

ST VLADIMIR'S SEMINARY PRESS
Popular Patristics Series
Number 43

The Popular Patristics Series published by St Vladimir's Seminary Press provides readable and accurate translations of a wide range of early Christian literature to a wide audience—students of Christian history to lay Christians reading for spiritual benefit. Recognized scholars in their fields provide short but comprehensive and clear introductions to the material. The texts include classics of Christian literature, thematic volumes, collections of homilies, letters on spiritual counsel, and poetical works from a variety of geographical contexts and historical backgrounds. The mission of the series is to mine the riches of the early Church and to make these treasures available to all.

Series Editor
JOHN BEHR

Associate Editor
AUGUSTINE CASIDAY

Works on the Spirit

ATHANASIUS AND DIDYMUS

Athanasius's
Letters to Serapion on the Holy Spirit
and Didymus's
On the Holy Spirit

Translated, with an Introduction and Annotations, by

MARK DELCOGLIANO,
ANDREW RADDE-GALLWITZ,
and LEWIS AYRES

ST VLADIMIR'S SEMINARY PRESS
YONKERS, NEW YORK
2011

Athanasius, <i>Letters to Serapion on the Holy Spirit</i>	51
Jerome's Prologue to <i>The Book of Didymus On the Holy Spirit</i>	139
Didymus, <i>On the Holy Spirit</i>	143
Bibliography	229
Index of Scripture	235

Preface

This volume is the fruit of a happy collaboration that originated during the years 2006–2007 when the three of us were at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia. Our partnership began when Lewis Ayres suggested that we translate Didymus's *On the Holy Spirit* with a view to publication. It was truly a joint effort. Each week the three of us prepared translations of a predetermined amount of text. At weekly meetings we then went through the Latin line-by-line, discussing the meaning and producing a collaborative translation that incorporated the best elements from each of our efforts. The translation of Athanasius's *Letters to Serapion on the Holy Spirit* is principally the work of Mark DelCogliano, though major sections were completed in collaboration with Andrew Radde-Gallwitz. All three of us carefully went through both translations in the autumn of 2007 in preparation for a weekend of meetings in January 2008, during which each was substantially revised. Two further years of tinkering with the translations on the part of all three of us have produced the versions that appear in this volume. Each section of the General Introduction has a primary author, whose work was critiqued by his two collaborators. Mark DelCogliano wrote the brief survey of pre-fourth century pneumatology and the Introduction to Athanasius's *Letters to Serapion on the Holy Spirit*, and Andrew Radde-Gallwitz the Introduction to Didymus's *On the Holy Spirit*. Lewis Ayres wrote the sections, "Athanasius's Argument" and "Didymus's Argument," within these two Introductions.

Abbreviations

AW	<i>Athanasius Werke</i>
PG	Patrologia Cursus Completus: Series Graeca.
SChr	Sources Chrétiennes
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistula (Letter)</i>
<i>h.e.</i>	<i>Historia ecclesiastica (Church History)</i>
<i>Serap.</i>	<i>Epistulae ad Serapionem (Letters to Serapion)</i>
<i>Spir.</i>	<i>De Spiritu sancti (On the Holy Spirit)</i>
<i>Trin.</i>	<i>De Trinitate (On the Trinity)</i>
<i>Zacc.</i>	<i>Commentarii in Zacchariam (Commentary on Zechariah)</i>
Gr.	Greek
Lat.	Latin
lit.	literally
LXX	Septuagint
ms.	manuscript
mss.	manuscripts

General Introduction

*By the Word of the Lord the heavens were established,
by the Spirit of his mouth all their power [Ps 32.6 LXX].*

*You send forth your Spirit, and they are created,
and you renew the face of the earth [Ps 103.30 LXX].*

Who is the Holy Spirit, especially in relation to the Father and the Son? What is the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of the church and in the life of individual Christians? Broadly speaking, these two questions animated reflection upon the Holy Spirit in early Christianity.¹ Athanasius's *Letters to Serapion* and Didymus's *On the Holy Spirit* are among the earliest Christian texts dedicated exclusively to the Holy Spirit, reflecting the pneumatological debates of the mid fourth century. Although the Holy Spirit only became the object of sustained theological reflection in the fourth century, there were earlier Christian pneumatologies. In fact, the pneumatological developments of the fourth century constitute what can be considered a *third* stage in the history of the theology of the Spirit.²

¹For standard accounts of the history of the theology of the Holy Spirit, see H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church* (London: MacMillan, 1912; repr. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 1996); J. Patout Burns, and Gerald M. Fagan, *The Holy Spirit, Message of the Fathers of the Church* 3 (Wilmington: M. Glazier, 1984; repr. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2002).

²See Lewis Ayres and Michel René Barnes, "Pneumatology: Historical and Methodological Considerations," *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 163–236, a collection of four papers, with an Introduction and Conclusion, originally delivered at the annual meeting of the North American Patristics Society in 2005. The individual contributions are cited below.

In the first and second centuries there was no single Christian pneumatology, but rather a variety of continuations and developments of diverse, pre-existing Jewish pneumatologies.³ The most important of these is Spirit as Creator pneumatology, according to which the Holy Spirit was identified as co-Creator on the basis of texts such as Psalms 32.6 and 103.30. Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Irenaeus are adherents of this pneumatological tradition.⁴ Other early Jewish-Christian pneumatologies identified the Spirit as an Angel, as Wisdom, as the Consort of God, and so forth. Angelic pneumatology is particularly relevant for our purposes since both Athanasius and Didymus were compelled to refute a fourth-century version of it.

The second stage, beginning in the third century, sees the end of this “high” pneumatology. In this period significant figures such as Tertullian and Origen abandoned earlier Jewish-Christian pneumatologies in response to a variety of doctrinal pressures.⁵ Monarchians, who viewed Christ and the Spirit as identical with the Father, differing only in name and in their mode of manifestation, may have been particularly important. For Tertullian and Origen, monarchian accounts threatened the priority and uniqueness of God, the Father of Jesus Christ and Creator of all things. In response they tried to

³Michel René Barnes, “The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology,” *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 169–86 at 171–80. On Jewish-Christian pneumatologies, see Jean Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, translated by John A. Baker (London: Darton, Longmann & Todd; Chicago: The Henry Regnery Company, 1964); Marie E. Isaacs, *The Concept of Spirit: A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and its Bearing on the New Testament*, Heythrop Monographs 1 (London: Heythrop College, 1976); John Levinson, “The Angelic Spirit in Early Judaism,” *SBL 1995 Seminar Papers*, 464–92; Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnostics* (Leiden: Brill, 1977; repr. 2002); idem, “Two Powers in Heaven and Early Christian Thinking,” in Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O’Collins, eds., *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Doctrine of the Trinity* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 73–95.

⁴On Irenaeus’s pneumatology, see J. Armitage Robinson, *St. Irenaeus: Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching* (London: SPCK; New York: MacMillan, 1920), 24–68; and Michel René Barnes, “Irenaeus’s Trinitarian Theology,” *Nova et Vetera* 7 (2009): 76–106.

⁵Barnes, “The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology,” 180–6.

distinguish the Son and the Spirit from the Father with greater clarity and order. As part of this shift, they neglected scriptural passages about the “Spirit” as Creator (such as Psalms 32.6 and 103.30) and reinterpreted other key scriptural passages about the “Spirit” (such as Luke 1:35), so that they were no longer understood as statements about the Holy Spirit, but about the pre-incarnate Son.⁶ Scriptural texts about the Wisdom of God were reinterpreted in a similar way. Such neglect of some passages and reinterpretations of others thus undercut the exegetical basis for the “high” Jewish-Christian Spirit as Creator pneumatology. In these “low” pneumatologies of the third century the Holy Spirit was considered subordinate to the Son, largely on the basis of John 1:3, *All things came to be through him*, i.e. the Word.⁷ Such subordination is in fact a key feature of the anti-monarchian Trinitarian theology of Tertullian and Origen, who employed the idea of Trinitarian order (*gradus* or *taxis*) to understand the unity and diversity of the three: Father, Son, and Spirit, while distinct, are unified in an ontological hierarchy. As Michel Barnes notes, while this new emphasis on Trinitarian order resulted in “a curtailment of previous pneumatological options,” it contained “its own tensions and possibilities that were played out in subsequent centuries.”⁸ Indeed, no one in the fourth century questioned this hierarchical Trinitarian order as such, though its meaning and significance was heavily contested.⁹

The third stage covers the mid to late fourth century and is characterized by the continuation, retrieval, and clash of older pneumatologies and their reconfiguration within the new context of Pro-Nicene Trinitarian theology.¹⁰ A comparison of the creeds of Nicaea

⁶For example, see Tertullian, *Against Praxeas* 26.

⁷For example, see Origen, *Commentary on the Gospel according to John* 2.73–88.

⁸Lewis Ayres and Michel René Barnes, “Conclusions,” *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 235–6 at 235.

⁹Barnes, “The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology,” 186.

¹⁰Lewis Ayres, “Innovation and Ressourcement in Pro-Nicene Pneumatology,” *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 187–206. For a survey of other theories why controversy about the divinity of the Holy Spirit broke out at this time, see Michael A. G. Haykin, *The Spirit of God* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 1–3.

in 325 and Constantinople in 381 gives a sense of the development of pneumatological doctrine in the mid fourth century:

Nicene Creed (325) Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed (381)

We believe . . . in the Holy Spirit.	We believe . . . in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and the Giver of Life, who proceeds from the Father, who is worshipped and glorified together with the Father and the Son, who spoke through the prophets.
--------------------------------------	--

By the time of the Council of Constantinople in 381, the original Nicene pronouncement was deemed no longer sufficient and was expanded in the light of the Pro-Nicene clarifications about the Holy Spirit that had developed in the interim. Pro-Nicene Trinitarian theology viewed the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as three irreducible agents who share or constitute one indivisible divine nature or power and operate inseparably.¹¹ Most significantly, this new context led to a recovery of pneumatology which emphasized the Spirit's status as Creator within the inseparable and unmediated creative activity of God.

This new Pro-Nicene theology of the Holy Spirit was, however, resisted by those who still adhered to the ontologically subordinated Trinitarian order developed by the anti-monarchians, by those who believed that the Holy Spirit was a creature. Such theologians appealed to the fact that scripture itself lacked clear support for the claim that the Holy Spirit was God, and drew upon a variety of older Jewish-Christian pneumatologies to establish their position for the created status of the Holy Spirit. For example, they retrieved Angelic pneumatology but rejected Spirit as Creator pneumatology, resulting in a "low" Angelic pneumatology in contrast to its earlier "high" Jewish-Christian precedent. These theologians may also have

¹¹On the meaning of "Pro-Nicene," see Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 236–40.

been influenced by wider currents in Homoian doctrine of the late 350s—the ecclesial alliance out of which the Heteroousians would emerge.¹² The subordinationist impulse of Homoian theology was surely extended to the Spirit, and the Heteroousians followed this impulse to its logical conclusion by completely depriving the Spirit of divinity.¹³ And so, we may posit a dual context for those who opposed Pro-Nicene pneumatology: (1) the continued presence of some older Jewish-Christian pneumatologies filtered through the low pneumatology of the anti-monarchians, and (2) the vitalization of these pneumatologies by Homoians and Heteroousians. The writings of Athanasius and Didymus on the Holy Spirit are the first Pro-Nicene writings directed against such groups, refuting both older (Jewish-Christian and anti-monarchian) and recent (Homoian and Heteroousian) pneumatological themes.

INTRODUCTION TO ATHANASIUS'S *LETTERS TO SERAPION*

Life and Legacy

Narratives of the fourth-century Trinitarian debates have, until quite recently, been dominated by the figure of Athanasius. Traditional accounts of these debates corral its participants into two competing camps: the beleaguered Athanasius and his supporters, who formulate an unalterable theological vision enshrined in the Creed of Nicaea in 325, and the Arians, who maliciously oppose Nicene theology at every chance in order to promote their shameless heresy. These two parties battle it out through the fourth century, with Athanasius bravely and resolutely at the helm of the ship of orthodoxy, however rocked by Arian waves it may be. Efforts on the part of the

¹²On the Homoians and Heteroousians, see Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, 138–9 and 144–9.

¹³See Eunomius, *Apology* 25–26.

In the course of revising our initial translation, we were able to confirm Joseph Lebon's view of Montfaucon's edition: "the text of the Benedictine edition hardly seems to call for important corrections; in fact, it does not appear to contain a lacuna, an interpolation, an insoluble puzzle, or a difficulty that affects the meaning."⁶⁰ Though the *Athanasius Werke* edition is based upon more manuscript evidence than Montfaucon's text, and furthermore takes into account the ancient Armenian translation (dated between the early 5th century and the 8th century and a witness to the original Athanasian text that is independent of the known Greek traditions), we found that the new edition differed only in minor ways from the old edition in approximately eighty-six places (excluding alternative word orders). Only rarely have we departed from the *Athanasius Werke* edition and preferred another reading; these are signaled and explained in the footnotes. In three cases the editors of the *Athanasius Werke* edition chose to insert words into the main body of the text based on evidence found in the Armenian translation but which are not found in any Greek manuscript (see *Serap.* 1.33.5, 2.2.1, 2.8.1). In two cases the editors chose to surround these additions with curved braces {}, indicating uncertainty over whether they are original to Athanasius. We have thought it best to relegate these three insertions to footnotes.

Our translation has benefited greatly from Shapland's version, which, though excellent, is not without occasional mistakes in translation, questionable word choices, infelicities in style, and digressions from good, idiomatic English prose. It goes without saying that we hope to have avoided these imperfections. May our rendition be honored and useful for as long as Shapland's has. If we may be allowed to slightly modify an oft-repeated expression attributed to the 12th century Bernard of Chartres: *vere nani gigantis humeris insidentes sumus*, "truly we are dwarves sitting on the shoulders of a giant."

⁶⁰Lebon, *Athanase d'Alexandre*, 20–1.

INTRODUCTION TO DIDYMUS'S ON THE HOLY SPIRIT

Life and Writings

In comparison with Athanasius, contemporary sources on Didymus are scarce. What we do have reveals a man renowned throughout the Mediterranean Christian world of his day as a teacher and interpreter of scripture. He was born in Alexandria, most likely in 313, and died in 398.⁶¹ Disease blinded him at age four, before he could receive any schooling.⁶² Yet this did not prevent him from learning. One of his disciples, Rufinus, records that Didymus had texts read to him which he would retain by memory. Late in the night after his weary lectures would succumb to sleep, he would stay awake, silently rehearsing what had been read, "like a clean animal chewing its cud."⁶³

According to Rufinus, he received training in dialectic, geometry, astronomy, and arithmetic. Rufinus portrays him as stunning philosophers who brought questions from these arts.⁶⁴ He claims that these disputations were recorded by stenographers, though none survive. Yet it must be noted that his praise of Didymus echoes formulaic praise of great teachers, such as Athanasius's descriptions of Antony (who is said to have paid Didymus the honor of a visit).⁶⁵ Jerome's assessment of Didymus in the preface to *On the Holy Spirit* emphasizes the uncultivated style of the work, reproducing another commonplace: the opposition between artless philosophy, committed solely to truth, and flowery rhetoric, concerned more with style than substance.⁶⁶ Recently, Richard Layton has argued that Didymus probably did not receive advanced training beyond what one

⁶¹See Gustave Bardy, *Didyme L'Aveugle* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1910), 3–4.

⁶²Disease: Socrates, *h.e.* 4.25; Age four: Palladius, *Lausiac History* 4.

⁶³Rufinus, *h.e.* 11.7.

⁶⁴*Ibid.*

⁶⁵Athanasius, *Life of St Antony* 74–80; visit: Rufinus, *h.e.* 11.7; Palladius, *Lausiac History* 4.

⁶⁶See below, p. 141.

would receive from a grammarian and that his obvious knowledge of classical philosophy—especially Aristotle's *Organon* and aspects of Stoic ethics—was likely gained as part of an ecclesiastical education. In other words, Didymus learned philosophy as a handmaiden to exegesis.⁶⁷

Didymus's reputation for erudition and virtue attracted some of the brightest students of the time. In addition to Rufinus, Palladius, best known as the author of the *Lausiaca History*, spent time studying with him.⁶⁸ So too did Jerome. It is possible that Gregory of Nazianzus knew him.⁶⁹ Evagrius praised him as "the great and gnostic teacher."⁷⁰ According to Rufinus's continuation of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*, Didymus played a key role in the ecclesiastical school in Alexandria: "Thus in a short time, with God as his teacher, he arrived at such expert knowledge of things divine and human that he became a teacher in the church school (*scholae ecclesiasticae doctor*), having won the high esteem of Bishop Athanasius and the other wise men in God's church."⁷¹ Some take this to suggest that the official catechetical school, formerly headed by Origen, continued to exist in fourth century Alexandria.⁷² However, it is not clear that the school Didymus taught in was quite as official as Rufinus suggests or that it was the direct successor of Origen's. Nor is it clear what exact role Didymus played in the school: whereas Rufinus merely calls him "teacher" (*doctor*) in this school, a generation later the Greek historian Sozomen more expansively calls him "president of the school

⁶⁷See Richard A. Layton, *Didymus the Blind and His Circle in Late-Antique Alexandria: Virtue and Narrative in Biblical Scholarship* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004), 137–43.

⁶⁸*Lausiaca History* 4: four times over a period of ten years.

⁶⁹See John A. McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography* (Crestwood, N.Y.: SVS Press, 2001), 44–5.

⁷⁰Evagrius, *Gnostikos* 48 (ed. A. Guillaumont and C. Guillaumont, *Évagre le Pontique. Le gnostique ou à celui qui est devenu digne de la science*, SChr 356 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989), 186).

⁷¹Rufinus, *h.e.* 11.7 (Amidon trans., altered in light of Layton); cf. Sozomen, *h.e.* 3.15.

⁷²See, e.g., Christopher Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997),

of sacred learning in Alexandria" (προϊστάμενος ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ τοῦ διδασκαλείου τῶν ἱερῶν μαθημάτων).⁷³ Didymus's role as teacher is not without significance for the interpretation of *On the Holy Spirit*, since, as we shall see in a moment, the work was written for certain "brothers" whom Didymus presumes are familiar with his previous writings—in other words, it is probably written for his students. We know from elsewhere that Didymus's writings were frequently prompted by requests from disciples, whether present or not. Learned Christians of the day sought his opinion on such vexed questions as why infants die prematurely, a topic on which Jerome says he wrote a treatise at the behest of Rufinus.⁷⁴ For Jerome, he wrote two multi-volume works on Old Testament books.⁷⁵

Less clear than Didymus's status as an illustrious teacher is the issue of his relationship with the episcopal hierarchy in Alexandria. While Didymus was instrumental in articulating the divinity of the Spirit and other key tenets of Pro-Nicene orthodoxy, he was condemned by contemporaries and by posterity as an "Origenist"—someone who followed his predecessor too closely in such areas as allegorical exegesis and the pre-existence of the soul.⁷⁶ No less than the Fifth Ecumenical Council (in Constantinople, AD 553) anathematized him for being "Origenist." It is imperative, however,

229. Edeltraut Staimer goes so far as to refer to it as a "episcopal academy" (*bischöfliche Hochschule*) and Didymus as its "director" (*Leiter*): "Die Schrift 'De Spiritu Sancto' von Didymus dem Blinden von Alexandrien," (Ph.D. diss., München, 1960), 119.

⁷³Sozomen, *h.e.* 3.15. Chester D. Hartranft, trans. in *Socrates, Sozomenus: Church Histories* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999 [orig. pub. 1894]) NPNF 2nd series, vol. 2, p. 294. Joseph Bidez, ed, Günther Christian Hansen, rev. Sozomen: *Kirchengeschichte*, GCS Neue Folge, 4 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995), 125.

⁷⁴This has not survived. Didymus's answer to Rufinus's query was that the infants who die sinned only a little in their pre-incarnate state, making the briefest contact with the flesh sufficient punishment. Jerome, *Against Rufinus* 3.28.

⁷⁵Jerome, *Against Rufinus* 3.28; *On Famous Men* 109; *Commentary on Zechariah*, preface.

⁷⁶For studies of the label "Origenism" in Didymus's day, see Jon Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen*, Patristic Monograph Series, no. 13 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988); and Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

in approaching *On the Holy Spirit*, to bracket later controversies over Origen. In this treatise, Didymus shows no interest in the themes which may have led to his condemnation. Many of his arguments are similar to those of Athanasius, who according to Rufinus favored him. There is no good reason to doubt this, even if the "Origenist" Rufinus would have had reason to emphasize *Athanasius's* support for Didymus as a subtle criticism of the great Archbishop's successors, who grew increasingly suspicious of all hints of "Origenism". Whatever Rufinus's motives, there would have been reasons for Athanasius, working before the rise of the "Origenist" specter, to endorse an independent scholar whose doctrinal agenda dovetailed with his own and whose writings emphasized episcopal authority. In particular, Layton points to a common opposition by Athanasius and Didymus to followers of Hieracas—like Didymus, an independent Christian scholar and teacher—as well as their support for the Council of Nicaea.⁷⁷ We might add their united front, beginning in the late 350s and early 360s, against those in the region of Alexandria who were associating the Spirit with the angelic realm.

While the discovery of more of Didymus's works at Tura has brought to light his exegetical labors (showing him to be a follower of Origen in this area), it has also led to an unfortunate neglect of Didymus's contributions to Trinitarian doctrine. Didymus the Origenist has eclipsed Didymus the dogmatician.⁷⁸ Though subtlety is not something one typically associates with Jerome, it is perhaps time we reconsider his appraisal of this man who was *both* (in Jerome's

⁷⁷Layton, *Didymus the Blind*, 15–8.

⁷⁸To some extent, this neglect has resulted from uncertainty over the authenticity of the three books *On the Trinity* attributed (rightly, we believe) to Didymus. *On the Trinity* has been shown to be most probably by Didymus. For a succinct presentation of the argument for its authenticity, see Alasdair Heron's analysis of its sources: "Some sources used in the *De Trinitate* ascribed to Didymus the Blind," in Rowan Williams, ed., *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 173–81; more fully, idem, "Studies in the Trinitarian Writings of Didymus the Blind: his Authorship of the *Adversus Eunomium* IV–V" (Ph.D. diss., Tübingen, 1972); cf. Jürgen Hönscheid, ed. and trans., *Didymus der Blinde: De trinitate, Buch I*, Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie 44 (Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1975), 6–7.

loaded language) "Catholic as regards the Trinity" and a successor to Origen on such doctrines as the pre-existence of souls, which might be less palatable to subsequent generations.⁷⁹ The variety of Didymus's writings—and the interplay of doctrine, exegesis, and philosophy in these works—is clear from the list of works attributed to him, even in those cases where only a title survives.

In his work *On Famous Men* from 392/93, Jerome lists the following works by Didymus: "Commentaries *On all the Psalms*, commentaries *On the Gospels of Matthew and John*, *On the Doctrines*, also two books *Against the Arians*, and one book *On the Holy Spirit*, which I translated into Latin, eighteen volumes *On Isaiah*, three books of commentaries *On Hosea*, addressed to me, and five books *On Zechariah*, written at my request, also commentaries *On Job*, and many other things."⁸⁰ Jerome conspicuously does not mention the extant work *On the Trinity*, which might suggest that it was written between 392 and Didymus's death in 398, if it is authentic, as we believe it to be.⁸¹ There are indeed other reasons for placing it late in Didymus's life.⁸² Also not mentioned is the short, partially extant work *Against the Manichees*. From other sources, we have more titles of works which have not survived: *On the Sects*, *On the Son*, *On Virtue and Vice*, a *Defense of Origen*, *To a Philosopher*, *On the Incorporeal*, as well as works on Galatians and Ephesians and possibly an exposition of the seven Catholic Epistles. Of the works named by Jerome, *On the Holy Spirit* is extant in Jerome's Latin translation, while, thanks to the discovery at Tura, all of the *Commentary on Zechariah* and portions of the works on Job and the Psalms are extant in Greek. We have fragments of his exegetical works on the Gospel of John, the Acts of the Apostles, and 1 and 2 Corinthians. There are also fragments

⁷⁹Jerome, *Apology against Rufinus* 2.16.

⁸⁰*On Famous Men* 109; trans. by W.H. Fremantle in *Theodoret, Jerome, Gennadius, Rufinus: Historical Writings, etc.*, ed. by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, NPNF, 2nd series, volume 3 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994 [orig. pub. 1892]), 381 (altered).

⁸¹For the authenticity of *On the Trinity*, see n. 78 above.

⁸²See Alasdair Heron, "The Two Pseudo-Athanasian Dialogues Against the Anomoeans," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 24 (1973): 101–22, at 121.

of his apologetically-motivated commentary on Origen's *On First Principles*, mentioned by Socrates⁸³ and Jerome⁸⁴ and preserved in catenae and in John of Damascus's *Sacra Parallela*.

It has also been claimed that he authored the works that come down to us as Basil of Caesarea's fourth and fifth books *Against Eunomius*, the seven pseudo-Athanasian dialogues, the pseudo-Athanasian works *On the Trinity and the Holy Spirit* and *On the Incarnation and Against the Arians*, the treatise *Against Arius and Sabellius*, frequently ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa,⁸⁵ and an unattributed treatise *On the Vision of the Seraphim*.⁸⁶ Of these extant pseudonymous works, *Against Eunomius* 4–5 and the pseudo-Athanasian *On the Trinity and the Holy Spirit* and *On the Incarnation and Against the Arians* are the most likely ones to have been written by Didymus, but scholars remain divided.⁸⁷

⁸³Socrates, *h.e.* 4.25.

⁸⁴Jerome, *Apology against Rufinus* 2.16.

⁸⁵Karl Holl attributed this text to Didymus in 1904: "Über die Gregor von Nyssa zugeschriebene Schrift 'Adversus Arium et Sabellium,'" *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 25 (1904): 380–98. Many remain unconvinced. Some prefer not to assign the work definitively to any known author: see Bardy, *Didyme L'Aveugle*, 17–9, 71–3, 113–4; Reinhard Hübner, "Gregor von Nyssa und Markell von Ankyra," in Marguerite Harl, ed., *Écriture et Culture Philosophique dans la Pensée de Grégoire de Nysse*, *Acts du Colloque de Chevetogne* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 199–229, at 211, n. 1; and Joseph T. Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology* (Washington, DC: CUA Press, 1999), 232–9. Gregorian authenticity is maintained by Jean Daniélou ("L'*Adversus Arium et Sabellium* de Grégoire de Nysse et l'Origénisme cappadocien," *Recherches de science religieuse* 54 (1966): 61–6) and Friedrich Müller (*Gregorii Nysseni Opera Dogmatica Minora, Pars I* (Leiden: Brill, 1958), lxi). Regardless of one's position, Holl's premise that the work must have been written before 358 is certainly false.

⁸⁶See Johannes Quasten, *Patrology, Vol. III: The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature from the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon* (Notre Dame, IN: Christian Classics, 1993), 90.

⁸⁷For discussion of these pseudo-Athanasian works, see Alasdair Heron, "The Pseudo-Athanasian Works *De Trinitate et Spiritu Sancto* and *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos: A Comparison*," in G. D. Dragas, ed., *Aksum-Thyateira: A Festschrift for Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain* (Athens and London: Thyateira House, 1985), 281–98; cf. Heron, "Some Sources."

The Date of On the Holy Spirit

The text translated here is unquestionably by Didymus. With respect to the question of when Didymus wrote *On the Holy Spirit*, only one thing is absolutely firm: it was written before Ambrose of Milan used it in writing his own treatise on the same subject in 381. The work clearly responds to contemporaries who claimed, on the basis of Amos 4.13 and John 1.3, that the Spirit is to be associated with the angelic order. The first evidence we have for a group like this outside of this treatise comes from the other work translated in this volume, though it is important to note certain differences: Athanasius's opponents made much use of 1 Timothy 5.21 and Hebrews 1.14. While Didymus does not record an opponent's argument based on Hebrews 1.14, he spends enough time on the verse to suggest that he might be attempting to reclaim it from his adversaries. But whereas Athanasius devotes an entire section to 1 Timothy 5.21, it is not mentioned in *On the Holy Spirit*. Nor do Athanasius's terms of abuse for his opponents, "Tropikoi" and "Pneumatomachians" (that is, "Spirit-fighters"), appear in Didymus's text. So it is likely that Didymus and Athanasius were responding to different currents of a broad movement. With respect to the question of dating, Athanasius demonstrates no awareness of Didymus and emphasizes the novelty of his opponents; thus, we should not expect Didymus's work to be significantly earlier than Athanasius's.

