

AKSUM

THYATEIRA

A Festschrift

For
Archbishop Methodios
of Thyateira and Great Britain

General Editor

DR. GEORGE DION. DRAGAS

1985
THYATEIRA HOUSE
London W. 2

A Festschrift

In Honour of Archbishop METHODIOS of Thyateira and Great Britain, (1985).

Patrons:

**Archbishop Robert Rancie of Canterbury
Cardinal Basil Hume Archbishop of Westminster
Metropolitan Meletios of France**

Editorial Committee:

**Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Myra, Istanbul.
Archbishop Basil of Brussels
Sir Steven Runciman, Dumfriesshire, Scotland., F.B.A.
Metropolitan Antony of Surozh.
Metropolitan John of Helsinki.
Prof. Gordon Rupp, Cambridge, F.B.A., D.D.
Prof. F. F. Bruce, Manchester, F.B.A., D.D.
Prof. T. F. Torrance, Edinburgh, F.B.A., D.D.**

General Editor:

Protopresbyter Dr. George Dragas, Durham, England.

THE PSEUDO - ATHANASIAN WORKS *DE TRINITATE ET SPIRITU SANCTO*
AND
DE INCARNATIONE ET CONTRA ARIANOS:¹ A COMPARISON

By

Professor Alasdair Heron

Lehrstuhl für reformierte Theologie
Kochstr. 6, D-8520 Erlangen

Montfaucon² seems to have been the first to notice a number of resemblances between DICA and DTSpS – the latter being known to him as the 12th book of the *De Trinitate* attributed at that time to Vigilius of Thapsus and more recently to Eusebius of Vercelli³. On the assumption that DICA was an authentic work of Athanasius⁴ he concluded that DTSpS was also by him and that the Latin version (which is all that we possess) must be a translation – though he offered no specific proof that it was from Greek, contenting himself with the assertion that this was manifestly the case⁵.

Montfaucon was followed by Stülcken⁶, and

then by Shapland⁷, who both similarly stated, without giving any detailed proof, that DTSpS was certainly a translation from Greek. Stülcken however went considerably further than Montfaucon, in that he also argued that DICA had taken its material from DTSpS⁸. He supported this conclusion with arguments: a) where the two works have material in common, DTSpS handles it much more competently; and b) the structure of DICA shows two clear breaks between chs 8 and 9, and between chs 19 and 20, so that it falls into three distinct sections – of which the first and third are Christological, and the second is Trinitarian, and it is only in the second that similar material to that in DTSpS is to be found. These observations suggested that DICA is a conflation of material, in which the author has used DTSpS as a source for his large Trinitarian interpolation in the middle of the work⁸. These general conclusions were supported by Shapland; he also felt that DTSpS handled the material better than DICA, and that chs 9–19 of DICA were unlikely to form any part of the original text⁹. In this analysis there are thus three components:

a) DTSpS is a translation from Greek;

b) DICA is shown by its structure to be a conflation;

c) DTSpS is older than DICA as evidenced by its superior handling of its material.

These conclusions have however been rejected in whole or in part, by others. First of all T. Scher-

1. Hereafter referred to as DTSpS and DICA. The text of DICA is given in MGP 26, 983–1028; that of DTSpS in MPG 26, 1191–1218 and also as Eusebii Vercellensis *De Trinitate Libellus XII*. CCSL 9, ed V. Bulhart, Turnhout, 1956, 165–205. Bulhart gives two recensions; we follow the first, giving the line numbering as printed, but also adding the MPG references for convenience.

2) In *Librum De Trinitate et Spiritu Sancto Monitum*, MPG 26, 1189, also 1207 n 27; 1213 n 30.

3) Cf M. Simonetti, *Studi sul De Trinitate Pseudoathanasiano*. NuDid 3, 1949, 57–72; Bulhart, *Praefatio*. CCSL 9. xxx.

4) That neither DICA nor DTSpS is in fact by Athanasius may now be taken for granted. For the most important evidence against DICA cf K. Hoss, *Studien über das Schrifttum und die Theologie des Athanasius*, Freiburg, 1899, 127; A. Stülcken, *Athanasiana*. TU 19, 4, 1899, 61–66; C.R.B. Shapland, *The Letters of St Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit*, London, 1951, 14–16; and M. Tetz, *Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I. Eine markellische Schrift „De Incarnatione et contra Arianos“*. ZKG 75, 1964, 217–270. With the conclusive rejection of his authorship of DICA, the only ground for ascribing DTSpS to him – apart from a few resemblances of a fairly slight kind to the Letters to Serapion – is removed at the same time.

5) MPG 26, 1189: „...res est explorata et plana fuisse ex Graeco translatum.”

6) Stülcken, *Athanasiana*, 75–76: „...zweifelloß Übersetzung eines griechischen Originals, das dem 4. Jahrhundert angehört.”

7) Shapland, *The Letters of St Athanasius*, 15: „...certainly from the Greek.”

8) *Athanasiana*, 63–4; 76.

9) *The Letters of St. Athanasius*, 14–15 nn 9–10.

mann¹⁰, and following him A. Wilmart¹¹ argued that DTSpS was indeed a Latin work, not a translation. More recently M. Simonetti¹², M. Tetz¹³, L. Chavou-tier¹⁴ and G. Kretschmar¹⁵ have also recorded their belief that DTSpS is a Latin writing. Of these six only Schermann produced any specific arguments to show that this is the case, although both Chavou-tier and Kretschmar offer interpretations of elements in DTSpS on the assumption that it is Latin—indeed, relatively late Latin, dating from perhaps the mid fifth century—which could be taken as proofs of its Latin origin. Second, Weigl¹⁶, Simonetti¹⁷ and Tetz¹⁸ have all rejected Stülcken's analysis of the structure of DICA and defended its coherence. None of these scholars except for Tetz has dealt with the third element in Stülcken's interpretation¹⁹, namely the contrast in the handling of the common material in the two works. Nor does Tetz treat the matter very fully or compare all the common passages; his argument is rather that at one crucial point (to which we shall come below) the priority of DICA is apparent and that the whole general line of theological reflection in DICA is unified, coherent and supports his ascription of the work to Marcellus of Ancyra^{19a}. The

thesis I wish to propose here is that closer attention to the whole range of parallel texts tends rather to support the view of Stülcken, albeit with some modification. Before coming to that, however, the other two questions—is it plausible to regard DTSpS as a translation from a Greek original? and does the evidence indicate that DICA is a compilation from more than one source?—must also be considered.

Is DTSpS originally a Greek or a Latin Work?

As we have said, Montfaucon, Stülcken and Shapland agreed that DTSpS was a translation of a Greek work, but without producing any decisive demonstration that this was in fact the case. There is, however, a considerable amount of evidence in their support. First of all DTSpS clearly reflects the concerns, the ideas and the theology which are common among Greek writers on the Trinity in the second half of the 4th century; the parallels we shall later be offering to DICA are a sufficient proof of that^{19b}). Second, the Latin of the work is at many points of a kind which appears to betray an underlying Greek—and to betray also the inability of a translator to do better than reproduce Greek idioms in a rather clumsy and awkward way²⁰. Both these features accord

10) T. Schermann, Die griechischen Quellen des hl. Ambrosius. Veröffentlichungen aus dem Kirchenhist. Seminar, München 10, 1902, 36–59, argues that DTSpS is the work of a Latin who used Greek sources. His arguments were however rejected by E. Stolz, Didymus, Ambrosius, Hieronymus. THQ 87, 1905, 372 n 4— with good reason, as we shall see.

11) A. Wilmart in Rev Bén 30, 1913, 271–2.

12) M. Simonetti, Sulla paternità del De Incarnazione Dei Verbi et contra Arianos. NuDid 5, 1953–5, 5–19. Simonetti refers (11) to Schermann as having proved „in maniera decisiva l'origine latina dell' operetta”.

13) Tetz, Zur Theologie des Markel von Ankyra I, 229.

14) L. Chavoutier, Un libellus pseudo-Ambrosien sur le Saint-Esprit. SE 11, 1960, 136–192 (cf esp 155–8; 177–9; 190).

15) G. Kretschmar, Neue Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Ostergottesdienstes II. Die Einführung des Sanctus in die lateinische Messliturgie. Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie 7, 1962, 79–86 (cf esp 79–80).

16) E. Weigl, Untersuchungen zur Christologie des hl. Athanasius. Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte 12, 4, Paderborn, 1914, 150–8.

17) Simonetti, Sulla paternità del De Incarnazione, 9.

18) Zur Theologie des Markel von Ankyra I, 224–231.

19) Even Schermann, loc cit supra (n 10), though presenting some of the material which DICA and DTSpS have in common, did not draw conclusions from it about the order of writing, rather justifying his later dating of DTSpS on the assumption that it was a Latin work.

19a) It is not possible within the space of this paper to take up and discuss Tetz' arguments for ascribing DICA to Marcellus. If the interpretation I offer of the relationship between DTSpS and DICA is wellgrounded, it must put a serious question mark against Tetz' thesis, but on the basis of a different approach to the material and a different questioning of the evidence from his. — In the study in which I first engaged with this material, my Tübingen dissertation of 1972, Studies in the Trinitarian Writings of Didymus the Blind, the chapter on DICA and DTSpS substantially reproduced here was followed by one dealing directly with Tetz' ascription. Its main conclusion was that while there are undeniable echoes of Marcellus in DICA, Marcellus' authorship is not demonstrated by Tetz' arguments and must rather be regarded as improbable

19b) Resemblances, some of them very close, can also be traced to Didymus, De Spiritu Sancto, Ps. —Basil (?Didymus), Adversus Eunomium IV–V and ?Didymus, De Trinitate; these are laid out in detail in chs 4–6 of my Studies in the Trinitarian Writings of Didymus the Blind.

20) The general style of DTSpS is one which seems rather to reflect Greek than Latin ways of writing. Two features are even on a casual reading — particularly striking: its use of present participles and its frequent particles and connectives. There are approximately 170 instances of present participles — which for a Latin writing which takes up only some thirty columns in Migne, is an unusually high proportion. Particularly common are a) the use of a present participle (*scribens, canans, clamans* etc) combined with verbs of speaking or writing (*dicere, scribere*, etc) — some 20 instances; b) such expressions as *secundum Paulum dicentem* — some dozen instances; c) *dicens* combined with other verbs, and *dicentem* — over 40 instances of these. While this kind of use of present participles is of course to be found in genuine Latin works of this period, the sheer number of these cases in DTSpS gives the entire work a Greek tone. The same can be said of the particles and connectives: to mention only the most common, there are almost 40 occurrences of *enim*; over 40 of *vero* (and 16 of *quidem...vero*); almost 40 of *sicut(i)*; almost 30 of *sic* and of *ergo*; in addition, *nam, itaque, igitur, ita, iterum, rursus/rursum* and *alioquin* all appear between 10 and 20 times. Here too, while these terms certainly belong to the structure of the Latin language, the total effect of so many instances is to make the entire work run and read like Greek rather than Latin.

In addition to these general stylistic features, DTSpS contains a good number of phrases and indeed whole sentences which are distinctly awkward, even in places incorrect as Latin, and thus hint at a possible Greek original. Only some of the more obvious of them need be mentioned here; these may serve as examples, though a full and detailed analysis of the work would certainly uncover more:

1097–8: ...in spiritu sancto, lumine et igne *existente*; along with 1224: ...filius fons *existens* spiritus; and 1353–4: ...spiritus... *in propria vita et substantia existens* all use *existens* in the sense

well with the theory that DTSpS is a translation. They could perhaps however also be explained on Schermann's hypothesis that the author of DTSpS was a Latin who had borrowed heavily from Greek writings. Thus they are inadequate by themselves to prove that DTSpS as a whole was first written in

of ὑπάρχων other than in its Latin meaning; while this use of *in propria vita et substantia* (also to be found at 1021-2; 1040-1; 1176; 1180-1; cf also in *substantia propria* at 485) seems at least likely to be a rendering of ἐν ἰδίᾳ ζωῇ καὶ ὑποστάσει.

