

Copyright © 2016 JohnMark Bennett Beazley

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation or instruction.

*DE SPIRITU SANCTO: NOVATIAN OF ROME'S
PNEUMATOLOGY IN DE TRINITATE*

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
JohnMark Bennett Beazley
December 2016

APPROVAL SHEET

*DE SPIRITU SANCTO: NOVATIAN OF ROME'S
PNEUMATOLOGY IN DE TRINITATE*

JohnMark Bennett Beazley

Read and Approved by:

Michael A. G. Haykin

Gregory A. Wills

Stephen J. Wellum

Date _____

I dedicate this dissertation to the four people who read every word of each draft and encouraged me to complete this process.

To Lauryn Beazley,
for her love, support, and reminders to use commas.

To Jeffrey and Sally Beazley,
for encouraging my love of learning and for finding many spelling and grammar errors.

To Dr. Michael Haykin,
who encouraged me to write on this topic and helped me to become a better writer and
thinker.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE.....	vii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Novatian and His Pneumatology.....	1
Scope of This Study.....	3
Third-century Pneumatology.....	3
Overview of Scholarship	6
2. THE LIFE OF NOVATIAN OF ROME	11
Introduction	11
Biography of Novatian of Rome	12
Novatian the Churchman	12
Novatian as an Author	15
Novatian as a Pastor.....	18
Leader of Schism	20
The <i>Lapsi</i> and Novatian’s Ecclesiology	23
The Consecration of Novatian as Bishop	25
Letters of Recognition	28
Novatian the Schismatic Bishop.....	30
The Death of Novatian.....	31
Conclusion	32
3. THE PNEUMATOLOGICAL PREDECESSORS OF NOVATIAN	34

Chapter	Page
Introduction	34
Ignatius of Antioch (d. 110)	34
Presence of the Spirit with the Church	38
The Ontology of the Spirit in Ignatius	39
Trinitarian Confession and Binitarian Theological Emphases	42
The Shepherd of Hermas (90s)	42
The Indwelling Presence of the Spirit	44
Prophecy and Revelation	47
Ontology of the Spirit in Hermas.....	50
Justin Martyr (d. 160s)	54
Person and Work of the Spirit	55
Justin’s Trinitarianism	60
Irenaeus of Lyons (130–200)	63
Holy Spirit and Prophecy.....	64
Baptism and Spiritual Life.....	67
Spirit Empowered Martyrdom.....	70
Spirit as the Divine Creator	70
Trinitarian Confession and Trinitarian Theology	72
Clement of Alexandria (150–215)	73
Scripture and the Spirit	74
The Spirit and the Christian.....	77
Gifts of the Spirit	79
Ontology of the Spirit	80
Tertullian (c. 170–220s).....	84
Ontology of the Spirit	85

Chapter	Page
Spirit and Scripture	88
Spirit and Prophecy.....	89
Spirit and Baptism	90
Spirit and Discipline	91
Spirit and Martyrdom	92
Conclusion	93
Hippolytus of Rome (c. 160–c. 235).....	93
Spirit and Humanity.....	95
Martyrdom	98
Church Leaders	98
Spirit and Scripture	99
Spirit and Prophets.....	100
Ontology of the Holy Spirit	101
Conclusion	103
4. NOVATIAN’S IDENTIFICATION OF THE SPIRIT THROUGH THE ACTIVITY OF THE SPIRIT	105
Introduction	105
Novatian’s <i>De Trinitate</i>	107
Novatian’s Methodology	109
Translation of <i>De Trinitate</i> Chapter 29.....	112
The Identity of the Spirit	117
The Spirit of the Old and New Testaments	118
The Spirit Who is Given	121
The Spirit Who Gives Gifts	123
The Spirit of Christ	126
Work of the Spirit in Christians.....	132

Chapter	Page
The Spirit against the Heretics.....	140
The Spirit and the Faithless	144
Novatian’s Closing Remarks on the Spirit	146
Conclusion	150
5. NOVATIAN’S ONTOLOGY OF THE SPIRIT	152
Introduction	152
Overview of Scholarship.....	155
Neither a Creature nor the Creator	159
The Ontology of the Spirit from.....	162
His Relation to the Son	162
Less than Christ	162
Ontological Implications from the Spirit’s Activity	169
The Spirit and Spiritual Transformation.....	171
The Giver of Life.....	175
The Divine Eternity of the Holy Spirit.....	178
Conclusion	183
6. CONCLUSION	186
Review of Main Arguments.....	186
Novatian and his Pneumatological Predecessors	189
Novatian’s Unique Contribution	194
Novatian’s Pneumatological Ontology	195
Novatian’s Pneumatological Legacy.....	196
Appendix	
GREGORY OF ELVIRA’S APPROPRIATION OF NOVATIAN’S PNEUMATOLOGY	199
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	203

PREFACE

My interest in the Church Fathers began with a desire to understand the history of biblical interpretation. When I encountered the writings of the Church Fathers, I found a treasury of the Christian faith. I continue to find gems of the faith as I read and learn from them. Novatian was no exception to this. I have found my study of him to be a fruitful endeavor that has led me to think more deeply and clearly about the faith once and for all delivered to the saints.

I would like to thank the many professors that I have had during my education. In particular, I thank Dr. Michael Haykin for guiding me to a deeper understanding and appreciation for the Fathers. This dissertation is the fruit of the seeds that he planted when he suggested this topic to me.

I would like to thank Lauryn Beazley for her patience and sacrifice during the time I spent writing this dissertation. I will never ask you to go through another Ph.D.

JohnMark Beazley

Louisville, Kentucky

December 2016

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Novatian and His Pneumatology

Novatian of Rome was born around 200 and was killed in 258 for his faith in Christ.¹ He is best remembered for a schism that bore his name and his subsequent role as an anti-bishop in Rome. Most of the recorded details of his life were preserved by his ecclesiastical opponents,² making it somewhat difficult to accurately trace the details of his life. One of the clearest things known about him is that he was an important leader in the church at Rome both before and after the schism.³ It is quite possible that his importance as a leader before the schism was due to his work *De Trinitate*.⁴ Novatian composed *De Trinitate* around the year 240. Despite its name, *De Trinitate* was not written as a treatise on the Trinity. It was written as an explanation of the Rule of Truth, which Novatian defined as belief in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.⁵

Novatian devoted an entire chapter (29) of *De Trinitate* to explaining the

¹Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.28. Pacian of Barcelona recorded that Cyprian said “my adversary has preceded me” when he heard of the death of Novatian (*Epistula* 2.4).

²Russell J. De Simone, *Novatian the Presbyter*, Fathers of the Church 67 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1974), 3. Much of what is known about Novatian has been recorded by Eusebius of Caesarea and Jerome, both of whom relied upon the ecclesiastical opponents of Novatian for their information about Novatian. The far more sympathetic work of Socrates Scholasticus does not include a detailed discussion of the life of Novatian but refers to Novatian as a martyr (Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.28).

³Novatian acted as the secretary for the church at Rome after the martyrdom of bishop Fabian in 250. He was made the leader of the rigorist party, and his name became associated with the entire schism.

⁴James L. Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome: A Study in Third Century Orthodoxy* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2008), 23.

⁵*De Trinitate* 30.1. All citations of Novatian are taken from *Novatiani Opera*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, ed. G. F. Diercks, vol. 4 (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1972).

identity of the Holy Spirit as an object of the Christian faith. The only controversy of his time that involved the Holy Spirit was with the Montanists and appears to have centered upon the nature of prophecy.⁶ Novatian addressed the nature of prophecy and provided an implicit critique of Montanism, but he did not engage in any overt polemic against the Montanists.⁷ Instead of polemics, Novatian was concerned with demonstrating the identity of the Holy Spirit as an object of the Christian Faith along with the Father and Son.⁸ He did this in three ways. First, he explained how the Holy Spirit is the same despite having worked in different ways at different times.⁹ Second, he noted the Holy Spirit's connection to Christ.¹⁰ Third, he detailed how the Spirit works in the church on behalf of Christ.¹¹ With all of these points, Novatian relied heavily upon Scripture to determine the content and vocabulary for his discussion of the Holy Spirit. Novatian's demonstration of the Holy Spirit's identity, however, did not involve any direct comments about the ontology of the Holy Spirit. Rather, he indirectly affirmed the divinity of the Holy Spirit, while also subordinating the Holy Spirit to the Son.¹²

⁶Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* 8.12; Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* 1.5.

⁷Hippolytus argued that the Montanists were in error because they relied upon their prophet Montanus and prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla more than Scripture and also created new fasts and feasts (*Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* 8.12).

⁸Novatian began his discussion of the Holy Spirit by writing in *De Trinitate* 29.1, *ordo rationis et fidei auctoritas digestis vocabus et literis Domini admonet nos post haec credere etiam in Spiritum Sanctum* ("the order of reason and the authority of faith set forth in the sayings and words of God urge us, after believing these previous things, also to believe in the Holy Spirit.") The remainder of his discussion of the Holy Spirit follows from this point that the faith and Scripture require belief in the Holy Spirit.

⁹*De Trinitate* 29.4, *Differentia sane in illo genera officiorum, quoniam in temporibus differens ratio causarum, nec ex hoc tamen ipse diuersus, qui haec sic gerit, nec alter est, dum sic agit, unus atque ipse est, diuidens officia sua per tempora et rerum occasiones atque momenta* ("Truly there are different kinds of offices in him, because in different times different occasions require different methods, yet he is not different because of these things, nor is he someone else while he does these things, but he is one and the same who divides his offices through seasons, occasions, and moments of human events.")

¹⁰See *De Trinitate* 29.7–15 for how Novatian connected the Holy Spirit to Christ.

¹¹*De Trinitate* 29.8-30. See chap. 4 of this present work for a full discussion of this topic.

¹²Key to this conclusion about the Spirit's being divine is Novatian's use of the phrase "Spiritus Sancti divina aeternitate" (the divine eternity of the Holy Spirit). Since Novatian had spoken of how only God could be eternal (*De Trinitate* 2.2–3), this phrase requires the conclusion that Novatian considered the Holy Spirit to be divine. For a full treatment of this topic, see chap. 5 of this work.

Novatian stated this in *De Trinitate* 16.3, "maior ergo iam paraclito Christus est, quoniam

Furthermore, Novatian did not define how he understood the Spirit's subordination to the Son in any of his extant works.

Scope of This Study

This dissertation primarily focuses upon Novatian's own pneumatological emphases in *De Trinitate*. It also engages the scholarship concerning Novatian's pneumatology and addresses the issues surrounding his pneumatology. *De Trinitate* is central to this dissertation because this work contains the vast majority of Novatian's statements concerning the Holy Spirit. Novatian's material in his other works concerning the Holy Spirit primarily serve to support the positions he presented in *De Trinitate*. Chapters 2 and 3 of this work provide historical and theological background from which to understand Novatian's pneumatology. Chapter 2 outlines the life and times of Novatian so that when encountering his pneumatology, his own experiences and emphases can be reflected upon. Chapter 3 of this work provides an outline of the pneumatological tradition(s) that Novatian had received by examining seven figures who influenced Novatian's pneumatology. Chapter 4 outlines Novatian's understanding of the Holy Spirit as an object of the Christian faith, and demonstrates how central Scripture was to Novatian's pneumatology. Chapter 5 argues that Novatian implicitly affirmed the Holy Spirit to be divine and subordinated to the Son. Chapter 6 provides a comparison of Novatian's pneumatology with his predecessors, offers some glimpse at how his pneumatology was received after his death, and concludes this thesis.

Third-century Pneumatology

Novatian's pneumatology was not produced apart from the influences of his own temporal and geographical context. Around the beginning of the third century, there

nec paracletus a Christo acciperet, nisi minor Christo esset" (therefore now Christ is greater than the Advocate. Because the Advocate would not receive from Christ, unless he was less than Christ).

was a significant shift in Christian pneumatology. Novatian's pneumatology was clearly shaped by this shift in thought. Michel René Barnes suggested that there were three fundamental turning points in early Christian pneumatology.¹³ The first point was the adoption of Jewish pneumatologies by early Christians. The second was the abandonment of these pneumatologies around the turn of the third century in favor of understanding the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in an ontological hierarchy. The third point is when the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were understood in light of divine unity, sharing in the same powers and activities.¹⁴ Barnes' second turning point is the most relevant for understanding the state of Christian pneumatology in the third century. Prior to the third-century, patristic pneumatology continued to utilize various forms of the Jewish pneumatologies.¹⁵ This change in pneumatology took place as part of the reaction to Monarchianism. Monarchianism emphasized the unity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in a manner in which there was no way to distinguish between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Illustrative of this issue was Tertullian's complaint that a certain Praxeas had "crucified the Father."¹⁶ According to Barnes, the response to Monarchianism by Tertullian and Origen¹⁷ led to the conclusion that the order of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit was understood as an ontological order.¹⁸ As a part of this ontological subordination within the Trinity, there is also a shift within the theology of the Holy Spirit. Scriptural passages that were formerly interpreted as referring to the Holy Spirit

¹³Michel René Barnes, "The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology," *Augustinian Studies* 39, no. 2 (2008): 169–86.

¹⁴Michel René Barnes, "Conclusions," *Augustinian Studies* 39, no. 2 (2008): 235.

¹⁵Barnes discussed several of these Jewish pneumatologies in "Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology," 169–80.

¹⁶*Adversus Praxean* 1.5.

¹⁷Papandrea has rightly noted, "While Origen and Novatian were contemporaries, there is no evidence that they ever met, corresponded, or that either one had read the other's works. In fact, Novatian and Origen seem completely ignorant of each other's works" (*Novatian of Rome*, xin17).

¹⁸Barnes, "Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology," 186.

as creator were now interpreted instead to refer to the Son as creator.¹⁹

This shift in Christian pneumatology took place roughly a generation prior to Novatian's writing of *De Trinitate*. Novatian's pneumatology largely follows the outline suggested by Barnes. First, Novatian did not make mention of the Holy Spirit having any role in creation. Second, Novatian's subordination of the Holy Spirit to the Son and the Son's subordination to the Father can be understood ontologically.²⁰ Novatian differed slightly from Barnes' outline in that he did not overtly present a three-fold taxis of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in *De Trinitate*. It is still possible to interpret Novatian's statements about the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as containing an ontological subordination, but Novatian's limited discussion makes it difficult to defend this with certainty. Nevertheless, Novatian followed the pneumatological emphases of the third century more closely than the pneumatological paradigms adopted from Judaism.²¹

¹⁹Barnes, "Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology," 181.

²⁰Daniel Lloyd argued that Novatian understood the subordination of the Son to the Father to be an ontological subordination ("Ontological Subordination in Novatian of Rome's Theology of the Son" [PhD diss., Marquette University, 2012]). James L. Papandrea argued that Novatian's subordination of the Son to the Father ought to be understood as a hierarchy of power and authority not ontology (*Novatian of Rome*, 104).

²¹Perhaps the greatest strength of Barnes' method for viewing early Christian pneumatology is its freedom from imposing anachronistic evaluations upon early Christian pneumatology. There is something of a proclivity to judge the Pre-Nicene writers in light of later theological frameworks such as the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. When viewed in this light, Pre-Nicene writers are often judged based upon how well their terminology and concepts comport with a later standard of orthodox belief. An example of this can be seen in Russell DeSimone's assessment of Novatian's pneumatology: "Novatian is of his time, since he makes the Son and the Holy Spirit subordinate to the Father as did his predecessors, Hippolytus and Tertullian . . . would that Novatian had been more completely of his time! For he would have found, especially in Tertullian, the Holy Spirit clearly defined as *tertiam personam*, the concept of substantial unity, and the term *trinitas* We have here a certain retrogression" (Russell J. DeSimone, "The Holy Spirit according to Novatian *De Trinitate*," *Augustinianum* 10 [1970]: 158). DeSimone's conclusion of Novatian's retrogression has no firm basis apart from the later acceptance of Tertullian's terms as being preferred terms to express Christian orthodoxy. At the time of Novatian, there is no hint that Tertullian's terms had been understood or accepted as the preferred terms to speak about the Trinity in an orthodox manner. This means of assessing Novatian's pneumatology is ultimately unhelpful because it imposes anachronistic criteria. It does not improve one's knowledge of Novatian as a theologian in his own time with his own categories.

Papandrea noted something similar to this. Speaking about the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, Papandrea wrote, "While it may seem anachronistic to ask whether Novatian anticipated the decisions of these later councils, it is clear the conclusions of later orthodoxy were built upon the foundations of orthodoxy of the second and third centuries" (*Novatian of Rome*, 110). Papandrea avoided judging Novatian by a later criteria of orthodoxy while still acknowledging Novatian's influence upon what would be considered orthodoxy at a later date.

Novatian's pneumatology contains several unique features that stand apart from the pneumatology of his near contemporaries. Foremost among these is that Novatian devoted an entire chapter of a major work to discussing the Holy Spirit. This is a unique contribution in his day, and even more unique in that it lacks overt polemical purposes or discussions of the ontology of the Holy Spirit. Novatian's pneumatology provides a glimpse into early Christian pneumatology from an author who did not use the term "God" to refer to the Holy Spirit. Unlike Tertullian²² and Hippolytus,²³ Novatian did not attempt an explanation of how the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are a unity of three. Nevertheless, Novatian's emphasis on the activity of the Holy Spirit reveals the importance that was placed upon the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit within both individual believers and the church as a whole in the third century.

Overview of Scholarship

Novatian's predominant focus on the Holy Spirit as an object of the Christian faith has not been central to most of the scholarly works regarding Novatian's pneumatology. Furthermore, the majority of scholarship concerning Novatian's pneumatology has not highlighted Novatian's own emphases about the Holy Spirit. The emphasis instead has been upon Novatian's ontology of the Holy Spirit.²⁴ Despite this latter emphasis, the only consensus that has been reached is that Novatian subordinated the Holy Spirit to the Son.²⁵ Novatian's subordination of the Spirit to the Son has been interpreted in several different ways.²⁶ This is partly due to the fact that Novatian did not

²²*Adversus Praxean* 2.3–4.

²³*Contra Noetum* 14.2.

²⁴James L. Papandrea avoided this error through his interpretation of Novatian's scriptural quotations in *De Trinitate*. Because of his focus upon Novatian's use of Scripture, he was able to address Novatian's pneumatological emphases (*The Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*).

²⁵Daniel Lloyd noted this very thing in his dissertation ("Ontological Subordination," 9).

²⁶James L. Papandrea argued that Novatian's subordinationism ought to be understood as a hierarchy of power and authority not ontology (*Novatian of Rome*, 104). Simonetti understood this as an

offer much detail as to how he understood this subordination.²⁷

There are a variety of opinions about how Novatian understood the ontology of the Holy Spirit.²⁸ Several have argued that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be ontologically equal with the Father and the Son. They have generally argued that the activities Novatian ascribed to the Holy Spirit required the Holy Spirit to be divine.²⁹ Others have argued that Novatian provided no clear support for viewing the Holy Spirit as divine. This argument relies upon the fact that Novatian never used the term “God” in reference to the Holy Spirit and he did not mention the Holy Spirit in his discussion of how the Father and the Son are two “persons” and one God in *De Trinitate* 30.³⁰ The

ontological subordination because Novatian considered the Holy Spirit to be a created being (Manlio Simonetti, “Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano,” in *Studi in onore di Angelo Monteverdi* [Modena: Società Tipografica Editrice Modenese, 1959], 2: 771–83). Adhemar D’Alès understood this subordination to be according to function and not ontology (*Novatien: Étude sur la Théologie Romaine au milieu du III^e Siècle* [Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1924], 118). Russell J. DeSimone followed D’Alès’ conclusion about the subordination of the Spirit to the Son (“The Holy Spirit according to Novatian *De Trinitate*,” *Augustinianum* 10 [1970]: 138–65).

²⁷Several scholars have sought to answer this question by understanding the subordination of the Spirit to the Son to be the same as the subordination of the Son to the Father. This led them to the conclusion that the Holy Spirit is ontologically equal with the Father (D’Alès, *Novatien*, 118; DeSimone, “Holy Spirit,” 152; and Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 109–10). It is quite possible that Novatian understood the Son to be ontologically subordinated to the Father as Lloyd argued in his dissertation “Ontological Subordination.” If Lloyd is correct, then this would mean that Novatian considered the Holy Spirit to be ontologically subordinated to the Son. The difficulty with this argument is that it is premised upon the assumption that Novatian would have understood the relation of the Spirit to the Son as being the same as the relationship of the Son to the Father. This is probable, but not provable because Novatian did not discuss how the Holy Spirit relates to the Father and the Son in the sections of *De Trinitate* devoted to explaining how the Father and Son are both God and yet there is only one God.

²⁸See chap. 5 of this work for a full discussion of Novatian’s pneumatology and how it has been understood in scholarly works.

²⁹Adolf von Harnack incorrectly stated, “Novatian adopted Tertullian’s formulæ ‘one substance, three persons’ (*una substantia, tres personae*)” (Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. Neil Buchman [London: Williams & Norgate, 1896], 2: 315). This, of course, led him to conclude that Novatian had a rather high view of the being of the Holy Spirit apart from looking at the activities of the Holy Spirit. W. York Fausset argued that the description of the Spirit’s work in the church and in the soul of the Christian demonstrates Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be divine (*Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri De Trinitate Liber: Novatian’s Treatise on the Trinity*, Cambridge Patristic Texts, trans. W. York Fausset [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909], xxviii). Swete came to a similar conclusion, stating that while Novatian does not “call the Spirit God, he certainly ascribes to Him offices and properties which no creature can exercise” (Henry B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers* [London: MacMillan and Co., 1912], 109). This same position is affirmed by D’Alès, *Novatien*, 117; DeSimone, “The Holy Spirit,” 142; and Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 109.

³⁰Anthony Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 213–14. Johannes Quasten viewed Novatian’s pneumatological ontology

third major view is that Novatian considered the Holy Spirit to be a creature. This view notes that Novatian did not refer to the Holy Spirit as “God” or as a divine person. Rather, it is observed that Novatian stated, “omnis enim spiritus creatura est” (every spirit is a creature).³¹ Therefore, the Holy Spirit must be a created being.³² None of these views are entirely satisfactory with regard to either methodology or conclusions.

The scholars who held these views have been placed into three broad categories as a means of simplifying the various views about Novatian’s pneumatological ontology. Many of these scholars will have distinct nuances in their arguments, yet their conclusions allow them to be grouped in this manner. Despite the variances in their conclusions, these scholars suffer from the same methodological weakness, in that they largely failed to allow Novatian’s own emphases and terminology to come to the fore and drive the discussion. The focus on Novatian’s pneumatological ontology has resulted in his actual pneumatological statements and methodology being partially obscured. This dissertation avoids this methodological failure by emphasizing Novatian’s own considerations of the Spirit as an object of the Christian faith, along with the Father and the Son.

Novatian was not concerned with recounting the activity of the Holy Spirit simply for the sake of proving the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Rather, he explained why the Holy Spirit was active and what the Holy Spirit was doing. The Holy Spirit was active because Christ left him to care for the church.³³ The activities of the Holy Spirit are a part of how he cares for the church on behalf of Christ. Novatian began his

as brief and undefined (Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 2, *The Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus* [Utrecht, Holland: Spectrum, 1950], 230).

³¹*De Trinitate* 7.4.

³²Simonetti, “Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano,” 2:771–83. See also Stuart G. Hall, *Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church* (London: SPCK, 1991), 83.

³³*De Trinitate* 29.8.

discussion on the Holy Spirit by writing, “ordo rationis et fidei auctoritas digestis vocabus et literis Domini admonet nos post haec credere etiam in Spiritum Sanctum” (the order of reason and the authority of faith set forth in the sayings and words of God urge us, after believing these previous things, also to believe in the Holy Spirit).³⁴ This demonstrates that Novatian’s purpose in recounting the activities of the Holy Spirit is to identify the Holy Spirit as one who is to be believed upon by Christians. Therefore, the activities of the Holy Spirit considered on their own should not be a basis from which to conclude the manner in which Novatian understood the being of the Holy Spirit.

Novatian’s description of the Holy Spirit’s activities can be used to ascertain his ontology of the Holy Spirit when it is viewed in light of his previous arguments for the divinity of the Father and the Son.³⁵ This is evident in two places. First, Novatian affirmed the Son to be divine because he gives eternal life.³⁶ This same reasoning applies to the Holy Spirit because he also gives eternal life.³⁷ Second, as the eternality of the Father is proof of his divinity,³⁸ so also the Holy Spirit is shown to be divine because he possesses “divine eternity.”³⁹ When viewed from this perspective, it is clear that Novatian implicitly affirmed the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, this affirmation of the Spirit’s divinity does not require the conclusion that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be ontologically equal with the Father and the Son. Because Novatian did not directly address the topic of the Holy Spirit’s ontology, little more can be affirmed with certainty beyond that he understood the Holy Spirit to be

³⁴*De Trinitate* 29.1.

³⁵This manner of assessing Novatian’s pneumatology hopefully avoids any tendencies to enter upon anachronistic arguments.

³⁶*De Trinitate* 15.7.

³⁷*De Trinitate* 29.16.

³⁸*De Trinitate* 2.3.

³⁹*De Trinitate* 29.16.

divine and subordinated to the Son in an undefined manner.

CHAPTER 2

THE LIFE OF NOVATIAN OF ROME

Introduction

This chapter places Novatian in his historical context. A biographical sketch of Novatian is presented with emphasis placed upon his leadership in the church. His activity in the schism that bears his name is examined with particular care given to the central issue of the schism, his view of the *lapsi*. Having examined these aspects of Novatian's life and works, the issue of the ecclesiological structure in Rome is then examined in connection to the events in Novatian's life. Finally, this chapter concludes with the issues surrounding Novatian's death.

The details of Novatian's life have predominantly come from the hands of his ecclesiastical opponents. Therefore, care must be used in handling these sources that offer the most information about his person and life.¹ Despite the bias in these accounts of Novatian, it is nevertheless possible to provide an outline of Novatian's life and leadership. The central act for which Novatian is remembered in church history is his schism. This act of schism was rooted in his pastoral concerns and his ecclesiology, which was controlled by his view of the purity of the church. These key aspects of Novatian's thinking formed a significant and visible reason for his other actions, especially his going into schism.

¹Russell J. DeSimone, *Novatian the Presbyter*, The Fathers of the Church 67 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University Press, 1974), 3. The bulk of what is recorded about Novatian comes from Cyprian's letters and from the writings of Dionysius of Alexandria and Cornelius of Rome as preserved by Eusebius of Caesarea.

Biography of Novatian of Rome

Novatian was born around the turn of the third century.² Photius (810–895) recorded the claim of Philostorgius (368–439) that Novatian was of Phrygian descent,³ but Philostorgius adduced no evidence to support this claim.⁴ Despite this assertion by Philostorgius, Novatian was likely of Italian or Roman origin. There are two reasons for this assertion about Novatian’s place of birth. He is consistently referred to as Novatian of Rome and not Novatian the Phrygian. Then, despite the Novatianist presence in Phrygia,⁵ the geographical and ecclesial affairs of Novatian were all centered in Rome. His style of Latin appears to be far more Roman/Italian than Phrygian.⁶ Therefore, it can be reasonably concluded that Novatian was either from Rome or a locale near Rome.

Novatian the Churchman

It is not known whether or not Novatian was born into a Christian family.⁷ If he was born to Christian parents, his baptism was delayed until he was an adult.⁸ Likewise, little is known with certainty about Novatian before he was a presbyter at the

²DeSimone, *Novatian the Presbyter*, 2.

³Philostorgius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 8.15.

⁴Despite this lack of support, Augustus Neander makes a great deal out of this statement and by combining it with the description of the Phrygians made by Socrates Scholasticus paints a very colorful picture of the character of Novatian the Phrygian moralist. See Augustus Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, trans. Joseph Torrey (London: Crocker and Brewster, 1859), 239.

⁵Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.28.

⁶G. F. Diercks, *Novatiani Opera*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 4 (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1972), viii.

⁷James L. Papandrea speculates that Novatian was not born to Christian parents on the basis of his late baptism (*The Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome: A Study in Third-Century Orthodoxy* [New York: Edwin Mellen, 2009], 6).

⁸Russell J. DeSimone rightly noted that Novatian might well have delayed baptism as it was a common practice at the time so that one could avoid post-baptismal sin (“The Treatise of Novatian the Roman Presbyter on the Trinity: A Study of the Text and the Doctrine,” *Studia Ephemeridis Augustianum* 4 [1970]: 23). Papandrea noted that Novatian could have delayed “his baptism as many upwardly mobile men if the empire did” (Novatian, *On the Trinity, Letters to Cyprian of Carthage, Ethical Treatises*, Corpus Christianorum in Translation 22, ed. and trans. James Papandrea [Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2015], 10). Papandrea also noted the possibility that Novatian was already a catechumen “planning to be baptized at the end of his catechumenate, when a serious illness led the clergy to believe that it was better to baptize him” (*On the Trinity, Letters to Cyprian of Carthage, Ethical Treatises*, 10n6).

Church of Rome. Drobner notes that Novatian appears to have been well-educated and a natural leader from his youth.⁹ This is a rather speculative claim. It is difficult to know what type of leader Novatian was in his youth since nothing is known about his youth. Yet, he clearly was an educated man. Cyprian (d. 258) hints that Novatian had been a Stoic philosopher before entering the church.¹⁰ It is difficult to discern if Cyprian said this because Novatian was a philosopher,¹¹ a teacher of rhetoric,¹² or simply because Cyprian wanted to connect Novatian to philosophy. This last option most clearly fits the context of Cyprian's work. Cyprian's point in this assertion was that Novatian was leading people astray through empty philosophy. Had Novatian been a philosopher prior to his conversion, then it is probable this would have been made into a larger point by his opponents, instead of being a veiled assertion based upon the result of Novatian leading people astray. The elements of stoicism¹³ in Novatian's writings hardly constitute a Stoic philosopher, as they could simply be the product of an education in Rome in the early third century.¹⁴ What is clear is that Novatian was an educated man when he entered the church, and as such, he would have been a promising candidate for leadership in the

⁹Hubertus Drobner, *The Fathers of the Church*. trans. Siegfried S. Schatzman (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007), 180.

¹⁰Cyprian, *Epistula* 51.16–24. Indeed, Cyprian asserted Novatian was leading people astray through empty philosophy.

¹¹Pacian of Barcelona, *Epistula* 2.14. Pacian says that Novatian was a philosopher of the world. However, such a statement must be viewed in light of the argument Pacian makes in this epistle regarding Novatian deceiving people through philosophy and himself being a philosopher of the world did not follow the philosophy of Christ.

¹²James L. Papendrea, *Novatian of Rome and the Culmination of Pre-Nicene Orthodoxy* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011), 56.

¹³W. Yorke Fausset lists Novatian's use of syllogisms and his cosmology as coming from Stoic thought (*Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri De Trinitate Liber: Novatian's Treatise on the Trinity*, Cambridge Patristic Texts [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909], xiv). Cyprian accused Novatian of practicing Stoic philosophy by refusing to allow for *lapsi* to be restored to the church (*Epistula* 51.16). Jean Daniélou noted Novatian's dependence upon stoic terminology and frameworks for his cosmology and anthropology in "Novatian and the Cosmic Religion," *The Origins of Latin Christianity*, trans. David Smith and John Austin Baker (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1977), 233–50.

¹⁴Hans Weyer, *Novatianus: "De Trinitate" Über den dreifaltigen Gott*, Testimonia 2 (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1962), 6.

church.

The account of Novatian's baptism has come down to us from Cornelius of Rome (d. 253) through Eusebius of Caesarea (260–340). According to Cornelius, Novatian was being treated by exorcists in the church, when he fell gravely ill and was baptized by aspersion on his sick bed.¹⁵ After baptism, Cornelius asserted that Novatian was not sealed by the bishop, and therefore never received the Holy Spirit.¹⁶ Cornelius mentioned the details of Novatian's baptism to cast doubt upon the conversion of Novatian. Novatian was a man who could barely have considered to have been baptized and was without the Holy Spirit. Therefore, if these assertions were true, Novatian would have been unfit for any leadership in the church. There is good evidence that the claim of Novatian's clinical baptism is true. Because of this clinical baptism it is most probable that Novatian did not have the bishop lay hands on him at his baptism. However, Cornelius undercut his own point when he mentioned the bishop did lay hands on Novatian when he raised him to the presbytery.¹⁷ Following Cornelius' logic, it is quite possible that Novatian could have received the Holy Spirit from the hands of the bishop at his ordination to the presbytery. Therefore, furthering this argument, Novatian should be viewed as lacking the Holy Spirit because the bishop did lay hands on him even though it was temporally separated from his clinical baptism.

The name of Fabian (d. 250), then bishop of Rome, is left out of Cornelius' account. However, it was Fabian who raised Novatian to the presbytery.¹⁸ If Cornelius is to be believed, Fabian raised Novatian to the presbytery despite the resistance of all the

¹⁵Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43.

¹⁶Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43.

¹⁷Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43.

¹⁸Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 56.

clergy and laity.¹⁹ Furthermore, Fabian was only allowed to ordain Novatian by asking for an exception.²⁰ While it is possible and even likely that some would have resisted the idea that Novatian be ordained a presbyter because of the nature of his baptism, it seems highly unlikely that all the clergy and all the laity would have been opposed to this.²¹ Further, if all the clergy and laity were opposed to Novatian being ordained then it would appear that Fabian was quite certain that Novatian should be ordained even if it was against the will of the clergy and the laity. It is far more likely that Novatian's ordination was made at the hands of bishop Fabian with far less opposition than Cornelius would have one believe. Indeed, a man as educated and gifted as Novatian in the presbytery could have been reason enough to overlook the irregularity of his baptism when ordaining him. If there had been widespread resistance to Novatian being ordained, it must have dissipated prior to the Decian persecution in 251. By the time of the Decian persecution, Novatian was a prominent leader in the church at Rome.

Novatian as an Author

If not for his act of schism, Novatian would have been remembered in church history as an author. He was the first Christian in Rome to compose theological works in Latin. His works were deemed significant enough that they were passed off as and preserved with the writings of Cyprian and Tertullian.²² Over one hundred years after the death of Novatian, Jerome (347-420) listed his literary works: “*On the Passover, On the*

¹⁹Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43.

²⁰ Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43.

²¹Papandrea and Dierks likewise agree that Cornelius' account of Novatian's ordination is not to be fully trusted: Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 7, and Diercks *Novatiani Opera*, viii.

²²Edgar Goodspeed aptly remarked about the works of Novatian, “It would seem that the ancients found so much value in them that they could not resist copying them but could not resist to credit them to the notorious Roman schismatic” (*A History of Early Christian Literature* [Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1966], 180).

Sabbath, On Circumcision, On the Priesthood, On Prayer, On Jewish Foods, On Zeal, On Attalus, many other works, a large tome *De Trinitate*,²³ and a large corpus of letters.²⁴ For a schismatic, his works appear to have been fairly well dispersed and preserved at the time of Jerome. Sadly, only a few of his works have been preserved until the present. Of Novatian's works Jerome listed by name, only *De Trinitate* and *De Cibis Iudaicis* remain. In addition to these, two other works *De Spectaculis* and *De Bono Pudicitiae*²⁵ have been preserved as well along with three letters Novatian wrote to Cyprian.²⁶

Between his baptism and the Decian persecution, Novatian wrote his longest work, namely *De Trinitate*.²⁷ This work is an explanation of the Rule of Truth and may have originally been titled *De Regula Veritatis*.²⁸ *De Trinitate* can be roughly divided into four parts. The first three parts follow the Rule of Truth with an examination of the Father (chaps. 1–8), then the Son (chaps. 9–28), and then the Holy Spirit (chap. 29). The fourth part offers an explanation of how the Father and the Son are one God (chaps. 30–31). The writing style demonstrates Novatian composed this for the laity and possibly for use in catechesis.²⁹ While Novatian's writing style was aimed more at the common reader, *De Trinitate* “proves Novatian to have been a diligent student, at its arguments are

²³Jerome, *Liber De Viris Illustribus* 70.

²⁴Jerome, *Epistula* 10.3.

²⁵It is possible that Jerome may have considered *De Spectaculis* and *De Bono Pudicitiae* to number among the letters of Novatian (Adolf von Harnack, “Novatian, Novatianism,” in *The New Schaff Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1952], 8: 198).

²⁶These three letters are *Epistula* 30, 31, and 36. (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 4: 199–250).

²⁷Papandrea listed some internal support for the composition of *De Trinitate* prior to the persecution of Emperor Decius (*Novatian of Rome*, 57n34). For further support of this view, see DeSimone, *Novatian the Presbyter*, 14.

²⁸Papandrea. *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 44. Novatian nowhere uses the term *Trinitas* in *De Trinitate*, and begins the work by saying he set forth to explain the Rule of Truth.

²⁹Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 57.

identical with those of Justin Martyr in his *Dialogus cum Trypho*. c. cxxvii.; Tertullian *Adversus Praxeam*. cc. xic.-xxv.; Clement of Alexandria. *Strom.* ii. 16, v. ii, 12.”³⁰ His diligence resulted in a work that was, according to Harnack: “In regards to completeness, extent of Biblical proofs, and perhaps influence on succeeding times, it may in many respects be compared with Origen’s *First Principles*.”³¹

The three letters Novatian composed to Cyprian were written during the Decian persecution. These three letters are all directed to the issue of the *lapsi* and how they ought to be treated. The works *De Spectaculis*, *De Cibis Iudaicis* and *De Bono Pudicitiae* were composed by Novatian during a period in which he was separated from his congregation, possibly while in some form of exile. Of these, *De Bono Pudicitiae* was written after the schism because, within this work, Novatian spoke of himself as a bishop.³² While *De Spectaculis* and *De Cibis Iudaicis* contain no such mention of Novatian being a bishop, it is possible they were also composed at the same time as *De Bono Pudicitiae*. *De Spectaculis* is a treatise against participation in and attendance of the games and theatres as they teach things which are antithetical to the Christian life.³³ In *De Cibis Iudaicis*, Novatian provided a thoroughgoing explanation of the clean and unclean foods in Leviticus 11 (which are also repeated in Deuteronomy 14). Novatian’s explanation of these laws used an allegorical method to view each animal as a vice or virtue that ought to be avoided or embraced. *De Bono Pudicitiae* follows its title as Novatian extolled three forms of purity: virginity, continence, and marital faithfulness.

