is our answer to this? We say, Blessed are the ears that have not heard you, and the hearts that have been kept from the wounds of your words. To you, on the other hand, who are lovers of Christ, I say that the Church recognizes both uses, and deprecates neither as subversive of the other. For whenever we are contemplating the majesty of the nature of the Only Begotten, and the excellence of His dignity, we bear witness that the glory is *with* the Father. While on the other hand, whenever we think of His bestowal on us of good gifts, and of our access to and admission into the household of God, we confess that this grace is effected for us *through* Him and *by* Him.

It follows that the one phrase “*with whom*” is the proper one to be used in the ascription of *glory*; while the other, “*through whom*,” is specially appropriate in giving *thanks*. It is also quite untrue to allege that the phrase “*with whom*” is unfamiliar in the usage of the devout. All those whose soundness of character leads them to hold the dignity of antiquity to be more honorable than mere new-fangled novelty, and who have preserved the tradition of their fathers unadulterated, in town and country alike, have employed this phrase. It is, on the contrary, those who are surfeited with the familiar and the customary, and arrogantly assail the old as stale, who welcome innovation; just as in dress, your lovers of display always prefer some utter novelty to what is generally worn. So you may even still see that the language of country folk preserves the ancient fashion, while the language of our cunning experts in logomachy¹⁸ bears the brand of the new philosophy.

We say the same as our fathers said, that the glory of the Father and of the Son is common; therefore we offer the doxology to the Father *with* the Son. But we do not rest only on the fact that such is the tradition of the Fathers. For they too followed the sense of Scripture, and started from the evidence which, a few sentences back, I deduced from Scripture and laid before you. For “the brightness” is always thought of with “the glory,” “the image” with the

¹⁸ Logomachy: arguments about words or the meaning of words.

archetype, and the Son always and everywhere together with the Father. Nor does even the close connection of the names, much less the nature of the things, admit separation.

CHAPTER 8

*In how many ways "Through whom" is used; and in what sense
"With whom" is more suitable. Explanation of how the Son
receives a commandment, and how late is sent.*

17. When the apostle then "thanks God through Jesus Christ," and again says that "through Him" we have "received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations," or "through Him have access to this grace in which we stand and rejoice," he sets forth the boons (blessings) conferred on us by the Son, at one time making the grace of the good gifts pass through from the Father to us, and at another bringing us to the Father through Himself. For by saying "through whom we have received grace and apostleship," he declares the supply of the good gifts to proceed from that source. And again, in saying "through whom we have had access," he sets forth our acceptance and being made "of the household of God" through Christ. Is then the confession of the grace wrought by Him to draw us upward, a detraction from His glory? Is it not truer to say that the recital of His benefits is a proper argument for glorifying Him? It is on this account that we have not found Scripture describing the Lord to us by one name, nor even by such terms alone as are indicative of His godhead and majesty. At one time it uses terms descriptive of His *nature*, for it recognizes the "name which is above every name," the name of *Son*, and speaks of the *true Son*, and *only begotten God*, and *Power of God*, and *Wisdom*, and *Word*. Then again, on account of the diverse manners in which grace is given to us, which — because of the riches of His goodness, according to his manifold wisdom, he bestows on those who need — Scripture designates him by innumerable other titles, calling him *Shepherd*, *King*, *Physician*, *Bridegroom*, *Way*, *Door*, *Fountain*, *Bread*, *Axe*, and *Rock*. And these titles do not set forth His *nature*, but as I remarked, the *variety* of the effectual working which He bestows on those who need, out of His tender-heartedness to His own creation, and according to the peculiar necessity of each. Those who have fled for refuge to His ruling care, and through patient endurance have mended their wayward ways, He calls "sheep," and confesses Himself to be a "shepherd" to those who hear His voice, and refuse to give heed to strange teaching. For "my sheep, He says, "hear my voice." To those who have now reached a higher stage, and stand in need of righteous royalty, He is a *King*.

And in leading men to good actions through the straight way of His commandments, and again, because He safely shuts in all who through faith in Him take themselves for shelter to the blessing of the higher wisdom, He is a *Door*. So He says, "If any man enters in by me... he will go in and out and find pasture." Again, because to the faithful He is a defense that is strong, unshaken, and harder to break than any bulwark, He is a *Rock*. Among these titles, it is when He is styled *Door*, or *Way*, that the phrase "through Him" is very appropriate and plain. However, as God and Son, He is glorified *with* and *together with* the Father, in that "at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those in heaven, and those on earth, and those under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." This is why we use both terms, expressing by the one His own proper dignity, and by the other His grace toward us.

18. For “through Him” comes every succor to our souls; and it is in accordance with each kind of care, that an appropriate title has been devised. So when He presents to Himself the blameless soul, like a pure maiden, not having spot or wrinkle, He is called *Bridegroom*. But whenever He receives one in sore plight from the devil’s evil strokes, healing it in the heavy infirmity of its sins, He is named *Physician*. And will His care for us degrade our thoughts of Him to meanness? Or, on the contrary, will it strike us with amazement at once at the mighty power and love to man of the Savior, in that He both endured to suffer with us in our infirmities, and was able to come down to our weakness? For not heaven and earth and the great seas, not the creatures that live in the water and on dry land, not plants, and stars, and air, and seasons, not the vast variety in the order of the universe, so well sets forth the excellency of His might, as that God, being incomprehensible, should have been able, impassibly, through flesh, to have come into close conflict with death, to the end that by His own suffering He might give us the boon of freedom from suffering. It is true, the apostle says, “In all these things we are more than conquerors through him who loved us.” But in a phrase of this kind, there is no suggestion of any lowly and subordinate ministry, but rather of the succor rendered “in the power of his might.” For He Himself has bound the strong man and spoiled his goods — that is, us men — whom our enemy had abused in every evil activity, and made us “vessels fit for the Master’s use.” We have been perfected for every work through making ready that part of us which is in our own control. Thus we have had our approach to the Father through Him, being translated from “the power of darkness to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.”

We must not, however, regard the economy through the Son as a compulsory and subordinate ministration resulting from the low estate of a slave, but rather the voluntary solicitude working effectually for His own creation in goodness and in pity, according to the will of God the Father. For we will be consistent with true religion if in all that was and is from time to time perfected by Him, we both bear witness to the perfection of His power, and in no case set it apart from the Father’s will. For instance, whenever the Lord is called the *Way*, we are carried on to a higher meaning, and not to that which is derived from the vulgar sense of the word. We understand by *Way*, that advance to perfection which is made stage by stage and in regular order, through the works of righteousness and “the illumination of knowledge;” ever longing after what is before, and reaching out to those things which remain, until we have reached the blessed end, the knowledge of God, which the Lord through Himself bestows on those who have trusted in Him. For our Lord is an essentially good Way (where erring and straying are unknown) to that which is essentially good: to the Father. For “no one,” He says, “comes to the Father but through [by, A.V.] me.” Such is our way up to God “through the Son.”

19. It will follow that we should next in order point out the character of the provision of blessings bestowed on us by the Father “through him.” All created nature, both this visible world and all that is conceived of in the mind, cannot hold together without the care and providence of God, the Creator Word, the Only begotten God. ^{Col 1.17} He apportions His succor according to the measure of the needs of each, and distributes various and manifold mercies on account of the many kinds and characters of the recipients of His bounty, but appropriate to the necessities of individual requirements. Those who are confined in the darkness of ignorance, He enlightens: for this reason He is *true Light*. Portioning requital in accordance with the desert of deeds, He judges: for this reason He is *righteous Judge*. “For the Father

judges no man, but has committed all judgment to the Son.” Those who have lapsed from the lofty height of life into sin, He raises from their fall: for this reason He is the *Resurrection*. Effectually working by the might of His power and the will of His goodness, He does all things. He shepherds; He enlightens; He nourishes; He heals; He guides; He raises up; He calls into being things that were not; He upholds what has been created. Thus the good things that come from God reach us “through the Son,” who works in each case with greater speed than speech can utter. For neither lightnings, nor light’s course in air, is so swift; not the eyes’ sharp turn, nor the movements of our very thought. No, by the divine energy, each one of these is further surpassed in speed than the slowest of all living creatures is outdone in motion by birds, or even winds, or the rush of the heavenly bodies; not to mention these, by our very thought itself. For what extent of time is needed by Him who “upholds all things by the word of His power,” and works not by bodily agency, nor requires the help of hands to form and fashion, but holds in obedient following and unforced consent the nature of all things that are? So as Judith says, “You have thought, and what things you determined were ready at hand.” (9.6)

On the other hand, and lest we ever be drawn away by the greatness of the works wrought, to imagine that the Lord is without beginning, what does the Self-Existent say? “I live through [*by*, A.V.] the Father,” and the power of God; “The Son has power [*can*, A.V.] to do nothing of himself.” And what does the self-complete Wisdom say? I received “a command, what I should say and what I should speak.” Through all these words, He is guiding us to the knowledge of the Father, and referring to Him our wonder at all that is brought into existence, to the end that “through Him” we may know the Father. For the Father is not regarded from the difference of the operations, or by the exhibition of a separate and peculiar energy. For whatever things He sees the Father doing, “these the Son also does likewise.” But He enjoys our wonder at all that comes to pass out of the glory which comes to Him from the Only Begotten, rejoicing in the Doer Himself, as well as in the greatness of the deeds, and exalted by all who acknowledge Him as Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, “through whom [*by whom*, A.V.] are all things, and for whom are all things.” Therefore, says the Lord, “All mine are yours,” as though the sovereignty over created things were conferred on Him; and “Yours are mine,” as though the creating Cause came from there to Him. We are not to suppose that He used assistance in His action, or yet was entrusted with the ministry of each individual work by detailed commission — a condition distinctly menial and quite inadequate to the divine dignity. Rather, the Word was full of His Father’s excellences. He shines forth from the Father, and does all things according to the likeness of Him who begat Him. For if He is without variation in *essence*, so too He is without variation in *power*. And of those whose *power* is equal, the *operation* is also equal in all ways. And Christ is the power of God, and the wisdom of God. And so “all things are made through [*by*, A.V.] him,” and “all things were created through [*by*, A.V.] him and for him,” not in the discharge of any slavish service, but in the fulfillment of the Father’s will as Creator.

20. When He says, then, “I have not spoken of myself,” and again, “As the Father said to me, so I speak,” and “The word which you hear is not mine. but [the Father’s] who sent me,” and in another place, “As the Father commanded me, even so I do” — it is not because He lacks deliberate purpose or power of initiation, nor yet because He has to wait for the preconcerted keynote, that he employs language of this kind. His object is to make it plain that His own will is connected in indissoluble union with the Father. Do not then let us understand by what is

called a “commandment” a peremptory mandate delivered by organs of speech, and giving orders to the Son, as to a subordinate, concerning what He ought to do. Let us rather, in a sense befitting the Godhead, perceive a transmission of will, like the reflection of an object in a mirror, passing without note of time from Father to Son. “For the Father loves the Son and shows him all things,” so that “all things that the Father has” belong to the Son, not gradually accruing to Him little by little, but with Him all together and at once. Among men, the workman who has been thoroughly taught his craft, and through long training has sure and established experience in it, is able to work for the future by himself, in accordance with the scientific methods which he now has in store. And are we to suppose that the wisdom of God, the Maker of all creation, He who is eternally perfect, who is wise without a teacher, the Power of God “in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,” needs piecemeal instruction to mark out the manner and measure of His operations? I presume that in the vanity of your calculations, you mean to open a school: you will make the one take His seat in the teacher’s place, and the other stand by in a scholar’s ignorance, gradually learning wisdom and advancing to perfection by lessons given to Him bit by bit. Hence, if you have sense to abide by what logically follows, you will find the Son being eternally taught, yet never able to reach the end of perfection, inasmuch as the wisdom of the Father is infinite, and the end of the infinite is beyond apprehension. The result is that whoever refuses to grant that the Son has all things *from the beginning*, will never grant that He will reach perfection. But I am ashamed at the degraded conception to which I have been brought down by the course of the argument. Let us therefore revert to the loftier themes of our discussion.

21. “He that has seen me has seen the Father;” not the express image, nor yet the form, for the divine nature does not admit of combination; but the goodness of the will which, being concurrent with the essence, is beheld as like, and equal, or rather the *same*, in the Father as in the Son. What then is meant by “became subject”? What is meant by “delivered him up”? It means that the Son has it of the Father, that He works in goodness on behalf of men. But you must hear, too, the words, “Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law;” and “while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.”

Give careful heed, too, to the words of the Lord, and note how, whenever He instructs us about His Father, He is in the habit of using terms of *personal* authority, saying, “I will; be clean;” and “Peace, be still;” and “But I say to you;” and “You dumb and deaf spirit, I charge you;” and all other expressions of the same kind, in order that we may recognize our Master and Maker by these, and may be taught by the former, the Father of our Master and Creator. Thus the true doctrine is demonstrated on all sides: that the fact that the Father creates *through* the Son, neither constitutes the creation of the Father as imperfect, nor exhibits the active energy of the Son as feeble, but indicates the *unity of the will*. So the expression “through whom” contains a confession of an *antecedent* Cause, and is not adopted in objection to the *efficient* Cause.

CHAPTER 9

Definitive conceptions about the Spirit which conform to the teaching of the Scriptures.

22. Let us now investigate what are our common conceptions concerning the Spirit, as well those which have been gathered by us from Holy Scripture concerning it, as those which we

have received from the unwritten tradition of the Fathers. First of all we ask, who upon hearing the titles of the Spirit, is not lifted up in soul? Who does not raise his conception to the supreme nature? It is called the “Spirit of God,” the “Spirit of truth which proceeds from the Father,” “right Spirit,” “a leading Spirit.” Its proper and peculiar title is “*Holy Spirit*,” which is a name specially appropriate to everything that is incorporeal, purely immaterial, and indivisible. So, when teaching the woman who thought God to be an object of local worship, that the incorporeal is incomprehensible, our Lord said, “God is a spirit.”¹⁹ On our hearing, then, of a spirit, it is impossible to form the idea of a nature circumscribed, subject to change and variation, or at all like the creature. We are compelled to advance in our conceptions to the highest, and to think of an intelligent essence, infinite in power, unlimited in magnitude, unmeasured by times or ages, generous of its good gifts. All things needing sanctification turn to it. All things that live in virtue reach after it, as being watered by its inspiration and helped on toward their natural and proper end. It perfects all other things, but lacks nothing in itself— living not as needing restoration, but as Supplier of life — not growing by additions, but straightway full, self-established, omnipresent, and the origin of sanctification. It is light that is perceptible to the mind, supplying, as it were, through itself, illumination to every faculty in search of truth; by nature unapproachable, apprehended by reason of goodness, filling all things with its power, but communicated only to the worthy; not shared in one measure, but distributing its energy according to “the proportion of faith” — simple in essence, various in powers, wholly present in each, and being wholly everywhere; impassively divided, shared without loss of ceasing to be entire, following the likeness of the sunbeam, whose kindly light falls on the one who enjoys it as though it shone for him alone, and yet it illumines land and sea, and mingles with the air. So also is the Spirit to everyone who receives it, as though given to him alone. And yet it sends forth grace that is sufficient and full for all mankind, and it is enjoyed by all who share it, according to the capacity, not of its power, but of their nature.

23. Now, the Spirit is not brought into intimate association with the soul by local approximation. How indeed could there be a *corporeal* approach to the *incorporeal*? This association results from the withdrawal of the passions, which afterwards coming gradually upon the soul from its friendship with the flesh, have alienated it from its close relationship with God. Only then, after a man is purified from the shame whose stain he took through his wickedness, and has come back again to his natural beauty — as it were, cleaning the Royal Image and restoring its ancient form — only thus is it possible for him to draw near to the Paraclete. And like the sun, He will by the aid of your purified eye, show you in Himself the image of the invisible. And in the blessed spectacle of that image, you shall behold the unspeakable beauty of the archetype. Through His aid hearts are lifted up, the weak are held by the hand, and those who are advancing are brought to perfection. Shining upon those who are cleansed from every spot, He makes them spiritual by fellowship with Himself. Just as when a sunbeam falls on bright and transparent bodies, they themselves become brilliant too, and shed forth a fresh brightness from themselves, so souls in whom the Spirit dwells,

¹⁹ KJV, ASV, DRA. Other translations, “is spirit.” Πνεῦμα ὁ θεός (Joh 4:24 BYZ, nom. case). The Spirit is referred to with “it” here, but either Basil or Schaff intermingled “whom” to indicate the Spirit’s personal nature. This is made clear in the next paragraph (23). – WHG

illuminated by the Spirit, become spiritual themselves, and send forth their grace to others. From this comes foreknowledge of the future, understanding of mysteries, apprehension of what is hidden, distribution of good gifts, the heavenly citizenship, a place in the chorus of angels, joy without end, abiding in God, being made like God, ^{Eph 4.24} and highest of all, being made God. ^{Joh 17.22} Such then, to instance a few out of many, are the conceptions concerning the Holy Spirit, which we have been taught to hold concerning His greatness, His dignity, and His operations, by the oracles of the Spirit themselves.

