

PARADOSIS

Contributions to the History of Early Christian Literature and Theology

IX

MARK DORENKEMPER C.P.P.S.

THE TRINITARIAN DOCTRINE
AND SOURCES OF
ST. CAESARIUS OF ARLES

THE UNIVERSITY PRESS • FRIBOURG SWITZERLAND

1953

PARADOSIS is intended as a series of studies in ancient Christian literature and theology. The Greek term, already familiar to the earliest Christian writers, has been adopted as a title since it is convenient for quotation and reference, while at the same time serving to cover contributions in various languages. It implies, furthermore, both a principle and a programme. Christian theology is by its nature rooted in the past. Only in so far as it remains in living contact therewith is it capable of further growth. Hence any study, however unassuming, that throws light on tradition or its sources becomes by the very fact a contribution to the theology of the present.

Fribourg, Switzerland.

OTHMAR PERLER.

PARADOSIS

Contributions to the History of Early Christian Literature and Theology

IX

MARK DORENKEMPER, C.P.P.S.

THE TRINITARIAN DOCTRINE
AND SOURCES OF
ST. CAESARIUS OF ARLES

THE UNIVERSITY PRESS - FRIBOURG, SWITZERLAND
1953

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	vii
Abbreviations	ix
Introduction	1

PART ONE

Caesarius's Doctrine of the Trinity

Chapter One

The Consubstantiality and Sequels	13
Division and plan of Caesarius's argumentation against the Semi-Arians	13
I. Catholic Faith — One God in Trinity	18
II. Consubstantiality and Personal Triplicity	28
III. Sequels of Consubstantiality	35
1. Equality	35
2. Coeternity	57
3. Omnipotence	63
4. Omnipresence	70
5. Lord and God	74

Chapter Two

The Internal Procession	83
Generation and the relations of paternity and filiation	84
Procession and the relations of active and passive procession	92

Chapter Three

The Divine Missions	101
The mission of the Son	101
The mission of the Holy Spirit	106

Chapter Four

Appropriation	115
---------------------	-----

PART TWO

Sources of Caesarius's Trinitarian Doctrine

Chapter One

Dependence on the <i>Quicumque</i>	127
--	-----

Chapter Two

Principal Patristic Dependence	141
St. Augustine	141
Faustus of Riez	169
St. Ambrose	179

Chapter Three

Secondary Patristic Dependence	187
St. Hilary of Poitiers	187
St. Fulgentius	192
Ithacius of Ossonoba	198
Gennadius of Marseilles	201

Chapter Four

No Dependence	210
Eugenius of Carthage	210
St. Vincent of Lerins	211
Eugyppius of Africa	213
Conclusion to Part Two	215
Index of Texts Cited	217
General Conclusion	221
Bibliography	225
Index of Scriptural Texts	229
Index of Persons and Things	230

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS WORK

B.A.H.	= Breviarium Adversus Haereticos, by Caesarius
BLE	= Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique, Paris,
CSEL	= Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, Vienna.
De Trin.	= Libellus de Mysterio Sanctae Trinitatis, by Caesarius.
Dic. Théol. Cath.	= Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, Paris.
JTS	= Journal of Theological Studies, London.
MBP	= Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, Lyon.
Misc. Agos.	= Miscellanea Agostiniana, vol. 1, Rome.
NRT	= Nouvelle Revue Théologique.
PL	= Patrologiae Latinae, Migne, Paris.
RB	= Revue Bénédictine, Maredsous.
RBI	= Revue Biblique Internationale, Paris.
RCF	= Revue du Clergé Français, Paris.
RHE	= Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, Louvain.
RHEF	= Revue d'Histoire de l'Eglise de France, Paris.
RHLR	= Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuse, Paris.
RSR	= Recherches de Science Religieuse, Paris.
RT	= Revue Thomiste, Paris.
RTAM	= Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale, Louvain.
VS	= La Vie Spirituelle, Paris.
ZntW	= Zeitschrift fuer neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der aelteren Kirche, Giessen.

Note: Citations from St. Augustine throughout are taken from the Maurists' edition, Paris 1689-1700.

INTRODUCTION

Literary tradition has not been favorable toward St. Caesarius. His doctrinal works, by no means negligible, have remained till our day in a very chaotic state. The textual difficulties alone which confronted one wishing to study his sermons were no less than insurmountable. The sermons which came from the pen of the saintly bishop of Arles were interspersed among the manuscripts ascribed to the most diverse names: St. Augustine, Faustus of Riez, Maximus of Turin. The task of disentangling such a conglomeration of texts was greatly augmented by the well-proven fact that Caesarius did not hesitate to borrow long passages from his predecessors. These he would then insert, more or less retouched, into his own discourses without hinting that he is indebted to another for perhaps most of the sermon. Morin tells us, "At times only the most discerning study will enable one to distinguish in the writings of the Saint that which he has taken over from another from that which is properly his own."¹ The near hopelessness of this situation is evidenced in the wide variety in the number of sermons attributed to St. Caesarius. Du Port, writing at the end of the 17th century, gives the number as about forty sermons.² Ampere, who wrote at the same time as Morin began his work, assures us that Caesarius had written prodigiously, and that the one hundred and fifty sermons at that time assigned to him were only a small part of those originally composed by him.³ Malnory writes in his *Life of St. Caesarius* that the reconstruction of the sermons of the Bishop of Arles is "a work which will demand of the editor endless research and unlimited patience."⁴ He knows of the work that Morin had already begun and joins in an appeal that patrologists had been making for centuries — for the speedy completion of a critical edition of the works of St. Caesarius of Arles.

This demand of scholars is now realized in Morin's *Opera Omnia Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis*.⁵ Thanks to the fifty years of tireless

1. G. MORIN, *Le symbole de S. Césaire d'Arles*. RB 46 (1934) 189.
2. DU PORT, *Histoire de l'Eglise d'Arles*. Paris 1690, 133.
3. M. AMPÈRE, *Histoire littéraire de la France*. Paris 1893, 2, 225.
4. A. MALNORY, *Saint Césaire*. Paris 1894, xi.
5. G. MORIN, *Sancti Caesarii Episcopi Arelatensis Opera Omnia*, Volumen I *Sermones et Admonitiones*. Maretoli, 1936. Volumen II *Opera Varia*. Maretoli, 1942.

labor on the part of this Benedictine monk, the greatest popular orator of Christian antiquity speaks to us once more.⁶ Once again he exhorts and teaches, and his message has lost none of the vividness and vitality that it possessed fourteen centuries ago. We stand in full accord with Lambot's estimation of the man who has made this possible. "Dom Morin is a scholar that posterity will number among the most eminent."⁷ Reviewers agree that the *Opera Omnia* possesses a thoroughness that is seldom found in works of this nature. The reader receives a new respect for the science of internal criticism, which the Benedictine scholar utilizes with rare mastery.⁸ Without internal criticism the work could never have been accomplished.⁹ With it, the student of St. Caesarius may be confident that he has before him the words of the saintly bishop of Arles. This is the more true in that every page of the *Opera Omnia* testifies to Morin's scrupulous fidelity to the one supreme principle he set for himself at the outset: "We seek but one thing, the triumph of the truth. *Non enim de adversario victoriam, sed contra mendacium quaerimus veritatem.* Faithful to this maxim of St. Jerome, as must be every honest writer,"¹⁰ he begins his work.

We do not hesitate, therefore, to accept the findings of Morin throughout the present study. It goes without saying that the very nature of this work of a lifetime is such that one cannot fully appreciate the force of the arguments and the certainty of the conclusions until he has become equally familiarized with the matter. Certainly such needless repetition is not demanded for progressive scientific work. The laws of internal criticism "are so firmly established and secure at the present time . . . that any abuse is easily discovered."¹¹ The universal acclaim the *Opera Omnia* has received from the savants

6. Cf. P. LEJAY, *Notes d'ancienne littérature chrétienne: Les sermons de Césaire d'Arles*. RBI 4 (1895) 607.

7. D. C. LAMBOT, *La première édition critique des sermons de saint Césaire d'Arles*. RB 49 (1937) 387.

8. Cf. D'ALÈS, *Les "Sermones" de saint Césaire d'Arles*. RSR 28 (1938) 372.

9. In all fairness much credit must be given to the Maurists for their edition of St. Augustine, in which they employed the internal critical method with much success. Morin confirms their judgment in almost every case (one hundred out of one hundred and three instances) in regard to the sermons of St. Caesarius.

10. G. MORIN, *Mes principes et ma méthode pour la future édition de S. Césaire*. RB 10 (1893) 62.

11. POPE PIUS XII, *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, (1943).

of patrology and philology precludes reasonable doubt of its trustworthiness. This is certainly not to imply however that the publishing of the *Opera Omnia* is to end any further study of the works of the Archbishop of Arles. Morin himself would be the first to point out the fallacy of such an estimation of his lifelong work. The appearance of a reliable edition of Caesarius's works should rather be viewed as an incentive to further study. Such progress will proceed in the main along two lines. First, the text itself ought to be perfected in the few places where that is still possible. Second, a study of the sources is now in place that we have a critical edition of Caesarius's works. Because we are convinced that we can in no better way express our gratitude to Morin for his invaluable contribution to patristics, we have primarily directed our attention to these two points in the following study.

Our research was directed towards Caesarius's Trinitarian doctrine because existing studies¹² have left untouched, for the most part,¹³ this particular doctrine of one of the Church's foremost defenders against the Semi-Arians. A partial reason for this is the fact that before the beginning of the present century an investigation of this aspect of Caesarius's theological thought had to rely entirely on incidental references to the Trinity scattered throughout his sermons. Now, however, largely because of the findings of Dom Morin, we have two doctrinal treatises against the Semi-Arians and two sermons on the divinity of the Holy Spirit coming from the pen of the Archbishop of Arles. The lack of an adequate treatment of Caesarius's doctrine on the Trinity, as found especially in these recently discovered works, was therefore

12. No one is unfamiliar with the important role played by Caesarius in the grace controversies of the first part of the sixth century. To him must go the credit for having given the deathblow to Semi-Pelagianism in the Second Council of Orange, over which he presided. Frequently mentioned also is Caesarius's moral doctrine, primarily because of his classification of sins into *peccata capitalia* and *peccata minuta*. The two Rules that the Archbishop wrote for the monks and nuns of his diocese have earned for him a place in the history of Catholic monasticism. Recently J. RIVIÈRE'S article, *La doctrine de la Rédemption chez saint Césaire d'Arles*, BLE 44 (1943) 3-20, offers us a competent judgment on the doctrine of the Redemption in Caesarius's works.
13. P. LEJAY'S article, *Le rôle théologique de Césaire d'Arles*, RHLR 10 (1905) is the only partial exception to this. However, the writer's purpose in this article is restricted to an investigation of the *Libellus de Mysterio Sanctae Trinitatis* and its Caesarian authorship and not a complete treatment of Caesarius's Trinitarian doctrine.

an invitation to make this doctrine of the sixth-century primate of Semi-Arian Gaul the object of a separate study.

The future Archbishop of Arles was born at Chalon-sur-Saone in 470 A.D. At twenty he entered the monastery of Lerins, perhaps the most famous monastery of occidental Christendom at this time. It would be difficult to overemphasize the lasting influence these few years spent as a novice and monk on this holy island had on the future life and work of St. Caesarius. What is more to our purpose here is that we must suppose that Caesarius's never-waning admiration of Faustus, which is much in evidence also in his Trinitarian works, owes its origin to the many hours of meditation by the young monk with the *Instructions* of this former abbot of Lerins in his hand. Failing health, however, cut short these few happy years at Lerins, and about 495 A.D. we find him at Arles following the lectures of Julianus Pomerius. Though Caesarius must have had occasion to peruse some of Augustine's works already at Lerins, yet in all likelihood it was only while he was a disciple of the thoroughly Augustinian Pomerius that he learned to know and love St. Augustine's teaching in the way that this is manifested in his sermons and doctrinal treatises.¹⁴

Caesarius was not long at Arles before Bishop Aeonius, recognizing the extraordinary qualifications of the young monk, ordained him priest and designated him as his successor in the see of Arles. In 503 A.D., a priest at most four years, he succeeded Aeonius as Archbishop of Arles. During his episcopacy the government of Arles changed hands three times. Two of these were Arian, that of the Visigoths (476-507) and that of the Ostrogoths (507-536). It was only in the last years of his life (536-543) that the Saint for the first time had Catholic civil rulers in the Franks under Childebert. As bishop of the prefecture city, but even more as Primate of Gaul, he was unavoidably involved in the politics of his day, which from time to time brought on a strained state of affairs between the ecclesiastical and civil authorities of Arles. Several times these resulted in a brief exile for Caesarius.¹⁵ As death approached, far from any fear at the

14. For Pomerius' influence on Caesarius, cf. M. J. SUELZER, translation and notes on *The Contemplative Life* by Julianus Pomerius in the Ancient Christian Writers series. Westminster, Maryland 1949, 3. Cf. also A. MALNORY, op cit. 23-24.

15. He was twice sent into exile by Aleric, but both times were very short. In 533 he was summoned to appear before Theodoric in Ravenna. However, Theodoric received him as an honored guest rather than as a

prospect of meeting his Judge, the Saint rejoiced that he would die so close to the day on which St. Augustine had died. "I trust in the Lord that my passing shall not be far separated from his (Augustine's), because, as he himself knows, to the extent that I have loved his most Catholic sense, to that extent my merits differ from his."¹⁶ He died August 27, 543, the vigil of the feast of St. Augustine.

This period in the history of the Church and of Western civilization, which is considered of epochal import, belongs in all truth to this monumental figure in whose person and activity is realized the entire drama of the death of the old civilization and the birth of the new. "The long episcopate of Saint Caesarius offers more than a purely passing interest in a spectacle one might expect when a bishop and a corner of Catholic Gaul are temporarily placed under the domination of a barbarian and Arian government. It occupies the interim between two great historical periods: the Gallo-Roman times which it ends and the Merovingian age and the Middle Ages which it begins. In it are concentrated almost all the religious and political interests of this epoch."¹⁷ Bound up with both of these was the last attempt of a form of Arianism to undermine the Trinitarian faith of the Church.¹⁸ One of the first duties of a bishop is to pre-

suspect. He paid him high honors, gave him a substantial monetary gift for charitable works and sent him on his way, assuring the bishop of his full confidence. Thus completely exonerated, Caesarius could return to his see confident that his calumniators had been silenced once and for all.

16. Vita Sancti Caesarii, II, p. 343.

17. A. MALNORY, op. cit. xix.

18. Germanic Arianism had its origin in the East at the height of the Arian strife there, when Constantius was determined to make the whole world Arian. The actual conversion of the invading barbarians seems principally due to the energetic labors of a certain Bishop Wulfila (d.380). An extant profession of faith made by Wulfila clearly manifests the subordinationist idea of the Trinity which he passed on to the Germanic converts. "I, Wulfila, bishop and confessor, behold how I have always believed and in this, the only true faith, I make my testament to my Lord: I believe in one only God the Father, alone unbegotten and invisible; and in His only Son, our Lord and our God, author and creator of all creation, who is also God among us — *ideo unus est omnium Deus, qui et de nostris est Deus* — and in the Holy Spirit, illuminating and sanctifying power, who is neither God nor Lord, but the minister of Christ, entirely subject and obedient to the Son, himself subject and obedient in all things to God the Father." (Cf. Dic. Theol. Cath. I, col. 1850) The profession is very clear in that part which refers to the

serve the Catholic faith of his subjects from the attacks of heresy. Certainly the bishop of the prefecture city and primate of all Gaul not only could not avoid entering the Catholic-Arian arena, but in virtue of these offices, must play the leading role. It was for him to set the pace which the other bishops of Gaul could follow in their dealings with the heresy and the heretics. With this in mind we are better able to appreciate the significance of Caesarius's Trinitarian writings both in refutation of the heresy and in the development of this fundamental Christian dogma.

The question might be asked, however, whether we are not straining a point even to connect the name of Caesarius with the doctrinal development of the dogma on the Most Blessed Trinity. It certainly must be admitted that if we seek one word to characterize the sermons of St. Caesarius, it is undoubtedly the word *practical*. All who have even hurriedly scanned his homilies concur in this judgment.¹⁹ Guizot expresses the mind of all in his historical work: "The tone of the preaching of Saint Caesarius is always simple, practical, foreign to all literary intention but uniquely intended to act on the soul of the listeners. His purpose is to excite them to a desire of good works and to that active zeal which pursues the good without relaxation."²⁰

In this emphasis on the practical nature of the sermons of St. Caesarius there is a danger from which not all have escaped. It certainly does not follow that the sermons are exclusively moral or that they treat only subjects immediately directed to action. On the contrary, the strictly doctrinal content of these sermons, though perhaps occupying less space, cannot be denied, ignored or minimized. To do so is to miss the principal and properly Caesarian quality of his preaching. His genius lies specifically in that superb technique by which he was able to conjoin and interrelate doctrine and moral:

Holy Spirit, a pure and simple doctrine of Macedonianism. The same clarity is not found when the Son is spoken of, especially because of the textual obscurity and the resulting uncertainty of the italicized crucial phrase. Nevertheless the formula is plainly subordinationist and contains the usual Arianistic expressions.

19. G. MORIN, *Le symbole d'Athanase et son premier témoin saint Césaire d'Arles*. RB 18 (1901) 346. P. LEJAY, op. cit. 614. M. AMPÈRE, op. cit. 218. CAYRÉ-HOWITT, *Manual of Patrology*. Paris 1940, 2, 203. TIXERONT-REAMERS, *A Handbook of Patrology*. St. Louis 1939, 334. M. CHAILLAN, *Saint Césaire*; Les Saints. Paris 1912, 151.
20. M. GUIZOT, *Histoire de la civilisation en France*. Paris 1847, 2, 13.

that to be believed and that to be done.²¹ The Archbishop of Arles might have granted in another age the possibility of separating dogma and moral in the theological chairs of a university, but such a division in his cathedral pulpit, never! The Christian life, the one object of all his preaching, is inseparably one, though he was well aware of the two elements contained in that unity: faith and action.

The first and more fundamental place is given to faith. We find in this a faithful adherence to the doctrine of St. Paul. No one can read his sermon on faith, *Expositio Fidei*,²² without being struck by its beauty and its strictly Pauline doctrine of faith: "all must learn the true and Catholic faith, firmly hold to it and inviolably preserve it."²³ As though the Apostle of the Gentiles himself were speaking, Caesarius insists that our faith is an absolutely gratuitous gift of God, preceded by no merits on our part.²⁴ It is the faith which distinguishes the Old Israel from the New and only the latter will obtain the kingdom that had been promised to the Israelites.²⁵

What then is meant by saying that the sermons of St. Caesarius are essentially of a practical nature? It is this: whatever is found in his preaching is directed to the one end of all that he did, the inculcation of the true Christian life in his flock. However, the Saint knew well the nature of the Christian life, first of all a life of faith and then only of doing.

Primogenita cordis nostri fides est: nemo enim bene operatur, nisi fides praecesserit; omnia opera tua bona filii tui sunt spirituales, sed inter istos tibi primogenita est fides.²⁶ Fides, sine qua nihil umquam boni operis inchoatur atque perficitur.²⁷

St. Caesarius did not neglect dogma in his preaching but here again it was probably his desire to instill some practical lesson.²⁸ Purely speculative questions, therefore, will have no place in his homilies.

21. Cf. A. MALNORY, op. cit. 176, 183.

22. Ser. 12, pp. 56-62.

23. Ser. 10, p. 51:2. The endless repetition of the expression "fides recta" assures one that the Archbishop is no less concerned with what his flock *believes* than with what it *does*. Ser. 12, p. 58:2; Ser. 139, p. 550:20; Ser. 69, p. 280:18; De Trin. II, p. 166:2; 179:9; Expos. in Apoc. II, 245:51.

24. Ser. 126, p. 500:19; Ser. 139, p. 550:20; Ser. 171, p. 660:5.

25. Ser. 106, p. 424:18; Ser. 124, p. 492:15; Ser. 122, p. 488:3.

26. Ser. 100, p. 396:3.

27. Ser. 12, p. 57:3.

28. CAYRÉ-HOWITT, op. cit. 2, 203.

This sort of oratory is, indeed, the characteristic note of the epoch. For this reason Guizot cites the Bishop of Arles as the outstanding representative of his own times.²⁹ It is a period in history when nearly all literature took on a practical character. Literature is no longer disinterested, but seeks "to act immediately on men, regulate their actions, to convert them who do not believe and to reform those who believe but do not practice."³⁰

There is no reason to suppose that this practical quality of everything that comes from the pen of St. Caesarius will diminish the place he has always had in theological tradition. Even if we prescind from his role in the Pelagian controversy and the Council of Orange, he will nonetheless be assured of a lasting place in the history of Catholic theological thought in virtue of other significant titles. Chaillan singles out one of the most important of these: "Caesarius, as the principal founder of the Merovingian Church, pre-eminently merits our study in speculative theology."³¹ Without a doubt now that we have a reliable critical edition of his works, we may look for a greater interest and study of the theology of this outstanding ecclesiastic of the sixth century.³²

The sermons of St. Caesarius together with his other writings display a certain underlying coherence of thought that one would ordinarily not expect in a popular preacher. This unity is achieved through a constant repetition of a few salient ideas to which he relates, coordinates and subordinates many other notions. As a result it is not difficult for him — as he frequently does — to condense Christian doctrine into simple and clear expressions, in the likeness of a creed. Thus, for example, the Church taking the place of the synagogue in the New Israel, with all that this implies, is a thought that is found in the majority of the scriptural sermons.³³ The central point of all

29. M. GUIZOT, *op. cit.* 2, 9.

30. *Ibid.* p. 6.

31. M. CHAILLAN, *op. cit.* 136.

32. Saint Césaire d'Arles est assurément la plus grande figure qu'ait connue au début du sixième siècle l'Église de Gaule, pour ne rien dire de l'Église tout court. A. D'ALÈS, *op. cit.* 315.

33. The Church is rich in grace whereas the synagogue is barren: Ser. 124, p. 492:15; Ser. 117, p. 469:16. Christians take the place of Jews: Ser. 122, p. 488:1; Ser. 163, p. 631; Ser. 165, p. 638:10. The law gives way to grace: Ser. 168, p. 651:7; Ser. 169, p. 657:10. The Old Testament is terrestrial but the New Testament is spiritual: Ser. 163, 634:13 etc.

his moral is clearly sin and its division into capital and small sins.³⁴ We might mention a few others of this nature,³⁵ but it is of greater interest to see if there is perhaps one central doctrine which acts as a focal point for his entire theological thought. The reply is definitely in the affirmative, and the doctrine is that of the Most Holy Trinity. The reasons which have led to this assertion seem conclusive even though other doctrines may be more frequently referred to in his sermons.³⁶

In the first place, the times in which he lived offer an a priori argument, so that we should expect this doctrine to have an important place in his thought. Having been born in Burgundy, Caesarius spent his childhood and his long episcopacy in constant contact with the Arian heresy. The city of Arles was occupied and encircled by the Arian Germanic peoples: the Burgundians to the North, the Visigoths to the West, and the Ostrogoths to the Southwest. The heresy was a reality ever present and to be dealt with.³⁷ We have also seen that the sole object of all his preaching was the inculcation of the true Christian life. We cannot suppose, however, that an orator of St. Caesarius's nature would be ignorant of the primary place the mystery of the Trinity must have in the subject he spoke on. On the contrary, the careful reader of the works of the Archbishop of Arles will find in them the full realization of the idea expressed by Breton: "The mystery of the Most Holy Trinity is at the same time the foundation, the center and the sublime summit of the entire Christian life."³⁸

It is readily conceded that the above considerations have no value unless they can be confirmed by evidence in the writings themselves. The difficulty here is that evidently the only conclusive argument, one way or the other, is a thorough and personal familiarization with Caesarius, his life, times and works. If we bear this in

34. Cf. P. LEJAY, op. cit. 613.

35. The necessity of grace for good works. Faith without works is the devil's faith. Through faith we come to Christ. Necessary dispositions for reception of Eucharist.

36. One or the other doctrine is referred to more often, but with this difference; whereas references to the Holy Trinity will be found throughout all his writings, these others are usually restricted to a particular type of sermon. Thus the doctrine of the Church as the New Israel, found so frequently in the sermons on the Old Testament and the commentary on Apocalypse, is hardly ever referred to elsewhere.

37. A. D'ALÈS, op. cit. 375.

38. V. BRETON, *La Trinité*. Paris 1931, 9.

mind, we shall be able to point out some of the reasons taken directly from his works which, to us, seem to warrant our position. One of these is found in the frequent passing and unexpected references he makes to the Most Holy Trinity when treating something apparently not immediately connected with this mystery. The very incidental nature of these instances together with their frequency seems to give this argument its special force. In treating the external universality of the Church he does not, as one might expect, speak of the world-wide preaching of the *Gospel*, but of the *mystery of the Trinity*. In the use of this part-for-the-whole metaphor we have an indication of the primary place this mystery has in his concept of Christianity.

Et quia civitas ista quae describitur, ecclesia est tota orbe diffusa, ideo per quattuor partes, civitatis ternae portae esse dicuntur; quia per totas quattuor mundi partes trinitatis mysterium in ecclesia praedicatur.³⁹

The dispositions required for the celebration of the Nativity of Our Lord are those which are expected of one who is to take part in a banquet in which the Most Holy Trinity is the host.

Ad istas ergo tam sanctus nuptias invitati, et ad convivium Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti intraturi, videte qualibus indumentis debeamus ornari. Et ideo mundemus, quantum possumus, cum dei adjutorio corda simul et corpora nostra; ut caelestis ille invitator nihil in nobis sordidum, nihil foedum, nihil obscurum, nihil oculis suis deprehendat indignum.⁴⁰

The number three, wherever it is met: in nature, in the New Testament, or in the Old Testament, is a sign of the Trinity. Whatever is to be said for or against this manner of viewing nature and interpreting Scripture, this much is certainly clear, it manifests a deep Trinitarian consciousness. One of the best known of these is found in the words of Exodus 3:18: "three days' journey in the desert."

Tres enim dies non incongrue possumus dicere Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum: quia et Pater dies est, et Filius dies est, et Spiritus sanctus dies est, et hi tres unus dies.⁴¹

In his sermon to priests, he emphasizes their obligation to preach the truths of the Catholic faith. Humbly asking their indulgence for

39. Expos. in Apoc. II, p. 273:23.

40. Ser. 188, p. 727:25.

41. Ser. 97, p. 380:20.

his presumption in offering several suggestions, he continues with a passage that clearly implies the place belief in the Trinity must have in our faith.

Tamen si quis me libenter et patienter audire voluerit, et trinitatem, quae deus est, voluerit credere, verus et verax (est), qui illi pro sancto consensu et benigna obedientia aeterna possit praemia repensare.⁴²

Here and in many other instances St. Caesarius does not hesitate to refer to our entire faith as the belief in the Trinity. The essential dependence of the whole of revelation on this sublime mystery was more for him than an abstract theological conclusion. It was the fundamental and unifying principle of all that the true and Catholic faith stood for. Many other texts might be cited to show that always, no matter what the particular subject he is treating, there is an intimate connection with the doctrine of the Trinity.⁴³

Even more direct evidence of this is not wanting. From time to time our Saint is very explicit in speaking of the importance of this doctrine in our faith. All of the Fathers were convinced of the necessity of Baptism for salvation, but with Caesarius belief in the Trinity and this sacrament are put on a par.

Ita et nunc in ecclesia catholica adsumptis spiritalibus cibis fidei spei caritatis pervenitur ad trinitatis mysterium et ad baptismi sacramentum.⁴⁴

There is no doubt about the essential place this mystery has in our redemption.

Venit ergo David cum tribus mensuris et decem formellis casei, ut fratres suos in praelio positos visitaret: quia venturus erat Christus cum decalogo legis et mysterio trinitatis, ut genus humanum de potestate diaboli liberaret.⁴⁵

A denial of the Trinity was equivalent to a denial of the divine perfection itself. So intimately and necessarily is his whole faith centered around this mystery that without it nothing, not even God Himself, remains.

42. Ser. 1, p. 19:23.

43. Cf. Ser. 123, p. 489; Ser. 121, p. 483:4; Ser. 88, p. 327:24; Ser. 212, p. 801:10-25.

44. Ser. 115, p. 457:22.

45. Ser. 121, p. 483:9.

In trinitate enim non est aut minus aliquid aut majus; quia si in deo aliquid minus dicitur, imperfecta divinitas accusatur.⁴⁶

These few considerations concerning the doctrinal and cultural setting of the times, the doctrinal character of Caesarius's sermons, and the role of the doctrine of the Trinity in his theology are all factors that cannot be ignored in an investigation of what precisely is the Saint's Trinitarian thought. Each of these points, to a greater or less extent, gives a certain direction to that thought. Without them much of what we find in Caesarius's works on the Trinity remains unexplained. With them in mind, we are closer to the times and mentality of our Saint and we can hope to obtain a much fuller appreciation of what he writes concerning the triune God.

The end we seek to accomplish in these pages — *to come as close as possible to the Trinitarian thought of St. Caesarius of Arles* — clearly marks the course we are to follow. Two things seem to us absolutely indispensable in an endeavor such as this, a thorough investigation of the author's own works and a true judgment on his sources. These two so complement each other in revealing a man's thought that to neglect either of these would be to frustrate our purpose. To consider Caesarius's personal writings without his sources is to surround him in a vacuum of our own making, and to forget the many external influences that cannot help but have left their imprint on his thought. On the other hand, if we so exaggerate the role of his sources that we do not allow for modifications — which could at times be very great — we no less imperil the trustworthiness of any judgments we make. In the following study of the Trinitarian doctrine of St. Caesarius we have divided our treatment into two parts according to a procedure which seems best suited for the avoidance of the pitfalls referred to. In part one, we shall examine exclusively whatever has come directly from the pen of our Saint, indicating his possible sources — without evaluating them — in the footnotes. Part two is a consideration of his sources, consisting of an evaluation and judgment of their influence in the formation of Caesarius's Trinitarian doctrine. The considerations of parts one and two, mutually complementing, correcting and modifying each other, find their end and purpose in the final conclusion, an appreciative judgment of Caesarius's Trinitarian thought and of his place in the doctrinal development of the dogma on the Most Blessed Trinity.

46. Ser. 213, p. 805:25.

PART I
CAESARIUS'S DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

CHAPTER I

THE CONSUBSTANTIALITY AND SEQUELS

An effort to formulate a complete and systematic theology from the writings of an author of St. Caesarius's caliber is, to say the least, hazardous. It was never his intention to write a theology and nothing in his writings suggests such a treatment of the Church's teachings. He is first and foremost not a theologian but a bishop and preacher. It is therefore to his sermons that we must go in search of not a theology but his theological thought. It is true that a study of his Trinitarian doctrine is greatly aided by — in fact, will principally depend on— his two apologetical treatises specifically treating this subject.¹ However, even these make no pretense at being a complete and logical exposé of the doctrine of the Most Blessed Trinity. A recognition of this fact from the outset may well lead to a more objective appreciation of his thought. The usual urge to harmonize and unify the variant and seemingly contradictory statements which are bound to show up in works of this nature will not be so great.

Division

Once the Council of Nice had defined the perfect consubstantiality of the Father and Son, the Church's stand was forever determined. From that time a firm adherence to the Council's "consubstantial" gave a uniformity to the Church's defense of the orthodox faith as is realized in her apologists from one century to the next. Within this uniformity, in its broad outlines, there was left room for the greatest variance in meeting a particular attack, which may vary greatly from time to time and from place to place. To oppose sixth-century Germanic Arianism by the same argumenta-

1. *Libellus de Mysterio Sanctae Trinitatis*, II, pp. 164-180. Cf. G. MORIN, *Le traité de S. Césaire d'Arles*. RB 46 (1934) 190-205. *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos*, II, pp. 180-208. Cf. G. MORIN, *Le "Breviarium Fidei" contre les Ariens*. RHE 35 (1939) 35-53.

tion that St. Athanasius used with success against post-Nicene Arianism would have been most ineffectual. A definite development in the Church's stand corresponding to the changing position of the Arians is manifest in the occidental writers several centuries later. It is still more evident in the many symbols written during the fourth and fifth centuries having their origin in the West. One of these which stands out above all is the *Quicumque* or Athanasian Creed.

The division of the Trinitarian part of this Symbol offers a fine example of the development here referred to. A similar division is found in practically all the Trinitarian writings of the period. But perhaps none show a so nearly identical division of the Church's Trinitarian beliefs as do Caesarius's works. This fact is made all the more significant by the general agreement of patrologists today that there exists a certain relationship between the *Quicumque* and this sixth-century primate of Gaul. For although much has been written during the past century on the authorship of the *Quicumque* — a point on which there is still no agreement except in regard to the general place and time — all, however, acknowledge at least that there is a relationship of dependence between the Symbol and St. Caesarius. But the order of this dependence, whether of Caesarius on the *Quicumque*, or of the *Quicumque* on Caesarius, or if perhaps Caesarius is himself the author, remains an open question.² Certainly then a study of the Trinitarian doctrine of this Saint must endeavor to determine whether and to what extent his doctrine and manner of presentation agree or disagree with those of the celebrated Symbol.

In a defense of the orthodox faith against the Semi-Arians of the fifth and sixth centuries it was no longer sufficient to show by undeniable testimony of Scripture the unity of God in Trinity. It is true that this is for the most part the scriptural expression of the mystery and in general was the extent of the explicit Trinitarian faith during the first two centuries of Christianity. Indeed, the Arians might not have taken exception to a doctrine of the Trinity so formulated and evidently founded on the scriptural terminology. From the beginning the Semi-Arians never held that the Son should be called a creature. They were most indignant when the Fathers accused them, equivalently, of doing just that. The Semi-Arians were especially quite ready to acknowledge any texts of Sacred Scripture which the Catholics would bring forth to show the oneness of God in Trinity.

2. Cf. p. 138.

All the while, however, they would understand a trinity that admitted a gradation of beings.

It was evidently necessary to determine more precisely in what this divine unity and multiplicity consisted. The Church Fathers were not slow to see this need. An added difficulty, one which not even all those on the Catholic side were able to surmount, was the confusion of terminology. The Catholic stand was, nevertheless, soon clarified by the insistence on the unity of *substance* (ousia) and the multiplicity of *persons* (hypostasis), though the latter term was not so generally accepted as the former. So it is true that the Nicene *homoousion* (consubstantial) dealt the deathblow, theologically speaking, to pure Arianism, which would not admit any form of unity of substance.

However, there was hardly a supporter of strict Arianism remaining in the Occident at the beginning of the sixth century, the period with which we are principally concerned. Indeed, the Semi-Arians of southern Gaul might well go along with the Catholic profession of a certain unity of substance and distinction of persons. It was an easy matter for them to understand the *unity* to mean a *similarity* of substance, and their error would still not be detected. For this reason we find in the *Quicumque* a characteristic of the Trinitarian writings of this period, namely the greatest emphasis not on the consubstantiality as such, but rather on particular conclusions flowing from the oneness of substance. Since it was precisely in these points that the Semi-Arians most bitterly opposed the Catholic belief, here also would have to be concentrated the Catholic defense. The *Quicumque* squarely meets the attack of the heretics by a series of words prefixed with "co": co-divine, coequal, coeternal, co-immense, co-uncreated, and co-omnipotent — the very points the Semi-Arians most frequently attacked.

The division of the Trinitarian part of the Athanasian Creed clearly reveals a development in the Church's stand. The Symbol has for an introduction a very clear and unequivocal statement of the necessity of knowing, holding, and inviolably preserving the entire Catholic faith. This is immediately followed by a declaration of the Catholic faith on the Mystery of the Blessed Trinity. The author of the Symbol progresses step by step before he comes to the real crux of the Catholic-Arian controversy of his time. We shall readily see this development if we divide the Trinitarian part of the Symbol in the following manner.

I. One God in Trinity (<i>The Fact</i>)	Unum deum in trinitate et trinitatem in unitate veneremur
II. Consubstantiality and Trinity of Persons (<i>The How</i>)	Non confundentes personas, neque substantiam, quae una in trinitate est, separantes. Alia est enim persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus sancti. Sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti una est divinitas
III. Sequels of Consubstantiality	
1. Equality	Aequalis gloria. . . . Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus sanctus In hac trinitate . . . nihil maius aut minus. . . . Sed totae tres personae . . . coaequales
2. Eternal	Aeternus Pater, aeternus Filius, aeternus Spiritus sanctus In hac trinitate nihil prius aut posterius Sed totae tres personae . . . coaeternae sibi sunt
3. Omnipotent	Similiter omnipotens Pater, omnipotens Filius, omnipotens Spiritus sanctus
4. Omnipresent	Immensus Pater, immensus Filius, immensus Spiritus sanctus
5. Lord and God	Ita deus Pater, deus Filius, deus Spiritus sanctus Ita dominus Pater, dominus Filius, dominus Spiritus sanctus Quia sicut singulatim unamquamque personam deum et dominum confiteri Christiana veritate compellimur ³

St. Caesarius divides his refutation of Semi-Arianism into the same three steps.⁴ To be sure, the division is not as orderly and dis-

3. Ser. 3, p. 22:1-25. All citations from the *Quicumque* are taken from that form of the Symbol which is found in the Zwiefalten Collection and which Dom Morin has included in the *Opera Omnia* of St. Caesarius.

4. The *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos* has three parts: 1) Equality of Father and Son, pp. 182-193; 2) Divinity of the Holy Spirit, pp. 193:17-199:24; 3) Unity of operation among the Persons, pp. 199:24-208. This arbitrary division is in no wise opposed to the Fact-How-Sequels division, but rather contains it. In dividing his work in this way, Caesarius is probably following the method of ITHACIUS'S *Contra Vari-*

tinct as we find it in the *Quicumque*. Nevertheless the same division is there and from time to time the step by step development is found in one and the same argument, as in the following.

The Fact

Quod autem, sicut iam dictum est, in uno deo tota Trinitas intellegenda sit, etiam in initio Genesis manifestissime declaratur, ubi dictum est: "Faciamus hominem ad imaginem. . . ." (Gen. 1:26).

The How

In eo enim quod dixit pluraliter "faciamus", propter tres personas Trinitatem intellege; in eo vero quod dixit "ad imaginem nostram" . . . , propter unam imaginem unum deum in Trinitate esse cognosce.

Sequels

Quod autem dei Filius non sit minor a Patre, sed cum Patre et Spiritu sancto unus verus et perfectus sit deus, audi et crede idoneo testi beato Johanni evangelistae.⁵

The division is, indeed, strictly logical, progressing from the fact and the how to those things which flow from these two. The development is not, however, one of content but of expression, insofar as the second step simply makes explicit what is already implicitly contained in the first; and the third what is implicit in the first and second. It is likewise plain that the first two steps are meant to serve merely as preparative to the last. The reason for this is found in the practical nature of the division, which owes its origin not so much to its logical character as to the end it had in view. In this it is most effective in that it strikes the Arians at their most vulnerable points. It is well known that from its inception much of the Arian success had been due to the mastery with which its proponents were able to masquerade their heretical doctrine in Catholic and traditional phraseology. Hence simply to expose and bring into sharp relief their heretical and insidious tenets was often in itself the most effectual refutation.

madum, which has an identical division: *Book 1*, Quod Filius sit unus Deus cum Patre; *Book 2*, Quod Spiritus Sanctus sit unus Deus cum Patre; *Book 3*, De Unitate Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti (PL 62, 353-434).

5. De Trin. II, p. 171:18.

I. Catholic Faith — One God in Trinity

Quicumque

Quicumque vult salvus esse, fratres, ante omnia opus est ut fidem catholicam sciat et teneat; quam si quis non integram inlaesamque servaverit, sine dubio in aeternum peribit. . . . Qui vult salvus esse, ita de trinitate sentire debet. . . . Fides autem catholica . . . haec est, unum deum in trinitate et trinitatem in unitate veneremur.⁸

Caesarius

Rogo et ammoneo vos, fratres carissimi, ut quicumque vult salvus esse, fidem rectam ac catholicam discat, firmiter teneat, inviolatamque conservet. Ita ergo oportet unicuique observare, ut credat Patrem, credat Filium, credat Spiritum sanctum.⁶ Et credas de uno deo, qui est Trinitas.⁷ Quia trinitas in unitate manet, et unitas in trinitate.⁹

Faith, the one true Catholic faith, comes first and is the foundation of the entire Christian belief according to Caesarian thought. We have seen the necessity of holding firmly to this faith.¹⁰ Likewise it was shown how, for Caesarius, the one focal point of the Catholic faith is the Mystery of the Most Blessed Trinity. The repeated insistence by the Saint upon the absolute necessity of holding the correct and true faith in regard to this doctrine quite naturally flows from all that has already been said previously. It is as essential for the true Christian as the sacrament of Baptism itself.¹¹ Moreover our faith in the Trinity must be integral. If one doubts or denies the divinity of one of the Persons, it is of no profit to him to confess the divinity of the others.¹² This faith in the Trinity will merit an eternal reward.¹³ To teach the divine revelation of this mystery

6. Ser. 10, p. 51:2.

7. De Trin. II, p. 173:16.

8. Ser. 3, p. 22.

9. B.A.H. II, p. 199:15.

10. Cf. p. 7.

11. Ser. 115, p. 457:24.

12. Ser. 213, p. 805:27: Ita tamen, quod qui in deitate minorem Patre aut Filio dicit Spiritum sanctum, non illi tantum iniuriam facit quem minorem iudicat, sed illi etiam quem maiorem putat; quia cum totius trinitatis una aequalitas sit atque maiestas, quicquid contumeliae in personam unius dicitur, a tota aequaliter trinitate sentitur.

FAUSTUS (Pseudo-Eusebius), *De Symbolo Homilia II* (MBP 6, 631D). Si quando aliquid dicere metus est, sancto Spiritu derogatur: Laeditur non tertia sed trina maiestas, quae utique et in tribus una, et in singulis trina. . . . Ergo quia in tribus una substantia est, unius offensa communis est iniuria.

13. Ser. 1, p. 19:23.

is the very reason for the Church's existence,¹⁴ because it above all must be the common faith of all Christians.¹⁵ The preservation of this faith in his flock is the express purpose of the Archbishop of Arles for writing the treatise on the Blessed Trinity.¹⁶

The unity that has been noted in Caesarian theological thought by means of a few central doctrines to which he connects and subordinates the sum total of Christian beliefs is manifest in a similar way within the individual doctrines. In the doctrine of the Trinity this unifying element is the firm conviction of faith that *the one true God is the Trinity*. This fundamental Trinitarian truth, which concerns the very existence of God as triune, is found as one of the terms in practically every argument that he raises against the Semi-Arians. The only exceptions are those few instances when he concerns himself with the scriptural proof of this fact itself. Hence it can in all truth be said that his whole argumentation against the heretics stands or falls depending upon the acceptance of this fundamental fact of the Catholic faith. Yet usually we meet it in his arguments as a supposition that he does not consider necessary to prove. Indeed, it was not at all necessary to do so. The reason is that in general the Semi-Arians were quite ready to admit some sort of a Trinitarian concept of God. In spite of this, St. Caesarius, anxious to establish his defense of the Catholic Trinitarian faith on most certain grounds, shows by numerous examples that the source of this truth is the manifest and infallible testimony of Sacred Scripture itself.

That the one true God is triune, is the clear teaching of both the Old and New Testament. Yet when his purpose is to show the scriptural basis for this first fundamental Trinitarian fact, that is, the very existence of the Trinity, his preference is nearly always the Old Testament. Hence, for him, the very first words of Genesis, narrating the events of creation, contain a revelation of the triune God.¹⁷

14. Expos. in Apoc. II, p. 273:23.

15. Ser. 9, p. 48:16; Ser. 82, p. 324:4.

16. De Trin. II, p. 165:2.

17. Ser. 212, p. 800:14: Legimus in veteri testamento, quia "in principio fecit Deus caelum et terram, et Spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas" (Gen. 1:2). In deo intellege Patrem, in principio accipe Filium, superfluum aquis agnosce Spiritum sanctum. AUGUSTINE, *De Gen. ad Litt.* 1, 6 (3, 121): Trinitas insinuatur Creatoris: nam dicente Scriptura, "In principio fecit Deus coelum et terram" (Gen. 1:1); intelligimus Patrem in nomine Dei, et Filium in principii nomine, . . . dicente autem

But even more explicit is the Trinitarian content of the words of the creation of man.

In uno deo tota Trinitas intellegenda sit, etiam in initio Genesis manifestissime declaratur, ubi dictum est: "Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram." (Gen. 1:26). In eo enim quod dixit pluraliter "faciamus," propter tres personas Trinitatem intellege; in eo vero quod dixit "ad imaginem nostram," et non ad imagines nostras, propter unam imaginem nostram unum deum in Trinitate esse cognosce.¹⁸

The words, "By the one God, one must understand the entire Trinity," constitute an oft-repeated theme whenever St. Caesarius gives the Trinitarian explanation of a text of Sacred Scripture.¹⁹ The Arians were well known for their machinations with the words of Scripture and not one of the Fathers fails to accuse them on this account. It is a point that Caesarius cannot treat with his accustomed charitable reserve.²⁰ His great zeal for the inspired word, so apparent in the invectives he hurls against the Manicheans because of their rejection

Scriptura, "Et Spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquam" (Gen. 1:2), completam commemorationem Trinitatis agnoscimus.

18. De Trin. II, p. 171:18. The Trinitarian content of this verse is taken for granted by all the Fathers who comment on it. St. Caesarius was undoubtedly familiar with Augustine's exegesis of the verse, but here he probably relies on FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 6 (CSEL 21, 109) Dixit deus: Faciamus. Diligenter adtende, dum unus dicit, et non unus facit dumque iterum singulari plurale permiscet nec dicit, ad imagines et similitudines nostras, vel certe: ad imaginem et similitudinem meam: unitatem singularitate, trinitatem pluralitate commendat. Itaque in eo quod dicit faciamus ad nostram personarum numerus explicatur; in eo vero quod singulariter ait: ad imaginem et similitudinem, in unam substantiam deitas indivisa colligitur.
19. One may point to this as one of the fundamental differences between the Trinitarian thought of Caesarius, who followed Augustine, and the subordinationist tendency, already incipient in some of the Apologists and permeating the Trinitarian works of Tertullian and Novatian. Of the many examples that might be cited, one of the clearest is the following from NOVATIAN'S *De Trinitate* 31 (ed. by Fausset, W.Y., Cambridge 1909, 115): Est ergo deus pater omnium institutor et creator, solus originem nesciens, invisibilis, immensus, immortalis, aeternus, unus Deus; cujus neque magnitudini neque majestati neque virtuti quicquam, non dixerim praeferri, sed nec comparare potest. Ex quo, quando ipse voluit, sermo Filius natus est.
20. Cf. MALNORY, op. cit. p. 130 for an explanation of Caesarius's reserve towards the Semi-Arians.

of the Old Testament, forces him to use similar expressions in treating the evidently biased and erroneous interpretations the Semi-Arians gave to certain passages of Scripture in order to justify their heretical tenets.

Hoc etiam perfidus error dicere solet, quod ubi in scripturis legimus aut solum deum aut altissimum, aut solum sapientem, hoc non de trinitate dici, sed de solo Patre accipi debeat.²¹

Against such an exegesis of the Sacred Text Caesarius argues from the first words of the Bible that two truths are undeniable: God is one, and the one true God is triune. From this it necessarily follows that whenever Scripture speaks of *God* without further determination, this must be understood to refer to the whole Trinity. And hence he is able to form a quasi principle of exegesis which henceforth will be a first principle of his entire Trinitarian thought.

Agnosce ergo quia, ubi dicitur "Dominus deus tuus dominus unus est," (Deut. 6:4) non solus Pater, nec solus Filius, nec solus Spiritus sanctus, sed simul Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, quae est verus et unus deus, Trinitas intellegenda est.²²

Quod quam absurdum sit ita sentire, de hoc uno testimonio convincatur. Dicit enim apostolus "Cognitum soli sapienti deo": (Rom. 16:27) non intellegunt quia non dixit, soli sapienti Patri, sed "soli sapienti deo," quae est trinitas.²³

St. Caesarius quite consistently follows the norm of interpretation he lays down here. Needless to say, at times the context will evidently re-

21. B.A.H. II, p. 187:18. AUGUSTINE, *De Trinitate* 2, 8 (8, 780): Et isti quidem ruinam erroris sui divinarum Scripturarum testimoniis quasi fulcire conantes, adhibent Pauli apostoli sententiam; et quod dictum est de uno solo Deo, in quo ipsa Trinitas intelligitur, tantum de Patre, non et de Filio et Spiritu sancto dictum accipiunt.
22. De Trin. II, p. 171:13. Cf. also p. 173-16. AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 23, 2 (8, 728): Si autem hoc dixit Trinitatem; profecto et verum dixit, et vos falsum dicere ostendit. Trinitas quippe secundum rectam fidem, id est, Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, in cuius nomine baptizamur, et unus Dominus Deus noster est et praeter ipsum alius non est.
23. B.A.H. II, p. 187:20. AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 13, 1 (8, 702): Cum vero non sit dictum, Soli sapienti Patri; sed, "Soli sapienti Deo" (Rom. 16:27); et Deus unus sit ipsa Trinitas; multo est facilius nobis hujus solutio quaestionis; ut sic intelligamus solum Deum sapientem, sicut intelleximus solum potentem, id est, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum, qui est unus et solus Deus.

strict the meaning of the term *God* to a particular Person of the Blessed Trinity. Nor is the Saint unaware of this scriptural usage of the divine name, and he also employs it in this way from time to time.²⁴

The Fathers had no difficulty finding abundant scriptural testimony to prove the existence of the Trinity. That this was especially the case at the time of our Saint is at once apparent to one reading, even cursorily, fifth and sixth century patristic literature. The reason for this has been well pointed out by Arnold: "The Arian controversy started on the Person of Christ. But at the time of Caesarius, the Catholics fought for the pure doctrine of God Himself as triune. They answered to the Arians: the true God is the Trinity; we have Him and you do not. However, if it belonged to the essence of God to be triune, then all nature and history, which has been created by Him, must give testimony of Him. Hence wherever in the Bible there is reference to three angels, three breads, three measures, etc., everywhere one saw testimony of the Trinity against the Arians."²⁵ The sermons of St. Caesarius which deal with the Old Testament personages and events show how true this is in his own case.

He devotes an entire sermon to the account in Exodus of God's command to Moses to take the Israelites three days' journey into the desert in order that they might there offer sacrifice to God.²⁶ A reference to the Trinity is seen in the mention of "three days."

Tres enim dies non incongrue possumus dicere Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum; quia et Pater dies est, et Filius dies est, et Spiritus sanctus dies est, et his tres unus dies.²⁷

24. Ser. 212, p. 800:15; B.A.H. II, p. 188:24, etc.

25. C. ARNOLD, *Caesarius von Arelate und die gallische Kirche seiner Zeit*. Leipzig 1894, 60.

26. Exodus 3:18; 5:3.

27. Ser. 97, p. 380:20. Caesarius depends on Origen for the greater part of this sermon. In this particular section, however, there seems to be rather a dependence on Augustine or Ambrose. AUGUSTINE, *Misc. Agost. Morin* 3, 6 (p. 600:16): Ubi nihil transit, unus est dies: et ipse dies Christus est. Et pater dies est: sed Pater dies de nullo die, Filius dies ex die. AMBROSE, *De Cain et Abel* 1, 8, 30 (CSEL 32, 364): "Et venit ad locum quem dixerat ei Deus, die tertia" (Gen. 22:3). . . . Vel quia is qui sacrificat in unum splendorem, unam lucem debeat credere trinitatis; ei enimque fideliter sacrificat dies lucet, nox nulla est. Sic et in Exodo Moyses ait: "Viam trium dierum ibimus, et immolabimus Domino Deo nostro" (Ex. 3:18).

The question arises whether these references to the Trinity in the Old Testament were understood to be a true scriptural sense or merely an accommodative interpretation made and understood as such by the Father in question. In the above citation the words, "We cannot incongruously say," would seem to imply the latter. On another occasion, however, Caesarius refers to these "three days" of Exodus and makes it very clear that we are not to ignore their Trinitarian content.²⁸ From this and many other instances we must rather conclude that St. Caesarius understood the reference to the Trinity in these passages of the Old Testament as belonging to the "spiritual meaning of the Sacred Scriptures."²⁹ For the Fathers this sense of Sacred Scripture included everything which we now classify under the typical, allegorical and accommodative senses of Scripture. This was, indeed, a true sense of the Scriptures for St. Caesarius. It was, in fact, the most important one, as is readily understood in view of his very Origenistic principle: "Everything which is written in the Old Testament indicates a type or figure of the New."³⁰ Hence he finds the same Trinitarian faith manifested in the Psalms³¹ and the Prophets.³²

28. Ser. 84, p. 330:22: Quod autem ad locum immolationis die tertia pervenitur, mysterium trinitatis ostenditur. Nam quod dies tertius in sacramento vel mysterio accipi debeat trinitatis, frequenter in sacris voluminibus invenitur; sicut in Exodo, "Viam, inquit, trium dierum ibimus in deserto" (Ex. 8:27). Et iterum quando ad montem Sinai ventum est, dictum est populo: "Sanctificamini, et estote parati in diem tertiam" (Ex. 19:15).

29. Ser. 81, p. 319:9.

30. Ibid. p. 319:4. For Origen the entire Old Testament figuratively represents something in the New Testament, not only in broad outline, but in every detail. *De Principiis* 4, 11, 15-19. Cf. CAYRÉ-HOWITT, op. cit. I, 206. Caesarius, however, differs from Origen in defending first of all the truth of the literal and historical sense, as he frequently does against the Manicheans.

31. Ser. 212, p. 801:9: In psalmis quoque absolute personis suis trinitas designatur: "Ne proicias me, inquit, a facie tua, et Spiritum sanctum tuum ne auferas a me" (Ps. 50:13). Ecce propheta Patri supplicans non minus Spiritus sancti quam Patris et Filii expavescit offensam, "Ne proicias me, inquit, a facie tua." Filius, sicut imago Patris, ita et facies Patris accipitur. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 6 (CSEL 21, 109).

32. Ser. 212, p. 801:30: Sed quia trina responsione persulta "Sanctus sanctus sanctus" (Is. 6:3), videamus ne hic honor ad totam respiciat trinitatem. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 7 (CSEL 21, 112).

In a consideration of the Old Testament belief in the Trinity the Patriarch Abraham must be given a place apart, for it is unquestionably the mind of the Bishop of Arles that no one before the coming of Christ had so perfect and complete a knowledge of this mystery as Abraham. Because of a great purity of heart the father of the Chosen People was granted an altogether singular vision of God and a penetrating insight into the mystery of the Most Blessed Trinity.³³ Arnold traces the origin of this preference for the great Patriarch back to the days when Caesarius was at Lerins. Here the monks came together at midday for the third time, and the hymn sung celebrated the mystery of the Trinity. The triune God is typically revealed in the inspired narrative of Abraham and his three angelic visitors.

Hoc et beatus tempore
Abrahamus fideliter
Peritus in mysterio
Tres vidit, unum credidit.³⁴

If Arnold is correct in his conjecture, the hymn certainly made a lasting impression on the future Archbishop. On three different occasions we find him returning to its thought in his later writings. The most important of these is an entire sermon explaining the narration of Genesis. The mention of three men and three measures of flour is, for Caesarius, conclusive proof that Abraham believed in the Trinity.

Tres viros suscepit, tribus mensuris panes adponit. Quare hoc, fratres, nisi quia mysterium trinitatis intellegit? . . . Tribus ergo occurrit Abraham, et unum adorat. In eo autem quod tres vidit, sicut iam dictum est, trinitatis mysterium intellexit.³⁵

33. Ser. 83, p. 328:21: Delectavit enim eum visio et perspicacia Abrahae erat enim mundus corde, ut posset deum videre. In tali ergo loco et in tali corde potest dominus habere convivium.

34. Hymnus ad Sextam no. 9. Hymns attributed to St. Ambrose (PL 17, 1178). Cf. C. ARNOLD, op. cit. 60.

35. Ser. 83, p. 327:23; Ser. 211, p. 801:7. AMBROSE, *De Cain et Abel* 1, 8, 30 (CSEL 32, 364): Sed etiam alibi cum visus esset deus Abrahae ad ilicem Mambrae (Gn. 18:2-3) . . . tres videt, unum adorat, tres mensuras offert (Gn. 18:6) similaginis. . . . Perfectae igitur in personis singulis Trinitati interiore mentis arcano, hoc est similaginis spiritalis sanctus patriarcha sacrificium deferebat. Cf. also AMBROSE, *De Fide* 1, 13, 80 (PL 16, 547).

Carrying the allegorical interpretation even further, the Saint is able to show that David and his father were also not ignorant of this mystery. But again he returns to Abraham as having the more perfect insight into this great truth.

From all these examples we are certainly on safe ground in supposing that, for St. Caesarius, there must be admitted an explicit faith in the Trinity already in the Old Testament.³⁶ It would be foolhardy to try to maintain that the Saint saw in these texts only implicit or preparatory revelation of the Trinity in a manner similar to the general interpretation of these texts by present-day exegetes. St. Caesarius knew of and opposed the opinion of those in the Church who said that the explicit belief in the Trinity is had only with the more perfect Christian revelation.³⁷

There are a number of reasons which account for the Trinitarian interpretation of the Old Testament texts by Caesarius and many of the other Fathers. First was the great impetus given to the allegorical interpretation of Sacred Scripture by Origen and his followers in the Alexandrian School. Later Fathers found in this manner of interpreting the Old Testament a vast and almost limitless reservoir to draw on in their argumentation against the Arians. A second reason is the prominent place the Old Testament books had in the catechetical and liturgical life of the early Christians. A final and perhaps the most important reason was the need of an exegesis that would refute the subordinationist interpretation of the Old Testament theophanies of the Arians.

We know that even a number of the Catholic apologists and many of the later Fathers up to the time of Augustine, because of a philosophical influence, held that the Verbum alone appeared in these theophanies.³⁸ The Father did not, and because of His exalted nature

36. Ser. 121, p. 483:1: "Dixit ergo Isai ad David filium suum: Accipe ephi polentae et decem formellas casei, et vade require fratres tuos" (I Kings 17:17). Ephī, fratres mei, trium modiorum mensura est: et in tribus mensuris mysterium intellegitur trinitatis. Bene noverat hoc mysterium etiam et beatus Abraham: denique quando sub ilice Mambrae (Gn. 18:6) in tribus personis sacramentum videre meruit trinitatis.

37. ST. HILARY, *De Trinitate* 3, 17 (PL 10, 86). Speaking of the mystery of the Blessed Trinity, he continues: Hoc a Filio praedicatur, hoc ignorantibus manifestatur; sic clarificatur per Filium Pater, cum pater filii talis agnoscitur. Cf. also Ibid. 3. 22; 5, 27.

38. NOVATIAN, *De Trinitate* 18 (Fausset op. cit. p. 62): Ex quo intellegi potest quod non pater visus sit, qui numquam visus est, sed filius, qui

seemingly could not, appear to men. The danger of subordinationism in such an understanding of the theophanies is at once apparent. The Arians carried this interpretation to its logical consequences. The Father alone is absolutely transcendent and needs the Verbum, possessing a visible nature, to reveal Himself to men. Hence the inferiority of the Second Person, who stands between God and man. Here also is the reason for Caesarius's insistence on the invisibility of the Son in His divine nature.³⁹ The divine substance is one and invisible and therefore not only the Father but all three Persons are equally invisible in their divinity.⁴⁰ The Son is visible only through the Incarnation and this is just in order that He might be seen by men.⁴¹ Hence the Arians are wrong in interpreting I Timothy 1:17:

et descendere solitus est, et videri quia descenderit. Imago est enim invisibilis dei, ut mediocritas et fragilitas condicionis humanae deum patrem videre aliquando iam tunc assuesceret in imagine dei, hoc est in filio dei.

39. B.A.H. II, p. 188:8: Solent etiam dicere: ideo minor est Filius, quia visibilis, Pater autem invisibilis. Non intellegunt, quia nec Filius in substantia deitatis suae sit visibilis, nisi in assumpto homine, qui et Christus dicitur. Nam Filius Dei, id est, "Verbum quod erat in principio deus apud deum" (Jh. 1:2), per quem facta sunt omnia, videri in sua substantia non potuit, sicut nec Pater in substantia sua. Interrogo autem sine sui iniuria illum ipsum, qui dicit quod visus sit Filius dei, utrum animam suam visibilem an invisibilem fateatur? Et cum dixerit invisibilem, sicut et verum est, dicatur ei: Si creatura, id est, anima tua invisibilis est, creatura utique dei, creator universitatis quomodo potuit esse visibilis? Cf. also p. 193:3; De Trin. II, p. 172:19. AUGUSTINE, *De Trinitate* 2, 8 (8, 780): Omittamus igitur eos, qui nimis carnaliter naturam Verbi Dei . . . non solum mutabilem, verum etiam visibilem esse putaverunt. . . . Anima quippe cum sit substantia spiritalis, cumque etiam ipsa facta sit, nec per alium fieri potuerit, nisi per quem facta sunt omnia, et sine quo factum est nihil, quamvis sit mutabilis, non est tamen visibilis: quod illi de Verbo ipso atque ipsa Dei Sapientia, per quam facta est anima crediderunt; cum sit illa non invisibilis tantum quod et anima est, sed etiam incommutabilis quod anima non est.
40. B.A.H. II, p. 193:11: Cum nec anima humana possit esse visibilis, quanto magis deus in sua substantia? AUGUSTINE, *Liber ad Paulinam* 8, 20 (2, 481): Invisibilis est igitur natura Deus, non tantum Pater, sed et ipsa Trinitas unus Deus.
41. B.A.H. II, p. 188:18: Sed ideo induit carnem, quae videri poterat, quia deitas ab homine videri non poterat. AUGUSTINE, *Tract. 53 in Joann.* 12 (3, 648): Prorsus in forma Dei in qua aequalis est Patri, etiam Filius

"To the King of ages, who is immortal, invisible, the one only God" as referring only to the Father.⁴² In his explanation of the divine theophanies, Caesarius manifests his characteristic Trinitarian thought. The theophanies are divine apparitions effected through the medium of creatural forms. Not the Son alone, but all three divine Persons appeared in the theophanies, at times even manifesting their triune personality, as they did to Abraham. The result is that the very basis of the Arian subordinationist interpretation is removed. Now the Old Testament theophanies, far from contradicting, substantiate the Church's Trinitarian faith. Much more might be said on this subject of the Trinitarian interpretation of the Old Testament. It is, however, by no means a peculiarly Caesarian question and has been extensively and capably treated by Lebreton in his widely acclaimed history of the dogma.⁴³

God is triune. This, then, is the conclusion of the first step of Caesarian Trinitarian thought. However, rather than consider it a conclusion, we are closer to the thought of the Saint, if we consider it the starting point for all that is to be said concerning this mystery. But it is not just a point of departure that is soon left and forgotten. It is a truth which contains in germ the whole of the Trinitarian faith. Hence it will serve as a norm ever distinguishing the true and Catholic faith from all heresies. It is significant to note that this fundamental Trinitarian notion plays an identical role in the *Quicumque*. The Symbol begins with the declaration of the Trinitarian doctrine: *Unum deum in trinitate et trinitatem in unitate veneremur*; and then having said all that could be said of this great mystery it ends with nearly

invisibilis est: ut autem ab hominibus videretur, formam servi accepit, et in similitudine hominum factus, visibilis factus est.

42. De Trin. II, p. 172:18: Nam et illud, quod ait apostolus, "Immortali invisibili soli Deo honor et gloria" (I Tim. 1:17), quod vos de solo Patre dictum accipitis, de tota Trinitate hoc apostolum dixisse manifestum est. AUGUSTINE, *De Trinitate* 1, 6 (8, 755): Hinc etiam consequenter intelligitur non tantummodo de Patre dixisse apostolum Paulum, "Qui solus habet immortalitatem" (I Tim. 6:16); sed de uno et solo Deo quod est ipsa Trinitas.
43. J. LEBRETON, *Histoire du dogme de la Trinité*. Paris 1928, 441-446. Cf. also F. SMID, *De adumbratione SS. Trinitatis in Vetere Testamento sec. S. Augustinum*. Mundelein, 1942. R. LEGEAY, *L'ange et les théophanies dans la Sainte écriture d'après la doctrine des Pères* RT. 10 (1902) 138-158; 405-424; 11 (1903) 46-69; 125-134. M. SCHMAUS, *Die psychologische Trinitätslehre des hl. Augustinus*, Münster 1927, 20-22; 160-163.

the same words: *Et trinitas in unitate, et unitas in trinitate veneranda sit.*⁴⁴ With the selfsame words St. Caesarius also lays down the norm of orthodoxy: *Audi adhuc quia trinitas in unitate manet et unitas in trinitate.*⁴⁵

II. Consubstantiality and Personal Triplicity

Quicumque

Non confundentes personas, neque substantiam, quae una in trinitate est, separantes. Alia est enim persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus sancti. Sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti una est divinitas.⁴⁶

Caesarius

Sine permixtione conjunctam, sine separatione disjunctam; quia Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus deus verus plenus et unus est. . . . Credantur ergo tres personae, sed non tres substantiae; tres proprietates, sed non tres potestates.⁴⁷

The transition from the first to the second step is succinctly stated by St. Caesarius in his sermon on the divinity of the Holy Spirit: "When you say Father, Son and Holy Spirit, you declare the Persons, but when you say God, the substance is signified."⁴⁸ Bound up with this second step in his Trinitarian thought is the Saint's conviction

44. Ser. 3, p. 22.

45. B.A.H. II, p. 199:15.

46. Ser. 3, p. 22.

47. B.A.H. II, p. 186:5-11. FAUSTUS (Pseudo-Eusebius), *De Epiphania Homilia I* (MBP 6, 622D): Credatur a nobis unitas sine confusione conjuncta, Trinitas sine separatione distincta: Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus sanctus, unus Deus credatur. Tres personae, sed non tres substantias. AUGUSTINE, *Ser. 7, 4* (5, 38): Catholica autem fides credit Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum unum Deum, unius substantiae Trinitatem, inseparabiliter, aequaliter, non commixtione confusam, non distinctione separatam.

