

*CHRISTIAN CLASSICS SERIES*

IV.

\*\*\*\*\*

THE TREATISE

OF

BASIL THE GREAT ON THE  
HOLY SPIRIT.



*CHRISTIAN CLASSICS SERIES.*

*Each volume, cloth boards, gilt top, uncut edges.*

- I. *Cur Deus Homo?* By ANSELM, Archbishop of Canterbury. Translated, with Introduction, Analysis, and Notes, by E. S. PROUT, M.A. 2s.
- II. *The Enchiridion of Augustine.* 2s.
- III. *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei.* By ATHANASIUS, Archbishop of Alexandria. Translated, with an Introduction, Analysis, and Notes, by T. HERBERT BINDLEY, M.A. 2s.
- IV. *Basil the Great on the Holy Spirit.* Translated, with an Analysis and Notes, by the Rev. GEORGE LEWIS, M.A. 2s.
- V. *The Obedience of a Christian Man,* by WILLIAM TYNDALE, Translator and Martyr. Edited, with Introduction, Analysis, and Notes, by R. LOVETT, M.A. 2s. 6d.



CHRISTIAN CLASSICS SERIES

IV

BASIL THE GREAT

*Archbishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia*

ON

THE HOLY SPIRIT

TRANSLATED

WITH ANALYSIS AND NOTES

By the Rev. GEORGE LEWIS

(M.A. Balliol College, Oxford; M.A. London

*Author of 'A Life of Joseph Hall, D.D., Bishop of Exeter and Norwich')*

NEW AND REVISED EDITION.

RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY

56, PATERNOSTER ROW, AND 164, PICCADILLY.



### *EDITORIAL NOTE.*

THE Committee of the Religious Tract Society have undertaken the issue of the famous theological treatises included in this Series in the hope that they will be widely read and studied, not only by professed students, but also by the thoughtful general readers of the present day.

Each treatise is complete in itself, and, as far as possible, gives the full text exactly as it came from the pen of the author, even when adherence to this principle involves variation in bulk and price, and the occasional retention of a few passages not fully in accord with the general teaching of the Society. The reader, as a rule, will easily discover these, and will not fail to see their importance in illustrating the weakness, as well as the strength, of the Christian opinion of other days. Care is taken to note such passages where there appears to be need for so doing.



## Introduction.



**S**T. BASIL, the illustrious author of the present treatise on the Holy Spirit, was born about the year A.D. 329. His father, who was of noble descent, and Bishop of Nazianzum, in the south-west of Cappadocia, was at the head of a family of ten, of whom three, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Peter of Sebaste, became bishops. Educated in the schools of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, he had for his companion Gregory Nazianzen, and the schoolfellows afterwards became fellow-students at Athens, where they came into contact with Julian the Apostate, whose bearing even then seemed to the keen

eye of Gregory to indicate his future career.\* Both Basil and Gregory, untainted by the associations of the university, resolved to adopt the religious life, and, after leaving Athens, they were both baptized (about A.D. 355). Then came an interval of travel in Egypt and Palestine. Basil is next found among the clergy of Cæsarea. He subsequently spent some time with the disciples of Eustathius, Bishop of Sebaste, who were living according to rule, and he eventually cast in his lot with them (A.D. 357), and became the founder of a monastic system in Pontus, the distinguishing features of which were the life in community as opposed to solitude, and the union of manual labour with devotion. At the end of five years he returned to Cæsarea, and was ordained presbyter; but before long returned to Pontus, on account, it is said, of the jealousy of his bishop, Eusebius, to whom he was eventually reconciled through the exertions of Gregory. On the death of the bishop, who died in his arms, he was elected to the vacant see of Cæsarea, and became Archbishop of the greater part of Asia Minor, not, however, without having to encounter the opposition of a party 'chiefly among the upper classes. They felt, no doubt, that he was too lofty in his single-mindedness to serve their purposes.' 'Thus, in June, 370,' says Dr. Bright,† 'Basil began his nine years of episcopal

\* Socrates, *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 23.

† *History of the Church*, p. 141.

trials, anxieties, and disappointments, all to be endured under a continual pressure of bad health. The episcopate was to him a burden indeed. Yet Gregory of Nazianzum could truly say that "What he did with one hand was worth more than what another man did with the labour of both." As Primate of Pontus, or as Bishop of Cæsarea, he was unwearied in his apostolic labours; seeking out fit persons for holy orders, busying himself in the improvement of Divine service, and in the rekindling of devotional zeal; framing, in substance at least, the Liturgy which bears his name, and is still used by the Greek Church on ten days in the year; diligent as a preacher, constant in visiting the sick, the founder of a hospital which resembled a town, guarding church discipline, rebuking clerical misconduct, winning over by a noble frankness and gentleness the bishops who had resisted his election. Such were some of his works in his own more immediate sphere of duty; but his anxiety to fulfil his ministry kept him watchful for the welfare of the whole Church.'

During the whole time of his episcopate a fierce contest was raging in the East respecting the Holy Ghost, and Basil for nearly ten years was the foremost champion of orthodoxy.\* Aetius (of whom more hereafter), the founder of Anomœanism, had bequeathed his doctrine to Eunomius, who for about five and

\* Swete's *Early History of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, p. 59.

twenty years continued to propagate them, and, not content with impugning the Godhead of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, endeavoured to separate the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity from one another by as wide an interval as possible. For he maintained that the Son was altogether unlike the Father, and the Spirit altogether unlike the Son. The Son was made by the Father, and the Spirit by the Son. Two of the productions of Eunomius have been preserved\*—the shorter one an *Exposition of the Faith*, and the *Apology*. The author's position respecting the Holy Spirit is thus set forth in the latter:— 'One Holy Spirit first and greatest of the works of the Only-Begotten, who came into being by the command of the Father, but by the operation and power of the Son.' It was this treatise which first led Basil to engage in controversy. He published his *Refutation* (probably before he was made bishop), and answered Eunomius 'paragraph by paragraph.' But, notwithstanding his orthodoxy, he was too loving and judicious to unnecessarily irritate an opponent. Like St. Athanasius with the *Homo-ousion*,† he was content to secure substantial truth. Hence it was that, while he constantly and most solemnly asserted the Godhead of the Spirit, he hesitated in preaching to call Him God, hoping by his forbearance to lead on the Pneumatomachs

\* Swete.

† Stanley's *Eastern Church*, lect. vii. ; Newman's *Arians*, Appendix, p. 432.



to fuller faith. His conciliatory temper was misunderstood by the orthodox ; he was called a Sabellian, an Apollinarian, a Tritheist, a Macedonian ; but he amply vindicated himself by his vigorous opposition of the heretical Eustathius, Bishop of Sebaste, who had reverted to his Arian error, and had developed into the uncompromising leader of the Pneumatomachs.\* This struggle, so painful to at least one of the combatants, took place in A.D. 373. Probably in the next year, or a little later, Basil found himself, reluctant though he was, compelled to again take up the pen in defence of himself and of what he valued more than life—‘the faith once for all delivered to the saints.’ The result was his ‘great work’ on the Holy Spirit, which is now in English dress presented to the reader. The occasion which gave it birth is clearly stated by its author (chap. i. sec. 3). Erasmus, although he translated the treatise into Latin, doubted whether it were St. Basil’s ; but, on the contrary, Isaac Casaubon was strongly of opinion that it was, and modern scholars, almost without exception, consider it the masterly work of the great Cappadocian prelate.

Four or five years after this Basil ‘died, an old man before his time, on the 1st of January, 379, saying, “Into Thy hands I commend my spirit.” His funeral was attended by multitudes, who thronged to touch

\* Bright, p. 152.

the bier, or the fringe of his funeral garments; even Jews and Pagans joined in the mourning. It was felt that "a prince and a great man" had been taken away; and there were probably those who believed that the noble life then closed at the age of fifty had been shortened, not only by frequent illnesses, but by the hard pressure of his brethren's injustice, and the breaking down of plans for the Church's welfare. "I seem for my sins," so he had written in 377 to Peter of Alexandria, "to be unsuccessful in everything." Yet doubtless he, whose correspondence is so rich in words of comfort for his afflicted friends, whose sympathy was so ready for those whose portion was the dreariest, was enabled to look beyond temporary failure, to be "blest in disappointment," and to know that his labour should bear fruit in God's own time.\*

\* Bright, p. 163.



## Contents.



### I. GENERAL DIVISIONS.

A. Ch. i.-iii. (1-5). Introductory—the origin and drift of the discussion.

B. Ch. iv., v. (6-12). The heretical contention respecting the use of *from, in, through*.

C. Ch. vi.-viii. (13-21). The Godhead of the Son.

D. Ch. ix.-xxviii. (22-70). The Holy Spirit.

E. Ch. xxix. (71-75). Historical Survey.

F. Ch. xxx. (76-79). The State of the Church, and Conclusion.

## II. ANALYSIS.

## A.

(1.) 1. Basil congratulates Amphilochius on his patient devotion to truth.

2. The importance of minute details in theology.

3. The origin of the discussion :—Basil's two forms of doxology ; (a) to the Father *with* the Son, *together with* the Holy Spirit ; (b) to the Father *through* the Son *in* the Holy Spirit.

(2.) 4. The contention against the former, and the strenuous defence of the latter taken with the restriction of *from* to the Father, *through* to the Son, and *in* to the Holy Spirit, involves an attack upon the Godhead of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

(3.) 5. The arguments of his opponents a misapplication of the philosophical doctrine of causation.

## B.

(4.) 6. Their inconsistency in the restricted use of the particles.

(5.) 7-11. *From*, *in*, *through*, are used indifferently of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

12. And not only in theology, but in common use exchange meanings.

## C.

(6.) 13. Objection :—the Son is not with the Father, but after the Father ; therefore through the Son is the appropriate phrase, and the Son is not co-ordinate with, but subordinate to, the Father.

Ans. 14. Does *after* denote posteriority in time ? or,

15. Inferiority of place ?

(7.) 16. Whether *with whom*, or *through whom*, is more appropriate to the Son. Each has its value ; *with*, in as-

cribing praise; *through*, in returning thanks—the former expresses the dignity of the Son, the latter His bounty towards us (17–end).

17–19. *Through* denotes the agent, not the mere instrument. The various names of the Son represent different sides of His redemptive work.

20, 21. Explanation of certain passages (John xii. 49, 50, xiv. 24, 31; Phil. ii. 8; Rom. viii. 32) which apparently subordinate the Son.

Conclusion. *Through whom* implies the Original Cause (the Father), and does not in any way detract from the dignity of the Efficient Cause (the Son).

## D.

(8.) 22. The scriptural description of the Spirit warrants us in believing Him divine.

23. The nature of the union of the human soul and the Spirit of God.

(9.) 24. The position that the Spirit ought not to be coupled with the Father and the Son.

25. Refuted by an appeal to the baptismal formula (Matt. xxviii. 19).

26. To impair the formula is to 'betray the faith.'

(10.) 27. The guilt of those who are thus faithless. Objections considered:—that

(11.) (a) 28. Baptism in the name of the Lord suffices;

(12.) (b) 29, 30. Angels are 'numbered with' the Father and Son, but are not therefore to be glorified with them;

(13.) (c) 31–33. The Jews were baptized into Moses and believed in Moses.

(14.) (d) 34–36. We are even baptized into water.

Constructive argument to prove the Godhead of the Spirit:—

(15.) 37. (a) I Cor. xiv. 24, 25; Acts v. 9, 4 (the Spirit is called God).

(b) The Spirit is associated with the other two Persons in the distribution of spiritual gifts.

(c) His work in creation :—

(a) 38. He bestows perfection, that is, sanctification and perseverance, on angelic beings.

(β) 39. He has ever been energetic in the dispensation of God to man—blessing the patriarchs, giving the Law, &c., and particularly in the Incarnation.

(γ) 40. Alienation from Him, or participation of Him, will constitute the misery or happiness of the future life.

(16.) 41-43. A discussion of the terms *Hyperithmesis* and *Syn arithmesis* (*numbering under, numbering with*, and thus nearly equivalent to subordination and co-ordination), which are proved to be borrowed from the logical doctrine of division. Refutation of the reasoning respecting them.

(17.) 44-47. The doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, and the Unity in Trinity, asserted.

(18.) Argument for the glorification of the Spirit drawn from

(a) 48. His names (John iv. 24 ; Lament. iv. 20 ; Ps. xcii. 15 ; John xiv. 16 ; Exod. xxxi. 3).

(b) 49. His operations before creation, in creation, and through coming ages.

50. The objection that the Spirit intercedes for us refuted.

(19.) 51. Discussion of the position that the Spirit is neither servant nor master (Lord), but free.

(20.) 52. The Spirit is Lord (2 Thess. iii. 5 ; 1 Thess. iii. 12, 13 ; 2 Cor. iii. 17 ; Exod. xxxiv. 34 ; 2 Tim. iii. 16).

(21.) 53. The Spirit no less inaccessible to human reason than the Father and the Son (John xiv. 17, 19 ; xvii. 25 ; Isa. xlii. 5).

(22.) 54. To glorify the Spirit is to enumerate His attributes and operations.

(23.) 55, 56. The creature is said to have glory; Why should not the Spirit be also glorified? But there is one glory of the former, another glory of the latter.

57. The objection that the Spirit is a gift refuted.

(24.) 58. It is argued that Scripture studiously avoids the form *with the Spirit*. Basil admits the point, but shows that *in* is often equivalent to *with*. The formula, *to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit* which he himself sometimes used is nowhere found in Scripture as a whole, though its clauses exist separately. If, then, his opponents stickle for the letter of Scripture, let them produce this formula for which they claim exclusive authority; if they urged custom in support of it, Why should not he do the same for the formula which they condemned?

59. Basil found both forms among the faithful, and therefore used both. *With* is closely allied to the *and* of the baptismal formula, only it denotes not merely sameness of action, but association in the same action. It is thus a powerful solvent of the Sabellian and of the exactly opposite error.

60. An appeal for peace:—let the doxology be allowed in both forms. But the heretics stoutly defend the exclusive use of *in*, and this necessitates

(25.) 61–63. A discussion of the various senses in which *in* is applied to the Spirit.

64. Without the Spirit worship is impossible.

(26.) 65–67. The traditional use of *with*. The importance of tradition insisted on.

68. The two forms are not contrary one to the other, but each contributes to the support of the faith. *In* should be used when we contemplate the Spirit in His relations to mankind; *with* expresses His communion with God. The confession of faith rests on the baptismal formula, and the doxology on the confession of faith.

(27.) 69, 70. Additional arguments for glorifying the Spirit.

## E.

(28.) 71–75. Historical survey of the use of the form

rogation abound; but nothing is rarer than an individual anxious to learn, and whose object in seeking truth is the cure of ignorance. Like the snare of the hunter, or the ambush of foes, the questions generally proposed contain some carefully contrived and hidden treachery. The majority propound their riddles not for the sake of getting useful information, but that in case the replies given do not suit their wishes they may have a plausible pretext for war.

2. But if 'A fool shall be counted wise when he asks for knowledge,'\* how much more shall we esteem the intelligent hearer who is coupled by the prophet with the Wonderful Counsellor? † It is surely right, if we see a man pressing toward perfection, to think him worthy of all commendation, to second his efforts, to share all his toil, and to lead him onwards. The men who not merely hear theological phrases, but endeavour to trace the hidden meaning of every word and syllable, are not the religious indifferentists, but those who understand what is the goal of our calling—that there is set before us the being made like to God so far as man's nature allows.

Now no likeness is possible without knowledge, nor can there be knowledge without lessons. And speech is the beginning of teaching, and the parts of speech are words and syllables. So that in investigating syl-

\* Prov. xvii. 28, Sept.

† Isa. iii. 3.



lables we do not miss the mark. Nor because the questions are minute, as one might think, ought they to be overlooked; but inasmuch as truth is hard to catch, we must everywhere diligently follow its traces. For if it be with the acquisition of piety as with arts, that it grows by small additions, nothing must be overlooked by those who are beginning to learn: just as if a man were to neglect the first elements on the ground of their insignificance, he would never attain to the perfection of wisdom. Yea and Nay are two syllables, but yet the best of all things, that is, truth, and the extreme of wickedness, that is, a lie, are often contained in these small words. What need is there to mention this, when at the present day if a martyr for Christ does but nod his head,\* he is judged to have fulfilled all piety? And if this be so, what word employed in theology is so small, that, whether it have a good signification or the contrary, it has not great weight one way or the other? For if one jot or tittle of the law shall not pass away, † how can we with safety neglect even the smallest portions? As to those points which you yourself wish to be thoroughly investigated by us, they are at the same time both small and great. Only a short time is required to utter them, and therefore perhaps they are exposed to contempt; but if regard be had to the force of the things signified, they are great, like the mustard seed, which

\* That is, by way of assent to the truth.

† Matt. v. 18.

is the least of the seeds of shrubs,\* and yet if it be thought worthy of proper care, rises to a considerable height, when it is sown and its natural powers have developed themselves. And if any one laughs on seeing, if I may use the language of the Psalms,† our keenness about syllables, let him know that he is reaping the unprofitable fruit of his laughter; but let us not yield to the reproaches of men, nor, overcome by their depreciation of us, abandon the inquiry. For so far am I from being ashamed of these points because they are small, that if I could attain to even a fractional part of their value I should congratulate myself on my distinguished merit, and should say that no small gain had thence accrued to my brother and fellow-explorer. When, then, I see this fierce struggle over little words, animated by the hope of the reward, I do not decline the toil, for I think that what I have to say will prove fruitful to myself, and that great benefit will result to my hearers. Wherefore, in company with the Holy Spirit Himself (thus I must speak), I will now proceed to the exposition. And, with your permission, so as to follow the course of the discussion, I will turn back some little distance to the origin of the question.

3. Recently when praying with the people I used both forms of the doxology, and one time ascribed glory to God and the Father *with the Son together with the Holy Spirit*, at

\* Matt. xiii. 31, 32.

† Psa. cxix. 85, Septuagint.

another to God and the Father *through* the Son *in* the Holy Spirit. Thereupon certain who were present suddenly accused me of having used expressions which were strange and at the same time contradictory.\* And you, chiefly out of regard for their good, or if they are quite incurable, with a view to the safety of such as come under their influence, thought that some judicious instruction should be published treating of the force of these syllables. We must therefore, as briefly as possible, give the admitted origin of the discussion.

4. The microscopic treatment by these men of words and syllables is not, as might be thought, due to simplicity, nor is the evil slight to which it tends; but it involves a deep and well-concealed design against piety. Their aim and object is to show that the utterances of Scripture respecting Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are unlike one another, and they hope thence to draw an easy proof of a difference of nature. For they have an old sophism which was discovered by Aetius,† the leader of this sect. Somewhere in his epistles he wrote that differences of nature are differently expressed, and *vice versâ*, that differences of expression correspond to differences of nature. And in support of his argument he adduces

\* Note 2.

† Note 3.

the words of the Apostle, 'One God and Father, *from whom* are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ *through whom* are all things.'\* As, then, these expressions are related to one another, so, he says, will also be related the natures denoted by them; *through whom* is unlike *from whom*, therefore the Son is unlike the Father. Upon this madness depends the trifling of these men about the words under discussion. Wherefore, as a peculiar distinction, they allot to God the Father the phrase *from whom*; but to God the Son they assign *through whom*, and to the Holy Spirit *in whom*. And they assert that this use of the syllables is invariable, so that, as I said, a difference of nature is clearly indicated by the change of expression. But it does not escape us that in thus quibbling about the words they are only trying to fortify their impious doctrine. For they would make the words *from whom* denote the Creator, and *through whom* the servant or the instrument, and *in whom* to signify the time or place; that so the Creator of the universe may be considered no more worthy of reverence than an instrument, and the Holy Spirit may appear to have contributed no more to existing things than time or place.

III. 5. Now they were led into this error by observing the practice of non-ecclesiastical writers, who assign

\* 1 Cor. viii. 6.

*from whom* and *through whom* to things essentially different. For those writers think that *from* denotes the material, and *through* represents the instrument, or at all events service. Or rather (for why should we not review the whole argument, and briefly show that its supporters are at variance with truth and disagree with another?), the professors of vain philosophy in their various expositions of the nature of cause\* and classifications of its meaning say that some causes are original, some co-operative or con-causal, while others are regarded as indispensable. And to each of these they appropriate and assign its own peculiar expression; so that the maker of anything is signified one way, the instrument another. They think that *by whom* is suitable to the maker, for they hold that with propriety we say that a bench is made by a carpenter; but *through which* to the instrument, for it is made, say they, by means of an axe, a gimlet, and other tools. In the same way they make *from which* belong to the material, inasmuch as the thing made is of wood; and *according to which* signifies, they think, the device, or the pattern set before the workman. For he either first pictures to himself that which is to be made, and so brings his imagination into play; or he looks at a pattern already lying before him and copies it. The phrase *on account of which* they will have belong to the final cause, because the

\* Note 4.

bench is made for the use of man; and *in which* represents, they say, the time or the place. When was it made? at such a time. And where? at such a place. And even though nothing be added by time and place to that which is made, yet nothing can be made without them, for a workman must have a place and time. Our opponents hear with wonder these observations, which are the offspring of folly and sheer delusion, and then apply them to the simple and artless doctrine of the Spirit, to the disparagement of God the Word and the rejection of the Holy Spirit. What they do is this—they are not afraid to apply to the Lord of the universe an expression appropriated by heathen writers to lifeless instruments, or manual labour of the meanest kind, I mean *through which*, and Christians are not ashamed to speak of the Creator in terms suitable to a saw or a hammer.

IV. 6. Now we admit that the Word of Truth also frequently uses these expressions; but we do not for a moment allow that the freedom of the Spirit is in bondage to the petty notions of heathen philosophers; on the contrary, we say that the language of Scripture varies with the subject matter, and according to its needs. For *from which* does not without exception, as they think, denote the material; but Scripture more commonly applies this expression to the

Supreme Cause. As for example, 'There is One God, from whom are all things;' \* and again, 'But all things are from God.' † The Word of Truth, however, frequently uses the phrase to denote the material, as when it says, 'Thou shalt make the ark of seasoned wood;' ‡ and 'Thou shalt make the candlestick of pure gold;' § and 'The first man is of the earth;' || and, 'Thou art made out of clay as I am.' ¶ But our opponents, that, as we said, they may establish the difference of nature, have ruled that this phrase belongs to the Father only. For the observation they are indebted originally to the heathen teachers, but they do not scrupulously in all respects follow their masters. However, in accordance with the ruling of the latter, they have given to the Son the name of an instrument, and to the Spirit that of a place. For *in* the Spirit they say, and *through* the Son; but the phrase *of* or *from whom* they apply to God. Here they no longer follow strangers, but keep to Apostolic usage, according as it is written, 'And of Him are ye in Christ Jesus;' \*\* and, 'All things are of God.' †† What, then, is to be gathered from this subtlety? There is one nature of cause, another of instrument, and another of place. It follows that in respect of nature the Son is different from the Father, since the instru-

\* 1 Cor. viii. 6.

† 1 Cor. xi. 12.

‡ Gen. vi. 14.

§ Exod. xxv. 31.

|| 1 Cor. xv. 47.

¶ Job xxxiii. 6.

\*\* 1 Cor. i. 30.

†† 1 Cor. xi. 12.

ment differs from the workman; and the Spirit is also different, inasmuch as place or time is distinct from the nature of those who handle the instruments.

v. 7. So much for their opinions; but we shall show, as we purposed, that neither does the Father appropriate the phrase *from whom* and throw *through whom* to the Son; nor again does the Son refuse to allow the Holy Spirit, as they rule, to share in *of whom* or *through whom*, as is maintained by our opponents in their new mode of distributing the phrases. 'There is One God and Father, of whom are all things, and One Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things.'\* These expressions are not intended to lay down a rule, but to carefully distinguish the persons. In thus speaking it was not the Apostle's object to bring before his reader a difference of nature, but to present a clear conception of the Father and of the Son. For that the expressions are not opposed to one another, and do not, as it were, take sides and draw into the battle the natures to which they belong, is clear from the fact that the blessed Paul brought them together, and applied them both to one and the same subject when he said, 'For of Him, and through Him, and unto Him are all things.' † Now this verse mani-

\* 1 Cor. viii. 6.

† Rom. xi. 36.



festly refers to the Lord, as any one would say who pays even the least attention to the meaning of the words. For the Apostle prefaced them with the passage from the prophecy of Isaiah—‘Who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor?’\* And that this is spoken by the prophet of God the Word, the Creator of the universe, may be discovered from what precedes, ‘Who hath measured the waters with His hands, and heaven with the span, and all the earth in a measure? Who hath set the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance? Who hath known the mind of the Lord, and who was His counsellor?’† The question does not indicate what is impossible, but what is rare, as in the passage, ‘Who will rise up for me against the evil-doers?’‡ and ‘What man is he that desireth life?’§ and ‘Who shall ascend to the mount of the Lord?’|| It is just the same in the passage, ‘Who hath known the mind of the Lord, and who hath shared His counsel?’¶ ‘For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth Him all things.’\*\* This is He who grasps with His hand the earth, and keeps it together; He who brings all things to order and beauty; who balances the mountains, and sets bounds to the waters, and assigns to everything in the world its proper place; who embraces the

\* Rom. xi. 34, 36. † Isa. xl. 12, 13. ‡ Psa. xciv. 16.

§ Psa. xxxiv. 12. || Psa. xxiv. 3. ¶ Isa. xl. 13.

\*\* John v. 20.

whole heaven with a small part of His power, which is figuratively called by the prophet a span. Wherefore the Apostle properly added, 'Of Him, and through Him, and unto Him, are all things.'\* For *of* Him things that are have the cause of their existence according to the will of God the Father. *Through* Him all things are constituted and continue; through Him who created all things, and apportioned to each work of this creation whatever is necessary for its welfare. Wherefore even the whole universe turns to Him, looking with a certain irrepressible longing and unspeakable affection to the author and giver of life, according as it is written, 'The eyes of all hope in Thee,'† and again, 'All things wait upon Thee,'‡ and, 'Thou openest Thine hand, and fillest every thing living with good.'§

8. If our opponents decline to accept our exposition, what reasoning will save them from being caught in their own snare? If it be not conceded that the three expressions of *Him*, and *through Him*, and *unto Him* are spoken of the Lord, they must of necessity be referred to God the Father, and then there is an end of the imaginary rule. For not only is *of whom*, but also *through whom*, found to be applied to the Father. And if the latter phrase signifies nothing base or mean, why in the world do our opponents assign it to the Son with the idea that it indicates inferiority?

\* Rom. xi. 36.

† Psa. civ. 27.

‡ Psa. cxlv. 15.

§ Psa. cxlv. 16.