382-3: ...ut sic mereatur *capere* per filium et patrem sanctificationem. *Capere* here is poor: one would rather expect *accipere* (which is indeed the reading given in the second recension). A Greek original, however, could well have used a simple λαβεῖν which could then have been reproduced with *capere*.

376-8: Pensate itaque statera mentis vestrae *conciipientes*, ut vel sic considerare possitis, quod vos ipsi etiam inviti confitemini spiritus dignitatem. *Conciipientes* here is (like the *capere* in the preceding example) poor. Bulhart suggests (ad loc) an emendation to *consipienter*, while the second recension has *consipientes*. But we may suspect that in fact *conciipientes* is the original reading, translating a Greek συλλάβοντες, while the structure of the whole sentence, with the awkward *ut vel sic* and the concluding *quod* clause seems to reflect Greek rather than Latin style.

914: In evangelio enim *cata* Iohannem. No comment!

37: *Non enim* Iohannes est qui dicit...? The sense here strictly demands *nome*? but *non enim* could well be a faithful reproduction of οὐ γάρ; which could have been used in this way in Greek.

221-2: ...*neesse est* iterum audire Paulum trinitatem praedicantem. The *neesse est* seems rather too emphatic, but would be explicable as a rendering of the much less emphatic δεῖ.

592-6: Si igitur hi, qui caelesti regeneratione generantur, ex spiritu sancto *generati* ex deo sunt *generati*, *cur non*, si quid magnum et divinum et trinitate dignum, de spiritu nos opinari oportet, *quantum ad* humanam possibilitatem est. The repeated *generati* is awkward (though not incorrect) and would run much better in Greek as γεννηθέντες...ἐγεννήθησαν *cur non*. si quid is even more awkward, but could reflect a Greek πῶς οὐκ εἴ τι (εἴ τι in the sense of „whatever” rather than of „if anything”); and the concluding *quantum... est* would seem to correspond to a phrase with ὥς ἐπι.

540-6: Et sicut per prophetas *est enim quando* pater et quando filius et quando spiritus sanctus loquitur, *sic* equidem pater per se ipsum *sic* de salvatore dicit...filius vero... The text as it stands is exceedingly clumsy: the *enim* destroys the sense, while the double *sic* (each time in a different sense, or at least with a different nuance) is equally suspect. The second recension begins differently: et quemadmodum per prophetas *est quidem*. This avoids the *enim*; but that recension too contains the double *sic*. It is difficult to know how or whether the text of the first recension ought to be emended: it seems not altogether impossible that the words *est enim... loquitur* should be put in parentheses, and regarded as a reference back to the preceding proof in 520 ff that the Father, Son and Spirit all speak through the prophets. But we may well suspect that the infelicities here are to be put down to a not altogether successful attempt at translation from Greek – which suspicion is supported by the fact that *est...quando* corresponds to the common εἶστιν ὅτε.

877-8: *Et ne tamquam* non scripta *memorantes...videamur*. Both the predicative participle and the very clumsy *et ne tamquam* non give cause for wonder here.

These instances, while certainly not sufficing to prove that DTSpS as a whole must be a translation, do serve to demonstrate that it could very well be.

Greek. On the other hand, the fact that the work survives only in Latin is equally no proof that it was first of all written in Latin. This was, however, Schermann's conclusion and we must ask what evidence he advanced to support it.

Throughout Schermann's discussion one finds repeated assertions that DTSpS is the work of a Latin author, but it is astonishing how little concrete justification for this is given. Vague generalisations to the effect that the author does not show the profound Greek spirit²¹ or that he does not share the Greek love of precise formulations²² – features which could be put down either to the fact that not all the Greeks necessarily corresponded to the picture Schermann had of them or to the possibility that a translator had not faithfully reproduced the original at all points – are scarcely enough to prove that DTSpS is not a Greek writing. But apart from these, Schermann presents only one concrete piece of evidence that the author was influenced by Latin rather than Greek theology.

The passage in question here is DTSpS 1194 B = CCSL 162 ff. According to Schermann²³, the author here refers to a previous work in which he has proved that Baptism is valid even when administered in the name of only one of the Trinity. In this he shares the opinion of Ambrose, who himself had misunderstood Athanasius and Basil; so DTSpS must itself be dependent on Ambrose, and therefore Latin. Schermann adds that the same thought recurs in DTSpS 1209 AB; 960 ff. But this does not square at all well with what DTSpS actually says. First of all 1194 B; 162 ff refers neither to Baptism nor to a previous work of the author's. It is part of a fairly long discussion in which the author is dealing with the heretical argument that in many places in Scripture the Father and Son are mentioned without the Spirit, and that therefore the Spirit is not divine as they are. To this he replies that there are other loci where the Father and Spirit are mentioned and yet the Son is not; the words to which Schermann refers are then used to state a general principle: *Licet enim singulariter sancti loquantur unius nominis mentione, id est patris vel filii vel spiritus sancti, in uno tamen nomine trinitatem se pronuntiare cognoscunt, quod novissime*. (i.e. in the immediately preceding argument) *probavimus*. (1194 B; 166-171) The point here is perfectly clear: even where Scripture on occasion mentions the name(s) of only one or two of the Trinity, the name(s) of the other(s) are to be taken as

21) Die griechischen Quellen des hl. Ambrosius, 48.

22) Op. cit., 54-55. It is worth noting that similar comments have been made about Jerome's translation of Didymus' De Spiritu Sancto – cf J. Leipoldt, Didymus der Blinde von Alexandrien. TU NF 14, 1906, 10; G. Bardy, Didyme l'Aveugle, Paris, 1910, 21-22; E. Staimer, Die Schrift De Spiritu Sancto von Didymus dem Blinden von Alexandrien. Diss, Munich, 1960, 21; 23; 32; 89.

23) Op. cit., 41-42.

read at the same time²⁴. In the light of this principle (on which the author appears to put some weight) the second passage mentioned by Schermann (which, unlike the first, does refer to Baptism) is equally clear. There it is maintained in a discussion of such texts as Acts 8, 16 and 19, 5, which refer to Baptism in the name of Jesus, that the disciples did not disobey the command to baptise in the name of the whole Trinity: *Numquid ergo praevaricati sunt? absit. Nam licet filii nomen tantummodo dicatur, habet tamen et patrem et spiritum secum pronuntiatum, sicut in Scripturis sanctis probavimus.* (1209 AB; 975–979) In other words, although the texts refer to Baptism as if it had been only given in the name of Jesus, it had in fact been given in the name of Father, Son and Spirit. DTSpS here, so far from repeating Ambrose' misunderstanding, takes precisely the opposite line—though it could well be that what the author says could have been misunderstood, and perhaps even have been the source for Ambrose' own misinterpretation²⁵.

Schermann's chief, indeed his only real argument for the Latin origins of DTSpS cannot thus be regarded as a very strong one; though it should perhaps also be said that even if this exegesis of DTSpS were correct, it yet would supply no very decisive proof that the work could not have been written by a Greek. As far as this evidence goes, DTSpS is still as likely to be Greek as Latin.

There remain the interpretations offered by Kretschmar and Chavoutier of material in DTSpS which allocate the work to the 5th century Latin church. One of these—relating to a possible reference to the Triple Sanctus in DTSpS 1208 C; 939 ff—will be discussed later²⁶. The other (which is advanced by Chavoutier alone) has to do with DTSpS 1216 BC: 1365 ff, where Matt 12, 28 and Luke 11, 20 are correlated to show that the Spirit is the finger of God, and so divine. Chavoutier²⁷, who is concerned primarily with the dating of the Pseudo-Ambrosian Libellus edited in his article, compares the use of this same proof in that Libellus III, 2 (p 146) with its formulation in other works written in Latin, in DTSpS, and in Didymus, De Spir. S. 1051 B. He concludes that in the Libellus there is a neat and well-constructed statement, which compares well with the earlier ones

in Didymus, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster and Pelagius, whereas in later writings—the instances DTSpS, and the works of Faustus of Riez and Caesar of Arles—we are presented with much wider-ranging and more diffuse discussions²⁸. But however accurate this assessment may in general be, the remarkable feature of DTSpS is how closely in spirit and formulation it resembles both Didymus, De Spiritu Sancto 1051 B and Ps.-Basil, Adv. Eunomium IV–V 716 C. These writings belong in the the second half of the 4th century and were written in Greek. One could therefore as easily argue here for the Greek 4th century origins of DTSpS as for Latin 5th century ones. We shall find that the situation is precisely the same with the possible reference to the Triple Sanctus at 1208C; 939ff: there too the passage supplies at least as much evidence for a Greek origin as for a Latin.

This does not of itself settle the question whether DTSpS is indeed a translation of a Greek work. The question could however be settled if it were to turn out that DTSpS had been used as a source by a Greek author; at this period, in the second half of the fourth century, it was the Latins who borrowed from the Greeks, not vice versa²⁹. Hence the potential significance of the comparison with DICA³⁰. But at any rate it should by now be clear that the arguments which have been thought or might be thought to demonstrate that DTSpS is a Latin work lack any real force whereas a number of significant indicators point in the opposite direction.

28. Loc cit supra (n 27): „...on est on présence d'un véritable fourre-tout, ou les auteurs commentent brièvement les textes bibliques qui font allusion à l'intervention des doigts divins.”

29. Simonetti's argument (Sulla paternità del De Incarnazione, 11 n 2) is absolutely correct: „È infatti assolutamente fuor di luogo avanzare soltanto l' ipotesi che nel IV secolo su argomenti concernenti la polemica ariana un autore greco abbia attinto ad un' opera latina.” Only, it depends what other premise one then adds. If one takes DTSpS to be a Latin work—as Simonetti does—then the conclusion must be that DICA does not depend on it. But if on the other hand one concludes in the light of the evidence of the works themselves that DTSpS is the older, then it equally follows that DTSpS cannot be Latin.

30. Not that we have to rely *only* on the comparison with DICA. There are also strong indications that DTSpS was used as a source for ?Didymus; De Trinitate, and this would point to the same conclusion. The theme cannot be developed here nor all the parallel texts advanced, but a few instances may be mentioned:

DTSpS 1206 D f = 842 ff and DT 741 A f;

DTSpS 1213 A f = 1188 ff and DT 553 B f;

DTSpS 1210 AB = 1023 ff and DT 556 C f;

DTSpS 1192 BC = 61 ff; 1209 B = 979 ff and DT 544 C f;

For more instances I refer to my above-mentioned dissertation, chs. 4–6. All the indications are that the author of De Trin. knew and used DTSpS along with a series of other sources, including Didymus, De Spiritu Sancto, Ps. –Basil, Adversus Eunomium IV–V and some of the pseudo-athanasian Dialogues. On these last: A. I.C. Heron, The Two Pseudo-Athanasian Dialogues against the Anomoeans. JTS (NS) 24.1, 1973, 101–122, esp. pp. 118 ff.

24. The principle is similarly expressed in Didymus, De Sp. S. 1059 CD; Ps.-Basil., Adv. Eun. 756 AB; ?Didymus, De Trin. 364 A. With the interpretation of Baptism „in the name of Jesus” in DTSpS 1209 AB; 975–9 cf also Didymus, Fr. on Acts, MPG 39, 1660 CD: ὡς διὰ ἑνώσειν ταύτην τὸν βαπτίζομενον εἰς ὄνομα Χριστοῦ, κατὰ τὴν τριάδα βαπτίζεσθαι, οὐκ ἀπομεριζομένου τοῦ θεοῦ περιγραφῆς καὶ διαστάσεως πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.

25. Schermann finds a number of parallels between DTSpS and Ambrose' De Spiritu Sancto, and concludes (op cit, 58) that DTSpS may have borrowed from Ambrose. But the probability is rather the reverse—that Ambrose used DTSpS along with his numerous other Greek sources traced by Schermann.