48. Ser. 213, p. 805:19. FAUSTUS (Pseudo-Eusebius), *De Symbolo Homilia II* (MBP 6, 631C): Cum dixeris Pater, Filius, Spiritus sanctus, personas explicuisti: cum dixeris Deus, substantiam demonstrasti. . . . Dicimus Patrem et Filium, et Spiritum sanctum: ne aestimes unam credere te debere personam. Item dicimus, unum Deum: ne putes esse plures naturas. In the *De Spiritu Sancto* the same passage is found, except that the last part is missing. *De Spiritu Sancto* 2, 6 (CSEL 21, 146): Ac sic communis appellatio unitatem loquitur propria trinitatem. Cum ergo dixeris Pater, Filius, Spiritus sanctus, singulorum personas specialiter explicasti, cum dixeris unus Deus, communem trinitatis substantiam, communem gloriam demonstrasti.

that there is a progressive revelation of the mystery of the Most Blessed Trinity. This is true in spite of what we have already seen concerning the knowledge of this mystery by Abraham, David, Isaias and others. For the explicit Old Testament faith in the Trinity does not exclude a more perfect revelation received from Christ. In his homily on King David, Caesarius certainly implies this: *Venturus erat Christus cum decalogo legis et mysterio trinitatis*.⁴⁹ These words are not intelligible unless we understand them to refer to a more perfect revelation of the moral law and the mystery of the Trinity. Moses had received the Decalogue a long time before on Mount Sinai, and, at least according to Caesarius, belief in the Trinity was also had long before the coming of Christ. Hence St. Caesarius assures us that with the coming of Christ mankind has received a more perfect revelation of the triune God.

The revelation of the Trinity as contained in the Old and New Testament seems to have a certain relation with Caesarius's exposition of the Trinitarian doctrine in three steps. We have seen that in the first of these, the existence of the Trinity, he draws almost exclusively from the Old Testament. Not that he does not show the same when arguing from a text of the New Testament, but there is a difference in his manner of demonstration. Usually when he cites an Old Testament passage, his immediate and direct purpose, though not always his sole purpose, is to show the existence of the Trinity as a revealed fact, whereas when he wants to show how this fact is realized, i.e., through the three Persons in one substance and the conclusions that flow from this fact, he finds only the much clearer texts of the New Testament adequate. When he uses a text of the Old Testament in the second and third steps, he will either understand this text in the light of Christian revelation or, more frequently, a New Testament text will be used to explain or determine the meaning of an Old Testament passage.⁵⁰

In this second step, with its unity of substance and plurality of persons, we touch on the two essential elements of the mystery. Concerning these, three points at once demand our consideration: 1) the unity of substance, 2) the threefold personality, 3) how these

49. Ser. 121, p. 483:11.

50. This relation between the two Testaments and the three steps is seen quite clearly in the citation from the *Libellus de Mysterio Sanctae Trinitatis* on page 17.

two are brought together. Evidently as soon as we speak of three persons in one substance, there is no possibility of an entirely distinct treatment, and yet the ineffability of this mystery, which enters into the intimate divine life, forces us to divide what is undivided and consider only a part of the mystery at a time. Thus the author of the *Quicumque* never dares affirm the unity without at once preserving the triplicity. This same method of assertion and denial, of affirming and qualifying, of emphasizing now the one element then the other, is found in Caesarius's demonstration of this second step.

The divine unity is founded on the one numerical substance. "When you say 'God' you show the substance."⁵¹ A favorite text to show the unity of substance is Isaias 40:12: "Who hath poised with three fingers the bulk of the earth." Caesarius sees in these words a direct reference to the unity of substance, but they also declare the threefold personality and the unity of operation. The Trinitarian content of Isaias's words is confirmed from Luke 11:20 and Matthew 12:28.

Ut agnoscas Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti unam esse substantiam ac deitatem, audi Isaiam prophetam dicentem: "Qui appendit tribus digitis molem terrae." Nam et singulariter invenimus in scripturis digitum sanctum Spiritum nominatum, ut est illud in evangelio ubi ait: "Si ego in digito dei daemonia eicio;" quod alius evangelista declarat, dicens: "Si ego in Spiritu dei eicio daemonia."⁵²

The first Christians, firmly founded in the Old Testament monotheism, were able to keep their Trinitarian faith free of any

51. Ser. 213, p. 805:20.

52. B.A.H. II, p. 195:24; cf. p. 199:4; Ser. 211, p. 802:21. In *Sermon 211* St. Caesarius depends for his explanation of the verse of Isaias on FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 8 (CSEL 21, 114). The above citation however, might also contain a dependence on AMBROSE, *De Spiritu Sancto* 3, 3 (PL 16, 780) where the explanation of the Old Testament text by the identical texts from the Gospels is also found: Unde etiam et digitus Dei appellatus est Spiritus, eo quod sit Patri et Filio et Spiritu sancto individua inseparabilisque communio. (He then cites Exodus 15:6, Luke 11:20 and Matthew 12:28). Quid igitur expressius ad significandum divinitatis vel operationis dici potuit unitatem, quae secundum divinitatem est Patris, vel Filii, vel Spiritus sancti, quam ut intelligamus multo magis quam corpus hoc nostrum aeternae plenitudinem divinitatis scindi videri, si quis unitatem substantiae separet, multiplicet potestates; cum una sit ejusdem divinitatis aeternitas?

infiltration from Roman paganism. In the fifth and sixth centuries the Church is confronted by a new form of paganism. The possibility for the barbarians to understand the Christian doctrine in a polytheistic sense was greater now that the Church had to defend the perfect divinity of all three Persons against the Arians. The author of the *Quicumque* is very much aware of this danger and for that reason, having presented the Catholic faith against the Arians, he at once warns: *Ita tres deos aut dominos dicere Catholica religione prohibemur*.⁵³ It is the selfsame warning that St. Caesarius takes up and repeats time and time again: *Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus et Spiritus Sanctus; sed non tres dii, sed unus Deus*.⁵⁴ A frequent *ad hominem* argument employed by the Archbishop is the accusation of the Arians of having fallen back into paganism in their rejection of the unity of the divine substance. *Et nolite de uno Deo more gentilium plures vobis maiores ac minores formare deos*.⁵⁵ The accusation is well founded, for it is quite true that certain forms of Arianism were nothing else than a Christianized paganism. By their contention that the Son is not a creature and yet less than the Father they were forced into a system of greater and lesser gods.⁵⁶ Even though they held the Father to be the one supreme being, the charge of paganism is justified, for many forms of paganism, in spite of their polytheism, usually recognized one supreme deity.

Just as the divine unity is based on the oneness of substance, so the triplicity arises from the distinction of Persons. *Cum dixeris, Pater, Filius et Spiritus sanctus, personas explicasti*.⁵⁷ Once again

53. Ser. 3, p. 22:8.

54. Ser. 10, p. 51:6.

55. De Trin. II, p. 175:19; Cf. B.A.H. II, p. 192:18; p. 199:23. AUGUSTINE uses the same argument on several occasions. *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 13, 1 (8, 702): *Dicentes (Ariani) unum Dominum Deum, cui soli serviendum est, non est nisi Deum Patrem et tamen etiam Filium Deum et Dominum confitentes; apertissime duos deos et dominos, majorem unum, minorem alterum dicitis.*

56. Ser. 123, p. 490:3: *Nolite Christum minorem facere Patre, nolite unitatem dividere, nolite unum deum diversis gradibus dividendo veluti idola gentium in vestris cordibus fabricare. Totum nobiscum possidete si vultis habere pacem, nolite unitatem scindere.* AUGUSTINE, *Enarr. in Ps.* 130, 11 (4, 1468): *At si Pater deus et Filius deus et Spiritus sanctus deus inaequales sunt et non sunt ejusdem substantiae; non est unus deus, sed tres dii.*

57. Ser. 213, p. 805:19.

if we understand the Old Testament in the light of the more perfect Christian revelation we shall find many references to show the personal distinction. Already in Genesis the threefold repetition of the divine name shows that the creation of man is the work of three Persons.⁵⁸ The verse: *Ne proicias me a facie tua, et spiritum sanctum tuum ne auferas a me* of the Miserere not only refers to the Trinity but also suggests the personal distinction. This can be known, however, only because of the words Our Lord addressed to Philip: *Philippe, qui me videt, videt et Patrem* (Jh. 14:9). The Psalmist addresses himself to the Father. Reference to the Son is found in the words *a facie tua*, since the Second Person is the perfect image of the Father. We know this because Christ Himself says that to see the one is to see the other. Finally it was taken for granted that *spiritum sanctum tuum* was an explicit reference to the Holy Spirit.⁵⁹

Generally, however, Caesarius prefers to defend the substantial unity and personal distinctions by texts of Sacred Scripture which contain both elements in the same text. An evident example of this is the formula of Baptism. The unity of substance is seen in the words *in nomine*, since it is in the singular. To this oneness is joined the distinct mention of each of the three divine Persons, manifesting the personal distinction.⁶⁰ The seraphic triple cry of adoration, *sanc-tus, sanctus, sanctus*, also proclaims both the threefold personality and the unity of substance. The former is seen at once without

58. Ser. 212, p. 800:25: Sic enim habemus in Genesi: "Et dixit Deus: faciamus hominem," et iterum: "Creavit Deus hominem," et tertio: "Benedixit ei Deus" (Gen. 1:26, 27, 28). Dixit deus, fecit deus, benedixit deus: dixit Pater, fecit Filius, benedixit Spiritus sanctus. Propter tres personas ter iteratur una divinitas. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 6 (CSEL 21, 109). Note the nearly identical words in ITHACIUS, *Contra Varimadum* 1, 1 (62, 353): Si Trinitas non est, cur in Geneseos dicitur: Dixit Deus, fecit Deus, benedixit Deus? (Gen. 1). Si unitas non est, quare tertio "Deus" dixit et non deos?

59. Ser. 212, p. 801:7. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 6 (CSEL 21, 109).

60. Ser. 213, p. 805:10: Unde et dominus in evangelio post resurrectionem suam ad discipulos suos ait: "Euntes baptizate omnes gentes in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti" (Mt. 28:19). In nomine, inquit, non in nominibus. Pater itaque deus, Filius deus, Spiritus sanctus deus: non tres dii, sed unus deus est. AUGUSTINE, *Tract. 6 in Joann.* 9 (3, 334): In cujus nomine? In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti. Iste unus Deus, quia non in nominibus Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti: sed in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti. Ubi unum nomen audis, unus est Deus.

further explanation. The latter, if not quite so apparent, is nonetheless certain. The identity of the word *sanctus* in each of its repetitions reveals the unity of substance.⁶¹ The substantial unity is also seen in the words that follow, *Dominus Deus Sabaoth*, inasmuch as they are in the singular.⁶²

The perfection of the Patriarch Abraham's Trinitarian faith is known especially in the fact that he not only manifests a belief in the triune God, but by his actions he even shows in what consists the unity and triplicity. For though the Patriarch had three heavenly visitors "he adored them as one and thereby recognized in the three persons one God."⁶³ Moreover, the direction he gave to his wife, Sara, manifests an even deeper penetration into this mystery: "Make haste, temper together three measures of flour, and make cakes upon the hearth" (Gen. 18:6). "Three measures" signify the three distinct Persons and the identical flour used in all three measures wonderfully symbolizes the divine unity of substance. Caesarius begins his explanation of Abraham's action with a quotation from the *Quicumque*, perhaps to show thereby that the Catholic faith expressed by *words* in the Symbol is just as clearly expressed by *actions* performed by the great Patriarch.

Sicut et Pater deus, et Filius deus, et Spiritus sanctus deus, et hi tres unus deus; nam et singillatim singulae quaequae personae plenus deus, et totae tres simul unus deus. Nam et in illis tribus mensuris similaginis propter unitatem substantiae non incongrue Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus intelligitur.⁶⁴

This superior Trinitarian faith which Caesarius attributes to Abraham can probably be traced back to the words of Our Lord: "Abraham your father rejoiced that he was to see my day. He saw it and was glad" (Jh. 8:56). In these words Caesarius saw a direct reference to Abraham's faith in the Trinity: "He says, 'he saw my day' because he acknowledged the mystery of the Trinity."⁶⁵

61. Ser. 212, p. 802:8.

62. B.A.H. II, p. 199:18.

63. Ser. 83, p. 327:33.

64. Ser. 83, p. 328:28. AMBROSE, *De Cain et Abel* 1, 8, 30 (CSEL 32, 1, 364): Tres ergo mensurae, una similago, hoc est unum erat sacrificium quod venerabili trinitati pari quadam mensura devotionis et congrua plenitudine pietatis oblatum est.

65. Ser. 83, p. 328:26. AMBROSE, *De Cain et Abel* 1, 8, 30 (CSEL 32, 364): Ut scias autem quia et Abraham in Christum credidit: "Abraham," in-

Substantia and *persona* are the two terms of vital significance with which we have been concerned in this second step. There is no evidence that St. Caesarius ever had any terminological problems such as we find in the works of St. Augustine. For the Archbishop of Arles the term which best expresses the unifying element in the Trinity is *substantia*.⁶⁶ The one and identical substance of Father, Son and Holy Spirit is *divinitas*⁶⁷ or *deitas*.⁶⁸ This substance is undivided⁶⁹ so that it is wholly possessed by each of the divine Persons, but in such a way that there are not three substances but only one.⁷⁰ Throughout his Trinitarian works Caesarius manifests the same preference found in the *Quicumque* for the term *substantia*. The only exceptions occur when a different term is used in a particular scriptural text he is citing.⁷¹ The other term, *persona*, also used in the *Quicumque*, accounts for any plurality,⁷² number,⁷³ distinction,⁷⁴ difference or division in God.⁷⁵ Because of all these things we say Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, lest one think that there is only one Person.⁷⁶

The specific doctrinal development of the second step, *Personas tres species dividit, divinitas jungit*,⁷⁷ raised a difficulty that could not be entirely ignored. Pointing to the identical testimony of Moses and St. Paul, Caesarius once more insists on a perfect adherence to the Catholic faith: All three Persons are equally God.⁷⁸ To this truth

quit, "diem meum vidit, et gavisus est" (Jh. 8:56). Et qui credit in Christum credit et in patrem et qui perfecte credit in patrem credit in filium et spiritum sanctum.

66. Ser. 213, p. 805:15; B.A.H. II, p. 195:24. Not once in his Trinitarian writings does St. Caesarius use the word, *consubstantial*. Perhaps he considered the word too technical for his ordinary readers. It is significant to note that the term also does not appear in the *Quicumque*.

67. Ser. 213, p. 805:15.

68. B.A.H. II, p. 185:28.

69. Ser. 212, p. 801:5.

70. Ser. 83, p. 328:30.

71. Ser. 213: p. 804:16 and 805:16 "natura;" *ibid.* p. 803:19 "essentia;" *ibid.* p. 805:14 "species;" *De Trin.* II, p. 172:26 "forma."

72. Ser. 212, p. 801:3.

73. *Ibid.* p. 801:4; Ser. 213, p. 805:23.

74. Ser. 213, p. 803:19; 805:24.

75. *Ibid.* p. 804:15; 805:14.

76. *Ibid.* p. 805:21.

77. Ser. 213, p. 805:14.

78. B.A.H. II, p. 192:15: Audi Paulum cum Mosi concordantem et tu noli a fide catholica discordare.

is joined the insistence of both Old and New Testament writers that the true God is one. In bringing these two truths together, he was brought face to face with the inevitable question: *Quomodo autem tres et unum credamus?* His reply — if it can be called such at all — is not so much an answer to the question as a beeline flight to the crux of the Catholic-Arian controversy: *Unitatem facit aequalitas virtutum, trinitatem proprietas personarum.*⁷⁹ From the question we might hope to get a closer insight into the Archbishop's Trinitarian thought. But again his utterly practical nature is in charge, and he replies with an implicit attack on the central Semi-Arian doctrine: i.e., the inequality of the Father and the Son. In so doing his reply introduces the third step of his Trinitarian thought, the sequels which flow from the unity of substance. The first and most important of these is the perfect equality of Father and Son. It is true that in his reply he also mentions *Trinitatem (facit) proprietas personarum*. We should like him to explain further in what precisely this personal property consists. The question, however, does not enter directly into the Semi-Arian controversy, and so he at once returns to the first part, the equality of Father and Son.

III. Sequels of Consubstantiality

1. Equality

Quicumque

Aequalis gloria . . . qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus sanctus. In hac trinitate . . . nihil maius aut minus. . . . Sed totae tres personae . . . coaequales.⁸²

Caesarius

Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus sanctus.⁸⁰ Maius autem aut minus ignorat trinitas.⁸¹ Multa testimonia . . . aequalitatem Patris et Filii ac Spiritus sancti ostendant.⁸³

The insistence on the perfect equality of the three divine Persons as the first sequel of the unity of substance is not accidental. The

79. B.A.H. II, p. 192:22-24. FAUSTUS, *Ser. 2* (CSEL 21, 228). Despite the seeming order indicated here Caesarius is quite aware — as he frequently states — that the unity of substance is the foundation for the perfect equality. This is also evident from the immediate context. His purpose here is simply to point out that the equality of power expresses and manifests the unity of substance.

80. *Ser. 10*, p. 51:7.

81. *Ser. 213*, p. 805:15.

essential connection between the consubstantiality and equality is the immediate link which unites the second and third steps. What is precisely meant by the equality? St. Fulgentius says that the equality in the Trinity consists in this that not one of the Persons precedes in eternity or excels in greatness or surpasses in power.⁸⁴ The *Quicumque* more simply defines the Trinitarian equality: *Nihil maius aut minus*.⁸⁵ We can see at once how equality in this sense flows immediately and necessarily from consubstantiality. For where there is one substance, there can be no question of more or less.⁸⁶ Where there is unity, there cannot be diversity.⁸⁷ A distinction is possible, but where there is equality there cannot be degrees.⁸⁸ In fine, unity necessarily demands equality among the Persons of the Trinity, for inequality excludes a strict unity.⁸⁹

In all truth, therefore, the whole Catholic position, as defined by the Council of Nice, stands or falls with the acceptance or rejection of the perfect equality of the Father and Son. Hence it is not surprising that against it the Semi-Arians directed their most frequent

82. Ser. 3, p. 22.

83. De Trin. II, p. 179:1.

84. De Fide ad Petrum 1 (PL 65, 674).

85. Ser. 213, p. 805; De Trin. II, p. 173:3; B.A.H. II, p. 183:9; p. 186:2; p. 187:2. AUGUSTINE, Ser. 114, 10 (5, 948): In hac Trinitate non est aliud maius aut minus, nulla operum separatio, nulla dissimilitudo substantiae. The same expression is found in the *Excerpta* of St. Vincent of Lerins: "Nihil enim minus aut maius habere potest." Cf. *Excerpta Vincentii Lirinensis* ed. by J. MADOZ, Madrid, 1940, p. 102.

86. B.A.H. II, p. 185:28: Ubi una est substantia, una deitas, et incorporealis immensitas, nulla est disparilitas vel diversitas aestimanda. Ubi enim unus deus creditur, ibi minor et maior excluditur.

87. De Trin. II, p. 173:3: Ubi enim unus et solus creditur, ibi maior et minor excluditur; ubi unitas est, diversitas esse non potest. AMBROSE, *De Fide* 2, 8, 73 (PL 16, 575): Et revera quomodo maiorem habet, qui divinitate cum Patre unum est (Jh. 10:30)? Quod enim unum est, dissimile non est: inter maiorem autem minoremque discretio est.

88. Ser. 213, p. 805:24: Nam etsi distinctionem recipit trinitas, gradum tamen nescit aequalitas. FAUSTUS (Pseudo-Eusebius) *De Symbolo Homilia II* (MBP 6, 631D); In his tribus personis numerus esse potest, ordo esse non potest. Nam etsi distinctionem recipit Trinitas, gradum tamen nescit aequalitas.

89. B.A.H. II, p. 192:19: Sed credamus scripturae dicenti, tam novi quam veteris testamenti, quia "Deus unus est" (Deut. 6:4); et si unus maior,

and most vehement attacks. The Semi-Arian was quite ready to admit that the Son is similar to the Father, and to that extent He should not be called a creature. His perfections were so great that He could be called God, since He was the most perfect being next to the Father Himself. But absolutely and perfectly equal to the Father — this no Semi-Arian would admit. To do so would make him a Catholic. As in the case of every heresy that preceded or followed, the Arians were able to find certain scriptural texts that seemed to bear out their error — and how the Arians repeated them over and over again! But the Church is equal to the attack. On no point are her writers more insistent than on the absolute equality of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. By a threefold repetition the *Quicumque* leaves no doubt about the Catholic faith on this point.⁹⁰ Caesarius meets the attack in his two Trinitarian works, of which the argument for the equality of Persons makes up by far the greatest portion.

a. Equality from Sacred Scripture

"Innumerable testimonies contained in the divine volumes show clearly the equality of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit."⁹¹ As we saw above in the questions of substantial unity and personal triplicity, so here in his scriptural defense of the perfect equality of Persons, St. Caesarius acknowledges a more perfect Trinitarian revelation in the New Testament. Allegorical interpretations of Old Testament texts depend for their argumentative force on the good will of the reader. Hence no longer allegories but the clear and explicit words of Our

alter minor est, ut Ariani dicunt, unus dici non potest, inaequalitas unitatem excludit. FAUSTUS, *Ser. 2* (CSEL, 21, 228): Confiteamur ergo imprimis unum deum dominum nostrum et non supererit alter, quem minorem dicere possumus. Qui enim unum majorem, alterum minorem loquitur, duos se necesse est deos fateatur habere. FAUSTUS (Pseudo-Eusebius), *Homilia in depositione S. Honorati*. (MBP 6, 684F): Teneamus in primis fidem rectam, credamus Patrem, et Filium et Spiritum sanctum, unum Deum. Ubi unitas, esse non potest inaequalitas.

90. *Ser. 3*, p. 22: Sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti una est divinitas, *aequalis gloria*. . . . Et in hac trinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil *maius aut minus*. . . . Sed totae tres personae coaeternae sibi sunt, et *coaequales*.

91. *De Trin. II*, p. 179:1.

Lord in the New Testament are taken to confound the heretics and show the perfect equality in the Trinity. "I and the Father are one" (Jh. 10:30). Certainly if unity gives equality and inequality diversity, then there must be the most perfect equality between the Father and the Son, for Christ is able to say that He is one with the Father.⁹²

The most conclusive scriptural testimony for the equality is, for Caesarius, found in the response Our Lord made to Philip's request: "Lord, show us the Father" (Jh. 14:8). So clearly does Jesus declare His equality to the Father on this occasion that with a note of desperation Caesarius demands of the heretics: "Tell me, how do you understand that which the Lord says, 'I am in the Father and the Father in Me' and again, 'But the Father dwelling in Me, it is He who does the works?'" (Jh. 14:10).⁹³ How can anyone sincerely consider these words and their significance and still say that the Son is less than the Father? It is impossible for the lesser to contain the greater, and yet Jesus clearly says that He contains the Father. Therefore Christ must be equal to the Father. Another conclusion from the same text is that the Semi-Arians incorrectly say that the Father is incomprehensible whereas the Son is comprehensible. Both are incomprehensible to any creature, but perfectly comprehensible to each other.

Si istis duabus sententiis deliberas credere, nulla argumentatione Filium minorem poteris approbare: non enim solum hoc dixit dominus, quod ipse in Patre maneat, sed addidit, quia et Pater in ipso. Certe vos estis, qui dicitis, quia Pater sit incapabilis, Filius autem capabilis. Si hoc verum est quomodo dicit Filius, quia in ipso maneat? . . . Apertum est quia Filius dicit, "Pater in me manens;" et quia numquam factum est ut minor maiorem capere possit, sublata contentione, dum audis,

92. B.A.H. II, p. 192:24: Audisti quomodo ipse (Filius) intellegendam aequalitatem suam et Patris docuerit: "Ego, inquit, et Pater unum sumus" (Jh. 10:30). Aliud est "unum", aliud "sumus." Nam cum dicit "sumus", personas significat. "Unum sumus," id est, iustitia sumus, eademque sapientia, virtus indivisa, par gloria. AUGUSTINE, *Misc. Agost. Guelferb* 11, 5 (p. 477:14): Ecce quare, "unum"; quare "sumus"? Quia Pater et Filius unus Deus est. FULGENTIUS, *De Trinitate* 1, 4 (65, 500): "Ego, inquit, et Pater unum sumus." "Unum" ad naturam referre nos docet, "sumus," ad personas.

93. De Trin. II, p. 175:1.

“Ego in Patre, et Pater in me est,” agnosce et intellege aequalitatem Patris et Filii.⁹⁴

The reasoning is unassailable and apologists still cite the same text to show the divinity of the Second Person. Yet there remains one objection to be answered. The Arians in interpreting this verse of St. John's Gospel referred it to the will of the Father. According to this interpretation Christ does not say that the Father Himself, but the will of the Father dwells in Him and His will in the Father. Caesarius's reply to this objection attacks the presupposition upon which the objection is based, i.e., that the Father Himself is something distinct from the will of the Father. Also the assertion is gratuitous, for Christ says very clearly that the *Father*, and not the will of the Father, dwells in Him.⁹⁵

Another convincing argument is taken from Philippians 2:6 by contrasting that which was the rightful possession of Christ, i.e., to be equal to the Father, to the sin committed by Satan. For what Christ possessed by nature, that, the rebellious angels tried to get by theft. Now one is not accused of theft unless he takes something which does not belong to him. Since, therefore, Christ already possessed perfect equality to the Father, and that by His very nature, He knew very

94. De Trin. II, p. 175:3: AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 9, 2 (8, 697): Sed quam sapienter ostendisti Filio incapabilem Patrem, Filium vero capabilem Patri. Dixisti enim, Vidit ergo Patrem, sed vidit incapabilem. Pater autem, inquis, sic videt Filium, ut tenens in sinu suo et habens. Sic non sapiunt, nisi qui carnaliter sapiunt. . . . Nam si incapabilis est Pater, Filius vero incapabilis non est, non veraciter dictum est, “Omnia quae habet Pater mea sunt” (Jh. 16:15): quando quidem responderi ei potest, Ecce incapabilitatem habet Pater, quae non est tua. Sed quoniam veraciter dictum est quod veritas dixit, et omnia quae habet Pater, Filii sunt; non potest non esse Filii quantacumque sit incapabilitas Patris.

95. De Trin. II, 175:16: “Ego in Patre, et Pater in me est” (Jh. 14:10). . . . Vos enim de voluntate hoc vultis accipere, quod non ipse Pater sed voluntas Patris in Filio maneat, et Filii voluntas in Patre: quasi aliud sit . . . aliud voluntas Patris. Sed ut ista calliditas locum habere non possit, non dixit Filius, Patris voluntas in me manet: sed ipsum Patrem in se manere testatus est. HILARY, *De Trinitate* 9, 70 (PL 10, 337): Haeretici quia negare non possunt, ita conantur eludere, ut ad voluntatis concordiam referant; ut in Deo Patre et in Deo Filio non divinitatis sit unitas sed voluntatis . . . certe non fuerit in usu eloquii divini, Voluntas Patris mei in me est, et voluntas mea in Patre meo est; sed conveniens huic dicto sit, “Ego in Patre, et Pater in me” (Jh. 14:11).

well that this equality was His not by any usurpation. It is true that the particular force of the argument rests on what is generally regarded as a less likely translation of the Greek,⁹⁶ but the essential validity of the argument from this text, based on Christ's possession of the divine nature, remains firm.

Et Apostolus: "Qui cum in forma dei esset, non rapinam arbitratus est esse aequalis deo" (Phil. 2:6). Quare hoc? quia nemo rapit, nisi quod non habet. Ille ergo qui habebat aequalitatem, non est arbitratus per rapinam; sed quam rebellis angelus assumere voluit per rapinam, Christus possedit per naturam.⁹⁷

An interesting argument of becomingness is taken from I John 3:2. In this passage St. John describes the exalted nature of the future state in which we shall see God as He is. Caesarius draws from these words an a fortiori argument. If all the saints will be like to God, how much must this be true of the Son of God and in a much greater sense. The argument is admittedly one of becomingness, but who would say that it lacks all persuasiveness.⁹⁸

In spite of this conclusive testimony of Sacred Scripture for the perfect equality of Father and Son there is — as the adage goes — no error that cannot be proven from the Bible. Erroneous and biased interpretations of individual verses torn from their context have been employed in the defense of every heresy that ever existed. This was never more true than in the case of the Arians, who would have us believe that the first Arian was Our Lord Himself. Completely ignor-

96. The different interpretations center around the word "rapinam" translating the Greek "arpazmon." The generally accepted reading now is that found in the *Confraternity Edition*: "Who though he was by nature God, did not consider being equal to God a thing to be clung to." Some, however, remaining faithful to the Latin, prefer to read the text: "Although he fully realized his equality with God was no usurpation, yet he put it aside." Cf. *Biblical Association Commentary*, 1942, p. 550.

97. B.A.H. II, p. 187:7. AUGUSTINE, *Ser.* 183. 4, 5 (5, 875): Non rapina, quia natura. Natura erat, rapina non erat. Non rapinam arbitratus est, esse aequalis Deo. Non erat ei rapina, natura erat.

98. De Trin. II, p. 175:22. AUGUSTINE, *Enarr. In Ps.* 49, 2 (4, 444): "Similes ei erimus quoniam videbimus eum sicuti est." Unicus similis nascendo, nos similis videndo. Non enim ita similes ut ille, qui hoc est quod ille a quo genitus est: nos enim similes, non aequalis; ille quia aequalis, ideo similis.

ing the many sayings of Jesus in which He declares His divinity and perfect equality with the Father, these heretics keep repeating the celebrated words of the Savior, "The Father is greater than I" (Jh. 14:28). Such an arbitrary and obstinately prejudiced use of Scripture could not but try the patience even of a Saint: *Tu vero, qui in ipso evangelio et minorem et aequalem frequentius legis, quare unum credis, et aliud credere non adquirescis?*⁹⁹

These apparently Arianistic words of Sacred Scripture offered no special problem to the Catholic apologist writing during the first part of the sixth century. Already the first Fathers to write against Arianism had been able to explain these words satisfactorily in a Catholic sense. Two explanations predominated. The one referred these seemingly subordinationist texts to the generation of the Son from the Father. According to this interpretation the words of Our Lord, "The Father is greater than I," would mean that the Father is greater than the Son inasmuch as the Father engendered the Son. Hence they imply no real superiority of the Father over the Son, but simply that the Son proceeds from the Father. This exegesis was usually preferred by the Greek Fathers, but it is also that of the great occidental Trinitarian theologian, St. Hilary of Poitiers. More often, however, the Latin Fathers, especially after the time of St. Ambrose, preferred to understand that and similar texts in connection with the Incarnation. The Son in His human nature is, indeed, less than the Father, but in His divine nature He is and remains even after the Incarnation perfectly equal to the Father.¹⁰⁰ It is the solution we read in the *Quicumque: Aequalis Patri secundum divinitatem, minor Patre secundum humanitatem*.¹⁰¹ The Archbishop of Arles simply accepts this explanation and makes it, as it were, another principle of his Trinitarian thought similar to the one we have seen: the one God is triune. Manifesting a truly theological mind, Caesarius goes to the ultimate foundation for the Catholic explanation, i.e., the two natures and one Person in Christ. From this doctrine he is able to lay down a rule of hermeneutics for interpreting those texts of Sacred Scripture which say the Son is less than the Father: *Cum nusquam*

99. De Trin. II, p. 174:5. AUGUSTINE, *Ser.* 341, 5, 6 (5, 1316): Accipio quod dicis: sed utrumque accipio, quia utrumque lego. Quare tu unum accipis, et unum non vis? Nam mecum utrumque legisti.

100. Cf. P. LEJAY, *op. cit.* p. 142.

101. *Ser.* 3, p. 23:2.

*omnino deus minor esse legatur, nisi, ut dictum est, propter dispensationem carnis assumtae. . . Secundum hanc ergo regulam duas in Christo crede substantias, deum verum et hominem verum.*¹⁰² Indeed he did not hesitate to carry this doctrine to its logical conclusions. He points out that the Son in His human nature is not only less than the Father, but also less than the angels and His Mother.¹⁰³ Another application of this norm of interpretation divides the operations of Christ into those He performed as God and those He performed as Man, even though all are attributed to the one Person of the Son.

Errare haereticos haec maxime causa facit, dum aut ignorant, aut nolunt advertere, in domino Jesu Christo sicut unam personam, ita duas esse substantias, deum ex deo Patre, et hominem ex homine matre; . . . et ubi audiunt dici "Pater major me est" (Jh. 14:28), secundum humanitatem acciperent: ubi vero audiunt, "Ego et Pater unum sumus" (Jh. 10:30), secundum divinitatem dictum non dubitarent, sicut ex eius operationibus datur intellegi.¹⁰⁴

102. B.A.H. II, p. 189:23; p. 190:2. AUGUSTINE, *De Trinitate* 1, 11, 22 (8, 764): Quapropter cognita ista regula intelligendarum Scripturarum de Filio Dei, ut distinguamus quid in eis sonet secundum formam Dei in qua aequalis est Patri, et quid secundum formam servi quam accepit, in qua minor est Patre.
103. B.A.H. II, p. 189:24: Propter dispensationem carnis assumtae, in qua non solum ab angelis minoratus est, . . . sed et matre sua iunior invenitur, sicut iam diximus. FAUSTUS, *Ser. 2* (CSEL 21, 229): Secundum divinitatem aequalis Patri, secundum humanitatem minor etiam angelis et junior matri, quam creavit.
104. B.A.H. II, p. 182:2; cf. also p. 186:15; 189:20; *De Trin.* II, p. 173:21. This exegesis is found so often in the Fathers in almost the same words that it is practically impossible to be sure of a real dependence in a particular instance. Nevertheless in the above passage we find definite traces of FAUSTUS, *III Epis. 7* (CSEL 21, 203): Audi quomodo sacra eloquia per unam personam explicant utramque substantiam. Justa divinam naturam loquitur: "Ego et Pater unum sumus" (Jh. 10:30), secundum humanam substantiam confitetur: "Quia Pater major me est" (Jh. 14:28), iuxta caelestem naturam pronuntiat: "Omnia, quae Pater habet, mea sunt" (Jh. 16:15), iuxta terrenae naturae infirmitatem dicit: "Filius autem hominis non habet, ubi caput reclinet" (Mt. 8:20). Quasi homo indicabat: "Tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem" (Mt. 26:38), quasi Deus contestabatur: "Potestatem habeo ponendi eam et potestatem habeo iterum sumendi eam" (Jh. 10:18). Secundum carnis naturam in cruce pendebat, secundum divinitatis substantiam paradisum et regnum caeleste donabat. We find very nearly

The Arian denial and the Catholic defense of the perfect equality of the divine Persons centered almost entirely around the Person of the Son. Not, indeed, because the heretics acknowledged the equality of the Third Person. On the contrary, we know that for the Semi-Arian especially, the Holy Spirit was inferior to both the Father and the Son. This follows quite naturally from their more fundamental doctrine that the Holy Spirit properly is and should also be called a creature. He is the illuminating and sanctifying power of Christ and hence strictly the minister of Christ.¹⁰⁵ To find scriptural justification for such a doctrine they were forced to resort to the most absurd distortion of the Sacred Text. Thus, for example, arguing from a figure used by Our Lord, the Semi-Arians tried to show the inferiority of the Holy Spirit from the fact that He is called the finger of God (Mt. 12:28; Lk. 11:20). Evidently it is not an objection which merits a lengthy refutation, and Caesarius simply restates his former explanation of this figure.¹⁰⁶ When Sacred Scripture calls the Holy Spirit the finger of God, it does not imply any diminution of glory for the the Third Person, but rather demonstrates the perfect unity of substance and hence the divinity of this Person.¹⁰⁷ This was the main point of contention concerning the Holy Spirit and for this reason it merits a separate treatment later on.

b. *Equality from Tradition*

The innumerable testimonies of Sacred Scripture to the perfect equality of Father and Son would seem to make any other form of

the same passage in one of FAUSTUS' homilies. Pseudo-Eusebius, *De Ascensio Domini Homilia II* (MBP 6, 648G): Nos ergo noverimus duplicem in Christo geminamque substantiam, de patre coelestem, de matre terrenam, etc. He then cites the same examples. We also see a dependence on another sermon of FAUSTUS (Pseudo-Eusebius), *Exhortatio De Deo Trino et Uno* (MBP 6, 668E): In primis intellectus noster hunc etiam fidei gradum teneat, ut redemptorem nostrum ex Deo et ex homine unum Christum verum Deum, et verum hominem noverimus. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonitorium* 1, 13 (50, 656): Ita igitur in uno eodemque Christo duae substantiae sunt; sed una divina, altera humana; una ex Patre Deo, altera ex matre Virgine; una coaeterna et aequalis Patri, altera ex tempore et minor Patri. Cf. also his *Excerpta*, op. cit. p. 102.

105. Cf. Wulfila's Profession of Faith, page 5, footnote 18.

106. Cf. p. 30.

107. Ser. 212, p. 802:10. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 8 (CSEL 21, 113).

proof superfluous. St. Caesarius thinks it is almost an irreverence toward the inspired books to confirm their infallible authority from other sources. Hence the apology with which he introduces the argument from tradition. "If it does not seem incongruous to you these things can be demonstrated to these men of the other religion (Arians) by what things are written below."¹⁰⁸ Yet much could be gained for the Catholic cause by looking at tradition. There was no better way to refute the Arian charge that Catholics had lost the true faith and that they alone preserved the original purity of belief.

This boastful claim of the heretics is seen to be false as soon as one investigates the faith of the first Christians as they had received it from the Apostles. Caesarius maintains that we are able to arrive at this faith in the constant teaching of those churches founded by the Apostles and their immediate successors. These churches, according to our Saint, have never been occupied by heretics. Faithful to His promise, Christ has never permitted these churches to waver from the orthodox Catholic faith.¹⁰⁹ Hence the importance of these churches, which we might call Apostolic churches. Caesarius enumerates them in this order: Jerusalem, Ephesus, Alexandria, Smyrna, all the churches founded by St. Paul, Rome, and the four Gallican churches of Arles, Narbonne, Toulouse, and Vasenne.¹¹⁰ Hence the simple test of orthodoxy is whether one's faith conforms to that of these churches. What brought this argument very close to home was the fact that Arles, over which Caesarius himself presided, was one of the Apostolic churches.

108. De Trin. II, p. 179:7.

109. De Trin. II, p. 179:33: Per istos enim quattuor apostolorum discipulos in universa Gallia ita sunt ecclesiae constitutae, ut eas per tot annorum spatia numquam permiserit Christus ab adversariis occupari, implens promissionem suam, qua dixerat: "Super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, et portae inferi," id est, hereticorum sectae, "non praevallebunt adversus eam" (Mt. 16:18). It was not a far step for Caesarius to take what Augustine said of the Church in general and apply it to what he calls the Apostolic churches. AUGUSTINE, *Misc. Agost. Mai.* 12, 3 (p. 287:9): Sed quia ab illis omnibus haeresibus et schismatibus, id est filiis superbiae non vincitur ecclesia catholica, ideo praedictum est: "Et portae inferorum non vincent eam" (Mt. 16:18).

110. Ibid. p. 179:20. ST. FULGENTIUS, *De Trinitate* 1 (65, 497): Illam itaque fidem crede sincerissimae menti tuae nos velle notescere, per quam justificati sunt patriarchae, prophetae, apostoli, martyres coronati, quam hactenus per totum orbem sancta tenet Ecclesia, cujus splendor credentium mentes illustrans aeternae vitae facit esse participes. Quae usque

Such argumentation must have had a very great apologetical value for the Catholics of Arles at a time when all in Arles accepted the Apostolic origin of their church. In a more critically minded age such as our own Caesarius's argument from tradition offers data of special historical interest. From this aspect Morin thinks that the argument is one of the most interesting passages of the entire opusculum.¹¹¹ This is especially the case since it touches on the question of the antiquity of the churches of France, a subject of considerable interest to historians and critics of recent decades. Testimony such as we have here in Caesarius's argument divides historical critics into two general schools of thought. There are those, often called traditionalists, who see in these statements the expression of an ancient tradition with true historical value. They therefore conclude that the year 251, the date Gregory of Tours gives for the origin of the Gallican church, is much too late.¹¹² Others, and in recent times by far the majority, reject such testimony as found in this opusculum as being without historical value. They do not credit such testimonies with the authority of tradition, but consider them the expression of legends which sprang up during the third and fourth centuries. In general these men place the origin of Gallican Catholicism around the time mentioned by Gregory of Tours.¹¹³ We are concerned with these discussions only to the extent that they will help us to form a judgment on the historicity of the data which Caesarius offers in his argument from prescription.

If we accept his definition of an "Apostolic church" as one founded by the Apostles or their immediate successors, we are ready to concede this honor to the first churches he lists. The case is not so clear, however, in regard to the four churches of Gaul and it is only in regard to this part of his testimony that we need concern ourselves.

nunc per successionem seriem in cathedra Petri apostoli Romae vel Antiochiae, in cathedra Marci evangelistae in Alexandria, in cathedra Joannis evangelistae Ephesi, in cathedra Jacobi Hierosolymae, ab episcopis ipsarum urbium praedicatur. Cf. P. LEJAY, op. cit. p. 145-146; G. MORIN, *Le "Breviarium Fidei" contre les Ariens*. RHE 35 (1939) 49-50.

111. G. MORIN, *Mélanges de Cabrières*. Paris 1899, p. 102.

112. C. FELLET, *Les origines des Églises de France et les fastes épiscopaux*. Paris 1898; A. THIERRY, *Origines chrétiennes de la Gaule et réfutation*. Paris 1867, 738, 749-752.

113. Duchesne, Guerard, Malmory, Lejay and Morin. All admit, however, the earlier origin of the church of Lyons.

First mentioned in this group is the church of Arles, which is Apostolic because its founder, St. Trophimus, is believed to have been a disciple of the Apostles. Duchesne, who rejects the historicity of this account, brands the apostolicity of the church of Arles as a legend which owed its origin to a letter sent to Pope Leo the Great in 449 by the bishops of the province of Arles.¹¹⁴ In this letter it is explicitly stated that Arles is the first see in Gaul, and that its first bishop was St. Trophimus, who was sent by the Apostle St. Peter himself. This opinion of Duchesne, however, is strongly contested by Bellet for the following reason. In their letter the bishops clearly affirm the Apostolic origin of the church of Arles to be a fact accepted throughout Gaul and even in Rome itself. It does not seem likely, however, that the authors of this letter would dare write in this way if they themselves were the originators of the idea.¹¹⁵ Moreover we have evidence of this tradition or legend a few decades earlier in Pope Zosimus's bull *Placuit Apostolicae* written in 417. In this bull the Pope, complying with the plea of Bishop Patroclus of Arles, raises the petitioner's see to the rank of metropolitan. In the same document Zosimus mentions the reasons — probably supplied by Patroclus — for this action. The first and most important of these is the great antiquity of the see, which has St. Trophimus as its first bishop. The inference is that the first bishop of Arles is to be identified with the Trophimus of Ephesus and fellow-worker of St. Paul.¹¹⁶

At first reading these early witnesses of a tradition seem to have historical value. One is likely to be impressed by the assurance with which the bishops affirm in their letter what seems to have been already admitted by Pope Zosimus a few decades previously. In judging the historical character of these claims, however, we are not only to attend to the wording of the claims in themselves but replace them into their historical setting and the circumstances surrounding them. In reality they constitute a "plea *pro domo*" and are destined to sustain the privileges of metropolitan and primate for the bishop of Arles against the bishops of Vienne.¹¹⁷ The period offers other ex-

114. L. DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*. Paris 1894, 1, 58.

115. C. BELLET, op. cit. p. 160.

116. Cf. T. SCOTT HOLMES, *The Christian Church in Gaul*. London 1911, 66.

117. L. GUERARD, *Une récente étude sur les origines des Églises de France*. RCF 18 (1899) 431.

amples of such interested falsification. Moreover in general it was a time which lacked a true historical sense.

Positive and more conclusive evidence that the account lacks the qualifications of history is found in the several certainly anachronous statements easily pointed out. The first of these concerns the slightly different tradition found in the Caesarian account from that contained in the letter of the bishops of Arles to Pope Leo and seemingly supposed by Bishop Patroclus. Whereas these latter claimed for St. Trophimus the title of "father of all the churches of Gaul," Caesarius is more modest in determining the role of his supposed Apostolic predecessor. For him St. Trophimus is not "the father of all the churches of Gaul" but one of the four co-founders and at most a *primus inter pares*. If, therefore, St. Trophimus is a personage of the New Testament¹¹⁸ for some time associated with St. Paul and then sent by St. Peter to missionize Gaul, then evidently the other three co-founders mentioned by St. Caesarius must have been contemporaries of the founder of the church of Arles.¹¹⁹ The first two of these, however, Paul of Narbonne and Saturninus of Toulouse, are for the most part unknown, but most probably belong to the third century. The third, Daphnus of Vienne, on the other hand, is perfectly recognized as the bishop of that city who came to the Council of Arles in 314 and signed the acts of that Council. Manifestly the fourth-century bishop did not receive his mandate from one of the Apostles. An apparent incoherence such as this must needs raise a doubt concerning the historicity of the entire account. No less untenable historically is the assertion made by St. Caesarius that these churches, which he calls "Apostolic," were never presided over by heretics. What are we to say of his own heretical predecessors in the see of Arles, such as Marcianus and Saturninus?¹²⁰ Whatever else might be concluded from these two examples, this much seems certain: we are not to look for historical exactitude in the writings of a sixth-century prelate. Certainly we can see from this that Caesarius, as many of his contemporaries, possessed a minimum of historical per-

118. Acts 20:4; 20:29; II Tim. 4:20.

119. A. D'ALÈS has briefly outlined the historical background of this argument and pointed out the anachronisms here referred to. Cf. D'ALÈS, *Les "Sermones" de saint Césaire d'Arles*. RSR 28 (1938) 329-332.

120. L. Guérard was led to question the Caesarian authorship of the *Libellus de Mysterio Sanctae Trinitatis* simply because of these manifest inaccuracies. Cf. L. GUÉRARD, op. cit. p. 432.

spicacity. He seems simply to have reproduced the current rumors, many of which lacked any real foundation in tradition and were often contradictory.¹²¹

In a final appraisal of Caesarius's argument from prescription it must at least be admitted that the historicity of the facts it affirms is brought into question. The majority of present-day historical critics prefer to reject the historical character entirely. There are perhaps good reasons, however, for the less hostile stand of Dom Morin. That St. Trophimus founded the church of Arles and that he received his mission from Rome has in its favor a truly ancient tradition that should not be completely ignored. But that this Trophimus was also an immediate disciple of St. Peter, though not impossible, is very improbable, and there is certainly not sufficient authority of the proper kind to affirm it as a fact.¹²²

c. *Equality shown from Reason*

Arianism has been called, not without good reason, a form of rationalism. Fundamentally the Arian broke from the orthodox Trinitarian faith because of an unwarranted rationalization of revealed truth.¹²³ St. Caesarius was not unaware of this abuse of our intellect

121. Cf. G. MORIN, op. cit. p. 124 and also *Le traité de S. Césaire d'Arles*. RB 46 (1934) 205: Que conclure de telles étrangetés? Selon Guérard, que l'évêque d'Arles ne saurait être l'auteur de notre traité; d'après Lejay, que l'excellent Césaire, évidemment, mettait dans ses souvenirs plus de piété que de critique. La première conclusion est celle d'un lecteur choqué de ne pas trouver dans un prélat du 6^e siècle le minimum d'exactitude et de connaissances historiques qu'on exigerait actuellement à l'examen d'un candidat quelconque; l'autre est d'un critique exercé, qui sait apprécier les différences des temps et des lieux, et qui en a vu plus d'une du même genre. Je suis d'avis qu'il est permis de s'en tenir à la seconde.

122. G. MORIN, *Mélanges de Cabrières*, p. 123.

123. St. Ambrose, with some of whose works Caesarius was certainly familiar, leaves no doubt concerning what he considered the root of all heresies, and especially of Arianism. AMBROSE, *Expositio in Psalmum* 118, Ser. 22, 10 (PL 15, 1514): Elaborandum est igitur ut in hoc saeculo stulti simus, nihil nobis cum philosophia; ne quis fidem nostram per elementa mundi hujus traducat a vero; ne quis assertionem nostram per philosophiam depraedetur. Sic enim Arianos in perfidiam ruisse cognovimus, dum Christi generationem putant usu hujus saeculi colligendam. Reliquerunt Apostolum, sequuntur Aristotelem. Reliquerunt sapientiam

and he opposed it at every turn with an insistence on a firm and humble faith. We saw that it was the heretic's insidious rationalizing which compelled the Archbishop to take up his pen to protect the faith of his flock.¹²⁴ In his defense of the Catholic faith St. Caesarius shunned equally extreme subtleties in explaining the Scriptures and difficult speculations into the divine mysteries. We have seen that his intellectualism was of a very practical nature. Nowhere is this so clearly evident as when he defends the personal equality of the divine Trinity. To be sure, Scripture and tradition offered a sufficient refutation of the Arian heresy, but in his zeal for the Catholic faith he would ignore no means in its defense and for this reason, in spite of the abuse of the Arians, an important place is given to the simpler confirmatory arguments drawn from reason that he found in the Fathers. It is not likely that a student of modern dogma textbooks would recognize the *argumentum ex ratione* as formulated by St. Caesarius. With a mastery and natural freshness not uncommon among the early Fathers he defends the perfect equality of the Father and Son not so much to refute the heretics as to give the simple and uneducated Catholics a better knowledge of their faith, in order that they might be better able to reply to the subtle and contriving questions of their Arian neighbors.¹²⁵

A favorite type of argumentation with the Saint was the *ad absurdum*. By starting with an admission of the Arians' doctrine he could lead them into logical absurdities. Thus Arianism acknowledged the Son to be God and yet He is less than the Father. Caesarius replies, however, that if He is really God, then nothing can be added to Him nor taken away. But if He is less than the Father, then something can be added to Him. Therefore either He is God and then equal to the Father, or He is less than the Father and then He is not God.¹²⁶ Starting again with the admission of the divinity of the

quae apud Deum est: elegerunt disputationis tendiculas. *De Fide* 1, 13, 85 (PL 16, 548): Nonne ex philosophia omnem impietatis suae traxerunt (Ariani) calorem?

124. Cf. *De Trin.* II, p. 165.

125. *Ibid.* p. 165:1.

126. *Ibid.* p. 173-7. Sed dices: Filius deus quidem est, sed minor Patri. Si deus est, minor non est; si minor est, deus non est: ipse est enim verus deus, cui nec addi aliquid nec minui potest. Filius enim si minor est, quia habet ubi crescat, deus non est; ac sic non erit verum quod scriptum est "Deus ex quo omnia" (I Cor. 8:6). On his use of this text of I Cor. in another context, cf. footnote 232, page 82.

Son, he accuses the Arians of not knowing what the divinity is. God must be absolutely perfect. However, more or less can be had only where there is imperfection. It follows that to say that the Son is less than the Father is tantamount to saying the divinity is imperfect, which is an absurdity of the first order.¹²⁷ In another place we find argumentation along similar lines. The Arians contended that in subordinating the Son to the Father they were really thereby extolling the Father and giving Him greater honor. Caesarius, not content to point out the irrationality of this reasoning, turns the point of the argument right back on the heretics. Indeed Scripture does at times — but by no means always — affirm the inferiority of the Son in His human nature. However, even if Scripture were always to speak of the Father as greater and never of the Son as equal, this would not redound to the glory of the Father. For in so doing Scripture would seem to imply that the Father had generated His only Son less than Himself and of a different nature.¹²⁸

An argument to show the equality of the Holy Spirit is rare, as it was not an immediate point of contention. Such an argument is found, however, in the sermon on the divinity of the Third Person and is based on an analogy set up between the human soul and the Holy Spirit. If the spirit which is in man is the greater part of man, how should it be believed that the Spirit of God is less than the Father and the Son?¹²⁹ Evidently an argument *de convenientia*, it was not meant to be taken too seriously. However, since there seems insufficient reason for the analogy in this regard, the choice is unfor-

127. Ser. 213, p. 805:15-25.

128. De Trin. II, p. 174:20: Et qui hominibus legitimos filios habere dedit, in suo hoc sibi Unigenito denegavit? Noli, rogo te, per iniuriam Filii Patrem velle honorare. Cum enim etiam apud homines patri probetur iniuriam facere, qui de nativitate filii sui voluerit derogare; et non sine grandi dolore audit pater, si filius eius minor, quam pater suus, aut sapiens aut prudens esse dicatur, quanto magis deo Patri cognoscitur iniuriam facere, qui unicum Filium eius minorem quam ipse est voluerit iudicare vel credere? AUGUSTINE, *Tract. 19 in Joan.* 6 (3, 439): Ego, inquis, maiorem honorem volo dare Patri, minorem Filio. Ibi tollis honorem Patri, ubi minorem das Filio. . . . Quia ita sentiendo ubi maiorem honorem vis dare Patri, ibi es contumeliosus in Patrem. Ser. 139, 4, 5 (5, 679): Certe enim ideo dicis non esse ejusdem substantiae Filium, ne injuriam facias Patri ipsius. Ego tibi cito ostendo, quia injuriam facis ambobus.

129. Ser. 213, p. 805:4.

fortunate and certainly more misleading than helpful.

We now come to the most important non-scriptural argument for the equality of Father and Son found in Caesarius. There is no doubt that he so considered it. It comes first in his tract on the Trinity and he emphasizes its importance when he asks the faithful to consider it carefully, for no Arian has ever been able to answer it. The argument is found in two places: it is developed at length in the *De Mysterio Sanctae Trinitatis*,¹³⁰ and is found in abridged form in the sermon *De Iudicio Salomonis*, from which we quote.

Dum enim Filio subtrahit aequalitatem, et bonum omnipotentemque denegavit Patrem. Deus enim Pater, si potuit Filium sibi similem gignere, et noluit, non est bonus; si voluit, et non potuit, non est omnipotens.¹³¹

The line of argumentation is not at all difficult to follow. He shows that the Arian denial of the equality of the Son will lead to a denial of the goodness or of the omnipotence of the Father. Caesarius confirms the main argument by a corollary in which he compares the divine and human generations. God the Father in His ineffable bounty has given to men such goodness that they will to and can generate sons who are equal and sometimes even greater than their fathers. Are we then to suppose less in God, that He should refuse to generate a Son equal to Himself? In so doing the Arians not only deny the goodness of the Father but blasphemously accuse Him of jealousy.¹³²

The importance St. Caesarius attaches to this argument is certainly reason for us to consider more carefully the nature and implications of this type of reasoning. It will, moreover, offer us some insight into the Saint's mind concerning the relation of the Trinitarian dogma to reason. Two questions arise concerning this argument: 1) Does it attempt to prove too much? 2) What probative force does

130. *De Trin.* II, p. 167:5-23.

131. *Ser.* 123, p. 490:9. AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 7 (8, 695): Ubi est, quod eum invidum non esse dixisti? An forte dare non potuit? Ubi est omnipotentia Dei Patris? Prorsus ad hunc articulum res colligitur, ut Deus Pater aequalem sibi gignere Filium aut non potuerit, aut noluerit. Si non potuit, infirmus: si noluit invidus invenitur. Sed utrumque hoc falsum est. Patri igitur Deo Filius verus aequalis est. Cf. also *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 15, 5; 2, 23, 6; *Ser.* 341, 6, 8; *Epis.* 238, 4, 25; *De Div. Quaest.* 83, Q. 50.

132. *De Trin.* II, p. 167:15-19.

it have? An answer to these two questions is necessary for a true appreciation of the Archbishop's thought in proposing this argument. For this reason a brief digression into the later acceptance of this argument seems justified in order that from a comparison of different points of view we may come closer to the true nature of the argument as found in St. Caesarius.

From the Vatican Council's definition on the existence of true mysteries,¹³³ theologians rightly argue that the mystery of the Blessed Trinity could never have been discovered by unaided reason and that it cannot be comprehended by reason after it is revealed.¹³⁴ Does this not seem to be the very purpose of the argument we are considering? St. Thomas points out the error of those who "to prove the Trinity have brought forward an argument based on the infinite goodness of God, which communicates itself infinitely in the procession of the three divine Persons."¹³⁵ The allusion probably refers to Alexander of Hales, who cites this argument from Augustine in demonstrating the thesis: *An generatio sit*. He adds a second argument based on the Dionysian principle: *Bonum est diffusivum sui*.¹³⁶

Without attempting to pass judgment on the use of the argument by Alexander of Hales, we are certain that the argument cannot be used as a true demonstration of the existence of the Trinity. The fundamental reason is that the argument as found in Caesarius is ultimately based on the principle, *bonum est diffusivum sui*. The principle, though a sound metaphysical principle founded on the nature of goodness, is nonetheless a philosophical principle that has been arrived at from investigation of the nature of the good as found in creatures. Since it is not permissible to make a univocal application of such a principle to the infinite being, all that can be said is that it must in some analogical way be realized in God too. This is as far as philosophy can go; it can say no more. It could never arrive at a notion of the Trinity. That the principle, *bonum est diffusivum sui*, is realized in God through the generation and procession of distinct Persons cannot be known by the human intellect except through revelation.

133. D.B. 1816.

134. A. TANQUEREY, *Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae*. Paris 1935, II, 417.

135. Sum. Theol. I, 32, 1, obj. 2.

136. ALEXANDER OF HALES, *Summa* I, no. 295.

From this we are not to conclude that this sort of reasoning can be of no value in regard to the existence of the Trinity. St. Bonaventure uses the same line of argumentation, but he at once warns us that we are not to suppose that we can understand the incomprehensible, and his reason is precisely the one given above. To the philosophical *summa communicabilitas* of the *Summum Bonum* there is added in the mystery of the Trinity, the property of Persons, a plurality of distinct hypostases.¹³⁷ In other words he argues that, positing the revelation of the Trinity, one can give an argument of becomingness from the principle *bonum est diffusivum sui*. Such argumentation fits in perfectly with St. Thomas's reply to the objection we have cited above: "Arguments may be said to manifest the Trinity; that is to say, given the doctrine of the Trinity, we find arguments in harmony with it."¹³⁸ We have seen the wrong and right use of the argument by later writers: now we ask how the argument is used or not used by St. Caesarius.

Not a rational demonstration of the Trinity: Not a few students of St. Augustine's doctrine on the Trinity have thought that Platonic influence at times led him too far in his Trinitarian speculations, so that he did not preserve the strictly mysterious character of the Trinity. That this criticism is not altogether unjust in regard to his earlier works may be conceded. To what extent the Bishop of Hippo was able to break away from this Platonic influence in his later Trinitarian writings, especially in the *De Trinitate*, has been the subject of much discussion.¹³⁹ This is not the place, however, to discuss this question further. In the first place, this criticism of Augustine is based primarily on his psychological explanations of the Trinity and not on the type of reasoning we are here considering. Secondly, whatever is to be said of St. Augustine in this regard, it is certain that no charge of rationalizing the doctrine of the Trinity can have the slightest appearance of truth in the case of Caesarius. The absolute ineffability of this mystery,

137. ST. BONAVENTURE, *Itin. Mentis in Deum*, (ed. by A. Peltier, Paris 1868) 6, 12, 18: Propter summam boni communicabilitatem necesse est trinitatem Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. . . . Sed cum haec contemplaris, vide, ne te existimes comprehendere incomprehensibilem. . . . Nam ibi est summa communicabilitas cum personarum proprietate, summa consubstantialitas cum hypostaseon pluralitate.

138. Sum. Theol. I, 32, 1 ad 2^{um}.

139. M. SCHMAUS, op. cit. 187-189.

which we know only through faith,¹⁴⁰ keeps constantly recurring in his discussion of the Trinity. Analogies are found in nature, but they never offer a true likeness.¹⁴¹ The most frequent reply to the Arians is simply "believe the Scriptures"¹⁴² or "hold the entire faith"¹⁴³ and do not inquire into what God has not revealed in regard to the Trinity, but hold firmly to what He has revealed.¹⁴⁴ There can be no question of his viewing this argument as having the force of demonstration of the existence of the Trinity.

Not an argument of becomingness for the existence of the Trinity: In neither passage in which Caesarius uses this argument is there question of the existence of the Trinity. We have seen that this is the object of the first step in Caesarius's general Trinitarian argumentation and is a fact already sufficiently proved from the Old Testament. The point had never been denied by the Arians and is therefore presupposed by Caesarius when he asked the heretics, "Whether the Father is good and omnipotent" in generating the Son. The whole point of this argument for Caesarius is, not the existence of the Trinity, but the perfect equality of the Second Person to the First Person. Hence it is of primary importance to note that later writers, in taking this argument from Augustine and using it in the thesis on the existence of the Trinity, are not using it in the same way as Caesarius does.¹⁴⁵ This alters our original position and the question is now: What probative force has the argument in showing the equality of the divine persons when we posit the internal processions and the resulting distinct Persons?

A true theological argument for the perfect equality of Son. The unfamiliar and unscholastic statement of an argument of the Fathers may often conceal from us the meaning of their most profound speculations until we have translated their reasoning into terms with which we are more familiar. The danger of this, however, is evident,

140. Ser. 115, p. 457:7.

141. De Trin. II, p. 177:35.

142. B.A.H. II, p. 192:19.

143. Ibid. p. 193:1.

144. Ser. 9, p. 48:26; Ser. 213, p. 804:1, p. 804:10.

145. Though we are here concerned only with Caesarius's use of this argument, yet since he uses it in the same way as Augustine from whom he takes it, what has been said here seems to be true also of Augustine's use of it.

for it is not easy to change the terminology without imposing a new content that was never intended by the Father of the Church when he wrote. With this in mind let us examine the different parts of the dilemma contained in this argument.

"If the Father could generate a Son similar to Himself and did not want to, He is not good."¹⁴⁶ This horn of the dilemma implicitly contains and presupposes the principle *bonum est diffusivum sui*.¹⁴⁷ Only in the light of this principle can the statement have any value whatsoever. For only because the good is diffusive, and the highest good diffusive in the most perfect way, can it be said that the generated Son must be equal to the Father or the Father is not good. The Father is indeed good in creating, and as St. Thomas points out: "If God communicates Himself by His infinite goodness, it is not necessary that an infinite effect should proceed from God; but that, according to its mode and capacity, the effect should receive the divine goodness."¹⁴⁸ In this way again the Angelic Doctor shows that the trinity of Persons cannot be demonstrated by reason. This does not, however, touch the matter at issue here: i.e., an internal divine procession known only from revelation in which the *Summum Bonum* diffuses itself within the divine nature. Positing such a procession, the philosophical principle is applicable and offers a true demonstration

146. It should be noted here that Petavius (II, 6, c. 8, n. 9) thought that the words *voluit* and *non voluit* used in this argument implied that the generation was considered free. For this reason he says that in arguments of this kind the Fathers are giving not their own thought but that of their opponents in order to refute them. As Schmaus points out, however, (op. cit. p. 120) this intention of the Fathers is not at all evident, and in the case of Caesarius the contrary is all too clear. Moreover there seems to be no reason to understand *voluit* as necessarily implying a free generation, as Petavius does. There is no question that both Augustine and Caesarius believed the generation a necessary procession, which, for them, distinguished it from the external free processions. Hence the term *voluit* in this argument only implies that the Father voluntarily yet necessarily wills the generation.

147. This is also confirmed from the context in which the argument is found in Augustine. He is treating the goodness of God in connection with the verse of Mark 10:18 and Luke 18:19: Denique ista duo de quibus agimus, hoc est, deitas et bonitas, quoniam dictum est, "Nemo bonus nisi Deus," in hac tua opinione deficiunt. Tantum enim quantus est ipse, et talem qualis est ipse, si non potuit gignere, quomodo Deus est? Si noluit, quomodo bonus est? (*Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 23, 6.)

148. Sum. Theol. I, 32, 1 ad 2^{um}.

of the perfect equality existing between the Father and the Son.

"If the Father wanted to generate a Son equal to Himself and could not, He is not omnipotent." The generation of a second divine Person equal to the first does not contain a contradiction and hence certainly falls within the scope of the divine omnipotence. St. Thomas implies as much in his reply to an objection which cites this part of the argument in confirming the proposition that it belongs to the Father's omnipotence to be able to beget a Son equal to Himself.¹⁴⁹ Hence there seems no reason to question the validity of this manner of argumentation. It contains all the elements required for a strict theological proof. Not without reason, therefore, does the Archbishop of Arles attach such importance to this argument. The reason no Arian had been able to answer the argument is simply that they were confronted with a valid and sound theological proof for the perfect equality of the Father and Son.

From Scripture, tradition and reason St. Caesarius has refuted Semi-Arianism in its fundamental tenet, namely the subordination of the Son to the Father. Near the end of his treatise on the Trinity the Saint expresses full confidence that his purpose, the defense of the Church's doctrine on the perfect equality of Father and Son, has been attained. "These few things are so valid and possess such strength that he who says the Son is less, has nothing he can truthfully reply, when he is questioned thereon."¹⁵⁰ The Semi-Arians have been forced to take refuge in silence, with the result that the faithful of Arles were no longer in such great danger of falling victim to the subtle contrivances of the heretics.

149. Sum. Theol. I, 42, 6, obj. 3.

150. De Trin. II, p. 165:12. Having considered the true nature of this argument, it does not seem to me — as it did to Schmaus (op. cit. p. 120) — that it in any way derogates from the advanced Trinitarian thought of St. Augustine. What probative force the Bishop of Hippo saw in the argument can be deduced from the number of times he returns to it — at least five different occasions.

151. De Trin. II, p. 177:34. AUGUSTINE, *De Civ. Dei* 11, 24 (7, 290): Credimus et tenemus fideliter praedicamus quod Pater genuerit Verbum, hoc est Sapientiam, per quam facta sunt omnia, unigenitum Filium, unus unum, aeternus coaeternum, summe bonus aequaliter bonum; et quod Spiritus sanctus simul et Pater et Filius sit Spiritus, et ipse consubstantialis et coaeternus ambobus.