By comparing the treatise itself to other, more easily datable works, we can further specify its date. It was once common to assign it to the middle of the 370s, around the time when Basil of Caesarea wrote his own *On the Holy Spirit*. But the arguments for this are weak, relying on a sense that Didymus's treatise, with its developed pneumatology, could not have preceded Basil's by many years. Subsequent work has shown that the two treatises deal with rather different currents of opposition to the Spirit's divinity.⁸⁸

⁸⁸Staimer, "Die Schrift 'De Spiritu Sancto,'" 127–32; Heron, "Studies in the Trinitarian Writings of Didymus the Blind," 169–70.

Returning to the question of possible parallels between Athanasius and Didymus, one must be careful not to overstate the case.⁸⁹ Louis Doutreleau, the editor of Jerome's Latin translation of Didymus, points to five similarities in the pneumatological polemics of Athanasius and Didymus, suggesting that they indicate the latter's dependence on the former.⁹⁰ Yet, for Doutreleau, the fact that Didymus handles the five themes differently shows a considerable gap between the two authors in time and overall disposition, Didymus being more "serene" and less polemically-driven. The five areas of overlap Doutreleau points to are:

1. Both draw a clear distinction between the Spirit and angels.
2. Both argue from the presence of the definite article: when it appears, scripture is referring to the *Holy* Spirit and not merely a created spirit.
3. Both worry over interpreting Amos 4.13 ("I [God] am the one who . . . creates spirit") rightly.
4. Both distinguish various uses of the word "spirit" in scripture.
5. Both respond to the *reductio* that, if the Father has a Son who in turn has a Son called 'Spirit', then the Father is in fact a Grandfather.

However, Doutreleau is wrong to conclude that the concurrence of these themes in the two demonstrates Athanasius's influence upon Didymus. Numbers 1 and 4 appear in Cyril of Jerusalem's *Catecheses*, which were delivered in 348 or 350, before either of Athanasius's or Didymus's writings and indeed before the likely rise of the Alex-

⁸⁹The argument here deals only with the relation between Didymus's *On the Holy Spirit* and Athanasius's *Letters to Serapion*. We will bracket the question of the influence of other Athanasian works upon Didymus's treatise.

⁹⁰Louis Doutreleau, ed. and trans., *Didyme L'Aveugle: Traité du Saint-Esprit*, SChr 386 (Paris: Cerf, 1992), 33–6.

andrian Pneumatomachians.⁹¹ Moreover, when Athanasius argues against the Tropikoi on point 1, he makes clear that they base their association of the Spirit with angels on 1 Timothy 5.21 ("In the presence of God and Jesus Christ and the elect angels . . ."), but Didymus never alludes to the verse. Point 2 is implicit in Cyril's contrast between "spirit without qualification" (*pneuma haplôs*) and the Holy Spirit, where he uses the same terminology we find in Athanasius and Didymus.⁹² Cyril also takes pains to argue that there is no "second Father" in the Trinity alongside the Father, a point not unlike number 5; he further parallels Didymus and Athanasius in his concern to deny that the Spirit is a second Son.⁹³ It is true that Cyril does not concern himself with recovering Amos 4.13 (point 3).⁹⁴ However, as we shall see shortly, the parallel between Didymus and Athanasius on this point is only partial. So, in sum, with the exception of the exegesis of the Amos passage, the parallels Doutreleau invokes between Didymus and Athanasius can be found in another work of Greek theology from the time. Consequently, he has given us no reason to believe Didymus used Athanasius's text in composing his own work. Indeed, in a major study of Didymus's treatise, Edeltraut Staimer argued that *On the Holy Spirit* was surely written *before* Athanasius's letters—a proposal which gives one pause, even though it has not met with general acceptance.⁹⁵

But perhaps Doutreleau has not noted all possible parallels between the two works. One is the appeal by both Athanasius and Didymus to the idea that the Spirit is capable of being participated in, but does not participate in the Father.⁹⁶ For both authors, this

⁹¹For point 1, see Cyril, *Catecheses* 16.23, and cf. 16.13. For point 4, see *Catecheses* 16.13–15.

⁹²*Catecheses* 16.13; cf. Didymus's use of *simpliciter* with *spiritus* (or Greek *pneuma*) in *Spir.* 8 and 246.

⁹³*Catecheses* 16.3. Cf. Staimer, "Die Schrift 'De Spiritu Sancto,'" 121; Heron, "Studies in the Trinitarian Writings of Didymus the Blind," 170.

⁹⁴Cyril's only reference to Amos 4.13 deals only with the phrase, "and announces his Christ to humanity," and does not mention the Spirit: *Catecheses* 10.15.

⁹⁵Staimer, "Die Schrift 'De Spiritu Sancto,'" 123ff.; cf. Heron, "Studies in the Trinitarian Writings of Didymus the Blind," 170.

⁹⁶Athanasius, *Serap.* 1.23, 1.27; Didymus, *Spir.* 10–19, 54ff., 265.

places the Spirit unequivocally on the far side of an absolute division between what is created and what is uncreated. The specific language used is not exactly commonplace and might suggest one author has used the other. However, Lewis Ayres has shown that this language comes from Origen, and is much more central to Didymus than to Athanasius.⁹⁷ Didymus explicitly states that he has already made this point in his (lost) work *On the Sects* (*Spir.* 19). One cannot, therefore, argue that he must have drawn the idea from Athanasius's *Letters to Serapion* or that Athanasius must have taken it from *On the Holy Spirit*. In sum, then, we have no firm grounds for believing that either author knew the other's work, let alone that either used the other as a source.

Further light can be shed upon the treatise's occasion by asking how *On the Holy Spirit* relates to three pieces of evidence roughly from this period. First, Lewis Ayres has shown that, in *On the Holy Spirit*, Didymus responds to Eunomius's *Apology*, which was most likely delivered at the Council of Constantinople in January 360 and published in that year or the next.⁹⁸ As mentioned above, by the middle of 360, Eunomius had established quite a reputation around the eastern Mediterranean.⁹⁹ In the *Apology*, for the first time in extant works by opponents of Nicene theology, Eunomius appeals to John 5.19 ("The Son can do nothing on his own, but only what he sees the Father doing"). Eunomius uses this to show the difference between the Father and the Son, and proceeds to explain the difference between the Spirit and the Son by alluding, most likely, to John 16.14.¹⁰⁰ Didymus addresses these verses together.¹⁰¹ Since they were

⁹⁷Lewis Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as Undiminished Giver: Didymus the Blind's *De Spiritu Sancto* and the Development of Nicene Pneumatology," in Janet Rutherford and Vincent Twomey, eds., *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011), 57–72. For further discussion of this doctrine see pp. 45–47 below.

⁹⁸Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as Undiminished Giver." For dating the *Apology*, see n. 56 above.

⁹⁹See pp. 28–29.

¹⁰⁰*Apology* 20 (Vaggione 60); cf. the use of John 5:19 at *Apology* 26 (Vaggione 70).

¹⁰¹*Spir.* 160–164.

first connected by Eunomius, it would appear he is responding to his *Apology*, which gives us a reasonably firm *terminus post quem* of 360. Thus, *On the Holy Spirit*, or at least one section of it, is the first work in a long career of opposing Eunomius, a polemical agenda for which Didymus had gained a reputation by 392.¹⁰²

Second, there is the Synod of Alexandria in 362 and the resultant *Tomus ad Antiochenos*. The *Tomus* sought to reconcile those Melitians in Antioch who taught three hypostases but a single deity with those older Nicenes around Paulinus who held only one hypostasis, equating the term with *ousia* as the Council of Nicaea had done. The pneumatology of the *Tomus* resembles that of Athanasius's *Letters to Serapion*.¹⁰³ Following Staimer, Heron suggested that "the doctrine of the Trinity in [*On the Holy Spirit*] is still in an early and undeveloped state as compared with the position after the Synod of Alexandria and the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*."¹⁰⁴ For Staimer and Heron, the *Tomus* provides a *terminus ante quem* for *On the Holy Spirit*. However, this document certainly did not have the effect Staimer and Heron ascribe to it: it was not immediately viewed as a "neo-Nicene Renaissance" rendering works like *On the Holy Spirit* obsolete.¹⁰⁵ Moreover, since its target is Antioch rather than Alexandria, it helps very little for dating Alexandrian theology. So, the *Tomus* does not help us to fix a date for *On the Holy Spirit*.

Third, it has recently been shown by Mark DelCogliano that there are striking parallels between Didymus's treatment of Amos 4.13 together with John 1.3 and Basil's brief remarks on the same verses in his *Against Eunomius* 3.7, which can be dated to 364 or 365. The verses appear together in both works and not in Athanasius. In a number of ways, Basil and Didymus interpret the verses similarly,

¹⁰²Jerome, *On Famous Men* 120. The anti-Eunomian agenda is carried forward in the Pseudo-Athanasian works *On the Incarnation* and *Against the Arians* and *On the Trinity and the Holy Spirit*, which are possibly by Didymus, since they are very closely related to *On the Trinity*; see n. 87 above.

¹⁰³See also pp. 26–27 above.

¹⁰⁴Heron, "Studies in the Trinitarian Writings of Didymus the Blind," 169.

¹⁰⁵See esp. Staimer, "Die Schrift 'De Spiritu Sancto,'" 132–3.

while differing from Athanasius's treatment of the verse in the *Letters to Serapion*. Given the way in which Basil appears to compress Didymus's fuller treatment, it is most likely Basil has read Didymus, rather than vice-versa.¹⁰⁶

The cumulative force of the evidence suggests that *On the Holy Spirit* should be dated to 360–365 and not to the mid-370s.¹⁰⁷ This fits nicely with our comments about the relative chronology of this work with the *Letters to Serapion*, since Didymus's tome is likely not to have been much later than Athanasius's letters. Heron, who proposed a range of 355–362, notes that the matter of dating has broader significance for interpreting Didymus: "This incidentally also means that [*On the Holy Spirit*] is the first systematic treatment of the subject, and that Didymus must be recognized as having been a much more original and pioneering spirit [than] had been thought."¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁶Mark DelCogliano, "Basil of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind, and the Anti-Pneumatomachian Exegesis of Amos 4:13 and John 1:3," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 61 (2010): 644–58.

¹⁰⁷The dating of 358/59 proposed by Hauschild and followed by Sieben ignores Didymus's use of Eunomius's *Apology*. Hauschild also dates Athanasius's *Letters to Serapion* to 358/9. See Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, "Die Pneumatomachen: Eine Untersuchung zur Dogmengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts" (Ph.D., Hamburg, 1967), 10–1, 34; and Hermann Josef Sieben, ed., *Didymus der Blinde: De Spiritu Sancto/Über den Heiligen Geist*, Fontes Christiani 78 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 39–41.

¹⁰⁸Heron, "Studies in the Trinitarian Writings of Didymus the Blind," 169. In his "Zur Theologie der 'Tropici' in der Serapionbriefe des Athanasius. Amos 4,13 als Pneumatologische Belegstelle," *Kyrios: Vierteljahresschrift für Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte Osteuropas* 14 (1974): 3–24, Alasdair Heron reverted to the traditional dating of ca. 370. See DelCogliano, "Basil of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind, and the Anti-Pneumatomachian Exegesis," 657 n. 50, for a critique of this reassessment. In our opinion, here Heron demonstrates (*contra* Staimer; see n. 95 above) that Didymus's treatise was *not necessarily* written *before* Athanasius's letters, but does not offer compelling evidence that it *must* have been written *after* Athanasius's letters (nor after Basil's *Contra Eunomium*).

The Context of *On the Holy Spirit*

From the treatise, we can glean some hints as to *why* Didymus wrote it. In his preface, he refers to unnamed pneumatological rabble-rousers:

some have raised themselves up to investigate heavenly matters by a kind of recklessness rather than by living rightly, and they brandish certain things concerning the Holy Spirit which are neither read in the Scriptures nor taken from any one of the old ecclesiastical writers. And so, we are compelled to acquiesce to the oft-repeated exhortation of the brothers that we set forth our opinion on the Holy Spirit by means of proof-texts from the Scriptures, lest those who hold contrary opinions deceive people through their lack of familiarity with so great a doctrine and instantly drag them away into the opinion of their enemies without careful reflection (*Spir.* 2).

While the passage does not identify Didymus's opponents, it does reveal that the immediate impetus for the work was given not by the "enemies" but by "the brothers" who have exhorted Didymus to respond to the current chatter. It also reveals the method of the treatise, which is of course not peculiar to Didymus: the citation and discussion of relevant "proof-texts." Throughout the course of the work, Didymus's principal authority is the text of scripture. He does, nonetheless, point the "brothers" to his earlier works *On the Sects* (*Spir.* 19 and 93) and *On Dogmas* (*Spir.* 145), neither of which is extant or datable. He also expects them to recognize his frequent teaching—does he refer to oral instruction?—on how to interpret passages where the Son is called the hand, the arm, and the right hand of the Father (*Spir.* 87). It would be unusual to cite one's work in a treatise addressed to one's opponent. So despite the obvious

polemical intentions of the work, it was clearly written for a group of like-minded students.

As for the errors Didymus opposes in the work, some have already been mentioned: the association of the Spirit with the angelic order; the notion that Amos 4.13 proves that the Spirit is created; the same inference from John 1.3; the objection that ascribing divinity to the Spirit would make the Father a Grandfather. To these we must add one which does not appear in Athanasius or in Cyril of Jerusalem: the doctrine that the Spirit is an activity of God and not a substantial reality (*Spir.* 97). Eunomius also argues against this doctrine in a highly compressed passage.¹⁰⁹ As with Eunomius, Didymus's response to this is evidently dependent on a fragment of Origen's *Commentary on John*.¹¹⁰ So in arguing that the Spirit is a substantial reality—an agent and not merely an act—Didymus is not opposing a contemporary group, but is using Origen's argument to mark out an extreme position to be avoided.¹¹¹

The Structure of On the Holy Spirit

The structure of Didymus's text may be described thus: after a brief introduction (*Spir.* 1–9), Didymus discusses the Spirit's nature (*Spir.* 10–73); the Spirit's activity (*Spir.* 74–109); the Spirit's sending, procession, and proper names (*Spir.* 110–131); scriptural testimonies on the Spirit (*Spir.* 132–230). He concludes with various reflections: he offers a proof that the Spirit shares the substance of the Father and

¹⁰⁹ *Apology* 25.

¹¹⁰ Frag. 37 (Erwin Preuschen, ed., *Origenes Werke, IV: Der Johanneskommentar*, GCS 10 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1903), 513–4). Given his fuller treatment of the issue, Didymus appears to draw his argument directly from the Origen fragment rather than from Eunomius. Still, he does modify Origen's argument.

¹¹¹ See Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, "The Holy Spirit as Agent, not Activity: Origen's Argument with Modalism and its Afterlife in Didymus, Eunomius, and Gregory of Nazianzus," *Vigiliae Christianae* 65 (2011): 227–248. The discussion of the date of *On the Holy Spirit* in this introduction revises the one found on pp. 235–6 of this article.

the Son from the Spirit's role along with them in making believers good and holy (*Spir.* 231–237), discusses the various senses of the term "spirit" in scripture (*Spir.* 237–256), analyzes the unique way in which the Spirit is said to "fill" believers substantially (*Spir.* 257–268), and dismisses talk of the Spirit as the Father's brother or the Son's son (*Spir.* 269–271). This is followed by a short conclusion which reiterates the danger of blasphemy against the Spirit (*Spir.* 272–277). Didymus's treatise is thus complex and at times appears to have no overarching organization.

Didymus's Argument

Despite this confusion, however, one fundamental argument provides a theological foundation to the work. Didymus argues that the Spirit is the boundless source of all sanctification in which Christians (and all angels) participate, and thus *a priori* cannot be a created reality participating in goodness:

Nor is it possible to find in the Holy Spirit any strength which he receives from some external activity of sanctification and virtue, for a nature such as this would have to be mutable. Rather, the Holy Spirit, as all acknowledge, is the immutable sanctifier, the bestower of divine knowledge and all goods. To put it simply, he himself subsists in those goods which are conferred by the Lord (*Spir.* 11).

For Didymus, as for Athanasius before him, if the Spirit may be described in these terms, then the Spirit must be one with the Father and the Son:

Now because he is good, God is the source and principle of all goods. Therefore he makes good those to whom he imparts himself; he is not made good by another, but is good.

Hence it is possible to participate in him but not for him to participate (*ideo capabilis, et non capax*) (18) . . . the Father and the Son are possessed rather than possessors, but the creature possesses while not being possessed (*Spir.* 17–18).

Didymus's use of the undiminished giver parallels Athanasius's in some respects, but shows independent development. For example, Didymus strongly emphasizes that only when we understand the Spirit to give without loss and to be immutable and omnipresent can we understand what it means for the Spirit to "fill" the apostles and Christians. In the same context, as we saw in the quotation from *Spir.* 11 above, Didymus places much emphasis on the Spirit being the substance of the gifts he is said to give, emphasizing the unmediated transforming presence of the Spirit. At the same time, this account of the Spirit's presence is placed in the framework of Didymus's strong insistence on the inseparability of Father, Son and Spirit: there is, for example, "a single reception of the Trinity" (*Spir.* 75).

The doctrine of the undiminished giver has a long history. Initial hints toward it in Plato are developed in Hellenistic thought and appear at Wisdom 7.27 and in Philo. Clement and Origen make use of it, as do a number of non-Christian Platonists.¹¹² In the fourth century the same doctrine crops up on different sides of the Trinitarian controversies. Eusebius of Caesarea, for example, uses a version of the doctrine to argue that the Spirit gives to those "below" but also receives from the Word who, in turn, receives from the Father. The Father alone is the true undiminished giver.¹¹³ Cyril of Jerusalem uses the doctrine to speak of the Father and the Spirit but without clearly indicating the relations between them.¹¹⁴ With Athanasius and Didymus, we see this doctrine used in order to assert the unity of Father, Son and Spirit. As we have already noted, Didymus may well

¹¹²See e.g. Philo, *De opificio mundi* 6.23, *De gigantibus* 25–7; Clement, *Stromata* 7.2.5; Origen, *Contra Celsum* 6.63–4. For further discussion of the doctrine's history, see Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as Undiminished Giver," 59–65.

¹¹³Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* 7.15.

¹¹⁴Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses* 6.7; 17.14.

know Athanasius's *Letters to Serapion*, but he also demonstrates an independent engagement with a variety of sources, especially Origen. The doctrine then appears in the Cappadocians, perhaps with some debt to our two Alexandrian authors—although this question lies outside the scope of this introduction.

One of the other distinctive features of this text is Didymus's willingness to speak of the Trinity as *homoousios*—rather than of the Son as *homoousios* with the Father in the manner most common in Athanasius. "Therefore, the fact that there is a single grace of the Father and the Son perfected by the activity of the Holy Spirit demonstrates that the Trinity is of one substance" (*Spir.* 76). Didymus does not make use of a formal terminology of *ousia* or *physis* and *hypostaseis* or *prosopa* (and in this he parallels Athanasius among others), expressing the unity of the irreducible Father, Son and Spirit in other striking ways. With specific reference to the Spirit, he reflects in intriguing fashion on what it means for the Spirit to be "the Spirit of Wisdom and Truth," a phrase he perhaps took from Athanasius. Didymus argues that Father, Son and Spirit each subsist as Wisdom and Truth. Because the Spirit shares this status the Spirit "possesses the same circle of unity and substance as the Son and, moreover, . . . the Son is not divided from the substance of the Father" (*Spir.* 94). This phrase poses many questions for the interpreter but it shows Didymus reflecting in far more detail than Athanasius on ways of imagining Father, Son, and Spirit as irreducible and yet in a unique unity of substance.

Jerome's Latin Translation of Didymus's On the Holy Spirit

The Greek original of *On the Holy Spirit* is lost. All we have is Jerome's Latin translation from 385, which is the text translated here from the critical edition prepared by Louis Doutreleau, SJ. In this work, Jerome is a literal and indeed rather wooden translator, though the dryness of the prose might be attributable to Didymus himself,

if we follow Jerome's backhanded reference in the preface to the Alexandrian's simplicity of style. Jerome's translation has some peculiarities, however, which the reader must bear in mind. First, when the argument depends upon features of the Greek, as in the dispute over the definite article which Latin lacks, Jerome provides both the Greek and a Latin rendering (*Spir.* 8 and 73). Jerome also provides the Greek for the technical terms ὁμοούσια and ἕτεροούσια, while also translating them. In these cases, we have kept the Greek, as Jerome does, while of course rendering his Latin into English. In one case, he provides a Greek title for the book of Wisdom (Πανάρετος) without translating it; we have provided the Greek and an English translation (*All-Perfect*) (*Spir.* 118). Finally, Jerome occasionally provides explanatory asides which are not part of Didymus's original text (*Spir.* 55, 70, and 223). Like Doutreleau, we have indented these paragraphs. Some of this is explained by Jerome's need to use Latin terms he does not use elsewhere in his corpus to convey difficult, but important Greek terms as [τὸ] μεθεκτόν, which he renders both with the unusual *capabilem* (*Spir.* 51 and 55–56) and, more expansively, with *quod capiat participatione* (*Spir.* 265).

A NOTE ON THE TRANSLATIONS

In the Benedictine edition, Athanasius's three letters to Serapion are subdivided into numbered sections, and in the new *Athanasius Werke* edition these numbered sections are further subdivided into subsections. In contrast, Didymus's treatise is divided into 277 short sections. These section and subsection numbers are signaled in each translation. For Athanasius's letters, the numbers of the letter, section, and subsection are provided; for example, 1.4.4 indicates the fourth subsection of the fourth section of the first letter. While influenced by the section and subsection divisions of the editors, our paragraphization in both translations is based upon the author's flow of thought and follows modern English practice. The part and

section subtitles in both translations are our own and are intended to facilitate a fruitful reading of the texts.

Italics are used in the translation for scriptural citations or reminiscences; these are always followed by the scriptural reference in square brackets, for example [Jn 1.1]. References to scriptural allusions are given in the footnotes. Note that the Psalms are referenced according to the Septuagint version. On rare occasions words are inserted in square brackets to improve the sense.

In line with scholarly consensus, the editors of the *Athanasius Werke* edition treat what the manuscripts call the second and third letters as a single letter, Letter Two. In addition, they divide what the manuscripts call the fourth letter into two separate documents (the first is Letter Three, the second is a short treatise on Mt 12.32).¹¹⁵ This has necessitated the adoption of a new numbering system for the *Letters to Serapion*. Here is a comparison of the old and new systems:

old	new
<i>Serap.</i> 1.1–33	<i>Serap.</i> 1.1–33 (no change)
<i>Serap.</i> 2.1–9	<i>Serap.</i> 2.1–9 (no change)
<i>Serap.</i> 3.1–7	<i>Serap.</i> 2.10–16
<i>Serap.</i> 4.1–7	<i>Serap.</i> 3.1–7
<i>Serap.</i> 4.8–23	<i>Serap.</i> 4.1–16

Since all scholarship on the *Letters to Serapion* has hitherto employed the old numbering system, at the appropriate places the old reference numbers are provided in curved braces—e.g. {4.4} indicates the beginning of the fourth section of the fourth letter according to the old numbering (now numbered as 3.4).

Finally, in our numbering of the subsections of the *Letters to Serapion* we have corrected two misprints in the *Athanasius Werke*

¹¹⁵See p. 19 n. 25 above.

edition. There are two subsections labeled 1.7.4: the second is renumbered 1.7.5 and consequently 1.7.5 of the AW edition appears here as 1.7.6. There are two subsections labeled 1.20.4: the second is renumbered 1.20.5 and consequently 1.20.5 and 1.20.6 of the AW edition are respectively renumbered 1.20.6 and 1.20.7.

ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA

LETTERS TO SERAPION
ON THE HOLY SPIRIT

Jerome's Prologue to the Book of Didymus on the Holy Spirit

When I was staying in Babylon¹ as a tenant of the harlot draped in purple,² living according to the law of the Quirites,³ I got it in my mind to spout some nonsense about the Holy Spirit and dedicated a small work I had started to the Pontiff⁴ of the same city. Imagine my surprise when the pot facing away from the north that is seen in Jeremiah after the rod began to boil⁵ and the senate of the Pharisees⁶ shouted out together. Not a scribe nor even someone pretending to be one but rather everyone in that coalition of ignorance, as if a battle over doctrines had been declared, conspired against me.⁷ I returned to Jerusalem at once just as if I were going home after exile,⁸ and after having seen the hut of Romulus⁹ and the festive rite

¹That is, Rome, according to Rev 14.8, 16.9, 17.5, 18.2, 10, and 21.

²Another designation for Rome, according to Rev 17.1, 4.

³Originally designating the inhabitants of the Sabine town Cures, the term "Quirites," after the full integration of Sabines into the Roman community around 268 B.C.E., came to be used of Romans in their capacity as citizens.

⁴From around 382 to 384, Jerome was secretary to Damasus, bishop of Rome from 366 to 384.

⁵Cf. Jer 1.11–13.

⁶The Roman clergy had criticized his relationship with certain aristocratic women in Rome.

⁷Interestingly, Jerome compares the vehemence of the attack on him with that of the doctrinal controversies of his day, as if the ferocity of these debates had already become a commonplace.

⁸Jerome fled Rome in August 385; see his *Ep.* 45.

⁹*Lat. casa Romuli*. One of the "tourist sights" in ancient Rome was a straw hut with a thatched roof on the southwestern corner of the Palatine Hill. It was thought to be the hut of Romulus. The most detailed report can be found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*, 2.79.11. Jerome's mention of the *casa Romuli* here is the last eye-witness report from antiquity.

at the Lupercal,¹⁰ I gazed upon the inn where Mary stayed¹¹ and the cave of the Savior.¹² And so, Paulinian my brother,¹³ since the above-mentioned Pontiff Damasus who first urged me to undertake this work has already fallen asleep in the Lord, now at your insistence and with the help of your prayers as much as those of my dear Paula and Eustochium,¹⁴ those venerable handmaidens of Christ, here in Judaea I mumble the song I could not sing *in a foreign land* [Ps 136.4]. For I judge the place which gave birth to *the Savior of the world* [1 Jn 4.14] to be far more glorious than the place which spawned the one who murdered his brother.¹⁵

By acknowledging the author of this book in the title, I confess that I have preferred to be the translator of another's work rather than to do what certain men do, that is, to adorn a hideous little crow with colors from another.¹⁶ Not long ago I read a certain man's little books on the Holy Spirit¹⁷ and I saw that what the Comic said

¹⁰Lat. *ludicrum Lupercal*. The Lupercal was a cave at the foot of the Palatine Hill where the she-wolf supposedly reared Romulus and Remus. Each year on February 15 odd rites were conducted whose meaning was disputed in antiquity as much as now.

¹¹Lat. *diversorium Mariae*. Cf. Lk 2.7. This was one of the "tourist sites" in fourth-century Palestine. See Jerome, *Ep.* 46.11.

¹²Lat. *speluncam Salvatoris*. This cave, not mentioned in the New Testament, was identified as the place of the birth of Jesus. See Jerome, *Ep.* 46.11, where he praises the cave and contrasts it with the Tarpeian rock in Rome. In these lines Jerome is signaling his rejection of Rome by stating his preference for the sites associated with the birth of Jesus rather than with the birth of Rome.

¹³Paulinian was in fact the blood-brother of Jerome.

¹⁴Jerome provided spiritual direction to the aristocrats Paula (+404) and her daughter Eustochium (+419) while in Rome from 382 to 385. It was the criticism of his association with them that precipitated his departure in 385. Both accompanied Jerome when he fled Rome, and eventually settled with him in Bethlehem where they founded a monastery.

¹⁵In the story of the foundation of Rome, Romulus kills his brother Remus.

¹⁶See Horace, *Ep.* 1.3, 14–20, where he compares the writer Celsus, who tends to borrow mostly from others when he writes, to a little crow (*cornicula*) that steals its colors from other birds.

¹⁷Here Jerome refers to the three books *On the Holy Spirit* hastily written by Ambrose of Milan in 381 at the request of Emperor Gratian. Ambrose based his work closely on that of Didymus.

was true: good Latin does not come from good Greek.¹⁸ The work was utterly devoid of logical structure, completely lacking the force and rigor that would draw the reader even unwillingly to agreement. Rather, everything was languid, weak, elegant, and refined, and adorned here and there with artificial colors.¹⁹

But my dear Didymus, who has the eye of the bride in the Song of Songs²⁰ and those lights which Jesus commanded be lifted up to the white harvests,²¹ gazed even higher and restored for us the ancient custom of calling a Prophet a "seer."²² Whoever reads this will certainly recognize how the Latins have robbed him²³ and will scorn the trickling stream once he begins to drink from the gushing spring. However unskilled in speaking he may be, he is not lacking in knowledge,²⁴ for his very style shows that he is an apostolic man as much as by the authority of his thoughts as by the simplicity of his words.