Or again, if it expresses service and nothing else, let them tell us who the ruler is that can claim the God of glory and the Father of Christ for a servant. Thus do they overthrow themselves; but the strength of our position will be secured both ways. For if the view prevail that the words are spoken of the Son, then *from whom* will be found to be suitable to the Son; and if any one be eager to refer the prophet's utterance to God, then he must grant that the expression *through whom* is suitable to God; and the two phrases will be of equal dignity, because they are used in the same way of God. And upon either supposition they will appear of equal value, inasmuch as they are applied to one and the same person. But let us return to our subject.

9. The Apostle writing to the Ephesians says, 'But that speaking truth in love we may grow up in all things into Him which is the Head, even Christ, from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love.'\* And, again, in the Epistle to the Colossians, to those who had not the knowledge of the Only-Begotten, it is said, 'And not holding fast the Head, that is Christ, from whom all the body, being supplied and knit together through the joints and bands, increaseth with the increase of God.†

\* Eph. iv. 15, 16.

† Col. ii. 19.

For that Christ is the Head of the Church we learn from another place, where the Apostle says, 'And the Father gave Him to be head over all things to the Church.\* And 'Of His fulness we all received.† And the Lord Himself says, 'He shall take of Mine, shall declare it unto you.‡ In short, the diligent reader will discover that *of* or *from* has many uses. For the Lord also says, 'I perceived that power had gone forth from Me.§ Likewise we have frequently noticed *of* or *from* applied to the Spirit: 'For,' we read, 'he that soweth unto the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life.¶ And John writes, 'Hereby we know that He abideth in us, from the Spirit which He gave us.¶¶ And the Angel, 'That which is begotten in her is of the Holy Ghost.\*\*\* And the Lord says, 'That which is born of the Spirit is spirit.†† Thus the matter stands.

10. We must now show that Scripture allows *through* to be used alike of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It would be superfluous to prove this with respect to the Son, because it is well known, and also because this is the very point which our adversaries maintain: but we will show that the preposition *through* is applied also to the Father. 'God is faithful,' says the Apostle, 'through whom ye were called into the fellowship of

\* Eph. i. 22.

† John i. 16.

‡ John xvi. 14.

§ Luke viii. 46.

¶ Gal. vi. 8.

¶¶ 1 John iii. 24.

\*\* Matt. i. 20.

†† John iii. 6.

His Son.\* And again, 'Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God.'† And again, 'So that thou art no longer a bond-servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God.'‡ And the passage, 'Like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father.'§ And Isaiah, 'Woe unto them who lay deep plans, and not through the Lord.'|| And many proofs might be advanced of the application of the word to the Spirit. 'But to us,' says Paul, 'He revealed them through the Spirit.'¶ And elsewhere, 'That good thing which was committed unto thee, guard through the Holy Ghost.'\*\* And again, 'For to one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom.' ††

II. We can say the same of the syllable *in*, namely that the Scripture has sanctioned its use in the case of God the Father. For instance, in the Old Testament we read, 'In God let us do valiantly.'‡‡ And, 'In Thee shall my praise be continually.'§§ And again, 'In Thy name will I exult.'||| In Paul's writings we find, 'In God who created all things.'¶¶ And 'Paul, and Silvanus, and Timothy, unto the church of the Thessalonians in God our Father.'\*\*\* And, 'If by any means now at length I may be prospered by the will of God to come unto you.'††† And,

\* 1 Cor. i. 9. † 2 Cor. i. 1, &c. ‡ Gal. iv. 7.  
 § Rom. vi. 4. || Isa. xxix. 15. ¶ 1 Cor. ii. 10.  
 \*\* 2 Tim. i. 14. †† 1 Cor. xii. 8. †† Psa. cviii. 13.  
 §§ Psa. lxxi. 6. ||| Psa. lxxxix. 16. ¶¶ Eph. iii. 9.  
 \*\*\* 2 Thess. i. 1. ††† Rom. i. 10.

‘Thou gloriest in God.’\* But the passages are too numerous even to count, and what we have to do is not to exhibit a multitude of proofs, but to show the unsoundness of our opponent’s views. I shall therefore take for granted the use of *in* with reference to our Lord and the Holy Ghost, since the fact is familiar. But this I must say, that the intelligent reader will find a sufficient refutation of objections in the method of contraries. For if a difference of expression proved a change of nature, as our opponents argue, the use of identical terms should shame them into admitting that the essence is unchanged.

12. And not only when the being and nature of God are the subject is there a variation in the use of the words, but there is a frequent transfer of denotation, as often as the words exchange connotation. For example, ‘I have gotten a man *through* God,’† says Adam, meaning the same as if he said *from* God. And elsewhere, ‘All that Moses commanded Israel *through* the commandment of the Lord.’‡ And again, ‘Is not the interpretation of them *through* God?’§ Joseph, when speaking to the prisoners concerning their dreams, himself, instead of saying *from* God, distinctly said *through* God. And on the contrary, Paul uses the preposition *from* for *through*, as when he says, ‘Made *from* a woman,’|| instead of *through* a woman. For

\* Rom. ii. 17.

† Gen. iv. 1.

‡ Lev. viii. 21; 1 Chron. xv. 15.

§ Gen. xl. 8.

|| Gal. iv. 4.

in another place he clearly distinguished the two by saying that it belonged to the woman to be made from the man, but to the man to be born through the woman, where he says that 'As woman is from man, so man is through the woman.'\* The passage just cited exhibits the different use of the two words; but the Apostle, at the same time, in passing, corrects the error of those who thought that our Lord had a spiritual body, † and in order to show that the God-bearing flesh ‡ was made out of the common lump of humanity, he preferred the more expressive word. Had he said *through* woman, this was likely to suggest the fleeting thought of our Lord's birth; but *from* the woman was an adequate expression of the community of nature between Him who was born and her who bore Him. The Apostle, therefore, is in no way inconsistent, but shows that the words are easily interchangeable. Once then it has been decided that to whatever objects *through* can be applied, *from* may be applied also, what reason is there for so carefully distinguishing the words from one another, to the great detriment of religion?

13. Nor can they who criticize our teaching with such  
 VI.  
 perverse ingenuity shelter themselves under the plea of ignorance. It is quite clear that they are vexed with us because we ascribe

\* 1 Cor. xi. 12.

† Note 5.

‡ Note 6.

the doxology to the Only-Begotten \* along with the Father, and do not dissociate the Holy Ghost from the Son. Hence it is that they call us innovators, novelty-mongers, word-inventors, or any other title of reproach. So far am I from being displeased with their abuse, that did not their punishment cause me sorrow and unceasing pain, I could almost say I was grateful to them for their hard words, because they are to me the source of blessedness. For, 'Blessed are ye,' says our Lord, 'when men shall revile you for My sake.' † But what excites their indignation is this: The Son, say they, is not *with* the Father, but *after* the Father. Wherefore it follows that *through* Him glory is given to the Father, but not *with* Him. For the phrase *with Him* denotes equality, but *through Him* represents service. Nor, say they, must we rank the Spirit *with* the Father and the Son, but under the Son and the Father; He is not co-ordinate, but subordinate, not numbered with, but numbered under. ‡ With some such verbal subtleties they subvert the plain simplicity of the faith. How, then, can we excuse them on the ground of ignorance when they are so officious that they will not even allow others to be in ignorance?

14. The first question I should like to ask is this—In what sense they say the Son is after the Father? Is it because He is

\* Note 7.

† Matt. v. 11.

‡ Note 8.



later in time? or is He after the Father in respect of rank, or of dignity? But no one is so senseless as to say that the Maker of the worlds is posterior to the Father, when the fact is that the natural conjunction of the Son and the Father admits of no dissociating interval of time. Nor does human thought allow us to say that the Son is more recent than the Father, not only because Father and Son are conceived of as relative terms, but because such things are said to be later in time as are less distant from the present, and, on the contrary, such things earlier as are farther removed from the present. For example, the history of Noah is earlier than that of Sodom, because more remote from the present; and again, the history of Sodom later than that of Noah, because in a manner it seems nearer to the present. But besides the impiety, is it not the extreme of folly to measure the existence of the life which transcends all time and all ages by its distance from the present? if, that is to say, just as beings subject to birth and decay are said to precede one another, we compare God the Father with God the Son, who subsisted before the worlds, and give the former the pre-eminence. But the priority of the Father in time is inconceivable, because it is utterly impossible for reason or thought to go beyond the generation\* of our Lord. Well did John by means of two words set fixed limit

\* See Note 20.

to thought when he said, 'In the beginning was the Word.' \* For thought cannot escape from *was*, and imagination cannot go beyond *beginning*. However far you run back in thought, you do not escape from *was*; and however much you may determine to see what lies beyond the Son, you will not be able to cross the *beginning*. Thus, then, piety would have us think of the Son together with the Father.

15. But if they think of a descent of the Son to a lower place than that occupied by the Father, so that the Father has the higher seat, and the Son is thrust to the next below, let them confess it, and we will say no more; once the point is clearly stated, the absurdity is self-evident. For they are logically inconsistent in not allowing the omnipresence of the Father, while the sound faith is that God filleth all things; nor do they who assign a higher place to the Father and a lower to the Son remember the words of the prophet, 'If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there; if I go down into Hades, Thou art present.' † To pass by in silence the ignorance of those who invest things incorporeal with attributes of space, what encouragement can they derive in their shameless opposition and hostility to Scripture from the words, 'Sit Thou on My right hand'? ‡ or from, 'He sat on the right hand of the majesty of God'? § For the

\* John i. 1.

† Psa. cx. 1.

‡ Psa. cxxxix. 8.

§ Heb. i. 3.

word *right* does not, as they maintain, denote a position of inferiority, but a relation of equality; the word is not to be taken in a corporeal sense (for then God might have a left hand), but by the metaphorical reference to a seat of honour Scripture represents the majesty and honour of the Son. It remains, therefore, for them to say that by this word is signified an inferiority in dignity.

Now I would have them know that Christ is the power of God, and the wisdom of God, and that He is the image of the invisible God, and the effulgence of His glory, and that God the Father sealed Him, having made Him the exact likeness of Himself. Shall we say, then, that these and all kindred passages throughout the whole range of Scripture are suggestive of humiliation, or that, as it were, they are public proclamations of the majesty of the Only-Begotten, and of His equality in glory with the Father? Let them listen to the Lord Himself, who clearly shows that His own glory is equal to the Father's by saying, 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father,'\* and again, 'When the Son cometh in the glory of the Father;' † and, 'That they may honour the Son even as they honour the Father;' ‡ and, 'We beheld His glory, glory as of an Only-Begotten from a Father;' § and, 'The Only-Begotten God || who is in the bosom of the Father.' ¶ They take none of

\* John xiv. 9.

† Mark viii. 38.

‡ John v. 23.

§ John i. 14.

|| Note 9.

¶ John i. 18.

these things into account, but assign to the Son the place destined for God's enemies. For the bosom of the Father is a fitting seat for the Son ; but the place of the footstool is for those who must needs be reduced to submission.

Being anxious to proceed to other matters, I have only cursorily touched on the evidence ; you at your leisure may collect the proofs, and vividly realize the height of the glory and the eminency of the power of the Only-Begotten. And yet to a well-disposed hearer, the little that I have adduced is of no small importance, unless a man take the phrases *right hand* and *bosom* in a mean and carnal sense, so as to circumscribe God by space, and imagine a bodily outline, figure, and position, all of which are far removed from our conception of a simple, incomprehensible, and incorporeal being—besides the fact that it is all one whether the Father or the Son be thus meanly conceived of, so that he who propagates such views does not rob the Son of His dignity, but incurs the guilt of blaspheming God. For whatever he may dare to say against the Son, he is compelled to apply to the Father. He who assigns to the Father the upper place by way of precedence, and says that the Only-Begotten Son sits below, will be unable to separate the creature of his fancy from all corporeal attributes.

Now such ideas are no better than the delusions of drunken delirium and the phantoms of a frenzied brain ; and how can they lay claim to piety who have been taught by Himself that

‘He who honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father,’\* and yet do not with the Father worship and glorify Him who is conjoined with the Father by nature, glory, and nobility of rank? What are we to say? How shall we justly defend ourselves at the terrible and general day of judgment, if, seeing that the Lord clearly declares that He will come in the glory of the Father,† and Stephen beheld Jesus standing on the right hand of God,‡ and Paul by the Spirit testified concerning Christ, that He is on the right hand of God,§ and the Father saith, ‘Sit Thou on My right hand,’|| and the Holy Spirit bears witness that He did sit on the right hand of the majesty of God ¶—if, seeing all this is so, we degrade the partner of the Father’s throne and His companion in honour from the relation of an equal to that of an inferior? For I think that sitting and standing indicate fixity and complete stability of nature, as Baruch, when he wished to show how unalterable and unchangeable is the life of God, said, ‘Thou sittest for ever, and we perish for ever;’\*\* and I also think by the right hand side is signified equality of honour and rank. What audacity must it be then to *rob* the Son of His share in the doxology, as though He were worthy only of some inferior place of honour!

\* John v. 23.

† Matt. xvi. 27.

‡ Acts vii. 55.

§ Rom. viii. 34.

|| Psal. cx. i.

¶ Heb. viii. 1.

\*\* Baruch iii. 3.

VII. 16. But, it is argued, to say *with* Him is altogether strange and unusual, while *through* Him both agrees with the language of Scripture and is a commonplace in the usage of the brethren. What answer shall we give to this? That blessed are the ears that hear you not, and the hearts that are preserved safe and sound from your words. But to you who love Christ I say that the Church is familiar with both usages, and does not decline either as destructive of the other. For whenever we contemplate the majesty of the nature of the Only-Begotten and His surpassing dignity, we testify that He is glorified with the Father; but whenever we have in mind the good things wherewith we are supplied, or our own access to, and intimate relationship with, God, we confess that through Him and in Him this grace is wrought for us. So that *with* is the proper word for those who are ascribing praise; but *through* belongs to those who give thanks. And it is false to say that the use of *with* is foreign to the practice of the devout. For those persons whose conservative temper leads them to prefer the gravity and solemnity of antiquity to novelty, and who preserve the tradition of their fathers unchanged, use the word both in town and country. But they who are satiated with what is familiar, and arrogantly treat what is ancient as if it were antiquated, these are the persons who welcome innovations, just as in dress those who are fond of show always prefer the latest fashion

to what is generally worn. And so, to this day, you may see the ancient customs of the country people preserved in this expression; but the phrases of these accomplished warriors in the strife of tongues bear the brand of the new philosophy.\* Accordingly, as I said, our fathers and we maintain that the Father and the Son have a common glory, and therefore we ascribe praise to the Father with the Son. And yet we are not satisfied with the fact that such is the tradition of the fathers: for they too followed the sense of Scripture, and began with the evidence from Scripture which we just now set before you. We think of the effulgence along with the glory, and the image along with the original, and without a doubt the Son is thought of with the Father, for the words imply one another; and this, to say nothing of the nature of things, forbids their separation.

17. When then the Apostle gives thanks to God through Jesus Christ,† and again says that through Him he ‘received grace and apostleship unto obedience of faith among all the nations,’‡ or that through Him ‘we have had our access into this grace wherein we stand and rejoice,’§ he represents the benefits which our Lord has bestowed on us, inasmuch as He is the channel through which the Father’s good gifts reach

VIII.

\* See Note 14.

† Rom. i. 5.

† Rom. i. 8.

§ Rom. v. 2.

us, and also because through Himself He brings us nigh to the Father. For by saying, 'Through whom we received grace and apostleship,'\* the Apostle shows that He is the source of the supply of good things; and by saying, 'Through whom we have had our access,' † he points out that God receives us and makes us His own through Christ. Do we then, by confessing the author of the grace given unto us, deprive Him of His glory? Is it not more correct to say that we fitly praise Him *because* we recite His benefits? And so we found the Scripture delivering our Lord to us, not by one name, nor by such as express His divinity and majesty only. It does indeed use words which characterize His nature, for it knows how to speak of the name which is above every name, ‡ the name of Son, and true Son, and Only-Begotten God, and Power of God, and Wisdom, and Word. But, on the other hand, on account of the variety of the grace given unto us, which by reason of the riches of His goodness He bestows according to His manifold wisdom and our several necessities, it designates Him by countless other titles. Now He is called a shepherd, now a king, or again a physician, a bridegroom, a way, a door, a fountain, bread, an axe, a rock. These titles do not represent His nature, but, as I said, the infinitely various modes of His working, which, out of His compassion for what He has Himself made

Rom. i. 5.

† Rom. v. 2.

‡ Phil. ii. 9.



He bestows upon His creatures according to their peculiar necessities. For those who have placed themselves under His care and in long-suffering have maintained steadfastness of mind, He calls sheep. And He professes to be the Shepherd of such, those, namely, who hear His voice and give not heed to strange doctrines. 'My sheep,' He says, 'hear My voice.'\* And He is the king of those who have already risen to a higher level, and who need His lawful rule. And a door because through the straight path of the commandments He leads us out to good deeds, and again safely shelters those who through faith in Him betake themselves to excellent knowledge. Wherefore He says, 'By Me if any man enter in, he shall go in and out, and shall find pasture.'† And a rock,‡ because He is to the faithful a defence strong, unshaken, and firmer than any rampart. Among these the phrase *through Him* has its most fitting and significant use whenever our Lord is spoken of as a door and a way. That, however, God the Son is glorified along with the Father and together with the Father is clear. We read, 'That in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father'§ Wherefore we use both expressions, by the one signifying His own

\* John x. 27.

† 1 Cor. x. 4.

† John x. 9.

§ Phil. ii. 10, 11.

dignity, by the other His favour towards us.

18. For through Him comes all the help which souls receive, and corresponding to every form of His care a peculiar appellation has been devised. When He presents to Himself, as a pure virgin, the soul without blemish, not having spot or wrinkle, He is called a bridegroom; but when He takes the soul, injured by the wicked stripes of the devil, and grievously sick with sin, and thoroughly cures it, He is called a physician. Do such instances of His concern for us generate a mean conception of Him? or, on the contrary, do they fill us with astonishment at the power no less than the philanthropy of the Saviour, inasmuch as He endured to sympathize with our infirmities, and was able to condescend to our weakness? For heaven and earth, the vasty deep and living creatures which move in the waters, animals of the dry land, and plants, stars, air, seasons, and the manifold evidence of design which meets us everywhere, do not so vividly impress us with the sense of transcendent power, as the fact that God, who is incomprehensible, should impassibly by means of flesh be in conflict with death, so that by His own suffering He might set us free from all suffering. And if the Apostle says, 'In all these things we are more than conquerors *through Him* that loved us,'\* he does not by the phrase suggest humiliating service, but the

\* Rom. viii. 37.

deliverance which is effected by the might of the Saviour's power. For having Himself bound the strong man, He spoiled him of his goods,\* namely, us, who had been used for every evil work; and He made vessels meet for the Master's use those who have been fitted for every good work † through the preparation of Him who is over us. Thus have we had through Him 'our access to the Father, having been translated out of the power of darkness into the share of the inheritance of the saints in light.' ‡ Let us not then regard the dispensation of the Son as a compulsory service arising from the base condition of a slave, but as a voluntary concern for the work of His hands, springing from goodness and compassion, and according to the will of God the Father. For thus shall we show our piety, if in all His actions we bear witness to His perfect power, and never dissociate it from the Father's will. Just as whenever the Lord is called the way, § we rise to loftier thoughts, and do not stop at the literal meaning of the word. The word *way* seems to tell us of orderly progress and advancement towards perfection by means of the works of righteousness and the illumination of knowledge. We are ever longing to go forward, and stretching out || to that which remains, until we reach the blessed goal, the knowledge of God which our Lord gives

\* Matt. xii. 29. † 2 Tim. ii. 21. ‡ Col. i. 12, 13.  
§ John xiv. 6. || Phil. iii. 13.

through Himself to those who believe in Him. For our Lord is a truly good way, where there is no losing one's way or fear of wandering, and He leads us on to the true good, the Father. For 'no one,' He says, 'cometh unto the Father but through Me.)\* Thus, then, we ascend to God through the Son.

19. We must next point out under what conditions we receive blessings from the Father through the Son. All created nature, both visible and invisible, requires the support of God's superintending care, and therefore the Creator Word, the Only-Begotten God, gives His help, and distributes His infinite benefits, according to the varying circumstances and individual necessities of the recipients. Those who are held down in the darkness of ignorance He enlightens: He is therefore the true light. He judges according to the merits of our deeds, and assigns the recompense: thus He is a righteous judge. 'For the Father judges no man, but hath given all judgment to the Son.† He raises the fallen who have slipped from an exalted life into sin: thus He is the resurrection.‡ But He does everything by the touch of His power, and the energy of His goodwill. He shepherds, enlightens, nourishes, leads, heals, raises. He gives being to things that are not, and supports things created. Thus do God's good

\* John xiv. 6.    † John v. 22.    ‡ John xi. 25.

gifts come to us through the Son, who works for each of His creatures with a rapidity which baffles speech. The lightning is not so quick, nor the sunbeam in the air, not the twinkling of the eyes, or the movement of thought itself; but each of these lags farther behind the speed of the Divine working than the most sluggish animals come short of, I will not say birds, or winds, or the heavenly bodies in their orbits, but of our own reason. What need of time has He who upholds all things by the word of His power,\* who does not work bodily-wise, and who is not compelled to resort to manual labour in creating, but has the nature of created things in voluntary obedience to His call? As Judith says, 'Thou didst but think, and all that Thou thoughtest of was at hand.'† Lest, however, we should be drawn by the greatness of His works to imagine that our Lord is unoriginate, ‡ what says self-existent life? 'I live because of the Father.'§ And what says the Power of God? 'The Son can do nothing of Himself.'|| And the perfect Wisdom? 'I received a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak.'¶ By all this He guides us to the knowledge of the Father, and gives to Him the marvellous credit of what is done, that through the Son we may know the Father. For we do not behold the Father because the works He does

\* Heb. i. 3.

§ John vi. 57.

† Judith ix. 4.

|| John v. 19.

‡ See Note 20.

¶ John xii. 49.

are different from those of the Son, as though He exhibited a peculiar and separate sphere of action (for what things soever He seeth the Father doing, those the Son also doeth in like manner\*); but the glory which accrues to Him through the Only-Begotten is the source of that admiration with which He is regarded, while He rejoices not only in the works, but also in the doer of them, and is extolled by those who acknowledge Him to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, 'through whom are all things, and for whom are all things.' Wherefore the Lord says, 'All things that are Thine are Mine,' † meaning to refer to Him the power over creation, and 'Thine are Mine,' inasmuch as He thence derives the creating cause, not that He avails Himself of assistance in His working, nor that He is furnished with detailed instructions for the execution of each several work, for that would be the condition of a servant, and would not in the least represent His Divine rank; but the Word is full of His Father's excellence, and beaming forth from the Father does all things according to the likeness of Him who begat Him. For if He be in no wise different from the Father as regards essence, neither will He be as regards power. And they who are equal in power will, I suppose, be equal in operation. For Christ is the 'Power of God, and the Wisdom of God.' ‡ And thus

\* John v. 19.

† John xvii 10.

‡ 1 Cor. i. 24.

when we say that all things were made through Him,\* and all things have been created through Him and unto Him,† we are not to suppose that He was a mere instrument or a slave, but that, as Creator, He fulfilled His Father's will.

20. When, then, He says, 'I spake not from Myself;'‡ and again, 'As the Father hath said unto Me, so I speak,'§ and, 'The word which ye hear is not Mine, but His that sent Me,'|| and elsewhere, 'As the Father gave Me commandment, so I do,'¶ we are not to think that He thus speaks because He has no choice in the matter, nor that He is disorderly, nor that He awaits a sign to give permission, but He shows that His own will is inseparably one with His Father's. Let us not then understand by a command an order expressed in so many words, and directing the Son, as if He were an inferior, in the work He has to do; but let us, as befits the dignity of God, compare the timeless communication of the Father's will to the reflection in a mirror. 'For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth Him all things.'\*\* So that all things that the Father hath are the Son's, and they do not come to Him by degrees, but are present all together. It is absurd to suppose that a man who has acquired the mastery over his art, and by long practice has become proficient in it, can henceforth unassisted work

\* John i. 3.

† Col. i. 16.

‡ John xii. 49.

§ John xii. 50.

|| John xiv. 24.

¶ John xiv. 31.

\*\* John v. 20.

according to the scientific rules with which he is furnished, but that the Wisdom of God, the Creator of the universe, the ever Perfect One, He that is wise without instruction, the Power of God, in whom are all the hidden treasures of wisdom and knowledge,\* needs an overseer to tell Him the manner and the measure of His operations. I suppose, in the vanity of your thoughts, you will open a school, and will make the Father preside as teacher, and the Son stand by as an ignorant scholar; and then your scholar will gradually be instructed in wisdom, and go on unto perfection. And thus, if you have an eye to logical consistency, you will find the Son *always* learning, but never able to attain perfection, because the Father's wisdom is infinite, and it is impossible to find an end of infinity. So then he who will not allow that the Son has all things from the beginning, will never grant that He will come to perfection. But I am ashamed of the mean thoughts to which the discussion has conducted me. Let us return to loftier topics.

21. 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father,' † not the figure, nor the form, for the Divine nature is uncompounded, but the benevolence, which being concurrent with the essence, is seen to be alike and equal, or rather identical, in the Father and the Son. What then is meant by His becoming obedient? ‡ and by 'He delivered Him for us all'? § That the

\* Col. ii. 3.

† Phil. ii. 8.

‡ John xiv. 9.

§ Rom. viii. 32.



Father is the source of the Son's beneficence on behalf of men. But let me mention the following passages: 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law;' \* and 'While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' † Pay great attention also to the utterances of our Lord, and observe that after instructing us concerning the Father, it is His practice to use words of authority, and such as become a master. 'I will,' says He, 'be thou made clean;' ‡ and, 'Peace be still'; § and, 'But I say unto you;' || and, 'Thou deaf and dumb spirit, I command thee;' ¶ and there are many similar passages, that by some we may know our Lord and Maker, and by others may be taught the Father of our Lord and Maker. Thus on all sides the true doctrine appears to be that the fact of the Father's creating through the Son does not make the creating power of the Father imperfect, nor does it prove the Son weak in action; but what is indicated is unity of will. So that the phrase *through whom* is a confession of an original cause, and is not to be taken as an impeachment of an efficient cause.

22. Now let us inquire into the character of our ordinary conceptions of the Spirit, whether those which we derive from the Scriptures, or those which we have received by unwritten tradition from the Fathers. In the first place, who, on

IX.