2. The Coeternity

Quicumque

Aeternus Pater, aeternus Filius, aeternus Spiritus sanctus

In hac trinitate nihil prius aut posterius

Sed totae tres personae coaeternae sibi sunt

Non tres aeterni sed unus aeternus Coaeterna majestas.¹⁵⁵

Caesarius

Non solum Filius sed etiam Spiritus sanctus semper cum Patre maneant¹⁵¹

Quia unus nec posteriorem recipit nec priorem¹⁵²

De unitate vel sempiternitate Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti.¹⁵³

Una sine principio sempiternitas¹⁵⁴ . . . ad coaeternitatem pertinet majestatis.¹⁵⁶

The Archbishop of Arles never failed to point out to the heretics their opposition to the inspired writings whenever he could find an apt text of Sacred Scripture with which to sustain the Catholic teaching and refute the objections of the Arians. In view of this we are surprised to find an almost total absence of scriptural citations when he comes to show the coeternity of Father and Son. The presumption is that St. Caesarius was not able to find many texts of Scripture which clearly predicated this attribute of the Second Person of the Trinity. He saw the pre-existence of the Son before His temporal birth in I John 5:20: "He is the true God and eternal life." But he refers to the coeternity only incidentally, being primarily concerned in this passage with the omnipresence.¹⁵⁷ Even the *In principio* of St. John does

152. B.A.H. II, p. 186:8. FULGENTIUS, *De Incarn. Filii Dei* 1, 3 (PL 65, 575): Ipsa Trinitas unus est Deus: ubi major minorque non dicitur, quia nec prior alius alio, nec posterior invenitur.

153. De Trin. II, p. 178:18.

154. B.A.H. II, p. 186:12.

155. Ser. 3, p. 22.

156. Ser. 212, p. 801:20. FAUSTUS, Ser. 2 (CSEL 21, 229): Quare unum deum? Quia una operatio virtutis, eadem concordia voluntatis, una divinitas, una sempiternitas, una majestas.

157. De Trin. II, p. 168:7: Iterum quaero a te, qui non adquiescis ut Filius Patri aequalis esse credatur, ut mihi respondeas, utrum ipse dei Filius, ante quam nasceretur de Maria virgine, erat aut non erat. Sine dubio respondere aliud non potes, nisi quia erat. Sed iterum te interrogo: Deus erat, an non? Et hic non potes aliud dicere, nisi quia Deus erat, dicente Johanne evangelista: "Ipsa est verus Deus, et vita aeterna" (I Jh. 5:20). AUGUSTINE, Ser. 225, l. 1 (5, 970): Putamus enim, Fratres mei, antequam Christus de Maria virgine nasceretur, erat, an non erat? Putate nos quaerere, unde non licet dubitare.

not seem to have any further signification for St. Caesarius than a reference to the time of creation, i.e., the beginning of the universe.

This lack of scriptural evidence did not, however, make the Son's possession of this attribute any less certain. The proof is essentially connected with the unity of substance. Sempiternity is an attribute of the divine substance which accounts for the relation Caesarius supposes between the unity and sempiternity of the Trinity: *Quid de unitate vel sempiternitate Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti credere possis, agnosces.*¹⁵⁸ How closely this notion corresponds to the thought of the author of the *Quicumque* is apparent from the following words of the Symbol: *Et tamen non tres aeterni, sed unus aeternus.*¹⁵⁹ The best defense, therefore, of the Church's teaching on the eternity of the Son is an insistence on the unity of substance. The Son through His perfect possession of the divine substance together with the Father must on that account be coeternal with the Father.¹⁶⁰

The main objection of the Arians to the coeternity of the Second Person was not a difficult one to propose. They argued from the notion of a son: "How can the Son, whom we believe to be generated by the Father, have a beginning with the Father?"¹⁶¹ Indeed, on the face of it there is a problem here and it must have disturbed the minds of not a few of the Christians of Arles — probably the reason for which their bishop frequently returns to this objection. It can happen, and often does happen, that a son is equal to and surpasses his father in many qualifications, but there must always remain one exception: the mutual ages of father and son. Deducing the coeternity from the consubstantiality is, indeed, valid and conclusive, but it does not offer a satisfactory solution to this problem in that it does not directly touch the objection. It is then in answer to this objection that St. Caesarius takes up a consideration of the coeternity of the three di-

158. De Trin. II, p. 178:18. AUGUSTINE, *Ser.* 126, 8, 10 (5, 617): *Pater per Filium in Spiritu sancto Trinitas est, sed una operatio, una majestas, una aeternitas, una coaeternitas.*

159. *Ser.* 3, p. 22:11.

160. B.A.H. II, p. 186:8; p. 186:12: De Trin. p. 178:18. St. Augustine also joins the coeternity and consubstantiality. AUGUSTINE, *Ser.* 71, 12, 18 (5, 392): *Et hanc Trinitatem, quamvis servata singularum proprietate et substantia personarum; tamen propter ipsam individuum et inseparabilem aeternitatis, veritatis, bonitatis essentiam vel naturam, non esse tres deos, sed unum Deum.*

161. De Trin. II, p. 177:28.

vine Persons from another viewpoint. The objection has its foundation in the generation, and for this reason a full and direct answer to the objection will have to show that the eternity of the Son is compatible with the doctrine of the generation of the Son by the Father.¹⁶² There is no mistaking this twofold manner of considering the coeternity of the Son in Caesarius, as is seen from the following. In the first place the coeternity, just as the coequality, is deduced from the unity of substance: *Ubi enim unus deus creditur, ibi minor et maior excluditur. . . . Ipsa enim per se ratio docet quia unus nec posteriorem recipit nec priorem.*¹⁶³ In the second place the coeternity is affirmed in connection with the filiation: *Sine auctore Pater, sine tempore Filius, sine maiore Spiritus sanctus.*¹⁶⁴ The *Quicumque* having several times affirmed the eternity of the Son as flowing from the consubstantiality, seems to hint at the same distinction when it adds the phrase: *Ex substantia Patris ante saecula genitus*. All of this shows clearly that the direction taken by Catholic theological thought and expression in the fifth and sixth centuries was almost entirely dependent on the principal objection raised by the heretics of the time.

The Archbishop of Arles answers the objection by at once striking at the false presupposition on which the objection is based. It is this: "You believe the Father generates His only-begotten Son in the same way as carnal men generate sons."¹⁶⁵ Again and again he returns to this accusation to demonstrate how the particular objection in question has its origin in this wholly false conception of the divine generation. Certainly no one can question that in human generation, where both the father and the son have a beginning and an end, the father must of necessity precede the son in time. But who cannot see the error of transferring such argumentation to God? The reason is apparent: "With God the Father and God the Son there can be no

162. In view of this we might consider this objection in connection with the processions. But since the point of the objection is directly a denial of the coeternity of the Son, it is more properly treated here.

163. B.A.H. II, p. 186:2.

164. B.A.H. II, p. 186:13.

165. De Trin. II, p. 177:32. AMBROSE, *De Fide* 1, 10, 66 (PL 16, 543): Verum si me ad consuetudinem trahis generationis humanae, ut Patrem dicas priorem; vide utrum ad generationem Dei terrenae generationis exempla conveniant. Si secundum hominem loquamur, negare non poteris prioris esse in homine patris quam filii passiones.

difference of age as there is no beginning nor end.”¹⁶⁶ There is yet another reason for not predicating of the divine generation all those qualities found in human generation. In the latter there is question of finite corporeal power, whereas in the former the generation proceeds from “the incorporeal, immense and omnipresent power of the divinity.”¹⁶⁷

The force of the Arian objection was removed by this distinction between the qualities of the human and divine generation. But it must have remained, especially to the ordinary Catholic, a hard doctrine to understand even the possibility of the Son’s being coeternal with the Father. Caesarius was aware of this difficulty, and without trying to explain the inexplicable he offers a few comparisons which might aid the understanding of the faithful. He nonetheless realizes that these comparisons, if wrongly understood, can be misleading, and for this reason he prefixes them with a warning that these analogies can only hint at the divine reality and are not at all “true likenesses.”¹⁶⁸ The first of these are the three elements: sun, brightness and warmth. Now if we view the sun as representing the Father, the brightness the Son, and the warmth the Holy Spirit, we are able to discover a certain analogy to the coeternity. For just as the sun can never be without brightness and warmth, so the Father can never have existed without the Son and the Holy Spirit. The second comparison differs from the above one only in the first member of the comparison. Fire takes the place of the sun in this analogy. Caesarius concludes these com-

166. De Trin. II, p. 174:10: Apud homines enim ideo homo pater maior est, et homo filius minor, quia et pater et filius initium habent et finem. . . . Apud deum autem Patrem et apud deum Filium noli aetatis gradus facere, ubi nec initium nec finem poteris invenire. FAUSTUS, (Pseudo-Eusebius), *Exhortatio De Deo Trino et Uno* (MBP 6, 668H). Nec minor aetate credatur, sed ita hanc primum sollicitudinem ingeniti patris, et geniti filii obtinere, ut qui natus est de in-temporali patre initium non invenitur habere de tempore vel de homine. AUGUSTINE, *Ser.* 117, 7, 10 (5, 585): Quia pater major est tempore quam filius: et ideo vis ut Filius Dei tempore minor sit quam Pater aeternus, quia invenisti minorem filium patre temporali. Da mihi aeternum patrem hic, et invenisti similitudinem. Filium minorem invenis patre in tempore, filium temporalem minorem patre temporali. Numquid invenisti mihi filium temporalem minorem aeterno patre? Quia ergo in aeternitate stabilitas est, in tempore autem varietas.

167. De Trin. II, p. 177:33.

168. Ibid. p. 177:35.

parisons with a few scriptural quotations which, he contends, justify his usage of these elements in an analogy of the Trinity.¹⁶⁹

The foundation of the Arian objection was destroyed; there were analogies to help the understanding, but as yet there was no real proof for the actual coeternity of the Father and Son. This is found in a strict theological argument which Caesarius constructs from the nature of paternity. Sacred Scripture clearly teaches that the First Person of the Blessed Trinity is the Father and the Second Person is the Son of the First Person. The nature of paternity, however, demands that if at any time the First Person existed without a Son, then at that time He was not the Father. It is impossible to conceive of a father who does not have a son. Moreover the absolute perfection of God is such that He can suffer no diminution or increase. But according to the supposition of the Arians paternity is a perfection that was later added to the First Person. Hence either the Father was not perfect before the generation of the Son or after the generation He is more perfect. But evidently both of these alternatives are opposed to the perfection of the divine nature, and therefore the absolute coeternity of the Son with the Father is beyond all doubt.¹⁷⁰

169. De Trin. II, p. 178:1-34. FAUSTUS (Pseudo-Eusebius), *De Symbolo Homilia I* (MBP 6, 628G). Sicut autem esse non sine splendore, vel ignis sine calore . . . nunquam Pater potuit esse sine Filio. AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Sermones Arianos* 1, 34 (8, 646): Ac per hoc, quemadmodum ignis et splendor qui ex igne gignitur et circumquaque diffunditur, simul esse incipiunt, nec genitus a gignente praeceditur: sic Deus Pater et Deus de Deo Filius esse simul incipiunt, quia pariter sine ullo initio temporis sunt, nec genitus a gignente praeceditur. Et sicut ignis gignens et splendor genitus coaevi sunt, ita Deus Pater gignens et Deus Filius genitus coaeterni sunt. *De Symbolo, Sermones ad Catechum.* 9, 9 (6, 574): Ecce in igne quaedam tria conspiciamus, ignem, splendorem et calorem: et cum sint tria, unum lumen est. Simul exsurgunt, simulque consistunt: nec ignis praecedit splendorem, nec splendor calorem. Et haec non confuse unum sunt, nec disjuncte tria; sed cum unum sint, tria sunt. Simul operantur, et cum inseparabiliter operantur, aliud igni tribuitur, aliud splendori, aliud calori.

170. De Trin. II, p. 166:18: Si vero negaverit cum Patre semper fuisse Filium, quomodo eum supra perfectum esse confessus est, cui postea Filius natus est, et per Filium nomen Patris additum? Ac sic aut ante, quam Filium gigneret, non fuit perfectus; aut, postquam genuit, plus quam perfectus. ITHACIUS, *Contra Varimadum* 1, 72 (PL 62, 398): Si ergo secundum vos primo Deus singulariter subsistendo, et postea Pater est dictus Filium generando, ergo ipsum Patris nomen nequaquam

An interesting corollary which Caesarius not infrequently adds to the above argumentation is taken from a scriptural appropriation. He develops essentially the same argument, except that instead of paternity and filiation he uses those powers and attributes which Scripture ascribes to the Son, e.g., power, wisdom, truth, justice, etc. If the Son is not eternal, then there was a time when the Father did not possess these perfections, which is evidently contrary to the divine perfection. His development of this argument is best appreciated in his own words.

Nam si aliquando, quomodo Ariani blasphemant, fuit sine Filio Pater, ergo imperfectus fuit Pater, ergo fuit sine Verbo, et, sicuti iam memoravimus, fuit sine sapientia, sine virtute, sine vita, sine iustitia, sine veritate; quia istae omnes species divinitatis secundum scripturas Filius esse noscuntur.¹⁷¹

The Arian denial of the coeternity of the Father and the Son is therefore seen to be false, whether from a consideration of the unity

- erit aeternum, quod ad suae appellationis vocabulum ex tempore sumpsit initium. . . . Proficiens ergo, quia cum se in Dei nomine positum minus perfectum videret, ad cumulum suae perfectionis conficiendum modo Patris sibi nomen adjecit. FAUSTUS (Pseudo-Eusebius), *De Symbolo Homilia I* (MBP 6, 628G): Dividi a se ac separare duo ista non possunt, ne iniuria fiat divinitati et plenitudine paternae, si ei aliquod postea videatur adiectum. Nova appellatione naturae, adserere videbitur defuisse aliqui Deo de perfectione, qui "Patris" nomen putat coepisse tempore. Ergo sicut semper Deus, ita semper et Pater. Si ergo ei nunquam Patris defuit nomen, quomodo unquam deesse Filius potuit.
171. B.A.H. II, p. 191:17. Cf. 184:23; De Trin. II, p. 166:23. AMBROSE, *De Fide* 1, 10, 62 (PL 16, 542): Accipe aliud quo clareat Filium sempiternum. Apostolus dicit quod Dei sempiterna virtus sit atque divinitas (Rom. 1:20): virtus autem Dei Christus, scriptum est enim Christum esse Dei virtutem, et Dei sapientiam (I Cor. 1:24). Ergo si Christus est Dei virtus, quia virtus Dei sempiterna: sempiternus igitur et Christus. Ibid. 4, 9, 111 (PL 16, 638): De Filio Dei dicunt quia antequam generaretur non erat, hoc est, de Dei sapientia, de virtute Dei, de Dei Verbo. . . . Quod si aliquando, ut volunt, non fuit (quod nefas dictu est) non fuit ergo in Deo perfectionis aliquando plenitudo divinae, si postea processum generationis accepit. *De Spiritu Sancto* 3, 4, 18 (PL 16, 781): Sed Filius et dextera et virtus dicitur. . . . Quando enim non fuit Dei virtus? Quod si aliquando putant non fuisse Dei virtutem, aliquando plenitudinem in Deo Patre negabunt fuisse, cui putant aliquando defuisse virtutem. Cf. AUGUSTINE, *De Div. Quaest.* 83, Q. 23: ITHACIUS, *Contra Varimadum* 1, 71 (PL 62, 397). We shall consider further this type of argumentation in the chapter on appropriations.

of the divine substance possessed equally by the Father and Son, or from an examination of the nature of the divine generation. Though St. Caesarius greatly depended on Scripture for his refutation of Arianism, he was not limited to this source as we have just seen in his defense of the eternity of the Son. He was unable to find much scriptural testimony for the coeternity, but he does not on that account insist less on this truth. His expression of the doctrine in question frequently resembles that found in the *Quicumque*, and there are traces of Caesarius's twofold manner of arguing in the Athanasian Symbol. The repeated attacks levelled by the heretics against this point of Catholic doctrine accounts for the importance Caesarius attaches to its defense. It is the same attitude we find manifested by the Council of Vaison, presided over by Caesarius, which enforced also for Gaul the custom of the Church of Rome of adding the words *sicut erat in principio* to the *Gloria Patri*.¹⁷²

3. The Omnipotence

<i>Quicumque</i>	<i>Caesarius</i>
Omnipotens Pater, omnipotens Filius, omnipotens Spiritus sanctus	Virtus Pater, virtus Filius, virtus et Spiritus sanctus. ¹⁷³
Non tres omnipotentes, sed unus omnipotens. ¹⁷⁵	Non tres potestates. ¹⁷⁴ Una est substantia, una voluntas, una potentia. ¹⁷⁶

The essential power that a being possesses is founded in and dependent on the essence of the particular being in question. Essentially, a being with a rational essence will possess rational powers. With an irrational essence there can be only irrational powers. On-

172. II Concilium Vasense, II, p. 87:12.

173. B.A.H. II, p. 204:11.

174. Ibid. p. 186:12.

175. Ser. 3, p. 22:13.

176. B.A.H. II, p. 191:2. AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 26, 14 (8, 744): Ex his ergo omnibus, quae sicut potui disputavi, satis apparet, Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti unam esse virtutem, unam esse substantiam, unam deitatem, unam majestatem, unam gloriam. *Tract. 22 in Joann.* 15 (3, 472): Quia Trinitatis hujus una voluntas, una potestas, una majestas est. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Excerpta*, ed. by Madoz, op. cit. p. 105 cites the above text of *Cont. Max. Ar.*

tologically, a finite being will possess finite power, and an infinite being, infinite power. In this way we are able to conclude to the omnipotence of each of the divine Persons from the unity of essence in all three Persons. This essential connection between the substance and the divine power is strikingly brought out in the *Quicumque*. What the Symbol affirms and denies concerning the substance, it affirms and denies concerning the divine power: not three but one substance, not three but one omnipotence. St. Caesarius expresses the same thought in almost the identical way, only showing a preference for the term *virtus* instead of *omnipotens*, perhaps because of the scriptural terminology. Caesarius's most explicit statement of this essential connection between the unity of essence and equality of power we have already seen: *Unitatem facit aequalitas virtutum*.¹⁷⁷

The omnipotence of the Son and Holy Spirit together with the Father is then another necessary sequel of the consubstantiality. But it is even more directly and evidently contained in the perfect equality which exists among the divine Persons and which we have already considered. The term "equal," it is true, has a broader signification, yet certainly in the first instance it designates a commensurate power. That the Athanasian Creed, after having repeatedly affirmed the personal equality in the Trinity, should nevertheless single out the co-omnipotence is certainly done only to meet squarely the Arian refusal to attribute this omnipotence to the Son and Holy Spirit. St. Caesarius had yet another reason for his insistence on the omnipotence of all three divine Persons. It served as the basis for his teaching on the equality of operation, a doctrine which seems to have been a favorite with him. He argues from the operations Sacred Scripture attributes to each of the divine Persons to their omnipotence in the one divine nature.¹⁷⁸ At the end of his tract against the heretics he makes an extended list of those operations which Sacred Scripture has attributed to each of the Persons. This list will concern us more in the chapter on appropriations. Here our attention is directed to only one of these, one which especially shows the omnipotence of all three divine Persons — the act of creation.

In scriptural terminology the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are all called "creator."¹⁷⁹ Taking this as a lead, many of the Fathers

177. B.A.H. II, p. 192:23.

178. B.A.H. II, p. 199:25.

179. B.A.H. II, p. 200:25.

placed a great deal of stress on the different roles played by each of the divine Persons in the work of creation. Caesarius, however, looks at creation from a slightly different viewpoint. He stresses the point that it was the one God, not the Persons as Persons, Who created.¹⁸⁰ Since Scripture attributes creation to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit,¹⁸¹ we know that it was the triune God, Who by His infinite divine nature — more specifically, His omnipotence — created all things that exist outside of God. In Caesarius's own words: "It is the power of the Trinity which operates in creation."¹⁸² Therefore when Sacred Scripture says that the Son creates, it affirms not only that He is creator but also that He possesses the divine nature and the divine omnipotence.¹⁸³ This equality of power in the Trinity, manifested in creation, Caesarius finds best expressed in the words of Isaiah: "Who hath poised with three fingers the bulk of the earth."¹⁸⁴

Quid evidentius de trinitatis unitate, quid clarius? Nonne hic in tribus digitis potentiae unius aequalitatem sub quadam mysterii lance libravit? Ergo . . . non dubites de parilitate virtutis.¹⁸⁵

Creation by the Verbum was admitted by some Arians, though they quite unphilosophically denied that He was on that account omnipotent and in possession of the divine nature. They admitted only that He was the most powerful being next to God the Father. Their stand was even more blasphemous in regard to the Holy Spirit. The Third Person, according to them, was not only not omnipotent, but did not create and is even less powerful than the Verbum. Against such a notion of the Trinity Caesarius shows that it is the entire Trinity which performs external works that are proper to God.¹⁸⁶ He

180. De Trin. II, p. 171:18; 173:20; p. 177:20; B.A.H. II, p. 199:6. AUGUSTINE, *Symbolo, Ser. ad Catechum.* 9, 9 (6, 574): Ita cum dicitur quod Deus fecerit mundum, intelligitur Pater cum Filio, et per Filium et cum Spiritu sancto. *Epis.* 169, 2, 5 (2, 604): Non a patre aliam, et a Filio aliam et a Spiritu conditam esse creaturam, sed omnia et singula quae creata sunt vel creantur, Trinitate creante subsistere.

181. Father: B.A.H. II, p. 200:25; Ser. 212, p. 800:15. Son: B.A.H. II, p. 188:17; p. 188:25; p. 189:4; p. 198:8. Holy Spirit: B.A.H. II, p. 197:5; p. 195:26; p. 198:9.

182. Ser. 212, p. 800:24. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 6 (CSEL 21, 108).

183. B.A.H. II, p. 192:1; p. 189:4.

184. Isaiah 40:12.

185. Ser. 212, p. 802:23. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 8 (CSEL 21, 113).

186. De Trin. II, p. 173:18: "Tu es Deus qui facis mirabilia solus." Si de solo Patre hoc credis ergo Christus non facit mirabilia: et quia hoc

defends the prerogatives of the Holy Spirit from I Corinthians 12:11: "All these things are the work of the one and same Spirit, who divides to everyone according as He will," inasmuch as these words manifest the omnipotence of this Person to be no less than that of the Father and Son.

In eo autem quod dicitur "pro ut vult" per potestatem voluntatis aequalis esse Patri et Filio evidenter ostenditur.¹⁸⁷

In the account of creation the words, "The spirit of God moved over the water" (Gen. 1:2), also proclaim a supereminent power, from which we are able to conclude to the divinity of the Holy Spirit.¹⁸⁸ Indeed, far from implying the inferiority of the Holy Spirit to the Son, Scripture at times almost gives the impression that the Holy Spirit is greater than the Son. To the Son, it is true, is attri-

negare nulla ratione poteris, deum, qui solus facit mirabilia, totam Trinitatem intellege. AUGUSTINE, *Enarr. in Ps.* 76, 16 (4, 813): "Tu es Deus qui facis mirabilia solus." Quomodo solus? numquid forte Pater, et non Filius? aut Filius et non Pater? Immo Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus. *De Trinitate* 1, 6 (8, 755): "Qui facit mirabilia solus." Quod velim scire de quod dictum accipiant: si de Patre tantum, quomodo verum est, quod ipse Filius dicit, "Quaecumque enim Pater facit, haec eadem et Filius facit similiter." An quidquam est inter mirabilia mirabilius quam resuscitare et vivere mortuos (Jh. 5:21). Quomodo ergo solus Pater facit mirabilia, cum haec verba nec Patrem tantum nec Filium tantum permittant intelligi, sed utique Deum unum verum solum, id est, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum.

187. *De Trin.* II, p. 169:25. VICTOR OF VITA, *Historia persecutionis Africanæ provinciae* II, 82, citing the *Liber fidei catholicae* by Eugenius of Carthage (CSEL 7, 60): "Haec autem omnia operatur unus atque idem spiritus, dividens propria unicuique prout vult" (I Cor. 12:11). Unde nullus ambiguitatis relinquitur locus, quin clareat Spiritum sanctum et deum esse et suae voluntatis auctorem, qui cuncta operari et secundum propriae voluntatis arbitrium divinae dispensationis dona largiri apertissime demonstratur. Cf. also B.A.H. II, p. 194:5 where Caesarius depends on Faustus for the same teaching: *De Spiritu Sancto* II, 10-11 (21, 154-155).

188. B.A.H. II, p. 193:20. In Genesi dicit sermo divinus: "Spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas", hoc est, eminentia potestatis, non inopia necessitatis. AUGUSTINE, *De Gen. Ad Lit.* 1, 5, 15 (3, 121): "Et Spiritus Dei superferebatur super aquam" (Gen. 1:2). . . . Ne facienda opera sua per indigentiae necessitatem potius quam per abundantiam beneficentiae. Deus amare putaretur? . . . Cui superferri diceretur: non enim loco, sed omnia superante, ac praecellente potentia.

buted the creation of the heavens, but to the Holy Spirit an even greater work, the creation of the hosts of heaven (Ps. 32:6).¹⁸⁹

The main difficulty connected with the doctrine of the omnipotence of the Son is a scriptural one. On several occasions Our Lord Himself seems to affirm a greater power in the Father and His own dependence on the Father in the exercise of His power. The Arians always had these texts in their mouth. The most important of them is found in John 5:19: "Amen, amen, I say to you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but only what he sees the Father doing." To refute the heretical interpretation the Arians gave to these words, the Archbishop employs the whole of his theological insight. The result is a logically developed argument which he has divided into three parts. Before considering his reply to this objection, however, we shall do well to note an explanation Caesarius gives to a similar text in his *Exposition of Apocalypse*. The text here is Matthew 28:18: "All power in heaven and on earth has been given to me." Caesarius simply explains these words of Our Lord by making the distinction we have already seen. Power is given to Christ in His human, but not in His divine nature.¹⁹⁰ At first we might expect to find this same distinction made to explain these words of John 5:19. But a second reading of the text will make it apparent that this will not do. The context in which Our Lord spoke these words makes it clear that He is here speaking as God and not only as Man. This at once excludes the above distinction, and St. Caesarius was well aware of this fact.¹⁹¹

189. B.A.H. II, p. 198:5: Interrogandi sunt etiam, quid maius sit, utrum caeli, an virtutes caelorum? Et cum sine dubio dixerint, virtutes caelorum, dicendum eis est: In tantum Spiritus sanctus minor non est, sed summus est, ut, cum Verbo domini dicantur caeli creati, Spiritu sancto virtutes caelorum. . . . Et divinum utique creatorem uno versiculo demonstravit, cum divinum appellat, et deum et creatorem ostendit; sicut et David dicit: "Emitte Spiritum tuum et creabuntur, et renovabis faciem terrae" (Ps. 103:30). AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 17, 2 (8, 715): Nam quid excellentius in creaturis quam virtutes caelorum: Scriptum est autem, "Verbo Domini coeli firmati sunt, et Spiritu oris ejus omnis virtus eorum" (Ps. 32:6). . . . Nam utique majus aliquid sunt virtutes caelorum, quae firmatae sunt Spiritu oris Domini, id est Spiritu sancto, quam caeli qui firmati sunt Verbo Domini. . . . Quid est autem inconsideratius, quam negare esse creatorem Spiritum Dei, cum Domino dicatur. . . . "Emittes Spiritum tuum et creabuntur et innovabis faciem terrae" (Ps. 103:30).

190. *Expositio in Apocalypsim* II, p. 223:17.

191. St. Augustine explicitly rejects the "as man" interpretation: "Non

Yet the verse is admittedly open to an Arian interpretation; hence the importance of determining its proper signification. Perhaps the Saint himself was troubled by these words at one time, a supposition which would account for the great care he took to explain them in the Catholic sense.

The first part of Caesarius's explanation of this difficult text is a warning. Our Lord here gives to poor rational creatures a little glimpse into the infinite and inexplicable divine life. He merely gives a hint concerning the inner personal relations of the triune God. But already it is too much for this sense-bound intellect of ours, and we begin at once to make comparisons with things we see about us. With very good reason, then, does Caesarius caution us at the very outset not to give Christ's words a too anthropomorphic interpretation.

Quod carnalis sensus non intelligens ideo dictum ut se ex Patre esse ostenderet, utpote et deum et Filium, quomodo inter homines fieri solet, veluti pater artifex filium suum artificium suum vellet docere, ut quod viderit patrem operantem filius, hoc specialius imitetur.¹⁹²

Having in the first part taken the objection from the human sphere and put it into the divine, where it belongs, he is ready to go one step further. But as in the first part, so here in the second step, he is only laying the groundwork for the ultimate solution from things generally admitted. He reaffirms what must be held in virtue of the consubstantiality, i.e., the perfect unity of operation existing between the Father and Son. From a comparison with the different operations performed by the one and same mind he argues a fortiori to the much more perfect unity of will and operation existing between the Father and the Son Who is the Wisdom of the Father.

potest Filius a se facere quidquam, nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem" (Jh. 5:19). Non enim hoc ex forma servi dixit, sed ex forma Dei, sicut jam ostendimus: haec autem verba non indicant quod minor sit, sed quod de Patre sit. *De Trinitate* 2, 3, 5 (8, 774). Cf. also *De Trinitate* 2, 1.

192. B.A.H. II, p. 190:12-15. AUGUSTINE, *Ser.* 126, 7, 9 (5, 617): Si ergo carnalem intellectum, vel potius sensum interrogemus, quasi duos sibi proposuit artifices, Patrem et Filium. . . . Fecit pater arcam, quam filius facere non poterat, nisi patrem videret facientem. Cf. also *Tract.* 18-21 in *Joann.* (3, 430-463), where Augustine gives a very extensive treatment of this verse. Perhaps this is the very reason, i.e., that it is so long and detailed, that Caesarius does not go here for his explanation of the verse.

Si enim nos homines terreni quod facere volumus corpore, animo nostro ante meditationis insinuatione praemissa, sapientia exsequente perficimus, et quodammodo consilio nato in mente nostra prius intus in corde agimus quod facere disponimus, quae tamen absque ulla partitione sensuum indissociabiliter una mens efficit: quomodo non deus Pater sapientiae suae cum deo Filio, qui est sapientia sua, in se manente, quia ipse est, ut saepe diximus, sapientia et virtus Patris, in una voluntate cuncta et una operatione perficit? Sed nec alia Pater facit, alia Filius; sed eadem quae Pater facit, ipsa et Filius facit.¹⁹³

We see at once that he does not yet touch the real objection, the seeming dependence of the Son on the Father in His operations. But what he has accomplished in this second step is to clear the way for the ultimate solution. He has done this by showing the connection

193. B.A.H. II, p. 191:3-11. This analogy with the human mind seems to contain elements from both Augustine and Faustus. The Augustinian tone of the analogy is unmistakable. The Caesarian adaptation we find here, however, makes it difficult to locate with certainty his source in Augustine. In the *Cont. Ser. Arian.* (1, 16) Augustine uses the analogy memoria-intelligentia-voluntas in his explanation of John 5:19. Beyond this, however, there are no indications of a dependence here. It seems much more likely that St. Caesarius borrowed from one of Augustine's sermons. In *Ser.* 52 Augustine uses the same analogy in order to show the unity of operation between the Father and Son. This is precisely the purpose for which Caesarius uses it, and here too we are able to find several indications of a dependence. AUGUSTINE, *Ser.* 52, 7, 19 (5, 309): Homo habes memoriam . . . intellectum . . . voluntatem. Haec ergo tria, memoriam, intellectum, et voluntatem; haec inquam, tria animadvertite separatim pronuntiari, inseparabiliter operari. He continues in 10, 23: Sufficit ergo quia ostendimus tria quaedam separabiliter demonstrari, inseparabiliter operari. Si hoc in te invenisti, si hoc in homine, si hoc in quadam persona in terra ambulante . . . crede Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum per singula quaedam visibilia, per species quasdam assumptae creaturae posse et separabiliter demonstrari et inseparabiliter operari. But the words "in corda" and "absque ulla partitione sensuum" most likely have their origin in FAUSTUS (Pseudo-Eusebius), *Homilia De Trinitate Generalis* (MBP 6, 653F): Sicut interdum ipse apud se homo officium multiplex sensus unius cordis ac voluntatis exsequitur, et tamen a semetipso discrepare non creditur. For the rest of the citation, Caesarius almost certainly returns to *Ser.* 126, 8, 10 (5, 617): Non alia Pater facit, alia Filius facit: quia omnia quae Pater facit, per Filium facit. . . Pater per Filium in Spiritu sancto Trinitas est, sed una operatio, una majestas, una aeternitas, una coaeternitas.

between these words of Our Lord and what we have already seen from the consubstantiality. Hence whatever interpretation is given to these words, it must not contradict the unity of operation, the unity of will and ultimately the unity of substance. However, just as a consideration of the divine essence in itself will never bring us to a distinction of persons — this is, indeed, due to the weakness of our intellects — so also a mere consideration of the consubstantiality will never bring us to any operational relation between the Father and Son. This can have no other explanation than the divine generation, which we can know only from Sacred Scripture. For it is the Father Who generates the Son and not the Son the Father, and for this reason and for this reason alone does Christ say, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but only what he sees the Father doing."

Sed ideo dixit, "Non potest Filius a se facere quicquam, nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem" (Jh. 5:19), ut nos cognoscamus et credamus, quia ex Patre est Filius, et non ex semetipso, vel aliunde.¹⁹⁴

Therefore the ultimate explanation of John 5:19 is the inner divine processions and the personal relations. Caesarius goes to the core of the Trinitarian mystery to answer this objection brought forth by the Arians. He gives us an intimation here of his doctrine on the processions and relations, which we shall see in a later chapter.

4. *The Omnipresence*

Quicumque

Caesarius

Immensus Pater, immensus Filius,
immensus Spiritus sanctus.¹⁹⁵

Quomodo Pater, ita et Filius et Spiritus sanctus ubique sint.¹⁹⁶

So far we have seen that the reason for which St. Caesarius has singled out particular attributes of the Son and demonstrated that

194. B.A.H. II, p. 191:13-16. AUGUSTINE, *Ser.* 126, 11, 15 (5, 619): Forte intelliges, quia illud quod dictum est, "Non potest Filius a se facere quicquam nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem," tale est, ac si diceret, Non esset Filius, nisi de Patre nasceretur. *Tract.* 20 *in Joann.* 4 (3, 450): Ergo quia Filius de Patre est, ideo dixit, "Filius non potest a se facere quicquam" (Jh. 5:19). Quia non est Filius a se, ideo non potest a se.

195. *Ser.* 3, p. 22:9.

196. *De Trin.* II, p. 170:19.

they flow from the consubstantiality is that these properties were the objects of special attack by the Arians. It is the same reason for which the author of the *Quicumque* makes explicit mention of these attributes in his Symbol, so that there be no mistaking the Church's teaching on these points, likely to be obscured by controversy. The case is not quite the same for the attribute we shall now consider, the omnipresence. There is no evidence that the Arians frequently made the omnipresence of the Son the object of direct attack. They did, however, oppose the equality of the Father and the Son on the grounds that Sacred Scripture frequently says the Son is *sent* by the Father, which, they argued, implies that the Father is greater than the Son. This objection is based on an erroneous notion of the divine missions, and at the same time it contains an implicit denial of the Son's omnipresence. It is because of this last element of the objection that the author of the *Quicumque* and St. Caesarius give special attention to this attribute. Not once does the Archbishop of Arles speak of the Son's omnipresence except in connection with this objection on the missions.¹⁹⁷

Once more, following a now very familiar line of argumentation, St. Caesarius defends the ubiquity of the Verbum as a necessary consequence of the unity of substance. Because the Son possesses the divine nature, He must be omnipresent. Otherwise we should be forced to say that the divinity is not omnipresent.¹⁹⁸ It will be well to recall here the stand of the Semi-Arians. They usually did not deny entirely that the Son was God, or at least that He should be called God, but only insisted that He was a lesser god than the Father. If we remember this, we shall not accuse Caesarius of begging the question when he begins his argumentation for the omnipresence with this admission of the Arian, the Son is God. One might indeed ask whether the "God" with which he begins his argumentation is the one true God in the Catholic sense, or the "lesser god" in the Arian

197. The omnipresence is considered here by itself because Caesarius also gives it a separate treatment, even though the reason for his separate treatment is the objection concerning the missions. First he considers the omnipresence as a sequel of the consubstantiality, and this, in turn, offers him the basis for his reply to the mission objection. But it should be noted that it is merely the foundation for the reply and in no sense the reply itself, which we shall see in the chapter on the divine missions.

198. B.A.H. II, p. 190 :24.

sense. Nevertheless for Caesarius the question is resolved into whether God is omnipresent or not.

Rogo te, deum credis esse Filium, an non? Sine dubio respondurus es, deum; quia et si tu negare volueris, sanctis scripturis convinceris, . . . Si ergo deus est Filius, immo quia deus est, . . . interrogo te utrum deus ubique sit, an forte localiter?¹⁹⁹

His reasoning is very similar when he considers Christ before His Incarnation. Caesarius asks, whether the Son of God existed before His birth from the Blessed Virgin Mary or not? They cannot but answer in the affirmative. Hence the next question: Was He then God or not? Again their answer must be yes. This forces them to an admission that at least at that time, i.e., before the Incarnation, He was omnipresent. Note how he is preparing the way for a discussion of the mission of the Son. He adds a few scriptural texts in confirmation of what he has just shown. Of particular interest is the way he draws an argument from the words: "I am in the Father and the Father in me."²⁰⁰

Et cum ipse dicat "Ego in Patre, et Pater in me est," (Jh. 14:10) sine dubio, qui in Patre est, quomodo Pater ubique est, ita et ille, qui in ipso est, ubique esse credendus est.²⁰¹

It is imperative to note that the connection between the omnipresence and the Caesarian explanation of the missions touches equally the prerogatives of the Second and Third Persons. Scripture speaks no less clearly of the missions of the Holy Spirit than of that of the Son. Up to now Caesarius has made little more than passing references to the Third Person. The Arian conflict was primarily concerned with the divinity and consubstantiality of the Son. But one would be far from the truth if he supposed that on that account the Arians admitted these attributes in regard to the Holy Spirit. As we have already seen, the contrary was the case. The Holy Spirit was considered an even lesser deity than the Son — often not a deity at all. Their proof for this contention was the Scripture in those passages which speak of the Holy Spirit as sent by both the Father and the Son. The Archbishop of Arles rejects the argument of the heretics in the same

199. B.A.H. II, p. 183 :25-184 :9.

200. John 14:11.

201. De Trin. II, p. 168 :19-21.

way as he does that from the mission of the Son. He first proves the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit, and with this as a basis he is able to give an orthodox explanation of the mission texts of the Third Person.

The argumentation, however, for the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit will have to be different than that employed in the case of the Verbum. Whereas before he could argue from the divinity of the Son to His omnipresence, such an argument will be useless to prove the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit, simply because the Semi-Arians of Caesarius's time professedly denied the divinity of the Third Person. The manner in which the Archbishop proceeds in his defense of the prestige of the Third Person manifests his ability as an apologist and his perfect knowledge of the stand of his opponent. His ratiocination is the very reverse — not from the divinity of the Holy Spirit to His omnipresence, but from His omnipresence to His divinity.²⁰² This presupposes, of course, that he can first prove the omnipresence of the Third Divine Person. This he does show from the many explicit texts of Sacred Scripture which refer to the ubiquity of the Holy Spirit. Wisdom 1:7, "For the spirit of the Lord hath filled the whole world", affirms at least that there is no limitation to the Holy Spirit's presence in the world.²⁰³ We know that for most of the early Christians there was never any doubt that texts of this kind referred to the Third Person of the Trinity. The Psalmist in just as clear terms declares the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit: *Qui ibo ab spiritu tuo, et a facie tua quo fugiam?* (Ps. 138:7). Caesarius says that this verse of the Psalm expresses the omnipresence of all three divine Persons: of the Father, because it is to Him that the Psalmist addresses himself: of the Son, because the words *a facie tua* refer to this Person: of the Holy Spirit, from the words *ab spiritu tuo*.²⁰⁴ The omnipresence is also listed at the end of the *Breviarium Adversus*

202. B.A.H. II, p. 198:14.

203. De Trin. II, p. 170:1.

204. B.A.H. II, p. 198:18: Absque dubio Spiritus sanctus deus est, et non creatura, qui ubique esse describitur; de quo, sicut iam dictum est, propheta omnipotentiam eius metuens dicit: "Quo ibo ab spiritu tuo, et a facie tua quo fugiam?" (Ps. 138:7). Agnosce ergo nullum esse locum, ubi non omnipotentia Spiritus sancti praesens esse probetur. AUGUSTINE, *Enarr. in Ps. 138*, 10 (4, 1540): "Quo ibo ab Spiritu tuo?" (Ps. 138:7). Spiritus enim Domini replevit orbem terrarum. Quis potest fugere in mundo ab illo Spiritu, quo plenus est mundus?

Haereticos as one of the properties that is common to all three Persons: *Sicut ubique esse dicitur Pater, ita Filius, ita et Spiritus Sanctus.*²⁰⁵ The full import of this last statement and the reason for his insistence on it we shall see only when we come to a consideration of his teaching on the divine missions.

5. Lord and God

<i>Quicumque</i>	<i>Caesarius</i>
Ita deus Pater, deus Filius, deus Spiritus sanctus. Et tamen non tres dii, sed unus est deus.	Deus Pater, deus Filius, deus et Spiritus sanctus; sed tamen non tres dii, sed unus est deus. ²⁰⁶
Quia sicut singulatim unamquamque personam deum et dominum confiteri christiana veritate compellimur.	Nam et singillatim singulae quaeque personae plenus deus, et totae tres simul unus deus. ²⁰⁷
Ita dominus Pater, dominus Filius, dominus Spiritus sanctus. Et tamen non tres domini, sed unus est dominus. ²⁰⁸	Ubi dicitur "Dominus deus tuus dominus unus est" non solus Pater, nec solus Filius, nec solus Spiritus sanctus, sed simul Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, quae est verus et unus deus, Trinitas intellegenda est. ²⁰⁹

In this final sequel of the consubstantiality that we find stressed in the *Quicumque* and in the Trinitarian writings of St. Caesarius, the

205. B.A.H. II, p. 203:6.

206. Ser. 10, p. 51:5. Cf. Ser. 213, p. 805:13. The formulas are by no means new. They are found repeated by all the contemporary authors. BOETHIUS, *De Trinitate* (PL 64, 1249): Pater, inquit, deus, Filius deus, Spiritus sanctus deus: igitur Pater, Filius, Spiritus sanctus unus non tres dii. FULGENTIUS, *Epis.* 14, 6 (PL 65, 397): Nec tamen tres dii, sed unus naturaliter deus est Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus. AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 23, 2 (8, 728): "Audi Israel, Dominus Deus tuus unus Dominus est" (Deut. 6:4): quia Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, non tres dii, sed unus Deus, nec tres domini, sed unus Dominus est. Ser. 214, 10 (5, 948): Nec tamen Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus tres dii, sed unus Deus.

207. Ser. 83, p. 328:29. Morin assures in the marginal note that St. Caesarius depends directly on the *Quicumque* in this passage.

208. Ser. 3, p. 22.

209. De Trin. II, p. 171:13. AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 26, 14 (8, 744): Quia ipsa Trinitas est unus Dominus Deus noster, de quo dictum est: "Audi Israel, dominus Deus tuus, Deus unus est" (Deut. 6:4).

precise point of emphasis has changed. Hitherto we have discussed almost exclusively the unity of substance between the Father and Son and what follows from this. The Holy Spirit and His relation to the first two Persons has been referred to only rarely and then in quite an incidental way. But in those parts of his Trinitarian writings where Caesarius concerns himself precisely with the divinity of the Persons, it is the Holy Spirit and not the Son Who is the object of chief concern. He devotes two entire sermons and a lengthy section of the *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos* to the divinity of the Third Person. No similar treatment is given to the divinity of the Son. It is true that he frequently cites texts of Scripture affirming the divinity of the Son — a few of which we shall consider here — but then his purpose is rather to show the equality, eternity, etc., of the Son than to prove His divinity. The reason, as we have seen, is that the Semi-Arians admitted the divinity of the Second Person, though still not equal to the First Person; but in regard to the Holy Spirit the Semi-Arians of Caesarius's time held pure Macedonianism: the Holy Ghost is not divine and should not be called God for he is a creature.²¹⁰ This notable difference in the doctrine of the heretics concerning the prerogatives of the Second and Third Persons is clearly reflected in Caesarius's refutation of them. He states it most precisely when he terminates his discussion of the one to commence the other.

Haec interim de aequalitate Patris ac Filii ad praesens dicta
sufficiant. . . . Nunc vero de sancti Spiritus deitate pauca de
multis testimoniis sunt ponenda.²¹¹

As the Archbishop assures us at the very outset, he had no difficulty finding abundant scriptural testimony for the divinity of the Holy Spirit. We shall see that many of the texts he refers to, even

210. B.A.H. II, p. 193:18; De Trin. II, p. 169:14. Cf. Wulfila's Profession of Faith, page 5, footnote 18.

211. B.A.H. II, p. 193:13. Note in how nearly identical fashion Caesarius and Eugenius of Carthage end their treatment on the equality of Father and Son and take up the defense of the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Haec de Patris et Filii aequalitate vel de substantiae unitate, quantum brevitatis ratio sivit, dixisse sufficiat. Superest ut de Spiritu sancto, quem Patri ac Filio consubstantivum credimus, coaequalem et coaeternum, dicamus et testimoniis adprobemus. VICTOR OF VITA, *Hist. persec. Afric. provin.* II, 74 citing the *Liber fidei cath.* by Eugenius of Carthage (CSEL 7, 56).

today, form the main part of our scriptural argument for the divinity of the Third Person. Thus St. Peter's words to Ananias: "That thou shouldst lie to the Holy Spirit . . . Thou hast not lied to men, but to God", (Acts 5:3-4) certainly could not more evidently affirm the divinity of the Holy Spirit.²¹² An a fortiori argument is taken from the words of Psalm 93:11: "The Lord knows the thoughts of men." If it is true that only God knows the thoughts of men, then what are we to say of the Holy Spirit, Who knows not only the inner secrets of men, but "searches all things, even the deep things of God" (I Cor. 2:10). Such a one is manifestly God, for who save God can comprehend the divinity?²¹³

We have already seen on several occasions the skill with which St. Caesarius combines texts in such a way as to proceed logically from one citation to another so that only in the final text appears the particular point he is demonstrating. Perhaps it is true that in some instances he proceeds in this way with more ingenuity than correctness. This is not the case, however, when he starts with the oft-repeated

212. De Trin. II, p. 169:15. B.A.H. II, p. 194:20-24. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 2, 8 (CSEL 21, 151): Ananias . . . deo votum promississe cognoscitur et Spiritui sancto mentitus arguitur, sicut Petrus apostolus ait: "Anania, cur temptavit Satanas cor tuum mentiri te Spiritu sancto?" (Acts 5:3). Et subsecutus adiecit: "non est hominibus mentitus, sed deo" (Acts. 5:4). AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Max.* 2, 21, 1 (8, 722): Et quod Ananiae dixit apostolus Petrus, "Ausus es mentiri Spiritui sancto?" (Acts 5:3). Atque ostendens Deum esse Spiritum sanctum, "Non es, inquit, hominibus mentitus, sed Deo" (Acts 5:4).
213. B.A.H. II, p. 196:8: Et sicut legimus, quod nemo noverit cogitationes hominum nisi deus, quomodo Spiritus sanctus non est deus, qui etiam non solum quae in homine, sed et quae in deo sunt scire dinoscitur, dicent apostolo: "Spiritus enim omnia scrutatur, etiam profunda Dei" (I Cor. 2: 10). FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 2, 1 (CSEL 21, 132): Et ideo de solo deo legimus: "Qui solus nosti corda hominum" (III Kings 8:39), et iterum: "Ipse enim novit occulta cordis" (I Cor. 14:25). Si hominis occulta cognoscere divinitatis est proprium, quanto magis scrutari profunda Dei summae in persona Spiritus sancti majestatis insigne est. Pseudo-Eusebius, *Homila De Trinitate Generalis*. (MBP 6, 653G): Deo enim tantum potest illud ascribi, "qui solus (inquit) nostri corda hominum" (III Kings 4:39): et Apostolus protestatur, "Spiritus scrutatur etiam alta Dei" (I Cor. 2:10). Si specialiter Deus creditur, qui occulta hominis intuetur: quanto magis Deus est, qui profunda paterni pectoris perscrutatur?

words of the prophets, *Haec dicit Dominus*, to prove the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

Et quis esset iste Spiritus sanctus, qui in prophetis locutus sit, beatus David expremat, dicens: "Audiam quid loquatur in me Dominus Deus." (Ps. 84:9). Et in Actibus: "Ut impleretur, inquit scriptura, quam praemisit Deus per os prophetarum suorum." (Act. 3:18). Et hic agnosce, quod eum deum evidenter declaret, qui per os prophetarum locutus est, sicut et Zacharias in evangelio ait: "Benedictus, inquit, Deus Israel, quia visitavit et fecit redemptionem plebis suae" (Lk. 1:68) et post pauca ait: "Sicut locutus est per os sanctorum prophetarum suorum." (Lk. 1:70). Agnoscis dominum deum esse Spiritum sanctum qui per os prophetarum locutus est.²¹⁴

The identical type of scriptural argumentation is followed when he begins with the appellation of Exodus 8:12, "The finger of God." In Exodus we learn that the ten Egyptian plagues wrought by the rod of Aaron were in reality the work of the "finger of God." In the New Testament we are again familiarized with the workings of the "finger of God." St. Luke assures us that it is by the "finger of God" that Christ casts out devils (11:20). But it is St. Matthew (12:28) who tells us explicitly what "the finger of God" is when he quotes the words of Our Lord: "I cast out devils by the Spirit of God."²¹⁵ If anyone

214. B.A.H. II, p. 195:5. Cf. also p. 197:10. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 2, 7 (CSEL 21; 147): Videamus autem utrum deus sit iste, per quem omnis prophetia inspirata memoratur. Lucas dominum deum asserit, qui locutus est per prophetas, ita dicens: "Benedictus dominus deus Israel, quia visitavit et fecit redemptionem plebis suae" (Lk. 1:68), et adiecit: "Sicut locutus est per os sanctorum qui a saeculo sunt prophetarum eius" (Lk. 1:70). Absolute Spiritum sanctum, qui prophetas inspiraverat, dominum et deum Israel esse evangelico celebratur oraculo. . . . Vides specialiter de Spiritu sancto intellegendum esse, cum dicitur in prophetis: "deus deorum dominus locutus est" (Ps. 49:1), et "Audiam, quid loquatur in me dominus deus" (Ps. 84:9). Hic nomen istud, id est dominus deus ad Spiritum sancti, qui locutus est in David, noveris referendum esse personam.

215. B.A.H. II, p. 195:26. AUGUSTINE, *Quaest. In Exodum* 2, 25 (3, 428): Quod dixerunt magi ad Pharaonem, "Digitus Dei est hoc" (Ex. 8:19). Digitus autem Dei sicut Evangelium manifestissime loquitur, Spiritus sanctus intelligitur. Namque uno Evangelista ita narrante verba Domini, ut diceret, "Si ego in digito Dei ejicio daemonia" (Lk. 11:20), alius Evangelista idipsum narrans exponere voluit quid sit digitus Dei et ait, "Si ego in Spiritu Dei ejicio daemonia" (Mt. 12:28).

should still doubt that the Holy Spirit is true God, how can they possibly explain the words of St. Paul concerning the divine indwelling: "Do you not know that your members are the temple of the Holy Spirit, who is in you? . . . Glorify God and bear him in your body" (I Cor. 6:19). That the heretics should stubbornly cling to their errors in spite of this overwhelming testimony of Scripture forces from the saintly bishop a final appeal almost of desperation: "Acknowledge then that the Holy Spirit is evidently God and desist from your blasphemy."²¹⁶

Other arguments taken from Sacred Scripture reveal the Archbishop's ingenuity in developing a scriptural proof. A first argument stems from the baptismal formula. If the Holy Spirit were not God, then He would not be mentioned together with the Father and the Son in the words of the Sacrament.²¹⁷ In developing another argument, Caesarius asks the heretics a leading question: "Whose sin is the greater, he who sins against the Father or he who sins against the Holy Spirit, whom you say is not God?" The question puts the heretics in a difficult position. For if they reply that a sin against the Father is the greater sin, then how is it that a sin against the Father can be forgiven, as is seen in the history of the Chosen People, whereas a sin against the Holy Spirit is unforgivable? And if they say a sin against the Holy Ghost is the greater sin, then how is it possible that a sin against one whom they say is a creature be greater than a sin against God.²¹⁸ However, just as one of the best

216. B.A.H. II, p. 194:12. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 2, 12 (CSEL 21, 156): Ait itaque Apostolus ad Corinthios: "Nescitis, quia corpora vestra templum est Spiritus sancti" (I Cor. 6:19). Templum Spiritus sancti templum esse dei praecedentia eiusdem epistolae evidentem insinuant, cum dicunt: "An nescitis, quia templum dei estis et Spiritus sanctus habitat in vobis?" (I Cor. 3:16). . . . Ita capitulum luculenta veritate concludit: "Glorificate, inquit, et portate deum in corpore vestro" (I Cor. 6:20). Cf. AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 21, 1 (8, 722).

217. B.A.H. II, p. 195:15. *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 8 (CSEL 21, 114): Ut illud autem evangelicum etiam gentibus possit esse manifestum: "Ite, inquit, baptizate omnes gentes in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti" (Mt. 28:19), ubi sub tribus personis unum opus et unum nomen indivisam asserit maiestatem.

218. B.A.H. II, p. 197:18. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 2, 8 (CSEL 21, 152): Manifeste divina praeditus est potentia, ad quem sacrilegii referatur offensa, de quo alio loco dicit: "Qui autem blasphemaverit in Spiritum sanctum, non habebit remissionem neque in hoc saeculo neque in futuro" (Mk. 3:29).

arguments for the divinity of Christ is found in His possession of the power to forgive sins, so also we know that the Holy Spirit is God in that He possesses this power to forgive sins.²¹⁹ Certainly in all of this Caesarius has sufficiently defended the Church's teaching on the divinity of the Holy Spirit even though this is not the primary purpose of his Trinitarian works. From this we may be sure, however, that at the time of St. Caesarius, controversy on the Holy Spirit played a significant role in the doctrinal struggle of the Church of Arles.

The divinity of the Son, which the Semi-Arians openly confessed, though as a divinity less than that of the Father, was in fact equivalently denied by them. Caesarius assures us of this when he says: "In secret the Arians believe the Son is only the first and greatest creature of God."²²⁰ Certainly in so doing they reject the most clear testimony of the inspired authors.²²¹ How can He be a creature through Whom all things have been made? *Si ipse creatura est, quomodo per ipsum creata sunt omnia?*²²² Nor are they in the least justified in saying that the Son, though divine, is less than the Father. "Never

219. B.A.H. II, p. 198:20. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 2, 4 (CSEL 21, 143): Vide quantae potentiae sit Spiritus sanctus. In baptismo peccatorem abremissa donantur. Pseudo-Eusebius, *Homilia De Trinitate Generalis*. (MBP 6, 654B): Dicit haereticus, creaturam esse Spiritum sanctum. Non ita est. Nam qui abolitionem criminum secunda nativitate largitur non creatura est, sed creator. Qui ergo hominem in secundis liberat a peccato, ipse in primis condidit sine peccato. . . . Ita enim legimus: "nemo potest donare peccata nisi solus Deus" (Jh. 20:22). Dicit Apostolus, "Quicumque Spiritu Dei aguntur, hi filii sunt Dei" (Lk. 5:21). Quapropter refuge de Spiritu sancto impiae persuasionis errorem.

220. B.A.H. II, p. 175:29.

221. B.A.H. II, p. 187:13: Quia vero est verus deus, audi beatum Johannem dicentem in epistola sua: "Et simus," inquit, "in vero Filio eius Jesu Christo. Hic est verus Deus, et vita aeterna" (I Jh. 5:20). Audis verum deum, et praesumis dicere minorem, et non confiteris aequalem? AUGUSTINE, *Misc. Agost. Morin* 3, 1 (p. 596:19): Habemus enim divinum de hac re testimonium, manifeste dicente ipso Johanne in epistola sua, "Ut simus in vero Filio eius Jesu Christo: ipse est enim verus Deus, et vita aeterna" (I Jh. 5:20). Tenete quia Christus verus Deus est.

222. De Trin. II, p. 175:32. AUGUSTINE, *De Trin.* 1, 6, 9 (8, 754): Et si non est Filius ejusdem substantiae cujus Pater; ergo facta substantia est; si facta substantia est, non omnia per ipsum facta sunt: at omnia per ipsum facta sunt: unius igitur ejusdemque cum Patre substantia est. *Tract. 1 in Joann.* 11 (3, 293): Si autem non dicis Verbum Verbi, concede non factum, per quod facta sunt omnia.

is it read that He is a lesser god except, as has been said, because of the dispensation of the assumed flesh."²²³

Finally because He is God, the Son must be adored no less than the Father. Sacred Scripture both commands this adoration and teaches us by the example of the first Christians. In this connection it is interesting to note that St. Caesarius seems to accept a not-very-often-met belief that St. Joseph was still living at the time of Christ's Resurrection: "If only the Father is to be adored, then why do Mary and Joseph together with the eleven apostles adore the Son after the Resurrection?"²²⁴ Hence the words of Matthew 4:11, "The Lord thy God shalt thou worship and him only shalt thou serve," must be understood to refer not only to the Father — as the Arians maintained — but to the triune God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.²²⁵ To say therefore that Christ is a creature is most certainly a blasphemy directly opposed to the second commandment: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."²²⁶

There remains one final point to consider under this title. It is Caesarius's use of and the significance he attaches to the divine names, *Lord* and *God*. We know that not a few of the first Fathers distinguished between these two names. The first, *God*, was reserved to the Father and the second, *Lord*, was used when

223. B.A.H. II, p. 189:23.

224. De Trin. II, p. 172:10. Cf. *Ser.* 89, p. 352:15. AMBROSE, *De Jos. Patri.* 1, 2 (PL 14, 644): Quis est ille quem parentes et fratres adoraverunt super terram, nisi Christus Jesus, quando eum Joseph et mater cum discipulis adorabant, Deum verum in illo corpore confitentes. . . .

225. De Trin. II, p. 172:3. AUGUSTINE, *Epis.* 170, 3 (2, 609): "Dominum Deum tuum adorabis et soli illi servies" (Deut. 6:13): proculdubio Dominus Deus noster cui soli "latreia" servire debemus, non est Pater solus nec Filius solus, nec solus Spiritus sanctus, sed ipsa Trinitas unus Deus solus, Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus. *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 26, 14 (8, 744): Hic est ergo Deus Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, Trinitas unus Deus: cui uni iubemur ea quae non nisi Deo debetur servitute servire, cum audimus: "Dominum Deum tuum adorabis et illi soli servies" (Mt. 4:10). VINCENT OF LERINS cites this passage of Augustine in his *Excerpta*, Madoz, op. cit. p. 106.

226. De Trin. II, p. 175:34: Agnosce ergo et intellege, quia ipse contradicente scriptura divina nomen domini sui in vanum accipit, qui eius Filium creaturam esse crediderit. AUGUSTINE, *Ser.* 9, 3 (5, 50): Dicitur tibi, "Ne accipias in vanum nomen Dei tui" (Ex. 20:7). Ne existimes creaturam esse Christum, quia pro te suscepit creaturam: et tu contemnitis eum qui aequalis est Patri, et unum cum Patre.

the Son was meant. The distinction was not absolute, nor always observed even by those Fathers who made it. There was a danger in making the distinction, and in many instances it is a sign of a subordinationist tendency.²²⁷ With the Latin Fathers at a very early time, at least by the time of St. Cyprian, the formula *Dominus et Deus* was used to designate Christ in order to counteract the heretical implications of distinguishing the names.²²⁸ Arianism quite naturally provoked further reflection on the divine names. So also Caesarius took up this question in order to prove from Sacred Scripture that the Son is rightly called "Lord and God." The agreement with *Quicumque* terminology, which we have seen throughout, shows up here in a striking way. Three times in the same paragraph the Archbishop of Arles repeats the expression found in the Athanasian Symbol, *Deum et Dominum*.²²⁹

The Arians rejected the use of this title in referring to the Son. They also sought justification of their stand in Sacred Scripture, and they maintained that this was furnished by St. Paul when he writes: "For us there is only one God, the Father from whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him."²³⁰ From this teaching of the Apostle of the Gentiles the Arians argued that only the Father can in the strict sense be called "God." Caesarius shows how such an interpretation of the text necessarily leads to the utmost absurdities. If the heretics argue from this text that only the Father can strictly be called "God," then they must also admit from the text that only Christ can be called "Lord." According to their interpretation both must be conceded: that Christ is not God, and that the Father is not Lord. How obviously false is this assertion Caesarius goes on to point out.

Et quid erit in dei virtute, nisi et dominus fuerit, et in domini proprietate, nisi et deus sit; cum deum id perficiat esse, quod dominus est, et dominum id constituat esse, quod deus est?²³¹

227. Thus we may see a trace of Tertullian's subordinationism in his use of the divine names: Itaque deos omnino non dicam nec dominos, sed apostolum sequar ut si pariter nominandi fuerint Pater et Filius, deum Patrem appellem et Jesum Christum dominum nominem. (Adv. Prax. 13; ed. and translated by E. Evans, London 1948, p. 104).

228. P. LEJAY, op. cit. p. 141.

229. De Trin. II, p. 170-171.

230. I Cor. 8:6.

231. De Trin. II, p. 177:7. HILARY, *De Trinitate* 8, 35 (PL 10, 263): Et

His conclusion is that in the one God and one Lord a division of power is impossible, for if it were possible then he who is Lord would not be God and he who is God would not be Lord.

The ultimate proof, however, that the Son is properly called "Lord and God" is the scriptural usage. For He is so called even by St. Paul from whose words to the Corinthians the heretics based their argument.²³² Even more eloquent in the refutation of all heresies which would call into doubt the divinity of the Son is the wonderful declaration of faith made by the doubting Apostle, "My Lord and my God" (Jh. 20:28).²³³ When he discusses the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Caesarius shows that this Person also is properly called "the Lord God."²³⁴

In this way the Archbishop of Arles is brought back to that fundamental revealed truth with which he began his Trinitarian work, *the one true God is the Trinity*. With it he ends his discussion of the divine names, and it is no less apt as a conclusion for this chapter on the consubstantiality and sequels, for on this sublime truth, which we know directly from the mouth of the *Verbum Dei*, ultimately depends everything that has been said in this chapter. So where it is said: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord,"²³⁵ we know that this solemn declaration must be understood "not only of the Father, nor only of the Son, nor only of the Holy Spirit, but of all together: Father and Son and Holy Spirit, who is the one and true God — Trinity."²³⁶

quid erit in Dei virtute, nisi Dominus est, et in Domini potestate nisi Deus est; cum et Deum id perficiat esse quod Dominus est, et Dominum id constituat esse quod Deus est?

232. De Trin. II, p. 171:3: Quod et dominus sit, ipse apostolus dixit: "Unus Deus, ex quo omnia; et unus Dominus Jesus Christus, per quem omnia" (I Cor. 8:6). Ecce apostolus eum et deum et dominum esse profitetur. One might be surprised by the freedom with which the Saint employs the Sacred Text to suit his purpose. In quoting I Corinthians here, he leaves out several significant words. The result of these omissions is that the text, which in its entirety refers to the Father and the Son, refers only to the Son in the way Caesarius cites it. The verse in full with the missing words italicized reads: "Unus Deus *Pater* ex quo omnia *et nos in illum*, et unus Dominus Jesus Christus, per quem omnia. . . ." A similar usage of the verse is found on page 173:11. But, quite inconsistently, on page 176:30 the same verse is used to show the unity existing between the Father and the Son.

233. De Trin. II, p. 171:6.

234. B.A.H. II, p. 195:13.

235. Deut. 6:4.

236. De Trin. II, p. 171:12.

CHAPTER II

THE INTERNAL PROCESSIONS

Everything St. Caesarius wrote to preserve the unity of substance in God could only emphasize the inevitable Trinitarian question: *Quomodo tres et unum?* The Archbishop's reply is both simple in its brevity and profound in its completeness: *Unitatem facit aequalitas virtutum, trinitatem proprietas personarum.*¹ The first part of this reply was the very crux of the whole Arian controversy at the time Caesarius wrote these words. To defend and prove this assertion is the principal purpose and end of his Trinitarian works. To this one truth can be reduced in some way all that we saw in the previous chapter. The second part of the reply: *Trinitatem (facit) proprietas personarum*, expresses the personal plurality existing in the Trinity. It was not a point that came directly into the Arian discussions. The Semi-Arians especially were ready to admit a plurality in God, if by this was meant a plurality of unequal persons. For this reason Caesarius did not consider it necessary to expatiate on this part of his reply. He answered the question in full, but whereas he goes on from there to write an entire tract on the unity and consubstantiality, he never returns to an *ex professo* treatment of the triplicity and the nature of this "property of persons" he refers to. This does not mean that we shall find nothing in his writings on the personal element of the mystery. The nature of the subject he treats forces him to consider not only the consubstantiality of the Son but also the Son Who is consubstantial; not only the divinity of the Holy Spirit but also the Holy Spirit Who is divine. We can see from this, however, that he treats the unity and triplicity from a slightly different aspect, and it will be well to bear this in mind as we begin our investigation into the latter element of his Trinitarian doctrine.

The property of the Persons makes the Trinity. What does he mean by the "property of Persons"? In another place he says that there are three properties just as there are three Persons.² And since

1. B.A.H. II, p. 192:22.

2. B.A.H. II, p. 186:11: *Credantur ergo tres personae, sed non tres substantiae; tres proprietates, sed non tres potestates.* VICTOR OF VITA, *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae* II, 56 citing *Liber fidei*

he says that it is the properties that make the triplicity, it follows that in the mind of Caesarius it is the properties of the Persons which give rise to whatever distinction there is between the Persons. The Persons, we know from Scripture, are the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. *Cum dixeris Pater, Filius et Spiritus sanctus, personas explicuisti.*³ Hence the property of the Persons is that which makes the Father the Father, the Son the Son, and the Holy Spirit the Holy Spirit. What this is in each instance is the precise point we should like St. Caesarius to tell us. He does, indeed, give us a starting point both for the Father and Son, and for the Holy Spirit. Of the first he writes: *Genitus et ingenuus personae est differentia, non naturae,*⁴ and of the Holy Spirit: *Ad essentiae distinctionem procedere eum ex Patre testatus est, sicut legimus, "Paracletus ex Patre procedit"* (Jh. 15:26).⁵ Generation of the Son by the Father, procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son — these two things Caesarius took directly from Scripture, and they offer him an infallible foundation for his twofold division: generation and procession.