26. Cf. infra.

27. Chavoutier, Un libellus pseudo-Ambrosien, 158.

The Structure of DICA

According to Stülcken's account, DICA falls into three parts, of which the first (chs 1–8) and the third (chs 20–22) are Christological while the second (chs 9–19) are Trinitarian. This, together with the clear and abrupt breaks between the sections, indicates that the second does not originally belong with the first and third, and is therefore a large interpolation, in which material from DTSpS has been included³¹.

Schermann, although refusing to accept that DTSpS had been a source of DICA, was not prepared to dismiss this account of structure of DICA out of hand, conceding that it might have been composed by the conflation of two different works³². Shortly afterwards however it was rejected by Weigl³³. He maintained that the appearance of Trinitarian material in a work otherwise dealing with Christology was not surprising, and indeed supplied an essential complement to the proofs offered to prove the divinity of the Son. Further, there is a connexion between the end of ch 8 and the beginning of ch 9 (that is at the transition from the first, Christological part to the second, Trinitarian one) as can be seen from the passage in which the transition is made (996 C– 997 A):

He is the God who bears flesh, and we are men who bear the Spirit... he gave us the first-fruits of the Spirit from the substance of the Father that we might all become sons of God, in the likeness of the Son of God. He then, the true Son of God by nature, bears us all, that we may all bear the one God. (End of ch 8)

Therefore it is impious to say that the Spirit of God is a creature or something made...

There is thus no such clear break here as Stülcken said. And finally, there is in any case further Christological material in the Trinitarian „second part” of the work, for chs 11–12 are also Christological rather than Trinitarian.

These points made by Weigl are taken up and carried further by Simonetti, who gives an alternative explanation to Stülcken's of the structure of DICA³⁴. Recognising that not only chs 1–8 and 20–22 but also 11–12 are rather Christological than Trinitarian, he suggests that the work should be seen as falling into three parts: chs 1–10; 11–19; 20–22. The first and second of these parts would thus be each first Christological and then Trinitarian, while the

third would be purely Christological. Further, he suggests that if the work is divided in this way it falls into a clear and understandable pattern. All three sections deal with the divinity and humanity of Christ, but they approach them from different angles: the first emphasises that the Son is not a creature, and naturally also adds that the Holy Spirit is not a creature either; the second stresses that the Son is Creator, and then goes on to point out that the Spirit also shares in the creativity of the Father and the Son; and the third finally deals with the fundamental question of the coexistence of two natures in the Son.

These answers to Stülcken are of some importance, although Tetz in his more recent discussion refers to them only in passing³⁵, and appears to feel that Stülcken's account of the structure of DICA needs no very detailed refutation –he himself makes only a few general comments which do not in any way come to terms with the real problems raised by Stülcken³⁶. From the points made by Weigl and Simonetti it is clear that Stülcken's analysis cannot be accepted simply as it stands: DICA has *three* Christological sections (chs 1–8; 11–12; 20–22) and not just two; and it has *two* Trinitarian ones (chs 9–10; 13–19) and not only one. Further, both Trinitarian sections are to some extent connected with the preceding Christological ones –in the transitional words we have quoted from chs 8–9, and in the association of the themes of the creative work of the Son and Spirit in chs 12–13. And in general it is not altogether surprising that both Christological and Trinitarian material should appear side by side in a work of this period. The whole of chs 9–19 cannot therefore so easily be regarded as a single massive interpolation in DICA.

Does this mean that Stülcken was wrong in principle? I believe not. The evidence presented by Weigl and Simonetti shows that the structure of DICA as it now stands makes more sense than Stülcken allowed; but the question of whether that was the original shape of the work, or whether that form has been imposed by a compiler, is not thereby settled. This evidence also shows that the structure of DICA

35. Tetz, *Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I*, 227 n 57 (on Weigl); 229 (on Simonetti).

36. Tetz, *op cit*, 224–5 argues that Stülcken's division of DICA is a „sehr gewagte Operation”, but does not explain why; points out that „Quellenscheidung war zu Zeiten Stülckens bei vielen Exegeten (besonders des Alten und Neuen Testaments) Trumpf”, which is true but by no means demonstrates that source criticism may not on occasions such as this have a valuable function to perform; and asserts that it is „fraglich, ob die Kennzeichnungen ‚christologisch’ und ‚trinitarisch’ sich überhaupt als Kriterien bei der Beurteilung von DICA bewähren und das zu leisten vermögen, was Stülcken sich von ihnen verspricht” – they are indeed „für das Verständnis dieser Schrift in der Stülckenschen Fassung nahezu unbrauchbar”. This last assertion seems to ignore the manifest character of the texts in question, where the difference between a Christological and a Trinitarian/Pneumatological *Fragestellung* is quite as apparent as Stülcken said.

31. Stülcken, *Athanasiana*, 63.

32. Although Schermann, *Die griechischen Quellen des hl. Ambrosius*, 52, describes Stülcken's division of DICA into two independent works as a „gefährliche Operation”, he then concedes: „Es wäre nicht unmöglich, dass Athanasius ursprünglich zwei selbständige Traktate hatte, von denen jeder aus einem anderen litterarischen Bedürfnis verfasst war...dass er aber den letzteren an passender Stelle...einschob, und zu einem Ganzen verwebte”. (52–3)

33. Weigl, *Untersuchungen zur Christologie des hl. Athanasius*, 151–2.

34. Simonetti, *Sulla paternità del De Incarnatione*, 9.

is more complex than Stülcken recognised, but this equally does not eliminate the possibility that elements in that structure are after all interpolations or additions. Four considerations suggest that Stülcken was in principle correct in his belief that DICA as it stands is the work of a compiler:

a) If the development of the argument throughout the work is followed, two distinct breaks can be seen. One of them, as Stülcken clearly saw, is at the end of ch 19 – i.e. at the end of the second Trinitarian part. The other is not, as Stülcken believed, at the end of ch 8 – for there is some connexion there – but at the end of ch 10 – i.e. at the end of the first Trinitarian part. Thus as the end of *both* Trinitarian sections of DICA no continuity can be traced, and the author returns abruptly to Christological topics.

b) While there are, as we have said, connexions linking the beginning of each of the Trinitarian parts to the end of the preceding Christological sections, these are both very noticeably transitional. Each time the author is moving from one set of concepts and arguments to another quite different set, and in each case the material which then follows the transition stands in no very clear internal relation to what had preceded it.

These two observations together do in fact suggest that the work as we have it betrays the hand of a compiler who has inserted two blocks of Trinitarian material in a work which was originally purely Christological; that each time he was indeed able to establish some transitional connexion as he moved from Christological to Trinitarian questions; but that he was unable to do the same in the opposite direction, thus leaving abrupt breaks at the points where he returned to his Christological original. (It is of course relatively easy to find a peg on which to hang an excursus, but much more difficult to integrate such an excursus so smoothly into the whole development that it will appear to be an integral part of the work!) The form of DICA thus indicates that Stülcken was basically right in his conclusion, even if the work should be seen as including two interpolations, and not simply one.

c) The material in the three Christological sections is of a different kind from that in the two Trinitarian ones. In the former, the author is concerned above all to demonstrate the divinity of Christ in spite of a number of Scriptural texts which appeared to imply that he was subordinate to the Father: this is his expressed intention in the very opening words of ch 1, where he attacks those who misinterpret things humanly spoken of the Son of God, and apply them to his divinity³⁷. He repeatedly asserts

37. DICA 984 f: οἱ κακοτέχνως τὰς θείας γραφάς βουλόμενοι νοεῖν, τὰ ἀνθρώπινα δῆματα τῆς πτωχείας τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ παράγειν βούλονται πρὸς τὸ συστήσαι τὴν ἑαυτῶν βλασφημίαν. This opening sentence sets the theme not only for the first, but for all three Christological sections of DICA: but it has no relevance at all for the two Trinitarian sections.

that such texts are only to be understood of Christ in his Incarnation and³⁸ in each of the three Christological sections he discusses certain of them – in the first, Prov 8, 22 ff; Mark 10, 18; John 20, 17; in the second, Prov 8, 25; in the third I Cor 15, 24–28; Acts 2, 36; John 17, 3³⁹. But in the two Trinitarian sections – apart from the opening words of ch. 9 – no heretical arguments are countered, no disputed texts interpreted, and the author presents only a series of different proofs of the co-equality of the Father, Son and Spirit. The three Christological sections could without any difficulty be combined into a single work dealing only with disputed texts, while the two Trinitarian ones could equally be put together to make a single set of proofs of the one shared divinity of Father, Son and Spirit. But as DICA now stands, the two sets of material co-exist somewhat uncomfortably.

d) Finally, the development which Simonetti tries to trace through the work, dividing it into three sections which each approach the divinity and humanity of Christ from three different angles, is not really to be found in the text. Although many different themes appear, there is no significant change in fundamental emphasis either in the Christological or in the Trinitarian parts throughout the entire work. In particular the co-existence of divinity and humanity in Christ is not approached from three sides – it is consistently dealt with from one angle, and that imposed by the necessity to answer heretical interpretations of certain texts. Some such attempt as Simonetti's has indeed to be made if one is to make sense of the structure of DICA as it now stands, but the argument of the work does not supply any clear basis for this division into three parts. That has been caused by the insertion of two blocks of Trinitarian material, not by shifts in the approach to Christological questions.

38. DICA 989B; 996 A; 1004 B. The principle is thus formally stated in both the first and second Christological sections; but it underlies the exegesis in the third as well.

39. That this is the significance of the handling of these texts in the third section is clear both from the way the author proceeds in dealing with them, and from the general similarity in approach to the first and second sections. The author is not in chs 20–22 engaged in the construction of a theological case on the basis of these verses: he is guarding against their misinterpretation, and thus what he is doing is of the same kind as what he does in chs 1–8 and 11–12, and radically different from his method in chs 9–10 and 13–19. Yet as the text of DICA now stands, it appears as if ch 20 were a continuation of the theological construction in the preceding chs up to ch 19 – only as the argument develops does it become clear that the author is on a quite different tack, and that there is no continuity with ch 19. The fact that this transition is so misleading is a further indication that chs 19 and 20 cannot originally have belonged together, and that 20 must originally have been preceded by material of the same kind as in chs 1–8 and 11–12. Incidentally all of the texts discussed in the three Christological sections of DICA are similarly discussed in the third book of Didymus, De Trinitate – where the fact that these are *disputed* texts is made abundantly clear.

For all these reasons I believe that Stülcken's thesis was fundamentally correct, though it demands some modification. DICA is basically a work concerned with refuting heretical interpretations of texts relating to the Son, and this material occupies chs 1-8; 11-12; 20-22; while two blocks of argument about the co-equality of the Trinity have been inserted as occasion suggested and now constitute chs 9-10 and 13-19. The differences between the two types of material, the fact that the two Trinitarian sections are clearly excursus which although linked to what precedes them are in no way related to what follows, and the lack of any clear development in the structure of the work as it now stands—these all combine to suggest that DICA is indeed the work of an editor or compiler rather than a single original composition. This by itself does not of course prove that the source for the material in the Trinitarian excursus was DTSpS—but it need not surprise us to find that it was.