¹⁸Lat. *ex graecis bonis latina vidi non bona*. Cf. Terence, *Eunuchus* prol. vv. 7–8: *qui bene vortendo et easdem scribendo male / ex Graecis bonis Latinas fecit non bonas*.

¹⁹Here Jerome borrows Horace's characterization of Celsus to characterize Ambrose in relation to Didymus.

²⁰Cf. Song 1.14, 4.1, 9; 6.4.

²¹Cf. Jn 4.35.

²²Cf. 1 Sam 9.9.

²³A reference to Ambrose acting like the little crow that steals its colors from other birds.

²⁴Cf. 2 Cor 11.6.

DIDYMUS THE BLIND

ON THE HOLY SPIRIT

PART I: INTRODUCTION [1–9]

Speaking about the Holy Spirit is a fearsome endeavor [1–2]

1. It is important to investigate all divine matters with reverence and zealous attention, but especially what is said about the divinity of the Holy Spirit, particularly since blasphemy against him is without forgiveness, so much so that the punishment of the blasphemer extends not only throughout the entirety of this present age, but also into the age to come. It was the Savior himself who said that there would be no pardon for whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit, *either in this age or in the age to come* [Mt 12.31–32; Mk 3.29]. Hence it is all the more important to investigate what the Scriptures report about him lest any error of blasphemy creep up, at least any error that comes through ignorance.

2. It is normally expedient for a faithful and reverent man in control of his capacities to pass over the enormity of the present question in silence and not to subject a matter so full of danger to his own judgment. Nonetheless, some have raised themselves up to investigate heavenly matters by a kind of recklessness rather than by living rightly, and they brandish certain things concerning the Holy Spirit which are neither read in the Scriptures nor taken from any one of the old ecclesiastical writers. And so, we are compelled to acquiesce to the oft-repeated exhortation of the brothers that we set forth our opinion on the Holy Spirit by means of proof-texts

from the Scriptures, lest those who hold contrary opinions deceive people through their lack of familiarity with so great a doctrine and instantly drag them away into the opinion of their enemies without careful reflection.

*Evidence for the Holy Spirit is found
in both Old and New Testaments [3–9]*

3. The designation “Holy Spirit” and the substance¹ which is indicated by this designation are altogether unknown to those who do philosophy outside of Sacred Scripture. For only in our writings, as much in the new as in the old, is reference made to both the idea and name of the Holy Spirit. For David, a man of the Old Testament who was made a sharer in him, used to pray that he would remain in him, saying: *Do not take your Holy Spirit from me!* [Ps 50.13]. And it is said that God stirred up the Holy Spirit in Daniel while he was still a boy, as if the Holy Spirit were already dwelling in him.²

4. Similarly, in the New Testament, those men described as pleasing to God were filled with the Holy Spirit. For John leapt upon being sanctified while he was still in his mother’s womb.³ And after Jesus had risen from the dead, he breathed into the face of his disciples, saying: *Receive the Holy Spirit* [Jn 20.22].

5. The books of the Divine Scriptures are filled with such statements. But for the moment I have refrained from enumerating the bulk of them in the present work because it is easy for each reader to discover similar statements for himself on the basis of those we have cited here.

6. But no one ought to consider that the Holy Spirit was one thing in the saints before the coming of the Lord and another thing

¹Lat. *substantia*. In what follows, “substance” is our normal translation of this word; instances in which it is not translated thus will be footnoted.

²Cf. Dan 13.45.

³Cf. Lk 1.44.

in the Apostles and the other disciples, as if the same name⁴ indicated different realities. For we are able to produce evidence from the Divine Writings that the same Spirit was both in the Prophets and in the Apostles.

7. In the letter which he wrote to the Hebrews, Paul cited a text from the book of Psalms and signaled that it was said by the Holy Spirit: *And as the Holy Spirit said: “Today if you should hear his voice, harden not your hearts,”* and so forth [Heb 3.7; cf. Ps 94.7–8]. And at the end of the Acts of the Apostles when he was arguing with the Jews, he said: *As the Holy Spirit spoke through the prophet Isaiah to your fathers: “You will hear what is said but will not understand”* [Acts 28.25; cf. Is 6.9–10]. Paul did not write about one Holy Spirit who was in the Prophets before the coming of the Lord as though he himself had another Holy Spirit, but wrote about the Holy Spirit in whom he himself shared, as did all those who were brought to a faith perfect in power.⁵

8. This is why Paul also speaks of him using the definite article, attesting that he is unique and one. Paul says: *And as the Holy Spirit said* [Heb 3.7], not with an unmodified⁶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον (that is, “a holy spirit”), but he adds the definite article, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (that is, *the Holy Spirit*). Paul also signals that Isaiah prophesied using the definite article: Διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος (that is, *Through the Holy Spirit*) [Acts 28.25], and not with an unmodified Διὰ ἁγίου Πνεύματος (that is, “Through a holy spirit”).⁷ Furthermore, in that speech in which Peter won over his audience, he said: *It was*

⁴Lat. *homonymum*.

⁵Cf. Origen, *De principiis* 1.4: “It is, however, certainly taught with the utmost clearness in the Church, that this Spirit inspired each one of the saints, both the Prophets and the Apostles, and that there was not one Spirit in the men of old and another in those who were inspired at the coming of Christ.” Translation by G. W. Butterworth, *Origen: On First Principles* (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1973), 3–4.

⁶Lat. *non simpliciter*. Here and a few lines down Didymus is employing technical grammatical terminology.

⁷The text of Acts 28.25 in modern critical editions differs from that of Didymus: τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησεν διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου. Nonetheless, the point about the use of the definite article remains valid.

appropriate for that Scripture to be fulfilled which the Holy Spirit—τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον—spoke beforehand through the mouth of David concerning Judas [Acts 1.16], demonstrating that the very same Spirit was working in the Prophets and in the Apostles.⁸

9. We will deal with this more fully in what follows when we begin to discuss not only how the Lord came as Word to the Prophets, but also how the Holy Spirit came to them, since he too is possessed inseparably with the only-begotten Son of God.⁹

PART II: THE NATURE OF THE SPIRIT [10–73]

The Holy Spirit is the incorporeal producer of wisdom and sanctification [10–15]

10. Therefore, the very expression “Holy Spirit” is not a meaningless designation but indicates the underlying essence that is associated with the Father and the Son and altogether foreign to creatures. Now creatures are divided into invisible and visible ones, that is, into incorporeal and corporeal ones. The Holy Spirit is not placed among corporeal substances, but indwells the soul and the mind as the producer of speech, wisdom and knowledge. Nor is he placed among invisible creatures, for all such realities are capable of participating in wisdom, the other virtues, and sanctification. 11. On the contrary, this substance we are now discussing produces wisdom and sanctification. Nor is it possible to find in the Holy Spirit any strength which he receives from some external activity of sanctification and virtue, for a nature such as this would have to be mutable. Rather, the Holy Spirit, as all acknowledge, is the immutable sanctifier, the bestower of divine knowledge and all goods. To put it simply, he exists in those goods¹⁰ which are conferred by the Lord.

⁸For similar comments on the definite article, see *Spir.* 73, and Athanasius, *Serap.* 1.4.

⁹See *Spir.* 125.

¹⁰Lat. *ipse subsistens in his bonis*.

12. Matthew and Luke record the same text in the Gospel. The one said: *How much more will the heavenly Father give good things to those who ask him!* [Mt 7.11], while the other said: *How much more will your heavenly Father give his Holy Spirit to those who ask him!* [Lk 11.13]. From these lines it is apparent that the Holy Spirit is the fullness of the gifts of God and that the goods bestowed by God are nothing other than the subsistent Holy Spirit. For it is this fountain that pours forth all benefits received by the grace of God's gifts.¹¹

13. Moreover, that which is essentially good cannot be capable of participating in an external goodness, since it is what bestows goodness on other things. Therefore, it is clear that the Holy Spirit is distinct from not only corporeal but also incorporeal creatures because other substances receive this substance for their sanctification. Indeed, it is not only incapable of participating in a foreign sanctification, but, above all, it is the Bestower and Creator of sanctification.

14. Next, those who enjoy communion with him are called “sharers” in the Holy Spirit, since they have surely been sanctified by him, as is clearly written: *And he insulted the Spirit of grace in whom he was sanctified* [Heb 10.29].¹² This *he* clearly refers to someone who has sinned after receiving the Holy Spirit. But if he had been sanctified through communion with the Holy Spirit, it has been shown that he himself must have been a sharer in him and that the Holy Spirit bestows sanctification.

15. Furthermore, when the Apostle wrote to the Corinthians and listed those who would not attain the kingdom of heaven, he added:

¹¹Cf. Didymus, *Trin.* 2.8 (PG 39.532a).

¹²Lat. *Et Spiritu gratiae contumeliam faciens in quo sanctificatus est*. Didymus's citation of Heb 10.29 deviates from the modern critical editions of the Greek text, which is the same as the source of the Vulgate: *et sanguinem testamenti pollutum duxerit in quo sanctificatus est et Spiritui gratiae contumeliam fecerit*, “he has profaned the blood of the covenant in which he was sanctified, and insulted the Spirit of grace.” Didymus has therefore not only altered the word order, but also construed the relative clause in *quo sanctificatus* as modifying *Spiritus gratiae*, not *sanguis testamenti*. He does the same in *Zacc.* 247, commenting on the πνεῦμα χάριτος of Zech 12.10 and making the same point as in the present passage, that the Spirit of grace is identical with the Holy Spirit.

And you were indeed such things. But now you have been washed, you have been sanctified, you have been justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God [1 Cor 6.11]. He asserts that the Spirit of God is none other than the Holy Spirit. And indeed in what follows he demonstrates this very same point when he says: *No one speaking in the Spirit of God says, "Cursed be Jesus!" and no one says "Jesus is Lord!" except in the Holy Spirit* [1 Cor 12.3]. In this way the Apostle confirms that the Spirit of God is the Holy Spirit.

*Why the Holy Spirit is placed with the
Father and the Son, not creatures [16–20]*

16. Therefore, if the Holy Spirit is the sanctifier, then it is evident that his substance is not mutable but rather immutable. Now the Divine Discourses report in the clearest possible way that immutable substance belongs to God alone and to his only-begotten Son, even as they proclaim that every creaturely substance is changeable and mutable. Therefore, since it has been shown that the substance of the Holy Spirit is not changeable but unchangeable, he will not be ὁμοούσιος [the same in substance] with a creature. To be sure, even a creature would be immutable if he were placed with the Father and the Son, possessing the same unchangeability. For everything which is capable of participating in the good of another is separated from this substance. All such realities are creatures.

17. Now because he is good, God is the source and principle of all goods. Therefore he makes good those to whom he imparts himself; he is not made good by another, but is good. Hence it is possible to participate in him but not for him to participate.¹³ Furthermore, his only-begotten Son is *Wisdom* [1 Cor 1.24] and sanctification; he does not become wise but makes wise, and he is not sanctified but sanctifies. For this reason too it is possible to participate in him but not for him to participate.

¹³Lat. *capabilis non capax*.

18. Therefore, since an invisible creature (which we customarily call a rational and incorporeal substance) cannot be participated in but is capable of participating (for if it could be participated in, it would not be capable of participating in any good), although it is simple in itself and receives another's good, it must have its good by participation and must not be thought to be placed among those possessed by others but rather among those possessing other things. For the Father and the Son are possessed rather than possessors, but the creature possesses while not being possessed.

19. Let us once more consider the Holy Spirit: if he too is actually holy through participation in another's sanctity, then he should be classified with the rest of creatures. But if he sanctifies those who are capable of participating in him, then he should be placed with the Father and the Son. Both here and in our book *On the Sects*,¹⁴ we have stated to the best of our abilities that the Holy Spirit may be participated in by others and may not participate in other realities. And it is very easy to confirm this statement of ours from the whole of Scripture.

20. The blessed Apostle wrote to the Ephesians and said: *Believing in him, you have been sealed with the promised Holy Spirit, who is the guarantee of our inheritance* [Eph 1.13–14]. For if some are sealed with the Holy Spirit and take on his form and likeness, the Spirit is among those which are possessed and do not possess, seeing that those who possess him are imprinted with his seal. And to the Corinthians the same Apostle writes: *Do not sadden the Holy Spirit in whom you have been sealed* [Eph 4.30],¹⁵ testifying that they are sealed who have accepted communion with the Holy Spirit. For just as someone, who takes up a practice and a virtue, receives into his mind, as it were, a seal and an image of the knowledge which he takes up, so too the one who is made a sharer in the Holy Spirit becomes, through communion in him, simultaneously spiritual and holy.

¹⁴Nothing is known about this book; it is also mentioned in *Spir.* 93.

¹⁵Didymus has mistaken the source of this text.

The Holy Spirit is uncircumscribed [21–23]

21. If the Holy Spirit were one of the creatures, he would indeed have a circumscribed substance just like all things which are made. For even if invisible creatures are not circumscribed by place and limits, they are nonetheless limited by the distinctive feature of their substance.¹⁶ But the Holy Spirit, even though he is in many, does not have a circumscribed substance.

22. For when Jesus sent forth those who were to preach what he taught, he filled them with the Holy Spirit, and breathing into their face, he said: *Receive the Holy Spirit* [Jn 20.22], and: *Go, teach all nations* [Mt 28.19], as if he were sending all of them to all nations. For all the Apostles did not travel in equal numbers to all nations, but some went to Asia, some to Scythia, and others were dispersed among the other nations, in accordance with the dispensation of the Holy Spirit whom they possessed among themselves, as the Lord said: *I am with you all days even unto the consummation of the age* [Mt 28.20]. This agrees with the following text: *You will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes upon you, and you will be witnesses to me in Jerusalem and in all Judaea and Samaria and even unto the end of the earth* [Acts 1.8].

23. Therefore, if those stationed at the farthest ends of the earth in order to bear witness to the Lord were separated from each other by the greatest possible distances, and yet the Holy Spirit was present to and indwelt them, then it is clear that the substance of the indweller is uncircumscribed. Being able to do such a thing would be completely foreign to an angelic power; for example, the angel who came to the Apostle in Asia as he was praying could not at the same time be present to others stationed in the other parts of the world.¹⁷

¹⁶Lat. *proprietas substantiae*.

¹⁷This is possibly a reference to Acts 20.36. Cf. Didymus, *Trin.* 2.4 (PG 39.488a).

The Holy Spirit and the angels [24–29]

24. But the Holy Spirit is not only present to human beings who are separated from each other, but also he is present to and indwells each single one of the angels, principalities, thrones, and dominions.¹⁸ Just as he sanctifies human beings and has a nature different from that of human beings, so too he sanctifies other creatures and he is different from them in substance. For every creature is sanctified not from his own substance but by communion with another's sanctity.

25. It is true that the angels were called holy in the Gospel when the Savior said that the Son of man would come *in his glory and that of the Father and the holy angels* [Lk 9.26]. And it is written in the Acts of the Apostles that Cornelius was *directed by a holy angel* to invite Peter, the disciple of Christ, to his house [Acts 10.22]. But the angels are holy through participation in the Holy Spirit and through the indwelling of the only-begotten Son of God, who is holy and the communion¹⁹ of the Father, about whom the Savior said: *Holy Father!* [Jn 17.11].

26. Therefore if angels are not holy by their own nature²⁰ but by participation in the Holy Trinity, it is clear that the substance of the angels is different from the Trinity.²¹ For just as the Father sanctifies and is different from those who are sanctified and the Son is different from those whom he sanctifies, so too the Holy Spirit's substance is different from those whom he sanctifies by the bestowal of himself.

27. But if the heretics should propose that the angels are holy due to their natural condition, it follows that they would be forced to say that the angels are *ὁμοουσίους* [the same in substance] with the Trinity and thus are immutably holy by nature.²² But if they reject

¹⁸Cf. Col 1.16.

¹⁹Lat. *communicatio*. This is Jerome's translation of *κοινωνία*, translated throughout as "communion."

²⁰Lat. *substantia*.

²¹See Athanasius, *Serap.* 1.26–27, for similar comments on the angels.

²²Lat. *iuxta substantiam*.

this and actually say that the angels share a single nature with the rest of the creatures but nevertheless do not have the same sanctity that human beings have, then they are by necessity reduced to saying that the substance of human beings is much better than that of angels. For if this were the case, human beings would have sanctity through communion with the Trinity, whereas the angels, being holy in their own nature, would nonetheless be foreign to the Trinity.

28. But perfect human beings approaching the consummation of sanctity pray to become *equal to angels* [Lk 20.36]. For it is angels who give help to human beings, not human beings to angels, being servants of their salvation²³ and announcing the one who bestows it. This clearly shows that angels are more honorable than and much superior to human beings because they participate in the Trinity with greater affinity (if I may use such an expression) and more completely.

29. Therefore, since the Holy Spirit is different from those whom he sanctifies, he does not share a single nature with the other creatures who receive him. But if his nature is different from those other creatures and he subsists in his own essence, it is clear that he is not created and not made.²⁴ There are many passages of Scripture which unambiguously prove that his nature is different from all created beings.

The Holy Spirit fills creatures [30–34]

30. It is also said that certain people are filled with the Holy Spirit, but it is never said, either in the Scriptures or in our habitual way of speaking, that anyone is filled with a creature. For neither Scripture nor ordinary language sanctions saying that someone is filled with an angel, with a throne, with a dominion.²⁵ For this way

²³Cf. Heb 1:14.

²⁴Lat. *incretatus et ineffectus*.

²⁵Cf. Col 1:16.

of speaking is only appropriate for the divine nature. But we do say that certain people are filled with power and teaching, such as, “He is filled with the Holy Spirit,” which indicates nothing other than that “they are filled completely and perfectly.”

31. It is written about John: *And he will be filled with the Holy Spirit even from his mother's womb* [Lk 1.15]. And again: *Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit* [Lk 1.41]. And then a little further on: *And Zechariah his father—meaning John's father—was filled with the Holy Spirit and he prophesied* [Lk 1.67]. And also in the Acts of the Apostles it is said of the many believers who were gathered together that *they were filled with the Holy Spirit* [Acts 2.4].

32. Yet even though the Holy Spirit can be participated in as one can participate in wisdom and teaching, he does not possess the reality²⁶ of knowledge in name alone. Rather, he is goodness itself because his nature sanctifies and fills the universe with good things. In connection with this, some are also said to be filled with the Holy Spirit, as is written in the Acts of the Apostles: *And all were filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke the word of God with confidence* [Acts 4.31]. For just as the one who is filled with another's knowledge can deliver a speech based on it in a learned and subtle manner because he perfectly grasps it, so too do they speak the word of God with confidence who perfectly receive the Holy Spirit to such an extent that they are filled with him, because the Holy Spirit is present furnishing a word worthy of God.

33. This is also why someone boldly said: *Thus says the Holy Spirit* [Acts 21.11] and the Apostle: *Be filled with the Spirit* [Eph 5.18]. In many passages of the Acts of the Apostles the disciples of the Lord were described as filled with the Holy Spirit: *Carefully choose from among you, brothers, seven men of good reputation filled with the Spirit and wisdom* [Acts 6.3]. Furthermore, it is said concerning Stephen: *But since he was filled with the Holy Spirit, he looked up to heaven and saw the glory of God and Jesus standing at the right hand of God* [Acts 7.55]. And it is said concerning the chosen vessel: *But*

²⁶Lat. *substantia*.

Saul, who is also Paul, filled with the Holy Spirit and looking at him, said [Acts 13.9]. In addition, it is noted concerning all believers in common: *The disciples too were filled with joy and the Holy Spirit* [Acts 13.52].

34. But the presence of an angel or some other lofty nature that was made fills neither the mind nor the understanding since it too is filled up from elsewhere. For just as someone who participates in the fullness of the Savior is made full of wisdom, truth, justice, and the word of God, so too whoever is filled with the Holy Spirit is at once filled with all the gifts of God, wisdom, knowledge, faith, and the rest of the virtues.²⁷ Therefore, whoever fills all creatures, at least those which are able to participate in power and wisdom, is not one of those whom he himself fills. It must be concluded from this that his nature²⁸ is different from that of all creatures. We have also said elsewhere that the fullness of the divine gifts is implied in the substance of the Holy Spirit.²⁹

The Holy Spirit is the substance of the gifts of God [35–53]

35. Next, it is impossible for anyone to receive the grace of God unless he has the Holy Spirit, in whom we confess that all the gifts of God consist. But now the Word demonstrates as clearly as possible that he who has the Holy Spirit acquires perfectly the word of wisdom and the other goods. We said a little before that the Holy Spirit is the substance of the goods of God, when we offered the example: *The Father will give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him* [Lk 11.13], and: *The Father will give good things to those who ask him* [Mt 7.11].³⁰

36. Nor ought we to think that the Holy Spirit is divided in substance because it is said that he is *a multitude of goods* [Is 63.7]. For

²⁷Note the difference and similarities regarding what virtues one is filled with respectively by the Savior and Holy Spirit: wisdom alone appears in both lists.

²⁸Lat. *substantia*.

²⁹See *Spir.* 12.

³⁰See *Spir.* 12.

he is impassible and indivisible and immutable. But according to the diversity of actions and notions, he is called by multiple titles of good things because he does not give one and the same power equally to those who participate in him through communion in him. For he is suitable for the benefit of each individual and fills with goods those in whom he judges that he ought to be present.

37. After all, Stephen, that first witness to the truth and a man worthy of his name,³¹ was said to be *filled with wisdom and the Holy Spirit* [Acts 6.3]—consequently, wisdom is implied when the Holy Spirit abides in him—as the Scripture says: *And the Apostles chose Stephen, a man filled with faith and the Holy Spirit* [Acts 6.5]. And after some other passages: *But Stephen, a man filled with grace and power, was doing great signs and wonders among the people* [Acts 6.8]. And still concerning the same: *And they were not able to withstand the wisdom and Spirit that was speaking in him* [Acts 6.10].³²

38. For the blessed man was filled with the Holy Spirit, and was made a participant in the faith which comes from the Holy Spirit, in accordance with the passage: *But to another, faith by the same Spirit* [1 Cor 12.9]. Having grace and power according to the same Spirit, he did great signs and wonders among the people. Indeed, he also abounded in those gifts according to the same Spirit which are called the graces of healing and power. For in the first epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians these are numbered among the gifts of God in the Spirit and according to the Spirit.³³

39. But Stephen overflowed with divine grace to such an extent that none of his opponents and those disputing with him were able to withstand the wisdom and Spirit who spoke in him. For he was wise according to the Lord and the Holy Spirit. This is why Jesus clearly proclaimed to his disciples: Whenever you are brought to authorities and powers and councils and synagogues, do not be

³¹The name “Stephen” from the Greek στέφανος, means “crown.” Hence even his name indicates that he was worthy of the “crown of martyrdom.”

³²Or, “in which he spoke.” Lat. *et non valebant resistere sapientiae et Spiritui qui loquebatur in illo*.

³³Cf. 1 Cor 12.8–10.

anxious regarding what you ought to say or how you should speak at that time. For words of wisdom shall be given to you by the Holy Spirit, which not even those very experienced in disputation will be able to oppose.³⁴

40. But let us cite the testimony itself, which goes thus: *But when they bring you in to synagogues and authorities and powers, do not be anxious regarding how and what you should respond, for the Holy Spirit will teach you the appropriate response at that hour* [Lk 12.11–12]. And in another [passage of the] Gospel: *Therefore keep it in your hearts not to prepare beforehand how you will respond since I myself will give you a mouth and wisdom which no one will be able to oppose and refute* [Lk 21.14–15].

41. Therefore, since the Holy Spirit grants words to the Apostles against those who go against the Gospel, it is quite clear that the speech of wisdom and knowledge is understood to be in his substance. But it is not the time to examine how the Savior bestows at that hour a mouth and knowledge on his disciples, whom not even those among men considered to be the most eloquent are able to oppose. For our present purpose is to demonstrate that the gifts of the virtues always imply the Holy Spirit, in such a way that he who has him is considered to be filled with the gifts of God.

42. For this reason, in Isaiah God himself says to someone: *I will place my Spirit upon your seed, and my blessings upon your sons* [Is 44.3], seeing that no one ever receives the spiritual blessings of God unless the Holy Spirit precedes. For he who receives the Spirit will consequently have blessings, that is, wisdom, understanding, and so forth. The Apostle wrote as follows about them: *For this reason, from the day we heard we also have not ceased praying for you and begging that you be filled with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding, leading a life worthy of God* [Col 1.9–10]. He is saying that those who worthily advance in good deeds through works and speech and prudence are filled with the will of God, who places his Spirit upon them so that they may be filled with wisdom,

³⁴Cf. Mt 10.17–20; Mk 13.9–11; Lk 21.12–15.

understanding, and the rest of the spiritual goods. But wisdom and understanding, which are in the Holy Spirit, are given by God: *The Lord will give wisdom, and from his face knowledge and understanding* [Prov 2.6], since that wisdom which comes from human beings is not spiritual, but carnal and human.

43. Concerning this, the Apostle wrote: *Not by carnal wisdom, but by the grace of God we have lived our lives in the world* [2 Cor 1.12]. By *carnal wisdom* he means that which arises from human reflections upon corporeal realities. Spiritual and intellectual wisdom, however, concerns itself with invisible and intellectual things and gives its own presence to those who receive it through the activity of the Holy Spirit.

In many other passages the Apostle reminds us that the gifts of God reside in the substance of the Holy Spirit, as in this one: *May the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in your believing so that you may abound in hope and in the power of the Holy Spirit* [Rom 15.13].

44. God, the bestower of goods, in the power of the Spirit grants the hope he promised to those who have the Spirit. With joy and peace he fills those who possess undisturbed, peaceful thoughts, and have minds joyful and calmed from every storm of the passions. Now whoever obtains the aforementioned goods in the power of the Holy Spirit also obtains the correct faith in the mystery of the Trinity.

45. In another passage of the same epistle, Paul says: *The kingdom of God is not food and drink, but justice and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit* [Rom 14.17]. By affirming, for those who were able to hear it, that justice in the Holy Spirit (that is, the entirety of virtue and the peace mentioned above) is united to the joy of God, he most clearly demonstrates that these goods are nothing other than the substance of the Holy Spirit.

46. Therefore, since these goods come to human beings from the bounty of the Holy Spirit, the very calling of the nations ushered in by the teaching of the Gospel is rendered acceptable and holy in the Holy Spirit. Since in this calling it is the Holy Spirit who makes holy and acceptable, he is the substance of the goods of God. And

whoever is filled with him acts entirely according to reason, teaching correctly, living irreprehensibly, doing signs and wonders in a true and perfect manner. For he has the strength of the Holy Spirit manifesting to himself the treasure and cause of the fullness of all goods.

47. Now Peter, the disciple of Jesus, knew that the nature of the gifts of God was the bounty of the Holy Spirit. For he said to those who rebuked him for entering the house of Cornelius: *And so, if God gave to them an equal grace when he bestowed the Holy Spirit as he gave to us in the beginning, who was I that I could withstand the Lord?* [Acts 11.17]. In addition, he said to his own: *And God the knower of hearts bore witness to them, giving the Holy Spirit as he gave him to us; and he made no distinction between us and them, by faith cleansing their hearts* [Acts 15.8–9].

48. This also agrees with the point made in many passages, that the Holy Spirit is given by God: *Jacob my son, him I will help; Israel my chosen, him my soul will help; I have put my Spirit in him* [Is 42.1]. And again: *He who gives breath to the people established upon it—without a doubt this it refers to the earth—and the Spirit to those who tread upon it* [Is 42.5]. Now we have demonstrated above that the Spirit of God is not one thing and the Holy Spirit another.³⁵

49. Paul too has said: *The love of God has been poured out into our hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us* [Rom 5.5]. And this: *How much more will your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him* [Lk 11.13]. Now this Spirit is said to be poured forth by God upon all flesh, so that whoever receives him prophesies and sees visions, according to Joel who speaks in the person of God: *I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons will prophesize and your daughters will see visions* [Joel 2.28]. For the Spirit is poured forth for the sake of prophesying and seeing the beauty of truth in the mind.

50. The very expression *pouring forth* also indicates that the substance of the Spirit is uncreated. For when God sends an angel

or another creature, he does not say, “I will pour forth of my angel or power or throne or dominion.” For this manner of speaking is employed only in the case of those who are participated in by others, as we are now saying and as we said a little before when we spoke of the love of God which is poured forth in the hearts of those who have received the Holy Spirit.³⁶ *The love of God, says Paul, is poured out into our hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us* [Rom 5.5].