Generation

The existence of a generation in the Trinity requires no extended proof. Nothing could be more certain in view of Sacred Scripture's constant reference to the Father and the Son. Such scriptural language can have no meaning whatsoever unless we suppose some kind of procession of the Son from the Father. This procession is properly called "generation" because it is the proper function of a father to generate a son.⁶ Scripture describes this relation between the Father and the Son usually by first mentioning the Father and then the Son, thereby demonstrating that the Son is from the Father and

catholicae by Eugenius of Carthage (CSEL 7, 47): *Quia ingenui Patris et geniti Filii et procedentis Spiritus sancti una est deitas, tres vero personarum proprietates.*

3. Ser. 213, p. 805:19.

4. Ibid. p. 804:15.

5. Ibid. p. 803:19.

6. To say "Father" at once supposes a generated Son. The necessary connection between such terms as: "generation," "Father," "Son" has an important place in Caesarius's consideration of the first procession. Cf. Ser. 9, 48:26; De Trin. II, p. 166:18.

not the Father from the Son.⁷ That Scripture at times makes exceptions to this order when speaking of these two Persons shows only that though from the Father, the Son is equal to the Father.⁸

So much for the fact of a generation. Concerning this there can be no doubt. But far from being satisfied, the human mind is only impelled to ask what and how. The generation of a human son by a human father is one of nature's greatest mysteries, but what are we to say of the generation of a divine Person? In what does it consist? How does it take place? The selfsame questions were asked of St. Caesarius, and his reply was: *Nolo discutias*. The servant is not to inquire into those things which pertain to the birth of his Lord.⁹ Our study would end here were it not for the fact that the Arians did not observe this rule of reverential etiquette. The heretics did not hesitate to investigate brazenly the manner of the Son's generation in the hope of finding something which would seem to support their error. Hence Caesarius, who refused to inquire into the manner of the divine generation in order to satisfy the curiosity of the human mind, was forced to do so to some extent in order to refute the Arianistic explanation of the divine generation.

The terminus of the divine generation is not a creature. This is the first and most fundamental quality of this procession, which distinguishes it from all human generation and also from the procession of the creature from the Creator. The proof that the Son, the term of the generation, is not a creature is that the principle of the generation is the *substance* of the Father.

7. B.A.H. II, p. 185:6: Etiam si priori semper loco nominaretur, valde videbatur esse conveniens, quia ex ipso est Filius, non ille ex Filio. AUGUSTINE, *De Fide et Symbolo* 9, 18 (6, 159): Quemadmodum non unus esset Pater et Filius, sed unum essent et quid proprie Pater esset, et quid Filius insinuare conati sunt, quod ille genitor, hic genitus; ille non de Filio, hic de Patre.
8. B.A.H. II, p. 185:7: Ut aequalitatem agnoscas, audi in scripturis ubi etiam prior Filius nominatur. ITHACIUS, *Contra Varimadum* 1, 49 (PL 62, 384): Si tibi dixerint: Ob hoc Filius Patri non coaequatur, quia in scripturis divinis prius Pater, et postea Filius nominatur. The author then refutes this objection, as does Caesarius, by citing a number of texts of Scripture where the Son is named first.
9. Ser. 9, p. 48:26. AMBROSE, *De Fide* 1, 10, 65 (PL 16, 543): Licet scire quod natus sit: non licet discutere quemadmodum natus sit. Illud negare mihi non licet, hoc quaerere metus est.

Pater enim quando dixit, "Ex utero ante luciferum genui te," (Ps. 109:3) non eum creaturam intellegi, sed ex substantia sua natum voluit credi.¹⁰

The immediate principle of generation, therefore, is the substance of the Father, but what then is the principle of creation from which it is distinguished? Caesarius did not consider it necessary to make this explicit. But from other passages there can be no doubt that he would have replied, the *will* of the Father, or rather the will of the Trinity.¹¹ The only essential point here is that the Son proceeds from the substance of the Father; hence He is not created out of nothing — not a creature.¹² in this doctrine of the *ex substantia Patris* one is struck by the identity of thought and word in Caesarius and the *Quicumque*. According to the Athanasian Creed Christ is God because *ex substantia Patris ante saecula genitus*.¹³ The emphasis which St. Caesarius lays on this doctrine and the frequency with which he returns to it make it clear that for him this is the most important and fundamental thing that can be said about the divine generation and will influence whatever else he has to say about it.

Caesarius mentions and demonstrates several notes of the divine generation which we might call properties of that act. In reality these are nothing else than those things which necessarily pertain to an act which proceeds from the substance of the Father. In the first place, it is a *perfect act*. We may judge the perfection of an act both from the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem*. Certainly an act can not have a more perfect *terminus a quo* than the substance of the Father, and of equal perfection is the *terminus ad quem*, the Son, Whose substance is one with that of the Father. Caesarius states it

10. De Trin. II, p. 176:4; p. 175:28. AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Max. Ar.* 1, 7 (8, 683): "Ex utero ante luciferum genui te". . . . Illa ineffabilis generatio etiam si ex utero Patris accipitur, hoc significatum est, quia de se ipso, hoc est, de substantia sua Deus Deum genuit. *Ser.* 135, 3, 4; (5, 657): Et quare dixit, "Ex utero," nisi ut intelligeretur de sua substantia genuisse.
11. B.A.H. II, p. 190:23; p. 191:23. De Trin. II, p. 169:25. *Ser.* 213, p. 804:26.
12. De Trin. II, p. 175:27: Scio enim quod ideo minorem Filium credatis, quia eum non de substantia Patris natum, sed ex nihilo creatum. . . . Si ipse creatura est, quomodo per ipsum creata sunt omnia. AUGUSTINE, *Ser.* 214, 5 (5, 945): Genuit unicum Verbum per quod facta sunt omnia: sed hoc non de nihilo, sed de se ipso: ideo non fecit, sed genuit. . . . Hic est Filius Dei unicus; quia de substantia Patris. . . . est.
13. *Ser.* 3, p. 22:29.

very briefly: *Itaque perfectus genuit perfectum*.¹⁴ A second property of the act of generation is that it is *eternal*.¹⁵ By this property is meant that the act of generation does not have a beginning. *Agnosce sic Filium de Patre natum esse, ut cum eo inveniatur initium non habere*.¹⁶ It is doubtful whether Caesarius thought of the act of generation as also eternal in *duration*, so that the Father, having never begun to generate, never ceases to generate. It is very probable that he never averted to the question, or if he did he did not come to a definite conclusion one way or the other. Yet we might point out indications that he may have considered the act of generation a completed act, for otherwise he probably would have expressed himself differently.¹⁷ A third property of this act is that it is *necessary*. Once again it is not possible to cite texts and give references for a particular point which Caesarius never treated *ex professo*. It is certainly his thought, however, and we can see it presupposed in much of what he says. Thus the insistence on the generation from the substance of the Father and not from the free will certainly implies its necessity. Negatively the necessity is implied when Caesarius affirms that the generation does not terminate in a creature, which is the effect of a free act of God. Finally after the revelation of the mystery we can see that the infinite goodness of the Father necessitates Him in His act of generation. We saw, indeed, that in his argument from the divine goodness Caesarius is not concerned with the necessity but with the equality.¹⁸ In spite of this fact, however, it does not take much reading between the lines to see that the necessity is also presupposed there. It will not hurt to recall what has already been pointed out, that, though the Father necessarily generates His Son, He is not coerced

14. B.A.H. II, p. 183:20. De Trin. II, p. 174:28. AMBROSE, *De Fide* 1, 1, 9 (PL 16, 531): . . . Quod perfectus Pater perfectum Filium genuisse credatur: et Pater et Filius unum sint, non confusione personae, sed unitate naturae.

15. Cf. the coeternity of the Father and Son, p. 59.

16. De Trin. II, p. 178:23.

17. B.A.H. II, p. 191:25-30. De Trin. II, p. 177:31; p. 166:12. At first sight one might think that the comparison with sun and fire which constantly give off light would indicate a perpetual generation of the Son. Caesarius does not make this a point of comparison, however. He rather sees in this necessary union of fire and light a comparison to the circumincession of the Father and Son. Cf. De Trin. II, p. 178:18.

18. Cf. equality from reason, p. 51 ff.

to do so, as though He would be unwilling to generate.¹⁹ In Caesarius's works, however, we find more explicit reference to the voluntary nature of the Father's generating than to the necessary nature of this generation.²⁰

If we have been able to arrive at the doctrine of the Archbishop of Arles with regard to the terms and the properties of the act of generation, we shall find it much more difficult to discover his thought on the precise nature of the act itself. In applying the term generation to God, we do so in an analogical manner — indeed the same is true of the names Father and Son — and hence a fortiori if we try to understand more about this act of generation, our explanation shall have to remain on an analogical level. The Semi-Arian explanation of the divine generation forced Caesarius to defend the Church's teaching on this matter by several analogies. From these we are able to gain some insight into the nature of the divine generation according to the thought of this sixth-century defender of the faith.

Notwithstanding his repeated and poignant criticisms of the Semi-Arians for attributing to the divine generation the imperfections found in human generation, on two occasions Caesarius himself draws a comparison between these two. We have seen how he uses this comparison to build up an a fortiori argument for the equality of the Son. If men can generate sons equal to and even greater than their fathers, are we to suppose less in God, so that the Father cannot generate a Son equal to Himself?²¹ What interests us more here, however, is the fact that he should make the analogy at all. In spite of the heretical turn often given to this comparison, he nevertheless admits that though infinitely separated there are yet certain similarities. The most important of these similarities is that in both there is a

19. Cf. page 55, footnote 146.

20. De Trin. II, p. 167:15-19; p. 174:20-25.

21. De Trin. II, p. 174:15: Et tamen cum in ipsa generatione humana frequentius videamus aliquos patres et sapientia et virtute et honoribus et divitiis multos maiores, quam ipsi erant, filios et habuisse et habere; si homo maiorem et meliorem filium, quam ipse est, gignere solet, deo Patri non concedis, ut aequalem sibi Filium generasset? AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 15, 5 (8, 712): Agnosce aequalitatem Patris et Filii. Quia et homo si posset, filium mox generaret aequalem, nec expectaret annos, per quos in forma filii posset voluntas ejus impleri. Deus ergo cur non aequalem genuit Filium? Cf. *Ser.* 139, 2, 2 (5, 678).

real generation. Sacred Scripture speaks of the Father and the Son, which supposes a generation. But does this act of divine generation have anything in common with what we know as human generation? That Caesarius uses the analogy when there were good reasons for steering clear of it altogether, certainly shows that he considered the divine generation a true generation with an analogy in human generation, but yet not to be circumvented by any of the imperfections of human generation.²² The First Person is truly a Father, analogous to a human father; the Second Person is truly a Son, analogous to a human son. Even when Caesarius rejects the heretical usage of this comparison, he does so in such a way that it is clear that he objects, not to the use of the analogy as such, but to the univocal way in which the heretics used it.²³

While considering the coeternity of the Father and the Son, we came across another comparison employed by St. Caesarius. He drew an analogy between sun, brightness and warmth on the one hand and the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit on the other.²⁴ His primary purpose in making this analogy was to find in nature something to which he could compare the coeternity of the divine Persons. Hence we should no longer be faithful to his thought if we took anything from the analogy beyond what Caesarius explicitly intended by it. He does use the same comparison, for instance, to show that the Son is truly generated by the Father and not the Father by the Son, just as the brightness is generated by the sun and not the sun by the brightness. Once more the emphasis is on a real procession of the Second Person from the First. Besides this there is nothing we can learn from this analogy concerning the nature of the divine generation.

A final and most important analogy for the divine generation was suggested to Caesarius by Christ's own words: "The Father has taught me."²⁵ The occasion for making the analogy was the heretical interpretation the Arians gave to another text in St. John: "The Son can do nothing of himself, but only what he sees the Father doing."²⁶

22. De Trin. II, p. 177:30: Hoc loco, sicut iam superius dictum est, similitudo te circumvenit generationis humanae, dum credis quod sic unigenitum suum genuerit Pater, quomodo carnales homines filios generare solent.

23. B.A.H. II, p. 183:11-23.

24. De Trin. II, p. 178. Cf. p. 60.

25. John 8:28.

26. John 5:19.

In the section on the co-omnipotence, we saw the general norm based on the divine processions which Caesarius formulated to interpret texts of this kind.²⁷ But here he goes much further than answering the objection concerning the co-omnipotence inasmuch as the nature of the divine generation itself is found in these texts. If at any time the Saint does not observe his own counsel that the servant is not to inquire into the birth of his Lord, it is here. The above words of Our Lord, "The Father has taught me" and "The Son can do nothing of himself" refer to His procession from the Father. It is thus that Caesarius unites the *teaching* and *generating* of the Son, so that *to generate* and *to speak* is the same in God the Father.

Si enim deus in cordibus nostris cum loquitur, miro modo loquitur sine sono, putas quomodo potest loqui Filio suo, qui est Verbum eius? Sic ergo cogita, quia incorporaliter loquutus est Filio, quia et incorporaliter genuit Filium. Nec enim sic docuit, quasi indoctum genuerit: sed hoc est eum docuisse, quod est doctum et scientem genuisse; et hoc est, "Docuit me Pater," (Jh. 8:28) quod est, scientem genuit me Pater.²⁸

Does Caesarius in this passage treat the manner in which the Father generates the Son? Again we have the difficulty of dealing with non-theological terminology and on that account the possibility of not reaching the full content of his words. On the other hand, an even greater danger is that we shall put into these words something more than was intended by their author and which we know only from other sources. To preserve the greatest possible objectivity, therefore, we shall take from his words only those things which seem beyond doubt. In the first place, we must answer the above inquiry in the affirmative. Caesarius is certainly referring to the manner in which the Father generates the Son. He identifies the Father's *speaking* to the Son and *generating* the Son; *teaching* the Son and *generating* the

27. Cf. p. 70.

28. B.A.H. II, p. 191:24-30. AUGUSTINE, *Tract 40 in Joann.* 5 (3, 567): Si ergo Deus, ut dicere coeperam, loquitur in cordibus nostris sine sono, quomodo loquitur Filio suo? Sic ergo, Fratres, sic cogitate, quantum potestis, ut dixi, si licet parva magnis modo aliquo comparare: sic cogitate. Incorporaliter Pater locutus est Filio, quia incorporaliter Pater genuit Filium. Nec eum sic docuit quasi indoctum genuerit: sed hoc est eum docuisse, quod est scientem genuisse; et hoc est "Docuit me Pater" (Jh. 8:28), quod est, scientem me genuit Pater.

Son. The Father generates the Son *knowing*, and the Son is the *Verbum* of the Father. Very rarely (two or three times in all) does Caesarius refer to the Second Person as the *Verbum*. That he does so on this occasion in connection with an explanation of the manner of generation of the Son cannot be supposed to have been by chance. We can hardly be accused of reading too much into his words when we see in the use of the proper name *Verbum* here another indication that Caesarius believed the act of generation to be wholly incorporeal, fittingly compared to such intellectual acts as speaking and teaching. In fine, the act of divine generation is in some way analogous to intellectual activity.

It is worthy of note that all we have seen from this last analogy is not the fruit of Caesarian speculation — nor anyone else's for that matter. Here, as we have seen throughout, St. Caesarius is faithful to the doctrine and word of Sacred Scripture. The Father "teaching" and "speaking to" His Son, the *Verbum Patris* — this is scriptural language to describe the manner in which the Father generates His Son. Though the servant has dared to inquire into the birth of his Lord, he has not thereby entered into forbidden territory. The light of revelation guided his investigations into the nature of divine generation, and because of this he does not fall victim to the blindness of the heretics, who "do not want to know what God does not want them to be ignorant of, and who want to know what God has not commanded to be known."²⁹

Finally, the generation constitutes the distinction between the first two divine Persons. The generating of the Father and the being-generated of the Son demand a distinction of Persons. This is the explicit teaching of St. Caesarius, as is clear from a number of passages. When explaining why the Holy Spirit is called neither "genitum" nor "ingenitum," he writes: *Non dixit genitum, ne Filium crederes; non dixit ingenitum, ne Patrem putares.*³⁰ Caesarius never uses the term "relation," but there is no doubt that his doctrine on the distinction of Persons is essentially one of opposite relations:³¹ *Quia si ille sem-*

29. Ser. 213, p. 803:18.

30. Ibid. p. 803:18.

31. It is significant that the *Quicumque* also, while clearly supposing a doctrine of relations, does not once use the term. One is reminded here of something similar in St. Athanasius, who, though his explanation

*per Pater, sine dubio et ille semper Filius fuit;*³² *Patrem cum audis, Filii intellege Patrem.*³³ Clearest of all: *Genitus et ingenuitus, personae est differentia.*³⁴ This is as clear a statement as can be found concerning the nature of the distinction between the Father and Son. We are now in a position to give a partial answer to our original question: What are the properties of the Persons? The personal property of the Father is His paternity;³⁵ the personal property of the Son is filiation. And since the properties of the Persons constitute the distinction in the Trinity, it follows that the paternity and filiation constitute the distinction between the Father and Son.

Procession

In the section on the divinity of the Holy Spirit we saw that the Semi-Arians with whom Caesarius had to deal held to a doctrine of pure Macedonianism in regard to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity.³⁶ They openly denied the divinity of this Person, Who, unlike the Son, was properly called a creature. The Archbishop of Arles, although primarily concerned with the Church's teaching in regard to the Second Person, was however no less resolute in his determination to safeguard also the Catholic doctrine concerning the Third Divine Person. To prove that the Holy Spirit is true God together with the Father and Son is the one end to which he directs in some way every word he wrote concerning this divine Person. Those things which went beyond this purpose were not of very great concern to him. Moreover in regard to the procession of the Holy Spirit, as in the case of the generation, he feels that one may readily be guilty of a culpable curiosity in seeking to understand more about this mystery of mysteries.

of the personal distinctions certainly supposes the relations, yet never uses the term, since it is a philosophical and not a scriptural word. It is not unlikely that the same reason accounts for the absence of the term in St. Caesarius.

32. De Trin. II, p. 167:3. AUGUSTINE, *Tract. 29 in Joann.* 5, (3, 514): Nec inter generantem atque generatum aliquod interfuisse temporis intervallum: tamen hoc servato et custodito ista dicimus, quod ille Pater est, ille Filius. Pater autem non est, si non habeat Filium, et Filius non est, si non habeat Patrem.
33. Ser. 9, p. 48:24.
34. Ser. 213, p. 804:15.
35. De Trin. II, p. 166:32.
36. Cf. p. 75.

*Non scruteris qualiter deus sit, quem deum esse manifestum est; hic ratio latet, veritas non latet.*³⁷ But just as his defense of the Son's equality drew him from time to time into a discussion of the generation, so in defending the divinity of the Holy Spirit, he was drawn into a consideration of the procession of the Holy Spirit.

Following the same plan used in treating the generation, we ask first of all concerning the existence of a second procession in the Trinity. Again we find that the procession of the Holy Spirit is a most certain fact of revelation. Scripture speaks so clearly of this procession that Caesarius does not consider it necessary to demonstrate its existence, but at once inquires into the terms. Thanks to the controversy waging at his time, he is very explicit in regard to the terms of this procession and goes to great pains to defend his stand from Sacred Scripture. The *terminus a quo* is the Father and the Son: *Spiritus vero sanctus ab utroque procedens*.³⁸ Procession from the Father is seen from John 15:26: "The Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father."³⁹ That the Spirit proceeds also from the Son is no less certain from the testimony of Sacred Scripture, even though it is perhaps not quite so explicit.

Ergo quia Spiritus sanctus de utroque procedit, ideo dicitur: "Qui autem Spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est eius" (Rom. 8:9) et alio loco: "Insufflavit, et dixit: Accipite Spiritum sanctum." (Jh. 20:22)⁴⁰

Note that Caesarius does not cite any mission texts to show the procession from the first two Persons. We shall see in the next chapter why he does not. We find the same insistence on the *Processio ab utroque* in the Athanasian Symbol: *Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio . . . procedit*.⁴¹ Finally the doxologies with which St. Caesarius ends the

37. Ser. 213, p. 804:1.

38. Ser. 10, p. 51:10. Cf. Ser. 213, p. 804:5. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 9 (CSEL 21, 115): Ergo quia Spiritus sanctus ex utroque procedit. . . . Ibid. 2, 6 (CSEL 21, 146): Item da proprium: ingenitus, genitus, ex utroque procedens. Morin also assures us that Caesarius made his own the formula "ex utroque procedens" which he borrowed from the Bishop of Riez. Cf. RB 18 (1901) 352.

39. Ser. 213, p. 803:20.

40. Ser. 213, p. 804:5. Verbatim from FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 9 (CSEL 21, 115).

41. Ser. 3, p. 22:20.

majority of his sermons give no clue to a distinction in the manner in which the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.⁴² It must be admitted, however, that his evident purpose in these doxologies is to proclaim the perfect equality and divinity of all three Persons and not to express the manner in which the processions take place.

From the above we believe it sufficiently clear that Caesarius held it as most certain that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. In spite of this it is very probable that the question will arise in the mind of the reader of Caesarius's Trinitarian works, whether this doctrine was always so much a part of the Archbishop's Trinitarian thought. In the first place, all the passages we have cited above which evidently speak of a procession from the Father and the Son are found in the *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos* or in *Sermons* 212 and 213, whereas the *Libellus De Mystério Sanctae Trinitatis* — a work which without any doubt antedates these others — nowhere contains this doctrine. This silence would in itself, however, hardly justify our raising the question, were it not for certain texts in the *Libellus* which seem to indicate a different doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit from that found in the *Breviarium*. The significant passages appear in Caesarius's argument for the eternity of the Son and the Holy Spirit from an analogy between divine generation and procession and the proper activity of the sun and fire.⁴³

Agnosce sic Filium de Patre natum esse, ut cum eo inveniatur initium non habere; et ita sanctum Spiritum a Patre procedere, ut illa processio numquam credatur originem habuisse.⁴⁴
Quomodo et Filius et Spiritus sanctus de Patre sunt, non Pater ab illis, sic et splendor et calor de sole nascuntur.⁴⁵

It must be admitted that Caesarius is not here specifically treating the procession and yet the evasive language comes as a sort of surprise after we have just considered the direct and clear teaching of the *Breviarium* on the divine procession from Father and Son. If one

42. His doxologies are nearly always the same. The following form with very slight variations is used whenever all three Persons are mentioned: " . . . praestante domino nostro Jesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto vivit et regnat in saecula saeculorum. Amen" (Ser. 46, p. 202:12).

43. Cf. p. 60.

44. De Trin. II, p. 178:23.

45. Ibid. p. 178:6.

considers the words in themselves, they certainly lend themselves very well to that doctrine which explains the procession of the Holy Spirit as from the Father only. Do we therefore have in Caesarius's later works a development in regard to the procession of the Holy Spirit that is not found in his earlier works? If so, is there a true doctrinal development, i.e., a doctrine of procession from the Father alone becoming a doctrine of procession from the Father and the Son, or is there merely question of an expressive development, i.e., the doctrine of the *Libellus* and the *Breviarium* is the same only better expressed in the latter work? That there is some development — hence at least a development in expression — seems to be sufficiently attested to from the different citations we have given from the two works. In regard to whether or not there is a development in doctrine, this much at least seems warranted from the intrinsic evidence: A certain doctrinal development in Caesarius's explanation of the procession of the Holy Spirit is possible and perhaps to some extent even probable. More than this, however, cannot be maintained from the intrinsic evidence, which is meagre and insufficient to offer us certainty or even a high degree of probability. If the question is ever to be settled, it will have to be done on related extrinsic evidence and so it is that we postpone the final word on this question until we consider it further in part two.⁴⁶

The term of divine generation is not a creature, as we saw, because it proceeds from the substance of the Father. If we recall Caesarius's purpose in writing about the Holy Spirit, we shall see why it is of still greater importance to show that this second procession also has a *terminus ad quem* equally divine with the *terminus a quo*. The Church's teaching of the procession from the Father and Son was understood by the Semi-Arians to mean a creation of the Holy Spirit by the Father and Son or by the Father through the Son. Caesarius refutes this notion of the second procession by a general principle applying equally to both of the divine processions and manifesting one of the most advanced theological concepts of his writings. *Qui enim de interioribus dei progreditur, non dei creatura, sed dei probatur esse substantia.*⁴⁷ The Holy Spirit is not a creature because He proceeds from the interior of the divinity, and in the procession

46. Cf. pp. 207-209.

47. Ser. 213, p. 803:24. Verbatim from FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 9 (CSEL 21, 115).

from the divinity, remains within the divinity. However, evidently nothing is more intrinsic to the Father and Son — from Whom the Holy Spirit proceeds — than the divine substance itself. In reality, therefore, the Holy Spirit is not a creature because He, as the Son, proceeds from the divine substance.⁴⁸ The divinity of the proceeding Person is maintained in either case in the same way, though Caesarius does not express this exactly in the same way both times. Yet there can be no doubt that from this aspect, i.e., of showing the divinity of the Person proceeding, the *ex substantia Patris* in the procession of the Son and the *de interioribus Dei* in the procession of the Holy Spirit have the same meaning. We shall see presently why St. Caesarius does not say this explicitly even though it is unquestionably the thought behind his words.

If the above is true — and his own words leave no doubt that it is — then how does Caesarius distinguish between these two processions? We are not here concerned with a problem that did not confront the Archbishop of Arles. In his sermon on the divinity of the Holy Spirit he raises the identical problem though in slightly different words: "Is the Holy Spirit generated or not generated?"⁴⁹ His reply is short and definitive: "It is an act of impiety to disrupt the divine silence."⁵⁰ Concerning the procession of the Son, we know from Sacred Scripture that it is a generation. But concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, he could find nothing in Sacred Scripture beyond the fact of its existence. It is, to be sure, clearly revealed in Scripture that the Third Person is divine, omnipresent and omnipotent, but whether He is generated or ungenerated is not revealed.⁵¹ St. Caesarius gives

48. Caesarius must have read *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 13, where Faustus expressly refers to the Holy Spirit as being from the substance of the Father: Quod ergo Spiritus sanctus a Patre procedit, tria in eo privilegia deitatis ostendit, id est, ut in persona sua substantia et sine ullo spatio temporis permanere et omnino ex substantia Patris probetur existere (CSEL 21, 128).

49. Ser. 213, p. 804:8: Utrum genitus, an ingenitus sit, requiris. Nihil ex hoc eloquia sacra cecinerunt. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 9 (CSEL 21, 115).

50. Ser. 213, p. 804:9: Nefas est inrumpere divina silentia. FAUSTUS, *ibid.*

51. Ser. 213, p. 803:16: Scripturae sanctae de potentia et deitate Spiritus sancti loquuntur: utrum vero genitus dici debeat, an ingenitus, non loquuntur. Vide quas sibi tenebras infidelitas facit: non vis scire quod deus noluit ignorari, et vis scire quod deus non iussit inquiri. FAUSTUS, *ibid.*

two reasons for this silence of Sacred Scripture. The first, as we have already seen, is that the Holy Spirit may not be confused with either of the other two Persons. He is not called *genitus* lest He be mistaken for the Son, and not *ingenitus* lest He be confused with the Father.⁵² The second reason is negative in that there is nothing unbecoming in this scriptural silence. Nothing would be added to the glory or substance of the Holy Spirit were it known that He is generated or ungenerated. Likewise it is not derogatory to the Son that the Spirit is not affirmed to be *ungenerated*, nor derogatory to the Father that the Spirit is not called *generated*.⁵³

Whether the procession of the Holy Spirit is a generation or not and in what way it is distinct from the procession of the Second Person, Caesarius does not know. He does know, however, and maintains unquestionably that there is a second procession and that this procession is in some way distinct from the generation of the Son. Of this he is certain from Sacred Scripture, but he knows no way to safeguard the distinction of this procession from that of the Son except by different terms. Hence he never says that the Holy Spirit proceeds *ex substantia Patris*, but *de interioribus Dei*; never "generation," but "procession." Indeed, so absolutely dependent is he on Scripture for whatever he says of this procession, that he will not even go so far as the *Quicumque* in its denial that this procession is a generation.⁵⁴ He rather preferred to make a humble admission of ignorance; and yet it is not ignorance but nescience and even a virtuous nescience.⁵⁵

52. Ser. 213, p. 803:18: Non dixit genitum, ne Filium crederes: non dixit ingenitum, ne Patrem putares. FAUSTUS, *ibid*.
53. Ser. 213, p. 804:12: Nam nec Filio quicquam derogat, quod ingenitus esse non legitur; nec Patri, quod genitus non habetur. FAUSTUS, *ibid*. (CSEL 21, 116).
54. Ser. 3, p. 22:20: Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus, neque creatus, neque genitus, sed procedens.
55. St. Augustine also acknowledges ignorance before this mystery of mysteries: Non potes tale aliquid cogitare. Magis pia est talis ignorantia, quam praesumpta scientia. . . . De Deo loquimur, quid mirum si non comprehendis? Si enim comprehendis non est Deus (*Ser.* 117, 2, 5 (5, 582). We may suppose that the Archbishop of Arles, who was familiar with this sermon as we know from several instances of dependence on it, was much more ready to make his own this acknowledgement of ignorance than to follow the Bishop of Hippo into the dreaded Trinitarian speculations.

Among the properties of this second internal procession St. Caesarius mentions only two: first, its eternity, and second, that it establishes no order or degree in the Trinity. In its eternity the procession of the Holy Spirit is exactly like that of the Son. It also is eternal in that it has no beginning. Whether it is also eternal in duration, an eternal act, remains an unanswered question here, as in the case of the generation of the Son.

Agnosce sic Filium de Patre natum esse, ut cum eo inveniatur initium non habere; et ita sanctum Spiritum a Patre procedere, ut illa processio numquam credatur originem habuisse.⁵⁶

Secondly, this eternal procession gives rise to no order or degree in the divinity. The reason for this is that both terms of the procession remain within the divine substance. *Procedentem ex deo non esse ordine vel gradu tertium monstrat unitas maiestatis.*⁵⁷ Certainly Caesarius does not deny that order which is inherent in a procession, i.e., the person proceeding and the person from whom he proceeds. He only affirms that this relative order implies no order or degree of being or perfection. The latter is not possible within the same substance. Thus the Archbishop masterfully connects the two elements of the inner divine processions: a real distinction manifested by a diversity of names and founded in the really distinct terms of the processions, and a perfect unity in the one substance giving absolute equality and excluding degree of being among the Persons.

An internal divine procession from the Father and the Son, eternal and without order or degrees — such is the procession of the Holy Spirit as St. Caesarius describes it. This much is revealed, and it is as far as the Saint will go. He found nothing on the nature of this procession in Scripture, and he refused to permit faulty rational speculation to supply for the silence of the Bible. But this lack of knowledge concerning the nature of the second procession made it all the more imperative to show clearly how there is a distinct personality. We saw above that what distinguishes the First and Second Persons is paternity and filiation, or generator and generated. However, since we do not know if the Holy Spirit is generated or ungenerated, how do we

56. De Trin. II, p. 178:23. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 11 (CSEL 21, 122): Nam si non esset Spiritus sancti processio sempiterna, localis videtur esse substantia.

57. Ser. 213, p. 803:24. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 9 (CSEL 21, 115).

know that the Holy Spirit is really a distinct Person? Caesarius seems to have been aware of this difficulty, and for that reason he goes to great pains to show that the Holy Spirit is a really distinct Person.

Just as the two divine processions are maintained distinct by means of a different terminology, so his first argument for the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit is based on the distinction of names found in Sacred Scripture: *Praeter duas esse tertium probat diversitas nominis*.⁵⁸ It is true that we have here a type of nominalism, but it is a nominalism that is based on ignorance and not on any identification of the objective reality. However, the case is not quite the same here as before with the processions. For though Caesarius could not show how the two processions are distinct, he could give real proof for the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit once there is established a second and really distinct procession.

Ad essentiae distinctionem procedere eum ex Patre testatus est, sicut legimus: "Paraclitus ex Patre procedit" (Jh. 15:26). Quae cum ita sint, vel sic agnosce Spiritum sanctum propriam habere personam.⁵⁹

Caesarius was not able to say whether generated or ungenerated, but he could say proceeded, and this is sufficient. For to say "proceeded from the Father" testifies to another distinction in God. For the one proceeding must be distinct from the one from whom he proceeds. Therefore, inasmuch as the Third Person proceeds from the first two Persons, it is known that "the Holy Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son but the Spirit of the Father and the Son."⁶⁰

58. Ser. 213, p. 803:23. FAUSTUS, *ibid.* Cf. also 2, 6 (CSEL 21, 146): Da in Deo nomen speciale vel proprium, id est, Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus. The same idea is found in AUGUSTINE, *De Civ. Dei* 11, 10, 1 (7, 279): Spiritus sanctus propria quadam notione hujus nominis sacris literis nuncupatur.

59. Ser. 213, p. 803:19.

60. Ser. 213, p. 805:1: Ita tamen in Spiritum sanctum credite, ut nec Patrem eum putetis esse nec Filium, sed Spiritum Patris et Filii. This expression, "Spiritum Patris et Filii" seems to have come from Augustine rather than from Faustus. AUGUSTINE, *De Symbolo*, Ser. ad *Catech.* 9, 9 (6, 573): Spiritus sancto nec Pater est, nec Filius, sed Spiritus est Patris et Filii. *De Trinitate*, 1, 4, 7 (8, 753): Spiritusque sanctus nec Pater sit nec Filius, sed tantum Patris et Filii Spiritus. *Misc. Agost. Morin* 3, 2 (p. 597:8): Non est tantummodo Patris Spiritus,

Returning now to our original question: What is meant by the property of the Persons?, we can reply that the properties are paternity, filiation and procession. These three personal properties distinguish the Persons and constitute the one true God triune. Thus Caesarius, without once using the word, gives a fairly exact and complete doctrine on the divine relations. The one generating and the one generated, the one proceeding and the one from whom he proceeds — these are all familiar ideas in Caesarian thought. It is precisely these relations that he calls the properties of the Persons which give the personal distinction in the one divine substance. Finally there are two processions: the generation of the Son by the Father and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son. These two processions proceed from the divine substance and yet remain in it; they are eternal and necessary and yet voluntary. Most important of all, though these two processions give rise to the personal properties and a distinction of Persons, they do not cause any order or degree of perfection among the three divine Persons, Who are absolutely equal in all things. Manifesting superb ability at synthesis, Caesarius gathers almost all that has been treated in this chapter in a few short phrases, which remind one of the language of the *Quicumque*.

Credantur ergo tres personae, sed non tres substantiae; tres proprietates, sed non tres potestates. Ita una sine principio sempiternitas, sicut una sine fine maiestas; sine auctore Pater, sine tempore Filius, sine maiore Spiritus sanctus.⁶¹

Quomodo tres et unum? If we found in the previous chapter that St. Caesarius is primarily concerned with the *Unitatem facit aequalitas virtutum*, this chapter shows that he did not entirely ignore the second part of the reply to this fundamental Trinitarian question: *Trinitatem (facit) proprietates personarum*.

aut tantummodo Filii: sed Spiritus est Patris et Filii. *Ser.* 114, 10 (5, 948): Nec Spiritus sanctus sit aut Pater aut Filius; sed . . . Spiritus sanctus Patris et Filii Spiritus.

61. B.A.H. II, p. 186:11.

CHAPTER III

THE DIVINE MISSIONS

Who is greater, he who sends or he who is sent? This question with its apparently simple answer was the basis for one of the most frequently repeated objections of the Arians against the Church's doctrine of perfect equality in the Trinity. Indeed those numerous texts of Sacred Scripture which speak of the missions of the Second and Third Persons would seem to make this a formidable objection. At least no Catholic apologist writing during the period of Arianism could afford to ignore it. What seemed to add weight to the objection was the fact that Scripture never referred to the Father as being sent. The Arian explanation of these scriptural texts was the evident one: the Father, being greater than the Son and the Holy Spirit, sends these two Persons; the Son, being greater than the Holy Spirit, sends the Third Person. The Archbishop of Arles had a different way of explaining these mission texts of Sacred Scripture. But what is of even greater interest to us is his doctrine on the divine missions, which we can learn from his refutation of the Arian objection.

The Mission of the Son

There was a slight variation in the way the Arians interpreted the mission texts of the Son and those of the Holy Spirit. This difference was, as we have already seen several times, based on their fundamental doctrine in regard to these two Persons. Caesarius gives us the Arian interpretation of those texts which speak of the Son's being sent: *Sed forte, quia audis missum, ideo putas minorem*.¹ Certainly it should be noted at the very outset that any solution of this problem must begin with the acknowledgment of the scriptural data. First of all, there is a mission of the Son. Secondly, the Son is sent by the Father. Lastly, it is clear from Sacred Scripture that the mission of the Son is the Incarnation. All of this is readily admitted also by St. Caesarius. That there is a mission of the Son and in what this mission consists is stated in so many words: *Filii missio incarnatio*

1. B.A.H. II, p. 183:25.

*eius intellegitur.*² As soon as we speak of a mission, we at once presuppose a sender. We have no difficulty identifying this sender. Our Lord declares over and over again that He comes forth from the Father and that it is His Father Who has sent Him into the world. From this Caesarius is also able to show what is the role of the Father in our redemption: *Quia ad redemptionem nostram deus Pater Filium suum misit.*³ Yet all these undeniable facts of revelation must be explained in such a way as to preserve intact the absolute and perfect equality of the Father and Son, of the Sender and the Sent.

The solution which St. Caesarius hit upon to explain the mission text has already been hinted at in the section on the omnipresence of the three divine Persons. In the first place, the Archbishop points out that the nature of a mission demands besides a *sender* and a *sent* a third element also. This is the *previous absence* of the one sent in that place to which he is sent. All three of these elements he considered so inherent in the notion of a mission that without any one of them it would be absurd to speak of mission.⁴ The irreconcilability of this notion of mission with the omnipresence of the divine Persons is at once apparent to all.⁵ Either we shall have to change our notion of mission or we shall have to deny the possibility, and hence the actuality, of a mission of a divine Person. The first was not an alternative for St. Caesarius. The possibility of reconciling the omnipresence and a mission of a divine Person never arose for the Saint. The only way out was the second alternative. He develops his argumentation to this end in a very logical step by step manner.

Rogo te, deum credis esse Filium, an non? Sine dubio respondurus es, deum; . . . Interrogo te, utrum deus ubique sit, an forte localiter? Cum impium sit negare quod ubique sit deus; et si ubique est, quaeso te, ubi missus est?⁶

2. De Trin. II, p. 170:7. Cf. B.A.H. II, p. 196:26.

3. Ser. 213, p. 804:29.

4. We are not to look for a one-two-three enumeration of these three constituent elements of a mission, but they are quite evident from the whole tenor of his argumentation.

5. We have here the underlying reason for his great insistence on the omnipresence of the Son and the Holy Spirit. Cf. p. 71.

6. B.A.H. II, p. 183:25; p. 184:8. The same thought is found in the De Trin. II, p. 168:26: "Ille enim in alio loco mitti solet, qui ubique esse non potest. Dei enim Filius quomodo ubique non est, per quem dicente apostolo "Omnia facta sunt" (Jh. 1:3), non solum caelum et terra, sed et angeli

The conclusion is no less surprising than compelling: *There is no mission of the Son insofar as He is God*. The Second Person is not sent, simply because He is God and hence there is no place where He is not already because of His omnipresence. St. Caesarius adds an interesting confirmatory argument. If the Son were sent, then it would follow that the Father also goes from place to place, for, as Christ testifies, "He who sent me is with me" (Jh. 8:29).⁷

In this way the Arian objection is certainly adequately dispatched. If there is no mission of the Son, there no longer remains any basis for the objection. But what about the mission texts? In telling us what Scripture does *not* say, Caesarius has said nothing concerning that which Scripture *does* say. He does however explain the mission texts. His explanation is very simple, one of which we have already seen in another connection.

Credi cum catholicis, (Filium) non esse missum nisi secundum carnem. . . . Agnosce ergo, Filium secundum deitatem minorem nec fuisse nec esse, nec mitti nisi per incarnationis mysterium.⁸

et archangeli, "throni, dominationes, principatus, et potestates" (Col. 1:16)? Unde iterum atque iterum quaero a te, ut mihi reddas rationem, quomodo mittitur, qui ubique est? Cf. AUGUSTINE, *Con. Serm. Arian.* 1, 4 (8, 627): Quis enim mittitur illo ubi est? Ubi autem non est sapientia Dei, quod est Christus, de qua legitur, "Adtingit a fine usque ad finem fortiter, et disponit omnia suaviter" (Wis. 8:1)? *Tract. 40 in Joann.* 6 (3, 567): Sed forte Pater ubique et Filius non ubique est? Evangelistam audi: In hoc mundo erat, et mundus per eum factus est" (Jh. 1:10). Ergo, inquit, "qui misit me," cujus auctoritate tamquam paterna incarnatus sum, "mecum est, non me reliquit" (Jh. 8:29). ITHACIUS, *Con. Varimadum*, 1, 3 (PL 62, 358): Dum manifestum est, eum qui carnem nostram dignanter assumpsit, voluntate, et non ab alio missus advenerit. Nam qui in Patre manens virtute potentiae suae consistit, ubi a Patre mitteretur omnino non habuit; quoniam nulla pars saeculorum ac terrae a conspectu Patris excipitur, ubi secundum vos a Patre Filius mitteretur.

7. De Trin. II, p. 169:3: Nam si secundum divinitatem dixeris missum, ergo et Patrem de loco ad locum transisse crediturus es, quem secum venisse Christus ipse testatus est, dicens: "Qui me misit, mecum est" (Jh. 8:29).
8. De Trin. II, p. 169:2. B.A.H. II, p. 184:10, p. 196:26. ITHACIUS, *Con. Varimadum*, 1, 3 (PL 62, 357): Cernisne quoniam Filius non secundum deitatem a Patre missus est, sed secundum carnem, quam clementer et pie pro nobis assumere non dedignatus est? AMBROSE, *De Fide* 5, 7 (PL 16, 667): Qui si secundum carnem non accipis missum,

The general rule formulated by St. Caesarius for interpreting those scriptural texts which seem to imply a subordination of the Son to the Father applies also to the mission texts.⁹ When Sacred Scripture says that the Son is sent, we must understand this can only refer to His human nature. Hence the explanation of the words, "The Father is greater than I" (Jh. 14:28) and "God sent His Son" (Gal. 4:4) is one and the same. Both texts refer to the human nature of Christ.¹⁰

However, if we lay aside for a moment what we saw previously concerning the mutual exclusiveness of the omnipresence and the Caesarian notion of a divine mission, it would seem that the above words of the Archbishop could have a different meaning. We know that our present theology texts also affirm the doctrine that the Son is not sent except in His Incarnation. However, what is precisely meant by this? It is certainly nothing else than the theological expression of the teaching of the Church that the *only* visible mission of the Second Person is had in the assumption of the human nature by the divine Verbum. Hence whenever Sacred Scripture speaks of the Son as sent in a visible manner, this is understood to refer to the Incarnation. Now the question is asked whether it might not be this that St. Caesarius

ut Apostolus dixit, ("In quo infirmabatur per carnem, Deus Filium suum mittens in similitudinem carnis peccati" Rom. 8:3), et ex verbo simplici praejudicium struis. . . . Throughout this chapter St. Ambrose keeps insisting that the Son is sent "secundum carnem." AUGUSTINE, *Tract. 40 in Joann.* 6 (3, 567): "Qui me misit, mecum est" (Jh. 8:29). Si ergo tecum est, O Domine, non unus ab alio missus est, sed ambo venistis. Et tamen cum ambo simul sint, unus missus est, alter misit: quoniam missio incarnatio est.

9. Cf. p. 41.

10. It is worthy of note that still in the fourth book of the *De Trinitate* (8, 826), ST. AUGUSTINE gives the above meaning of the Son's mission as one of the ways to interpret the mission texts. Ch. 19: "Cum ergo venit plenitudo temporis, misit Deus Filium suum factum ex muliere, factum sub lege" (Gal. 4:4); usque adeo parum, ut factum; eo itaque missum, quo factum. Si ergo major mittit minorem fatemur et nos factum minorem et in tantum minorem in quantum factum, et in tantum factum in quantum missum. Ch. 20 (8, 827): Secundum hoc jam potest intelligi non tantum ideo dici missus Filius quia Verbum caro factum est, sed ideo missus ut Verbum caro fieret, et per praesentiam corporalem illa quae scripta sunt operaretur; id est, ut non tantum homo missus intelligatur quod Verbum factum est, sed et Verbum missum ut homo fieret. FULGENTIUS, *Cont. Fab.* Frag. 29 (PL 65, 797): Sed quia non uno modo in scripturis sanctis dicitur missio. . . . etc.

had in mind when he writes: *Nec mitti nisi per incarnationis mysterium*; and not, as we have stated above, that the Son is only sent in His human nature in the same way as He is less than the Father in His human nature? We grant that this is a possible interpretation of his literal words considered apart from the context in which they are found. It is not, however, the meaning intended by St. Caesarius. This is evident, first of all, from the Saint's purpose in writing these words. By them he wanted to give an explanation of the mission texts which would constitute a refutation of the Arian interpretation of these texts. If, however, he merely wanted to say that the only mission of the Son is the Incarnation, he would not even be touching the Arian objection. Secondly, comparing this explanation of the mission texts with that of the seemingly subordinationist texts, we find that his interpretation of both is the same. In either case we meet an identical manner of expression and never a hint that the two species of texts are to be interpreted differently. For both the key to the explanation is "the mystery of the Incarnation" and — more important — the manner of interpreting is the same.¹¹ In both explanations the truth of the scriptural text is found realized only in the human nature of Christ.¹² Even more conclusive, however, in showing this identity of interpretation is Caesarius's own union of the two explanations in his exegesis of Galatians 4:4, "God sent His Son, born of a woman, born under the Law." Evidently the last part of this verse is realized in the human nature of Christ and Caesarius argues that the same is true for the first part, which speaks of God sending His Son. Just as the Son is born of a woman only in His human nature, so He is sent only in His human nature.¹³

11. De Trin. II, p. 173:29: Minor dicitur Filius propter incarnationis mysterium; p. 169:6: Nec mitti nisi per incarnationis mysterium.

12. B.A.H. II, 182:5: Ipse dominus secundum dispensationem carnis assumptae loquitur, deputant divinitati, ut est illud: "Pater major me est" (Jh. 14:28). Cf. also Ibid. p. 193:7. De Trin. II, p. 169:2: Non esse missum nisi secundum carnem. Cf. Ibid. p. 168:24.

13. De Trin. II, p. 169:5: Agnosce ergo, Filium secundum deitatem minorem nec fuisse nec esse, nec mitti nisi per incarnationis mysterium; quod etiam apostolus evidenter ostendit, ubi ait: "Misit Deus Filium suum, factum ex muliere, factum sub Lege" (Gal. 4:4). Diligenter adtende, quia secundum hoc et missus et minor dictus est, iuxta quod non solum ex muliere, sed etiam sub lege factus est. AUGUSTINE, *De Trinitate*, II, 5, 8 (8, 776): Itaque cum ait: "Misit Deum Filium suum factum ex muliere" (Gal. 4:4), satis ostendit eo ipso missum Filium quo factus est ex

A number of difficulties are connected with Caesarius's interpretation of the mission texts. In the first place, the context of the scriptural passages usually seems to imply that the Son is sent not only through the created nature which He assumed, but specifically as a divine Person. Moreover, how can it be said that in the Incarnation itself the Son is sent in His human nature when this nature was assumed only in the Incarnation and is the *terminus ad quem* of His mission? If we begin, however, as Caesarius does, with the impossibility of harmonizing the mission of a divine Person with the omnipresence, then any questions such as these are of little import in the final analysis. For then the axiom holds: *Contra factum non valet argumentum*. The fact is and remains that the Son as God cannot be sent and therefore is not sent. If Scripture nonetheless does say that the Son is sent, that can be true only in His human nature.

Mission of the Holy Spirit

Starting again with the missions — this time of the Holy Spirit — the Arians and especially the Semi-Arians used the same line of argumentation but went even further than in the case of the Son. *Vos enim, quia frequenter missus dicitur Spiritus sanctus, non solum minorem, sed etiam creaturam eum creditis esse.*¹⁴ In Caesarius's refutation we shall find much that is similar to what we just saw in regard to the mission of the Son. Here again he begins with the denial of a strict mission of the Holy Spirit. His demonstration is the same as we saw before, except that here, in line with his usual argumentation concerning this Person, he argues directly from the omnipresence of the Third Person and not from the divinity to the omnipresence, as he did for the Second Person.

“Spiritus, inquit, Domini replevit orbem terrarum” (Sap. 1:7).
Cum vero totum mundum impleat, et nulli loco absens esse

muliere. Quod ergo de Deo natus est, in hoc mundo erat: quod autem de Maria natus est, in hunc mundum missus advenit. ST. VINCENT OF LERINS cites this section of the *De Trinitate* in the *Excerpta* 5, Madoz, op. cit. p. 114. FULGENTIUS, *Cont. Ser. Fast.* 1, 8 (PL 65, 516): Dicimus aequalem Patri, in quo cognoscimus sine initio natum de Patre; dicimus et minorem, quia cum “venit plenitudo temporis, misit Deus Filium suum factum ex matre, factum sub lege” (Gal. 4:4).

14. De Trin. II, p. 169:13.

probetur, quomodo intellegendum est illud, quod totiens missus dicitur? . . . Quomodo Pater, ita et Filius et Spiritus sanctus ubique sint et mitti de loco ad alium locum omnino non possint.¹⁵

Once more the conclusion is unavoidable: the Holy Spirit, no less than the Son, cannot be sent. Evidently if the omnipresence renders a mission of the Son impossible, it must also exclude the possibility of a mission of the Holy Spirit, Who is omnipresent together with the Son.¹⁶

Again, however, there is the evident testimony of Sacred Scripture to a mission, indeed, to a number of missions of the Holy Spirit. The first mission of the Holy Spirit mentioned in the New Testament is His appearance in the form of a dove at Christ's baptism. The second and most clear mission is that of Pentecost, when He appeared in the form of tongues of fire. St. Caesarius seems to think that there are yet others, for besides the appearances in the forms of a dove and of tongues of fire, he speaks of "different assumed signs of this kind."¹⁷ One of these is undoubtedly the gift of tongues given to the Apostles also on Pentecost.¹⁸ If we examine these missions, we find that in each instance the Holy Spirit makes His presence known in some wonderful visible manner. It is precisely this common element that Caesarius holds to be the mission of the Third Person.

Missio Spiritus sancti non aliter recte potest intellegi, nisi apparitio vel declaratio operum eius. . . . Ita et quando Spiritus sancti missio dicitur, non aliud quam magnitudo operum eius ostenditur.¹⁹

15. De Trin. II, p. 170:4, 20. FULGENTIUS, *De Trinitate* 1, 6 (PL 65, 503): Missus quippe in eo quod super Christum in columbae specie venerit in flumine, quod supra apostolos venerit in igne. Ipsa quippe apparitio missio est. Nam ubi mittitur, qui ubique est? "Spiritus," inquit, "Domini replevit orbem terrarum" (Sap. 1:7. *Cont. Fab. Frag.* 28 (PL 65. 787): Agnosces Spiritum sanctum, quia unus est sicut Pater et Filius, immensus, implens omnem creaturam, et opera faciens quae sola divinitas facit: qua idem unus de loco ad locum mitti non potest.

16. Cf. p. 72.

17. B.A.H. II, p. 197:1.

18. De Trin. II, p. 170:10: Denique quando in pentecoste missus legitur, dum beati apostoli repleti eius gratia linguis alienis "loquebantur magnalia Dei," praesentem eum esse monstrabant.

19. De Trin. II, p. 170:13-18. Cf. B.A.H. II, p. 196:25.

In other words, a mission of the Holy Spirit is nothing else than the manifestation of His presence by the greatness of His works.²⁰ After having excluded the possibility of a mission of the Holy Spirit as a divine Person, St. Caesarius is now able to explain those passages of Sacred Scripture which refer to the Holy Spirit as being sent. It is important to note carefully what essentially constitutes this mission, and to this end it may be helpful to restate his doctrine in more familiar terms: the external sign itself, which manifests the presence of this divine Person, constitutes and is the mission of the Holy Spirit.

In order to clarify further the precise nature of a mission of the Holy Spirit, St. Caesarius compares it to the mission of Christ: *Sicut Filii missio incarnatio intellegitur ita Spiritus sancti missio manifestatio declaratur.*²¹ This, however, gives rise to a difficulty that was not hitherto apparent. Does the Archbishop wish to say here that the Holy Spirit assumes these visible forms, e.g., those of a dove or of tongues of fire, in a way similar to the union of the divine and human natures in Christ?²² His words may be open to this interpretation, but we may be sure that this was furthest from the Saint's mind when he made the above comparison. Long before the time of our Saint the essentially different manner in which the Son assumed the human nature and the Holy Spirit assumed these creatural forms was universally acknowledged as a part of the Church's teaching. We cannot suppose anything but the accepted doctrine in one so unquestionably orthodox as the Archbishop of Arles, even though he does not expressly refer to the matter in his Trinitarian works. It was not a point of vital importance in the Semi-Arian disputes. Moreover there is no reason to see a contrary opinion in the above comparison. St. Caesarius frequently says that the Son is sent in His human nature, but never does he say, for instance, that the Holy Spirit is sent in the nature or form of a dove. Here then we come upon an important

20. De Trin. II, p. 170:9: Tunc enim missus dicitur, quando per operum magnitudinem praesentia eius agnoscitur.

21. B.A.H. II, p. 196:26. FULGENTIUS, *De Trinitate* 1, 6 (PL 65, 503): Quo modo Filium credimus missum secundum hominem, ita missum Spiritum sanctum propter columbam vel ignem.

22. The doctrine of the two natures in one Person is the basis of all Caesarius has to say about the mystery of the Incarnation: In domino Jesu Christo sicut unam personam, ita duas esse substantias. (B.A.H. II, p. 182:3.)

distinction between the missions of the Son and the Holy Spirit. Though the omnipresence renders equally impossible a mission of the Son and of the Holy Spirit in their divinity, yet Caesarius's explanation of the mission texts referring to the Son and those referring to the Holy Spirit is not the same. As the Saint often repeats, the Son is, indeed, sent in His human nature. The Holy Spirit, on the other hand, is not in reality sent, but is *said* to be sent when some visible sign manifests His presence.²³ This distinction does not, however, exclude a very essential element which the two missions have in common. This is that in both missions the truth of the mission text is realized in creatures: the human nature of Christ and the forms of a dove or of tongues of fire. This was uppermost in the mind of St. Caesarius and it is unquestionably from this aspect that he compares the two missions.

So far we have seen that there is nothing that would hint to a connection between the internal divine processions and the missions. Yet we might expect the Saint to find some sort of relation between these two. We saw that he taught without hesitation that the Son proceeds from the Father.²⁴ No less a part of his thought is the sending of the Son by the Father.²⁵ Equally certain is the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son,²⁶ and in like manner Scripture assured him that both the Father and the Son sent the Holy Spirit.²⁷ In spite of all this, however, there is no indication that Caesarius saw any relation between the divine processions and the missions. Indeed, when we recall his fundamental notion of a divine mission, this is not surprising. For him there was no mission of a divine Person — except of the Son in His human nature — and therefore there is hardly any reason to look for any such connection. The same reason why the Father is not sent, i.e., the omnipresence, is also the

23. It must be admitted that St. Caesarius never expressly makes the distinction we here refer to, but it seems to follow necessarily from all that we have seen up to this point. Moreover that it does accurately express his thought is, I believe, equally certain from several statements that implicitly make this distinction. De Trin. II, p. 170:9: Tunc enim (Spiritus sanctus) missus *dicitur* quando per operum. . . etc. Ibid. p. 175:15: Quando Spiritus sancti missio *dicitur*, non aliud. . . etc. Cf. full citation p. 107.

24. Cf. p. 84.

25. Cf. p. 102.

26. Cf. p. 94.

27. John 14:26 and 15:26.

reason why the Son and the Holy Spirit are not sent.²⁸ There is an even stronger reason not to suppose any dependence of the missions on the processions in the mind of St. Caesarius. He held firmly to a procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son, and yet, when demonstrating the equality of the Holy Spirit to the other two Persons, he states explicitly that in the Incarnation the Son is sent by the Holy Spirit.²⁹

If, then, for the Archbishop of Arles, there is no relation between the divine processions and the missions, why does Sacred Scripture speak of the missions of individual Persons at all? St. Caesarius gives us the answer to this query, though we find it mentioned in a

28. De Trin. II, p. 170:19: Quod autem, quomodo Pater, ita et Filius et Spiritus sanctus ubique sint, et mitti de loco ad alium locum omnino non possint.
29. B.A.H. II, p. 196:15: Ideo (Spiritus sanctus) minor est, quia missus legitur. Et quid dicturus est, cum legit in Isaia propheta ex persona Christi dicentis: "Dominus misit me, et Spiritus eius" (Is. 48:16)? Ibid. p. 197:2: Quomodo ergo minor credendus est, qui etiam deum, qui sicut ipse aequalis est Patri, approbatur ad nostram remissionem misisse? et non solum misisse, sicut per Isaia dictum memoravimus, sed etiam secundum carnem creasse, sicut habes in evangelio angelum ad Mariam dixisse: "Spiritus, inquit, sanctus veniet in te. . . etc." Not that we also have here a confirmation of what has been said in regard to the mission of the Son. FULGENTIUS, *Ad Monimum* 2, 6 (65, 184): . . . Ideo Spiritum sanctum minorem credendum Patre et Filio, quia et a Patre missus est, et a Filio. Porro autem si misso mittens potior est credendus, cognoscant in hoc suam convinci perfidiam, quia sicut a Patre et Filio missus legitur Spiritus sanctus, sic a Patre et Spiritu missus invenitur et Filius. . . . Sed et alio ejusdem prophetae loco a Domino atque ab ejus Spiritu se missum his verbis ostendit: "Et nunc Dominus misit me, et Spiritus ejus" (Is. 48:16). ITHACIUS, *Cont. Varimadum* 2, 2 (PL 62, 400): Quoniam ipse (Filius) Spiritum discipulis misit, ita se a Spiritu sancto missum prophetica annuntiatione praedocuit, ipso Isaia loquente: "Spiritus Domini super me, propter quod unxit me evangelizare pauperibus misit me" (Is. 61:1). AUGUSTINE, *Cont. Ser. Arian.* 1, 19 (8, 637): Ubi ostenditur quod et Pater et Filius miserint Spiritum sanctum. Sicut ostenditur per prophetam quod et Pater et Spiritus sanctus miserint Filium. Nam quis nisi Filius per Isaia adventum suum praenuntians dicit, . . . "Dominus misit me, et Spiritus eius" (Is. 48:16). *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 20, 4 (8, 721): Nec sic arbitremur a Patre missum esse Filium, ut non sit missus ab Spiritu sancto: cum vix ipsius sit per Prophetam, "Et nunc Dominus misit me, et Spiritus ejus" (Is. 48:16). . . . Nec sic a Patre et Spiritu sancto missus est, ut se ipse non miserit. Cf. also *De Trinitate* 2, 5, 8 (8, 776).

slightly different connection. The question arose, why was it necessary for the Holy Spirit to come after the Ascension of Christ? Had not Christ sufficiently instructed His Apostles? Was the Holy Spirit perhaps sent to complete the doctrine of Christ? Caesarius rejects all these explanations as nothing less than blasphemous and goes on to state the true reason, and in so doing he also gives us the purpose of the divine missions.

Quomodo hoc agnosci evidentius potest? quomodo nisi quia ad redemptionem nostram deus Pater Filium suum misit, Filius nos sua passione salvavit, fidem autem nobis Spiritus sanctus inspiravit? Ac sic salus ecclesiarum totius divinae trinitatis operatio est.³⁰

These words also seem to confirm what we have seen throughout, that St. Caesarius does not make a clear distinction between the missions and the appropriations. Above all, however, the Saint wants to teach here the purpose of the divine missions. It is to make known to us that the work of salvation is the work of the entire Trinity.

Caesarius's doctrine on the divine missions is, therefore, an effort to harmonize two contradictory elements. These are the mission texts of Sacred Scripture on the one hand, and on the other, the starting premise that a mission of a divine Person is incompatible with omnipresence. The Archbishop never broke away from the idea that a mission implies that the one sent goes to a place where he was not present in any way before. Certainly with such a notion of mission, he had to reject the possibility of the mission of a divine Person. Not to do so would be to fall into the very error of the Arians. The only explanation he could find for the mission texts of Sacred Scripture, therefore, was to refer them to His human nature in the case of the Son, and to consider the external manifestation the mission in the case of the Holy Spirit.

30. Ser. 213, p. 804:28. FAUSTUS (Pseudo-Eusebius), *Homilia de Trinitate generalis* (MBP 6, 654C): Ecce salutis tuae tota trinitas Deus militat, redemptionem tuam Pater ordinat, Filius administrat, Spiritus sanctus aequa virtute confirmat. AMBROSE, *De Spiritu Sancto* 3, 1 (PL 16, 777): Ideo autem speciem (columbae) praetendit, ut per speciem crederet, qui Spiritum non videbat, et per speciem declararet unius honoris in imperio, unius operationis in mysterio, unius muneris in lavacro cum Patre et Filio sibi esse consortium, nisi forte invalidum credimus, ut in eo baptizetur servulus, in quo baptizatus est Dominus.

This doctrine of missions as it appears in the works of St. Caesarius raises a question of some import in the ultimate appraisal of the Archbishop's Trinitarian thought. How is it that we find such an imperfect and incomplete explanation of the missions in a sixth-century Catholic apologete? The question is by no means gratuitous in view of the much more perfect doctrine on the missions found in his contemporaries and predecessors. This is especially true of St. Augustine and St. Fulgentius, on both of whom Caesarius greatly depends in his Trinitarian works. Another factor which adds to the appositeness of the question is that the Archbishop of Arles never treats of the missions except in connection with a refutation of the Arian argument that the mission texts of Sacred Scripture declare the Son and Holy Spirit less than the Father, Who is never spoken of as sent. Hence before attempting a reply to the first question, it will be necessary to answer a second and more fundamental question. Is it possible that Caesarius would have given us an essentially different idea of the divine missions if he had treated them specifically?

There are a number of good reasons which make it quite possible that the question should be answered in the affirmative. In the first place, there can be no doubt of the essentially polemical character of the whole of his Trinitarian writings. This is, moreover, eminently true in regard to his explanations of the divine missions. Not once does he refer to the missions except to refute the Arian interpretation of the mission texts. His whole purpose in regard to the missions has been attained when the Arian position has been overthrown. This Caesarius certainly believes was done by the explanation which he gives. What need was there, therefore, to say more, even though he had not given a full exposition of the nature of the divine missions as perhaps he himself conceived it? Might not all that he says about the divine missions be something like an *ad hominem* argument of this tenor: The Arians say that the Son is less because He is sent. But certainly no one is so foolish as to think that God can be sent from place to place. If we say that the Son is sent in His human nature, then what happens to the Arian objection? What need was there, then, to go into a further explanation on the nature of the missions and their relation to the divine processions? The purpose for which he is writing is accomplished without that. This purpose, for the Archbishop of Arles, was to refute, and not to teach, the Arians, and in this way to defend the Catholic faith of his flock.

On the other hand good reasons can be brought forth for an-

swering this question in the negative.³¹ The first of these reasons is concerned with Caesarius's works themselves. If we suppose that Caesarius had a fuller doctrine on the missions than that found in his works, is it likely that this would be so completely concealed when he treats the missions unless he wanted specifically to conceal it? But there is hardly sufficient evidence to suppose this. The second reason is taken from the manner in which Caesarius uses his sources. Thus, though we might look for a more perfect doctrine on the missions in Caesarius because of his dependence on Augustine, yet in our consideration of this dependence we shall see that his doctrine on the missions is not the only place where the Gallican disciple departed from his African master. The same is found in regard to Caesarius's second most important source, Faustus of Riez, who as Augustine relates the missions to the processions. In the two sermons on the divinity of the Holy Spirit which Caesarius takes almost wholly from Faustus one gets the impression that the Archbishop intentionally omits any reference to the missions because he does not agree with the notion of mission he found in the Bishop of Riez. On the other hand the *Contra Varimadum* of Bishop Ithacius, a work highly esteemed and utilized by St. Caesarius, contains an explanation of the missions which is nearly identical with that found in the works of the Archbishop of Arles.

After a consideration of these reasons for and against a fuller doctrine on the divine missions in St. Caesarius, we are probably no better able to answer our original question than we were at the outset. Caesarius's treatment on the missions is too brief to enable one to form a definitive judgment. With our present evidence it seems that the matter can hardly be settled one way or the other. It is certainly possible that Caesarius's personal understanding of the missions was more complete and in greater harmony with that of the Bishop of Hippo. On the other hand, perhaps St. Caesarius did not fully understand the African Doctor's explanation of the divine missions, so that he thought it did not sufficiently preserve the personal equality, and for that reason he did not accept it as his own. There are certainly some indications in Caesarius's use of sources to suppose this. In the end, however, it must be admitted that we do not know.

31. These reasons are merely mentioned in passing here. A fuller treatment of them will be found in connection with an examination of the individual sources.

Whatever be the answer to the above question, this much is certain; in not relating the missions to the inner divine processions he is hard put — at least in regard to the missions of the Holy Spirit — to preserve the personal character of the missions. What he calls the mission of the Holy Spirit is evidently an *opus ad extra* that is necessarily common to all three divine Persons and hence can be assigned to one Person only by way of appropriation. A final solution of this last difficulty, however, arising from Caesarius's doctrine on the missions, must wait until we have seen his doctrine on the appropriations.

CHAPTER IV

APPROPRIATION

At the end of his treatise *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos* St. Caesarius enumerates a long list (thirty-eight in all) of operations and properties that are common to the three divine Persons.¹ In each instance he cites a text of Sacred Scripture to prove that the specific operation or property belongs to each of the Persons. His immediate purpose for this long enumeration is, as he states at the outset, to prove the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

Quem etiam deum esse, ex operationum aequalitate, qui oculos cordis sanos habet, facile poterit approbare, sicut in sequentibus demonstrabimus.²

Previously, however, in referring to this list, he promises to show by it the equality of operation existing in the entire Trinity.³ Since Sacred Scripture attributes the same operation to the different divine Persons, we must conclude to a perfect equality among the Divine Persons in their operations. This argument from the equality of operation to perfect equality, consubstantiality and divinity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit is a favorite with Caesarius.⁴ It is at once evident how closely this is joined up with what we mean by an appropriation.