The Relation between DTSpS and DICA

While both Stülcken and Shapland believed that DTSpS must be older than DICA because its arrangement of its material seemed to them more satisfactory⁴⁰, neither offered a detailed comparison. Nor on the other hand did those who rejected Stülcken's conclusions. Tetz was the only one to produce a single comparative textual argument for the priority of DICA⁴¹. This is that in DICA the quotation formula *ek prosopou* (*tinou legein*) is a characteristic feature, occurring no fewer than eight times⁴². DTSpS only uses the Latin equivalent *e persona* (*cuiusdam loqui*) three times, all in 1200 D f; 520 ff, which is parallel to DICA 1013 B f. This Tetz regarded as a decisive proof of DICA's priority. But we may well take leave to wonder. Quite apart from the fact that the relation between two works which have so much material in common as these two can hardly be finally settled by a single piece of evidence of this kind while the rest of the material is ignored, two factors indicate that this particular argument cannot bear much weight. First of all, as I have tried to show, the unity and coherence of DICA is at least questionable, while DTSpS seems very likely to be a translation from Greek: this demands that one proceed with caution

before assuming either that a particular repeated feature of DICA is a characteristic of a specific author, or that DTSpS in its present form has preserved all the formulations of the original. It could well be that on the one hand the compiler of DICA found the formula in more than one of his sources, and so came to use it as often as he did; it is also impossible to be sure that the Greek original of DTSpS may not have used the formula elsewhere at points where it has been translated somewhat differently⁴³. Second, the quotation formula was very widely used by many authors in many different works⁴⁴. Some use it frequently, some only rarely; but in general it is so common that we are certainly not entitled to assume that a work in which it apparently occurs more rarely is dependent on one in which it is used more frequently. If there were absolutely no other evidence for the order of writing of DTSpS and DICA one could perhaps take this feature as tending—but not very strongly—to indicate the priority of DICA; but even that it would by no means constitute a decisive proof. As it is however, there is abundant further evidence indicating that the reality of the situation is the reverse in the parallel passages in the two writings.

The most comprehensive list of these passages is that given by Shapland⁴⁵, and it does indeed cover most of the important material, though one or two further examples also deserve to be taken into consideration. The whole series of parallels may be divided into three groups: a) those where the two works are very close to each other in detail, but where a number of indications tend to suggest the priority of DTSpS; b) those where the resemblances are still clear, though not so close, but where the contrasts supply even more evidence for the priority of DTSpS; c) those where the similarities and contrasts put the priority of DTSpS beyond all reasonable doubt.

a) Five separate arguments are stated very similarly in both writings. First of all we have:⁴⁶

43. Of particular interest here is DTSpS 1204 D f; 754ff. There, in the course of an argument proving the divinity of the Spirit, the author combines Ps 94, 8-9 with Ps 94, 9-11, describing the Spirit as speaker in both texts, but distinguishing them as follows (758 ff.): *aut non audivimus eum in nonagesimo et quarto psalmo dicentem de deo: Hodie quidem... (Ps 94, 8-9) de se vero: Probaverunt et viderunt... (Ps 94, 9-11)*. The sense here is unclear: the *de deo* and *de se* could be taken either to mean „about God” and „about himself” or „from God” and „from himself”. If the latter is the case, then it could well be that a Greek use of the quotation formula underlies the text of DTSpS—and this passage is not paralleled in DICA. That this may indeed be so is all the more likely when it is observed that ?Didymus, *De Trin.* 365 B—a passage with several striking similarities to this locus in DTSpS—does use the formula, stating that Ps 94, 9-11 are spoken by David *ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρὸς*.

44. C. Andresen, *Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personbegriffs*. ZNW 52, 1961, 1-39.

45. Shapland, *The Letters of St Athanasius*, 14 n 9.

46. This combination of I Cor 12, 4ff and 11 is also to be found in Ps.-Basil, *Adv. Eun.* IV-V, 717 AB and 729AB and ?Didymus, *De Trin.*, 368 C and 601 C f.

40. Stülcken, *Athanasiana*, 64: The Trinitarian section of DICA „(weist) geistlos und ohne innere Verknüpfung nur die einzelnen Prädicate für jede der drei göttlichen Hypostasen nach”; whereas in DTSpS „die betreffenden Stücke meist in einem grösseren Zusammenhang stehen” (p 76). Cf. Shapland, *The Letters of St Athanasius*, 14 n 9: „DICA is more likely to be dependent on DTSpS than vice versa. The writer of the former quarries parts of the latter, interfering with the order, and occasionally introducing lectures or comments of his own. The arrangement of the material is less coherent and satisfactory than in DTSpS.” As we shall see, these judgments are wholly justified.

41. Tetz, *Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I*, 225.

42. DICA 988 A; 988 C; 977 A; 997 C; 1004 C; 1013 BC (three times).

DTSpS 1195 *BC*; 220 *ff*:

In prima quoque epistola ad Corinthios necesse est iterum audire Paulum trinitatem praedicantem; dicit enim: (I Cor 12, 4-6) Cum dixisset autem deum omnia in omnibus operari et professus fuisset dona, quae per spiritum ecclesiae donantur, addicit: (I Cor 12, 11).

The resemblance here is clear; but it is the point of contrast which is important. Not only is *DTSpS* fuller than *DICA* (which may suggest that it is the original formulation, and that the author of *DICA* has trimmed it down^{46a}); it is also more accurate in its reference to v 11, which says only that the gifts are the work of the Spirit, but not, as *DICA* asserts, that the Spirit „works all in all”. *DICA* carries the argument further than *DTSpS* in drawing a conclusion which *DTSpS* does not state, and which indeed is not strictly justified by Scripture as quoted in both writings. This suggests that *DICA* is a stage further removed from the original formulation, and that it displays an inclination to shorten and sharpen proofs and arguments taken over from *DTSpS*. In several other cases we shall find that such a tendency is indeed one of the features of *DICA*.

The next set of passages follows a little later in both works:⁴⁷

DTSpS 1199 *AB*; 435 *ff*:

Deus enim ait in Hieremia deduxisse se hunc Israhel in deserto dicens ad populum: (Jr 2, 6) Dicit autem et Esaias, qui audiendus est, spiritum sanctum deduxisse Israhel in deserto, ita: (Is 63, 13-14)

DICA 1008 *C f*:

ὡς καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος ἐδίδαξε λέγων (I Cor. 12, 4-6) εἰρηκῶς οὖν, ὅτι ὁ πατήρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον λέγει τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα εἶναι τὸ ἐνεργοῦν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι. (I Cor 12, 11)

DICA 1012 *C f*:

καὶ ὅτε λέγει ὁ Ἱερემίας περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς ὠδήγησεν τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (Jer 2, 6) ὁ Ἥσαϊας τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἶπεν ὠδηγηκέναι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐστὶ γοῦν ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ λέγοντος (Is 63, 13-14)

DICA follows these two texts with a third – I Cor 10, 4 – to show that the Son also led Israel through

the desert, while *DTSpS* does not. But it is impossible to draw any conclusion from this or the other slight contrasts between these two works here about the order of writing.

The next pair of passages come from the immediately following paragraph in *DICA*, from a slightly later paragraph in *DTSpS*:

DTSpS 1200 *B f*; 495 *ff*: *DICA* 1013 *AB*:

Et Paulus sane a deo se vocatum ait ad Galatas scribens: (Gal. 1, 15-16) Romanos vero a Christo vocatos esse ait, scribens ad eos: (Ro 1, 6) et spiritus sanctus Paulum et Barnaban a se dixit esse vocatos, ut gentibus adnuntiarent Christum. Et plane mirabile, cum salvator diceret ad Paulum in templo: (Acts 22, 21) et Paulus ad Galatas scriberet: (Gal 1, 1) spiritus tamen sanctus misit Paulum et Barnaban probatos ad praedicandum gentibus Jesus Christum. Dicit namque scriptura sic: (Acts 13, 1-4) et sic deinceps praedicatio gentibus per Paulum facta exponitur.

καὶ ὅτε λέγει ὁ Παῦλος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κεκλησθαι αὐτόν (Gal 1, 15-16) Ῥωμαίους δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ κεκλησθαι λέγει γράφων πρὸς αὐτούς (Ro 1, 6) τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸν Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Βαρνάβαν κεκληκέναι εἶρηκεν εἰς τὸ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὸν Χριστόν. καὶ τὸ γε θαυμαστόν, τοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰπόντος Παύλῳ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (Acts 22, 21) καὶ τοῦ Παύλου Γαλάταις γράφοντος, (Gal 1, 1 & 11) τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἀποστείλαν τὸν τε Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Βαρνάβαν φαίνεται, κηρῶσαι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τὸν Χριστόν.

Here *DTSpS* is the fuller, in that it includes the full quotation of Acts 13, 1-4 on which the whole point of the argument depends (for in both works at this moment it is the divinity of the Spirit which is under discussion). That *DICA*, in spite of quoting

are entirely correct: it is widely held that the more polished presentation of an argument must be the derivative and secondary one, whereas I adopt the opposite view in comparing *DICA* and *DTSpS*. I do so, however, for reasons which seem to me compelling. No „überlieferungsgeschichtliches Gesetz” can be more than a rule-of-thumb; there are copiers who improve on the material they employ and there are those who reduce it to chaos, as any Professor must know who has found his material reproduced in examinations! That *DICA* presents us with such a reproduction of material originally better ordered and more intelligently presented in *DTSpS* appears to me in the light of all the evidence I present here the only possible conclusion.

47. Cf also ?Didymus, De Trin. 365 C f, which appears to conflate this appeal to Jer. 2, 6 and Is 63, 13-14 with two other texts similarly used in Ps.-Basil, Adv. Eun. IV-V, 709 B – Deut. 32, 12 and I Cor 10, 4.

46a. In a private communication of August 14th, 1973, Prof. Tetz advanced against this and similar suggestions in my comparison of *DTSpS* and *DICA* that „Es ist ein überlieferungsgeschichtliches Gesetz, dass korrektere Zitierung, grössere Ausführlichkeit und Spezifizierung im allgemeinen auf Überarbeitung bzw. sekundären Charakter schließen lassen. Sie behaupten durchgehend das Gegenteil.” These observations

the other Biblical texts in virtually the same way as DTSpS, contents itself with a mere reference to – but not a quotation from – the Acts passage is remarkable, and again must raise the suspicion that it has abbreviated the proof from its initial length, whereas DTSpS has preserved the original form. (This may appear inconsistent with our remark above that the appearance of an extra text in DICA 1012 C f does not supply evidence for the order of writing. But the two situations are not the same. In that instance, the text which DICA included, but which was not in DTSpS, was not essential to the whole argument as the divinity of the Spirit – which there too was the chief point at issue – was covered by Is 63, which both works quote, and DICA's addition of I Cor 10 added little more than embellishment. In this case everything depends on Acts 13, so that its omission from DICA does tend to indicate that the author is shortening proofs he has found already more fully expressed in DTSpS).

The next argument in both works follows immediately after the preceding one:

DTSpS 1200 *D f*; 520 *ff*: *DICA* 1013 *Bf*:

Et est quidem quando ex persona patris loquuntur prophetae – sic David in psalmis ait:

(Ps 88, 36–38)

et rursum:

(Ps 131, 11)

sicut et Petrus:

(Acts 2, 30)

quando vero ex persona

filiū-cum Esaias dicit:

(Is 52, 5–6)

quando autem ex persona spiritus sancti – ut cum propheta Agabus dicit:

(Acts 21, 11)

Paulus autem ad Timotheum scribit:

(I Tim 4, 1)

καὶ ὅτε μὲν ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ πατρὸς λαλοῦσιν οἱ προφήται, ὡς ὅταν ἐν ψαλμοῖς λέγῃ ὁ θεός:

(Ps 88, 36–38)

καὶ πάλιν:

(Ps 131, 11)

καὶ καθὼς ὁ Πέτρος εἶρηκε:

(Acts 2, 30)

ὅτε δὲ ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ υἱοῦ, ὡς ὅταν

λέγῃ ὁ Ἡσαΐας:

(Is 52, 5–6)

ὅτε δὲ ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος

ὡς ὅταν ὁ μὲν προφήτης Ἀγαβὸς λέγῃ:

(Acts 21, 11)

καὶ πάλιν ὁ Παῦλος πρὸς Τιμόθεον γράφει:

(I Tim 4, 1)

καὶ πάλιν:

(Acts 8, 29)

These two passages are for the most part identical, with only two smallpoints of contrast. First, DICA here again includes an extra quotation – Acts 8, 29 – but as in the previous instance where we found it to have an extra text, so too here the addition supplies nothing new or vital for the construction of the ar-

gument, and could be nothing more than decoration. More significant is perhaps the contrast in the way in which Ps 88 is introduced: DTSpS refers it to David, DICA to God. As the theme of the discussion is that the *prophets* speak in the person of the Father, Son and Spirit, and as the other texts quoted are all ascribed to the men who uttered them, it seems likely that DTSpS has preserved the older form of the argument, and that the compiler of DICA has perhaps rather carelessly overlooked the point of the ascription of the text to David, and lapsed into the simple ascription of it to God.