CHAPTER 10

Against those who say that it is not right to rank the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son.

24. We must proceed to attack our opponents in the endeavor to confute those oppositions advanced against us, which are derived from “knowledge falsely so-called.” ^{1Tim 6.20} It is not permissible, they assert, for the Holy Spirit to be ranked with the Father and Son, on account of the difference of His nature and the inferiority of His dignity. Against them it is right to reply in the words of the apostles, “We ought to obey God rather than men.” For if our Lord, when enjoining the baptism of salvation, charged His disciples to baptize all nations in the name “of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,” ^{Mat 29.19} not disdaining fellowship with Him, and these men allege that we must not rank Him with the Father and the Son, then is it not clear that they openly withstand the commandment of God? If they deny that coordination of this kind is declaratory of any fellowship and conjunction, let them tell us why it behooves us to hold this opinion, and what more intimate mode of conjunction they have.

If the Lord did not indeed conjoin the Spirit with the Father and Himself in baptism, do not let them lay the blame of conjunction on *us*, for we neither hold nor say anything different. If, on the contrary, the Spirit is conjoined there with the Father and the Son (and no one is so shameless as to say anything else), then let them not lay blame on us for following the words of Scripture.

25. But all the apparatus of war has been readied against us; every intellectual missile is aimed at us; and now blasphemers’ tongues shoot and hit and hit again, yet harder than Stephen of old was struck by the killers of the Christ. And do not let them succeed in concealing the fact that, while an attack on us serves for a pretext for the war, the real aim of these proceedings is higher. It is against *us*, they say, that they are preparing their engines and their snares; against *us* that they are shouting to one another to come on, according to each one’s strength or cunning.

But the object of attack is *faith*. The one aim of the whole band of opponents and enemies of “sound doctrine” is to shake down the foundation of the faith of Christ, by leveling apostolic tradition with the ground, and utterly destroying it. So, like the debtors — of course *bona fide* debtors — they clamor for written proof, and reject as worthless the unwritten tradition of the Fathers. But we will not slacken in our defense of the truth. We will not cowardly abandon the cause. The Lord has delivered to us as a necessary and saving doctrine, that the Holy Spirit is to be ranked with the Father. Our opponents think differently, and they see fit to divide and rend asunder, and relegate Him to the nature of a ministering spirit. Is it not indisputable then, that they make their own blasphemy more authoritative than the law prescribed by the Lord? Come, then, set aside mere contention. Let us consider the points before us, as follows:

26. Through what is it that we are Christians? The universal answer would be, through our *faith*. And in what way are we saved? Plainly because we were regenerate through the grace given in our baptism. How else could we be? And after recognizing that this salvation is established through the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, shall we fling away “that form of doctrine” which we received? Would it not rather be ground for great groaning if we are found now further off from our salvation “than when we first believed,” and deny now what we then received? Whether a man have departed this life without baptism, or have received a baptism lacking in some of the requirements of the tradition, his loss is equal. And whoever does not always and everywhere keep to and hold fast as a sure protection the confession which we recorded at our first admission, when, being delivered “from the idols,” we came “to the living Gods” constitutes himself a “stranger” from the “promises” of God, fighting against his own handwriting, which he put on record when he professed the faith. For if to me my baptism was the beginning of life, and that day of regeneration was the first of days, it is plain that the utterance uttered in the grace of adoption was the most honorable of all. Can I then, perverted by these men’s seductive words, abandon the tradition which guided me to the light, which bestowed on me the boon of the knowledge of God, and by which I — so long a foe by reason of sin — was made a child of God? But for myself, I pray that with this confession I may depart from here to the Lord, and I charge them to preserve the faith secure until the day of Christ, and to keep the Spirit undivided from the Father and the Son, preserving in both the confession of faith and the doxology, the doctrine taught them at their baptism.

CHAPTER 11

That they who deny the Spirit are transgressors.

27. “Who has woe? Who has sorrow?” For whom is distress and darkness? For whom is eternal doom? Is it not for the transgressors? For those who deny the faith? And what is the proof of their denial? Is it not that they have negated their own confessions? And when and what did they confess? Belief in the Father and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit, when they renounced the devil and his angels, and uttered those saving words. What fit title then has been discovered for them, for the children of light to use? Are they not addressed as *transgressors*, as having violated the covenant of their salvation? What am I to call the denial of God? Or the denial of Christ? What, if not *transgressions*? And to him who denies the Spirit, what title do you wish me to apply? Must it not be the same, inasmuch as he has broken his covenant with God? And when the confession of faith in Him secures the blessing of true religion, and its denial subjects men to the doom of godlessness, is it not a fearful thing for them to negate their confession, not through fear of fire, or sword, or cross, or scourge, or wheel, or rack, but merely led astray by the sophistry and seductions of the *Pneumatomachi*? I testify to every man who is confessing Christ and denying God, that Christ will profit him nothing; to every man who calls upon God but rejects the Son, that his faith is vain; to every man that sets aside the Spirit, that his faith in the Father and the Son will be useless, for he cannot even hold it without the presence of the Spirit. For he who does not believe the Spirit does not believe in the Son; and he who has not believed in the Son does not believe in the Father. For none “can say that Jesus is the Lord except by the Holy Spirit,” and “No man has

seen God at any time, but the only begotten God ²⁰ who is in the bosom of the Father; he has declared him.” Such a one has neither part nor lot in true worship; for it is impossible to worship the Son, except by the Holy Spirit; impossible to call upon the Father, except by the Spirit of adoption.

CHAPTER 12

Against those who assert that the baptism in the name of the Father alone is sufficient.

28. Let no one be misled by the fact of the apostle’s frequently omitting the name of the Father and of the Holy Spirit when mentioning baptism, or on this account imagine that the invocation of the names is not observed. “As many of you,” he says, “as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ;” and again, “As many of you as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death.” For the naming of Christ is the confession of the whole, showing forth as it does the God who gave, the Son who received, and the Spirit who is, the unction. So we have learned from Peter, in the Acts, of “Jesus of Nazareth whom God anointed with the Holy Spirit;” and in Isaiah, “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me;” and the Psalmist, “Therefore God, even your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness above your fellows.” Scripture, however, in the case of baptism, sometimes plainly mentions the Spirit alone.

“For into one Spirit,” it says, “we were all baptized into one body.” And in harmony with this are the passages: “You shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit,” and “He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit.” But no one on this account would be justified in calling that baptism a *perfect* baptism, in which only the name of the Spirit was invoked. For the tradition that has been given to us by the quickening grace must remain forever inviolate. He who redeemed our life from destruction gave us a power of renewal, of which the cause is ineffable and hidden in mystery, but bringing great salvation to our souls. So that, to add or to take away anything involves manifestly a falling away from the life everlasting. If then in baptism the separation of the Spirit from the Father and the Son is perilous to the baptizer, and of no advantage to the baptized, how can rending apart the Spirit from Father and from Son be safe for us? Faith and baptism are two kindred and inseparable ways of salvation: faith is perfected through baptism, baptism is established through faith, and both are completed by the same names. For as we believe in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, so are we also baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. First comes the confession, introducing us to salvation, and baptism follows, setting the seal upon our assent.

CHAPTER 13

*Statement of the reason why in the writings of Paul
the angels are associated with the Father and the Son.*

29. It is objected, however, that other beings which are *enumerated* with the Father and the Son, are certainly not always *glorified* together with them. The apostle, for instance, in his

²⁰ In this passage in St. Basil “God” is the reading of three mss. at Paris, Moscow, the Bodleian Library, and the one at Vienna. “Son” is read by Regius III., Regius I., Regius IV., and Regius V. in Paris, the last three being of the 14th century, the one in the British Museum, and another in the Imperial Library at Vienna.

charge to Timothy, associates the angels with them in the words, “I charge you before God and the Lord Jesus Christ and the elect angels.” We are not for alienating the angels from the rest of creation; and yet it is argued we do not allow their being reckoned with the Father and the Son. To this I reply — although the argument, so obviously absurd, does not really deserve a reply — that possibly before a mild and gentle judge, and especially before One who by His leniency to those arraigned before Him demonstrates the unimpeachable equity of His decisions, one might be willing to offer as witness even a fellow-slave. But for a slave to be made free and called a son of God, and quickened from death, can only be brought about by Him who has acquired natural kinship with us, and has been changed from the rank of a slave. For how can we be made kin with God by one who is an alien? How can we be freed by one who is himself under the yoke of slavery? It follows that the mention of the Spirit, and of angels, are not made under like conditions. The Spirit is called on as *Lord of life*, and the angels as allies of their fellow-slaves and faithful witnesses of the truth. It is customary for the saints to deliver the commandments of God in the presence of witnesses, as the apostle also says to Timothy, “The things which you have heard from me among many witnesses, commit the same to faithful men.” And now he calls the angels to witness, for he knows that angels shall be present with the Lord when He comes in the glory of His Father to judge the world in righteousness. For the Lord says, “Whoever confesses me before men, the Son of Man shall also confess him before the angels of God; but he that denies Me before men shall be denied before the angels of God.” And in another place Paul says, “When the Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven with his angels.” Thus he already testifies before the angels, preparing good proofs for himself at the great tribunal.

30. And not only Paul, but generally all those to whom any ministry of the word is committed, never cease from testifying, but call heaven and earth to witness. This is on the ground that now every deed that is done, is done within them, and that in the examination of all the actions of life, they will be present with the judged. So it is said, “He shall call to the heavens above and to earth, that he may judge his people.” And so Moses, when he is about to deliver his oracles to the people, says “I call heaven and earth to witness this day;” and again in his song he says, “Give ear, O you heavens, and I will speak, and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth;” and Isaiah, “Hear, O heavens. and give ear, O earth;” and Jeremiah describes astonishment in heaven at the tidings of the unholy deeds of the people: “The heaven was astonished at this, and was horribly afraid, because my people committed two evils.” And so the apostle, knowing the angels are set over men as tutors and guardians, calls them to witness. Moreover, Joshua, the son of Nun, even set up a stone as witness of his words (a heap somewhere had already been called a *witness* by Jacob), for he says, “Behold this stone shall be a witness to you this day to the end of days, when you lie to the Lord our God.” Perhaps he believed that by God’s power, even the stones would speak to the conviction of the transgressors; or if not, that at least each man’s conscience would be wounded by the force of the reminder. In this manner, those who have been entrusted with the stewardship of souls provide witnesses, whatever they may be, so as to produce them at some future day. But the Spirit is ranked together with God, not on account of the emergency of the moment, but on account of the natural fellowship. He is not dragged in by us, but invited by the Lord.

CHAPTER 14

*Objection that some were baptized unto Moses and believed in him,
and an answer to it; with remarks upon types.*

31. But even if some are baptized into the Spirit, it is urged that it is not right, on this account, for the Spirit to be ranked with God. Some “were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea.” ^{1Cor 10.2} And it is admitted that faith has been put in men even before now; for “The people believed God and his servant Moses.” ^{Exo 14.31} Why then, it is asked, on account of faith and of baptism, do we exalt and magnify the Holy Spirit so far above creation, when there is evidence that the same things have been said by men before now? What then shall we reply? Our answer is that faith in the Spirit is the same as faith in the Father and the Son; and in like manner, baptism too. But faith in Moses and in the cloud is, as it were, in a *shadow and type*. The nature of the divine is very frequently represented by the rough and shadowy outlines of types. But because divine *things* are prefigured by small and human things, it is obvious that we must not therefore conclude that the divine *nature* is small. The type is an exhibition of things expected, and it gives an imitative anticipation of the future. So Adam was a type of “Him who was to come.” ^{Rom 5.14} Typically, “That rock was Christ.” ^{1Cor 10.4} And the water was a type of the living power of the word. As He says, “If any man thirsts, let him come to me and drink.” The manna is a type of the living bread that came down from heaven; and the serpent on the standard is a type of the passion of salvation accomplished by means of the cross; this is why those who even looked at it were preserved. So in like manner, the history of the exodus of Israel is recorded to exemplify those who are being saved through baptism. For the firstborn of the Israelites were preserved, like the bodies of the baptized, by giving grace to those who were marked with blood. For the blood of the sheep is a type of the blood of Christ; and the firstborn is a type of the first-formed. And inasmuch as the first-formed exists in us of necessity, and in sequence of succession, is transmitted till the end, it follows that “in Adam” we “all die,” and that “death reigned” until the fulfilling of the law and the coming of Christ. And the firstborn were preserved by God from being touched by the destroyer, to show that we who were made alive in Christ no longer die in Adam. The sea and the cloud for *that time being*, led on through amazement to faith; but for the *time to come* they typically prefigured the grace to be. “Who is wise? He shall understand these things.” ^{Hos 14.9} — how the sea is typically a baptism bringing about the departure of Pharaoh; in like manner, washing causes the departure of the tyranny of the devil. The sea slew the enemy in itself: and in baptism too, our enmity dies towards God. The people came out from the sea unharmed: we too, as it were, alive from the dead, step up from the water, “saved” by the “grace” of Him who called us. And the cloud is a shadow of the gift of the Spirit, who cools the flame of our passions by the “mortification of our members.” ^{Col 3.5}

32. What then? Because they were typically baptized into Moses, is the grace of baptism therefore small? If it were so, and if we were in each case to prejudice the dignity of our privileges by comparing them with their *types*, then not even one of these privileges could be reckoned great. Then the love of God, who gave His only begotten Son for our sins, would not be great and extraordinary, because Abraham did not spare his own son. Then even the passion of the Lord would not be glorious, because a *sheep* typified the offering, instead of *Isaac*. Then the descent into [sheol] was not fearful, because Jonah had previously typified

the death in three days and three nights. The same prejudicial comparison is also made in the case of baptism by all who judge the reality by the shadow, and comparing the typified with the type, they attempt by means of Moses and the sea, to disparage at once the whole dispensation of the Gospel. What remission of sins, what renewal of life, is there in the sea? What spiritual gift is there through Moses? What dying of sins is there? Those men did not die with Christ; therefore they were not raised with Him. They did not “bear the image of the heavenly;” they did “bear about in the body the dying of Jesus;” they did not “put off the old man;” they did not “put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him which created him.” Why then do you compare baptisms which have only their name in common, while the distinction between the things themselves is as great as might be that of dream and reality, or that of shadow and figures with substantial existence?

33. But belief in Moses not only does *not* show our belief in the Spirit to be worthless, but if we adopt our opponents’ line of argument, it rather weakens our confession in the God of the universe. “The people,” it is written, “believed the Lord and his servant Moses.” Moses then is joined with God, not with the Spirit; and he was a type not of the Spirit, but of Christ. For at that time in the ministry of the law, he typified “the Mediator between God and men.” Moses, when mediating for the people in things pertaining to God, was not a minister of the Spirit. For the law was given, “ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator,” namely Moses, in accordance with the summons of the people: “You speak with us,... but do not let God speak with us.” Thus faith in Moses is referred to the Lord, the Mediator between God and men, who said, “Had you believed Moses, you would have believed me.” Is then our faith in the Lord a trifle, because it was signified beforehand through Moses? So then, even if men were baptized into Moses, it does not follow that the grace given by the Spirit in baptism is small. I may point out, too, that it is usual in Scripture to say “Moses and the Law,” as in the passage, “They have Moses and the Prophets.” Therefore, when it is meant to speak of the baptism of the Law, the words are, “They were baptized into Moses.”