\* Gal. iii. 13.      † Rom. v. 8.      ‡ Matt. viii. 3.  
§ Mark iv. 39.    || Matt. v. 22, seq.    ¶ Mark ix. 25.

hearing the titles of the Spirit, does not experience an elevation of soul and rise in thought to the supreme nature? For He is called the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of Truth, who proceedeth from the Father,\* the Upright Spirit, the Princely Spirit.† Holy Spirit is His peculiar and distinguishing appellation, and this is a name pre-eminently adapted to what is incorporeal, purely immaterial, and indivisible. Accordingly our Lord, when teaching the woman who thought of a local worship of God that the incorporeal is incomprehensible, says, God is a Spirit.‡ It is, then, impossible when we hear of a Spirit to picture to the imagination a circumscribed nature, or one which is subject to turning and changing,§ or which is at all like the creature; but rising to the sublimest thoughts, we are compelled to think of an intellectual essence, infinite in power, illimitable in magnitude, immeasurable by periods or ages; who ungrudgingly imparts His excellence; unto whom all things needing sanctification turn, for whom all things living long according to their excellence, being, as it were, watered by His breath, and assisted to attain their own proper and natural end; perfective of all else, Him-

\* John xv. 26.

† Psa. li. 10, 12. Sept. Heb. A steadfast spirit, *i.e.*, 'a spirit steadfastly purposed to lead a new life,' cf. lxxviii. 37, cxii. 7, and a free, *i.e.*, willing spirit. Whether the latter does not refer to the Holy Spirit (in this case 'Thy freely-bestowed Spirit') is disputed. It must be noted, however, that 'the Holy Spirit is not spoken of in the Hebrew Scriptures as a Person, but as an influence.

‡ John iv. 24.

§ See Note 19.

self lacking nothing ; who lives not because He is endowed with life, but because He is the giver of life ; who does not grow by additions, but is at once full, self-sustaining, and everywhere present ; the source of sanctification, light invisible, who, as it were, illuminates every faculty of reason in its search for truth ; unapproachable by nature, accessible by reason of His goodness ; filling all things by His power, but communicable only to the worthy ; not shared by all in the same degree, but distributing His energy according to the proportion of faith ; simple in essence, manifold in powers ; wholly present with each individual, and wholly everywhere ; impassibly divided, and shared without division, like a sunbeam, whose gracious influence is as much his who enjoys it as though he were alone in the world, but which also blends with the air, and shines over land and sea. Thus, too, the Spirit is present with every one who receives Him as if there were only one receiver, but bestows sufficient and complete grace on all ; whom all things that partake of Him enjoy according to the capacity of their nature, not to the extent of His power.

23. Now the relationship existing between the Spirit and our souls is not one of local proximity, for how can you bodily-wise draw near to the incorporeal ? But it consists in the forsaking of lusts which, fostered by the love of the flesh, fasten on the soul and alienate it from its fellowship with God. Hence it is only by being purified from shame, the stain

incurred through wickedness, and by returning to our natural beauty, and as it were by cleansing and restoring the King's image,\* that we can approach the Paraclete. And He, like the sun, when thy sight is purged, will show thee in Himself the image of the invisible. And in the blessed vision of the image thou shalt see the ineffable beauty of the archetype. Through Him hearts are lifted up, the weak are taken by the hand, those advancing are perfected. He, shedding His bright beams upon those who are cleansed from every stain, makes them spiritual by their communion with Himself. And as clear, transparent bodies, if a ray of light fall upon them, become radiant themselves and diffuse their splendour all around, so souls illuminated by the indwelling Spirit are rendered spiritual themselves, and impart their grace to others. Thence comes the knowledge of the future, the understanding of mysteries, the comprehension of secrets, the distribution of gifts, the heavenly life, companionship with angels, unending joy, abiding in God, likeness to God, the utmost of our heart's desires,—the being God. Such, in brief, are the views which we have been taught by the oracles of the Spirit themselves to hold respecting the greatness, the dignity, and the operations of the Holy Spirit.

Now we must proceed against our disputatious opponents, and endeavour to refute the objections drawn from knowledge falsely so-called which they urge against us.

\* Compare St. Athanasius, *De Inc.*, sec. 14.

24. The Holy Spirit, they say, ought not to be put in the same rank with the Father and the Son, partly because His nature is different, partly because He is inferior in dignity. In reply, it is right to give the Apostles' answer, 'We ought to obey God rather than men.'\* For if our Lord, when He delivered saving baptism, clearly commanded the disciples to baptize all nations 'into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost,'† and did not disdain fellowship with Him, is it not perfectly plain that our opponents who say we ought not to rank Him with the Father and the Son, withstand the ordinance of God? If they say that such an arrangement of the names does not indicate any connection or fellowship, they ought to tell us why we must think so, and what other way they have of more clearly expressing intimate connection. At the same time, if the Lord did not connect the Spirit with Himself and the Father at baptism, they ought not to find fault with us for so connecting Him. For we do not in thought or speech go beyond the words. But if He be there connected with the Father and the Son—and no one would have the effrontery to say anything else—let them not blame us as they do for following the Scriptures.

25. But the machinery of war is set in motion, and every thought is aimed at us, and blasphemous tongues shoot out their arrows and strike harder blows than did the stones

\* Acts v. 29.

† Matt. xxviii. 19.

with which Christ's murderers assailed Stephen. They must not, however, hope to hide the fact that we are only the occasion of the strife, but that their real aim is a higher mark. And so they prepare their engines against us, and lay their snares, and urge one another to lend assistance according to the individual's strength or skill. But it is the faith which is assailed, and the common aim of all the adversaries and enemies of sound doctrine is to sap the foundations of the faith of Christ by levelling to the ground and utterly destroying apostolic tradition. Hence, like prudent debtors, they clamour for written proofs, but dismiss as of no account the unwritten evidence of the fathers. But we shall not abate from the truth, nor prove cowardly and traitorous allies. For if the Lord delivered as a necessary and saving doctrine the co-ordination of the Holy Spirit with the Father, and our opponents being otherwise minded divide and tear them asunder, and relegate the Spirit to the level of a servant, it is infallibly certain that they attach more importance to their own blasphemy than to the Master's command. Come then, laying aside all contentiousness, let us thus consider the matter.

26. What is it that makes us Christians? Faith, every one will say. But how are we saved? By being born again, of course, through baptismal grace. How else could we? Knowing then, as we do, that this salvation is secured to us through the Father, Son, and

Holy Ghost, shall we throw away the form of doctrine which we received? \* Would it not, on the contrary, be a subject for the deepest regret if we were now found to be farther from our salvation than when we believed, if we were now to reject what we then received? The loss is the same whether a person departs this life without baptism, or receives a baptism which lacks some of its traditional accompaniments. And whoever does not constantly adhere to the profession which we made at our first entrance into the Church, when we were delivered from idols and came unto the living God, and who does not embrace it throughout the whole of life as a sure protection, alienates himself from the promises of God, and disputes his own bond which he deposited when he professed the faith. For if baptism is to me the beginning of life, and the day of regeneration the first of days, it is clear that there can be no more precious words than those which accompanied the grace of sonship. The tradition which brings me to the light, the tradition which gives me the knowledge of God, and through which I was made a child of God, whereas I was before an enemy through sin, shall I, seduced by the specious arguments of our opponents, prove a traitor to it? Nay, but it is the prayer of my inmost heart that with this confession on my lips I may depart to the Lord; and I exhort

\* The view of baptism in this passage is to be taken as that of Basil, not necessarily that to which all can, or must, subscribe. See pp. 74, 75, and also Note 10.

them to keep the faith inviolate, unto the day of the Lord, and to maintain the Spirit inseparable from the Father and the Son, jealously guarding the baptismal doctrine both in the profession of faith and in the ascription of praise.

XI.           27. Who hath woe? Who hath tribulation? Who hath distress and darkness? Who hath eternal condemnation? Have not they that transgress? Have not they that deny the faith? And what is the proof of their denying it? Is it not that they multiply their own professions? But what did they profess, or when? Belief in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, at the time when they renounced the devil and his angels, and uttered those saving words. What suitable title for them has been discovered by the children of light? Are they not called transgressors, inasmuch as they have proved faithless to the covenant of their salvation? What then shall I call him who denies God, or him who denies Christ? What else but a transgressor? And what title would you have me give to him who denies the Spirit? Is it not the very same, inasmuch as he transgresses the covenant which he made with God? So then, seeing that the confession of faith in Him secures the blessedness of piety, and the denial of Him subjects to the condemnation of godlessness, is it not a fearful thing now to reject Him, not from fear of fire, or sword, or



cross, or scourge, or wheel, or rack, but merely because they have been led away by the fallacies and quibbles of the Pneumatomachs? \* I testify to every man who confesses Christ, and denies God, that Christ will profit him nothing; or, if he call upon God, and does not acknowledge the Son, that his faith is vain; and if a man reject the Spirit, I tell him that his faith in the Father and the Son will be futile, for he cannot even have that faith without the presence of the Spirit. For he who does not believe the Spirit, does not believe in the Son; and he who does not believe the Son, does not believe in the Father. For he cannot call Jesus Lord but by the Holy Spirit; † and ‘No one hath seen God at any time, but the Only-Begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him.’ ‡ Such an one has no part in true worship. For it is not possible to worship the Son but by the Holy Spirit, nor is it possible to call upon the Father but by the Spirit of adoption.

28. And no one must be  
 misled by the Apostle's practice XII.  
 of frequently omitting the name of the Father  
 and of the Holy Spirit, when he speaks of  
 baptism, nor on this account suppose that  
 there is any carelessness in the invocation of  
 the names.

\* Note II.

† 1 Cor. xii. 3.

‡ John i. 18.

‘As many of you,’ he says, ‘as were baptized into Christ put on Christ.’\* And again, ‘As many of you as were baptized into Christ were baptized into His death.’† For the title Christ is a confession of everything, because it indicates both God who anointed, and the Son who was anointed, and that wherewith He was anointed, namely, the Spirit, as we have learned from Peter in the Acts. ‘Jesus of Nazareth, whom God anointed with the Holy Spirit.’‡ And in Isaiah we read, ‘The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me;’§ and the Psalmist, ‘Wherefore God, even Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy companions.’|| The Apostle, however, appears to sometimes speak of the Spirit only when he refers to baptism. ‘We were all,’ he says, ‘baptized in one body into one Spirit.’¶ And with this agree the words, ‘But ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost;’\*\* and, ‘He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.’†† But no one on this account would call that perfect baptism wherein the Spirit only was invoked. For the tradition which was given us as an element of the quickening grace must ever remain unchangeable. He that redeemed our life from corruption gave us a power of renewal, which power has a cause ineffably mysterious, but brings to our souls great

\* Gal. iii. 27.

† Rom. vi. 3.

‡ Acts x. 38.

§ Isa. lxi. 1.

|| Psa. xlv. 7.

¶ 1 Cor. xii. 13.

\*\* Acts i. 5.

†† Luke iii. 16.

salvation, so that to add anything or take anything away is manifestly a falling from eternal life. If, therefore, the separation in baptism of the Spirit from the Father and the Son is perilous to the baptizer, and unprofitable to him who receives baptism, where is our safety if we sever the Spirit from the Father and the Son? Faith and baptism are two modes of salvation, of kindred origin and inseparable. For on the one hand faith is perfected through baptism, and on the other baptism is founded on faith, and the same names give full significance to both. For as we believe on the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, so also are we baptized into the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. And the confession goes before, leading to salvation, while baptism follows after, setting the seal on our assent.

29. But, it is said, other  
beings which are numbered with  
the Father and the Son are by no means  
glorified with them. The Apostle, for  
instance, in his charge to Timothy associated  
angels with them, saying, 'I charge thee in  
the sight of God, and Christ Jesus, and His  
elect angels,'\* which angels we neither  
separate from the rest of creation, nor can  
we endure to number them with the Father  
and the Son. But I, although the argument

XIII.

\* 1 Tim. v, 21.

deserves no answer and I know it to be palpably absurd, nevertheless reply that one might perhaps cite even a fellow-slave to give evidence before a mild and clement judge, and all the more if the judge were one who by his forbearance towards those he judged left no room to complain of the equity of his decisions. But if we are to be set free from slavery, and called sons of God, and made alive from the dead, it can be only through Him who has a close natural relationship, and is far removed from the condition of a slave. For how shall a stranger associate with God? And how shall he make free who is himself subject to the yoke of bondage? So that the Spirit and the angels are not mentioned for the same purpose, but the Spirit as the Lord of life, while the angels are summoned as helpers of those who are slaves together, and as faithful witnesses of the truth. For it is customary with the saints to deliver God's commands before witnesses: as Paul himself says, 'The things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit to faithful men.'\* And now he calls the angels to witness, for he knows that the angels will accompany the Judge when He comes in the glory of the Father to judge the world in righteousness. 'For whosoever,' He says, 'shall confess Me before men, him also shall the Son of Man confess before the angels of God; but he that denieth Me

\* 2 Tim. ii. 2.

before men shall be denied before the angels of God.\* And Paul elsewhere says, 'At the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with angels.' † Hence in the passage before us he charges Timothy before the angels, thus securing the best of evidence for himself at the great tribunal.

30. And Paul is not alone. All those, without exception, who are entrusted with a ministry of the Word never cease to call heaven and earth to witness, but appeal to them, inasmuch as all that is done takes place within them, and when men's lives shall be examined they will be present at the trial. 'He shall call,' says the Psalmist, 'to the heavens above, and to the earth, that He may judge His people.' ‡ Wherefore Moses, when about to deliver his oracles to the people, said, 'I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day;' § and again in the Song, 'Give ear, ye heavens, and I will speak: and let the earth hear the words of my mouth.' || And Isaiah, 'Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth.' ¶ But Jeremiah tells of an amazement of the heavens on hearing of the unholy deeds of the people: 'The heavens were astonished at this, and were horribly afraid, for My people have committed two evils.' \*\* And therefore the Apostle, knowing the angels to be set over men as tutors or governors are set over children, called

\* Luke xii. 8, 9.

† 2 Thess. i. 7.

‡ Psa. l. 4.

§ Deut. iv. 26.

|| Deut. xxxii. 1.

¶ Isa. i. 2.

\*\* Jer. ii. 12, 13.

them to witness. And Joshua the son of Nun even set up a stone as a witness of his words (a heap in a certain place had already been called a witness by Jacob \*): 'Behold,' he says, 'this stone to-day shall be a witness among you in the last days, when ye shall have lied to the Lord our God.'† He perhaps believed that by the power of God even the stones would speak to reprove transgressors; or, if this were not so, at all events that every one's conscience would be deeply wounded by the forcible reminder. Thus do they who have been entrusted with the dispensation of souls provide witnesses of all kinds so as to perpetuate themselves to posterity. But the Spirit is co-ordinated with God not on account of the exigencies of a particular occasion: we do not drag Him in: He appears at the invitation of the Lord.

XIV. 31. But, it is urged, even if we are baptized into Him, it does not follow that He is justly co-ordinated with God. For some were also baptized into Moses‡ in the cloud and in the sea. Similarly it is admitted that faith before now has had men for its object. For 'the people believed God and Moses His servant.'§ Why then, say they, do you because of faith and baptism so highly extol and magnify the Holy

\* Gen. xxxi. 47.

† 1 Cor. x. 2.

‡ Josh. xxiv. 27.

§ Exod. xiv. 31.

Ghost above the creature, when we have already proved what you allege to be equally true of men? What shall we say then? That faith in the Spirit is like faith in the Father and the Son; and similarly baptism; but when we speak of faith in Moses, and of baptism into Moses and the cloud, it is only a question of type and shadow. Nor does it follow that, because things Divine are foreshadowed by the petty things of human life, the nature of things Divine is petty too. What that nature is has often been prefigured by the shadowy outlines of the types. For a type is a pictorial representation of things expected, and an anticipatory indication of the future. For example, Adam was a type of Him that was to come,\* and the rock was typically Christ,† and the water from the rock ‡ was a type of the quickening efficacy of the Word. ‘For if any one,’ says our Lord, ‘thirst, let him come unto Me and drink.’§ And the manna is a type of the living bread that came down from heaven ||; and the serpent fastened upon the pole is a type of the saving passion of Him who was perfected through the cross, wherefore all who looked at it were saved.¶ In the same way the history of the deliverance of Israel is intended to represent the fortunes of those who are saved through baptism.\*\* For the firstborn of the Israelites were preserved, as are also the bodies of the

\* Rom. v. 14.

§ John vii. 37.

¶ Numb. xxi. 9.

† 1 Cor. x. 4.

|| Deut. viii. 3; John vi. 41.

\*\* Exod. xii. 13.

‡ Exod. xvii. 6.

baptized, grace being given to those who have been signed with the blood. For the blood of the lamb is a type of the blood of Christ; and the firstborn a type of the first man created, who of necessity subsists in us and propagates himself by his successors unto the end; and thus it comes to pass that in Adam we all die,\* and death reigned until the fulfilling of the law, and the appearing of Christ. But the firstborn were preserved by God, that the destroyer might not touch them, to show that we who have been made alive in Christ no longer die in Adam. The sea and the cloud at the time led to faith through the astonishment of the beholders; but in respect of the future they typically indicated beforehand the grace that would be. 'Who is wise, and he shall understand these things?' †—how the sea separating the Israelites from Pharaoh is typically baptism, inasmuch as this laver also separates from the tyranny of the devil. The sea slew the enemy in itself; and here our enmity towards God dies also. The people emerged therefrom uninjured; we, too, ascend from the water alive as it were from the dead, 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 through the mortification of our members.

32. What then? Because we were figuratively baptized into Moses, does it follow that the grace of baptism is small? In this way,

\* 1 Cor. xv. 22.

† Hos. xiv. 9.



all our other ordinances will be unimportant, if we allow their dignity to be prejudiced by their respective types. The love of God towards men, although He gave His Only-Begotten Son for our sins, would not be exceedingly great, since Abraham also did not spare his own son ; \* nor would the passion of our Lord be glorious, since a ram instead of Isaac typified the offering ; † nor would His descent into Hades be fearful, since Jonas for three days and as many nights in former times adequately typified death. ‡ Now this is just what happens in the case of baptism when we compare the reality with the shadow, and set the antitypes side by side with the types themselves, and attempt by means of Moses and the sea to rend in pieces the whole dispensation of the Gospel. For what remission of sins, what renewal of life, is there in the sea ? What spiritual gift is communicated through Moses ? what death of sin ? They did not die with Christ, and therefore neither were they raised with Him. § They did not bear the image of the heavenly, || they did not bear about in the body the death of Jesus, ¶ they did not put off the old man, they did not put on the new man which is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of Him that created him. \*\* Why then do you compare baptisms which have only the name in common, but which are in fact

\* Gen. xxii. 16.

† Gen. xxii. 13.

‡ Jonah i. 17.

§ Rom. vi. 8.

|| 1 Cor. xv. 49.

¶ 2 Cor. iv. 10.

\*\* Col. iii. 9, 10.

as widely different as a dream from truth, or shadows and images from realities?

33. Moreover, belief in Moses does not prove our belief in the Spirit to be of little value, but, according to their reasoning, it rather weakens our confession of faith in the God of the universe. For it is said that the people believed God and Moses His servant.\* Moses, then, is joined with God, not with the Spirit, and he was a figure not of the Spirit, but of Christ: so that he himself, in the ministration of the law, prefigured the Mediator between God and men.† For Moses was not a type of the Spirit when he mediated for the people in things pertaining to God. For a law was given, ordained by angels, in the hand of a mediator ‡ (Moses, that is), in accordance with the invitation of the people who said, ‘Speak thou with us, and let not God speak with us.’§ So that faith in Moses becomes faith in our Lord, the Mediator between God and men, who said, ‘If ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me.’|| Are we to say, then, that faith in our Lord is of slight importance because it was foreshadowed through Moses? It follows that baptismal grace received from the Spirit is not to be despised, even if a man were baptized into Moses. At the same time, I might urge that it is customary for Scripture when it speaks of Moses to mean the law, as for

\* Exod. xiv. 31.      † 1 Tim. ii. 5.      ‡ Gal. iii. 19.  
 § Exod. xx. 19.      || John v. 46

example, they have Moses and the prophets.\* And when the Apostle says, 'They were baptized into Moses,' † his meaning is the baptism of the law. Why then do they use types and shadows to slander the truth, and make contemptible the glorying of our hope, and the rich gift of our God and Saviour, who through regeneration reneweth our youth like that of an eagle? Surely it is absolutely infantile and worthy of a child who must be really fed on milk, to be ignorant of the great mystery of our salvation—that just as we received our earliest instruction, so, in exercising unto godliness and going on unto perfection, we were first trained by lessons easy to apprehend and suited to our intelligence. He who regulates our lives deals with us as with those who have been reared in darkness, and gradually accustoms our eyes to the light of truth. For He spares our weakness, and in the depth of the riches of His wisdom and the unsearchable judgments of His understanding adopts this gentle treatment, so well adapted to our needs, accustoming us first to see the shadows of objects, and to look at the sun's reflection in water, so that we may not suddenly be blinded by exposure to the pure light. By parity of reason, the law, being a shadow of things to come, ‡ and the typical teaching of the prophets, which is the truth darkly, have been devised as exercises for the eyes of the heart, inasmuch as it will be easy for us to

\* Luke xvi. 29.

† 1 Cor. x. 2.

‡ Heb. x. 1.

pass from these to the wisdom hidden in mystery. So much then concerning types. For we may not tarry longer here, otherwise the episode will occupy much more space than the main argument.

xv. 34. What else will our opponents say? They abound in solutions of the difficulty. They tell us that we are baptized into water, and we should not dream of honouring the water more than all creation, nor do we make it partaker of the honour due to the Father and the Son. These are the words of angry men, who having their minds darkened by passion, spare no means if they can avenge themselves on him who has offended them. We shall not, however, shrink from discussing their views, for either we shall teach the ignorant, or shall show a bold front to evil doers. But let us go back some little distance.

35. The dispensation of our God and Saviour relating to man consists in a restoration from the effects of the fall, and in returning to intimate relations with God after the alienation which resulted through disobedience. Hence the coming of Christ in the flesh, the pattern life of the Gospels, our Lord's sufferings, His cross, burial, and resurrection; so that the man who is being saved through the imitation of Christ receives the adoption of the days of old. Now for perfection of life we must not only copy the

patterns of gentleness, lowliness, and long suffering which Christ set us in His life, but we must also follow the example of His death. Paul, the imitator of Christ, speaks of 'being conformed to His death, if by any means I may attain to the resurrection from the dead.'\* How then do we come to be in the likeness of His death? By being buried with Him through baptism. But how are we buried? And what advantage is derived from the imitation? In the first place, the course of the former life must be interrupted. But this is impossible for one who has not been born again, as our Lord said. For regeneration, as the very name shows, is the beginning of a second life. So that before we begin the second, we must put an end to the first. Just as when runners in the double course turn the post there is a sort of pause and rest between the contrary movements, so in changing our lives it seemed necessary that death should separate the two, ending what goes before, but beginning that which comes after. How, then, do we accomplish the descent into Hades? By imitating the burial of Christ by means of baptism. It is as if the bodies of the baptized were buried in the water. Baptism symbolically represents the putting away of the works of the flesh, according to the Apostle's words, 'Ye were circumcised with a circumcision made without hands, in the putting off the body of the

\* Phil. iii. 10, 11.

flesh, in the circumcision of Christ, being buried with Him in baptism.\* And there is, as it were, a cleansing of the soul from the filth attaching to it through the fleshly mind, according as it is written, 'Thou shalt wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.'† Hence it is that we do not, like the Jews, wash ourselves for every defilement, but we know one saving baptism; for there is one death on behalf of the world, and one resurrection from the dead, and of these baptism is the type. Wherefore the Lord, who ordereth our life, made with us the covenant of baptism, which involves a figure of life and death: for the water adequately represents death, while the Spirit gives the earnest of life. And this clearly answers the question, Why was the water conjoined with the Spirit?‡ Because there are two ends proposed in baptism: on the one hand, the destruction of the body of sin, that it may no longer bear fruit unto death; on the other, that it may live to the Spirit, and have its fruit in sanctification. Now the water expresses the likeness of death, for it receives, as it were, the body into a tomb, but the Spirit is the source of the quickening power, by renewing our souls and bringing them from the deadness of sin into the life which was originally theirs. This, then, is to be born again of water and the Spirit,§ for death is effected in the

\* Col. ii. 11, 12.

† John iii. 5.

‡ Ps. li. 7.

§ John iii. 5.

water, but our life is wrought through the Spirit. The great mystery of baptism is therefore celebrated with three immersions,\* and the same number of invocations, that death may typically be fully represented, and the baptized by the delivery of the Divine knowledge may have their souls enlightened. So that if there be any grace in the water, it is not from the nature of the water, but from the presence of the Spirit. For baptism is not 'the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God.' † Therefore, by way of fitting us for the resurrection life, our Lord describes the whole of our conversation under the Gospel, and commands that our character be gentle, forbearing, undefiled by the love of pleasure, free from avarice; so that we may by anticipation and of deliberate choice attain to the natural endowments of the world to come. Therefore, if any one were to maintain that the Gospel prefigures the resurrection life, I should not think him far wrong. Now let us return.

36. Through the Holy Spirit we are restored to paradise, ascend to the kingdom of heaven, recover the adoption of sons, may boldly call God our own Father, are made partakers of the grace of Christ, are called children of light, partake of eternal glory, and, in a word, enjoy the fulness of blessing both in this world and in that which is to come;

\* Note 12.

† 1 Peter iii. 21.

the rich treasures of the promises are ours, and through faith we have the fruition of them, as if they were present, since we see the grace as in a mirror. For if the earnest be what it is, what must the perfection be? And if the firstfruits be so great, what the realization of the whole? Moreover, the difference between the grace of the Spirit and the baptism by water is known from the fact that John baptized with water unto repentance, but our Lord Jesus Christ with the Holy Ghost. 'For I,' says John, 'baptize you with water unto repentance, but He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose sandals I am not worthy to bear; He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.'\* By the baptism of fire he means the testing in the judgment, as says the Apostle, 'The fire itself shall prove each man's work of what sort it is.' † And again, 'For the day shall declare it, because it is revealed in fire.' ‡ But already there are some who in their struggles for godliness have really, and not only by way of imitation, suffered death for Christ. They had no need of the symbolical water, for they were baptized in their own blood.§ And I do not say this to depreciate the baptism by water, but to overthrow the reasoning of those who exalt themselves against the Spirit, joining together things which must be kept apart, and finding analogies where no parallel exists.

\* Matt. iii. 11.

‡ 1 Cor. iii, 13.

† 1 Cor. iii. 13.

§ Note 13.