The next (and last) argument to be compared in this group of parallels follows directly from the previous one in DICA, but not quite directly in DTSpS, where another brief proof of the equality of the Son and Spirit comes between the last one and this:

DTSpS 1201 *BC*; 551 *ff*: *DICA* 1016 *AB*:

Et propheta quidem Ezechiel contra veterem populum clamans dicit:

(Ez 16, 43)

Paulus vero scribit ad novellum populum:

(Eph 4, 30)

Et David nihilominus contra Iudaeos dicit:

(Ps 77, 40)

Esaias etiam de iisdem ait:

(Is 63, 10)

Et ad Corinthios scribens Paulus ait:

(II Cor 13, 3)

καὶ ὁ μὲν προφήτης Ἴεζεκιήλ, αἰτιώμενος τὸν παλαιὸν λαόν, ἔλεγε:

(Ez 16, 43)

ὁ δὲ Παῦλος γράφει τῷ νέῳ λαῷ:

(Eph 4, 30)

καὶ ὁ μὲν Δαβὶδ περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων λέγει:

(Ps 77, 40)

ὁ δὲ Ἡσαΐας περὶ αὐτῶν:

(Is 63, 10)

καὶ ὁ Στέφανος ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι λέγει: (Acts 7, 51)

Such contrasts as there are between these two passages are very slight, and do not really permit us to draw conclusions about the order of priority.

Of these five sets of parallels in which DTSpS and DICA resemble each other very closely indeed, the first, third and fourth all supply contrasts which indicate that DTSpS is more likely to be the original. One other contrast points in the same direction: in DICA these passages – apart from the first – make up a single block of material. In DTSpS on the other hand, while all five passages appear in the same order as in DICA, other material is to be found between the second and the third, and again between the fourth and fifth. Thus in this section in which the two writings have so much in common, DTSpS supplies more than DICA. This at least encourages a suspicion that DICA, which we have seen may reflect a tendency to abbreviate and sharpen material taken from DTSpS, also reflects a more general tendency to excerpt from DTSpS, selecting only some of the arguments and proofs which the other work offers.

If this is so, then again it would mean that DICA is the later.

This material thus tends to suggest the priority of DTSpS over DICA, though not conclusively. But this suggestion will be confirmed in the remaining two groups of parallels, where we shall see even more clearly, that DICA does abbreviate and sharpen the arguments from DTSpS, while DTSpS does indeed, as Stülcken and Shapland, saw, handle the material rather better than DICA. The parallels in the second group are all, like those already given, from the second Trinitarian section of DICA (chs 13–19); those in the third group are from the first (chs 9–10).

b) Two further passages in DICA show resemblances to DTSpS of a kind which strongly suggest that DTSpS is the older, and that DICA contains an abbreviated and to some extent muddled reproduction and reorganisation of material from DTSpS. The first of these is DICA 1005 B f, which contains material which is also to be found, much more lucidly expressed, in three different passages in DTSpS. The opening part of DICA's statement parallels DTSpS 1201 C f; 567 ff:

DTSpS 1201 C f; 567 ff:

Et in Esaia dominus dicit:
(Is 1, 2)

In evangelio vero:
(Jo 3, 6)

Et rursum:
(Jo 3, 8)

Ergo haec ad initium evangelii comparans minuit spiritus sancti divinitatem? Nam in principio quidem evangelii Ioannes de salvatore et de his qui crediderunt ait:
(Jo 1, 12–13)

De regeneratione quoque fidelium exponens dominus et postmodum Nicodemum instruens eos qui in se credunt, hoc est qui accipiunt illum, regenerari ex spiritu sancto oportere dixit sic:
(Jo 3, 7–8)

et commemorans ante:
(Jo 3, 6)

Si igitur hi, qui caelesti regeneratione generantur, ex spiritu sancto generati ex deo sunt generati, cur non, si quid magnum et divinum et trinitate dignum, de spiritu nos opinari oportet, quantum ad humanam possibilitatem est?

DICA 1005 B f:

καὶ ὅταν λέγῃ ὁ Κύριος ἐν Ἡσαΐα:
(Is 1, 2)

ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ λέγει:
(Jo 3, 6)

καὶ πάλιν:
(Jo 3, 8)

ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰωάννης λέγει:
(Jo 1, 12–13)

ὅσοι οὖν ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐγεννήθησαν. οὗτοι ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν.

DTSpS here constructs its argument with some care and indeed at considerable length, in a way which suggests that the author is developing it in this way for the very first time – hence his repetition of the Johannine texts in the second part of his statement, by which he tries to ensure that the point he is making will be fully comprehensible⁴⁸. In DICA on the other hand the author knows already what he wants to say, and what his conclusion is going to be, and so states both argument and conclusion very briefly – and yet in a way which very closely resembles the more laborious formulations in DTSpS. Indeed he states them so briefly that even Schermann, who believed DTSpS to be the later work, remarked in his comment on these passages⁴⁹ that the author of DTSpS had felt it necessary to draw out the inner structure of the argument by making explicit what in DICA is only implicit and therefore unsatisfactory. But it would surely have been more logical to conclude that the more detailed statement was in fact the original one: it is easy to understand how a dependent author could abbreviate a borrowed argument to the point of obscurity (and this is neither the first nor the last occasion on which we shall find cause to suspect the author of DICA of doing exactly that), but it is much less easy to imagine that a compressed argument in a source would have been expanded in the way in which, according to Schermann, this argument has been expanded in DTSpS. On the evidence of these passages, DTSpS is much more likely to be the original than the copy.

The immediately following sentences in DICA support this conclusion. It continues (1005 C):

48. Such repetitions of key texts are something of a characteristic of DTSpS – cf e.g. the repetitions of Eph 1, 13–14 in 1210 B f; 1048 ff, and of Jer 2, 13 in 1213 A f; 1188 ff. The writer is obviously anxious to ensure that his arguments will be fully stated and clearly understandable – in which he contrasts sharply with the author of DICA, at least in the Trinitarian sections. Stülcken, Athanasiana 76, suggested that the text of DTSpS was probably not entirely intact, and advanced as evidence this repetition of Jo 3, 6–8, along with the further quotation of these vv at 1203 CD; 675 ff; but both this repetition and the further occurrence of them there are perfectly natural – in that further instance they are used in the context of a rather different argument, which is concerned not with *our* being born of the Spirit, but with his role in the Incarnation. The other evidence advanced by Stülcken to support his suggestion can for the most part be similarly accounted for: the correlation of I Thess 5, 23 with I Cor 6, 11 which appears three times (1195 C; 231 ff; 1198 C; 387 ff; 1206 B; 824 ff) is in fact introduced on the third occasion with the words *sicut ad Thessalonicenses, quod frequenter memoravimus...*; while the double appearance of Ro 8, 11 and Ps. 103, 29 ff (1199 A; 415 ff; 1205 D; 800 ff) is understandable – in the second case it is introduced by Jo 5, 21, which is not in the earlier passage. Only the repetition of much of the content of 1200 A f; 475 ff in 1215 D f; 1345 ff might suggest that the original form of the work has been distorted – though it is equally possible that this is an intentional recapitulation of a kind not uncommon in patristic writings.

49. Schermann, Die griechischen Quellen des hl. Ambrosius 46: „Der Verfasser von DTSpS fand die Zusammenstellung der verschiedenen Johannesstellen in DICA offenbar unpassend, glaubte daher deren inneren Zusammenhang herstellen zu sollen.“

καὶ ὄσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθησαν, οὗτοι εἰς πατέρα καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐβαπτίσθησαν. καὶ πάλιν, ὅτε λέγει ὁ Πέτρος τῷ Ἀνανίᾳ: (Acts 5, 3-4) ὥστε ὁ ψευδόμενος τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, τῷ θεῷ ἐψεύσατο, τῷ κατοικοῦντι ἐν ἀνθρώποις διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ.

Both the points made here, about Baptism and about Ananias' lying to Peter, are even more compressed and allusive than DICA's statement of the argument to which they are appended. And both are the subject of lengthy discussion in DTSpS – Baptism at 1208 D f; 956 ff, which we have already discussed;⁵⁰ and the *lic o.* Ananias in 1202 B f; 605 ff, shortly after the passage on the begetting of the faithful which we have just been discussing. In both cases, what DICA says is in effect a (very compressed) summary of the point made in some detail in DTSpS. Their appearance in DICA is so brief and indeed so unclear that one can scarcely suppose that DICA was the source on which the author of DTSpS drew; but it makes very good sense indeed to see in DTSpS the source from which DICA has taken its material, and whose arguments DICA thus summarily reproduces.

The second DICA passage to be discussed here is at 1009 A f, which shows a number of resemblances to DTSpS 1210 A f; 1023 ff, and which, like the previous instance, is very considerably more likely to be dependent on DTSpS than to be its source. The passage in DTSpS has just described the Spirit as the „oil of anointing”, and the „seal”, and so come to quote II Cor 1, 21. This verse introduces the fresh idea that the Spirit is also an „inheritance”. At this point the similarities to DICA begin; but whereas in DTSpS the following discussion follows on closely from the preceding arguments, in DICA it represents the introduction of an entirely fresh statement, which stands in no close relation to what has preceded it:⁵¹

DTSpS 1210 B f; 1048 ff: DICA 1009 AB:

(II Cor 1, 21)
et iterum ad Ephesios ait:
(Eph 1, 13-14)
Magna nos de spiritu sancto
sapere praeferant sancti; nam
cum David diceret in quinto
decimo psalmo:
(Ps 15, 5)
et Moyses scriberet:
(Deut 10, 9)
et Hieremias clamaret:
(Jer 51, 19)
et cum dominum heredita-

καὶ ὅτε μὲν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος διδάσκει περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ὅτι ἀρραβῶν τῆς κληρονομίας ἐστὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὁ Δαβὶδ λέγει τὸν Κύριον εἶναι τὴν κληρονομίαν·
(Ps 15, 5)
καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ λέγει·
(Ps 141, 6)

tem sanctorum scripturae dicent, Paulus arram hereditatis sanctorum spiritum sanctum esse dixit:
(Eph 1, 13-14)

ὁ δὲ Ἱερεμίας λέγει ὅτι
(Jer 51, 19)
τῶν οὖν προφητῶν τὸν Κύριον κληρονομίαν λεγόντων τῶν ἁγίων, ὁ Παῦλος τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα κληρονομίαν εἶναι εἶπεν·
(Eph 1, 13-14)

Although not all the texts cited here are the same in both works, the structure of the argument and the language used to formulate it are recognisably very similar. Within the sections quoted by us here, there is no clear evidence as to which is or might be the earlier and more original formulation; but when it is recognised that, as we have said, the passage in DTSpS follows naturally on from what has preceded it, whereas in DICA this appears as an entirely fresh argument, it must appear more likely that DTSpS is the original version, and that DICA has excerpted from it, also making certain alterations. And if the further development in both works is taken into account, this comes to seem even more probable. First of all, DTSpS follows its second quotation of Eph 1 with two further texts – Is 54, 17 and 55, 1 – which also relate to the theme of „inheritance”: it is thus here, as elsewhere, fuller than DICA. And seconds a comparison of the following passages in both work, (in DTSpS up to 1212 D; 1182, and in DICA up to 1012 A) reveals that they have much in common, and also that DTSpS is considerably clearer and more coherent than DICA. In DTSpS there is a long survey which handles the themes of the „light of the countenance”; the „fire that sanctifies”; the *spiratio* of God and its reception by men. In this discussion a large number of texts are cited including (in this order) Is 10, 17; Deut 4, 24; Acts 2, 1-4. The whole passage is throughout clearly argued; the argument develops smoothly; the various themes follow on from each other in a way which both gives each its proper weight, and also makes clear how they are connected in the mind of the author. The corresponding passage in DICA is much shorter, and by comparison with DTSpS distinctly compressed and even confused. The author there associates with the idea of the „seal” of the Spirit in Eph 1 the „sealing” of Moses when his face shone; asserts that Moses was sealed with the Spirit, the „light of the divine countenance”; refers to the prophecy that the righteous „will shine like the sun”; and reminds his readers that both the Father and the Son are „light”. This light is then equated with the „fire that sanctifies”; John the Baptist's warning of a baptism in Holy Spirit and in fire is mentioned; and it is pointed out that God himself is „a consuming fire”. This leads to a reference to Pentecost, when the Spirit came as fire upon the apostles;