Why then do these slanderers of the truth, by means of the shadow and the types, endeavor to bring contempt and ridicule on the “rejoicing of our hope,” and the rich gift of our God and Savior, who through regeneration renews our youth like the eagle’s? Surely it is altogether childish, like a babe who must be fed on milk, to be ignorant of the great mystery of our salvation.^{1Cor 3.2} Inasmuch as, in accordance with the gradual progress of our education, while being brought to perfection in our training for godliness, we were first taught elementary and easier lessons, suited to our intelligence, while the Dispenser of our lots was ever leading us up, by gradually accustoming us, like eyes brought up in the dark, to the great light of truth. For He spares our weakness, and in the depth of the riches of His wisdom, and the inscrutable judgments of His intelligence, He used this gentle treatment. It is fitted for our needs, gradually accustoming us to see first the shadows of objects, and to look at the sun in water, to save us from dashing against the spectacle of pure unadulterated light, and being blinded. Just so, the Law having a shadow of things to come, and the typical teaching of the prophets, which is a dark utterance of the truth, have been devised means to train the eyes of the heart, in that from there the transition to “the wisdom hidden in mystery” will be made easy. Enough so far concerning types; nor indeed would it be possible to linger longer on this topic, or the incidental discussion would become many times bulkier than the main argument.

CHAPTER 15

*Reply to the suggested objection that we are baptized “into water.”
Also concerning baptism.*

34. What more? Truly, our opponents are well equipped with arguments. We are baptized, they urge, into *water*; of course, we will not honor the water above all creation, or give it a share of the honor of the Father and of the Son. The arguments of these men are such as might be expected from angry disputants, leaving no means untried in their attack on whoever has offended them, because their reason is clouded over by their feelings. We will not, however, shrink from the discussion even of these points. If we do not teach the ignorant, at least we will not turn away before evil doers. But let us for a moment retrace our steps.

35. The dispensation of our God and Savior concerning man is a recall from the fall, and a return from the alienation caused by disobedience to close communion with God. This is the reason for the sojourn of Christ in the flesh, the pattern of life described in the Gospels, the sufferings, the cross, the tomb, the resurrection — so that the man who is being saved through imitation of Christ receives that old adoption. The imitation of Christ is necessary for perfection of life, not only in the example of gentleness, lowliness, and long-suffering set for us in His life, but also the example of His actual death. So Paul, the imitator of Christ, says, “being made conformable to his death; if by any means I might attain to the resurrection of the dead.” ^{Phi 3.10-11} How then are we made in the likeness of His death? In that we were buried with Him by baptism. What then is the manner of the burial? And what is the advantage resulting from the imitation? First of all, it is necessary that the continuity of the old life be cut. And this is impossible unless a man is born again, according to the Lord’s word; for the regeneration, as indeed the name shows, is a beginning of a second life. So before beginning the second, it is necessary to put an end to the first. For just as when runners turn back and take the second course, a kind of halt and pause intervenes between the movements in the opposite direction. So too, in making a change in lives, it seemed necessary for death to come between the two as mediator, ending all that goes before and beginning all that comes after.

How then do we achieve the descent into [Hades]? By imitating through baptism the burial of Christ. For the bodies of the baptized are, as it were, buried in the water. Baptism then symbolically signifies putting off the works of the flesh. As the apostle says, you were “circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism.” ^{Col 2.11-12} And there is, as it were, a cleansing of the soul from the filth that has grown on it from the carnal mind. As it is written, “You shall wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.” On this account we do not wash ourselves at each defilement, as is the fashion of the Jews, but we admit the baptism of salvation is *one*. For there the death on behalf of the world is one, and the resurrection of the dead is one, of which baptism is a type. For this cause the Lord, who is the Dispenser of our life, gave us the covenant of baptism, containing a type of life and death. For the water fulfills the image of death, and the Spirit gives us the earnest of life. Hence it follows that the answer to our question of why the water was associated with the Spirit, is clear: the reason is because in baptism two ends were proposed. On the one hand, destroying the body of sin so that it may never bear fruit unto death; on the other hand, the end is our living to the Spirit, and having our fruit in holiness. The water receives the body, as a tomb figures death; while the

Spirit pours in the quickening power, renewing our souls from the deadness of sin, to their original life. This then is what it is to be “born again of water and of the Spirit” — being made dead is effected in the water, while our life is wrought in us through the Spirit. In three immersions, then, and with three invocations, the great mystery of baptism is performed to the end that the type of death may be fully figured, and that by the tradition of the divine knowledge, the baptized may have their souls enlightened. It follows that if there is any grace in the water, it is not of the *nature of the water*, but of the *presence of the Spirit*. For baptism is “not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God.” So in training us for the life that follows upon the resurrection, the Lord sets out all the manner of life required by the Gospel. He lays down for us the law of gentleness, of endurance of wrong, of freedom from the defilement that comes from the love of pleasure, and from covetousness — to the end that we may by set purpose win beforehand and achieve all that the life to come possesses by its inherent nature. If therefore anyone attempting a definition were to describe the gospel as a forecast of the life that follows upon the resurrection, he would not seem to me to go beyond what is fitting and right. Let us now return to our main topic.

36. Through the Holy Spirit comes our restoration to paradise, our ascension into the kingdom of heaven, our return to the adoption of sons, our liberty to call God our Father, our being made partakers of the grace of Christ, our being called children of light, our sharing in eternal glory. In a word, it is being brought into a state of all “fullness of blessing,” both in this world and in the world to come, of all the good gifts that are in store for us, by the promise of it. Through faith, beholding the reflection of their grace as though they were already present, we await the full enjoyment. If such is the earnest, what is the perfection? If such is the first fruits, what is the complete fulfillment? Furthermore, from this too may be apprehended the difference between the grace that comes from the Spirit, and baptism by water. John baptized with water, but our Lord Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit. “I indeed,” he says, “baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that comes after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire.” Here He calls the trial at the judgment, the *baptism of fire*. As the apostle says, “The fire shall test every man’s work, of what sort it is.” And again, “The day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire.” Before now there have been some who, in their championship of true religion, have undergone death for Christ’s sake, not in mere similitude, but in actual fact. And so they have needed none of the outward signs of water for their salvation, because they were baptized in their own blood. Thus I write not to disparage baptism by water, but to overthrow the arguments of those who exalt themselves against the Spirit; who confound things that are distinct from one another, and compare those which allow no comparison.

CHAPTER 16

That the Holy Spirit is in every conception separable from the Father and the Son, alike in the creation of perceptible objects, in the dispensation of human affairs, and in the judgment to come.

37. Let us then revert to the point raised from the outset, that in all things the Holy Spirit is inseparable and wholly incapable of being parted from the Father and the Son. St. Paul, in the passage about the gift of tongues, writes to the Corinthians, “If you all prophesy and someone comes in who does not believe, or is unlearned, he is convinced by all, he is judged by all; and

thus the secrets of the heart are made manifest. And so, falling down on his face, he will worship God and report that God is truly among you.” ^{1Cor 14.24-25} If God is known to be in the prophets by the prophesying that acts according to the distribution of the gifts of the Spirit, then let our adversaries consider what kind of place they will attribute to the Holy Spirit. Let them say whether it is more proper to rank Him with God, or to put Him in the place of the creature. Peter’s words to Sapphira: “How is it that you have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? You have not lied to men, but to God.” These show that sins against the Holy Spirit and against God are the same. And thus you might learn that in every operation, the Spirit is closely conjoined with, and inseparable from, the Father and the Son. God works the differences of operations, and the Lord works the diversities of administrations. But all the while, the Holy Spirit is present too, of His own will, dispensing distribution of the gifts according to each recipient’s worth. For it is said, “there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; and differences of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God who works all in all.” “But one and the same Spirit,” it is said, “works all these, dividing to every man severally as He will.” However, it must not be supposed that, because in this passage the apostle names in the first place the Spirit, in the second the Son, and in the third God the Father, their rank is therefore reversed. The apostle has only started in accordance with our habits of thought. For when we receive gifts, the first that occurs to us is the distributor, next we think of the sender, and then we lift our thoughts to the fountain and cause of the boons.

38. Moreover, from the things created at the beginning may be learned the fellowship of the Spirit with the Father and the Son. The pure, intelligent, and super-mundane (extraordinary) powers are and are *styled* holy, because they have their holiness of the grace given by the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, the mode of the creation of the heavenly powers is passed over in Silence; for the historian of the cosmogony (origins) has revealed to us only the creation of things perceptible by sense. But you, who have power from the things that are seen, to form an analogy of the unseen, glorify the Maker by whom all things were made, visible and invisible, principalities and powers, authorities, thrones, and dominions, and all other reasonable natures whom we cannot name. And in the creation, think first, I pray you, of the *original* cause of all things that are made (the Father); of the *creative* cause (the Son); of the *perfecting* cause (the Spirit); so that the ministering spirits subsist by the will of the Father, are brought into being by the operation of the Son, and perfected by the presence of the Spirit. Moreover, the perfection of angels is sanctification and continuance in [the creation].

And let no one imagine me either to affirm that there are three original hypostases, or to allege the operation of the Son to be imperfect. For the First Principle ²¹ of existing things is One, creating through the Son and perfecting through the Spirit. The operation of the Father who works all in all is not imperfect, neither is the creating work of the Son incomplete if not perfected by the Spirit. The Father, who creates by His sole will, could not stand in any need of the Son, but nevertheless He wills through the Son; nor could the Son, who works according to the likeness of the Father, need co-operation; but the Son too wills to make perfect through the Spirit. “For by the word of the Lord the heavens were made, and all the host of them by

²¹ The First Principle is the *a priori*, irreducible, originating cause of all other things; *God is One* (Deu 6.4). – WHG

the breath [the Spirit] of His mouth.” Psa 33.6 The Word, then, is not a mere significant impression on the air, borne by the organs of speech; nor is the Spirit of His mouth a vapor, emitted by the organs of respiration. But the Word is He who “was with God in the beginning” and “was God;” Joh 1.1-2 and the Spirit of the mouth of God is “the Spirit of truth which proceeds from the Father.” Joh 15.26 You are therefore to perceive three: the *Lord* who gives the order, the *Word* who creates, and the *Spirit* who confirms. And what other thing could confirmation be than *perfecting* according to holiness? This perfecting expresses the confirmation’s firmness, unchangeableness, and fixity in good. *But there is no sanctification without the Spirit.* The powers of the heavens are not holy by nature; if it were so, there would in this respect be no difference between them and the Holy Spirit. It is in proportion to their relative excellence, that they need their holiness from the Spirit. The branding-iron is conceived of together with the fire; and yet the material and the fire are distinct. Thus too in the case of the heavenly powers: their substance is perhaps an aerial spirit, or an immaterial fire. As it is written, “Who makes his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.” Heb 1.7 Therefore they exist in space and become visible, and appear in their proper bodily form to those who are worthy. But their *sanctification*, being external to their substance, superinduces their perfection through the communion of the Spirit. They keep their rank by abiding in the good and true. And while they retain their freedom of will, they never fall away from their patient attendance on Him who is truly good. It results that, if by your argument you do away with the Spirit, the hosts of the angels are disbanded, the dominions of archangels are destroyed, all is thrown into confusion, and their life loses law, order, and distinctness. For how are angels to cry “Glory to God in the highest” without being empowered by the Spirit? For “No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Spirit, and no man speaking by the Spirit of God calls Jesus accursed.” This might be said by wicked and hostile spirits, whose fall establishes our statement of the freedom of the will of the invisible powers, being, as they are, in a condition of equipoise between virtue and vice. And on this account they need the succor of the Spirit.

I indeed maintain that even Gabriel in no other way foretells events to come, than by the foreknowledge of the Spirit, by reason of the fact that one of the boons distributed by the Spirit is *prophecy*. And from where did he who was ordained to announce the mysteries of the vision to the Man of Desires²² derive the wisdom by which he was enabled to teach hidden things, if not from the Holy Spirit? The revelation of mysteries is indeed the peculiar function of the Spirit. As it is written, “God has revealed them to us by His Spirit.” 1Cor 2.10 And how could “thrones, dominions, principalities and powers” live their blessed life, if they did not “behold the face of the Father which is in heaven”? Jdt 6.19 But to behold it is impossible without the Spirit! At night, if you withdraw the light from the house, the eyes fall blind and their faculties become inactive, and the worth of objects cannot be discerned, and gold is trodden on in ignorance as though it were iron. So too in the order of the intellectual world, it is impossible for the high life of Law to abide without the Spirit. For it so to abide would be as likely as that an army would maintain its discipline in the absence of its commander, or a chorus maintain its harmony without the guidance of the coryphaeus.²³ How could the

²² Dan 9.23 DRA, speaking of Daniel.

²³ *Coryphaeus*: in ancient Greece, the conductor or leader of the chorus of a drama.

Seraphim cry “Holy, Holy, Holy,” if they were not taught by the Spirit how often true religion requires them to lift their voice in this ascription of glory? Do “all His angels” and “all His hosts” praise God? It is through the co-operation of the Spirit. Do “a thousand thousands” of angels stand before Him, and “ten thousand times ten thousand” ministering spirits? They are blamelessly doing their proper work *by the power of the Spirit*. All the glorious and unspeakable harmony of the highest heavens, both in the service of God and in the mutual concord of the celestial powers, can therefore only be preserved by the direction of the Spirit. Thus with those beings who are not gradually perfected by increase and advance, but are perfect from the moment of the creation, there is in their creation the presence of the Holy Spirit, who confers on them the grace that flows from Him for the completion and perfection of their essence.

39. But when we speak of the dispensations made for Man by our great God and Savior Jesus Christ, who will challenge their having been accomplished through the grace of the Spirit? Whether you wish to examine ancient evidence — the blessings of the patriarchs, the succor given through the legislation, the types, the prophecies, the valorous feats in war, the signs wrought through just men — or on the other hand, the things done in the dispensation of the coming of our Lord in the flesh — all of it is *through the Spirit*. In the first place, He was made an unction, and being inseparably present, He was with the very flesh of the Lord, according to what is written, “Upon whom you see the Spirit descending and remaining on Him,” ... “this is my beloved Son;” and “Jesus of Nazareth” whom “God anointed with the Holy Spirit.” After this, every operation was wrought with the co-operation of the Spirit. He was present when the Lord was being tempted by the devil; for it is said, “Jesus was led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted.” He was inseparably with Him while working His wonderful works; for it is said, “If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God...” And He did not leave Him when He had risen from the dead; for when renewing man, and by breathing on the face of the disciples, restoring the grace, *that* came by the inbreathing of God, which man had lost. What did the Lord say? “Receive the Holy Spirit: whoever’s sins you remit (release), they are remitted to them; and whoever’s you retain, they are retained.” And is it not plain and incontestable that the ordering of the Church is effected through the Spirit? For it is said He gave “in the church, first Apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues;” for this order is ordained in accordance with the division of the gifts that are *of the Spirit*.

40. Moreover, by anyone who carefully uses his reason, it will be found that even at the moment of the expected appearance of the Lord from heaven, the Holy Spirit will not (as some suppose) have no functions to discharge. On the contrary, even in the day of His revelation, in which the blessed and only Potentate will judge the world in righteousness, the Holy Spirit will be present with Him. For who is so ignorant of the good things prepared by God for those who are worthy, as not to know that the crown of righteous is the grace of the Spirit. It will be bestowed in more abundant and perfect measure in that day when spiritual glory will be distributed to each, in proportion as he has nobly played the man.²⁴ For among the glories of the saints are “many mansions” in the Father’s house, that is, differences of dignities. For as

²⁴ To “play the man” is to act honorably and courageously despite stiff opposition, even unto martyrdom. – WHG

“star differs from star in glory, so also is the resurrection of the dead.” ^{1Cor 15:41-42} Those, then, who were sealed by the Spirit unto the day of redemption, and who preserve pure and undiminished the first fruits which they received of the Spirit, are those who shall hear the words “well done you good and faithful servant; you have been faithful over a few things, I will make you ruler over many things.” In like manner, those who have grieved the Holy Spirit by the wickedness of their ways, or have not wrought for Him who gave to them, shall be deprived of what they have received, their grace being transferred to others.²⁵ Or, according to one of the evangelists, they shall even be wholly cut asunder — “cutting asunder” meaning complete separation from the Spirit. The body is not divided, part being delivered to chastisement, and part let off. For when a whole has sinned, it would be like the old fables, and unworthy of a righteous judge, for only half to suffer chastisement. Nor is the soul cut in two — the whole of that soul possesses the sinful affection throughout, and works the wickedness in co-operation with the body. “Cutting asunder,” as I observed, is the separation forever of the soul from the Spirit. For now, although the Spirit does not suffer admixture with the unworthy, He nevertheless does seem in a manner to be present with those who have once been sealed, awaiting the salvation which follows on their conversion. But then He will be wholly cut off from the soul that has defiled His grace. For this reason, “In [sheol] there is none who makes confession; in death none who remembers God,” ^{Psa 6:5} because the succor of the Spirit is no longer present. How then is it possible to conceive that the judgment is accomplished *without* the Holy Spirit, where the word points out that He is Himself the prize of the righteous; and when instead of the earnest, that which is perfect is given; and the first condemnation of sinners, when they are deprived of that [Spirit] which they seem to have? But the greatest proof of the conjunction of the Spirit with the Father and the Son, is that He is said to have the same relation to God which the spirit in us has to each of us. “For what man” it is said, “knows the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so, no man knows the things of God, but the Spirit of God.” On this point I have said enough.