51. Since the Savior himself can be participated in, he is also said to be poured forth like perfume: *Your name is perfume poured forth* [Song 1.2]. For just as perfume contained in a bottle has a certain odor which is prevented from being spread outside because it is enclosed within the bottle, yet sends forth its fragrance far and wide when it is poured forth outside the bottle, so too the fragrant name of Christ, before his coming, dwelt in the people of Israel alone, as if the Jews were a closed bottle: *For God is known in Judah, in Israel his name is great* [Ps 75.2]. But when he was refulgent in the flesh, the Savior extended his own name through all the earth, or rather, through all creation, thereby fulfilling what is written: *How great is your name through all the earth!* [Ps 8.2]. In agreement with this, the Apostle said: *For there is no other name given under heaven by which we must be saved* [Acts 4.12]. In addition, in the Psalms it is said to the Lord: *Above everything you have exalted your holy name* [Ps 137.2]. It was only at this point that the following was accomplished: *Your name is perfume poured forth* [Song 1.2].

52. Now the expression *pouring forth* indicates a lavish gift of great bounty and abundance. 53. And so, whenever one or two receive the Holy Spirit anywhere,³⁷ “I will pour forth of my Spirit” is not said. For this is only said when the gift of the Holy Spirit is given in abundance to all nations. The Apostle reminded Titus that salvation was given to the nations *not because of works of righteousness done by us, but through the washing of the second regeneration*

³⁶See *Spir.* 49.

³⁷I.e., anywhere in the Scriptures.

³⁵See *Spir.* 15.

and the renewal of the Holy Spirit, whom he has poured forth upon us abundantly [Titus 3.5–6]. For this too demonstrates that the expression *pouring forth* indicates a bountiful distribution of the Spirit.

*Because the Holy Spirit can be participated in
and is immutable, he is uncreated [54–60]*

54. From all of this we learn that the substance of the Holy Spirit can be participated in (*capabilis*), and because of this, that he is uncreated.³⁸

55. [Didymus] calls a substance “capable of being participated in” (*capabilis*) when it is participated in (*capiatur*) by many and bestows on them a share in itself. But a substance is “capable of participating” (*capax*) when it is filled through communion with another substance and participates in (*capiens*) something else, while not being participated in (*capiatur*) by another.³⁹

56. After all, immutability follows upon the capacity to be participated in, and eternity follows upon immutability. Conversely, mutability follows upon the capacity to participate, and being creatable follows upon mutability. Therefore, no created thing is immutable; for this reason, no created thing is eternal. 57. Accordingly, not only is rationality in human beings subject to mutability and being created, but this same mutability is also found in all creatures.

58. The Divine Utterances demonstrate that the angels changed and fell. While the multitude of angels and the other pre-eminent powers persevered in blessedness and holiness, it was nonetheless those who were similar in nature to them that changed. This most clearly shows that the former remained in their original state not because their substance was immutable, but because they were attentively devoted to God. 59. For it is impossible for co-equals to be diverse in nature. Just as individual human beings are mortal

³⁸See *Spir.* 17.

³⁹*Spir.* 55 is an addition by Jerome.

because the entire genus of human beings is mortal, so too, conversely, if some of the superior beings are immortal, all those beings in the same genus and species must surely also be immortal. 60. Under conditions such as these, if but one angel is revealed to be mutable, then all must be mutable, although they need not change if they persevere in blessedness. Such too is the case for all human bodies: all are divisible, but not all are divided. Even if some of them undergo division, we realize that the rest of them are similar in nature to them.

An objection based on John 1.3, and its refutation [61–64]

61. These explanations show that the Holy Spirit has a nature⁴⁰ that is different from visible and invisible creatures. Now if this is true, it is the pinnacle of impiety for some people to classify the Holy Spirit with *all things*, claiming that the passage which states that *all things* have been made by God through the Word⁴¹ indicates that the Holy Spirit has been made.⁴² Regarding both of these points, we have shown that the Holy Spirit is not one of the *all things*, but another thing beyond *all things* in nature.⁴³ As we have shown above,⁴⁴ if creatures are divided into corporeal and incorporeal ones, and the Holy Spirit is created, then it is certain that he will be either a visible or an invisible creature, that is, either a corporeal or an incorporeal creature. As we explained earlier,⁴⁵ it is utterly impossible for him to be a body, since he teaches and bestows knowledge, and can be participated in by mind and soul.

62. Neither is the Holy Spirit an invisible creature, a point we discussed a little before.⁴⁶ This is why Paul proves in the epistle

⁴⁰Lat. *substantia*.

⁴¹Cf. Jn 1.3.

⁴²Cf. Didymus, *Trin.* 3.3 (PG 39.805c) and 3.32 (PG 39.957c).

⁴³Lat. *per substantiam*.

⁴⁴See *Spir.* 10 and 16.

⁴⁵See *Spir.* 10.

⁴⁶See *Spir.* 10.

he wrote to the Hebrews that he is different from all angels.⁴⁷ He begins by saying: *For to what angel has he ever said: Sit at my right until I shall place your enemies as a stool for your feet? Are they not all ministering spirits sent to minister to those who will receive salvation?* [Heb 1.13–14]. And after some other passages: *How shall we escape if we neglect such a great salvation? This salvation took its beginning when it was declared by the Lord, and it has been confirmed for us by those who heard him. All the while God has borne witness by signs and wonders and various acts of power, and by the distributions of the Holy Spirit according to his will* [Heb 2.3–4].

63. Now the passage that says to *what angel* can be taken as equivalent to saying “to none,” since the noun *angel* indicates the nature⁴⁸ of all invisible creatures. For neither to any angel nor to another rational creature has God said: *Sit at my right*. And so, the text declares in general terms that *Sit at my right* is not said to any creature. And this holds true in general terms for creation. After he made a declaration about all invisible creatures, he said that they are ministering spirits, for which reason he added: *Are they not all ministering spirits sent to minister?* Not all invisible creatures are sent individually. Nonetheless, since others of the same kind and rank are sent, the rest are themselves somehow sent potentially, sharing in being sent and being of equal substance.

64. Therefore, the Lord is different from all creatures. The Apostle did not want us to neglect the great salvation initiated by the Lord, saying: *How shall we escape if we neglect such a great salvation?* This great salvation began when the Lord declared it and it was confirmed for us by those who heard him. Moreover, God bore witness to this salvation by signs and wonders, and he is different from all the ministering spirits. Likewise, the Holy Spirit. God bore witness to the distributions of the Holy Spirit according to his will, distributing him not by cutting him into parts, but by his communion

⁴⁷The “he” here is Christ. What follows in *Spir.* 62–64 is an argument based on the exegesis of Heb 1.13–14 and 2.3–4 that the Holy Spirit’s substance, on the parallel of Christ’s substance, is different from that of all creatures.

⁴⁸Lat. *substantia*.

with those on whom God decided to bestow him. The Holy Spirit is himself of a nature⁴⁹ different from those in which he is dispersed when poured forth.

An objection based on Amos 4.13, and its refutation [65–73]

65. Since we have proved that, according to the sense of the Scriptures, the Holy Spirit is different from all creatures, it is therefore to no avail, or rather, it is with impiety that those who want to show that he is created use the testimony which says that all things were made through the Word⁵⁰ so that even the eternal substance may be included among all things. Since as proof that this is his condition they also appropriate the prophetic utterance in which God says: *I am the one who creates spirit* [Am 4.13],⁵¹ we ought to show that even in this they are utterly estranged from understanding the truth.⁵²

66. For the subject of the Prophet’s utterance was not even the Holy Spirit, as is understood from the very flow and context of the speech, for indeed Amos speaks in the person of God: *Prepare to call upon your God, O Israel, since I am the one who gives strength to thunder and who creates spirit and who proclaims his Christ to humanity, who makes the dawn and foggy mist, and who mounts upon the high places of the earth: Almighty Lord is his name* [Am 4.12–13].

67. Note that God, who had already said he *creates spirit*, at the same time says he *gives strength to thunder* and *makes the dawn and foggy mist*. Therefore, if we closely follow the narrative just cited, namely, *thunder and dawn and foggy mist*, we also ought to place

⁴⁹Lat. *substantia*.

⁵⁰Cf. Jn 1.3.

⁵¹Lat. *Ego creo spiritum*. Gk. ἐγὼ ... κτίζων πνεῦμα. In Greek the word πνεῦμα can mean either “spirit” or “wind,” just as in Latin *spiritus* can mean “breath” or “spirit.” In the exegesis that follows, Didymus attempts to show that in Am 4.13 it means “wind” rather than being a reference to the “Spirit.” In the Vulgate Jerome removes the ambiguity of the Greek with the translation: *creans ventum*.

⁵²Cf. Didymus, *Trin.* 3.31 (PG 39.949–58).

spirit in the same narrative order, so that what God says is as follows: "When you call upon me, who am God, who administer the universe, who am the Creator of all things, who give strength to thunder and create spirit, who make the dawn and foggy mist useful for humanity, prepare to call upon me, O Israel, in such a way that, when you have prepared to call upon me and you have prayed to me who have established what I mentioned earlier, you may enjoy happy times and the lavish bestowal of other goods, as I guide all things to you year after year according to the order of nature, with the result that the year flows fruitfully, that the seasons unfold at the right intervals, that thunders rumble at the right time, and that a salutary dawn blows with favorable breezes."⁵³

68. Now if *thunder and the dawn and the foggy mist* and the creation of *spirit* are understood through the cloud of allegory, they will not indicate the thing itself but a figurative interpretation. 69. But if, on the contrary, they argue that these things are said about the Holy Spirit in a literal manner⁵⁴ on the grounds that mention is made of the creation of the Spirit in the passage which follows: *And who proclaims his Christ to humanity*, then it is also necessary to respond to this.

70. The Hebrew has *he proclaims what he is thinking to humanity*,⁵⁵ meaning that he who is the Creator of all things is also the one who inspires the Prophets and through them reveals his will to humanity.⁵⁶

71. Now it is necessary to respond to this claim because certain heretics falsely allege that the Creator is different than the God and Father of the Savior.⁵⁷ Declaring this with great impiety, they do not

⁵³Here Didymus practices a standard exegetical technique in which a passage is explained by paraphrasing it expansively in the style of someone else. The style here is bucolic.

⁵⁴Lat. *manifeste*, i.e. not allegorically, as mentioned in *Spir.* 68.

⁵⁵The reading of the Masoretic Text is: מה־שֵׁחֹר (*mahsēkhō*), "what he is thinking." Apparently, this word was misconstrued as מְשִׁיחֹר (*māshiakhō*), "his Messiah" or "his Christ."

⁵⁶*Spir.* 70 is an addition by Jerome.

⁵⁷This teaching was typically associated with Marcion and the Manichees.

foresee that their profane conjecture is stricken down by God who says: "I am the one who gives strength to thunder and who creates spirit and who makes and governs the other parts of the world, who proclaims my Christ to humanity. In fact, this latter providential work of mine stands above all my other works, such that I am the cause not only of externals, but also of those things which pertain to the advantage of the soul and the benefit of the mind."

72. Therefore this expression *who creates spirit* I judge to be the same as saying *who creates wind*. Indeed, by his providence God directs those winds produced by the motion of air, according to that passage we read elsewhere: *Who brings forth winds from his treasures* [Ps. 134.7]. But it is a good thing that in this text he did not say "who created" but *who creates wind*. For if the passage were about the existence of the Holy Spirit, he would have certainly said "who created." For he does not create the same thing continually. Thus it follows that *who creates* is said about wind because winds were not made just once, but inasmuch as they exist, they come into existence daily.

73. But it is not without purpose that in the present case *spirit* is said to be created without the use of the definite article (which in Greek indicates uniqueness).⁵⁸ For in this case *spirit* is not holy. In almost every case, the Holy Spirit is named with the use of the definite article, such as: *The Spirit himself*—Αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα—*bears witness with our spirit* [Rom 8.16]. And elsewhere: *It is the Spirit who gives life*—Τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐστὶν τὸ ζωοποιεῖν [Jn 6.64]. And again: *So too no one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God*—τὸ Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ—for the Spirit—τὸ Πνεῦμα γάρ—*scrutinizes all things, even the depths of God* [1 Cor 2.10–11]. It is possible to excerpt many such passages from the Sacred Writings. On those rare occasions when the Holy Spirit is named without the use of the definite article, one ought to realize that he is named with some additional indication of his magnificence. It is true that he is sometimes also

⁵⁸This parenthetical remark is probably Jerome's. Didymus made similar comments in *Spir.* 8.

mentioned without the use of the definite article when the focus is not on him *per se* but on participation in him, as for example *Elijah's Spirit* [2 Kg 2.15],⁵⁹ *Walk by Spirit* [Gal 5.16],⁶⁰ and other passages similar to these.

PART III: THE SPIRIT'S ACTIVITY [74–110a]

74. On the basis of the passages I have brought to our attention (as well as many others), we have shown that the Holy Spirit is not a creature and is never classified with created things but is rather always placed together with the Father and the Son. And so, let us now investigate in what way he is not different from either of them.⁶¹

*The Spirit bestows the same grace and love
as the Father and Son [75–80]*

75. At the end of the second epistle he wrote to the Corinthians, Paul said: *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all* [2 Cor 13.13]. This passage clearly shows that there is a single reception of the Trinity, since whoever receives the grace of Christ has it as much by the Father's administering as by the Holy Spirit's bestowing. Now God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ give grace in the way described in the passage: *Grace be with you and peace from God the Father and the Lord Christ* [Rom 1.7]. It is not the case that the Father gives one

⁵⁹But the LXX has the article at 2 Kg 2.15. Perhaps Didymus was thinking of Elisha's words to Elijah in 2 Kg 2.9: "Let a double-share of your Spirit (διπλᾶ ἐν πνεύματι σου) come upon me."

⁶⁰Gk. πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε.

⁶¹Lat. *nunc videamus quam cum utroque habeat indifferentiam*. The word *indifferentia* is unusual in Latin, probably representing the Gk. τὸ ἀδιάφορον or ἀδιαφορία. It appears also in *Spir.* 87 and 100.

grace and the Savior another, inasmuch as Paul writes that the grace given by both the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ is perfected by the communion of the Holy Spirit.

76. Indeed the Spirit himself is also called grace, according to the passage: *And he insulted the Spirit of grace in whom he was sanctified* [Heb 10.29].⁶² In Zechariah too God promised that he would pour himself out: that is, he would be most lavish in granting to Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and compassion.⁶³ For whenever anyone receives the grace of the Holy Spirit, he has it as a gift from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, the fact that there is a single grace of the Father and the Son perfected by the activity⁶⁴ of the Holy Spirit demonstrates that the Trinity is of one substance.⁶⁵

77. In yet another passage: *The love of God be with all of you* [2 Cor 13.13], it is the Trinity who both grants and sustains the love. In fact the Savior says: *Whoever keeps my commandments and obeys them loves me, but whoever loves me will be loved by my Father, and I will love him* [Jn 14.21]. After all, the Savior's love for those who are loved is not different from the Father's love. For God loves in order to save, since *God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, so that all who believe in the Son may not perish, but have eternal life* [Jn 3.16]. The same holds true also for the Son, who is life: in order to grant life and salvation, he loves those whom he wants to become better. This is why he says that he loves whoever is loved by the Father. The same point is made in the Prophet: *And he himself will save them because he loved them* [Is 33.22; 35.4].

78. The Apostle bears witness that this love is the fruit of the Holy Spirit, just like the joy and the peace granted by the Father and Son, when he says: *But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, and peace* [Gal 5.22]. This love is poured into the hearts of believers by the Holy Spirit: *Indeed, the love of God is poured into our hearts by*

⁶²See the comments at *Spir.* 14 on Didymus's reading of Heb 10.29.

⁶³Cf. Zech 12.10.

⁶⁴Lat. *operatio*, probably representing Gr. ἐνεργεια.

⁶⁵The argument here is that the Holy Spirit is not an activity but a substance that has an activity, and that activity demonstrates substance.

the Holy Spirit [Rom 5.5]. In fact, according to the passages: *And the communion of the Holy Spirit be with all of you* [2 Cor 13.13], and: *If there is any communion with the Spirit* [Phil 2.1], since everyone who has communion with the Holy Spirit through participation in him possesses God's Wisdom and Word and Truth in every way, he will also possess a share⁶⁶ of holiness with the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. *For God is faithful, through whom you have been called to communion with his Son* [1 Cor 1.9]. 79. John too writes concerning the Father: *If we walk in the light, just as he himself is in the light, we have communion with him* [1 Jn 1.7]. And again: *But our communion is with the Father and his Son Jesus Christ* [1 Jn 1.3].

80. Therefore, since whoever has communion with the Holy Spirit immediately has communion with both the Father and Son, whenever anyone has the love of the Father, he has it as a gift from the Son through the Holy Spirit. In addition, whenever anyone is a participant of the grace of Jesus Christ, he has the same grace as a gift from the Father through the Holy Spirit.

*The Father, Son, and Spirit have a single activity,
indicating a single substance [81–86]*

81. On the basis of all these passages it is proved that the activity of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit is the same. But those who have a single activity also have a single substance. For things of the same substance—ὁμοούσια—have the same activities, and things of a different substance—ἐτεροούσια—have discordant and distinct activities.⁶⁷

82. Beside these passages just mentioned, countless others teach the unity of the Trinity. We will now cite a few of these one by one.

⁶⁶Lat. *consortium*.

⁶⁷Elsewhere Jerome prefers to leave the ὁμοούσιον untranslated (see *Spir.* 16, 27, and 145), but here he supplies the translation *eiusdem substantiae*, avoiding *consubstantialis*.

83. When Peter publicly exposed Ananias as a fraud in the passage where Ananias claimed he was offering all the proceeds from the sale of his field, Peter proved the Holy Spirit's unity with God not according to number but according to substance, when he said: *Ananias, why has Satan so filled your heart that you lied to the Holy Spirit and hid away part of the proceeds of the field? Isn't it true that while it remained unsold it remained yours and that when it was sold it was at your disposal? Why have you contrived such a thing in your heart? You have not lied to men, but to God* [Acts 5.3–4].⁶⁸ Now if whoever lies to God lies to the Holy Spirit, and whoever lies to the Holy Spirit lies to God, there can be no doubt that the Spirit has partnership⁶⁹ with God. And it is understood that in whatever way holiness subsists in God, in the same way deity subsists in the Holy Spirit.

84. Now it is also true that this Holy Spirit, whom we have said is of the same nature as the Father, does not differ from the divinity of the Son. The Savior said to his disciples: *When they bring you in to synagogues and authorities and powers, do not be anxious regarding how and what you should respond, for the Holy Spirit will teach you at that hour what it is fitting to say* [Lk 12.11–12]; *therefore keep it in your hearts not to prepare beforehand how you will respond since I myself will give you a mouth and wisdom which no one will be able to oppose and refute* [Lk 21.14–15].⁷⁰ After saying in these passages that “they ought not be anxious regarding what they should respond to opponents because at that hour they will be taught the appropriate response by the Holy Spirit,”⁷¹ he immediately adduces the grounds for this confidence: *Keep it in your hearts not to prepare beforehand how you will respond since I myself will give you a mouth* (that is, a word)⁷² *and wisdom which no one will be able to oppose and refute* [Lk 21.14–15]. For after he said that when it is time to respond they will be taught the appropriate response by the Holy Spirit, he says in

⁶⁸The example of Ananias also appears in *Spir.* 131 and 259.

⁶⁹Lat. *consortium*.

⁷⁰These are the same two verses cited in *Spir.* 39–40.

⁷¹Didymus here paraphrases Lk 12.11–12.

⁷²This parenthetical remark may be another insertion of Jerome.

what follows: *since I myself will give you a wisdom which no one will be able to oppose and refute* [Lk 21.14–15].

85. These passages show that the wisdom given to the disciples by the Son is the wisdom of the Holy Spirit, and that the teaching of the Holy Spirit is the teaching of the Lord, and that the partnership⁷³ which the Spirit has with the Son is one in both nature and will. And since it was demonstrated above⁷⁴ that the Spirit is associated by nature with the Only-Begotten of God and God the Father—and certainly the Son and Father are one according to the passage: *I and the Father are one* [Jn 10.30]—it is shown that the Trinity is undivided and inseparable according to nature.

86. Also, in another Gospel it is said: *For it is not you who speak but it is the Spirit of your Father who is speaking in you* [Mt 10.20]. Therefore, if the Spirit of the Father speaks in the Apostles, teaching them the appropriate response, and if what they are taught by the Spirit is wisdom, which we cannot understand as anything other than the Son, then it is clear that the Spirit is of the same nature as the Son and as the Father whose Spirit he is. Furthermore, Father and Son are one. Therefore, the Trinity is associated in a unity of substance.

*The Spirit is the same nature and power
as the Father and Son [87–90]*

87. Another scriptural example shows that Trinity has a single nature and power. The Son is called the Hand, the Arm, and the Right-hand of the Father. Just as we have often taught⁷⁵ that these terms demonstrate that the one nature lacks difference,⁷⁶ so too is the Holy Spirit named the Finger of God because he is conjoined in nature to the Father and the Son.

⁷³Lat. *consortium*.

⁷⁴See *Spir.* 10–73.

⁷⁵Here Didymus probably refers to his oral teaching. See p. 43 above.

⁷⁶Lat. *unius naturae indifferentiam demonstrari*. See n. 61 above on *indifferentia*.

88. In one of the Gospels, when some were disparaging the miracles of the Lord by saying: *He casts out demons by Beelzebub, the prince of demons* [Lk 11.15], the Savior, asking why they said this, replied: *If it is by Beelzebub that I cast out demons, by whom do your sons cast out demons? But if it is by the Finger of God that I cast out demons, then the reign of God has come upon you* [Lk 11.19–20]. When writing about this same event, another evangelist has the Son say: *But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons* [Mt 12.28]. These passages show that the Finger of God is the Holy Spirit. Therefore, if a finger is joined to a hand and a hand to him whose hand it is, then without a doubt the finger is ascribed to the substance of him whose finger it is.

89. But be careful not to descend to lowly things, forget what we are now discussing, and thereby depict in your mind a variety of bodily limbs and begin to imagine for yourself their sizes, their inequalities, and other body parts larger or smaller than they, saying “a finger differs in size from a hand by quite a bit and a hand differs likewise from him whose hand it is.” For Scripture is speaking here of incorporeal realities, and wishes only to demonstrate the unity of a substance, not also its dimensions.

90. For just as the hand, through which everything is accomplished and worked, is not divided from the body, and just as the hand belongs to him whose hand it is, so also is the finger not separated from the hand of which it is the finger. And so, spurn inequalities and dimensions when you think about God, and understand the unity that obtains among the finger and the hand and the entire body.⁷⁷ Now it is by this Finger that the Law was written on tablets of stone [cf. Ex 31.18].

⁷⁷The unity of the various parts of the body is recognized by Aristotle as an example of things which are one in themselves (καθ' αὐτό), i.e. essentially or by nature (*Phys.* Δ.6.1016a3).

*The Spirit gives the same wisdom and truth
as the Father and Son [91–95]*

91. But it is easy enough to prove our faith also through another Scripture. 92. God is called *Only-Wise* [Rom 16.27] not by receiving wisdom from another. Nor is he named wise through participation in someone else's wisdom. If in fact many are called wise, it is due not to their own nature but to their communion with wisdom. But God is called *Only-Wise* not because he is made wise by participation in another's wisdom or from some other source, but because he generates wisdom and makes others wise. This wisdom is our Lord Jesus Christ. For Christ is *the Power of God and the Wisdom of God* [1 Cor 1.24]. The Holy Spirit is also called the Spirit of Wisdom, since in the old books it is recorded that *Joshua the son of Nun was filled by the Lord with the Spirit of Wisdom* [Deut 34.9].

93. Therefore, since God is the *Only-Wise* not by receiving wisdom from any source, but by making others wise and generating wisdom, out of all who are called wise based on his name,⁷⁸ he alone is wise. *A multitude of the wise is the salvation of the world* [Wis 6.24]. And: *Those who know themselves are wise*.⁷⁹ And again: *When you have been with the wise, you will be wise* [Prov 13.20]. In the same way the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of Wisdom not by receiving wisdom from some other source. For his very being is the Spirit of Wisdom, and his nature is nothing other than the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of God. Now we discussed these matters at length in the book *On the Sects*.⁸⁰ Hence in order to avoid needlessly repeating the same points, let the previous discussion suffice for us.

94. Therefore, since the Spirit of Wisdom and Truth is inseparable from the Son, he too is Wisdom and Truth. If he were to

⁷⁸Lat. *per nuncupationem*. The thought here is that God alone is properly called wise; all others who are called wise are thus designated because God has made them wise and share in the designation that belongs properly to God.

⁷⁹Lat. *Qui semetipsos cognoscunt, hi sunt sapientes*. This passage cannot be traced to a known scriptural source.

⁸⁰See n. 14 above.

participate in wisdom and truth, at some point he could descend into a state of ceasing to possess what he received from somewhere, namely, wisdom and truth. And the Son, who is himself Wisdom and Truth, is not separated from the Father, whom the words of the Scriptures proclaim as the *Only-Wise* and Truth. We will see that the Holy Spirit, because he is the Spirit of Wisdom and Truth, possesses the same circle of unity and substance⁸¹ as the Son, and, moreover, that the Son is not divided from the substance of the Father.

95. Since *the Son is the Image of the invisible God* [Col 1.15] and *the Form of his substance* [Heb 1.3], whoever is fashioned and formed according to this Image or Form⁸² is led into likeness to God (though attaining such a form and image only insofar as the capacity of humans to advance allows). In a similar way, since the Holy Spirit is the seal of God, he seals those who receive the form and image of God and leads them to the seal of Christ, filling them with wisdom, knowledge, and above all faith.

The Spirit is "distributing" like the Father and the Son [96–97]

96. Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are varieties of service, but the same Lord; and there are varieties of activity, but it is the same God who works them all in everyone [1 Cor 12.4–7]. This manifold fullness of gifts is produced by the Father, multiplied by the Son, and exists through the Holy Spirit. *For to one is given a word of wisdom through the Spirit; to another a word of knowledge according to the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit* [1 Cor 12.8–9]. After the Apostle lists the rest of the gifts, he adds: *But one and the same Spirit works all these, apportioning to each as he wills* [1 Cor 12.11].

⁸¹Lat. *circulum unitatis atque substantiae*.

⁸²Lat. *quicumque ad hanc imaginem vel formam imaginantur atque formantur*. The translation cannot capture the parallelism of the Latin.

97. From this we learn that the nature of Holy Spirit is active and “distributing” (if I may speak thus). Accordingly, let us not be taken in by those who say that the Holy Spirit is an activity and not the substance of God.⁸³ Many other passages also show that the nature of the Holy Spirit is subsistent, as in the passage that the Apostles write: *For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us* [Acts 15.28]. For the expression *it seemed good* does not indicate an activity but a nature, especially since we also find something similar said about the Lord: *as it seemed good to the Lord, so it was done* [Job 1.21].

The Spirit calls to ministry like the Father and Son [98–99a]

98. Next, there are the Spirit’s own words that we read very frequently, as in the following passage: *While they were fasting and worshipping*—that is, the disciples of Christ—the *Holy Spirit said*: “*Set apart for me Barnabas and Paul for the work to which I have called them*” [Acts 13.2]. This voice of divinity and sign of authority indicates that his substance is not created but uncreated. For the Holy Spirit did not call Barnabas and Paul to some other work which is not that of the Father and of the Son, since the ministry which the Spirit entrusted and handed over to them is the ministry of the Father and the Son. Paul said to the Galatians: *For he who has worked in Peter for the apostolate to the circumcised, has worked in me and Barnabas for the gentiles* [Gal 2.9]; they are sent to the nations in the same way by the authority of the Holy Spirit. 99. Similarly, when Christ works in the Apostles, the ministry of the Spirit is perfected. Because of this, the Apostles confessed that they *spoke in Christ* [2 Cor 2.17], that they *saw him with their own eyes* [1 Jn 1.1], that they were made *ministers of the Word* [Acts 6.4], that is, Christ, and that they were *stewards of the mysteries of God* [1 Cor 4.1].

⁸³On this argument, see Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, “The Holy Spirit as Agent, not Activity: Origen’s Argument with Modalism and its Afterlife in Didymus, Eunomius, and Gregory of Nazianzus,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 65 (2011): 227–248.

The Spirit baptizes like the Father and Son [99b–103]

Next, since the Apostles possessed primacy in priesthood, Christ indicated that they were initiators of the faith by saying: *Go, go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit* [Mt 28.19]. 100. And Paul was very correct to write: *There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism* [2 Cor 2.17]. Who, then, is not compelled by the truth itself to admit the absence of difference⁸⁴ in the Holy Trinity? For there is one faith in the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, and the baptismal washing is conferred and confirmed in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.⁸⁵

101. Nor do I think that anyone would be so foolish and insane as to consider a baptism given in the name of the Father and the Son complete without also adding the Holy Spirit. Or think one given in the name of the Father and the Holy Spirit complete if the name of the Son is omitted. Or think one given in the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit complete without the name of Father placed at the beginning. 102. For even if there could be someone with a stony heart⁸⁶ (if I may speak thus) and a very disturbed mind who tries to baptize in such a way that he omits one of the prescribed names—such a man would clearly legislate against the law of Christ!⁸⁷—he would still baptize incompletely,⁸⁸ or rather, he would be altogether unable to liberate those, whom he thinks he has baptized, from their sins.