³⁰George Stokes, “Novatian and Novatianism,” in *A Dictionary of Early Christian Biography and Literature to the End of the Sixth Century A.D.: With an Account of the Principal Sects and Heresies*, ed. Henry Wace and William Piercy (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999), 763.

³¹Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. N. Buchanan, (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1897), 2: 313.

³²*De Bono Pudicitiae* 1.2.

³³It is very likely that Novatian was influenced by Tertullian, who had written a larger work with the same title.

Novatian as a Pastor

Through his writings, we obtain glimpses of the character and gifting of Novatian. Novatian demonstrated great concern for his congregation's spiritual and moral state in his works *De Spectaculis*, *De Cibis Iudaicis* and *De Bono Pudicitiae*. Novatian noted how he preached daily from the Gospels³⁴ and when absent sought to make himself present to his congregation through his writing.³⁵ Novatian understood himself to owe a debt of love to his flock.³⁶ He exhorted his readers to avoid the public games held in the Roman circus and non-virtuous traits and instead to attain the virtuous life,³⁷ to hold fast to Christ,³⁸ to occupy themselves with the Scriptures,³⁹ and to view their own salvation in the victory of Christ.⁴⁰ This glimpse of his pastoral concern is matched, even amplified, in the anonymous work *Ad Novatianum*. In this work, Novatian is described as bewailing the sins of his neighbors as though they were his own, bearing the burdens of the brethren, and strengthening the faltering with heavenly counsel.⁴¹ This statement should not be understood as sarcasm on the part of the anonymous author, because the main point is that despite the concern that Novatian showed for others, he had neglected himself. Novatian comes across as a pastor deeply concerned for the spiritual health of those under his watch. Cornelius sarcastically spoke

³⁴*De Bono Pudicitiae* 1.1.

³⁵*De Cibis Iudaicis* 1.2.

³⁶*De Cibis Iudaicis* 1.1.

³⁷In *De Cibis Iudaicis*, Novatian interprets the clean and unclean creatures as speaking of virtuous and non-virtuous traits. With this framework, the Law understood to encourage one to acquire the virtuous traits.

³⁸*De Cibis Iudaicis* 1.4–1.5; *De Bono Pudicitiae* 2.1.

³⁹*De Spectaculis* 10.1; *De Bono Pudicitiae* 14.4.

⁴⁰*De Spectaculis* 10.3.

⁴¹*Ad Novatianum* 13.8.

of Novatian as the dogmatist and champion of church discipline.⁴² The sarcasm of course flows from the fact that if Novatian really was a dogmatist and champion of church discipline, he would never have departed from the church. Despite this sarcastic bite, there is some truth to be found in the description. Novatian made known his concern for ecclesial discipline in *De Spectaculis*, where he spoke of how vice is always seeking to weaken ecclesiastical discipline.⁴³ As for his being a dogmatic theologian, Novatian's work *De Trinitate* should secure that title for him. To sum up: from the pens of Novatian and his opponents, we have a picture of a man deeply involved with pastoral care through discipline and teaching, showing great concern for the moral state of his flock.

The literary output⁴⁴ and pastoral service must have played no small influence in the rise of Novatian within the church at Rome. In fact, after the martyrdom of bishop Fabian in 250, the church at Rome looked to Novatian as the interim leader.⁴⁵ Novatian recorded that the circumstances of the times prevented them from electing another bishop.⁴⁶ Instead of a new bishop, Novatian acted as a provisional leader until the persecution had ended and a new bishop elected. Novatian's leadership during this time is most evident in the letters he wrote on behalf of the church in Rome to other churches and their bishops.⁴⁷ This activity in leading the church at Rome stands in marked contrast to the account of Cornelius that Novatian "denied he was a presbyter through cowardice and the love of life," refusing to leave his hiding place and aid his fellow Christians in

⁴²Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43.

⁴³*De Spectaculis* 1.3.

⁴⁴Papandrea views Novatian's ability as a writer as being a likely reason for him to have this position (*Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 23).

⁴⁵Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 23.

⁴⁶*Epistula*, 30.5.2. See also *Epistula*, 30.8, where Novatian speaks about those seeking restoration to the church waiting until God should give them a bishop in Rome.

⁴⁷Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 12. Novatian's action in this role is particularly evident in his correspondence with Cyprian when Novatian wrote on behalf of the church in Rome.

distress, and did not want to be a presbyter because he followed a different philosophy.⁴⁸ While it is probable that Novatian did have a hiding place, the other assertions Cornelius made about Novatian's disposition during the persecution hardly seem to fit the character of the man who was the chief correspondent on behalf of the church at Rome to other churches and bishops. It would be far more helpful to understand Novatian as a gifted and concerned presbyter who rose to act as a temporary leader of a Roman church now without a bishop during a time of intense persecution.

Leader of Schism

The schism of Novatian is firmly rooted in Novatian's pastoral concerns and the leading pastoral issue of his day, the *lapsi*. During the persecution of the emperor Decius (d. June 251), not an insignificant numbers of Christians found ways to comply with the edict to offer sacrifice to the emperor. Such an act was understood to place them outside of the church. The issue arose when some of those who had offered the sacrifice sought to be readmitted into the church even while the persecution was still ongoing. These individuals who had been part of the church prior to offering the sacrifice to the emperor were collectively referred to as the *lapsi*, that is, those who had apostatized. The *lapsi* posed an immense problem for the church leadership. It was this issue that led to Novatian's schism.

With the rather sudden death of the emperor Decius, his persecution of Christians came to an abrupt halt. Despite Novatian's leadership after the martyrdom of bishop Fabian, Novatian was not elected the next bishop of Rome. Instead of Novatian, Cornelius was chosen as bishop of Rome.⁴⁹ While it is possible that there were other unknown factors that played significant roles in the election of Cornelius as the bishop of

⁴⁸Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43.

⁴⁹DeSimone, *Novatian the Presbyter*, 4.

Rome instead of Novatian, the issue that appears to have driven the election was the issue of the *lapsi*.

Novatian laid out his understanding of how the *lapsi* ought to be restored in his three letters to Cyprian (letters 30, 31, and 36 in the letters of Cyprian). In these letters to Cyprian, Novatian mentioned his prayer for the *lapsi* that they be restored.⁵⁰ He presented a view that the *lapsi* should knock at the door of the church,⁵¹ and that restoration to the church is possible for the truly penitent.⁵² Further, he held that the dying penitent, who had demonstrated true repentance, could be restored before a new bishop was chosen.⁵³ All other penitents should wait until the next bishop could determine their case.⁵⁴ This waiting was for the benefit of the penitent *lapsi*, as the delay gives their spiritual wound time to prepare for healing.⁵⁵ From this, it is quite clear that when Novatian wrote these letters to Cyprian he was not completely opposed to the idea of the *lapsi* being restored.⁵⁶

In his correspondence with Cyprian, Novatian presented himself and the church at Rome to be steering a middle course in their dealing with the *lapsi*.⁵⁷ This is important, because it demonstrates Novatian was aware of at least two other positions

⁵⁰*Epistula* 30.6.2.

⁵¹*Epistula* 30.6.3.

⁵²*Epistula* 30.8; *Epistula* 31.6.3–4; *Epistula* 36.3.3.

⁵³*Epistula* 30.8.

⁵⁴*Epistula* 30.8.

⁵⁵*Epistula* 31.7.2; *Epistula* 36.3.1.

⁵⁶Novatian laid out an understanding of how the *lapsi* ought to be restored in his letters to Cyprian. For Novatian, restoration must take place within a framework of strictness and discipline (*Epistula* 30.7.2; 36.1.2; 36.2.3). Indeed, Novatian said God strictly demands obedience and has prepared both eternal refreshment and eternal torment (*Epistula* 30.7.2). This strictness and discipline lay at the heart of Novatian's conception of Christianity. C. B. Daly rightly notes how Novatian used the terms "gospel" and "evangelical" as terms of strictness ("Novatian and Tertullian: A Chapter in the History of Puritanism," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 19 [1952]: 36). Novatian spoke of "evangelical discipline" (*Epistula* 30.1.1; 30.1.2; 30.4; 36.1.1) and spoke of the Gospel in terms of rules and precepts (*Epistula* 31.4; 36.1.2; 36.2.1). Therefore, any act of restoration apart from strictness with discipline and rules would not be a restoration, but a further condemnation of the *lapsi*.

⁵⁷*Epistula* 30.8

which he sought to avoid: namely, easy or instant reconciliation and no restoration at all. This again demonstrates Novatian was not initially of the group that held no hope of restoration for the *lapsi*.⁵⁸ Importantly, there is no record of Novatian writing against those who held there was no restoration for the *lapsi*. However, he was contemptuous of those *lapsi* who demanded their restoration and claimed forgiveness.⁵⁹ Therefore, it is clear that Novatian was not always of the rigorist position that refused reconciliation to the *lapsi*. Nevertheless, he clearly leaned towards the rigorist position prior to his schism by emphasizing the need for strictness and for time before re-admittance to the church.⁶⁰

Novatian's exact position on the *lapsi* underwent some definite shifts between his letters to Cyprian and the election of Cornelius. Within just a couple of years, Novatian went from allowing restoration in his letters to Cyprian, to barring all *lapsi* from being restored to the church.⁶¹ It is not possible to speak with certainty as to when Novatian changed his position regarding the restoration of the *lapsi*. Papandrea identifies the shift in Novatian's thinking as evident in his letters to Cyprian.⁶² He notes how Novatian initially presented a view that allows for the repentant *lapsi* to be restored in a strict and orderly manner. Yet, by the time Novatian penned his third letter to Cyprian,

⁵⁸Papandrea understands Novatian's statement about pursuing the middle course in his third epistle to be lip service paid to a view that Novatian was distancing himself from (*Novatian of Rome*, 65).

⁵⁹*Epistula* 36.1.2–3.

⁶⁰It is important to consider that Novatian's position on the *lapsi* in these letters may not have been Novatian's opinion alone. Novatian was writing these letters on behalf of the church at Rome and may have represented something of a consensus view formed by personality of Novatian. However, it appears more likely that Novatian changed his position regarding the *lapsi*.

⁶¹Papandrea offers a timeline of events in which he sees Novatian altering his view on the *lapsi* in these three epistles. He sees Novatian taking a progressively more rigorist stance regarding the *lapsi* in each letter (*Novatian of Rome*, 64–65). While Novatian can be seen to take a harder line against the *lapsi*, this hardness could well be explained by his reaction against those of the *lapsi* who claimed that they had been forgiven and restored to the church. This increasing strictness regarding the restoration of the *lapsi* could also be the result of how the restoration of the *lapsi* was being practiced in Rome during this time.

⁶²Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 64–65.

his view on the *lapsi* had taken on harsher tones than in his first two letters.⁶³ Papandrea has rightly noted the shift in Novatian's tone regarding the *lapsi*. Whether or not Novatian was merely giving lip-service to the idea of restoration cannot be known with any certainty.⁶⁴ This assertion requires that Novatian had already arrived at the position that the *lapsi* should not or could not be restored, yet continued to write to Cyprian about the means by which they could be restored. This is not an impossibility. However, it is more likely that Novatian was still moving towards his rigorist conclusion during his correspondence with Cyprian. What is clear is that Novatian moved from allowing the restoration within certain boundaries to disallowing their restoration and that his tone became progressively harsher towards their restoration in his correspondence with Cyprian.

The *Lapsi* and Novatian's Ecclesiology

Regrettably, Novatian's own arguments for the schism are not extant. Likewise, his final position concerning the *lapsi* is only to be found in the writings of his opponents. However, the material from Novatian prior to his arrival at complete exclusion of the *lapsi* offers a good overview of his thought in this regard. Moreover, from Novatian's own writings it is possible to provide some general sketches of Novatian's ecclesiology. Novatian's understanding of the *lapsi* and his ecclesiology are interconnected. Furthermore, his understanding of the church can be seen to direct his later approach towards the *lapsi*.

Novatian did not write anything directly concerning the nature of the church that is still extant.⁶⁵ Yet, Novatian did write about the church in chapter 29 of *De*

⁶³Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 64.

⁶⁴Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 65.

⁶⁵Novatian makes mention of the church in his letters to Cyprian, but in these letters Novatian makes no claims about the church except for her purity.

Trinitate where he discussed the Holy Spirit.⁶⁶ As such, his discussion of the church is secondary to his understanding of the work of the Spirit. Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to make the church of Christ perfect and complete through giving gifts and placing leaders in the church.⁶⁷ The Spirit, likewise, maintains the church “uncorrupted and inviolable in the holiness of perpetual virginity and truth.”⁶⁸ Novatian also stated that in this Spirit, “no one ever says Jesus is accursed, no one has denied the Christ is the Son of God.”⁶⁹

From these few statements in *De Trinitate*, it is clear that Novatian understood the true church to be inviolable in holiness and guided and gifted by the Spirit to be perfect. His citation of 1 Corinthians 12:3 is important to examine in light of his concern with the *lapsi*.

In hoc spiritu positus nemo umquam dicit anathema Iesum, nemo negavit Christum Dei Filium aut repudavit creatorem Deum, nemo contra scripturas ulla sua verba depromit, nemo alia et sacrilega decreta constituit, nemo diversa iura conscribit. In hunc quisquis blasphemaverit, remissionem non habet, non tantum in isto saeculo, verum etiam nec in future.

Established in this Spirit *no one ever said Jesus is accursed* (1 Cor 12:3), no one has denied Christ is the Son of God or has rejected God is the creator; no one draws out the words of Scripture against Scripture, no one has established different and impious teachings, no one writes different laws. Anyone who *would blaspheme* against Him *does not have forgiveness, not in this age, nor truly in the future* (Matt 12:32).⁷⁰

Novatian’s quote of 1 Corinthians 12:3 begins several statements that define several acts which no one, who has been established in the Spirit, could do. Further, his quotation of

⁶⁶A full treatment of Novatian’s pneumatology is given in chaps. 4 and 5 of this work.

⁶⁷*De Trinitate* 29.9–10.

⁶⁸*De Trinitate* 29.26.

⁶⁹*De Trinitate* 29.24.

⁷⁰*De Trinitate* 29.24–25. Novatian used masculine pronouns when speaking about the Holy Spirit in *De Trinitate* because *spiritus* is a masculine noun in Latin.

Matthew 12:32 provided a clue to understand Novatian's definition of the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit. It is highly probable that Novatian used these quotations of Scripture to present his understanding that the unforgiveable sin is connected to and perhaps defined by anathematizing Jesus. The logic that in the Spirit no one can deny Christ or curse Jesus could easily lead to the conclusion that the *lapsi* were without the Spirit or even had blasphemed the Spirit. When combined with Novatian's concept of the church's perfection and holiness, this conclusion could partly account for his final position that the *lapsi* could never be restored to the church. That the purity of the church was central to Novatian's ecclesiology is also supported by the fact that the Novatianists referred to themselves as "the pure ones."⁷¹ Therefore, it would almost be expected that Novatian could not be part of a body that allowed for the restoration of the *lapsi*, as this would compromise the purity of the church.

The Consecration of Novatian as Bishop

The death of Decius in June 251 did not completely end the persecution of Christians. Although the persecution continued under Decius' successor Gallus, the death of Decius brought enough peace to the church at Rome for them to choose a new bishop. Despite Novatian's leadership during the persecution, Cornelius was chosen as the new bishop. The details of Cornelius' election as the bishop of Rome are now largely lost. What is evident is that there were two parties involved: those in favor of reconciliation for the *lapsi* and those opposed to their restoration. The party in favor of reconciliation appears to have been led by the presbyter and confessor Moses who supported Cornelius.⁷² There is no recorded leader(s) for the party opposed to reconciliation until the election of Novatian as bishop.

⁷¹Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43. Jerome also confirms this title was used in Greek to refer to the Novatianists (*Liber De Viris Illustribus* 70.1).

⁷²C. B. Daly, *Tertullian the Puritan and His Influence* (Dublin: Four Court Press, 1993), 191.

The accounts of Novatian's election as bishop provide enough information to gain a basic outline of what transpired.⁷³ Jerome recorded that Novatian tried to seize the bishopric from Cornelius.⁷⁴ Eusebius likewise records Cornelius as writing that Novatian "attempted to seize and usurp the episcopate not given him from above."⁷⁵ These statements lead to the reasonable conclusion that Novatian was consecrated bishop after the consecration of Cornelius.

The details of Novatian's consecration as bishop have been obscured by his opponents. Eusebius recorded Cornelius' narrative of Novatian's consecration. According to his account, Novatian used two characters of ill-repute to find three simple country bishops and bring them to Rome on a false pretense. After the three bishops were drunk and sick, they were forced to consecrate Novatian as bishop.⁷⁶ The difficulty with Cornelius' account is found in the character of the rigorists. It is highly doubtful that those who would deny reconciliation to the *lapsi* would have accepted as a leader a man who intoxicated fellow-clergy and forced them to consecrate him as bishop. It seems probable that Cornelius gave this account as a means of causing those who might look favorably upon Novatian's position on the *lapsi* to reject Novatian and embrace Cornelius. Pacian of Barcelona (310–390) also offered a detail that casts significant doubt on Cornelius' story. Pacian held that Novatian did not have a legitimate consecration even though Novatian had letters from those who pretended to be confessors.⁷⁷ This small statement from a later opponent demonstrates Novatian was

⁷³These accounts are recorded in: Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43; Jerome, *Liber De Viris Illustribus* 70; Pacian, *Epistula* 2; Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.28; and in the letters of Cyprian.

⁷⁴Jerome, *Liber De Viris Illustribus* 70.1.

⁷⁵Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43.

⁷⁶Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43.

⁷⁷Pacian, *Epistula* 2.14. Eusebius names two confessors, Maximus and Urbanus, as those who had supported Novatian (*Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43). Cyprian records the names of four confessors:

supported by more than “villains.” The support of confessors would have had significantly bolstered Novatian’s claim to be the legitimately-consecrated bishop, as confessors at this time “formed a group that asserted sacramental authority distinct from that of the bishop.”⁷⁸ The tale of Cornelius thus should not be viewed as an accurate telling of Novatian’s consecration as bishop.

The most believable narrative of Novatian’s consecration as bishop is conveyed by Socrates Scholasticus.⁷⁹ He recorded that Novatian separated from the church because Cornelius received the *lapsi* and communed with them. After Novatian left he was made a bishop by other bishops in agreement that the *lapsi* should not be restored.⁸⁰ Novatian proceeded to write to other churches encouraging them not to admit the *lapsi* into the church and leave their forgiveness to God.⁸¹ Cornelius, however, wrote

Maximus the presbyter, Urbanus, Sidonius, and Macharius in *Epistula* 50.1.

⁷⁸Allen Brent, *Cyprian and Roman Carthage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 251.

⁷⁹The reliability of Socrates Scholasticus regarding the Novatianists is important to address. John of Rhodes (eighth or ninth century) recorded that Socrates was of the sect of Novatian (Philostorgius, *Church History*, trans. Philip Amidon [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007], 167). While it is difficult to prove the point of Socrates’ relationship to the Novatianists from this one quote, his writing about the Novatianists is quite revealing. Socrates “was extremely well informed about the followers of Novatian and that he had great sympathy for them—in other words, that he wrote from an insider perspective” (Martin Wallraff, “Socrates Scholasticus on the History of the Novatianists,” in *Papers Presented to the International Conference on Patristic Studies, Studia Patristica*, ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone vol. 29 [Louvain, Belgium: Peeters Publishers, 1997]: 172). Henricus Valesius argued that Socrates viewed the Novatianists as separate from the church based upon the statement in 2.38.25 when speaking of the persecutions of Macedonius upon those who were members of the church as well as the Novatianists (Henricus de Valesius, *Socratis Scholastici et Hermiae Sozomeni Historia Ecclesiastica* [Paris: Christian Gerlach & Simon Beckenstein, 1677], 35). At the same time he said that even if Socrates was not a Novatianist, he considered the Novatians to be part of the homoousians (Valesius, *Socratis Scholastici et Hermiae Sozomeni Historia Ecclesiastica*, 69). Theresa Urbainczyk supports the conclusion that Socrates was not a Novatianist despite critiquing the argument of Valesius. Urbainczyk critiques Valesius’ argument because these statements could be read in light of simply noting who was in power at the time and thus describe the historical situation and not the opinion of Socrates (Theresa Urbainczyk *Socrates of Constantinople: Historian of Church and State* [Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1997], 26). However, Urbainczyk offers a close reading of Socrates record of the dialogue between the bishop Atticus and the Novatianist Asclepiades to reveal in their own words the unforgiving nature of the Novatianists. Yet, Urbainczyk concedes that there is too little evidence for a conclusive judgment (*Socrates of Constantinople*, 27). Therefore, it would be best to view Socrates as sympathetic to the Novatianists and supplied with Novatianist sources, even if he himself was likely not a Novatianist.

⁸⁰Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.28.

⁸¹Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.28.

letters to all the churches asking that they show indulgence to those who had denied Christ during the persecution. These contrary opinions were each supported by Scripture. Thus Socrates concluded that everyone chose the opinions to which they were predisposed.⁸²

Socrates' account lacks quotes from contemporaries of the events of Novatian's consecration. Yet, his account does seem to be the most likely account of events. If Novatian had been consecrated, as Cornelius said, by making simple-minded clergy drunk, then it is most doubtful that he would have been the leader of a group known for moral rigorism and not restoring sinners to communion. Likewise, it is evident that some confessors had joined with Novatian and had supported him for some time. Therefore, it would be best to view Novatian as (possibly forcefully)⁸³ consecrated by those of the rigorist party, without hint of scandalous behavior, and with the support of some notable confessors.

Letters of Recognition

Socrates correctly relayed that both Cornelius and Novatian wrote letters to other churches urging them to follow their examples with the *lapsi*. While the letters they wrote are no longer extant, some responses to these letters are extant. From the letters of Cyprian, it is possible to glimpse how Cornelius and Novatian understood themselves in their respective offices of bishop. This is of particular importance because it demonstrates that by the time of Novatian and Cornelius, the practice of a single bishop had become the practice of the church at Rome.

The letters of recognition penned by Cornelius and Novatian have not been

⁸²Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.28.

⁸³Eusebius preserved a letter Dionysius of Alexandria wrote in response to Novatian in which Dionysius noted Novatian claimed he was forcibly consecrated bishop (*Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.45).

preserved. Yet, some of the responses to these letters have been preserved. Cyprian recorded receiving letters from both Cornelius and Novatian with each one claiming to have been elected as the bishop of Rome.⁸⁴ Cyprian hesitated to acknowledge either one as the next bishop of Rome.⁸⁵ This hesitation is not without reason. Cyprian had been in communication with the church at Rome through the person of Novatian, and had found in Novatian a leader who more or less supported his position for readmitting the *lapsi* through repentance. Simply put, Cyprian found himself in a difficult position when he was forced to choose who he should recognize as the next bishop of Rome. Cyprian's own account to Cornelius reveals that Cyprian had received messengers from both Novatian and Cornelius.⁸⁶ Yet, he had delayed in making a decision until he had received the reports from his own people.⁸⁷ Likewise, Fabian, the bishop of Antioch, appears to have been somewhat inclined towards Novatian. Fabian received letters from both Cornelius⁸⁸ and Dionysius bishop of Alexandria⁸⁹ encouraging him to recognize Cornelius. What is clear from all of these letters is that by the middle of the third century none of the parties involved appear to have considered recognizing two bishops in Rome at the same time.⁹⁰

⁸⁴Cyprian, *Epistula* 40.1.

⁸⁵Cyprian, *Epistula* 41.

⁸⁶Cyprian, *Epistula* 40.1.

⁸⁷Cyprian, *Epistula* 40.1. Cyprian records sending two bishops named Caldonius and Fortunatus to discern who should be recognized as the new bishop of Rome.

⁸⁸Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43.

⁸⁹Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.44.

⁹⁰Novatian's own view on this topic is evident in his letters to Cyprian when he speaks about awaiting a singular bishop for the church at Rome after the cessation of the persecution (*Epistula* 30.8). Cornelius made an even stronger assertion that Novatian's schism revealed that he was ignorant that there should only be one bishop over the church at Rome (Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43). While the practice in the church at Rome only a generation or two before the time of Novatian points clearly to an ecclesiological practice rather different than the mono-episcopate that was the practice of Novatian and Cornelius. The details of when this transition took place and what the ecclesiological practices were in Rome before the rise of the mono-episcopacy are difficult to piece together with certainty. For further information, see Allen Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tensions before the Emergence of a Monarch Bishop* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995); James Jeffers, *Conflict at*

Novatian the Schismatic Bishop

There are two events that demonstrate Novatian was the leader of a schism in the church: his election as bishop and the spread of Novatianist communities in the Roman Empire. Novatian's actions after his election as bishop demonstrate he was the leader of a schism. Novatian did not attempt to move away from the practice of mono-episcopacy. Instead of leading a group of rigorist dissenters while remaining in communion with Cornelius, Novatian tried to be the bishop instead of Cornelius. This is evident from the letters of recognition. Novatian did not try to become another bishop alongside Cornelius; rather he sought to be recognized as the sole bishop of Rome.

When other bishops refused to recognize him as the bishop of Rome, Novatian established Novatianist congregations in other locales across the empire.⁹¹ These Novatianist communities were not in communion with non-Novatianist communities. Indeed, Cyprian recorded that the Novatianists were rebaptizing those who “they enticed from the church.”⁹² This demonstrates that the Novatianist communities, from the very beginning, understood themselves to be distinctly separate from those Christians who allowed for the restoration of the *lapsi*. Novatian had thus become the leader of an intentional and wide-spread schism.

The only recorded reasons for Novatian's actions are from Socrates Scholasticus (c. 380–450) and Cornelius. For Cornelius, Novatian's schism was based upon his haughtiness and personal desire to be bishop.⁹³ For Socrates, the reason was

Rome: Social Order and Hierarchy in Early Christianity (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1991); and George La Piana, “The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century,” in *Studies in Early Christianity: Orthodoxy, Heresy, and Schism in Early Christianity*, ed. Everett Ferguson (New York: Garland Publishing, 1993).

⁹¹The Novatianists were being called by the name Novatianists. This is evident in Pacian of Barcelona when he wrote how the Novatianists are named after Novatian (*Epistula* 2.3). Similarly Jerome affirms the use of the term “Novatians” (*Liber De Viris Illustribus* 70.1).

⁹²Cyprian, *Epistula* 72.2.

⁹³Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.43

that “Cornelius received the *lapsi* and communed with them.”⁹⁴ It is not possible to ascertain the desires of Novatian or his personal haughtiness from our present vantage point. These reasons recorded by Cornelius could be contributing factors to the schism. In contrast, the reason given by Socrates fit, with the historical particularities of the Novatianists, the practices of the church at Rome under Cornelius, and the emphasis on purity found in the writings of Novatian. Therefore, Novatian’s ambition should not be discounted when viewing his reasons for schism, but the deciding factor rests upon the issue of the restoration of the *lapsi*.

The Death of Novatian

The death of Novatian can be placed during the persecution of the Emperor Valerian around the year 258.⁹⁵ Novatian was killed as a part of the Emperor Valerian’s order that all Christian clergy be executed;⁹⁶ he can thus be called a martyr even though he died in schism.⁹⁷ It is not known if Novatian died while in exile or while in Rome.⁹⁸ Either way, his burial place is most likely in Rome in the catacomb which bears his name

⁹⁴Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.28.

⁹⁵Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.28.

⁹⁶Paul Keresztes, “Two Edicts of the Emperor Valerian,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 29 (1975): 81–95.

⁹⁷The dispute over classifying Novatian as a martyr can be seen as early as Pacian of Barcelona when he argued that Novatian could not have been a martyr because he died while apart from the church (Epistula 2.14–15). This argument has been picked up and repeated by Michael Permanederi, who asserted that the report of Novatian’s martyrdom by Socrates Scholasticus was a fabrication (Novatian, *Patres et Scriptorum Seculi III complectens ecclesiae latinae*, ed. Michael Permanederi [Landshut, Germany: J. G. Wölfle, 1844], 802). Joseph Tixeront likewise refers to Novatian’s martyrdom as a fabrication (*A Handbook of Patrology*, trans. S. A. Raemers [St. Louis: Herder Book Company, 1920], 133). Some more recent scholarship on Novatian places greater reliability on Socrates Scholasticus’ assertion that Novatian was a martyr and less upon the reasoning of Pacian’s denial that Novatian was a martyr (Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 68). Others take no decisive position on whether or not Novatian was a martyr (DeSimone, *Novatian the Presbyter*, 6–7; Drobner, *The Fathers of the Church*, 180). While some ecclesiastical bodies, such as the Roman Catholic Church, may not acknowledge Novatian as a martyr since he died while apart from their body, this does not mean that Novatian should not be termed a martyr when speaking from a historical perspective.

⁹⁸Novatian wrote *De Spectaculis*, *De Cibis Iudaicis*, and *De Bono Pudicitiae* from exile, yet it is not known if this exile took place under the reign of Gallus or Valerian. It also unknown if he was executed while in exile or was recalled and then executed in Rome.

along the *Via Tiburtina*.⁹⁹ The death of Novatian did not bring an end to the Novatianists. The Novatianists continued for several centuries as a distinct ecclesiastical body after the death of Novatian.¹⁰⁰

Conclusion

Novatian's schism is memorable because it lasted well beyond his own lifetime. While the character of Novatian has been distorted by his contemporaries, it is still possible to see Novatian as a pastor of the flock of Christ. The picture of Novatian that is left is of a pastor who would break fellowship with and refuse to recognize as members of the church those who did not maintain the rigorism he understood the Christian faith to demand. He was a recognized leader from his ordination by Fabian to his leadership during the Decian persecution, and afterwards as the leader of schism. He was

⁹⁹The title reads "Novatianus the Most Blessed Martyr by the Deacon Gaudentius" (Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 71–72). Brent argued it is probable that Novatian is buried in Rome in the catacomb that bears the inscription of his name near via Tiburtina (*Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century*, 374–75). Brent adds a historical aspect to the probability that this is the tomb where Novatian was buried based on the fact Pope Damasus considered Hippolytus a Novatianist. Brent believes this was caused partly because of the proximity of the cult center of Hippolytus to this supposed tomb of Novatian (Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century*, 372–74). Papandrea likewise affirmed the probability that this is the burial place of Novatian (*Novatian of Rome*, 68). Anita Rocco's work demonstrates that this catacomb is very similar to one that dates from the fourth century, and that this catacomb fell out of use in the fifth century (Rocco, "La Tomba del Martire Novaziano," *Vetera Christianorum* 45 [2008]: 323–41). This time of its use would fit with a Novatianist catacomb as it would have been in use from about fifty years after the death of Novatian until the early fifth century when Celestine Bishop of Rome seized all the Novatianist church properties in Rome.

¹⁰⁰The Novatianist bishop Acesius was present at the Council of Nicaea and affirmed the Nicene Creed. Acesius explained he refused to commune with those who committed "a sin unto death" after baptism (Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1.10). Canon 8 of Nicaea set forth requirements for Novatianists to be received back into communion. Among these requirements were the inclusion at communion of the twice married and the lapsi who had been restored. Thus, it appears that by 325, the Novatianists were considered theologically orthodox while being schismatics who excluded people from communion for various post-baptismal sins. Some of the response to the Novatianists is seen in Ambrose *De Penitentia* and the anonymous *Contra Novatianum*. These works demonstrate that the Novatianists were not an insignificant party in the fourth century. However, in the fifth century the Roman bishop Celestine (d. 432) confiscated the buildings of the Novatianists who were flourishing in Rome (Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 7.11). The Novatianists in the western Empire were reabsorbed in the church during the fifth century. In the East, the Novatianists existed at least into the eighth century as Canon 95 of the Council of Trullo mentioned how Novatians were to be received into communion. Yet, sometime in the eighth century their sect came to an end (Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 42).

a theologian who wrote about the faith and spoke to the issues facing the faithful in his own day. Thus, it is seen that the key reasons for his schism were rooted in his pastoral concerns and an ecclesiology that is seen to rest upon his pneumatology. So to understand Novatian the schismatic, one must first understand Novatian the rigorist pastor-theologian.

CHAPTER 3
THE PNEUMATOLOGICAL PREDECESSORS
OF NOVATIAN

Introduction

This chapter introduces the pneumatology of seven Christian writers prior to the time of Novatian: Ignatius of Antioch, the Shepherd of Hermas, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus of Lyon, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Hippolytus of Rome. An overview of each one's pneumatology is presented in turn. While there were other Christians, such as Origen, who wrote at length about the Spirit, these writers were selected because of their importance and possible influence on Novatian.¹ All the authors examined in this chapter had either been read by Novatian² or had a significant connection with the city of Rome. As such, these writers would have been part of forming the way a Christian would think and speak about the Holy Spirit in the Rome of Novatian's time.

Ignatius of Antioch (d. 110)

Ignatius of Antioch (d. 110) wrote seven letters while en-route to his martyrdom in Rome sometime during the first third of the second-century.³ These seven

¹Novatian's writings do not demonstrate that Origen had any influence. It is possible that Novatian had not read Origen's writings.

²It is uncertain if Clement of Alexandria ever visited Rome. Yet, Novatian demonstrated an awareness of Clement's work.

³Eusebius of Caesarea recorded Ignatius was martyred during the reign of Trajan (*Historia Ecclesiastica* 3.21–22), which would place Ignatius' martyrdom between A.D. 95 and A.D. 117. See Christine Trevett, *A Study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1992), 3–9, for an argument for the date of 110. Lightfoot argued for a date between 110 and 118 (J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, pt. 2, *Ignatius and Polycarp* [London: Macmillan, 1889] 2: 435–72). Brent's epigraphic analysis supports a date of Ignatius' martyrdom in the reigns of either Trajan (95–117) or Hadrian (117–38) (Allen Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origin of Episcopacy* [New York: T&T Clark,

letters form the entirety of his extant writings. While Ignatius' letters were focused on issues other than the Holy Spirit, he made scattered mentions of the Holy Spirit. From these few and scattered statements, it is possible to draw an outline of Ignatius' pneumatology.

Ignatius' few statements about the Holy Spirit reveal how he understood the work of the Spirit. Ignatius mentioned the Holy Spirit's role in the incarnation of Jesus in *Ephesians* 18.2, "For our God Jesus was conceived by Mary according to the plan of God, from the seed of David and of the Holy Spirit. He was born and baptized so that by his suffering he might purify the water." This statement has been termed as "[c]learly traditional"⁴ and likely reflects an early Christian creedal statement.⁵ Ignatius' language concerning the work of the Spirit in the incarnation of Jesus clearly reflects the language used in the Synoptic Gospels. In this sense Ignatius added nothing new about the work of the Spirit in the Incarnation, but affirmed the tradition preserved in the synoptic Gospels. Beyond preserving and passing down this tradition, Ignatius also affirms the existence and activity of the Holy Spirit prior to the incarnation. In *Magnesians* 9.2, Ignatius referred to the Old Testament prophets as "disciples in the Spirit." For Ignatius to speak about the prophets as disciples of the Spirit could be taken as an affirmation of the Holy Spirit inspiring the Old Testament, or that these prophets "did not have the advantage of looking back to Christ's fleshly presence."⁶ Either way, this statement reveals that Ignatius understood the Spirit to have been present and active in Ancient Israel and in the

2007], 150–51). Schoedel allowed for a date of 100–118 (William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, ed. Helmut Koester [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985], 5).

⁴Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 84.

⁵Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 84–85; Clayton Jefford, *Reading the Apostolic Fathers*, 2nd ed. [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012], 55).

⁶Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 125.

incarnation of Jesus.

The majority of Ignatius' discussions of the Spirit center on the Spirit's work in and for the church. In *Ephesians* 9.1, Ignatius used a metaphor in which the Ephesians are considered as stones being built into a temple according to the plan of God, with the cross of Jesus Christ as a crane, and the Spirit as a rope. This demonstrates Ignatius understood the work of the Spirit to be central to the ongoing building of the church.

Ignatius offers more specificity about how the Spirit builds the church in his letter to the *Philadelphians*. In the greeting of this letter, Ignatius mentions how Jesus appointed a bishop, presbyters, and deacons who he "securely established according to his own will by his Holy Spirit." This demonstrates Ignatius' understanding that the leadership of the church was dependent upon the work of the Holy Spirit. Ignatius reaffirmed this point and in *Philadelphians* 7.1–2.

For as some people have desired that they might deceive me according to the flesh, but the Spirit is not deceived for it is from God, it know where it is from and where it is going, and it reveals the hidden things, I called out when among you, with a loud voice, God's voice, "Pay attention to the bishop, the council of presbyters, and the deacons." Those who accused me of saying these things because I knew in advance about the division of some. But He is my witness for whose sake I am bound, that I did not learn this from any human flesh. But the Spirit revealed it, and said, "Do nothing without the bishop. Guard your bodies as the temple of God. Love unity. Flee divisions. Become imitators of Jesus Christ, just as he is of the Father."⁷

In this passage, Ignatius spoke about how the Spirit is not deceived. Despite the attempted deceptions of people, the Spirit revealed to Ignatius that he should say, "Do nothing without the bishop. Guard your bodies as the temple of God. Love unity. Flee divisions. Become imitators of Jesus Christ, just as he is of the Father." This statement has many aspects that are relevant to Ignatius' pneumatology. The Spirit is not capable of being deceived, and he also reveals the truth to Ignatius. This demonstrates the work of the Spirit in guiding the church into all truth (John 16:13). From the content of the

⁷Ignatius of Antioch, *Philadelphians* 7.1–2. All translations mine unless otherwise noted.

Spirit's message, it is evident that the Spirit affirmed the leadership in the Philadelphian church, the need for holiness and unity, and the need to imitate Jesus.

The practice of the prophetic utterance demonstrated here is worth examining. Trevett is certainly correct in her assessment that when Ignatius “declared that the Spirit had spoken through him in Philadelphia, either we have to take the Syrian at his word or else brand him a manipulative liar who made use of the conventions of prophecy for his own cause.”⁸ Since there are no good reasons to view Ignatius as a manipulator and liar, it is best to understand Ignatius was convinced that he gave a prophetic utterance. From the context provided by Ignatius, the details of how this prophetic utterance occurred are unknown. Yet, what is known is that Ignatius’ practice affirms that he understood the Spirit to give utterance and reveal things that were not humanly known.⁹

Ignatius made at least one reference to the Holy Spirit by means of symbolic language.¹⁰ In *Romans* 7.2, Ignatius wrote, “My earthly desire¹¹ has been crucified, and there is no fire for earthly longing in me, but living water in me, from within me saying, ‘Come to the Father.’” This phrase, “living water” is a reference to John 4:10–11 and John 7:38–39.¹² In light of John 7:39, this would make the living water a reference to the

⁸Trevett, *A Study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia*, 137.