37. Let us, then, go back to what was laid down at the beginning, that in all respects the Spirit is inseparable and utterly incapable of severance from the Father and the Son. In the passage which treats of the gift of tongues, Paul, writing to the Corinthians says, 'If ye all prophesy, and there come in one unbelieving or unlearned, he is reprov'd by all, he is judg'd by all; the secrets of his heart are made manifest; and so he will fall down on his face and worship God, declaring that God is among you indeed.'\* If, then, by prophetic utterances according to the distribution of the gifts of the Spirit, God is known to be in the prophets, let our opponents consider what place they will assign to the Holy Spirit: whether they will more justly rank Him with God, or banish Him to the level of creation. And Peter's words to Sapphira, 'Why have ye agreed together to tempt the Holy Ghost? Ye have not lied unto men, but unto God,' † show that sins against God are also sins against the Holy Ghost. And thus you may be instructed that the Spirit is conjoined with and inseparable from the Father and the Son in every operation. When God worketh diversities of workings, and the Lord diversities of ministrations, the Holy Ghost is also present, dispensing and distributing the gifts of His own authority and according to the dignity of the individual. 'For there are,' Paul says,

XVI.

\* I Cor. xiv. 24, 25.

† Acts v. 9, 4.

‘ diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God who worketh all things in all. But all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as He will.’\* We must not, however, suppose because the Apostle here mentions the Spirit first, and the Son second, and God the Father third, that the order at the present day is quite reversed. For he adapted himself to our ways :—When we receive gifts, we first meet with him who distributes them, then think of the sender, then carry back our thoughts to the author and giver of the good things.

38. We may learn that the Spirit has fellowship with the Father and the Son even from the first works of creation. For the pure, intellectual, and supramundane powers both are and are called holy, inasmuch as through the grace given by the Holy Spirit they have holiness. We hear nothing as to the mode of the creation of the heavenly powers; for the historian of creation revealed the Creator by sensible objects only. But do you who can from things visible infer things invisible, glorify the Maker by whom all things were created, whether visible or invisible, whether principalities, or authorities, or powers, or thrones, or dominions,† or if there be any other rational creatures whose

\* I Cor. xii. 4-11.

† Col. i. 16.

natures we know not? And in the creation of these consider, I pray you, the original cause of existing things, namely, the Father; the creating cause, the Son; the perfecting cause, the Spirit; so that by the will of the Father ministering spirits subsist, by the working of the Son they are brought into being, and by the presence of the Spirit they are perfected. But the perfection of angels is sanctification and continuance therein.

And no one must suppose me either to say there are three original hypostases,\* or to allege the working of the Son to be imperfect. For there is one Source of things that are, creating through the Son, and perfecting in the Spirit. And neither is the working of the Father, who worketh all things in all, imperfect, nor does the creation of the Son lack aught unless it be perfected by the Spirit. Thus the Father, who creates by merely willing to do so, would not need the Son, but He nevertheless wills through the Son; nor would the Son, who works after the likeness of the Father, need assistance, but He also wills to make perfect through the Spirit. For 'by the word of the Lord were the heavens made firm, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth.'† The Word, then, is not an expressive sign, an intelligible impress left upon the air by the organs of speech, nor is the Spirit breath of the mouth from the organs of respiration; but the Word

\* See Note 23.

† Psa. xxxiii. 6.

is He who was with God in the beginning, and is God ; \* and the Spirit of the mouth of God is the Spirit of truth who proceedeth from the Father. †

So you see there are three, the Lord who commands, the Word who creates, the Spirit who confirms. And what else is this *confirming* but perfecting in holiness ? The Word expresses constancy, unchangeableness, and unshaken fixity in goodness. But there is no sanctification without the Spirit. For the heavenly powers are not holy by nature : they would then be nowise different from the Holy Spirit ; but in proportion to their relative excellence they have a measure of sanctification from the Spirit. For as we conceive of a branding iron along with fire, and yet the material is one thing, the fire another, so also in the case of the heavenly powers their essence is, it may be, an aerial spirit, or immaterial fire, according as it is written, ‘ Who maketh His angels spirits, and His ministers a flame of fire ; ’ ‡ wherefore they are limited by space, become visible, and show themselves to the worthy in their own bodily form. But sanctification, which is no part of the essence, constitutes their perfection through fellowship with the Spirit. And they keep their rank by persevering in goodness, for though masters of their own choice, they never falter in their devotion to Him who is really good. So that if you argue the Spirit away, the angel bands

\* John i. 1.

† John xv. 26.

‡ Psa. civ. 4.

are broken up, the archangels' authority is destroyed, and all is confusion: their life is unregulated, undisciplined, unsettled.

How can the angels say, 'Glory to God in the highest,'\* if they are not enabled by the Spirit? For 'no one can say that Jesus is the Lord except by the Holy Ghost, and no one speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus anathema,'† which is what would be said by the wicked and antagonistic spirits whose fall substantiates our argument, that the invisible powers have free will, and incline equally to virtue and to vice, and therefore need the help of the Spirit. When Gabriel foretells the future, I say it is only by the foreknowledge of the Spirit, because prophecy is one of the gifts which the Spirit distributes. And who but the Holy Spirit gave wisdom to him who was commanded to announce the mysteries of the vision to the man greatly beloved,‡ and enabled him to teach hidden things?

The revelation of mysteries belongs properly to the Spirit, according as it is written, 'God hath revealed them to us through the Spirit.'§ But how could thrones, and dominions, and principalities, and authorities live the life of happiness, were it not that they ever behold the face of their Father in heaven?|| But there is no vision without the aid of the Spirit. For as at night, if you leave the house in darkness, the eyes are blind and the faculties inactive, and the value of things is

\* Luke ii. 14.      † 1 Cor. xii. 3.      ‡ Dan. x. 11.  
§ 1 Cor. ii. 10.      || Matt. xviii. 10.

not discerned, but gold and iron are trodden on alike through ignorance, so in the order of spiritual things it is impossible for that law-abiding life to continue without the Spirit, any more than an army can maintain discipline in the absence of its commander, or a chorus preserve harmony without the control of its leader. How could the Seraphim say, 'Holy, Holy, Holy,' \* if they were not taught by the Spirit how often piety would have this doxology repeated? Whether, then, all the angels of God praise Him, and all His powers praise Him, it is through the co-operation of the Spirit; or if a thousand thousand angels stand beside Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand ministering spirits, it is by the power of the Spirit that they blamelessly perform their proper functions. The ineffable harmony of highest heaven, both in the service of God and in the mutual concord of the supramundane powers, cannot possibly be maintained except by the directing influence of the Spirit. Thus, then, is the Holy Spirit present at their creation with those beings who are not perfected by degrees, but are at once created perfect, bestowing His own grace for the perfecting and completing of their essence.

39. And as for dispensations relating to man, in which the agents are the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ according to the goodness of God, who will deny that they are fulfilled through the grace of the Spirit? If

\* Isa. vi. 3.

you will look at the things of old, the blessings on the patriarchs, the help that was given through the law, the types, the prophecies, the heroic feats of warfare, the miracles wrought by the righteous; or if you turn to the events which accompanied the dispensation of the Incarnation of our Lord, all was done through the Spirit. For in the first place He was united with the very flesh of our Lord, being that wherewith He was anointed, and inseparably present, according as it is written, 'Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon Him, the same is My beloved Son';\* and, 'Jesus of Nazareth, whom God anointed with the Holy Ghost.'† In all His subsequent action the Spirit was present. He was with our Lord when He was tempted by the devil. 'For Jesus,' we are told, 'was led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted.'‡ And He was His inseparable companion in working miracles. 'If I,' says our Lord, 'cast out devils by the Spirit of God.'§ Nor did the Spirit forsake Him after He rose from the dead. For when our Lord, by way of renewing man, and restoring the lost grace wherewith God inspired His creature, breathed into the face of the disciples, what did He say? 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted, and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.'|| And is not the Church

\* John i. 33.            † Acts x. 38.            ‡ Matt. iv. 1.  
§ Matt. xii. 28.            || John xx. 22, 23.

clearly and beyond contradiction governed and preserved through the Spirit? For 'He gave,' says Paul, 'first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, divers kinds of tongues.'\* This order has been formulated according to the distribution of the gifts of the Spirit.

40. And if you weigh the matter carefully, you will find that even at the time of the expected appearing of the Lord from heaven, the Holy Spirit will not be without a part, as some suppose. But He will be present also in the day of His revelation, that day in which the blessed and only Potentate will judge the world in righteousness. For who is so ignorant of the good things prepared by God for those who are worthy of them, as not to know that the crown of the righteous is the grace of the Spirit, which is then given more abundantly and in greater perfection, when spiritual glory is distributed to every one in proportion to his good deeds? In the splendid future of the saints there are many mansions with the Father,† that is to say, differences of rank. 'For as one star differs from another star in glory, so also is the resurrection of the dead.' ‡ Those, therefore, who have been sealed with the Holy Spirit unto the day of redemption, and who have preserved pure and undiminished the firstfruits of the Spirit which they received, these are

\* 1 Cor. xii. 28. † John xiv. 2. ‡ 1 Cor. xv. 41, 42.



they who will hear the words, 'Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things.'\* And in the same way, those who have grieved the Holy Spirit by the wickedness of their lives, or who have not traded with that which was given them, shall be deprived of that which they received, and the grace shall be transferred to others: or, as one of the Evangelists says,† they shall be cut asunder, by which we must understand that they will be utterly dissevered from the Spirit. For the meaning is not that the body is divided, one part being given up to punishment, the other released. It is a fable, and unworthy of the righteous Judge, that when the whole has sinned the punishment should be confined to half. Nor is the soul cut in two, for the whole soul was pervaded by the affection for sin, and was associated with the body in doing evil. But the cutting asunder, as I said, is the perpetual alienation of the soul from the Spirit. For now, though the Spirit be not closely connected with the unworthy, yet in some way He seems to be present with those who have been sealed once for all, awaiting their conversion and salvation. But then He will be altogether cut off from the soul which has profaned His grace. Wherefore there is in Hades none that giveth thanks, nor in death that remembereth God,‡ since the assisting

\* Matt. xxv. 21.

† Matt. xxiv. 51.

‡ Psa. vi. 5.

Spirit is no longer present. How, let me ask, can we conceive judgments executed without the Holy Spirit, whereas the Word shows that He is the reward itself of the righteous, when that which is perfect is given instead of the earnest, and the chief condemnation of sinners, when they are stripped even of what they seem to have? But the chief proof of the conjunction of the Spirit with the Father and the Son is this—that He is said to be so related to the Father as our own spirits are to each of us. ‘For who among men,’ says Paul, ‘knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man which is in him? Even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God.’\* So much for this point.

XVII. 41. But what it is they call ‘sub-numeration,’ and what meaning they attach to the term, is difficult even to imagine. That it is an importation from the wisdom of the world † everybody knows; but let us consider whether it has any peculiar bearing on our subject. Now these clever triflers say that some names are general, ‡ and of wide denotation, while others are more specific, and that some have a more limited application than others. For example, substance is a general name applicable to all things, animate and inanimate alike; but

\* 1 Cor. ii. 11.

† Note 14.

‡ Note 15.

animal is more specific, being predicated of fewer subjects than the former, though it has a wider denotation than those which are related to it, as species to genus. For it comprehends both rational and irrational natures. Again, man is more specific than animal, and a man than man, and the individual Peter, Paul, or John than a man. This, then, is their conception of 'sub-numeration'—the division of the genus into the subordinate species? But I should be reluctant to believe that they had reached such a pitch of madness as to say that the God of the universe, like a common quality, which is a mere abstraction, and has no personal existence, admits of subordinate divisions,\* and then that this subdivision is also called sub-numeration. Surely a madman would not venture to say this. For beside the impiety of such a doctrine, they furnish an argument to refute their own principles, inasmuch as they maintain that the subdivisions and the thing divided have a common essence. But the absurdity is so transparent that words seem to fail us, and we are at a loss to know how to attack their folly. Thus their foolishness looks like a real gain to them. For just as it is impossible to strike soft and yielding bodies with force because they offer no resistance, so when a thing is clearly absurd, it is incapable of vigorous refutation. The only way is to let their abominable impiety pass in silence. But love

\* Note 16.

for the brethren, and the importunity of the adversary, will not allow me to be silent.

42. What is their contention? See how they express their imposture. 'We maintain that co-numeration suits things equal in honour; but sub-numeration things relatively inferior.' And why in the world do you say so? I do not understand this curious wisdom. Do you mean that gold is numbered *with* gold, while lead is unworthy of being so numbered, but on account of its cheapness is numbered *under* gold? And do you attach so much importance to arithmetic that it can enhance the value of what is common, or diminish the worth of what is precious? You ought consistently to number gold under precious stones, and such stones as are inferior in size and lustre under those which excel in magnitude and brilliancy. But what is it that men will not say who spend their time in nothing else but saying or learning some new thing? Let the patrons of ungodliness be henceforth classed with Stoics and Epicureans. For how can things of little value be 'numbered under' things more precious? How can a brass obolus be 'numbered under' a golden stater? 'Because,' our opponents reply, 'we do not say we have *two* coins, but we take them separately—one of each kind.' Which, then, of these is 'numbered under' the other? For both were spoken of in the same way. If you count each separately by itself, you make them of equal value by counting them in the same way; but if you join them together, you

again make them of the same value by reckoning them with one another. But if the sub- numeration belongs to whichever is counted second, it is open to the reckoner to begin to reckon with the brass coin. Let us, however, postpone the refutation of their ignorance, and now turn to the main argument.

43. Do you say that the Son is numbered under the Father, and the Spirit under the Son, or do you restrict the phrase to the Spirit only? For if you apply it to the Son also, you revive the old and impious doctrine of the unlikeness of the substance, the inferiority of rank, the birth in time, and in short by this one phrase you will evidently once more bring to the front all blasphemies which have been uttered against the Only-Begotten. It would be going beyond my present purpose to oppose these impious tenets, and all the more because elsewhere we have to the best of our ability refuted them.\* But if sub-numeration be considered proper for the Spirit only, let me tell those who take this view that the Spirit and our Lord are spoken of together, just as are the Son and the Father. For there is no difference in the delivery of the names of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. As, then, the Son is to the Father, so is the Spirit to the Son, according to the baptismal formula.† But if the Spirit be co-ordinate with the Son, and the Son with the Father, it

\* In the treatise against Eunomius.

† Matt. xxviii. 19.

clearly follows that so also is the Spirit co-ordinate with the Father. How, then, can it be said that the one is numbered *with*, the other numbered *under*, when the names are placed in the same class? In fact, is there anything in the world which ever lost its own nature through being numbered? Is it not the case that things numbered remain what they originally were, and that number is a device of our own to indicate a multitude of objects? Some bodies we count, others we measure, or weigh. Such as have continuity we measure; those which are by nature separate we count, such excepted as owing to their minute subdivision must be measured; while heavy things we judge with the scales. It does not therefore follow that because we have invented for ourselves signs of quantity, we have changed the nature of things. As, then, we do not *weigh under* one another things that are weighed, even though one be gold and the other tin, nor *measure under* things that are measured, so neither do we *number under* \* things that are numbered. But if nothing else admits of this sub-numeration, how are they justified in saying that sub-numeration is appropriate to the Spirit? The fact is that, smitten with this Grecian brain-sickness, they fancy sub-numeration is characteristic

\* Or (nearly) ~~As~~ 'As then we do not subordinate to one another things weighed. . . . nor things measured, so neither do we subordinate to one another things numbered.'

of things in a descending scale of rank or essence.

44. When our Lord delivered the formula of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,\* the gift was not accompanied by any reference to numbers. For He did not say, Baptize them into first, second, and third ; nor into one, two, and three ; but by means of the holy names He bestowed the knowledge of the faith which leads to salvation. So that what saves us is faith ; but number is a device to indicate the quantity of things. And yet our opponents, who bring ruin on themselves in every possible way, turn the faculty of number against the faith ; for though nothing else be changed by association in a series, they are afraid of number in the case of the Divine essence, lest through it they may unduly honour the Paraclete. But, my learned friends, you must allow that things beyond our reach are utterly incapable of being numbered ; just as the old Hebrew piety by peculiar characters expressed the unutterable name of God, and thus showed its pre-eminence. If, however, we must employ numbers, let us at all events beware of injuring the truth. Either let things ineffable be honoured by silence, or let holy things be numbered with piety. There is one God and Father, and one Only-Begotten

XVIII.

\* Matt. xxviii. 19.

Son, and one Holy Spirit. We proclaim each of the Persons by Himself; but when enumeration is necessary, we are not so ignorant as to be led into imagining more Gods than one.

45. For we do not reckon them in a progressive series, and proceed from one to many; we do not say one, two, three, nor first, second, third: 'For I, God, am the first, and I am the last.'\* We have never yet heard of a second God; for when we worship God of God, we confess the distinction of persons, and are true to the unity of essence. We do not scatter the Divine nature into a multitude of disconnected personalities, because, if I may so speak, one form, portrayed in the unchangeable Godhead, is seen in God the Father and God the Only-Begotten. For the Son is in the Father, and the Father in the Son; because such as is the Father, such is the Son; and such as is the Son, such is the Father; and herein consists the unity. So that as regards the distinction of persons we think of them severally, but as regards community of nature they are both one. How, then, if we think of them severally, can we say they are not two Gods? Because we speak of a king and the portrait of a king, but not of two kings, for the power is not divided, nor the glory distributed. For as the sovereignty and the authority over us is one, so also we have one doxology, not many,

\* Isa. xliv. 6.



because the honour paid to the portrait extends to the original.\* Now what resemblance makes the portrait to be in the one case, that the Son is naturally in the other. And as in works of art there is a similarity of form, so with regard to the Divine and un-compounded nature, union consists in the communion of the Godhead. The Holy Spirit is also one, and is Himself separately announced, being conjoined with the one Father through the one Son, and through Himself completing the adorable and blessed Trinity; and His intimate union with the Father and the Son is sufficiently clear from the fact that He is not ranked with the multitude of created beings, but is spoken of by Himself. For He is not one of many, but He is one. For as there is one Father and one Son, so also is there one Holy Spirit. He is therefore as far removed from created nature as that which is simple reasonably is from compound bodies, and such as admit of multiplication; but He is as closely united with the Father and the Son as unity is related to unity.

46. And the evidence of the community of nature does not rest upon this reasoning only, but there is also the fact that He is said to be from God, not as the universe is from God, but inasmuch as He proceeded† from God, not by generation‡ as did the Son, but as the Spirit of His mouth. The mouth, however,

\* Note 17.

† Note 18.

‡ Note 19.

is as far as possible from being a member of a body, or the Spirit fleeting breath ; but the word mouth is used in a sense suitable to God, and the Spirit is a living substance, having the power of sanctification ; and thus His fellowship is indicated, while the mode of His ineffable subsistence is guarded. But He is also called the Spirit of Christ, as being His own by nature. Wherefore 'if any one have not the Spirit of Christ, he is not His.\*' Hence it is that the Spirit only worthily glorifies the Lord. 'He shall glorify Me,'† says Christ, not as creation, but as the Spirit of truth, by clearly showing that the truth is in Himself ; and as the Spirit of wisdom in His own greatness revealing Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. And as Comforter He expresses in Himself the goodness of the Comforter who sent Him, and by His own high rank He shows the majesty of Him from whom He proceeded. Now, there is a natural glory, as the light is the glory of the sun ; and there is a derived glory which is with deliberate judgment bestowed on the worthy. And this last is twofold. 'A son,' says the Scripture, 'will glorify his father, and a slave his master.‡' Now the glory which is given by creation is that of the slave, but, if I may so speak, that of an intimate companion is given by the Spirit. For as our Lord said concerning Himself, 'I glorified Thee on the earth, I accomplished the work

\* Rom. viii. 9.

† John xvi. 14.

‡ Malachi i. 6.

which Thou gavest Me to do.\* So concerning the Comforter He says, 'He shall glorify Me, for He shall take of Mine, and shall declare it unto you.'† And as the Son is glorified by the Father, who says, 'I have both glorified it and will glorify it again,'‡ so the Spirit is glorified through His fellowship with the Father and the Son, and through the witness of the Only-Begotten, who says, 'Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven.'§

47. And when, enlightened and endued with power, we gaze upon the beauty of the image of the invisible God, and through the image are led on to the more than beautiful vision of the archetype, we have, I suppose, for our inseparable companion the Spirit of knowledge, who in Himself bestows on those who love to contemplate the truth the power of beholding the image, for He does not direct by means external to Himself, but in His own person conducts to perfect knowledge. For as 'No one knows the Father save the Son,'|| so 'No one can say Jesus is the Lord but in the Holy Spirit.'¶ He does not say *through* the Spirit, but *in* the Spirit; and God is Spirit; and 'those who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth,'\*\* as it is written, 'In Thy light shall we see light,'††

\* John xvii. 4.      † John xvi. 14.      ‡ John xii. 28.  
 § Matt. xii. 31.    || Matt. xi. 27.      ¶ 1 Cor. xii. 3.  
 \*\* John iv. 24.      †† Psa. xxxvi. 9.

that is, in the illumination of the Spirit we shall see the 'true light which lighteth every man coming into the world.\*' So that in Himself He shows the glory of the Only-Begotten, and on true worshippers He bestows in Himself the knowledge of God. So the way to the knowledge of God is from one Spirit through the one Son to the one Father. And again, the natural goodness, and the natural sanctification, and the royal rank begin with the Father and reach the Spirit through the Only-Begotten. Thus we confess the Persons, and at the same time preserve intact the godly doctrine of the *Monarchia*.† But those who assert the doctrine of sub-numeration by speaking of first, second, and third, must know that they are grafting the error of heathen polytheism into the undefiled theology of Christianity. For the only result of the evil device of sub-numeration is that we are compelled to confess a first, a second, and a third God. But we are satisfied with the order prescribed by our Lord, and he who disturbs that order will be no less guilty than those impious heretics to whom we have referred.

Enough has been said to prove that the community of nature is not in the least invalidated, as they erroneously maintain, by the method of sub-numeration. But let us yield a point to our contentious and weak-minded opponent, and allow that his sub-numeration implies a first and second. Let

\* John i. 9.

† Notes 20 and 21.

us then see what results from so speaking. 'The first man,' he says, 'is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven.'\* And elsewhere, 'That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; then that which is spiritual.'† If, then, the second is reckoned under the first, and that which is lower in the series is less honourable than the term above it, it follows according to you that the spiritual is less honourable than the natural, and the heavenly than the man of the earth.

48. That may be, it is replied, but the glory due to the Spirit  
XIX.  
is by no means such as to warrant us in extolling Him with doxologies. How then shall we prove the dignity of the Spirit, which passes understanding, if our antagonists will not allow His fellowship with the Father and the Son to be trustworthy evidence of His rank? At all events we can turn our eyes to what is implied by His titles, and to the vastness of His operations, and the benefits bestowed on us, or rather on all creation, and thus form some idea of the nobility of His nature and of His unapproachable might. He is called a Spirit. For instance, 'God is a Spirit.'‡ And, 'The Spirit of our nostrils, the anointed Lord.'§ He is holy, as the Father

\* 1 Cor. xv. 47. † 1 Cor. xv. 46. ‡ John iv. 24.

§ Lament. iv. 20 (Rev. Version, 'The breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the Lord,' *i.e.* Zedekiah).

is holy, and the Son is holy. In the case of creation, sanctification is an addition from without ; in the case of the Spirit, holiness is the complement of His nature. Wherefore we do not find Him being sanctified, but sanctifying. He is good, as the Father is good, and as He that was begotten of the good Father is good, and He has essential goodness. He is upright, as the Lord God is upright,\* because He is very truth, and very righteousness, incapable of turning† or inclining to one side or the other, inasmuch as His essence‡ is unchangeable. He is called Comforter, as is the Only-Begotten, according to our Lord's own words, 'I will ask My Father, and He shall give you another Comforter.'§ Thus the names given to the Spirit are the same as those borne by the Father and the Son, and He derives these titles from the close affinity of His nature to theirs. From what other source can they come? Again He is called a princely Spirit, and a Spirit of truth, and a Spirit of wisdom. Also 'the Spirit of God that made me.'|| And, says the Scripture, 'God filled Bezaleel with a Divine Spirit of wisdom, and understanding, and knowledge.'¶ Such names as these are great and noble, and yet do not exaggerate His glory.

49. But what are His operations? Ineffable for greatness, and innumerable for multitude. For what conception can we

\* Psa. xcii. 15.

† Note 22.

‡ Note 23.

§ John xiv. 16.

|| Job xxxiii. 4.

¶ Exod. xxxi. 3.

have of that which transcends all time? What were His operations before the invisible creation came into being? how vast His favours to creation? and what His influence in the coming ages? For He existed, and pre-existed, and was present with the Father and the Son before the ages. So that, even if you conceive something beyond the ages, you will find it later in time than the Spirit.

And if you think of creation, the powers of heaven were established by the Spirit, by which we are to understand they were created with a fixed and settled habit of goodness. For from the Spirit the powers have their close relationship with God, their incapability of change to wickedness, the perpetuity of their blessedness. Christ comes, the Spirit is His forerunner. He is present in the flesh, the Spirit is inseparable from Him. There are workings of miracles, gifts of healing, through the Holy Spirit. Demons were driven out by the Spirit of God. The devil was stripped of his power in the presence of the Spirit. Remission of sins is effected by the grace of the Spirit. For 'ye were washed and sanctified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost.\*' Union with God is through the Spirit, for 'God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts crying, Abba, Father.'† The resurrection from the dead is by the working of the Spirit, for 'Thou wilt send out Thy Spirit, and they

\* I Cor. vi. 11.

† Gal. iv. 6.

shall be made, and Thou wilt renew the face of the earth.\* If by creation be here intended the restoration of the dead to life, how mighty must be the working of the Spirit who dispenses to us the resurrection life, and attunes our souls to that spiritual life! Or if by creation be meant a change for the better on the part of those who have here fallen through sin (a frequent use of the word in Scripture, as when Paul says, 'If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature' †), and consequent renewal in this world, and translation from the earthly, restless life to the heavenly conversation which is ours through the Spirit, we rise to the top of admiration. With these facts before us, ought we to be afraid of paying extravagant honour to the Spirit? or, on the contrary, ought we to fear lest our conception of Him be too low, even though we seem to utter the highest eulogy human thought can frame, or the tongue of man express? In what follows, the Spirit speaks with the authority of the Lord Himself: 'Get thee down, and go with them, nothing doubting, for I have sent them.' ‡ These are surely not the words of one who cowers in subjection. 'Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.' § Can this be the utterance of a slave? And Isaiah says, 'The Lord hath sent me and His Spirit.' || And 'The Spirit descended from the Lord

\* Psa. civ. 30.      † 2 Cor. v. 17.      ‡ Acts x. 20.  
§ Acts xiii. 2.      || Isa. xlvi. 16.



and led them.'\* And pray do not perversely interpret the leading as a piece of undignified service. For upon the evidence of the Word it is God's work. 'Thou leddest Thy people like a flock;' † and, 'He that leadeth Joseph like a flock;' ‡ 'He led them in hope, and they were not afraid.' § So, then, when you hear it said that 'When the Comforter is come, He shall put you in remembrance, and shall lead you into all the truth,' || understand the 'leading' as you have been taught: deal honestly with the thought.