103. From these texts we conclude that the substance of the Trinity is indivisible, and that the Father is truly the Father of the Son, and that the Son is truly the Son of the Father, and that the Holy Spirit is truly the Spirit of the Father and God, and especially the

⁸⁴Lat. *indifferentia*. See *Spir.* 74.

⁸⁵Cf. Didymus, *Trin.* 2.15 (PG 39.720a); also see Athanasius, *Serap.* 1.29.3 and 2.15.6.

⁸⁶Cf. Ezek 11.19.

⁸⁷Such a baptizer would legislate against the law laid down in Mt 28.19. Didymus here possibly also alludes to Jam 4.12.

⁸⁸See Athanasius, *Serap.* 1.30.

Spirit of Wisdom and Truth, that is, of the Son of God. So then, this is salvation for those who believe.

*The Spirit establishes ecclesiastical discipline
like the Father and the Son [104–105]*

104. Furthermore, the administration of ecclesiastical discipline⁸⁹ is made complete in this Trinity. For when the Savior sent his disciples to preach the Gospel and to teach the doctrines of truth, the Father is said to have established in the Church *first Apostles, second prophets, third teachers* [1 Cor 12.28]. On this same topic, the Apostle offers a similar opinion: *And just as we have been approved by God to believe the Gospel, so too we speak, not in order to be pleasing to men, but to God who has approved our hearts* [1 Thess 2.4]. Those whom Christ commanded to be teachers, these same the Father approved, and it is rightfully said that the Holy Spirit established the same as administrators and leaders in the Church.

105. When the Apostle Paul gathered presbyters from various places and many churches at Miletus, he said: *Watch over yourselves and the entire flock over whom the Holy Spirit has set you as bishops to direct the church of the Lord, which he has acquired through his own blood* [Acts 20.28]. If those whom Christ sent to evangelize and baptize the nations are those whom the Holy Spirit placed in charge of the Church and the Father appointed by his decree, there can be no doubt that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit have a single activity and approval. It follows from this that the Trinity has the same substance.

The Spirit indwells like the Father and the Son [106–110a]

106. We still need to consider the fact that it is impossible for any creature to dwell in a heart and mind, but that it is possible for God and his Word in the Holy Spirit. For instance, the Father said to a certain group of people: *I will dwell in them and I will walk among them* [2 Cor 6.16; cf. Lev 26.12 and Ezek 37.27]. In addition, someone directed his voice to him: *You dwell in a holy place, O praise of Israel!* [Ps 21.4]. For the *exalted* Creator of all creation *dwells in exalted places* [Ps 112.4–5].

107. The only-begotten Son also dwells in the pure minds and hearts of believers. For the Apostle said that Christ dwells through faith in the inner person in the Spirit when he wrote: *In the Spirit in the inner person Christ dwells through faith in your hearts* [Eph 3.16–17]. He also spoke of himself: *Christ lives in me* [Gal 2.20]. And again: *It is Christ who speaks in me* [2 Cor 13.3]. And our Savior said: *I and my Father will come*—no doubt *to the one who keeps his commands* [Jn 14.21]—*and we will make our dwelling-place with him* [Jn 14.23].⁹⁰ Then the following text is added: *If anyone loves me he will keep my word, and I will love him, and to him we will come and make our dwelling-place with him* [Jn 14.23].

108. In another passage, it is said that the entire nature of the rational creatures is the house of the Savior and that Christ is *over his house, whose house we are* [Heb 3.6]. This house of Christ is the temple of God in whom the Spirit of the same God dwells, for when he wrote to the Corinthians, Paul said: *Do you not know that you are the temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwells in you?* [1 Cor 3.16]. Now if the Holy Spirit is also found in the very house and temple where the Savior and Father dwells, this demonstrates that the substance of the Trinity is indivisible. Just a little further on in the same epistle, Paul writes: *Do you not know that your bodies are the temple of the Holy Spirit whom you have from God?* [1 Cor 6.19].

⁸⁹Lat. *disciplina*. By “discipline” here, Didymus means Church order and practice.

⁹⁰Neither Vulgate nor the Greek contains the words *Ego et Pater*, which may be borrowed from Jn 10.30.

109. Therefore, since we have learned that the Holy Spirit dwells in the mind and the inner person in the same way as the Father and the Son, I will not say that it is silly but that it is impious to claim that he is a creature. After all, it is possible for that which we have learned (I mean the virtues and arts), and for the disturbances, ignorance and passions contrary to these, to dwell in souls, yet not as substances but as accidents. But it is impossible for a created nature to dwell in the mind. Now if it is true that the Holy Spirit unambiguously indwells the soul and heart, surely we ought to believe that, together with the Father and the Son, he is uncreated. 110. Therefore, everything discussed in the preceding paragraphs has demonstrated that, in accordance with the nature of the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit is incorruptible and everlasting.

PART IV: THE SPIRIT'S PROCESSION, SENDING, AND PROPER NAMES [110b–131]

The Spirit's "coming forth" from the Father [110b–116]

And so, the Holy Spirit removes all doubt and conjecture regarding himself so that he will not be classified as one of the created substances. He is the Spirit of God, and the words of the Savior in the Gospel declare that he has gone out from the Father: *When the Consoler whom I will send to you comes, the Spirit of Truth who comes forth from the Father, he himself will give testimony about me* [Jn 15.26]. Now the Holy Spirit is called *the Consoler who comes*, being given a name derived from his activity. He is thus named not only because he consoles those whom he has found worthy of himself and renders them free from all sadness and disturbance, but also because he bestows on them incredible joy and gladness, to such an extent that anyone who gives thanks to God for being considered worthy of such an important guest can say: *You have put joy into my heart* [Ps 4.8]. For there is abiding, everlasting joy in the heart of those indwelt by the Holy Spirit.

111. The Spirit, who is the Consoler, is sent from the Son, not in the way that the angels or the Prophets and Apostles are sent to minister, but as is appropriate for the Spirit of God to be sent from Wisdom and Truth.⁹¹ For the Spirit has an undivided nature together with the same Wisdom and Truth. After all, when the Son is sent from the Father, he is not separated and sundered from him, as he remains in him and has him in himself.

112. Furthermore, the Spirit of Truth who is sent by the Son in the way mentioned above comes forth from the Father without moving from one place to another. After all, this is as impossible as it is blasphemous. For if the Spirit comes forth from one place and goes to another, then the Father himself resides in a place, and the Spirit of Truth is circumscribed by a particular location as befits a corporeal nature, and abandoning one place he migrates to another. But just as the Father is not in a place since he is beyond every corporeal nature, so too the Spirit of Truth is in no way confined by any spatial boundary, since he is incorporeal and, to tell the truth, he surpasses every essence of rational creatures.

113. And so, since it is impossible and impious to believe such things about incorporeal beings, we ought to understand that the Holy Spirit goes out from the Father as the Savior himself goes out from God, to which he bears witness when he says: *I have gone out from God and have come* [Jn 8.42]. And just as we separate places and changes of place from incorporeal realities, so too do we distinguish emissions⁹² (whether internal or external) from the nature of intellectual realities, since they belong to bodies which can be touched and have extension.

114. And so, we ought to believe the following statements that used ineffable words known by faith alone: the Savior *has gone out from God* [Jn 8.42],⁹³ and *the Spirit of Truth comes forth from the*

⁹¹Cf. 2 Cor 3.8.

⁹²Lat. *prolationes*, undoubtedly representing προβολαί. The term had corporeal overtones, implying a kind of generation in which the offspring was actually a divided-off portion of the parent.

⁹³Cf. Jn 16.28 and 17.8.

Father [Jn 15.26]—the same Father who said: *The Spirit who comes forth from me* [Is 57.16]. Indeed, well-said is the passage: *he who comes forth from the Father* [Jn 15.26]. For even though it is possible to say “from God” or “from the Lord” or “from the Almighty,” none of these is used. Instead, *from the Father* is used, but not because the Father is different from God Almighty—for it would be criminal to think this! Rather, the Spirit of Truth is said to *come forth from the Father* [Jn 15.26] according to the distinctive feature of the Father⁹⁴ and the concept of fatherhood.⁹⁵

115. Although on many occasions the Savior says that he has gone out from God,⁹⁶ he nevertheless claims for himself the distinctive feature and, as it were, that kinship (to which we have already devoted much discussion) when he speaks of himself using the term “Father,” as when he says: *I am in the Father and the Father is in me* [Jn 14.10], and elsewhere: *I and the Father are one* [Jn 10.30]. An observant reader will find in the Gospel many other passages that are similar to these.

116. And so, regarding this Holy Spirit who comes forth from the Father, the Lord said: *he will testify about me* [Jn 15.26]. In this, he bears testimony similar to the testimony of the Father, about whom the Lord says: *The Father who sent me has borne testimony about me* [Jn 5.37].

The sending of the Spirit by the Father and the Son [117–120]

117. Now when the Son *sends the Spirit of Truth*, whom he called *the Consoler* [Jn 15.26], at the same time the Father also sends him. The Father does not send the Spirit without the Son sending him since he comes through the identical will of the Father and Son, seeing that the Savior speaks through the Prophets (as will be clear

⁹⁴Lat. *proprietaem Patris*, probably representing ἰδιωμα, ἰδιότης, or χαρακτήρ πατέρος.

⁹⁵Lat. *intellectum parentis*, probably representing ἐπινοια or ἔννοια.

⁹⁶E.g. Jn 8.42.

to anyone who reads through this entire passage): *And now the Lord has sent me and his Spirit* [Is 48.16]. Without a doubt, God sends not only the Son but also the Spirit. 118. In addition, the Apostle says: *These things have now been announced to you through those who preached the Gospel to you by the Holy Spirit who is sent from heaven* [1 Pet 1.12].

Furthermore, in the Book of Wisdom (which is named Πανάπετος, or *All-Perfect*,⁹⁷ by those who have obtained from God the gifts of grace), the voice there is understood to be giving thanks to God: *Who has searched out what is in the heavens? Who has come to know your will, unless you have given Wisdom and sent your Holy Spirit from on high? And thus the paths of those on earth were made straight and people were taught what is pleasing to you* [Wis 9.16–18]. 119. In this text the Father not only gives the Wisdom of God (that is, his Only-Begotten Son), but also sends the Holy Spirit.

120. The Gospel itself also declares that the Father gives and sends the Holy Spirit, when the Savior says: *And I will ask my Father, and he will give to you another Paraclete to be with you forever, the Spirit of Truth* [Jn 14.16–17]. And again: *But the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things* [Jn 14.26]. These passages are saying that the Father gives another Paraclete [i.e. the Son], another apart from the one who is sent by the Son [i.e. the Spirit]⁹⁸ according to the passage: *But when he comes, the Paraclete whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth* [Jn 15.26]. The Son has not called him *another Paraclete* because they are different in nature, but because they have separate activities.

⁹⁷Jerome keeps this in the Greek; this was a common name for the book among Greek speakers.

⁹⁸Lat. *Nam et in his sermonibus alium Paracletum dare dicitur Pater alium absque eo qui a Filio mittitur*. The confusing thought in this passage has led to several unnecessary conjectural emendations both in the mss. and by Migne and Doutreleau. We follow the reading of A Θ. We have inserted words (in square brackets) to clarify the sense.

The Spirit as the Consoler [121–124]

121. Since the Savior has the role of mediator⁹⁹ and ambassador, in virtue of which he prays for our sins as high-priest, *forever saving those who draw near to God through him since he always lives to intercede for them with the Father* [Heb 7.25], the Holy Spirit has been named “Paraclete” in another sense: because he is the consolation for the sorrowing. 122. But do not think that the natures of the Son and Holy Spirit are different because they have separate activities. After all, we find in other passages that the Spirit Paraclete fulfills the role of ambassador to the Father, as in this one: *For we do not know how we ought to pray as is fitting, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with inexpressible groanings, and he who searches hearts knows what the Spirit desires since he makes requests for the saints according to God* [Rom 8.26–27].

123. The consolation for which the Holy Spirit is named “Paraclete” is also effected in the hearts of those in need by the Savior. For it is written: *And he has consoled the downcast of his people* [2 Cor 7.6].¹⁰⁰ It is for this reason that he who attained this benefit gave him praise, saying: *Lord, when there was a multitude of cares in my heart, your consolations gave joy to my heart—or have shown love to my soul* [Ps 93.19]. For even today we find both readings in different copies.

124. The Father himself is also called *the God of all consolation* [1 Cor 1.3]. He consoles those who are in affliction so that they may attain first salvation and then the crown of glory through patience in their distresses. And so, the Father gives the Spirit, who is the Consoler and Holy and the Spirit of Truth, so that he may always abide with the disciples of Christ. With them the Savior also abides, saying: *Behold! I am with you to the consummation of the age* [Mt 28.20].

⁹⁹Cf. Heb 8.6, 9.15, 12.24.

¹⁰⁰Lat. *Et humiles populi sui consolatus est*. Didymus has conflated 2 Cor 7.6 with either Is 49.13 or 52.9 to make the subject of the verse be the Lord.

The Spirit as the inspirer of the Prophets [125–131]

125. Since both the Holy Spirit and the Son are always present in the Apostles, it follows from this that the Father is also with them. For he who receives the Son receives the Father, and the Son with the Father makes his home in those who are worthy of his presence.¹⁰¹ In addition, one instantly finds the Son wherever the Holy Spirit is. Thus, when the Holy Spirit is in the Prophets, causing them to predict future events and do the other things which pertain to the activity of prophets, it is said that the Word of God has come to them. For that phrase which customarily indicates prophetic activity, *Thus says the Lord* [Is 38.5] is preceded by the phrase, *the Word which came to Isaiah* [Is 38.4], or to one of the other Prophets.

126. We know that the Prophets have the Holy Spirit because this is what God clearly says: *Whatever I commanded to my servants the prophets by my Spirit* [Zech 1.6]. In addition, the Savior indicates in the Gospel that the just men and those who prophesied future events to the people before his coming were filled with the breath of the Holy Spirit. For when the Savior asked the Pharisees what they thought about the Christ and heard [their reply] that he would be the son of David, he said: *How is it then that David says about him: “The Lord said to my Lord: Sit at my right hand”? Therefore, if David by the Holy Spirit called him “Lord,” how is he his son?* [Mt 22.43–45]. 127. Furthermore, Peter says to his companions in faith: *It was fitting for the scripture to be fulfilled which the Holy Spirit predicted through the mouth of David of Judah*, and so forth [Acts 1.16]. Again, in the same book: *You who spoke through the Holy Spirit by the mouth of David your servant: “Why is there tumult among the nations, and among the peoples useless murmuring?”* [Acts 4.25].

128. It is reported at the end of the same Acts that the Word of God impelled Isaiah to prophesy, and Isaiah did so at the command of the Holy Spirit: *The Holy Spirit was right when he spoke to your fathers through Isaiah the prophet, saying: “Go to this people and say:*

¹⁰¹Cf. Jn 14.23.

'You will hear with your ears . . . ' and the rest [Acts 28.25–26]. **129.** But the Prophet's own book relates that the prophecy Paul claimed to be pronounced by the Holy Spirit was said by the Lord: *And I heard, said Isaiah, the voice of the Lord saying: "Whom shall I send, and who shall go to this people?" And I said: "Here I am! Send me." And he said: "Go, and say to this people: "You will hear with your ears . . . Then after a few words, the Lord himself says: and they turn and I should heal them.* Then at once the Prophet replied: *How long, Lord?* [Is 6.8–11]. Although the Lord told the Prophet to say what is written, and although the Prophet replied to the Lord when commanded by him, saying: *How long, Lord?*, Paul nevertheless claims that what the Lord said through the Prophet was actually pronounced by the Holy Spirit.¹⁰²

130. This clearly shows (as we have often said) that the Lord and the Holy Spirit have the same will and nature, and that the name of Lord is also to be understood when the Spirit is mentioned. **131.** For in [the epistle to the] Corinthians, attributing the name "God" to the Father and the name "Lord" to Son¹⁰³ deprives neither the Father of his lordship nor the Son of his deity. Likewise, the Holy Spirit is named Lord by the same rationale by which the Father is Lord and the Son is God. But if he is Lord, it follows from this that he is also God (as we said a little earlier when we cited the saying of the Apostle Peter to Ananias who withheld money).¹⁰⁴ For deity is also to be understood when we say "Holy Spirit."¹⁰⁵

PART V: SCRIPTURAL TESTIMONIES [132–230]

1. JOHN THE EVANGELIST: JOHN 14.26 [132–145]

*The Spirit sent in the name of the Son
is the Spirit of the Son [132–139]*

132. This line of inquiry finds its point of departure in the passage: *But when the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, comes, he will teach you all things* [Jn 14.26]. And so, come, let us now seek from this text points of agreement with our earlier discussion. **133.** The Savior affirms that the Father sends the Holy Spirit *in his name*. Now, properly speaking, the name of the Savior is "Son," because this name indicates the sharing of nature¹⁰⁶ and (so to speak) what is proper to the persons.¹⁰⁷ Since the Father sends the Holy Spirit in the name of the Son, one should not understand him as a servant, as foreign to, or as cut off from the Son.

134. In addition, just as the Son comes in the name of the Father, saying: *I have come in the name of my Father* [Jn 5.43]—after all, it belongs only to the Son to come in the name of the Father without violating what is proper to Son vis-à-vis the Father and what is proper to the Father vis-à-vis the Son¹⁰⁸—so too, inversely, no one else comes in the name of the Father, but rather, for example, in the name of the Lord and in the name of Almighty God. You will be able to see this point more clearly by re-reading the Prophets.

135. For instance, Moses, the great minister and servant of God, came in the name of "He Who Is" and in the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. For God said to him: *Say this to the sons of Israel: "He Who Is" sent me to you* [Ex 3.4]. And again: *Say to them:*

¹⁰⁶Lat. *naturae consortium*.

¹⁰⁷Lat. *proprietates personarum*. This is the sole appearance of the word *persona* in a Trinitarian context in the treatise. Doutreleau suggests that the underlying Greek is ιδιότης τῶν προσώπων. Didymus's hesitancy in using the expression (*ut ita dicam*, "so to speak") may indicate that it was a new concept.

¹⁰⁸Lat. *salua proprietate Filii ad Patrem et Patris ad Filium*.

¹⁰²Thus the witness of Paul helps interpret the Book of Isaiah regarding who speaks in the Prophets.

¹⁰³Cf. 1 Cor 8.6.

¹⁰⁴See *Spir.* 83.

¹⁰⁵This is one of Didymus's three explicit expressions of the divinity of the Holy Spirit; see also *Spir.* 83 and 224.

the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob sent me to you [Ex 3.15]. 136. Another example: when he said the following passage about his righteous servants: *I will command to my servants the prophets by my Spirit* [Zech 1.6], this sending was given in the name of God. Since they proved themselves worthy of God, they are said to have come in the name of God. Again, since they progressed to better things and stood under the authority of the one God, they came in the name of Almighty God. 137. In addition, when the sons of Israel were sojourning in Egypt, they learned to worship as gods those who are not and to venerate the fathers of this world¹⁰⁹ with divine honors. Accordingly, Moses was sent to them under the name of "He Who Is." He liberated them from false gods and brought them over to true deity, to the God of their fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

138. And so, just as servants who have come in the name of the Lord point toward the Lord and communicate what is proper to him¹¹⁰ because they are subject to and serve him—for they are servants, after all, of the Lord—so too, the Son who comes in the name of the Father communicates what is proper to the Father and his name.¹¹¹ These supply the proof that he is the only-begotten Son of God. 139. Therefore, the Holy Spirit is sent by the Father in the name of the Son, and has what is proper to the Son insofar as he¹¹² is God, but does not have sonship such that he¹¹³ is God's son. This shows that he is joined to the Son in unity. For this reason, he is also called the Spirit of the Son, and by adoption makes sons of those who wanted to receive him: *For since you are sons of God, the Father has sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying out, "Abba, Father!"* [Gal 4.6; cf. Rom 8.14–16].

¹⁰⁹This is possibly an allusion to Eph 6.12.

¹¹⁰Lat. *proprietatem eius*.

¹¹¹Lat. *proprietatem Patris et nomen*.

¹¹²I.e. the Son.

¹¹³I.e. the Holy Spirit.

The Spirit teaches all things [140–143]

140. The Holy Spirit himself, who has been sent by the Father and comes in the name of the Son, will teach all things to those who are perfect in the faith of Christ,¹¹⁴ (that is, all things which are spiritual and intelligible)¹¹⁵—in sum, the mysteries of truth and wisdom. 141. But he will not teach as an instructor or teacher of a discipline which has been learned from another. For this method pertains to those who learn wisdom and the other arts by means of study and diligence. Rather, as he himself is the art, the teaching, the wisdom, and the Spirit of Truth, he invisibly imparts knowledge of divine things to the mind.

In fact, the Father also teaches his disciples in this way, as one of those taught by him says: *God, you have taught me wisdom* [Dan 2.23]. And another boldly cries out: *You have taught me, God, from my youth* [Ps 70.17]. In this way all of them have been taught. 142. In addition, the Son of God, who is the Truth and the Wisdom of God, teaches those who participate in him in such a way that his instruction is imparted, not by some method, but in virtue of who he is by nature.¹¹⁶ It is for this reason that his disciples¹¹⁷ are taught to call him alone "teacher."¹¹⁸

And so, those same teachings that the Father and the Son give to the hearts of believers, the Spirit provides to those who have stopped living like animals. *For the one living like an animal does not receive what belongs to the Spirit*, thinking that what the Spirit says is foolishness [1 Cor 2.14]. But whoever cleanses his mind of disturbance is filled with the teachings of the Holy Spirit (that is, with words of wisdom and knowledge), to such an extent that he who has received them says: *But God has revealed these things to us through the Holy Spirit* [1 Cor 2.10].

¹¹⁴Cf. Jn 14.26.

¹¹⁵I.e. non sense-perceptible.

¹¹⁶Lat. *ut disciplinam non arte doceat, sed natura*.

¹¹⁷His "disciples" (*discipuli*) are those to whom the Son has imparted his "instruction" (*disciplinam*).

¹¹⁸Cf. Mt 23.10.

143. God bestows the Spirit of Wisdom and revelation on those who have prepared themselves in this way in order that they may know him.¹¹⁹ Those who receive the Spirit of Wisdom are made wise not from another but from the Holy Spirit, and because of him they come to understand the Lord and what pertains to the will of God. When he reveals himself, they also recognize this same Spirit such that they know what the Lord has given them. Just as the one who has obtained the Spirit of revelation and wisdom is able to preach the doctrines of truth by relying not upon human skill but upon the skill of God,¹²⁰ so too we can hear one of them, the Apostle, saying: *And my word and my preaching are not with persuasive words of human wisdom but with the demonstration of the Spirit and the power of God* [1 Cor 2.4].

The Holy Spirit creates like the Father and the Son [144–145]

144. It is true that we cannot interpret the *power* which is equal to the Spirit as another besides Christ the Lord. For he himself said to his disciples: *For you will receive the power of the Holy Spirit when he comes upon you* [Act 1.8].¹²¹ And the archangel said to Mary: *The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you* [Luke 1.35]. Therefore, when the Holy Spirit came upon the virgin Mary, the creating power of the Most High fashioned the body of Christ: using it as a temple, he was born without the seed of a man.

145. All this shows that the Holy Spirit is the Creator, as we have already shown briefly in our volume *On Doctrines*.¹²² And in the

¹¹⁹Lat. *semetipsum*. That is, God.

¹²⁰Lat. *non humana sed Dei arte*.

¹²¹Lat. *accipietis enim virtutem Spiritus Sancti venientem super vos*. There is significant difference between Didymus's citation and the standard Greek text, which is the same as the source of the Vulgate: *sed accipietis virtutem supervenientis Spiritus Sancti in vos*. In the standard text it is "the Holy Spirit" who comes upon the disciples. Here, it is "the power of the Holy Spirit" which does.

¹²²This work is no longer extant, but is also mentioned by Jerome in *De viribus illustribus* 109.

psalm it is said to the Lord: *You take back from them your Spirit, and they die and they return to the earth. You send forth your Spirit, and they are created, and you renew the face of the earth* [Ps 103.29–30]. Nor it is particularly astonishing if the Holy Spirit is the maker of the Lord's body, since along with the Father and the Son he creates all things which the Father and the Son create: *Send forth your Spirit, and they are created* [Ps 130.30]. Furthermore, we have already demonstrated at length that the Holy Spirit's activity is the same as that of the Father and the Son, and that a single substance is implied by the same activity, and, vice versa, that those who are *ὁμοούσια* [the same in substance] do not have an activity that is diverse.¹²³

2. JOHN THE EVANGELIST: JOHN 16.12–15 [146–174]

146. Let us now cite yet another passage which can aid our faith in the Holy Spirit. Here is a text written in the Gospel:

¹²I still have many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. ¹³But when the Spirit of Truth comes, he will guide you into the whole Truth. For he will not speak on his own accord, but whatever he hears he will speak, and the things that are to come he will announce to you. ¹⁴He will glorify me since he will receive from what is mine and announce it to you. ¹⁵All that the Father has is mine. It is for this reason that I have said to you that he will receive from what is mine and announce it to you [Jn 16.12–15].

¹²³See *Spir.* 81.

*Interpretation of John 16.12–13a:
the Spirit guides to the Truth [147–152]*

147. These words of mystery teach us that, after Jesus had taught his disciples many things, he said: *I still have many things to say to you* [Jn 16.12a]. The phrase *I still have many things to say to you* is not directed to novices or those totally ignorant of the wisdom of God, but to hearers of his words who have not yet attained *all things*. 148. For he handed on to them whatever they could bear and deferred for a future time the rest which they would not be able to understand without the teaching of the Holy Spirit.

Now the Holy Spirit was not given to humanity before the Lord's passion took place, as the Evangelist says: *For the Spirit had not been given because Jesus was not yet glorified* [Jn 7.39]; being "glorified" here means that Jesus *tastes death for all* [Heb 2.9]. And so, after the resurrection he appeared to his disciples, breathed on their face, and said: *Receive the Holy Spirit* [Jn 20.22]. And again: *You will receive the power of the Holy Spirit when he comes upon you* [Acts 1.8].¹²⁴ 149. When the Holy Spirit comes into the hearts of believers, they are filled with words of wisdom and knowledge. When they are made spiritual in this way, they receive the teaching of the Holy Spirit which can guide them toward the whole Truth.

150. Therefore, since it was still not appropriate for them to be filled with the Holy Spirit at the time when he said to them: *I still have many things to say to you* [Jn 16.12a], accordingly he added: *but you cannot bear them now* [Jn 16.12b]. Because they were still *serving a shadow and copies* [Heb 8.5] and a type of the law, they were not able to look upon the truth, *whose shadow the law conveyed* [Heb 10.1]. It is for this reason that they were unable to bear the weight of spiritual things. *When he comes*—that is, the Paraclete—*the Spirit of Truth will guide you into the whole Truth* [Jn 16.13a], through his own teaching and instruction conveying you from the death of the

¹²⁴The citation of Acts 1.8 reflects the standard version. See *Spir.* 144 for an alternative.

letter to the Spirit that gives life [cf. 2 Cor 3.6]. In him alone resides all the truth of Scripture.

151. And so, when the Spirit of Truth himself enters into a pure and simple mind, he will impress upon you the knowledge of truth; since he always joins the new to the old,¹²⁵ he will guide you into all truth. 152. Moreover, someone praying to God the Father said: *Guide me in your Truth* [Ps 25.5], meaning "in your Only-Begotten." He bears witness to this with his own voice: *I am the Truth* [Jn 14.6]. God grants this perfection by sending the Spirit of Truth who guides believers into the whole Truth.

Jn 16.13b: Divine speech [153–162]

153. Next, in what follows, the Savior, who is also the Truth, speaks about the Spirit of Truth who is sent by the Father and is the Paraclete: *For he will not speak on his own accord* [Jn 16.13b]. By this he means "not without me and not without my and the Father's authority, seeing that he is inseparable from my and the Father's will because he is not from himself but from the Father and me. For his very being and speaking belongs to him from the Father and from me. As for me, I speak the truth, by which I mean that I inspire what he speaks, for he is the Spirit, after all, of Truth."