50. Cf supra.

51. For a similar passage cf ?Didymus, De Trin. 368 B.

and the conclusion is that the apostles, in bearing the Spirit, bore light; to bear light is to put on Christ; to put on Christ is to put on the Father; and this is to put on immortality: Thus those who bear the Spirit bear immortality, and God is immortality. While one can indeed follow the train of thought (with some difficulty!) the whole passage is exceedingly compressed: the author rushes breathlessly on, never stopping to develop his arguments, and only coming at the very end to offer any kind of reasoned proof of the divinity of the Spirit. Much of what he says simply falls by the wayside because he makes no real use of it. Yet in this untidiness the themes which are also in DTSpS appear („light of the countenance”, „fire” and „sanctification”), and the following texts are cited: Exod 34, 30; Matt 13, 43; *Is 10, 17*; Matt 3, 11; Lev 22, 16; *Deut 4, 24*; *Acts 2, 3-4*; I Cor 15, 53. By far the most natural explanation for the resemblances and the contrasts between the carefully constructed development in DTSpS and the relatively almost chaotic flood of texts and ideas in DICA is that the author of DICA has borrowed from the other work, has attempted to modify its material and add further of his own, but has found it beyond his ability to do so very successfully. The alternative hypothesis that the author of DTSpS has disentangled the confusing passage in DICA and built his own lucid discussion with the material from it is by contrast exceedingly improbable. Thus the arrangement of this material throughout these two passages, as well as the fact that in DTSpS it follows closely on what had gone before, indicate very strongly that DTSpS is the older.

The conclusion which was suggested by the first group of parallels between the two writings is thus very considerably reinforced by the evidence of the second. It will be strengthened even further by the third group, to which we now turn.

c) Finally the two passages which virtually make up the first Trinitarian section of DICA betray its dependence on DTSpS even more clearly than the material in the second Trinitarian part. The first of these passages comes shortly after the beginning of that first Trinitarian section at 997 A. The author there argues that the Spirit is to be numbered with the Father and the Son; he is given by the Father and the Son; he is indeed the fullness of the godhead which dwelt in Christ and from which we receive; he is sent by Christ as God, he descends on Christ as man (997 A-C). Then he continues (997 C f):

καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἡσαίας ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ πατρὸς βοᾷ λέγων (Is 44, 2-3, which includes the words ἐγὼ δώσω ὕδωρ... ἐπιθήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου) ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ ὁ υἱὸς ἐπαγγέλλεται διδόναι ὕδωρ τοῖς πορευομένοις ἐν δίψει, λέγων τῇ Σαμαρείτιδι περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος: (Jo 4, 10) καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα λέγει αὐτῇ: (Jo 4, 13-14, which includes the words τὸ ὕδωρ... γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγῇ) καὶ διὰ

τοῦτο ὁ Δαβὶδ ψάλλων τῷ θεῷ λέγει: ὅτι παρὰ σοὶ πηγὴ ζωῆς, ἐν τῷ φωτὶ σου ὀνόμαθα φῶς: (Ps 35, 10) οἶδε γὰρ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ ὄντα τὸν υἱὸν τὴν πηγὴν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. καὶ διὰ Ἱερεμίου ὁ υἱὸς λέγει: (Jer 2, 13, which includes the words ἐμὲ ἐγκατέλιπον πηγὴν ὕδατος ζῶντος).

With this citation of Jer 2, 13 the discussion abruptly ends, and the next passage we shall be considering below begins. At first sight this little paragraph may appear quite in order. It follows previous assertions that the Spirit is divine, and is to be associated with the Father and Son, who both give him. Thus the themes appearing here—that the Spirit is the „living water” given by the Father and the Son, and that therefore the Son is the „fountain” of the Spirit—are quite natural and fully in place. That is certainly true; but when the development of the thought is more closely examined a quite recognisable incoherence, or at least compression, appears. This is admittedly of a kind that is not uncommon in patristic writings, so that it would not necessarily be always a cause for suspicion. But in this case, as the comparison with DTSpS will show, there is more to it than that.

In the passage first of all the transition from Jo 4, 13-14 to Ps 35, 10 is distinctly clumsy, for that Johannine text does not say either that the Father or that the Son is a fountain, but rather that the water the Son will give (i.e. the Spirit) will become a fountain. Immediately thereafter Ps 35, 10 is introduced to show that the Son is the fountain of the Spirit; and the author appears to regard these two texts as hanging very closely together (καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὁ Δαβὶδ... λέγει). But while each can well be applied as he applies them, it is rather awkward to combine them as he does, without discussion or explanation. Nor is this all: the passage includes two Scriptural citations which add little or nothing to the argument. Ps 35, 10 is quoted in full, with the inclusion of the words „in thy light shall we see light”, but those play no role in the discussion, which uses only the preceding clause „which thee is the fountain of life”. And the quotation of Jer 2, 13 is tacked on at the very end as if it were simply an afterthought of the author's — it is not in any way integrated into the structure of the argument, though clearly relating to its central themes; and had it fallen out we should have had absolutely no reason to suppose that anything was missing. And in general the whole discussion is one in which, while one can clearly see the general themes which hold it together, the particular connections between the individual stages in the development are as often as not obscure — the author proceeds more allusively and imaginatively than analytically, and while the general drift is clear, the details justifying that general drift remain veiled in kindly shadow.

All this by itself of course would not show that there was anything wrong with DICA: untidiness,

loose ends, allusive argument, compression of distinct stages in logical development into one jump – all these are features to be found in other patristic writings, not to mention elsewhere! But it does raise the question whether the author of DICA might not in fact here be reproducing material from a source – a source in which the logical connexions, the distinct stages in the argument, and the significance of the apparently superfluous material in DICA would be made clear. In fact, such a source is to be found – in DTSpS 1213 A f; 1188 ff:

Fontem vero spiritus sancti filium dei esse dicimus ipso filio in Hieremia dicente, (Jer 2, 13) Aqua vero viva spiritus sanctus, sicut Johannes docuit dixisse salvatorem ad Samaritanam mulierem: (Jo 4, 10) Et rursum: (Jo 4, 14) Nam et in medio templi clamat: (Jo 7, 37–38) et interpretatus est sic: (Jo 7, 39) Ita etiam et Esaias dominum dixisse ait: (Is 44, 3–4) Ergo manifeste scripturis sanctis profitentibus aquam vivam spiritum sanctum esse cognoscimus. Dominus se fontem esse spiritus dixit sic: (Jer 2, 13) Sic et David cantat in tricesimo quinto psalmo, dicens ad deum: Quia apud te est fons vitae. (Ps 35, 10 a) Igitur praeter dominum alium ostende fontem esse vitae, qui apud eum sit: not enim dixit Quia tu es fons vitae, sed Quia apud te. Est vero apud deum et est fillus fons existens spiritus, de quo Paulus ad Romanos scribit: (Ro 8, 10) Ita non alienum, sed proprium patris esse eum dicit; nam cum professus fuisset: Quia apud te est fons vitae, adiunxit: In lumine tuo videbimus lumen, (Ps 35, 10 b) id est in filio tuo videbimus spiritum.

The similarity and yet the contrast to DICA could hardly be more striking! All the material we have quoted from DICA is to be found here as well – but here it is developed and balanced with a lucidity both in expression and in the structuring of the argument which enable the puzzled reader of DICA to see for the first time what the author believed he was saying. First of all DTSpS carefully distinguishes the two related but different themes which in DICA were placed awkwardly side by side – that the Spirit is the „water of life”, and that the Son is the „fountain” of the Spirit. Each is discussed at sufficient length to make it clear how they are related to each other, whereas, in DICA such discussion is lacking and the two themes are conflated rather than distinguished. Secondly, DTSpS achieves this precise separation and balancing of the two themes by building its case round Jer 2, 13, in which both of them can be recognised: thus this verse is quoted at the beginning, then followed by the group of Johannine and Isaian texts on the theme of living water; then it is quoted again, and followed by the other texts which have to do with the Son as fountain. Thus this text which in DICA plays no very clear role is absolutely central in DTSpS. Thirdly, the second half of Ps 35, 10 has a decisive part to play in DTSpS – it supplies the concluding „punch” for the whole argument, whereas

in DICA it is quoted but not used. And lastly, one can hardly avoid noticing that the point made very allusively in DICA that the Son is „beside the Father” as fountain of the Spirit is also made, much more fully and clearly in DTSpS. DTSpS is not only an incomparably neater and more satisfying presentation than DICA: it also reveals the real significance of all those elements in DICA which DICA itself does not exploit or explain. This, however, makes it quite impossible to believe that DICA could have been the source for DTSpS: rather DICA offers us a not altogether successful reformulation of material borrowed from DTSpS – a reformulation in which the original structure and balance of the material has been virtually totally lost, and in which vital elements have been so distorted or misunderstood that they have remained only as untidy awkwardnesses in DICA’s discussion⁵².

Following its quotation of Jer 2, 13, DICA moves on to a quite different discussion which occupies the rest of its first Trinitarian section. Here too its dependence on DTSpS emerges very clearly indeed: the entire passage in DICA 1000 B – 1001 B is nothing more or less than an abbreviated – and confused – reproduction of DTSpS 1207 B – 1208 C; 877–982, to which one or two little decorative details have been added. As both discussions are rather long, we shall not give them in full, but simply give a précis of each in which the significant similarities and contrasts can be underlined. In this case we shall begin with DTSpS, as the inadequacies in DICA’s presentation emerge more clearly when we have first seen how DTSpS sets about its construction of the argument they both present.

In DTSpS the passage in question follows one where the author has been arguing that the Spirit should be worshipped with the Father and the Son; for worship „in the Spirit” is tantamount to worship of the Spirit just as worship „in the Son” is tantamount to worship of the Son. But, feeling that this is perhaps not altogether conclusive, he goes on at 1207 B; 877 ff:

Et ne tamquam non scripta memorantes sed de nostro loqui videamur, demonstranda est his caelestium virtutum adoratio, sicut scripturis sanctis didicimus; forsitan et illi aemulatores effecti sic et venerari discant et orare. Quem visum volunt Esaias in templo laudari et adorari et glorificari a sepaphim, patremne an filium? Forte enim aures obstruent, si audiant et spiritum sanctum.

52. Similar material to that in this passage in DTSpS is also to be found in? Didymus, De Trin. 553 C f and Ps. –Athanasius, Dialogue II 1200 BC, which quotes Jer 2, 13; Gal 3, 5; Jo 4, 14; 7, 38; 7, 39; Jer 2, 13, and thus closely resembles the first half of the statement in DTSpS. Neither De Trin. nor Dial. II show here any but remote resemblances to DICA, which may best be regarded as wandering off from the tradition more solidly represented by DTSpS, Dial II and De Trin. It clearly cannot be the source for that tradition.