⁹The exact manner of prophecy in Ignatius is somewhat unclear at this point. Ignatius does not speak about when he received or how he received or transmitted this prophecy.

¹⁰It is also possible that Ignatius had the Spirit in mind in Eph 17.1 when he wrote, “For this reason the Lord received the oil on his head that he might breathe immortality on the Church.” Virginia Corwin noted, “It seems likely that Ignatius has in mind the oil of chrism connected with baptism in the later Syrian church” (Virginia Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1960], 100). Yet, despite later authors clearly connecting the Spirit with the oil of chrism at baptism, it is not possible to demonstrate that Ignatius already made these interpretive connections between the anointing oil and the Holy Spirit. It is possible that Ignatius intended to make this connection and that later authors followed in the same tradition.

¹¹The Greek phrase translated as “my earthly desire” is ἐμὸς ἔρωσ. Origen appears to have started a tradition of interpretation that understood ἐμὸς ἔρωσ as a reference to Jesus. However, this interpretation does not fit as naturally with the context because it is on the same grammatical level with “and there is no fire for earthly longings in me.” (See Michael Haykin “‘Come to the Father’: Ignatius of Antioch and His Calling to Be a Martyr” *Themelios* 32 [May 2007]: 36; and Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 185.

¹²Lightfoot stated that this “whole passage is inspired by the Fourth Gospel” (J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, pt. 2, *Ignatius & Polycarp*, 224). Schoedel noted, “This water is apparently to be

Holy Spirit.¹³

The Holy Spirit then is seen in this brief passage as the one who called Ignatius to his martyrdom. In this instance, “martyrdom is, in a sense, a gift of the Spirit.”¹⁴ Beyond martyrdom as a gift, there is also the work of the Spirit as the extinguisher of “earthly longings” in Ignatius. Shoedel holds that the Spirit accomplished this “by calling him from deep within: ‘Come to the Father.’”¹⁵ While the Holy Spirit’s call to martyrdom could lead to the end of earthly longings, this could also reveal a more general opposition of the Spirit to earthly longings.¹⁶

Presence of the Spirit with the Church

One of the central aspects of Ignatius’ pneumatology is the presence of the Spirit with the church. The presence of the Spirit with the church was not addressed in the Ignatian corpus. Yet, what Ignatius did say about the Spirit presupposes and requires that the Holy Spirit be present with the church. Apart from the presence of the Spirit, Ignatius could not have things revealed to him by the Spirit, he would not have been called to the Father in his martyrdom, and the leaders of the church would not have been established. The Spirit’s presence with the church is not an entirely new thing. Ignatius spoke of how the Old Testament prophets were disciples in the Spirit as they looked forward to Christ.¹⁷ Corwin noted, “The Spirit also operates among men to introduce them to the divine things. It is in this sense that the prophets could be said to be

identified with the Holy Spirit” (*Ignatius of Antioch*, 185).

¹³For others with this view, see Haykin, “Ignatius of Antioch and His Calling to Be a Martyr” 36, and Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 185.

¹⁴Haykin, “Ignatius of Antioch and His Calling to Be a Martyr,” 36.

¹⁵Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 185.

¹⁶Haykin, “Ignatius of Antioch and His Calling to Be a Martyr,” 36.

¹⁷*Magnesians* 9.2.

“disciples in the Spirit” as they looked forward to Jesus Christ “who would come as their teacher.”¹⁸ Regarding the prophets, Corwin is correct. The Spirit introduced the prophets to divine things and so, through guiding and teaching the prophets, the Spirit can be understood as the one who disciplined the Old Testament prophets.

The Ontology of the Spirit in Ignatius

Ignatius’ ontology of the Holy Spirit can be glimpsed in his presentation of the activity¹⁹ of the Spirit and his Trinitarian formulas. The work of the Spirit in the incarnation of the Son is the most relevant activity for understanding Ignatius’ ontology of the Spirit. In *Ephesians* 7.2, Ignatius spoke of Jesus being “both of Mary and of God.” This statement became particularly important when compared with what Ignatius wrote later in *Ephesians* 18.2, “For our God Jesus was conceived by Mary according to the plan of God, from the seed of David and of the Holy Spirit. He was born and baptized so that by his suffering he might purify the water.” When compared, these passages imply the divinity of the Holy Spirit, since Ignatius spoke of Jesus being of Mary and of God and then spoke of Jesus being of the seed of David and of the Holy Spirit. If the Spirit was the agent by which the conception of the Son of God took place, then the Spirit would be God since Jesus was “of God.” Yet, these two passages from *Ephesians* do not prove Ignatius viewed the Holy Spirit as equally divine with the Father and the Son.²⁰ These passages do show that Ignatius understood the Spirit to be intimately involved in the

¹⁸Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*, 141.

¹⁹The activity of the Holy Spirit in the letters of Ignatius reveals that the Spirit was at work in the incarnation of Jesus (*Ephesians* 18.2), the Spirit disciplined the prophets as they looked forward to the coming Christ (*Magnesians* 9.2), The Spirit was in Ignatius and opposes earthly longings, the Spirit called Ignatius to the Father in his martyrdom (*Romans* 7.2), The Spirit established church leaders (*Philadelphians* Intro.), and reveals truth (*Philadelphians* 7.1–2).

²⁰Corwin noted, “The *κατ’ οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ* calls attention to the divine grounding of the event, and indicates that Ignatius probably thinks of the Holy Spirit as God, as Christ also is. At least this passage can be linked with that which declares him to be the Son of Mary and the Son of God (Eph. 7), but it defines nothing” (*St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*, 141).

work of God at the very least, and hint at a Trinitarian understanding of the divinity of the Spirit.

The connection of the Spirit to the Father and the Son is most clearly evident in Ignatius' Trinitarian wording. However, there are some textual peculiarities surrounding Ignatius' Trinitarian statements. These peculiarities complicate the task of gleaning aspects of his pneumatological thought from his Trinitarian statements. In *Magnesians* 13.1, Ignatius wrote, “. . . physically and spiritually, in faith and in love, in the Son and the Father and in the Spirit, in the beginning and in the end. . . .” The inclusion of “and in” makes the statement, “in the Son and the Father and in the Spirit” parallel to the other paired words immediately preceding it and immediately following it.²¹ This means that Ignatius' inclusion of the Spirit breaks the pattern in his list of paired words. Viewed alone, this Trinitarian formula could demonstrate a distinction between the Spirit and the unity of the Father and the Son.²² The Son and the Father could be seen as clearly connected, with the Spirit grammatically set off from them in this passage. However, the break in the pattern of paired words more likely demonstrates a form of Trinitarian thought in Ignatius that was significant enough to interrupt his writing style. Corwin commented about this passage, “the addition of the Spirit might mean that the idea of the Trinity had enough reality for Ignatius so that he occasionally introduced it even when by doing so the rhythm was destroyed.”²³ Corwin is correct that the break in Ignatius'

²¹Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 130.

²²Corwin noted, “From one point of view its curious form is a witness against belief in a clearly conceived Trinity. The Father and the Son seem to crowd out the Spirit who is presented as an afterthought” (Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*, 143). This is certainly a possible way to construe Ignatius' wording, but it fails to account for the grammar of the passage. Schoedel goes further than Corwin's possible reading and argued that the Spirit is a later interpolation. He argued that the Trinitarian formula in 13.1 is a latter addition just as the Trinitarian formula in 13.2 despite an utter lack of textual evidence for this position. To the credit of this view, it does appear that *Magnesians* 13.2 had “the Spirit” added to the text by the hand of an editor (Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 130–31). This addition by no means serve as the basis for removing the Spirit from *Magnesians* 13.1.

²³Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*, 143.

pattern is significant. Yet, the addition of “the Spirit” is not what breaks this pattern. The break in the pattern is caused by the inclusion of “and the Father” after “and in the Son” since the Son and the Spirit are set off by the preposition “in” whereas “and the Father” is not preceded by the preposition “in.” Apart from the inclusion of “and the Father,” “in the Son and the Father and in the Spirit” is precisely parallel to the paired words that follow, “in the beginning and in the end.” Grammatically speaking, instead of questioning the placement of the Spirit, commentators should question the placement of the Father in this pairing of the Son and the Spirit. Therefore this passage indicates a Trinitarian confession and possibly a Trinitarian theology that was important enough for Ignatius to break his stylistic tendencies.

It is worth returning to Ignatius’ metaphor for the church in *Ephesians* 9.1, as it provides a Trinitarian statement. Ignatius wrote how the Ephesian believers were “being stones of the temple prepared before according to the plan of God the Father, being raised up to the heights by the crane of Jesus, which is the cross, using as a rope the Holy Spirit.” The difficulty with this passage is that it is a metaphor for how the church is built.²⁴ Yet even as a metaphorical image, it demonstrates the Son and the Spirit sharing the same work with different capacities in building the church. This shows in some sense that the Spirit does the work of God. Sharing in the work of God, however, does not provide any clear definitions of the ontology of the Spirit.²⁵ Taken together, it is difficult to say that Ignatius did not consider the Spirit to be in some way divine.²⁶ Yet the

²⁴Corwin commented upon these Trinitarian passages “The boldest passages indicate more about Ignatius’ use of vigorous metaphors than his belief in the Trinity” (*St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*, 143). Her argument is based upon the fact that when speaking about how one ought to respect church leaders in *Trallians* 3.1, Ignatius listed the Father, Jesus Christ, and the apostles instead of the Father, Jesus and the Holy Spirit (*St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*, 143).

²⁵Corwin’s conclusion on Ignatius’ Trinitarian statements is that, “None of these passages adds anything to an understanding of what the Trinity meant to Ignatius, and we are forced to conclude that it was a very undefined belief” (*St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*, 143).

²⁶Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*, 141.

divinity of the Spirit was not addressed directly in Ignatius' letters.

Trinitarian Confession and Binitarian Theological Emphases

From Ignatius' use of Trinitarian phrasing and imagery, it is clear that "Trinitarian language was rooted in the Christianity known to Ignatius."²⁷ Indeed, Ignatius clearly held to a Trinitarian confession. Yet, if Ignatius had a full-orbed Trinitarian theology, it is only partially glimpsed in his letters. Schoedel's assertion that Ignatius was a binitarian²⁸ does not stand up to the evidence in Ignatius' writings. However, Ignatius' theological emphases clearly center upon the Father and the Son. Thus Schoedel's assertion of binitarianism, while not entirely correct, does grasp the binitarian theological emphases in Ignatius' writings. These binitarian emphases in his theology have no conflict with his Trinitarian confession, and are likely a product of the Christological issues facing the church during the life of Ignatius. Therefore, it would be best to understand Ignatius as holding to a Trinitarian confession and a, perhaps ill-defined, Trinitarian theology with strong binitarian emphases as he countered the Christological issues of his day.

The Shepherd of Hermas (90s)

The author of *Pastor Hermae* is unknown. This work was most likely composed sometime near the end of the first-century at Rome.²⁹ It can loosely be

²⁷Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 66, n. 6.

²⁸Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 131 n. 14. Schoedel argued that uses of the Father and the Son without the Holy Spirit demonstrates that Ignatius was a binitarian. He listed *Ephesians* 3.2, 5.1 15.1; *Magnesians* 7.1–2; *Philadelphians* 7.2, 9.1 and *Smyrneans* 3.3 and 8.1 as support because these passages all mention Jesus/Christ and the Father apart from any mention of the Spirit.

²⁹There are a few points that are used to date the *Pastor Hermae*. *Pastor Hermae* mentions a Clement in 8.3, and this could be a reference to Clement of Rome (90–100). Origen (185–254) connected the author of *Pastor Hermae* with the Hermas mentioned in Rom. 16:14 (*Commentarii in Romanos* 10.31). Irenaeus (130–200) quoted *Pastor Hermae* as Scripture in *Adversus Haresaios* 4.20.2. Each of these points support a date for composition in the later part of the first century. Against these sources stands The Muratorian Fragment, which dates the composition of *Pastor Hermae* to when Pius (140–154) was bishop of Rome. The *Liber Pontificalis* likewise asserts *Pastor Hermae* was written when Pius was bishop of

considered part of the apocalyptic genre even though it contains visions, parables, and commands. It has been said that the *Pastor Hermae*, “bristles with problems, both literary and theological.”³⁰ This is an accurate assessment of *Pastor Hermae*. The multiple types of genres along with the elusive nature of the imagery presented in *Pastor Hermae*, pose significant difficulties to those who seek precise theological understandings from *Pastor Hermae*. As a consequence, the pneumatology in the *Pastor Hermae* is obfuscated by its imagery and associated lack of clarity, and this is then compounded by some statements about the Spirit which seem odd when viewed through the lens of later pneumatology. The nature of this work and its seemingly odd statements have led to a divergent range of opinions about how Hermas understood the identity of the Holy Spirit.³¹ This in turn has caused some translators to avoid capitalizing “spirit” to avoid the issues regarding Hermas’ pneumatology.³² Despite these issues, Hermas

Rome. Irenaeus’ use of *Pastor Hermae* as Scripture would appear to preclude the option that *Pastor Hermae* was composed in his lifetime. When viewed in addition to the witness of Origen and the mention of a Clement in *Pastor Hermae*, it is best to conclude that *Pastor Hermae* was composed near the end of the first century. On the dating in the first century, see John Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and Its Pneumatology* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1993), 24–61, and James Jeffers, *Conflict at Rome: Social Order and Hierarchy in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 106–12.

Attempts have been made to accommodate multiple timeframes for the composition of *Pastor Hermae*. If *Pastor Hermae* was the work of multiple authors, then it would be quite possible for parts of The Shepherd of Hermas to have been composed between the end of the first-century and 154. However, the arguments for multiple authorship do not adequately address the thematic unity of *Pastor Hermae* (Carolyn Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999], 8–10).

This view of Rome as the place where *Pastor Hermae* as written is nearly universally supported (Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 18).

³⁰W. Coleborne, “A Linguistic Approach to the Problem of the Structure and Composition of the Shepherd of Hermas” *Colloquium* 3 (1969), 133.

³¹For example Osiek concluded that the Holy Spirit is often one of many holy spirits from God (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 33). Kelly concluded that the Holy Spirit was the preexistent Christ (J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* [New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1978], 94–95). Bucur understood the Holy Spirit to be the divine indwelling presence (Bogdan Gabriel Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses* [Boston: Brill, 2009], 138).

³²An example of this is Michael Holmes. He wrote, “With regard to the Holy Spirit, the reader will note that The Shepherd uses the word ‘spirit’ in a variety of ways. Some of these usages are clearly generic, referring to this or that good or evil spirit. Others may at least appear to approach equivalence with the eventual Christian understanding of the Holy Spirit as a divine hypostasis distinct from the Father and the Son . . . distinctions of the sort implied by modern conventions of capitalization (or noncapitalization) would have been quite foreign to the author and his readers, as Greek documents typically were written in a single case. Consequently, I have followed the example of other recent translators and lowercased all occurrences of ‘spirit’ in Hermas” (*The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and*

addressed both the work and the person of the Holy Spirit at length. He possessed a distinctive pneumatology that would be found to be lacking when viewed from the vantage of later reflections upon the Spirit.

The Indwelling Presence of the Spirit

The indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit in humans is one of the central aspects of Hermas' pneumatology. Hermas spoke of how God caused a spirit to live in this flesh.³³ This spirit is called "a spirit uncontaminated by deceit,"³⁴ "the spirit of truth,"³⁵ and "holy and true."³⁶ These descriptions of the spirit given by God clearly point to this being the Holy Spirit.³⁷ This Spirit of Truth is set in opposition to lies and falsehood.³⁸ This opposition of the Holy Spirit to falsehood and other vices does not view the Holy Spirit as beyond the effects of a person's sin. Indeed, Hermas wrote, "all flesh in which the Holy Spirit has dwelt will receive a reward, if it is found undefiled and spotless."³⁹ This means that the Holy Spirit can be defiled through the lying actions of the person who received the Spirit. Further, Hermas linked salvation to the purity of the Spirit in a person. This theme is repeated in the Fifth Similitude, "For if you defile your flesh, you will defile the Holy Spirit. And if you defile your flesh you will not live."⁴⁰ Again, the Spirit is capable of being defiled and this defilement has salvific

English Translations 3rd ed. [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007], 444).

³³*Pastor Hermae* 28.1.

³⁴*Pastor Hermae* 28.2.

³⁵*Pastor Hermae* 28.4

³⁶*Pastor Hermae* 28.4.

³⁷Clayton Jefford, *Reading the Apostolic Fathers: A Student's Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 151–52; and Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas*, 66.

³⁸*Pastor Hermae* 28.2–5.

³⁹*Pastor Hermae* 60.7.

⁴⁰*Pastor Hermae* 60.2.

consequences. At the core of this is Hermas' concept that the Holy Spirit is so intimately joined with the flesh that, "one cannot be defiled without the other being defiled."⁴¹

This connection between the actions of a person and the state of the Holy Spirit indwelling them is further expounded upon in the Fifth Mandate. In this Mandate, the Holy Spirit is associated with patience. "For if you are patient the Holy Spirit who lives in you will be pure, unhindered by another evil spirit."⁴² The patience required for the purity of the Holy Spirit is contrasted with anger.

But if it comes upon a bad temper, immediately the Holy Spirit, being delicate, is distressed because it does not have a clean place, and it seeks to depart from that place. For it is choked by the evil spirit, and it does not have a place to serve the Lord as it desires, because it is polluted by a bad temper. For the Lord lives in patience, but the devil lives in a bad temper.⁴³

In this passage, the Holy Spirit is connected with patience and evil spirit is connected with anger. This dualism between the virtues and vices, between the Holy Spirit and evil spirits, is a repeated theme in Hermas' pneumatology.⁴⁴ Here, the presence of the vice and the accompanying evil spirit distresses and chokes the Holy Spirit. Because the Holy Spirit is delicate, it seeks to depart. The delicacy of the Holy Spirit⁴⁵ is the reason Hermas presents the way vices with their accompanying evil spirits cause the Holy Spirit to depart from a person. Indeed, Hermas repeated this theme saying, "the delicate Spirit,

⁴¹*Pastor Hermae* 60.4.

⁴²*Pastor Hermae* 33.2.

⁴³*Pastor Hermae* 33.3.

⁴⁴Wilson noted that the pattern of pneumatological dualism in Hermas "is remarkably similar to the dualistic pneumatology of the Qumran literature" (*Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas*, 63). For an example of this dualism, see *Pastor Hermae* 34.4–5. In this passage, Hermas provided a list of vices, "a bad temper is first foolish, fickle, and senseless. Then from foolishness comes bitterness, and from bitterness wrath, and from wrath comes anger, and from anger comes vengefulness. Then vengefulness, consisting of all these evils, becomes a great and incurable sin. . . . If these spirits dwell in a vessel with the Holy Spirit there is no room." Hermas clearly connected these vices as evil spirits with whom the Spirit cannot dwell.

⁴⁵Osiek argued that "delicate" cannot be a good translation, unless Hermas used it as a parody to emphasize how the Holy Spirit cannot abide with an evil spirit (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 119). However, she did not offer a different translation for this term nor explain how this idea of parody is supported from the text of Hermas.

which does not have the habit of dwelling with evil spirits nor with harshness, departs from this type of person and seeks to live with gentleness and quiet.”⁴⁶ In this passage, the Holy Spirit does not merely seek to depart, but actually departs from the person. This departure leaves the person filled with the evil spirits that drove the Holy Spirit out.⁴⁷ In the Ninth Parable, the Holy Spirit is described as being capable of being corrupted by the presence of evil spirits and so becoming useless.⁴⁸ While a departure of the Spirit is not mentioned, it does reaffirm the concept of the Spirit’s inability to withstand the presence of vices in a person.

Prior to the Holy Spirit’s departure, there is an alteration to the Spirit’s intercession. The presence of a vice/evil spirit renders the intercession of the Holy Spirit “no longer useful to God.”⁴⁹ If the Holy Spirit is crushed by the grief in a person, the Spirit will “intercede to God against you and depart from you.”⁵⁰ Hermas did not explain how or towards which end the Spirit intercedes against the person He indwells, or at which point the Spirit’s intercession is no longer useful. Yet, it is clear that Hermas assumed that the Holy Spirit intercedes for the person within whom He dwells and that the intercession of the Spirit is tied to the presence of evil spirits in the person.

In these mandates, the Spirit is seen indwelling and interceding for Christians. Yet, the depiction of the Spirit is presented in such a way that human effort is required to be worthy of the indwelling Holy Spirit.⁵¹ Hermas did not present the Holy Spirit as an empowering entity that brings about transformation in a person, but as delicate and

⁴⁶*Pastor Hermae* 34.6.

⁴⁷*Pastor Hermae* 34.7.

⁴⁸*Pastor Hermae* 109.2–5.

⁴⁹*Pastor Hermae* 33.6.

⁵⁰*Pastor Hermae* 41.5.

⁵¹*Pastor Hermae* 33.7.

incapable of cohabitating with evil spirits.⁵² The emphasis upon human action is furthered in the Sixth Mandate when the human is presented as having an evil angel and a good angel encouraging the human towards either vice or virtue.⁵³ This creates a strange form of synergism in which the power of the Spirit is barely evident and the effort of the human appears utterly decisive even to the point of driving out the Holy Spirit through embracing vice.

Prophecy and Revelation

The Eleventh Mandate addresses how one can discern a true prophet from a false prophet. The work and presence of the Spirit is the basis upon which one can separate true prophecy from false prophecy. Hermas start from a dualistic pneumatology in which true prophets⁵⁴ are known by the divine Spirit, whereas false prophets are filled with the spirit of the devil.⁵⁵ The operation of the Holy Spirit in the prophets is complicated by the use of different pneumatological titles in Eleventh Mandate: the Spirit from God, the divine Spirit, the Holy Spirit, “the spirit which comes from God and has power,” and “the angel of the prophetic spirit.”⁵⁶ The use of these different titles becomes important because of how Hermas uses them in the Eleventh Mandate.

Therefore when a man who has the divine Spirit comes into the assembly of the righteous people who have the faith in the divine spirit, and intercession is made to God by the assembly of those people, then the angel of the prophetic spirit that is

⁵²Osiek was certainly correct when she noted, “For Hermas the holy spirit is not the driving force of Luke’s Pentecost narrative, even though words like “power” are applied to it; in fact, it flees when too much pressure is applied! It is rather a steady quiet inspiration toward good” (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 147).

⁵³*Pastor Hermae* 36.1–6. While there is a dualism evident in these angels, it is of a different type than the pneumatological dualism. Both the good angel and the wicked angel live inside the person at the same time. The ability of the good angel to dwell with the angel of wickedness is something the Holy Spirit lacks and marks a distinction between angels and the Holy Spirit in the thought of Hermas.

⁵⁴Hermas did not use the adjective “true” when describing the prophet. He simply spoke of the prophet, and used the adjective “false” to describe the false prophet.

⁵⁵*Pastor Hermae* 43.3.

⁵⁶*Pastor Hermae* 43.5–9.

appointed to him fills the man, and having been filled with the Holy Spirit, he speaks to the multitude, just as the Lord wills.⁵⁷

In this passage, the true prophet has the divine Spirit, and then is filled with “the angel of the prophetic spirit” which Hermas then equates with being filled by the Holy Spirit. This leaves three different titles all being used at the same time, but does not necessarily mean that there are three different referents with these titles. The divine Spirit is clearly the Holy Spirit indwelling the prophet.⁵⁸ The identity of the “the angel of the prophetic spirit” needs to be examined. Reiling argued that “the angel of the prophetic spirit” is “a guardian angel whose area of responsibility is prophecy,”⁵⁹ and “can be identical with the prophetic word.”⁶⁰ Osiek offered that “the angel of the prophetic spirit” is generally identified as “Ramiel, the angel in charge of prophetic visions.”⁶¹ Osiek presented that this could also be understood as “another set of terms for the Spirit of God.”⁶² Wilson argued that “the angel of the prophetic spirit” should be understood as an angel under the charge of the prophetic Spirit.⁶³ While this passage might sound like there are three spirits at work, it is better to read these as all speaking of the Holy Spirit. Wilson argued that the divine Spirit refers to the indwelling aspect of the Holy Spirit, while the prophetic

⁵⁷*Pastor Hermae* 43.9.

⁵⁸Reiling is certainly correct in stating that Hermas takes pains to point out that the prophet has the Spirit prior to being filled by the Spirit since a prophet without the Spirit is a false prophet (*Hermas and Christian Prophecy*, 111–12).

⁵⁹Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy*, 106.

⁶⁰Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy*, 107. Reiling argued that “the angel of the prophetic spirit” should be understood as the prophetic spirit and connects the prophetic spirit with the Spirit of the LORD as used in the Old Testament and in Justin Martyr.

⁶¹Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 144. Ramiel is an angel who presides over visions in *The Apocalypse of Baruch* 55.3. The argument for identifying “the angel of the prophetic spirit” with Ramiel has some significant weaknesses. Ramiel is the angel of visions, yet Hermas addressed prophecy and not visions in this passage. When Hermas spoke of visions he made no use of the title “the angel of the prophetic spirit.” Also, Hermas does not appear to offer any significant reason to identify “the angel of the prophetic spirit” with Ramiel or any other particular identity (Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas*, 98–99).

⁶²Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 144.

⁶³Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas*, 98.

spirit refers to the momentary procession of the Holy Spirit.⁶⁴ Wilson noted this follows a biblical pattern, as seen in Acts and Ephesians, where believers in possession of the Spirit are later filled with the Spirit.⁶⁵ This passage then demonstrates two aspects of the same Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit indwells the prophet (following the pattern of indwelling set forth earlier in Hermas) and the Holy Spirit fills the prophet for the moment of prophecy.

This mandate reveals the central role of the Spirit in prophecy. Only a prophet with the Holy Spirit can prophesy. This prophecy occurs in the assembly of those that both have the Holy Spirit⁶⁶ and have faith in the Holy Spirit. The Spirit then fills the prophet and the prophet prophesies what and when⁶⁷ God determines. The work of the Spirit in acts of revelation are encountered throughout Hermas. Hermas' first two visions occurred when "the Spirit took me and carried me."⁶⁸ The Spirit both spoke to Hermas in the form of the church and empowered Hermas to receive this revelation.⁶⁹ In one of the more interesting passages, the Spirit even revealed the Spirit to Hermas.⁷⁰ This takes place in the ninth Parable, when the twelve virgins are explained. These

⁶⁴Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas*, 100–101.

⁶⁵In Eph 1:13, Paul writes of his readers "having believed, were sealed by the promised Holy Spirit," and then in Eph 5:18 encourages them to be filled with the Holy Spirit. Likewise, the Book of Acts presents Peter being filled with the Holy Spirit in Acts 4:8 and 4:31, while ostensibly already having received the Spirit in Acts 2:4. Luke did the same thing with Paul, who received the Holy Spirit in Acts 9:17 and then was filled with the Spirit in Acts 13:9.

⁶⁶*Pastor Hermae* 43.14.

⁶⁷*Pastor Hermae* 43.8.

⁶⁸*Pastor Hermae* 1.3 and 5.1.

⁶⁹*Pastor Hermae* 78.1–2.

⁷⁰Holmes considered this passage to be an example of an unclear pneumatology in Hermas (*The Apostolic Fathers*, 444). Jefford identified these virgins as aspects of the Holy Spirit (*Reading the Apostolic Fathers*, 153). Taylor identified these virgins as the Holy Spirit (Charles Taylor, *The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels* [London: Cambridge University Press, 1892], 133).

twelve virgins are described as “holy spirits,”⁷¹ “the powers of the Son of God,”⁷² “they are given to all who enter the church,”⁷³ they are identified with the names of virtues,⁷⁴ and they are set against twelve dark-clothed women who are identified as vices.⁷⁵ The Shepherd told Hermas that these virgins would live with him as long as he remained pure because they would leave when they encountered impurity.⁷⁶ From these descriptions, they should be identified as a metaphor for the Holy Spirit. The pneumatological dualism seen in the Mandates is evident along with the indwelling presence of the Spirit. Added to these aspects of the Holy Spirit, the work of the Spirit is evident in unifying and directing the building of the church. With even more specificity, their interaction with Hermas reveal the Spirit is a source of joy, loves the church, and prays with the church.⁷⁷

Ontology of the Spirit in Hermas

The fifth Parable provides a clear affirmation of the divinity of the Holy Spirit. In this parable Hermas wrote of the Spirit as “the pre-existent Spirit which created all of creation.”⁷⁸ In writing this, Hermas clearly set apart the Holy Spirit from the created order. The Spirit cannot be a creature because the Spirit is the creator. This work of the Holy Spirit in creation affirms the divinity of the Holy Spirit because Hermas earlier wrote, “First of all believe that God is one, who created all things and set them in

⁷¹*Pastor Hermae* 90.2.

⁷²*Pastor Hermae* 90.2.

⁷³*Pastor Hermae* 90.5–6.

⁷⁴*Pastor Hermae* 92.2.

⁷⁵*Pastor Hermae* 92.3.

⁷⁶*Pastor Hermae* 113.1–2.

⁷⁷*Pastor Hermae* 88.3–7.

⁷⁸*Pastor Hermae* 59.5.

order.”⁷⁹ If God is the creator of all and the Spirit is the creator of all, then in some sense, the Spirit must be God. In this parable, Hermas related the Spirit to God as a Son to a Father.⁸⁰ This affirms the Spirit to be a divine person and not merely a power emanating from God.⁸¹

While the divinity of the Holy Spirit is clearly affirmed, the relationship of the Spirit with the Son is significantly less clear. Directly after speaking about the preexistent Spirit, Hermas wrote, “God caused it to dwell in the flesh that he wished.”⁸² Writing about this flesh, Hermas said, “Therefore because it conducted itself rightly and purely and worked with the Spirit, conducting itself with strength and bravery, he chose it as a partner with the Holy Spirit. For the conduct of this flesh pleased God because it was not defiled on earth while it had the Holy Spirit.”⁸³ Osiek correctly assessed this statement saying, “The easiest way to understand these verses is to see them as teaching a pneumatic adoptionist Christology.”⁸⁴ Likewise, Wilson held that this should be interpreted as a pneumatic adoptionism, with the incarnation functioning as an example for others to follow and be rewarded.⁸⁵ However, the previous interpretation of the parable clearly defined the Spirit as the son, and the Son of God as the slave in the parable. This creates enough ambiguity in the text that this “flesh” discussed in this passage could be about humanity and the relationship of the human to the Holy Spirit.⁸⁶ Yet, the way in which the passage speak about this flesh makes it seem as though the

⁷⁹*Pastor Hermae* 26.1.

⁸⁰*Pastor Hermae* 26.1.

⁸¹Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas*, 131–32.

⁸²*Pastor Hermae* 59.5.

⁸³*Pastor Hermae* 59.6.

⁸⁴Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 179.

⁸⁵Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas*, 134–35.

⁸⁶Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 180.

incarnation provided the example for how to live rightly with the Spirit. The Shepherd's concluding remarks to Hermas offer some help to clarify what was meant by "flesh," "For all flesh in which the Spirit has dwelt will receive a reward if it proves to be undefiled and spotless."⁸⁷ The conclusion then affirms that the Son of God is the "flesh" which was chosen as a dwelling place for the Spirit. If this is pneumatic adoptionism, then the same reward is offered to all people who follow the example of the Son of God when the Spirit dwelt in him on earth. Thus, the pneumatic adoptionism here discussed appears to be the same form available to all Christians. This does not answer the Christological issues in the text, but does demonstrate the work of the Spirit in making people into sons of God.

The passage that most distinctly blurs the Son of God and the Holy Spirit is at the beginning of the ninth parable where the Shepherd said, "I want to explain to you what the Holy Spirit that spoke with you in the form of the church revealed to you, for that spirit is the Son of God."⁸⁸ Quasten suggested, "Here the Holy Spirit is identified with the Son of God, in other words, we have only two divine persons, God and the Holy Spirit."⁸⁹ At first glance this would appear to be the case. However, an interpretation like Quasten's does not adequately address whether Hermas intended this statement to be understood in an ontological sense or how the Holy Spirit/the Son of God spoke in the form of the church.⁹⁰ Wilson took this statement as ontological and considered it to be the outworking of the Son of God living in perfect accord with the Spirit so that the two

⁸⁷*Pastor Hermae* 59.7.

⁸⁸*Pastor Hermae* 78.1.

⁸⁹Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 1, *From the Apostles Creed to Irenaeus* (Utrecht, Holland: Spectrum, 1950), 99.

⁹⁰The preexistence of the Holy Spirit (59.5) and the Son of God (89.2) are important to consider at this point because the church also is spoken of as being created first (8.1). That these three share this commonality could be of relevance to how they are connected in this passage.

have become one.⁹¹ The difficulty lies with how the church is the form that is spoken through by the Spirit. This statement is more about adding meaning to the figure of the woman who had spoken with Hermas in the Visions and what she had previously said. Therefore, Osiek wrote, “It is not correct to say that the church is therefore equated with the Son of God any more than it is correct to say that the Son of God and the Holy Spirit are equated in *Sim. 5.5*.”⁹² If this statement is about interpreting the figure of the woman, then there is nothing necessarily ontological about equating the Holy Spirit with the Son of God speaking through the form of the church. Indeed, this statement underlines the unity of the Son of God with the Spirit and the church, as witnessed in this and earlier parables. While Hermas does provide the clearest distinctions between the person of the Spirit and the Son of God, he does not clearly affirm a pneumatic adoptionism either.

Hermas shared some views of the Holy Spirit that are found in the New Testament and those who would follow after his time. He viewed the Spirit as divine and active in building the church. The distinctive aspects of Hermas’ pneumatology center upon his pneumatological dualism. The Holy Spirit, as it indwelt Christians, was understood to be intimately connected with virtues, while vices were connected to evil spirits. The Spirit indwelt Christians as long as they remained pure because the delicate Holy Spirit cannot dwell with evil spirits. If Christians maintain the purity of the Spirit, they will receive salvation. In these distinctives, Hermas could appear confused when viewed from statements in the New Testament or from later pneumatological reflection. Yet, when viewed on its own merits *The Shepherd of Hermas* does present a coherent pneumatology, regardless of what it may have lacked in precision or accuracy.

⁹¹Wilson, *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas*, 137–38.

⁹²Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 212.

Justin Martyr (d. 160s)

Justin Martyr was born sometime around the beginning of the second-century. He appears to have been born into a Roman family living in Samaria.⁹³ He was martyred sometime between 160 and 168 in the city of Rome.⁹⁴ He first became a philosopher and subsequently converted to Christianity in his adulthood around the year 133. Justin's reason for conversion was that Christianity was the only sure and useful philosophy.⁹⁵ He composed three works that remain extant: *1 Apologia*, *2 Apologia*, and *Dialogus cum Tryphone*.⁹⁶ These works most likely were composed between 150 and 160.⁹⁷ On the basis of these works alone, Justin Martyr is the greatest of the apologists from his time.⁹⁸ He engaged the issues of his time with intelligent arguments for Christianity. In doing this, he provided a glimpse into the shape of pneumatology in the second-century. As far as can be known, Justin Martyr was the first Christian writer to attempt to give an account of the relation of the Son to the Spirit.⁹⁹ However, Swete rightly noted that he does not altogether succeed in this task.¹⁰⁰

⁹³Eric F. Osborn, *Justin Martyr* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1973), 6. Justin Martyr, *1 Apologia* 1.1.

⁹⁴Hubertus Drobner, *The Fathers of the Church*, trans. Siegfried S. Schatzman (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007), 78.

⁹⁵*Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 8.

⁹⁶It is quite possible that Justin composed another Apology that is no longer extant since Eusebius of Caesarea mentions two apologies and quotes from what has been preserved as the Second Apology, and calls it the First Apology (*Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.16–18). Further, Eusebius attributed other works to Justin Martyr that are no longer extant.

⁹⁷L. W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr, His Life and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 11–12.

⁹⁸Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 13; Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 20–21.

⁹⁹From the sections on Ignatius of Antioch and the Shepherd of Hermas it is clear that they did not make an attempt to relate the Son to the Spirit. Yet, Justin attempts to provide a well-argued account for the Christian faith and in so doing encounters the issue of relating the Son to the Spirit in a more direct fashion.

¹⁰⁰Henry B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1912), 35–36.

Person and Work of the Spirit

Justin Martyr most often referred to the Holy Spirit as the “prophetic Spirit.”¹⁰¹ This title is used in connection with the Spirit’s work in speaking through Scripture. Stanton rightly noted that this “is nearly always used in the context of fulfillment of prophetic predictions.”¹⁰² An example of this is in *I Apologia* 31.1, through the prophets “the prophetic Spirit predicted events that were to happen before they took place.” This work of the Spirit in prophecy is more than prediction because in *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 114.1, Justin spoke about how the Holy Spirit caused something to be a type of a future anti-type, and would speak of the future as though it had already happened. Therefore, the Spirit is seen to know the future and create the prophetic predictions. The means by which the Holy Spirit worked through the prophets appears to be dictation. In *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 34.1 Justin introduced his quote from Psalm 18 by saying, “which the Holy Spirit dictated to David by the Holy Spirit.” The Holy Spirit is also said to be the one who speaks in the words of Scripture in *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 74.2 and 124.1.

The work of the Spirit in creating Scripture is not an activity that is unique to the Holy Spirit. Indeed, Justin presented the Son as the real author of prophecy.¹⁰³ In *I Apologia* 33.9 the prophets are said to be inspired by none other than the divine Logos; again in *I Apologia* 36.1 the prophets were prompted by the Logos of God. This then creates an almost complete overlap between the work of the prophetic Spirit and the Logos with regards to prophecy and Scripture. Regarding these statements, Osborn wrote, “from the subject matter of prophecy it is clear that only the logos can be its

¹⁰¹This is used 25 times in the Apologies and another 12 times in *Dialogus cum Tryphone*. Stanton speculated that Justin may well have coined this term himself (Grant N. Stanton, “The Holy Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], 327).

¹⁰²Stanton, “The Holy Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” 326.

¹⁰³George T. Purves, *The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity* (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph and Company, 1889), 277.

author. The unity of the Logos and the Spirit is here explicit.”¹⁰⁴ While Osborn may have overstated by using “explicit,” there remains a clear blurring of the work of the Spirit with the work of the Logos to such an extent that it hints of more than a shared labor.