1. B.A.H. II, p. 199-207. This whole section with one or the other exception is, as Morin points out in the footnote, taken from book three of the *Contra Varimadum* of ITHACIUS, bishop of Ossonoba (PL 62, 411-434).
2. B.A.H. II, p. 199:25.
3. Ibid. p. 193:14: Nam de aequalitate operum trinitatis, id est, Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti paulo post donante domino de scripturis sanctis monstrabimus.
4. It is not difficult to learn the source for Caesarius's emphasis on the perfect equality and inseparability of the divine Persons in their operations *ad extra*. Saints Hilary, Augustine and Fulgentius are constantly returning to this doctrine. This very abundance of texts, however, often makes it impossible to point out instances of direct dependence. For although one finds many expressions of this truth in Caesarius which are similar to those of these Fathers, yet more frequently than not they do not show a direct dependence on a particular Father except in the general way that the emphasis these great theologians placed on this doctrine must leave its impress on one who reads their works as much as did the Archbishop of Arles.

The whole doctrine of appropriations as we understand it has its fundamental explanation in the consubstantiality of the three divine Persons. When the appropriations are viewed on this basic level, we find that we have already met a number of clear indications of this doctrine in the Trinitarian thought of our Saint.⁵ The occasion which prompted Caesarius to develop a doctrine of appropriation was an erroneous interpretation the Semi-Arians gave to many scriptural texts. They often interpreted texts as referring only to the Father, when from the context it was clear that the entire Trinity or divinity was intended.⁶ This was an abuse of scriptural interpretation, as Caesarius was not slow to point out. It is worthy of note, however, that in every instance the Saint does not say that their error is in referring these texts to the Father, but in saying that they refer *only* to the Father.

Of even greater interest to us in this chapter is the more proximate foundation for Caesarius's doctrine on appropriations, namely, the unity of those operations which have their effect outside the divine nature. We saw how the inner divine operations, i.e., the processions, which have their term within the divine nature, not only are not common to the Persons, but give rise to the very distinction of Persons. Thus in the Incarnation, though only the Son assumes the human nature, the entire Trinity cooperates in effecting the miraculous conception of Christ's human nature.

Sic enim ait evangelium: "Spiritus sanctus superveniet in te, et virtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi." (Lk. 1:35) Videte ergo cooperantem sibi invicem Trinitatem.⁷

Once more manifesting his faithful adherence to scriptural usage, Caesarius begins with instances where the Bible expresses this unity of operation. A very fine example is the Resurrection of Christ. One

5. Cf. p. 64. We can certainly trace the origin of his doctrine on the essential connection between the consubstantiality, equality of power and unity of operation to the very clear statements of ST. AUGUSTINE to that effect. *Cont. Faustum Manich.* 15, 6 (8, 276): Quorum est non solum una eademque substantia, sed etiam una eademque operatio, per ipsa propriam unam eandemque substantiam. *Cont. Serm. Arian.* 15 (8, 635): Non potest operatio esse divisa, ubi non solum aequalis est, verum etiam indiscreta natura.

6. Cf. p. 20.

7. Ser. 9, p. 48:37.

might think that at least His own Resurrection would be the proper action of the Verbum; yet the unity of operation is found here also, as is seen from Scripture's attributing it to both the Father and the Son. And from this Caesarius concludes to the unity of operation of these two Persons.⁸ The same idea is found in Caesarius's interpretation of I Corinthians 8:6, "For us there is only one God, the Father from whom are all things, and we through him." For the Archbishop the scriptural "from whom" and "through whom" are one and the same, expressing a perfect unity of operation.⁹ The similar text in Romans 11:36, *Omnia ex ipso. et per ipsum, et in ipso sunt omnia*, includes the Holy Spirit also in this operative unity. *Ex ipso* refers to the Father, *per ipsum* to the Son, and *in ipso* to the Holy Spirit.¹⁰

8. De Trin. II, p. 176:12-18: Denique de Patre apostolus dicit, "Quod Christum suscitaverit" a mortuis; et Christus de seipso dicit: "Solvite templum hoc, et ego tribus diebus excitabo illud" (Jh. 2:19). Quis enim haec legens non intellegat, unam esse operationem Patris et Filii, secundum quod ipse dominus dixit: "Quaecumque Pater facit, haec eadem et Filius similiter facit" (Jh. 5:19)? Non dixit, alia vel similia: sed ea ipsa quae Pater facit, cum Patre etiam et Filius similiter facit. AUGUSTINE, *Tract. 47 in Joann. 7* (3, 610): Audi alio loco in Evangelio, quia non solum Pater suscitavit Filium, sed etiam Filius seipsum. "Solvite, inquit, templum hoc, et in triduo suscitabo illud" (Jh. 2:19). *Enarr. in Ps. 108, 23* (4, 1225): Unde inquantum homo est Filius Dei, Deus suscitavit illum a mortuis, hoc est Pater, cui dicit in Psalmis, "Suscita me, et reddam illis" (Ps. 40:11). Inquantum autem Deus est etiam ipse se suscitavit: propter quod dicit, "Solvite templum hoc etc." (Jh. 2:19). *Cont. Serm. Ar. 1, 15* (8, 634): "Quaecumque enim Pater facit, haec eadem Filius similiter facit" (Jh. 5:19). Evangelica est et ista sententia, Filii ipsius consequenter ore prolata. Non sunt ergo alia Filii, et alia Patris, opera, sed haec eadem: nec dissimiliter fiunt a Filio sed similiter. *Tract. 18 in Joann. 8* (3, 434): Non alia Pater, alia Filius facit; sed eadem opera sunt Patris et Filii.
9. De Trin. II, p. 177:17: Confessus enim apostolus unum Patrem, ex quo omnia sunt, et unum dominum Jesum Christum, per quem omnia sunt: quaero quid diversitatis attulerit dicens, "ex Deo" et "per Christum omnia" (I Cor. 8:6). Omnia enim ex nihilo per Filium substiterunt, et a Deo, ex quo omnia, ad Filium vero, per quem omnia, apostolus retulit; et non invenio quid differat, cum per utrumque opus sit virtutis eiusdem. St. Caesarius takes this word for word from HILARY, *De Trinitate*, 8, 38 (PL 10, 265).
10. B.A.H. II, p. 199:6: Quod apostolus de trinitate dictum intellegens ait: "Omnia ex ipso, et per ipsum, et in ipso sunt omnia" (Rom. 11:36); id est, ex Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto omnia continentur. This exegesis of Romans 11:36 is found in St. Augustine several times (*De*

Another resurrection from the dead manifests the same Trinitarian cooperative action. When Elias raised the son of the widow of Sarephtha, he stretched over the boy three times,¹¹ an action which Caesarius believes is meant to indicate that the miracle is performed by the triune God. The Archbishop then goes on to draw a beautiful comparison between this miracle and the resurrection of the Gentiles from the death of paganism to the Christian life. This last spiritual resurrection is also the work of the entire Trinity, and this is symbolized by the triple action of Elias. "Not the Father alone without the Son, nor the Father and Son without the Holy Spirit, but the whole Trinity raises to life."¹² This unity of operation among the divine Persons is such that Caesarius does not hesitate to say that the Father and Son accomplish all things in one will and one operation.¹³ Perhaps nowhere does the Saint find this truth better expressed than in Isaiah 40:12, "Who hath poised with three fingers the bulk of the earth. . . ."

Nonne his in tribus digitis potentiae unius aequalitatem sub quadam mysterii lance libavit? Ergo, ut dictum est, cum iam instructus sis de societate operis, non dubites de paritate virtutis.¹⁴

The explanation of the unity of operation is ultimately without doubt the consubstantiality, but more proximately it is the unity of power possessed by all three Persons. Hence Caesarius declares that, though there are three Persons and three personal properties, there are not three powers, but only one undivided power.¹⁵ Of course,

Trinitate 1, 6, 12; *Liber de Fide et Symbolo* 9, 19), but Caesarius probably depends on St. Hilary for his interpretation of this verse as for that of the similar verse in I Corinthians. HILARY, *De Trinitate*, 8, 39 (PL 10, 266): Cum enim specialiter Deo id adscripserit, ut ex eo omnia; et proprium Christo detulerit, ut per eum omnia; et nunc honor Dei sit, quod ex ipso et per ipsum et in ipso sint omnia; et cum Spiritus Dei idem sit et Spiritus Christi; vel cum in ministerio Domini et in operatione Dei Spiritus unus operetur et dividat, non possunt non unum esse, quorum propria unius sunt; cum in eodem Domino Filio, et in eodem Deo Patre, unus atque idem Spiritus in eodem Spiritu sancto dividens, universa perficiat.

11. III Kings 17:21.

12. Ser. 124, p. 494:26.

13. B.A.H. II, p. 191:10.

14. Ser. 212, p. 802:24. FAUSTUS, *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 8 (CSEL 21, 113).

15. B.A.H. II, p. 186:12 and p. 192:27.

as we saw, the unity of power is in turn due immediately to the unity of substance. This, I believe, shows sufficiently that Caesarius held firmly and without the slightest doubt to a perfect unity of operation among the divine Persons in regard to the external divine operations.¹⁶ It is a point that we have stressed, because we shall find other passages in his writings which seem to limit certain common operations and properties to one or the other of the divine Persons. In view of what we have just seen, however, we must understand these doubtful passages in the light of his very explicit and most certain teaching concerning the unity of operation.

In spite of this firm conviction of the unity of operation, Caesarius does not refuse to follow the lead of the inspired writers in attributing certain operations and properties first to one and then to another of the divine Persons. A few examples of his style of appropriation will suffice to give some idea of how they fit in with his anti-Arian purpose and to what extent he imitated the scriptural appropriations. The first and most important of these, both because of the frequency with which he returns to it and because of its special efficacy in the Semi-Arian controversies, is *creation*.¹⁷ Though in the special list of appropriations at the end of the *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos* creation is attributed to each of the Persons,¹⁸ most of the time we read in Caesarius that it is the Son who creates.¹⁹ In justification of this appropriation he has only to cite St. John 1:3, "All things were made through him," which he does on at least six different occasions in his Trinitarian works. From time to time creation is also attributed to the Father and once or twice also to the Holy Spirit.²⁰

Appropriations to the Holy Spirit are by far the most numerous. The power to *forgive sins* is with few exceptions attributed to this Person as it is in Sacred Scripture itself. As we saw, Caesarius found

16. Thus for Caesarius the union of the three Persons in the one divine nature has its external expression in their inseparability in the *opera ad extra*. In this way he makes his own the doctrine so fundamental to Augustinian Trinitarian thought. Cf. AUGUSTINE, *Tract. 20 in Joann.* 3 (3, 450): Non ergo tantum Patris et Filii, sed et Spiritus sancti, sicut aequalitas et inseparabilitas personarum, ita etiam opera inseparabilia sunt.

17. Cf. Chapter I on omnipotence, p. 64 ff.

18. B.A.H. II, p. 200:25.

19. Ibid. p. 184:21, p. 188:25, p. 190:20, p. 198:8, De Trin. II, p. 175:23.

20. Ser. 212, p. 800:14, B.A.H. II, p. 198:11.

this appropriation helpful in defending the divinity of the Holy Spirit.²¹ *Inspiration*, i.e., speaking through the prophets and evangelists, is so consistently attributed to the Third Person that one might think Caesarius in some way considered this action proper to this Person.²² Yet in making this attribution, he is merely repeating a constantly recurring appropriation of Sacred Scripture. That he does not consider inspiration a proper operation of the Holy Spirit is seen from the fact that, at least at times, Caesarius states that the Father and the Son also speak through the prophets.²³ *Grace, charity*, and the *indwelling* are generally referred to the Holy Spirit, but from time to time also to the Father and Son.²⁴ The Father is represented as the Person accepting the satisfaction arising from the redemptive death of Christ.²⁵ Thus the list might be doubled several times over, but these few frequently recurring instances sufficiently show that the Archbishop of Arles simply repeats the traditional appropriations, most of which owe their origin to Sacred Scripture. We must not, however, lose sight of the fact that every single one of these appropriations is, in another place in his writings, attributed to a different Person, proof that he considered none of them personal activities or properties.

Two difficulties, tending toward opposite extremes in the doctrine of appropriations, have already been referred to, but can be better dealt with now that we have seen Caesarius's teaching concerning the appropriations. These two problems, which we shall now consider, are: 1) The Caesarian doctrine on the missions does not sufficiently distinguish the missions from the appropriations, so that the missions are reduced to appropriations; 2) On the other hand his argumentation from the scriptural appropriation of I Corinthians 1:24, *Christus Dei virtutem et Dei sapientiam*, seems to view power and wisdom as personal properties of Christ and not merely appropriations.

In regard to the first difficulty arising from Caesarius's definition of the missions, we do not consider it necessary to cite a host

21. B.A.H. II, p. 198:25.

22. Ser. 4, p. 24:6, Ser. 5, p. 27:16, Ser. 36, p. 148:2, B.A.H. II, p. 195:3.

23. B.A.H. II, p. 202:11, 22.

24. Ser. 213, p. 805:32, p. 806:11, Ser. 23, p. 98:21, Ser. 96, p. 377:4, Expos. in Apoc. II, p. 228:28, p. 239:17, B.A.H. II, p. 194:16.

25. Expos. in Apoc. II, p. 232:4. FAUSTUS, *Homilia IV S. Caesarii* (PL 67, 1050): Quotidie Pater Filium recipit. Semper Christus credentibus immolatur. This sermon, which is attributed to Caesarius, Morin shows properly belongs to the Pseudo-Eusebius Collection of Faustus. Cf. ZntW 34 (1935) 94.

of passages which clearly show that Caesarius must have considered the Incarnation of the Son and the Descent of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost in some way proper to these two Persons. The personal role of the Son in the Incarnation and of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost is so evidently a part of Caesarian thought that at the very outset we must clearly define the nature of the difficulty we are here concerned with. It is not at all whether there is or is not a personal role in the Incarnation and the Pentecostal Descent,²⁶ but rather how he was able to harmonize the admittedly personal character of these missions with what we have seen to be his doctrine on the divine missions. The fact is that the former question arises only when we take *our* notion, and not Caesarius's notion of mission and try to apply it to what he has to say about the Incarnation and the Descent of the Holy Spirit.

In the first place, a distinction is necessary both in the Incarnation and in the Pentecostal Descent of the Holy Spirit. In these two missions there is indeed a personal element, but there is also an element that is common to all three Persons. It is only the Son Who became man, but it was, as Caesarius also clearly teaches, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit Who effected the Incarnation. It is only the Holy Spirit Who in a special way descended on Pentecost, but it was the Father, Son and Holy Spirit Who effected the external signs that accompanied the Holy Spirit's Descent. The personal part we call a mission and the common part an *opus ad extra*. Caesarius could not, because of his notion of mission, call the personal element a mission; and therefore, without for a moment doubting that there was a personal role in these missions, he is forced to give a different explanation of the missions, and this we have already seen in the previous chapter.

Because in the mission of the Son there is a personal union with the human nature, whereas in the missions of the Holy Spirit there is no such union with the visible signs that accompanied a mission of this Person, the solution to our problem will not be the same for both missions. In the case of the mission of the Son, as Caesarius

26. This doctrine is so clearly stated by the Fathers in opposing the different Monarchianistic heresies of the second and third centuries, and was so firmly a part of the Church's deposit of faith long before the time of our Saint, that it is out of the question to suppose anything but the accepted doctrine in a Catholic bishop of the sixth century as thoroughly orthodox as St. Caesarius.

understands it, there is no difficulty in preserving its personal character. He simply interprets the sending as referring to the human nature. However, this in no wise excludes the personal character of this mission. Even though the Son is not sent as God, yet it is the Son and only the Son Who is sent as man. The case is identical with the inferiority of the Son to the Father. The Son in His divine nature is in no wise less than the Father, yet it is the Son alone in His human nature Who is less than the Father. Perhaps a comparison of our idea of the Son's mission with that of Caesarius will help to clarify the Saint's teaching here in regard to the personal character of the mission. For Caesarius the Son is sent and is less than the Father only in His human nature. Our present theology on this mission agrees that the Son is less than the Father only in His human nature, but He is sent as a divine Person. Both explanations, indeed, preserve the personal character of the mission but not in the same way. The foundation of the personal character of the Son's mission, as we understand it, is the procession of the Son from the Father as well as the hypostatic union. For Caesarius, however, the personal character of the Son's mission is due to the hypostatic union alone.

In the mission of the Holy Spirit, where there is no personal union with a creature, Caesarius does not say that the Holy Spirit is sent in His created nature. Here he calls the visible manifestation the mission, and the Holy Spirit is "said" to be sent inasmuch as these external signs indicate His presence through a special activity of the Person. It must be admitted, however, that the external manifestation, which Caesarius says constitutes the mission, is an *opus ad extra* and as such is common to the three Persons. The mission as such is here, then, not proper to the Third Person but merely appropriated to Him. All that we have seen in the previous chapter leads to this conclusion. Caesarius implies it when He says the Holy Spirit is "said" to be sent, and, at least on one occasion when explaining this mission, he is quite explicit in affirming the appropriative nature of the mission of the Holy Spirit.

Quomodo enim, quando in aliquo periculo fuerint homines, si eis misericordia divina subvenerit, dicitur quia praesens sibi fuerit dominus, cum utique absens esse nullatenus possit; ita et quando Spiritus sancti missio dicitur, non aliud quam magnitudo operum eius ostenditur.²⁷

27. De Trin. II, p. 170:14-18. We find a similar thought in *Ser.* 83 in explanation of a passage in Genesis (18:20-21): Quando ad Abraham

Though the mission as mission in the Caesarian sense is not proper to the Holy Spirit, yet this does not, for Caesarius, preclude the possibility of a personal role connected with the missions. There is here, as we have frequently seen, a special activity proper to the Holy Spirit, and though this is not the mission — which is rather the external sign — it is, however, the reason why the mission is appropriated to the Holy Spirit. To summarize we may say that according to the thought of St. Caesarius the Son alone as a divine Person — though not sent — became incarnate and is sent in His human nature, and this latter sending is properly the mission of the Second Person. The Holy Spirit alone — though not sent — descended on Pentecost and the external manifestation accompanying this Descent is properly the mission which is appropriated to the Third Person.

The argumentation of Caesarius which gives rise to the second difficulty is summarized very well by the Saint himself. He quotes St. Paul (I Cor. 1:24): *Dei virtutem et Dei sapientiam Christum esse*, and from these words formulates an argument for the coeternity.

Si Christus dei virtus est et dei sapientia, sine dubio, si secundum te fuit tempus quando Pater sine Filio fuit, nec virtutem nec sapientiam habuit.²⁸

It would certainly seem to follow from these words that Caesarius considered wisdom and power proper to the Son just as filiation itself. He argues that if the Son were not eternal the First Person would not only not be a Father but would also not possess power and wisdom. If these perfections were merely appropriated to the Son, then the Father would possess them nonetheless at that hypothetical time that He existed without the Son. Does Caesarius believe, therefore, that power and wisdom are properties of the Son?

In view of what we have seen over and over again, we might simply reply to this question by referring to those many and explicit passages in which Caesarius unquestionably affirms a perfect unity of power and an identity of operation in the Trinity. Moreover, we

responsa redduntur, non dicitur descendere deus, sed supra ipsum adstare; nunc autem, quia peccatorum causa agitur, descendere dicitur deus. Vide ne ascensionem et descensionem localem sentias: indignum est hoc de incorporea et ubique tota sentire substantia; sed descendere dicitur deus, quando curam humanae fragilitatis habere dignatur (p. 329:9).

28. De Trin. II, p. 166:25, B.A.H. II, p. 184:25, p. 191:20.

are able to find other places in his writing where the Saint clearly predicates these two specific attributes to the divine nature, which he most certainly held to be the common nature of all three Persons. In rejecting the Arian interpretation of Romans 16:27, "To the only wise God" as referring only to the Father, Caesarius proves that these words are spoken of the entire Trinity.²⁹

If, however, we consider Caesarius's argument from the words of I Corinthians 1:24, we dare not ignore the context in which it is found. It is an argument against Semi-Arianism. Now if one were to suppose, as the Semi-Arians do, that the Son is not consubstantial with the Father, then there would no longer be a foundation for mere appropriations. In that case the words of St. Paul could not be understood as an appropriation, and it would then seem true to say that if the Father ever existed without the Son He would really lack the perfections which Sacred Scripture attributes to the Son. Perhaps it was in this way that Caesarius argued from the words of St. Paul. I believe, however, that it is much more likely that the Saint — throughout manifesting a great dependence on the word of Sacred Scripture — did not hesitate to employ this argument simply because of the scriptural predication. It is possible that he never adverted to the invalidity of the argumentation inasmuch as Scripture in this text is merely making an appropriation to the Son. Another explanation, one which does not lack all probability in view of Caesarius's clear teaching elsewhere that these attributes pertain to the divine nature, is that in this argument the Saint is simply making an all-out effort to combat the heresy. To this end the Archbishop is not above employing an occasional species of sophism if he judges it advantageous.³⁰ However one chooses to understand his argumentation here, this much is certain: A few doubtful passages such as these do not have the force of the many other clear and explicit statements in which power and wisdom are attributes pertaining to the divine nature and common to all three Persons.

29. B.A.H. II, p. 187:23: *Dicit enim apostolus "Cognitum soli sapienti Deo" (Rom. 16:27): non intellegunt quia non dixit, soli sapienti Patri, sed "soli sapienti Deo," quae est trinitas. Also p. 188:4: Si ergo per Spiritum sanctum, sicut verum est, et sapientiae et scientiae sermo donatur, quomodo solius Patris personae hoc potest adscribi, quod solus sit sapiens, nisi, ut dictum est, aequè vere trinitati ista conveniunt?*

30. Other instances of a similar nature give some likelihood to this final explanation. Cf. page 82, footnote 232.

Finally the same question that was asked in regard to the missions is now asked in regard to the appropriations. Does St. Caesarius make his appropriations because of some similarity to the personal property arising from the divine processions? Again the reply must almost certainly be made in the negative. Caesarius never refers to the question, and for this reason our judgment must be largely a priori from what we have seen of his general Trinitarian thought. The Saint acknowledged an almost complete ignorance of the nature of the divine processions, and maintained that we should not even try to learn more about the manner in which they take place. With such an attitude it is not very likely that he would look for any similarity between the scriptural appropriations and the manner in which a particular procession takes place.

At first we might think that at least one exception to this would be his frequent appellation of the Son as the "Wisdom of the Father." In his explanation of the generation of the Son we saw that Caesarius compares the Father's act of generation to the incorporeal act of speaking to, or teaching the Son, Who is the *Verbum Patris*. It is possible that in this appropriation, due to its particular aptness, Caesarius does make the appropriation because of the similarity to the personal property of the Son, Whose generation is in some way analogous to intellection. Even here, however, more probably the only reason for the appropriation is that St. Paul had made it before him. So it seems to be with all his appropriations. He simply picked out those which had already been made by the inspired authors and which best suited the particular end in view in his defense of the equality of the Son and the divinity of the Holy Spirit. That there was a reason for the appropriation in the divine processions and relations was probably never averted to. That he does not, even without this guiding norm, make any strange and doctrinally dangerous appropriations is due entirely to his close imitation of the scriptural usage.

The conclusion of this chapter also brings to an end our exposé of the Saint's Trinitarian doctrine. As we have endeavored throughout to be objective in setting forth the Archbishop's Trinitarian thought, it will be fitting to close in the tone with which he ends his defense of the Catholic faith in the one triune God, the mystery of mysteries:

Audi adhuc quia trinitas in unitate manet, et unitas in trinitate, angelorum et archangelorum voces declarant in Isaia, ubi seraphim hymnum scribitur dicere "Sanctus sanctus sanctus Dominus Deus sabaoth." (Is. 6:3) Non tres sanctos, sed ter

sanctum concludit dicendo "Dominus Deus Sabaoth," id est, ut tres personas et unum deum intellegas. Non semel dicunt, ne singularitatem credas: non bis, ne Spiritum sanctum excludas: non sancti domini dii sabaothes, ne tres deos more gentilium fatearis; sed dicunt "Sanctus sanctus sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth," et est trinitas. Deus laudatur, qui est Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus.³¹

Thus the closing words of St. Caesarius, turning from controversy to praise, proclaim their author not only a great apologist and bishop, but also and above all a saint.

31. B.A.H. II, p. 199:15. AMBROSE, *De Spiritu Sancto* 3, 16, 110 (16, 803): "Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth" (Is. 6:3). Non semel dicunt, ne singularitatem credas: non bis dicunt, ne Spiritum excludas: non sanctos dicunt, ne pluralitatem aestimes: sed ter repetunt, et idem dicunt, ut etiam in hymno distinctionem Trinitatis, et divinitatis intelligas unitatem. *De Fide* 2, 12, 107 (16, 582): Et ut ostenderet Trinitatis unam esse deitatem, cum tertio dixisset: "Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus"; addidit singulariter: "Dominus Deus Sabaoth." Sanctus igitur Pater, sanctus Filius, sanctus et Dei Spiritus.

PART II

SOURCES OF
CAESARIUS'S TRINITARIAN DOCTRINE

CHAPTER I

DEPENDENCE ON THE "QUICUMQUE"

The proper evaluation of all those elements which converge to form and give a determined direction to a man's thought is, without doubt, the most difficult task which confronts one endeavoring to arrive at an objective appreciation of an author's works. Yet to ignore this factor in a study of the Trinitarian thought of St. Caesarius would be to enclose his writings in a vacuum in which it would be impossible to arrive at anything approaching an accurate appraisal of his thought. In the foregoing exposé our sole purpose was to come as close as possible to the Saint's Trinitarian thought from an investigation of his own writings. Only secondarily was an effort made at the same time to point out in the footnotes, wherever possible, a dependence on his predecessors and contemporaries. Much of this, however, has been little more than the gathering of specific data. It remains, therefore, to bring this data together and evaluate its role in the formation of what can be called the specifically Caesarian Trinitarian thought. The norm of division in this second part is the varying degree of influence different sources have in the formulation of Caesarius's Trinitarian doctrine. In the first place we take up a consideration of the Archbishop's dependence on the *Quicumque*. In succeeding chapters the patristic sources are examined according as they represent a principal patristic dependence, a secondary patristic dependence and, negatively, an absence of dependence.

If the previous investigation has shown anything, it has certainly confirmed Morin's conclusion that a dependent relationship must be admitted between the Pseudo-Athanasian Symbol and St. Caesarius. This is not claimed as anything more than a confirmation

of something generally acknowledged by the modern patrologist.¹ Our purpose here is rather to discover the extent and the direction of this dependence. For this reason we are no longer primarily concerned with technical similarities of division, style and terminology, which are so important for establishing a relationship.² Though a preference will be given to those passages in St. Caesarius indicating a relationship also in these points, our primary objective is to discover the extent of the doctrinal relationship between the first part of the *Quicumque* and St. Caesarius's Trinitarian works. In the schema which follows, the citations from the *Quicumque* are on the left and those from Caesarius on the right.

Necessity of Faith

Quicumque vult salvus esse, fratres,
ante omnia opus est ut fidem ca-
tholicam sciat et teneat.³

Rogo et ammonéo vos, fratres car-
rissimi, ut quicumque vult salvus
esse, fidem rectam ac catholicam
discat, firmiter teneat, inviolatamque
conserveat.⁴

In words which clearly manifest a relationship existing between the two passages, both demand a knowledge of and a firm adherence to the Catholic faith. The author of the Symbol, anxious to leave no doubt concerning so fundamental a point, repeats three times during the course of his brief masterpiece the warning that there can be no hope of salvation without this firm belief in the truths he sets forth. The same insistence on the need of faith for salvation is found throughout the sermons and doctrinal treatises of the Archbishop of Arles.⁵

1. Morin's demonstration of this relationship stands as firm today as it did fifty years ago when he proposed it for the first time, RB 18 (1901) 337-363. He confirmed it for the last time in 1932, RB 44 (1932) 207-219. I know of no recent patrologist who rejects this aspect of his findings. Cf. J. TIXERONT, *S. Césaire*, Dictionnaire pratique de connaissance religieuses, I, 1235. P. LEJAY, *Le rôle théologique de Césaire d'Arles*. RHLR 10 (1905) 181. *Césaire d'Arles*, Dic. Théol. Cath. 2, 2177. A. D'ALÈS, *Les "Sermones" de S. Césaire d'Arles*. RHLR 28 (1938) 394. J. MADDOZ, *Excerpta Vincentii Lirinensis*. Madrid 1940, 66.
2. We have seen in the previous exposé the similarities of division and terminology. Moreover the above articles of Morin make further discussion on the subject a mere repetition.
3. Ser. 3, p. 22:2.
4. Ser. 10, p. 51:2.
5. Cf. p. 18.

A little further on, the *Quicumque* also demands that this faith be a *fides recta* firmly believed (*firmiterque crediderit*), in close parallelism with the above citation from Caesarius.

One God in Trinity

Unum deum in trinitate et trinitatem in unitate veneremur.⁷

Et credas de uno Deo, qui est trinitas.⁶ Quia trinitas in unitate manet, et unitas in trinitate.⁸

As fundamental as correct faith is for the Christian life in general so faith in the oneness and triplicity of God is for whatever is said concerning the God of the Christians. Around this preliminary notion revolves the whole of what Caesarius has to say about the mystery of the Trinity. For Caesarius it gives a new meaning to much of the Old Testament. With it as a major premise he argues to refute the errors of the Semi-Arians. So also one God in Trinity begins the *Quicumque's* exposition of the Trinitarian faith. Convinced that this is the beginning and end of that faith, the author of the Symbol repeats in almost identical words the same idea at the end of the exposé on the doctrine of the Trinity.

One Substance

Neque substantiam, quae una in trinitate est, separantes.¹⁰

Sine separatione disiunctam;⁹ Nolite unitatem dividere . . . nolite unitatem scindere.¹¹ Ut agnoscas . . . unam esse substantiam.¹²

God is one because of His absolutely unique substance. The Semi-Arians acknowledged a certain unity of substance between the Father and the Son in virtue of which the Son should not be called a creature. The Son is divine, and yet not divine in the same way as the Father; a certain unity in the divine substance, but not an absolute oneness. Theirs is a unity that permits division. It is precisely this manner of viewing the divinity that is opposed by both the *Quicumque*

6. De Trin. II, p. 173:16.

7. Ser. 3, p. 22:5.

8. B.A.H. II, p. 199:15.

9. Ibid. p. 186:5.

10. Ser. 3, p. 22:6.

11. Ser. 123, p. 490:3.

12. B.A.H. II, p. 195:24.

and St. Caesarius. First of all, therefore, against the Semi-Arians' deceptive unity of substance is opposed an insistence on the perfect oneness of substance. To express this the *Quicumque* and Caesarius prefer the expression *una substantia* to the Nicene term *consubstantialis*, though this term had been employed by Augustine and very frequently by other occidental writers after him. It is true that on a few occasions St. Caesarius speaks of *natura* or *essentia*, but this is only by way of exception. There is yet another significant similarity apparent in the two passages cited above. In both the oneness of substance is clearly defined, but the greater stress in both is on the negative aspect that there can be no division or separation in the divine substance. It is especially here that is manifested the sameness of viewpoint of the author of the *Quicumque* and Caesarius. They wish to affirm not only a unity of substance but a unity of substance that admits of no division.

Personal Distinctions

Non confundentes personas. . . .	Sine permixtione coniunctam ¹³ . . .
Alia est enim persona Patris alia	Cum dixeris, Pater, Filius et Spiritus sanctus, personas explicuisti. ¹⁵
Filii, alia Spiritus sancti. ¹⁴	

Neither author manifests a great preoccupation about maintaining the personal distinction. Sufficiently clear to all, it was not thought necessary to give the matter any of the emphasis given to the oneness of substance and those things that flow from it. Thus the author of the *Quicumque* refers to the personal distinction at the beginning of his Symbol and never returns to it. St. Caesarius states it here and there, but not once does he give it a specific treatment. A more or less academic warning not to confound the Persons, as did some heretics in the past, is considered sufficient by both writers, so that it is quite evident that it is not a point of much practical import for either of them.

All Three Persons God

Ita deus Pater, deus Filius, deus Spiritus sanctus. . . . Ita dominus	Deus Pater, deus Filius, deus et Spiritus sanctus ¹⁶ . . . Nam et singil-
---	--

13. B.A.H. II, p. 186:6.

14. Ser. 3, p. 22:5.

15. Ser. 213, p. 805:19.

16. Ser. 10, p. 51:5.

Pater, dominus Filius, dominus Spiritus sanctus . . . Quia sicut singulatim unamquamque personam deum et dominum confiteri christiana veritate compellimur.¹⁸

latim singulae quaeque personae plenus deus¹⁷ . . . Ubi dicitur "Dominus deus tuus dominus unus est" (Deut. 6:4) . . . simul Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, quae est verus et unus deus, Trinitas intellegenda est.¹⁹

The special emphasis on the demonstration of the divinity of the Holy Spirit which we saw in St. Caesarius is not so evident in the *Quicumque*. The rhythmic style of the Symbol would not allow for the singling out of one Person to stress His divinity. However, the divinity of the Holy Spirit is stated clearly enough by the Symbol and, in view of the precise purpose of the author referred to above, it is possible that the threefold repetition of *deus* was primarily meant to include the Third Person.

Not Three Gods but One

Et tamen non tres dii, sed unus est deus.²⁰

Sed tamen non tres dii, sed unus est deus.²¹

The special need to warn against conceiving the Trinity in the sense of a plurality of gods has its explanation in the pagan environment brought to southern Gaul by the Semi-Arian Germanic masters. In order to ward off such an understanding of his immediately preceding words, the author of the *Quicumque* repeats several times that there are not three gods but only one God. The pagan conception of the Trinity is frequently referred to by the Archbishop of Arles. But his purpose is not so much to warn against polytheism as to use it as an *ad hominem* argument against the Semi-Arians. To accuse the Germanic invaders, especially the rulers, of falling back into their former barbarism and polytheism by their Semi-Arianism, might on occasion be a very forceful argument against these new rulers, who so admired the high Roman culture and so wanted to be identified with it. If we can suppose the same idea underlying the words of

17. Ser. 83, p. 328:29.

18. Ser. 3, p. 22:14. Cf. RB 18 (1901) 351, where Morin discusses the relation between the Symbol's *singulatim* and Caesarius's *singillatim*.

19. De Trin. II, p. 171:13.

20. Ser. 3, p. 22:15.

21. Ser. 10, p. 51:6.

the *Quicumque* they would certainly fit in much better with the evident purpose of the first part of the Symbol.

Equality of the Persons

Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus sanctus. In hac trinitate . . . nihil maius aut minus. . . . Totae tres personae coaequales.²⁴

Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus sanctus²² . . . Majus autem aut minus ignorat trinitas.²³ Aequalitatem Patris et Filii ac Spiritus sancti ostendant.²⁵

The perfect equality of the three divine Persons, but especially of the Father and Son, is beyond all doubt the predominant idea of the Trinitarian part of the *Quicumque* and of Caesarius's works on the Trinity. It is therefore the personal equality and not the unity of substance, except indirectly, that is the primary objective that both authors wished to attain by their writings.

Son Both Equal and Less

Aequalis Patri secundum divinitatem, minor Patre secundum humanitatem.²⁶

Secundum humanitatem minorem dictum esse Filium, ibi invenias secundum divinitatem etiam aequalem.²⁷

The principle for the explanation of the apparently subordinatist texts of Sacred Scripture also seems to bring the two authors together. To be sure, this explanation is by no means proper to the *Quicumque* and St. Caesarius, for it is found in nearly all the occidental writers after St. Augustine. Evidence, however, of a special relationship between Caesarius and the Athanasian Symbol is found in their wording of the principle. Whereas St. Augustine and many of his followers speak much more frequently of the *secundum carnem* . . . *secundum divinitatem*, *secundum formam servi* . . . *secundum humanam naturam*, Caesarius generally prefers the wording found in

22. Ser. 10, p. 51:7.

23. Ser. 213, p. 805:15.

24. Ser. 3, p. 22:8, 23.

25. De Trin. II, p. 179:1.

26. Ser. 3, p. 23:2.

27. De Trin. II, p. 173:27.

the *Quicumque*: *secundum divinitatem . . . secundum humanitatem*. In the study of his sources we shall find that several times Caesarius changes the reading of his source to conform with the wording of the Symbol.

Coeternity of the Persons

Aeternus Pater, aeternus Filius aeternus Spiritus sanctus . . . In hac trinitate nihil prius aut posterius . . . Non tres aeterni sed unus aeternus. . . . Coaeterna maiestas.²⁹

Non solum Filius sed etiam Spiritus sanctus semper cum Patre manent.²⁸ Quia unus nec posteriorem recipit nec priorem. . . . Una sine principio sempiternitas³⁰ . . . ad coeternitatem pertinet maiestatis. . .³¹

The coeternity of the Father and the Son is so difficult to understand by reason, that it was necessary to stress this truth. But the more important consideration prompting Caesarius and the author of the *Quicumque* to single out the coeternity was the Arian objection that it is opposed to the concepts of father and son that they be co-eternal.

Omnipotence of the Persons

Omnipotens Pater, omnipotens Filius, omnipotens Spiritus sanctus. . . . Non tres omnipotentes, sed unus omnipotens.³⁴

Virtus Pater, virtus Filius, virtus et Spiritus sanctus³² . . . Non tres potestates³³ . . . Una potentia . . . esse credatur.³⁵

The slight difference in terminology manifested in these passages is probably due to Caesarius's desire to avoid new terms in preference to those used in the Scriptures. These slight variances, however, in no way obscure the essential identity of the thought expressed. Each Person possesses the divine power, and yet this does not make for three distinct powers as there is but one infinite power in God.

28. De Trin. II, p. 177:34.

29. Ser. 3, p. 22:22.

30. B.A.H. II, p. 186:8-12.

31. Ser. 212, p. 801:20.

32. B.A.H. II, p. 204:11.

33. Ibid. p. 186:12.

34. Ser. 3, p. 22:13.

35. B.A.H. II, p. 191:2.

36. Ser. 3, p. 22:9.

Omnipresence of the Persons

Immensus Pater, immensus Filius, immensus Spiritus sanctus. ³⁶	Quod autem quomodo Pater, ita et Filius et Spiritus sanctus ubique sint. . . . ³⁷
--	--

We saw that the primary reason why Caesarius insists on the omnipresence of the divine Persons is his explanation of the missions. Whether this is also the reason for the *Quicumque*'s singling it out we cannot say, since it does not treat the missions. Since there is not much evidence, however, that the Semi-Arians specifically attacked the immensity of the Son and Holy Spirit, it is not improbable that the author of the Symbol is moved by the same reason as Caesarius for his mention of the immensity.

Generation of the Son

Filius a Patre solo est, non factus, neque creatus, sed genitus. . . . Deus est ex substantia Patris ante saecula genitus, et homo est ex substantia matris in saeculo natus. ⁴¹	Incorporaliter genuit Filium ³⁸ . . . Deum ex Deo Patre et hominem ex homine matre ³⁹ . . . Ex substantia sua (Patris) natum ⁴⁰ . . . Hoc est "Docuit me Pater" (Jh. 8:28) quod est scientem genuit me Pater. ⁴²
---	---

St. Caesarius and the Athanasian Symbol have the following elements in common in regard to the divine generation: 1) The Son is generated by the Father; 2) He is not created; 3) He proceeds from the substance of the Father; 4) There is an eternal and a temporal generation. This is the sum total of what the *Quicumque* says about the generation. It corresponds perfectly with what Caesarius has to say. To what extent the latter goes beyond the doctrine of the *Quicumque* in his explanation of the words, *Docuit me Pater* (Jh. 8:28), will be considered in connection with his dependence on St. Augustine. Here, however, it seems in place to point out that not too much significance should be given to this single passage which is not found in a treatment of the generation but only in that on the Son's omnipotence.

37. De Trin. II, p. 170:19.

38. B.A.H. II, p. 191:27.

39. Ibid. p. 182:4.

40. De Trin. II, p. 176:4.

41. Ser. 3, p. 22:19, 29.

42. B.A.H. II, p. 191:29.

At best the full import of the passage is doubtful, but at the same time it cannot be denied that there is here a development that is not found in the Athanasian Symbol.

Procession of the Holy Spirit

Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus, neque creatus, neque genitus, sed procedens.⁴⁴

Spiritus vero sanctus ab utroque procedens.⁴³ Qui enim de interioribus dei progreditur, non dei creatura, sed dei probatur esse substantia.⁴⁵ Utrum vero genitus dici debeat, an inginitus, non loquuntur.⁴⁶

Concerning all the essential points on the Holy Spirit's procession there is complete agreement between the two writers. The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. He is not created, and St. Caesarius adds the reason. However, together with this agreement in essentials is to be noted a slight difference concerning whether this procession is a generation or not. The *Quicumque* states most explicitly that it is not a generation. Caesarius on the other hand says that we cannot know whether it is or not, since Scripture says nothing about it. But for the Archbishop too the procession of the Holy Spirit dare not be called a generation lest this confuse the Person of this procession with the Son. Hence the practical difference is not very great, and it may be that they intend to say the same thing. If we could understand the Symbol's *neque genitus sed procedens* in the sense that Scripture does not say generated but proceeding, then there would be no difference between the two authors. But if we must see in the Symbol's words a direct denial of the generation, it is still not certain that this is not also the thought behind the words of the Archbishop of Arles, though because of his quotation from Faustus this would remain doubtful.

Distinction of Persons

Filius a Patre solo est, Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio. . . . Unus ergo

Genitus et inginitus personae est differentia.⁴⁷ Ad essentiae distinc-

43. Ser. 10, p. 51:10.

44. Ser. 3, p. 22:20.

45. Ser. 213, p. 803:24.

46. Ibid. p. 803:15.

47. Ibid. p. 804:15.

Pater, non tres Patres; unus Filius,
non tres Filii; unus Spiritus sanc-
tus, non tres Spiritus sancti.⁴⁹

tionem procedere ex Patre testatus
est . . . sic agnosce Spiritum sanc-
tum propriam habere personam.⁴⁸

The doctrine of opposite relations is clearly contained in both the *Quicumque* and the writings of St. Caesarius, but because neither ever used the term *relatio*, it remains more or less implicit. The notion, however, is more in evidence in St. Caesarius than in the Symbol. There is very good reason for this. The *Quicumque* sufficiently safeguards the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit when it says *neque genitus sed procedens*. But Caesarius, who was not sure whether this Person is generated or not, would necessarily have to be more explicit in demonstrating the proper personality of the Holy Spirit.

Missions

The Athanasian Symbol does not so much as mention the divine missions, and so there is nothing corresponding to Caesarius's explanation of the mission texts. On the surface this would seem to constitute a considerable doctrinal development over what is found in the *Quicumque*. Through closer consideration, however, it can be discovered that the explanation of the Son's mission which we found in St. Caesarius contains nothing that is not also in the *Quicumque* at least in its foundation. The omnipresence of the divine Person and "sent in His humanity" are the two essential factors in all that the Archbishop has to say about this mission. But these two elements are also the clear teaching of the *Quicumque*, except that the Symbol, not referring to the missions, says only *minor Patre secundum humanitatem*. But, as we saw, "less than the Father" and "sent by the Father" have for Caesarius but one meaning — in His humanity. Thus what at first looked like a major difference between the Athanasian Creed and St. Caesarius resolves itself into a mere application, in the latter, of principles clearly contained in the former. The same is not quite true in regard to the mission of the Holy Spirit. For although the omnipresence of this Person is also affirmed by the *Quicumque* there is nothing in the Symbol telling us in what this mission consists, and hence for this, we shall see, Caesarius had to rely on other sources.

48. Ser. 213, p. 803:19.

49. Ser. 3, p. 22:19.

Appropriation

Ita ut per omnia . . . et trinitas in unitate, et unitas in trinitate veneranda sit. Non tres omnipotentes, sed unus omnipotens.⁵²

Ex Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto omnia continentur.⁵⁰ Nam de aequalitate operum trinitatis . . . monstrabimus.⁵¹ Una voluntas, una potentia⁵³ Unam esse operationem Patris et Filii.⁵⁴

A brief resumé of the Catholic faith such as the *Quicumque* could not be expected to contain particular examples of appropriations. It is notable, however, that we do not find there more than a vague insinuation of the Caesarian doctrine on the unity of operation existing among the divine Persons in the *opera ad extra*. There is in the *Quicumque* the foundation for this doctrine in the unity of substance and even more in the unity of power. Yet there is certainly no parallel in the famous Symbol to the many and clear statements in Caesarius which speak of this unity of operation. This granted, it should nevertheless be noted that from Caesarius's standpoint the unity of operation is not so much a new doctrine not contained in the *Quicumque*, as an argument to prove a truth of faith mentioned by the Symbol. Whenever the Archbishop speaks of the unity and equality of operation it is to prove one of three things: the equality of the Son, the omnipotence of the Son or the Holy Spirit, or the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

From this brief comparison of the *Quicumque* and St. Caesarius's works on the Trinity together with the previous exposé of the Saint's complete Trinitarian thought, at least one conclusion seems to stand out as beyond all reasonable doubt. It is that the Trinitarian doctrine of the Athanasian Symbol and that of St. Caesarius of Arles are almost identical, and this not only in regard to the broad essentials but, with one or two exceptions, also in accidental details. When we add to this doctrinal conformity the technical similarities of division, style and terminology, seen in the previous chapters and pointed out by Morin, the question arises whether the close relationships be-

50. B.A.H. II, p. 199:6.

51. Ibid. p. 193:14.

52. Ser. 3, p. 22:24.

53. B.A.H. II, p. 191:1.

54. De Trin. II, p. 176:13.

tween these two writings are to be satisfactorily explained only by attributing both to the same author.

That Saint Caesarius at least possessed and was familiar with the Symbol is no longer questioned by most patristic authorities. Not a few believe, in view of the evidence we have referred to, that it is not enough to suppose that Caesarius was familiar with the *Quicumque*, but that he is himself the author. J. Tixeront, writing in 1925, has this to say: "One is not far from admitting that Caesarius is the author of the symbol *Quicumque vult*."⁵⁵ P. Lejay seems to have considered the Caesarian authorship almost a settled issue.⁵⁶ M. Chailan expresses a similar opinion in his book on the life of the Saint.⁵⁷ It is of considerable importance, however, to note that all these authors in attributing the Athanasian Creed to St. Caesarius rely on the investigations made by Dom Morin and contained in his article "Le Symbole d'Athanase" in the *Revue Bénédictine* of 1901. Since they all acknowledge this dependence on Morin's findings, we may ask whether they perhaps went further than the evidence would warrant. Dom Morin himself concluded at that time that the evidence is not sufficient to credit Caesarius with the authorship.⁵⁸ A few years later he believes that St. Martin of Braga must be taken into serious consideration in a discussion on the authorship of the famous Symbol.⁵⁹ In his final judgment on the question, Morin develops his earlier study in this sense: in 1901 he tended toward the possibility at least that Caesarius might be the author, whereas in the view he expresses in 1932 (the same year in which the second volume of the *Opera Omnia* appeared) Morin is quite confident that St. Caesarius is not the author of the *Quicumque*. He nevertheless is convinced that the Archbishop of Arles is certainly a witness to the *Quicumque* — perhaps the first — and moreover that its author should be sought in an environment similar to that in which St. Caesarius lived, and at a time not long before his.⁶⁰

55. Dic. Prat. Con. Rel. I, 1235.

56. RHLR 10 (1905) 182. Dic. Théol. Cath. 2, 2177.

57. M. CHAILLON, *Saint Césaire*, Paris 1912, 141.

58. RB 18 (1901) 363: Ce n'est pas assez, je le sais, pour faire honneur à Césaire de la composition du *Quicumque*: aussi m'ai-je gardé de me prononcer en ce sens.

59. G. MORIN, *L'origine du Symbole d'Athanase*. JTS 12 (1911) 358.

60. G. MORIN. *L'origine du Symbole d'Athanase*. RB 44 (1932) 207-219. We have further confirmation that this was the final stand of Morin in a personal letter written to Othmar Perler in 1943, three years before his death. In this letter he restates substantially his conclusions

This final stand of Morin, which seems well founded upon the accumulated evidence, also fits very well with the findings of our study. The following reasons seem of such a nature that they exclude St. Caesarius as the author of the *Quicumque*.

1) The text of the *Quicumque* which Caesarius gives us in the Zwiefalten collection (Morin has included this form of the Symbol in his *Opera Omnia*), though in general conforming to the accepted text of the original, differs in certain points of detail. What is more important, many of these changes, far from improving the text, make it heavy, destroy the rhythm, and in no way offer a clarification of the formula.⁶¹ Both in the Zwiefalten text and in references from the *Quicumque* in his Trinitarian works Caesarius manifests the same liberty towards the original text. As Morin points out, it is difficult to admit that the *Quicumque* owes its literary form to that same hand which seems to have so little regard for its beauty. These strange liberties which Caesarius takes with the text "show almost certainly that he is not himself the creator, that an anonymous and more capable hand must be responsible for this theological and literary masterpiece."⁶²

2) The comparison of the union of the body and soul to the hypostatic union, found in the *Quicumque*, argues against the Caesarian authorship. St. Caesarius never uses this comparison in his writings, though certainly not for lack of occasion to do so. We must suppose that he intentionally avoids the comparison because of the heretical turn frequently given to it during his time.

3) If Caesarius were the author of the *Quicumque*, we should certainly expect a much clearer declaration of certain favorite notions.

of the article in the *Revue Bénédictine* of 1932. First rejecting the opinion which credits St. Ambrose with the *Quicumque* as "inadmissible, inconceivable and absurd," he goes on to state his position: "Le *Quicumque* ne saurait être de beaucoup antérieur aux environs l'an 500. Le premier qui l'ait mentionné et propagé avec ardeur est incontestablement S. Césaire d'Arles: il n'est pas exclu que la rédaction définitive soit son oeuvre, car les expressions vraiment caractéristiques sont de lui. Cependant, j'admettrais volontiers le sentiment du P. Madoz que l'auteur premier est saint Vincent de Lérins. En tout cas, c'est vers la Provence, vers l'an 500, vers les milieux Lérins — Arles, que toutes les données du problème nous aiguillent." (O. PERLER, *Dom Germain Morin OSB. Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique Suisse* 40 (1946) 34).

61. For examples, cf. Morin's article in RB 44 (1932) 217, from which we have taken this first reason for rejecting the Caesarian authorship.

62. G. MORIN, RB 44 (1932) 218.

Thus it would have been easy to add at one place or another: *unitas et aequalitas in operatione* or again *Filius non mittitur nisi secundum humanitatem*.

4) We saw how the *neque genitus* of the *Quicumque* does not have a very Caesarian tone. The Archbishop of Arles would almost certainly have written, *Ubique Pater, ubique Filius, ubique Spiritus sanctus*, instead of employing the word *immensus* as does the Symbol. It seems Caesarius thought that *ubique* better expressed the idea that the divine Persons are in every place and hence cannot be sent.

A final conclusion, then, concerning the relation of the *Quicumque* and St. Caesarius seems from the above considerations to be no longer a matter of conjecture. St. Caesarius is not the author of the *Quicumque*. He is, however, a witness — perhaps the first witness — to the famous Symbol. Nor is his only a passing testimony to the Athanasian Creed. The dependence of division, style and terminology together with the nearly perfect doctrinal identity indicates a much more important role for the *Quicumque* in the formation of the Trinitarian thought of the Archbishop of Arles.⁶³ All the evidence points to the fact that Caesarius recognized in the *Quicumque* an exact and complete expression of the Church's faith in regard to the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. It is not unlikely that Caesarius was personally acquainted with the author of the Symbol or at least knew who it was. This fact would not, as Morin has conclusively shown, hinder St. Caesarius from attributing the Symbol to St. Athanasius even if we suppose that the author himself did not do so.⁶⁴ It was the custom of the time and especially of St. Caesarius to attribute writings to the great defenders of the faith such as Athanasius and Augustine. At any rate the author of the Symbol does not, as Morin also points out, antedate Caesarius by a long time.⁶⁵ This fact would explain why the Archbishop of Arles does not show towards the text of the *Quicumque* that special reverence which is ordinarily accorded to ancient creeds and symbols. But he does accept the doctrine of the *Quicumque*, whole and entire, and when he writes his anti-Arian works, this doctrine will serve him as a norm of those truths which must be defended at all costs.

63. A confirmation of this will be seen in the manner in which Caesarius often changes the terminology of a source to agree with that of the *Quicumque*.

64. RB 18 (1901) 362.

65. RB 44 (1932) 219.

CHAPTER II

PRINCIPAL PATRISTIC DEPENDENCE

If the *Quicumque* serves as a sort of *regula fidei* for St. Caesarius, in the *defense* of the doctrine he found there he shows the greatest dependence on the "teachings of the holy and ancient Fathers," for whom he always had the highest respect. In looking for the sources utilized by the Bishop of Arles, we are confronted with a problem which, though not peculiar to this author, yet is seldom found to the same degree. This difficulty, which Morin also speaks of, is that often it is all but impossible to distinguish in his writings what St. Caesarius borrowed from another from what is properly his own. Following the literary conventions of his time, Caesarius rarely credits another for those parts of his writings that he borrows. An even greater cause of this obscurity is the absolute freedom with which Caesarius uses his sources, changing and adapting entirely at will. Yet we do owe the Archbishop thanks for at least giving a little direction to our search. For we shall quite naturally go first to those Fathers whom he himself recommends to others for reading. These are St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and St. Hilary.¹ One does not read far in Caesarius's Trinitarian works before he discovers the influence of other writers besides these three. The advantages of treating these different influences according to their relative importance is at once apparent. We shall therefore treat the principal and secondary patristic dependence and end in a negative vein with those authors and works which were examined without finding any influence on St. Caesarius's Trinitarian works.

St. Augustine

The altogether unique place held by St. Caesarius in the theology of grace — indeed, in the development of the Church's doctrine of grace — is, as is known to all, due entirely to the Archbishop's Augustinianism. It is not then a matter of surprise that in the previous consideration of Caesarius's Trinitarian works we should have found the references to the Bishop of Hippo surpassing those from all other sources taken together. It will therefore be of special interest to ex-

1. Ser. 1, p. 13:23.

amine more carefully some of these more important references in order to come to a fuller appreciation of the extent to which the Augustinian influence is a factor in the formation of Caesarius's Trinitarian thought. In the following schema the citations from Caesarius will always be on the right and the sources from which they are taken will be on the left.

The mention at the very outset of the *Quicumque* of the "Catholic faith" seems to have reminded Caesarius of a similar passage he had read in St. Augustine. For though Caesarius begins *Sermon* 10 with a nearly verbatim citation from the Athanasian Creed, he at once adds a phrase that is not found in the Symbol and which he probably took from St. Augustine.

Catholica autem fides credit Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum unum Deum, unius substantiae Trinitatem, inseparabiliter, aequaliter, non commixtione confusam, non distinctione separatam.²

Ita ergo oportet unicuique observare, ut credat Patrem, credat Filium, credat Spiritum sanctum.³ Sine permixtione coniunctam, sine separatione disiunctam: quia Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus deus verus plenus et unus est.⁴

In spite of the apparent differences in the two passages, there seems to be a dependence of the one on the other. It is not at all surprising that Caesarius should repeat the *credat* for reasons of emphasis. Augustine's mention of the *catholica autem fides* would explain why Caesarius inserts this line immediately after citing from the *Quicumque* concerning the necessity of faith. Our real concern here, however, centers around the last part of the citation from Augustine. We shall see in the next source to be considered the origin of Caesarius's *Sine permixtione coniunctam, sine separatione disiunctam*.⁵ Certain changes which Caesarius makes, however, are best explained in the light of the passage from Augustine. The principal change is the word *permixtione*, not found in the original source but closely parallel to Augustine's *commixtione*. The thought of the *Quicumque*, *Non confundentes personas, neque substantiam . . . separantes*, is very similar, but the construction and terminology are different. Hence

2. Ser. 7, 4 (5, 38).

3. Ser. 10, p. 51:4.

4. B.A.H. II, p. 186:5.

5. Cf. Dependence on Faustus, p. 170.

the reason for the change is hardly to be sought there. It would seem, therefore, that though the principal dependence is on another source, there is an Augustinian influence in the words also. This probability is greater if we admit a true dependence on Augustine in the first part of the quotation, *credat Patrem*, etc.

The starting point for both the Archbishop of Arles and the Bishop of Hippo in their Trinitarian discussions is unquestionably the same, i.e., one God in Trinity. In his use of Old Testament testimony for this most fundamental truth Caesarius was able to borrow much from St. Augustine. But in so doing he exercises his full freedom to adapt and change at will, making his own what he borrows from St. Augustine.

Trinitas insinuatur Creatoris: nam dicente Scriptura, "In principio fecit Deus coelum et terram" (Gen. 1:1); intelligimus Patrem in nomine Dei, et Filium in principii nomine, . . . dicente autem Scriptura, "Et Spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquam," (Gen. 1:2) completam commemorationem Trinitatis agnoscimus.⁷

Legimus in veteri testamento, quia "in principio fecit Deus caelum et terram, et Spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas." (Gen. 1:1-2) In deo intellege Patrem, in principio accipe Filium, superfusum aquis agnosce Spiritum sanctum.⁶

The most important Old Testament text to show the Trinity for all the Fathers is that of Genesis 1:26, which narrates the creation of man. Though St. Caesarius undoubtedly often read Augustine's exegesis of this verse, yet his own exegesis of it does not come from the Bishop of Hippo, as we shall see in the next source to be considered. Apart from the essential identity of the Trinitarian content found in this verse there is one significant difference between Caesarius's explanation of it and that usually found in St. Augustine. The reference to the Trinity for both is in the word *faciamus*. But whereas Caesarius sees the unity of substance in the singular *imaginem et similitudinem*, Augustine finds in these words the basis for his psychological explanation, inasmuch as man is created according to the *imaginem et similitudinem* of God as triune. The unity of substance Augustine finds in the words which follow: *Et fecit Deus hominem ad imaginem Dei*.⁸

6. Ser. 212, p. 800:14.

7. De Gen. ad Litt. 1, 6 (3, 121).

8. Cf. De Gen. ad Litt. 1, 16, 61; 3, 19, 29; Ser. 126, 9, 11. De Trinitate 12, 5.

More important than these Trinitarian interpretations of individual Old Testament texts in a consideration of Caesarius's indebtedness to the Bishop of Hippo is his frequently repeated norm of exegesis: Whenever Sacred Scripture speaks of God without further determination, this must always be understood as referring to the entire Trinity.

Et isti quidem ruinam erroris sui divinarum Scripturarum testimoniis quasi fulcire conantes . . . et quod dictum est de uno solo Deo, in quo ipsa Trinitas intelligitur, tantum de Patre, non et de Filio et Spiritu sancto dictum accipiunt.⁹

Hoc etiam perfidus error dicere solet quod ubi in scripturis legimus aut solum Deum aut solum altissimum, aut solum sapientem, hoc non de trinitate dici, sed de solo Patre accipi debeat.¹⁰

Also in the application of this principle there is a dependence on Augustine.

Cum vero non sit dictum, Soli sapienti Patri; sed, "Soli sapienti Deo" (Rom. 16:27); et Deus sit ipsa Trinitas: multo est facilius nobis hujus solutio quaestionis; ut sic intelligamus solum Deum sapientem, sicut intelleximus solum potentem, id est, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum, qui est unus et solus Deus.¹²

Quod quam absurdum sit ita sentire, de hoc uno testimonio convincatur. Dicit enim apostolus "Cognitum soli sapienti deo" (Rom. 16:27): non intellegunt quia non dixit, soli sapienti Patri, sed "Soli sapienti deo," quae est trinitas.¹¹

The importance of this principle and its application of particular Scripture texts is so great that in itself it gives an Augustinian color to the greater part of Caesarius's anti-Arian writings.

One of the greatest contributions of the Bishop of Hippo to the Catholic cause against Arianism was his explanation of the Old Testament theophanies. The Platonic influence, which had for so long made it impossible for the Catholic theologians to answer satisfactorily the Arian objections based on the divine theophanies, is finally cut away in Augustine's explanation of these theophanies. In them no longer just the Son, but all three Persons appeared to men.

9. De Trinitate 2, 8 (8, 780).

10. B.A.H. II, p. 187:18.

11. Ibid. p. 187:23.

12. Cont. Max. Ar. 2, 13, 1 (8, 702).

The divine substance is entirely one, indivisible, and invisible, and therefore all three divine Persons are equally invisible. Though St. Caesarius does not always depend on St. Augustine for his explanation of individual theophanies, yet he does rely on him for his fundamental norm of interpretation, which is by far the more important. Thus we can see the dependence on Augustine when Caesarius proves the invisibility of the Son of God by an *a fortiori* argument from the invisibility of the soul.

Omittamus igitur eos, qui nimis carnaliter naturam Verbi Dei . . . non solum mutabilem, verum etiam visibilem esse putaverunt. . . . Anima quippe cum sit substantia spiritalis, cumque etiam ipsa facta sit, nec per alium fieri potuerit, nisi per quem facta sunt omnia, et sine quo factum est nihil, quamvis sit mutabilis, non est tamen visibilis: quod illi de Verbo ipso atque ipsa Dei Sapientia, per quam facta est anima crediderunt; cum sit illa non invisibilis tantum quod et anima est, sed etiam incommutabilis quod anima non est.¹⁴

Solent etiam dicere: ideo minor est Filius, quia visibilis, Pater autem invisibilis. Non intellegunt, quia nec Filius in substantia deitatis suae sit visibilis, nisi in assumpto homine, qui et Christus dicitur. Nam Filius Dei, id est, "Verbum quod erat in principio deus apud deum," (Jh. 1:2) per quem facta sunt omnia, videri in sua substantia non potuit, sicut nec Pater in substantia sua. Interrogo autem sine sui iniuria illum ipsum, qui dicit quod visus sit Filius dei, utrum animam suam visibilem an invisibilem fateatur? Et cum dixerit invisibilem, sicut et verum est, dicatur ei, Si creatura, id est, anima tua invisibilis, creatura uniusque dei, creator universitatis quomodo potuit esse visibilis?¹⁵

After His Incarnation the Son is, indeed, visible in His human nature, and Caesarius again follows Augustine in pointing out that one of the reasons why the Son took on His created nature was just that He might be seen by men.

Prorsus in forma Dei in qua aequalis est Patri, etiam Filius invisibilis est: ut autem ab hominibus videretur, formam servi accepit, et in similitudine hominum factus, visibilis factus est.¹⁶

Sed ideo induit carnem, quae videri poterat, quia deitas ab homine videri non poterat.¹⁵

13. B.A.H. II, p. 188:8.

14. De Trinitate 2, 8 (8, 780).

15. B.A.H. II, p. 188:18.

16. Tract. 53 in Joann. 12 (3, 648).

Hence it is also seen that the words of St. Paul in I Timothy 1:7 are to be understood not only of the Father but of the entire Trinity.

Hinc etiam consequenter intelligitur non tantummodo de Patre dixisse apostolum Paulum, "Qui solus habet immortalitatem;" (I Tim. 6:16) sed de uno et solo Deo quod est ipsa Trinitas.¹⁷

Nam et illud quod ait apostolus, "Immortali invisibili soli Deo honor et gloria" (I Tim. 1:17) quod vos de solo Patre dictum accipitis, de tota Trinitate hoc apostolum dixisse manifestum est.¹⁸

A final sequel to this explanation of the theophanies, which St. Augustine mentions but which is not so clear in St. Caesarius, is that the divine Persons did not appear to men in their divine substance, but through the medium of creatures, usually angels and created visible forms. Whether the Archbishop of Arles supposes an angelic mediation is doubtful, but certainly from the above texts it is clear that he admits the mediation of created forms, since the divine substance is absolutely invisible.

In defending the perfect oneness of the substance of the Father and the Son, Caesarius frequently employs an *argumentum ad hominem* which he found in St. Augustine. If the Arians say the Son is less than the Father, they divide the divine substance. The result is a plurality of greater and lesser gods similar to the polytheism of the pagans.

Dicentes (Ariani) unum Dominum Deum cui soli serviendum est, non est nisi Deum Patrem et tamen etiam Filium Deum et Dominum confitentes; apertissime duos deos et dominos, majorem unum, minorem alterum dicitis.²⁰

Et nolite de uno deo more gentilium plures vobis maiores ac minores formare deos.¹⁹ Nolite Christum minorem facere Patre, nolite unitatem dividere, nolite unum deum diversis gradibus dividendo veluti idola gentium in vestris cordibus fabricare.²¹

One of the best scriptural arguments, however, for both the unity of substance and the distinction of Persons is to be found in the formula of Baptism.

17. De Trinitate 1, 6 (8, 755).

18. De Trin. II, p. 172:18.

19. Ibid. p. 175:19.

20. Cont. Max. Ar. 2, 13, 1 (8, 702).

21. Ser. 123, p. 490:3.

In cuius nomine? In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti. Iste unus Deus, quia non in nominibus Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti: sed in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti. Ubi unum nomen audis, unus est Deus.²²

Unde et dominus in evangelio post resurrectionem suam ad discipulos suos ait: "Euntes baptizate omnes gentes in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti." (Matt. 28:19) In nomine, inquit, non in nominibus. Pater itaque deus, Filius deus, Spiritus sanctus deus: non tres dii, sed unus deus est.²³

A number of Caesarius's principal arguments from Sacred Scripture to show the perfect equality of the Father and the Son manifest a clear dependence on the writings of St. Augustine.

Sed quam sapienter ostendisti Filio incapabilem Patrem, Filium vero capabilem Patri. Dixisti enim, Vidit ergo Patrem, sed vidit incapabilem. Pater autem, inquis, sic videt Filium ut tenens in sinu suo et habens. Sic non sapiunt, nisi qui carnaliter sapiunt. . . . Nam si incapabilis est Pater, Filius vero incapabilis non est, non veraciter dictum est, "Omnia quae habet Pater mea sunt." (Jh. 16:15) quando quidem responderi ei potest, Ecce incapabilitatem habet Pater, quae non est tua.²⁴

Certe vos estis, qui dicitis, quia Pater sit incapabilis, Filius autem capabilis. Si hoc verum est, quomodo dicit Filius, quia in ipso maneat? "Pater, inquit, in me manens" . . . Apertum est quia Filius dicit "Pater in me manens;" et quia numquam factum est ut minor maiorem capere possit, sublata contentione, dum audis, "Ego in Patre et Pater in me est," (Jh. 14:10) agnosce et intellege aequalitatem Patris et Filii.²⁵

We notice a somewhat different manner of argumentation in Caesarius, which is due to the seemingly more appropriate scriptural text he chooses to demonstrate what Augustine proves from another text. The reliance on Augustine is certainly not excluded by this change, as it could readily have been made by Caesarius. The nearly identical statement of the Arian position and the word *capabilis* seem sufficient to indicate the dependence. Other writers use the same texts to prove the same thing, but the significant word *capabilis* is not found elsewhere.