50. But, it will be said, He intercedes for us. ¶ Now, however far the suppliant is inferior to the benefactor, so far does the dignity of the Spirit fall short of that of God. But have you never heard that the Only-Begotten is on the right hand of God, and intercedes for us? \*\* Do not then, because the Spirit is in you (if indeed He is at all in you), and because He opens our blinded eyes and teaches us to choose the good, do not on this account suffer yourself to lose that opinion of Him which is most consonant with piety and holiness. For it would be extreme insensibility to make the loving tenderness of our benefactor an occasion of ingratitude. Grieve not, then, the Holy Spirit. †† Hear what Stephen, the firstfruits of the martyrs, says, while he reproaches the disobedience and

\* Isa. lxiii. 14, Sept. † Psa. lxxvii. 20. ‡ Psa. lxxx. 1.

§ Psa. lxxviii. 53, Sept. || John xiv. 26; xvi. 13.

¶ Rom. viii. 34. \*\* Rom. viii. 34. †† Eph. iv. 30.

rebellion of the people. 'Ye do always,' he says, 'resist the Holy Ghost.'\* And again Isaiah says, 'They provoked His Holy Spirit, and He was turned to be their enemy.' † And elsewhere, 'The house of Jacob angered the Spirit of the Lord.' ‡ Tell me whether such passages as these do not indicate authoritative power. I leave it to the judgment of any one who hears them to say what our views ought to be. Shall we regard the Spirit as an instrument, an inferior, on a level with creation, and our fellow servant? or shall we say that the mere words sound like grievous blasphemy in the ears of the godly? Do you call the Spirit a servant? But 'the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth;' § while the Spirit so knoweth the things of God as the spirit of a man knoweth what is in him. ||

XX. 51. But, say they, the Spirit is neither slave, nor master, but free. What marvellous stupidity, what pitiable audacity is implied in such an assertion! I hardly know which to lament most, their ignorance or their blasphemy. They degrade the doctrine of the Divine nature by parallels from human life, and endeavour to apply to the ineffable nature of God those distinctions

\* Acts vii. 51.

† Isa. lxiii. 10.

‡ Psa. cvi. 32.

§ John xv. 15.

|| 1 Cor. ii. 11.

and differences of rank with which we are familiar, not perceiving that no man is naturally a slave.\* For either men have been brought under the yoke of slavery by conquest, as is the case with captives taken in war; or they have been enslaved through poverty, as the Egyptians became Pharaoh's bond-servants; or, in accordance with a wise and mysterious dispensation, the inferiors in the family have been assigned by their father's command to the service of their wiser and better brethren, an arrangement which an unbiassed student of the facts would say was not a harsh sentence, but a positive benefit. It is better that he who through lack of intelligence has not in himself a natural power of command should belong to another, so that, directed by the reason of his master, he may be like a chariot with a driver, and a ship with a commander sitting at the helm. Wherefore Jacob by his father's blessing was made lord of Esau,† that the foolish son, being without his proper guardian, his reason, might, though he did not desire it, be benefited by the prudent one. And 'Canaan shall be a servant of servants unto his brethren,'‡ because he would not learn virtue, and was the son of an unwise father, Ham. Thus, then, do men become slaves in the world; but free men are they who escape poverty or war, or do not need the care of others. So that even though one be called master, and another servant, yet because

\* Note 24.

† Gen. xxvii. 37.

‡ Gen. ix. 25.

relatively to one another we are of equal honour, and inasmuch as we belong to Him who made us, we are all bond-servants alike. And in the unseen world what is there that you can exempt from bondage? for creation and the state of bondage began together. The heavenly existences have no covetous desires, and therefore do not rule one another; but all things bow to God, and give Him as Master the fear which is His due, and as Creator the glory which belongs to Him. For 'A son will glorify his father, and a servant his master.'\* And God demands of all one of these two. 'For if I am a Father, where,' He says, 'is My glory? and if I am a Master, where is My fear?'† Otherwise the life of all would be most pitiable, if it were not under the supervision of the Master. This is the condition of the revolted powers who stiffened their neck against God Almighty, and forsook their service, not that they were differently constituted, but because they were rebellious against their Maker. Whom then do you call free? Is it he who has no king? is it he who neither has the power to govern another nor will submit to be governed? But there is no such nature in existence, and to think this of the Spirit is manifest impiety. So that if He has been created, He is surely a servant like all the rest, 'For all things serve Thee.'‡ But if He be above creation, He shares the kingdom.

\* Malachi i. 6.

† Malachi i. 6.

‡ Psa. cxix. 91.

52. But what need is there to fight over trifling points like these, and so snatch a victory for our doctrine, when we may adduce grander proofs and show beyond dispute the surpassing excellence of the glory? Yet if we were to mention all that we have been taught by Scripture, the Pneumatomachs would perhaps quickly unite in crying us down, stop their ears, take up stones, or whatever came to hand for a weapon, and make an assault upon us. We must not, however, have more regard to our own safety than to the truth. Well, we find the Apostle saying, 'Now the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patience of Christ on account of tribulations.'\* Who is the Lord that directs into the love of God, and into the patience of Christ on account of tribulations? Let those answer who make the Spirit a bond-servant. Were the words spoken of God the Father, we should certainly have read, 'Now the Lord direct you into *His own love*'; or if of the Son, we should have the addition, *into His own patience*. Let them seek some other person who may justly be honoured with the title of Lord. And there is another passage like this: 'May the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men, even as we also do toward you; to the end He may stablish your hearts unblameable in holiness before our God and

XXI.

\* 2 Thess. iii. 5.

Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all His saints.\* What Lord does he entreat to stablish the hearts of the faithful Thessalonians firmly in holiness before our God and Father at the coming of our Lord? Let those answer who place the Holy Spirit among the ministering spirits who are sent on service. But they cannot. Wherefore let them attend to another piece of evidence in which the Spirit is plainly called Lord. 'Now the Lord,' it says, 'is the Spirit;' † and again, 'As from the Lord the Spirit.' ‡ But to leave no occasion of dispute, I will adduce the very words of the Apostle: 'Unto this very day, at the reading of the old covenant the same vail remaineth unlifted; which vail is done away in Christ. But whensoever it shall turn to the Lord, the vail is taken away. Now the Lord is the Spirit.' § Why does he say this? Because he who abides in the bare meaning of the letter, and there busies himself about legal observances, has, as it were, the Jewish interpretation of the letter for a veil over his heart, and this befalls him because he does not know that the external observance of the law is done away by the coming of Christ, since for the future the types are absorbed in the reality. For we do not need lamps when the sun has risen; and the law is inoperative, and prophecy is silent,

\* 1 Thess. iii. 12, 13.

† 2 Cor. iii. 17.

‡ 2 Cor. iii. 18.

§ 2 Cor. iii. 14, 16, 17.

when the truth has appeared. But he who can look into the depth of the meaning of the law, and, piercing the obscurity of the letter as he would rend a veil, penetrate to the heart of mysteries, he imitates Moses, who took off the veil when he talked with God,\* since he too turns from the letter to the Spirit. So that the obscurity of legal doctrines is parallel to the veil upon the face of Moses, but spiritual contemplation corresponds to the turning to the Lord. He, then, who, at the reading of the law, strips off the letter, turns to the Lord (but the Lord is now called the Spirit), and becomes like Moses, whose face was glorified by being in the presence of God. For as objects in the neighbourhood of brilliant colours are themselves tinted by the radiant splendour, so he who openly gazes upon the Spirit is in some way transformed through His glory and brought to greater brightness, when the heart is illuminated as it were by a mysterious light, the truth of the Spirit. And when we speak of being transformed by the glory of the Spirit into His own glory, we do not mean feebly and faintly, but so far as he ought to be who is illuminated by the Spirit. Do you not, O man, fear the Apostle when he says, 'Ye are a temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?'† Could he ever have honoured the dwelling of a bond-servant

\* Exod. xxxiv. 34.

† 1 Cor. iii, 16

with the title of temple? Is it conceivable that he who says the Scripture is inspired of God, inasmuch as it was written by the inspiration of the Spirit, uses the language of the man who insults and degrades the Spirit?

XXII. 53. But not only from the fact that He bears the same names as the Father and the Son, and is associated with them in their operations, do we derive the knowledge of the surpassing excellence of His nature, but also from the fact that the contemplation of Him is equally hard to attain unto. For what He says of the Father, that He passes human understanding, and what He says of the Son, the same does our Lord say of the Holy Spirit. 'Righteous Father, the world hath not known Thee,'\* meaning not the world which consists of earth and sky, but this mortal life with its countless changes.† And speaking of Himself, He says, 'Yet a little while, and the world beholdeth Me no more, but ye behold Me.'‡ Here again He means by the world those who, bound with the chains of material and carnal life, and who, looking at the truth with their eyes only, were, through not believing the resurrection, no more to see our Lord with the eyes of the heart. And He said the same of the Spirit also. 'The

\* John xvii. 25. † James iv. 14. ‡ John xiv. 19.



Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it beholdeth Him not, nor knoweth Him.\* For the carnal man having never exercised his mind in contemplation, or rather having it altogether buried in the mire of carnal affection, cannot look upon the spiritual light of truth. Wherefore the world, that is to say, the life enslaved by the lusts of the flesh, like a weak eye which cannot bear the light of the sun, does not welcome the grace of the Spirit. But our Lord having by His teaching borne witness to pureness of life, bestows upon His own disciples the present power of beholding and contemplating the Spirit. 'For now,' He says, 'ye are clean through the word which I have spoken to you.'† 'Wherefore the world cannot receive Him, for it beholdeth Him not; but ye know Him, for He abideth with you.'‡ And Isaiah says the same: 'He that stablished the earth and the things that are therein, and giveth breath to the people that are upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein.'§ For they who trample upon earthly things and rise above them, are proved worthy of the gift of the Holy Spirit. Seeing, then, that the world is incapable of Him, and the saints alone through pureness of heart can contemplate Him, what ought we to think He is, or what honours shall we deem proportioned to Him?

\* John xiv. 17.

† John xiv. 17.

‡ John xv. 3.

§ Isa. xlii. 5.

XXIII. 54. Each of the other heavenly powers is believed to be in some one definite place. For the angel that stood beside Cornelius \* was not at the same moment also present with Philip, † nor was the one that conversed with Zacharias from the altar ‡ at the same time filling his own station in heaven. But we believe that the Spirit at the same time was working in Habakkuk and in Daniel at Babylon, and was with Jeremiah in the cataract, § and with Ezekiel by the river Chebar. || For the Spirit of the Lord fills the world, ¶ and ‘Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit, and whither shall I go from Thy presence? \*\* And the prophet, ‘Because I am with you, saith the Lord, and My Spirit abideth among you.’ †† But what must we think of that nature which is capable of omnipresence, and of being the companion of God? Shall we say it is a nature which embraces all things, or that it is one confined to particular spots, such as the word shows the angels to possess? No one would say this. Shall we not then highly extol Him that is Divine by nature, of infinite greatness, powerful in operations, good in blessing? Shall we not glorify Him? And when I speak of glory, I mean nothing else but the enumeration of His marvellous attributes. So that our

\* Acts x. 3. † Acts viii. 26.

§ Jer. xx. 2, Sept.; correctly, ‘stocks.’

¶ Wisdom i. 7. \*\* Psa. cxxxix. 7.

‡ Luke i. 11.

|| Ezek. i. 1.

†† Hagg. ii. 5.

opponents will forbid us to even remember His benefits. At all events, the exposition of His attributes is the expression of the highest form of praise. For we can in no other way glorify God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and His Only-begotten Son than by recounting their marvellous acts so far as our powers will admit.

55. Ordinary man is crowned with glory and honour, and the treasures of glory, honour, and peace are promised to him who doeth good.\* And there is a certain peculiar glory belonging to Israel, 'whose are the adoption, and the glory, and the service.' † And the Psalmist speaks of a certain glory which was his own: 'When my glory shall sing unto Thee;' ‡ and again, 'Awake my glory.' § And there is a glory of the sun, and of the moon, and of the stars; || and according to the Apostle even the ministration of condemnation is with glory. ¶ Seeing, then, that so many objects are glorified, would you have the Spirit alone unglorified? And yet we read that 'the ministration of the Spirit is in glory.' \*\* How then can He be unworthy to be glorified? Again, according to the Psalmist, the glory of the righteous man is great: †† according to you, the glory

XXIV.

\* Rom. ii. 10

† Rom. ix. 4.

‡ Psa. xxx. 12.

§ Psa. cviii. 1 (*i.e.* his tongue).

|| 1 Cor. xv. 41.

¶ 2 Cor. iii. 9.

\*\* 2 Cor. iii. 8.

†† Psa. xxi. 5.

of the Spirit is none at all. Is there not a manifest danger of involving ourselves by such arguments as these in that sin from which there is no escape? If a man who is saved by works of righteousness glorifies even those who fear the Lord, much less would he rob the Spirit of the glory due to Him. We grant, says some one, that the Spirit is to be glorified, but not along with the Father and the Son. And why, I ask, should we abandon the place appointed by our Lord for the Spirit, and invent some other? Why rob the Spirit of His fellowship in glory, seeing that the Spirit is everywhere conjoined with the Godhead, in the confession of faith, in the baptism of redemption, in the working of miracles, in the indwelling in the saints, in benefits conferred on the obedient? For not one single gift reaches creation without the Holy Spirit, since not even a mere word can be spoken in defence of Christ without the co-operation of the Spirit, as we have learned in the Gospels from our Lord and Saviour.\* Now I doubt whether any one who has partaken of the Holy Spirit will allow us to neglect all this, to forget His fellowship in all things with the Father and the Son, and dissociate Him from them. How, then, shall we rank Him? with created beings? But all creation is in bondage, and the Spirit maketh free. 'For where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' † I

\* Matt. x. 20.

† 2 Cor. iii. 17.

might say much to show that it is improper to co-ordinate the Holy Spirit with created nature, but I will now forbear. For if I attempt to adduce the arguments on our side as befits the importance of the question, or to refute the objections of our adversaries, a long discussion will be necessary, and my readers will be worn out with the prolixity of the book. So let us reserve that for a special treatise, and keep to our subject.

56. Let us look at the points one by one. He is naturally good as the Father is good, and the Son is good; but the goodness of creation consists in the choice of what is good. He knows the deep things of God; creation receives the elucidation of mysteries through the Spirit. Along with God who quickens all things, and with the Son who giveth life, He quickens, for 'He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through His Spirit, that dwelleth in you.'\* And again, 'My sheep hear My voice, and I give unto them eternal life.'† But we find that the Spirit also quickens.‡ And again, 'The Spirit is life because of righteousness.'§ And the Lord testifies that it is the Spirit that quickeneth: 'The flesh profiteth nothing.'|| How, then, shall we divest the Spirit of His quickening power, and associate Him with lifeless nature? Who is so contentious, who

\* Rom. viii. 11.      † John x. 27, 28.      ‡ John vi. 63.  
§ Rom. viii. 10.      || John vi. 63.

has so little share in the heavenly gift, and has so slightly tasted the good words of God, who is so devoid of eternal hope, as to separate the Spirit from the Godhead, and place Him on a level with creation ?

57. But we are told that the Spirit is in us as a gift from God, and the gift is certainly not regarded with the same reverence as the giver. The Spirit is indeed God's gift, but a gift of life, for 'the law of the Spirit of life set us free.'\* And He is a gift of power, for 'ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost has come upon you.† He surely is not to be despised on that account. Did not God also freely give His Son to men ? 'He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not also with Him freely give us all things ?' ‡ And in another place, 'That we might know the things that are freely given to us by God,' § where the Apostle is speaking of the mystery of the Incarnation. Is it not clear that they who say these things outdo the Jews in ingratitude, and turn the marvellous kindness of God into an occasion of blasphemy ? For they blame the Spirit because He gives us boldness to call God our Father. 'For God sent out the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father,' || that His voice may be the voice of those who have received Him.

\* Rom. viii. 2.

† Acts i. 8.

‡ Rom. viii. 32.

§ 1 Cor. ii. 12.

|| Gal. iv. 6.

58. How is it then, they ask, that the Scripture nowhere re-  
presents the Spirit as glorified with the Father  
and the Son, but, on the contrary, carefully  
avoids the phrase *with the Spirit*, while it  
everywhere, in ascribing praise, prefers the  
form *in the Spirit*, as though this were more  
appropriate? Now I would not myself say  
that the syllable *in* is suggestive of a less  
honourable meaning, but rather that, soundly  
interpreted, it leads us to the highest flights  
of thought, for we have observed that it is  
frequently used instead of *with*. For instance,  
'I will go into Thine house *in* whole burnt  
offerings,'\* instead of *with* whole burnt  
offerings. And, 'He led them out *in* silver  
and gold,' † that is *with* silver and gold; and,  
'Thou goest not forth *in* our hosts,' ‡ instead  
of *with* our hosts; and there are countless  
similar passages. § I am anxious to learn what  
kind of glory the Apostle ascribed when he  
used *in* according to the pattern which  
the Pneumatomachs pretend to draw from  
Scripture. Pretend, I say, for I nowhere find  
'To Thee, the Father, be honour and glory  
through the Only-Begotten Son *in* the Holy  
Spirit,' a formula which is now, if I may so  
speak, as natural to opponents as the air they  
breathe. Each of the clauses may indeed be  
found separately, but no instance can be

XXV.

\* Psa. lxvi. 13. † Psa. cv. 37. ‡ Psa. xlv. 9.

§ Due to the rendering in the Septuagint of the Hebrew  
*beth* of accompaniment by *ἐν* (in), which corresponds to  
the primary meaning of the Hebrew preposition,

adduced of the clauses being joined together in this construction. So, then, if they advocate Scriptural exactness, let them show us upon what they rest their assertions ; but if they follow custom, we claim the like privilege.

59. For ourselves, finding both expressions in use among the faithful, we use both ; for we believe that glory is equally ascribed to the Spirit by both, while the mouth of those who corrupt the truth is more effectually stopped by that preposition which closely expresses the meaning of the Scriptures, and yet does not afford so convenient a handle to our adversaries (it is itself now the point of attack), inasmuch as it is taken for the conjunction *and*. It comes to the same thing whether you say, Paul and Silvanus and Timothy, \* or Paul with Timothy and Silvanus. For the connection of the names is preserved whichever mode of expression be adopted. If, then, when our Lord says, 'Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' I myself were to say, 'Father and Son with the Holy Ghost,' should I make any difference in the sense? There are many proofs of the connection of the names by means of the conjunction *and*. 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost.' † And again, 'I beseech you by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the love of the Spirit.' ‡ Now if we wished to use *with* instead of *and*, what difference should we make? I see none,

\* 1 Thess. i. 1.

† 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

‡ Rom. xv. 30.



unless some one devoted to the frigid rules of grammar should prefer the conjunction on the ground of its being copulative, and constituting a closer unity, but should reject the preposition, as not being equally expressive. And if we had to defend our position we should not need many words for our defence. But now the dispute does not turn upon syllables, nor upon this or that signification of a word, but we are concerned with things widely different in power and truth. Hence it is that, though the syllables may be indifferently used, our opponents endeavour to admit some, banish others from the Church. I will, however, although we no sooner hear the preposition *with* than we perceive its usefulness, explain the reason why our fathers, not without good cause, adopted it. In addition to its being a no less powerful refutation of the Sabellian \* error than *and*, and beside its suggesting just as clearly the distinction of persons, as in the passages, 'I and My Father will come,' † and 'I and the Father are one thing,' ‡ it contains an admirable proof of the eternal fellowship and unceasing conjunction of the Blessed Trinity. For he that says that the Son is with the Father, at the same time shows the distinction of persons and their inseparable fellowship. And this may be illustrated by human experience, where the conjunction *and* declares community of operation, while the preposition *with* somehow indicates fellowship beside. For example,

\* See Note 25. † John xiv. 23. ‡ John x. 30.

Paul and Timothy sailed to Macedonia, but both Tychichus and Onesimus were sent to the Colossians, from which we learn that in both cases the two associates did the same thing. But if we were to hear that they sailed together and were sent together, we should understand that they performed the action in the company of one another. Thus while the preposition is more fatal to the Sabellian error than any other word, it reduces to the same category the supporters of that heresy and those who are guilty of the exactly opposite impiety, those persons,\* I mean, who separate by intervals of time the Son from the Father, and the Holy Spirit from the Son.

60. But the chief difference between it and the syllable *in* is this—that *with* denotes the mutual conjunction of those who are concerned in common action, for example, sail together, live together, or do anything else in common; but *in* shows the relation between action and the sphere of action. For when we hear of sailing in, and dwelling in, we at once think of the boat and the house. Such is the difference between them in their ordinary use, and the point might be further elaborated by the industrious; but I have not time to investigate the history of the syllables. Since, then, *with* has been proved to be the most expressive symbol of conjunction, proclaim a truce, and put a stop to the bitter and implacable warfare which you have waged against

\* See Note 26.

it. Nevertheless, though the word is so expressive, if any one likes to couple the names in doxologies by the syllable *and*, and thus give glory after the manner taught us by the Gospels in the baptismal formula, 'Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' well and good, no one will say Nay. On these terms let us lay down our arms. But they would rather pull out their tongues than accept this word. This, then, is the cause of the implacable and relentless war in which we are engaged. We must, say they, give glory to God *in* the Holy Spirit, but we must not say *and* to the Spirit, and they cling with the greatest vehemence to this word *in* because it seems to humiliate the Spirit. It will therefore not be unprofitable to speak of it at greater length; and when they have heard our arguments, we shall be surprised if they do not repudiate it as a traitor and a deserter to the cause of the glory of the Spirit.

61. Now it seems to me, on reflection, that although the expression is simple and concise, it is susceptible of many different significations, for varied as are the uses of *in*, we find them all ministering to our conceptions of the Spirit. *Form*\* is said to be in matter, and *power* in what is capable of it, and *habit* in him who is the subject of it, and so on. Similarly, inasmuch as the Holy Spirit brings rational creatures to perfection, and completes their excellence, He corresponds to form.

XXVI.

\* Note 27.

For he who no longer lives according to the flesh, but is led by the Spirit of God, and called a son of God, and has become conformed to the image of the Son of God, is called spiritual. And as the power of sight is in the healthy eye, so is the operation of the Spirit in the cleansed soul. Hence Paul prays for the Ephesians that they may have their eyes enlightened in the Spirit of wisdom.\* And as an art is in him who has acquired it, so the grace of the Spirit is in him who has received it, ever present with him, but not perpetually in operation. For the art is potentially in the artist, but actually only when he works according to its rules. So also the Spirit is ever present with the saints, but works as necessity requires, either in prophecies, or in healings, or in some other miraculous operations. Moreover, our variable bodily states, for example, health, or warmth, illustrate the action of the Spirit in the soul of those who through instability easily banish the grace which they have received. He does not abide with them. This was the case with Saul, and the seventy elders of the sons of Israel (except Eldad and Medad,† the only two with whom He appears to have remained), and is generally true of such as are of like disposition. And as speech is in the soul, sometimes as a thought of the heart, sometimes as uttered by the tongue,‡ so is the Holy Spirit, now bearing witness with our

\* Eph. i. 17, 18. † Numb. xi. 25, 26. ‡ Note 28,

spirit, and crying in our hearts, 'Abba, Father,'\* now speaking on our behalf, according to the saying, 'It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you.' †

Again, as we conceive of a whole in its parts, so do we think of the Spirit with regard to the distribution of His gifts. For we are all members of one another, but have gifts differing according to the grace of God given unto us. Wherefore, 'The eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee, or again the head to the feet, I have no need of you;' ‡ but all the members together make up the body of Christ in the unity of the Spirit; and of their gifts they impart to one another such help as is required. For God put the members in the body, every one of them as He willed. But the members have the same care for one another, according to the spiritual communion arising from their natural affection for one another. Wherefore, 'Whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it: or if one member be glorified, all the members rejoice with it.' § And as are the parts in the whole, so are we individually in the Spirit, for we all were baptized in one body into one Spirit.

62. Again, though it may sound paradoxical, it is none the less true that the Spirit is frequently spoken of as the place || of those who are being sanctified. Nor will this figure of speech appear to degrade the Spirit, but to

\* Rom. viii. 16, 15. † Matt. x. 20. ‡ 1 Cor. xii. 21.  
§ 1 Cor. xii. 26. || Note 29.

glorify Him. For bodily appellations are often for the sake of clearness applied in Scripture to spiritual conceptions. We have observed that the Psalmist, even when speaking of God, says, 'Be Thou my protecting God, and a strong place that Thou mayest save me.'\* And with respect to the Spirit, 'Behold, there is a place by Me, and stand thou upon the rock.'† What other meaning can we give to *place* than vision in the Spirit, into which Moses entered, and then could see God clearly manifesting Himself to him? This is the proper place for true worship. 'Take heed to thyself,' we read, 'that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place, but in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose.'‡ What is a spiritual burnt offering? The sacrifice of praise.§ And in what place except the Holy Spirit do we offer it? Where did we learn this? From the Lord Himself, who said, 'The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.'|| This was the place that Jacob saw when he said, 'The Lord is in this place.'¶ So that the Spirit is truly a place of the saints. And the saint is a place proper for the Spirit, since the saint offers himself that God may dwell in him, and is called a temple of God. For as in Christ Paul says, 'Before God we speak in Christ,'\*\* and Christ was in Paul according to his own words, 'Seek ye a proof of Christ

\* Psa. xxxi. 2. † Exod. xxxiii. 21. ‡ Deut. xii. 13, 14.

§ Psa. l. 14. || John iv. 22. ¶ Gen. xxviii. 16.

\*\* 2 Cor. ii. 17.

speaking in me?'\* so also in the Spirit he speaks mysteries, and the Spirit again speaks in him.

63. Thus in divers portions and in divers manners is the Spirit said to be in things created;† but it is more consistent with piety to say, not that He is *in* the Father and the Son, but *with* them. For the grace which results from His dwelling in those who are worthy, and working His own purpose, is rightly held to be in such persons as receive Him; but when we contemplate His eternal pre-existence and His never-ending abiding with the Father and the Son, titles are required which denote eternal conjunction.‡ For co-existence is properly and correctly predicated of inseparable companions. We say that warmth exists in the heated iron, but co-exists with the fire itself. And that breath is in the body, but that life is co-existent with the soul. So that when we have a proper fellowship, con-natural and inseparable, the word *with* more expressively suggests the thought of the undivided fellowship; but when the grace which the Spirit bestows may come and go, we correctly and properly speak of its being in this or that person, even though His grace abide continually, owing to the steadfast inclination to good. Accordingly, whenever we think of the proper rank of the Spirit, we contemplate Him as being with the Father and the Son; but whenever we dwell upon His grace

\* 2 Cor. ii. 17.