CHAPTER 17

*Against those who say that the Holy Spirit is not to be numbered with,
but numbered under, the Father and the Son. In which, moreover,
there is a summary notice of the faith concerning right sub-numeration.*

41. However, what they call ***sub-numeration***, and in what sense they use this word, cannot even be imagined without difficulty. It is well known that it was imported into our language from the “wisdom of the world;” but a point for our present consideration will be whether it has any immediate relation to the subject under discussion. Those who are adepts in vain investigations tell us that while some nouns are common and of widely extended denotation, others are more specific, and that the force of some is more limited than that of others. *Essence*, for instance, is a common noun, predicable of all things both animate and inanimate; while *animal* is more specific, being predicated of fewer subjects than the former, though of more than those which are considered under it, as it embraces both rational and irrational nature. Again, *human* is more specific than animal, and *man* than human, and *individuals*

²⁵ Parable of the talents, Mat 25:29.

(such as Peter, Paul or John), more specific than man. Do they mean by *sub-numeration*, then, the division of the common into its subordinate parts? But I would hesitate to believe that they have reached such a pitch of infatuation as to assert that the God of the universe — like some common quality that is conceivable only by reason, and without actual existence in any hypostasis — is divided into subordinate divisions, and that this subdivision is then called *sub-numeration*. This would hardly be said even by madmen; for besides its impiety, they are establishing the very opposite argument to their own contention. For the subdivisions are of the same *essence* as that from which they have been divided. The very obviousness of the absurdity makes it difficult for us to find arguments to confute their unreasonableness. So that really, their folly looks like an advantage to them; just as soft and yielding bodies offer no resistance, and therefore cannot be struck a stout blow. It is impossible to bring a vigorous confutation to bear on a palpable absurdity. The only course open to us is to pass by their abominable impiety in silence. Yet our love for the brethren and the importunity of our opponents makes silence impossible.

42. What is it that they maintain? Look at the terms of their imposture. “We assert that con-numeration is appropriate to subjects of equal dignity, and sub-numeration to those which vary in the direction of inferiority.” “Why do you say this?” I rejoined, “I fail to understand your extraordinary wisdom. Do you mean that gold is numbered with gold, and that lead is unworthy of the con-numeration, but because of the cheapness of the material, it is sub-numerated to gold? And do you attribute so much importance to number, that it can either exalt the value of what is cheap, or destroy the dignity of what is valuable? Therefore, again, you would number gold under precious stones, and precious stones that are smaller and without luster, you would number under those which are larger and brighter in color. But what will not be said by men who spend their time in nothing else but either ‘to tell or to hear some new thing’? Let these supporters of impiety be classed for the future with Stoics and Epicureans. What sub-numeration is even possible for things that are *less* valuable in relation to things that are *very* valuable? How is a brass obol to be numbered under a golden stater? “Because,” they reply, “we do not speak of possessing two coins, but one and one.”²⁶ Yes, but which of these is sub-numerated to the other? For each is similarly mentioned. If then you number each by itself, you cause an equality of value by numbering them in the same way. But if you join them, you make their value *one*, by numbering them one with the other. But if sub-numeration belongs to the one which is numbered second, then it is in the power of the counter to begin by counting the brass coin. Let us, however, pass over the confutation of their ignorance, and turn our argument to the main topic.

43. Do you maintain that the Son is numbered *under* the Father, and the Spirit *under* the Son, or do you confine your sub-numeration to the Spirit alone? If, on the other hand, you apply this sub-numeration *also* to the Son, then you revive what is the same impious doctrine — the unlikeness of the substance, the lowliness of rank, coming into being at a later time — and once for all, by this one term, you will plainly set to circling again, all the blasphemies against the Only-begotten. To controvert these blasphemies would be a longer task than my present purpose allows; and I am less bound to undertake it because the impiety has been

²⁶ An *obol* is equivalent to one sixth of a drachma; a gold stater is equivalent to four drachmas. — WHG

refuted elsewhere to the best of my ability. If on the other hand, they suppose the sub-*numeration* to benefit the Spirit alone, they must be taught that the Spirit is spoken of together with the Lord in precisely the same manner in which the Son is spoken of with the Father. “The name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” is delivered in like manner, and according to the co-ordination of words delivered in baptism, the relation of the Spirit to the Son is the same as that of the Son to the Father. And if the Spirit is co-ordinate with the Son, and the Son with the Father, it is obvious that the Spirit is also co-ordinate with the Father. When the names are then ranked in one and the same co-ordinate series, what room is there for speaking on the one hand of *con-numeration*, and on the other of *sub-numeration*? Indeed, without exception, which thing ever lost its own nature by being numbered? Is it not a fact that when things are numbered, they remain what they naturally and originally were, while number is adopted among us as a sign indicative of the plurality of subjects? For, some bodies we *count*, some we *measure*, and some we *weigh*. Those which are continuous by nature, we apprehend by measure; to those which are divided we apply number (with the exception of those which are measured on account of their fineness); while heavy objects are distinguished by the inclination of the *balance*. It does not however follow that, because we have invented symbols for our convenience, to help us to arrive at the knowledge of quantity, we have therefore changed the nature of the things signified. We do not speak of “*weighing* under” one another, things which are weighed, even though one is gold and the other is tin. Nor do we “*measure* under” things that are measured; and so, in the same way, we will not “*number* under” things which are numbered. And if none of the rest of things allows for sub-*numeration*, then how can they allege that the *Spirit* ought to be sub-*numerated*? Laboring as they do under heathen unsoundness, they imagine that things which are inferior, either by grade of rank or subjection of substance, ought to be sub-*numerated*.

CHAPTER 18

*In what manner in the confession of the three hypostases
we preserve the pious dogma of the Monarchia. In which also
is the refutation of those who allege that the Spirit is sub-numerated.*

44. In delivering the formula of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, ^{Mat 28.19} our Lord did not connect the gift with a number. He did not say “into First, Second, and Third,” nor yet “into one, two, and three; but He gave us the boon of the knowledge of the faith which leads to salvation, by means of holy names. So that what saves us is our *faith*. Number has been devised as a symbol indicative of the quantity of objects. But these men, who bring ruin on themselves from every possible source, have turned even the capacity for counting, against the faith. Nothing else undergoes any change in consequence of the addition of number. And yet these men in the case of the divine nature, pay reverence to number, lest they exceed the limits of the honor due to the Paraclete. ²⁷ But, O wisest sirs, let the unapproachable be altogether above and beyond number, just as the ancient reverence of the Hebrews wrote the unutterable name of God in peculiar characters [YHWH], thus endeavoring to set forth its infinite excellence. Count, if you must; but you must not do damage to the faith by counting.

²⁷ *Paraclete*: an advocate; one called to aid or support; hence, the Consoler, Comforter, or Intercessor — a term applied to the Holy Spirit.

Either let the ineffable be honored by silence; or let holy things be counted consistently with true religion. There is one God and Father, one Only-begotten, and one Holy Spirit. We proclaim each of the hypostases singly; and, when we must count, we do not let an ignorant arithmetic carry us away to the idea of a plurality of Gods.

45. For we do not count by way of addition, gradually making increase from unity to multitude, and saying one, two, and three — nor yet first, second, and third. For “I,” God, “am the first, and I am the last.” And up to now we have never, even at the present time, heard of a second God. Worshipping as we do *God of God*, we both confess the distinction of the Persons, and at the same time abide by the Monarchy. We do not fritter away the theology in a divided plurality, because one Form — so to speak, united in the invariableness of the Godhead — is beheld in God the Father, and in God the Only begotten. For the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son; since such as is the latter, such is the former; and such as is the former, such is the latter; and in this is the Unity. So that, according to the *distinction of Persons*, both are one and one, and according to the *community of Nature*, one. How then, if both are one and one, are there not two Gods? Because we speak of *a King*, and of *the King’s image*, and not of two kings. ^{1Sam 12.12} The majesty is not cloven in two, nor is the glory divided. The sovereignty and authority over us is one, and so the doxology ascribed by us is not plural but one; because the honor paid to the *image* passes on to the prototype. ^{2Cor 4.4} Now, what the image is in the one case by reason of *imitation*, the Son is *by nature* in the other case. As in works of art, the likeness is dependent on the form, so in the case of the divine and uncompounded nature, the union consists in the communion of the Godhead. Moreover, one is the Holy Spirit; and we speak of Him singly, conjoined as He is to the one Father through the one Son, and through Himself completing the adorable and blessed Trinity. His intimate relationship to the Father and the Son is sufficiently declared by the fact of His not being ranked in the *plurality* of the creation, but being spoken of *singly*; for He is not one of many, but One. For as there is one Father and one Son, so is there one Holy Spirit. He is consequently as far removed from created Nature as reason requires the singular to be removed from compound and plural bodies. And He is in such a way united to the Father and to the Son, as unit has affinity with unit.

46. And it is not from this source alone that our proofs of the natural communion are derived, but from the fact that He is moreover said to be “of God;” ^{Gen 1.2} not indeed in the sense in which “all things are of God,” but in the sense of *proceeding out of God*, ^{Joh 15.26} not by generation, like the Son, but as “Breath of His mouth.” ^{Psa 33.6} But in no way is the “mouth” a member, nor is the Spirit breath that is dissolved; but the word “mouth” is used so far as it can be appropriate to God; and the Spirit is a Substance having life, gifted with supreme power of sanctification. Thus the close relation is made plain, while the mode of the ineffable existence is safeguarded. He is moreover styled the ‘Spirit of Christ,’ ^{Rom 8.9} as being closely related to Him by nature. Therefore, “If any man does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.” Hence He alone worthily glorifies the Lord; for it is said, “He shall glorify me,” ^{Joh 16.14} not as the creature, but as “Spirit of truth,” ^{Joh 14.17} dearly showing forth the truth in Himself; and as the Spirit of wisdom, in His own greatness revealing “Christ the Power of God and the wisdom of God.” ^{1Cor 1.24} And as *Paraclete*, He expresses in Himself the goodness of the Paraclete who sent Him, ^{Joh 16.7} and in His own dignity He manifests the majesty of Him from whom He proceeded. There is then, on the one hand, a natural glory, as light is the glory of

the sun. And on the other hand, a glory bestowed judicially and of free will '*ab extra*'²⁸ on those who are worthy. The latter is twofold. "A son," it is said, "honors his father, and a servant honors his master." Of these two, the one (the *servile*) is given by the creature; the other, which may be called *the intimate*, is fulfilled by the Spirit. For, as our Lord said of Himself, "I have glorified You on the earth: I have finished the work which you gave me to do;" so He says of the Paraclete, "He shall glorify me: for He will receive from mine, and show it to you." And just as the Son is glorified by the Father when He says, "I have both glorified it and will glorify it again," so the Spirit is glorified through His communion with both Father and Son; and through the testimony of the Only-begotten, when He says, "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven men; but blasphemy against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven men."

47. And when, by means of the power that enlightens us, we fix our eyes on the beauty of the image of the invisible God, and through the image are led up to the supreme beauty of the spectacle of the archetype, then I conceive the Spirit of knowledge is inseparably with us, in Himself bestowing on those who love the vision of the truth, the power of beholding the Image — not making the exhibition from without, but in Himself leading on to the full knowledge. "No man knows the Father save the Son." And so "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Spirit." For it is not said *through* the Spirit, but *by* the Spirit. "God is a spirit, and those who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." As it is written, "in your light we shall see light;" namely, by the illumination of the Spirit, "the true light which lights every man who comes into the world." The result is that in Himself He shows the glory of the Only begotten, and in Himself He bestows on true worshippers the knowledge of God. Thus the way of the knowledge of God lies from One Spirit, through the One Son, to the One Father. And conversely, the natural Goodness and the inherent Holiness and the royal Dignity extend from the Father through the Only-begotten, to the Spirit. Thus there is both acknowledgment of the hypostases, and the true dogma of the Monarchy is not lost. On the other hand, those who support their sub-numeration by talking of first and second and third ought to be informed that they are importing the polytheism of heathen error into the undefiled theology of Christians. No other result can be achieved by the felling device of sub-numeration than the confession of a first, a second, and a third God. For us, the order prescribed by the Lord is sufficient. Whoever confuses this order, will be no less guilty of transgressing the law than are the impious heathen.

Enough has been now said to prove, in contravention of their error, that the communion of Nature is in no way dissolved by the manner of sub-numeration. Let us, however, make a concession to our contentious and feeble-minded adversary, and grant that what is second to anything is spoken of in sub-numeration to it. Now let us see what follows. "The first man," it is said, "is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven." Again "that was not first which is spiritual but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual." If then the second is sub-numerated to the first, and the sub-numerated is inferior in dignity to that to which it was sub-numerated, according to you the spiritual is inferior in honor to the natural, and the heavenly man is inferior to the earthy.

²⁸ *Ab extra*: from outside.

CHAPTER 19

Against those who assert that the Spirit should not be glorified.

48. “Be it so,” it is rejoined, “but glory is by no means so absolutely due to the Spirit as to require His exaltation by us in doxologies.” From where then could we get demonstrations of the dignity of the Spirit “surpassing all understanding,” if His communion with the Father and the Son were not reckoned by our opponents as good for testimony of His rank? It is, at all events, possible for us to arrive, to a certain extent, at an intelligent apprehension of the sublimity of His nature and of His unapproachable power, by looking at the meaning of His title; and at the magnitude of His operations; and by His good gifts bestowed on us, or rather on all creation. He is called Spirit, as “God is a Spirit,” and “the breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the Lord.” ^{Lam 4.20} He is called holy, as the Father is holy, and the Son is holy, for to the *creature*, holiness was brought in from without. But to the *Spirit*, holiness is the fulfillment of nature, and it is for this reason that He is described not as being sanctified, but as sanctifying. ^{1Pet 1.2} He is called good, as the Father is good; and He who was begotten of the Good is good, but to the Spirit His goodness is essence. He is called upright, as “the Lord is upright,” in that He is Himself truth, ^{Joh 14.17} and is Himself Righteousness, ^{2Cor 3.8-9} having no divergence nor leaning to one side or to the other, on account of the immutability of His substance. He is called *Paraclete*, like the Only begotten, as He Himself says, “I will ask the Father, and He will give you another comforter.” Thus names are borne by the Spirit in common with the Father and the Son, and He gets these titles from His natural and close relationship. From what other source could they be derived? Again He is called royal, Spirit of truth, and Spirit of wisdom. ^{Isa 11.2} “The Spirit of God,” it is said, “has made me.” ^{Job 33.4} God filled Bezalel with “the divine Spirit of wisdom and understanding and knowledge.” ^{Exo 31.2-3} Such names as these are super-eminent and mighty, but they do not transcend His glory.

49. And His operations, what are they? For majesty *ineffable*; and for numbers *innumerable*. How shall we form a conception of what extends *beyond* the ages? What were His operations *before* that creation of which we can conceive? How great was the grace which He conferred on creation? What power was exercised by Him over the ages to come? He existed; He pre-existed; He co-existed with the Father and the Son before the ages. It follows that, even if you can conceive of anything beyond the ages, you will find the Spirit yet further above and beyond. And if you think of the creation, the powers of the heavens were established by the Spirit, the establishment being understood to refer to the disability to fall away from good. For it is from the Spirit that the powers derive their close relationship to God, their inability to change to evil, and their continuance in blessedness.