154. Now when we say that there is "saying and speaking" within the Trinity, we should not understand this as taking place in the manner to which we are accustomed when we converse and speak among ourselves in turn, but in the way that conforms with incorporeal natures and especially with the Trinity, who instills his will in the heart of believers and those worthy of hearing it. This is what "saying and speaking" means.

¹²⁵Cf. Mt 13.52. The scriptural allusion is here most apt: just like every scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven is like a householder who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old, the Holy Spirit brings new meaning to the old Scriptures.

155. When we human beings speak to one another about something, we first conceive what we want to say in our mind without speech. Then when we want to convey it into the mind of another, we set the tongue in motion as an instrument, and by striking it like a kind of plectrum on the strings of the teeth, we emit an articulate sound. So then, just as we control how we strike our tongue on the palate and the teeth and modulate how we force our air into various utterances in order to communicate to others what we have in mind, so too it is necessary for the listener to offer open ears uninhibited by any impediment and to turn them¹²⁶ to what is being said in order for him to be able to know what is being expressed just as the one who is speaking knows them.

156. But, God, who is simple and of a nature that is incomposite and unique, possesses neither ears nor organs with which he emits a voice. Rather, his solitary and incomprehensible substance is not composed of any members or parts. The very same point should be understood likewise with regard to the Son and the Holy Spirit. 157. Therefore, when we read in Scripture: *The Lord said to my Lord* [Ps 109.2], and elsewhere: *God said: "Let there be light!"* [Gen 1.3], and things similar to these, we ought to understand them in a way worthy of God.

158. Nor does the Father announce his will to the Son, who is Wisdom and Truth, as if he does not already know it. For the Son, who is wise and true, has in wisdom and in substance everything that the Father speaks. Therefore, when Father speaks and the Son hears, or vice versa, when the Son speaks and the Father hears, it indicates that in the Father and the Son there is the same nature and agreement.¹²⁷

159. Nor is it possible for the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Wisdom, to hear what he does not know when the Son speaks, since he is the very thing expressed by the Son.¹²⁸

¹²⁶Lit. "to prick them up."

¹²⁷Lat. *consensus*.

¹²⁸Several important mss. and Migne insert the following at this point: "that is, God proceeds from God, the Spirit of Truth proceeds from Truth, Consoler emanates from Consoler." Doutreleau does not attribute this insertion to Jerome, but judges it to be an interpolation by a later copyist.

160. Next, so that no one separates the Holy Spirit from the will and fellowship of the Father and the Son, it is written: *For he will not speak on his own accord, but he will speak as he hears* [Jn 16.13].¹²⁹

The Savior said something similar to this about himself: *As I hear, so I judge* [Jn 5.30]. And elsewhere: *The Son is not able to do anything on his own accord, but only what he sees the Father doing* [Jn 5.19].

161. For if the Son of the Father is one, not according to the error of Sabellius who confuses the Father and the Son, but according to their inseparability of essence or substance, then he is unable to do anything without the Father. The works of separate individuals are distinct, but when the Son sees the Father working, he is himself also working, yet working not in a second rank and after him. After all, the works of the Son would begin to diverge from those of the Father if they were not performed by equals.

162. In addition, it is written: *For whatever he does*—no doubt meaning the Father—*the Son does these same things likewise* [Jn 5.19]. When the Father and the Son work, if they do not work in order as a second after a first but simultaneously, then all the things which they do are the same and not dissimilar, and the Son is unable to do anything on his own accord since he cannot be separated from the Father. Likewise, the Holy Spirit, who is in no way separated from the Son on account of their sharing¹³⁰ of will and nature, is not believed to speak on his own accord, but speaks all that he speaks according to the Word and Truth of God.

*Interpretation of John 16.14:
how the Spirit "receives" the Son [163–169]*

163. The following words of the Lord confirm this opinion: *He will glorify me*—that is, the Paraclete—*because he will receive from*

¹²⁹Didymus's citation differs slightly from that found in Spir. 146, which reads: *but whatever he hears he will speak*.

¹³⁰Lat. *consortium*.

what is mine [Jn 16.14]. Again, "receive" here ought to be understood in a way that is appropriate to divine nature. **164.** For just as, when the Son gives, he is not deprived of those things which he gives and does not share with others to his own detriment, so too the Spirit does not receive what he did not have before. If he receives what he did not have earlier, then when the gift is transferred to another, its bestower is left empty-handed, ceasing to have what he gave.¹³¹

165. Therefore, just as we understood the natures of incorporeals in our discussion above, so too we now ought to acknowledge that the Holy Spirit receives from the Son that which belongs to his own nature. This does not signify that there is a giver and a receiver, but one substance, since the Son is said to receive the same things from the Father which belong to his very being.¹³² For the Son is nothing other than those things which are given to him by the Father, and the substance of the Holy Spirit is nothing other than that which is given to him by the Son. **166.** These statements are made for this reason: so that we may believe that in the Trinity the nature of the Holy Spirit is the same as that of the Father and the Son.¹³³

167. Now every human term can indicate nothing other than corporeal things, and the Trinity (the subject of our present discussion) is beyond all material substances. For these reasons, no word can be applied to him in the proper sense and thereby signify his substance. Rather, when we speak about incorporeals in general and especially about the Trinity, every thing we say is said καταχρηστικῶς, that is, in an improper sense.

168. And so, the Holy Spirit glorifies the Son by showing him and manifesting him to the pure in heart who are worthy of understanding him, seeing him,¹³⁴ and knowing the Splendor of his

¹³¹The paragraph expresses the so-called doctrine of undiminished giving. The unexpressed assumption of the last sentence seems to be that in order to be an undiminished giver one must be what one gives rather than receiving it from another. See Didymus, *Trin.* 3.40 (PG 39.981b) for similar comments.

¹³²I.e. wisdom, truth, etc.

¹³³Several important mss. (BCA) omit: "of the Holy Spirit" and "as that of the Father and the Son."

¹³⁴Cf. Mt 5.8.

substance¹³⁵ and *the Image of the invisible God* [Col 1.15]. The Image himself glorifies the Father in turn, by showing himself to pure minds, thereby introducing him to those who do not know him: *He who sees me sees the Father* [Jn 14.9]. **169.** In addition, the Father glorifies his Only-Begotten by revealing the Son to those who have merited to attain the summit of knowledge, showing his magnificence and power. Furthermore, the Son himself glorifies the Holy Spirit by bestowing him on those who have prepared themselves to be worthy of his gift and by distributing to them the sublimity of his glorification and greatness.

*Interpretation of John 16.15: the mutual possessions
of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit [170–173]*

170. Next he explains the manner in which he said: *he will receive from what is mine*, by immediately adding: *all things which the Father has are mine; for this reason I said, "from what is mine he will receive and will announce to you."* [Jn 16.15]. It is as if he said: "Although *the Spirit of Truth proceeds*¹³⁶ *from the Father* [Jn 15.26] *and God gives the Holy Spirit to those who ask him* [Lk 11.13], nonetheless since all things which the Father has are mine, even the very Spirit of the Father is mine and he will receive from what is mine."

171. Now when such things are said be careful not to slip into the error of a depraved understanding and think that the Father and the Son hold some object or possession. Rather, that which the Father has substantially, that is, eternity, immutability, incorruptibility, immutable goodness subsisting of and in itself—these same things the Son has as well. In addition, whatever the Son himself is and whatever belongs to the Son, these same things the Father has as well.

¹³⁵Cf. Heb 1.3.

¹³⁶Lat. *procedat*. Jerome elsewhere translates ἐκπορεύεται by *egreditur* (*Spir.* 110 and 114).

172. Let the snares of the dialecticians be far from here! Banish from the truth those sophisms of theirs that seize an opportunity for impiety from pious preaching and say: "Therefore, the Father is the Son and the Son is the Father." For if he had said: "All things whatsoever God has are mine," then impiety would have an opportunity for fabrication and such a lie would seem to be plausible. But since he said: *All that the Father has is mine* [Jn 16.15], by using the name of "Father" he declared himself to be the Son. He who is his Son does not usurp his paternity, even if the Son himself is also the father of many saints through the grace of adoption, according to that passage in the psalms where it is read: *If your sons keep . . .* [Ps 131.12], and again: *If his sons forsake my law . . .* [Ps 88.31].

173. From this text and in the sense already established, it follows that the Son also possesses what belongs to the Father (we mentioned above what those things are), and that the Holy Spirit also possesses what belongs to the Son. For he said: *From what is mine he will receive, for this reason he will announce to you what is to come* [Jn 16.13]. Indeed, certain knowledge of future events is granted to holy men through the Spirit of Truth. This is why the Prophets, filled with this same Spirit, used to foretell in oracles events to come and gazed upon them as if they were already present.

Conclusion to the interpretation of John 16.12-15 [174]

174. This discussion of the present chapter of the Gospel should suffice and more than suffice, given the poverty of our talent. But if the Lord has accorded a revelation to certain others, drawing them close to the Truth and making them more capable of discerning the Truth, then we concede that their account is better since he who is the Spirit of Truth gives it support. Furthermore, we ask those who will read this to forgive our lack of expertise and pardon the eagerness of someone who desires to offer all that he can to God, even if he was unable to accomplish his plan.

3. THE APOSTLE PAUL: ROMANS 8.4-17 [175-196]

175. Now it is time to present the testimony of the Apostle Paul's epistle to the Romans and indicate how we think it pertains to our present subject:

176. ⁴*So that the requirement of the law may be fulfilled in you, who do not walk according to the flesh but according to the Spirit.* ⁵*For those who are according to the flesh are wise about the things of the flesh, but those who are according to the Spirit are wise about the things of the Spirit.* ⁶*After all, the wisdom of the flesh is death, but the wisdom of the Spirit is life and peace.* ⁷*For the wisdom of the flesh is hostile to God; after all, it does not submit to God's law, nor can it.* ⁸*But those who are in the flesh cannot be pleasing to God.* 177. ⁹*However, you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if in fact the Spirit of God dwells in you. But if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Christ.* ¹⁰*But if Christ is in you, although your body is dead because of sin, the Spirit is alive because of righteousness.* ¹¹*But if the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Jesus Christ from the dead will give life even to your mortal bodies through his Spirit who dwells in you.* ¹²*Therefore, brothers, we are not in debt to the flesh such that we have to live according to the flesh.* ¹³*For if you live according to the flesh, then you will die, but if you mortify the deeds of the body by the Spirit, then you will live.* 178. ¹⁴*For all who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God.* ¹⁵*For you have not received a spirit of slavery leading you back into fear, but you have received the Spirit of adopted sonship through whom we cry out, "Abba! Father!"* ¹⁶*For the Spirit himself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God.* ¹⁷*And if children, then heirs, indeed heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ, if we suffer with him in order that we may also be glorified together with him* [Rom 8.4-17].

179. This chapter of the Apostle has much to say about the fellowship that the Spirit has with the Father and the Son.

*Interpretation of Romans 8.4–8:
Living according to the Spirit [180–183]*

180. The Apostle says that the *requirement of the* divine and spiritual law¹³⁷ *is fulfilled by those who do not walk according to the flesh but according to the Spirit* [Rom 8.4]. The Apostle's text describes the person who walks according to the flesh: it is someone who is united to the body through the pleasures and the vices of the flesh and therefore does all the deeds that belong to the flesh and to the body. But the person who walks according to the Spirit is someone who advances in the precepts of the Gospel and therefore follows the prescriptions of the spiritual commandments. As a matter of fact, just as it is the vice of fleshly people to be wise in the matters of the flesh and to think about the concerns of the body, so too, inversely, it is always the virtue of spiritual persons to occupy themselves with heavenly realities, eternal matters, and the concerns of the Spirit.

181. The *wisdom of the flesh* is directly linked with *death* and kills those who advance and are wise according to the flesh, but the *wisdom of the Spirit* bestows tranquility of mind, *peace*, and eternal *life* on those who have it [Rom 8.6]. Those who come to possess it will trample under their feet all disturbances, every kind of vice, and even the demons themselves who strive to suggest these things. And so, since the *wisdom of the flesh* is joined to death, it is *hostile to God* [Rom 8.7]. For it is always contrary to and fighting against the will of God and his law, and makes those bound to its laws *hostile to God*.

182. Nor it is possible for the person who is in the wisdom of the flesh to keep the precepts of God and be subject to his will. As long as we are servants of pleasure, we are incapable of being servants of

¹³⁷Lat. *iustificationem divinae et spiritualis legis*. We read *divinae* with BFA instead of Doutreleau's *divinam*.

God. But whenever we stamp out the enticements of self-indulgence and convey our entire selves to the Spirit so that we are no longer in the flesh (that is, in the passions of the flesh), it is then that we will be subject to God.

183. Now the Apostle's text is not concerned with this flesh in which we live and in whose vessel our soul is contained, since all the saints were pleasing to God while encompassed by body and flesh. Rather, it is concerned with that which is perpetrated in human society against the precepts of God such as: *You shall love the Lord your God* [Deut 6.5] and *That which you do not like . . .* [Tob 4.15], and so forth.¹³⁸

*Interpretation of Romans 8.9: the Spirit is
inseparable from the Father and the Son [184–191]*

184. "But as for you," he says, undoubtedly meaning the disciples of Christ, "who have received the wisdom of the Spirit, his life, and his peace, you are not in the flesh, (that is, in the work of the flesh). For you do not perform its works, since you have the Spirit of God in you."¹³⁹ Now the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ are the same, leading and joining the person who has him to the Lord Jesus Christ. This is why it is written in what follows: *But if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Christ* [Rom 8.9b]. 185. So once again, from this text we learn of the fellowship that the Holy Spirit has with Christ and God.

¹³⁸Lat. *Quod tibi non vis*. This is a partial translation of the LXX: ὃ μισεῖς μηδὲν ποιῆσῃς, "that which you hate do to no one." The full text in the Vulgate translation reads: *quod ab alio odis fieri tibi vide ne alteri tu aliquando facias*, "that which you hate to happen to you by another take care lest you at some time do it to another." Interestingly, both examples cited here by Didymus are prominent in the New Testament as well: Deut 6.5 is the core of the Great Commandment cited by Jesus at Mk 12.29–30 (|| Mt 22.34–40; Lk 10.25–28) and Tob 4.15 is a negative statement of the Golden Rule expressed by Jesus at Mt 7.12 (|| Lk 6.31). Both the Great Commandment and the Golden Rule are explicitly presented by Jesus as the essence of the Law and the Prophets. Hence, the scriptural citations made by Didymus here are particularly fitting.

¹³⁹This is a paraphrase of Rom 8.9a.

186. In the epistle of Peter there is further proof that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ: he says that the Prophets whom he mentioned above¹⁴⁰ *investigated and inquired into what time or which circumstance was being indicated by him who was the Spirit of Christ in them, when he was bearing witness to the sufferings reserved for Christ and the things decreed to follow after; it was revealed to them that they were serving not themselves but us in those things which have now been announced to you through the Holy Spirit* [1 Pet 1.11–12].¹⁴¹

187. The *Holy Spirit* just mentioned is also called the Spirit of God, not only in the present text,¹⁴² but also in many other passages, such as: *No one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God* [1 Cor 2.11].

188. Then, following the passage which says: *But if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Christ* [Rom 8.9b], it is added: *But if Christ is in you* [Rom 8.10a]. This demonstrates most clearly that the Holy Spirit is inseparable from Christ because wherever the Holy Spirit is, there also is Christ, and from wherever the Spirit of Christ departs, Christ also withdraws from that place.

189. *For if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Christ* [Rom 8.9b]. If anyone were to assume the contrary of this conditional proposition,¹⁴³ he could say: “If anyone belongs to Christ such that Christ is in him, then the Spirit of Christ is in him.”¹⁴⁴ 190. This same logic can also be deployed likewise in the

¹⁴⁰Prophets are mentioned in the verse (1 Pet 1.10) just before the citation that follows.

¹⁴¹This citation differs considerably from the standard Greek text and the Vulgate.

¹⁴²I.e., Rom 8.9.

¹⁴³Lat. *cui coniuncto si quis contrarium assumat*. In *Spir.* 189–193 Didymus employs Stoic logic. As Rom 8.9b is clearly a conditional, the term *coniunctum* most likely translates *συνημμένον*, the standard Stoic designation for a conditional proposition. It has the form: “if p, then q,” e.g., “if it is day, then it is light.” Note that according to the second-century Latin miscellanist Aulus Gellius (*Noctes atticae* 6.8.10–11), the kind of proposition known in Latin as the *coniunctum* corresponded to the Greek *συνπεπλεγμένον ἀξίωμα*, or conjunctive proposition, while *συνημμένον ἀξίωμα*, the Greek for a conditional proposition, was translated into Latin as *adiunctum* or *conexum* (*Noctes atticae* 16.8.9). Either Jerome has mistranslated *συνημμένον*, or by the late fourth century *coniunctum* had become an acceptable translation.

¹⁴⁴The “contrary” (*contrarium*) of Rom 8.9b presented by Didymus is technically

case of God the Father: “If anyone does not have the Spirit of God, he does not belong to God.” Again, one may assume the contrary of this, saying: “If anyone belongs to God, then the Spirit of God is in him.”¹⁴⁵ This is why it is written: *Do you not know that you are a temple of God and that in you dwells the Spirit of God?* [1 Cor 3.16]. And in the epistle of John: *By this it is recognized that God dwells in certain persons, when the Spirit whom he gave remains in them* [1 Jn 3.24; 4.13]. 191. All these passages demonstrate that the substance of the Trinity is inseparable and indivisible.

*Interpretation of Romans 8.10–12:
The Spirit gives us life [192–194]*

192. Therefore, when he said: *But if Christ is in you, although your body is dead because of sin* [Rom 8.10a], in no way does he mean that the body is a slave to vices and wantonness. Rather, he means that when the body is made dead to sin, it will not be moved to vice and in no way will it be alive to sin. After the body has become dead to sin, Christ, who is present in those who have made their own bodies dead, manifests the Spirit of life when they do righteous works, either when they correct their deadly vices, or when they believe in Jesus Christ and live their lives according to faith in him.

193. Then the Apostle uses another conditional proposition¹⁴⁶ (which the dialecticians more precisely call an ἀξίωμα),¹⁴⁷ and

known as the contrapositive, which is the inverse of the converse. Contraposition was understood in antiquity as “conversion by negation” (ἡ σὺν ἀντιθέσει ἀντιστροφή; cf. Anon., *In Aristotelis sophisticos elenchos paraphrasis* 30.5 & 15 (M. Hayduck, *Anonymi in Aristotelis sophisticos elenchos paraphrasis*, Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 23.4 (Berlin: Reimer, 1884), 1–68)). Given the conditional “if p, then q,” the converse is “if q, then p” and the inverse is “if not p, then not q,” and the contrapositive accordingly takes the form “if not q, then not p.” Didymus’s reasoning is here unassailable: the contrapositive of a true conditional is always true, a basic fact about the logic of conditionals of which the ancients were surely aware, including the Stoics.

¹⁴⁵Again, this is the contrapositive. See the previous note.

¹⁴⁶Lat. *sylogismo coniuncto*. See n. 143 above.

¹⁴⁷The Stoics recognized three other kinds of propositions (ἀξιώματα) in addi-

says: *But if the Spirit of him who raised Jesus Christ from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will give life even to your mortal bodies through his Spirit who dwells in you.* [Rom 8.11]. Doesn't it seem to you that he is saying: "If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead"—that is, he who is the Spirit of the same Jesus Christ—"dwells in you, then as a consequence of this, along with your immortal souls even your mortal bodies will be given life by him who raised Jesus Christ from the dead and manifested him as the ruler and the first-born of the resurrection."¹⁴⁸

194. Since the Holy Spirit has divinely granted us such a great gift as this, we are in debt to the Spirit, not to the flesh such that we have to live according to the flesh [Rom 8.12]. After all, whoever lives according to the flesh will die from that death which is the consequence of sin. According to James, *when sin is fully grown it gives birth to death* [Jam 1.15]. In addition, Ezekiel writes that the sinful soul dies when it is separated from the life that resides in the wisdom of the Spirit.¹⁴⁹

Interpretation of Romans 8.13–17: The life the Spirit gives makes us children of God [195–196]

195. If anyone passes beyond the life of the flesh and mortifies its deeds by the Spirit, he will live a blessed and eternal life, being counted among the children of God and directed to the true path through the Holy Spirit, who is also called the Spirit of God. *For if you live according to the flesh, then you will die, but if you mortify the deeds of the body by the Spirit, then you will live* [Rom 8.13]. And then it follows: *For however many are led by the Spirit of God, they are children of God* [Rom 8.14].¹⁵⁰ So then, after reviving and consoling

tion to the conditional: the subconditional, the conjunctive, and the disjunctive. One suspects that the phrase "which the dialecticians more precisely call an ἀξίωμα" is a misinformed display of erudition on the part of Jerome.

¹⁴⁸Cf. Col 1.18 and Rev 1.5.

¹⁴⁹Cf. Ezek 18.26.

¹⁵⁰Note the slightly different wording than the citation in *Spir.* 178.

them, and encouraging those to whom he spoke to hope for better things, he continues: *For you have not received a spirit of slavery leading you back into fear* [Rom 8.15a]. In other words: "You have not abstained from vices out of fear and terror of punishment, like a slave does. For the Father has given you the Spirit of adopted sonship,"¹⁵¹ that is, the Holy Spirit, who is himself called the Spirit of the Son of God, the Spirit of Christ, and the Spirit of Truth and Wisdom. Now if this Spirit adopts as the children of God those in whom he has deigned to indwell, I leave it to you to infer the consequences of this power of his."

196. Furthermore, those who have this God as their Father cry out through this Spirit of adopted sonship, as the text shows: *through whom we cry out, "Abba! Father!"* [Rom 8.15b]. *The Spirit himself* adopts us as children and *bears witness* when our spirit possesses the same Spirit by participation *that we are children of God* [Rom 8.16]. In consequence of this, on the one hand, God bestows spiritual gifts upon us like a father bestows a bountiful inheritance, but on the other hand, we are *fellow heirs with Christ* [Rom 8.17], insofar as we are called his brothers through his grace and kindness. We will be *heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ if we suffer with him in order that we may also deserve to be glorified together with him* through association with his sufferings [Rom 8.17].

4. THE PROPHET ISAIAH: ISAIAH 63.7–12 [197–230]

197. Now that we have discussed these matters to the extent that we could, let us examine a chapter of the Prophet which contains statements about the Holy Spirit. In this way, we learn not only from the New Testament but also from the Old Testament what we

¹⁵¹Lat. *Spiritum adoptionis*; Gk. Πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας. The word υιοθεσία literally means "adopting as a son" (υιός), a nuance that the normal English translation, "adoption," does not capture. For Didymus and many other Greek fathers, the title "Spirit of adopted sonship" shows Spirit's intimate connection with the Father's adoption of sons in Christ.

should believe and understand about him. For we said above that the grace of the Holy Spirit resides in all the saints, both those who lived after the advent of our Lord, and those who lived even before it (namely, the Patriarchs and Prophets), and that he filled them with various charisms and powers. Just as those who raised the standard of his righteousness both before and after his advent attained the knowledge of truth by possessing the grace of the one God and his Only-Begotten, so too will they possess the grace of the Holy Spirit. For time and again we have demonstrated in many places above that the Holy Spirit is inseparable from the Father and the Son. **198.** So then, it is written in the Prophet:

⁷I have remembered the mercy of the Lord, and his power in all he has granted us. The Lord, the good judge of the house of Israel, treats us according to his mercy and according to the abundance of his righteousness. ⁸And he said: "Are my people not my children? And will they not refrain from dealing falsely?" And he became for them salvation ⁹from all their affliction. Neither a legate nor an angel, but he himself saved them because he loved them and spared them. He redeemed them and took them and raised them in all the days of the age. ¹⁰But they did not believe and they enraged his Holy Spirit, and he turned to them in animosity. He fought against them. ¹¹And he remembered the days of the age, who led the shepherd of the sheep from the earth, who put the Holy Spirit on them, ¹²gathering them at the right hand of Moses [Is 63.7–12].

Interpretation of Isaiah 63.7: God judges with mercy [199–202]

199. Frequent recipients of the blessings of God know that they have obtained them through his grace and mercy rather than through their own efforts. Being harmonious in mind and soul, they all speak as one: *I have remembered the mercy of the Lord* [Is 63.7].

200. When they reflect on their frequent reception of gifts from the Lord through Moses, they give thanks. And besides his *mercy*, they also remember the manifestations of the Lord's *power*,¹⁵² whether the wonders he repeatedly performed on their behalf among the peoples, or the soul's advancement through education in the Law, the Prophets, and the salutary precepts of Moses. After all, in the Scriptures the term "power" signifies both.¹⁵³

201. Continuing on, they say that they remembered his mercy and powers *in all that he has granted us*, not according to his righteousness but *according to the mercy* and goodness of him who is the *judge* of both "the house that sees" and the one who sees God with a pure heart¹⁵⁴ [Is 63.7]. Note that the phrase "the mind that sees God" translates "Israel" from Hebrew into our language.¹⁵⁵ **202.** Now even though a judge sometimes brings in the rack and other instruments to torture the condemned, nonetheless when someone considers the motives for these things with deeper insight, he sees the good intentions of the one who desires to correct the sinner and confesses that he is good, saying: *He treats us according to his mercy* [Is 63.7]. For *if the Lord should mark the iniquities of those whom he judges, who could survive?* [Ps 129.3]. Furthermore, since *forgiveness is found with the Lord* [Ps 129.4], our Lord and Savior treats us according to his mercy by bestowing everything conducive for our salvation. In addition, when he treats us according to his mercy in rendering judgment upon us, the sentence he justly grants is mixed with the goodness of mercy.

¹⁵²Cf. Is 63.7.

¹⁵³Lat. *virtus*. The word can refer both to external manifestations of the power of God such as miracles and other prodigious acts and to internal manifestations of the power of God such as virtues of the soul which are made possible only through the grace of God. The point is that both external wonders and interior virtue are both manifestations of the same power of God. Here *virtus* translates the Greek δύναμις, which has the same range of meaning as *virtus*.

¹⁵⁴Cf. Mt 5.8.

¹⁵⁵The same etymology is found in Philo (*Congr.* 51, *Fug.* 208, *Abr.* 57, *Praep.* 44, and *Legat.* 4), Origen (*Princ.* 4.3.8 and *Comm. Jo.* 2.189), and Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* 11.6.32, *Dem. ev.* 7.2.36, and *Comm. Isa.* 2.45).

*Refutation of a heretical interpretation of Isaiah 63.7 :
The unity of the Old and New Testaments [203–205]*

203. On the basis of the present chapter, we must confront the error of those heretics who separate goodness from justice, and fabricate one God who is good and another who is just.¹⁵⁶ After all, you can see for yourself how in the present passage God himself is both good and judge, rewarding according to his mercy and justice, and being equally good and just. 204. Accordingly, it is to no avail that they make a pretense of defending the wicked teaching that the God of the Gospel is good and that the God of the Old Testament is just. For in many other passages as well as in the present text of the Prophet, God is described as a “good judge.” In addition, they deny that God is referred to as a “just judge” in the epistle of Paul the Apostle, who certainly is a preacher of the New Testament: *Laid up for me is a crown of justice which the just judge will award me* [2 Tim 4.8].

205. Therefore, even if they deny it, the God of the New and Old Testaments is the same, the Creator of things seen and unseen. The Savior too gives clear testimony in the Gospel that the Father is just and good: *Just Father, the world has not known you* [Jn 17.25]. And in another passage: *No one is good, except God alone* [Mk 10.18]. Furthermore, in the Old Law, in some places God is called “just” and in others “good.” In the psalms: *The Lord is just and loves justice* [Ps 10.7]. And the opposite in Jeremiah: *God is good to those who endure for him* [Lam 3.25]. Again in the psalms: *How good the God of Israel is to those who are pure of heart!* [Ps 72.1]. These testimonies truly suffice to sum up our position against the heretics.

*Interpretation of Isaiah 63.8–9 :
Christ the Lord is our only Savior [206–211]*

206. It is time for us to return to the thread intended by the Prophet, which continues in this way: *And he*—without a doubt, the Lord—*said: “Are my people not my children? And will they not refrain from dealing falsely?”* [Is 63.8]. He is saying that they will not be like those who, after being born and raised, scorned the one who begot them. *And he became for them salvation* [Is 63.8], that is, for those about whom the Lord said: *“Are my people not my children? And will they not refrain from dealing falsely?”* [Is 63.8]. Because they refrained from dealing falsely and did not despise the Father, for them he became salvation. Or because they are called children, he became for them a cause of salvation.

207. The voice of the angel affirmed to the shepherds that Christ the Lord bestows salvation, when the angel said: *Behold! I bring you tidings of a great joy which will come to all people. For to you is born today in the city of David a Savior who is Christ the Lord* [Lk 2.10–11]. He became for all who believe in him the occasion for eternal salvation.¹⁵⁷ He is the Savior of the world who comes to seek whatever is lost.¹⁵⁸ Concerning him, the choir of saints sings: *This God of ours is a God who saves!* [Ps 67.21].