In the same way as prophecy, the work of the Spirit in rebuking the people of Israel is shared by the Logos.¹⁰⁵ This is seen in *I Apologia 63*, where the Spirit reproached the people of Israel through the prophet Isaiah, and the Son rebuked them while incarnate. However, there is some distinction here between the means of the rebuke. The Spirit rebuked through the prophet while the Son rebuked in the flesh. If not for Justin’s previously examined statements regarding the work of the Logos in prophecy, there could be a distinction between how the Spirit and the Son rebuked the people of Israel.

This linking of the work of the Spirit with the work of the Logos can be seen in two ways. First, it is possible that Justin does not distinguish between the Spirit and the Logos and that for him they are the same entity. Second, it is also possible to understand that this is a shared activity of the Logos and the Spirit. In *I Apologia 38*, the Spirit is said to speak in the person of the Son. Justin writes this shortly after affirming that the divine Logos is the source of prophecy. This suggests that either Justin understood the work of prophecy to be shared by the Logos and the Spirit or that the Logos and Spirit are in some way one.

Justin’s interpretation of the work of the Spirit in the incarnation is important

¹⁰⁴Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 89.

¹⁰⁵Perhaps the only aspect of the Spirit’s work which Justin leaves to the Spirit alone is the work of allowing humanity to perceive God. This is only mentioned in passing in *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 4.1. It comes in the form of a question asked by the old man, “Or will the human mind see God when not adorned by the Holy Spirit?” This question is not directly answered. The flow of the dialogue concludes that the human soul cannot see God, but can perceive God exists. Briggman connects being adorned by the Holy Spirit with being filled with the Holy Spirit (*Dialogus cum Tryphone* 7.1) as the precondition to have insight into divine things. He also notes that this resembles the work of Christ in 7.3 who gives understanding so that invisible and incomprehensible truths may be opened (Anthony Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2012], 17).

to understand how Justin did not always differentiate the Son and the Holy Spirit. Justin mentioned how the prophetic Spirit foretold the virgin birth through the prophet Isaiah. Then he stated, “Therefore, it is not right to understand the Spirit and the power of God as anything other than the Logos, who is the first born of God... and it was this Spirit who came upon the virgin.”¹⁰⁶ Justin used his most common expression for the Holy Spirit “prophetic Spirit,” and then stated that this Spirit is the Logos. It is possible to conclude as Hillar did, that the “prophetic Spirit mentioned frequently by Justin is positively identified by him as the Logos or the Son, and the prophetic function ascribed to the Holy Spirit was performed by the divine Logos.”¹⁰⁷ Barnard stated something similar saying, this passage “seems decisive proof, at least on the surface, that for Justin, Spirit and Logos were two names for the same person.”¹⁰⁸ The difficulty of this position is that Justin did not consistently speak of the Spirit and the Logos as the same entity.¹⁰⁹ Justin consistently spoke of the Spirit and the Logos as distinct entities even though he did not clearly distinguish their work.¹¹⁰

Justin’s understanding of “power” is best seen in two passages, *I Apologia 32* and *Dialogus cum Tryphone 87–88*. In *I Apologia 32.11*, Justin wrote, “The first power after God the Father and Lord of all things is the Logos, who is also his Son.” Justin clearly understood the Logos to be the first power. Turning to *Dialogus cum Tryphone*

¹⁰⁶*I Apologia 33.9.*

¹⁰⁷Marian Hillar, *From Logos to Trinity: The Evolution of Religious Beliefs from Pythagoras to Tertullian* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 178.

¹⁰⁸Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 25. Barnard is rightly more cautious in his conclusion by using the phrase “at least on the surface.” He also noted that this “does not exclude the possibility of his (Justin’s) believing in the Spirit distinct from the Father and the Son” (*Justin Martyr*, 104).

¹⁰⁹Swete rightly noted this and wrote, “While he (Justin) usually distinguishes the Spirit of prophecy from the Logos, he fails to draw this distinction in reference to the Conception” (*The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, 38).

¹¹⁰See *Dialogus cum Tryphone 36.6* and *I Apologia 60* for two examples where Justin distinguished the Spirit from the Logos. Minns and Parvis note that Justin “certainly distinguishes between the Spirit who prophecies about Christ, and Christ himself” (Denis Minns and Paul Parvis. *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*, ed. Henry Chadwick [New York: Oxford University Press, 2009], 66).

87–88, Trypho set the stage for his question by quoting Isaiah 11:1–3, “There will come forth a rod out of the root of Jesse, and a flower will rise up out of his root. The Spirit of God will rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and fortitude, the spirit of knowledge and piety, and he will be filled with the spirit of the fear of the Lord.” Trypho then asked, “How can it be shown that Christ has preexisted, who through the powers of the Holy Spirit, that the Scripture of Isaiah lists, is filled as though he was lacking them?”¹¹¹ In doing this, Trypho calls the spirits listed in Isaiah “powers” connected to the Holy Spirit. Justin accepted that these are powers of the Holy Spirit¹¹² and asserted that these came upon Christ not because he was lacking them, but so that these powers might rest upon him and find their end in him.¹¹³ By finding their end in Christ, Justin understood the work of the Spirit to have passed from the Jews to the Christians.¹¹⁴

Bucur argued that the term “powers” refers to the Holy Spirit. In response to Trypho’s quote of Isaiah 11:2, Justin demonstrated that Christ had the fullness of the powers of the Spirit and distributed them in part to Christians. Bucur identified these powers as certain angelic beings and as the seven powers of the Spirit; and he noted that the Logos is the Lord of the powers.¹¹⁵ He concludes that the Logos and the Spirit are the same reality presented “in a complex and paradoxical relation of simultaneous unity and

¹¹¹*Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 87.2.

¹¹²Bucur rightly noted, “Trypho finds nothing objectionable in Justin’s pneumatology. . . . It seems rather that Justin and Trypho share a pneumatology” (*Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 153). For a similar conclusion, see Michel Barnes “The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology,” *Augustinian Studies* 39, no. 2 (2008): 169–70.

¹¹³*Dialogus cum Tryphone* 87.3. Justin affirmed that because Christ always had these powers of the Spirit, the descent of the Spirit at Jesus’ baptism had no effect and that he was baptized solely for the benefit of mankind.

¹¹⁴*Dialogus cum Tryphone* 87.5.

¹¹⁵Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 150–55.

multiplicity, and with definite angelomorphic traits.”¹¹⁶ The difficulty with Bucur’s position is that Justin’s language elsewhere does not allow for such a strong conclusion regarding the identity of the Spirit and the Son. This passage certainly could allow for this conclusion, but if Bucur’s position were correct, this type of language should be more evident elsewhere in Justin’s writings.

Briggman offers a different interpretation.¹¹⁷ He correctly noted that these “references to the Word as Power combined with his understanding of the Spirit as Power enabled Justin to take the next step and assert the Word to be Spirit: Word=Power=Spirit is the same as Word=Spirit.”¹¹⁸ He understood “the ‘Powers of the Holy Spirit’ which must at all times be continually possessed by Christ refer to the Holy Spirit.”¹¹⁹ He then argued that a type of Spirit-Christology makes the best sense out of Justin’s affirmation that Christ always had the Spirit and that the Spirit was not added to him. Therefore, “Christ is the incarnation of the Spirit-Power-Word.”¹²⁰ Justin’s symbolic interpretation of Jesus’ baptism “coordinates the Trinitarian theophany of the baptismal story . . . with the binitarian logic of Spirit-Christology underlying Justin’s thought in *Dial* 87 and 88.”¹²¹ In this conclusion, Briggman is correct. He limited his binitarianism and Spirit-Christology statements to this passage at hand and avoided making wider claims about Justin’s understanding of the Spirit and the Son. Further, Justin’s understanding of “power,” along with his desire to affirm that the preexistent Logos was never without the

¹¹⁶Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 155.

¹¹⁷Both Bucur and Briggman agree that there is a type of Spirit-Christology at work in Justin and that he used a binitarian theological framework (Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 155, and Anthony Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2012], 29).

¹¹⁸Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 24.

¹¹⁹Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 28.

¹²⁰Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 28.

¹²¹Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 29.

powers of the Holy Spirit, clearly appear to be the textual reasons for his identification of the Logos with the Spirit. In doing this, Justin demonstrated a binitarian tendency in this theological method.

Concerning the powers of the Spirit, Justin understood these as a partial gift of the Spirit. He wrote, “. . . prophets, by receiving one or two powers from God, said the things we have learned from Scripture, Solomon had the spirit of wisdom, Daniel of understanding and counsel. . . .”¹²² Then Justin spoke of how these powers of the Holy Spirit now rest upon Christians.¹²³ Justin’s language here gives the impression that the relationship of Christ to the Spirit is unique. Only in Christ does the Spirit rest in the fullness of its powers. The Spirit was given in a fragmentary fashion before the incarnation, and Justin makes no mention that the Spirit is given in a different fashion to Christians.¹²⁴

Justin’s Trinitarianism

Justin’s confusion of the Son with the Holy Spirit must be read within the context of his Trinitarian statements before strong conclusions are drawn regarding the identity of the Spirit and the Son. Perhaps one of the more enigmatic passages in Justin’s *I Apologia*¹²⁵ is his Trinitarian statement in 6.2, “We revere and worship Him and the

¹²²*Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 87.4. Justin lists many other figures from the Old Testament, but listing them all is not necessary at this point.

¹²³*Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 88.1.

¹²⁴Stanton disagreed with this conclusion, writing, “Justin claims that whereas Israel had experienced the gifts of the Spirit in a limited way before the coming of Christ, with his coming they have ceased to be in evidence among the Jewish people and were given in full to Christian believers” (“The Holy Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” 333). The difficulty with Stanton’s conclusion is that nowhere does Justin speak about the gifts or the powers of the Spirit being given in any more of a complete fashion to Christians than they were to the Jews. Justin wrote, “You can see among us Christians both men and women endowed with gifts from the Spirit of God” (*Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 88.1). Morgan-Wynne rightly noted Justin spoke of both men and women to demonstrate that Christians are the living fulfillment of Joel 2:28–29 (J. E. Morgan-Wynne, “The Holy Spirit and Christian Experience in Justin Martyr,” *Vigilae Christianae* 38 [1984]: 175). Yet, his language in no way hinted that the Spirit is given in a non-fragmentary fashion to Christians.

¹²⁵Barnard rightly called this one of the most enigmatic passages in *I Apologia*. He also notes that attempts to translate around this issue are unconvincing (Leslie W. Barnard, *The First and Second*

Son who came from Him and taught us these things, and also the army of other good angels who follow him and are made like him, and the prophetic Spirit.” The difficulty with this passage is rather obvious; Justin added an army of angels who appear to be worshipped with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Bucur correctly noted, “the phrase, “the army of the other angels” is linked not to the Spirit but to the Son.”¹²⁶ Therefore, this passage does not give the impression that the Holy Spirit is one of the army of angels. However, it does give the appearance that the Spirit is ranked after the army of angels.¹²⁷ Justin did not add angels in any of his other Trinitarian statements, which makes this passage all the more difficult to explain. Regarding this passage, it is clear that Justin linked the Spirit with the Father and the Son. The inclusion of angels¹²⁸ in this statement makes any conclusions about the relation of the Spirit to the Father and Son ambiguous.

Justin’s other Trinitarian statements lack both the mention of angels and the resulting ambiguity of his statement in *I Apologia* 6.2. When describing the deity Christians worship, Justin spoke about the Son being second and the Spirit being third in rank.¹²⁹ Through ranking the Father first, the Son second and the Spirit third, Justin provided a clear distinction between them. It is also quite possible that this ranking conveyed a sense of subordination, but such subordination is not explicit in the text.¹³⁰

Apologies, Ancient Christian Writers 56 [Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1997], 110).

¹²⁶Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 147.

¹²⁷Minns and Parvis. *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr*, 66.

¹²⁸Bucur suggested these angels should be understood as the powers of the Holy Spirit (*Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 148–55). The difficulty with this view is that Bucur also holds the Logos and the Holy Spirit to be the same reality, which creates more problems with understanding Justin’s other Trinitarian statements than the idea that Justin understood angels could be worshipped. Schoedel hypothesized that Justin may have wished to present a rich conception of deity to lessen the charge of atheism. He further noted the reference to “good” here sets off the divine from the demonic and that the Christians have a substitute to the pagan deities (William Schoedel, “A Neglected Motive for Trinitarianism,” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 31 [1980]: 365).

¹²⁹*I Apologia* 13.3.

¹³⁰Briggman noted that a hierarchical understanding of the Trinity appeared to be the norm in

Justin recorded that baptism was done in the name of the Father and of Jesus Christ and of the Holy Spirit.¹³¹ Likewise, at the Eucharist, praise and glory is offered to the Father in the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit.¹³² In a general context of worship, Justin recounts that the Creator is blessed through the Son and the Holy Spirit.¹³³ From these few statements, it is clear that Trinitarian formulas were at the center of Justin's Christian worship experience, and that he held to a Trinitarian confession. Further, Justin provided a Trinitarian confession in which he distinguished the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit as distinct entities.

Lest it be said that Justin's Trinitarianism was only the result of his worship experiences, Justin composed a couple of Trinitarian statements where the context does not appear to necessitate a Trinitarian statement. In *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, Justin wrote, "After these princes in heaven seeing that he [Christ] was without beauty, honor, or glory in appearance, and not recognizing him they asked, 'Who is this King of Glory?' The Holy Spirit either in his own or the Father's name answered, 'The Lord of Hosts. He is the King of Glory.'¹³⁴ Here, Justin included the Spirit as the one who announced that the Son is the King of Glory, and this could have been said in the Spirit's voice or the

the second-century, as the pitfalls of this position were not yet known (*Irenaeus of Lyons*, 12). Barnard went so far as to say that Justin's ranking was "not intended to suggest degrees of subordination in the Godhead" (*Justin Martyr the First and Second Apologies*, 117). Quasten argued that Justin had a tendency to subordinate the Son to the Father (*Patrology*, 1:209), and if he is correct in this assessment, this ranking could be evidence of subordination. At the very least, Justin left open the possibility for others to find subordinationism in his vocabulary at this point.

¹³¹*I Apologia* 61.3. See also *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 114 where Justin discussed how Christ is called a stone and how Christians receive their circumcision from the Stone. Then he spoke about how living water gushes forth from the Stone to the hearts of those who love him through the Father. This is likely a Trinitarian statement with the "living water" being a figure of speech for the Holy Spirit. Morgan-Wynne, associated this circumcision with baptism and that, as a result of baptism, the Christian receives the Holy Spirit ("The Holy Spirit and Christian Experience in Justin Martyr," 173). This may well be the case, but the connection between circumcision and baptism and the reception of the Holy Spirit is not clear in Justin's writings.

¹³²*I Apologia* 65.3.

¹³³*I Apologia* 67.2.

¹³⁴*Dialogus cum Tryphone* 36.6.

Father's voice.¹³⁵ This demonstrates that the Spirit can speak in the name of the Father concerning the Son. With the Spirit speaking about the Son in this manner, Justin affirms a distinction between the Spirit and the Son. Justin even more clearly demonstrated his Trinitarian belief in *I Apologia* 60.6-7,

Plato's mention of a third [subsistence] also originated, as we already stated, from his reading of Moses who said: 'The Spirit of God moved over the waters.' For indeed, he gives the second place to the Word of God, who he said is placed in the universe in the form of the letter X, and the third place to the Spirit.¹³⁶

Briggman notes that the Pseudo-Platonic works that Justin quoted do not contain a mention of a spirit in them.¹³⁷ This then leaves Justin as adding the Spirit, and that it occupies the third place, into the supposed writings of Plato. Justin would not have engaged in such exegetical practices unless the Trinity was an important enough reality for him that he sought to find it in the works of others.

In conclusion, Justin's pneumatology contains a clear Trinitarian confession alongside binitarian tendencies. Neither one of these can be overlooked when describing Justin's theology and, in this case, his pneumatology. In several instances, Justin clearly distinguished the Holy Spirit to be both divine with and distinct from the Father and the Son. Yet, he also did not carefully distinguish the work of the Spirit from the work of the Son, and in one clear example considered them to be the same entity. This disparity in Justin's thought produced a pneumatology that is central to the Christian life, while at the same time being somewhat confused.

Irenaeus of Lyons (130–200)

Irenaeus was born sometime between 130 and 140.¹³⁸ As a youth he was

¹³⁵Briggman noted that the Spirit speaking in the voice of the Father must mean that Justin viewed the being of the Spirit in the same way he viewed the being of the Father (*Irenaeus of Lyons*, 13).

¹³⁶*I Apologia* 60.6–7.

¹³⁷Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 13.

¹³⁸For a list of other proposed dates, see Eric F. Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons* (New York:

taught by Polycarp of Smyrna (d. 156).¹³⁹ It is possible that he also encountered Justin Martyr during a visit to Rome on his way to Lyons.¹⁴⁰ He became the bishop of Lyons in 177 after the previous bishop died during persecution.¹⁴¹ Irenaeus died around the year 200, but the cause of his death is uncertain.¹⁴² His extant works consist of the five volume *Adversus Haereses* and the significantly shorter *Epideixis*. *Adversus Haereses* was written first in the 180s, with *Epideixis* being written some time afterwards.¹⁴³ In *Adversus Haereses*, Irenaeus refuted Gnosticism through pointing out its own inconsistencies and the true knowledge which is the Christian faith. Irenaeus provided an outline of the Christian faith in his shorter work, *Epideixis*. In Irenaeus' explanations of the Christian doctrine, he set forth a relatively clear pneumatology.¹⁴⁴

Holy Spirit and Prophecy

Irenaeus continued the Christian tradition of using the term “prophetic Spirit”

Cambridge University Press, 2001), 2. Osborn notes the limiting factors for Irenaeus' birth are that Irenaeus had to be old enough to be made bishop in 177 and to have been taught by Polycarp in his youth.

¹³⁹*Adversus Haereses*, 3.3.4.

¹⁴⁰James R. Payton Jr., *Irenaeus on the Christian Faith: A Condensation of Against Heresies* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Press, 2011), 2.

¹⁴¹Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 4.

¹⁴²Jerome recorded that Irenaeus was martyred in his *Commentariorum in Esaiam* 17.64. However, he did not mention Irenaeus' martyrdom in his earlier work *Liber De Viris Illustribus*. Likewise, Eusebius of Caesarea made no mention of Irenaeus being a martyr in *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Since there is no other recorded mention of Irenaeus' martyrdom prior to Jerome, and Jerome did not include this in the work where it would be expected, it is best to view this claim with some suspicion.

¹⁴³Payton, *Irenaeus on the Christian Faith*, 2–3. See also Michel Barnes, “Irenaeus' Trinitarian Theology,” *Nova et Vetera* 7, no. 1 (2009): 72.

¹⁴⁴Michel Barnes, “Irenaeus' Trinitarian Theology,” 71. While his pneumatology is relatively clear, Briggman argued that it was not entirely consistent. He notes that Irenaeus developed his understanding of the creative work of the Spirit as he wrote *Adversus Haereses*. He argues that it is not until Irenaeus was writing book three that he encountered the writing of Theophilus of Antioch (d. 180's) and then developed the idea of the Son and the Spirit as the two hands of God (Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 32–37). Lashier followed Briggman's argument concerning the influence of Theophilus on Irenaeus' pneumatology (Jackson Lashier, *Irenaeus on the Trinity* [Boston: Brill, 2014], 168–75). When compared with Justin Martyr as seen previously in this chapter, Irenaeus' pneumatology is far clearer and more consistent.

for the Holy Spirit.¹⁴⁵ The connection between the Spirit and the Old Testament prophets is clearly stated in *Epideixis* 6, “the Holy Spirit, through whom the prophets prophesied.”¹⁴⁶ This demonstrates that Irenaeus understood “the Spirit to be the source and agent of prophecy.”¹⁴⁷ As with Justin, Irenaeus saw the Spirit’s connection with prophesy to be tied directly to Scripture. Irenaeus clearly affirmed this writing, “The one and the same Spirit of God, who foretold through the prophets how and in what manner the Lord would come, and who through the elders well translated the things that had been well prophesied, preached in turn through the Apostles.”¹⁴⁸ In this passage, Irenaeus made several connections of the Spirit to Scripture. The Holy Spirit foretold prophecies through the prophets. The translation of the LXX is also the work of the Spirit through the elders. Furthermore, the same Spirit preached through the Apostles. The use of the preposition “through” in each of these three activities hints that Irenaeus understood the Spirit to work in an equal and same manner in all three. This is important due to Irenaeus’ understanding of Scripture. When it comes to difficult to understand passages of Scripture, Irenaeus wrote, “We leave questions like this to God who made us, knowing well that the Scriptures are indeed perfect because they were spoken by the Logos of God and his Spirit.”¹⁴⁹ This quote affirms Irenaeus understood the Scripture to be perfect because it was the work of the Son and the Spirit.¹⁵⁰ Because the Spirit spoke through

¹⁴⁵Barnes, “Irenaeus’s Trinitarian Theology,” 71. For a couple examples of this usage, see *Adversus Haereses* 3.11.8 and 4.20.6.

¹⁴⁶*Epideixis* 6. All quotations from *Epideixis* are taken from *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, trans. Joseph P. Smith. (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1952). Irenaeus also mentioned in this passage how the Spirit taught the patriarchs about God and led them in the path of justice. However, Irenaeus did not offer any details on how he understood this to have occurred.

¹⁴⁷Barnes, “Irenaeus’s Trinitarian Theology,” 71.

¹⁴⁸*Adversus Haereses* 3.21.4.

¹⁴⁹*Adversus Haereses* 2.28.2.

¹⁵⁰It is consistent to view the work of the Spirit in the translation of the LXX to have brought the LXX to a similar perfection.

Scripture, Irenaeus understood the words of Scripture to be the words of the Spirit.¹⁵¹

Irenaeus, elsewhere, directly wrote about the perfection that the Spirit worked in the Apostles. Regarding the Apostles, “they were made perfect by the Spirit after the Lord’s assumption.”¹⁵² The context of this quote does not provide any clarification as to how Irenaeus understood this “perfection.” Irenaeus had previously provided some explanation of how he understood this in the context of the Apostles ministry, “For after our Lord had risen from the dead, they were clothed with power from on high when the Holy Spirit came upon them, they had full assurance concerning all things, and had perfect knowledge; they went out to the ends of the earth, preaching the good news to us. . . .”¹⁵³ This perfect knowledge is a work of the Spirit which resulted in the apostles having “perfect knowledge.” Irenaeus understood this “perfect knowledge” to be found in their preaching of the good news. Briggman rightly notes, “Irenaeus does not, in this regard, distinguish between the oral proclamation and the written testimony—both have as their origin apostles who received the power and gifts of the Spirit at Pentecost.”¹⁵⁴ The work of the Spirit in making the Apostles perfect is in direct relation to the preaching and teaching of the Apostles. For Irenaeus, then, the work of the Spirit in the Apostles placed both the oral tradition and the New Testament¹⁵⁵ on the same authoritative level as the Old Testament. This same level of authority is not attributed to the prophetic work of the Spirit among Christians of his day. In the midst of writing about how the presence of

¹⁵¹The speaking of the Spirit in Scripture is evident in *Epideixis* 24, “He [God] testified about him [Abraham] saying through the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures: And Abraham believed God; and it was reputed to him unto justice.” The quotation of Gen 15:6 is introduced as spoken by the Father through the Holy Spirit, revealing the Spirit speaks the words of the Father in Scripture.

¹⁵²*Adversus Haereses* 3.12.5

¹⁵³*Adversus Haereses* 3.1.1.

¹⁵⁴Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 49–50. This provides an explanation for the weight which Irenaeus gives to the apostolic tradition in his argument.

¹⁵⁵In *Adversus Haereses* 3.11.8, Irenaeus spoke of the four Gospels as the foundations of the church which are held together by the Holy Spirit.

the Spirit makes one spiritual, Irenaeus notes that “many brothers in the church, who have prophetic gifts and who speak in all kinds of tongues through the Spirit.”¹⁵⁶ Speaking in tongues and prophecy are accomplished through the Spirit, and so serve as an example of the work of the Spirit in making people spiritual.¹⁵⁷

Baptism and Spiritual Life

Irenaeus understood the Spirit to have a vital role in the ministry of Jesus. This begins with the baptism of Jesus. Irenaeus was quite clear that the Spirit came upon Jesus because of his humanity, “For in as much as the Logos of God was a man from the root of Jesse and the son of Abraham, the Spirit of God rested upon him.”¹⁵⁸ Irenaeus then connected the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus with Jesus being anointed to preach the Gospel. Yet, the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus has greater implications than merely preparing the humanity of Jesus for his earthly ministry. Irenaeus wrote that the Spirit descended upon Jesus “in order that we might be saved, having received from the abundance of his anointing.”¹⁵⁹ This passage is somewhat confusing because Irenaeus does not explain how this occurs. Briggman notes that elsewhere Irenaeus spoke of the coming of Jesus in brilliant flesh to enlighten humanity.¹⁶⁰ This incorruptibility is then passed to humanity from Jesus after his glorification through the Spirit who became accustomed to dwelling in humanity in the incarnation.¹⁶¹ This allows Irenaeus to write

¹⁵⁶*Adversus Haereses* 5.6.1.

¹⁵⁷In *Adversus Haereses* 3.32.4, Irenaeus mentions how exorcisms, raising the dead, prophecy, and speaking in tongues are things that the church does in the name of Jesus. He did not mention the Spirit in relation to these activities in this passage.

¹⁵⁸*Adversus Haereses* 3.9.3. Irenaeus is quite clear that Jesus in his divinity had no need for the Spirit to come upon him. Briggman argues Irenaeus understood the anointing of the Spirit as “a non-qualitative empowerment of Jesus’ humanity for the fulfillment of the Christological mission” (*Irenaeus of Lyons*, 59-77).

¹⁵⁹*Adversus Haereses* 3.9.3.

¹⁶⁰*Adversus Haereses* 4.20.2.

¹⁶¹Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 76–77.

that about bodies of believers as “rising by means of the Spirit become spiritual bodies, so that by the Spirit they may have everlasting life.”¹⁶² Therefore, the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at his baptism both prepared the humanity of Jesus for his ministry and was the first step towards the Spirit bringing life to those who believe in Jesus.

In *Adversus Haereses* 3.17.1, Irenaeus detailed the way Jesus’ baptism allowed the Spirit to become accustomed to resting and dwelling in humans. Then speaking of Christian baptism, Irenaeus wrote, “For our bodies received unity through that laver which leads to incorruptibility, but our souls through the Spirit.”¹⁶³ Irenaeus viewed the act of baptism directly pertaining to the human body’s incorruptibility, whereas the soul’s incorruptibility comes through the Spirit. Irenaeus repeats this distinction of the soul and body in relation to baptism in *Epideixis* 41, “purifying their souls and their bodies through the baptism of the water and of the Holy Spirit.” Briggman suggests that based upon Irenaeus’ use of “laver”¹⁶⁴ in *Adversus Haereses* 5.15.3, that “laver” in this instance refers only to an external washing of the body. This then means that the soul needs to be purified by means of the Spirit since it is not purified in the water of baptism.¹⁶⁵

Briggman argued that Irenaeus did not view the Spirit to be given in baptism. Key to his argument is the wording of Irenaeus who wrote that baptism only leads to incorruptibility, but does not itself provide incorruptibility.¹⁶⁶ He then rightly suggested that the liturgy of the time may well have been a two-rite liturgy with the Spirit

¹⁶²*Adversus Haereses* 5.7.2.

¹⁶³*Adversus Haereses* 3.17.2

¹⁶⁴Preserved in the Latin as *lavacrum*. In *Adversus Haereses* 5.15.3, Irenaeus uses “laver” in his interpretation of the blind man who was healed after Jesus placed spittle and dirt upon his eyes and he regained his sight. Irenaeus interpreted his washing as “the laver of regeneration” as the means by which his body was restored. This example was used as a prefiguration of the resurrection of the body.

¹⁶⁵Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 80.

¹⁶⁶Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 79-81.

understood to be given in the post baptism anointing.¹⁶⁷ Briggman's interpretation has a serious weakness at this point. In attaching the argument so closely to the notion that baptism only leads to incorruptibility, he has left out the possibility of the Spirit's departure from the baptized. Irenaeus allowed for this possibility, for "without the Spirit of God we cannot be saved, the apostle encourages us through faith and chaste living to preserve the Spirit of God, lest we lose the kingdom of heaven by having become non-participators with the Divine Spirit."¹⁶⁸ If one can cease to participate with the Spirit and so lose the kingdom of heaven, then it would only make sense for Irenaeus to speak of the presence of the Spirit given at baptism as only leading to incorruption. This by no means necessitates that Irenaeus understood the Spirit to be given at baptism, but it certainly leaves it as a viable possibility.¹⁶⁹ Irenaeus closely connected the coming of the Spirit with the act of baptism, yet he did not directly address whether the Spirit was received by Christians at baptism or at another time.

The incorruptibility into which the Spirit leads a Christian is a renewal that culminates in the resurrection life. This is seen in several different aspects. In *Adversus Haereses* 3.17.1, Irenaeus wrote about the Spirit renewing people "from their old selves for the newness of Christ." The Spirit also "purifies humans and raises them up to the life of God."¹⁷⁰ This life reaches its culmination in the resurrection., "Therefore in this present time, if fleshly hearts are made partakers of the Spirit, how is it strange if in the

¹⁶⁷Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 81–82. Briggman lists Origen, Hippolytus, and Tertullian as all supporting a two-rite baptismal practice.

¹⁶⁸*Adversus Haereses* 5.9.3. This idea is repeated in 5.9.4.

¹⁶⁹Supporting this discussion of Christian baptism is the baptism of Jesus. This is clear in the last sentence of *Adversus Haereses* 3.17.2, "Receiving the Spirit as a gift from his Father, the Lord gives it to those who partake of him, sending the Holy Spirit upon the earth." Therefore, Irenaeus understood that it is through the union with Christ, received in baptism, that Christ gives the Spirit to the baptized. At the same time, in *Adversus Haereses* 3.24.1, the Spirit is the means of communion with Christ to "all participating members." Briggman correctly assessed these two passages as being in agreement with each other. This then leaves the Spirit uniting people to Christ as the Spirit unites them to himself (*Irenaeus of Lyons*, 89).

¹⁷⁰*Adversus Haereses* 5.9.2.

resurrection they receive the life that is given by the Spirit?”¹⁷¹ Eternal life in the resurrection is received from the Spirit. In this sense, Irenaeus clearly understood the Spirit to be the giver of spiritual life.¹⁷²

Spirit Empowered Martyrdom

As Ignatius of Antioch understood the Spirit to have called him to martyrdom, so also Irenaeus spoke about the role of the Spirit in martyrdom. Irenaeus interpreted the statement of Jesus “the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak”¹⁷³ as a reference to the Holy Spirit. He then builds upon this interpretation to explain how the stronger (Spirit) prevails over the weaker (flesh) with the result that the Christian becomes spiritual through the fellowship of the Spirit. The evidence of this is then seen in the martyrs. “The martyrs were able to despise death and to give witness, not through the weakness of the flesh, but because of the assistance of the Holy Spirit.”¹⁷⁴ The ability of Christians to become a martyrs rests upon the presence and transformative work of the Spirit within them. Therefore, martyrdom is evidence of the activity and presence of the Holy Spirit.

Spirit as the Divine Creator

Irenaeus’ understanding of the work of the Spirit in creation is crucial to his ontology of the Spirit. In explaining how only God could create the image of God, Irenaeus wrote,

For God did not need these [angels] to do what he himself had determined beforehand as if he did not possess his hands. For The Word and Wisdom, the Son

¹⁷¹*Adversus Haereses* 5.13.4.

¹⁷²Behr argued that Irenaeus understood the Spirit to be the source of all life, and that the Spirit is present in every human, nourishing them in order for them to live physically (John Behr, *Aesceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement*, ed. A. Louth and G. Clark [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000], 96–107). Briggman rightly notes that the passages quoted by Behr to support this view do not address the presence of the Spirit with those who do not follow God (*Irenaeus of Lyons*, 153–64).

¹⁷³Matt 26:41.

¹⁷⁴*Adversus Haereses* 5.9.2.

and the Spirit, were always present with him by whom and in whom he made all things. To whom he also speaks saying, ‘Let us make man after our image and likeness.’¹⁷⁵

This short passage demonstrates Irenaeus understood the Spirit to be the creator of humanity along with the Son. The image here of the Son and the Spirit as the two hands of God does not speak about the Spirit and the Son as “emanations” from the Father. Rather this image of “the hands of the Father” demonstrates that the Holy Spirit is not an intermediary who is less than God. This imagery of “two hands” means the Spirit is spoken of on the same level of divinity as the Son. This is important because Barnes notes that in Irenaeus’ writings, there is no hint of subordination of the Son to the Father, and by implication the Spirit as well.¹⁷⁶ The eternity of the Spirit is affirmed because the Spirit was always present with the Father, and therefore cannot be a lesser emanation from the Father.¹⁷⁷ The presence of the Spirit with the Father is doubly affirmed as Irenaeus understood the Spirit and the Son to be addressed by the Father who said to them, “Let us make” in Genesis 1:26. Irenaeus’ connection of the Spirit with “Wisdom,” as distinct for the Son who is the “Word,” provides a point from which he distinguished their work in creation.¹⁷⁸ This is seen in *Adversus Haereses* 4.20.2, “God who made all

¹⁷⁵*Adversus Haereses* 4.20.1.

¹⁷⁶Barnes notes that Irenaeus’ understanding of the spiritual nature of God is such that the relationship between Father, Son and Spirit cannot be understood in a spatial manner. This is because in *Adversus Haereses* 2.13.6–7, Irenaeus spoke of how the Father contains and emits the Son and how the Son partakes of the Father. This discussion indirectly pertains to the Spirit as well as to the Son (“Irenaeus’ Trinitarian Theology,” 76–85). Briggman speculates that there is no subordination in Irenaeus’ view of God partly because the view of his gnostic opponents was filled with intermediaries (Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 122).

¹⁷⁷Barnes notes that Irenaeus did not provide an account of the origin of the Holy Spirit (“Irenaeus’ Trinitarian Theology,” 93–96). Briggman argues that Irenaeus’ quotation of Prov 8:22 in *Adversus Haereses* 4.20.3, “the Lord created me,” should not be used to speak to Irenaeus’ understanding of the origin of the Spirit. The string of quotations from Proverbs in this passage are all centered upon affirming the existence of the Spirit with the Father before all of creation (*Irenaeus of Lyons*, 130). Lashier hypothesizes that Irenaeus’ emphasis on the equality of divinity of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit is the reason for his reluctance to address the origin of the Spirit (*Irenaeus on the Trinity*, 208). Despite being silent on the origin of the Spirit, Irenaeus clearly affirmed the eternity of the Spirit in this passage by presenting the Spirit as present with the Father before creation.

¹⁷⁸Lashier observes that “Irenaeus does not identify the creative function of Sophia distinct from that of the Logos until Haer. 3.24.2.” He argues that Irenaeus did so at this point because he had encountered this idea of connecting Wisdom with the Spirit in the writings of Theophilus of Antioch

things by the Word and adorned them by Wisdom.” The creative work of the Spirit is adornment and is distinct from the work of the Son. This distinction is also evident in *Epideixis 5*, where “the Word “establishes,” that is, works bodily and consolidates being, while the Spirit disposes and shapes the various “powers.”” While the Son “establishes,” the Spirit “disposes” and “shapes.”¹⁷⁹ This demonstrates the work of the Son and the work of the Spirit are distinct and complementary.

The Spirit’s distinct work with creation extends beyond the act of creation. The Spirit also makes God known to creation. An example of this is seen in *Epideixis 7*; “So without the Spirit there is no seeing the Word of God, and without the Son there is no approaching the Father, for the Son is the knowledge of the Father, and knowledge of the Son is through the Holy Spirit.”¹⁸⁰ The only way to see or to approach the Father is first through the Spirit. Swete rightly noted, while the Spirit holds “the lowest place in the work of human salvation, it is not the least important or necessary.”¹⁸¹ For without this first work of the Spirit revealing the Son to humanity, humans would not be able to see the Son or know the Father. Therefore, one can only know God through the work of the Holy Spirit.

Trinitarian Confession and Trinitarian Theology

Irenaeus continued in the traditional aspects of the aforementioned pneumatology in affirming the work of the Spirit in prophecy, in creation, and being

(*Irenaeus on the Trinity*, 179).

¹⁷⁹Briggman provides a list of the six verbs that Irenaeus used to speak of the work of the Spirit in creation. These verbs are *adornare*, *aptare*, *compingere*, *consonare*, *disponere*, and *gubernare*. He offers that the variety of verbs used for the work of the Spirit demonstrate Irenaeus’ concern for the effect of the Spirit’s work and not primarily the act itself. The effect of the Spirit’s work is of producing harmony throughout all the variety of creation (*Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit*, 136–45).

¹⁸⁰Irenaeus also presented this concept in *Adversus Haereses* 3.17.2–3 and 5.36.2.

¹⁸¹Swete, *Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, 90–91.

present in the church. Yet Irenaeus also developed a Trinitarian theology to match the Trinitarian confession that he had received. Unlike Justin Martyr, there is no hint of pneumatological subordination in Irenaeus. In the same way, there is not a hint of confusion of the work of the Spirit with the work of the Son. The Holy Spirit in Irenaeus' thought is distinct from the Father and the Son while at the same time sharing in the same divinity.

Clement of Alexandria (150–215)

Clement, who converted to Christianity as an adult,¹⁸² was born between 140 and 150,¹⁸³ possibly in Athens.¹⁸⁴ He presented his life as a movement from one teacher to another until he met Pantaenus¹⁸⁵ who was the head of the catechetical school in Alexandria.¹⁸⁶ Clement succeeded Pantaenus as the director of this school.¹⁸⁷ He left Alexandria during the persecution in 202 under the Emperor Septimius Severus¹⁸⁸ and died around 215, likely in Palestine.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸²*Paedagogus* 1.1.

¹⁸³Piotr Ashwin-Siejkowski, *Clement of Alexandria: A Project of Christian Perfection* (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 20.

¹⁸⁴Eric F. Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 21.

¹⁸⁵*Stromateis* 1.11.

¹⁸⁶Jerome, *Liber De Viris Illustribus* 36; Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 5.10. Little is known about Pantaenus. Jerome and Eusebius recorded him to have been a stoic, to have traveled to India, and to have been the leader of the catechetical school in Alexandria. Therefore, Pantaenus should be understood to have studied some philosophy, to have been a teacher of some ability, and was acquainted with some travels.