Is it Christ’s advent? The Spirit is forerunner. Is there the incarnate presence? The Spirit is inseparable. Working of miracles, and gifts of healing, are through the Holy Spirit. Demons were driven out by the Spirit of God. The devil was brought to naught by the presence of the Spirit. Remission of Sins was by the gift of the Spirit; for “you were washed, you were sanctified,... in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the holy Spirit of our God.” ^{1Cor 6.11} There is close relationship with God through the Spirit; for “God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father.” The resurrection from the dead is effected by the operation of the Spirit; for “You send forth your spirit, they are created; and You renew the face of the earth.” ^{Psa 104.30} If here *creation* may be taken to mean the bringing of the

departed to life again, how mighty is the operation of the Spirit, Who is to us the dispenser of the life that follows on the resurrection, and attunes our souls to the spiritual life beyond? Or if here *creation* means the change to a better condition of those who in this life have fallen into sin (for it is so understood according to the usage of Scripture, as in the words of Paul “if any man is in Christ, he is a new creation”) — that is, the renewal which takes place in this life, and the transmutation from our earthly and sensuous life to the heavenly conversation which takes place in us through the Spirit — then our souls are exalted to the highest pitch of admiration.

With these thoughts before us, are we to be afraid of going beyond due bounds in the extravagance of the honor we pay? Should we not rather fear lest we let our thoughts about Him fall too low, even though we seem to give Him the highest names which the thoughts of man can conceive, or man’s tongue utter? It is the Spirit which says, as the Lord says [to Peter], “Get down and go with them, doubting nothing: for I have sent them.” ^{Act 10.20} Are these the words of an inferior, or of one who is in dread? “Separate to me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them.” ^{Act 13.2} Does a slave speak this way? And Isaiah, “The Lord God and His Spirit has sent me,” ^{Isa 48.18} and “the Spirit came down from the Lord and guided them.” ^{Isa 63.4 LXX} And I pray, again, do not understand this guidance to be some humble service, for the Word witnesses that it was the work of God — “You led your people,” it is said “like a flock;” ^{Isa 63.14} and “You who leads Joseph like a flock;” ^{Psa 80.1} and “He led them on safely, so that they feared not.” ^{Psa 78.53} Thus when you hear that when the Comforter has come, He will put you in remembrance and “guide you into all truth,” do not misrepresent the meaning.

50. But, it is said that “He makes intercession for us;” ^{Rom 8.26} and it follows then, that as the suppliant is inferior to the benefactor, so the Spirit is inferior in dignity to God. But have you never heard concerning the Only-begotten, that He “is at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us?” ^{Rom 8.34} So then, because the Spirit is in you (if indeed He is in you at all), nor yet because He teaches us who were blinded, and guides us to the choice of what profits us — do not for this reason, allow yourself to be deprived of the right and holy opinion concerning Him. For to make the loving kindness of your benefactor a ground of ingratitude, would indeed be a true extravagance of unfairness. “Do not grieve the Holy Spirit;” hear the words of Stephen, the first fruits of the martyrs, when he reproaches the people for their rebellion and disobedience: “You always resist the Holy Spirit;” and again, in Isaiah: “They vexed His Holy Spirit, therefore He was turned to be their enemy;” ^{Isa 63.10} and in another passage, “the house of Jacob angered the Spirit of the Lord.” ^{Mic 2.7} Are these passages not indicative of authoritative power?

I leave it to the judgment of my readers to determine what opinions we ought to hold when we hear these passages — whether we are to regard the Spirit as an instrument, a subject of equal rank with the creature, and a fellow servant of ourselves; or whether, on the contrary, the mere whisper of this blasphemy is most grievous to the ears of the pious. Do you call the Spirit a *servant*? But it is said, “a servant does not know what his Lord does.” Yet the Spirit knows the things of God, as “the spirit of man that is in him.” ^{1Cor 2.11}

CHAPTER 20

*Against those who maintain that the Spirit is in the rank
neither of a servant nor of a master, but in that of the free.*

51. The Spirit is not a slave,²⁹ it is said; nor a master, but free. Oh the terrible insensibility, the pitiable audacity of those who maintain this! Should I lament in them their ignorance rather than their blasphemy? They try to insult the doctrines that concern the divine nature by comparing them with the human. And they endeavor to apply to the ineffable nature of God, that common custom of human life by which the difference of degrees is variable; not perceiving that among men, no one is a slave *by nature*. For men are either brought under a yoke of slavery by conquest, as when prisoners are taken in war; or they are enslaved on account of their poverty, as the Egyptians were oppressed by Pharaoh; or, by a wise and mysterious dispensation, the worst children are condemned by their fathers' order, to serve the wiser and better children. Any righteous enquirer into the circumstances would declare this to be a *benefit*, not a sentence of condemnation. For it is more profitable that the man who, through lack of intelligence, has no natural principle of rule within himself, should become the chattel of another — to the end that, being guided by the reason of his master, he may be like a chariot with a charioteer, or a boat with a steersman seated at the tiller.

For this reason, Jacob became Lord of Esau by his father's blessing, in order that the foolish son, who did not have intelligence as his proper guardian, might be benefited by his prudent brother, even though he did not wish it. So Canaan shall be "a servant to his brethren" ^{Gen 9.25} because, since his father Ham was unwise, he was uninstructed in virtue. In this world, then, it is thus that men are made slaves, but those who have escaped poverty or war, or do not require the tutelage of others, are free.

It follows that even though one man is called *master* and another *servant*, nevertheless, both in view of our mutual equality of rank, and as chattels of our Creator, we are all fellow slaves. But in that other world, what can you bring out of bondage? For no sooner were they created, than bondage was commenced. The heavenly bodies exercise no rule over one another for they are unmoved by ambition; but all bow down to God, and render to Him alike the awe which is due to Him as Master and the glory which fails to Him as Creator. For "a son honors his father and a servant his master," and from all God asks one of these two things; for "if I then am a Father, where is my honor? and if I am a Master where is my fear?" ^{Mal 1.6} Otherwise the life of all men, if it were not under the oversight of a master, would be most pitiable. Such is the condition of the apostate powers who, because they stiffen their neck against God Almighty, fling off the reins of their bondage — not that their natural constitution is different; but the cause is in their disobedient disposition toward their Creator. Whom then do you call free? The one who has no King? The one who has neither power to rule another, nor the willingness to be ruled? Among all existent beings, no such nature is to be found. To entertain such a conception of the Spirit is obvious blasphemy. If He is a creature, of course He serves with all the rest; for "all things," it is said "are your servants." ^{Psa 119.91} But if He is above Creation, then He shares in royalty.

²⁹ Slave and servant are used interchangeably in this paragraph, as they often are in Scripture. — WHG

CHAPTER 21.

Proof from Scripture that the Spirit is called Lord.

52. But why get an unfair victory for our argument, by fighting over these undignified questions, when it is within our power to prove that the excellence of the glory is beyond dispute by adducing more lofty considerations? If indeed we repeat what we have been taught by Scripture, every one of the *Pneumatomachi* ³⁰ will perhaps raise a loud and vehement outcry, stop their ears, pick up stones or anything else that comes to hand for a weapon, and charge against us. But our own security must not be regarded by us above the truth. We have learned from the Apostle, “the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God and into patient waiting for Christ” *for our tribulations.* ^{2The 3-5} Who is “the Lord” that directs us into the love of God, and into patiently waiting for Christ for our tribulations? Let those men answer us who are for making a slave of the Holy Spirit. For if the argument had been about God the Father, it would certainly have said, ‘the Lord direct you into His own love;’ or if it had been about the Son, the argument would have added ‘into His own patience.’ Let them then seek what other Person there is, who is worthy to be honored with the title of *Lord*. And parallel with this, is that other passage, “and the Lord make you to increase and abound in love, one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do towards you — to the end that He may establish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all His saints.” ^{1The 3.12-13} Now, what Lord does he entreat to stablish the hearts of the faithful at Thessalonica, unblameable in holiness before God even our Father, at the coming of our Lord? Let those answer who place the Holy Spirit among the ministering spirits that are sent forth on service. *They cannot.* Therefore, let them hear yet another testimony which distinctly calls the Spirit *Lord*. “The Lord,” it is said, “is that Spirit;” and again “even as from the Lord the Spirit.” ^{2Cor 3.17-18} But to leave no ground for objection, I will quote the actual words of the Apostle: “For even to this day, the same veil remains unlifted in the reading of the Old Testament; this veil is taken away in Christ.... Nevertheless, when one turns to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit.” ^{2Cor 3.15-17} Why does he speak this way? Because whoever abides in the bare sense of the letter, and busies himself in it with the observances of the Law, has gotten, as it were, his own heart enveloped in the Jewish acceptance of the letter, *like a veil*. And this befalls him because of his ignorance that the bodily observance of the Law has been done away with by the presence of Christ, in that for the future the *types* are transferred to the *reality*.

Lamps are made needless by the advent of the sun; and upon the appearance of the truth, the occupation of the Law is gone, and prophecy is hushed into silence. On the contrary, whoever has been empowered to look down into the depth of the meaning of the Law, and after passing through the obscurity of the letter, *as through a veil*, to arrive at things unspeakable, is like Moses taking off the veil when he spoke with God. He too turns from the *letter* to the *Spirit*. So, the face of Moses “with the veil on” corresponds with the obscurity of the teaching of the Law; and spiritual contemplation corresponds with turning to the Lord. Whoever, then, in the reading of the Law, takes away the *letter* and turns to the *Lord* — and the Lord is now called *the Spirit* — becomes moreover like Moses, who had his face *glorified* by the

³⁰ See note, p. 1. The *Pneumatomachi* denied the godhood of the Holy Spirit.

manifestation of God. For just as objects which lie near brilliant colors are themselves tinted by the brightness which is shed around, so the one who fixes his gaze firmly on the Spirit, is somehow transfigured by the Spirit's glory into greater splendor, having his heart lit up, as it were, by some light streaming from the truth of the Spirit. And this is "being changed from the glory of the Spirit" into "His own "glory." ^{2Cor 3.18} This is not in a paltry degree, nor dimly and indistinctly, but as we might expect anyone to be, who is enlightened by the Spirit. Do you not, O man, fear the Apostle when he says, "You are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwells in you"? Could he ever have brooked to honor the quarters of a slave, with the title of "temple"? How can he who calls Scripture "God-inspired," because it was written through the inspiration of the Spirit, use the language of someone who insults and belittles Him?

CHAPTER 22

*Establishment of the natural communion of the Spirit from His being,
equally with the Father and the Son, unapproachable in thought.*

53. Moreover, the surpassing excellence of the nature of the Spirit is to be learned not only from His having the same *title* as the Father and the Son, and sharing in their *operations*, but also from His being, like the Father and the Son, unapproachable in thought. For what our Lord says of the Father. as being above and beyond human conception, and what He says of the Son — this same language He also uses of the Holy Spirit. "O righteous Father," He says, "the world has not known You." Here, by "the world" he does not mean the complex whole compounded of heaven and earth, but this life of ours as subject to death, and exposed to innumerable vicissitudes. And when discoursing about Himself He says, "Yet a little while and the world will see me no more, but you will see me." Again, in this passage, he is applying the word *world* to those who being bound down by this material and carnal life, and beholding the truth by material sight alone, were ordained through their unbelief in the resurrection, to see our Lord no more with the eyes of the heart. And He said the same concerning the Spirit. "The Spirit of truth," He says, "whom the world cannot receive, because it does not see Him, nor know Him: but you know Him, for He dwells with you." ^{Joh 14.17} For the carnal man, who has never trained his mind to contemplation, but rather keeps it buried deep in the lust of the flesh, as in mud, is powerless to look up to the spiritual light of the truth. And so *the world* — that is, life enslaved by the affections of the flesh — can no more receive the grace of the Spirit, than a weak eye can receive the light of a sunbeam.

But the Lord, who by His teaching bore witness to purity of life, gives to His disciples the power of *now* beholding and contemplating the Spirit. For He says, "You are now clean through the word which I have spoken to you." ^{Joh 15.3} This is why "the world cannot receive Him, because it does not see Him, ... but you know Him; for he *dwells* with you." And so says Isaiah: "He that spread out the earth and what comes out of it; He that gives breath to the people on it, and Spirit to those who trample on it;" ^{Isa 42.5} — for those who trample down earthly things and rise above them are borne witness to as worthy of the gift of the Holy Spirit.

What then ought to be thought of Him whom the world cannot receive, and Whom saints alone can contemplate through pureness of heart? What kind of honors can be deemed adequate to Him?

CHAPTER 23

The glorifying of the enumeration of His attributes.

54. Now, as to the rest of the *Powers*, each is believed to be in a circumscribed place. The *angel* who stood by Cornelius was not at one and the same moment with Philip; nor yet did the *angel* who spoke with Zacharias from the altar, at the same time occupy his own pose in heaven. But the *Spirit* is believed to have been operating at the saint time in Habakkuk and in Daniel at Babylon, and to have been at the prison with Jeremiah, and with Ezekiel at the river Chebar. For the Spirit of the Lord *fills* the world: “where shall I go from your spirit? or where shall I flee from your presence?” ^{Psa 139.7} And in the words of the Prophet, “For I am with you, says the Lord... and my spirit remains among you.” ^{Hag 2.4-5} But what nature is appropriate to assign to Him who is omnipresent, and exists together with God? The nature which is all-embracing? Or one which is confined to particular places, like that which our argument shows the nature of *angels* to be? No one would say that. Shall we not then highly exalt Him who is in His nature *divine*, in His greatness *infinite*, in His operations *powerful*, in the blessings He confers, *good*? Shall we not give Him glory? And I understand *glory* to mean nothing else than the enumeration of the wonders which are His own. It follows, then, that either we are forbidden by our antagonists even to mention the good things which flow to us from Him, or on the other hand, that the mere recapitulation of His attributes is the fullest possible attribution of glory. For not even in the case of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Only begotten Son, are we capable of giving them glory other than by recounting, to the extent of our powers, all the wonders that belong to them.

CHAPTER 24

*Proof of the absurdity of the refusal to glorify the Spirit,
from the comparison of things glorified in creation.*

55. Furthermore, man crowned with glory and honor,” and “glory, honor and peace” are laid up by promise “to every man who works good.” There is moreover a special and peculiar glory for Israelites “to whom pertains the adoption and the glory... and the service;” ^{Rom 9.4} and the Psalmist speaks of a certain glory of his own, “that my glory may sing praise to You;” ^{Psa 16.9} and again, “Awake my glory.” ^{Psa 57.8} And according to the Apostle, there is a certain glory of sun and moon and stars, ^{1Cor 15.41} and “the ministration of condemnation is glorious.” ^{2Cor 3.9} While so many things are glorified, do you then wish the Spirit alone, of all things, to be unglorified? Yet the Apostle says, “the ministration of the Spirit is glorious.” ^{2Cor 3.8} How then can He Himself be unworthy of glory? How, according to the *Psalmist*, can the glory of the just man be great, and according to *you*, the glory of the Spirit be none? How is there not a plain peril from such arguments bringing upon ourselves the sin from which there is no escape? ^{Mat 12.31} If the man who is being saved by works of righteousness glorifies even those who fear the Lord, much less would he deprive the Spirit of the glory which is His due.

We grant, they say, that He is to be glorified, but not with the Father and the Son. But what reason is there in giving up the place appointed by the Lord for the Spirit, and inventing some other? What reason is there for robbing Him of His share of glory, Who is everywhere associated with the Godhead: in the confession of the Faith, in the baptism of redemption, in

the working of miracles, in the indwelling of the saints, in the graces bestowed on obedience? For there is not even one single gift which reaches creation without the Holy Spirit; not even a single word can be spoken in defense of Christ, except by those who are aided by the Spirit, as we have learned in the Gospels from our Lord and Savior. ^{Mat 10.19} And I do not know whether anyone who has been a partaker of the Holy Spirit will consent that we may overlook all this, and forget His fellowship in all things, and tear the Spirit asunder from the Father and the Son. Where then are we to take Him and rank Him? With the *creature*? Yet the whole creature is in bondage, but the Spirit makes us free. “And where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.” ^{2Cor 3.17} Many arguments might be adduced to show that it is unseemly to coordinate the Holy Spirit with created nature; but for the present I will pass them by. If I were indeed to bring forward, in a manner befitting the dignity of the discussion, all the proofs always available on our side, and so overthrow the objections of our opponents, a lengthy dissertation would be required, and my readers might be worn out by my prolixity. I therefore propose to reserve this matter for a special treatise, and to apply yourself to the points now more immediately before us.