208. Therefore, since it was God who bestowed eternal salvation, it was said: *Neither a legate nor an angel* [Is 63.9].¹⁵⁹ In other words, neither a Prophet, nor a Patriarch, nor Moses the Lawgiver saved them. For all those whom I have just listed could only serve as legates before God on behalf of their people.¹⁶⁰ When Moses interceded on behalf of the sinful people, he said: *If you will forgive them of their sin, forgive it* [Ex 32.32]. He begged for their forgiveness, fasting for forty days and calling upon the mercy of God in the affliction of

¹⁵⁷Cf. Heb 5.9

¹⁵⁸Cf. Mt 18.11 Vulgate.

¹⁵⁹In *Trin.* 3.27 (PG 39.944a) Didymus cites the same verse and interprets it as he does here.

¹⁶⁰Cf. 2 Cor 5.20.

¹⁵⁶This teaching was associated with Marcion and the Manichees.

his soul. For no legate from among those I listed can be the Savior since the legate himself also needs him who is the true bestower of salvation. As for angels, however many spirits there may be and to however many diverse ministries they may be sent for the sake of those who are to obtain salvation,¹⁶¹ they are nonetheless not the authors of salvation. Rather, they speak for and proclaim him who is the font of salvation.

209. When it is said that *neither a legate nor an angel, but the Lord himself saved them* [Is 63.9], he saved them for no other reason than this: *because he loved them and spared them* [Is 63.9]. The phrase *he spared them* means that he spared his creatures, as we see in the passage written elsewhere: *You spare all, O Lord the lover of souls, because they belong to you. For you do not hate what you have made* [Wis 11.27+25]. **210.** For this reason and for their salvation, the Father did not spare his own Son and handed him over to death,¹⁶² so that through his Son's death, after the destruction of the one who had the power of death (that is, the devil), he could redeem all who had been held by him in the chains of captivity.¹⁶³

Hence it is added: *He redeemed them and took them and raised them* [Is 63.9]. For he took and raised those who had been saved and redeemed. He carried them to the heights on the wings of virtue through both knowledge and understanding of the truth. He dwells in them and with them, not for one or two days only, but for all the days of eternity. He bestows life upon them and is the author of salvation even to the consummation of the age. Enlightening their hearts for all the days of the age, he does not permit them to live in the darkness of ignorance and error. **211.** And this, I think, is the meaning of the passage: *he raised them in all the days* [Is 63.9].

¹⁶¹Cf. Heb 1.14.

¹⁶²Cf. Rom 8.32.

¹⁶³Cf. Heb 2.14.

*Interpretation of Isaiah 63.10:
sinners enrage the Holy Spirit [212–214]*

212. Nonetheless, since they were inconstant and willingly fell into vice, after such great kindnesses they lost faith in God, abandoned his precepts, and enraged the Holy Spirit of God, who had granted them many goods. They fell into the sin that resembles that of those who scorned their Father after being born and raised. We can be quite certain that those of whom we now speak are identical with others who were mentioned earlier. For after their sin, it was also said to them there: *You have forsaken the Lord and roused the Holy One of Israel to wrath!* [Is 1.4]. The present passage says something equivalent: *But they did not believe and they enraged his Holy Spirit* [Is 63.10]. **213.** Therefore, the present passage demonstrates the Spirit is associated with God. Whoever forsakes the Lord and loses faith provokes the Holy One of Israel to wrath and enrages his Holy Spirit. In addition, the same anger directed at sinners is ascribed to the Holy Spirit as much as it is to the Holy One of Israel.

214. Even what follows demonstrates that the Trinity has a similar bond. For Scripture says that the Lord *turned in animosity* to those who had *enraged his Holy Spirit* [Is 63.10] and that he handed them over to everlasting torment after they had blasphemed against his Holy Spirit, not in their words, but in their deeds.¹⁶⁴ And so, the Lord *turned to them in animosity, fought against them* [Is 63.10], and subjected them to manifold and lengthy torments, so that neither in the present time nor in the future would they attain forgiveness for their sins.¹⁶⁵ For *they enraged his Holy Spirit* [Is 63.10] and blasphemed against him.

¹⁶⁴This is a reference to the Exodus story.

¹⁶⁵Cf. Mk 3.29.

*Interpretation of Isaiah 63.10–11.
How the Jews enraged the Holy Spirit [215–220]*

215. But perhaps you want to apply this passage to the Jews who crucified the Lord Savior and accordingly enraged the Holy Spirit. If so, that which is written: *he fought against them* [Is 63.10] can be understood in this sense: they were handed over to the Romans when the wrath of God came upon them in the end. **216.** For throughout the entire earth and all regions they wander alone in foreign lands as exiles from their homeland, having neither their ancient city nor their own habitations.¹⁶⁶ They are recipients of what they did to the Prophets and to their Savior. Since they were bloodthirsty and continually seized by a frenzied insanity, not only did they kill the Prophets and stone those sent to them,¹⁶⁷ but proceeding to the pinnacle of impiety, they betrayed and crucified the Lord Savior who deigned to descend to earth for the salvation of all. For this reason they were expelled from the city which they stained with the blood of the Prophets and Christ.

217. And so, it is in this sense that we ought to understand that the Lord *fought against them* [Is 63.10]: not for a brief time, but for every age to come, even to the consummation of the world. For as we said, they wander as fugitives and captives among all nations, having neither a city nor their own region. But yet, since the one who previously fought against them is naturally kind and merciful, he grants them an opportunity for repentance, if they want to be converted for the better. **218.** This is why it is said: *And he remembered the days of the age* [Is 63.11]. For when he remembered the times to come, he partially opened to them the door that had been closed, so that after *the full number of gentiles has entered*, then *all Israel* worthy of this designation¹⁶⁸ *might be saved* [Rom 11.25–26].

¹⁶⁶Cf. Ps 106.4–7. Didymus says much the same in *Zacc.* 4.185–193; 5.28–30.

¹⁶⁷Cf. Mt 23.37; Lk 13.34.

¹⁶⁸Cf. Rom 9.6.

219. Even though they burst out into such heedlessness that they murdered the one who was sent on their behalf, saying: *His blood be upon us and upon our sons!* [Mt 27.35], nonetheless God raised him up from the earth *in the heart of which he abided for three days and three nights* [Mt 12.40] as the shepherd of his sheep. For the text continues as follows: *he led the shepherd of sheep from the earth* [Is 63.11]. **220.** But we learn clearly in the Gospel that the shepherd of the sheep of God whom the Prophet describes in the present text is our Lord Jesus Christ. For the Savior himself testifies: *I am the good shepherd, and I lay down my life for my sheep* [Jn 10.27]. And again: *My sheep hear my voice* [Jn 10.27].

*Interpretation of Isaiah 63.11–12. The Holy Spirit is given
so that believers may be saints [221–225]*

221. After all these passage, the Prophet continues: *Where is he who put the Holy Spirit upon them?* [Is 63.11].¹⁶⁹ For he is astonished that they have passed from such great happiness to so many miseries. It is as if he says: “This one who redeemed them, who raised them, who put his Holy Spirit on them, dwelling with them: where is he now? Where did he go? He forsook them because they first forsook him and provoked the Holy One of Israel to wrath. But long ago God had put the Holy Spirit on them while they were still good and striving to follow his precepts.”

222. Now the Holy Spirit is only introduced to those who have forsaken their vices, who follow the choir of the virtues, and who live by faith in Christ in accordance with and through virtue. But if little by little, when negligence creeps up on them, they begin to fall into worse things, they arouse against themselves the Holy Spirit who dwells in them, and they make the one who gave him to them hostile. The Apostle wrote something like this to the Thessalonians: *For God did not call you to impurity, but rather to holiness* [1 Thess 4.7].

¹⁶⁹Note that Didymus's citation here differs considerably from that cited above in *Spir.* 198: *who put the Holy Spirit on them.*

223. And so, he who spurns (note that "he who deals falsely with" better renders the Greek)¹⁷⁰ does not deal falsely with a man but with God who gave his Holy Spirit to you.¹⁷¹ For in these texts, God who calls to holiness through faith, that is, who calls in order that believers may become holy, gave the Holy Spirit to them. As long as they kept the precepts of God, the Holy Spirit whom they received remained on them. But when they fell through slippery vice and lapsed into impurity, they spurned (or rather they dealt falsely with) God who gave the Holy Spirit to them to make them holy, not slaves to impurity.¹⁷² Accordingly, those who committed such acts will pay a penalty not as if they spurned a man, but as if they spurned God.

224. So that we may know that the Holy Spirit who is given to believers is God,¹⁷³ let us learn from the utterance of the Prophet Isaiah himself when he introduces God saying to someone: *My Spirit is in you, and I gave my words to your mouth* [Is 59.21]. This text indicates that whoever receives the Spirit of God also possesses along with him the words of God (that is, words of wisdom and knowledge). And indeed in another passage of the same Prophet, God says: *I gave my Spirit upon him* [Is 42.1].

225. And so, he who puts the Holy Spirit on them remembers that Moses was sanctified by his right hand [Is 63.12],¹⁷⁴ or rather that he was an enlightened man and an initiate into the mysteries of God. Concerning him, the Lord said to Joshua the Son of Nun: *Moses is my servant* [Jos 1.13, 15], or rather, his Law written in the Old Testament. For I remember frequently reading that Moses is named in place of the Law, as here: *Even to today, when Moses is read* [2 Cor 3.15]. And Abraham said to the rich man being punished: *There they have Moses and the prophets* [Lk 16.29]. These passages are clear and

¹⁷⁰This parenthesis is an unnecessary comment by Jerome.

¹⁷¹Cf. Is 63.8+11. Didymus refers here to the "you" of 1 Thess 4.7, just cited.

¹⁷²Cf. 1 Thess 4.7.

¹⁷³This is one of the rare occasions when Didymus clearly affirms that the Holy Spirit is God. See also *Spir.* 83 and 130.

¹⁷⁴Note that this reference to Is 63.12 differs from that cited in *Spir.* 198 and reflects the standard text: ὁ ἀγαγὼν τῇ δεξιᾷ Μωϋσῆν, "he leads Moses by his right hand."

certain proof that Moses does not signify the man mentioned above, but rather the Law.

Interpretation of Isaiah 63.12.

The right hand of God and the Lordly Man [226–230]

226. Furthermore, what is the right hand of God that guided Moses, if not our Lord and Savior? For he is the right hand of the Father and through him the Father brings salvation, raises, and triumphs, as it is said elsewhere about God: *His right hand and his holy arm have brought salvation to him* [Ps 97.1]. And again: *The Lord's right hand has triumphed; the Lord's right hand raised me; I shall not die, but I shall live and recount the works of the Lord* [Ps 117.16–17].

227. This passage is certainly the most manifest proof that this voice belongs to the person of the Lordly Man, whom the only-begotten Son of God deigned to assume from the virgin because he¹⁷⁵ is the right hand of God, as is written in the Acts of the Apostles.¹⁷⁶ He¹⁷⁷ was descended from David according to the flesh [Rom 1.3] and born of a virgin when the Holy Spirit came upon her and the power of the Most High overshadowed her [Lk 1.35]. David prophesied about him in the Spirit, saying that after he arose from the dead, he would be assumed into the heavens and lifted up by the right hand of God.¹⁷⁸ 228. But here is how it is written in the Acts of the Apostles:

³¹*In his foresight the same David spoke of the resurrection of the Christ, that he was not abandoned to the netherworld, nor did his flesh see corruption.* ³²*This Jesus God raised up,*

¹⁷⁵I.e., the only-begotten Son of God.

¹⁷⁶Cf. Acts 2.33.

¹⁷⁷I.e., the Lordly Man.

¹⁷⁸Cf. Ps 117.16–17. Though Didymus here starkly distinguishes the only-begotten Son of God and the Lordly Man such that they appear to be two agents, in *Spir.* 230 he affirms that the two natures of Christ belong to a single subject.

of which we are all witnesses. ³³*Therefore he was raised up by the right hand of God, and when he had received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he poured out this gift on us which you yourselves see and hear.* ³⁴*For not even David ascended into the heavens* [Acts 2.31–34].

After all, there can be no doubt that it was the Lord Jesus who was raised by the right hand of God and rose again from the netherworld, as he himself testifies in the text of Scripture. For he who rose from the dead says: *I lie down to rest and I began to sleep, and I rose again, for the Lord upholds me* [Ps 3.6].

229. And so, the word of God proclaims that he who was assumed into the heavens was raised up by the right hand of God (which we spoke about above), and that he received the promise of the Spirit from the Father and poured him out on believers so that *the mighty works of God were declared in every language* [Acts 2.11]. Thus the Lordly Man received communion with the Holy Spirit, as is written in the Gospels: *Therefore, Jesus being full of the Holy Spirit returned from the Jordan* [Lk 4.1]. And in another passage: *Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit to Galilee* [Lk 4.14].

230. But we ought to take these statements in a spirit of piety without any malicious criticism about the Lordly Man.¹⁷⁹ It is not the case that “Lord” is one thing and “Man” another. Rather, we must reason about one and the same subject as if he were one thing according to the nature of God and another thing according to the nature of man.¹⁸⁰ Furthermore, we must do this because God the Word, the only-begotten Son of God, admits of neither alternation nor increase, since he is the fullness of good things.

¹⁷⁹At this point, several important mss. add: “who is the whole Christ, the one Jesus, the Son of God,” clearly an interpolation by a copyist concerned to bring Didymus’s archaic language in line with later Christological sensibilities.

¹⁸⁰Lat. *sed quod de uno atque eodem quasi de altero secundum naturam Dei et hominis disputetur*.

PART VI: FURTHER REFLECTIONS [231–277]

The Spirit makes believers good and holy like the Father and the Son do [231–237]

231. Our discussion of the testimony of the Prophet is sufficient and more than sufficient. Let us now proceed to what remains so that we may learn that the Holy Spirit is of one substance with the Father and the Son even from this: just as the Father and the Son make believers holy and good through communion with them, so too does the Holy Spirit render believers good and holy through participation in him.

232. The following saying is addressed to God in the psalms: *Let your good Spirit guide me on a straight path* [Ps 142.10]. Now we know that in some copies it is written: “Let your Holy Spirit.”¹⁸¹ Furthermore, in Esdras the Spirit is called good without any ambiguity: *You gave your good Spirit to make them understand* [Neh 9.20].¹⁸²

233. The Apostle writes that the Father sanctifies: *May the God of peace sanctify you in every way* [1 Thess 5.23]. And the Savior said: *Father, sanctify them in the Truth; your Word is Truth* [Jn 17.17]. Clearly, he is saying: “Sanctify them in me, who am your Word and your Truth, when they believe and share in me.” Elsewhere God is called good: *No one is good, save one, God* [Lk 18.19].

234. We also demonstrated above¹⁸³ that the Son sanctifies, with which Paul is in agreement when he uses the same words: *For he who sanctifies and they who are sanctified are all of them from one* [Heb 2.11], signifying that it is Christ who sanctifies, and those who are sanctified can say: *Christ became for us wisdom from God and righteousness and*

¹⁸¹In fact, “Holy Spirit” is the reading of the Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus.

¹⁸²In the early Christian period, four different books circulated under the name of Esdras (Ezra), but they were numbered differently in the Greek and Latin traditions. Here Didymus refers to Esdras III, known in the Latin tradition as Esdras II, and it corresponds to Nehemiah in our modern bibles.

¹⁸³See *Spir.* 17 and 26.

sanctification [1 Cor 1.30]. After all, he is also called the *Spirit of sanctification* [Rom 1.4]. This is why it is also said to him: *And all the sanctified are under your hands and they are under you* [Deut 33.3].

235. Our Lord Jesus Christ is good and is begotten of the good Father. Concerning him we read: *We confess to the Lord for he is good* [Ps 117.1]. Those who *confess* are those who implore the forgiveness of their sins or render thanks to his mercy for the kindnesses he has shown.

236. The Holy Spirit also sanctifies those whom he deigns to fill, as we have already demonstrated above when we showed that he can be participated in and received by many at the same time.¹⁸⁴ And now the following testimony of Paul shows that he is the bestower of sanctification: *But we ought to give thanks to God always for you, brothers beloved by the Lord, since God chose us as the first-fruits for salvation through the sanctification of the Spirit and faith in the truth* [2 Thess 2.13]. Now in this passage, the gifts of God are best understood to exist in the Spirit, since one possesses faith and truth alike through the sanctification of the Spirit. 237. Therefore, since our statements on these matters are right and pious and true, the terms "holiness" and "goodness" apply equally to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,

The various meanings of the term "spirit" [237–256]

The same holds true for the term "spirit." For the Father is called "spirit," as in the passage which says: *God is spirit* [Jn 4.24], and the Son is called "spirit": *The Lord is spirit* [2 Cor 3.17]. And the term "spirit" is always used to name the Holy Spirit, not because he is considered along with the Father and the Son merely on the basis of a shared name, but because a single nature possesses a single name. And since the term "spirit" has many meanings, we ought briefly enumerate the realities to which this term applies.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁴See *Spir.* 21–24.

¹⁸⁵See Athanasius, *Serap.* 1.7–8, where he similarly enumerates the meanings of "spirit."

(1) The term "spirit" is used for the wind

238. Wind is called "spirit," as in Ezekiel: *A third part you shall scatter in the spirit* [Ezek 5.2], that is, "in the wind." In addition, if you want to understand the following passage according to the historical sense: *With a vehement spirit you shall shatter the ships of Tarshish* [Ps 47.8], then take "spirit" there as meaning nothing other than "wind." Moreover, among the many graces that Solomon received from God, he also received the gift of knowing "the tempers of the spirits,"¹⁸⁶ meaning by this nothing other than that he had received the gift of knowing the fierce gusts of the winds and the causes that determine their nature.

(2) The term "spirit" is used for the soul

239. The soul is also called "spirit," as in the epistle of James: *as the body is dead without the spirit*, and so forth [Jam 2.26]. For it is utterly clear that the "spirit" named here is nothing other than the soul. In this sense Stephen also called his soul "spirit": *Lord Jesus, receive my spirit* [Acts 7.59]. In addition, there is what is said in Ecclesiastes: *Who knows if the spirit of a human being ascends on high and the spirit of a beast descends below?* [Eccl 3.21]. You could also consider whether the souls of beasts are also called spirits.

(3) The term "spirit" is used for the human spirit

240. Besides the soul and the Holy Spirit, some other spirit is also said to be in a human being, about which Paul writes: *For who among human beings knows the things that belong to a human being except the human spirit that is in him?* [1 Cor 2.11]. Now if anyone wants to argue that here the term "spirit" signifies the soul, who

¹⁸⁶Cf. Wis 7.20.

then is the man whose thoughts, intimate opinions, and the hidden secrets of his heart no one else knows except his spirit? Wanting to understand this passage as about the body alone is utterly foolish.

241. But if someone who maintains that these words are written about the Holy Spirit and strives through cunning deception to snatch them away, then when he carefully considers the words themselves he will stop asserting this lie. For thus it is written: *For who among human beings knows the things that belong to a human being except the human spirit that is in him? Thus also no one knows the things that belong to God except the Spirit of God* [1 Cor 2.11]. Just as human being is different from God, so too is the human spirit that is in him distinct from the Spirit of God who is in him. Now time and again we have demonstrated that the Spirit of God is the Holy Spirit.

242. But in another passage the same Apostle also distinguishes the Spirit of God from our spirit: *The Spirit himself gives testimony with our spirit* [Rom 8.16]. This means that the Spirit of God (that is, the Holy Spirit), bestows testimony on our spirit, which we have just now said is the human spirit. And to the Thessalonians: *May your spirit and soul and body be sound* [1 Thess 5.23]. For just as the soul is different from the body, so too is the spirit different from the soul, which is specifically mentioned in this passage. It is this spirit for which he prays, asking that it be kept sound along with the soul and the body. After all, it would be unbelievable and even blasphemous for the Apostle to pray that the Holy Spirit be kept sound, since he can admit of neither diminution nor increase. **243.** Therefore, as we have said, the words of the Apostle in this passage also witness to the human spirit.

(4) The term "spirit" is used for good or bad rational powers

244. The heavenly and rational powers, which the Scriptures are in the habit of designating angels and forces, are also called by the

term "spirit," as here: *He who makes his angels spirits* [Heb 1.7], and elsewhere: *Are not all of them ministering spirits?* [Heb 1.14]. I think that what is written in the Acts of the Apostles should be understood in this sense as well: *The spirit of the Lord carried off Philip, and the eunuch did not see him anymore* [Acts 8.39]. In other words: "The angel of the Lord raised Philip up to the heights and conveyed him to another place."

245. The other rational creatures who fall from good into evil through their own will are called wicked spirits and unclean spirits, as here: *But when an unclean spirit departs from a man* [Mt 12.43], and in what follows: *he brings seven spirits more wicked than him* [Mt 12.45]. **246.** In the Gospels, the demons are also called spirits. But we ought to note that they are never called "spirit" without some qualification. Rather, the Gospels signify an adversarial spirit with some modifier, such as "unclean spirit" or "demonic spirit." But those spirits which are holy are called "spirits" without qualification and without any modifier.

(5) The term "spirit" is used for the human will

247. We ought to know that the term "spirit" also means the human will and the thought of the mind. **248.** After all, when the Apostle wanted a virgin to be holy not only in deed but also in mind (that is, not in body alone but also in the deep movements of her heart), he said: *Let her be holy in body and in spirit* [1 Cor 7.34]. By "spirit" he meant her will and by "body" her works. You could also consider whether what Isaiah says resonates with this: *And they who erred in spirit will discover understanding* [Is 29.24]. For those who mistake good things for bad through an error of judgment will receive *understanding* so that their error may be corrected and they may choose upright things in place of wicked things. Moreover, you could consider this: *The strength of your spirit is vain* [Is 33.11], and see whether this demonstrates the same thing.

(6) *The term "spirit" is used for the understanding of Scripture*

249. But above all, the term "spirit" means the deeper and mystical sense in the Holy Scriptures, as here: *The letter kills, but the spirit gives life* [2 Cor 3.6]. This says that the letter is the simple and obvious narrative in accordance with the historical sense, but that the spirit gives knowledge of what is holy and spiritual in the text read. The following is also in agreement with this sense: *We are the circumcision who serve the Lord in the spirit and place no trust in the flesh* [Phil 3.3].

250. Now there are those who do not mutilate their flesh through the letter but circumcise their heart through the spirit, removing from it everything superfluous that is attached and allied to coming to be.¹⁸⁷ These people are truly circumcised in the spirit, being Jews in secret and true Israelites *in whom there is no guile* [Jn 1.47]. Passing beyond the shadows and images of the Old Testament¹⁸⁸ and being true worshippers, *they adore the Father in spirit and in truth* [Jn 4.24]. *In spirit*, because they have passed beyond all bodily and lowly realities; *in truth*, because they have left behind the types, shadows, and copies, and come to the substance of Truth itself; they have scorned the lowly and bodily simplicity of words (as we said above) and attained knowledge of the spiritual law.

251. At this point, we have touched upon as many things as our meager talent allows regarding what "spirit" means. When the time is right, we will examine what each of them means, if Christ should grant it.

(7) *The term "spirit" is used for the Son of God*

252. Sometimes our Lord Jesus Christ (that is, the Son of God), is also called "spirit": *For the spirit of wisdom is kind* [Wis 1.6]. And

¹⁸⁷I.e., impermanent realities that come to be and pass away.

¹⁸⁸Cf. Heb 8.5. See also *Spir.* 150.

in another passage: *The Lord is spirit* [2 Cor 3.17], as we mentioned earlier when we added: *God is spirit* [Jn 4.24]. The Son is spirit not merely because of a communion in name, but also because of a sharing of nature and substance.

(8) *The term "spirit" is a synonym for the Trinity*

253. Now in the case of realities which are different in substance, it sometimes happens that they share the same name, and their names are called ὁμώνυμα [homonyms]. Likewise, in the case of realities which are identical in nature and substance, when they have the same name together with equality of nature, it is the practice of dialecticians to call these names συνώνυμα [synonyms]. This is why the term "spirit," and any other term ordinarily applied to the Trinity, is a συνώνυμον, for example, holy, good, and other terms similar to these upon which we touched a little before.¹⁸⁹

Avoiding the danger of misinterpreting the term "spirit"

254. Furthermore, we needed to discuss these matters lest the term "spirit" be a stumbling block for us, since this word is dispersed throughout the Divine Scriptures. We should look at each instance of this word, bearing in mind the variety of passages in which it is used and the senses it has in them. And so, contemplating with all zeal and diligence the context and manner in which the term "spirit" is used, let us destroy the sophistical arguments and deceitful snares of those who claim that the Holy Spirit is a creature.

255. Because they are ignorant of the multiple senses that the term "spirit" could have in the passage: *I am the one who gives strength to thunder and who creates spirit* [Am 4.13] when they read it in the Prophet, they think that it is the Holy Spirit who is indicated

¹⁸⁹See *Spir.* 231–237a.

by this term. But in this instance the term "spirit" means "wind."¹⁹⁰ Moreover, when they hear that God said in Zechariah that he is the one who *created the human spirit within a person* [Zech 12.1], they think that it is the Holy Spirit who is signified in this chapter, unaware that the term "spirit" can signify the soul or spirit of human being. We have already mentioned that this human spirit is third in a human being.¹⁹¹

256. Therefore, as we said earlier, we should consider the manner in which the term is used in each instance, lest perhaps through ignorance we fall into the pit of error. Now when it is a question of other matters, an error that arises through a shared use of terms brings confusion and shame to the one who made the error. But when it is a question of someone falling from the divine heights to wicked things, the error leads him to eternal punishment and the infernal regions of hell, especially if once he is deceived he chooses not to recover his senses but rather prefers to defend his error shamelessly.

An objection: Satan also fills the human heart [257–268]

257. Given the length of this volume, it would be altogether fitting to conclude our treatise. But an objection has been raised which opposes the claims we made above. We left it aside for the moment to avoid an interruption of the flow of our treatise and the insertion of impious wrangling into the middle of our pious discourse. But it is necessary, I think, to respond to this proposition and let the reader judge what he thinks about these matters.

258. So then, we argued above that the soul and mind of a human being cannot be filled with a created thing according to substance, but by the Trinity alone, since the mind is filled with created things only according to activity and the will's error or virtue.¹⁹² In response

¹⁹⁰See *Spir.* 66–72.

¹⁹¹Cf. *Spir.* 242.

¹⁹²See *Spir.* 30 and 34.

to this, an objection has been put to us as if it destroyed our view on this subject. Here it is: there is a created substance called Satan in the Scriptures that enters into certain people and is said to fill their heart. 259. For example, Peter the Apostle said to the man who kept back half of the proceeds from the sale of his field while declaring another amount: *Ananias, why has Satan filled your heart?* [Acts 5.3].¹⁹³ And the Savior himself said about Judas that *Satan entered into him* [Jn 13.27].¹⁹⁴ We will address both these examples, the second after the first.

260. And so, we must first concern ourselves with the Scripture: *why has Satan filled your heart?* [Acts 5.3]. How can Satan fill the mind and commanding-faculty¹⁹⁵ of someone without entering into him and into his mind and (so to speak) without stepping through the doorway of his heart, since this power belongs to the Trinity alone? But like a cunning, wicked, deceptive, and fraudulent imposter, by suggesting thoughts about the vices and offering incentives for them Satan draws the human soul to those desires for wickedness with which he himself is filled.

261. Next, it is written that Elymas the magician, the son of the devil, who lived a life of wickedness and malice, was full of all deceit and wickedness. Satan his father practically instilled this will in him and it became by habit like second nature. And so, when the Apostle Paul exposed and rebuked him, he said: *You are full of all deceit and all iniquity, you son of the devil!* [Acts 13.10]. Because that crafty and cunning man received in himself all deceit and fraud, he is called *the son of the devil*. The devil filled his heart and commanding-faculty with fraud and wickedness and all malice, and enticed and deceived him, so much so that one may think that Satan himself filled his soul and dwelt in him. For Satan had molded him to be his very own minister and servant of all his duplicity and perversity.

¹⁹³See *Spir.* 83 and 131.

¹⁹⁴Didymus is slightly inaccurate here. Neither in Jn 13.27 nor in Lk 22.3 does Jesus say that Satan entered into Judas; rather, this is a statement of the narrator.