¹⁸⁷Jerome, *Liber De Viris Illustribus* 38.1. Jerome recorded that Clement was a priest. Eusebius of Caesarea made no mention of Clement being a priest in *Historia Ecclesiastica* 5.11 or 6.13–14. Eusebius mentioned Clement was the teacher of Alexander the bishop of Jerusalem (d. 250). A letter from this same Alexander appears to have provided Jerome with the knowledge that Clement was a priest (*Liber De Viris Illustribus* 38.6).

¹⁸⁸Ashwin-Siejkowski, *Clement of Alexandria*, 30.

¹⁸⁹Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria*, 1. Roberts and Donaldson astutely observed about Clement, “[t]he close of his career is covered with obscurity” (Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, *Clement of Alexandria, Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. 4 [Edinburgh: Murray and Gibb, 1867], 11–12).

Clement's writings can be dated from 192–203.¹⁹⁰ As with many other writers from this era, many of Clement's works have been lost.¹⁹¹ His three major works that are fully extant are: *Protreptikos*, *Paidagogos*, and *Stromateis*. In addition to these there remain the works *Quis Dives Salvetur*, *Eclogae Propheticae*, which may have originally been part of *Hypotyposeis* (which has not been wholly preserved), and fragments of other works. Clement wrote in *Stromateis* 5.13 that he would discuss what the Holy Spirit is in later books entitled "On Prophecy" and "On the Soul." Clement either never wrote these works, or they were not preserved.¹⁹² Therefore, Clement's pneumatology must be gleaned from his works which did not directly address the work and person of the Spirit.

Scripture and the Spirit

From Clement's extant works, his most pervasive understanding of the Holy Spirit was the Holy Spirit as the speaker in and of Scripture. Clement often introduced Scriptural quotations by noting the words he was about to quote originated from the Holy Spirit. A fine example of this is in *Protreptikos* 9.68, "I could bring to you ten thousand passages of Scripture of which not even "one stroke will pass away" without being fulfilled, for the mouth of the Lord, the Holy Spirit has spoken these things." In this

¹⁹⁰Drobner, *Fathers of the Church*, 132.

¹⁹¹Jerome listed *Stromateis*, *Hypotyposeis*, *Protrepticus*, *Pedagogus*, and several other works among the corpus of Clement (*Liber De Viris Illustribus* 38.3–3).

¹⁹²Bucur presented the notion that Clement's *Hypotyposeis* contains the books "On Prophecy" and "On the Soul" which Clement mentioned in *Stromata* 5.13.89. He then considered passages which mentioned the Spirit in *Hypotyposeis* (and the other fragmentary works of Clement) to be more important than Clement's extant works and the pneumatology found in them (*Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 5). Bucur's position on the *Hypotyposeis* containing the books "On the Soul" and "On Prophecy" faces significant difficulties. Eusebius recorded that Clement's *Hypotyposeis* was a work that presented his biblical interpretation, made an account of all the canonical and disputed books of the Bible, along with the traditions he had received (Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.13–6.14). It is within the realm of possibility that *Hypotyposeis* was the work which addressed the ontology of the Holy Spirit. However, if such were the case then it seems odd that there is no mention of this by Eusebius or Jerome. Further, the fact that *Hypotyposeis* is preserved in fragments and that none of these fragments contain a section in which Clement wrote that he was addressing the Holy Spirit, makes Bucur's position speculative at best. It is far more likely that Clement never composed the books "On the Soul" and "On Prophecy," or that these works were not preserved. Therefore, this work will not treat the pneumatology in any of Clement's works as being more definitive than the pneumatology in any of Clement's other works.

passage, Clement affirmed the Spirit to be the mouth of the Lord and to have spoken Scripture. Because of the Spirit's work, everything in Scripture will be fulfilled. The human author is also evident in Scripture. Clement would write about how the Spirit spoke through the mouth of the human author. An example of this is in *Paidagogos* 1.5.15, where he wrote of the Spirit speaking through the mouth of Isaiah.¹⁹³ The work of the Spirit in speaking Scripture includes both Old and New Testament books. Clement wrote of how the Spirit spoke through the Apostle Paul¹⁹⁴ and how he also spoke the words of Matthew 21:15.¹⁹⁵ The frequency with which Clement speaks of the Holy Spirit in relation to Scripture is such that Osborn wrote, "The spirit is above all a spirit of prophecy, who speaks in both the Old and New Testament."¹⁹⁶ Osborn's assessment is quite correct. Clement mentioned the Spirit primarily as the one who speaks the words of God in Scripture.¹⁹⁷

Clement wrote about the Spirit being involved in the correct understanding of Scripture. In *Protreptikos* 9.70, Clement wrote how if you desire, "the Spirit will explain to you" the meaning of the word "proving" found in Hebrews 3:9. He then quoted Hebrews 3:10-11 as the explanation of the Spirit. This affirms the Spirit's role in speaking Scripture, and provides some hints as to the role of the Spirit in biblical interpretation. Clement's brief statement appears to affirm that using one passage of Scripture to understand another passage of Scripture is part of the work of the Spirit who speaks in both passages. This interpretation is supported by Clement's statements in *Stromateis* 2.2.7. "But those who possess the Holy Spirit 'search the deep things of

¹⁹³*Paidagogos* 1.5.15.

¹⁹⁴*Paidagogos* 1.6.49.

¹⁹⁵*Paidagogos* 1.5.12.

¹⁹⁶Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria*, 151.

¹⁹⁷Clement also begins quotations from Scripture by noting the Lord or the Son spoke the words which Clement is about to quote.

God,' that is, they grasp the secret which is in the prophecies.” The prophecies which Clement mentioned here are nothing other than Scripture.¹⁹⁸ Therefore, the Spirit for Clement is not only the speaker in Scripture, but also the one who enables humans to understand the meaning of Scripture.

The role of the Spirit speaking the words of the God has some relevance to the ontology of the Spirit. Bucur commented that in *Stromateis* 5.6, Clement reworked the phrase “the self-same Holy Spirit works in all”¹⁹⁹ to refer to the Logos and affirmed that both the Spirit and the Logos are the agent of prophecy.²⁰⁰ Bucur is correct that Clement spoke of both the Logos and the Spirit as the agent of prophecy. The context in *Stromateis* 5.6 does not necessitate that the identity of the Logos and the Spirit are confused here. Clement wrote of the Spirit being the mouth of the Lord²⁰¹ and how the Holy Spirit spoke in the voice of the Lord.²⁰² If the Holy Spirit is the mouth of the Lord and speaks in the voice of the Lord, then Clement did not rework a passage about the Spirit to refer to the Logos, since they share the work of prophetic inspiration in such a manner that it is difficult to distinguish them.²⁰³

Osborn connected the work of the Spirit in Scripture with the statement in *Stromateis* 6.15.123 where Clement, following Plato, affirmed that it is only possible to learn truth from God or the Son of God.²⁰⁴ Clement agreed with Plato and offered that

¹⁹⁸This is clearly adduced by a cursory examination of the end of *Stromateis* 2.2, where Clement states that the divine Scriptures are to be believed and by so doing one will receive a demonstration in the voice of God.

¹⁹⁹*Stromateis* 5.6.38. Here Clement quoted 1 Cor 12:11.

²⁰⁰Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 76.

²⁰¹*Protrepitkos* 9.68.

²⁰²*Paidagogos* 1.6.49.

²⁰³The issue of the identity of the Spirit and the Son is examined more closely in the section on the ontology of the Spirit.

²⁰⁴Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria*, 151.

this truth is the reason for how he knows the truth by the Son of God from the Scriptures. Clement does not mention the Spirit and the role of the Spirit in speaking Scripture in this section. Despite this omission and Clement's focus on the Son of God, Osborn's observation retains some relevance. If truth can only be revealed by God, and the Spirit is the mouth of God, speaking the truth in Scripture, then Clement by his very definitions gave the distinction impression that the Spirit is in some sense divine.

The Spirit and the Christian

For Clement, the beginning of the work of the Spirit in the life of a Christian is at the moment of baptism.²⁰⁵ Baptism removes sin and allows the Christian to perceive divinity with the aid of the Spirit, "who is poured forth from heaven upon us."²⁰⁶ Itter correctly noted that the ability to contemplate the divine is restored by the Holy Spirit at baptism.²⁰⁷ The removal of sins is accomplished by the Father as Clement wrote, "the Father forgives with mercy and the dew of the Holy Spirit."²⁰⁸ The dew of the Holy Spirit is the coming of the Spirit at baptism. The coming of the Spirit is then connected with the forgiveness of sins, yet the role of the Spirit in the forgiveness of sins is undefined.²⁰⁹ Clement offered few details upon the initial activity of the Spirit being

²⁰⁵Clement did not appear to open the possibility of the Spirit being at work among the catechumen when he wrote, "Instruction leads to faith and faith with baptism is trained by the Holy Spirit" (*Paidagogos* 1.6.30). With faith and baptism being trained by the Holy Spirit, the Spirit's work of training is placed squarely in the life of Christians and not in the lives of those who are outside the church.

²⁰⁶*Paidagogos* 1.6.28.

²⁰⁷Andrew C. Itter, *Esoteric Teaching in the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria* (Boston: Brill, 2009), 131. Itter also noted that the baptized did not receive a light which they did not already possess prior to baptism (*Esoteric Teaching*, 131). If Itter is correct, this means that the enlightenment received at baptism is centered upon the removal of sins so that the soul is free to perceive the divine.

²⁰⁸*Quis Dives Salvetur*, 40.

²⁰⁹In the context of the presence of the Spirit and the forgiveness of sin, Clement connected the righteousness of one's life to how near the illuminating Spirit is to one (*Stromateis* 4.17.109). The context hints that the Spirit has a significant role in revealing sin and purifying the Christian from sin. Again, the exact role of the Spirit in forgiving sin is left unspecified.

bestowed at baptism,²¹⁰ beyond the contemplation of the divine and some form of involvement in the forgiveness of sins.²¹¹

The source of the Spirit is hinted at in the context of how Christians ought to use perfume. Clement wrote, “let her always be anointed with the ambrosial chrism of modesty, and find delight in the holy unguent, the Spirit. Christ prepares this ointment of pleasant fragrance for his disciples, compounding the myrrh of celestial aromatic herbs.”²¹² Immediately following this quote, Clement quoted Psalm 44:8 and commented how the Lord anointed himself with the Holy Spirit.²¹³ This demonstrates Clement interpreted the oil in Psalm 44:8 as a reference to the Holy Spirit. Further, he placed the source of the Spirit in Christ. Christ prepares the Spirit to anoint Christians and was anointed himself by the same Spirit.

As the Holy Spirit is given to Christians, he remains undivided. Clement stated this saying, “the Spirit of God is indivisibly divided to all those who are justified by faith.”²¹⁴ This means that although the Spirit is given to many, he is not split or divided, but remains the same Spirit. In saying this, Clement affirmed the Spirit to have some form of omnipresence. The Spirit works to bring people to God and to transform them. An example of this transformation is the Eucharist, through which, Christians are led by

²¹⁰Clement understood Christ’s baptism to be the model which Christians followed. After explaining the baptism of Christ (*Paidagogos* 1.6.25), Clement wrote, “This is what happens with us, whose model the Lord made himself. When we are baptized, we are enlightened. Being enlightened, we are adopted as sons. Being adopted as sons, we are made perfect. Becoming perfect, we are made divine” (*Paidagogos* 1.6.26). While all these things are connected with baptism, Clement offers few clues as to the Spirit’s activity in this transformation, beyond being able to perceive divinity.

²¹¹See Arkadi Choufrine, *Gnosis, Theophany, Theosis: Studies in Clement of Alexandria’s Appropriation of His Background* (New York: Peter Lang, 2002), 17–76, for a lengthy comparison of Clement’s understanding of baptism viewed in light of gnostic practice and thought.

²¹²*Paidagogos* 2.8.65.

²¹³Ps 44:8 “Therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness above your companions.”

²¹⁴*Stromateis* 6.16.138.

the Spirit towards incorruptibility.²¹⁵ Clement also spoke of how the Holy Spirit draws the virtuous to heaven as a magnet attracts steel.²¹⁶ This drawing work of the Spirit can be seen in the way that the Spirit wings (πτερόω) believers to the New Jerusalem,²¹⁷ and how by following the illuminating Spirit, the Christian “becomes impassible, that is to rest.”²¹⁸ The goal of the Spirit’s work is theosis²¹⁹ and bringing the Christian into the place where God dwells with humankind. Within Clement’s conception of the Spirit drawing Christians to God, is the idea of the virtue and effort of the human. The virtuousness of the Christian acts as the means by which the Spirit operates to transform, illumine, and guide the Christian. Yet, Clement did not present the presence of the Spirit as contingent upon virtue. Indeed, Clement viewed the presence of the Spirit with the Christian as something that is not easily broken since the Christian is united to the Spirit by unending love.²²⁰

Gifts of the Spirit

Clement appears to have followed the Apostolic practice of speaking about the gifts and virtues that the presence of the Spirit produces. He wrote that “when the soul is adorned by the Holy Spirit, and inspired with the radiant charms which proceed from him, — righteousness, wisdom, fortitude, temperance, love of the good, and modesty.”²²¹ These virtues proceed from the Holy Spirit who adorns the soul of the Christian. This list

²¹⁵*Paidagogos* 2.2.19–20.

²¹⁶*Stromateis* 7.2.9.

²¹⁷*Stromateis* 4.26.172

²¹⁸*Stromateis* 6.16.138.

²¹⁹Osborn noted that the work of the Spirit in theosis begins with baptism and that “the gift of the spirit can produce this transformation into God’s likeness” (*Clement of Alexandria*, 234). For a lengthier examination of Clement’s conception of theosis, see Choufrine, *Gnosis, Theophany, Theosis*, 159–97.

²²⁰*Stromateis* 7.7.44.

²²¹*Paidagogos* 3.11.64.

of virtues then demonstrates the transformative work of the presence of the Spirit in the writings of Clement.

Concerning the gifts of the Spirit, Clement quoted 1 Corinthians 12:7–10²²² in *Stromateis*, 4.21.132 to demonstrate that there is diversity in the perfection that the Spirits brings. After this quote, he wrote that “the prophets are perfect in prophecy, the righteous ones in righteousness, and the martyrs in confession, and others in preaching.”²²³ This statement continues with the concept of perfection in light of the Spirit’s gifts by noting four type of people who are perfect in their work: prophets, the righteous, martyrs, and preachers. From this, it is evident that Clement connected the perfecting work of the Spirit to be active in martyrs and preachers. Indeed, he wrote of how the Holy Spirit testifies within martyrs as they face death.²²⁴ He thus regarded martyrdom as a work of the Spirit and a spiritual gift that perfects the martyr. Likewise, Clement interpreted Exodus 31:2–5, to mean that artistic taste and artistic skill are gifts of the Spirit.²²⁵ The Spirit also indicated whom the Apostle John should ordain,²²⁶ which makes church leaders a gift of the Spirit to the church.

Ontology of the Spirit

Clement did not provide a formal definition of the Trinity.²²⁷ Despite this, Clement’s Trinitarian statements remain important for understanding how he perceived

²²²The gifts as listed by Paul and Clement include the word of wisdom, the word of knowledge, faith, the gift of healing, miracles, prophecy, the discernment of spirits, tongues, and interpretation of tongues.

²²³*Stromateis* 4.21.132.

²²⁴*Stromateis* 4.9.73.

²²⁵*Stromateis* 1.4.25.

²²⁶*Quis Dives Salvetur* 42.

²²⁷Burgess speculated that Clement’s use of negative theology kept him from attempting any formal definition of the Trinity (Stanley M. Burgess, *The Holy Spirit: Ancient Christian Traditions* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishing, 1984], 70).

the ontology of the Spirit. In *Stromateis* 5.14.103 Clement quoted Plato²²⁸ and interpreted Plato's "second" and "third" as the Son and the Spirit respectively, with the first being the Father. This list of first, second, and third, provides something of a distinction between the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. In a similar manner, Clement wrote, "The Universal Father is one, the universal Word is one, and the Holy Spirit is one and the same in all places."²²⁹ The use of one with each appears to affirm a distinction between the members of the Trinity. After making this distinction, Clement appeared to confuse the Son and the Spirit by saying, "the Lord Jesus, the Word of God, that is, the Spirit made flesh."²³⁰ Bucur's explanation of this occurrence is that whenever Clement "offers his own theological reflection (as opposed to simply passing on traditional formulas of faith), Clement feels free to use 'Logos' and 'Pneuma' as synonyms by shifting between them repeatedly and without much explanation."²³¹ Bucur is correct that Clement did at times speak of the Logos and the Spirit in ways that appear as though they were the same entity.²³² Osborn viewed Clement's practice here in light of the "powers"²³³ and that "all the powers of the spirit become collectively one thing, and come together in the same point—the Son."²³⁴ This interpretation makes Clement's

²²⁸Plato, *Timaeus* 28–32.

²²⁹*Paidagogos* 1.6.42.

²³⁰*Paidagogos* 1.6.43.

²³¹Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 75.

²³²His conclusion that Clement only separated the Logos from the Spirit in passing on traditional formulas of faith is difficult to ascertain. Apart from an external list of the formulas of faith that were part of Clement's tradition, it is impossible to accurately discern when Clement followed or departed from traditional formulas. Since Justin Martyr demonstrated a practice of speaking of the Logos and the Spirit as the same entity, it is equally possible that Clement's practice in this regard is as much a part of his tradition as the Trinitarian formulas.

²³³According to Osborn, Clement's understanding of the powers was informed by both philosophy and by the Scriptural description of the manifold powers of the Spirit. For some philosophers such as Posidonius and Philo, the cosmos was understood to be governed by a system of powers which stand in the place of Plato's "forms." This led to Osborn's conclusion, "The son is one thing as all things, the circle of the powers rolled into" (*Clement of Alexandria*, 152).

²³⁴Eric F. Osborn, *The Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria* (New York: Cambridge

statement not a matter of confusion between the identity of the Son and the Spirit, but a matter of the singular nature of divine action.²³⁵

Clement did not directly address the divinity of the Holy Spirit despite the aforementioned Trinitarian statements. On occasion, he even made statements that appear to view the Logos and the Spirit as the same entity. Bucur made three points to demonstrate that Clement did not view the Holy Spirit as God. First, he noted that determining what is “God” is best done by determining the object of worship. That which is the object of worship is considered ‘God.’²³⁶ Second, he stated that Clement presented the Spirit as subordinate to the Father and the Son and observed *Quis Dives Salvetur* 42.20 supports this: “The Good Father who is in heaven through his Son Jesus Christ, Lord of the living and the dead, and through the Holy Spirit be glory, honor, might, and eternal majesty.”²³⁷ Third, Bucur rightly noted that Clement did not call the Spirit God, and quoted *Quis Dives Salvetur* 34.1 as evidence of this,²³⁸ “They do not know how great a treasure we carry in an earthen vessel, protected by the power of God the Father and the blood of God the Son and the dew of the Holy Spirit.”²³⁹ In the passage used to support Bucur’s third point, Clement called the Father and the Son God, but he did not call the Spirit God. His pattern of wording would lend itself to calling the Spirit God, yet he did not call the Spirit God. It is difficult to treat this as persuasive evidence since the Holy Spirit is not explicitly called God in Scripture. If Clement

University Press, 1957), 41.

²³⁵Osborn, *Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria*, 42–44. Bucur takes a very different interpretation of “powers” and understands them to be the first created entities. Clement, then, would have understood the Holy Spirit to be the first created beings who are the “powers” (*Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 36–61).

²³⁶Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 74. This is a summary of Bucur’s summary of Larry Hurtado, *At the Origins of Christian Worship* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

²³⁷*Quis Dives Salvetur* 42.20.

²³⁸Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 75.

²³⁹*Quis Dives Salvetur* 34.1.

followed the practice of Scripture in speaking about the Spirit, then he would not have called the Holy Spirit God. Bucur's second point about the subordination of the Spirit likewise has little bearing upon the divinity of the Spirit. Even if the Spirit is ontologically subordinated to the Father and to the Son,²⁴⁰ this does not necessitate that the subordinated Spirit is not in some sense divine.

When Bucur applied his formula that what is worshipped is God, he engaged with one of the clearest Trinitarian statements in the corpus of Clement: "and giving thanks may praise, and praising thank the only Father and Son, Son and Father, the Instructor and Teacher, with the Holy Spirit, whom being the One. . . . To whom be glory both now and forever. Amen."²⁴¹ Bucur noted that the inclusion of the Holy Spirit seems "a formulaic afterthought."²⁴² This argument is weak. Even if the inclusion of the Spirit is a formulaic afterthought, this would simply raise the larger issue of why Clement would have included such a formulaic afterthought. The most reasonable explanation would be that Trinitarian formulas praising the Spirit along with the Father and the Son were part of Clement's worship experience. Even if his theological paradigm did not account for the inclusion of the Spirit as divine, there is no reason to doubt that the Holy Spirit would have been included in worship with the Father and the Son in Clement's Christian worship experience. Indeed, Clement even wrote of the Spirit as a necessary object of faith for the Christian by interpreting the "spiritual" of 1 Corinthians 3:2-3 as those who believed in the Holy Spirit.²⁴³ If then the Holy Spirit is worshipped with the Father and the Son and is an object of faith for Christians, then it is very difficult indeed

²⁴⁰This is not an affirmation that Clement understood the Spirit to be ontologically subordinate. This is only affirming that even if one were to affirm the most rigorous form of subordination taking place in Clement (ontological), that even this position does not exclude the Spirit from being divine.

²⁴¹*Paidagogos* 3.12.101.

²⁴²Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 75.

²⁴³*Paidagogos* 1.6.36. The "spiritual" in this instance were Christians. Clement interpreted the "carnal" to be the catechumens.

to argue that Clement understood the Spirit to be a creature.

At the end, Clement clearly held to a Trinitarian confession and a Trinitarian worship. He did not however make an effort to define the Trinity, and as such his Trinitarian thought did not provide an opportunity to address the ontology of the Spirit. It is quite possible that at times he confused the Son and the Spirit in both person and work. Even if he truly had such confusions, the manner in which Clement wrote about the Spirit revealing God, working in the forgiveness of sin, being the agent of theosis, and being the object of faith and worship, provides a pattern of thought and practice that would place Clement's pneumatology in a trajectory moving away from viewing the Spirit as a creature. At the same time, Clement avoided calling the Spirit divine. This places the Spirit as the object of Christian faith and worship with an undefined ontology.

Tertullian (c. 170–220s)

Tertullian was born around the year 170.²⁴⁴ He received an excellent education²⁴⁵ which he put to great use after his adult conversion.²⁴⁶ He is best remembered for his writings which he began in 196.²⁴⁷ He wrote as a Christian and a strict moralist who sought to correct error when and where he saw it. As such, his writings are somewhat polemical in nature and he himself was something of “a pugilist with a pen.”²⁴⁸ He was most likely a presbyter,²⁴⁹ although it is not impossible that he

²⁴⁴Timothy D. Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Survey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 58.

²⁴⁵Geoffrey Dunn, *Tertullian* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 5.

²⁴⁶Eric Osborn, *Tertullian: First Theologian of the West* (New York: Cambridge, 1997), 9.

²⁴⁷Barnes, *Tertullian*, 55.

²⁴⁸Dunn, *Tertullian*, 8.

²⁴⁹Pierre De Labriolle, *History and Literature of Christianity from Tertullian to Boethius*, trans. Herbert Wilson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1924), 61–62.

could have composed his works as a layman.²⁵⁰ Sometime around 206, he began to be influenced by Montanism, which he called the “New Prophecy.” This influence is seen in his writings from around 207 and onward.²⁵¹ Despite the influence of Montanism, there is no evidence that Tertullian ever left the church.²⁵² He died sometime in the 220’s,²⁵³ and he is remembered as the Father of Latin Theology because he first used the term *Trinitas* for the Trinity.²⁵⁴

Ontology of the Spirit

Tertullian is remembered for his Trinitarian theology and there can be no doubt that he viewed the Spirit as equally divine with the Father and with the Son. He set forth this view in his little work *Adversus Praxean*.

Since the same God himself is both Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit . . . all come from one, through unity of being, of course, and from nothing less, than that mystery of the economy may be preserved. This economy arranges the unity in trinity, ordering the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit not by status, but by rank, not by being, but by form, not by office, but by appearance, but of one being, one status, and one power.²⁵⁵

Tertullian clearly defined the Holy Spirit as fully divine, sharing in the same divinity as the Father and the Son.²⁵⁶ At the same time, he differentiated the persons of the Trinity

²⁵⁰David Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church* (New York: Cambridge University, 1995), 38–40.

²⁵¹The exact chronology of Tertullian’s writings is a matter of some debate. Jerome divided Tertullian’s writings into those he wrote before he lapsed into Montanism and those he wrote afterwards (*Liber De Viris Illustribus* 53.4–5). This division of Tertullian’s works remains even if other aspects of Jerome’s record of Tertullian’s life have been viewed with suspicion. This present work will follow the chronology provided by Barnes (*Tertullian*, 32–56).

²⁵²Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church*, 27–38. Trevett rightly said that “Tertullian the Montanist was Tertullian the Montanist catholic” (Christine Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority, and the New Prophecy* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996], 69).

²⁵³Barnes, *Tertullian*, 59.

²⁵⁴James L. Papandrea, *Reading the Early Church Fathers: From the Didache to Nicaea* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2012), 97.

²⁵⁵*Adversus Praxean* 2.3–4.

²⁵⁶Osborn rightly noted that Tertullian’s definition here could be open to a subordinistic interpretation, but the terms were used to avoid speaking of alius “another” when distinguishing between persons (Eric F. Osborn, *The Emergence of Christian Theology* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993], 189–90). Michel Barnes argues that Tertullian used the term *gradus* “rank” to denote an ontological

from each other while maintaining a unity of persons. The methods and terminology that Tertullian employed in *Adversus Praxean* to speak about the Trinity were employed by later Christians to articulate with accuracy the Christian belief in the Trinity.

Tertullian did not however always write in this manner about the Trinity. It has been suggested by some that Montanism influenced Tertullian's Trinitarian conclusions.²⁵⁷ Stegman argued that Montanism was the catalyst that led Tertullian to move from a binitarian to a Trinitarian view of God.²⁵⁸ She rightly noted that Tertullian often used *spiritus Dei* to refer to the Son.²⁵⁹ Her view errs when she argued that Tertullian's use of *spiritus*, *spiritus Dei*, and *spiritus sanctus* did not refer to the Holy Spirit in his pre-Montanist works²⁶⁰ and that there is no third member of the Trinity in his early Montanist works.²⁶¹

Against this view, Barnes rightly noted that Tertullian sounded binitarian even in his most aggressively Montanist works.²⁶² Indeed, even in Tertullian's most "Trinitarian" work, *Adversus Praxean*, there are statements that could be understood as binitarian. In 12.6–8 Tertullian spoke about creation with reference to the Father and the Son concerning how one commands and the second does the action.²⁶³ So that he wrote,

order in Tertullian's conception of the Trinity ("Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology," 184-85).

²⁵⁷Jaroslav Pelikan suggested that Montanism had a moderate impact on Tertullian's pneumatology in that it caused him to think about the Spirit in more personal terms (*The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol. 1, *The Emergence of Catholic Tradition* (100-600) [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971], 105).

²⁵⁸Claire Stegman, "The Development of Tertullian's Doctrine of *Spiritus Sanctus*" (PhD diss. Southern Methodist University, 1978).

²⁵⁹Stegman, "Development of Tertullian's Doctrine of *Spiritus Sanctus*," 17–38.

²⁶⁰Stegman, "Development of Tertullian's Doctrine of *Spiritus Sanctus*," 4.

²⁶¹Stegman, "Development of Tertullian's Doctrine of *Spiritus Sanctus*," 172.

²⁶²Barnes, *Tertullian*, 139. For a more detailed argument of this view that is focused on the Spirit, see David Wilhite, "The Spirit of Prophecy: Tertullian's Pauline Pneumatology," in *Tertullian and Paul*, ed. Todd D. Still and David E. Wilhite (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 57–61.

²⁶³Briggman correctly observed that Tertullian did not speak of the Spirit as the creator except in *Adversus Praxean* 7, when he interpreted Gen 1:26 "Let us make" as proof of the plurality of God;

“according to John ‘the Word was God,’ you have two, one saying it should be done and another doing it.”²⁶⁴ In this passage, there is no reference to the Spirit as the third only of how there are two persons with the same being.²⁶⁵ Tertullian’s binitarian emphases in his later works are important for his pneumatology because of certain statements such as in *Adversus Marcionem*, 5.8.4, “On that Christ the entire being of the Spirit had come to rest, not as a later addition to him who has always been the Spirit of God.”²⁶⁶ In this statement, Tertullian appears to have equated the Spirit of God with the Son of God. Even if Tertullian had a distinction in his mind between the Son as *spiritus Dei* and the Holy Spirit as *spiritus Dei*, such a distinction is not clearly evident at all times. His lack of consistency with the identity of *spiritus Dei* complicates the attempt to understand his pneumatology and leaves open the possibility to read him in a more binitarian manner than would be otherwise.²⁶⁷ Therefore, the same binitarian theological tendencies that were in Tertullian’s pre-Montanist writings²⁶⁸ occur even in his later Montanist writings.

While Tertullian’s pre-Montanist writings demonstrate binitarian tendencies, they also demonstrate passages that distinguish the Spirit from the Son. Tertullian wrote of the Spirit in ways that give every impression that the Spirit was distinct from the Son. An example of this is when he wrote that Jesus Christ, “has sent another in his place the

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (*Irenaeus of Lyons*, 211). This again demonstrates a binitarian framework for how Tertullian understood the act of creation.

²⁶⁴*Adversus Praxean* 12.6. See also *Adversus Praxean* 14.9 and 19.3 for further examples of binitarian sounding statements.

²⁶⁵Tertullian’s explanation of the twoness of God, here in *Adversus Praxean* 12.6–8, bears some resemblance to a similar argument he made in *Adversus Marcionem* 1.5, where he affirmed a plurality in the God with reference to a twoness and not a threeness.

²⁶⁶*Adversus Marcionem* 5.8.4.

²⁶⁷Adhemar D’Alès noted this issue in Tertullian’s terminology “singularly complicates the theology of the Trinity” (*Novatien: Étude sur la Théologie Romaine au milieu du III^e Siècle* [Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1924], 114).

²⁶⁸*De Oratione*, 1.1 is a fine example in which Tertullian appears to merge the Spirit of God with the Son of God, “The Spirit of God and the Word of God and the reason of God, the word of reason and the reason of the word, both of which are spirit, that is Jesus Christ our Lord.”

power of the Holy Spirit, who leads believers.”²⁶⁹ If the Spirit is “another” then the Spirit cannot be the same as the Son, but must in some sense be distinct from him. Tertullian even made Trinitarian statements in his pre-Montanist writings such as Christians are “debtors of three, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.”²⁷⁰ Therefore, since Tertullian cannot be viewed as fully binitarian, it would be best to view Tertullian as Trinitarian while operating with binitarian emphases in his theology.

Spirit and Scripture

Tertullian’s tendency to equate the Son with the Spirit of God complicates any attempt to understand the work of the Spirit in prophecy and Scripture as distinct from the Son. In the third book of *Adversus Marcionem*, Tertullian wrote, “Christ who is the Word and the Spirit of the Creator, had prophesied then in Isaiah about John”²⁷¹ and “Christ always spoke in the prophets as the Spirit of the Creator.”²⁷² He equated Christ with the Spirit of God, and so Christ is the source of prophecy. Stegman argued that the connection Tertullian made between the Spirit departing from John and resting upon Jesus demonstrated that the Spirit of prophecy was “inseparably associated with the Son.”²⁷³ Yet, there are also passages in which Tertullian appears to distinguish between the Son and the Spirit as it pertained to prophecy.²⁷⁴ When speaking about Isaiah 63:1, Tertullian said, “For at once the Spirit contemplates the Lord as coming to his

²⁶⁹*De Praescriptione Haereticorum* 13.5.

²⁷⁰*De Oratione* 25.5.

²⁷¹*Adversus Marcionem* 4.33.9.

²⁷²*Adversus Marcionem* 3.6.7.

²⁷³Stegman, “The Development of Tertullian’s Doctrine of *Spiritus Sanctus*,” 26. Tertullian wrote, “After the whole Spirit was transferred to the Lord, the Spirit of prophecy passed from (John),” so that John questioned if Jesus was the one to come (*De Baptismo*, 10.5).

²⁷⁴See also *Adversus Marcionem* 5.17.6, “The Spirit speaks to the Father about the Son, ‘You have subjected all things under his feet.’”

passion.”²⁷⁵ Here, the Spirit is not the Son, but spoke about the Son. In light of Tertullian’s equation of the Son with the Spirit who spoke through the prophets, it is difficult to affirm much about the Spirit’s work in the inspiration of Scripture.²⁷⁶

Spirit and Prophecy

At the end of *De Resurrectione Carnis*, Tertullian wrote about the Paraclete as the one who rightly explained Scripture, “Therefore now he has struck down all the former ambiguities and laid bare the great number of the chosen parables and cleared every mystery of prophecy through the new prophecy descending from the Paraclete.”²⁷⁷ The work of the Spirit in explaining Scripture took place in the context of ongoing prophecy.²⁷⁸ This ongoing prophecy is a large part of how Tertullian understood the Paraclete as “the guide to all truth.”²⁷⁹

It is in the nature of this prophecy that the influence of Montanism is most felt upon Tertullian’s pneumatology. For Tertullian, the prophetic act took place in a state of ecstasy, “For Adam at one prophesied this great mystery about Christ and the church . . . he endured the experience of the Spirit. For the ecstasy fell upon him, the strength of the Holy Spirit’s prophetic work.”²⁸⁰ This ecstatic experience of the Spirit’s prophetic work

²⁷⁵*Adversus Marcionem* 4.40.6.

²⁷⁶An example of some statements that connect the Spirit with Scripture include “The Holy Spirit even established this rule for his Scripture” (*Adversus Hermogenem* 22.1), and *De Idololatria* 4.5 where Tertullian quoted Enoch and Isaiah and then equated the Scriptures with the voice of the Holy Spirit, “Why recall from Scripture? Or is the voice of the Holy Spirit insufficient and is it beyond deliberation?” See also *De Idololatria* 14.6, for a similar attribution of the Spirit speaking through Hosea.

²⁷⁷*De Resurrectione Carnis* 63.9.

²⁷⁸Rankin rightly assessed that “the New Prophecy for Tertullian did not seek to replace the Scriptures; it sought rather only to illuminate and support them by removing the dangers presented by those ambiguities which are regularly and willfully seized upon by the heretics” (*Tertullian and the Church*, 48). See Tertullian’s *De Exhortatione Castitatis* for his method of placing the commands of the “New Prophecy” within the context of Scripture.

²⁷⁹*De Fuga in Persecutione* 1.1.

²⁸⁰*De Anima* 11.4.

necessitated that the prophets lose their senses.²⁸¹ Tertullian's fullest description of the prophetic act is made about a certain "sister."

At this time, there is sister among us who has obtained by lot the gifts of revelation, which she experiences in the Spirit during the sacred rites on the Lord's Day through an ecstasy in the church; she converses with angels and sometimes even with the Lord, she sees and hears mysteries, she discerns the hearts of certain people, and she obtains medicines for those in need.²⁸²

The act of prophecy was ecstatic and took place during the church services in the Spirit. The result of her experiences is that she provided spiritual aid "medicines" to those who needed them. While the Spirit is the agent by whom the prophetic ecstasy is experienced, it is the Son who was the giver of the spiritual gifts.²⁸³ Therefore, it is difficult to say much about the Spirit as the giver of gifts, and the work of the Spirit in those gifts.

Spirit and Baptism

Tertullian placed the coming of the Spirit upon a Christian within the baptismal service, in which the Spirit was active.²⁸⁴ The Spirit was not given in the act of baptism,²⁸⁵ even though the Spirit sanctified the waters of baptism²⁸⁶ and acted as a witness and a surety of salvation alongside the Father and the Son.²⁸⁷ The act of baptism cleanses the believer for the Holy Spirit.²⁸⁸ After being anointed with oil, the "most Holy

²⁸¹"For when a man is in the Spirit, particularly when he has seen the glory of God, or when God is speaking through him, it is necessary that he lose his senses" (*Adversus Marcionem* 4.22.5).

²⁸²*De Anima* 9.4.

²⁸³*Adversus Marcionem* 5.8.7. For further descriptions of the Spiritual gifts see *Adversus Marcionem* 5.8.

²⁸⁴Tertullian commented that "the Apostles have the Holy Spirit properly, who have him fully in the work of prophecy, the effect of powers, the evidence of tongues, not in part as all others have him" (*De Exhortatione Castitatis* 4.6). There could be room in here to understand that the Spirit was given differently to the Apostles than to other Christians. It is more likely that Tertullian was over-arguing this point to demonstrate that the Apostle Paul gave a command from the Holy Spirit not to marry.

²⁸⁵*De Baptismo* 6.1. "We do not acquire the Holy Spirit in the water."

²⁸⁶*De Baptismo* 4.4.

²⁸⁷*De Baptismo* 6.2.

²⁸⁸*De Baptismo* 6.1.

Spirit willingly descends from the Father upon the cleansed and blessed body”²⁸⁹ when hands are laid upon the baptized.²⁹⁰ Baptism, and then the coming of the Spirit, are not separated from faith or repentance. Repentance is required to cleanse the soul so that it may be a fit place for the Holy Spirit to abide.²⁹¹ It is faith that obtains the forgiveness of sins in baptism “by being sealed in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.”²⁹² Despite this, through sin, the Christian can lose the gift of the Spirit and the hope of eternity.²⁹³ Tertullian even described the Spirit received in baptism as “delicate” and troubled by the zeal of the spectacles.²⁹⁴ Thus, reception of the Spirit needs to be met with an avoidance of sin and the places where sinful activities occur.

Spirit and Discipline

Tertullian’s moral teaching “was marked with a certain rigor and inflexibility”²⁹⁵ even before the influence of Montanism. It is not surprising that the Spirit be presented as encouraging a certain moral strictness. All the more since Tertullian understood that certain post-baptism sins were unforgivable.²⁹⁶ In light of

²⁸⁹*De Baptismo* 7.1–2.

²⁹⁰Tertullian argued that baptism should be reserved for adults or for those who were of an age to know how to ask for salvation, “Let them know how to ask for salvation” (*De Baptismo* 18.5).