56. Let us then examine the points one by one. The Spirit is good by nature, in the same way as the Father is good, and the Son is good. The creature, on the other hand, shares in goodness by choosing the good. He knows “The deep things of God;” ^{1Cor 2.10-11} the creature receives the manifestation of ineffable things only through the Spirit; He quickens together with God, who produces and preserves all things alive, and also together with the Son, who gives life. “He that raised up Christ from the dead,” it is said, “shall also quicken your mortal bodies by the spirit that dwells in you;” ^{Rom 8.11} and again “my sheep hear my voice,... and I give them eternal life;” but the Spirit also, it is said, “gives life;” ^{2Cor 3.6} and again “the Spirit is life, because of righteousness.” ^{Rom 8.10} And the Lord bears witness that “it is the Spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing.” ^{Joh 6.63} How then shall we alienate the Spirit from His quickening power, and make Him belong to lifeless nature? Who is so contentious, who is so utterly without the heavenly gift and unfed by God’s good words, who is so devoid of part and lot in eternal hopes, as to sever the Spirit from the Godhead, and rank Him with the creature?

57. Now, it is urged by them that the Spirit is in us as a gift from God, and that the gift is not to be revered with the same honor as that which is attributed to the Giver. Yes, the Spirit is a gift of God, but it is a gift of *life*; for the law of “the Spirit of life,” it is said, “has made” us “free;” and it is a gift of *power*, for “you shall receive power after the Holy Spirit has come upon you.” On this account, is He to be lightly esteemed? Did God not also bestow His *Son* as a free gift to mankind? “He who did not spare His own Son,” it is said, “but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?” And in another place, “that we might truly know the things that are freely given to us by God;” this is in reference to the mystery of the Incarnation. It follows, then, that the maintainers of such arguments, in making the greatness of God’s loving kindness an occasion of blasphemy, have really surpassed the ingratitude of the Jews. They find fault with the Spirit because He gives us freedom to call God *our Father*. “For God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into” our “hearts crying Abba, Father,” so that the voice of the Spirit may become the very voice of those who have received Him.

CHAPTER 25

*That Scripture uses the words “in” or “by” (ἐν), in place of “with.”
In this, it is also proved that the word “and” has the same force as “with.”*

58. It is asked by our opponents, however, how it is that Scripture nowhere describes the Spirit as glorified together *with* the Father and the Son, but carefully avoids the use of the expression “*with* the Spirit;” rather, everywhere it prefers to ascribe glory “*in* Him” as being the fitter phrase. For my own part, I would deny that the word *in* [or *by*] implies lower dignity than the word “*with*.” I would maintain, on the contrary, that rightly understood, it leads us up to the highest possible meaning. As we have observed, this is often the case where it stands *instead* of “*with*.” For instance, “I will go into your house *in* burnt offerings,” Psa 66.13 *instead* of *with* burnt offering; and “he brought them forth also *by* silver and gold,” Psa 105.17 that is, *with* silver and gold; and “you do not go forth *in* our armies,” Psa 60.10 *instead* of *with* our armies; and innumerable similar passages. In short, I would very much like to learn from this newfangled philosophy, what kind of glory the Apostle ascribed by the word *in*, according to the interpretation which our opponents proffer as derived from Scripture. For I have nowhere found the formula “To You, O Father, be honor and glory, through Your only begotten Son, *by* [or *in*] the Holy Spirit” — a form which comes to our opponents, so to say, as naturally as the air they breathe. You may indeed find each of these clauses separately, but they will nowhere be able to show them to us arranged in this conjunction. If they want exact conformity to what is written, then let them give us exact references. On the other hand, if they make a concession to custom, they must not make us an exception to such a privilege.

59. As we find both expressions in use among the faithful, we likewise use both, in the belief that full glory is equally given to the Spirit by both. However, the mouths of revilers of the truth may best be stopped by the preposition which, while it has the same meaning as that of the Scriptures, is not so wieldy a weapon for our opponents. Indeed, it is now an object of their attack, and it is used *instead* of the conjunction *and*. For to say “Paul and Silvanus and Timothy” is precisely the same as saying Paul with Timothy and Silvanus; for the connection of the names is preserved by either mode of expression. The Lord says, “The Father and the Son *and* the Holy Spirit.” If I say the Father and the Son *with* the Holy Spirit, will it make any difference in the sense? There are many instances of the connection of names by means of the conjunction *and*. We read “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *and* the love of God *and* the fellowship of the Holy Spirit;” and again, “I beseech you for the Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, *and* for the love of the Spirit.” Now, if we wish to use *with* instead of *and*, what difference will we have made? I do not see it, unless anyone according to hard and fast grammatical rules, might prefer the conjunction as copulative, making the union stronger, and reject the preposition as of inferior force. But if we had to defend ourselves on these points, I do not suppose we would require a defense of many words. As it is, their argument is not about syllables, nor yet about this or that sound of a word, but about things differing most widely in power and in truth. It is for this reason that, while the use of the syllables is really a matter of no importance whatever, our opponents are making the endeavor to authorize *some* syllables, and run *others* out of the Church.

For my own part, although the usefulness of the word is obvious as soon as it is heard, I will nevertheless set forth the arguments which led our fathers to adopt the reasonable course of

employing the preposition “*with*.” Indeed, it does equally well with the preposition “*and*,” it confutes the mischief of Sabellius; and it sets forth the distinction of the hypostases quite as well as “*and*” — as in the words “I and my Father will come,” and “I and my Father are one.” In addition to this, the proof it contains of the eternal fellowship and uninterrupted conjunction is excellent. For to say that the Son is *with* the Father is to exhibit at once the distinction of the hypostases, and the inseparability of the fellowship. The same thing is observable even in mere human matters; for the conjunction “*and*” intimates that there is a common element in an action, while the preposition “*with*,” in some sense, declares as well the communion in action. For instance, Paul and Timothy sailed to Macedonia, but both Tychicus and Onesimus were sent to the Colossians. Hence we learn that they did the same thing. But suppose we are told that they sailed *with*, and were sent *with*? Then we are informed in addition, that they carried out the action in company with one another. Thus, while the word “with” upsets the error of Sabellius as no other word can, it also routs sinners who err in the very opposite direction; I mean, those who separate the Son from the Father, and the Spirit from the Son, by intervals of *time*.

60. As compared with “*in*,” there is this difference: that while “*with*” sets forth the mutual conjunction of the parties associated — for example, of those who sail with, or dwell with, or do anything else in common — “*in*” shows their relation to that matter in which they happen to be acting. For we no sooner hear the words “sail in” or “dwell in” than we form the idea of the boat or the house. Such is the distinction between these words in ordinary usage; and laborious investigation might discover further illustrations. I have no time to examine the nature of the syllables. Since it has been shown, then, that “*with*” most clearly gives the sense of conjunction, let it be declared, if you will, to be under safe-conduct, and cease to wage your savage and truceless war against it. Though the word is naturally auspicious in this way, if anyone likes in the ascription of praise, to couple the names by the syllable “and,” and to give glory in the formula of baptism, as we are taught in the Gospel — Father and Son and Holy Spirit — let it be so; no one will make any objection. On these conditions, if you will, let us come to terms. But our foes would rather surrender their tongues, than accept this word. It is this that rouses against us their implacable and truceless war. We must offer the ascription of glory to God, it is contended, *in* the Holy Spirit, and not *and to* the Holy Spirit; and they passionately cling to this word *in*, as though it lowered the Spirit. It will be not unprofitable therefore to speak at greater length about it; and I shall be astonished if they do not (when they have heard what we have to urge) reject the “*in*” as itself a traitor to their cause, and a deserter to the side of the glory of the Spirit.

CHAPTER 26

That the word “in,” in as many senses as it bears, is understood of the Spirit.

61. Now, short and simple as this utterance is, it appears to me as I consider “*in*,” that its meanings are many and various. For of the senses in which “*in*” is used, we find that all help our conceptions of the Spirit. *Form* is said to be *in Matter*; *Power* is said to be *in* what is capable of it; *Habit* is said to be *in* whoever is affected by it; and so on. Therefore, inasmuch as the Holy Spirit perfects rational beings, completing their excellence, He is analogous to *Form*. For the one who no longer “lives after the flesh,” but being “led by the Spirit of God,”

is called a Son of God, being “conformed to the image of the Son of God,” is described as *spiritual*. And as the power of seeing is in the healthy eye, so the operation of the Spirit is in the purified soul. This is also why Paul prays for the Ephesians, that they may have their “eyes enlightened” by “the Spirit of wisdom.” And as *art* is in someone who has acquired it, so the grace of the Spirit is ever present in the recipient, though not continuously in operation. For just as art is *potentially* in the artist, but only in operation when he is working in accordance with it, so also the Spirit is ever present with those who are worthy, but He *works* as need requires — in prophecies, or in healings, or in some other actual carrying into effect of His *potential* action. Furthermore, just as health, or heat, or generally, their variable conditions are in our bodies, so too, very frequently the Spirit is in the soul— since He does not abide with those who, on account of the instability of their will, easily reject the grace which they have received. An instance of this is seen in Saul, ^{1Sam 16.14} and the seventy elders of the children of Israel — except Eldad and Medad. ^{Num 11.26} With these alone, the Spirit appears to have remained; and generally, He remains with anyone similar to these men in character.

Like *reason* in the soul — which at one time is the thought in the heart, and at another, the speech uttered by the tongue — so the Holy Spirit is in the soul, such as when He “bears witness with our spirit,” ^{Rom 8.16} and when he “cries in our hearts, Abba, Father,” ^{Gal 6.4} or when He speaks on our behalf. As it is said, “It is not you who speak, but the Spirit of our Father who speaks in you.” ^{Mat 10.20} Again, the Spirit is conceived of, in relation to the distribution of gifts, as a whole in parts. For we are all “members of one another, having gifts differing according to the grace that is given us.” ^{Rom 12.5-6} Therefore “the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of you; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you;” ^{1Cor 12.21} but all, *together*, complete the Body of Christ in the Unity of the Spirit, and they render to one another the needed aid that comes from the gifts. “But God has set the members in the body, every one of them, as it has pleased Him.” ^{1Cor 12.18} And “the members have the same care for one another,” ^{1Cor 12.25} according to the inborn spiritual communion of their sympathy. Therefore, “if one member suffers, all the members suffer with it; or if one member is honored, all the members rejoice with it.” ^{1Cor 12.26} And as *parts* in the whole, so we are *individually* in the Spirit, because we “were all baptized in one body ... into one Spirit.” ^{1Cor 12.13}

62. It is an extraordinary statement, but it is nonetheless true, that the Spirit is frequently spoken of as the *place* of those who are being sanctified. And it will become evident that even by this figure, the Spirit, so far from being degraded, is rather glorified. For words that are applicable to the body, for the sake of clearness, are frequently transferred in scripture to spiritual conceptions. Accordingly we find the Psalmist, even in reference to God, saying “Be a champion to me God, and a strong place to save me.” ^{Psa 31.2} And concerning the Spirit, “behold there is place by me, and stand upon a rock.” ^{Exo 33.21} Plainly it means the place or contemplation in the Spirit, in which, after Moses had entered [the cleft], he was able to see God intelligibly manifested to him. This is the special and peculiar place of true worship; for it is said “Take heed to yourself that you do not offer your burnt offerings in every place... but in the place the Lord your God shall choose.” ^{Deu 12.13-14} Now, what is a spiritual burnt offering? “The sacrifice of praise.” And in what place do we offer it? In the Holy Spirit. Where have we learned this? From the Lord himself in the words “True worshippers shall worship the Father in [the] Spirit and in truth.” Jacob saw this place and said, “The Lord is in this place.” It follows that the Spirit is truly the place of the saints, and the saint is the proper place for the

Spirit, offering himself as he does for the indwelling of God; and called God's Temple. ^{1Cor 6.19} So Paul speaks in Christ, saying "In the sight of God, we speak in Christ," ^{2Cor 2.17} and Christ speaks in Paul, as he himself says: "Since you seek a proof of Christ speaking in me." ^{2Cor 13.3} So also, *in the Spirit* he speaks mysteries, ^{1Cor 14.2} and again [as to Peter], the Spirit speaks *in him*. ^{1Pet 1.11}

63. In relation to the originate, then, the Spirit is said to be *in* them "in diverse portions and in diverse manners;" ^{Heb 1.1} while in relation to the Father and the Son, it is more consistent with true religion to assert that He is not *in*, but *with* them. For the grace flowing from Him when He dwells in those who are worthy, and carries out His own operations, is well described as existing in those who are able to receive Him. On the other hand, His essential existence before the ages, and His ceaseless abiding with Son and Father, cannot be contemplated without requiring titles expressive of eternal conjunction. For absolute and real co-existence is predicated in the case of things which are mutually inseparable. We say, for instance, that heat exists in the hot iron; but in the case of the actual fire, it co-exists; and similarly, that health exists in the body, but that life co-exists with the soul. It follows that wherever the fellowship is intimate, congenital, and inseparable, the word *with* is more expressive, suggesting as it does, the idea of inseparable fellowship. Where, on the other hand, the grace flowing from the Spirit naturally comes and goes, it is properly and truly said to *exist in* them, even if on account of the firmness of the recipients' disposition to good, the grace *abides with* them continually. Thus, whenever we have in mind the Spirit's proper rank, we contemplate Him as being *with* the Father and the Son. But when we think of the grace that flows from Him operating on those who participate in it, we say that the Spirit is *in* us. And the doxology which we offer "in the Spirit" is not an acknowledgment of His rank; it is rather a confession of our own weakness, while we show that we are not sufficient to glorify Him of ourselves, but our sufficiency is in the Holy Spirit. Enabled in [or *by*] Him, we render thanks to our God for the benefits we have received, according to the measure of our purification from evil, as one receives a larger and another a smaller share of the aid of the Spirit, so that we may offer "the sacrifice of praise to God." According to one use, then, we offer our thanksgiving as the true religion requires, *in* the Spirit; although it is not quite unobjectionable that anyone should testify of himself, that "the Spirit of God is in me, and I offer glory after being made wise through the grace that flows from Him." For to a Paul it is becoming to say, "I think also that I have the Spirit of God;" ^{1Cor 7.40} and again, "that good thing which was committed to you, keep by the Holy Spirit who dwells in us." ^{2Tim 1.14} And of Daniel it is fitting to say that the Holy Spirit of God is in him, and to say similarly of men who are like these in virtue.

64. Another sense may, however, be given to the phrase that just as the Father is seen in the Son, so is the Son is seen in the Spirit. The phrase "worship in the Spirit" suggests the idea of the operation of our intelligence being carried on in the light, as may be learned from the words spoken to the woman of Samaria. ^{Joh 4.9} Deceived as she was by the customs of her country, into the belief that worship was local, our Lord, with the object of giving her better instruction, said that worship ought to be offered "in Spirit and in Truth," ^{Joh 4.23-24} plainly meaning Himself as *the Truth*. As then we speak of worship offered in the Image of God the Father, as worship in the Son, ^{Col 1.15-16} so too we speak of worship in the Spirit, as showing in Himself the Godhead of the Lord. This is why even in our worship, the Holy Spirit is inseparable from the Father and the Son. If you remain outside the Spirit, you will not be able

to even worship at all; ^{Phi 3:3} and upon becoming *in Him*, you will in no way be able to dis sever Him from God — any more than you can divorce light from visible objects. For it is impossible to behold the Image of the invisible God except by the enlightenment of the Spirit. And it is impracticable for someone fixing his gaze on the Image, to dis sever the light from the Image, because the *cause* of that vision is of necessity seen at the same time as the visible objects. Thus, fitly and consistently, we behold the “Brightness of the glory of God...” by means of the illumination of the Spirit; and by means of the “...Express Image,” ^{Heb 1:3} we are led up to Him of whom He is the Express Image and Seal, graven to the like.

CHAPTER 27

*Of the origin of the word “with,” and what force it has.
Also concerning the unwritten laws of the church.*

65. The word “*in*” say our opponents, “is exactly appropriate to the Spirit, and sufficient for every thought concerning Him. Why then, they ask, have we introduced this new phrase, saying, “*with the Spirit*” instead of “*in the Holy Spirit*,” thus employing an expression which is quite unnecessary, and sanctioned by no usage in the churches? Now, it has been asserted in the previous portion of this treatise, that the word “*in*” has not been specially allotted to the Holy Spirit, but is common to the Father and the Son. It has also been, in my opinion, sufficiently demonstrated that, so far from detracting anything from the dignity of the Spirit, it leads all but those whose thoughts are wholly perverted, to the sublimest height. It remains for me to trace the origin of the word “*with*;” to explain what force it has, and to show that it is in harmony with Scripture.