† Note 30.

‡ Note 31.

working towards those who partake of it, we say that the Spirit is in us. And when in the doxology we add the words *in the Spirit*, this is not a confession of His dignity, but a frank avowal of our own weakness; for we show that we are not able of ourselves even to give glory, but that our ability is in the Holy Spirit; and when we have been enabled by Him we return thanks to our God for His benefits, in proportion as we have been cleansed from evil, and have received more or less assistance from the Spirit that we may offer unto God the sacrifices of praise. This, then, is one way of piously returning thanks in the Spirit. And yet the words would not lack weight if some one were to bear witness to himself and say, 'The Spirit is *in me*, and made wise through His grace I ascribe praise.' For Paul might well say, 'I think that I also have the Spirit of God;' \* and again, 'Keep the good deposit through the Holy Spirit that dwelleth in us;' † and in the case of Daniel ‡ we read that the Holy Spirit of God was in him, and not only in him but in all those whose virtue resembles his.

64. There is a second view which we must not reject—that as the Father is seen in the Son, so also is the Son seen in the Spirit. When then we worship in the Spirit, we have as it were our minds working in the light. We might learn so much from what was said to the Samaritans. For when our

\* 1 Cor. vii. 40.

† 2 Tim. i. 14.

‡ Dan. v. 11.



Lord was instructing the woman who, misled by the custom of the place, believed in a local worship, He said that we ought to worship in spirit and in truth.\* Here by 'truth' He plainly means Himself. As then we speak of worshipping in the Son, that is in the image of God the Father, so also do we speak of worshipping in the Spirit, inasmuch as He shows in Himself the Godhead of our Lord. Wherefore also in worship the Holy Spirit is inseparable from the Father and the Son. For dissociated from Him you will not worship at all; but being in Him you cannot by any means separate Him from God, any more than you can sever the light from things seen, for it is impossible to see the image of the invisible God, except by the illumination of the Spirit. And he who gazes upon the image cannot sever the light from the image, for the cause of vision is of necessity seen together with the things we see. So then, as is meet and right, through the illumination of the Spirit we behold the effulgence of the glory of God; and through the impress we are led up to Him of whom He is the impress and exact representation.†

65. Why then, they ask, seeing that the syllable *in* properly belongs to the Spirit, and is adequate to all our conceptions of Him, do you introduce this new syllable, and say *with*, not *in*, the Holy Spirit? There is no need of the phrase,

\* John iv. 24.

† Heb. i. 2.

nor are the Churches accustomed to it. Now we have already proved that *in* is not distinctive of the Holy Spirit, but is also common to the Father and the Son. I think, too, that enough has been said to show that it does not at all detract from the dignity of the Spirit, but conducts those who are not utterly perverse to the most sublime thoughts. It remains for us to discuss *with*, and point out how the word came into use, what force it has, and how it harmonizes with Scripture.

66. As regards ordinances\* observed in the Church and the subjects of our preaching or teaching, some are derived from the written doctrine, others we have received by way of apostolic tradition as they were secretly transmitted to us.† And these two classes are of equal value to piety. No one will dispute this, at all events, no one will who has had the least experience of ecclesiastical institutions. For if we were to attempt to reject such customs as have not the authority of Scripture on the ground that they are therefore of no great importance, we should unwittingly inflict a deadly wound on the gospel, or rather we should make the matter of our preaching a name, and nothing more. For example (to mention first the earliest and

\* Note 32.

† The genuineness of this section has been doubted, and Erasmus noted that it differs in style from other parts of the treatise. But while there seems to be no real evidence against the passage, it should be noted that Basil here attributes to oral *tradition* an authority which Evangelical Christians do not concede to it. He also indicates that there is no Scriptural warrant for the practices described.

most common), who taught us in writing to sign with the sign of the cross those who hope in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ? Where have we been taught in Scripture to turn to the East during prayer? What saint was it that bequeathed to us in writing the words of invocation at the 'showing' of the Eucharistic bread and the cup of blessing? For we are not satisfied with what the Apostle or the Evangelist recorded, but we add a preface and an epilogue which we have received from unwritten tradition, and which we consider to be of great import in celebrating the mystery. We also bless the water of baptism, and the anointing oil, and what is more, the person himself who is baptized. Where can we find written authority for these things? Do we not get them from silent and secret tradition? Why, where is the written word from which we learned the practice itself of anointing with oil? \* And what is the source of trine immersion? † Or take the other baptismal ceremonies: ‡ where in Scripture do we find the renunciation of Satan and his angels? § Are we not indebted to this esoteric and secret teaching which our fathers thus guarded from a meddlesome and prying curiosity? They had been well taught the lesson that secrecy is the best preservative of a reverent regard for mysteries. Was it in the least to be expected that they would parade in writing their instruction respecting

\* Note 38. † Note 39. ‡ Note 40. § Note 41.

mysteries which the uninitiated were not allowed even to witness? What did the great Moses mean by not making all parts of the temple accessible to everybody? \* The profane he stationed outside the sacred enclosure, the first courts were open to those who had purified themselves, the Levites alone he adjudged worthy to perform divine service; † the offering of sacrifices and burnt offerings and other priestly functions he allotted to the priests, ‡ while one person chosen out of the whole nation was admitted by him to the shrine, § and not even he at all times, but only on one day in the year, and a certain hour was fixed for his going in, so that the strange and novel sight of the Holy of Holies || might fill him with amazement. Moses was wise enough to know well that the familiar and the obvious are exposed to contempt, while the liveliest interest by the very nature of things attaches to what is rare and veiled in obscurity. Now in the same way the original legislators of the Church, Apostles and Fathers, guarded the dignity of our mysteries by secrecy and silence. For once a thing reaches the ears of a promiscuous multitude, there is no mystery about it. This is why we have unwritten tradition, that the knowledge of ordinances may not be neglected and despised by the many through familiarity. A ceremonial observance is one thing. What we openly preach or teach, is another. || The

\* Numb. iv. 20. † Numb. xviii. 21, 22.

‡ Numb. xviii. 7. § Exod. xxx. 10. || Levit. xvi. 2.

former is kept secret, the latter is for all the world. And a species of secrecy is the obscurity which we find in Scripture, the meaning of the observances being thus rendered less evident for the greater benefit of readers. For this cause we all look to the East at the prayers, but few of us know that we are seeking our old fatherland, Paradise,\* which God planted Eastward, in Eden. On the first day of the week we pray standing,† but we do not all know the reason. It is not only because we regard ourselves as risen with Christ, and bound to seek the things above that on the day of resurrection by standing at prayer we remind ourselves of the grace given to us, but because that day seems in a certain manner to be an image of the world to come. Hence although it is the beginning of days, Moses does not call it the first day, but he says *one* day. ‘The evening and the morning were one day,‡ as though it often recurred. One therefore implies the same as eighth, and in itself expresses that real and true octave § of which the Psalmist made mention in certain inscriptions of the Psalms, || the state of things which will follow the present time, the eternal day which knows no evening, that has no successor, the world that never ends and never grows old. Perforce, then, the Church teaches her own children to pray standing on that day that, diligently remembering the unending life, we may not neglect to make

\* Gen. ii. 8.

† Note 42.

‡ Gen. i. 5.

§ Note 43.

|| Psa. vii. and xiii.

provision for our removal thither. And the whole season of Pentecost is a memorial of the resurrection for which we look in another world. For that one and first day, being seven times repeated gives the seven holy Pentecostal weeks. For the season begins and ends with the first day after fifty similar intervening revolutions. Hence it is a figure of eternity, revolving, as it were, in a circle, and beginning and ending at the same point. On this day the rules of the Church have taught us to prefer the upright attitude of prayer, and by the plain reminder in a manner transfers our thought from the present to the future. And whenever we bend the knee and rise again we show by the mere action that through sin we fell to earth, and through the loving kindness of our Creator we have been restored to heaven.

67. The time would fail me were I to recount the unwritten mysteries of the Church. To omit the rest, what is the written source of the confession of faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? \* If, in accordance with baptismal tradition and consistent piety, our belief must correspond to our baptism, and we therefore make the confession essential to baptism, we crave permission no less consistently to ascribe praise in accordance with the faith. But if they reject our form of the doxology on the ground that it lacks written authority, let them show us the written evidence for our

\* Note 44.

confession of faith and the other details which we have enumerated. Although, therefore, there are so many traditional usages having a powerful bearing upon the mystery of godliness, they will not allow us one little word handed down from the Fathers, and which, originating in spontaneous custom, we found rooted in the use of orthodox Churches,—a word which has no mean arguments on its side, and gives completeness in no slight degree to the mystery.

68. I have now explained the force of both expressions. But I will again state in what respects they agree with one another, and in what they differ, not that they contradict one another, but each enriches godliness with its own meaning. *In* sets forth the truth more on our side: *with* declares the fellowship of the Spirit with the Father. Wherefore we use both words; by the one we declare the dignity of the Spirit, by the other we proclaim the grace given to us. Thus we ascribe glory to God *in* the Spirit, and *with* the Spirit, and we say nothing of ourselves, but follow the rule, that is, the teaching of our Lord, when we apply the word to things in close and intimate relation, and which are of necessity mystically conjoined. We cannot but think it right in confessing the faith to couple with the Father and the Son Him who was numbered with them at baptism. We have made the confession of faith in a manner the source and fount of the doxology. But what were we to do? As things are,

let them boldly tell us not to baptize as we have received, or not to believe as we were baptized, or not to give glory as we have believed. Either let some one show that there is no necessary and irrefragable connection between these three, or that innovation in these particulars does not mean utter ruin. But they are never tired of dinning into our ears that the form of doxology *with the Holy Ghost* is unsupported by evidence, or by Scripture, and so on. Now we have already pointed out that it makes no difference whether you say, 'Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost,' or 'Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, with the Holy Ghost.' So that no one may reject or expunge the syllable *and* which came from our Lord's own lips; nor is there anything to forbid our reception of its equivalent. How the latter agrees with or differs from the former, we showed before. And the Apostle by using both words indifferently confirms our argument, for at one time he says, 'In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God;'\* at another, 'When ye are gathered together, and my spirit, together with the power of our Lord Jesus.'† He thought it made no difference whether in connecting the names he used the conjunction, or the preposition.

COLLEGE

MCCXVIII.

Usage of

S. E. 25.

69. But let us see if we can discover any defence for this usage of our fathers; for they who were the

† I Cor. vi. 11.

† I Cor. v. 4.



first to use the word are more to blame than we are. Now Paul, writing to the Colossians, says, 'And you who were dead in trespasses and in uncircumcision, hath He quickened together with Christ.' \* Can it be the fact, then, that God bestowed the life with Christ upon a whole people and the Church, and that the Holy Spirit has not life with Christ? But if the mere thought be impiety, is it not as pious as it is natural to conjoin the three in our confession? Then, again, is it not extreme stupidity for our opponents to confess that the saints are with Christ (if, indeed, Paul being absent from the body, is present with the Lord, † and having departed is now with Christ), but not to grant the Spirit as well as men the privilege of being with Christ? And Paul calls himself a fellow-worker with God in the dispensation of the gospel; but if we call the Holy Spirit, through whom the gospel bears fruit in every creature under heaven, a fellow-worker, will they here also tax us with impiety? It seems that the life of those who hope in the Lord is hidden with Christ in God, and when Christ shall appear, we also shall appear with Him in glory. ‡ And is the Spirit of life who freed us from the law of sin § by no means with Christ, neither in the secret and hidden life with Him, nor in the manifestation of glory which we expect to be revealed in the saints? We are heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; ||

\* Col. ii. 13.

† 2 Cor. v. 8.

‡ Col. iii. 3, 4.

§ Rom. viii. 2.

|| Rom. viii. 17.

and is the Spirit without part or lot in the communion of God and Christ? The Spirit Himself bears witness to our Spirit that we are the children of God ;\* and do we allow the Spirit not even the witness of His fellowship with God which we have learned from our Lord? But it is stupendous folly through faith in Christ, which faith is in the Spirit, to hope to be raised with Christ, and to sit with Him in the heavenly places when He shall have changed the body of our humiliation from an animal body to a spiritual body, and yet not give the Spirit a share in that sitting with Christ, nor in glory, nor in any other of His own gifts to us. And do we really believe ourselves worthy to receive blessings according to the gift of Him who promised and cannot lie, and yet concede none of these things to the Holy Spirit, on the ground that they surpass His dignity? It is yours if you so deserve to be ever with the Lord, and you expect to be carried up into the clouds to meet Him in the air, and so to be ever with the Lord ; † and do you deny that the Spirit is now with Christ? you who excommunicate as guilty of intolerable impiety the man who associates the Spirit with the Father and the Son in number and rank.

70. I am ashamed to add the rest—that you expect to be glorified with Christ (for if we suffer with Him, we shall also be glorified together), ‡ but do not glorify the Spirit of holiness with Christ, as though He were not

\* Rom. viii. 16. † 1 Thess. iv. 17. ‡ Rom. viii. 17.

even worthy of being on an equality with you. And you hope to reign with Christ, but insult the Spirit of grace by assigning to Him the rank of a slave and an underling. And this I say not to indicate the measure of glory due to the Spirit, but to confute the folly of those who, far from paying Him even so much respect, shrink with pious horror from associating the Spirit in glory with the Son and the Father. Who could speak of these things without emotion? For it is level to the apprehension of a child that the present condition of affairs is only the prelude to the threatened revolt from the faith. Things once indisputable have become ambiguous. We believe in the Spirit, and quarrel with our confessions. We are baptized, and again we are at variance. We invoke the Spirit as the giver of life, and we despise Him as our fellow-slave. We received Him along with the Father and the Son, and we dishonour Him as part of creation. And they who know not what to pray for,\* if they are induced to speak with some reverence of the Spirit, trim their words to bring them into proportion, as though the bounds of His dignity were reached. They ought to lament their own infirmity, because we cannot make grateful words adequate to gracious deeds: for He passes all understanding, and baffles language, which is not in the least commensurate with His dignity. We read in the book called Wisdom, 'Extol Him as much as ye

\* Rom. viii. 26.

can. He is still above you : extol and magnify Him. Labour not, for ye cannot attain unto it.\* Such words as these imply a terrible reckoning for you who have been told by God, who cannot lie, that there is no forgiveness for blasphemy against the Spirit.†

XXIX. 71. Our reply to the assertion that there is no written authority for the formula of praise, *with the Spirit*, is this :—if it be a solitary instance of traditional usage let us not receive it ; but if the greater number of our mysteries have a recognized status independent of Scripture, we will receive this one among the rest. My own opinion, however, is that in abiding by unwritten tradition we are following the Apostles. ‘I praise you,’ says Paul, ‘that ye remember me in all things, and as I delivered them unto you so ye keep the traditions.’‡ And again, ‘Hold fast the traditions which ye received, whether by word, or by a letter ;’ § and one of these is the practice under discussion ; prescribed by our forefathers, and by them delivered to their successors, its use grew with time, until through long custom it took deep root in the Church. Suppose, then, if we may borrow an illustration from the law-courts, in the absence of documentary evidence we were to confront you with a multitude of witnesses, would you not acquit us ? I think you would, for ‘in the mouth

\* Eccclus. xliiii. 30.

‡ 1 Cor. xi. 2.

† Luke xii. 10.

§ 2 Thess. ii. 15.

of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.’\* And if we were to clearly prove that long usage was on our side, would you not think we urged with reason that the matter was not within the jurisdiction of the court? For a sense of awe comes over us in the presence of ancient ordinances of a venerable and hoary antiquity. I will therefore enumerate those who have countenanced the word, for its use did not originate with us, and the fact must be borne in mind that it has passed unchallenged all this time. How could its use have begun with us? We are but as of yesterday, as Job says,† compared with the duration of this custom.

For myself, if I must express my own view, I jealously guard this word as an heir-loom, for I received it from a man who spent a long life in the service of God, and by whom I was baptized and admitted to the ministry of the Church.‡ But when I privately inquired if any of the blessed men of old used those words which are now spoken against, I found many who were deserving of all credit by reason of their early date, and also, unlike our contemporaries, on account of their accurate knowledge. Some of them coupled the words of the doxology by means of the preposition, others by means of the conjunction, and yet were thought in no way to injuriously affect orthodoxy.

72. There is the great Irenæus,§ and

\* Deut. xix. 15.

‡ Note 45.

† Job viii. 9.

§ Note 46.

Clement\* of Rome, and Dionysius of Rome; † and Dionysius of Alexandria, ‡ strange to say, thus concluded his second letter to his namesake on *Refutation and Defence*. I will give the exact words: 'Accordingly, as we have received a form and rule from the elders who preceded us, we unite with them in one harmonious strain of thanksgiving. To God the Father, and the Son our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Ghost, be glory and might for ever and ever. Amen.' Nor can any one say that the passage as it stands is a correction. He would not have so earnestly asserted that he had received a form and rule, had he said *in the Spirit*, for the use of the word *in* was general. But it was the use of *with* that required to be defended. And Dionysius about the middle of his treatise thus combats the Sabellians: 'If, because there are three Persons, they say the Persons are divided, I tell them there are three whether they will have it so or not: or, if they will not admit this, they must destroy the Divine Trinity altogether.' And again, 'Wherefore, after the Unity there is the Divine Trinity.' But Clement speaks with more simplicity: 'God lives, and our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost.' And let us hear in what terms Irenæus, who lived near the time of the Apostles, made mention of the Spirit in his treatise against heresies: 'The unbridled who are carried away to their own lusts, and have no desire for the Divine Spirit, the

\* Note 47.

† Note 48.

‡ Note 49.

Apostle justly calls carnal.' And elsewhere the same author says, 'That we may not be deprived of the Divine Spirit, and come short of the kingdom of heaven, the Apostle exclaims that the flesh cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven.'\* And if any one thinks Eusebius † of Palestine an authority on account of his great experience, I draw attention to his very own words in discussing the difficulties started in connection with ancient polygamy. He thus speaks by way of stimulating himself to his task: 'We invoke the holy God of the prophets, the Author of light, through our Saviour Jesus Christ, together with the Holy Ghost.'

73. Moreover, we find that Origen, ‡ in many of his expositions of the Psalms, when ascribing glory to God, uses the form *with the Spirit*. He was a man whose views respecting the Spirit were not altogether sound, but still he everywhere reverences established usage, and speaks of the Spirit in terms of piety. I think it is in the sixth book of his Commentary on the Gospel according to John that he clearly shows that the Spirit is to be worshipped. The exact words run thus: 'The washing of water is a symbol of the cleansing of the soul which is purified from all the defilement of wickedness; but it none the less is of itself, through the power of the invocations, the source and fountain-head of blessings to him who surrenders himself to the Godhead of the adorable Trinity.' And

\* 1 Cor. xv. 50.

† Note 50.

‡ Note 51.

again, in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, he says, 'The holy powers are receptive of the Only-Begotten and of the deity of the Holy Spirit.' Thus, I think, the force of tradition frequently leads men to contradict their own views. But this form of doxology did not escape the notice of Africanus\* the historian. For we find even him speaking thus in the fifth book of his Epitome of History: 'We who have measured those words, and are not ignorant of the grace of faith, give thanks to the Father, who bestowed on us, His own creatures, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, to whom be glory, and majesty, with the Holy Spirit, for ever.' We may perhaps suspect that other passages have been tampered with; we may feel that the deception is hard to detect, because the difference depends upon one syllable. But the passages which we have quoted at length baffle the attempt, and are supported by the clear testimony of the context. And I will now add what perhaps would otherwise be too insignificant to adduce, but on account of its antiquity is required for the refutation of him who accuses us of novelty. It seemed good to our fathers not to receive in silence the gift of light at eventide, but as soon as it appeared to return thanks. Who was the author of those words of thanksgiving at the lighting of the lamps we are unable to say; the people, however, use the old form, and no one ever thought them guilty of impiety

\* Note 52.



for saying, 'We praise Father, Son, and God's Holy Spirit.'\* And whoever is acquainted with the hymn of Athenogenes,† which he bequeathed as a legacy to his disciples when on the point of hastening to his consummation by fire, knows the mind of the martyrs with regard to the Spirit. So much for this point.

74. But where shall we place Gregory the Great,‡ and his utterances? Shall we not rank with Apostles and Prophets a man who walked by the same spirit as they, followed the steps of the saints all through life, and to the day of his death exhibited the ideal of the gospel conversation? My own opinion is that we shall be traitors to truth if we do not number with God's own people that soul which shone far and wide like a beacon-light in the Church of God, who through the co-operation of the Spirit had tremendous power over devils, and was gifted with such grace of speech 'for obedience to faith' among the heathen, that though he found only seventy Christians, he brought the whole people, both in town and country, to the knowledge of God. He even changed the course of rivers by a command in the great name of Christ, and dried up a lake which afforded a pretext of strife to some covetous brethren. His predictions are such as no way come short of those of the other prophets. But it would take far too long to relate the marvellous history of the man who, through the superabundance of gifts wrought

\* Note 53.

† Note 54.

‡ Note 55.

in him by the Spirit in all power and signs and wonders, was called a second Moses by the enemies of the truth themselves. Thus in every word and work which grace enabled him to say or do a marvellous light shone forth, disclosing the heavenly power which was secretly supplied to him. To this day the people of those parts have a great admiration for him, and his memory lives in the churches fresh and evergreen, unimpaired by lapse of time. Thus it is that not an action, not a word, not a mystic rite have they added to the Church since his day. Hence many of their ceremonies are of such primitive simplicity that they appear defective; for his successors in the see could not bear to supplement them with subsequent discoveries. Well, of the things associated with Gregory, one is the form of doxology now disputed: handed down by him, it has been carefully preserved in the Church, and any one may without much trouble, by taking a short journey, convince himself of the truth of what I say.

That our Firmilianus \* held this belief, the books which he has left testify. And that Meletius † was altogether of this opinion, his contemporaries assert. But what need is there to revert to the distant past? In the East at the present day, is not this word the one mark of the orthodox and the shibboleth by which they are known? I heard from a certain Mesopotamian who had a good knowledge of the language, and whose views were orthodox,

\* Note 56.

† Note 57.

that it was impossible to say anything else in the dialect of the country, even if they wished to do so, but that they were bound in ascribing praise to follow their native idiom, and use the syllable *and*, or rather its equivalents. And we Cappadocians thus speak according to the custom of the country, the Spirit even at the time of the confusion of tongues having foreseen the utility of the word. And what shall we say of almost the entire West from Illyricum to the borders of our own part of the world? Does it not maintain the use of the expression?

75. How then can I be justly called an innovator and a coiner of phrases when I show that the expression in question has the authoritative support of cities, of whole nations, of immemorial usage, and of men who were pillars of the Church and pre-eminent in all knowledge and spiritual power? For this cause the battle is set in array against us, and every city and village, and all the most remote places, are full of our calumniators. This is grievous and painful to the hearts of those who seek peace; but since the reward is great if we endure suffering for the sake of the faith, beside all this let the sword flash, and the axe be sharpened, and the fire burn fiercer than that of Babylon, and every instrument of torture be brought against us, for to me nothing is more fearful than not to fear the threats of the Lord against those who blaspheme the Spirit. Well-disposed persons will be satisfied with the defence

I have made—that we accept an expression so agreeable and so dear to the saints, and warranted by so long custom. For from the time when the gospel was announced until now it is proved to have been generally recognized by the Churches, and, what is most important, to have been understood in a pious and holy sense. But at the great tribunal what defence could we make for ourselves? That we were first led to glorify the Spirit by the honour which our Lord gave Him when He associated Him with Himself and His Father in baptism;\* then that every one of us by such an initiation was introduced to the knowledge of God; above all, there is the dread of threatened punishment, which excludes every unworthy thought and mean opinion. And what will our adversaries say? What defence will they have for their blasphemy, seeing that they neither regard the honour which our Lord pays to the Spirit, nor fear His threats? It is for them to see to their own interests, or even now to change their mind. But it shall be my most earnest prayer that the good God may make His own peace to rule in the hearts of all, so that these men, who are swollen with pride and vehemently set against us, may be kept in check by the Spirit of meekness and love. If, however, they are barbarously fierce and wild, yet may God grant us to bear with long-suffering the wrongs they inflict! In short, to those who have the sentence of death in

\* Matt. xxviii. 19.

themselves it is not grievous to suffer for the faith, but not to struggle for it is very hard to endure. Athletes would much rather be wounded in the contest than not be admitted to the stadium. Perhaps, after all, this was the time for silence of which wise Solomon speaks ; \* for what is the good of crying to the wind when life is swept by so fierce a storm that there is not a man instructed in the word whose mind is not clouded with fallacious reasoning, and, like an eye irritated by dust, full of confusion, and every ear is deafened by harsh unearthly noises, and everything is shaken and on the point of falling ?

**XXX.** 76. To what then shall we compare our present condition ? It is surely like a naval battle which has arisen out of old quarrels and long-cherished animosities, and in which the combatants are experienced veterans eager for the fight. Now look at the picture, and behold the terrible spectacle of the rival armaments rushing to the attack, and with an outburst of irrepressible fury engaging in the desperate struggle. You may suppose, if you like, that the ships are tossed by a violent tempest, and that the whole scene is black with thick clouds and darkness, so that friend and foe can no longer be distinguished, because in the confusion the watchwords are not recognized. Let us also, to make our meaning plain, add

\* Eccles. iii. 7.

to the picture a swelling, heaving, boisterous sea, torrents of rain, and mighty billows rolling mountains high. Next let us imagine the winds blowing from all quarters at once, and all the ships colliding with one another, and some of the combatants turning traitors, and deserting in the very thick of the fight, while others are compelled to navigate their vessels driving before the wind and at the same time meet their assailants. Split into factions by jealousy of authority and the desire for individual supremacy, they slaughter one another. Think, too, of the babel of sounds floating over all the adjacent sea, from the roaring winds, the colliding ships, the boiling surge, the thousand and one cries of those in conflict as they bemoan their sufferings, so that neither commander nor steersman can make himself heard. On all sides there is terrible disorder and confusion. Men in their despair of life, and crushed by misfortune, grow fearless in every kind of villainy.

Suppose the sailors, moreover, to be afflicted with an incurable disease—an insane love of glory—so that when the ship is on the point of sinking, their contentious rivalry is as keen as ever.