From the important dogmatic text of St. Paul in Philippians 2:6, St. Augustine explains why it was not robbery for Christ to be

22. Tract. 6 in Joann. 9 (3, 334).

23. Ser. 213, p. 805:10.

24. Cont. Max. Ar. 2, 9, 2 (8, 697).

25. De Trin. II, p. 175:6.

equal to the Father. We notice here an instance in which St. Caesarius uses the term *natura* instead of the usual *substantia*, either because of the scriptural usage or his dependence of Augustine.

Non rapina, quia natura. Natura erat, rapina non erat. Non rapinam arbitratus est, esse aequalis Deo. Non erat ei rapina, natura erat.²⁶

Nemo rapit, nisi quod non habet. Ille ergo qui habebat aequalitatem, non est arbitratus per rapinam; sed quam rebellis angelus assumere voluit per rapinam, Christus possedit per naturam.²⁷

Caesarius's argument of becomingness for the equality of the Father and of the Son still more clearly manifests the influence of Augustine: Certainly the Son is not less than the Father for even men will see God as He is in Himself.

"Similes ei erimus quoniam videbimus eum sicuti est." (I Jh. 3:2) Unicus similis nascendo, nos similes videndo. Non enim ita similes ut ille, qui hoc est quod ille a quo genitus est: nos enim similes, non aequales; ille quia aequalis, ideo similis.²⁸

Cum enim beatus evangelista de omnibus sanctis, qui cum Christo regnaturi sunt, dicat, quia cum apparuerit similes ei futuri sint, quia videbunt eum sicuti est; qua conscientia Filius dei dissimilis dicitur Patri, cum etiam homines dei Filio similes futuri esse legantur? Ille te similem sibi vult facere: et tu eum Patri similem nec erubescis nec metuis abnegare?²⁹

The explanation of the seemingly subordinationist texts of Sacred Scripture as it is found in St. Caesarius again indicates a dependence on the Bishop of Hippo. Here, however, as we saw several times already, the Archbishop of Arles relies on Augustine for the principle and either makes his own application or borrows from another writer. Hence Caesarius, seemingly depending on Augustine, speaks of the *regula* for interpreting these texts.

Quapropter cognita ista regula intelligendarum Scripturarum de Filio Dei, ut distinguamus quid in eis sonet

Cum nusquam omnino deus minor esse legatur, nisi, ut dictum est, propter dispensationem carnis assum-

26. Ser. 183, 4, 5 (5, 875).

27. B.A.H. II, p. 187:7.

28. Enarr. in Ps. 49, 2 (4, 444).

29. De Trin. II, p. 175:20.

secundum Dei in qua aequalis est Patri, et quid secundum formam servi quam accepit, in qua minor est Patre.³¹

tae. . . . Secundum hanc ergo regulam duas in Christo crede esse substantias, deum verum et hominem verum.³⁰

The same accusation against the Arians which we find in St. Augustine is repeated by the Archbishop of Arles. The Arians, in saying that Christ is less than the Father without admitting His equality, are accepting only a part of the Scriptures.

Accipio quod dicis: sed utrumque accipio, quia utrumque lego. Quare tu unum accipis, et unum non vis? Nam mecum utrumque legisti.³²

Tu vero, qui in ipso evangelio et minorem et aequalem frequentius legis, quare unum credis et aliud credere non adquiescis?³³

But throughout these explanations of the seemingly subordinationist texts the influence of the *Quicumque* is undeniable, even where there is a dependence on St. Augustine. The latter speaks of the *formam Dei* and the *formam servi*; while Caesarius says *duas substantias* and very frequently *secundum divinitatem* and *secundum humanitatem*.

The argument from reason to show the equality of the Father and the Son is one of the most Augustinian sections of Caesarius's Trinitarian works. He first refutes the Arian claim that they give more honor to the Father because they believe the Son is less than the Father.

Ego, inquis, maiorem honorem volo dare Patri, minorem Filio. Ibi tollis honorem Patri, ubi minorem das Filio. . . . Quia ita sentiendo, ubi maiorem honorem vis dare Patri, ibi es contumeliosus in Patrem.³⁴

Noli, rogo te, per iniuriam Filii Patrem velle honorare . . . quanto magis deo Patri cognoscitur iniuriam facere, qui unicum Filium eius minorem quam ipse est voluerit iudicare vel credere?³⁵

Much more important, however, is Caesarius's principal argument taken from the omnipotence and goodness of the Father. We have

30. B.A.H. II, p. 189:23-190:2.

31. De Trinitate I, 11, 22 (8, 764).

32. Ser. 341, 5, 6 (5, 1316).

33. De Trin. II, p. 174:5.

34. Tract. 19 in Joann. 6 (3, 439).

35. De Trin. II, p. 174:21.

here a dependence on the Bishop of Hippo that is not frequently found among post-Augustinian writers.³⁶

Ubi est, quod eum invidum non esse dixisti? An forte dare non potuit? Ubi est omnipotentia Dei Patris? Prosus ad hunc articulum res colligitur, ut Deus Pater aequalem sibi gignere Filium aut non potuerit, aut noluerit. Si non potuit infirmus: si noluit invidus invenitur. Sed utrumque hoc falsum est. Patri igitur Deo Filius versus aequalis est.³⁷

Istum, quem et bonum et omnipotentem professus es, voluit sibi similem Filium gignere, an non voluit? Si non voluit, quomodo est bonus? Si vero voluit, et non potuit, quomodo est omnipotens? . . . Cum enim deus Pater pro ineffabili pietate tantam bonitatem hominibus dederit, ut etiam maiores et meliores, quam ipsi sunt, filios habere velint; quomodo ipse, non solum non bonus, sed etiam invidus credendus est, si bonitatem, quam hominibus dedit, sibi negavit, et unicum Filium aequalem sibi esse non voluit?³⁸

There is not much doubt that for the extended form of this argument found in his treatise on the Trinity the Archbishop of Arles gathered material from several places in St. Augustine. Though the principal dependence seems to be on the passage cited above, yet from other places where St. Augustine gives the same argument we can fill in the parts that Caesarius adds here. Thus in *Cont. Max. Ar. Episc.* 2, 23, 6 the emphasis is on the goodness of the Father, and the phrase *Si noluit, quomodo bonus est?* has a close parallel in Caesarius's *Si non voluit, quomodo est bonus?* Also the comparison to human generation which Caesarius makes here is undoubtedly due to a similar thought in the same work of Augustine.³⁹

To prove the eternity of the Son, Augustine began by showing that the Son existed before His temporal birth. Though Caesarius did not think it necessary to prove this, since the Semi-Arians admitted it, yet in mentioning it in words identical with those of the

36. It is interesting to note that, though it is Augustine who develops and frequently utilizes this argument, yet one finds the essential argumentation already in St. Ambrose: *Si minorem generavit Deus Filium, minus contulit; si minus contulit, aut minus voluit, aut minus potuit: sed nec infirmus nec invidus Pater.* (*De Fide* 5, 18, 224).

37. *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 7 (8, 695).

38. *De Trin.* II, p. 167:10-19.

39. *Cont. Max. Ar.* 2, 15, 5. Cf. page 88, footnote 21.

Bishop of Hippo, it would seem that he must have had Augustine's sermon before him.

Putamus enim, Fratres mei, antequam Christus de Maria virgine nasceretur erat, an non erat? Putate nos quaerere, unde non licet dubitare.⁴⁰

Iterum quaero a te, qui non adquiescis ut Filius Patri aequalis esse credatur, ut mihi respondeas, utrum ipse dei Filius ante quam nasceretur de Maria virgine, erat aut non erat. Sine dubio respondere aliud non potes, nisi quia erat.⁴¹

The principal argument raised by the Arians against the coeternity of the Son is taken from the qualities of a human father and son. St. Caesarius refutes this argument in the same way as Augustine by showing that what holds for a temporal father and son does not prove anything concerning the divine generation which does not take place in time.

Quia pater major est tempore quam filius: et ideo vis ut Filius Dei tempore minor sit quam Pater aeternus, quia invenisti minorem filium patre temporali. Da mihi aeternum patrem hic et invenisti similitudinem.⁴²

Apud homines enim ideo homo pater major est, et homo filius minor, quia et pater et filius initium habent et finem. . . . Apud deum autem Patrem et apud deum Filium noli aetatis gradus facere ubi nec initium nec finem poteris invenire.⁴³

The analogy from nature which Caesarius uses to show the possibility of the coeternity of the Father and Son has its counterpart in St. Augustine. It must be acknowledged, however, that this is not Caesarius's sole source for this analogy,⁴⁴ of which he took little more than the idea from Augustine, developing it into an extended and detailed comparison.

Ac per hoc, quemadmodum ignis et splendor qui ex igne gignitur et circumquaque diffunditur, simul esse incipiunt, nec genitus a gignente praeceditur: sic Deus Pater et Deus de Deo Filius esse simul incipiunt, quia pariter sine ullo initio temporis sunt,

Considera solem istum, et vide quomodo de se ipso et splendorem generet et calorem, et in hac significatione intellege Trinitatem. . . . Et hoc diligenter attende, quia, quomodo et Filius et Spiritus sanctus de Patre sunt, non Pater ab illis, sic et

40. Ser. 225, 1, 1 (5, 970).

41. De Trin. II, p. 168:7.

42. Ser. 117, 7, 10 (5, 585).

43. De Trin. II, p. 174:10.

44. Cf. page 61, footnote 169.

nec genitus a gignente praeceditur.⁴⁵ Ecce in igne quaedam tria conspici-mus, ignem, splendorem et calorem: et cum sint tria, unum lumen est. Simul exsurgunt, simulque consis-tunt: nec ignis praecedit splendorem, nec splendor calorem.⁴⁷

splendor et calor de sole nascuntur, et non ex ipsis sol ipse generatur; et tamen quomodo numquam fuit sol sine splendore et calore suo, sic nec Pater sine Filio et Spiritu sancto. . . . Unde quod de sole iam supra dictum est hoc de igne sentiendum est. Quo-modo enim ignis sine splendore et calore numquam fuit, ita Pater sine Filio et Spiritu sancto nec fuit nec esse poterit.⁴⁶

St. Caesarius adds a scriptural justification for the comparison, but this in itself does not suggest a different source, for it fits in very well with his universal anxiety not to part from scriptural usage. It does not seem at all unlikely that the sun-comparison in the first part and the Scripture texts cited at the end to justify the comparison are properly Caesarian additions.

The Caesarian argument for the coeternity of the Son with the Father from the fact that St. Paul speaks of Him as the wisdom and power of God raises a difficult question concerning the dependence of Caesarius on Augustine. We know that Augustine in his earlier writings used a similar argument.⁴⁸ Later, however, he retracts this type of argumentation as misleading.⁴⁹ In the sixth book of the *De Trinitate* he had already rejected his former view and criticizes those Catholic writers who in the defense of the faith against the Arians argue that the Son must be eternal because the Father could not be without His wisdom.⁵⁰ Does Caesarius, in spite of the later teaching of Augustine, depend on the Bishop of Hippo for this very argument? On the one hand it cannot be certainly established that he knew of the later teaching of Augustine.⁵¹ On the other hand we do not find in Caesarius's formulation of the argument any indications of dependence on Augustine beyond the argument itself. Nor have

45. Cont. Ser. Arian. 1, 34 (8, 646).

46. De Trin. II, p. 178:1-15.

47. De Symb., Ser. ad Catechum. 9, 9 (6, 574).

48. De Fide et Symbolo 4, 5. De Div. Quaes. 83, p. 23. Epis. 238, 3, 24.

49. I Retrac. 26 (1, 38); De Patre et Filio: Ubi dixi quod eam ipse genuerit, qua sapiens dicitur, sapientiam; sed melius istam quaestionem in libro postea de Trinitate tractavimus.

50. De Trinitate 6, 1, 1. Cf. M. SCHMAUS, op. cit. 344-345.

51. Cf. page 167.

there been found other certain instances of a dependence on those particular works of Augustine where the argument is found, which would show that the Archbishop of Arles possessed these works. Moreover, we are able to find sufficient evidence in other Fathers, upon whom Caesarius certainly depends, to account for the presence of the argument in the latter's writings. Therefore, though it does not seem that the matter can be definitively settled, it is more probable that there is not a dependence on Augustine here. This, however, does not exclude the possibility and the probability that the frequent references of St. Augustine to Christ as the Wisdom and Power of God, in virtue of the text of St. Paul, may have had an influence on the Bishop of Arles when he came across this type of argumentation in other writers.

In his demonstration of the omnipotence of the Son, Caesarius's principal indebtedness to Augustine is for the doctrine of the oneness of the divine power as a sequel to the unity of substance.

Satis apparet Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti unam esse virtutem, unam esse substantiam, unam deitatem, unam maiestatem, unam gloriam.⁵³ Quia Trinitatis hujus una voluntas, una potestas, una maiestas est.⁵⁴

Una est substantia, una voluntas, una potentia, una gloria, nihil ibi maius nihilque minus esse credatur.⁵²

A more direct argument for the omnipotence of the Son is found in the miracles worked by Christ, when these are taken in conjunction with the words of the Psalmist: *Tu es Deus qui facis mirabilia solus*.⁵⁵

"Tu es Deus qui facis mirabilia solus" (Ps. 76:15). Quomodo solus? Numquid forte Pater, et non Filius? aut Filius et non Pater? Immo Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus. . . . Non enim tres dii, sed unus Deus facit mirabilia solus.⁵⁷

"Tu es Deus qui facis mirabilia solus" (Ps. 76:15). Si de solo patre hoc credis ergo Christus non facit mirabilia: et quia hoc negare nulla ratione poteris, deum, qui solus facit mirabilia, totam Trinitatem intellege.⁵⁶

There can be no doubt about the reliance on St. Augustine in the following argument for the omnipotence of the Holy Spirit.

52. B.A.H. II, p. 191:1.

53. Cont. Max. Ar. 2, 26, 14 (8, 744).

54. Tract. 22 in Joann. 15 (3, 472).

55. Ps. 76:15.

56. De Trin. II, p. 173:18.

57. Enarr. in Ps. 76, 16 (4, 813).

"Et Spiritus Dei superferebatur super aquam" (Gen. 1:2). . . . Ne facienda opera sua per indigentiae necessitatem potius quam per abundantiam beneficentiae. Deus amare putaretur? . . . Cui superferri diceretur: non enim loco, sed omnia superante, ac praecellente potentia.⁵⁹

In Genesi dicit sermo divinus: "Spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas" (Gen. 1:2), hoc est, eminentia potestatis, non inopia necessitatis.⁵⁸

The clear signs of dependence on Augustine here are the words *inopia necessitatis* — *indigentiae necessitatem*, and *eminentia potestatis* — *praecellente potentia*. Another equally clear indebtedness to the same Father is found when Caesarius, again to prove the omnipotence of the Third Person, argues from the scriptural attribution of the creation of the heavenly powers to the Holy Spirit.

Nam quid excellentius in creaturis quam virtutes caelorum: Scriptum est autem, "Verbo Domini coeli firmati sunt, et Spiritu oris ejus omnis virtus eorum" (Ps. 32:6) Nam utique majus aliquid sunt virtutes caelorum, quae firmatae sunt Spiritu oris Domini, id est, Spiritu sancto, quam caeli qui firmati sunt Verbo Domini. . . . Quid est autem inconsideratius, quam negare esse creatorem Spiritum Dei, cum Domino dicatur. . . . "Emitte Spiritum tuum et creabuntur et innovabis faciem terrae." (Ps. 103:30)⁶¹

Interrogandi sunt etiam, quid maius sit, utrum caeli, an virtutes caelorum? Et cum sine dubio dixerint, virtutes caelorum, dicendum eis est: In tantum Spiritus sanctus minor non est, sed summus est, ut, cum Verbo Domini dicantur caeli creati, Spiritu sancto virtutes caelorum. . . . Et divinum utique creatorem uno versiculo demonstravit, cum divinum appellat, et deum et creatorem ostendit; sicut et David dicit: "Emitte Spiritum tuum et creabuntur, et renovabis faciem terrae." (Ps. 103:30)⁶⁰

Caesarius's refutation of the Arian objection based on the words of John 5:19, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but only what he sees the Father doing," is also Augustinian throughout. However, the Archbishop of Arles greatly summarizes the lengthy reply Augustine gives to this objection. As we saw when we considered this matter in the first chapter, there are three parts to Caesarius's reply, and all three come from Augustine.

58. B.A.H. II, p. 193:20.

59. De Gen. ad Litt. 1, 5, 15 (3, 121).

60. B.A.H. II, p. 198:5.

61. Cont. Max. Ar. 2, 17, 2 (8, 715).

Si ergo carnalem intellectum, vel potius sensum interrogemus, quasi duos sibi proposuit artifices, Patrem et Filium. . . . Fecit Pater arcam, quam Filius facere non poterat, nisi Patrem videret facientem.⁶²

Non alio Pater facit, alia Filius facit, quia omnia quae Pater facit, per Filium facit. . . . Pater per Filium in Spiritu sancto Trinitas est, sed una operatio.⁶⁴

Forte intelliges, quia illud quod dictum est, "Non potest Filius a se facere quidquam nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem," (Jh. 5:19) tale est, ac si diceret, Non esset Filius, nisi de Patre nasceretur.⁶⁷ Ergo quia Filius de Patre est, ideo dixit, "Filius non potest. . . ." Quia non est Filius a se, ideo non potest a se.⁶⁸

Quod carnalis sensus non intellegens ideo dictum ut se ex Patre esse ostenderet, utpote et deum et Filium, quomodo inter homines fieri solet, veluti pater artifex filium suum artificium suum vellet docere, ut quod viderit patrem operantem filius, hoc specialius imitetur.⁶³

Quomodo non deus Pater sapientiae suae cum deo Filio, qui est sapientia sua, in se manente, quia ipse est, ut saepe diximus, sapientia et virtus Patris, in una voluntate cuncta et una operatione perficit? Sed nec alia Pater facit, alia Filius; sed eadem quae Pater facit, ipsa et Filius facit.⁶⁵

Sed ideo dixit, "Non potest Filius a se facere quicquam, nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem," (Jh. 5:19) ut nos cognoscamus et credamus quia ex Patre est Filius, et non ex semetipso, vel aliunde.⁶⁶

The analogy with the human mind which Caesarius employs in this connection has been sufficiently considered in the treatment of this argument in the second chapter. We can say here briefly that the analogy most probably comes from Augustine, with an admixture of certain elements from another source.⁶⁹

The need for explaining the mission texts of the Holy Spirit made the omnipresence of this Person a matter of no less concern for

62. Ser. 126, 7, 9 (5, 617).

63. B.A.H. II, p. 190:12-15.

64. Ser. 126, 8, 10 (5, 617).

65. B.A.H. II, p. 191:8-11.

66. Ibid. p. 191:13-16.

67. Ser. 126, 11, 15 (5, 619).

68. Tract. 20 in Joann. 4 (3, 450).

69. Cf. page 69, footnote 193.

St. Caesarius than that of the Son. St. Augustine offered the Archbishop of Arles some assistance in his demonstration of the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit.

"Quo ibo ab Spiritu tuo?" (Ps. 138: 7) Spiritus enim Domini replevit orbem terrarum. Quis potest fugere in mundo ab illo Spiritu, quo plenus est mundus?⁷⁰

"Quo ibo ab spiritu tuo, et a facie tua quo fugiam?" (Ps. 138:7) Agnosce ergo nullum esse locum, ubi non omnipotentia Spiritus sancti praesens esse probetur.⁷¹

It must be admitted that the dependence is only probable, even though it is found in a work of Augustine on which Caesarius often relies. The argument for the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit from this text is so frequently found in the Fathers that it is impossible to be certain of a particular dependence. It might be mentioned here that, though Augustine does discuss the omnipresence from time to time, he does not emphasize this doctrine to the degree that St. Caesarius does. The evident reason is that Augustine's refutation of the Arian objections based on the missions is by no means so essentially bound up with the omnipresence of the divine Persons as it is for the Archbishop of Arles.

In his demonstration of the divinity of all three divine Persons Caesarius is primarily concerned with the defense of the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Here St. Augustine is not, as we shall see later, the principal source used by St. Caesarius. Nevertheless the Augustinian element is not entirely lacking, as is seen in the frequently repeated formula: *Non tres dñi sed unus Deus est*, which Caesarius must have read in Augustine many times. After Augustine, however, the phrase had become so common that in any particular instance the dependence on Augustine may be only mediate. But for at least one of his arguments for the divinity of the Holy Spirit Caesarius is indebted to Augustine.

Quod dixerunt magi ad Pharaonem, "Digitus Dei est hoc." (Ex. 8:19) . . . Digitus autem Dei sicut Evangelium manifestissimi loquitur, Spiritus sanctus intelligitur. Namque uno Evangelista ita narrante verba Do-

Nam et singulariter invenimus in scripturis digitum sanctum Spiritum nominatum, ut est illud in evangelio ubi ait: "Si ego in digito Dei daemonia eicio" (Lk. 11:20); quod alius evangelista declarat, dicens: "Si

70. Enarr. in Ps. 138, 10 (4, 1540).

71. B.A.H. II, p. 198:18.

mini, ut diceret, "Si ego in digito Dei ejicio daemonia" (Lk. 11:20), alius Evangelista idipsum narrans exponere voluit quid sit digitus Dei et ait, "Si ego in Spiritu Dei ejicio daemonia." (Mt. 12:28)⁷³

ego in Spiritu Dei eicio daemonia" (Mt. 12:28). Et magi Pharaonis victi signis divinis dicunt: "Digitus Dei est." (Ex. 8:19)⁷²

Before beginning an inquiry into Caesarius's dependence on Augustine for his doctrine on the processions, it will be worth while to recall what we saw when we considered the divine processions as they are presented in the writings of the Archbishop of Arles. We found at that time that his entire teaching on the processions does not contain a single notion of the Augustinian psychological explanations of the Trinity.⁷⁴ Hence at the very outset is excluded any dependence on the last eight books of Augustine's *De Trinitate*. Since these books contain Augustine's principal and proper contribution to Catholic Trinitarian thought, whatever dependence on Augustine's other works we may find in Caesarius's treatment of the divine processions will be of little importance for its strictly Augustinian character.

In spite of this all-important restriction there remains in Caesarius's doctrine on the processions a dependence on the Bishop of Hippo that is considerable. First of all, Caesarius's statement that the Son is from the Father, not the Father from the Son, finds many very close parallels in Augustine. Even more certainly is there a reliance on him when Caesarius argues from Psalm 109 to show that the Son proceeds from the substance of the Father.

"Ex utero ante luciferum genui te." (Ps. 109:3) . . . Illa ineffabilis generatio etiam si ex utero Patris accipitur, hoc significatum est, quia de se ipso, hoc est de substantia sua Deus Deum genuit.⁷⁶ Et quare dixit, "Ex utero" nisi ut intelligeretur de sua substantia genuisse.⁷⁷

Pater enim quando dixit, "Ex utero ante luciferum genui te," (Ps. 109:3) non eum creaturam intellegi, sed ex substantia sua natum voluit credi.⁷⁵

72. B.A.H. II, p. 195:26.

73. Quaes. in Exodum 2, 25 (3, 428).

74. Perhaps there is one partial exception to this general statement in Caesarius's explanation of the words, *Docuit me Pater*, which will be presently considered.

75. De Trin. II, p. 176:2.

76. Cont. Max. Ar. 1, 7 (8, 683).

77. Ser. 135, 3, 4 (5, 657).

It is precisely the fact that the Son proceeds from the substance of the Father that Augustine and Caesarius give as the reason why the Son is generated and not created; and God rather than a creature.

Genuit unicum Verbum per quod facta sunt omnia: sed hoc non de nihilo, sed de se ipso: ideo non fecit, sed genuit. . . . Hic est Filius Dei unicus; quia de substantia Patris.⁷⁸

Scio enim quod ideo minorem Filium credatis, quia eum non de substantia Patris natum sed ex nihilo creatum, . . . Si ipse creatura est, quomodo per ipsum creata sunt omnia.⁷⁹

The Archbishop of Arles repeatedly condemns the Semi-Arians for their belief that the Son must be less than the Father simply because in all human generation there is always a certain inequality between the father and the son. Yet he does not hesitate to follow St. Augustine when he turns this argument around and argues for the equality of the Father and Son by drawing a comparison from that same human generation.

Agnosce aequalitatem Patris et Filii. Quia et homo si posset, filium mox generaret aequalem, nec expectaret annos, per quos in forma filii posset voluntas ejus impleri. Deus ergo cur non aequalem genuit Filium?⁸¹

Si homo maiorem et meliorem filium, quam ipse est, gignere solet, deo Patri non concedis, ut aequalem sibi Filium generasset?⁸⁰

In Caesarius's whole doctrine on the divine processions the most significant dependence on St. Augustine is found in a place where the Archbishop is not primarily concerned with the processions at all. It comes in connection with his refutation of the Arian argument based on the words of John 5:19, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but only what he sees the Father doing." We saw Caesarius's dependence on St. Augustine in his reply to this argument, in which he shows that these words of Our Lord are to be understood as referring to His generation from the Father. This in turn brought him to a consideration of an equally difficult verse of St. John, *Docuit me Pater*. (Jh. 8:28) In order to explain these words Caesarius abandons his customary free use of sources and repeats almost word for word the essential explanation he found in St. Augustine.

78. Ser. 214, 5 (5, 945).

79. De Trin. p. 175:27.

80. Ibid. p. 174:15.

81. Cont. Max. Ar. 2, 15, 5 (8, 712).

Si ergo Deus, ut dicere coeperam, loquitur in cordibus nostris sine sono, quomodo loquitur Filio suo? Sic ergo, Fratres, sic cogitate, quantum potestis, ut dixi, si licet parva magnis modo aliquo comparare: sic cogitate. Incorporaliter Pater locutus est Filio, quia incorporaliter Pater genuit Filium. Nec eum sic docuit quasi indocutum genuerit: sed hoc est eum docuisse, quod est scientem genuisse; et hoc est "Docuit me Pater" (Jh. 8:28) quod est, scientem me genuit Pater.⁸²

Si enim deus in cordibus nostris cum loquitur, miro modo loquitur sine sono, putas quomodo potest loqui Filio suo, qui est Verbum eius? Sic ergo cogita, quia incorporaliter loquutus est Filio, quia et incorporaliter genuit Filium. Nec enim sic docuit, quasi indoctum genuerit: sed hoc est eum docuisse, quod est docutum et scientem genuisse; et hoc est "Docuit me Pater," quod est scientem genuit me Pater.⁸³

Though we have seen many instances of a clear reliance on the Bishop of Hippo, yet in none is there the close adherence to the word of Augustine that we find here. There is no doubt that for St. Augustine these words of St. John contain an important confirmation of his psychological explanation of the first procession. The question arises, therefore, whether Caesarius, in quoting Augustine, also saw in these words a reference to the manner of the Son's generation, or are they for him only a means of defending the Son's omnipotence, about which he is primarily concerned when he quotes them? Even if we grant — and his words seem to leave no choice in the matter — that because of Augustinian influence Caesarius does view the Son's generation as in some way an intellectual activity, yet it does not seem that we can place too much emphasis on this single passage which he takes from Augustine. This is the one and only time that Caesarius gives any suggestion of the intellectual nature of the generation of the Son. There is not the slightest hint of it when he specifically treats this procession. Moreover it is far from certain that the Archbishop had any intention here of explaining anything concerning the manner of the Son's generation. We know that his primary purpose is to explain the words of St. John in a way that would safeguard the omnipotence of the Son. Nor can we forget that which he has said on another occasion, that the manner of the Son's generation is not to be discussed.⁸⁴ Hence this much can be said, that to see in Caesarius's explanation of this text all that was intended by the

82. Tract 40 in Joann. 5 (3, 567).

83. B.A.H. II, p. 191:24-30.

84. Cf. p. 85.

Bishop of Hippo would be to ignore completely their context and all that we know from elsewhere concerning the Trinitarian thought of the Archbishop of Arles.

That opposite relations constitute the personal distinctions in the Trinity is certainly supposed by St. Caesarius even though he never specifically treats the matter. It is implicitly contained in much of his argumentation, however, as in the following proof of the eternity of the Son from the relative concepts of father and son.

Nec inter generantem atque generatum aliquod interfuisse temporis intervallum: tamen hoc servato et custodito ista dicimus, quod ille Pater est, ille Filius. Pater autem non est, si non habeat Filium, et Filius non est, si non habeat Patrem.⁸⁶

Crede Filium et aequalem Patri, et semper cum Patre fuisse; quia si ille semper Pater, sine dubio et ille semper Filius fuit.⁸⁵ Patrem cum audis, Filii intellege Patrem. Hoc ergo ipso nomine, quod deus Pater appellatur, cum Patre pariter subsistere etiam Filius demonstratur.⁸⁷

The same argumentation is found in other writers upon whom Caesarius depends and so we cannot be sure of a direct dependence on St. Augustine in the above. However, St. Caesarius certainly read this argument in Augustine's *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John*, on which he so frequently depends. Hence even if there is not a direct dependence — though this is certainly possible — there is at least an influence of Augustine upon Caesarius's formulation of this argument for the eternity of the Son.

Very little of Augustine's great contribution to the doctrine on the Holy Spirit finds its way into Caesarius's treatment of the procession of the Third Person. Augustinian thought is there, indeed, but we shall see that it comes only indirectly through other writers. Perhaps one exception to this is the formula *Spiritus Patris et Filii*. To be sure, the teaching on the Holy Spirit's procession from the Father and the Son is clearly found in Faustus, upon whom Caesarius principally depends for this doctrine; yet the particular form *Spiritus Patris et Filii*, so frequently used by St. Augustine and hardly ever by Faustus, would seem to indicate a direct dependence on Augustine at least in his use of this expression.⁸⁸

85. De Trin. II, p. 167:3.

86. Tract. 29 in Joann. 5 (3, 514).

87. Ser. 9, p. 48:24.

88. Cf. page 99, footnote 60.

If we saw little of Augustine in Caesarius's exposition of the inner divine processions, it was still considerable in comparison to the Augustinian influence on what the Archbishop has to say about the divine missions. Even in those instances where there may be a dependence on the Bishop of Hippo, we are frequently able to find something similar in other sources of Caesarius, so that the reliance on St. Augustine is rendered doubtful. For the omnipresence of the divine Persons, however, which is Caesarius's fundamental element in the explanation of the missions in general, we are able to find remarkably similar parallels in the writings of Augustine.

Quis enim mittitur, illo ubi est? Ubi autem non est sapientia Dei, quod est Christus.⁸⁹ Sed forte Pater ubique et Filius non ubique est? Evangelistam audi: "In hoc mundo erat, et mundos per eum factus est" (Jh. 1:10). Ergo, inquit, "Qui misit me" (Jh. 8:29), cujus auctoritate tamquam paterna incarnatus sum.⁹¹

Ille enim in alio loco mitti solet, qui ubique esse non potest. Dei enim Filius quomodo ubique non est, per quem dicente apostolo "Omnia facta sunt" (Jh. 1:3) . . . Unde iterum atque iterum quaero a te, ut mihi reddas rationem, quomodo mittitur, qui ubique est?⁹⁰

That there is a dependence on St. Augustine in these passages is not unlikely. The similarities between the two are greater than was found in any other writer upon whom Caesarius depends. It is of primary importance, however, to note carefully that in spite of similarities of expression, these words have an essentially different purpose in Augustine and Caesarius.⁹² The end Augustine had in view, which is always evident from the context, was to exclude a corporal and local understanding of the missions, but by no means the missions themselves. But Caesarius, who is never concerned with anything but a local mission, wishes by these arguments to exclude entirely the mission of a divine Person except in the created terminus of the mission.

The second fundamental element of Caesarius's explanation of the missions is that the mission texts are verified only in a created nature.

89. Cont. Serm. Arian. 1, 4 (8, 627).

90. De Trin. II, p. 168:26.

91. Tract. 40 in Joann. 6 (3, 567).

92. This is true at least in regard to their purpose in the mission doctrine as it appears in Caesarius's doctrinal treatises. As we have seen, however, (p. 113) we cannot be sure that we have here a full expression of his doctrine on the missions.

In the case of the mission of the Son, this is His human nature. Whether and to what extent there is a dependence on St. Augustine for this notion requires a careful examination of several texts which might indicate a dependence.

"Qui me misit, mecum est" (Jh. 8:29). Si ergo tecum est, O Domine, non unus ab alio missus est, sed ambo venistis. Et tamen cum ambo simul sint, unus missus est, alter misit: quoniam missio incarnatio est.⁹⁴

Nam si secundum divinitatem dixeris missum, ergo et Patrem de loco ad locum transisse crediturus es, quem secum venisse Christus ipse testatus est, dicens: "Qui me misit, mecum est." (Jh. 8:29)⁹³ Sed missionem Filii incarnationem eius intellege.⁹⁵ Filii missio incarnatio intellegitur.⁹⁶

There are two indications of a dependence on St. Augustine in the above passages. The first is the citation from John 8:29. Though Caesarius's use of the verse is quite different from that of St. Augustine, yet the above passage from Augustine might well have occasioned the argument the Archbishop of Arles draws from the scriptural text. The second reason for believing that there is a reliance on Augustine here are the words, *quoniam missio incarnatio est*. The phrase finds several parallels in the works of St. Caesarius and might well account for his repetition of the expression. Again the expression does not have the same meaning in the two Fathers. For Augustine it simply means that the Son is sent in His Incarnation and that in this mission the Sent is in some wonderful way accompanied by the Sender. But for Caesarius, we have, I believe, sufficiently demonstrated that the phrase means that the Son is sent in His human nature.⁹⁷

The scriptural proof that the Son is sent only in His human nature, is for Caesarius, contained in the words of Galatians 4:4, "God sent His Son, born of a woman, born under the Law." His explanation of this verse raises one of the most difficult and yet most important questions concerning the relation of Caesarius to Augustine in the former's doctrine on the missions. We find a similar explanation of the verse in two places of Augustine's *De Trinitate*.

93. De Trin. II, p. 169:3.

94. Tract. 40 in Joann 6 (3, 567).

95. B.A.H. II, p. 184:10.

96. Ibid. p. 196:26.

97. Cf. p. 105.

Cum itaque ait: "Misit Deum Filium suum factum ex muliere," (Gal. 4:4) satis ostendit eo ipso missum Filium quo factus est ex muliere. Quod ergo de Deo natus est, in hoc mundo erat: quod autem de Maria natus est, in hunc mundum missus advenit.⁹⁸

"Cum ergo venit plenitudo temporis misit Deus Filium suum factum ex muliere, factum sub lege;" (Gal. 4:4) usque adeo parum ut factum; eo itaque missum, quo factum. Si ergo major mittit minorem fatemur et nos factum minorem et in tantum minorem in quantum factum, et in tantum factum in quantum missum.⁹⁹

Agnosce ergo, Filium secundum deitatem minorem nec fuisse nec esse, nec mitti nisi per incarnationis mysterium quod etiam apostolus evidenter ostendit, ubi ait: "Misit Deus Filium suum, factum ex muliere, factum sub Lege." (Gal. 4:4) Diligenter adtende, quia secundum hoc et missus et minor dictus est, juxta quod non solum ex muliere, sed etiam sub Lege factus est.¹⁰⁰

The passage in Caesarius is so short once we take away the Scripture text that it is difficult to be sure if there is a dependence on Augustine or not. It certainly does not seem improbable, however. Both readings of the *De Trinitate* offer certain similarities to that found in Caesarius which might well indicate a dependence. Thus the words of Caesarius, *minorem nec fuisse nec esse, nec mitti*, might well have their origin in the last part of the citation from Book IV of the *De Trinitate*. Moreover in the other sources used by Caesarius nothing is found that is similar to what he has here.¹⁰¹ It is true that St. Vincent of Lerins cites the passage from Book II in his *Excerpta*, but there is not sufficient evidence to suppose that Caesarius ever depends on this work. This is rather another indication that the Archbishop of Arles could well depend on Augustine here, for it proves the existence of the second book of the *De Trinitate* at Lerins, and that enough importance was attached to this particular passage of Augustine to prompt St. Vincent to include it in his *Excerpta*.

What Caesarius intends by the above explanation of the words of St. Paul is quite evident, for it fits in perfectly with all that we have

98. De Trinitate 2, 5, 8 (8, 776).

99. Ibid. 4, 19 (8, 886).

100. De Trin. II, p. 169:5.

101. One possible exception is a passage in St. Fulgentius (cf. page 106, footnote 13) but it is too short to indicate a dependence and shows none of the similarities to Caesarius's account that are found in Augustine.

seen in his discussion of the missions. But how does what St. Augustine says here harmonize with his doctrine on the missions? In the preceding paragraph of Book II Augustine clearly states his strict doctrine on the missions: "Therefore to be sent, is to come forth from the Father, and to come into the world."¹⁰² In the fourth book of the *De Trinitate* is found his full development of the doctrine on the missions, which we know is essentially joined up with the inner divine processions. Why then does St. Augustine here say that the Son is "in this way therefore sent, in that He was made . . . and in so far made, in so far sent"? Schmaus rightly points out that Augustine distinguishes between the mission of the Incarnate Word and the mission of the Son of God Who is to become man; between the mission of the Man Christ and that of the Eternal Word Who will take to Himself a human nature. That Augustine does indeed make this distinction is sufficiently apparent in chapter twenty of Book Four: "According to this manner we can now understand that the Son is not only said to have been sent because 'the Word was made flesh' (Jh. 1:14), but therefore sent that the Word might be made flesh, and that He might perform through His bodily presence those things which were written; that is, that not only is He understood to have been sent as man, which the Word was made but the Word, too, was sent that it might be made man."¹⁰³ The question still remains, however, why does Augustine make this distinction when speaking about the missions? Is it because he admits a twofold conception of the nature of a divine mission? This is not admissible. For Augustine the only true notion of the mission of the Verbum is that in which the Son of God is sent in virtue of His generation by the Father, and the external term of this mission is the assumption of the human nature. If we look for the reason for this distinction in St. Augustine, it is found where he introduces this concept of mission in the nineteenth chapter of Book IV. He is concerned with the Arian objection that the Son is less because He is sent by the Father. Before going into his full exposé on the nature of the divine missions, Augustine gives a brief reply to the objection in the form of something similar to an ad hominem argument. "If the greater sends the less, we too acknowledge Him to have been made less; and in so far less, in so far as made; and in so far made, in

102. *De Trinitate* 2, 5. Translation from Oates, *Basic Writings of St. Augustine*, New York 1948.

103. *De Trinitate* 4, 20. Translation, Oates, op. cit. 2, 751. Cf. M. SCHMAUS, op. cit. p. 167.

so far sent.”¹⁰⁴ In other words Augustine is saying that if the Arians want to insist that the Son is less because He is sent, we agree, but only in the sense that “sent” refers to His human nature.

If we return now to what St. Caesarius says, it may be asked whether perhaps this is also all he intends by his explanation of Galatians 4:4? This is certainly possible, as we have previously pointed out.¹⁰⁵ Since Caesarius, however, nowhere else gives us the fuller notion of mission found in Augustine, the point must remain doubtful. When we consider Caesarius’s frequent repetition and insistence that the Son is not sent except in His human nature, and nowhere hints to another concept of mission, the possibility — if not the probability — always remains that the Archbishop of Arles understood these words of Augustine, on which he probably depends for his argument, as containing a true, and for him the only notion of a divine mission.

In regard to the mission of the Holy Spirit, there is no evidence of any dependence on St. Augustine. It is worthy of note, however, that we find something similar in Augustine to Caesarius’s argument from the words of Isaias, *Dominus Deus misit me, et Spiritus ejus*.¹⁰⁶ From these words the Archbishop argues that the Son is also sent by the Holy Spirit. Augustine also cites this verse to show that the Son is sent by the Holy Spirit in the creation of Christ’s human nature.¹⁰⁷ It is evident, however, that Augustine is here using “sent” in the improper sense of an activity *ad extra*, and so he says that the Son also sends Himself in the same sense.¹⁰⁸ Again it is possible that Caesarius understands the verse in the same way. It cannot be denied, however, that according to his explanation of the Son’s mission, i.e., only in His human nature, he can very well say that the Holy Spirit sends the Son.

The Caesarian doctrine on appropriations once more manifests a great indebtedness to the Bishop of Hippo. Caesarius’s emphasis on the perfect equality and inseparability of the divine Persons in their external operations finds many parallel passages throughout Augustine’s polemical works. These Augustinian expressions became so common in post-Augustinian writers that it is practically impossible in most cases to say whether a particular writer is depending directly on Augustine or not.

104. De Trinitate 4, 19. Translation, Oates, op. cit. 2, 751.

105. Cf. p. 112.

106. Isaias 48:16.

107. Cf. page 110, footnote 29.

108. Cf. M. SCHMAUS, op. cit. p. 168.

In the following examples, however, there seems to be a direct dependence on the Bishop of Hippo.

Audi alio loco in Evangelio, quia non solum Pater suscitavit Filium sed etiam Filius seipsum: "Solvite, inquit, templum hoc, et in triduo suscitabo illud." (Jh. 2:19)¹¹⁰

Denique de Patre apostolus dicit, "Quod Christum suscitaverit" (I Cor. 15:15) a mortuis; et Christus de seipso dicit: "Solvite templum hoc et ego tribus diebus excitabo illud." (Jh. 2:19)¹⁰⁹

Quaecumque enim Pater facit, haec eadem Filius similiter facit. Evangelica est et ista sententia, Filii ipsius consequenter ore prolata. Non sunt ergo alia Filii, et alia Patris, opera, sed haec eadem: nec dissimiliter fiunt a Filio, sed similiter.¹¹¹

Quis enim haec legens non intellegat, unam esse operationem Patris et Filii, secundum quod ipse dominus dixit: "Quaecumque Pater facit, haec eadem et Filius similiter facit"? (Jh. 5:19) Non dixit, alia, vel similia: sed ea ipsa quae Pater facit, cum Patre etiam et Filius similiter facit.¹¹²

Before concluding this investigation into the relation between the Trinitarian works of St. Augustine and St. Caesarius, it will be of interest to note which works of Augustine were principally utilized by the Archbishop of Arles. It is not a matter of surprise to find that both his purpose and his practical nature prompted Caesarius to rely almost entirely on the polemical works of St. Augustine. Of these, we find the greatest dependence on the *Contra Maximinum Arianorum Episcopum*. There are some less frequent passages taken from the *Contra Sermonem Arianorum*. Among the many sermons from which Caesarius borrows, the most important are *Sermon* 126, and *Sermon* 52. The second most important work of Augustine for its contributions to the Trinitarian thought of the Archbishop of Arles is the *Tractatus in Joannis Evangelium*. Among Augustine's other exegetical works the ones most frequently utilized are: *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, *De Genesi ad Litteram* and once or twice the *Quaestiones in Exodum*. There are several probable instances of a reliance on the *De Civitate Dei*.

Before determining the extent of Caesarius's dependence on Augustine's *De Trinitate*, we must recall a number of factors. First, a reliance on the first two books of this work and probably also on the fourth has

109. De Trin. II, p. 176:12.

110. Tract. 47 in Joann. 7 (3, 610).

111. Cont. Sermon. Arian. 1, 15 (8, 634).

112. De Trin. II, p. 176:14.

been certainly established in the above investigation. Secondly, St. Vincent of Lerins also cites in his *Excerpta* from these same books and from no others. Thirdly, Caesarius gives no hint that he read or possessed any other books of the *De Trinitate*. Fourthly, Caesarius's argument for the eternity of the Son from His being the wisdom and power of God seems to indicate that Caesarius did not have or did not read the sixth book of the *De Trinitate*. For the Archbishop of Arles not to accept something in the writings of St. Augustine is one thing, but directly to oppose the teaching of his master and model does not seem to be a part of Caesarius's Augustinianism. It must be admitted that it is only the first part of the *De Trinitate*, which contains the anti-Arian argumentation, that would primarily interest both Vincent of Lerins and Caesarius. But why do they both stop with the fourth book? There is certainly still a great deal that could well be used by them in their controversies against the Arians in the fifth, sixth and seventh books. These few negative arguments, therefore, though they by no means constitute a conclusive proof, yet raise the question whether the whole of the *De Trinitate* had reached southern Gaul by the end of the fifth century. The plausibility of this hypothesis is greatly increased by something we find in St. Augustine himself. For we know that it was a matter of great concern to him that parts of the *De Trinitate* were widely diffused among his readers long before he had finished the work or had had time to revise it. In *Epistola* 174 (written in 417, the year he completed the *De Trinitate*) he complains to Bishop Aurelius of Carthage that some had merely the first four or five books; others had the twelfth book without the last part.¹¹³ The fact that he mentions the first four books as

113. Epis. 174 (PL 33, 758): *De Trinitate*, quae Deus summus et verus est, libros juvenis inchoavi, senex edidi. Omiseram quippe hoc opus, posteaquam comperi praereptos mihi esse sive subreptos antequam eos absolverem, et retractatos, ut mea dispositio fuerat, expolirem. Non enim singillatim, sed omnes simul edere ea ratione decreveram, quoniam praecedentibus consequentes inquisitione proficiente nectuntur. Cum ergo per eos homines (quia priusquam vellem, ad quosdam illorum pervenire potuerunt) dispositio mea nequivisset impleri, interruptam dictationem reliqueram, cogitans hoc ipsum in aliquibus meis scriptis conqueri, ut scirent, qui possent, non a me fuisse eosdem libros editos, sed ablatos priusquam mihi editione mea digni viderentur. . . . Sunt autem qui primos quatuor vel potius quinque etiam sine proemiis habent, et duodecimum sine extrema parte non parva: sed si eis hacc editio potuerit innotescere, omnia si voluerint et valuerint, emendabunt. Peto sane ut hanc epistolam, seorsum quidem, sed tamen ad caput eorumdem librorum jubeas anteponi. Cf. also *Retrac.* II, 15, 1.

one of the sections that was making its way alone might readily be the explanation why only these four books were known at Arles at the time of St. Caesarius.

At the end of this search into the extent of St. Caesarius's dependence on St. Augustine several conclusions are quite apparent whereas other points remain doubtful. Certainly we may say that the starting point of the Trinitarian discussion is the same for both the Bishop of Hippo and the Archbishop of Arles. This is an emphasis on the substantial unity and all those things which flow from it. In this section we find the greatest dependence on Augustine. This dependence is not so much one of doctrine, however, as one of defense of doctrine. For the doctrine on the substantial unity — frequently also for its manner of expression — together with those sequels of special importance in combating the Arians, Caesarius simply accepts and makes his own what he found in the *Quicumque*. His arguments to defend that doctrine he borrows for the most part from St. Augustine. In his doctrine on the inner divine processions his reliance on the Bishop of Hippo is not so great, but by no means insignificant. In his explanation of the missions, though there is probably also here some dependence on Augustine, it is insignificant and not at all of such a nature as to give his doctrine on the missions an Augustinian color.

In general it is certainly true that the Trinitarian works of St. Caesarius are imbued with Augustinian thought. Caesarius was eclectic, however, in his Augustinianism, taking only what fitted his personal character and his particular purpose and leaving the rest. In this regard d'Ales makes an enlightening comparison between the Augustinianism of St. Caesarius and that of his illustrious contemporary, St. Fulgentius. The latter, much more speculative, was the master of an Augustinianism somewhat narrowed and more severe. St. Caesarius, on the other hand, of an essentially practical nature, was master of an Augustinianism perhaps more prudent and certainly somewhat moderated.¹¹⁴ It was this type of Augustinianism that enabled him to represent Augustine's doctrine on grace in a form that could receive the definitive sanction of the Church. It was also this kind of Augustinianism which prompted him to pass over Augustine's speculations on the Trinity in favor of the Trinitarian faith he found best expressed in the Pseudo-Athanasian Symbol.

114. A. D'ALÈS, op. cit. p. 383.

Faustus of Riez

Before taking up the consideration of Caesarius's dependence on St. Ambrose, the second Father he recommends, we shall examine the extent of his reliance on Faustus of Riez. For there can be no doubt that, next to Augustine, the greatest single influence on the general formation of Caesarius's thought is this severe Abbot of Lerins and later Bishop of Riez, the greatest theologian of Semi-Pelagianism. In spite of his great veneration for Faustus, Caesarius never compromises in the least his Augustinian anti-Pelagian principles. In the doctrine of the Trinity, however, which is the most orthodox of Faustus' teachings, the Archbishop of Arles takes the occasion to render honor to the former Abbot of Lerins. Here Caesarius transcribes large sections of Faustus' treatise on the Holy Spirit.

A proof for his first and most fundamental doctrinal principle, the one God is triune, Caesarius found in Faustus' explanation of the verse of the *Miserere*: *Ne proicias me a facie tua et spiritum sanctum tuum ne auferas a me.*¹¹⁵ The triple angelic cry of adoration: *Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus*, shows that divine honor is to be given to all three Persons of the Blessed Trinity.¹¹⁶ In the *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos* Caesarius again argues from these words to show their Trinitarian content, but here, as we shall see, he depends on another writer.

In the second step of his Trinitarian doctrine, the personal distinctions and the substantial unity, we find a dependence on Faustus for one of the clearest statements of this truth in the writings of the Archbishop of Arles.

Credatur a nobis unitas sine confusione conjuncta, Trinitas sine separatione distincta: Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus sanctus, unus Deus credatur. Tres personae, sed non tres substantias.¹¹⁷

Teneat cum catholica inseparabilem trinitatem, sine permixtione coniunctam, sine separatione disiunctam; quia Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus deus verus plenus et unus est. . . Credantur ergo tres personae, sed non tres substantiae.¹¹⁸

115. Cf. page 23, footnote 31. Those parts of Sermons 212 and 213 which are taken verbatim from the *De Spiritu Sancto* are not repeated here, as there is no question of their origin.

116. Cf. page 23, footnote 32.

117. Pseudo-Eusebius: *De Epiphania* Homilia I (MBP 6, 622D).

118. B.A.H. II, p. 186:5-11.

The word *permixtione* in Caesarius is probably taken from Augustine, who, as we saw, has the similar term *commixtione* in a passage which has much in common with that of Caesarius.¹¹⁹ Another difference is the word *disiunctam* of Caesarius for *distincta* in Faustus. It is possible that Caesarius made this change in order to contrast it with the previous *coniunctam*. But it is also not unlikely that the original in Faustus was also *disiuncta*, which was changed by a later copyist for the sake of greater conformity with the accepted terminology, *persona distincta*.

Though Caesarius's greatest dependence is on the treatise *De Spiritu Sancto*, another important source is Faustus's *Sermon II: Legimus et fideliter retinemus*. To appreciate better the great use Caesarius made of this sermon, we shall gather together all the different passages which show a reliance on it.

Confiteamur ergo imprimis unum deum dominum nostrum et non supere-rit alter quem minorem dicere pos-simus. Qui enim unum majorem, alterum minorem loquitur, duos se necesse est deos fateatur habere.

Quare unum deum? Quia una opera-tio virtutis, eadem concordia volun-tatis una divinitas, una sempiternitas, una majestas. . . .

Una enim in tribus gloria, una sub-stantia, unitatemque facit aequalitas virtutum, trinitatem facit proprietas nominum et numerus personarum. . .

Secundum divinitatem aequalis Patri secundum humanitatem minor etiam angelis et junior matri, quam crea-vit.¹²³

Sed credamus scripturae dicenti, tam novi quam veteris testamenti, quia "Deus unus est;" (Deut. 6:4) et si unum major, alter minor est, ut Arriani dicunt, unus dici non potest, inaequalitas unitatem excludit.¹²⁰

Ita una sine principio sempiternitas, sicut una sine fine maiestas.¹²¹

Quomodo autem tres et unum creda-mus adverte. Unitatem facit aequa-litas virtutum, trinitatem proprietas personarum.¹²²

Propter dispensationem carnis as-sumtae, in qua non solum ab angelis minoratus est, . . . sed et matre sua iunior invenitur, sicut iam dixi-mus.¹²⁴

119. Cf. page 28, footnote 47; and Caesarius's dependence on Augustine, page 142.

120. B.A.H. II, p. 192:19.

121. Ibid. p. 186:12.

122. Ibid. p. 192:22.

123. Ser. 2 (CSEL 21, 228).

124. B.A.H. II, p. 189:24.

The dependence in each case seems sufficiently clear without further explanation. Though in general his reliance on Faustus is more literal than when he borrows from Augustine, yet these few examples show that here also there is not a question of merely copying. In all the above citations, Caesarius treats the unity of substance and the personal distinctions, and hence, though his principal dependence on Faustus is found in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, it is by no means restricted to that doctrine.

The extensive use St. Caesarius makes of the seventy-five homilies and sermons which comprise the *Collection of Eusebius of Emesa*¹²⁵ is quite understandable now that we know that Faustus of Riez is their author.¹²⁶ In his Trinitarian writings the Archbishop of Arles borrows primarily from three of these homilies: two on the Apostles' Creed and one on the mystery of the Trinity. Faustus' two homilies *De Symbolo* are — as Morin points out in his edition — the model for the sermon of Caesarius on the same subject. It might even be said that the latter's sermon *De Symbolo* is nothing more than a condensation of the two homilies of Faustus. There is, however, a dependence on these two homilies also in Caesarius's doctrinal treatises on the Trinity. Since the dependence in each case is sufficiently clear, it will not be necessary here to do more than gather together the different passages in Caesarius which show a reliance on these homilies. Taking little more than the idea from Faustus, Caesarius exercises the greatest freedom of adaptation in the following three instances of dependence on Faustus' first homily *De Symbolo*.

"Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem." Per Dei appellationem commune adhuc Trinitatis nomen locutus es. . . .

Cum vero dici: "Credo in Deum Patrem:" ecce unam iam expressisti de Trinitate personam. . . . Nova

"Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem." Sicut optime novit caritas vestra carissimi, fides omnium christianorum in Trinitate consistit.¹²⁷

Deum cum audis, substantiam intellege, sine initio, sine fine. Patrem cum audis, Filii intellege Patrem.

125. This collection of seventy-five homilies is almost entirely in the MBP vol. 6, 628 ff. The collection is completed by two homilies *De Pascha*, attributed to St. Caesarius, but which Morin believes belong to this collection and which are found in Migne PL 62, 1047, 1050.

126. Cf. G. MORIN, La Collection gallicane dite d'Eusèbe d'Emèse et les problèmes qui s'y rattachent. ZntW 34 (1935) 92-115.

127. Ser. 9, p. 48:15.

appellatione naturae, adserere videbitur defuisse aliqui Deo de perfectione, qui "Patris" nomen putat coepisse tempore. Ergo sicut semper Deus, ita semper et Pater. Si ergo nunquam Patris defuit nomen, quomodo unquam deesse Filius potuit. . .

Sicut autem esse non potest sol sine splendore, vel ignis sine calore . . . nunquam Pater potuit esse sine Filio.¹²⁹

Hoc ergo ipso nomine, quod deus Pater appellatur, cum Patre pariter subsistere etiam Filius demonstratur.¹²⁸

Quomodo numquam fuit sol sine splendore et calore suo, sic nec Pater sine Filio et Spiritu sancto. . . . Quomodo enim ignis sine splendore et calore numquam fuit, ita Pater sine Filio et Spiritu sancto nec fuit nec esse poterit.¹³⁰

When he borrows from Faustus' second homily *De Symbolo*, he is more faithful to his source, which is on that account more easily discovered.

Cum dixeris Pater, Filius, Spiritus sanctus, personas explicuisti: cum dixeris Deus, substantiam demonstrasti. . . . Dicimus Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum sanctum: ne aestimes unam credere te debere personam. Item dicimus, unum Deum: ne putes esse plures naturas. . . .

In his tribus personis numerus esse potest, ordo esse non potest. Nam etsi distinctionem recipit Trinitas gradum tamen nescit aequalitas. . . .

Cum dixeris, Pater Filius et Spiritus sanctus, personas explicuisti: cum dixeris, deus, substantiam demonstrasti. Dicimus Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum, ne te aestimes unam credere debere personam; item dicimus unum deum, ne putes tres esse naturas.¹³¹

In his itaque tribus personis numerus esse potest, ordo esse non potest: nam etsi distinctionem recipit trinitas, gradum tamen nescit aequalitas.¹³²

128. Ser. 9, p. 48:23. It would seem that Caesarius is also influenced by Augustine in this argumentation. This is almost certainly the case when he argues in the same way in the treatise on the Trinity. Cf. p. 160.

129. Pseudo-Eusebius: *De Symbolo* Homilia I (MBP 6, 628).

130. De Trin. II, p. 178:8-15. We saw previously the dependence on Augustine for this analogy. Cf. p. 152. It is likely that there is the double influence of Augustine and Faustus in Caesarius's development of the comparison.

131. Ser. 213, p. 805:19. We are able to identify Caesarius's source in this instance by the last part of the citation: "Dicimus Patrem, etc.," since this is not added in the *De Spiritu Sancto*, where a similar passage is found. Cf. page 28, footnote 48.

132. Ser. 213, p. 805:23.

Si quando aliquid dicere metus est, sancto Spiritu derogatur: Laeditur non tertia, sed trina majestas, quae utique et in tribus una, et in singulis trina. . . . Ergo quia in tribus una substantia est, unius offensa communis est iniuria.¹³³

Ita tamen, quod qui in deitate minorem Patre aut Filio dicit Spiritum sanctum, non illi tantum iniuriam facit quem minorem iudicat, sed illi etiam quem maiorem putat; quia cum totius trinitatis una aequalitas sit atque maiestas, quicquid contumeliae in personam unius dicitur, a tota aequaliter trinitate sentitur.¹³⁴

The dependence of Caesarius on Faustus' *Homilia de Trinitate generalis* can be summed up in the following three points: 1) The unity of operation of the Father and Son as seen from an analogy with the psychological activity of man; 2) The divinity of the Holy Spirit proven from His knowledge of the divine secrets and from His possession of the power to forgive sins; 3) The purpose of the missions as a means of manifesting the cooperation of the entire Trinity in the work of salvation.

Non putes aliud agere Patrem, aliud Filium, aliud Spiritum sanctum: et si eis in administratione salutis humanae diversus est actus, unus tamen in operatione consensus. Sicut interdum ipse apud se homo officium multiplex sensus unius cordis ac voluntatis exequitur, et tamen a semetipso discrepare non creditur.

Si enim nos homines terreni quod facere volumus corpore, animo nostro ante meditationis insinuatione praemissa, sapientia exsequente perficimus, et quodammodo consilio nato in mente nostra prius intus in corde agimus quod facere disponimus, quae tamen absque ulla partitione sensuum indissociabiliter una mens efficit: quomodo non deus Pater sapientiae suae cum deo Filio . . . in una voluntate cuncta et una operatione perficit?¹³⁵

Deo enim tantum potest illud ascribi, "qui solus (inquit) nostri corda ho-

Et sicut legimus, quod nemo noverit cogitationes hominum nisi deus, quo-

133. Pseudo-Eusebius: *De Symbolo* Homilia II (MBP 6, 631).

134. Ser. 213, p. 805:27. The same idea, probably from the same source, is found again in Caesarius's sermon on the *Symbol*, p. 50:6.

135. B.A.H. II, p. 191:3. The dependence on Faustus in this comparison with the human mind is suggested by the words "in corde" and "absque ulla partitione sensuum in una voluntate," which might well come from Faustus' "multiplex sensus unius cordis ac voluntatis exequitur." It is not a certain dependence, however, and certainly does not exclude a dependence also on Augustine as was previously contended. Cf. p. 155 and page 69, footnote 193.

minum:" (III Kings 8:39) et Apostolus protestatur, "Spiritus scrutatur etiam alta Dei." (I Cor. 2:10) Si specialiter Deus creditur, quanto magis Deus est, qui profunda paterni pectoris perscrutatur?

Ita enim legimus: "nemo potest donare peccata, nisi solus Deus." (Lk. 5:21) Dicit Apostolus, "quicumque Spiritu Dei aguntur, hi filii sunt Dei." (Rom. 8:14) Quapropter refuge de Spiritu sancto impiae persuasionis errorem.

Ecce salutis tuae tota trinitas Deus militat, redemptionem tuam pater ordinat filius administrat, Spiritus sanctus aequae virtute confirmat.¹³⁶

modo Spiritus sanctus non est deus, qui etiam non solum quae in homine, sed et quae in deo sunt scire dinoscitur, dicente apostolo: "Spiritus enim omnia scrutatur, etiam profunda Dei." (I Cor. 2:10)¹³⁶

Item interrogandi (sunt) utrum possit alius praeter deum peccata dimittere; et cum responderint quia nullus nisi deus, quia scriptum est "Nemo potest peccata dimittere nisi solus Deus," (Lk. 5:21) dicendum est eis: Sine dubio Spiritus sanctus deus est, qui remissionem peccatorum conferre dinoscitur, sicut dominus dixit: "Accipite Spiritum sanctum: quorum remiseritis peccata, remittentur eis." (Jh. 20:22) Qui etiam in baptismo cum Patre et Filio baptizatis remissionem tribuit peccatorum.¹³⁷

Quomodo hoc agnoscere evidentius potest? quomodo, nisi quia ad redemptionem nostram deus Pater Filium suum misit, Filius nos sua passione salvavit, fidem autem nobis Spiritus sanctus inspiravit? Ac sic salus ecclesiarum totius divinae trinitatis operatio est.¹³⁹

That equality is a necessary sequel of the oneness of the divine substance is seen very clearly in the nature of unity which excludes diversity or inequality.

136. B.A.H. II, p. 196:8. Though we have in this passage a certain dependence on Faustus, it is impossible to say whether Caesarius relies directly on the *Homilia de Trinitate* — from which the citation in the opposite column was taken — or on the *De Spiritu Sancto*, which contains the identical passage. Cf. page 76, footnote 213.

137. B.A.H. II, p. 198:20. The last part of the citation, which refers to the power of the Holy Spirit to forgive sin in the Sacrament of Baptism, is an addition from the *De Spiritu Sancto*. Cf. page 79, footnote 219.

138. Pseudo-Eusebius: *Homilia de Trinitate generalis* (MBP 6, 653).

139. Ser. 213, p. 804:28. It is not unlikely that there is also a dependence on St. Ambrose in this citation. Cf. page 111, footnote 30.

Teneamus in primis fidem rectam, credamus Patrem, et Filium et Spiritum sanctum, unum Deum. Ubi unitas esse, non potest inaequalitas.¹⁴⁰

"Deus unus est;" (Deut. 6:4) et si unus maior, alter minor est, ut Arianus dicunt, unus dici non potest, inaequalitas unitatem excludit.¹⁴¹

In order to defend the equality of the Son against the argument of the Arians from the seemingly subordinationist texts, Caesarius lists different texts of Scripture which refer either to the human or the divine nature in Christ. These lists of texts find parallel listings in Augustine and most of the writers after him. The Archbishop of Arles never seems to repeat an entire list of any individual author; but one does find certain similarities between the choice of texts used by Faustus and by St. Caesarius.¹⁴² Thus both authors mention that in His human nature Christ hung on the Cross, but in His divine nature He promised paradise to the Penitent Thief, an entry rarely found in other similar lists.¹⁴³

An important argument for the omnipotence of the Holy Spirit has its foundation in Faustus' principle that it is the power of the Trinity which operates in creation.¹⁴⁴ This truth in turn is proved from the words of Isaiah: "Who hath poised with three fingers the bulk of the earth."¹⁴⁵ But an even more direct argument for the omnipotence of the Third Person is contained in the words of Sacred Scripture: "All these things are the work of one and the same Spirit, who divides to everyone according as He will."¹⁴⁶ The argument from this verse is found in two places in Caesarius's works, but his source in each case is different. In the treatise on the Trinity the dependence is on Eugenius of Carthage, but in the *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos* Caesarius almost certainly relies on Faustus, as is seen in the fact that just before this argument he cites verbatim from the *De Spiritu Sancto*, in which this argument is found.

140. Pseudo-Eusebius: *In depositione S. Honorati* (MBP 6, 684).

141. B.A.H. II, p. 192:19.

142. Cf. page 42, footnote 104.

143. Faustus, (Pseudo-Eusebius): *De Ascensione Domini* Homilia II (MBP 6, 648G). Caesarius, B.A.H. II, p. 182:23.

144. Cf. page 65, footnote 182.

145. Isaiah 40:12. Cf. page 65, footnote 185.

146. I Cor. 12:11.

"Haec autem omnia operatur unus atque idem Spiritus dividens singulis prout vult." (I Cor. 12:11) Nulli subditus, sed coelestis dominus, qui dona coelestia propria voluntate et de potentiae suae iure largitur.¹⁴⁷

"Haec autem omnia operatur unus atque idem Spiritus, dividens singulis prout vult." (I Cor. 12:11) Qui divina munera prout vult dispensat, legem superioris ignorant. Agnosce tandem quia, qui prout vult dividit, nulli subditus esse probatur, sed suae potestatis esse dinoscitur. De summa enim potestate descendit voluntas, cui nulla contradicit auctoritas.¹⁴⁸

That there is truly a dependence here is seen also in the *nulli subditus* found in both passages and in the mention by both authors of the supremacy of *will* enjoyed by the Holy Spirit.

The part of Caesarius's Trinitarian works that is strictly Faustinian is the argumentation for the divinity of the Holy Spirit. One proof after another is taken from the works of the Bishop of Riez with a minimum of adaptation, so that it is quite easy to recognize their source. The first of these arguments is taken from the scriptural narration of the incident of Ananias and Saphira.¹⁴⁹ St. Augustine also argues to the divinity of the Holy Spirit from this text and it is probable that in the treatise on the Trinity, where Caesarius also has this argument, the dependence is on Augustine.¹⁵⁰ This is only a presumption, however, based on the more frequent dependence on Augustine in the *Libellus De Mysterio Sanctae Trinitatis* and on Faustus in the *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos*. The divinity of the Holy Spirit is also demonstrated from the fact that it is this Person Who speaks through the prophets. This argument is built up by taking a number of different texts of Sacred Scripture and showing that the one text is confirmed and clarified by another. The dependence on Faustus in Caesarius's argument is seen in the citation of the same scriptural texts, though the order is not the same.