66. Of the beliefs and practices (whether generally accepted or publicly enjoined) which are preserved in the Church, some that we possess are *derived* from written teaching; others we have *received*, delivered to us “in a mystery” by the tradition of the apostles. And both of these, in relation to true religion, have the same force. And these no one will challenge — at least, no one who is even moderately versed in the institutions of the Church. For were we to attempt to reject those customs which have no written authority, on the ground that the importance they possess is small, we would unintentionally injure the Gospel in its very vitals; or rather, we would make our public definition a mere phrase and nothing more. For instance, to take the first and most general example, who has taught us *in writing* to sign with the sign of the cross, those who have trusted in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ? What writing has taught us to turn to the East at prayer time? Which of the saints has left us in writing the words of the invocation at the displaying of the bread of the Eucharist and the cup of blessing? For we are not, as is well known, content with what the apostle or the Gospel has recorded. But both in preface and conclusion, we add other words as being of great importance to the validity of the ministry, and these we *derive* from unwritten teaching. Moreover, we bless the water of baptism and the oil of the chrism; and besides these we bless the catechumen who is being baptized. On what written authority do we do this? Is not our authority, silent and mystical *tradition*? Indeed, by what written word is the anointing of oil itself taught? And from where does the custom of baptizing thrice come from? And as to the other customs of baptism, from what Scripture do we derive the renunciation of Satan and his angels? Does this not come from that unpublished and secret teaching which our fathers guarded in silence,

out of the reach of curious meddling and inquisitive investigation? They had learned the lesson well, that the awful dignity of the mysteries is best preserved by silence. What the uninitiated are not even allowed: to look at, was hardly likely to be publicly paraded about in written documents.

What was the meaning of mighty Moses, in not making all the parts of the tabernacle open to everyone? He stationed the profane outside the sacred barriers; the first courts he conceded to the purer; the Levites alone he judged worthy of being servants of the Deity; sacrifices and burnt offerings and the rest of the priestly functions he allotted to the priests; one chosen out of all he admitted to the shrine, and even this one not always, but on only one day a year; and of this one day, a time was fixed for his entry, so that he might gaze on the Holy of Holies amazed at the strangeness and novelty of the sight. Moses was wise enough to know that contempt stretches to the trite and to the obvious, while a keen interest is naturally associated with the unusual and the unfamiliar.

In the same manner, the Apostles and Fathers who laid down laws for the Church from the beginning, thus guarded the awful dignity of the mysteries in secrecy and silence. For what is rumored abroad randomly among the common folk, is no mystery at all. This is the reason for our tradition of unwritten precepts and practices: so that the knowledge of our dogmas may not become neglected and contemned by the multitude through familiarity. “Dogma” (doctrine) and “Kerugma” (the Gospel call) are two distinct things; the former is observed in silence; the latter is proclaimed to all the world. One form of this silence is the obscurity employed in Scripture, which makes the meaning of “dogmas” difficult to be understood for the very advantage of the reader: Thus we all look to the East at our prayers, but few of us know that we are seeking our own old country, Paradise, which God planted in Eden in the East. We pray standing on the first day of the week, but we do not all know the reason. On the day of the resurrection (or “standing again” Grk. ἀνάστασις, *anastasis*) we remind ourselves of the grace given to us by *standing* at prayer, not only because we rose with Christ, and are bound to “seek those things which are above,” but because the day seems to us to be in some sense an image of the age which we expect.

This is why, though it is the beginning of days, it is not called by Moses the *first* day, but *one* day. For he says, “There was evening, and there was morning, *one* day,” ^{Gen 1.5} as though the same day often recurred. Now, *one* and *eighth* are the same [day of the week]. In itself this distinctly indicates that really, the “one” and “eighth” which the Psalmist mentions in certain titles of the Psalms,³¹ is the state which follows after this present time, the day which knows no waning or eventide, and no successor — that age which ends not, nor grow old. Of necessity, then, the church teaches her own foster children to offer their prayers *standing* on that day, to the end that through continual reminder of the endless life, we may not neglect to make provision for our removal there. Moreover, all Pentecost is a reminder of the resurrection expected in the age to come. For that one and first day, if multiplied seven times

³¹ In the Douay-Rheims, Psa 6.1 reads, “for the *octave*” (Latin for eight); Psa 11.1, “Unto the end; for the octave.” The King James interprets it, “On an eight-stringed harp.” Early church writings and practice prescribed certain feasts to be celebrated as an “octave,” for eight succeeding days. The *Feast of Theophany* in the eastern churches, is an *octave*, lasting eight days and ending on the *Feast of the Naming of the Lord*, which points to the circumcision and naming of a male child on the eighth day (Luk 1.59). – WHG

seven, completes the seven weeks of the holy Pentecost. For beginning at the first, Pentecost ends with the same, making fifty revolutions through those intervening days. And so it is a likeness of eternity — beginning as it does, and in a circling course, ending at the same point. On this day, the rules of the church have educated us to prefer the upright attitude of prayer. For by their plain reminder, as it were, they make our mind no longer dwell in the present, but in the future. Moreover, every time we fall on our knees in prayer, and then rise off them, we show by the very act, that we fell down to earth by our sin, and by the loving kindness of our Creator, we were called back to heaven.

67. Time will fail me if I attempt to recount the unwritten mysteries of the Church; so I will say nothing of the rest. But what is the written source of the confession of our faith in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? ³² If it is granted that, as we are baptized under the obligation to believe, we make our confession of faith in terms like those of our baptism, then in accordance with the tradition of our baptism, and in conformity with the principles of true religion, let our opponents also grant us the right to be as consistent in our ascription of glory, as we are in our confession of faith. If they deprecate our *Doxology* on the ground that it lacks written authority, then let them give us the written evidence for the confession of our faith and the other matters we enumerated. While the unwritten traditions are so many, and their bearing on “the mystery of godliness” ^{1Tim 3.16} is so important, can they refuse to allow us a single word which has come down to us from the Fathers — which we found, derived from untutored custom, abiding in unperverted churches — a word for which the arguments are strong, and which contributes in no small degree to the completeness of the force of the mystery?

68. The force of both expressions has now been explained. I will proceed to state once more where they agree, and where they differ from one another — not that they are opposed in mutual antagonism, but each contributes its own meaning to true religion. The preposition “*in*” states the truth rather relative to ourselves; while “*with*” proclaims the fellowship of the Spirit with God. This is why we use *both* words, the one expressing the dignity of the Spirit, and the other announcing the grace that is with us. Thus we ascribe glory to God both “*in*” the Spirit, and “*with*” the Spirit. And in doing this, it is not *our* word that we use, but we follow the teaching of the Lord, as we might a fixed rule. And we transfer His word to things that are connected and closely related, and of which the conjunction is necessary in the mysteries. We deemed ourselves under a necessary obligation to combine in our Confession of Faith, Him (the Spirit) who is numbered with Them (the Father and the Son) at Baptism. And we have treated the Confession of Faith as the origin and parent of the doxology. What then is to be done? They must now instruct us either not to baptize as we have received it, or not to believe as we were baptized, or not to ascribe glory as we have believed. Let any man prove, if he can, that the relation of sequence in these acts is not necessary and unbroken; or let any man deny, if he can, that innovation *here* must mean ruin *everywhere*. Yet they never stop dinning in our ears that the ascription of glory “with” the Holy Spirit is unauthorized, and unscriptural, and the like. We have stated that so far as the *sense* goes, it is the same to say, “glory be to the Father and to the Son *and* to the Holy Spirit,” and “glory be to the Father and to the Son *with* the Holy Spirit.” It is impossible for anyone to reject or cancel the syllable “and,” which is

³² That is, the *Nicene Creed* of 325, and as sung in the *Doxology*, dating to about the same time, “Glory be to the Father, and to Son, and to the Holy Ghost. As it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be,” etc. — WHG

derived from the very words of our Lord; and there is nothing to hinder the acceptance of its equivalent. We have already shown what amount of difference and similarity there is between the two. And our argument is confirmed by the fact that the Apostle uses either word indifferently — saying at one time, “in the name of the Lord Jesus, and *by* the Spirit of our God,” ^{1Cor 6.11} and at another, “when you are gathered together, *and* my Spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus” ^{1Cor 5.4} — with no idea that it makes any difference to the connection of the names, whether he uses the *conjunction*, or the *preposition*.

CHAPTER 28

That our opponents refuse to concede in the case of the Spirit, the terms which Scripture uses in the case of men, such as reigning together with Christ.

69. But let us see if we can think of any defense of this usage of our fathers; for those who first originated the expression are more open to blame than we ourselves. In his Letter to the Colossians, Paul says, “And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision... He has quickened together with [Christ].” ^{Col 2.13} Did God give to a whole people and to the Church, the boon of life with Christ, and yet this life with Christ does not belong to the Holy Spirit? But if it is impious to even think this, is it not rightly reverent to make this our confession, as these Persons are by nature in close conjunction? Furthermore, if as we know is the case, on becoming absent from the body, Paul is present with the Lord, and after departing, he is with Christ, then what boundless lack of sensibility does it show in these men, to confess that the *Saints* are with Christ, and so far as it lies in their power, to refuse to allow to the *Spirit* to be with Christ, even to the same extent as men? Paul calls himself a “laborer together with God” in the dispensation of the Gospel. Will they bring an indictment for impiety against us, if we apply the term “fellow-laborer” to the Holy Spirit, through whom in every creature under heaven the Gospel brings forth fruit? It would seem that the life of those who have trusted in the Lord “is hidden with Christ in God.” And when Christ appears, who is our life, then they themselves will also “appear with Him in glory.” ^{Col 3.3-4} And is the Spirit of life, “Who made us free from the law of sin,” not with Christ, both in the secret and hidden life with Him, and in the manifestation of the glory which we expect to be manifested in the saints? We are “heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ,” ^{Rom 8.17} and is the Spirit without part or lot in the fellowship of God and of His Christ? “The Spirit Himself bears witness with our spirit that we are the children of God;” ^{Rom 8.16} and are we not to allow to the Spirit even that testimony of His fellowship with God, which we have learned from the Lord? For the height of folly is reached if through the faith in Christ, which is in the Spirit, we hope to be raised together with Him and sit together in heavenly places, whenever He shall change our vile body from the natural to the spiritual. And yet we refuse to assign to the Spirit any share in that sitting together, or in the glory, or anything else which we have received from Him. Of all the boons of which, in accordance with the indefeasible grant of Him who has promised them, we have believed ourselves worthy, are we to allow *none* to the Holy Spirit, as though they were all above His dignity? It is yours according to your merit to be “ever with the Lord,” and you expect to be “caught up ... in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and to be ever with the Lord.” ^{1The 4.17} Yet you declare the man who numbers and ranks the Spirit with the Father and the Son, to be guilty of intolerable impiety. Can you really now deny that *the Spirit is with Christ*?

70. I am ashamed to add the rest. You expect to be *glorified* together with Christ (“if indeed we suffer with Him, that we may also be glorified together” Rom 8.17); but you do not glorify the “Spirit of holiness” together with Christ, as though He were not worthy to receive equal honor even with you. You hope to “*reign* with” Christ; ^{2Tim 2.12} but “insult the Spirit of grace” ^{Heb 10.29} by assigning Him the rank of a slave and a subordinate. And I say this not to demonstrate that so much is due to the Spirit in the ascription of glory, but to prove the unfairness of those who will never give so much as this, and shrink from the fellowship of the Spirit with Son and Father, as from impiety. Who could touch on these things without a sigh? Is it not so plain as to be within the perception even of a child, that this present state of things preludes the threatened eclipse of the faith? The undeniable has become the uncertain. We profess belief in the Spirit, and then we quarrel with our own confessions. We are baptized, and begin to fight again. We call upon Him as the Prince of Life, and then despise Him as a slave like ourselves. We received Him with the Father and the Son, and dishonor Him as a part of creation. Those who “know not what they ought to pray for,” even though they are induced to utter a word of the Spirit with awe, as though coming near His dignity, yet prune down all that exceeds the exact proportion of their speech. They should rather bewail their weakness, in that we are powerless to express in words our gratitude for the benefits which we are actually receiving. For He “surpasses all understanding,” and convicts speech of its natural inability even to approach His dignity in the least degree. As it is written in the Book of Wisdom, “Exalt Him as much as you can, for even yet He will far exceed; and when you exalt Him put forth all your strength, and do not be weary, for you can never go far enough.” ^{Sir 43.30} Truly terrible is the account to be given for words of this kind by you who have heard from God, who cannot lie, that there is no forgiveness for blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. ^{Luk 12.10}

CHAPTER 29

Enumeration of the illustrious men in the Church who in their writings have used the word “with.”

71. In answer to the objection that the doxology in the form “with the Spirit” has no written authority, we maintain that if there is no *other* instance of that which is unwritten, then *this* must not be received. But if the greater number of our mysteries are admitted into our constitution without written authority, then in company with the many others, let us receive this one. For I hold it apostolic to abide by the unwritten traditions also. “I praise you,” it is said, “that you remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances *as I delivered them* to you;” ^{1Cor 11.2} and “Hold fast the *traditions* which you have been taught, whether by *word* or our Epistle.” ^{2The 2.15} One of these traditions is the practice which is now before us, which those who ordained it from the beginning, and rooted firmly in the churches, delivered to their successors. Its use through long custom, advances pace by pace with time. If, as in a Court of Law, we were at a loss for documentary evidence, but were able to bring before you a large number of witnesses, would you not give your vote for our acquittal? I think so; for “by the mouth of two or three witnesses the matter shall be established.” ^{Mat 18.16} And if we could prove clearly to you that a long period of time was in our favor, would we not have seemed to you to urge with reason, that this suit should not be brought into court against us? For ancient dogmas inspire a certain sense of awe, venerable as they are with hoary antiquity. I will therefore give you a list of the supporters of the word (and the time must also be taken into

account in relation to what passes unquestioned). For it did not originate with us. How could it? In comparison with the time during which this word has been in vogue, to use the words of Job, “we are but of yesterday.”^{Job 8.9} If I must speak of what concerns me individually, I myself cherish this phrase as a legacy left to me by my fathers. It was delivered to me by one who spent a long life in the service of God; I was both baptized and admitted to the ministry of the church by him.³³ While examining, so far as I could, if any of the blessed men of old used the words to which objection is now made, I found many worthy of credit both on account of their early date, and also a characteristic in which they are unlike the men of today: because of the exactness of their knowledge. Of these, some coupled the word in the doxology by the *preposition* (with), others by the *conjunction* (and), but they were in no case supposed to be acting divergently — at least so far as the right sense of true religion is concerned.

72. There is the famous Irenaeus, and Clement of Rome; Dionysius of Rome, and strange to say, DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA so concludes in his second letter to his namesake, on “Conviction and Defense.” I will give you his very words.

“Following all these, we, too, since we have received from the presbyters who were before us a form and rule, offering thanksgiving in the same terms with them, thus conclude our Letter to you. To God the Father and the Son our Lord Jesus Christ, *with* the Holy Spirit, glory and might for ever and ever; Amen.”

And no one can say that this passage has been altered. He would not have so persistently stated that he had received a form and rule if he had said “*in* the Spirit.” For the use of this phrase is abundant: it was the use of “*with*” which required defense. Moreover, in the middle of Dionysius’ treatise, he thus writes in opposition to the Sabellians,

“If by the hypostases being three, they say that they are *divided*, there are three; though they do not like it. Or else let them destroy the divine Trinity altogether.” And again: “most divine on this account, after the Unity is the Trinity.”

CLEMENT [of Rome], in more primitive fashion, writes,

“God lives, and the Lord Jesus Christ, *and* the Holy Spirit.”

And now let us hear how IRENAEUS, who lived near the times of the Apostles, mentions the Spirit in his work, “*Against the Heresies*.”

“The Apostle rightly calls them *carnal* who are unbridled and carried away to their own desires, having no desire for the Holy Spirit.”

And IRENAEUS says in another passage,

“The Apostle exclaimed that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of the heavens lest we, being without a share in the divine Spirit, fall short of the kingdom of the heavens.”

If anyone thinks EUSEBIUS OF PALESTINE worthy of credit on account of his wide experience, I point further to the very words he uses in discussing questions concerning the polygamy of the ancients. Stirring up himself to his work, he writes, “invoking the holy God of the Prophets, the Author of light, through our Savior Jesus Christ, *with* the Holy Spirit.”