²⁹¹*De Paenitentia* 2.6.

²⁹²*De Baptismo* 6.1. See also the rhetorical questions in *De Anima* 1.4, “By whom has Christ been explored without the Holy Spirit? By whom has the Holy Spirit been attained without the mystery of faith?”

²⁹³*De Pudicitia* 9.9.

²⁹⁴*De Spectaculis* 15.2. “God has instructed about the Holy Spirit, in as much as his good nature is tender and delicate, to treat him with stillness, gentleness, quiet, and peace and to trouble him not with frenzy, bitterness, anger, or sorrow.” For Tertullian, the term “spectacles” included the chariot races, plays, as well as gladiatorial events. Tertullian’s point in calling the Spirit delicate was to demonstrate that the spectacles were not fitting places for Christians. Therefore, it is possible to see that in some manner Tertullian followed Hermas, who also thought the Spirit could be repelled and lost through a Christian’s actions.

²⁹⁵Rudolph Arbesmann, *Tertullian: Disciplinary, Moral, and Ascetical Works*, trans. Rudolph Arbesman, Emily Joseph Daly, and Edwin A. Quain (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1959), 9.

²⁹⁶See *De Pudicitia* 19 for Tertullian’s discussion on this topic. Among the unforgivable sins he listed: “murder, idolatry, fraud, apostasy, blasphemy, adultery, fornication, and any such violation of the

this, Tertullian posed this rhetorical question, “Therefore, what is the office of the Paraclete except this, that discipline be directed, Scripture be revealed, the intellect be reformed, and that the better things be advanced?”²⁹⁷ The revelation of Scripture should be understood in light of the Spirit’s ongoing prophetic work that encourages stricter moral behavior. This revelatory act is then a part of the discipline that the Spirit brings. In a similar manner, the reformation of the intellect and the advancement of better things involve a change in moral behavior. Laxity even in such a thing as marital intercourse in a first marriage “repels the Holy Spirit.”²⁹⁸ Therefore, the office of the Spirit and by extrapolation the work of the Spirit has a significant emphasis upon moral discipline. In this manner, the Spirit can be seen to be the encourager of holiness through discipline.²⁹⁹

Spirit and Martyrdom

For Tertullian, the Spirit was at work in martyrdom. Tertullian quoted a Montanist oracle in which the counsel of the Spirit was for Christians to seek death “in martyrdom.”³⁰⁰ The Spirit did more than simply encourage Christians to seek death in martyrdom. The Spirit entered into prison with those on their way to martyrdom.³⁰¹ And Tertullian encouraged potential martyrs to see that the Spirit “remains with you there and lead you out of that place to the Lord.”³⁰² Tertullian used the metaphor of the Holy Spirit

temple of God” (*De Pudicitia*, 19.25). Tertullian does allow that God may forgive all post-baptismal sins, but that the church cannot (*De Pudicitia*, 3). See also C. B. Daly, *Tertullian the Puritan and His Influence* (Dublin: Four Court Press, 1993), 99–140.

²⁹⁷*De Virginibus Velandis* 1.8.

²⁹⁸*De Exhortatione Castitatis* 10.6.

²⁹⁹*De Resurrectione Carnis* 40.7. “For also this inward man by all means needs to be renewed through the suggestion of the Holy Spirit who makes faith and discipline day after day.”

³⁰⁰*De Fuga in Persecutione* 9.4.

³⁰¹*Ad Martyras* 1.3. “Do not grieve the Holy Spirit’ who has entered prison with you.”

³⁰²*Ad Martyras* 1.3.

as the trainer of the martyrs who are entering into a contest.³⁰³ Likewise, he wrote about the martyrs being anointed with the Holy Spirit by Jesus in preparation for their martyrdom.³⁰⁴ In these metaphors and exhortations, the Spirit is clearly seen as present and preparing the Christian for martyrdom as well as leading them to the Lord after their martyrdom. Exegetically, Tertullian interprets Jesus' words, "the spirit is willing,"³⁰⁵ as a reference to the Holy Spirit. So he exhorted his readers to understand "they have the strength of the Spirit" and so should not heed the weakness of the body when facing martyrdom.³⁰⁶ Similar to Clement, Tertullian viewed martyrdom as a work of the Spirit.

Conclusion

Tertullian's pneumatology is a mixture of contrasts. The Spirit who cannot abide the frenzy of chariot races, plays, and gladiatorial events is the same Spirit who causes such ecstasy among the prophets that they lose their senses. The same Spirit who is clearly divine with the Father and the Son, yet differentiated from them, is at times indistinguishable from the Son. Tertullian's Trinitarian belief runs parallel with his binitarian methodology so that it becomes difficult to discern the work of the Spirit from the work of the Son. He also provided great detail regarding the Spirit's work of prophecy and in martyrdom, yet such descriptions are tainted by the shadow of Montanus and his movement. In spite of these contrasting aspects to his pneumatology, Tertullian wrote with greater clarity than any of his predecessors regarding the divinity of the Spirit.

Hippolytus of Rome (c. 160–c. 235)

Not much that is known about the life of Hippolytus of Rome. Born around

³⁰³*Ad Martyras* 3.3.

³⁰⁴*Ad Martyras* 3.4.

³⁰⁵Matt 26:41.

³⁰⁶*De Fuga in Persecutione* 8.2.

the year 160, he was a bishop in Rome in what appears to have been the final generation in which there were two (or more) bishops of Rome at the same time.³⁰⁷ This appears to have caused some confusion in later Christian writers. Jerome called him a bishop³⁰⁸ and Eusebius noted he was the leader of a church,³⁰⁹ but neither of them mentioned the city in which Hippolytus was bishop. This is likely because they did not have a frame of reference to understand two bishops operating simultaneously in the same city. Hippolytus was exiled under Emperor Maximin and died in exile around 235,³¹⁰ possibly as a martyr. He was the last major Christian figure in the west to write in Greek, and his corpus has been the topic of no small scholarly debate with very little agreement.³¹¹ Therefore, this brief work will simply address the pneumatology found within the Hippolytean corpus without attempting to answer the question of the authorship of these works.

Hippolytus directly addressed the work and the ontology of the Spirit as well as the practice of worshipping the Spirit with the same worship as the Father and the Son received. His work *Traditio Apostolica* provides a glimpse into Christian worship of the Spirit in the early third century.³¹² He crafted a clear Trinitarian definition in his work

³⁰⁷For a detailed argument for this, see Allen Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tensions before the Emergence of a Monarch Bishop* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995). His conclusion is that the “schism” of Hippolytus was a concoction of later authors who had no other schema apart from schism to understand two bishops in Rome simultaneously overseeing different congregations. For a shorter argument that follows Brent’s major points, see Hippolytus, *On the Apostolic Tradition*, trans. Alistair Stewart-Sykes (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2001), 12–16.

³⁰⁸Jerome, *Liber De Viris Illustribus* 61.1.

³⁰⁹Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.20.2.

³¹⁰Drobner, *Fathers of the Church*, 122.

³¹¹Ronald Heine astutely observed, “No general consensus has been achieved on basic questions concerning Hippolytus’ person and works, nor does it appear one is likely” (“Hippolytus, Ps.-Hippolytus and the Early Canons,” in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, ed. Frances Young [Cambridge University Press, 2004], 1: 148). For monographs addressing this topic, see J. A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus* (New York: Oxford, 2002); Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*; and Pierre Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe* (Paris: Editions Du Cerf, 1947).

³¹²Brent argued that *Traditio Apostolica* was a living document after the lifetime of Hippolytus and received various emendations over time (Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church*, 195–96). If this is

Contra Noetum. Yet the most pneumatological work would be his commentary *In Canticum Canticorum*. He considered the Song of Songs to be a “symbolic representation of the Holy Spirit,”³¹³ and to be a work of “praise for the joy of the Holy Spirit.”³¹⁴

Spirit and Humanity

Hippolytus interpreted the “fragrance of anointing oil” in Song of Solomon 1:3 to be a reference to the Holy Spirit.³¹⁵ He then presented the Holy Spirit as a tribulation to some and as joy to others, “it is troublesome to some and to others he gives joy, for the power of the aroma... subdues believers in God and it frustrates the disobedient.”³¹⁶ Hippolytus applies this dual effect of the Spirit to understand the predominately Gentile composition of the church³¹⁷ and the actions of biblical characters in the Old Testament. These two effects of the Spirit are evident in Noah and Ham, “The oil gladdened the righteous. This was dear to Noah and he was justified and through the arc he was saved. But it was rejected by Ham, and he revealed the nakedness of this father.”³¹⁸ Hippolytus

the case, these emendations could alter the pneumatology which Hippolytus originally included in this work. The text of *Traditio Apostolica* relies upon eleventh-century Sahidic translation, Arabic translations from the fourteenth century, Ethiopic translation from the eighteenth century, and a Boharic translation from the nineteenth century (Paul F. Bradshaw, Maxwell E. Johnson, and L. Edward Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition*, ed. Harold W. Attridge [Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 2002], 6–9). Further, if it could be proven that *Traditio Apostolica* is as Hippolytus penned it, it could not be demonstrated that these were the actual practices of the church of Rome in the third century and not Hippolytus’ own idealized worship practices.

³¹³*In Canticum Canticorum* 1.5. Smith considered the central theme in Hippolytus’ commentary *In Canticum Canticorum* to be “the ‘unity of the Holy Spirit’ as symbolized by the rite of anointing with the fragrant anointing oil known as *myron*” (Yancy W. Smith, “Hippolytus’ Commentary on the Song of Songs in Social and Critical Context” [PhD diss., Brite Divinity School, 2009], 205).

³¹⁴*In Canticum Canticorum* 1.5.

³¹⁵*In Canticum Canticorum* 2.5.

³¹⁶*In Canticum Canticorum* 2.7. All quotations of *In Canticum Canticorum* are cited from Smith, “Hippolytus’ Commentary on the Song of Songs.”

³¹⁷Hippolytus wrote, The Spirit “was poured out on the Gentiles, and it congregated the Gentiles. It was poured out on Israel, nevertheless those who were disobedient did not accept the aroma” (*In Canticum Canticorum* 2.8).

³¹⁸*In Canticum Canticorum* 2.10–11.

repeated this same pattern offering the desire and reception of the Holy Spirit as the reason why the righteous of the Old Testament acted rightly. Likewise, the rejection of the Holy Spirit is the cause of unrighteous actions. This pneumatological paradigm is also evident in Hippolytus' commentary *In Danielelem*. Speaking of the wicked elders from the story of Susannah, he wrote, "they themselves were tested by the Holy Spirit, being darkened in mind they named foreign trees."³¹⁹ The Spirit then brings judgment upon the unrighteous while bringing joy to the righteous.

Hippolytus did not mention how the Old Testament saints received the Holy Spirit; only that they had the Spirit.³²⁰ He did mention with great specificity how Christians received the Holy Spirit.³²¹ The Spirit was received in the post baptismal anointing.³²² This is evident in *In Danielelem* 1.17.5, when Hippolytus asked, "But what then were the ointments, but the commandments of the Word? What *was* the oil, but the power of the Holy Spirit, in which after washing believers are anointed as with myrrh?"³²³ The connection of the Spirit with the oil is here reaffirmed and connected to the post baptismal anointing. The post baptismal prayer likewise affirms the reception of the Spirit in a post baptismal anointing, "Lord God, you have made them worthy to deserve the remission of sins through the laver of regeneration: make them worthy to be

³¹⁹*In Danielelem* 1.32.5.

³²⁰*In Danielelem* 1.28.5; *In Canticum Canticorum* 2.24.

³²¹Pelikan correctly noted that the "liturgical evidence in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus about the granting of the Holy Spirit to the baptized is garbled in textual transmission and remarkably equivocal on the very question of whether baptism itself or some other part of the ritual conferred the Spirit" (*The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition*, 166). However, Hippolytus' other works do not suffer from this ambiguity.

³²²Hippolytus does give a place for the work of the Spirit in the act of baptism. In a likely reference to baptism, he wrote that the Spirit "was sent down over the waters and it purified the waters" (*In Canticum Canticorum* 2.8). Smith noted the purifying aspect of baptism for Hippolytus, saying, "Baptism is . . . a preparation for receiving the Spirit in the anointing and baptism is a purifying bath preparing for the separate giving of the Spirit" ("Hippolytus' Commentary on the Song of Songs," 62–63). However, he did not note how the Spirit was connected to preparing the waters of baptism for this purifying work.

³²³*In Danielelem* 1.17.5.

filled with the Holy Spirit”³²⁴ Smith noted that the “anointing with fragrant oil (*In Canticum Canticorum* 2.1–34, especially 2.9) is a central component of the *In Canticum Canticorum* and probably refers to the post-baptismal anointing.”³²⁵ This then clearly demonstrates the Holy Spirit was understood to be given in a post baptismal anointing.

The work of the Spirit in a Christian had many aspects for Hippolytus. He understood the Spirit to give “perfect grace to those who rightly believe.”³²⁶ This “perfect grace” is limited to those who rightly believe so that any heretics and unbelievers would be excluded from this gift of the Spirit. It is possible that this is connected with Hippolytus’ understanding of receiving the Spirit in the Eucharist, which is clearly evident in the Eucharistic prayer: “And we ask that you should send your Holy Spirit on the presbytery of the whole church. Gathering into one, may you grant to all the saints who receive for the fullness of the Holy Spirit, for the confirmation of their faith in truth.”³²⁷ The Spirit is sent upon the whole church and, in some sense, is received by those who are present and, ostensibly, communing. The result of this experience is the confirmation of faith in the truth. In a similar way, the Spirit illumines those “who believe in the word of truth and who are led by his word to eternal life, and who are taught by the prophets.”³²⁸ Therefore the Spirit is seen to confirm faith in truth to give perfect grace to those with the correct faith, and to illumine those who believe and are led by Scripture.

The power of the indwelling Spirit is manifested in making the sign of the cross.³²⁹ The sign of the cross is made to drive away the devil, “For if the Adversary sees

³²⁴*Traditio Apostolica* 21.21.

³²⁵Smith, “Hippolytus’ Commentary on the Song of Songs,” 183.

³²⁶*Traditio Apostolica* 1.4.

³²⁷*Traditio Apostolica* 4.12–13.

³²⁸*In Daniele* 4.12.1.

³²⁹Botte argued that this is not a manifestation of the indwelling Spirit, but a manifestation of

the power of the Spirit being outwardly demonstrated in the likeness of baptism, he will flee away trembling.”³³⁰ The power of the Spirit is not manifested through the use of the gifts of the Spirit, but through a simple action in the likeness of baptism.

Martyrdom

The Spirit is the one who empowers the martyrs,³³¹ “You see how the Spirit of the Father cares for martyrs, he teaches, while urging and encouraging them, to despise this death and to hasten to the better.”³³² The Spirit then is the active agent who urges and encourages Christians to martyrdom. Apart from the Spirit, those facing martyrdom are described as cowering in agony, afraid, and hiding because they would rather seek the things of the world.³³³ The Holy Spirit, though, calls the martyr to that which is better than the things of this world; the martyr is called to heaven and the presence of God.

Church Leaders

The Spirit comes in a special way upon church leaders. Bishops receive the Spirit to empower them for the task of leading the church.³³⁴ The Father is asked to send the Spirit upon the presbyters to empower them for ministry.³³⁵ Likewise, the Father is

the power that the Spirit has given to the Christian (Bernard Botte, “Un passage difficile de la ‘Tradition apostolique’ sur le signe de croix,” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 27 [1960]: 15–16). While Botte’s argument is supported by the phrasing “power of the Spirit” it is not clear that Hippolytus understood the Spirit to give power to believers apart from the Spirit’s indwelling presence. Therefore, the power of the Spirit is better understood as the power of the Spirit which indwells the Christian.

³³⁰*Traditio Apostolica* 42.2.

³³¹For a more complete overview of Hippolytus’ view of martyrdom, see W. Brian Shelton, *Martyrdom from Exegesis in Hippolytus: An Early Church Presbyter’s Commentary on Daniel* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2008), 79–112.

³³²*In Daniele* 2.21.1.

³³³*In Daniele* 2.21.1–2.

³³⁴*Traditio Apostolica* 3.3. Bradshaw, Johnson, and Phillips rightly noted that this prayer did not “envisage any sort of transmission of the gift of the Holy Spirit from the ordainer to the ordained” (Bradshaw, Johnson, and Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition*, 35). Rather, the Spirit was poured out on the ordained by God.

³³⁵*Traditio Apostolica* 7.1–4.

asked to send the Spirit upon the deacons at their ordination so that they might be empowered by the Spirit for their ministry.³³⁶ In all three cases, the Father is addressed in the prayer as the one who gives the Spirit. The prayer for the bishop also mentions how Christ gave the Spirit to the apostles.³³⁷ With the church so arrayed with leaders empowered by the Spirit, it is only right that Hippolytus would understand the church to be “the place where the Holy Spirit abounds.”³³⁸ Likewise, church leaders were understood to be given profitable things to speak from the Holy Spirit.³³⁹ Hippolytus’ experience of church then is an experience of the Spirit abounding and empowering the leaders to serve.

Spirit and Scripture

Hippolytus closely connected the Spirit with Scripture. The Spirit is understood as both the author of Scripture and the voice speaking in scripture. The Spirit is seen speaking in the Old Testament as Hippolytus noted, “The Spirit says: ‘Catch for us the little foxes who are ruining the vines.’”³⁴⁰ Likewise, in the New Testament, he wrote that “the all-Holy Spirit from the person of the apostles, has testified, saying, ‘And who has believed our report?’”³⁴¹ In these quotes, Hippolytus affirmed the Spirit to speak in both the New and Old Testament.³⁴² The voice of the Spirit was not the only voice Hippolytus heard in Scripture. He noted that Solomon spoke through his mouth

³³⁶*Traditio Apostolica* 8.11.

³³⁷*Traditio Apostolica* 1.3. This could be interpreted as an early support for the *filioque*.

³³⁸*Traditio Apostolica* 41.3.

³³⁹*Traditio Apostolica* 41.3.

³⁴⁰*In Canticum Canticorum* 20.4.

³⁴¹*Contra Noetum* 17.1.

³⁴²As with earlier authors, Hippolytus also spoke of the Word as having a similar role in Scripture as the Spirit. As an example, Hippolytus wrote that “the Word arranging in the prophets clearly spoke about Himself” (*Contra Noetum* 12.1).

“by the Holy Spirit.”³⁴³ This mixture of the human and the Spirit in Scripture is also seen in the composition of Scripture. Hippolytus understood that Solomon composed three books, and that they were composed “under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.”³⁴⁴ The Spirit even arranged the prophetic visions in Scripture.³⁴⁵ The Spirit’s work results in Scripture that does not lie because the Holy Spirit did not deceive the prophets.³⁴⁶ At the same time, Hippolytus understood that “no one will be able to describe the heavenly mysteries, unless he should interpret them as a partner of the Holy Spirit.”³⁴⁷ Therefore Hippolytus presented the Spirit as the author, inspirer, and arranger of Scripture apart from whom Scripture could not be rightly understood.

Spirit and Prophets

Hippolytus generally wrote about prophets in reference to those who lived in the times of the Old Testament. He interpreted the title “Psalm of the wine vats” to be a reference to the prophets because the wine of the Holy Spirit flowed into them.³⁴⁸ Possessing the Spirit appears to have been a *sine quod non* from his interpretation of Daniel, “Daniel, as he was a prophet and possessed the Spirit of God.”³⁴⁹ The Spirit works through the writings of these prophets and the whole of Scripture to illuminate

³⁴³*In Canticum Canticorum* 1.3.

³⁴⁴*In Canticum Canticorum* 1.2.

³⁴⁵*In Danielelem* 1.5.3–4.

³⁴⁶*In Danielelem* 4.6.2. This presents the Spirit as the Spirit of truth. Indeed, Hippolytus understood his act of pointing out heresies as “showing the abundance of the grace of the Holy Spirit” (*Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* 8.1). It is possible to see in this statement that pointing out errors reveals the grace of the Holy Spirit, he affirmed that the Holy Spirit has nothing to do with lies. Therefore, the Spirit can be seen as the Spirit of truth.

³⁴⁷*In Danielelem* 2.2.4. See also *In Danielelem* 3.2.3, wherein Hippolytus wrote of how the prophets always understood because they were partaking of the Holy Spirit.

³⁴⁸*De Psalmis* 12.

³⁴⁹*In Danielelem* 1.28.5.

believers.³⁵⁰

The practice of the prophets was above all orderly. Concerning the singers David appointed to sing in the sanctuary, Hippolytus, noted that they were moved by the Spirit to sing and were silent when another sang because they were governed by the Spirit.³⁵¹ This orderly practice set the pattern for the church to follow.³⁵² The orderly nature of the prophets is also glimpsed through the relationship of the Spirit with the prophets. After affirming that Scripture does not lie, Hippolytus wrote, “nor does the Holy Spirit deceive his slaves the prophets.”³⁵³ The use of “master” and “slave” leaves little room for the prophet to act unilaterally. Therefore the Spirit is understood first and foremost as a Spirit of order who speaks through well-ordered slaves.

Ontology of the Holy Spirit

Before examining the pneumatological dimensions of Hippolytus’ Trinitarian statements, it is important to return to the image of the Spirit as the anointing oil in the Song of Songs. Hippolytus clearly understood the “anointing oil” to be the Holy Spirit.³⁵⁴ Speaking about the Spirit, he wrote, “what was poured out did not diminish from the vessel itself and it filled the ones nearby. Such is the nature of this anointing oil. O Beloved, it is the well-spring of the gospel and it constantly goes forth and does not

³⁵⁰*In Daniele* 4.12.1.

³⁵¹*De Psalmis* 4–5.

³⁵²Hippolytus understood Paul’s injunctions to the Corinthians, in 1 Cor 14, to be based upon this practice of the sanctuary singers.

³⁵³*In Daniele* 4.6.2.

³⁵⁴*In Canticum Canticorum* 2.24. After a lengthy discussion of the Spirit being sought by the Old Testament saints and rejected by others, Hippolytus changes his interpretation of “anointing oil” to refer to Christ. This occurred when he interpreted Judas’ statement, “Why was this anointing oil wasted? It was worth selling for three hundred denarii” (*In Canticum Canticorum* 2.29), to demonstrate that his oil was a type of Christ (*In Canticum Canticorum* 2.30). He did not reinterpret the previous statements concerning the Spirit as “anointing oil,” but simply switched referents for the “anointing oil.”

wane.”³⁵⁵ In saying this, Hippolytus, notes that the Spirit is not lessened or divided by constantly going forth and filling humans. This means that he understood the Spirit to be omnipresent and continually at work.

Turning to Hippolytus’ Trinitarianism, one of the first things to note is that Hippolytus worshipped the Holy Spirit along with the Father and the Son.³⁵⁶ Those who were baptized would affirm their belief in the Holy Spirit at their baptism.³⁵⁷ This means that the Holy Spirit was both an object of faith and an object of worship. Hippolytus provided several Trinitarian definitions in *Contra Noetum*. He spoke of one God in three, “I will not speak of two gods, but one, and two persons, and a third economy which is the grace of the Holy Spirit.”³⁵⁸ There is a small distinction here, the Spirit is not added as a third person, but as an economy along with the Father and Son who are “persons.” While Hippolytus used the term “person” for the Father and the Son, he did not use “person” to speak about the Spirit in *Contra Noetum*. His reason for speaking of the Spirit as an “economy” instead of a “person” is unknown.

Despite not referring to the Spirit as a person, the Spirit is clearly divine sharing the same divinity of the Father and the Son. Hippolytus wrote of Christ saying, “to whom the Father made all things subject, except for himself and the Holy Spirit. Therefore these are three.”³⁵⁹ These three are one God because God has one power.³⁶⁰ Here, Hippolytus locates the unity of God in the one power of God. He also places the Father and the Spirit in the same class of those which are not subject to Christ.

³⁵⁵*In Canticum Cantorum* 2.8.

³⁵⁶*Traditio Apostolica* 3.6; 4.13; 6.4; 7.5; 8.12; 21.21; 25.9.

³⁵⁷*Traditio Apostolica* 21.17, and 21.36.

³⁵⁸*Contra Noetum* 14.2.

³⁵⁹*Contra Noetum* 8.1.

³⁶⁰*Contra Noetum* 8.2.

Therefore, any subordination of the Spirit to the Son cannot be understood to lessen the divinity of the Spirit who shares in the one divine power and with the Father is not subjected to Christ. Further, the Spirit is seen to share in the work of the Father and Son, for “it is through this Trinity that the Father is glorified. For the Father willed, the Son did, the Spirit revealed. Therefore, all the Scriptures reveal this.”³⁶¹ This demonstrates the unity of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, while at the same time affirming a distinction in the roles of this one work.

Hippolytus then affirmed the spirit to be fully divine with the Father and the Son even if the Spirit is subordinated to the Son. He continued several emphases of his predecessors. He affirmed the Spirit to be the inspirer of Scripture and the voice that speaks in Scripture. Martyrdom is a work of the Spirit in the martyr. His interpretation of prophets being controlled and ordered by the Spirit picks up a pneumatological theme from the Apostle Paul that had not been seen in other Christian writers prior. Finally, Hippolytus leaves no doubt as to the place of the Spirit in Christian worship as an active agent in the church services, an object of worship with the Father and the Son, and as an object of the Christian faith.

Conclusion

Novatian’s Christian predecessors bequeathed to him a rich and varied pneumatology. Despite the variety of differences in these authors examined in this chapter, there were several themes which appear in multiple authors. Indeed, there is one aspect of the Spirit’s work which they all affirmed. They all wrote of how the Spirit inspired and spoke through Scripture. They also understood and presented the Spirit as active in their own times. They affirmed that the Spirit continued to give prophecy within the church. Likewise, the Spirit was understood to indwell believers. Aside from

³⁶¹*Contra Noetum* 14.8.

Hermas and Justin Martyr, they all affirmed that the Spirit had an active role in Christian martyrdom.

Of the seven writers examined in this chapter, only Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Hippolytus overtly stated that the Holy Spirit was divine. There is a significant difference in the manner in which Irenaeus spoke of the Spirit's divinity compared with Tertullian and Hippolytus. Tertullian and Hippolytus each presented explanations of the Trinity in which they addressed the ontology of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit with overtones of ontological subordination. This tone of subordinationism as well as an explanation of the Trinity is absent from Irenaeus. The other writers presented the Spirit in a way that would lead one to view the Spirit as something other than part of creation. Indeed, despite the emphases they placed upon the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit was included in their Trinitarian formulas. At the very least this demonstrated the Spirit was placed alongside the Father and the Son in Christian thought at those times.

Novatian stood in a tradition that affirmed the presence of the Holy Spirit within believers, who would have received the Spirit around the time of their baptism. The Spirit was understood to be active in leading the church through both Scripture and ongoing prophecy. Holiness and martyrdom were effected by the indwelling Spirit. While only some in the tradition addressed the question of the divinity of the Holy Spirit, all those who did affirmed his divinity. Those who did not address the divinity of the Spirit, spoke of the Spirit in such a way either hinted or implicitly affirmed his divinity.

CHAPTER 4

NOVATIAN'S IDENTIFICATION OF THE SPIRIT THROUGH THE ACTIVITY OF THE SPIRIT

Introduction

Novatian's treatment of the Holy Spirit in *De Trinitate* has been recognized as predominately pertaining to the activity and work of the Spirit.¹ Swete astutely observed that, "No passage of ante-Nicene literature is more rich in the New Testament doctrine of the work of the Spirit."² Despite Novatian's emphasis on the work of the Spirit, most of the scholarship surrounding Novatian's pneumatology has focused on his ontology of the Spirit, which Novatian did not directly address.³ This focus on the Spirit's ontology has led to a practice in which the work of the Spirit is viewed as the key to understanding the ontology of the Spirit. Hitherto, no work has directly addressed Novatian's understanding of the work of the Spirit in a sustained and direct fashion. Perhaps as a

¹Russell J. DeSimone stated this very thing: "We find in Novatian's work a serious effort to gather together the Scriptural texts pertaining to the action of the Holy Spirit" (Russell J. DeSimone, *Novatian the Presbyter*, The Fathers of the Church 67 [Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1974], 18).

²Henry B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1912), 108–9.

³For examples of this, see James L. Papandrea *Novatian of Rome and the Culmination of Pre-Nicene Orthodoxy* (Eugene: OR, Pickwick Publications, 2011), 108–9; Adhemar D'Alès, *Novatien: Étude sur la Théologie Romaine au milieu du III^e Siècle* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1924), 117–34; Manlio Simonetti, "Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano," in *Studi in onore di Angelo Monteverdi* (Modena: Società Tipografica Editrice Modenese, 1959), 2: 771–83; and Russell J. DeSimone, "The Holy Spirit according to Novatian *De Trinitate*," *Augustinianum* 10 (1970): 138–65. DeSimone made a summary of the work of the Spirit on pp. 143–45.

A notable exception to this is James L. Papandrea, *The Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome: A Study in Third Century Orthodoxy* (New York: Edwin Mellen 2009), 112–295. Papandrea's comments about the work of the Spirit take place within the context of his commentary on Novatian's New Testament exegesis. Thus the work of the Spirit is of secondary concern. For a monograph on Novatian's pneumatology that did not focus on Novatian's ontology of the Spirit, see Ronald Kydd, "Novatian's *De Trinitate*, 29: Evidence of the Charismatic?" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 30 (1977): 313–18. Kidd's monograph only briefly addressed Novatian's view of the gifts of the Holy Spirit in the lives of believers, and was overly concerned with drawing a direct link to the modern charismatic movement.

result of this, Novatian's presentation of the Spirit has been understood to focus on the activity of the Spirit. This chapter argues that Novatian's presentation of the Spirit takes place within the larger framework of his identification of the Spirit as an object of faith. In so doing, this chapter will also provide the first sustained and direct treatment upon Novatian's understanding of the work of the Spirit.

In *De Trinitate*, Novatian's focus on the Spirit's activity is a part of his explanation of the Spirit as an object of Christian faith along with the Father and the Son. He identified the Holy Spirit through the words and concepts of Scripture, which, by the nature of their content, focus on the activity of the Spirit. This focus on the identity of the Spirit explains how Novatian can address the Spirit as the giver and worker of gifts,⁴ and then in an adjacent passage he can speak about the Spirit's relationship to the Son.⁵ If Novatian were only describing the activity of the Spirit, then such a shift in topic would be noticeable and appear as a digression. However, as the identity of the Spirit was the focus, there was no real shift in topic, only another aspect of the identity of the Spirit.

Novatian identified the Holy Spirit as the same in both the Old Testament prophets and the New Testament apostles, though he was given by Christ in a new way to Christians. The identity of the Spirit is intimately bound up with Christ and can neither be understood nor experienced apart from Christ. Christ's experience of the Spirit is completely unique; and it is from the relationship with Christ that Christians have as his followers that they receive the Spirit. He identified the Spirit as the one who upholds the truth of the faith and transforms the faithful through his indwelling presence and moral guidance. This Holy Spirit, as Novatian identified him, is one in whom all Christians ought to believe.

⁴*De Trinitate* 29.9–10.

⁵*De Trinitate* 29.11.

This chapter begins with a brief examination of the structure of *De Trinitate* and Novatian's method of writing about the Spirit. The reason for the focus on *De Trinitate* is that Novatian's thoughts about the Holy Spirit have been preserved primarily within this text.⁶ The bulk of Novatian's statements about the Holy Spirit occur in chapter 29 of *De Trinitate*. Therefore, a translation of this chapter from *De Trinitate* is provided. Novatian's understanding of the Spirit's identity and activity will then take place within the immediate context of his work *De Trinitate* and the historical context of those Christian writers who preceded him.

Novatian's *De Trinitate*

Between his baptism in the 230's and the Decian persecution (251), Novatian wrote his longest work, namely *De Trinitate*.⁷ It is an explanation of the "Rule of Truth"⁸

⁶The only other instance in which Novatian mentions the Holy Spirit is in *De Bono Pudicitiae* 2.1.

⁷Papandrea listed some internal support for the composition of *De Trinitate* prior to the persecution of Emperor Decius (*Novatian of Rome*, 57n34). For further support of this view, see also DeSimone, *Novatian the Presbyter*, 14.

⁸*regula veritatis* (*De Trinitate* 1.1). It is most likely that this "rule of truth" was the baptismal creed of the church at Rome. Novatian did not present the entirety of the "rule of truth" in one place. Fausset pieced together statements Novatian made in *De Trinitate* about the "rule of truth," and offered that the baptismal creed in Rome at the time of Novatian would have been, "*Credo in Deum [unum] Patrem et Dominum omnipotentem [rerum omnium conditorem]: et in Filium Dei, Christum Iesum, Dominum Deum nostrum: credo etiam in Spiritum Sanctum [ecclesiae repromissum]*" (W. York Fausset, *Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri De Trinitate Liber: Novatian's Treatise on the Trinity*, Cambridge Patristic Texts [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909], xxvi). Herbert Moore largely followed Fausset and suggested that the creed behind *De Trinitate* was, "I believe in one God the Father and Almighty Lord; and in the Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord; I also believe in the Holy Spirit." (Herbert Moore, *The Treatise of Novatian on the Trinity*, Translations of Christian Literature, Series II, Latin Texts [London: MacMillan, 1919], 12).

Jerome referred to *De Trinitate* as a sort of ἐπιτομήν of Tertullian's work (*Liber De Viris Illustribus* 70.2). Harnack followed Jerome's hint and concluded that *De Trinitate* "is based on Tertullian's treatise against Praxeas. No important argument in that work has escaped Novatian; but everything is extended, and made more systematic" (Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol 2, trans. Neil Buchman [London: Williams & Norgate, 1896], 313). Fausset disagreed with this assessment noting, "Some perplexity has been created by Jerome's description of the work as an epitome of a work of Tertullian's. There is nothing in the writings of the latter except the *Adversus Praxean* which can come into consideration: he has left no treatise *De Trinitate*" (*Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri*, xxiii). Even if Jerome intended to compare *De Trinitate* with *Adversus Praxean*, the style and structure of these two are distinct enough that Jerome's comment should be viewed with some suspicion. D'Alès observed that Novatian's "style has not the violent eloquence of Tertullian, but he wins with clarity" (*Novatien*, 132). Quasten rightly notes Jerome "is greatly mistaken and considerably underrates Novatian." (Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 2, *The Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus* [Utrecht, Holland: Spectrum, 1950], 217). Therefore, it is likely that this statement was less about noting the influence of one author upon another and more about belittling Novatian's work by asserting that it was a shortened version of an

and may have originally been titled *De Regula Veritatis*.⁹ Novatian's writing style in *De Trinitate* is relatively simple and straightforward. As Quasten noted while Novatian avoids "every trace of Platonism, he makes use of Stoic and Aristotelian syllogistic and dialectic method."¹⁰ In his explanation of the rule of truth, Novatian engaged and refuted various heresies.¹¹ However, as Charles Kannengiesser has rightly noted, "He explains with the clear and vigor of the best classical prose that he is not so much interested in polemics as he is in showing the truth of scripture."¹² His style hints that this work was composed for a more common reader, or even for use in catechesis.¹³

De Trinitate can be divided by content into four parts. The first three parts follow the "Rule of Truth" with an examination of the Father (chaps. 1–8), then the Son (chaps. 9–28),¹⁴ and then the Holy Spirit (chap. 29). The fourth part explains "the oneness of God in the distinction of the two persons of the Father and the Son"¹⁵ (chaps. 30–31). Even when one takes into account the moderate disparity in the length of

unmentioned work of Tertullian.

⁹Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 44. Novatian nowhere uses the term *Trinitas* in *De Trinitate*, and began the work by saying he set forth to explain the Rule of Truth.

¹⁰Quasten, *Patrology 2*: 226–27. For a similar conclusion, see Harnack, *History of Dogma*, 2: 315.

For a treatment of Novatian's Stoicism, see Jean Daniélou, *The Origins of Latin Christianity*, vol. 3, *A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea*, trans. David Smith and John Austin Baker, ed. John Austin Baker (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1977), 233–50.

¹¹DeSimone notes that Novatian addressed the following heresies: Gnosticism, Doceticism, Adoptionism, and Modalism (*Novatian the Presbyter*, 14–15). To this list, Charles Kannengiesser added Ebionites and Patripassionists (*Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, ed. D. Jeffery Bingham [Boston: Brill, 2006], 634).

¹²Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, 634.

¹³Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 57.

¹⁴Papandrea divided the chapters on the Son into subsets pertaining to the Christological perspectives against which Novatian wrote: Marcion (9), doceticism (10), adoptionism (11–22), patripassianism (23–24), and further arguments for the divinity of Christ (25–28) (*Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 44).

¹⁵Hubertus Drobner, *The Fathers of the Church*, trans. Siegfried S. Schatzman (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Inc, 2007), 181.

chapters in *De Trinitate*,¹⁶ Novatian's treatment of the Holy Spirit is noticeably shorter than the space devoted to the Father and the Son. This may have been due to the fact that the pressing theological issues of Novatian's day were Christological and not primarily concerned with the Holy Spirit.¹⁷

Novatian's Methodology

Novatian's methodology for discussing the Spirit began with the rule of truth, which is belief in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. When he came to address the Holy Spirit, he started by noting: "ordo rationis et fidei auctoritas digestis vocabis et literis Domini admonet nos post haec credere etiam in Spiritum Sanctum" (the order of reason and the authority of faith set forth in the sayings and words of God urge us, after believing these previous things, also to believe in the Holy Spirit).¹⁸ In this way, Novatian approaches the discussion of the Holy Spirit from the faith of the church which is contained in the rule of truth. This rule of truth is itself presented in Scripture. There is no hint in Novatian that there could be any division between the rule of truth and the Scriptures. Scripture, when rightly understood, affirms the truth of the Christian faith. Therefore, Novatian based his discussion of the Spirit upon Scripture.¹⁹ Indeed, Novatian affirmed the centrality of Scripture to his explanation of the Rule of Truth by stating,

Et haec quidem de Patre et de Filio et de Spiritu Sancto breviter sint nobis dicta et strictim postea et non longa disputatione porrecta. Latius enim potuerunt porigi et

¹⁶The chapter divisions were the product of Jacques de Pamelé in 1579 (Fausset, *Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri*, xxv). For a history of the transmission of the text of *De Trinitate*, see Fausset, *Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri*, xxiv–xxvi, and Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 49–54.