77. Now turn from the picture to the evil itself. Was there not a time when the Arian schism, having formed itself into a party antagonistic to the Church, looked as if it were the only hostile force arrayed against us? But when, after long and bitter contention, they

prepared for open combat, then the war was one of many parts and many phases : \* so that public enmity and private suspicion inflamed the hearts of all with implacable hatred. And is not this tempest of the Churches fiercer than a storm at sea ? For in it every landmark of the Fathers has been moved, and everything upon which our opinions rested, or by which they might be defended, has been convulsed. Everything which rested on a rotten basis has been overturned and hurled to the ground ; we fall foul of one another and become one another's ruin. If the adversary does not strike you first, your comrade wounds you ; or should he fall wounded, his fellow-soldier is upon you. We have enough fellowship with one another to hate our common foes, but once the enemy has disappeared, we find we are mutual enemies. Beside this, how innumerable are the wrecks ! Some sink through the assault of the enemy, others through the treachery of allies, or through the inexperience of their leaders. Whole Churches strike as it were upon the sunken reefs of crafty heresy and perish, while other enemies of our Saviour's passion hold the helm and make shipwreck of the faith. But no storm or hurricane can equal the violence of the tumults by means of which the rulers of this world subvert their peoples. The night of the Church is indeed dark and gloomy when the lights of the world, which God placed in it to illumine the souls of men,

\* Note 58.

are extinguished. And yet unbounded rivalry and contentiousness, though the fear of universal ruin is imminent, makes them utterly callous. For private enmity is more deadly than open and public warfare, since the common good, as compared with the glory of vanquishing an opponent, is a secondary consideration in the minds of such as find more pleasure in the gratification of a momentary ambition than in the treasures and rewards of the world to come. And thus all alike, each as best he can, engage in bloody conflict. And the harsh clamour of disputatious combatants, inarticulate cries, and the confused sounds of perpetual tumults which end in the destruction of godly orthodoxy, has now filled nearly the whole Church. For some, through confounding the persons of the Blessed Trinity, are carried away to Judaism, others to Heathenism through contrasting the natures; neither inspired Scripture is competent to arbitrate between them, nor apostolical tradition to frame a basis of reconciliation; friendship has but one aim—to say what will please, and a difference of opinion is a sufficient pretext for a quarrel. Agreement in error is a surer pledge of seditious fellowship than the most stringent oath. Every one is a theologian, even the man whose soul is branded with countless pollutions. Hence revolutionists easily augment their numbers, while self-appointed individuals with a keen appetite for place reject the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, and then



divide among themselves the high offices of the Church. And now that disorder has led to the utter confusion of evangelical ordinances, there is an indescribable pushing and elbowing for precedence; every one who is ambitious to make an appearance strains every nerve to bring himself prominently forward. This lust of power is followed by a widespread and prevalent disregard of all authority, and the exhortations of superiors become absolutely null and void, for every one in his ignorant pride thinks he is no more bound to obey than to command.

78. For these reasons, feeling that the voice of man could not make itself heard in such an uproar, I thought silence better than speech. For if Ecclesiastes\* says truly that the words of the wise are heard in quiet, it would be far from proper to discuss these matters in the present state of affairs. I am also restrained by that saying of the prophet, 'He who understandeth shall keep silence at that time, because it is an evil time' †—a time when some supplant their brethren, others trample on the fallen, other applaud, but the man to stretch out a helping hand in sympathy for him who has sunk in weariness is not to be found. And yet, according to the old law, ‡ not even he who passed by an enemy's beast fallen under its burden escaped condemnation. This is not the way now. Can we expect it when the love of all has

\* Eccles. ix, 17. † Amos v. 13. ‡ Exod. xxiii. 5.

grown cold, and brotherly concord is therefore destroyed, and the very name of unity is unknown, when brotherly admonitions are a thing of the past, Christian mercy is nowhere to be found, nowhere a sympathetic tear? There is none that welcomes the weak in faith, but kinsmen are inflamed with so fierce a hatred that they exult more at a neighbour's fall than at their own good deeds. And just as during an outbreak of pestilence those who live lives of the utmost regularity contract the disease through intercourse with the infected, and suffer no less than the rest, so now we are all alike carried away to a rivalry in evil by the spirit of contention which has gained possession of our souls. Hence the bitter and relentless censure of what is done amiss, the hardhearted and hostile criticism of what is done aright; and the evil under which we labour would seem to be so gigantic that we have become less rational than the brutes—for animals of the same species do herd with one another, but our worst foes are those of our own household.

79. For all these reasons I ought to have held my peace; but love, seeking not her own,\* and desirous to overcome every difficulty of time and circumstance, drew the other way. And the youths at Babylon taught us the lesson that when there is no one on the side of godliness, we should in solitude do our duty; for out of the midst of

\* 1 Cor. xiii. 5.

the fire they sang hymns to God;\* they regarded not the multitude of those who despised the truth, but were a sufficient support to one another. Wherefore we are not dismayed by the cloud of our enemies, but we rest our hope on the aid of the Spirit, and with all boldness proclaim the truth. It would be terrible to think that the blasphemers of the Spirit so readily face every risk in attacking the doctrine of godliness, while we who have such a helper and protector shrink from ministering the word, I mean ancestral tradition, which has by memory been safely transmitted to us. And what proved a still more powerful incentive was the fervour of your unfeigned love, and your earnest character, and quiet disposition, which last was a guarantee that what I had to say would not be published—not that it is worth concealing, but it is well not to cast pearls before swine. My task is ended. But as regards yourself, if you think the foregoing adequate, here let the matter rest. If, however, it seems inadequate, you are welcome to diligently pursue the inquiry, and to supplement your knowledge by asking any well-intentioned questions. For the Lord will grant, either by us or by others, satisfaction on any points which remain unsettled, according to the knowledge supplied by the Spirit to those who are worthy of Him.

\* Dan. iii. 25.



## NOTES.



1. Amphilochius was bishop of Iconium, and himself the author of a work on the Holy Spirit which is now lost. A letter bearing his name still remains, and may have been the Synodical Epistle of some Council at Iconium over which he presided. Besides the *De Spiritu Sancto*, Basil addressed to him three epistles on points of discipline, which became part of the Eastern canon law. (Bright, *History of the Church*, p. 157; Swete, *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, p. 67.)

2. The 'judicious' Hooker thus estimates St. Basil's conduct, and points a lesson:—'It hath been the custom of the Church of Christ to end sometimes prayers, and sermons always, with words of glory: wherein, as long as the Blessed Trinity had due honour, and till Arianism had made it a matter of great sharpness and subtilty of wit to be a sound believing Christian, men were not curious what syllables or particles of speech they used. Upon which confidence and trust, notwithstanding when St. Basil began to practise the like indifferency, and to conclude public prayers, glorifying sometime the Father with the Son and the Holy Ghost, sometime the Father by the Son in the Spirit, whereas long custom had inured them unto the former kind alone, by means whereof the latter was new and strange in their ears; this needless

experiment brought afterwards upon him a necessary labour of excusing himself to his friends, and maintaining his own act against them, who, because the light of his candle had much drowned theirs, were glad to lay hold on so colourable a matter, and exceeding forward to traduce him as an author of suspicious innovation. . . . It was thought in him an unpardonable offence to alter anything; in us as intolerable that we suffer any thing to remain unaltered; &c. (*Ecc. Polity*, Bk. V. xlii. 11.)

3. Aëtius, the father of that extreme form of Arianism which took for its symbol the *Anomion*, and asserted that the Son was *unlike the Father* in substance and in will, had been a vinedresser's slave, a goldsmith, a medical man. Leontius of Antioch, hoping to make him an Arian propagandist, ordained him deacon, but was so severely censured that he thought it best to depose him. His early education was scanty; but having acquired some knowledge of geometry and dialectics, he insisted upon applying the rules of those sciences to theology.\* His disputatious character, recklessness, and irreverence, were so notorious that he was called *Atheos* (Godless). Eunomius, who became bishop of Cyzicum, went even farther, and held that there was no place for the affections in religion, no mystery, no sacramental influence. The Son, he said, was like the Father in nothing but His working, and the Holy Spirit was created by the Son. (Bright, Robertson, *Ch. Hist.*; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, A. ii. 265.)

4. Aristotle divided causes into four kinds,—(a) the material, (b) the formal, (c) the efficient, (d) the final. In the text six kinds are enumerated—(1)  $\acute{\upsilon}\phi' \acute{\omicron}\nu$ , (2)  $\delta\iota' \acute{\omicron}\nu$ , (3)  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi \acute{\omicron}\nu$ , (4)  $\kappa\alpha\theta' \acute{\omicron}$ , (5)  $\delta\iota' \acute{\omicron}$ , (6)  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\psi}$ , which fall under the three heads (a) original or immediate, (β) co-efficient, or concurring, (γ) indispensable. Of these (1) and (2) correspond to (c) ( $\acute{\eta} \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\eta} \tau\eta\varsigma \kappa\iota\nu\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ), (3) to (a), (4) to (b), which in Aristotle is the form, idea, or archetype, or pattern of a thing, (5) to (d). Basil (sec. 21) speaks of the Father as the original, of the Son as the

\* For his application of the categories see Socrates *Ecc. Hist.*, Bk. II. 35. He could not 'understand how there can be ingenerate generation, or how that which is begotten is co-eternal with him that beget.'

efficient, or, more accurately, productive (ποιητικόν) cause, and says that both are implied in δι' οὗ used of the Son. The Stoic Chrysippus (B.C. 280-203) distinguished between principal and auxiliary causes in order 'to maintain the doctrine of fate, and yet to escape from that of necessity, asserting that fate related only to auxiliary causes, while the *appetitus* remained in our own power.' (Ueberweg, *Hist. Phil.*, vol. i. 196.)

5. The form of Docetism here alluded to is that which taught that our Lord's body was 'an immaterial phantom'; but Docetism went through many phases and was in some form common to all the numerous Gnostic sects. It has been traced to the widespread notion that matter and spirit were in antagonism, and that matter was essentially evil. It 'proposes to find the deeper meaning of Christianity by laying stress on the higher side in Christ,' and thus, from another point of view, was the offspring of the exaggeration of an element not duly estimated by the Church. In the earliest times the true human *body* of Christ was fully taught, but the doctrine connected with the soul remained undeveloped, and room would in this way be left for Docetism. The prevalence of eschatological teaching, giving undue prominence to the Divine side of the Personality of Christ, would also tend to the same result. In dwelling upon the thought of 'Christ a King,' exalted to the right hand of God, and one day to return with power to judge the quick and dead, the mind would be in danger of losing sight of the human life of humiliation. Again, in attaching almost exclusive importance to the Second Advent, and particularly if the Advent were regarded as a sudden event rather than an historical development, there would be a danger of depreciating the work done by Christ on earth in and through the flesh. It is, therefore, justly said that while Docetism was a protest against and a virtual denial of Ebionism, while it shows that the Church never recognized mere humanitarianism, it would inevitably by re-action create what it seemed to condemn. Simon Magus is said to have been the first of the Docetæ. At all events the language of 1 John iv. 3 would appear to prove that even in the Apostle's lifetime the heresy had begun to infest the Asiatic Churches; and as early as Ignatius no less than three essential elements of the

human life, the birth of the Son of God by a woman, the reality of His passion and resurrection, were attacked. How Docetism found a place in Arianism is an interesting question. The Arians held that the First-born of Creation who became incarnate was of another genus than man, though still a creature. They further maintained that it was abstractedly possible for the incarnate Christ to sin (*ῥηπρός*). But here a new difficulty arose. How could two finite beings, two free wills, be joined in one and the same person? The problem was solved by making the Logos supply the place of the human soul, and thus the apparent human development was only an illusion. Apollinaris was orthodox as to the divinity of Christ, but thought it necessary to admit the Arian tenet in order to preserve the perfect sinlessness by excluding the seat of sin—the rational soul. Whether Apollinaris is to be credited with all the errors connected with his name may be doubted; but how energetic Docetism was about his time (A.D. 370) may be seen from the fact that some of his reputed followers held that the body of Christ was called human because it is in the form of man, by conversion of the Godhead into flesh; others taught that the two substances are confounded or blended; others that nothing of the human soul was assumed; others the sensitive soul alone. The error could only be overthrown by the gradual development of both elements of our Lord's being, and their scientific fusion into one personality. In the time of Leo, who held the Papal see from A.D. 440 to A.D. 461, Docetism was still potent, and it was perhaps owing to the inevitable imperfection of the work of the Council of Chalcedon (A. D. 451), which asserted most emphatically the human nature and the Divine without attempting to reconcile them, that the 'Church subsequently to the end of the eighth century, was greatly under the influence of Monophysitic, nay, even Apollinaristic elements, which were in reality but a more subtle form of Docetism.'

Much later the mystical school of Anabaptists maintained that our Lord's 'humanity was peculiar, not consisting of flesh and blood which He derived from the substance of the Virgin.' Joan of Kent was burnt for holding the view (May 2, A.D. 1550), and the Fourth Article of the Church of England, which treats of the

resurrection of Christ, was originally directed against the error. (For authorities see an excellent note in Bright's *St. Leo*, p. 152; Dorner's *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*; and Farrar's *Early Days of Christianity*, p. 556, popular edition.)

6. Just fifty years after the death of Basil, Cyril of Alexandria drew up his twelve famous anathematisms in his second letter to, and against, Nestorius. The fifth of these anathematized any one who should say that Christ was a 'God-bearing man.' Theodoret of Cyrus in Mesopotamia, who wrote a *Refutation* of Cyril's statements, quoted Basil as having used the term here and in his exposition of the fiftieth Psalm. But the difference between a 'God-bearing man' and 'God-bearing flesh' is the difference between Nestorianism and orthodoxy.

7. Only Begotten. 'This rendering somewhat obscures the exact sense of the original word (*μονογενής*), which is rather "only born." That is, the thought of the original is centred in the personal Being of the Son, and not in His generation. Christ is the One only Son, the One to whom the title belongs in a sense completely unique and singular, as distinguished from that in which there are many children of God.' See Luke vii. 12; viii. 42; ix. 38; Heb. xi. 17. 'Christian writers from early times have called attention to the connection of the two words applied in the New Testament to Christ "the Only Son" (*μονογενής*) and "the first-born" (*πρωτότοκος*, Col. i. 15), which present the idea of His Sonship under complementary aspects. The first marks His relation to God as absolutely without parallel, the other His relation to creation as pre-existent and sovereign. Comp. Lightfoot on Coloss. i. 15.' (Westcott, *St. John* i. 14; *Ep. of St. John*, Second Edition, p. 169-172.) The Arians made the word equivalent to 'begotten of God only.'

8. For co-numeration and sub-numeration see note on Sec. 41.

9. For a discussion of the three readings (or rather four, for the *only begotten* is found in one Latin copy), the *only begotten Son*, *God only begotten*, the *only begotten God*, see Westcott's *St. John*, ch. i. 18, additional note. 'The best attested reading [viz. *God only begotten*] has the advantage of combining the two great predicates of the word,



which have been previously indicated (ver. 1, God; ver. 14, only-begotten.)'

10. The Seventh Canon of Constantinople (A. D. 381), 'if it may be called a Canon—for it ordains nothing—it only recites a usage—doubtless a usage of the Church at Constantinople,' deals with the mode of receiving converts from the different sects. Converts from the Arians, Macedonians, Sabbatians, Novatians, Quarta-decimans, Apollinarians, were to be received on giving 'libelli' or written professions of orthodox belief. After anathematizing every sect which did not hold the Catholic Faith, they were anointed with chrism, &c. (*i.e.* confirmed). The validity of their baptism was thus implied. The Eunomians, Montanists, and other sects were 'received as Gentiles, and then on the first day were made Christians.' It is surprising to find Arians and Macedonians more favoured than Eunomians, but Dr. Bright (*Notes on the Canons*, p. 108), points out that Arianism (and the same may be said of Macedonianism) left unimpaired the distinct identity of one or more of the Divine Persons. Montanism destroyed that identity, and it was customary with the Eunomians to baptize into the death of Christ rather than into the threefold name of the Trinity.\* 'Gradually the rule observed in the West . . . was, that baptism administered with water in the name of the Trinity, no matter by whom, was true baptism; and that all heretics so baptized were to be received with imposition of hands alone. The Eastern rule differed only from this in maintaining that a wrong belief in the Trinity vitiated baptism even when conferred in their name.' (Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes in *Dict. Chris. Biog.*)

11. The Pneumatomachs (*i.e.* Adversaries of the Spirit), against whom Basil principally contends, would appear to have become more or less prominent in Egypt about A. D. 360. Athanasius between the years A. D. 356 and A. D. 362 was an exile in the desert, and on hearing from Serapion, bishop of Thmuis in the Delta, that certain who had returned to the Church from Arianism were speaking of the Spirit as a creature, and 'a ministering Spirit,' superior to the

\* Another form ascribed to them was, 'In the name of the uncreated God, the created God, and the sanctifying Spirit, created by the created Son.'

angels only in degree, he wrote two letters in defence of the faith. In the former of these he calls the heretics *Tropici*, because they treated metaphorically all passages of Scripture which assert plainly the Godhead of the third Person. On returning to Alexandria in A.D. 362, Athanasius summoned a Council. The synodical letter deals in passing with the rising heresy, and anathematizes those 'who say that the Holy Spirit is a creature, and of a different and separate essence from our Lord.' The heresy broke out at Constantinople nearly about the same time, and the sect became very numerous 'in the neighbourhood of Constantinople and in Thrace, along the shores of the Hellespont and in Bithynia. Their blameless lives, grave manners, ascetic habits, and persuasive speech, gained for them a respectful hearing, and enlisted a large number of the laity on their side.' The Pneumatomachs are also generally known as Macedonians, and Macedonius, who was deposed from the bishopric of Constantinople in A.D. 360 on the triumph of the Homœan party, has been by some considered the founder of the sect: but 'it was not until some years after his death that his name was connected with the heretical tenet, through the circumstance that the Semi-Arians happened to be called after him at the time when this tenet became the prominent mark of their party' (i.e. about A.D. 375). They were also called Marathonians, after a wealthy monk who had founded a monastic community at Constantinople, and supported them both by purse and personal influence and effort. After being vigorously opposed by Basil, Amphilochius, Epiphanius, the blind Didymus, Damasus, and Gregory of Nazianzum, who at Constantinople was the champion of the faith after Basil's death, and won over the Emperor Theodosius, the heresy was banished from the Church by the Constantinopolitan Council. As is well known, the clauses of the Nicene Creed from 'the Lord and Giver of life' to the end were then added (A.D. 381). (See Swete, *Early History of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, &c.*)

12. 'The Eunomians (Anomœans) are said to have been the first to introduce single instead of trine immersion in baptism. They had some strange baptismal rites, and rebaptized converts not only from Catholicism, but from other forms of Arianism.' (Robertson, *Church History*, Bk. II. ch. ii. See Note 9.)

13. 'To think that a man whose baptism the crown of martyrdom preventeth, doth lose in that case the happiness which so many thousands enjoy, that only have had the grace to believe, and not the honour to seal the testimony thereof with death, were almost barbarous.' (Hooker, *Ecc. Polity*, v. lx. 5). Some of the earliest Fathers appear to have ascribed merit to martyrdom, such as to cancel all sins.

14. The 'worldly wisdom' of which Basil speaks was a mixture of Aristotle's Logical Division and Neo-Platonism, which, founded at Alexandria by Ammonius Siccus towards the close of the second century, was propagated by a series of famous heathen teachers such as Plotinus, Porphyry, and Iamblichus, until in the sixth century it was suppressed. It also had its adherents amongst Christians, of whom the most eminent were Origen, who was a pupil of Ammonius, Gregory of Nazianzum, Basil's friend, among the Greeks, and the great Augustine in the Western Church. For a detailed account the reader may be referred to the various ecclesiastical histories. Its professors were called Eclectics, but strictly speaking it was not an eclectic philosophy, since it allowed the utmost freedom in the search for truth. At the same time it borrowed something from all previous schools of thought except the Epicurean. The Aristotelian, the Sceptic, the Platonic, the Stoic, the Pythagorean, were represented in it. 'The chief seat of Aristotelian studies was the Platonic school at Athens, and this school also carried out that combination of Aristotelism with the theosophy of Iamblichus which imprinted a peculiar stamp on the Neo-Platonism of the fifth and sixth centuries.' The school of Origen was the prevailing theological party in Cappadocia, and Basil, when a student at Athens, would become familiar with the 'New' philosophy. Among its tenets were the following:—'Christ Himself was classed with sages of the first rank; it was said that His object had been to reform religion; that His own views had agreed with those of the Neo-Platonists, but that His followers had corrupted His system by serious additions—among which were the doctrines of His Godhead and mediation, and the prohibition of worshipping the gods. . . . It laid down the doctrine of one supreme God, and recognized the Platonic

Trinity, consisting of the One, His Intelligence (*νοῦς*), and his Soul (*ψυχή*). In subordination to these, it held the existence of many inferior gods and demons, the ministers of the supreme; and it represented the vulgar polytheism as a corruption of this truth.' However much a system like this might be 'corrected and modified' by learned Fathers of the Church, the combination of the Gospel and Philosophy could only lead to 'a variety of subtle conclusions which neither Christ nor Plato ever thought of.' The 'sub-numeration' which Basil condemns is perhaps to be regarded only as a logical result of the Eunomian position that the Holy Spirit was to be numbered with the creatures (see Basil, *adv. Eunom.* iii. 2, and v. i.); but may not the numerical refinements which Basil combats be a perpetuation of Pythagoreanism? Philolaus,\* who, next to Archytas, was the most illustrious of the sect, was the first to publish a book on the Pythagorean doctrines. Now Plato made use of this treatise in composing the *Timæus*. And Aristotle says, 'The Pythagoreans seem to have looked upon numbers as the principle and, so to speak, the matter of which existences exist'; and again, 'they supposed the elements of numbers to be the elements of existence, and pronounced the whole heavens to be in harmony and number.' 'Number,' says Philolaus, 'is great and perfect and omnipotent, and the principle and guide of Divine and human life.' The soul and understanding were also reduced to number, and each number had its own mystic properties; e.g., *one* was identified with reason because it was unchangeable, *two* with opinion because it is unlimited and indeterminate, *four* with justice, and so on. Possibly light may moreover be thrown upon the argument by remembering that the Neo-Platonic theory assumed 'the world to be an effluence or irradiation of God, in such manner that the remoter emanation possesses ever a lower degree of perfection than that which precedes it, and represents consequently the totality of existence as a descending series.'

(See Mosheim; Robertson, *Ch. Hist.*; *Enc. Brit.* articles

\* Iamblichus (v. supra), who died in the reign of Constantine, probably before A.D. 333, also wrote a book on the philosophy of Pythagoras. It was intended as a preparation for the study of Plato.

*Neo-Platonism and Pythagoras*; Zeller's *Outlines of Greek Philosophy*, pp. 50 and 348; Schwegler's *Hist. of Philos.*, p. 141; G. H. Rendall's Hulsean Lecture for 1879, on the Emperor Julian, p. 62, seq.)

15. The doctrine of the Predicables (*genus, species, differentia, proprium, accidens*), *i.e.* 'a five-fold division of General Names, not grounded as usual on a difference in their meaning, that is, in the attribute which they connote, but on a difference in the kind of class which they denote,' is an addition to the Aristotelian logic taken from the Isagoge, or Introduction to the *Categories*, by Porphyry in the third century. The only important addition to the matter of logical science thus emanated from the Neo-Platonic school. (Mill's *Logic*, vol. i. p. 134; Mansel's *Aldrich*, p. 24, &c.)

16. In further illustration of this difficult passage, Dörner's Exposition (Div. i. vol. ii. pp. 310, 311) of Basil's views respecting 'number' may be quoted at length. 'Number,' *i.e.* according to Basil, 'is inapplicable to God. Computability presupposes a separateness of existence, which can have no place in God. We do not designate God One, at all, as to number, but as to essence; that is, we define Him as simple; whereas, amongst creatures, even that which is one is not simple. It does not follow, because a thing is one in point of number, it is therefore simple; and that which is one as to essence, that is, simple, is not therefore one as to number: to the Divine simplicity, the idea of number cannot be applied, for number relates to corporeal objects. His idea seems to be, that whatever is subjected to the laws of number, is for that very reason not absolute. For the one involves the possibility of a duality, of a plurality of beings in the same genus; it implies therefore a limitation, which has no place with God. Sooner could we suppose Father, Son, and Spirit, if not the essence of God, to be subjected to number. But even this, Basilus refuses to allow (*De Spiritu Sancto*, c. 18). "We do not maintain three Gods, but one essence. The king and his picture are one. But each of the hypostases is like itself alone, and therefore cannot be taken together with the others by computation. We cannot say of Father, Son, and Spirit, one, two, three; but one Father, one Son, one Spirit."—In the last point he undoubtedly goes too far, unless he means

wholly to exclude number from the Trinity : for what objection can there be to comprising the three under the common idea of the *τρόπος ὑπάρξεως*, and to saying, there are three hypostases? His intention, however, was simply to avoid viewing them as three Gods ; the unity of essence, denominated deity, must remain unaffected by the triplicity ; regarding the matter in the light of the deity alone, there is but a simple, indivisible unity. Basilus appears further to have been guided by the just feeling, that deity, Divine essence, ought not to be taken as the higher, the generic conception, under which the three are subsumed ; for if deity be the generic idea, it will scarcely be possible to avoid Tritheism, and then the distinctions in the Divine substance would be divisions. Whereas everything wears a different aspect, if hypostasis be taken as the common conception, under which are included Father, Son, and Spirit ; for hypostasis can undoubtedly be a subject of computation, seeing that, as a relative idea, it suggests at once another like itself, which cannot be affirmed of the Divine essence.'

17. Philo's conception of the Logos as the 'image' of God, or the language of the New Testament (2 Cor. iv. 4 ; Col. i. 15 ; Heb. i. 3—Philo also spoke of the Logos as a seal-ring), may have been in Basil's mind ; but possibly the illustration may be traced to a very different source. Julian the Apostate argued for the usefulness in worship of images of the heathen gods on the ground (*inter alia*) that 'as subjects adopt pictures and other representations of their princes, and by paying them honour obtain their goodwill, though they had no necessity for the compliment ; so also in this case, the zeal which is shown in the religious service which men can pay, may well be taken as a sign of true piety. . . . *He who loves his king feels a pleasure in looking upon the king's image ; he who loves his father feels the same towards his father's portrait.*' (Neander's *Emperor Julian and his Generation*, translated by G. V. Cox, p. 93.)

18. The Eunomian error. See Introduction.

19. *Procession* is a technical term used to express the mode of the Spirit's eternal existence, as *generation* does that of the Son. John xv. 26. 'Being the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and being so the same in the unity of the nature of God, are yet distinct in their

Personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other; and because the Father hath been already shown to have it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from Him' (Pearson on the Creed, Art. viii.). For the question whether the Holy Ghost 'proceedeth' from the Son, and for the history of the *Filioque* clause of the Nicene Creed, see Andrew's *Sermons on the Holy Ghost*, vol. iii., Library of Ang. Cath. Theology; Pearson on the Creed, art. viii. and notes; Swete's *Procession, &c. Procession* was known to the schoolmen as *spiration*, which was 'only made use of in order to the naming this relation of the Spirit to the Father and the Son, in such a manner as may best answer the sense of the word *Spirit*.'