¹⁹⁵Lat. *principale cordis*, no doubt a translation of ἡγεμονικόν. This was the Stoic term for that part of the soul which was the center of consciousness and the seat of all

262. But now it is time to address the second example that we proposed, that Satan entered into Judas. 263. When the devil noticed to which vices Judas' heart was most strongly inclined by observing his motions and what his activities signified, he discerned that he was exposed to the snares of avarice. When he found an door open to greed, he sent to the mind of Judas a strategy for obtaining the money he desired. Through this opportunity for monetary gain, he became the betrayer of his own teacher and Savior, exchanging piety for silver and receiving the reward for his crime from the Pharisees and the Jews.¹⁹⁶

264. Therefore, when this thought occurred to Judas, it gave Satan the opportunity to enter into his heart and fill him with the worst kind of will. Yet he did not enter according to substance, but rather according to activity, since entering into another belongs to the uncreated nature which can be participated in by many. The devil is not capable of being participated in, seeing that he is not the Creator but a creature. For this reason too, being capable of change and alteration, he fell from holiness and virtue.

265. We said above that τὸ μεθεκτόν¹⁹⁷ (that is, "that which is received by participation") is incorruptible and immutable and consequently eternal, but that that which is able to be changed is made and has a beginning. In addition, that which is incorruptible is everlasting whether one looks at ages past or ages to come. Therefore, it is not the case, as certain people think, that a person is filled with the devil or becomes indwelt by him through participation in his nature or substance. Rather, we believe that he indwells the person whom he fills through fraud, deception, and malice.

mental states. While it is analogous to the brain as we understand it today, the Stoics located the ἡγεμονικόν in the heart.

¹⁹⁶Cf. Mt 27:3–5.

¹⁹⁷We read here τὸ μεθεκτόν, which seems to be the reading transliterated in B (to *meteXton*), C (to *mettecton*), and Δ (*thometecton*). The term τὸ μεθεκτόν is standard in philosophical contexts and is preferable to Doutreleau's τὸ μετοχικόν. Cf. Athanasius, *Serap.* 1.27.2.

266. The devil used this fraud of his even against the elders who turned their love for Suzanna into cruelty against her, and filled their souls with burning lust and a late-blooming passion of old age. For it is written: *Now two elders came, full of their wicked plot* [Dan 13.28]. He also filled the whole Jewish people with these snares, about whom the Prophet said: *Woe to you, a sinful nation, a people full of sin, a race of the worst kind, wicked sons!* [Is 1.4]. Now they are called a wicked race of the devil and his sons because they are wicked and full of sins.

267. If those who are called his sons in the Scriptures are not capable of receiving the devil through participation in his substance (for time and again we have shown that this is impossible for creatures), then no one else can receive him through participation in his substance, but only by adopting his most deceptive will. 268. After all, we have said that, in the case of creatures, activity and zeal can participate in works both good and bad. But the nature and the substance of the Trinity alone is able to enter into others.

The dismissal of a foolish teaching about the Holy Spirit [269–271]

269. Quite sufficiently, I think, we have replied to the objection that was put to us. But since it seems silly and foolish to respond to idiotic matters and to want to resolve whatever the mouth of the impious may belch forth—for impiety consists in not only proposing wicked things but even more so in wanting to debate these wicked things with your opponent—therefore, I pass over in silence those assertions which they are in the habit of bandying about, proclaiming brazen sacrileges against us.¹⁹⁸ For they say that if the Holy Spirit is not created, then he is either a brother of God the Father or the uncle of the only-begotten Jesus Christ. Or he is either the son of Christ or the grandson of God the Father. Or he is himself the Son of

¹⁹⁸See Athanasius, *Serap.* 1.15–17, who deals with these same heretical teachings.

God, and in that case the Lord Jesus Christ will not be only-begotten since he has a brother.

270. How wretched and pitiable are those who remain unaware that they should not discuss incorporeal and invisible realities as they would a corporeal and visible nature. As for "brother" or "uncle" or "grandson" or "son," these are corporeal names and terms that characterize human weakness. But the Trinity transcends all these names, and whenever he condescends to one of these names, he is not declaring his own nature by using our names and incongruent terms.

271. Therefore, since the only point holy Scripture makes about the Trinity is that God is the Father of the Savior and the Son is generated from the Father, we ought to think only that which is written. Once it has been demonstrated that the Holy Spirit is uncreated, we ought to understand that the one whose substance is not created is rightly joined to the Father and the Son.

CONCLUSION [272–277]

272. Given the poverty of our eloquence, what I have said on the present topic should suffice to indicate my great trepidation when I dared to speak about the Holy Spirit. 273. For whoever blasphemes against him will receive no pardon, not only in this age but also in the age to come.¹⁹⁹ Nor will mercy and forgiveness be held in store for the one who has trampled on the Son of God and insulted the Spirit of grace in whom he has been sanctified.²⁰⁰

274. Indeed, this ought to be understood as holding true also in the case of God the Father. For the one who has blasphemed against him and acted impiously will be tortured without any relief, since no one will pray to the Lord on his behalf, according to the Scripture: *But if someone has sinned against the Lord God, who will pray for*

¹⁹⁹Cf. Mt 12.31–32.

²⁰⁰Cf. Heb 10.29.

him? [1 Sam 2.25]. 275. Moreover, whoever denies the Son before people will be denied by him before the Father and his angels.²⁰¹

276. Therefore, since no pardon is granted to those who blaspheme against the Trinity, we must take all precaution and care to avoid slipping up when we are discussing him, even in a brief and short explanation.

277. Even more, if anyone wishes to read this book, we ask that he purify himself of every evil work and all wicked thoughts, so that he may be able, once his heart is enlightened, to understand what we have said. Furthermore, being full of holiness and wisdom, he will be able to pardon us if anywhere the result of our endeavor does not fulfill our intention, and thus he can consider only the sense of what we said, not the words we used to express ourselves. For just as we confidently claim that according to our conscience we have a pious mind, so too, when it is a question of artistic prose and rhetorical eloquence and the flow and structure of the treatise, we simply confess that we fall far short of these. After all, the goal of our study when discussing the holy Scriptures was to understand piously what was written and pay no attention to our lack of skill and our limitations when it comes to speaking.²⁰²

²⁰¹Cf. Mt 10.33.

²⁰²Ms. B, from the 12th or 13th century, has the following *explicit*: "Here ends, by God's help, the book of Didymus the Seer on the Holy Spirit, translated from Greek into Latin by Blessed Jerome, presbyter." The *incipit* of the same ms. reads: "Here begins the book of Didymus the Seer on the Holy Spirit."

Bibliography

Editions and Translations of Athanasius and Didymus

- Doutreleau, Louis, ed. and trans. *Didyme L'Aveugle: Traité du Saint-Esprit*. SChr 386. Paris: Cerf, 1992.
- Lebon, Joseph, trans. *Athanase d'Alexandre. Lettres à Sérapion sur la divinité du Saint-Esprit*. SChr 15. Paris: Cerf, 1947.
- Montfaucon, Bernard de, ed. S. P. N. *Athanasii Epistulae IV ad Serapionem episcopum Thmuitanum*. PG 26.529–638.
- Shapland, C. R. B., trans. *The Letters of Saint Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit*. London: Epworth Press, 1951.
- Sieben, Hermann Josef, ed. and trans. *Didymus der Blinde: De Spiritu Sancto/Über den Heiligen Geist*. Fontes Christiani 78. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- Wyrwa, Dietmar, and Kyriakos Savvidis, eds. *Athanasius Werke I/1. Die dogmatischen Schriften. 4. Lieferung. Epistulae I-IV ad Serapionem*. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.

Selected Secondary Literature

- Anatolios, Khaled. *Athanasius: The Coherence of his Thought*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- . *Athanasius*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Arnold, Duane W.-H. *The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991.
- Ayres, Lewis. "Athanasius' Initial Defense of the Term 'Ὁμοούσιος': Rereading the *De decretis*." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 12 (2004): 337–59.
- . *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- . "The Holy Spirit as Undiminished Giver: Didymus the Blind's *De Spiritu Sancto* and the Development of Nicene Pneumatology." Pages

- 57–72 in Janet Rutherford and Vincent Twomey, eds., *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church. The Proceedings of the Seventh International Patristic Conference, Maynooth, 2008*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011.
- and Michel René Barnes. "Pneumatology: Historical and Methodological Considerations." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 163–236. Consisting of:
- and ———. "Introduction and Acknowledgements." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 165–7.
- Barnes, Michel René. "The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 169–86.
- Ayres, Lewis. "Innovation and Ressourcement in Pro-Nicene Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 187–206.
- . "Spiritus Amborum: Augustine and Pro-Nicene Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 207–21.
- Barnes, Michel René. "Augustine's Last Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 223–34.
- Ayres, Lewis, and Michel René Barnes. "Conclusions." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 235–6.
- Bardy, Gustave. *Didyme L'Aveugle*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1910.
- Barnes, Michel René. "Irenaeus's Trinitarian Theology." *Nova et Vetera* 7 (2009): 76–106.
- Barnes, Timothy D. *Athanasius and Constantius*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Beeley, Christopher A. *Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God*. New York: Oxford, 2008.
- Behr, John, *The Nicene Faith*. 2 vols. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004.
- Brakke, David. *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Burns, J. Patout, and Gerald M. Fagan. *The Holy Spirit*. Message of the Fathers of the Church 3. Wilmington: M. Glazier, 1984; repr. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2002.
- Casey, R. P. *Serapion of Thmuis against the Manichees*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Daniélou, Jean. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. Translated by John A.

- Baker. London: Darton, Longmann & Todd; Chicago: The Henry Regnery Company, 1964.
- Dechow, Jon. *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen*. Patristic Monograph Series, no. 13. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988.
- DelCogliano, Mark. "Basil of Caesarea on Proverbs 8:22 and the Sources of Pro-Nicene Theology." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 59 (2008): 183–90.
- . "Basil of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind, and the Anti-Pneumatomachian Exegesis of Amos 4:13 and John 1:3." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 61 (2010): 644–658.
- Dragüet, René. "Une lettre de Sérapion de Thmuis aux disciples d'Antoine (A.D. 356) en version syriaque et arménienne." *Le Muséon* 64 (1951): 1–25.
- Egan, George A. *The Armenian Version of the Letters of Athanasius to Bishop Serapion Concerning the Holy Spirit*. Studies and Documents 37. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.
- Fitschen, Klaus. *Serapion von Thmuis: Echte und unechte Schriften sowie die Zeugnisse des Athanasius und anderer*. Patristische Texte und Studien 37. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1992.
- Gwynn, David M. *The Eusebians: The Polemic of Athanasius of Alexandria and the Construction of the Arian Controversy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Haas, Christopher. *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Hanson, R. P. C. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- Hauschild, Wolf-Dieter. "Die Pneumatomachen: Eine Untersuchung zur Dogmengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts." Ph.D. diss., Hamburg, 1967.
- Haykin, Michael A. G. *The Spirit of God: The Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Heron, Alasdair. "Studies in the Trinitarian Writings of Didymus the Blind: his Authorship of the Adversus Eunomium IV–V." Ph.D. diss., Tübingen, 1972.

- . "The Two Pseudo-Athanasian Dialogues Against the Anomoeans." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 24 (1973), 101–22.
- . "Zur Theologie der 'Tropici' in der Serapionbriefe des Athanasius. Amos 4,13 als Pneumatologische Belegstelle." *Kyrios: Vierteljahresschrift für Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte Osteuropas* 14 (1974): 3–24.
- . "The Pseudo-Athanasian Works *De Trinitate et Spiritu Sancto* and *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*: A Comparison." Pages 281–98 in G. D. Dragas, ed. *Aksum-Thyateira: A Festschrift for Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain*. Athens and London: Thyateira House, 1985.
- . "Some sources used in the *De Trinitate* ascribed to Didymus the Blind." Pages 173–81 in Rowan Williams, ed. *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Hildebrand, Stephen M. *The Trinitarian Theology of Basil of Caesarea: A Synthesis of Greek Thought and Biblical Truth*. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2007.
- Isaacs, Marie E. *The Concept of Spirit: A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and its Bearing on the New Testament*. Heythrop Monographs 1. London: Heythrop College, 1976.
- Kannengiesser, Charles. *Athanasie d'Alexandrie. Évêque et Écrivain: Une lecture des traités contra les Ariens*. Paris: Beauschesne, 1983.
- Layton, Richard A. *Didymus the Blind and His Circle in Late-Antique Alexandria: Virtue and Narrative in Biblical Scholarship*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004.
- Levinson, John. "The Angelic Spirit in Early Judaism." Pages 464–92 in *SBL 1995 Seminar Papers*.
- Lienhard, Joseph T. "Ousia and Hypostasis: The Cappadocian Settlement and the Theology of 'One Hypostasis.'" Pages 99–121 in Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O'Collins, eds. *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Doctrine of the Trinity*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Lyman, J. Rebecca. *Christology and Cosmology: Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- McGuckin, John A. *St. Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography*. Crestwood, N.Y.: SVS Press, 2001.

- Meijering, E. P. *Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius. Synthesis or Antithesis?*, 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Morales, Xavier. *La théologie trinitaire d'Athanasie d'Alexandrie*. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2006.
- Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology, Vol. III: The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature from the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon*. Notre Dame, IN: Christian Classics, 1993.
- Radde-Gallwitz, Andrew. "The Holy Spirit as Agent, not Activity: Origen's Argument with Modalism and its Afterlife in Didymus, Eunomius, and Gregory of Nazianzus." *Vigiliae Christianae* 65 (2011): 227–248.
- Segal, Alan F. *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnostics*. Leiden: Brill, 1977; repr. 2002.
- . "Two Powers in Heaven and Early Christian Thinking." Pages 73–95 in Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O'Collins, eds. *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Doctrine of the Trinity*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Smythe, H. R. "The interpretation of Amos IV, 13 in St. Athanasius and Didymus." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 1 (1950): 158–68.
- Staimer, Edeltraut. "Die Schrift 'De Spiritu Sancto' von Didymus dem Blinden von Alexandrien." Ph.D. diss., München, 1960.
- Swete, H. B. *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*. London: MacMillan, 1912; repr. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 1996.
- Troiano, Marina Silvia. "Il *Contra Eunomium* III di Basilio di Cesarea e le *Epistolae ad Serapionem* I–IV di Atanasio di Alessandria: nota comparativa." *Augustinianum* 41.1 (2001), 59–91.
- Vaggione, Richard Paul, ed. and trans. *Eunomius: The Extant Works*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- . *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Weinandy, Thomas G. *Athanasius: A Theological Introduction*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- Widdicome, Peter. *The Fatherhood of God from Origen to Athanasius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Index of Scripture

OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis

1.1 89, 112, 122
 1.2 61
 1.3 194
 1.10 83n
 1.14 97n, 124n
 2.7 109n
 3 111n
 6.3 61
 8.1 66
 11.24–28 80n, 138n
 28.12 96
 48.15–16 77

Exodus

3.4 89, 99, 112, 187
 3.15 187–8
 14.31 76–77
 26.1–2 114n
 31.18 173
 32.32 209
 33.1–2 74
 33.15 74
 33.17 74

Leviticus

11.45 75
 26.12 179

Numbers

11.29 61
 14.24 67
 23.19 79, 80, 137–8, 138

Deuteronomy

1.30 75
 6.5 201
 32.8 96n
 33.3 218
 34.9 174

Joshua

1.13 214
 1.15 214

Judges

3.10 61
 6.8 75
 11.29 61
 13.24–25 61
 15.14 61

1 Samuel

2.25 228–9
 9.9 143n

1 Kings

18.45 68

2 Kings

2.9 168n
 2.15 168, 168n

Nehemiah

9.20 217

Tobit

4.15 201, 201n

Job

1.6 96
1.21 176
4.18 95-6
25.5 96, 111

Psalms

3.6 216
4.8 180
8.2 161
10.7 208
13.1 89n, 122, 135
18.2 111
21.4 179
23.1 111
23.2 109
25.5 193
32.6 13, 14, 15, 27, 103, 117, 126, 134
42.3 106
44.2 115
44.7 113
44.7-8 117
47.8 219
50.12 69
50.13 61, 145
64.10 84
67.21 209
70.17 189
72.1 208
75.2 161
76.7 66
76.21 75
77.53 75
81.5 116
81.6-7 112
88.31 198
92.1 70-1
93.19 184
94.7-8 147
94.10 138
97.1 215
101.26 112
101.26-28 111
102.20 111
103.24 117, 133

103.29-30 69, 93, 125, 191
103.30 13, 14, 15, 90, 133, 191
106.4-7 212n
106.20 117
106.25 66
109.2 194
112.4-5 179
113.3 111
115.2 95
117.1 218
117.16-17 215, 215n
129.3 207
129.4 207
131.12 198
134.7 167
135.16 75
136.4 142
137.2 161
138.7 96, 125
142.10 217
142.10-11 61
145.7-8 85
147.18 27, 103
148.5 115
148.7-8 66

Proverbs

2.6 159
3.19 117, 133
8.22 58, 116, 118, 119
9.18a 129
13.20 174
26.4-5 132

Ecclesiastes

3.11 83
3.21 219
7.16 81

Song of Songs

1.2 161 bis
1.14 143n
4.1 143n
4.9 143n
6.4 143n

Wisdom

1.4 82
1.5 95
1.6 222
1.7 96, 125
4.10 67
5.23 134
6.24 174
7.20 219n
7.27 48
9.16-18 183
11.20 134
11.25 210
11.27 210
12.1 95, 96

Isaiah

1.4 211, 227
1.11 128
6.8-11 186
6.9-10 147
7.2 67
7.14 68
8.19 58
11.2 94, 134
29.24 221
30.1 61
33.11 221
33.22 169
35.4 169
38.4 185
38.5 185
40.23 112
42.1 160, 214
42.5 160
43.10 79n
44.3 218
44.8 75
45.14-15 113
45.21 75
48.16 61, 76, 183
49.13 184n
52.6 70
52.9 184n
57.16 182

59.21 61, 214
61.1 61, 91, 117, 122
63.7 156, 206, 207 bis, 207n
63.7-12 206
63.8 209 ter, 214n
63.9 209, 210 ter
63.9-10 62
63.10 211 ter, 212 bis
63.11 212, 213 bis, 214n
63.11-12 74
63.12 214, 214n
63.14 74
66.2 112

Jeremiah

1.1 133n
1.4 103n
1.11-13 141n
2.13 84

Lamentations

3.25 208

Baruch

3.1 66
3.10 84
3.12 84

Ezekiel

5.2 219
10.7 96
11.19 177n
11.24 62
16.1 103n
18.26 204n
18.31 67
18.31-32 70
27.25-26 66
28.2 112
28.12 96
36.26-27 69
37.27 179

Daniel

2.23 189

3.25 115n
 3.57 115
 3.86 66
 7.10 73, 97
 13.28 227
 13.45 62, 146n

Hosea

13.4 75

Joel

2.28 104, 160
 3.1 62, 120

Amos

4.12–13 58, 67n, 68n, 70, 165
 4.13 24, 39, 40, 41, 43, 46, 55n, 65n,
 68, 88n, 165, 223

Jonah

1.1 133n
 1.4 66, 67

Micah

2.7 62

Zechariah

1.1 126n
 1.6 62, 103, 126, 185, 188
 4.5 73
 4.5–6 73
 7.12 62, 103, 126
 12.1 69, 224
 12.10 169n

Haggai

2.4–5 76

NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew

1.23 68
 3.16 72n
 3.17 120
 4.1 60
 4.11 74
 5.8 196n, 207n
 7.11 149, 156
 7.12 201n
 10.17–20 158n
 10.20 63, 172
 10.33 229n
 11.27 119
 12.24–27 107n
 12.28 63, 173
 12.31 107n
 12.31–32 145, 228n
 12.32 51, 58, 129
 12.34 78, 137
 12.40 213
 12.43 221
 12.45 221
 13.41 74

13.49 74
 13.52 193n
 16.16 117
 17.17 130n
 18.10 77
 18.11 209n
 21.25–27 132n
 22.34–40 201n
 22.43–45 185
 23.10 189n
 23.37 212n
 25.27 132
 27.3–5 226n
 27.35 213
 28.19 63, 74, 99, 114, 127, 136, 152, 177,
 177n
 28.20 152, 184

Mark

3.17 70
 3.22 107n
 3.29 107n, 145, 211n
 10.18 208

11.27–33 131n
 12.29–30 201n
 13.9–11 158n
 13.32 118, 119 bis

Luke

1.15 155
 1.35 15, 72, 127 bis, 190, 215
 1.41 155
 1.44 146n
 1.67 155
 2.7 142n
 2.10–11 209
 3.21 73n
 3.21–22 60
 3.22 62, 73, 73n
 4.1 60, 216
 4.14 216
 6.31 201n
 6.45 78, 137
 9.26 153
 10.18 96, 111n
 10.25–28 201n
 11.13 149, 156, 160, 197
 11.15 173
 11.15–19 107n
 11.19–20 173
 12.10 107n
 12.11–12 158, 171, 171n
 13.34 212n
 16.29 214
 18.2 76
 18.19 217
 20.36 154
 21.12–15 158n
 21.14–15 158, 171 bis, 172
 22.3 225n

John

1.1 70, 116 bis
 1.3 15, 39, 43, 46, 69n, 90, 91, 111,
 112, 117, 119, 125, 133, 163n, 165n
 1.9 84
 1.12 85
 1.14 69n, 116, 124n

1.18 124n
 1.32–33 62
 1.47 222
 3.16 87, 124n, 169
 3.18 124n
 4.14 91
 4.21–24 106
 4.24 218, 222, 223
 4.26 70
 4.35 143n
 5.19 42, 42n, 125, 195 bis
 5.30 195
 5.37 182
 5.43 87n, 187
 6.64 167
 7.19 117
 7.39 91, 192
 8.26 87
 8.40 117
 8.42 181 bis, 182n
 10.27 213 bis
 10.30 110, 119, 172, 179n, 182
 10.35 112
 12.45 122n
 13.27 225, 225n
 14.6 59, 85, 106, 193
 14.9 110, 119, 123n, 197
 14.10 103, 110n, 113, 113n, 119, 135, 182
 14.10–11 85, 117n
 14.11 123n, 124n, 125n
 14.16 72n, 94
 14.16–17 183
 14.17 94 bis, 106
 14.21 169, 179
 14.23 85, 102, 103, 127n, 179 bis, 185n
 14.26 62, 72n, 87, 94, 133, 134n, 183,
 187, 189n
 15.26 57, 63, 72n, 74, 94 ter, 106, 121,
 180, 181–2, 182 ter, 183, 197
 16.7 87, 94
 16.12–15 191
 16.12a 192 bis
 16.12b 192
 16.13 94 bis, 195, 198
 16.13a 192

16.13b	193
16.13–14	120
16.14	42, 74n, 87 bis, 131, 195–6
16.15	102n, 109, 113, 120, 134, 197, 198
16.27	72n
16.28	181n
16.30	119
17.4	87
17.8	181n
17.10	109n, 120
17.11	153
17.17	217
17.25	208
20.22	62, 74, 85, 120, 132, 134n, 145, 152, 192

Acts

1.4	63
1.6	126, 185
1.8	152, 190, 192, 192n
1.16	103, 148
1.18	119n
2.1–4	63
2.4	155
2.11	216
2.31–34	215–6
2.33	215n
3.15	91
4.12	161
4.24–25	103
4.25	185
4.31	155
5.3	225 bis
5.3–4	171
5.39	58
6.3	155, 157
6.4	176
6.5	157
6.8	157
6.10	157
7.51	57n
7.55	155
7.59	219
8.17–18	63n
8.30	67

8.39	63, 221
10.22	153
11.17	160
13.2	176
13.9	155–6
13.10	225
13.52	156
15.8–9	160
15.28	176
17.26	96n
20.22–23	104
20.23	126
20.28	63, 178
20.36	152n
21.11	63, 104, 155
28.25	103, 147 bis, 147n
28.25–26	185–6

Romans

1.3	215
1.4	72n, 90, 218
1.7	168
1.15	100n
1.25	74
1.30	130
3.23	95
4.3	81
4.17	112
5.5	160, 161, 169–70
7.6	67
7.14	67
7.25–8.2	67
8.4	200
8.4–17	199
8.6	200
8.7	200
8.9	72n, 202n
8.9a	201n
8.9b	201, 202 bis, 202n
8.9–11	64
8.10a	202, 203
8.11	85, 91, 204
8.12	204
8.13	204
8.14	204

8.14–16	188
8.15	72n, 84–5, 94 bis, 134
8.15a	205
8.15b	205
8.16	167, 205, 220
8.16–17	66
8.17	205 bis
8.26–27	184
8.29	93, 133
8.32	210n
9.5	99, 109, 112, 129
9.6	212n
11.25–26	212
11.33–34	81
11.34	135
14.17	159
15.13	159
15.18–19	85–6
16.27	85, 174

1 Corinthians

1.3	184
1.9	170
1.24	85, 94, 116, 127, 134–5, 150, 174
1.30	217–8
2.4	86, 190
2.8	94 bis
2.10	89, 121, 189
2.10–12	64
2.10–11	78, 121n, 167
2.11	66, 89, 95, 121, 134–5, 202, 219, 220
2.11–12	89, 121
2.12	121n, 122n, 132
2.14	189
2.14–15	105n
3.16	64, 123, 179, 203
3.16–17	92
4.1	176
6.3	96
6.11	64, 90, 103, 150
6.19	179
7.34	221
8.6	124, 133, 186n
10.4	84

12.3	150
12.4–6	102
12.4–7	175
12.6	127
12.8–9	175
12.8–10	157n
12.9	157
12.11	64, 124, 175
12.13	84, 124
12.28	178
15.32	109
15.42	109n
15.53–54	109n

2 Corinthians

1.3	55
1.12	159
2.15	92, 123
2.17	176, 177
3.6	66, 193, 222
3.8	181n
3.15	214
3.17	64, 218, 223
4.4	80
5.20	209n
6.16	179
7.6	184, 184n
11.6	143n
12.4	81, 86
13.3	104, 126, 179
13.13	102, 127, 168, 169, 170

Galatians

2.9	176
2.19–20	85
2.20	179
3.2	60, 81
3.14	64
4.6	94, 120, 134, 188
4.6–7	64
4.19	92, 123
5.16	168
5.22	169
6.10	129

Ephesians

1.13	91, 122
1.13–14	151
1.17	85, 94
1.17–18	84
2.15	69–70
3.16–17	103, 179
4.3	64
4.5	101n, 128, 134n
4.6	77, 99, 100, 127, 129
4.24	69–70
4.30	64, 91, 122–3, 151
5.18	155
6.12	188n

Philippians

1.19	104, 126
1.18–20	64–5
2.1	170
2.6	123
3.3	65, 222

Colossians

1.9–10	158
1.15	80, 133, 175, 197
1.16	97, 153n, 154n
1.17	124
1.18	204n
1.20	104
3.1	117n

1 Thessalonians

2.4	178
4.7	213, 214n bis
4.8	65
5.19	60
5.23	66, 217, 220

2 Thessalonians

2.8	65
2.13	218

1 Timothy

2.5	117
4.1	103–4

4.13	73n
5.8	101
5.21	24, 39, 41, 55n, 71, 73n, 88n
6.4	130n
6.13–14	76

2 Timothy

1.10	117n
2.11	70n
2.14	130n
4.1	77
4.8	208

Titus

3.4–7	90
3.5	60
3.5–6	93, 161–2
3.10	78n, 138n
3.10–11	130

Hebrews

1.2	109n, 112n
1.3	80, 84, 121n, 175, 197n
1.7	221
1.10	112
1.10–12	111
1.13–14	164
1.14	22, 39, 55, 72, 96, 154n, 210n,
	221
2.3–4	164
2.9	192
2.11	217
2.14	210n
3.5	81
3.6	179
3.7	147 bis
3.10	138
5.9	209n
6.4	90, 97
7.25	184
8.5	192, 222n
8.6	184n
9.8	65
9.13–14	65
9.15	184n

9.26	116
10.1	70, 192
10.29	65, 149, 149n, 169, 228n
11.6	83, 135n
12.24	184n
12.26–28	70
12.28	70n
13.8	111

James

1.15	204
1.17	95
2.26	219
4.12	177n

1 Peter

1.9–11	63
1.10	202n
1.11	72n
1.11–12	202
1.12	183
1.23	60
2.5	115
3.4	95
4.11	139
4.14	94 bis

2 Peter

1.4	92 bis
-----	--------

1 John

1.1	176
1.3	170
1.5	84
1.7	170
1.22–23	56n
2.23	57n, 122
2.27	91, 122
3.24	203
4.6	94 bis
4.12–13	85
4.13	63, 92, 123, 203
4.14	142
5.20	110

Jude

1.6	95, 111n
-----	----------

Revelation

1.5	204n
1.8	110
5.13	114
14.8	141n
16.9	141n
17.1	141n
17.4	141n
18.2	141n
18.10	141n
18.21	141n