³³ Referring to Eustathius of Sebaste (c. 300-377), bishop of Sebastia in Armenia.

73. ORIGEN, too, in many of his expositions of the Psalms, we find using the form of doxology “with the Holy Spirit. The opinions which he held concerning the Spirit were not always and everywhere sound. Nevertheless, in many passages even he himself reverently recognizes the force of established usage, and expresses himself concerning the Spirit in terms that are consistent with true religion. It is, if I am not mistaken, in the Sixth Book of his *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John* that he distinctly makes the Spirit an object of worship. His words are:

“The washing or water is a symbol of the cleaning of the soul which is washed clean of all filth that comes of wickedness. But nonetheless, it is also by itself — to him who yields himself to *the Godhead of the adorable Trinity*, through the power of the invocations — the origin and source of blessings.”

And again, he says in his *Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans*, “the holy powers are able to receive the Only-begotten, and *the Godhead of the Holy Spirit*.” Thus I apprehend, the powerful influence of tradition frequently impels men to express themselves in terms that are contradictory to their own opinions.

Moreover, this form of the doxology was not unknown even to AFRICANUS the historian. In the Fifth Book of his *Epitome of the Times*, he says

“We who know the weight of those terms, and are not ignorant of the grace of faith, render thanks to the Father, who bestowed on us His own creatures, Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world and our Lord, to whom be glory and majesty *with the Holy Spirit*, forever.”

The rest of the passages may perhaps be viewed with suspicion; or may really have been altered; and the fact of their having been tampered with, will be difficult to detect because the difference consists in a single syllable. However, those which I have quoted at length, are out of the reach of any dishonest manipulation, and can easily be verified from the actual works.

I will now adduce another piece of evidence which might perhaps seem insignificant, but because of its antiquity must in no way be omitted by a defendant who is indicted on a charge of *innovation*. It seemed fitting to our fathers not to receive the gift of the light at eventide in silence, but on its appearing, to immediately give thanks. We are not able to say who was the author of these words of thanksgiving at the lighting of the lamps. The people, however, utter the ancient form. And no one has ever reckoned them guilty of impiety, who say “We praise Father, Son, *and God’s Holy Spirit*.” And if anyone knows the *Hymn of Athenogenes*,³⁴ which he left as a kind of farewell gift to his friends as he was hurrying on to his perfecting by fire, he knows the mind of the martyrs as to the Spirit. On this head I will say no more.

³⁴ Also known as *Phos Hilaron*, “O Joyous Light,” Latin, *Lumen Hilare*. The Greek text, translated verbatim:

O Light gladsome of the holy glory of the Immortal Father,
the Heavenly, the Holy, the Blessed, O Jesus Christ,
having come upon the setting of the sun, having seen the light of the evening,
we praise the Father, the Son, **and** the Holy Spirit: God.
Worthy it is at all times to praise You in joyful voices,
O Son of God, Giver of Life, for which the world glorifies You.

— <https://santosepulcro.co.il/en/saints/st-athenogenes/>

74. But where shall I rank the great GREGORY,³⁵ and the words uttered by him? Shall we not place among Apostles and Prophets, a man who walked by the same Spirit as they did; who never, through all his days, diverged from the footprints of the saints; who maintained as long as he lived, the exact principles of evangelical citizenship? I am sure that we will do the truth a wrong if we refuse to number that soul with the people of God, shining as it did like a beacon in the Church of God. For by the fellow-working of the Spirit, the power which he had over demons was tremendous. And so gifted was he with the grace of the word, “for obedience to the faith among... the nations,” that although only seventeen Christians were handed over to him, he brought the whole people alike, in town and country, through knowledge to God. He too, by Christ’s mighty name commanded even rivers to change their course, and caused a lake to dry up, which afforded a ground of quarrel to some covetous brethren. Moreover, his predictions of things to come were such that in no way do they fall short of those of the great prophets. To recount all his wonderful works in detail would be too long a task. By the superabundance of gifts wrought in him by the Spirit, in all power and in signs and in marvels, he was styled a second Moses by the very enemies of the Church. Thus, in all that he accomplished through grace, by word and deed alike, a light seemed to be ever shining, a token of the heavenly power from the Unseen which followed him. To this day, he is a great object of admiration to the people of his own neighborhood. And his memory, established in the churches ever fresh and green, is not dulled by length of time. Thus, not a practice, not a word, not a mystic rite has been added to the Church besides what he bequeathed to it. Hence, truly, on account of the antiquity of their institution, many of their ceremonies appear to be defective. For his successors in the administration of the Churches could not endure to accept any subsequent discovery in addition to what had his sanction.

Now, one of the institutions of Gregory is the very form of the doxology to which objection is now being made, preserved by the Church on the authority of his tradition. This is a statement that may be verified without much trouble by anyone who likes to make a short journey. Our *Firmilian*³⁶ held this belief, as testified by the writings which he left. Also, the contemporaries of the illustrious *Meletius*³⁷ say he was of this opinion. But why quote ancient authorities? Now in the East, are not the maintainers of true religion known chiefly by this one term, and separated from their adversaries as though by a watchword? I have heard from a certain Mesopotamian, a man at once well skilled in the language and of unperverted opinions, that by the usage in his country, it is impossible for anyone to express himself in any other way, even if he wishes to do so. And he says they are compelled by the idiom of their mother tongue to offer the doxology by the syllable “and” — or I should more accurately say, by their equivalent expressions. We Cappadocians too, so speak in the dialect of our country, the Spirit having so early as the division of tongues, foreseen the utility of the phrase. And what of the whole West, almost from Illyricum to the boundaries of our world? Does it not support this word “and”?

³⁵ *Gregory of Neocaesarea*, in Pontus, Asia Minor (c. 213-275), also known as *Thaumaturgus* (the miracle-worker).

³⁶ *Firmilian*, Bishop of Caesarea Mazaca c. 232 (died c. 269); disciple of Origen.

³⁷ *Meletius of Antioch*, Patriarch from 360 to 381.

75. How then can I be an innovator and creator of new terms, when I adduce as originators and champions of the word, whole nations, cities, and custom, going back beyond the memory of many men who were pillars of the church, and conspicuous for all knowledge and spiritual power? For this cause, this banded array of foes is set in motion against me, and town and village and remotest regions are full of my defamers. These things are sad and painful to those who seek peace; but great is the reward of patience for sufferings endured for the Faith's sake. So besides these, let sword flash, let axe be whetted, let fire burn fiercer than that of Babylon, let every instrument of torture be set in motion against me. To me nothing is more fearful than failure to fear the threats which the Lord has directed against those who blaspheme the Spirit. Kindly readers will find a satisfactory defense in what I have said: that I accept a phrase so dear and so familiar to the saints, and confirmed by usage so long, inasmuch as from the day when the Gospel was first preached, up to our own time, it is shown to have been admitted to full rights within the churches. And what is of greatest moment, it is shown to have been accepted as bearing a sense that is in accord with holiness and true religion.

But what have I prepared to say in my defense before the Great Tribunal? *This*: that I was led in the first place, to the glory of the Spirit, by the honor conferred by the Lord in associating Him with Himself and with His Father at baptism. ^{Mat 28.19} And I was led secondly, by the introduction of each of us to the knowledge of God, by such an initiation. And above all, I was led by the fear of the threatened punishment shutting out the thought of all indignity and unworthy conception. But our opponents, what will *they* say? After showing neither reverence for the Lord's honor, nor fear of His threats, what kind of defense will they have for their blasphemy? It is for them to make up their mind about their own action, or even now to change their mind. For my own part I would pray most earnestly that the good God will make His peace rule in the hearts of all, so that these men who are swollen with pride and set in battle array against us, may be calmed by the Spirit of meekness and of love. And I pray that if they have become utterly savage, and are in an untamable state, He will grant to us at least to bear with longsuffering all that we have to bear at their hands. In short, "to those who have in themselves the sentence of death," it is not *suffering* for the sake of the Faith which is painful; what is hard to bear, is to *fail to fight its battle*. The athlete does not complain so much of being wounded in the struggle, as of not being able even to secure admission into the stadium. Or perhaps this was the time for silence spoken of by Solomon the wise. ^{Ecc 3.7} For, when life is buffeted by so fierce a storm, that all the intelligence of those who are instructed in the word is filled with the deceit of false reasoning, and confounded like an eye filled with dust; when men are stunned by strange and awful noises; when all the world is shaken and everything is tottering to its fall, what does it profit to cry, as I am really crying, to the wind?

CHAPTER 30

Exposition of the present state of the Churches.

76. To what then shall I liken our present condition? It may be compared, I think, to some naval battle which has arisen out of old-time quarrels, and fought by men who cherish a deadly hatred against one another, who are of long experience in naval warfare, and eager for the fight. Look, I beg you, at the picture thus raised before your eyes. See the rival fleets rushing in dread array to the attack. With a burst of uncontrollable fury, they engage and fight

it out. Fancy, if you like, the ships driven to and fro by a raging tempest, while thick darkness falls from the clouds and blackens all the scenes, so that watchwords are indistinguishable in the confusion, and all distinction between friend and foe is lost. To fill up the details of the imaginary picture, suppose the sea is swollen with billows, and whirled up from the deep, while a vehement torrent of rain pours down from the clouds, and the terrible waves rise high. From every quarter of heaven, the winds beat upon one point where both fleets are dashed against one another. Some of the combatants are turning traitors; some are deserting in the very thick of the fight; some at one and the same moment, have to urge on their boats, all beaten by the gale, to advance against their assailants. Jealousy of authority and the lust for individual mastery splits the sailors into parties which deal mutual death to one another., Besides all this, think of the confused and unmeaning roar sounding over the whole sea — from howling winds, from crashing vessels, from boiling surf, from the yells of the combatants as they express their varying emotions in every kind of noise — so that not a word from admiral or pilot can be heard. The disorder and confusion is tremendous; for when life is despaired of, the extremity of misfortune gives men license for every kind of wickedness. Suppose, too, that the men are all struck with the incurable plague of mad love of glory, so that they do not cease from their struggle to get the better of each other, while their ship is actually sinking down into the deep.

77. Turn now, I beg you, from this figurative description, to the unhappy reality. Did it not at one time appear that the ARIAN SCHISM, after its separation into a sect opposed to the Church of God, stood alone in hostile array? But when the attitude of our foes against us was changed from one of long standing and bitter strife, to one of open warfare, then, as is well known, the war was split up in more ways than I can tell — split into many subdivisions, so that all men were stirred to a state of inveterate hatred, by common party spirit and individual suspicion alike. But what storm at sea was ever so fierce and wild as this tempest of the Churches? In it every landmark of the Fathers has been moved; every foundation, every bulwark of opinion has been shaken. Everything buoyed up on the unsound, is dashed about and shaken down. We attack one another; we are overthrown by one another. If our enemy is not the first to strike us, we are wounded by the comrade at our side. If a foeman is stricken and falls, his fellow soldier tramples him down. There is at least this bond of union between us: that we hate our common foes. But no sooner has the enemy gone by, than we find enemies in one another. And who could make a complete list of all the wrecks? Some have gone to the bottom upon the attack of the enemy — some through the unsuspected treachery of their allies; some from the blundering of their own officers.

We see whole churches, crews and all as it were, dashed and shattered on the sunken reefs of disingenuous heresy; while other enemies of the Spirit of Salvation have seized the helm and made shipwreck of the faith. And then the disturbances wrought by the princes of the world, have caused the downfall of the people, with a violence unmatched by that of hurricane or whirlwind. The luminaries of the world, whom God set to give light to the souls of the people, have been driven from their homes; and a darkness that is truly gloomy and disheartening has settled on the Churches. The terror of universal ruin is already imminent, and yet their mutual rivalry is so unbounded as to blunt all sense of danger. Individual hatred is of more importance than general and common warfare. For men by whom the immediate gratification of ambition is more highly esteemed than the rewards that await us in a time to come, prefer

the glory of getting the better of their opponents, to securing the common welfare of mankind. So all men alike lift the hand of murder against one another, each as best he can.

Harsh rises the cry of the combatants encountering one another in dispute. Already, all the Church is almost full of the inarticulate screams, the unintelligible noises, rising from the ceaseless agitations that divert the right rule of the doctrine of true religion — now in the direction of *excess*, now in that of *defect*. On the one hand are those who confound the Persons and are carried away into Judaism; on the other hand are those who, through the opposition of the natures, pass into heathenism. Inspired Scripture is powerless to mediate between these opposite parties; the traditions of the apostles cannot suggest terms of arbitration. Plain speaking is fatal to friendship, and disagreement in opinion is all the ground that is wanted for a quarrel. No oaths of confederacy are so efficacious in keeping men true to sedition, as their likeness *in error*. Each one is a theologian, even though his soul is branded with more spots than can be counted. The result is that innovators find a plentiful supply of men ripe for faction; while self-appointed scions of the house of place-hunters reject the government of the Holy Spirit, and divide the chief dignities of the Churches. The institutions of the Gospel have now been thrown into confusion everywhere, by the lack of discipline. There is an indescribable pushing for the chief places, while every self-advertiser tries to force himself into high office. The result of this lust for ordering, is that our people are in a state of wild confusion for lack of being ordered; the exhortations of those in authority are rendered wholly purposeless and void because there is not a man who does not, out of his ignorant impudence, think it is just as much his duty to give orders to other people, as it is to obey anyone else.

78. So, since no human voice is strong enough to be heard in such a disturbance, I reckon silence is more profitable than speech. For if there is any truth in the words of the Preacher, “The words of wise men are heard in quiet,” ^{Ecc 9.17} in the present condition of things, any discussion of them must be anything but decorous. I am moreover restrained by the Prophet’s saying, “Therefore the prudent shall keep silence in that time, for it is an evil time,” ^{Amo 5.13} — a time when some trip up their neighbors’ heels, some stamp on a man when he is down, and others clap their hands with joy. But there is not one to feel for the fallen, and hold out a helping hand, even though according to the ancient law, he is not uncondemned who passes by even his enemy’s beast of burden that has fallen under its load. ^{Exo 23.5} This is not the state of things now. Why not? The love of many has waxed cold; brotherly concord is destroyed; the very name of unity is ignored; brotherly admonitions are heard no more; nowhere is there Christian pity; nowhere does the tear of sympathy fall. Now there is no one to receive “the weak in faith,” but mutual hatred has blazed so high among fellow clansmen, that they are more delighted at a neighbor’s fall than at their own success. Just as in a plague, men of the most regular lives suffer from the same sickness as the rest because they catch the disease by communication with the infected; so nowadays, by the evil rivalry which possesses our souls, we are carried away to emulate wickedness, and we are all, each of us, as bad as the others. Hence, merciless and sour sit the judges of the erring; unfeeling and hostile are the critics of the well-disposed. And this evil is rooted to such a depth among us, that we have become more brutish than the brutes. *They* at least herd with their fellows; but our most savage warfare is with our own people.

79. For all these reasons, I should have kept silent. But I was drawn in the other direction by love, which “seeks not her own,” and desires to overcome every difficulty put in her way by time and circumstance. I was taught also by the children at Babylon, that when there is no one to support the cause of true religion, we should do our duty, even alone and all unaided. From out of the midst of the flame, they lifted up their voices in hymns and praise to God — not reeking of the host who ignored the truth as nothing — but even if but three, they were sufficient with one another. This is why we too are undismayed at the cloud of our enemies. Resting our hope on the aid of the Spirit, we have proclaimed the truth with all boldness. Had I not so done, it would truly have been terrible that the blasphemers of the Spirit should be so easily emboldened in their attack on true religion; and that we, with so mighty an ally and supporter at our side, should shrink from the service of that doctrine, which by the tradition of the Fathers, has been preserved by an unbroken sequence of memory to our own day.

A further powerful incentive to my undertaking was the warm fervor of your “love unfeigned;” and the seriousness and taciturnity of your disposition. It was a guarantee that you would not publish to all the world what I was about to say— not because it would not be worth making known, but to avoid casting pearls before swine.

My task is now done. If you find what I have said satisfactory, let this make an end to our discussion of these matters. If you think any point requires further elucidation, I pray you, do not hesitate to pursue the investigation with all diligence, and to add to your information by putting to me any uncontroversial question. Either through me or others, the Lord will grant full explanation on matters which have yet to be made clear, according to the knowledge supplied to the worthy by the Holy Spirit.

AMEN.