Videamus autem utrum deus sit iste, per quem omnis prophetia inspirata memoratur. Lucas dominum deum asserit, qui locutus est per prophetas, ita dicens: "Benedictus dominus deus Israel, quia visitavit et fecit redemp-

Et quis esset iste Spiritus sanctus, qui in prophetis locutus sit, beatus David expremat, dicens: "Audiam quid loquatur in me Dominus Deus." (Ps. 84:9) Et in Actibus: "Ut impleretur, inquit, scriptura, quam

147. De Spiritu Sancto 2, 10 (CSEL 21, 154).

148. B.A.H. II, p. 194:5.

149. B.A.H. II, p. 194:20. De Spiritu Sancto 2, 8.

150. De Trin. II, p. 169:15. Augustine, Cont. Max. Ar. 2, 21, 1.

tionem plebis suae," (Lk. 1:68) et adiecit: "Sicut locutus est per os sanctorum qui a saeculo sunt prophetarum eius." (Lk. 1:70) Absolute Spiritum sanctum, qui prophetas inspiraverat, dominum et deum Israel esse evangelico celebratur oraculo. . . Vides specialiter de Spiritu sancto intellegendum esse, cum dicitur in prophetis: "Deus deorum dominus locutus est," (Ps. 49:1) et "Audiam, quid loquatur in me dominus deus." (Ps. 84:9) Hic nomen istud, id est dominus deus ad Spiritus sancti, qui locutus est in David, noveris referendum esse personam.¹⁵²

praemisit Deus per os prophetarum suorum." (Acta 3:18) Et hic agnosce, quod eum deum evidenter declarat, qui per os prophetarum locutus est, sicut et Zacharias in evangelio ait: "Benedictus, inquit, Deus Israel, quia visitavit et fecit redemptionem plebis suae;" (Lk. 1:68) et post pauca ait: "Sicut locutus est per os sanctorum prophetarum suorum." (Lk. 1:70) Agnoscis dominum deum esse Spiritum sanctum, qui per os prophetarum locutus est.¹⁵¹

Perhaps the most explicit scriptural testimony, however, to the divinity of the Third Person is given to us by St. Paul, when he speaks of the divine indwelling in the souls of the justified.

Ait itaque Apostolus ad Corinthios: "Nescitis, quia corpora vestra templum est Spiritus sancti?" (I Cor. 6:19) Templum Spiritus sancti templum esse dei praecedentia eiusdem epistolae evidenter insinuant, cum dicunt: "An nescitis, quia templum dei estis et Spiritus sanctus habitat in vobis?" (I Cor. 3:16) . . . Ita capitulum luculenta veritate conclusit: "Glorificate, inquit, et portate deum in corpore vestro." (I Cor. 6:20)¹⁵³

Et ad Corinthios: "Nescitis, inquit, quoniam templum Dei estis, et Spiritus Dei habitat in vobis? Si quis autem templum Dei violaverit, disperdet illum Deus." (I Cor. 3:17) Et quis iste deus sit, cuius templum prohibet violari, audi in sequentibus: "Nescitis, quia membra vestra templum est Spiritus sancti?" (I Cor. 6:19) Et quis esset iste Spiritus sanctus, cuius templum essemus, sic concludens demonstrat: "Glorificate, inquit, et portate Deum in corpore vestro." (I Cor. 6:20) Agnosce Spiritum sanctum evidenter deum, et desine blasphemare.¹⁵⁴

Other instances of certain dependence on Faustus in proving the divinity of the Holy Spirit are found in Caesarius's arguments from the formula

151. B.A.H. II, p. 195:5.

152. De Spiritu Sancto 2, 7 (CSEL 21, 147).

153. Ibid. 2, 12 (CSEL 21, 156).

154. B.A.H. II, p. 194:12.

of Baptism¹⁵⁵ and from the gravity of a sin against the Holy Spirit.¹⁵⁶

In the doctrine on the internal processions, we may pass over entirely the first procession, as there does not seem to be any reliance on Faustus in Caesarius's explanation of the Son's generation. But in regard to the procession of the Holy Spirit, there are a number of important elements in Sermons 212 and 213 which are almost wholly taken from the *De Spiritu Sancto*. In the first place, it is undoubtedly to this source that Caesarius is indebted for the expression which occurs a number of times in his writings, *Spiritus sanctus ab utroque procedit*.¹⁵⁷ The scriptural proof which Caesarius offers for the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son also manifests the influence of Faustus.¹⁵⁸ Another very important contribution Faustus makes to the Caesarian doctrine on the processions is the general principle which distinguishes *proceeding* and *Persons* from *creating* and *creatures*. "He who proceeds from the interior of God is not a creature but God, and is shown to be from the substance of God."¹⁵⁹ Therefore this procession is also eternal, having no beginning.¹⁶⁰ Moreover this second procession, without giving rise to any order or degree, is the foundation for a third distinct Person in the Trinity.¹⁶¹ The distinction of Persons is likewise to be seen in the distinct names with which Scripture refers to each of these Persons.¹⁶²

There is not the slightest trace of the influence of Faustus in the doctrine of the missions. There is no mention of the mission of the Holy Spirit in Sermons 212 and 213. This omission is surprising, for we should certainly expect to find some explanation of the mission texts which refer to the Holy Spirit in these sermons, which have for their primary purpose the defense of the divinity of that Person. What makes this omission all the more significant is the fact that it cannot be explained from their not being treated by Faustus in the *De Spiritu Sancto*, from which, we saw, these sermons are taken. Just a few pages after the place from which Caesarius compiles his two sermons on the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Faustus speaks of the two missions, with special emphasis

155. B.A.H. II, p. 195:15. *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 8.

156. B.A.H. II, p. 197:18. *De Spiritu Sancto* 2, 8.

157. Cf. page 93, footnote 38.

158. Cf. page 93, footnote 39.

159. Cf. page 95, footnote 47.

160. Cf. page 98, footnote 56.

161. Cf. page 98, footnote 57.

162. Cf. page 99, footnote 58.

on the mission of the Third Person. In this place the Bishop of Riez clearly teaches that the mission texts are to be explained in connection with the inner divine processions.¹⁶³

An explanation which attempts to account for an author's not saying something that he might be expected to say, is in practically every case a matter of conjecture. Thus in this case there might be a number of reasons why Caesarius omits mention of the missions in these two sermons. However — if we may be permitted to make a conjecture that certainly does not seem to lack probability — one of these reasons could very well be that, in compiling these sermons from the *De Spiritu Sancto*, Caesarius came across an explanation of the divine missions which in no way harmonizes with his own conception of them, and for this reason he makes no mention of the mission of the Holy Spirit. If we have the true reason for the omission, it constitutes an important indication of Caesarius's doctrine on the missions. In these sermons the Archbishop's primary concern is not to refute Semi-Arianism, but to offer his faithful an exposition of the Church's teaching concerning the Third Divine Person. Certainly here we should expect to find the mission of the Holy Spirit explained in its relation to the procession — as Faustus indeed explains it — if this were truly Caesarius's understanding of the mission doctrine when he is not concerned with a refutation of Arianism. That St. Caesarius does not do so seems at least an indication that he did not accept Faustus' explanation of the missions. At least it is a point that cannot be entirely ignored in a final appraisal of the Archbishop's doctrine on the missions.

St. Ambrose

In his works against the Arians St. Augustine takes and elaborates much that is already found in his predecessors, especially St. Ambrose and St. Hilary of Poitiers. Because of this it is often impossible to be sure if in a given instance St. Caesarius — so free in his use of sources — is depending for what he writes on the Bishop of Hippo or directly on the latter's source. Hence it is not improbable that in determining Caesarius's

163. *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 13 (CSEL 21, 128): Mitti a Patre et Filio dicitur et de ipsorum substantia procedere et unum cum eis opus agere dinoscitur et propterea Filius de eo dicit, "Paraclitus qui a Patre procedit" (Jh. 15:26). . . . Et quia legimus, "Ego sum qui sum" (Ex. 3:14), et: "Qui est misit me" (Ex 3: 14), hoc similiter indicat et procedit.

indebtedness to St. Ambrose, not all the credit will be given to him that is his due. The dependence on him is not completely obscured, however. We can find sufficient evidence to be sure that the Ambrosian influence is by no means negligible in the formation of Caesarius's Trinitarian thought.

The Trinitarian content of the angelic hymn, *Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus*, is twice referred to by St. Caesarius. In Sermon 212, his explanation depends on Faustus, but in the *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos* he is certainly following the explanation given by St. Ambrose.

"Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth." (Is. 6:3) Non semel dicunt, ne singularitatem credas: non bis dicunt, ne Spiritum excludas: non sanctos dicunt, ne pluralitatem aestimes: sed ter repetunt, et idem dicunt, ut etiam in hymno distinctionem Trinitatis, et divinitatis intelligas unitatem.¹⁶⁵

"Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth." (Is. 6:3) Non tres sanctos, sed ter sanctum concludit dicendo "Dominus Deus Sabaoth," id est, ut tres personas et unum Deum intellegas. Non semel dicunt, ne singularitatem credas: non bis, ne Spiritum sanctum excludas.¹⁶⁴

The special points of contact, to which we find nothing similar in Faustus, are the negative parts of the passage: *Non semel dicunt, ne singularitatem credas; non bis, ne Spiritum sanctum excludas.*

St. Caesarius's attribution of a perfect Trinitarian faith to Abraham is certainly for the most part due to St. Ambrose. St. Augustine, evidently also depending on Ambrose, gives a very long treatment on the Trinitarian context of Abraham's vision of the three young men in the *Contra Maximinum* and in the *De Trinitate*.¹⁶⁶ The Archbishop of Arles undoubtedly read these accounts, at least that in the first work. When he comes to explain this theophany, however, it is undoubtedly directly to St. Ambrose that he goes, for it is only he who has all the points found in Caesarius's explanation. St. Ambrose explains this

164. B.A.H. II, p. 199:15.

165. De Spiritu Sancto 3, 16, 110 (PL 16, 803).

166. Augustine, Cont. Max. Ar. 2, 15, 5; 2, 26, 5. Quaes. in Gn. 1, 33. De Trinitate 4, 28, 31. St. Hilary also explains this theophany, but there is no indication that Caesarius in any way depends on his explanation. Moreover, for St. Hilary the reason why Abraham, seeing three, adores only one, is that the other two were angels. It is at once evident that this interpretation in no wise harmonizes with that of Caesarius, who follows St. Ambrose.

theophany in his work *De Abraham* as well as in *De Cain et Abel*, and it is upon the latter that Caesarius relies.

Sed etiam alibi cum visus esset deus Abrahæ ad ilicem Mambræ. . . . Tres vidit, unum adorat, tres mensuras offert similaginis . . . perfectæ igitur in personis singulis Trinitati, interiore mentis arcano, hoc est, similaginis spiritalis sanctus patriarcha sacrificium deferebat. . . .

Ut scias autem quia et Abraham in Christum credidit: "Abraham, inquit, diem meum vidit, et gavisus est." (Jh. 8:56) Et qui credit in Christum credit et in patrem, et qui perfecte credit in patrem credit in filium et spiritum sanctum. Tres ergo mensuræ, una similago, hoc est unum erat sacrificium, quod venerabili Trinitati pari quadam mensura devotionis . . . oblatum est.¹⁶⁷

Tres viros suscepit, tribus mensuris panis adponit. Quare hoc, fratres, nisi quia mysterium trinitatis intelligit? . . . Tribus ergo occurrit Abraham, et unum adorat. In eo autem quod tres vidit, sicut jam dictum est, trinitatis mysterium intellexit.¹⁶⁷

De ista visione dominus in evangelio locutus est ad Iudæos dicens: "Abraham exultavit ut videret diem meum; vidit et gavisus est." (Jh. 8:56) Diem, inquit, meum vidit quia mysterium trinitatis agnovit. Vidit Patrem diem, Filium diem, Spiritum sanctum diem, et in his tribus unum diem. . . . Nam et in illis tribus mensuris similaginis propter unitatem substantiæ non incongrue Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus intellegitur.¹⁶⁹

It must be acknowledged that beyond the fundamental interpretation of the theophany in a Trinitarian sense, there are not very many similarities of expression in the two accounts to indicate dependence. Yet the phrase, *Tribus ergo occurrit Abraham, et unum adoret* of Caesarius does not differ widely from that in St. Ambrose, *Tres vidit, unum adoret*. The principal reason, however, for seeing a dependence on St. Ambrose here is the interpretation of John 8:56 as referring to Abraham's faith in the Trinity, and the sameness of the flour used in all three measures as symbolizing the unity of substance in the trinity of Persons. These two elements contained in both Ambrose and Caesarius were not found in other authors who give a Trinitarian explanation to this theophany.

We saw that Caesarius's argument for the eternity of the Son

167. Ser. 83, p. 327:23.

168. De Cain et Abel 1, 8, 30 (CSEL 32, 1, 364).

169. Ser. 83, p. 328:24-32. The calling of each of the divine Persons "dies" seems to be due to Augustinian influence. Cf. page 22, footnote 27.

from the fact that He is the wisdom and power of God most probably does not owe its origin to St. Augustine. The Bishop of Hippo criticizes those defenders of the faith who employ this argument against the Arians. Though out of respect he does not mention him, yet we can be sure that among this group one whom he had in mind was his spiritual father, St. Ambrose. In a number of places the Bishop of Milan develops this argument, and it is not difficult to find here the source of Caesarius's use of the same argumentation.

Accipe aliud quo clareat Filium sempiternum. Apostolus dicit quod Dei sempiterna virtus sit atque divinitas: (Rom. 1:20) virtus autem Dei Christus; scriptum est enim Christum esse Dei virtutem, et Dei sapientiam (I Cor. 1:24). Ergo si Christus est Dei virtus, quia virtus Dei sempiterna: sempiternus igitur et Christus.¹⁷⁰

De Filio Dei dicunt quia antequam generaretur non erat, hoc est, de Dei sapientia, de virtute Dei, de Dei Verbo. . . . Quod si aliquando, ut volunt, non fuit (quod nefas dictu est) non fuit ergo in Deo perfectionis aliquando plenitudo divinae, si postea processum generationis accepit.¹⁷²

Iterum interrogandus est, utrum credat illud, quod apostolus dixit, "Dei virtutem et dei sapientiam" (I Cor. 1:24) Christum esse. Cum hoc negare nulla ratione potuerit, dicendum est illi: Si Christus dei virtus est et dei sapientia, sine dubio, si secundum te fuit tempus quando Pater sine Filio fuit, nec virtutem nec sapientiam habuit.¹⁷¹

Nam si aliquando, quomodo Arriani blasphemant, fuit sine Filio Pater, ergo imperfectus fuit Pater, ergo fuit sine Verbo, et, sicuti iam memoravimus, fuit sine sapientia, sine virtute, sine vita, sine iustitia sine veritate; quia istae omnes species divinitatis secundum scripturas Filius esse noscuntur.¹⁷³

The addition of three other attributes: life, justice and truth, is probably a strictly Caesarian contribution based on John 14:6, *Ego sum via, veritas, et vita*, as is seen in another place where he gives this argument.¹⁷⁴

An interesting dependence on St. Ambrose is that which contains a refutation of the Arian interpretation of Matthew 4:11, "The Lord thy God shalt thou worship and him only shalt thou serve," as indicating that only the Father should be adored. Christ also must be adored, as

170. De Fide 1, 10, 62 (PL 16, 542).

171. De Trin. II, p. 166:23.

172. De Fide 4, 9, 111 (PL 16, 638).

173. B.A.H. II, p. 191:17.

174. Cf. B.A.H. II, p. 184:24.

is seen from the adoration given Him by His own mother, St. Joseph, and the Apostles.

Quis est ille quem parentes et fratres adoraverunt super terram, nisi Christus Jesus, quando eum Joseph et mater cum discipulis adorabant, Deum verum in illo corpore confitentes. . . .¹⁷⁶

Si solus Pater adorandus est, quare ipsum Filium post resurrectionem sancta Maria et sanctus Joseph cum undecim apostolis adoraverunt?¹⁷⁵

The very rare opinion that St. Joseph was still living at the time of Christ's Resurrection is not necessarily supposed by the passage in St. Ambrose. Perhaps St. Caesarius adds the *post resurrectionem* because he thought it more likely that this adoration of the Son which Ambrose refers to took place at that time when Christ more openly and more or less continuously manifested His divinity.¹⁷⁷

If we look for the fundamental reason for most of the differences we saw between the Trinitarian thought of St. Augustine and that of St. Caesarius, we shall undoubtedly find it in the all-pervading reticence of the Archbishop of Arles in regard to any speculative discussions on the mystery of the Trinity. To be sure, this is due primarily to the intensely practical nature of the Archbishop and to his deep-founded repugnance for the rationalizations of the Arians. Among the many elements that directed the Saint's thought into these channels, we may be sure that not the least among them was the influence of St. Ambrose. Caesarius must have read the bitter invectives hurled by the Bishop of Milan against the philosophizing by the Arians on the Trinitarian mystery.¹⁷⁸ But it is especially in the condemnation of all speculation on the manner of the Son's generation that the Ambrosian influence is revealed.

Licet scire quod natus sit: non licet discutere quemadmodum natus sit. Illud negare mihi non licet, hoc quaerere metus est.¹⁸⁰

Quomodo sane deus Pater genuerit Filium, nolo discutias.¹⁷⁹

175. De Trin. II, p. 172:10.

176. De Jos. Patri. 1, 2, 8 (PL 14, 644).

177. The dependence on St. Ambrose in this passage is referred to by Morin in RB 46 (1934) 205.

178. Cf. page 48, footnote 123.

179. Ser. 9, p. 48:26.

180. De Fide 1, 10, 65 (PL 16, 543).

The perfection of the Father calls for a perfect generation, which in turn demands the perfect equality of the Son to the Father. This idea of the perfection of the Father as an argument against the Semi-Arians turns up in a number of places in St. Caesarius's works and may well have its origin in a similar notion in St. Ambrose.

Quod perfectus Pater perfectum Filium genuisse credatur.¹⁸²

Itaque perfectus perfectum genuit.¹⁸¹
Quaero . . . utrum Pater perfectum genuerit Filium an imperfectum. Si perfectum dicis, quomodo aequalem negas?¹⁸³

It is not, however, until we come to the doctrine on the missions that we find the most significant dependence on the Bishop of Milan. We are here able to discover the origin of Caesarius's explanation of the missions, which we could not find in St. Augustine. Throughout an entire chapter of the *De Fide* Ambrose is concerned with one thing: to show that the Son is sent *secundum carnem*, an expression which turns up again and again and could very well be the origin for Caesarius's use of it.

Qui si secundum carnem non accipis missum, ut Apostolus dixit, ("In quo infirmabatur per carnem, Deus Filium suum mittens in similitudinem carnis peccati") (Rom. 8:3); et ex verbo simplici praejudicium struis, quo dicas inferiores a superioribus mitti solere: quid ad illa respondes, quia Filius ad homines missus est?¹⁸⁵

Crede cum catholicis, (Filium) non esse missum nisi secundum carnem. . . . Agnosce ergo, Filium . . . nec mitti nisi per incarnationis mysterium.¹⁸⁴

A dependence on St. Ambrose cannot be deduced from the above citation alone, especially since we shall see later another source for Caesarius's formula, *secundum carnem*, as applied to the missions. Moreover this phrase, which Augustine uses so frequently to determine in what the Son is less than the Father, is far too common an expression to prove a dependence. What is important is that it is here used by St. Ambrose in

181. B.A.H. II, p. 183:20.

182. *De Fide* 1, 1, 95 (PL 16, 531).

183. *De Trin.* II, p. 174:28.

184. *Ibid.* p. 169:2.

185. *De Fide* 5, 7 (PL 16, 667).

connection with an explanation of the Son's mission in the same way as it is used by St. Caesarius. Nor can the fact be overlooked that this way of explaining the Son's mission is found in a work of the Bishop of Milan possessed by Caesarius and familiar to him, as is seen from a number of other instances of dependence on it.

There is no doubt of what St. Ambrose means when he says that the Son is sent *secundum carnem*. As for Caesarius so also for the Bishop of Milan it does not mean simply that the Son is sent in the Incarnation, but very certainly that the Son is sent in His human nature, and that as such He is also sent by the Holy Spirit.

Nec illud sane metuo, quod solent obtendere minorem esse, quia missus est. . . . Considera quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus in Isaia locutus est ab Spiritu sancto esse se missum. (Is. 61:1) Numquid ergo Spiritu minor Filius quia missus ab Spiritu est? . . . Servemus distinctionem divinitatis et carnis. Unus in utraque loquitur Dei Filius; quia in eodem utraque natura est; et si idem loquitur, non uno semper loquitur modo.¹⁸⁶

The same teaching is found in Ambrose's *De Spiritu Sancto*, upon which it is likely that Caesarius also depends from time to time.

Ergo mirari possumus si et prophetas et apostolos Spiritus misit cum Christus dixerit: "Spiritus Domini super me"? (Lk. 4:18) Et bene, "super me" dixit, quia quasi filius hominis loquebatur. Quasi filius enim hominis et unctus et missus est ad Evangelium praedicandum.¹⁸⁷

The doctrine on the missions in St. Ambrose, therefore, has much in common with what we saw in Caesarius. A full agreement is found in the following points: 1) The Son is sent *secundum carnem*; 2) The Son is *less* than the Father, and the Son is *sent* by the Father, are explained in the same way; 3) The Son is sent by the Holy Spirit. This common doctrine together with some similarities of expression seems sufficient to show that one of Caesarius's principal sources for his explanation of the mission of the Son is St. Ambrose.

Ambrose's explanation of the mission of the Holy Spirit does not manifest the same close relationship to that of St. Caesarius that was found in the mission of the Son. It is possible, however, to admit some

186. De Fide 2, 9, 74-77 (PL 16, 575-6).

187. De Spiritu Sancto 3, 1, 2 (PL 16, 777).

influence of the Bishop of Milan here also, especially in his insistence that the Third Divine Person is omnipresent and does not go from place to place.¹⁸⁸ The unacceptable and somewhat confusing terminology of St. Ambrose, who uses the word *procedere* to express the external mission of the Holy Spirit, could very well explain the lack of greater dependence by Caesarius in regard to this mission. When Caesarius teaches that the purpose of the divine missions is to show that the fulfillment of our salvation is the work of the entire Trinity, he may also be depending on the Bishop of Milan.¹⁸⁹

The works of St. Ambrose most frequently utilized by Caesarius are: the *De Fide*, the *De Spiritu Sancto* and the *Old Testament Commentaries*. The two important treatises, *De Mysteriis* and *De Sacramentis* were also examined but there is no indication that St. Caesarius borrowed anything from these works when writing against the Semi-Arians. The importance of Ambrose's influence on Caesarius's Trinitarian thought is not to be judged from the number of instances in which an evident dependence can be pointed out. These have admittedly been few, but the content of the dependence, where it is found, is most significant. In studying the Caesarian reliance on Augustine, we found only two instances where there was not agreement between the two Fathers.¹⁹⁰ These were the eternity of the Son proved from His being the wisdom and power of God, and the explanation of divine missions. Both of these discrepancies can for the most part be explained in the light of Caesarius's dependence on St. Ambrose. It is from this aspect that the influence of St. Ambrose on the Archbishop of Arles must be appraised.

188. Cf. *De Spiritu Sancto* 1, 11, 122.

189. Cf. page 111, footnote 30.

190. There is question here of those places where there is a real opposition between the doctrines of the two Fathers, and not only of those where Caesarius does not have a teaching that is found in Augustine.

CHAPTER III

SECONDARY PATRISTIC DEPENDENCE

St. Hilary of Poitiers

The last Father whom St. Caesarius recommends to the reader is St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers. It is doubtful, however, that he had in mind Hilary's *De Trinitate* when he made this recommendation. The difficulty of following the vigorous reasoning, the length of the periods, and the intricacy of the ideas make the *De Trinitate* a work hardly suitable for the common faithful of Arles. Moreover one will read a long time in the *De Trinitate* before coming across anything that will reveal itself as a source for Caesarius's doctrine on the Trinity. Apart from the essential orthodox Trinitarian doctrine, it can certainly be said that the similarities are far outnumbered by the differences. A few outstanding examples of differences are found without reading very far. In the first place and at the basis of many of the variances between the Trinitarian writings of these two Fathers is a difference of viewpoint. Hilary writes primarily against strict Arianism and is therefore concerned above all with proving the divinity of the Son. Caesarius, on the other hand, writes against Semi-Arianism and for this reason presupposes some sort of divinity of the Son, so that his first concern is a defense of the sequels of that divinity: the equality, eternity, omnipotence, etc.¹ We saw that one of the most fundamental concepts in Caesarius's argumentation against the Semi-Arians is the distinction of the divine and human natures of Christ. St. Hilary, on the other hand, understands the text, *Pater major me est*, of Christ even as God in virtue of the relative preeminence of the Father. The Bishop of Poitiers, anxious to disassociate himself from the Sabellianists, makes a special effort to affirm clearly the distinction of Persons. But for Caesarius, farther removed from Sabellianism and entirely concerned with Semi-Arianism, the personal distinctions are sufficiently preserved by the distinct names found in Scripture, and hence he never refers to it except in passing. St. Hilary, indeed, defends the divinity of the Holy Spirit, but there is not found that preoccupation concerning the doctrine on the Third Person that is evidenced in

1. Cf. p. 14-15.

Caesarius's works. Certainly the latter's frequent repetition that the Holy Spirit is true God, proceeding from the Father and the Son, has no parallels in Hilary, who — out of deference for the Semi-Arians — never designates this Person as God, and who preferred the Eastern formula "from the Father through the Son."

Considering this divergence of viewpoint, therefore, we may be more surprised that there are a number of similarities in the two authors than that they are not more numerous. There are at least three very evident cases of reliance on the *De Trinitate* of St. Hilary. These three are, in brief: 1) The *Dominus-Deus* argument; 2) The unity of operation in the divine Persons; 3) Christ is in the Father not merely through a union of wills.

The first of these dependencies on St. Hilary is Caesarius's argument that Christ is not only Lord, but is and is properly called Lord God. In this reliance on the Bishop of Poitiers we have something altogether singular in Caesarius's use of sources in his doctrinal treatises. Far from his usual free adaptation of a source, in this instance the Archbishop lifts a large section of Hilary's *De Trinitate* and inserts it into his own treatise on the Trinity. He does this with his customary practice of giving no hint that he is borrowing from another.

Because of this transposition from St. Hilary we shall now be able to eliminate one of the textual scars of Morin's *Opera Omnia*. In this section the last line of all the manuscripts had been so worn that it was no longer legible, and Morin was forced to leave a blank space to be emendated. Because of Caesarius's literal transcription, however, it is now possible to fill in this line from Hilary's *De Trinitate*. The singularity of this dependence warrants quoting these two passages from St. Hilary and St. Caesarius. The very few slight changes which Caesarius makes — though many of these may be due to different manuscript readings — and the missing line of Morin's edition are italicized.

Si enim professionem unius Dei
ad *id usurpas*, ne Christus Deus
sit; quia ubi unus est, soli-
tarius sit intelligendus, et
id, quod unus est, proprium ei
sit ac singulare qui unus est:
quid de eo *profiteberis*, quod
Jesus *Christus* unus est Dominus?
Si enim secundum te, quod unus

Si enim professionem unius dei
ad *hoc accipis*, ne deus Christus
sit, quia, ubi unus est, soli-
tarius sit intellegendus,

quid de eo *profiteris*, quod
Jesus unus est dominus?
Si enim secundum te, quod *unus*

Pater Deus est, Christo non relinquit ut Deus sit: necesse est, ut etiam secundum te unus Dominus Christus Deo non relinquat ut Dominus sit; quia quod unus est, proprium *ei velis esse* qui unus est. Si itaque unum Dominum Christum esse etiam Deum negabis, unum quoque Deum Patrem esse negabis et Dominum: et quid erit in Dei virtute nisi Dominus est, et in Domini *potestate*, nisi Deus est; cum et Deum id perficiat esse quod Dominus est, et Dominum id constituat esse quod Deus est? . . . *Neque* in uno Deo et in uno Domino discernere poteris potestatem: ne qui Dominus est, non sit et Deus: vel qui Deus *est*, non sit et Dominus. *Cavit* enim Apostolus *per eloquia nominum*, duos vel deos praedicare vel dominos. Et idcirco *usus est eo genere doctrinae, ut in uno Domino Christo unum significaret et Deum*, et in uno Deo patre unum significaret et Dominum; nec tamen impiam nobis ad perimendam unigeniti Dei nativitatem inveheret unionem, et Patrem professus et Christum. Nisi forte eo usque ultimae desperationis furor audebit erumpere, ut quia Christum Dominum Apostolus dixerit, nemo aliud eum praeter quam Dominum debeat confiteri, et habens Domini proprietatem, non habeat Dei veritatem. Sed *non* ignorat Paulus Christum Deum, dicens: "Quorum Patres et ex quibus Christus, *qui est super omnia Deus*." (Rom. 9:5)²

Pater deus est, Christo non relinquit ut deus sit, necesse est ut etiam secundum te unus dominus Christus deo *Patri* non relinquat ut dominus sit: quia quod unum est, proprium *eius esse debet* qui unus est. Si itaque unum dominum Christum esse etiam deum negabis, unum quoque deum Patrem esse negabis et dominum. Et quid erit in dei virtute nisi et dominus fuerit, et in domini *proprietate*, nisi et deus sit: cum deum id perficiat esse, quod dominus est, et dominum id constituat esse, quod deus est? Nec in uno deo et uno domino discernere poteris potestatem, ne, qui dominus est, non sit et deus, vel qui deus, non sit et dominus. *Observavit* enim apostolus, *ne* duos vel deos praedicaret vel dominos; et idcirco (*Here is found the lacuna in Morin's edition.*)

in uno deo Patre unum significaret dominum. *Tu enim putas quod Filius, qui habet domini potestatem, non habeat etiam dei virtutem.*

Sed ignorat Paulus, Christum deum *esse*, dicens: "Quorum patres, ex quibus Christus, *qui est Deus benedictus in saecula?*" (Rom. 9:5).³

2. De Trinitate 8, 35-37 (PL 10, 263-264).

3. De Trin. II, p. 176:35-177:17.

The second dependence on St. Hilary is an explanation of two verses of St. Paul to show the unity of operation among the divine Persons. The first, an exegesis of I Corinthians 8:6, has its purpose in the demonstration of the oneness of operation of the Father and Son. This is found immediately after the above passage in both Fathers and is, therefore, simply a continuation of the same quotation.

Confessus enim unum *Deum* patrem ex quo omnia *sunt*, et unum Dominum Jesum Christum per quem omnia: quaero quid diversitatis attulerit, dicens, "Ex Deo omnia, et per Christum omnia"? (I Cor. 8:6) Anne possit separabilis a se naturae et spiritus intelligi ex quo et per quem omnia? Omnia enim per Filium ex nihilo substiterunt, et *ad Deum ex* quo omnia, ad Filium vero per quem omnia Apostolus retulit. Et non invenio quid differat, cum per utrumque opus sit virtutis ejusdem. Si enim ad universitatis substantiam proprium ac sufficiens creaturis *esset* quod ex Deo sunt; quid habuit necessitatis memorasse, quod quae ex Deo sunt, per Christum sint, nisi quod unum idem est, per Christum esse et ex Deo esse?⁴

Confessus enim *apostolus* unum Patrem ex quo omnia, et unum dominum Jesum Christum, per quem omnia *sunt*: quaero quid diversitatis attulerit dicens, "Ex Deo et per Christum omnia." (I Cor. 8:6).

Omnia

enim ex nihilo per Filium substiterunt, et *a Deo, ex* quo omnia, ad Filium vero, per quem omnia, apostolus retulit; et non invenio quid differat, cum per utrumque opus sit virtutis ejusdem. Si enim ad universitatis substantiam proprium ac sufficiens creaturis *est*, quod ex deo sunt, quid habuit necessitatis memorari quod, quae ex deo sunt, per Christum sint, nisi quod unum idemque est per Christum esse, et ex deo esse?⁵

The second verse from St. Paul is Romans 11:36, and in it Caesarius finds expressed the unity of operation of all three divine Persons. His explanation of the verse is so brief that there is not enough to identify with certainty the source of his exegesis. It could be St. Augustine, who explains the verse much as St. Caesarius does. Since, however, in Hilary's *De Trinitate* the explanation of this verse follows immediately after the above, it seems more probable that he depends on this Father also in the exposition of this argument for the unity of operation so as to include the Holy Spirit.

Cum enim specialiter Deo id adscriperit, ut ex eo omnia; et proprium Christo detulerit, ut per eum om-

Quod apostolus de trinitate dictum intellegens ait: "Omnia ex ipso, et per ipsum, et in ipso sunt omnia"

4. De Trinitate 8, 38 (PL 10, 265).

5. De Trin. II, p. 177:17-27.

nia; et nunc honor Dei sit, quod ex ipso et per ipsum et in ipso sint omnia; (Rom. 11:36) et cum Spiritus Dei idem sit et Spiritus Christi; vel cum in ministerio Domini et in operatione Dei Spiritus unus operetur et dividat, non possunt non unum esse, quorum propria unius sunt; cum in eodem Domino Filio, et in eodem Deo Patre, unus atque idem Spiritus in eodem Spiritu sancto dividens, universa perficiat.⁷

(Rom. 11:36); id est, ex Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto omnia continentur.⁶

In the final dependence found in the *De Trinitate* there is question of a refutation by Caesarius of the erroneous exegesis given by the Arians to John 14:11, "I am in the Father and the Father is in me." According to the Arians these words of Our Lord signify no more than a moral union of wills between Father and Son.

. . . haeretici quia negare non possunt, ita conantur eludere, ut ad voluntatis concordiam referant; ut in Deo Patre et in Deo Filio non divinitatis sit unitas, sed voluntatis . . . certe non fuerit in usu eloquii divini, Voluntas Patris mei in me est, et voluntas mea in Patre meo est; sed conveniens huic dicto sit, "Ego in Patre, et Pater in me." (Jh. 14:10-11).⁸

Dum audis, "Ego in Patre, et Pater in me est," (Jh. 14:10-11) agnosce et intellege aequalitatem Patris et Filii. Vos enim de voluntate hoc vultis accipere, quod non ipse Pater, sed voluntas Patris in Filio maneat, et Filii voluntas in Patre: quasi aliud sit . . . aliud voluntas Patris. Sed ut ista calliditas locum habere non possit, non dixit Filius, Patris voluntas in me manet: sed ipsum Patrem in se manere testatus est.⁹

It is seen at once that these three instances of reliance on St. Hilary contain no doctrinal development, but are rather three arguments for a doctrine frequently referred to elsewhere. Thus the first dependence is nothing more than a justification of the *Deum et Dominum*, which Caesarius found in the *Quicumque* and which occurs a number of times in his treatise on the Trinity. In the second, he borrows from the Bishop of Poitiers a scriptural argument for the

6. B.A.H. II, p. 199:6.

7. De Trinitate 8, 39 (PL 10, 266).

8. Ibid. 9, 70 (PL 10, 337).

9. De Trin. II, p. 175:13.

perfect unity of the Trinity in the external operations, a doctrine which we saw is most probably due to Augustinian influence. In the last instance, St. Hilary aids the Archbishop of Arles in a defense of the fundamental Trinitarian doctrine, the unity of substance, against any conception of this divine oneness as a mere moral union of wills. Besides these three passages no other reliance was found, whether in the *De Trinitate*, the *De Synodis* or the *Fragmenta Ex Opere Historico*, works of St. Hilary which were examined as the most likely to fit in with Caesarius's needs.

St. Fulgentius

The difficulties connected with an effort to show a dependence of an author on a contemporary writer are almost insurmountable. In most cases there could very well be other reasons to account for the similarities between the two authors. This is pre-eminently true in the case of St. Fulgentius and St. Caesarius. Both Fathers lived at the same time,¹⁰ both were followers of St. Augustine, and both opposed the errors of the Germanic Semi-Arians, the one in Africa and the other in southern Gaul. Evidently any one of these reasons could explain what might look like a dependence of the one writer on the other.

In spite of this, most apologists today acknowledge some sort of dependence in St. Caesarius on the writings of the Bishop of Ruspa.¹¹ It cannot be doubted that there are many similarities of doctrine and expression between the two bishops. Most of these, however, are readily explained in their common source, St. Augustine. But there are also other instances of identical turns of expression not found in other writers that are not easily explained unless we suppose a dependence between the two authors. Thus, for example, one finds in St. Fulgentius the possible origin of the Caesarian formula, *inseparabilem trinitatem*.¹² Morin points out that the adjective, *consempiternus*, found four times in the *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos*, confirms the opinion that the author of this work drew from the writings of the

10. Fulgentius 468-533, Caesarius 470-543.

11. G. MORIN, RB 18 (1901) 344: Il ne sera peut-être hors de propos de faire remarquer ici que saint Césaire a connu et mis à profit les écrits de Fulgence. Cf. P. LEJAY, RHLR 10 (1905) 146.

12. B.A.H. II, p. 186:5.

Bishop of Ruspa.¹³ One frequently meets the phrase, *nec major . . . nec minor* in the Fathers, but only in St. Fulgentius was there found a parallel to Caesarius's expression, *nec posteriorem . . . nec priorem*.¹⁴ It is possible that the Caesarian usage is due entirely to the somewhat similar phrase in the *Quicumque, nihil prius aut posterius*, but it may well also have its origin in the much closer form of St. Fulgentius, *nec prior . . . nec posterior*.¹⁵ Our primary concern, however, in examining the works of St. Fulgentius as a source for the Archbishop of Arles centers almost exclusively around two points. These are, Caesarius's argument from tradition and his doctrine on the missions. In these two cases there seems to be much more conclusive evidence of a reliance by St. Caesarius on his African contemporary.

We saw in our treatment of the argument from tradition, which is found at the end of Caesarius's treatise on the Trinity, that it presents a number of problems for the patrologist. Not the least among these is the attempt to discern its source. There seems no reason to connect it with any of Augustine's arguments from tradition and even less with Tertullian's argument from prescription. Perhaps the closest we can come to it is in St. Fulgentius, and if we remember Caesarius's readiness to make adaptations, there is a strong probability, if not certainty, of a dependence here.

Illam itaque fidem crede sincerissimae menti tuae nos velle notescere, per quam justificati sunt patriarchae, prophetae, apostoli, martyres coronati, quam hactenus per totum orbem sancta tenet Ecclesia, cujus splendor credentium mentes illustrans aeternae vitae facit esse participes. Quae usque nunc per successionem seriem in cathedra Petri apostoli Romae vel Antiochiae, in cathedra Marci evangelistae in Alexandria, in cathedra Joannis evangelistae Ephesi, in cathedra Jacobi Hierosolymae, ab episcopis ipsarum urbium praedicatur. Coge ergo Arianos, Donatistas, Nestorianos, Eutychianos,

Quia quomodo per totum mundum per apostolos et apostolicos viros Christus ecclesiam fundavit catholicam, ita in ipso fundamento gratia sua cooperante permanet, ut exinde divelli nullis unquam persecutionibus potuisset: in tantum, ut nec ipsis temporibus, quibus imperatores vel reges religionis alterius ecclesiam catholicam totis viribus impugnabant, fundamentum, quod apostoli posuerant, aut invadere praesumpserint, aut invadere potuerint. Denique, si volumus considerare, in ipsa Hierosolyma, ubi Christus et natus et passus est, ecclesia catholica optinet principatum. In Epheso autem, quo-

13. Cf. RHE 35 (1939) 49.

14. B.A.H. II, p. 186:8.

15. De Incarn. Filii Dei 1, 3 (PL 65, 575).

Manichaeos et reliquas haereseon pestes hisce communicare Ecclesiis quibus apostoli praesederunt.¹⁶

modo a sancto Johanne evangelista constituta est, ita perdurat: in Alexandria, sicut a domno Marco fundata est, ita deo auxiliante usque hodie perseverat: in Smyrna etiam, ubi sanctus Policarpus et successor apostolorum fuit episcopus, ecclesia catholica privilegium tenet. Similiter et illas omnes ecclesias, quibus apostolus Paulus scripsit, numquam vel potuerunt vel praesumpserunt alterius religionis principes occupare. Ipsa etiam Romana ecclesia, quae et prius imperatores et postea reges alterius legis habuit, considerent quod nullus ex eis ausus fuerit sedem apostolicam occupare. In Galliis etiam civitas Arelatensis discipulum apostolorum sanctum Trophimum habuit fundatorem, Narbonensis sanctum Paulum, Tolosana sanctum Saturninum, Vassensis sanctum Daphnum. Per istos enim quattuor apostolorum discipulos in universa Gallia ita sunt ecclesiae constitutae, ut eas per tot annorum spatia numquam permiserit Christus ab adversariis occupari, implens promissionem suam. (Mt. 16: 18).¹⁷

At first sight it might seem rather arbitrary to suppose a relation between these two accounts, but on closer examination it is seen that the differences are not of such a nature as greatly to lessen the probability of a dependence on St. Fulgentius. The essential argumentation for both is the same. The truth of the Catholic faith is seen from the uninterrupted faith of those churches founded by the Apostles and — for Caesarius — by their immediate successors. These Churches have, from their founding, preserved the orthodox Catholic faith free from all heresies. Among these churches both mention Jerusalem, Ephesus, Alexandria and Rome. The only notable difference is that Caesarius adds a goodly number of churches not mentioned by Fulgentius. These additions, however, as Lejay points out, can readily

16. De Trinitate 1 (PL 65, 497).

17. De Trin. II, p. 179:13.

be explained as properly Caesarian contributions.¹⁸ The inclusion of the four Gallican churches gives rise to no difficulty and is probably nothing more than the expression of a common Arlesian belief. That Caesarius adds the church of Smyrna, where Polycarp was bishop, Lejay believes is also due to a Gallican legend honoring this church with apostolicity in a manner similar to the four churches of Gaul. The addition to this list of the churches founded by St. Paul certainly does not surpass the originality of the Archbishop of Arles. The dependence on Fulgentius is not ruled out, therefore, by these variances, but neither can it be said to be established with certainty by the similarities. There is always the possibility that both authors relied on the same source. Since, however, we are able to find other traces of a dependence on St. Fulgentius, the probability is in favor of a reliance on him also here.¹⁹

The explanation of the missions given by St. Fulgentius is that which he found in St. Augustine. The missions are founded in the processions and are a sort of external prolongation of them. By the very fact that the Son is engendered by the Father and that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the first two Persons, the Son and the Holy Spirit are sent.²⁰ Certainly in all this we find nothing resembling the Caesarian explanation of the divine missions. However, together with the proper notion of mission, we find in Fulgentius a remnant of that improper and polemical concept of mission which we saw in St. Augustine. But whereas the Bishop of Hippo never meant this improper notion of mission to constitute a second true explanation of a divine mission, this is not so clear when St. Fulgentius speaks of these two understandings of a divine mission.²¹ It is perhaps because of this

18. P. LEJAY, *op. cit.* p. 145.

19. Morin considered the dependence on Fulgentius sufficiently probable to make a footnote to that effect in the *Opera Omnia* II, p. 179.

20. J. TIXERONT, *Hist. des dogmes.* 3, 337.

21. Cont. Fab. Frag. 29 (PL 65, 797): Filius est igitur a Patre missus, non Pater a Filio: quia Filius a Patre natus, non Pater a Filio. Similiter etiam Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio legitur missus, quia a Patre Filioque procedit. Sed quia non uno modo in Scripturis sanctis dicitur missio; propterea in sacramento Incarnationis, non solum a Patre, verum etiam a Spiritu sancto missus est Filius: quia mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus totius est Trinitatis operatione plasmatus. Alio autem modo mittitur a Patre et Filio Spiritus sanctus, qui naturaliter a Patre Filioque procedit.

that we are able to discern a dependence on the Bishop of Ruspa in Caesarius's explanations of the missions.

In St. Ambrose we found much that was similar to Caesarius's explanation of the mission of the Son, but very little about the mission of the Holy Spirit. The contrary is the case here. Wherever there are indications of a dependence on Fulgentius, it is the mission of the Holy Spirit that is uppermost in the mind of St. Caesarius. Thus to prove that the Holy Spirit is not less because He is sent, St. Fulgentius declares, no less explicitly than does St. Caesarius, that the Son is sent by the Holy Spirit.

... Ideo Spiritum sanctorum minorem credendum Patre et Filio, quia et a Patre missus est et a Filio. Porro autem si misso mittens potior est credendus cognoscant in hoc suam convinci perfidiam, quia sicut a Patre et Filio missus legitur Spiritus sanctus, sic a Patre et Spiritu missus invenitur et Filius. Quod ipse Filius et per prophetam, multo antequam mitteretur dixit, et postquam missus est, propria testificatione firmavit. . . . "Spiritus Domini super me, propter quod unxit me, evangelizare pauperibus misit me." (Lk. 4:18) . . . "Hodie impleta est haec scriptura in auribus vestris." (Lk. 4:21) Sed et alio ejusdem prophetae loco a Domino atque ab ejus Spiritu se missum his verbis ostendit: "Et nunc Dominus misit me, et Spiritus ejus." (Is. 48:16) . . . A Patre ergo et a Spiritu missus est Filius, et a Patre et Filio missus est Spiritus. Verumtamen nec Filii nec Spiritus sancti missionem localiter factam quisquam debet Christianus accipere, sed illo missionis nomine, opus intelligamus manifestationis indultae.²²

Ideo (Spiritus sanctus) minor est, quia missus legitur. Et quid dicturus est, cum legit in Isaia propheta ex persona Christi dicentis: "Dominus misit me, et Spiritus ejus"? (Is. 48:16) Et alibi: "Spiritus Domini super me, propter quod unxit me, ad evangelizandum pauperibus remissionem, et caecis visum, annunciare annum placabilem Domini," (Is. 61:1) et reliqua. Et ut scias evidenter de Domino dictum, evangelista dicit: "Cum venisset dominus Jesus in synagoga, datus est ei liber Isaiae prophetae, quem aperiens invenit scriptum: Spiritus Domini super me," (Lk. 4:17) et reliqua quae supra diximus. Et post haec: "Plicuit, inquit, librum et dedit ministro, et dixit: Hodie in vobis impleta est scriptura ista." (Lk. 4:20) Credendum est mitti, qui ubique esse dinoscitur? sicut dicit psalmista: "Qui ibo ab Spiritu tuo, et a facie tua quo fugiam"? (Ps. 138:7) . . . Quomodo ergo minor credendus est, qui etiam deum, qui sicut ipse aequalis est Patri, approbatur ad nostram remissionem misisse? et non solum misisse, sicut per Isaiam dictum memoravimus, sed etiam secundum carnem creasse.²³

22. Ad Monimum 2, 6 (PL 65, 184).

23. B.A.H. II, p. 196:15.

Again, because of Caesarius's adaptation, the differences might seem to outweigh the similarities. A closer examination, however, reveals an extraordinary number of points of contact: 1) The problem is introduced in the same way: *ideo . . . minorem; ideo minor*. 2) Both clearly teach that the Son is sent by the Holy Spirit. 3) This is confirmed from Isaias 48:16. 4) This text in turn finds its fulfillment in Luke 4:18. 5) Both then cite Luke 4:20-21 to show that Christ fulfills these words. 6) There is a warning not to understand mission in a local sense, and Caesarius confirms this by a text he uses on several occasions. 7) The mission of the Holy Spirit is the *manifestatio* of His works. 8) In the same context Caesarius draws a comparison between the missions of the Son and the Holy Spirit which, we shall presently see, also comes from St. Fulgentius. The number and nature of these points of agreement certainly seem to leave no doubt that there is a dependence on the Bishop of Ruspa in this passage. Again the question may be asked whether both Fathers, in using the same argumentation, had the same end in view? There can be no doubt that for St. Fulgentius there can be question here only of a mission in the improper sense. In regard to St. Caesarius our reply is the same as when we considered a similar dependence on St. Augustine.²⁴

The great emphasis Caesarius places on the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit might well have been influenced by a similar insistence on this Person's immensity by St. Fulgentius in order to exclude any notion of a local mission. It would also give us the origin of Caesarius's expression, *de loco ad alium locum*. Thus Fulgentius, after a very long argument to demonstrate the immensity of the Holy Spirit, concludes in the following manner.

Agnosces Spiritum sanctum quia unus est sicut Pater et Filius, immensus, implens omnem creaturam, et opera faciens quae sola divinitas facit: qua idem unus de loco ad locum mitti non potest, qui naturaliter docetur immensus.²⁵

Quod autem, quomodo Pater, ita et Filius et Spiritus sanctus ubique sint, et mitti de loco ad alium locum omnino non possint, etiam psalmista evidenter ostendit, dicens: "Quo ibo ab Spiritu tuo? Et a facie tua quo fugiam?" (Ps. 138:7)²⁶

24. Cf. p. 165.

25. Cont. Fab. Frag. 28 (PL 65, 787).

26. De Trin. II, p. 170:18.

Another instance of dependence is the explanation of the mission of the Holy Spirit as found in the *De Trinitate* of Fulgentius. For him as for Caesarius, the mission of the Third Person is the *apparitio*. The African bishop also makes a comparison here between the mission of the Son and that of the Holy Spirit, which is very similar to the same comparison made by St. Caesarius.

Missus quippe in eo quod super Christum in columbae specie venerit in flumine, quod supra apostolos venerit in igne. Ipsa quippe apparitio missio est. Nam ubi mittitur, qui ubique est? . . . Quo modo Filium credimus missum secundum hominem, ita missum Spiritum sanctum propter columbam vel ignem.²⁸

Quomodo enim Filii missio incarnatio eius intellegitur, ita Spiritus sancti missio apparitio mirabilium operum ipsius declaratur.²⁷ Sed sicut Filii missio incarnatio intellegitur ita Spiritus sancti missio manifestatio declaratur, cum se dignatus est aut in columbae specie, vel in igne, aut diversis huiusmodi assumptis indiciis declarare.²⁹

In these different dependencies on St. Fulgentius we have a situation similar to that found in St. Augustine. In those places of Augustine and Fulgentius from which Caesarius draws his explanation of the missions we find in the same context a clear exposition of a mission in the strict sense as founded in the processions. In our consideration of Caesarius's doctrine of the missions, we found nothing corresponding to this. There is however no reason for questioning the dependence in view of the eclecticism which characterizes the use of sources by the Archbishop of Arles. What St. Ambrose offers to Caesarius's mission of the Son, St. Fulgentius contributes to his explanation of the mission of the Holy Spirit. There is perhaps one important difference in Caesarius's dependence on these two Fathers. The nature of the divine mission as explained by St. Ambrose and St. Caesarius is nearly the same. But Caesarius's exposition of the missions, not joined to the processions, corresponds only in part with the explanation of the divine missions by St. Fulgentius.

Ithacius, Bishop of Ossonoba

St. Caesarius divides his *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos* into three parts: 1) The unity of substance of the Father and Son and

27. De Trin. II, p. 170:7.

28. De Trinitate I, 6 (PL 65, 503).

29. B.A.H. II, p. 196:26.

the sequels of this; 2) The divinity of the Holy Spirit; 3) The unity of operation between all three Persons. He owes this division to Bishop Ithacius's only extant work, the *Contra Varimadum Arianum*,³⁰ where one finds the identical division.³¹ The most significant dependence on this work, however, is a long series of diverse operations common to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. This enumeration, which takes up the last part of the *Breviarium*, is a very close imitation of that contained in the *Contra Varimadum*. The very slight changes Caesarius makes are almost always merely a matter of choosing a different scriptural text to demonstrate the unity of operation.

There are a few other indications of dependence which manifest the importance of the *Contra Varimadum* as a source for the Trinitarian doctrine of the Archbishop of Arles. Thus Caesarius found in Ithacius's work a confirmation of the argument he took from St. Ambrose to prove the eternity of the Son from His being the wisdom and power of God.³² More important, however, is his dependence on this same work in showing the eternity of the Son from the more valid argument based on the absolute perfection of the Father in His paternity.

Si ergo secundum vos primo Deus singulariter subsistendo, et postea Pater est dictus Filium generando, ergo ipsum Patris nomen nequaquam erit aeternum, quod ad suae appellationis vocabulum ex tempore sumpsit initium. . . . Proficiens ergo, quia cum se in Dei nomine positum minus perfectum videret, ad cumulum suae perfectionis conficiendum modo Patris sibi nomen adjecit.³⁴

Si vero negaverit cum Patre semper fuisse Filium, quomodo eum supra perfectum esse confessus est, cui postea Filius natus est, et per Filium nomen Patris additum? Ac sic aut ante, quam Filium gigneret, non fuit perfectus; aut, postquam genuit, plus quam perfectus.³³

30. The majority of patrologists accept the attribution of the *Contra Varimadum* to "Idacius clarus Hispanus" of J. Sichard's edition, as well as Bardenhewer's identification of this writer with Bishop Ithacius of Ossonoba (4th cent.) Cf. O. BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*. Freiburg 1924, IV, 555. B. STEIDLE, *Patrologia*, Freiburg 1937, 198. Morin rejects this opinion in the RB 31 (1914-1918) 346, but in the RHE 35 (1939) 45, 50 he no longer shows any opposition to the commonly accepted view and seems to follow Bardenhewer in identifying the author as Bishop Ithacius.

31. Cf. page 16, footnote 4.

32. Cf. Cont. Var. 1, 71 (PL 62, 397).

33. De Trin. II, p. 166:18.

34. Con. Var. 1, 72 (PL 62, 398).

Ithacius also furnishes the Archbishop of Arles with the refutation of the Arian argument that the Son is seen to be less than the Father in that Scripture names the Father first. The refutation is very simple, because the supposition of the Arians is false. Scripture often reverses this order and mentions the Son first and then the Father. Caesarius improves on Ithacius's reply somewhat by pointing out that even if Scripture were always to mention the Father in the first place, this would be the becoming order, for it is the Son Who proceeds from the Father and not the Father from the Son.

Si tibi dixerint: Ob hoc Filius Patri non coaequatur, quia in scripturis divinis prius Pater, et postea Filius nominatur. . . . (The author then refutes this objection, as does Caesarius, by citing a number of texts in which the Son is named before the Father.)³⁵

In tantum, inquit, maior est Pater, ut priori semper nominetur loco. Etiam si priori semper loco nominaretur, valde videbatur esse conveniens, quia ex ipso est Filius, non ille ex Filio: tamen, ut aequalitatem agnoscas, audi in scripturis ubi etiam prior Filius nominatur.³⁶

In the *Contra Varimadum* we once again encounter a source for Caesarius's doctrine on the missions. Because of the great esteem the Archbishop of Arles had for the work of the Bishop of Ossonoba, evidenced by the largest single dependence on any author — the last eight pages of the *Breviarium* — we shall not be surprised to find that Caesarius's Trinitarian doctrine was considerably influenced by the *Contra Varimadum*. This fact has a special significance in a final judgment on Caesarius's doctrine on the divine missions. The explanation of the Son's mission given by Bishop Ithacius is identical with that of St. Caesarius. The Son as a divine Person is not sent by the Father, but came.³⁷ Hence when Scripture speaks of the Son's being sent, this refers to His human nature.

Cernisne quoniam Filius non secundum deitatem a Patre missus est, sed secundum carnem, quam clementer et pie pro nobis assumere non dedignatus est?³⁸

Quia ergo secundum divinitatem eum missum nulla argumentatione probare poteris, crede cum catholicis, non esse missum nisi secundum carnem.³⁹

35. Con. Var. 1, 49 (PL 62, 384).

36. B.A.H. II, p. 185:4.

37. Cf. page 106, footnote 6.

38. Con. Var. 1, 3 (PL 62, 357).

39. De Trin. II, p. 169:2.

No one can doubt that we have here a perfect parallel with that teaching on the Son's mission that we have seen time and time again in the writings of Caesarius. There is, moreover, an identity of expression which clearly indicates a dependence. That the Archbishop of Arles prefers *divinitatem* to *deitatem* is to be expected because of the usage of the *Quicumque*.

Though we saw that Caesarius depends on Fulgentius for his teaching that the Holy Spirit sends the Son, yet he certainly found excellent confirmation of this idea in the *Contra Varimadum*. Moreover, in this work also there is no connection between the missions and processions, and hence it comes much closer to the concept of mission found in Caesarius. Ithacius makes a revealing comparison when he places on a par the Son's sending the Holy Spirit and His being sent by the Holy Spirit. There is no hint of a mission in the proper and improper sense here. He has only one notion of mission and it involves no relation to the processions. In order to preserve the personal equality, he is forced to understand the Son's mission as *secundum carnem*; and though he does not explain satisfactorily the mission of the Holy Spirit, he preserves His equality by showing that He sends the Son. The agreement with the doctrine of the missions which we found in Caesarius is very close. It seems very probable that the Archbishop of Arles depends first of all on the *Contra Varimadum* for his doctrine on the missions, at least insofar as he reveals it to us in his works, and this doctrine he confirms and further develops with the aid of St. Ambrose and St. Fulgentius.

Gennadius

The *Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum*, an important monument of fourth century Christian belief, has been the object of a number of thorough studies since the beginning of the present century. Without two of these, Turner's restoration of the original text⁴⁰ and Morin's defense of the Gennadian authenticity,⁴¹ it would have been impossible for anyone to suspect that the names of Gennadius and Caesarius should be brought together in any way. In the following

40. C. TURNER, *The Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum*. JTS 7 (1906) 78-99; 8 (1907) 103-114.

41. G. MORIN, *Le Liber Dogmatum de Gennade de Marceille*. RB 24 (1907) 445-455.

treatment of Caesarius's dependence on Gennadius, it will be necessary to make an exception to the norm followed throughout this second part of limiting our investigation of sources to the immediate sources of Caesarius's Trinitarian thought. The reason for departing from the procedure followed up to this point arises from a special problem of Caesarius's dependence on Gennadius. This dependence will be better understood in the light of the *Professio Fidei*⁴² of Bacharius. Hence we shall first investigate the dependence of Gennadius on Bacharius and then only the dependence of Caesarius on Gennadius.

a) *Bacharius* — *Gennadius*

A careful reading of Bacharius' *Professio Fidei* revealed nothing that would suggest it as a source used by St. Caesarius. This investigation was not however in vain for quite unexpectedly there was uncovered a clear dependence of Gennadius on the *Professio Fidei* of Bacharius. Since this dependence is important for the later influence that Gennadius has on Caesarius, it merits our consideration at this point. First, however, a word about Gennadius's *Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum*.⁴³ Two forms of the *Liber* have come down to us which are distinguished by the presence of the name Gennadius in the title. Turner, in restoring the original text, has succeeded in showing that Gennadius's name is not in the original form of the *Liber*. That form of the *Liber* which has Gennadius's name in the title and which contains a number of variant passages is the result of an early revision. Inasmuch as these variations are all important in the Bacharius - Gennadius dependence and also, as we shall see later, in the Gennadius - Caesarius dependence, we shall cite in each instance both the original and the Gennadian form of the *Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum*.

<i>Bacharius</i> (P.L. 20)	<i>Liber (Original form)</i> (J.T.S. 7 and 8)	<i>Liber (Gennadian form)</i> P.L. 58
Credimus Deum esse quod fuit, erat; quod erat, erit, numquam aliud, semper idem: Pater Deus, Filius Deus, Spiritus sanctus Deus: unus	Credimus unum esse deum patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum; patrem eo quod habeat filium . . . qui sicut numquam fuit non deus ita	Credimus unum esse Deum Patrem et Filium, et Spiritum sanctum: Patrem eo quod Filium habeat . . . qui sicut nunquam fuit non Deus,

42. PL 20, 1019-1036.

43. PL 58, 979-1000.

Deus, et unus Filius de Patre, Spiritus sanctus Patris et Filii.	numquam fuit non pater; a quo filius natus. . . .	ita nunquam fuit non Pater, a quo Filius natus. . . .
--	---	---

Pater enim <i>principale nomen divinitis</i> per se, quod creditur, et quod dicitur Pater Deus, Filius Deus ex Patre, non ex se, sed Patris.	pater ergo <i>principale nomen deitatis</i> , qui sicut numquam fuit non deus ita numquam fuit non pater; a quo filius natus. . . .	Pater ergo <i>principium deitatis</i> : qui sicut nunquam fuit non Deus, ita nunquam fuit non Pater, a quo Filius natus. . . .
--	---	--

Pater enim unus ingenitus, Filius unus est genitus, Spiritus sanctus <i>a Patre procedens</i> , Patri et Filio coeternus.	. . . patrem eo quod habeat filium, filium eo quod habeat patrem, spiritum sanctum eo quod sit <i>ex patre procedens</i> , patri et filio coeternus.	. . . Patrem eo quod filium habeat; Filium eo quod patrem habeat; Spiritum sanctum eo quod sit <i>ex Patre et Filio procedens</i> , Patri et Filio coeternus.
---	--	---

Itaque Spiritus sanctus nec Pater esse ingenitus, nec Filius genitus, aestimetur; sed Spiritus sanctus, <i>qui a Patre procedit</i> . Sed non est aliud quod procedit, quam quod unde procedit. ⁴⁴	. . . a quo (Patre) spiritus sanctus, non natus, quia non est filius, neque ingenitus, quia non est pater, nec factus sed <i>ex deo patre deus</i> procedens. ⁴⁵	. . . a quo (Patre) Spiritus sanctus non natus quia non est Filius, neque ingenitus, quia non est Pater, neque factus, quia non est ex nihilo, sed <i>ex Deo Patre et Deo Filio</i> Deus procedens. ⁴⁶
---	---	---

Many other examples might be cited to show this reliance of Gennadius on the work of Bachiarus. It is beyond our purpose here, however, to investigate fully the extent of this dependence. A careful reading of their works will convince the reader that there can be little doubt concerning Gennadius's dependence on Bachiarus. It is at once evident that this dependence can only be seen in the *Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum* in its original form. It is here also where we note the most significant factor about this dependence, namely the explanation of the procession of the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father only. We know that some oriental writers did hold that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father only. Others, while maintaining an active role of the Father and the Son in the spiration of the Holy

44. PL 20, 1025-1027.

45. JTS 7 (1906) 89; 8 (1907) 113.

46. PL 58, 979-981.

Spirit, employed expressions less clear on this point than the language ordinarily used by western writers. The author of the original *Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum*, however, is generally accepted as being an occidental. Turner⁴⁷ and Morin⁴⁸ set this down as certain, but they do not explain how a western author of the fifth century could be so explicit an exponent of a procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father only. In view of the dependence on Bacharius as we have seen it above, I think this question is adequately answered in regard to the author of the *Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum* in its original form.

b) Gennadius — Caesarius

The problem we encounter in determining the extent of Caesarius's dependence on Gennadius is one that confronted us to a greater or lesser degree in all of the Archbishop's sources we have considered. With an unrestrained liberty he adapts his sources to fit the particular end at hand — a practice fully sanctioned by the literary norms of his time. As a result we are often able to discover many of his sources only after a careful examination of a number of texts which seem to indicate a dependence. From the combined evidence we are then permitted to conclude — often with a certain degree of probability — that this is an author or work that influenced the Trinitarian thought of our Saint. It will be necessary again to cite both texts of the *Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum*.

<i>Liber (Original form)</i>	<i>Liber (Gennadian form)</i>	<i>Caesarius</i>
<i>Ex deo dei filius et secundum veritatem naturae ex homine hominis filius . . . non ergo duos Christos neque duos filios, sed deum et hominem unum filium, . . . Deum et hominem unum manentem in duabus substantiis.</i> ⁴⁹	<i>Ex Deo Dei Filius, et secundum veritatem naturae ex homine hominis Filius. . . . Non ergo duos Christos, neque duos filios fatemus sed Deum et hominem unum Filium. Quem propterea et unigenitum dicimus, manentem in duabus substantiis.</i> ⁵⁰	In domino Jesu Christo sicut unam personam, ita duas esse substantias, <i>deum ex deo Patre, et hominem ex homine matre.</i> ⁵¹

47. C. TURNER, op. cit. p. 104.

48. G. MORIN, op. cit. p. 455.

49. JTS 7 (1906) 89; 8 (1907) 113.

50. PL 58, 981.

51. B.A.H. II, p. 182:3.

<p>Pater aeternus, eo quod aeternum habeat filium cuius aeternus sit pater: filius aeternus eo quod sit patri coaeternus.⁵²</p>	<p>Pater aeternus, eo quod aeternum habeat Filium, cuius aeternus sit Pater. Filius aeternus, eo quod sit Patri coaeternus.⁵³</p>	<p>Crede Filium et aequalem Patri, et semper cum Patre fuisse; quia si ille semper Pater, sine dubio et ille semper Filius fuit.⁵⁴</p>
--	--	---

The following passage of the *Liber* may well be the origin of the two fundamental tenets which influence everything Caesarius teaches on the divine missions, namely, the invisibility of the Son in His divine nature and the omnipresence of the Son and Holy Spirit.

<p>Nihil <i>incorporeum</i> et invisibile natura credendum nisi solum Deum, id est patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum; qui ideo incorporeus creditur quia <i>ubique est et omnia implet</i> adque constringit.⁵⁵</p>	<p>Nihil <i>incorporeum</i> et invisibile in natura credendum, nisi solum Deum, id est Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum sanctum.⁵⁶</p>	<p>Sed absit hoc ab illa <i>incorporea</i> et immensa et ubique tota divinitatis potentia.⁵⁷ Nec Filius in substantia deitatis suae sit visibilis⁵⁸ . . . quia divinitas <i>ubique tota et praesens</i>, tam Patris, quam Filii, quam Spiritus sancti.⁵⁹</p>
---	---	---

It is not unlikely that at the basis of Caesarius's frequent attacks against the Arians for conceiving the divine generation after the manner of a human generation are the following clear words of the *Liber Dogmatum*.

<p>Nihil creatum aut serviens in trinitate credendum, ut vult Dionysius fons Aarii . . . nihil corporeum . . . nihil corporaliter effigiatum ut Anthropomorphus.⁶⁰</p>	<p>Nihil creatum aut serviens in Trinitate credamus, ut vult Dionysius fons Aarii . . . nihil corporeum . . . nihil corporaliter effigiatum, ut Anthropomorphus.⁶¹</p>	<p>Sed dum similitudinem generationis humanae consideras, et putas, quomodo carnalis pater maior est filio suo, sic deus Pater Unigenito suo maior debeat credi, ideo erras.⁶²</p>
---	---	---

52. JTS 7 (1906) 89; 8 (1907) 113.

53. PL 58, 981.

54. De Trin. II, p. 167:3.

55. JTS 7 (1906) 91; 8 (1907) 113.

56. PL 58, 984.

57. De Trin. II, p. 177:33.

58. B.A.H. II, p. 188:8.

59. B.A.H. II, p. 190:25.

60. JTS 7 (1906) 90; 8 (1907) 113.

61. PL 58, 982.

62. De Trin. II, p. 174:7; cf. p. 177:30.

It must be acknowledged that the dependence of Caesarius on Gennadius is very tenuous up to this point. We now come, however, to a consideration of the most revealing and significant indication of Gennadius's influence on the Archbishop of Arles. It is such because of the connected interesting questions it raises and because it suggests a solution to a difficulty we were unable to settle definitively when we treated Caesarius's doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit.