20. The following classical passage from Hooker (Bk. V. ch. liv. 2) explains in what sense *generation* is predicated of the Son:—'By the gift of eternal generation Christ hath received of the Father one and in number the self-same substance, which the Father hath of Himself unreceived from any other. For every *beginning is a father* unto that which cometh of it; and every *offspring is a son* unto that out of which it groweth. Seeing therefore the Father alone is originally that Deity which Christ originally is not (for Christ is God by being of God, light by issuing out of light), it followeth hereupon that whatsoever Christ hath common unto Him with His Heavenly Father, the same of necessity must be *given* Him, but naturally and eternally given, not bestowed by way of benevolence and favour, as the other gifts both are.\* And therefore where the Fathers give it out for a rule, that whatsoever Christ is said in Scripture to have *received*, the same we ought to apply only to the manhood of Christ; their assertion is true of all things which Christ hath received *by grace*, but to that which He hath received of the Father by eternal nativity or birth it reacheth not.' The invention of the phrase 'eternal generation' is due to Origen, who 'endeavoured to secure the unity of the essence of God by means of the opposed principles of the equality and subordination of the Son. The latter was intended to leave a place for an independent hypostasis of the Son; the former for His Deity' (Dorner).

\* That is, the gifts of union and unction.

21. 'In the last years of the second century, the difficulty of reconciling the fundamental doctrine of the Divine Unity (*Monarchia*) with that of the threefold Name' gave rise to Monarchianism, which troubled the Church for about two hundred years. There were two courses open to the impugners of the Trinity. It was possible to deny the Godhead of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Of this, the Ebionitic form of Monarchianism, the chief exponents were Theodotus, the accomplished money-changer of Byzantium, Artemon, and Paul of Samosata, who taught that the Logos 'did not dwell in Christ as a person, but merely as a quality or power (*οὐκ ὀυσιωδῶς ἀλλὰ κατὰ ποιότητα*).' The Council of Antioch (A.D. 269), which condemned Paul, dealt only with this error; but there is reason to believe that he denied also the Personality of the Holy Ghost, and resolved Him into an impersonal energy. (Robertson's *Ch. Hist.*, Dorner, Swete.) The other form of the error consisted in regarding Father, Son, and Holy Ghost 'as merely denoting three different manifestations or aspects of one and the same Divine Person.' Traces are to be found as early as Justin Martyr. Praxeas was the first to formulate the heresy, and the 'system attained sudden ripeness and wide diffusion even in the Church; first, under the imperfect form of Patripassianism,' which is identified with Praxeas and Noetus, 'shortly before the end of the second century; and again, after some links of development had intervened, soon after the middle of the third century,' in the more refined and elaborate teaching of Sabellius. Praxeas held that there was no distinction of persons, and thus exposed himself to the taunt of being a *Patripassian*, i.e. one who made the Father die upon the cross. Sabellius acknowledged three 'persons,' but interpreted the word as equivalent to characters assumed or represented by the Monad who extends into the Trinity.

22. Socrates relates (*Letter of Alexander*, Bk. I. c. 6) that some one asked the Arians, 'Can the Word of God alter as the Devil altered?' and that they 'were not afraid to say, Yes, He can; for He is of a nature capable of turning, inasmuch as He is originate and susceptible of change.' This was to 'fix the stamp of finitude' on the Son, and the same argument would apply to the Spirit. (See Newman's *Athanasius*, vol. ii. p. 383.)



23. *Hypostasis* and *usia* (sec. 48) are words of deep interest. Around some form of the latter the great Arian controversy always raged. The *Homo-ousion*, which had nervously been disowned as savouring of Sabellian heterodoxy by the Council of Antioch (A.D. 264-269), was adopted as the symbol of orthodoxy at the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325), was then introduced into the Creed, and there remains at the present day, although it was 'momentarily abandoned by four hundred bishops at Ariminum (A.D. 359), who were tricked and worried into the act.' *Usia* is defined by Cyril of Alexandria as that which exists in itself, independent of everything to constitute it. Hence the Church, in asserting that the Son was *homo-ousios* with the Father, *i.e.* consubstantial, or co-essential, affirmed the Godhead of the Son. In the West hypostasis was synonymous with *usia*, and it was customary to speak of one hypostasis, as of one *usia*, of the Divine nature. The Alexandrians, on the other hand, spoke of more than one hypostasis, that is of three. Thus the Council of Alexandria \* (A.D. 362) determined to leave the use of the word open, so that, according to the custom of their own church or school, Catholics might freely speak of three hypostases or one. The words are discussed at length in Newman's *Arians*, Appendix, p. 432, where the view is expressed that 'the word hypostasis stands neither for person nor essence exclusively; but it means the Personal God of natural theology, the notion of whom the Catholic corrects and completes as he views Him as a Trinity.'

24. How far St. Basil's views respecting slavery agreed with those of Aristotle, and how far they were coloured by the distinctive teaching of Christianity, may be gathered from the two following quotations (Jowett's translation):—'Others affirm that the rule of a master over slaves is contrary to nature, and that the distinction between slave and freeman exists by law only, and not by nature; and being an interference with nature, is therefore unjust' (*Politics*, Bk. I. sec. 4). 'Is there any one thus intended by nature to be a slave, and for whom such a condition is expedient and right, or rather is not all slavery a violation of nature? There is no difficulty in

\* See Bright's *History of the Church*, pp. 115-118.

answering this question, on grounds both of reason and fact. For that some should rule, and others be ruled, is a thing not only necessary, but expedient; from the hour of their birth some are marked out for subjection, others for rule. . . . Where, then, there is such a difference as that between soul and body, or between men and animals (as in the case of those whose business is to use their body, and who can do nothing better), the lower sort are by nature slaves, and it is better for them, as for all inferiors, that they should be under the rule of a master. . . . It is clear, then, that some men are by nature free, and others slaves, and that for these latter slavery is both expedient and right' (*Politics*, Bk. I. sec. 5). The influence of Christianity in ameliorating the conditions of slavery must have been great, seeing that slaves were admitted to full spiritual privileges here and hereafter, and that some were even raised to the episcopate. But it has been observed that the early Fathers 'inculcated humanity on the part of the master by arguments which much resemble those with which the modern philanthropist urges the exercise of the same virtue towards the brute creation.' And perhaps Christianity was less effective than Stoicism, which, 'deserting the restrictions of natural politics, raised itself to conceive of all mankind as one brotherhood, each member standing in direct relation to God' (Grant's *Ethics of Arist.*, i. 371), and, according to Mr. Lecky (*History of Morals*, ii. 327), supplied the Roman jurists and judges with guiding principles. Within two years of the national recognition of Christianity by the Edict of Milan (A.D. 313), legislation for many years was in favour of the slave, but his condition remained much the same. In the fourth century Christian writers assumed a bolder tone. Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzum, Lactantius, Arnobius, spoke out plainly, and the last of these (he died about A.D. 327) had stigmatized slavery 'as a reversal of natural law.' The growth of feeling is illustrated by the fact that when a lady claimed one of her slaves, who, without being enfranchised, had been made bishop over a small community in the desert, she was severely rebuked by Basil. At the same time it must be remembered that even Gregory of Nazianzum owned slaves, some of whom were not liberated until his death. (See

further, *Diſt. of Antiq.*; Sir W. Maine's *Early History of Institutions*; Milman's *Latin Christianity*; E. S. Talbot, *Slavery as affected by Christianity*, p. 34, &c.) In a letter with which I have been favoured, and from which I venture to quote, Dr. Bright ſays: 'I do not know of any Patric ſiſt paſſage which treats ſlavery as a merciful arrangement for the weak to the extent to which Baſil does in §. 51. Auguſtine docs ſay (*Quæſt. in Heptat. i. 153*), *Primos ſervos quibus hoc nomen in Latina lingua inditum eſt, bella fecerunt. Qui enim homo ab homine ſuperatus jure belli poſſet occidi, quia ſervatus eſt, ſervus eſt appellatus. (He has ſaid before, ſervum hominem hominum, vel iniquitas, vel adverſitas, fecit.)* He adds that normally the infirmior ratio ſhould ſerve the ſtronger—but this is often reversed in hoc sæculo per iniquitatem hominum vel per naturarum carnalium diverſitatem.'

25. For the Sabellians ſee note on Monarchianism (21).

26. The perſons alluded to are the Arians, whoſe formula ran, 'There was when He (the Son) was not; and before He was begotten, He did not exiſt.' They held that the Spirit was created by the Son. The Semi-Arians, amongſt whom Macedonius was reckoned, alſo believed in the creation of the Holy Ghhoſt.

27. 'Form' (εἶδος) has been ſaid (J. S. Mill's *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philoſophy*, fourth edition, p. 454, ſeq.) to be one 'of the obſcureſt and moſt confuſing expreſſions in the whole range of metaphyſics.' Its proper ſignification, bodily figure, is obviously inadequate in the text. Ariſtotle (*Psychology*, Bk. II., ch. i., ſec. 14) ſays, 'The ſoul muſt neceſſarily be a real ſubſtance, as the form which determines a natural body poſſeſſed potentially of life.' And, again, the ſoul is called the ἐντελέχεια of the body, a term invented by Ariſtotle (Grant's *Ethics*, vol. i. p. 235) to expreſs the oppoſition between actual exiſtence as oppoſed to poſſible exiſtence or potentiality, and of 'which the moſt natural account is that it is a compound of ἐν τέλει ἔχειν, being in the ſtate of perfection.' Form is thus to matter as the ſoul to the body, and the Holy Spirit is to thoſe in whom He dwelle, and who preſent no bar to His action, their 'perfect realization.' To make the parallel clear, however, it muſt be remembered that *soul* has no precise English equivalent, but that it ſtands for all that is immaterial in man, including mind, deſires, will,

and even life. See further Moore's *Ethics of Aristotle*, third edition, p. li. Other Aristotelian words used in this section are *δύναμις* (faculty or power), *ἔξις* (acquired habit of body or mind), *ἐνέργεια* (action or operation, generally used instead of *ἐντελέχεια*), *διάθεσις* (disposition or condition).

28. The distinction is that between the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* (discourse which is still immanent, *i.e.* thought), and *λόγος προφορικός*, uttered discourse, which was drawn by Philo. 'The distinction . . . entirely in Philo's sense, may unhesitatingly, nay more, must, in any case, be substantially transferred to the Divine Logos; and it is to be regarded as quite accidental that Philo did not, like some subsequent writers, apply the distinction himself.' (Dorner, *Div. I.*, vol. i., note N, p. 338). Others hold that Philo did thus apply the terms, and Dorner himself admits that Philo undoubtedly has 'the spirit of the application.' Catholics admitted the terms. (See Newman's *Arians*; Suicer's *Theol.*; Westcott, *John i.* 1, &c.)

29. 'The most lasting of the evils which this school (the Alexandrian of the second century) introduced into the Church was the license of figurative interpretation in explaining Holy Scripture.' Origen, with his threefold sense—the literal, the moral, and the mystical, which last was again divided into the *allegorical* and the *anagogical*, 'where the narrative typified the things of a higher world,' completed the Alexandrian method. It must not be forgotten here and elsewhere that Basil was of the same philosophical lineage as Origen. (See Robertson's *Ch. Hist.*, Bk. I., ch. v., vi.; Mosheim, Bk. I., cent. iii., &c.)

30. The Benedictine editors prefer the reading *gennētois* to *genetois*. *Agennētos* was the philosophical term to denote that which had existed from eternity. It was applied by Aristotle to the world or to matter, which, according to him, was without beginning; and by Plato to his ideas. In process of time a distinction was made between *agenētos* (increate) and *agennētos* (ingenerate). (Newman's *Arians*, p. 181.) Thus, strictly, *genetois*, *originate*, as opposed to *eternal*, is more appropriate in the text than *gennetois*, *begotten*, as opposed to *made*.

31. The term here used, *συναφεία*, *i.e.* conjunction, was, when applied to the combination of the Divine and human nature in Christ, not adequate, in Cyril's judgment. He

preferred *ἔνωσις*, union. (*Μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ τῆς συναφείας ὄνομα παραιτούμεθα, ὡς οὐκ ἔχον ἰκανῶς σημεῖναι τὴν ἔνωσιν. Ep. ad Nest. ii.*) *Συναφεία* had, however, been used also by Chrysostom, and was afterwards used by John Damascene. Nestorius, it has been said, did not reject *ἔνωσις*, but preferred *συνάφεια*. Whatever might be urged on either side for or against the words, would be equally valid of the union of the Spirit with the Father and the Son.

32. Basil in this section uses two words of which it is difficult to fix the exact meaning. The Benedictine editors, illustrating from the reserve practised in the case of catechumens, understands by *dogmata*, 'nonnulla . . . veluti interiora, quæ post exteriorem et propositam omnibus doctrinam tradantur'; *kerugmata* he interprets as 'leges ecclesiasticæ, et canonum decreta, quæ promulgari in ecclesia mos erat, ut neminem laterent.' Suicer (*Theol. s. v.*) takes the exactly opposite view, and remarks as follows:—'*Κηρυγμάτων* nomine intelligi doctrinam fidei, sive capita illa Religionis Christianæ, quæ sunt Catholica et perpetua; *δόγματα* autem esse ceremonias et ritus, quorum ratio non omnibus perspecta.' 'By *kerugmata* is meant the doctrine of faith, or the cardinal doctrines of the Christian Religion, which are universal and of perpetual obligation; *dogmata* are rites and ceremonies, the reason for which is not seen by all.' Lightfoot, on Coloss. ii. 14, says, 'The word *δόγμα* is here used in its proper sense of a "decree," "ordinance," corresponding to *δογματίζεσθε* below, ver. 20. This is its only sense in the New Testament; e.g. Luke ii. 1, Acts xvii. 7, of the Emperor's decrees; Acts xvi. 4 of the Apostolic ordinances.' Again, 'the *δόγματα* . . . though referring primarily to the Mosaic ordinances, will include all forms of positive decrees in which moral or social principles are embodied, or religious duties are defined.' *Κήρυγμα* occurs in Matt. xii. 41; Luke xi. 32; Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Cor. i. 21; ii. 4; xv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 17; Tit. i. 3—and in all these passages the word may best be understood as 'the matter preached.'

N.B.—The notes which stood under numbers 33 to 37 in the first edition have, owing to the controversial nature of their contents, been omitted in this revised issue.

38. In the East the unction with exorcised oil took place immediately before baptism, and, according to some, both sexes were anointed over the whole body. There was also an anointing on the forehead after baptism in the West; in the East not only on the forehead, but on other parts also. The latter ceremony was a part of the rite of Confirmation. For an excellent note on 'the anointing of the sick,' see Dean Plumtree on James v. 14 (Cambridge Bible). Anointing with oil was practised at coronation and ordination, and even things were 'anointed.'

39. Triple immersion, that is, thrice dipping the head while standing in the water, was the all but universal rule of the Church in early times. There is proof of its existence in Africa, Palestine, Egypt, at Antioch and Constantinople, in Cappadocia and Rome. 'The Apostolical Canons give special instructions . . . saying that any bishop or presbyter should be deposed who violated this rule.' Eunomius (circ. A.D. 360) appears to have been the first to introduce simple immersion. (See Note 12.) Gregory the Great ruled that either form was allowable, the one symbolizing the Unity of the Godhead, the other the Trinity of Persons.

40. Amongst the other ceremonies at baptism to which Basil alludes were the kiss of peace, white robes, and the tasting of milk and honey. These probably dated from very early times. In the fourth century some new ceremonies were introduced, such as the use of lights and salt, the unction with oil before baptism, in addition to that with chrism, which continued to be administered after baptism.

41. The Catechetics of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, when combined with allusions incidentally made by Dionysius, St. Basil, and others, put before us very vividly the ceremonial with which these renunciations were made. St. Cyril, addressing the neophytes, says, 'Ye entered in first into the outer chamber of the baptistery, and standing with your faces to the West, ye heard how ye were bidden to stretch forth the hand with a gesture of repulsion, and ye renounced Satan, as though there present before you . . . saying, "I renounce thee, Satan." . . . Then, with a second word thou art taught to say, "and thy works." . . . And then again thou sayest.

"and (his) thy pomp." And afterward thou sayest, "and all thy worship." When thou hadst thus renounced Satan, breaking altogether all covenants with him, then . . . turning from the West toward the Sun-rising, the place of light, thou wast told to say, "I believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and in one baptism of repentance." From Dionysius we learn further that, before making this renunciation, the catechumen was divested of his upper garment, and standing barefoot, and in his chiton (shirt) only, made three separate renunciations in answer to questions put to him (this is implied, but not so distinctly stated, by St. Cyril), and then being turned towards the East, was bidden to look up to heaven, and, with uplifted hands, to declare his allegiance unto Christ, and after so doing he again, in answer to questions put to him, thrice made confession of his faith. (*DiE. of Christian Biography.*)

42. 'It was the custom in the earliest times of Christianity to pray standing, with the hands extended and slightly raised towards heaven, and with the face turned towards the East. Frescoes, sarcophagi, sepulchral monuments, ancient glass, mosaics in the earliest basilicas, above all, the Roman catacombs, exhibit the faithful, more especially women, praying in this attitude.' The Old Testament proves that while standing was the ordinary attitude among the Jews, kneeling was also common, and the first converts imported their former customs into the Church. Luke xxii. 41; Acts vii. 60, ix. 40, xxi. 5; Eph. iii. 14, show that kneeling was 'probably the general position of the early Christians in prayer not regulated by public authority.' At Holy Communion the first prayer of the faithful was said by all kneeling. During the rest of the liturgy all stood. At other times of service the rule was for all to kneel in prayer, except, as Basil relates, on Sundays and between Easter and Whitsuntide.

43. The term to which Basil refers is in Hebrew *sh'minith*, which also occurs in I Chron. xv. 21. The Sept. has ὑπὲρ ἑπτῆς ὀγδόης. The Vulgate, *pro octava*. Some explain the title as meaning an instrument with eight strings; but it probably means 'in a lower octave,' or 'in the bass.' The Fathers thought the Septuagint rendering referred to the blessedness of eternity. See

Jennings and Lowe on the Psalms, Introduction, p. xxxi.; also Delitzsch on Psa. vi.

44. The profession of faith is founded on our Lord's words in Matt. xxviii. 19; and from the case of the Eunuch in Acts viii. 37, it appears to have been required from the very first. It seems also to be required by our Lord's own words, 'He that *believeth* and is baptized' (Mark xvi. 16); for as belief must necessarily, in adults, precede baptism, so some confession of what is believed seems necessary as an outward evidence of belief. The object, however, is not that each person should declare his own private belief, but that he should assent to that of the Church. Tertullian (*De Coron.* iii.) speaks of such a confession being made in his time, 'pledging ourselves to something more than the Lord hath prescribed in the Gospel'; that is, to a fuller creed than the confession of belief in the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity. 'Such a confession is extant in the case of Palmatius, who was baptized A.D. 220, a few years after Tertullian wrote. . . . St. Cyprian, in his seventieth and seventy-sixth Epistles, gives part of a similar creed, and others are extant which were used at the baptism of various persons in the third and fourth century.' (Blunt's *Annotated Prayer Book*, 1888, p. 414.)

45. That is, Dianius, bishop of Cappadocian Cæsarea. Basil was not baptized until after his return from Athens (A.D. 355). He would then be at least twenty-six years old. Dianius probably died in A.D. 362.

46. Irenæus, by birth a Greek, and born probably near Smyrna, was the friend of Polycarp. He became bishop of Lyons, and suffered martyrdom about A.D. 202 or A.D. 208.

47. Clement of Rome, by the ancient writers accounted the same Clement whom St. Paul mentions in Phil. iv. 3, is supposed to have succeeded Anacletus as bishop of Rome, A.D. 91. He died 100.

48. Dionysius became bishop of Rome A.D. 259, and died A.D. 269. His only remaining work is a fragment against the Sabellians.

49. Dionysius of Alexandria was sprung from a noble heathen family, but early became a convert to Christianity. He was a pupil of Origen, was made presbyter of the Church of Alexandria in A.D. 232, and was raised to that



see in A.D. 247. During the Valerian persecution he was banished to the deserts of Libya, where he remained three years. Died A.D. 267. He wrote against Sabellius, the Novatians, and Paul of Samosata. The book referred to was in reply to the accusation of false teaching on the Holy Trinity.

50. Eusebius, the well-known ecclesiastical historian, was born about A.D. 267, and became bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine A.D. 313. He died A.D. 338. Basil hints that some would hesitate to accept Eusebius as an authority. This was no doubt owing to the fact that 'he was one of the prelates on whom Arius relied; and although the extent of his sympathy with Arianism has been disputed, it may be truly said that "his acts are his confession." Nor did he "scruple to say plainly that Christ was not true God."' (Bright's *History of the Church*, p. 15.) If this be so, he is to be regarded as a witness for the use of the words only, not for the doctrinal significance of them.

51. The illustrious Origen was born at Alexandria in Egypt about A.D. 185. A pupil of Ammonius, the Neo-Platonic philosopher, and of Clemens Alexandrinus, he became Catechist, or Professor of Theology, at Alexandria. After indefatigable labours, and suffering torture during the Decian persecution, he died at Tyre, aged 69. The obscurity of the subjects which he treated, and his peculiar system of interpretation, exposed him to the danger of being misunderstood. He complains 'even in his own lifetime of falsifications by heretics, and of misrepresentation by indiscreet admirers, while he was conscious that prejudiced readers might be likely to apprehend him as heretical.' The Arians claimed him as a forerunner of their heresy, and he is said (on account of his theory of the origin of souls, and his views respecting the freedom of the will) to have 'furnished the Pelagians with principles.' The book in which he is specially accused of having spoken blasphemy concerning the Spirit of God is the first book of the *De Principiis*. The book, however, exists only in the translation of Rufinus, and Jerome maintained that Rufinus had mistranslated his author. Bishop Harold Browne (*Articles*, note 1, p. 113) thinks that 'if Rufinus has given at all a fair representation of his author . . .

Origen cannot have been very heretical concerning the Holy Ghost,' and he quotes the passage from Origen— 'Porro autem nihil in Trinitate majus minus ve dicendum est quum unius Divinitatis Fons Verbo ac Ratione sua teneat universa, Spiritu vero oris sui quæ digna sunt sanctificatione sanctificet.' (See also Robertson's *Ch. Hist.*)

52. Sextus Julius Africanus was a learned Christian writer at the beginning of the third century. He passed the greater part of his life at Emmaus in Palestine, and afterwards at Alexandria. His principal work was a *Chronicon*, in five books, from the creation of the world to A.D. 221. Only fragments remain in various authors.

53. 'We cannot doubt that they' (Basil and Gregory, with the monks of their community in Pontus) 'used at Evensong that noble hymn which was already old in their time, and which must have had a special significance in an age when Christ's true Godhead was called in question:—

"Light of Gladness, Beam divine  
From the glory's inmost shrine,  
Where in heaven's immortal rest,  
Reigns Thy Father ever blest;—

Jesus Christ, our hymn receive;  
Sunset brings the lights of eve;  
Day is past, and night begun;  
Praise we Father, Spirit, Son.

Night and day for Thee is meet  
Holy voices' anthem sweet,  
Ringing through the world abroad,—  
Hail, life-giving Son of God."

It is still the vesper-hymn of the East.' (Bright, *Ch. Hist.*, p. 89.)

54. Athenogenes lived about A.D. 196, and was contemporary with Clement of Alexandria. The hymn which he sang on his way to the stake and left as a legacy (*ἔξιτηριον*), or a charm (*ἀλεξητήριον*), to his disciples, has been identified with one of the two very early Christian hymns—'Gloria in excelsis,' and the hymn quoted above. But Basil plainly says that no one knew the author of this

latter, and moreover appears to distinguish it from the hymn ascribed to Athenogenes. 'This hymn, with the early form of the "Gloria in excelsis," the latter being given as the morning hymn in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, probably represent in their rhythmic but unmetrical structure many early Christian hymns now lost.' For supposed quotations from hymns in the New Testament, see Eph. v. 14; 1 Tim. iii. 16, vi. 15, 16; 2 Tim. ii. 11-13; also Eph. v. 19, 20; Col. iii. 16, 17, though the last two passages are supposed to refer to social and festive gatherings rather than to worship, and might thus be compared to the Spiritual Songs of Luther, the *Ghostly Psalms* of Coverdale, or the early Wesleyan hymns. Owing in great measure to the disputes between Arians and Catholics, a great impulse was given to Christian hymnody in the fourth century. In the East, Bardesanes, or his son Harmonius, in Syria; Chrysostom and two priests, Flavian and Deodorus, at Constantinople; and in the West, Ambrose (A.D. 385), at Milan, were the prominent leaders in the movement. (See Articles in *Dict. Christian Biog.*, and *Dict. Christian Antiq.*)

55. Gregory, surnamed *Thaumaturgus*, or the *Wonder-worker*, from his miracles, was born at Neocæsarea, in Cappadocia, of heathen parents. Converted to Christianity by Origen, about A.D. 234, he subsequently became bishop of his native town. He died soon after A.D. 265. (See Newman's *Essay on Miracles*, 126-132.)

56. Firmilian was another pupil of Origen, and when bishop of Neocæsarea (A.D. 236-8) had the privilege of sheltering his former master, who had been compelled by persecution to leave Cæsarea in Palestine. About twenty years afterwards he was in correspondence with Cyprian, who, being, like the Asiatics, 'excommunicated' by Stephen of Rome for holding that 'converts must be baptized unless they had received the regular baptism of the Church before falling into heresy or schism, in which case imposition of hands would suffice,' had written to consult him. The reply of Firmilian dealt so freely with Stephen's character and conduct, that the first editors suppressed it, and later Roman writers have denied its genuineness.

57. Meletius, the learned and accomplished bishop of Pontus, of whom Eusebius relates (*Hist.* vii. 32) that he

was frequently called 'Attic honey.' He is said to have lived seven years in Palestine, whither he had retired during the Diocletian persecution.

58. 'The extraordinary versatility, the argumentative subtlety, and the too frequent profanity of Arianism are matters of which a few lines can give no idea. But it is necessary, in even the briefest notice of this long-lived heresy, to remark on the contrast between its changeable inventiveness, and the simple steadfastness of Catholic doctrine. On the one side, some twenty different creeds (of which several, however, were rather negatively than positively heterodox) and three main sects, the Semi-Arians . . . the Acacians . . . the Aetians. On the other side, the Church with the Nicene Creed, &c.' (Bright's *St. Leo*, note 12.)