¹⁷DeSimone correctly observed, "The question of the Holy Ghost before 360 was not pressing; hence they simply announced the faith of the Catholic Church in the Holy Ghost as expressed in Scripture" ("The Holy Spirit" 139–40).

¹⁸*De Trinitate* 29.1.

¹⁹Harnack commented about Novatian's use of Scripture in *De Trinitate*, "Taking his book in all we may see that he thereby created for the West a dogmatic vademecum, which, from its copious and well selected quotations from Scripture, must have been of extraordinary service" (*History of Dogma 2*: 315–16).

propensiore disputatione produci, quandoquidem ad testimonium, quod ita se habeat fides vera, totum et vetus et novum testamentum possit adduci.

Let these few things about the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit which have been superficially put forth be briefly stated and not be extended with a lengthier argument. For they could be extended more broadly and prolonged by even more weighty arguments since, for testimony, one might have the true faith supported by the whole of both the New and the Old Testaments.²⁰

Novatian spoke as though he was convinced that he could have produced evidence for the rule of truth from an even greater breadth of Scripture than he had already brought forth in *De Trinitate*.²¹ In a similar manner Novatian noted that his arguments could have been extended. Thus, Novatian's method for discussing the Holy Spirit in *De Trinitate* rested upon Scripture and was intentionally brief, yet sufficient for the reader to understand what the rule of truth required one to believe. Kannengiesser termed what Novatian created in *De Trinitate* "a dogmatic form of exegesis."²² In a sense his assessment is correct. Novatian was the first Christian known to engage in this theological writing style.

Novatian's use of Scripture in *De Trinitate* has a few aspects that are particularly relevant to understanding his discussion of the work of the Spirit. Novatian had a penchant for placing more than one scriptural quotation in a row without necessarily adding any words of explanation. This is evident in a couple of instances in his discussion about the Spirit.²³ These consecutive quotations are often given without any explanation. Novatian often left his readers to grasp the obvious (to Novatian)

²⁰*De Trinitate* 30.1.

²¹Even granting a certain amount of hyperbole in this statement, it is likely a correct assessment of how Novatian understood Scripture. Novatian did not present very many allegorical readings of Scripture in *De Trinitate*. His biblical interpretation in *De Cibis Iudaicis* rested entirely upon allegorical interpretations of the Levitical regulations about clean and unclean animals representing virtues and vices respectively. From this range of interpretive options, Novatian's assertion that the true faith is "supported by the whole of both the New and the Old Testaments" (*De Trinitate* 30.1) could well have had a level of veracity behind it that one might otherwise mistake for a mere overstatement.

²²Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, 634.

²³For examples of this see, *De Trinitate* 29.2, 29.7, and 29.12–15.

logical sequence in these quotations and the point he understood them to make. This practice requires the reader to find the logical connections between the quoted passages in the arrangement of quotes, and the point that Novatian made with the quotes. An example of this can be seen in *De Trinitate* 29.7:

Rogabo enim, aiebat, Patrem, et alium advocatum dabit vobis, ut vobiscum sit in aeternum, Spiritum veritatis. Et cum venerit advocatus ille quem ego missurus sum vobis a Patre meo, Spiritum veritatis qui de Patre meo procedit. Et si non abiero, remittam illum ad vos. Et cum venerit Spiritus veritatis, ille vos diriget in omnem veritatem.

For he said, "I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Advocate, so that he might be with you forever, the Spirit of Truth." And, "when the Advocate has come, whom I will send to you from my Father, the Spirit of Truth who proceeds from my Father." And, "If I do not leave, the Advocate will not come to you; but if I leave, I will send him to you." And, "When the Spirit of Truth has come, he will guide you into all truth."

In this passage, Novatian strings together four passages from John's Gospel (14:16–17, 15:26, 16:7, and 16:13) to explain the coming of the Spirit. In particular, these verses address the role of Christ and the need for him to depart before the Spirit would be given. Novatian's style here assumes that his readers will be able to make the connections between the wording and concepts in each quote as they flow one into the other.

At other moments, Novatian is content to simply affirm something about the Holy Spirit apart from any apparent scriptural support. An example of this comes at the end of chapter 29, "ecclesiam incorruptam et inviolatam perpetuae virginitatis et veritatis sanctitate custodit" (He guards the church uncorrupted and inviolable in perpetual virginity and the sanctity of the truth).²⁴ There is no apparent proof text to support this conclusion. However, it would be misleading to affirm that Novatian would not have understood these statements to be drawn from Scripture. This is more likely an instance of Novatian summarizing a longer biblical and theological argument into a single assertion.

²⁴*De Trinitate* 29.26.

Translation of *De Trinitate* Chapter 29

1 For, after believing these things, the order of reason and the authority of faith set forth in the sayings and words of God urge us, after believing these previous things, also to believe in the Holy Spirit who was promised long ago to the church, but who was given at the established time.²⁵

2 For he has been promised through the prophet Joel, but he was given through Christ. “In the last days,” he said, “I will pour out my Spirit upon my servants and maids.”²⁶ But the Lord said, “Receive the Holy Spirit. Whoever’s sins you will forgive, they will be forgiven, and whoever’s sins you retain, they will have been retained.”²⁷

3 But now the Lord Christ calls this²⁸ Holy Spirit the Advocate. Now the Holy Spirit is said to be the Spirit of truth, he is not new in the Gospel, nor newly given; for he himself in the prophets accused the people (of Israel) and in the apostles stands before the Gentiles as the Advocate.²⁹ For the Jews deserved to be accused, because they had treated the law with contempt, and those of the Gentiles who believe deserve to be aided by the patronage of the Spirit, because they are eager to come to the Gospel law.

4 Truly there are different kinds of offices in him, because in different times different occasions require different methods, yet he is not different because of these things, nor is he someone else while he does these things, but he is one and the same who divides his offices through seasons, occasions, and moments of (human) events.

²⁵This translation is made from the Latin text compiled by Diercks in *Novatiani Opera. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* 4 (Turnholt, Belgium: Brepols, 1972).

²⁶Joel 2:29. The use of *novissimus* “in the last days” denotes Novatian interpreted his own time as the last days.

²⁷John 20:22-23. The Latin text used here by Novatian does not correspond with the Vulgate.

²⁸Novatian uses the masculine pronouns to speak about the Spirit since *spiritus* is a masculine noun.

²⁹*paracletus*.

5 Indeed the apostle Paul said, “Having the same Spirit, as it is written: “I believed, therefore I spoke” and we believe, therefore we speak.”³⁰

6 Therefore the one and the same Spirit who was in the prophets was in the apostles, except he was in the prophets for a moment, but he was in the apostles always. Moreover, he was not always in the prophets, but he always remained in the apostles. He was moderately distributed on the prophets, but he was completely poured out on the apostles; being sparingly given to the prophets, and being lavishly bestowed upon the apostles. He was not revealed before the resurrection of the Lord, but has been given through the resurrection of Christ.

7 For he said, “I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Advocate,³¹ so that he might be with you forever, the Spirit of Truth.”³² And, “when the Advocate has come, whom I will send to you from my Father, the Spirit of Truth who proceeds from my Father.”³³ And, “If I do not leave, the Advocate will not come to you; but if I leave, I will send him to you.”³⁴ And, “When the Spirit of Truth has come, he will guide you into all truth.”³⁵

8 And because the Lord was departing to be in heaven, He necessarily gave the Advocate to the disciples, so that he would not leave them as orphans³⁶ and desert them without an Advocate or tutor, which would not be proper.

³⁰2 Cor 4:13 which is a quote of Ps 116:10. Here Novatian’s quotation does not include the *fidei* that should follow *spiritum* according to the biblical texts, so that this would read, “Having the same spirit of faith” It is uncertain if Novatian is bearing witness to an alternate reading or simply left out a word in his quotation.

³¹*paracletus*.

³²John 14:16–17.

³³John 15:26.

³⁴John 16:7.

³⁵John 16:13.

³⁶Allusion to John 14:18.

9 For it is the Holy Spirit who strengthened their hearts and minds, who made clear the mysteries of the gospel, who in them was the illuminator of divine things, by whose encouragement they did not fear prisons or chains for the name of the Lord, but they trampled upon the rulers and persecutors of this age, because of course they were armed and strengthened through him, having in themselves the gifts which this same Spirit distributed and arraigned as ornaments on the church, which is the bride of Christ.

10 For it is he who establishes prophets in the church, who instructs teachers, who distributes tongues, who makes miracles and healings, who does wondrous works, who grants the discernment of spirits, who assigns administrations, who suggests counsel and organizes and arranges whatever other spiritual gifts³⁷ there are, and disperses them.³⁸ Therefore the church of the Lord is perfect and complete in every respect and in all things.

11 It is he who in the manner of a dove came down and remained upon our Lord, after he was baptized,³⁹ dwelling fully and completely only in Christ, who did not lack measure or portion, but with all the Spirit's fullness overflowing abundantly having been distributed and given (to him), so that everyone who follows him is able to receive from the Holy Spirit a kind of first fruits of his graces. The entire fount of the Holy Spirit remains in Christ, so that the stream of gifts and works might be brought forth from the Holy Spirit who dwells abundantly in Christ.

12 For indeed the prophet Isaiah already said this, "The Spirit of wisdom and understanding rests upon him, the Spirit of counsel and truth, the Spirit of knowledge and

³⁷*charismatum dona.*

³⁸Notice the similarities to 1 Cor 12:8–11, where Paul listed the following as gifts of the Spirit: the utterance of wisdom, the utterance of knowledge, faith, the gift of healing, the working of miracles, prophecy, the ability to distinguish between spirits, tongues, and the interpretation of tongues.

³⁹Matt 3:16.

piety, and the Spirit of the fear of God has filled him.”⁴⁰

13 And this same thing has been said in another place from the person of the Lord himself, “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, for this reason he has anointed me, he has sent me to preach to the poor.”⁴¹

14 Similarly David said, “For this reason God, your God, has anointed me with the oil of joy above your peers.”⁴²

15 The apostle Paul said about him, “For those who do not have the Spirit of Christ do not belong to him,”⁴³ and, “Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom.”⁴⁴

16 It is he who works a second birth⁴⁵ from the waters (of baptism), he is a sort of seed of the divine birth⁴⁶ and he consecrates the heavenly birth.⁴⁷ He is a pledge of the promise of inheritance and a kind of written bond of eternal salvation⁴⁸ so that he might make us the temple of God,⁴⁹ and cause us to be a home for him. He disturbs the divine ears “on our behalf with unutterable groans,”⁵⁰ fulfilling the office of advocate and presenting the offices of (our) defense. He has been given to inhabit our bodies and to effect our holiness, bringing this into us, he leads our bodies to eternity and to the resurrection of immortality. While in our bodies, he makes them accustomed to combine

⁴⁰Isa 11:2.

⁴¹Isa 61:1–2 and Luke 4:16–21.

⁴²Ps 45:7.

⁴³Rom 8:9.

⁴⁴2 Cor 3:17.

⁴⁵*nativitas*.

⁴⁶*genus*.

⁴⁷*nativitas*.

⁴⁸Eph 1:14.

⁴⁹1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19; and 2 Cor 6:16.

⁵⁰Rom 8:26.

with the heavenly power, uniting them with the divine eternity of the Holy Spirit.

17 For in him and through him our bodies are instructed to advance to immortality, while they learn to control themselves according to his commands.

18 For it is he who desires against the flesh, because the flesh fights against him.⁵¹

19 It is he who restrains the insatiable desires, he extinguishes illicit loves, he conquers the flames of passion, he drives back drunkenness, he repels greed, he flees luxuriant feasts, he binds together loves, he holds together affections, he repels sects, he delivers the rule of truth, he crushes heretics, he casts out the immoral, and he guards the gospel.

20 Likewise the Apostle said about him, “For we have accepted not the spirit of the earth, but the Spirit who is from God.”⁵²

21 About the Spirit he exulted and said, “However, I think that I also have the Spirit of God.”⁵³

22 He said about the Spirit, “And the Spirit of the prophets has been subjected to the prophets.”⁵⁴

23 He relates about the Spirit, “However the Spirit obviously says that in the last times some will withdraw from the faith, following seductive spirits, the doctrines of demons, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having seared their consciences.”⁵⁵

⁵¹Allusion to Gal 5:17.

⁵²1 Cor 2:12.

⁵³1 Cor 7:40.

⁵⁴1 Cor 14:32. The noun *spiritus* has the same form in both the nominative singular and plural. However, in this passage, Novatian employed the singular form of the verb *subjectus est* which clearly denotes a singular *spiritus*. This textual issue is dealt with at length as it relates directly to the activity of the Spirit.

⁵⁵1 Tim 4:1–2.

24 In this Spirit no one is ever able to say “anathema to Jesus,”⁵⁶ no one can have denied Christ is the Son of God or have rejected God as the creator, no one has brought out against Scripture some of its own words, no one has written other and sacrilegious commands.

25 Whoever has blasphemed against him, “does not have forgiveness, either in this age, or even in the future.”⁵⁷

26 He gives testimony to Christ in the apostles. He demonstrates the firm faith of our religion in the martyrs. He encloses admirable continence of sealed love in the virgins. In others, he guards the laws of the master’s teaching uncorrupted and uncontaminated. He destroys heretics, corrects the perverse, convicts the disloyal, reveals the pretenders, and also chastises the wicked. He guards the church uncorrupted⁵⁸ and inviolable⁵⁹ in perpetual virginity⁶⁰ and the sanctity of the truth.

30.1 Let these few things about the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit⁶¹ which have been superficially put forth be briefly stated and not extended with a lengthier argument. For they could be extended more broadly and prolonged by even more weighty arguments since, for testimony, one might have the true faith supported by the whole of both the New and Old Testaments.

The Identity of the Spirit

Novatian’s discussion of the Spirit has often been viewed as though his focus

⁵⁶1 Cor 12:3.

⁵⁷Matt 12:32; Mark 3:29; and Luke 12:10.

⁵⁸*incorruptam*.

⁵⁹*inviolatam*.

⁶⁰*perpetuae virginitatis*.

⁶¹There is only one other passage (*De Bono Pudicitiae* 2.1) in his writings in which Novatian explicitly mentions the Trinity: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

was on describing the activity of the Holy Spirit. Simonetti stated that Novatian “restricts himself to describing the sanctifying activity of the Spirit.”⁶² DeSimone more correctly assessed that Novatian brought the Pauline doctrine of “the interior life of the Christian, lived in the grace of the Holy Spirit”⁶³ to the front. Simonetti, whether intentionally or unintentionally, overlooked the fact that Novatian described far more than the sanctifying work of the Spirit. While he did address the Spirit’s activity in the life of the Christian, Novatian’s purpose in *De Trinitate* 29 was to present the identity of the Spirit from the words of Scripture. His explanation of the Spirit’s identity has largely been overlooked because he identifies the Spirit through the actions of the Spirit and the Spirit’s relation to the Son. Even though Novatian might appear to have focused on the activity of the Spirit, he did so in such a way as to reveal the identity of the Spirit in whom all Christians ought to believe.

The Spirit of the Old and New Testaments

Novatian began his discussion on the Holy Spirit by noting that “ordo rationis et fidei auctoritas digestis vocabus et literis Domini admonet nos post haec credere etiam in Spiritum Sanctum” (the order of reason and the authority of faith set forth in the sayings and words of God urge us, after believing these previous things, also to believe in the Holy Spirit).⁶⁴ The Holy Spirit is an object of faith along with the Father and the Son, and it is this belief in the Spirit that is set forth in Scripture. Once this was established, Novatian began to explain the identity of the Holy Spirit. He noted that the Spirit had been promised through the prophet Joel in Joel 2:29, but the Spirit had been given

⁶²Manlio Simonetti, *History of Theology I: The Patristic Period*, ed. Angelo Di Berardino and Basil Studer (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996), 217.

⁶³DeSimone, *Novatian the Presbyter*, 17–18. Novatian also brought a Johannine influenced view of the identity of the Spirit to the front along with the Pauline emphases.

⁶⁴*De Trinitate* 29.1.

through Christ in John 20:22–23.⁶⁵ This promise and fulfillment provides a starting point from which Novatian addressed the unity of the Spirit in light of the distinct activities of the Spirit. Novatian noted that Jesus called the Holy Spirit the *Paracletus*. He used this term to explain how the same Spirit was active in the prophets and in the Apostles. As the *Paracletus*, the Spirit worked in the (Old Testament) prophets to accuse the people of Israel for “contempserant legem” (they treated the law with contempt).⁶⁶ So also, the Spirit worked in the apostles to act as the patron of the Gentiles “quia ad evangelicam pervenite gestiunt legem” (because they are eager to come to the Gospel law).⁶⁷ Therefore, as the Spirit is at work in both the prophets and apostles, Novatian notes that the Spirit is not new in the Gospel. This means that the same Holy Spirit who spoke in the prophets also spoke in the apostles.

Novatian was concerned with demonstrating the unity of the Holy Spirit in light of the different activities of the Holy Spirit. He noted that “differentia sane in illo genera officiorum, quoniam in temporibus differens ratio causarum” (there are different kinds of offices in him, because in different times different occasions require different methods)⁶⁸ yet these differences do not necessitate that the Holy Spirit is someone else. The reason for this is that the Spirit *unus atque ipse est* (“is one and the same”)⁶⁹ and only acts differently to accommodate times and events of humanity. To demonstrate this very point, Novatian quoted 2 Corinthians 4:13, “Habentes, inquit, eundem spiritum, sicut scriptum est: Credidi, propter quod locutus sum; et nos credimus, ideo loquimur” (Having the same Spirit, as it is written: ‘I believed, therefore I spoke’ and we believe,

⁶⁵*De Trinitate* 29.2.

⁶⁶*De Trinitate* 29.3.

⁶⁷*De Trinitate* 29.3.

⁶⁸*De Trinitate* 29.4.

⁶⁹*De Trinitate* 29.4.

therefore we speak).⁷⁰ In this passage the apostle Paul quoted Psalm 116:10; Paul thus affirms the same Spirit lay behind both the Old Testament and himself.⁷¹ Papandrea has rightly observed, “Novatian’s point in quoting this verse is to show that the same Spirit which inspired the prophets also inspired the apostles.”⁷² Despite the same Spirit being at work in both the prophets and the apostles, Novatian affirmed that the Spirit operated differently with each group. With the prophets, the Spirit was only present for a time and was not always with them, but was given sparingly to them.⁷³ With the apostles, the Spirit was always in them and always remained with them, being lavishly bestowed upon them.⁷⁴

This difference between the prophets and the apostles is an example of how the Spirit has operated differently at different times in human history. This difference is also the probable reason for how Novatian understood the presence of the Spirit prior to Jesus giving the Spirit. There is a noticeable absence of any explanation of how the Spirit has worked in the prophets, yet the same Holy Spirit was given through Christ. Novatian’s quotation of Joel followed by John 20:22–23 gives every impression that Novatian viewed this giving of the Spirit in temporal terms and not in terms of an eternal

⁷⁰*De Trinitate* 29.4.

⁷¹Papandrea understood this quotation by Novatian to describe “the continuity of inspiration between the Old and New Testament, against Marcionite rejection of the Old Testament” (*Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 260). While this quotation could certainly be understood in this manner, Novatian’s purpose in chap. 29 seems far more focused on demonstrating the sameness of the Spirit in both the prophets and the apostles. However, in *De Trinitate* 8.3, Novatian wrote how the Father “instructed the prophets by the Spirit and through them all he promised his Son Christ and when he sent him as he had promised to give him.” This passage also affirmed the Spirit’s work of inspiration even though such was not the purpose for which Novatian penned those words.

⁷²Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 260.

⁷³*De Trinitate* 29.6.

⁷⁴*De Trinitate* 29.6. Harnack looked upon the difference between the prophets and the apostles as evidence of the subordination of the Old Testament to the New Testament and the prophets to the apostles (*History of Dogma*, 2: 64). If Novatian did subordinate the Old Testament to the New Testament in this passage, he did so in terms of the Old Testament presenting the promise and the New Testament bringing the fulfillment of that promise. This level of subordination is difficult to avoid as long as one views the incarnation of the Son of God as the greatest revelation of God to humanity.

procession at this point. When this is viewed against the difference of the Spirit's work in the prophets versus the apostles, it is likely that Novatian had in mind the Spirit being given by Christ in a full and permanent manner to the apostles. Such is hinted at in Novatian's statement "nec tamen ante resurrectionem Domini exhibitus, sed per resurrectionem Christi contributus" (He was not revealed before the resurrection of the Lord, but has been given through the resurrection of Christ).⁷⁵ Either Novatian could not keep track of his own argument about the activity of the Holy Spirit in the prophets, or he understood the giving of the Spirit by Jesus to be a matter of substantive difference of degree and quality over the presence of the Spirit in the prophets.⁷⁶

The Spirit Who Is Given

Novatian relies upon the Gospel of John to prove that the Holy Spirit was given after the resurrection of Christ. He linked together four quotes from the Gospel of John.

Rogabo enim, aiebat, Patrem et alium advocatum dabit vobis, ut vobiscum sit in aeternum, Spiritum veritatis. Et: cum venerit advocatus ille quem ego missurus sum vobis a Patre meo, Spiritum veritatis qui de Patre meo procedit. Et: si non abiero ego, advocatus ille non veniet ad vos; si autem ergo abiero, remittam illum ad vos. Et: cum venerit Spiritus veritatis, ille vos diriget in omenem veritatem.

'I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Advocate, so that he might be with you forever, the Spirit of truth' (John 14:16-17). And, 'when the Advocate has come, whom I will send to you from my Father, the Spirit of Truth who proceeds from my Father' (John 15:26). And, "If I do not leave, the Advocate will not come to you; but if I leave, I will send him to you" (John 16:7). And, 'When the Spirit of Truth has come, he will guide you into all truth' (John 16:13).⁷⁷

Novatian began with the promise that the Father would send the Advocate and identified the Advocate as the Spirit of truth (John 14:16–17). The second quotation (John 15:26)

⁷⁵*De Trinitate* 29.6.

⁷⁶Papandrea wrote something similar: Novatian's "point, however is that it is Christ who is the cause of the Spirit's coming to the church in a more full and permanent way than the Spirit was with the prophets" (*Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 218).

⁷⁷*De Trinitate* 29.7.

repeated the identification of the Advocate as the Spirit of truth. In addition, Jesus identifies himself as the one who will send the Spirit from the Father, with the clarification that the Spirit proceeds from the Father. The third quotation (John 16:7) continues with Jesus sending the Advocate, and notes that this will only happen after Jesus has left. The fourth quotation (John 16:13) focuses on the activity of the Spirit of truth in guiding the disciple into truth. These quotations reaffirmed Novatian's use of the term *Paracletus* for the Holy Spirit, as well as Jesus' role in sending the Spirit.⁷⁸ Novatian appears to have relied upon John 14:18⁷⁹ to provide the reason that Jesus sent the Spirit to his disciples, because otherwise Jesus would have left them as orphans without a tutor which, according to Novatian, *quod minime decebat* ("would not be proper").⁸⁰

It is important to note with Papandrea that in *De Trinitate* 29.6, "Novatian seems to connect the coming of the Spirit with the resurrection, while elsewhere (29.8) he connects it to the ascension of Christ."⁸¹ This confusion is best explained by Novatian's reliance upon the Gospel of John and not necessarily upon any personal confusion in his own thoughts. Novatian's initial quotation of John 20:22–23 would appear to more closely connect the giving of the Spirit with the resurrection of Jesus. The quotations from John 14–16 presented the Spirit as being given after Jesus departed, and thus after his ascension. It is possible that Novatian was unaware of this difference or that he did not consider it to be substantive. It is also possible that Novatian felt himself under no compulsion to discern when the Spirit was given with exactitude because he was simply

⁷⁸Papandrea understands Novatian intended "to argue that the Holy Spirit of the church, the 'Spirit of Truth,' who was promised by Jesus, is the Spirit who inspired the Old Testament prophets." (*Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 217).

⁷⁹"I will not leave you as orphans."

⁸⁰*De Trinitate* 29.8.

⁸¹Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 218.

repeating what he had found in the Scriptures.

The Spirit Who Gives Gifts

Novatian began his discussion of the work of the Holy Spirit in the church revealing the identity of the Spirit through the Spirit's work among Jesus' disciples. The Spirit strengthened them and "evangelica sacramenta distinxit" (made clear the mysteries of the gospel)⁸² and "in ipsis illuminator rerum divinarum fuit" (was the illuminator of divine things).⁸³ This work of the Spirit is foundational to the establishment of the church. The disciples understood the Gospel and other divine things because of the Holy Spirit in them, guiding them into all truth. Through the encouragement of the Spirit, the disciples did not fear prison and "quin immo ipsas saeculi potestates et tormenta calcaverunt" (trampled upon the rulers and persecutors of this age).⁸⁴ Considering that only one of the disciples is remembered as having died a death from natural causes, the trampling of the rulers and persecutors of this age should be understood as a victory over them through suffering and martyrdom, supported by the strength and encouragement of the Spirit. Novatian appears to link the strengthening of the Spirit with the presence of the gifts of the Spirit "armati iam scilicet per ipsum atque firmati, habentens in se dona quae hic idem Spiritus ecclesiae Christi sponsae quasi quaedam ornamenta distribuit et dirigit" (they were armed and strengthened through Him, having in themselves the gifts which this same Spirit distributed and arraigned as ornaments on the church which is the bride of Christ).⁸⁵ Novatian hinted that the disciples have been given all the gifts of the Spirit. It is uncertain if he understood each of the disciples to have received all of the

⁸²*De Trinitate* 29.9.

⁸³*De Trinitate* 29.9.

⁸⁴*De Trinitate* 29.9.

⁸⁵*De Trinitate* 29.9.

different gifts of the Spirit or if the disciples as a group had received all of the different gifts of the Spirit. What is clear is that the same gifts which Spirit gave to the disciples, the Spirit also distributes throughout the entire church.

Papandrea rightly noted that Novatian alludes to 1 Corinthians 12:7–11 in *De Trinitate* 29.10 as he explained the gifts of the Spirit.⁸⁶ In Novatian’s allusion to 1 Corinthians 12:7–11 he makes a subtle and very important change. He shifted from the emphasis found in Paul on the recipient of the gifts to the activity of the Spirit himself within his gifts. Thus, he did not write about someone being given the gift of healing by the Spirit, but the Spirit “qui. . . virtutes et sanitates facit” (who makes miracles and healings).⁸⁷ This demonstrates Novatian viewed the Spirit not only as the giver of the spiritual gifts, but also as the operator of the gifts in the church through those whom he gifted. Papandrea appears to have missed this change in emphasis when commenting upon this passage that “it is the Spirit, as Christ’s gift to the church, who empowers the church to do Christ’s work in the world.”⁸⁸ The Spirit is not simply the one who empowers the church, but he is the active agent who works within the gifts which he gives.

Kydd’s concern with finding support for the modern charismatic experience in Novatian’s writings led him to make some helpful observations on this passage. He correctly noted that “Novatian thought the charismata were important,”⁸⁹ and that Novatian “does not attempt to explicate the nature of these phenomena.”⁹⁰ Kydd argued

⁸⁶In 1 Cor 12:8–10, Paul listed the following gifts: wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, miracles, prophecy, discernment of spirit, tongues, and interpretation of tongues. In *De Trinitate* 29.10, Novatian listed establishing prophets, instructing teachers, miracles, healings, wondrous works, discernment of spirits, assigning administrators, suggesting counsel, and other spiritual gifts.

⁸⁷*De Trinitate* 29.10.

⁸⁸Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 251.

⁸⁹Kydd, “Novatian’s *De Trinitate*, 29,” 315.

⁹⁰Kydd, “Novatian’s *De Trinitate*, 29,” 315.

that even though Novatian drew heavily upon the traditional material supplied by Paul, he understood the Spirit's *charismata* to be present in the church.⁹¹ Novatian's manner of speaking about the Spirit giving gifts in the present tense, further leads Kydd to understand this to support the idea that Novatian understood the gifts of the Spirit to be a present reality in his own time.⁹² Kydd is quite possibly correct in this assessment. After listing the gifts of the Spirit in the church, Novatian wrote, "ideo ecclesiam Domini undique et in omnibus perfectam et consummatam facit" (Therefore the church of the Lord is perfect and complete in every respect and in all things).⁹³ In Kydd's assessment, Novatian "appears to attribute the perfection and completion of the church to them [the spiritual gifts]."⁹⁴ Novatian's assertion that the church is complete and perfect because of the gifts of the Spirit supports the understanding that the gifts Novatian wrote about were present in the church at his time. However, because Novatian did not offer any definition to the nature and operation of the spiritual gifts,⁹⁵ he could well have understood them quite differently from Kydd. Therefore, Kydd's conclusion that *De Trinitate* 29 "may be interpreted as providing evidence of charismatic experience"⁹⁶ is correct. Novatian may be interpreted this way, but there is no clear support for finding the various doctrinal distinctives of the modern charismatic movement in Novatian's writings.⁹⁷

⁹¹Kydd, "Novatian's *De Trinitate*, 29," 316–17.

⁹²Kydd, "Novatian's *De Trinitate*, 29," 315–17.

⁹³*De Trinitate* 29.10.

⁹⁴Kydd, "Novatian's *De Trinitate*, 29," 315.

⁹⁵It is quite likely that Novatian did not find it was necessary to explain the gifts of the Spirit any further since, if they were active in church life, they would have been visible and understood to operate within a certain context and in certain ways. Novatian does address the issue of prophecy later in chap. 29 as part of his implicit critique of Montanism.

⁹⁶Kydd, "Novatian's *De Trinitate*, 29," 318. For a similar conclusion see also Stanley M Burgess, *The Holy Spirit: Ancient Christian Traditions* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984), 79.

⁹⁷Anthony C. Thiselton made an important observation about understanding Novatian's use of the present tense as an argument for understanding the presence of the *charismata* in Rome at the time of Novatian. He noted that it "is certainly arguable, but the distinction between charisma and office is not always easy to make, and the least that we can say is that the Holy Spirit remains crucial for Novatian in

The Spirit of Christ

Novatian followed the biblical pattern of affirming the Holy Spirit's work in the incarnation of Christ.⁹⁸ Novatian made several quotations of Luke 1:35. These all took place as he explained the meaning of this passage in *De Trinitate* 24.4–11.

Novatian's argued in *De Trinitate* 24 that there is a distinction between the Son of Man and the Son of God and that Jesus is both the Son of Man and the Son of God.⁹⁹ In this discussion, the Spirit plays a minor, yet important role. Of particular importance for his pneumatology is this statement:

ait enim: Propterea et quod ex te nascetur sanctum, ut illud ostenderet non principaliter hoc sanctum quod ex illa nascitur, id est istam carnis corporisque substantiam, Filium Dei esse, sed consequenter et in secundo loco principaliter autem Filium Dei esse verbum Dei incarnatum per illum spiritum de quo angelus refert: Spiritus veniet in te, et virtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi.

For it says "And for this reason the holy one who will be born from you . . ." so that it would show that what is born from her is the substance of flesh and body, is not principally the Son of God, but consequently and in second place. However the Son of God is principally the incarnate Word of God through that Spirit about whom the angel refers, "The Spirit will come into you, and the power of the most high will overshadow you."¹⁰⁰

Some words about Novatian's christological argument here are of benefit, before the pneumatology can be rightly understood. Novatian's Christological framework relies

the actualization and performance of offices and gifts. But clearly he does not believe in a 'second, decisive blessing' (*The Holy Spirit — In Biblical Teaching, through the Centuries, and Today* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013], 190). Thiselton's point that, even if Novatian wrote about the *charismata* as active at his time, Novatian's understanding of the Spirit and his gifts does not comport with the modern charismatic understanding(s) in at least this one key aspect.

⁹⁸Ignatius of Antioch and Justin Martyr had also briefly elaborated on the Spirit's work in the incarnation (Ignatius, *Ephesians* 18.2; 7.2 and Justin Martyr, *1 Apologia* 33.9). Thus Novatian could be said to follow both the biblical pattern and the traditional view.

⁹⁹He began this chapter by stating, "Sed erroris istius haereticorum inde, ut opinor, nata materia est, quia inter Filium Dei et filium hominis nihil arbitrantur interesse, ne facta distinctione et homo et Deus Iesus Christus facile comprobetur. Eundem enim atque ipsum, id est hominem filium hominis etiam Filium Dei volunt videri, ut homo et care et fragilis illa substantia eadem at que ipsa Filius Dei esse dicatur, ex quo, dum distinctione filii hominis et Filii Dei nulla secernitur." [But the errors of these heretics therefore, I suppose, are born from the fact that they do not think there is any distinction between the Son of God and the son of man, truly making such a distinction easily proves Jesus Christ to be both human and God. For they want to consider the very same man himself, that is the human, which is the son of man, is also the Son of God, so that the human, both flesh and frailty, is said to be the same substance as the Son of God. Without distinction the son of man is not separated from the Son of God] (*De Trinitate* 24.1–2).

¹⁰⁰*De Trinitate* 24.7.

upon a distinction between the son of man and the Son of God.¹⁰¹ He used the framework of the son of man and the Son of God to affirm both the humanity and the divinity of Jesus, respectively. His use of *principaliter* “principally” refers to that which belongs to that particular nature of Jesus (either the human or the divine). His use of *consequenter* “consequently” refers to something unique to one nature that is experienced by the other nature through the unity of divinity and humanity in Jesus Christ. Concerning the two natures, Papandrea noted that “Novatian maintained a distinction between the human and the divine nature in Christ so that, while each nature affects the other, neither is diminished by union with the other.”¹⁰² Therefore, Novatian’s discussion in this passage deals primarily with the two natures in Jesus Christ.

Regarding the work of the Spirit in this passage, Novatian affirmed that the divinity of Christ came through the Holy Spirit. He affirmed this same point shortly afterwards saying, “ut principalitas nominis istius Filius Dei in spiritu sit Domini, qui descendit et venit, ut sequela nominis istius in Filio Dei et hominis sit et merito consequenter hic Filius Dei factus sit. Dum non principaliter Filius Dei est” (So that primacy of that name of the Son of God may be in the Spirit of the Lord, who descended and came to Mary that secondarily that name may be in the Son of God and the Son of Man and rightly and consequently the Son of Man became the Son of God, though he was not principally the Son of God).¹⁰³ In Novatian’s explanation of the two natures of Christ at the incarnation, the important point for his pneumatology is that he understood that the divinity of Christ came through the Holy Spirit. When these two quotations are

¹⁰¹Alloys Grillmeier noted, “Novatian’s criticism of the doceticism, modalism, and adoptionism of his time, which he bases firmly upon biblical arguments, leads to some confusion of two christological frameworks. On the one hand he sets the ‘Son of God’ over against the ‘Son of Man’ to combat the tendency of these heresies to dissolve Christ’s manhood, while on the other hand he speaks in the ‘Word-flesh’ framework so as to stress the Godhead” (*Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 1, *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, 2nd ed., trans. John Bowden [Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975], 132).

¹⁰²Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian or Rome*, 121.

¹⁰³*De Trinitate* 24.8.

viewed together, it is clear that Novatian understood there was a distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Son of God. The Holy Spirit, as a distinct entity, is the one whose activity of coming upon Mary ensures that Christ is the Son of God. In this way, Novatian supported the divinity of Christ through the work of the Spirit in the incarnation.

Novatian affirmed the divinity of Christ through the work of the Spirit, so he also explained the Spirit's identity through the Spirit's relationship to Christ. He noted that the Spirit descended in the form of a dove upon Jesus after his baptism. Jesus is the only one in whom Novatian understood the Spirit to dwell completely. He was rather emphatic about this point, saying that the Spirit was "habitans in solo Christo plenus et totus nec aliqua mensura aut portione mutilatus, sed cum tota sua redundantia cumulate distributus et missus" (dwelling fully and completely only in Christ, who did not lack measure or portion, but with all the Spirit's fullness overflowing abundantly, having been distributed and given to him).¹⁰⁴ Novatian repeated the idea of the fullness of the Spirit being in Christ with the words "fully," "completely," "measure," "portion," and the phrase "fullness overflowing abundantly." There can be no doubt from the words of Novatian that the incarnate Son lacked nothing of the Spirit's presence. This relationship was completely unique. In Novatian's line of thinking, this unique relationship is the basis from which Christians receive the Spirit. The purpose for the Spirit's presence in Christ is "ut ex illo delibationem quamdam gratiarum ceteri consequi possint" (so that everyone who follows him is able to receive from the Holy Spirit a kind of first fruits of his graces).¹⁰⁵ Therefore those who follow Christ receive the Spirit because Christ has the fullness of the Spirit. Indeed, Novatian viewed Christ as continuing to be the one from whom Christians received the Spirit, "totius Sancti Spiritus in Christo fonte

¹⁰⁴*De Trinitate* 29.11.

¹⁰⁵*De Trinitate*, 29.11.

remanente, ut ex illo donorum atque operum venae ducerentur, Spiritu Sancto in Christo affluenter habitante” (The entire fount of the Holy Spirit remains in Christ, so that the stream of gifts and works might be brought forth from the Holy Spirit who dwells abundantly in Christ).¹⁰⁶ For Novatian, Christ ever continues to be the fount of the Spirit. Indeed, the imagery of water in this metaphor is important. Christ is the fount of the Spirit; the Spirit flows from him as a “stream of gifts and works.”¹⁰⁷ This connects the activity of the Spirit directly with Christ because he is the fount from whom the Spirit flows.¹⁰⁸

Novatian’s language about Christ as the fount of the Holy Spirit could be interpreted to speak about the eternal procession of the Spirit. Papandrea viewed Novatian as implying “that the Spirit proceeds also from the Son, anticipating the Western addition of the *filioque* to the creed.”¹⁰⁹ On the other hand, DeSimone¹¹⁰ has sided with Fausset¹¹¹ and D’Alès,¹¹² who viewed this statement as a reference to the temporal procession of the Spirit and not a reference to the eternal procession of the Spirit. Earlier in *De Trinitate*, Novatian spoke about the Father saying, “Per quem nobis in nototiam venire voluit et in nos indulgentiae suae sinus largos profudit, egenis et abiectis locupletem Spiritum conferendo” (He willed to come through him into acquaintance with us, and his mercy has lavishly poured out on us, by bringing the rich

¹⁰⁶*De Trinitate*, 29.11.

¹⁰⁷*De Trinitate*, 29.11.

¹⁰⁸It is quite possible that Novatian had in mind chap. 4 of John’s Gospel and implicitly interpreted the “living water” in John with the Holy Spirit.