Thus he sets out to show that the Spirit is worshipped by the seraphim, along with the Father and the Son. He undertakes this first by quoting Is 6, 1–11, in which the words spoken by God to Isaiah are quoted: „Go to this people and say to them, ‚Hear, and hear, and you will not understand...‘; then Jo 12, 39–41, in which these words are again quoted, and taken to prophesy the Jews’ inability to recognise Jesus: „This is what Isaiah said when he saw his glory...“; and finally Acts 28, 25–27, in which Paul again quotes the same words and states that they were uttered by the Spirit: „How well the Holy Spirit spoke to your fathers through the prophet Isaiah when he said...“ The author of DTSpS then continues at 1208 B; 936 ff:

Ecce Johannes quidem filium, Paulus vero spiritum sanctum esse dicit, qui sit visus Esaiae, sedens super thronum altum et elevatum, qui et adoratur et laudatur et glorificatur a seraphin. Ecclesiae autem Christi omnes ab oriente usque ad occidentem convenienter patrem a seraphim laudari profitentur in ministeriorum relatione. Dicant itaque nobis, qui venerationem spiritui sancto derogant, quisnam ex his fallit, utrumne Johannes an Paulus an vero omnes ecclesiae Christi? Si vero nemo eorum fallit – absit enim ut fallant – sed omnes veritatem dicunt, manifeste probatum est, quod etiamsi solius patris nomen dicatur, habet tamen filium et spiritum sanctum secum pronuntiatum, vel si filium, habet tamen patrem et spiritum, vel si spiritum, habet et patrem et filium. Sic venerentur, qui adorant, venerationem caelestium animalium imitantes, et non suas cogitationes sequantur.

With this conclusion, the author achieves three aims: a) he establishes that the Spirit was worshipped by the seraphim; b) he thereby fills in the gap which he felt had been left in his previous argument; c) he once more enunciates the principle, which we have already mentioned as being of some importance to him⁵³, that mention of only one or two of the divine Persons in Scripture is not to be taken to exclude the other(s). Thus this whole demonstration fits naturally into its context, as well as reflecting a concern that is expressed elsewhere in the work. In addition, it leads equally naturally into what follows; for he goes on at once to discuss the question of Baptism „in the name of Jesus“, which he argues on the basis of the principle he has just enunciated to have been in fact Baptism in the name of the Trinity. (1208 D f; 956 ff) He then returns briefly to Isaiah’s Vision at 1209 B; 979 ff:

Itaque et spiritus sanctus Sabaoth dicitur et est et cum deo et cum filio a seraphin adoratus; propter quod etiam ter dicunt Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, ut trinitatem pronuntiarent. Unde et Paulus dominum vocari spiritum domini non negat...⁵⁴.

53. Cf supra.

54. This interpretation of the Triple Sanctus rests on Origen’s exegesis in Hom. in Is. 4, 1, GCS 33, 258:30–259:7.

With this he moves on to a discussion of the Spirit, as Lord, which, like the little excursus on Baptism, forms a natural development from the exegesis of Is 6.

In this whole long passage, as we have tried to show, the argument moves smoothly along: there are no awkward breaks or abrupt transitions in the development of the various themes or in the arrangement of the material; the thought is throughout fully and clearly expressed; and the entire discussion fits naturally and easily both with what precedes and with what follows. There is only one little point at which a critical reader might feel he could recognise a non-sequitur: it is certainly not a serious one, but it is of potential significance for assessing the relationship between DTSpS and DICA. This is that the conclusion that the Spirit was *seen* by Isaiah is not directly justified by the wording of Acts 28, 25–27. What Paul says there is that the Spirit *spoke through* the prophet. Certainly, given the context in Isaiah, and the fact that the words ascribed by Paul to the Spirit are in Isaiah ascribed to the Lord, whom Isaiah had seen, it is not a very big jump to conclude that the Spirit had been seen. But when one notices that in what appears to be an earlier statement of the argument in Didymus, De Spir. S. 1059 Af⁵⁵, where only Is 6 and Acts 28 (but not Jo 12) are cited, the conclusion drawn is that the Spirit *spoke* to Isaiah, one should perhaps ask what brought DTSpS to take this further step. The answer is not hard to find: as compared with Didymus DTSpS has expanded the argument by including Jo 12, which states that Isaiah *saw* the glory of the Son. In the light of this addition to the argument, it is not surprising that in DTSpS the seeing is extended to include the Spirit. The author of DICA, on the other hand, concludes that all three Persons *spoke*: this is also in its own way a departure from the primary meaning of the texts, as Jo 12 states only that the Son’s glory was seen. But before we discuss the possible significance of this contrast between DTSpS and DICA we must give an account of the whole DICA passage.

Immediately after the quotation of Jer 2, 13 which we have already discussed DICA continues at 1000 B:

καὶ ὅτε δοξολογοῦσι τὰ σεραφίμ τὸν θεόν, λέγοντα τρίτον: Ἄγιος, ἅγιος, ἄγιος Κύριος Σαβαώθ,

It is also to be found in Ps.–Athanasius, De Comm. Esentia, MPG 28, 48 C; In Illud, Omnia mihi tradita sunt, MPG 25, 220 AB; Basil, Adv. Eunomium III 3, MPG 29, 661 A; De Spir. S. 16, 38, ed. Pruche, 179–180; ?Didymus, De Trin. 545 AB.

55. This argument for the divinity of the Spirit and the co-equality of the Trinity is indeed to be found in several Greek and Latin works, but the oldest form I have so far been able to identify is that in Didymus’ De Spir. S., while DTSpS may be the first to give a fully developed trinitarian version. For other versions cf Ps. – Basil, Adv. Eun. IV–V, 721 C f; ?Didymus, De Trin., 364 A f.

πατέρα και υἰόν και ἅγιον πνεῦμα δοξολογοῦσι. και διὰ τοῦτο, ὡσπερ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς και τοῦ υἱοῦ βαπτίζομεθα, οὕτως και εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, και γινόμεθα υἱοὶ θεοῦ, οὐ θεῶν. πατὴρ γὰρ και ἅγιος και ἅγιον πνεῦμα Κύριος Σαβαώθ ἐστι. μία γὰρ ἡ θεότης και εἰς θεός⁵⁶. και διὰ τοῦτο, ἅπερ εἶπεν ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ Ἑσαΐα, ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς εἶπεν ἐν δὲ ταῖς Πράξεσι ὁ Παῦλος φησιν, ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἶπε. λέγει γὰρ οὕτως ὁ Ἑσαΐας

Thereafter the author quotes Is 6, 1–3; 8–10, then Jo 12, 39–41. (1000 B–1001 B) Then however⁵⁷ instead of proceeding directly to Acts 28, he turns aside to give a little catena of texts reinforcing the implication in Jo 12 that the Son is Lord of Hosts—Ps 23, 10; 22, 1; 79, 2; Jo 10, 14, which combine to show that the Son is the Lord, the Shepherd of Israel, the Good Shepherd, who sits above the cherubim. Only then is Acts 28 referred to—and it is not even verbally quoted (1001 B):

ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα λέγει διὰ Ἑσαΐου εἰρηκέναι ταῦτα, ἅπερ εἶπεν Ἑσαΐας, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος Σαβαώθ μοι εἶπεν. ὁ πατὴρ οὖν και ὁ υἱὸς και τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα Κύριος Σαβαώθ ἐστι.

With this, the discussion of Isaiah's Vision is completed, and DICA moves on to a quite different topic – the creative power of the Father and Son. Indeed at this point the first Trinitarian section ends, and there is no continuity with what follows. In this DICA is quite different from DTSpS, in that where the latter gives an argument which is well-anchored in the whole development of the work, and stands in a close relation both to what precedes and to what follows it, DICA shows clear breaks both before and after this passage. That by itself indicates the probability that DTSpS is the original version; but there is more significant evidence still in the way the material is handled in the two works.

The most immediately obvious contrast is that in DTSpS a wide range of inter-related ideas and proofs are offered, each being given adequate space and emphasis, whereas in DICA everything is flattened out, as it were, and reduced to one dimension. DICA is concerned only to show that the Father, Son and Spirit are one Lord of Hosts; and to this single theme the cry of the seraphim, the Baptismal formula, and the proof from Is 6, Jo 12 and Acts 28 are all subordinated. The rich and varied discussion in DTSpS, where the equality of the three Persons, the claim of the Spirit to be worshipped, the meaning of Baptism in the name of the Trinity, the mystery of the Triple Sanctus and the worship of the heavenly beings

are all combined into an harmonious and creative presentation of faith in the Trinity which has depth as well as logical force, has in DICA been compressed and systematised into a rather featureless dogmatic formula.

First of all it is striking that whereas DTSpS carefully works out the argument from Is 6, Jo 12 and Acts 28 in detail, quoting all the texts and explaining his conclusions from them, DICA is by contrast almost careless: it announces in advance what the conclusion is going to be, and does not trouble even to quote the verses from Acts. In DTSpS we may well have the first formulation of this proof, whereas in DICA it is patently one which is already familiar to the author, and only needs to be briefly stated, not argued in detail. The fact that DICA includes its little catena of texts in 1001 B points in the same direction: these are nothing more than embroidery, inserted to embellish the argument in exactly the way one might expect a copyist to attempt to make some small contribution to the argument he owes to another. They add nothing significantly new to the proof, but merely underline the sole point which the author of DICA wants to make – that the Trinity are one Lord of Hosts.

Secondly, DICA begins with its two very brief and compressed references to the Triple Sanctus and to the Baptismal formula before leading into the discussion of the Vision. But it is more than a little difficult to see why they are included there, and why they are put together, except that they do in a general way have to do with the theme of the following exegesis. But in the light of DTSpS, which not only includes these elements, but integrates them into its study of the Vision in a clear and effective way, it becomes all too obvious what the writer of DICA has done: he has included them because he found them in DTSpS: but in his own systematising reduction of the whole passage from DTSpS he was unable to give them their proper place. Thus he was compelled simply to include them as unexplained components in his own presentation, where – although not exactly out of place – they do not play a role in any way comparable to that assigned to them in DTSpS. This makes it impossible to believe that DTSpS here could be the later and dependent work: rather the order of dependence is entirely the other way.

Thirdly there is the point of contrast which we mentioned before: DTSpS states that all three Persons were *seen* in the Vision, while DICA asserts that all three *spoke*. As Jo 12 refers to the Son as being seen, and Acts 28 to the Spirit as speaking, it might at first seem that DTSpS and DICA here are equally close to – or far from – the actual meaning of the texts cited. But the position is not so simple, and rather suggests the priority of DTSpS; for while it argues in a way which is certainly supportable from Acts 28 that the Spirit must have been seen as well as heard, DICA makes the quite inaccurate

56. In the MPG text the words και εἰς θεός are followed by ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσι. This is, however, an interpolation – cf Tetz, Zur Theologie des Markell von Ankyra I 244.

statement that John says that the Son spoke the words ascribed by Isaiah to the Lord and by Acts to the Spirit. This is not the case: John says that *Isaiah* spoke these words when he saw the glory of the Son. That is, DICA here not only reveals the general tendency to abbreviate arguments taken over from the DTSpS which we have found in several passages; it also betrays the same lack of concern for accuracy in its reference to what its Biblical sources actually say which we noted above when we compared the correlation of I Cor 12, 4–6 with I Cor 12, 11 in DICA 1008 C f and DTSpS 1195 BC; 220 ff. Here, as there, DICA seems to be concerned only to summarise an established argument as briefly and pointedly as possible, but not to construct an entirely new one from the foundations up.

For all these reasons it is quite impossible seriously to maintain that DTSpS could in this passage be dependent on DICA. Rather, DICA here, as in the preceding section, patently betrays its dependence on DTSpS. The evidence of this third set of parallels confirms what the first two sets suggested and shows how well-grounded the judgment of Stülcken and Shapland was. DICA has used DTSpS; it has not been DTSpS's source. This implies that DTSpS itself was originally a Greek work, not a Latin one, for the reasons already given⁵⁷. It also means that DICA must be recognised for what it really is: the work of a compiler who drew on other sources, notably DTSpS, in constructing his work.

We are not, however, entirely finished with this excerpt from DTSpS, for it is in this passage that both Chavoutier and Kretschmar find evidence for its Latin provenance in the mid 5th century⁵⁸. The sentence in question is one we have already quoted from DTSpS 1208 B; 939 ff:

Ecclesiae autem Christi omnes ab oriente usque ad occidentem convenienter patrem a seraphin laudari profitentur in ministeriorum relatone.