Spiritus sanctus aeternus, eo quod sit patri et filio coaeternus.⁶³

Spiritus sanctus aeternus, eo quod sit Patri et Filio coaeternus.⁶⁴

Non solum Filius sed etiam Spiritus sanctus semper cum Patre maneat, et a Patre separari non possint.⁶⁵

Patrem eo quod habeat filium, filium eo quod habeat patrem, spiritum sanctum eo quod sit *ex patre procedens*, patri et filio coaeternus . . . a quo (patre) filius natus; a quo spiritus sanctus, non natus, quia non est filius, neque inginitus, quia non est pater, nec factus, sed *ex deo patre deus procedens*.⁶⁶

Patrem eo quod Filium habeat; Filium eo quod Patrem habeat; Spiritum sanctum eo quod sit *ex Patre et Filio procedens*, Patri et Filio coaeternus . . . a quo (Patre) Filius natus, a quo Spiritus sanctus non natus quia non est filius, neque inginitus; quia non est Pater neque factus, quia non est ex nihilo, sed *ex Deo Patre et Deo Filio Deus procedens*.⁶⁷

Agnosce sic Filium de Patre natum esse, ut cum eo inveniatur initium non habere; et ita sanctum Spiritum *a Patre procedere*, ut illa processio numquam credatur originem habuisse. . . . Quomodo et Filius et *Spiritus sanctus de Patre* sunt, non Pater ab illis, sic et splendor et calor de sole nascuntur.⁶⁸

The procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father only, which we concluded to be at least the probable doctrine of Caesarius's first Trinitarian work, is without much doubt the doctrine of the *Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum* in its original form. Already the reviser of the *Liber* understood the words cited above in this wise and he was very careful to add the words *et Filio* in his revision. It might be

63. JTS 7 (1906) 89; 8 (1907) 113.

64. PL 58, 981.

65. De Trin. II, p. 177:34.

66. JTS 7 (1906) 89; 8 (1907) 113.

67. PL 58, 979-981.

68. De Trin. p. 178.

asked, however, whether the above passages from Caesarius's *Libellus De Mystério Sanctae Trinitatis* are not just as explicit on this point as the original *Liber*? It certainly must be granted that the similarities between the two texts are unmistakable. Do we have therefore in the *Liber* of Gennadius the explanation for one of the most perplexing passages in Caesarius's Trinitarian works? Unfortunately I do not believe the evidence is sufficient for a definitively affirmative reply. A reliance of Caesarius on Gennadius was not firmly established before this nor does the passage under consideration remove all room for doubt. Nevertheless I believe a dependence of Caesarius on Gennadius's original *Liber* to be a well-founded probability and it reveals itself primarily in the doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit found in the *Libellus*.

Apart from the internal evidence, a number of external considerations confirm this opinion. It must be remembered that Caesarius is a thoroughly western author and one who greatly depends on antecedent and contemporary sources. That we find in his early Trinitarian work the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father only or even — what is more certain — terminology that lends itself to that interpretation, is not satisfactorily explained except by a dependence on an authority highly esteemed by St. Caesarius. One may readily suppose that he had access to Gennadius's *Liber*, written in the neighboring see of Marseilles not more than a decade or two before Caesarius became Archbishop of Arles. Indeed, one might ask what other possible source, among the works at his disposal, could Caesarius have for this doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit. Western literature is almost unanimous in speaking of the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father and the Son, and it is hardly probable that he had personal contact with the eastern writers with the exception of Origen through Rufinus' translation. These extrinsic considerations, even though of a negative character, do serve to supply in part the lack of convincing internal textual evidence and seem to warrant the conclusion that Gennadius's *Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum* had an influence on Caesarian Trinitarian thought. In the *Libellus De Mystério Sanctae Trinitatis* the Gennadian influence might even have been considerable.

In view of this conclusion, the question of a development in Caesarius's doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit — a point we left unsettled in part one⁶⁹ — is somewhat clarified. If we suppose

69. Cf. p. 95.

Caesarius was influenced by Gennadius's *Liber*, that would explain the doctrine of a procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father only, found in his *Libellus*, a work which dates from the first years of his episcopate. It is certain that his later works clearly teach a procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. Hence the development in this doctrine at which we arrived from a consideration of Caesarius's own Trinitarian works in part one is confirmed by an examination of his sources. We are therefore enabled to offer, what seems to us, a very plausible solution to the problem arising from the doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit contained in Caesarius's *Libellus*. Just as the Occidental, Gennadius, has the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father only, because of his dependence on Bachiarus, so this same doctrine is found in Caesarius's first Trinitarian work because of his reliance on Gennadius's original *Liber*.

A final question merits our attention before we leave Gennadius. If Caesarius depends on the *Liber* in its original form, then we may reasonably conclude that the Gennadian form of the *Liber* had not yet made its appearance when he wrote his *Libellus*. This chronology can, I believe, be readily harmonized with the opinion of Morin that the Gennadian form of the *Liber* dates from around 500 A.D. He sees the origin of this revised form of the *Liber* in this wise: The Gennadian form of the *Liber* "is the result of revision by an unknown hand seemingly a short time after the death of the author. The reviser knew who the author was; it was he who placed the name of Gennadius at the head of the treatise."⁷⁰ If we admit a dependence on the original *Liber* in Caesarius's *Libellus*, then we shall have to date the Gennadian form of the *Liber* after 502 A.D., when Caesarius became Archbishop of Arles, for the pastoral character of the introduction to the *Libellus* leaves little doubt about that work being written after Caesarius became the chief pastor of the Church of Arles. However, since the *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua*, which also dates from around the year 500 A.D., shows a dependence on the *Liber* in its Gennadian form,⁷¹ we cannot date the appearance of this revised form of the *Liber* much after the year 502. Whose then is this unknown hand which revised the *Liber* shortly after the year 502? The question will probably not be answered without further manuscript

70. G. MORIN, op. cit. p. 446.

71. C. TURNER, op. cit. p. 104.

discoveries, but the possibility that it is Caesarius's must be taken into consideration. It may be taken for granted that Caesarius, becoming Archbishop of Arles while Gennadius still occupied the neighboring see of Marseilles, knew — as Morin supposes — that Gennadius is the author of the original *Liber*. Finally we have seen that the development in the doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit as it appears in the *Liber* in its original form, and in the *Liber* in its Gennadian form is the same as that found in Caesarius's early work, the *Libellus De Mysterio Sanctae Trinitatis*, and his later treatise, the *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos*. Very much therefore points to the conclusion that Caesarius, influenced by Faustus's Trinitarian works, took it upon himself to revise the original *Liber's* teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit just as he changed his own explanation of that procession in his later Trinitarian works.⁷²

72. The long insertion of the additional chapters on grace and free will raises a manuscript problem that we cannot take up here. However, if further manuscript study reveals these to be a part of the original Gennadian form of the *Liber*, this will conform very well with the hypothesis proposed here.

CHAPTER IV

NO DEPENDENCE

Eugenius, Bishop of Carthage

The possibility of a dependence on Eugenius cannot be entirely ruled out and yet inasmuch as the evidence of a Caesarian dependence on his *Liber Fidei Catholicae*¹ is so tenuous, it seems more correct to include him in this chapter rather than in the preceding. Perhaps one of the closest similarities between Eugenius's work and the *Breviarium Contra Haereticos* is the nearly identical way of making the transition from a consideration of the equality of the Son to a treatment on the divinity of the Holy Spirit.² Another possible dependence on the *Liber Fidei* is found in Caesarius's explanation of the words, *Dividit singulis Spiritus pro ut vult* (I Cor. 12:11), so as to show the omnipotence and divinity of the Holy Spirit. But the use of the verse in this way is too common to establish a relation with certainty. In the *Breviarium* Caesarius depends on Faustus when he argues from this verse, but in the treatise on the Trinity the explanation approaches more that given by Eugenius.

"...dividens propria unicuique prout vult." (I Cor. 12:11) Unde nullus ambiguitatis relinquitur locus, quin clareat spiritum sanctum et deum esse et suae voluntatis auctorem, qui cuncta operari et secundum propriae voluntatis arbitrium divinae dispensationis dona largiri apertissime demonstratur.³

"Dividit singulis Spiritus pro ut vult" (I Cor. 12:11). Non dixit, quomodo iussus fuerit, sed, "pro ut vult."... In eo autem quod dicitur, "pro ut vult," per potestatem voluntatis aequalis esse Patri et Filio evidenter ostenditur. Et illud ad eius deitatem pertinet, quod dictum est, "Deus spiritus est." (Jh. 4:24)⁴

There are a number of other instances of a possible dependence on the *Liber Fidei Catholicae*, as, for example, the expression "three personal properties,"⁵ the teaching that the union of Father and Son

1. This work of Bishop Eugenius (d. 505) is found in Victor of Vita's *History of the Persecution of the Province of Africa* 2, 56-101 (CSEL 7).
2. Cf. page 75, footnote 211.
3. Hist. Persec. Af. 2, 82 (CSEL 7, 60).
4. De Trin. II, p. 169:23.
5. Cf. page 83, footnote 2.

is in the substance and not only in the will;⁶ the comparison with fire to show the eternity of the Son;⁷ the eternity of the Son because He is the power of God.⁸ In most of these cases, however, we have already seen much more likely sources in other writers. There are, it is true, a rather large number of similarities between the works of Caesarius and Eugenius, but usually these points of possible contact lack the definite signs of dependence. It is quite possible, therefore, that St. Caesarius knew and drew on the *Liber Fidei Catholicae* — there are some indications that would seem to make this probable⁹ — but to say more does not seem warranted by the evidence.

St. Vincent of Lerins

There is nothing to make us think that the great respect, even veneration, which Caesarius manifests toward Faustus was in any way also shown toward St. Vincent of Lerins. We have seen how heavily St. Caesarius depends on Faustus in his Trinitarian works. Vincent of Lerins, on the other hand, is mentioned here for the surprising lack of dependence rather than for the contrary. It is true that such dependence may be hidden to some extent by their common formation at Lerins, but if it were present to any appreciable degree, it would show up from time to time. Yet a careful reading of Vincent's *Commonitorium* did not reveal a single instance of certain dependence on this work by St. Caesarius.

If an exception is to be found for this lack of dependence on the *Commonitorium*, it would be the teaching on the two natures and one Person in Christ.

Ita igitur in uno eodemque Christo duae substantiae sunt; sed una divina, altera humana; una ex Patre Deo, altera ex matre Virgine; una coaeterna et aequalis Patri, altera ex tempore et minor Patre.¹⁰

In domino Jesu Christo sicut unam personam, ita duas esse substantias, deum ex deo Patre, et hominem ex homine matre; et quae de se ipse dominus secundum dispensationem carnis assumptae loquitur, deputant (haeretici) divinitati.¹¹

6. De Trin. II, p. 175. Hist. Persec. Af. 2, 60 (CSEL 7, 48).

7. De Trin. II, p. 178. Hist. Persec. Af. 2, 74 (CSEL 7, 56).

8. B.A.H. II, p. 184. Hist. Persec. Af. 2, 71 (CSEL 7, 54).

9. Morin believes that Caesarius depends on the *Liber Fidei Cath.* at least in his *Breviarium Adversus Haereticos*. Cf. RHE 35 (1939) 50.

10. *Commonitorium* 1, 13 (PL 50, 656).

11. B.A.H. II, p. 182:2.

The essential role this doctrine plays in Caesarius's refutation of Arianism would in itself constitute a major dependence on St. Vincent were it not for the fact that the same clear distinction between the two natures in Christ is also contained in the *Quicumque*¹² and in the works of Faustus.¹³ Hence if there is a dependence on Vincent of Lerins in this passage, it is merely one of expression, and even for that there is hardly more than a certain probability.

In spite of this well-nigh fruitless search in the *Commonitorium* it was still with a certain expectation that the examination of Vincent's *Excerpta* was taken up. The anti-Augustinian sections of the *Commonitorium* might have turned away so fervent an admirer of Augustine as St. Caesarius. But the case is quite different for the *Excerpta*, which is nothing else than a compilation of passages from the writings of Augustine. But the situation here was the same. We do not even find sufficient evidence to know whether the Archbishop of Arles possessed or read this work. It is true that there are several instances of a dependence by Caesarius on the same passage in Augustine that Vincent cites in the *Excerpta*. If in these cases there were question of works of Augustine not elsewhere utilized by Caesarius, then there might be some reason for thinking that he is depending on the quotation in the *Excerpta* and not directly on Augustine. The very contrary is the case, however. The passages in question are taken from the *Contra Maximinum* and the first part of the *De Trinitate*, the very works on which St. Caesarius depends most.

Though we have not been able to find any certain dependent relation between St. Vincent of Lerins and St. Caesarius of Arles, it will not be too far from our point to remark a significant similarity between the Augustinianism of these two saints of Lerins. In the first place, both are rightly called disciples of Augustine. The ardent devotion of Caesarius for this master manifests itself at every turn. The *Excerpta* of St. Vincent of Lerins also reveal a very fervent Augustinianism in its author, so that Madoz classes him among the most famous disciples of St. Augustine in regard to the doctrine of the Incarnation.¹⁴ Both are, therefore, in a very true sense disciples of

12. Ser. 3, p. 22:29 Deus est ex substantia Patris ante secula genitus, et homo est ex substantia matris in seculo natus.

13. Cf. page 42, footnote 104.

14. J. MADDOZ, op. cit. p. 97.

Augustine, but not blind followers. Vincent, without renouncing his anti-Augustinianism in predestination and grace, renders him great honor in his doctrine on the Trinity and Christology. Caesarius, without accepting anything of Augustine's psychological Trinitarian speculations and perhaps also not his notion of the missions, shows the greatest dependence on Augustine in his doctrine of grace and his argumentation against the Arians. There two saints of Lerins are truly Augustinians, but theirs, unlike that of Pomerius and Fulgentius, is an eclectic Augustinianism.

Eugyppius of Africa

The same question we had to consider in regard to St. Vincent's *Excerpta* arises in connection with the *Thesaurus Ex S. Augustini Operibus* of Eugyppius. Does St. Caesarius depend directly on the works of St. Augustine or on a collection of citations from Augustine? The reply to this question will evidently affect our whole treatment of Caesarius's dependence on St. Augustine — hence its importance. It was quite easy to show that the *Excerpta* of St. Vincent must be ruled out. The much greater length of Eugyppius's *Thesaurus*, however, made it necessary to examine thoroughly the possibility of its being the immediate source of Caesarius's Augustinianism. It will be sufficient for our purpose to give the conclusions of our consideration of this matter, together with a brief summary of the reasons which seem to justify these assertions.

In the first place, it is certain that Eugyppius's *Thesaurus* is not Caesarius's sole nor principal source for the works of Augustine. In his Trinitarian writings, the Archbishop of Arles borrows principally from the *Contra Maximinum Arianorum* and the *Tractatus in Johannis Evangelium*. The *Thesaurus* on the other hand has nothing from the first treatise and only one insignificant citation from the latter and this is not found in Caesarius. Other works of Augustine utilized by St. Caesarius — though to a lesser degree — and which are not in the *Thesaurus* are: the *Ennarrationes in Psalmos*, *Contra Sermonem Ariarum* and a number of Augustine's sermons.

A special difficulty arises in regard to Augustine's *De Trinitate*, concerning which we are primarily concerned. In a number of instances where Caesarius seems to depend on Augustine's great Trinitarian work, we find these same sections of the *De Trinitate* in the *Thesaurus* of

Eugyppius.¹⁵ At other times, however, Caesarius borrows from parts of the *De Trinitate* which are not cited in the *Thesaurus*.¹⁶ We may therefore conclude that at least at times Caesarius depends directly on Augustine's *De Trinitate*. There is moreover good reason for doubting that Caesarius even possessed or read Eugyppius's *Thesaurus*. The reason is the same as that which led us to the conclusion that Caesarius did not have all of the *De Trinitate* of Augustine. We saw at that time that it was not likely that Caesarius would have so frequently employed the argument for the eternity of the Son from the fact of His being the wisdom and power of the Father, if he had read books six and fifteen of the *De Trinitate* in which Augustine so strongly rejects this manner of argumentation.¹⁷ Eugyppius's *Thesaurus* also contains that section of book fifteen in which Augustine attacks this argument. For the same reason therefore it seems doubtful that Caesarius possessed or read the *Thesaurus Ex S. Augustini Operibus* of Eugyppius.

Other writers, whom the Archbishop of Arles certainly knew and utilized in his moral and exegetical sermons, exert no influence on his Trinitarian thought. In this class are principally: Origen, St. Cyprian, St. Jerome and Pomerius. There is no evidence of any significant dependence on the writings of St. Avitus of Vienne, and little could be expected in view of certain difficulties that arose between the two Saints.¹⁸ This, however, in no way excluded a close similarity of doctrine on the Trinity and of style of exposition by these two contemporary bishops of southern Gaul. Selected works of the following were examined as sources for Caesarius: Irenaeus, Boetius, Didymus, Tertullian, Novatian, Faustinus presbyterus, Lucifer of Calaris, Gregory of Elvira,¹⁹ Eusebius of Vercelli, Pope Leo I, Phoebadius of Agen, Marius Victorinus, Pelagius,²⁰ Zeno of Verona, St. Pacian of Barcelona and the *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum*. In no case, however, was sufficient evidence found to demonstrate any reliance on these authors by the Archbishop of Arles.

15. Thus for example we saw a Caesarian dependence on the *De Trinitate* I, 6; I, 11, 22; II, 5, 8 and we also find these sections of the *De Trinitate* in Eugyppius's *Thesaurus* chapters 231, 239 and 241.

16. Some examples of this are Caesarius's dependence on *De Trinitate* I, 47; II, 8; IV, 19.

17. Cf. page 152.

18. Cf. MALNORY, op. cit. p. 108.

19. The *De Fide Orthodox*, under the name of Phoebadius, P.L. 20, 31-50.

20. The *Quattuor Fragmenta Pelagio Restituenda* published by C. MARINI, *Antonianum* 13 (1938) 293-334.

CONCLUSION TO PART TWO

The study of the sources for Caesarius's Trinitarian thought has, I believe, brought into relief the necessity of distinguishing between the doctrine and the argumentation used to defend that doctrine. In regard to the doctrine it is not an exaggeration to say that, except for one or the other point of lesser importance, Caesarius's sole doctrinal source is the Athanasian Symbol. All the evidence points to the conclusion that Caesarius accepted the first part of the *Quicumque* as a precise and complete expression of the Catholic faith in regard to the mystery of the Trinity. In spite of this, the *Quicumque* did not yet possess in his eyes the nature of a strict symbol, whose text must be faithfully adhered to. It was indeed an exact expression of the Church's Trinitarian faith and as such he accepts its doctrine as a norm to direct his entire combat against Semi-Arianism. It can be said, therefore, that the purpose St. Caesarius wished to attain by taking up his pen against the Semi-Arians, was a defense of the Trinitarian doctrine of the Athanasian Symbol.

We have also seen that it is in his defense, rather than in his Trinitarian doctrine, that St. Caesarius manifests that great respect he nurtured toward the teachings of "the ancient and holy Fathers." For on them we have found a dependence for nearly every element that goes to make up that defense. Entirely foreign to his character is any literary vanity; he accepts from all hands that which they will offer him for the accomplishment of his task. Well in the first place among these contributors is St. Augustine, his master and model par excellence. On him Caesarius depends for the greatest part of his argumentation for the unity of substance and the sequels flowing from it. To Augustine's influence is also due the one or other slight development in Caesarius of a doctrine not in the *Quicumque*. These are principally the doctrine on the unity of the external operations — though credit must also be given here to St. Hilary — and a hint at the intellectual nature of the Son's generation. In the doctrine on the processions and missions, the dependence on Augustine, though not entirely absent, is not such as to characterize this part of his doctrine as Augustinian. Faustus's important contribution is a defense of the divinity of the Holy Spirit and an explanation of the processions, especially that of the

Third Person, in such a way as to preserve the substantial unity and the personal distinctions. St. Ambrose offers Caesarius added proof of a Trinitarian belief in the Old Testament and the significant, though questionable, argument for the coeternity of the Son. But the principal contribution of St. Ambrose to Caesarian Trinitarian thought — and in this he shares honors with Fulgentius and Ithacius — is an explanation of the divine missions that in no way endangers the personal equality.

In brief, therefore, the sources of Caesarius's Trinitarian thought are: *Quicumque* for the doctrine; Augustine, Faustus, Ambrose, Fulgentius, Ithacius, and Hilary of Poitiers for the defense of that doctrine. This enumeration will fairly well account for everything that we found when we considered the Archbishop's doctrine on the Trinity from an examination of his own works.

INDEX OF TEXTS CITED

SAINT AUGUSTINE

<i>De Trinitate</i>		18, 8	117 ⁸ .
1, 4, 7	98 ⁵⁶ .	*19, 6	50 ¹²⁸ , 149.
1, 6	79 ²²² .	20, 3	119 ¹⁶ .
1, 6	66 ¹⁸⁶ .	20, 4	70 ¹⁹⁴ , 155.
*1, 6	27 ⁴² , 146.	*22, 15	63 ¹⁷⁶ , 153.
*1, 11, 22	42 ¹⁰² , 148.	*29, 5	92 ³² , 160.
2, 3, 5	68 ¹⁹¹ .	*40, 5	90 ²⁸ , 159.
2, 5		40, 6	103 ⁶ , 161.
2, 5, 8	105 ¹³ , 163.	*40, 6	104 ⁸ , 162.
*2, 8	21 ²¹ , 144.	*47, 7	117 ⁸ , 166.
*2, 8	26 ³⁹ , 145.	53, 12	26 ⁴¹ , 145.
4, 19	104 ¹⁰ , 165.		
4, 20	104 ¹⁰ , 164.	<i>Ennarationes in Psalmos</i>	
<i>Contra Maximum Arianorum</i>		*49, 2	40 ⁹⁸ , 148.
*1, 7	86 ¹⁰ , 157.	*76, 16	66 ¹⁸⁶ , 153.
*2, 7	51 ¹³¹ , 150.	108, 23	117 ⁸ .
*2, 17	67 ¹⁸⁹ , 154.	130, 11	31 ⁵⁶ .
*2, 9, 2	39 ⁹⁴ , 147.	138, 10	73 ²⁰⁴ , 156.
*2, 13, 1	31 ⁵⁵ , 146.	<i>De Genesi ad Litteram</i>	
*2, 13, 1	21 ²³ , 144.	*1, 6	19 ¹⁷ , 143.
*2, 15, 5	88 ²¹ , 158.	*1, 5, 15	66 ¹⁸⁸ , 154.
2, 20, 4	110 ²⁹ .		
2, 21, 1	76 ²¹² .	<i>Questiones in Exodum</i>	
2, 23, 2	21 ²² .	*2, 25	77 ²¹⁵ , 157.
2, 23, 2	74 ²⁰⁶ .		
2, 26, 2	74 ²⁰⁹ .	<i>Contra Faustum Manichaeum</i>	
2, 26, 14	80 ²²⁵ .	15, 6	116 ⁵ .
2, 26, 14	63 ¹⁷⁶ , 153.		
<i>Contra Sermonem Arianorum</i>		<i>De Fide et Symbolo</i>	
1, 34	61 ¹⁶⁹ , 152.	9, 18	85 ⁷ .
1, 4	103 ⁶ , 161.		
1, 15	117 ⁸ , 166.	<i>Liber ad Paulinum</i>	
1, 19	110 ²⁹ .	8, 20	26 ⁴⁰ .
<i>Tractatus in Joannis Evangelium</i>		<i>De Civitate Dei</i>	
1, 11	79 ²²² .	11, 10, 1	99 ⁵⁸ .
*6, 9	32 ⁸⁰ , 147.	11, 24	56 ¹⁵¹ .

* Certain dependencies

<i>De Symbolo ad Catechumenos</i>		<i>Miscellanea Agostiniana</i>	
9, 9	61 ¹⁸⁹ , 152.	<i>Guelferb</i>	
9, 9	65 ¹⁸⁰ .	11, 5	38 ⁸² .
9, 9	99 ⁸⁰ .	<i>Mai</i>	
		12, 3	44 ¹⁰⁹ .
<i>Sermo</i> 7		<i>Morin</i>	
*4	28 ⁴⁷ , 142.	3, 1	79 ²²¹ .
<i>Sermo</i> 9		3, 2	99 ⁸⁰ .
*3	80 ²²⁸ .	3, 6	22 ²⁷ .
<i>Sermo</i> 52		<i>Epistola</i> 169	
7, 19	69 ¹⁹³ .	2, 5	65 ¹⁸⁰ .
<i>Sermo</i> 71		<i>Epistola</i> 170	
12, 18	58 ¹⁸⁰ .	3	80 ²²⁵ .
<i>Sermo</i> 114		<i>Retractiones</i>	
10	36 ⁸⁵ .	1, 26	152 ⁴⁹
10	100 ⁸⁰ .		
<i>Sermo</i> 117		FAUSTUS	
2, 5	97 ⁸⁵ .		
7, 10	60 ¹⁸⁶ , 151.	<i>De Spiritu Sancto</i>	
<i>Sermo</i> 126		*1, 6	20 ¹⁸ .
*7, 9	68 ¹⁹² , 155.	1, 8	78 ²¹⁷ .
*8, 10	58 ¹⁵⁸ , 155.	1, 9	93 ³⁸ .
*8, 10	69 ¹⁹³ .	1, 11	99 ⁸⁶ .
*11, 15	70 ¹⁹⁴ , 155.	1, 13	96 ⁴⁸ .
		1, 13	179 ¹⁶³ .
<i>Sermo</i> 135		*2, 1	76 ²¹³ .
3, 4	86 ¹⁰ , 157.	*2, 4	79 ²¹⁹ .
<i>Sermo</i> 139		2, 6	99 ⁵⁸ .
4, 5	50 ¹²⁸ .	2, 6	93 ³⁸ .
		*2, 6	28 ⁴⁸ .
<i>Sermo</i> 183		*2, 7	77 ²¹⁴ , 177.
*4, 5	40 ⁹⁷ , 148.	*2, 8	78 ²¹⁸ .
		*2, 8	76 ²¹² .
<i>Sermo</i> 214		*2, 10	176.
*5	86 ¹² , 158.	*2, 12	78 ²¹⁶ , 177.
10	74 ²⁰⁶ .	<i>Sermo</i> 2	
<i>Sermo</i> 225			*37 ⁸⁹ , 170.
*1, 1	57 ¹⁸⁷ , 151.		*42 ¹⁰³ , 170.
<i>Sermo</i> 341		<i>III Epistola</i> 7	
*5, 6	41 ⁸⁹ , 149.		42 ¹⁰⁴ .

* Certain dependencies

Pseudo-Eusebius		<i>De Spiritu Sancto</i>	
<i>De Symbolo Homilia I</i>		3, 1	185.
	*61 ¹⁷⁰ , 172.	3, 3	30 ⁵² .
		3, 4	62 ¹⁷¹ .
<i>De Symbolo Homilia II</i>		3, 14	111 ⁸⁰ .
	*18 ¹² , 173.	*3, 16	126 ⁸¹ , 180.
	*28 ⁴⁸ , 173.	<i>De Joseph Patriarcha</i>	
	*36 ⁸⁸ , 173.	*1, 2	80 ²²⁴ , 183.
<i>Homilia de Trinitate</i>		<i>De Cain et Abel</i>	
	*76 ²¹³ , 174.	1, 3	24 ³⁵ .
	*79 ²¹⁹ , 174.		24 ³⁵ , 181.
	*111 ⁸⁰ , 174.		33 ⁸⁴ , 181.
	69 ¹⁹³ .	*1, 8	33 ⁸⁵ , 181.
		1, 8	22 ²⁷ .
<i>Exhortatio de Deo Trino et Uno</i>		<i>Expositio in Psalmum 118</i>	
	43 ¹⁰⁴ .	<i>Sermo 22</i>	
	60 ¹⁸⁰ .	10	48 ¹²³ .
<i>De Epiphania Homilia I</i>		SAINT HILARY	
	*28 ⁴⁷ , 169.	<i>De Trinitate</i>	
<i>De Ascensione Domini Homilia II</i>		3, 17	25 ⁸⁷ .
	43 ¹⁰⁴ .	*8, 35-37	81 ²³¹ , 189.
<i>Homilia IV S. Caesarii</i>		*8, 38	190.
	120 ²⁵ .	8, 39	191.
		*9, 70	39 ⁹⁵ , 191.
<i>Homilia in depositione S. Honorati</i>		SAINT FULGENTIUS	
	37 ⁸⁹ , 175.	<i>De Trinitate</i>	
SAINT AMBROSE		*1	44 ¹¹⁰ , 194.
<i>De Fide</i>		1, 4	38 ⁹² .
1, 1	87 ¹⁴ , 184.	*1, 6	107 ¹⁵ , 198.
1, 10	62 ¹⁷¹ , 182.	*1, 6	108 ²¹ , 198.
1, 10	85 ⁹ , 183.	<i>Contra Fabianum Arianum</i>	
1, 10	59 ¹⁶⁵ .	<i>Frag. 28</i>	107 ¹⁵ , 197.
1, 13	49 ¹²³ .	<i>Frag. 29</i>	195 ²¹ .
2, 8	36 ⁸⁷ .	<i>Contra Sermonem Fastidiosi Ar.</i>	
2, 9	185.	1, 7	106 ¹³ .
2, 12	126 ⁸¹ .	<i>De Incarnatione Filii Dei</i>	
4, 9	62 ¹⁷¹ , 182.	1, 3	57 ¹⁵² .
5, 7	103 ⁸ , 184.		
5, 18	150 ⁹⁶ .		

* Certain dependencies

<i>Ad Monimum</i>		EUGENIUS	
*2, 6	110 ²⁹ , 196.	<i>(Liber Fidei Catholicae)</i>	
<i>Epistola</i> 14		<i>Hist. Persec. Afric.</i>	
6	74 ²⁰⁸ .	2, 56	83 ² .
		2, 74	75 ²¹¹ .
		2, 82	66 ¹⁸⁷ , 210.
ITHACIUS			
<i>Contra Varimadum</i>		ST. VINCENT OF LERINS	
1, 1	32 ⁵⁸ .	<i>Commonitorium</i>	
1, 3	103 ⁶ .		
1, 3	103 ⁸ , 200.	1, 13	43 ¹⁰⁴ , 211.
1, 49	85 ⁸ , 200.		
*1, 72	61 ¹⁷⁰ , 199.	BOETHIUS	
2, 2	110 ²⁹ .	<i>De Trinitate</i>	
BACHIARIUS		1	74 ²⁰⁶ .
<i>Professio Fidei</i>		TERTULLIAN	
3	203.	<i>Adversus Praxean</i>	
GENNADIUS		13	81 ²²⁷ .
<i>Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum</i>		NOVATIAN	
1	203, 205, 206.		
2	204.	<i>De Trinitate</i>	
4	205.	18	25 ³⁸ .
11	205.	31	20 ¹⁹ .

* Certain dependencies

CONCLUSION

The Arian controversy started on the Person of Christ. Just as it is true to say that Arianism is essentially a denial of the divine nature of the Word, so also the opponents of strict Arianism are adequately classified as the defenders of the divine nature, the consubstantiality, of the Second Divine Person. Thus the name of St. Athanasius, the greatest among the adversaries of early Arianism, is symbolical for the doctrine of the divinity of the Word.

Later Arianism spoke of a similarity of nature between the Father and the Son, hesitated to call the Son a creature, admitted that He is in some way divine and yet less than the Father. The Holy Spirit is more frequently referred to by this group as being even less than the Son, in no way divine and properly called a creature. It is this form of Arianism, known as Semi-Arianism, which the Germanic peoples brought to the Occident in the second half of the fifth century. The Catholics of the Western Church met this new threat to their faith by a defense of a pure notion of God Himself. The one true God is triune. God's substance is one, but it belongs to the one divine essence to be triune in Persons. So it is that the triune personality of God is seen manifested at every turn: in nature, in history, and in unsuspected texts of both the Old and the New Testaments. To be sure, underlying the whole defense of these occidental writers must be Athanasius's "divinity" and Nicea's "consubstantiality," but it is only the hidden foundation. Much more in the foreground are those things which flow from this consubstantiality and the true notion of God as one and triune. This is the Trinitarian doctrine we profess every time we recite the *Quicumque*. It is the doctrine on the Trinity which we have found in St. Caesarius.

The doctrinal relationship between the *Quicumque* and St. Caesarius is so close that if we were to summarize the Trinitarian doctrine of the Archbishop of Arles, we could do no better than copy the first part of this celebrated Symbol. If we add to this identity of viewpoint of both writers, the similarities of division and terminology, we shall have some idea of the place which the Athanasian Creed — which we have seen to be more Augustinian than Athanasian — has in the formation of Caesarius's doctrine on the Trinity, which we also found replete with the Augustinian influence. Yet, for Caesarius, the *Quicumque* was not a revered symbol of faith demanding

absolute submission to its content and reverential respect for its terminology. It was simply an exact and complete expression of the Catholic Trinitarian faith and as such Caesarius uses it in his defense of that faith. The close relationship existing between the Athanasian Creed and the Trinitarian works of St. Caesarius is due not to a submission to this Symbol as a symbol, but to a belief in what it professes.

It is not unlikely that St. Caesarius knew who was the author of the *Quicumque*, but he does not pass on this information to his readers. Nor has our investigation of Caesarius's Trinitarian works brought this author from the mysterious anonymity in which he has ever been shrouded. This is not to say, however, that our study has been entirely fruitless in this regard. For even though we still do not know the author, I believe we do know a little more about him, his place and time. Our findings are for the most part of a negative character, but even these are not without value in a matter about which so much has been written during the last century, not always with real clarification of the issues at stake. In the first place, the opinion that the *Quicumque* is a production of the seventh or eighth century cannot henceforth be reasonably sustained. Nor do I believe that the view which maintains that Caesarius himself is the author of the *Quicumque* can still claim any great degree of probability. Caesarius is, however, the first certain witness to the existence of the *Quicumque*. This, together with the recent findings of Madoz which point to Vincent of Lerins in the *Excerpta* as the most immediate precursor of the Athanasian Creed, makes it possible to fix the limits for the composition of the Symbol. The compilation of the *Excerpta* (434-440) and the citation by Caesarius (before 543) determines it. If we allow some time between the composition of the *Quicumque* and Caesarius's citation of it, then we concur in Madoz's final conclusion that the Pseudo-Athanasian Creed must have been written between 450 and 500 A.D.²¹ The use of the Symbol by Caesarius so shortly after its composition together with its admittedly Lerinensian color sufficiently indicates its place of origin as the region of Arles and Lerins. A more precise solution to this problem, as Morin points out at the end of his investigation, does not seem possible at the present state of our knowledge.²²

21. J. MADOZ, op. cit. p. 99.

22. G. MORIN, *L'origine du symbole d'Athanase: Témoignage inédit de S. Césaire d'Arles*. RB 44 (1932) 219.

His close adherence to the doctrine he found in the *Quicumque* precludes any real originality in Caesarius's treatment of Trinitarian doctrine. Nor is there any great degree of originality in his argumentation to defend that doctrine against the Semi-Arians. He accepts from every hand that which they offer him for the accomplishment of his purpose. In using his sources, however, he is never a blind follower, but a true disciple, taking what fitted his nature and purpose and leaving the rest. It is this essentially eclectic nature of the Saint which enabled him to formulate a proper theological thought, comprising elements of the two schools with which he came into contact, the thought of Augustinianism, and that emanating from that ancient monastery of Lerins.

St. Caesarius is an Augustinian. This statement is frequently made, and is true if properly understood. It demands, however, a number of important reservations. The essentially practical and, we may even say, anti-speculative nature of Caesarius's writings at once suppose a fundamental difference in the theological thought of these two bishops. Though the great influence of St. Augustine is manifest throughout Caesarius's doctrinal treatises, it is not such that we find no admixture of other elements foreign to Augustinian thought. All admit, for example, the substantially Augustinian character of Caesarius's teaching on grace. This same pure Augustinianism, however, is certainly not to be found in Caesarius's very reserved explanation of predestination. In our search for the sources of Caesarius's Trinitarian doctrine, we found the greatest dependence on the Bishop of Hippo. Nevertheless I do not believe that as a whole his doctrine on the Trinity can be called Augustinian. There is extensive utilization of Augustine's argumentation against the Arians, but there is hardly a trace of the specifically Augustinian explanation of the processions and missions. If we compare the influence of Augustine in Caesarius's doctrine on grace and his doctrine on the Trinity, we find that the influence is much less in the latter. For his doctrine on grace Caesarius depends on Augustine not only for the argumentation against the Semi-Pelagians, but also to a great extent for the doctrine itself. In his Trinitarian doctrine the case is quite different. There is a great dependence on Augustine in arguing against the Semi-Arians, but for doctrine he accepts the *Quicumque*, and the dependence on Augustine is negligible. If, therefore, we restrict ourselves to the doctrine on the Trinity, it seems more correct to say that, notwithstanding the great dependence on the Bishop of Hippo, Caesarius is not *here* an Augustinian.

This particular way of viewing the relation between St. Augustine and St. Caesarius is of primary importance in the ultimate appraisal of the latter's place in the theological development of the doctrine on the Trinity. Certainly if his first claim to importance here were his preservation of the fruits of Augustine's teaching for Gaul and the Western Church in general — as is frequently maintained in regard to Caesarius's theology as a whole — that claim to renown would be very small indeed. There is, however, a much greater place than this for the Archbishop of Arles in the history of Trinitarian theology. The first reason for this statement is his theological method. Through it St. Caesarius was able to bring the most abstract dogmas and the most profound of all mysteries, that of the Trinity, to the faithful by presenting these in a way suited to the intellectual capacity of the ordinary Catholic. In this his model is none other than Our Lord Himself. It is certainly a point in which the modern theologian and preacher might learn much from St. Caesarius. A second reason, of even greater importance in the history of dogma, is that Caesarius's Trinitarian writings offer us a much fuller insight into the Trinitarian doctrine of the *Quicumque*. Writing at a time and place intimately associated with that of the Symbol, Caesarius supplies to a great extent the theological background which gave rise to this masterpiece of our Trinitarian faith. For though he writes after the composition of the *Quicumque*, the identity of doctrinal viewpoint manifested by the two authors assures us that what the Archbishop of Arles writes, depending on the Symbol, reveals also in all likelihood the theological mind that produced the *Quicumque*. Caesarius gives us a commentary on the Athanasian Creed that supplies the complete lack of anything similar by the anonymous author himself, and it is this aspect which constitutes Caesarius's greatest claim to recognition in the theological development of the doctrine of the Trinity. This I believe is not an insignificant role which the Archbishop of Arles plays, for it is not the exalted speculations of Augustine's *De Trinitate*, but the simple and direct language of the *Quicumque* that the Church puts on our lips to profess our faith in the mystery of mysteries, one God in three divine Persons.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Original Sources

- ST. AMBROSE: Migne, PL, vols. 14-17, Paris 1845. CSEL (Schenkl) vol. 32, 1, Vindobonae 1897.
- ST. AUGUSTINE: *Opera Omnia*, opera et studio Monachorum Ordinis S. Benedicti Congregatione Mauri, Paris 1689-1700.
- — *Sermones post Maurinos reperti*, edited by G. Morin, O.S.B., Miscellanea Agostiniana, vol. 1, Rome 1930.
- — *Basic Writings of St. Augustine*, vol. 2, *De Trinitate*, edited by W. Oates, New York 1948.
- BACHIARIUS: Migne, PL, vol. 20, Paris 1845.
- ST. CAESARIUS OF ARLES: *Opera Omnia*, edited by G. Morin, Martelli 1937, 1942.
- — B. Krusch, *Vita Caesarii Episcopi Arelatensis*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum Rerum Merovingicarum, vol. 3, pp. 433-457, Hanover 1896.
- FAUSTUS OF RIEZ: CSEL (Engelbrecht), vol. 21, Vindobonae 1891. Migne, PL, vol. 62, pp. 1047-1050 (under Caesarius), Paris 1848. Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, vol. 6, Lugduni 1677.
- ST. FULGENTIUS: Migne, PL, vol. 65, Paris 1847.
- GENNADIUS OF MARSEILLES: Migne, PL, vol. 58, Paris 1862.
- — C. Turner's edition, *The Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum*, Journal of Theological Studies, vol. 7, 1906, pp. 78-99; vol. 8, 1907, pp. 103-114.
- ST. HILARY OF POITIERS: *De Trinitate*, Migne, PL, vol. 10, Paris 1845.
- ITHACIUS: *Contra Varimadum*, Migne, PL, vol. 62, Paris 1848.
- NOVATIAN: *De Trinitate*, edited by W. Yorke Fausset, Cambridge 1909.
- TERTULLIAN: *Treatise against Praxeas*, edited and translated by Ernest Evans, London 1948.
- VICTOR OF VITA: CSEL (Petschenig), vol. 7, Vindobonae 1881.
- ST. VINCENT OF LERINS: Migne, PL, vol. 50, Paris 1846. *Excerpta Vincentii Lirinensis*, edited by J. Madoz, Madrid 1940.

Monographs

- B. ALTANER, *Patrologie* 2 Aufl., Freiburg i.B. 1950.
- M. AMPÈRE, *Histoire littéraire de la France avant le douzième siècle*, vol. 2, pp. 209-231, Paris 1893.
- C. ARNOLD, *Caesarius von Arelate und die gallische Kirche seiner Zeit*, Leipzig 1894.
- U. BALTUS, *Un opusculé inédit de S. Césaire d'Arles sur la grâce*. Revue Bénédictine, vol. 13, 1896, pp. 433-443.
- O. BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Freiburg i.B. 1902-1932.

- G. BARDY, *L'histoire du dogme de la Trinité*, Revue Apologétique, vol. 47, 1928, pp. 280-294.
- — *La prédication de saint Césaire d'Arles*, Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France, vol. 29, 1943, pp. 201-236.
- — *L'attitude politique de saint Césaire d'Arles*, Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France, vol. 33, 1947, pp. 241-256.
- C. BELLET, *Les origines des Églises de France et les fastes épiscopaux*, Paris 1898.
- V. BRETON, *La Trinité*, Paris 1931.
- A. BURN, *An Introduction to the Credo and to the Te Deum*, London 1899.
- D. CAPELLE, Book Review of Morin's *Opera Omnia*, Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale, vol. 10, 1938, pp. 197-198.
- C. CAPPUYNS, *L'origine des "Capitula" d'Orange 529*, Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale, vol. 6, 1934, pp. 121-142.
- A. D'ALÈS, *Les "Sermones" de saint Césaire d'Arles*, Recherches de Science Religieuse, vol. 28, 1938, pp. 314-384.
- W. DEROUAUX, Book Review of Morin's *Opera Omnia*, Analecta Bollandiana, vol. 56, 1938, pp. 163-164.
- L. DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, Paris 1894.
- — *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, Paris 1911.
- G. DU PORT, *Histoire de l'Église d'Arles*, Paris 1690.
- E. FFOULKES, *The Athanasian Creed*, London 1872.
- L. FOUcart, *Un prédicateur populaire: Saint Césaire d'Arles*, Nouvelle Revue Théologique, vol. 52, 1925, pp. 381-395.
- L. GUÉRARD, *Une récente étude sur les origines des Églises de France*, Revue du Clergé Français, vol. 18, 1899, pp. 425-440.
- M. GUIZOT, *Histoire de la civilisation en France*, Paris 1847.
- H. GWATKIN, *Studies of Arianism*, Cambridge 1900.
- T. HOLMES, *The Origin and Development of the Christian Church in Gaul*, London 1911.
- A. JACQUIN, *Saint Césaire d'Arles*, La Vie Spirituelle, vol. 64, 1943, pp. 97-121.
- D. LAMBOT, *La première édition critique des sermons de saint Césaire d'Arles*, Revue Bénédictine, vol. 49, 1937, pp. 385-388.
- M. LANZIERE, *Saint Césaire d'Arles: L'enseignement*, La Vie Spirituelle, vol. 64, 1943, pp. 122-153.
- X. LE BACHELET, *Arianisme chez les peuples germaniques*, Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, vol. 1, cols. 1849-1859, Paris 1903.
- J. LEBRETON, *Histoire du dogme de la Trinité*, Paris 1928.
- — *Le dogme de la Trinité dans l'ancienne Église chrétienne*, Recherches de Science Religieuse, vol. 8, 1918, pp. 1-35.
- — *Saint Augustin théologien de la Trinité, Son exégèse des théophanies*, Miscellanea Agostiniana, vol. 2, Rome 1931.
- — *La révélation du mystère de la sainte Trinité*, La Vie Spirituelle, vol. 74, 1946, pp. 764-776.
- D. LEGEAY, *L'ange et les théophanies dans l'Écriture Sainte d'après la doctrine des Pères*, Revue Thomiste, vol. 10, 1902, pp. 138-158; 405-424; vol. 11, 1903, pp. 46-69; pp. 125-154.

- P. LEJAY, *Notes d'ancienne littérature chrétienne — Les sermons de Césaire d'Arles*, Revue Biblique Internationale, vol. 4, 1895, pp. 593-610.
- — *Le rôle théologique de Césaire d'Arles*, Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuse, vol. 10, 1905, pp. 135-188.
- — *Césaire d'Arles*, Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, vol. 2, cols. 2168-2185, Paris 1905.
- A. MALNORY, *Saint Césaire*, Paris 1894.
- C. MARTINI, *Quattuor fragmenta Pelagio restituenda*, Antonianum, vol. 13, 1938, pp. 293-334.
- G. MORIN, *Mes principes et ma méthode pour la future édition de S. Césaire*, Revue Bénédictine, vol. 10, 1893, pp. 62-77.
- — *L'Homélaire de Burchard de Würzburg — Contribution à la critique des sermons de S. Césaire d'Arles*, Revue Bénédictine, vol. 12, 1896, pp. 97-111.
- — *Un écrit de saint Césaire d'Arles renfermant un témoignage sur les fondateurs des Églises des Gaules*, Mélanges de littérature et d'histoire religieuse publiés à l'occasion du jubilé épiscopal de Mgr. de Cabrières, pp. 109-124, Paris 1899.
- — *Le symbole d'Athanase et son premier témoin saint Césaire d'Arles*, Revue Bénédictine, vol. 18, 1901, pp. 337-363.
- — *Studia Caesariana — Nouvelle série d'inédits tirée du manuscrit d'Épinal*, Revue Bénédictine, vol. 23, 1906, pp. 189-214; 350-372.
- — *Le Liber Dogmatum de Gennade de Marseille*, Revue Bénédictine, vol. 24, 1907, pp. 445-455.
- — *L'origine du symbole d'Athanase*, The Journal of Theological Studies, vol. 12, 1911, pp. 161-190; 337-361.
- — *Quelques aperçus nouveaux sur l'Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, Revue Bénédictine, vol. 37, 1925, pp. 239-262.
- — *Une compilation antiarienne inédite sous le nom de S. Augustin issue du milieu de Cassiodore*, Revue Bénédictine, vol. 31, 1914-19, pp. 237-243.
- — *Les éditions des sermons de S. Césaire d'Arles du 16^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours*, Revue Bénédictine, vol. 43, 1931, pp. 23-37.
- — *L'origine du symbole d'Athanase: Témoignage inédit de S. Césaire d'Arles*, Revue Bénédictine, vol. 44, 1932, pp. 206-219.
- — *Le symbole de S. Césaire d'Arles*, Revue Bénédictine, vol. 46, 1934, pp. 178-189.
- — *Le traité de S. Césaire d'Arles: De Mysterio Sanctae Trinitatis*, Revue Bénédictine, vol. 46, 1934, pp. 190-205.
- — *La collection gallicane dite d'Eusèbe et les problèmes qui s'y rattachent*, Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, vol. 34, 1935, pp. 92-115.
- — *"Le Breviarium Fidei" contre les Ariens*, Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, vol. 35, 1939, pp. 35-53.
- G. OMMANNEY, *A Critical Dissertation on the Athanasian Creed*, Oxford 1897.
- O. PERLER, *Dom Germain Morin, O.S.B.*, Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique Suisse, vol. 40, 1946, pp. 31-41.

- J. RIVIÈRE, *La doctrine de la rédemption chez saint Césaire d'Arles*, Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique, vol. 44, 1943, pp. 3-20.
- P. SCHEPENS, *Pour l'histoire du symbole Quicumque*, Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, vol. 32, 1936, pp. 548-569.
- M. SCHMAUS, *Die psychologische Trinitätslehre des hl. Augustinus*, Münster 1927.
- F. SMID, *De adumbratione SS. Trinitatis in Vetere Testamento secundum sanctum Augustinum*, Mundelein 1942.
- B. STEIDLE, *Patrologia*, Freiburg i.B. 1937.
- G. SWAINSON, *The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds, together with an Account of the Growth and Reception of the Sermon on the Faith commonly called The Creed of St. Athanasius*. London 1875.
- J. TIXERONT, *Histoire des dogmes dans l'antiquité chrétienne*, Paris 1922.
— — *S. Césaire*, Dictionnaire pratique des connaissances religieuses, vol. 1, pp. 1234-1235. Paris 1925.
- J. TRICHAUD, *Histoire de saint Césaire archevêque d'Arles*, Arles 1853.
- D. WATERLAND, *A Critical History of the Athanasian Creed*, London 1727.

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL TEXTS

Genesis :

1:1	19, 143.
1:2	19, 66, 154.
1:26	20, 32, 143.
18:2-3	24.
18:6	24, 33.
22:3	22.

Exodus :

3:18	10, 20.
8:19	157.
8:27	23.
19:15	23.

Deuteronomy :

6:4	21, 81, 170.
-----	--------------

I Kings :

17:17	25.
-------	-----

III Kings :

17:21	118, 174, 175.
-------	----------------

Psalms :

36:6	67.
50:3	23.
50:12	32, 169.
76:15	153.
84:9	77, 176.
93:11	76.
103:30	154.
109:3	157.
138:7	73, 156, 196, 197.

Wisdom :

1:7	73, 106.
-----	----------

Isaías :

6:3	23, 32, 126, 169, 180.
11:20	30.
40:12	30, 65, 118, 175.
48:16	165, 196.
61:1	185, 196.

Matthew :

4:11	80, 82.
8:20	42.
12:28	30, 43, 77, 157.
16:18	44.
28:18	67.
28:19	32, 147.

Mark :

3:19	78.
10:18	55.

Luke :

1:35	116.
1:68	77, 177.
1:70	77, 177.
4:18	185, 196.
4:20	196.
5:2	174.
11:20	43, 156.
18:19	55.

John :

1:2	26, 145.
1:3	119, 161.
2:19	166.
5:19	67, 70, 89, 154, 158, 166.
8:28	89, 90, 103, 134, 158.
8:29	162.
8:56	33, 181.
10:18	42.
10:30	37, 42.
14:9	32.
14:11	72, 191.
14:28	41, 104.
15:26	84, 93, 99.
16:15	42, 147.
20:22	93, 174.
20:28	82.

Acts :

3:18	77, 177.
5:3-4	76, 176.

Romans :

8:9 93.
9:5 189.
11:6 190.
11:36 117.
16:27 21, 124, 144.

I Corinthians :

1:24 120, 123, 152, 182.
2:10 76, 174.
3:17 177.
6:19-20 78, 177.
8:6 49, 81, 117, 190.
12:11 66, 175, 210.
15:15 166.

Galatians :

4:4 104, 105, 162, 163.

Philippians :

2:6 39, 40, 147.

I Timothy :

1:17 26, 146.
6:16 146.

I John :

1:2 26.
3:2 148.
5:20 57.

INDEX

Abraham 24, 25, 27, 29, 33, 180-181.
Accommodation 23.
Aeonius 4.
Alexander of Hales 52.
Alexandria, Church of 44.
Alexandrian School 25.
Allegorical 25, 37.
Ambrose 179-186, 218, *passim*.
Ampere 1.
Analogies 54, 60-61, 88-90;
 human mind 69, 155, 173.
 native 151, 172, 221.
Angels 24, 42, 170.
Anthropomorphic 68.
Antioch, Church of 45.
Apologists 25, 41.
Apostles 11, 44.
Apostles Creed 171.
Apostolic Churches 44, 47, 194.
Appropriation 62, 115-126, 137, 165.
 consubstantiality 116, 118;
 creation 119;
 grace 120;
 inspiration 120;
 missions 120-121;
 personal properties 120, 123-125.

Arianism 14-19, 48, 67, 101, 106,
 221, *passim*; cf. Semi- .
Arles 4, 9.
Arles, Church of 44-48.
Arles, I Council of 47.
Arnold 22, 24.
Athanasius 14, 221.
Augustine 1, 4, 34, 53, 67, 141-168,
 217-218, *passim*.
Augustinianism:
 of Caesarius 168, 171, 183, 186,
 212-213, 223;
 of Fulgentius 168;
 of Vincent of Lerins 212-213.
Avitus of Vienne 214.

Bachiarus 201-204, 220.
Baptism, formula of 32, 78, 146,
 178.
Bardenhewer, O., 199.
 becomingness, argument of 40,
 53, 148.
Bellet, C. 46.
Boethius 214, 220.
Bonaventure 53.
Bonum est diffusivum sui 52, 55.

- Breton, V. 9.
 Breviarium Adversus Haereticos
 13, 16, 94-95, 115, 176, 198, 209.
- Caesarius:
 life 4-5;
 practical theologian 6-8;
 role of Trinity in theology 9-12,
 18;
 role of — in theology 8, 223-
 224;
 doctrine on grace 8-9;
 doctrine on Redemption 3;
 moral doctrine 3, 6, 9;
 doctrine on faith 7;
 rules for religious 3;
 orator 2, 18, 13;
 use of sources 141, 171, 188;
 eclectic 171, 181, 223.
 cf. Augustinianism, Quicumque.
- Catholic faith; cf. Faith —.
- Chaillan, M. 8, 138.
- Churches; cf. Apostolic, Gallican.
- Comprehensible 38, 147.
- Consubstantiality:
 Appropriation and — 116;
 divine operations and — 68;
 personal triplicity and — 16,
 28-35;
 sequels of — 15-16, 35ff, 215;
 cf. substance.
- Creation 64-65, 86, 154, 175.
- Cyprian 81, 214.
- D'Ales, A. 47, 168.
- Daphnus of Vienne 47.
- Decalogue 29, 214.
- Didymus 214.
- doxologies 63, 93.
- Duchesne, L. 46.
- Du Port, G. 1.
- Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum, Liber
 207ff.
- eclectic 171, 181, 223.
- Ephesus, Church of 44.
- equality 37-56, passim.
 sequel of consubstantiality 35ff,
 59, 174;
 proof from S. S. 37ff, 56;
 proof from Tradition 43ff, 56;
 proof from reason 48ff, 56, 149-
 150;
 cf. Son and Holy Spirit.
- essentia 130.
- eternity 57-63, passim;
 sequel of consubstantiality 58-59;
 proof from S. S. 57-58, 63;
 cf. Father, Son, Holy Spirit.
- Eugenius 210-211, 220.
- Eugypius 213-214.
- Eusebius of Emesa, Collection of
 171ff.
- Eusebius of Vercelli 214.
- exegesis 21, 144.
- Faith, Catholic:
 priority 7;
 in Trinity 15, 17-27, 44, 54;
 necessity 18, 54;
 merit 18.
- Father:
 substance of — 59, 85ff, 95;
 perfect 61-62;
 eternal 58, 61;
 omnipotent 56, 64;
 omnipresent 16, 72, 73;
 creator 64ff, 119;
 generator 84, 91;
 cf. paternity.
- Fathers:
 Greek — 41;
 Latin — 41, 80;
 interpretation of S. S. 23, 25.
- Faustinus 214.
- Faustus of Riez 1, 4, 169-179,
 218, passim.
- filiation 59, 62, 92.
- France, churches of: cf. Gallican.
- Fulgentius 36, 192-198, 219, passim.
- Gallican churches 44-47.
- Gallo-Roman 5.
- Gaul 4, 5, 15.
- generation, divine:
 analogical 88-89;
 creation and — 86;
 eternal 87, 100;

- incorporeal 90-91;
- intellectual 90-91, 134, 159, 215;
- name 84;
- nature of 85, 90-91, 159, 183;
- necessary 87, 100;
- perfect act 86-87, 184;
- principle of 85-86, 100, 134, 157;
- psychological explanation of ———
68-69, 143, 155, 157, 159, 213;
- true ——— 88.
- generation, human 51, 85, 150-151,
158, 88-89, 205.
- genitus 84, 91, 92, 97.
- Gennadius 201-209, 220.
- Germanic:
 - Arianism 5, 13;
 - Peoples 4, 5, 9, 131, 221.
- Gloria Patri 63.
- God, one and triune 12, 14, 16-27.
- grace 8-9, 168.
- Gregory of Elvira 214.
- Gregory of Tours 45.
- Guérard, L. 46, 47.
- Guizot, M. 6.
- Hilary of Poitiers 41, 187-192,
219, *passim*.
- homousion 15.
- Holy Spirit:
 - adored 80;
 - creator 64ff, 119;
 - creature 43, 65-66, 72, 75, 78,
92, 95-96;
 - divinity of ——— 3, 43, 74ff, 115,
156, 173-174, 176ff, 215;
 - distinct person 98-99;
 - equality 43, 50;
 - eternity 68;
 - Lord and God 82, 177;
 - minister of Christ 43;
 - omnipotent 16, 65-66, 153-154,
175;
 - omnipresent 16, 72-74, 156, 197;
 - cf. procession of ———, missions
of ———.
- hymns 24.
- hypostasis 15, 53.
- Immensity: cf. omnipresent.
- Incarnation 26, 41, 72, 103, 121,
185, cf. missions of Son.
- ingenitus 84, 91-92, 97.
- Irenaeus 214.
- Ithacius 15, 198-201, 220.
- Jerome 214.
- Jerusalem, Church of 44.
- Joseph 80, 183.
- Lambot, D. 2.
- Lebreton, J. 27.
- Lejay, P. 2, 3, 48, 138, 195.
- Leo I, Pope 46-47, 214.
- Lerins Monastery 4, 24, 163, 169,
211, 212, 223.
- Libellus de Mysterio Sanctae Trini-
tatis 13, 19, 94-95, 176, 207,
209.
- liturgy 25.
- Lord and God 16, 73-82, 188ff;
sequel of consubstantiality 73;
cf. Son ———, Holy Spirit ———.
- Lucifer of Calaris 214.
- Macedonianism 6, 47.
- Marcianus 47.
- Madoz, J. 139, 212, 222.
- Malnory, A. 1, 7.
- Manicheans 20.
- Marius Victorinus 214.
- Martin of Braga 138.
- Mary, Blessed Virgin 42, 72, 80,
151, 170, 183.
- Matthaeum, Opus Imperfectum in
214.
- Maximus of Turin 1.
- Merovingian 5.
- monotheism 30.
- Morin, G.:
 - Opera Omnia of Caesarius 1-3,
8, 188-189;
 - traditional argument 45, 48,
192, 195;
 - Quicumque 74, 127, 137-140,
222.
 - Liber Eccles. Dogm. 201, 204,
208.

- Moses 29, 34.
 mystery 52-53, 55, 70, 68.
 Names, divine 22, 82.
 Narbonne, church of 44.
 nature 22, 39, 130, 148.
 New Testament, Trinity in 10, 25,
 29, 32, 37.
 Nice, Council of 13, 15, 36, 221.
 nominalism 99.
 Novatian 20, 214, 220.
 number three 10, 22, 24, 34.
 Old Testament, Trinity in 10, 19,
 22-25, 29, 32, 37, 54, 143, 215,
 221.
 omnipotence 16, 56, 63-70, 133,
 153, 175;
 sequel of consubstantiality 63-
 64;
 equality and — 64;
 omnipo and — 64;
 cf. Son —, Holy Spirit —.
 omnipresence 16, 57, 70-74, 134,
 156, 161, 197;
 sequel of consubstantiality 71;
 cf. Son's —;
 cf. Holy Spirit's —.
 opera ad extra 65, 114, 121-122,
 137.
 operations, external divine 64, 68-
 70, 115ff, 137, 165, 173, 188,
 190, 215.
 Orange, II Council of 8.
 Origen 22, 23, 25, 214.
 ousia 15.
 Pacian of Barcelona 214.
 Paganism 31, 131, 146.
 paternity 61-62, 92.
 patristic 22.
 Patroclus 46-47.
 Paul, Apostle 44, 46, 47.
 Paul of Narbonne 47.
 Pelagius 214.
 Pelagianism: cf. Semi —.
 Persons, divine 15, 16, 34, 65;
 distinct 31ff, 37, 70, 84, 91, 100,
 130, 135, 160, 169, 171, 187,
 215;
 divinity of — 75, 83, 131, 156;
 trinity of — 16, 28-35, 221.
 personal properties 35, 53, 83-84,
 92, 100, 170;
 cf. appropriation.
 Petavius 55.
 Peter, Apostle 46, 47.
 Phoebadius of Agen 214.
 Platonic 53, 144.
 polytheistic 31, 131, 146.
 Pomerius, J. 4, 214.
 prescription, argument of 193.
 procession of Holy Spirit 84, 92-
 100, 160, 215;
 ab utroque 93, 160, 178;
 creation and — 95-96;
 generation and — 96-99;
 eternal 98;
 principle of — 93-95, 100, 134,
 188;
 from Father only 94-95, 203,
 206-208;
 doctrinal development in Cae-
 sarius 95, 206-209;
 cf. missions —.
 properties of the Persons: cf. per-
 sonal —.
 Quicumque:
 author 14, 138-140, 222;
 purpose 14-15;
 division 15-16;
 Caesarius and —: 14-17, 27,
 30-31, 33, 34, 37, 41, 58-59,
 63, 64, 71, 81, 86, 90, 97, 100,
 127-140, 168, 215-216, 221-224.
 Rationalism 48, 53, 183.
 reason, argument from 48ff.
 Redemption 3.
 regula fidei 141.
 relation, operational 70.
 relations, personal 68, 70, 100,
 136, 160.
 religious rules 3.
 Resurrection 116, 183.
 Rivière, J. 3.
 Rome, church of 44, 46.

- Sabellianism 187.
- Sacred Scripture:
- interpretation 21, 23, 25, 37, 144, 148;
 - seeming subordinationist texts 41ff, 67, 81, 104-105, 132, 148, 175, 187;
 - cf. Old Testament, New Testament.
- Satan 39.
- Saturninus of Arles 47.
- Saturninus of Toulouse 47.
- Schmaus, M. 55, 56.
- Semi-Arians 3, 9, 14-15, 35, 83, 88-89, 95, 187, 221, *passim*.
- Semi-Pelagianism 3, 8, 169.
- Sermon 9, De Symbolo, 171.
- Sermons 212 & 213: 94, 169, 178.
- Smyrna, church of 44.
- Son:
- adored 80;
 - comprehensible 38;
 - creator 64ff, 119;
 - creature 37, 79, 85-86, 221;
 - divinity of 39, 41, 81-82, *passim*;
 - equality 16, 35ff, 49ff, *passim*;
 - eternity 16, 57ff, 150, 215;
 - omnipotent 16, 64-65;
 - omnipresent 16, 57, 71-73;
 - cf. missions, generation, Verbum.
- Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua 208.
- Steidle, B. 199.
- speculation 183.
- Subordinationism 19, 25, 26, cf. Sacred Scripture.
- substance, divine:
- unity of 15, 26, 28-35, 70, 83, 129, 139, 143, 146, 168, 171, 215, 221;
 - invisible 26;
 - similarity of 15;
 - moral union 39, 188, 192.
- Terminology 15, 34, 55, 64, 137, 222.
- Tertullian 20, 81, 193, 214, 220.
- theology: cf. Caesarius —.
- theological argument 54-56, 61.
- theophany 25-27, 144-146, 180-181.
- Thomas Aquinas 52, 53, 55.
- Tixeront, J. 138.
- Toulouse, church of 44.
- tradition, argument of 43ff, 193-195.
- traditionalists 45.
- Trophimus of Ephesus 46-48.
- Turner, C. 201, 202, 204, 208.
- Vaison, Council of 63.
- Vasenne, church of 44.
- Vatican Council 52.
- Vienne, church of 46.
- Verbum 25, 26, 91.
- Vincent of Lerins 139, 211-213, 220.
- Wulfila 5.
- Zeno of Verona 214.
- Zosimus, Pope 46.
- Zweifalten Collection 16, 139.

CUM APPROBATIONE ECCLESIASTICA

OF THE SAME COLLECTION HAVE APPEARED :

- I. LEONHARD WEBER : Hauptfragen der Moralthologie Gregors des Großen. Ein Bild altchristlicher Lebensführung.
xii + 288 S. (1947). Fr. 9.35 / DM 9.—
- II. ANDREAS SCHMID O. S. B. : Die Christologie Isidors von Pelusium.
xii + 114 S. (1948). Fr. 5.20 / DM 5.—
- III. JOSEPH K. STIRNIMANN : Die Praescriptio Tertullians im Lichte des römischen Rechts und der Theologie. xii + 180 S. (1949).
Fr. 6.75 / DM 6.50
- IV. KARL FEDERER : Liturgie und Glaube. Eine theologiegeschichtliche Untersuchung. viii + 144 S. (1950). Fr. 6.25 / DM 6.—
- V. ALOIS MÜLLER : Ecclesia-Maria. Die Einheit Mariens und der Kirche. xvii + 240 S. und Tafel (1951). Fr. 9.15 / DM 8.80
- VI. HENRI DE RIEDMATTEN O. P. : Les Actes du Procès de Paul de Samosate. Etude sur la Christologie du III^e au IV^e siècle.
172 pages (1952). Fr. 7.50 / DM 7.20
- VII. HUBERT MERKI O. S. B. : 'Ομολοσις θεῶν. Von der platonischen Angleichung an Gott zur Gottähnlichkeit bei Gregor von Nyssa.
xx + 188 S. (1952). Fr. 8.10 / DM 7.80
- VIII. OTHMAR HEGGELBACHER : Die christliche Taufe als Rechtsakt nach dem Zeugnis der frühen Christenheit. ix + 196 S. (1953).
Fr. 8.30 / DM 8.—
- IX. MARK DORENKEMPER C. PP. S. : The Trinitarian Doctrine and Sources of St. Caesarius of Arles. ix + 234 p. (1953).
Fr. 10.40 / DM 10.—

In preparation :

- X. TARSICIUS VAN BAVEL O. E. S. A. : Recherches sur la Christologie de saint Augustin.