In the pseudo-Ambrosian Libellus edited by Chavoutier a statement is made which bears some resemblance to this:

Unde etiam tractum est per omnes fere orientales ecclesias et nonnullas occidentales, ut in oblationibus sacrificiorum, quae deo patri offerentur, una cum sacerdote voce populus utatur, id est: Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Sabaoth, plena est omnis terra maiestate eius. Ergo secundum hoc constat prophetiam ad personam dei patris referri oportere.

In the Libellus, as in DTSpS, this statement comes in the context of the presentation of the argument from Is 6, Jo 12 and Acts 28, and is used to demonstrate the presence of the Father in Isaiah's Vision. And these two works appear to be alone among those which use the argument in finding it necessary

to prove that the Father was indeed included. In the Libellus the point is very clear: the author is referring to the use of the Triple Sanctus in the liturgy, which as he indicates was at the time he was writing common in the Eastern and spreading in the Western Church. Chavoutier and Kretschmar accordingly take the statement in DTSpS to refer to the use of the Triple Sanctus in the liturgy, and conclude that DTSpS is dependent on the Libellus. Chavoutier contrasts the precise and emphatic reliance on the appeal to the Triple Sanctus with the vaguer, more rhetorical remark in DTSpS, and argues from this that DTSpS must be the later;⁵⁹ while Kretschmar suggests that the argument from these three texts met with difficulties when it was imported into the Church in the West (via Jerome, Ep 18a ad Damasum⁶⁰) because of some Western uncertainty as to whether the Father had really been seen by Isaiah; and that the reference to the currently spreading use of the liturgical Triple Sanctus in the Western Church was a convenient means of establishing, against such doubts, that the Father was indeed present in the Temple⁶¹. Thus on this interpretation DTSpS is Latin, later than the Libellus, and reflects the period when the use of the liturgical Triple Sanctus was spreading in the West (i.e. during the 5th century).

If this interpretation is correct, we should have to conclude either that DTSpS is as a whole a Latin work from the mid 5th century; or that at this point an editor or translator has sought to improve the work by inserting a fresh line of argument. The first of these alternatives is however very hard to accept in view of the considerable evidence for the priority of DTSpS over DICA, not to mention the significant indications in DTSpS that it is a Greek work in origin. The second is equally unattractive for more than one reason. First, the reference in 1208 B; 939 ff forms an integral part of the whole discussion of Isaiah's Vision. Second, the argument from the Vision, and the emphasis on the worship of the seraphim, clearly belong to the original conception of the work: the very last words of the whole writing are (1218 C; 1470–2): *...ita sentientes de trinitate et imitantes adorationem seraphyn heredes regni caelorum effici poterimus. Amen.* These two points together make it very hard to believe that such a central element in the discussion of the Vision could be an interpolation. Third, this reference to „all the churches of Christ” (which is repeated twice a few lines later at 1208 C; 945–6) is very similar to two other references, one much earlier and one much later in DTSpS – 1197 B; 321–3: *... tamen apostoli ecclesias totius orbis docuerunt credere in patrem et filium et in spiritum san-*

59. Chavoutier, op cit, 179: „La précision de l'argument et l'importance qu'il lui accorde donnent à penser que le libellus fournit un témoignage direct à l'appui d'une idée originale. Il est la source du pseudo-Athanase.”

60. Ed Labourt I, 57, 22 ff.

61. Kretschmar, loc cit.

57. Cf supra, n 29.

58. Chavoutier, Un libellus pseudo-Ambrosien sur le Saint-Esprit, 177–9; 190; Kretschmar, Neue Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Ostergottesdienstes II, 79–80.

ctum; and 1218 A; 1435–6: *Et cum spiritus sanctus haec promulgasset, omnes ecclesiae Christi custodiunt*. The appeal to the common faith of the churches would thus appear to be one which the author of DTSpS was in the habit of using. But in spite of these difficulties, one or other of these two alternatives would have to be adopted if Chavoutier and Kretschmar are right. Is their interpretation, however, right—or even probable? Closer consideration of it, and of the DTSpS passage, is necessary to come to a decision on this. First of all the sentence in DTSpS should be given in its context in 1208 B; 936 ff:

Ecce Johannes quidem filium, Paulus vero spiritum sanctum esse dicit, qui sit visus Esaiae, sedens super thronum altum et elevatum qui et adoratur et laudatur et glorificatur a seraphin. Ecclesiae autem Christi omnes ab oriente usque ad occidentem convenient patrem a seraphin laudari profitentur in ministeriorum relatione. Dicant itaque nobis, qui venerationem spiritui sancto derogant, quisnam ex his fallit, utrumne Johannes an Paulus an vero omnes ecclesiae Christi? quoniam quidem omnes ecclesiae patrem profitentur esse qui adoratur a seraphin, Johannes autem filium, Paulus vero spiritum sanctum.

The most remarkable feature of this paragraph is one which itself puts a very large question mark against Chavoutier's and Kretschmar's interpretation. In it DTSpS does not explicitly mention the Triple Sanctus at all! All it states is that all the churches confess that the Father is worshipped by the seraphim *in ministeriorum relatione*. But it does not introduce the Triple Sanctus to prove this: that is only referred to some forty lines later (at 1209 B; 981–2), when it is used not simply to prove that the Father was present in the Vision, but rather to demonstrate what the whole Trinity was present. This use of the Triple Sanctus goes back to Origen, and is to be found in more than one Greek work (including of course DICA, as we have just seen) of the fourth century⁶². But it is quite different from the appeal to the Triple Sanctus in the Libellus, which specifically mentions the liturgical Triple Sanctus and argues that it is addressed to the Father.

The contrast here between DTSpS and the Libellus is indeed seen, but not perhaps correctly interpreted, by Chavoutier⁶³. He argues that DTSpS is so vague and rhetorical that it must itself be dependent on the more precise statement in the Libellus. This would certainly be justified – if DTSpS and the Libellus were saying the same thing. But are they? Is DTSpS referring even indirectly to the liturgical Triple Sanctus to show that the Father is present in Isaiah's Vision? This is by no means obvious from the text of DTSpS itself: it only comes to seem obvious when DTSpS is interpreted via the Libellus

on the assumption that it is saying the same as the pseudo-Ambrosian work. But if this interpretation can only really be put on DTSpS on that assumption, it can clearly supply no very strong argument for the Latin origins of DTSpS – in effect, in order to be able to interpret this passage in DTSpS in a way which will reveal the work's Latin context, one has first of all to assume that it is Latin, and can be understood via the Libellus! Chavoutier and Kretschmar naturally did assume that DTSpS belongs to the 5th century Western Church, and so accepted the equation of DTSpS's concern with that of the Libellus as self-evidently correct. But the evidence of the DTSpS passage itself scarcely gives them very strong support, while all the other evidence indicates that DTSpS does not belong in the Western Church in the 5th century.

This is not to say that the author of DTSpS may not have had the liturgical Triple Sanctus – or some other liturgical feature – in mind when he wrote the passage. The key sentence (*Ecclesiae autem Christi omnes ab oriente usque ad occidentem convenient patrem a seraphin laudari profitentur in ministeriorum relatione*) is in its general intention perfectly clear, but in its particular reference perfectly obscure. That the author wishes to emphasise that in all the churches it is recognised that the Father is worshipped by the seraphim is obvious; but precisely when, how, or in what particular way the churches are supposed to do this remains unexplained. In the light of the other references in the work to „all the churches” it may well be that the author is only making a general remark, pointing out ironically that there can at any rate be no doubt that the Father was included in the Vision, as all the churches would recognise that he was. This would accord with the ironic tone throughout the whole discussion – a tone which indeed can clearly be recognised in the immediately following sentence: „Let them tell us, those who deny worship to the Holy Spirit, which of these is deceived – is it John, or Paul, or even all the churches of Christ?” On the other hand it is possible that he may have had something more in mind – a particular liturgical occasion on which the churches explicitly confessed that the Father is worshipped by the seraphim.

That he may have intended something of this kind is suggested by the concluding phrase *in ministeriorum relatione*. This could be taken to refer to the liturgy and the sense would then be that „all the churches *in their worship* confess that the Father is worshipped by the seraphim”. If this is the intended meaning, then the liturgical Triple Sanctus could well be what he is referring to. On the other hand, the phrase could just as easily be taken to refer to the status of the seraphim themselves and the sense would then be that „all the churches confess that the Father is worshipped by the seraphim *in the status of servants*”. The text of DTSpS itself does not appear to make it possible to come to a decision between these two choices. But

62. Cf supra, n 54; 55.

63. Chavoutier, loc cit.

even if the author was in fact referring to the liturgical Triple Sanctus, which we may well suspect, but of which we cannot be certain, it would still not necessarily follow that Cavoutier's and Kretschmar's interpretation should be reinstated; for *in ministeriotum relatione* is not the only ambiguous phrase in this puzzling sentence: the earlier *ab oriente usque ad occidentem* is equally open to more than one interpretation.

Chavoutier and Kretschmar take these words with the preceding *ecclesiae... Christi omnes*, so understanding it as meaning „all the churches of Christ from the east to the west". When this is then compared with the reference in the Libellus to *omnes fere orientales ecclesias et nonnullas occidentales*, it is quite natural to conclude as they do that the author of DTSpS means to say that the liturgical feature to which he is *ex hypothesi* referring – i.e. the Triple Sanctus – is used in all the churches in east and west. But even though this interpretation is understandable it is not necessarily correct: the phrase can be put in a very different light if DTSpS is not compared with the Libellus (which it in any case only remotely resembles) but with the Alexandrian Liturgy of St Mark⁶⁴.

In the Liturgy of St. Mark, where the Triple Sanctus was an established feature earlier than in the Western Church, it was immediately preceded by Mal 1, 11: „From the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same My Name shall be great among the gentiles". And it is the language of this text which is echoed here in DTSpS. If the writer of the work had the Triple Sanctus in mind; if he was, as the other available evidence suggests, a Greek; and if, as there may be some ground for suspecting, DTSpS was

written in or near Alexandria⁶⁵ – then it would be by no means beyond the bounds of possibility that his original Greek formulation referred not to the churches in east and west, but to the worship of God from the rising of the sun (or from the east) to its setting (or to the west) as it was described in the Liturgy. Even as the Latin text stands the phrase could, admittedly with some awkwardness, be taken in this sense; and such awkwardness as is involved would of course be no argument against this interpretation if what we now have in DTSpS is the attempt of a Latin, unfamiliar with the liturgical background of the original author, to reproduce his meaning in Latin.

In brief: no very strong argument for assigning DTSpS to a mid 5th century Latin author can be drawn from the resemblances in this excerpt to the Libellus, as to interpret DTSpS in the light of the Libellus is in effect already to assume that it comes from a similar background, and that the obscurities and ambiguities in DTSpS must be taken in the same sense as the clear formulations in the Libellus. In fact these elements in DTSpS are open to other interpretations; and even if the author is referring to the liturgical use of the Triple Sanctus – which is by no means certain – his reference could as well be understood in terms of mid 4th century Alexandria as of the mid 5th century Latin Church. Altogether this passage speaks at least as strongly for a Greek origin for the work as for a Latin one. This means that none of the arguments which have been or might be advanced on the basis of investigation so far to show that DTSpS is a Latin writing can be allowed to have any great force, or advanced as objections to the conclusion that DTSpS is in fact older than DICA, and must therefore be translated from a Greek original.

64. For the Liturgy of St Mark, see Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie* 21, 1956, 157; 187.

65. Admittedly this cannot be more than a suspicion. I base it chiefly on the observation that DTSpS seems to reflect a similar stage and state of controversial debate to Didymus' *De Spiritu Sancto* and Athanasius' *Letters to Serapion* and that there are signs of literary dependence of DTSpS on Didymus' work which suggest some sort of direct or indirect Alexandrian influence. But that is perhaps enough to support the suggestion I hazard here that the author may have the words of the Alexandrian liturgy in mind.