¹⁰⁹Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 109.

¹¹⁰DeSimone, “The Holy Spirit,” 153.

¹¹¹Fausset, *Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri*, 108n10.

¹¹²D’Alès, *Novatien*, 119.

Spirit to the poor and destitute).¹¹³ This passage repeats the same theme of the Spirit coming upon humans bringing gifts. As such, it should likewise be understood to refer to a temporal procession of the Spirit. When this is viewed together with Novatian's quotations from John's Gospel concerning the sending of the *paracletus*, it is clear that Novatian understood the Spirit to proceed temporally from both the Father and the Son. He does not provide a clear affirmation about the eternal procession of the Spirit.

After affirming the connection of the Spirit to Christ, Novatian entered upon a string of five biblical quotations to demonstrate the Spirit's connection to Christ. He started by quoting Isaiah 11:2, "Et requiescit super eum spiritus sapientiae et intellectus, spiritus consili et virtutis, spiritus scientiae et pietatis, et implevit eum spiritus timoris Dei" (The Spirit of wisdom and understanding rests upon him, the Spirit of counsel and truth, the Spirit of knowledge and piety, and the Spirit of the fear of God has filled him).¹¹⁴ In this quote, Novatian interpreted the seven Spirits listed in Isaiah as references to the Holy Spirit. Of particular importance is that this one Spirit with seven titles "has filled him," and this "him" is to be understood as Christ. Novatian introduced his next quotation saying, "Hoc idem atque ipsum et alio in loco ex persona ipsius Domini" (And this same thing has been said in another place from the person of the Lord himself).¹¹⁵ After this, Novatian quoted Luke 4:18 in which Jesus read from Isaiah 61:1, "Spiritus Domini super me, propter quod unxit me, evangelizare pauperibus misit me" (The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, for this reason he has anointed me, he has sent me to preach to the poor).¹¹⁶ Novatian's introduction clarified that these quotations are speaking about the relation of the Spirit to the Son. Further, in this passage, Jesus himself affirmed that

¹¹³*De Trinitate* 8.3.

¹¹⁴As quoted by Novatian in *De Trinitate* 29.12.

¹¹⁵*De Trinitate* 29.13.

¹¹⁶As quoted by Novatian in *De Trinitate* 29.13.

he had the Spirit and had been anointed. This concept of anointing is picked up by Novatian in his next quotation from Psalm 45:7, “Propterea unxit te Deus Deus tuus oleo laetitiae a consortibus tuis” (For this reason God, your God, has anointed me with the oil of joy above your peers).¹¹⁷ Novatian followed Clement and Hippolytus by interpreting the “oil of joy” as a reference to the Holy Spirit. Psalm 45 is also important because the Son is anointed with the Spirit “above your peers.” This could be part of Novatian’s exegetical basis for understanding Jesus’ experience of the Spirit being completely different from everyone else. He quoted Romans 8:9 to reaffirm the close connection of the Spirit to Christ, “Qui enim spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est eius” (For those who do not have the Spirit of Christ do not belong to him).¹¹⁸ The Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ, and one cannot belong to Christ apart from the Spirit. Novatian’s quotation of Romans 8:9 is immediately followed by a quotation from 2 Corinthians 3:17, “ubi spiritus Domini, ibi libertas” (Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom).¹¹⁹ Papandrea correctly observed, “The Holy Spirit is called the ‘Spirit of the Lord.’ Novatian assumes that ‘Lord’ here refers to Christ, thus making the connection between Christ and the Spirit.”¹²⁰ Papandrea interpreted Novatian’s use of 2 Corinthians 3:17 to mean, “The Spirit is the gift of Christ to the believer, so that those who belong to Christ have the Spirit within them, and receive the freedom of regeneration and sanctification.”¹²¹ This interpretation is valid, but not without difficulty. The foremost difficulty with the interpretation of this passage is that Novatian’s only other use of the term *libertas* “freedom” occurs in *De Trinitate* 1.8–10, where he spoke of how humans

¹¹⁷As quoted by Novatian in *De Trinitate* 29.14.

¹¹⁸As quoted by Novatian in *De Trinitate* 29.15.

¹¹⁹As quoted by Novatian in *De Trinitate* 29.15.

¹²⁰Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 259.

¹²¹Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 259.

alone being the image of God were given freedom by God. The purpose of freedom was so that humans would willingly obey God and so arrive at immortality. It is quite possible that Novatian could have viewed the Spirit as the one who leads believers into the obedience for which freedom was intended. It is also possible that Novatian could have intended to draw upon the larger context in 2 Corinthians. In so doing, he could have understood this quote to be part of the experience of Christ through the Spirit.

Work of the Spirit in Christians

Novatian understood the work of the Holy Spirit to be necessary for a human to know God. He presented this view with a quotation of Isaiah 66:2, “Et super quem requiescat spiritus meus, nisi super humilem et quietem et tremementem verba mea?, ut Deum aliquatenus quantues sit possit agnoscere, dum illum per spiritum collatum discit timere.” (And upon whom will my Spirit rest, except upon the humble, the quiet, and the one who trembles at my words? So that he might be able to know to some degree how great is God, while he learns to fear Him through this Spirit).¹²² Novatian did not interpret Isaiah 66:2 as much as he explained the reason for the Holy Spirit resting upon someone. For Novatian, the presence of the Spirit is to provide one with a limited knowledge of God and the fear of God. A full knowledge of God is not possible as humans lack the ability to fully understand God.¹²³ From the statement here Novatian appears to present the idea that the true, albeit incomplete, knowledge of God comes through the Spirit. In this sense the Holy Spirit is the revealer of God. The

¹²²*De Trinitate* 3.4. DeSimone’s translation does not capitalize “Spirit” and therefore it appears as though he does not see Novatian making a reference to the Holy Spirit in this passage (*Novatian the Presbyter*, 30). The context of the Isaiah quote supports the interpretation that this is the Holy Spirit because the “spirit” here is described as God’s “spirit” being given to certain humans. Papandrea understood this to be a reference to the Holy Spirit in his translations (*Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 374, and *On the Trinity, Letters to Cyprian of Carthage, Ethical Treatises*, *Corpus Christianorum in Translation* 22, ed. and trans. James Papandrea [Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2015], 16).

¹²³Novatian had earlier stated that the greatness of God is such that humans cannot adequately conceive of God. Human knowledge of God then is always incomplete (*De Trinitate* 2.4–12).

characteristics of people upon whom the Spirit comes does provide a fairly strong suggestion that Novatian understood Christians to be at least the primary recipients of the Spirit and the knowledge of God given by the Spirit. Humility, quietness, and trembling before the word of God were not esteemed as virtues by the Greco-Roman culture. Therefore, Novatian affirms the Spirit comes upon those marked with distinctly Christian virtues for the purpose of providing the (limited) knowledge and fear of God.

Novatian also presented the Holy Spirit as the One who allows a human to understand the knowledge of God through negation. After noting how God's being called love, light, and spirit does not state all that God is, Novatian wrote, "dum mens hominum intellegendo usque ad ipsum proficit spiritum, conserva iam ipsa in spiritualius quid amplius per spiritum conivere Deum esse possit" (While the mind of humans progresses with understanding towards the Spirit himself, by now itself repenting in the Spirit, it may be able to conclude that God is more than spirit, love, or light).¹²⁴ Once again, the Holy Spirit is at center of how humans come to the knowledge of God. This time, the Spirit is the goal that the human mind progresses towards and by the Spirit the human mind repents. Through this repentance, the human mind is able to know what God is not. Further, this knowledge of God by negation is also directly linked to the understanding of scriptural statements about God. Therefore, Novatian presented the notion that the human mind, by seeking the Holy Spirit and by repenting in the Holy Spirit, can rightly understand Scripture and know (in part) what God is not.

Novatian appears to present the knowledge of God given by the Holy Spirit to be equally experiential and cognitive. Yet, the Spirit's work of revealing the knowledge of God is intimately intertwined with the believer's own repentance and fear of God. This connection with the inner state of a human demonstrates that in a certain sense the

¹²⁴*De Trinitate* 7.2.

knowledge of God is experiential especially since the Spirit is presented as the object the human mind progresses towards. The cognitive aspect is clearly evident in the Spirit enabling the human mind to interpret Scripture and understand what God is not. Thus, from these short statements, both the cognitive and experiential knowledge of God comes through the believers following the Spirit in fearing God and repenting.

In chapter 29 of *De Trinitate*, Novatian began his overview of the Spirit's work in believers with their baptism. This is seen in *De Trinitate* 29.16, "Hic est qui operatur ex aquis secundam nativitatem, semen quoddam divini generis et consecrator caelestis nativitatis" (It is he who works a second birth from the waters, he is a sort of seed of the divine birth, and he consecrates the heavenly birth). Novatian's reference to an "ex aquis secundam nativitatem" (second birth from the waters) is clearly a reference to baptism and quite likely baptismal regeneration.¹²⁵ The context hints that he believed the Spirit was given sometime around baptism, which would be in keeping with what had been stated previously by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Hippolytus.¹²⁶

Novatian's use of both *nativitas* and *genus* in this passage should be addressed. It is possible that Novatian used *genus* for stylistic reasons to break up what would otherwise have been three uses of *nativitas* in the same sentence. It is also possible that he used these terms to emphasize slightly different aspects of birth. It is difficult to know with certainty as Novatian does not appear to have used the terms *nativitas* and *genus* as

¹²⁵Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 265; DeSimone, *Novatian the Presbyter*, 102n23; and D'Alès, *Novatien*, 94.

¹²⁶Irenaeus did not overtly affirm that the Spirit was received at baptism, although he hints that the Spirit was received at baptism. He wrote that the apostles were sent to the Gentiles for the "purifying their souls and their bodies through the baptism of the water and of the Holy Spirit" (*Epideixis* 41). In a similar way he wrote that "our bodies received unity through that laver which leads to incorruptibility, but our souls through the Spirit" (*Adversus Haereses* 3.17.2). These two passages well be interpreted to support the idea that the Spirit was given at baptism because both connect the work of the Spirit with the act of baptism. Clement of Alexandria connected the receiving of the Spirit with baptism (*Quis Dives Salvetur* 40). Tertullian understood the Spirit to be received directly after baptism in the anointing with oil and the laying on of hands (*De Baptismo* 7.1–2). Hippolytus presented the Spirit as being received in a post baptismal anointing (*In Daniele* 1.17.5 and *Traditio Apostolica* 21.21).

technical terms.¹²⁷ Based upon the context, Novatian's use of *genus* when speaking of the "divine birth" would be best understood as a reference to entering the divine family. He repeated this view of baptism granting new life and entrance into the divine family in *De Bono Pudicitiae* 2.1, "scientes . . . filios Dei, fratres Christi, consortes Spiritus Sancti, nihil iam carni debentes, qua renatos ex aqua" (You know that you are . . . sons of God, brothers of Christ, sharers of the Holy Spirit, you now owe nothing to the flesh, because you have been born again from water). For Novatian, a Christian becomes a son of God and a brother of Christ through baptism. Therefore the Holy Spirit can be seen as the one who brings a Christian into the divine family.

Novatian extends the work of the Spirit in the salvation of humans beyond the initial act of baptism. He understood the Spirit to be "pignus promissae hereditatis et quasi chirographum quoddam aeternae salutis, qui nos Dei faciat templum et nos eius efficiant domum" (a pledge of the promise of inheritance and a kind of written bond of eternal salvation so that he might make us the temple of God, and cause us to be a home for him).¹²⁸ The Spirit is given to the believer as an assurance of eternal salvation for the purpose of transformation. The Spirit is given to the believer. He transforms the believer into a temple of God and into a home for himself. Novatian elsewhere spoke to his congregation saying, "scientes templum esse vos Domini, membra Christi, habitationem Spiritus Sancti" (You know that you are to be the temple of the Lord, members of Christ, the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit).¹²⁹ Therefore, by the presence of the Holy Spirit, a

¹²⁷Papandrea noted that "Novatian uses a variety of more or less synonymous terms to try to get to the nuance he is trying to convey. At other times, Novatian is left to resort to using a limited set of Latin terms to refer to different concepts. For example, in his text the term *natus* can refer to Christ's generation, his incarnation, or his nativity" (*On the Trinity, Letters to Cyprian of Carthage, Ethical Treatises*, 20). A couple of examples of his use of near synonyms can be seen in *De Trinitate* 24.5, where he used *gigno* and *nascor* synonymously. Likewise, in *De Trinitate* 31.12, *nascor* and *gigno* are used synonymously. Therefore, when the noun forms of these verbs are encountered there is no need to interpret them as necessarily having distinct meanings and usages from each other.

¹²⁸*De Trinitate* 29.16.

¹²⁹*De Bono Pudicitiae* 2.1.

Christian is transformed into “the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit” and “the temple of God.”

While speaking about the Spirit’s presence and work inside of humans, Novatian mentioned how the Spirit fulfills his “advocationis implens official” (office of the Advocate) by “interpellat divinis aures pro nobis gemitibus ineloquacibus” (disturbing the divine ears on our behalf with unutterable groans) and presenting a defense.¹³⁰ Papandrea correctly interpreted this passage saying, “Though Novatian does not say it explicitly, it is clear that he understands the Spirit to be a kind of mediator between Christ and humanity in the age of the church.”¹³¹ That is, the Spirit in his office of Advocate acts as a mediator between believers and God, praying and presenting a defense for them before God.

For Novatian, the presence of the Spirit was transformative with eternity as its goal. He noted that the Holy Spirit “inhabitor corporibus nostris datus et sanctitatis effector, qui id agens in nobis ad aeternitatem et ad resurrectionem immortalitatis corpora nostra producat” (has been given to inhabit our bodies and to effect our holiness, bringing this into us, he leads our bodies to eternity and to the resurrection of immortality).¹³² Holiness is the result of the work of the Spirit in the believer. This holiness comes from outside into the believer through the Spirit. Novatian noted this saying, “bringing this (holiness) into us.”¹³³ The Spirit’s concern with the human body is important as well. The Spirit is given to inhabit human bodies for the purpose of leading them towards eternity and specifically the future resurrection. Novatian did not mention the non-

¹³⁰*De Trinitate* 29.16. Where Novatian quoted Rom 8:26.

¹³¹Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 237.

¹³²*De Trinitate* 29.16.

¹³³It is possible that Novatian would have understood this holiness brought by the Spirit as a change in moral behavior. Given Novatian’s emphases on morality, it is more likely that he had this in mind. However, Novatian did not provide enough detail at this point to hold this view with certainty.

corporeal aspects of humans when writing about the Spirit's work of bringing about holiness and salvation. Intentionally, he did not leave any room for one to consider salvation apart from the body. In this way, Novatian clearly refuted any Gnostic or Gnostic-influenced conceptions of salvation.

The work of the indwelling Spirit also includes making the bodies of believers “assuefacit cum caelesti virtute misceri et cum Spiritus Sancti divina aeternitate sociari” (accustomed to combine with heavenly power uniting them with the divine eternity of the Holy Spirit).¹³⁴ Novatian continued his emphasis upon the bodily nature of salvation while addressing the manner in which the body is transformed by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit who brings holiness into a person also makes the human body accustomed to heavenly power and the Spirit's own divine eternity. At this point, the question of the divinity of the Holy Spirit is important to address briefly.¹³⁵ The “divine eternity of the Spirit” is one of the central statements to demonstrate Novatian understood the Spirit to be divine. The implications for the divinity of the Spirit are examined in detail in the next chapter of this work. For now, Novatian's understanding of the Holy Spirit to be divine will be stated without further argument. In light of this, his statement, “accustomed to combine with heavenly power uniting them with the divine eternity of the Holy Spirit,”¹³⁶ could well be understood to present an aspect of salvation in which the Christian is united and transformed into the image of God. Following this line of argument, the Spirit brings about this union with God by instructing the bodies of Christians “ad immortalitatem proficere, dum ad decreta ipsius discutunt moderanter temperare” (to advance to immortality, while they learn to control themselves according

¹³⁴*De Trinitate* 29.16.

¹³⁵The issue of the Spirit's divinity is examined at length in chap. 5 of this work.

¹³⁶*De Trinitate* 29.16.

to his commands).¹³⁷ Fausset commented as follows from the perspective that Novatian affirmed the divinity of the Holy Spirit:

We read that the Holy Spirit is the Renewer of those who are dead in sin, this involving the thought that in place of a sin-laden immortality man comes to share the 'Divine eternity' of the Spirit through the obedience of holiness. It is only sin which prevents corruptible man from growing into the likeness of the incorruptible God.¹³⁸

He rightly noted the moral nature of the Spirit's transformation. It is difficult to affirm his statement about sin being the only thing which prevents man from growing into the likeness of God. Novatian clearly viewed sin as an obstacle that the Spirit would train a Christian to overcome. Fausset has overlooked the nature of the Spirit's work in accustomating the body of the Christian to heavenly power and divine eternity in Novatian's writing. Novatian understood sin was not the only obstacle to being remade in the likeness of God. The indwelling work of the Spirit is also necessary. The Spirit also prepares believers for immortality by uniting them to his own "divine eternity."¹³⁹ The transformation of the Christian takes place through union with the indwelling Spirit. The Spirit brings about this transformation through self-control taught by the Spirit for the purpose of advancing to immortality. Papandrea commented on this passage saying, "Sanctification is a process of training the flesh to obey the Spirit."¹⁴⁰ This is a true statement in part. Novatian's view of sanctification is profoundly influenced by the work of the Spirit beyond his training of the flesh to obey. Sanctification, for Novatian, includes a transformation by the Spirit in which the body of a believer is united with the Spirit. This union with the Spirit results in the body of the believer being combined with

¹³⁷*De Trinitate* 29.17.

¹³⁸Fausset, *Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri*, lviii–lix.

¹³⁹It is possible that Novatian may have had in mind 1 Pet 1:4, ". . . so that through them you may become partakers of the divine nature..."

¹⁴⁰Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 265.

heavenly power, united to the divine eternity of the Spirit, while also learning self-control through obedience to the Spirit.

Novatian continued his identification of the Spirit through the actions of the Spirit by writing, “Hic est enim qui contra carnem desiderat, quia caro contra ipsum repugnant” (For it is he who desires against the flesh, because the flesh fights against him).¹⁴¹ The language Novatian used here is so similar to that used by the apostle Paul in Galatians 5:17¹⁴² that this could almost be considered a quotation. After this near quote, Novatian provided a list of the desires of the Spirit that are contrary to the flesh,

Hic est qui inexplebiles cupiditates coercet, immoderatas libidines frangit, illicitos adores extinguit, flagrantem impetum vincit, ebrietates reicit, avaritias repellit, luxuriosas comissiones fugit, caritates nectit, affectiones constringit, sectas repellit, regulam veritatis expedit, haereticos revincit, improbos foras expuit, evangelia custodit.

It is he who restrains the insatiable desires, he extinguishes illicit loves, he conquers the flames of passion, he drives back drunkenness, he repels greed, he flees luxuriant feasts, he binds together loves, he holds together affections, he repels sects, he delivers the rule of truth, he crushes heretics, he casts out the immoral, and he guards the gospel.¹⁴³

Once again, Novatian’s list shares some resemblance to Paul’s list of the works of the flesh in Galatians 5:19–21.¹⁴⁴ Given the context of Novatian’s use of Galatians 5:17 directly preceding this list, it is reasonable to see some Pauline influence at this point. Novatian’s list is much shorter than Paul’s and focused upon the Spirit’s activity instead of the activity of the flesh. The desires of the flesh Paul listed were given by Novatian in a context that focused on the Spirit actively working to destroy the desires of the flesh.

Novatian’s list demonstrates the Spirit’s work in the lives of individual

¹⁴¹*De Trinitate* 29.18.

¹⁴²“For the flesh desires against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh, for they are opposed to each other. . . .” The exact reading of this verse in the text used by Novatian is unknown.

¹⁴³*De Trinitate* 29.19.

¹⁴⁴“But the works of the flesh are evident, whatever is: fornication, sexual impurity, sensuality, idolatry, sorcery, hatred, strife, jealousy, wrath, selfishness, dissensions, factions, envy, drunkenness, excessive feasting, and things like these. . . .”

believers and the church as a whole. It provides a glimpse of the Spirit's commands that Novatian mentioned in 29.17, "dum ad decreta ipius discuntse moderanter temperare" (while they learn to control themselves according to his commands). These then would be the actions that Novatian expected every Christian to exhibit because this is the way he understood the Spirit to work in the life of a Christian. With the use of Galatians 5:17, it is possible to see the Spirit as the one who actively works to suppress and destroy the works of the flesh listed by Paul in Galatians.

The Spirit against the Heretics

In his list of the desires of the Spirit in 29.19, Novatian presented two different types of actions of the Holy Spirit. There are those acts which concern the inner moral behavior of a believer and those acts which the Spirit does on behalf of the church as a whole. These actions on behalf of the church are evident in the last part of 29.19, "sectas repellit, regulam veritates expedit, haereticos revincit, improbos foras expuit, evangelia custodit" (he repels sects, he delivers the rule of truth, he crushes heretics, he casts out the immoral, and he guards the gospel).¹⁴⁵ The Spirit encourages unity around the rule of truth and the gospel. Orthodoxy and orthopraxy are both seen in this passage as the Spirit casts out those who do not live according to the rule of truth and the gospel and he crushes those who deny the rule of truth and the gospel. These actions are still within the context of Novatian explaining how the Spirit desires contrary to the flesh. Therefore, one could rightly state that Novatian understood sects, heretics, immorality, and failure to guard the rule of truth and the gospel as actions that follow after the desires of the flesh.

After noting these actions of the Spirit on behalf of the church, Novatian enters into a seemingly odd set of scriptural quotations from Paul's first letter to the

¹⁴⁵*De Trinitate* 29.19. Fausset commented on this passage, "We have in these words . . . a third century affirmation of the principle that 'the Church is witness and keeper of Holy Writ'" (*Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri*, 110n18).

Corinthians.

De hoc item Apostolus: Non enim spiritum mundi accepimus, sed spiritum qui ex Deo est. De hoc exultat et dicit: Puto autem quia et ego spiritum Dei habeo. De hoc dicit: Et spiritus prophetarum prophetis subjectus est. De hoc refert: Spiritus autem manifeste dicit quia in novissimis temporibus recedent quidam a fide, attendentes spiritibus seductoribus, doctrinis daemoniorum, in hypocrisi mendacia loquentium, cauteriatam habentium conscientiam suam.¹⁴⁶

Likewise the Apostle said about him, “For we have accepted not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit who is from God” (1 Cor 2:12). About the Spirit he exulted and said, “However I think that I also have the Spirit of God” (1 Cor 7:40). He said about the Spirit, “And the Spirit of the prophets has been subjected to the prophets” (1 Cor 14:32). He relates about the Spirit, “However the Spirit obviously says that in last times some will withdraw from the faith, following seductive spirits, the doctrines of demons, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having seared their consciences” (1 Cor 12:3).

At first glance, there does not appear to be any logical connections between the content of these quotes. However, there is a logic grouping together these quotations. In the first passage Paul spoke of how he and the Corinthian believers had received the Spirit from God (1 Cor 2:12). This is followed by Paul’s assertion that he himself had the Spirit of God (1 Cor 7:40). Novatian’s point in quoting these two passages was to demonstrate that the Apostle Paul (and other Christians) had received the Spirit and to identify this Spirit as being “from” and “of” God. The Spirit they received is the Spirit of the prophets. This Spirit of the prophets is subject to the prophets (1 Cor 14:32). This same Spirit has warned that some will follow seductive spirits and depart from the faith (1 Cor 12:3). Now, the immediate context of the Spirit’s work on behalf of the church and the mention of the Spirit being subject to the prophets, may well be an exegetical rebuke of Montanism.

This movement arose in Phrygia around the year 165.¹⁴⁷ Even though

¹⁴⁶*De Trinitate* 29.20–23.

¹⁴⁷William Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy and Polluted Sacraments: Ecclesiastical and Imperial Reactions to Montanism* (Boston: Brill, 2007), xxix.

Montanus was the founder, Tertullian remains the most famous Montanist.¹⁴⁸ Montanism as a movement is difficult to quantify, yet there were some general distinctives. It emphasized the Paraclete's close connection to the person of Montanus and his prophecies,¹⁴⁹ and the practice of ecstatic prophetic utterances.¹⁵⁰ Butler described the prophetic utterances of Montanus in which he spoke as the Spirit which demonstrates his "passive instrumentality as the instrument of God."¹⁵¹ Some leaders in the church at Rome appear to have already decided against the "New Prophecy" around 189–190.¹⁵² A few years later, Hippolytus ranked the Montanists among the heretics.¹⁵³ Therefore, the ecclesial context in Rome at the time of Novatian appears to have already solidly rejected Montanism as an orthodox expression of Christianity.

Novatian's quotation of 1 Corinthians 14:32 is crucial to his critique of Montanism. There are both textual and theological issues that need to be addressed concerning this quotation. Textually Novatian's quotation is different than the passage in the present Greek and Latin editions of the New Testament. Novatian's quote reads, "Et Spiritus prophetarum prophetis subiectus est" (And the Spirit of the prophets has been

¹⁴⁸Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy and Polluted Sacraments*, xxx.

¹⁴⁹Christine Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 64–65. She noted Montanists "believed in the outpouring of the Spirit and the appearance of a new, authoritative prophecy which brought fresh disciplinary demands to the churches" (Montanism, 3). Rankin noted, "At *De Pudicitia* 12.1, where Tertullian speaks of the failure of the 'Psychici' to recognise 'alium Paracletum in prophetis propriis' (another Paraclete in his special prophets) he comes very close to repudiating outright the apostolicity of the catholic church" (David Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church* [New York: Cambridge University, 1995], 49).

¹⁵⁰Alastair Stewart-Sykes, "The Original Condemnation of Asian Montanism," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 50 (1999): 8–9. He pointed out that the term "ecstatic" is not the most helpful term since the same thing could be said of contemporaneous Christian prophets. He preferred the term "manic delivery" since it was the delivery that led to the condemnation of Montanism.

¹⁵¹Rex D. Butler, *The New Prophecy & New Visions* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006), 28.

¹⁵²Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy and Polluted Sacraments*, 39–40.

¹⁵³*Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* 8.12. See Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy and Polluted Sacraments*, 73–74 for a summary of Brent's position that Hippolytus was not the author of this work. For Brent's full discussion of this position, see Allen Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch Bishop* (New York: Brill, 1995).

subjected to the prophets).¹⁵⁴ The composite texts in current use have the plural *subiecti sunt*¹⁵⁵ instead of the singular *subiectus est* in Novatian's quotation.¹⁵⁶ Papandrea commented on this passage that "Novatian's text has this as singular, so that he assumes it to mean the Holy Spirit, however, the Greek text has it as plural, meaning that prophets should control their own spirits."¹⁵⁷ Papandrea, however, failed to note that there are Greek manuscripts that agree with Novatian's text.¹⁵⁸ Therefore, Novatian likely did not alter the text, but instead bears witness to a variant reading of 1 Corinthians 14:32.¹⁵⁹

The theological issue that this reading raises is not unimportant. In Papandrea's words: "It is difficult to understand Novatian's interpretation of this verse, since if it were about the Holy Spirit, it would seem to subordinate the Spirit of God to human prophets in the church."¹⁶⁰ Papandrea correctly noted that "Novatian has placed this quotation in the context of many quotations regarding the Spirit."¹⁶¹ Indeed, as Novatian quoted the passage, he was referring to the Holy Spirit, and so subjecting the Spirit to the prophet. However, the sense in which the Spirit is subject to the prophet can

¹⁵⁴*De Trinitate* 29.22.

¹⁵⁵Barbara Aland et al., *The Greek New Testament*, 4th ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1998), and Barbara Aland et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993).

¹⁵⁶*Spiritus* is the form for both the nominative singular and plural in Latin. Therefore, in this context, the only ways to determine whether *spiritus* refers to a singular spirit or a plurality of spirits is the number of the verb.

¹⁵⁷Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 459n669.

¹⁵⁸Novatian's reading can be found in Latin manuscripts of the eighth century (see Robert Weber and Roger Gryson, *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, 4th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007) and from some Greek manuscripts, including D from the fifth century (Aland et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th ed., 466n32).

¹⁵⁹D'Alès noted, "Concerning this Bible, Novatian is the principal and almost only witness" (*Novatien*, 43).

¹⁶⁰Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 459n669.

¹⁶¹Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 252. Papandrea commented that "Paul is not referring to the Holy Spirit, but the "spirit" of prophecy within a prophet of the church" (*Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 252). While Paul's intended meaning may very well align with Papandrea's interpretation, Novatian's text of Paul's epistle does not correspond with Papandrea's interpretation of what Paul might have actually meant.

be determined by the context. The subjection to the Spirit takes place after a discussion of the Spirit's activity against the desires of the flesh, in the middle of a series of scriptural quotations that began with Paul and the Corinthian believers having the Spirit, and concludes with people departing from the faith to follow the doctrine of demons.¹⁶² This context points to a critique of Montanism which had been rejected and which emphasized a mode of prophecy in which the prophets were marked by a loss of self-control. Novatian's presentation of the subjection of the Spirit to the prophets should be understood as the prophets being both self-aware and able to control their utterances from the Spirit. That is, the Spirit is subject to the prophet in that the prophet maintained self-control as the Spirit worked through the prophet to provide utterances. By saying this, Novatian left no room for ecstatic utterances made by prophets who have lost control of themselves or their identity. This stands in direct opposition to the Montanist prophetic practices.

The Spirit and the Faithless

Novatian's scriptural rebuttal of Montanism formed a hinge upon which he moved from a discussion of the Spirit being present in believers to a discussion of what the Spirit does not do. In this, however, he continued to address the identity of the Spirit through the Spirit's inactivity. He began with a partial quote of 1 Corinthians 12:3, "In hoc spiritu positus nemo umquam dicit anathema Iesum" (In this Spirit no one is ever able to say 'anathema to Jesus').¹⁶³ Novatian expanded this with more detail including that "nemo negavit Christum Dei Filium aut reudiavit creatorem Deum" (no one can have denied Christ is the Son of God or have rejected God as the creator).¹⁶⁴ This summarizes

¹⁶²*De Trinitate* 29.23.

¹⁶³*De Trinitate* 29.24.

¹⁶⁴*De Trinitate* 29.24.

the first two portions of the rule of truth and connects back to the Spirit's work in delivering the rule of truth.¹⁶⁵ The presence and activity of the Spirit preclude anyone with the Spirit from denying the two most fundamentally important aspects of the Father and the Son: that God is the creator and Christ is the Son of God.

Just as the Spirit upholds the rule of truth, so the Spirit also protects Scripture and its interpretation, "In hoc Spiritu . . . nemo contra scripturas ulla sua verba depromit, nemo alia et sacrilege decreta constituit" (In this Spirit . . . no one has brought out against Scripture some of its own words, no one has written other and sacrilegious commands).¹⁶⁶ The Spirit does not pit scripture against itself,¹⁶⁷ nor does the Spirit work to add other commands.¹⁶⁸ Novatian provided a brief understanding of what Spirit-led interpretation looked like. For him, it would affirm the rule of truth, it would understand scripture as a unified whole, and it would not add a new source of divine commands. Any method of interpretation that did not follow these rules would likely be viewed by Novatian as being opposed to the Spirit and the church.

Novatian quoted the words of Jesus himself when speaking about the Spirit, "In hunc quisquis blasphemaverit remissioem non habet, non tantum in isto saeculo, verum etiam nec in future" (Whoever has blasphemed against him, 'does not have forgiveness, either in this age, or even in the future').¹⁶⁹ The Synoptic Gospels all give the same reading in this instance, so Novatian's quote could have come from either

¹⁶⁵*De Trinitate* 29.19.

¹⁶⁶*De Trinitate* 29.24.

¹⁶⁷Kannegiesser noted that Novatian viewed "'heresy' consisting precisely in refusing to admit the basic principles of scriptural rationality: the principle of non-contradiction, the principles of deductive logic, etc., in short the *veritas* as understood in Novatian's hermeneutics" (*Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, 634).

¹⁶⁸This statement would cover most heretical groups who added another writing or prophetic word to the commands of God.

¹⁶⁹*De Trinitate* 29.25.

Matthew 12:32, Mark 3:29, or Luke 12:10. Novatian did not add anything to explain how he understood the blasphemy of the Spirit. His quotation of Jesus speaking about the blasphemy of the Spirit is a distinct break in Novatian's pattern of thought. In his prior statements, there was an ongoing effort to demonstrate how the Spirit supported correct belief about the Father and the Son as well as a correct interpretation of Scripture. Now, the Spirit has suddenly become the passive recipient of a possible action. This shift is a contextual construct that pulls together the most important themes from *De Trinitate*. Novatian's mention of God (the Father), the Son, Scripture, and the Holy Spirit in this order is in keeping with his statements about Scripture in *De Trinitate* 29.1, "ordo rationis et fidei auctoritas digestis vocabis et literis Domini admonet nos post haec credere etiam in Spiritum Sanctum" (the order of reason and the authority of the faith set forth in the words of God urge us, after believing these things, also to believe in the Holy Spirit). The "these things" mentioned in this quote are the things about God (that he is the creator) and about the Son (that he is the Son of God) that Novatian had explained in chapters 1–28 of *De Trinitate*.

Novatian's Closing Remarks on the Spirit

At the end of chapter 29, Novatian entered into a lengthy sentence affirming multiple actions of the Spirit with very little that could be considered a repeat of what he had already written.

Hic in apostolis Christo testimonium reddit, in martyribus constantem fidem religionis ostendit, in virginibus admirabilem continentiam signatae caritatis includit, in ceteris incorrupta et incontaminata doctrinae dominicae iura custodit, haereticos destruit, perversos corrigit, infideles arguit, simulatores ostendit, improbos quoque corrigit, ecclesiam incorruptam et inviolatam perpetuae virginitatis et veritatis sanctitate custodit.

He gives testimony to Christ in the apostles. He demonstrates the firm faith of our religion in the martyrs. He encloses admirable continence of sealed love in the virgins. In others, he guards the laws of the master's teaching uncorrupted and uncontaminated. He destroys heretics, corrects the perverse, convicts the disloyal, reveals the pretenders, and also corrects the wicked. He guards the church

uncorrupted and inviolable in perpetual virginity and the sanctity of the truth.¹⁷⁰ His concluding remarks are not a summary of what he had previously stated, but a final addition for which he provided no biblical quotations for support. These affirmations of the Spirit's work do not appear to share a definite structure or follow a logical flow of argument. These statements cover the Spirit's work in Scripture, in individual Christians, for the church, and against the wicked and heretics. This sentence appears almost as a last minute addition to address aspects of the Spirit's works which were not previously addressed. It introduces several aspects of the Spirit's work which Novatian's predecessors had already discussed.

Absent from Novatian's discussion of the identity of the Holy Spirit is a clear affirmation of the Spirit as the inspirer and speaker in the text of scripture. The Spirit's work as the speaker and or inspirer of Scripture had been mentioned by Justin Martyr,¹⁷¹ Irenaeus,¹⁷² Clement,¹⁷³ Tertullian,¹⁷⁴ and Hippolytus.¹⁷⁵ The closest Novatian came to addressing the Spirit's inspiration of Scripture is his statement about how the Spirit was in the prophets for a limited amount of time.¹⁷⁶ The Spirit's presence in the prophets hints at the Spirit's activity in their message, but does not clearly present the Spirit as the inspirer of Scripture. The work of the Spirit in speaking through Scripture can be glimpsed in Novatian's statement that "Hic in apostolis Christo testimonium reddit" (He gives testimony to Christ in the apostles).¹⁷⁷ The use of the present tense verb *reddit* 'he

¹⁷⁰*De Trinitate* 29.26.

¹⁷¹*Dialogus cum Tryphone* 74.2 and 124.1.

¹⁷²*Adversus Haereses* 2.28.2; 3.21.4; and *Epideixis* 24.

¹⁷³*Protrepitkos* 9.68; *Paidagogos* 1.5.15.

¹⁷⁴*Adversus Hermogenem* 22.1; *De Idololatria* 4.5; *Adversus Marcionem* 5.17.6.

¹⁷⁵*Contra Noetum* 12.1; 17.1; *In Canticum Canticorum* 1.2–3; 20.4.

¹⁷⁶*De Trinitate* 29.6.

¹⁷⁷*De Trinitate* 29.26.

gives' reinforces the Spirit's role in speaking through Scripture. It reveals that Novatian understood the Spirit to be presently giving testimony through the apostles who, at his time, had been dead for well over a century. In this manner, it is possible to see Novatian affirming the ongoing work of the Spirit, who is testifying about Christ in the writings of the apostles.

Novatian viewed martyrdom as part of the Spirit's work as did Ignatius,¹⁷⁸ Irenaeus,¹⁷⁹ Clement,¹⁸⁰ Tertullian,¹⁸¹ and Hippolytus¹⁸² before him. For him, the Spirit "in martyribus constantem fidem religionis ostendit" (demonstrates the firm faith of our religion in the martyrs).¹⁸³ Martyrdom is a demonstration of the firmness of the Christian faith by the Spirit. Novatian presents martyrdom as a spiritual gift, but not necessarily a gift to the martyr. Novatian did not say that the Spirit strengthens the martyr; this would be a gift of the Spirit to the martyr. He said that it "demonstrates the firm faith." Therefore, he understood martyrdom to be a spiritual gift to the church, which demonstrates the Christian faith.

Novatian also hints that there was a group of people within the church who were devoted to living in virginity. He understood this virginity to be a gift of the Spirit as the Spirit, "in virginibus admirabilem continentiam signatae caritatis includit" (he encloses admirable continence of sealed love in the virgins).¹⁸⁴ While Novatian praised

¹⁷⁸In *Romans* 7.2, Ignatius wrote how the Spirit was calling him to the Father through his upcoming martyrdom.

¹⁷⁹*Adversus Haereses* 5.9.2.

¹⁸⁰*Stromateis* 4.21.132.

¹⁸¹*De Fuga in Persecutione* 8.2; 9.4; *Ad Martyras* 1.3; 3.3; and 3.4.

¹⁸²"You see how the Spirit of the Father cares for martyrs, he teaches, while urging and encouraging them, to despise this death and to hasten to the better" (*In Daniele* 2.21.1–2). See also W. Brian Shelton, *Martyrdom from Exegesis in Hippolytus: An Early Church Presbyter's Commentary on Daniel* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2008), 79–112.

¹⁸³*De Trinitate* 29.26.

¹⁸⁴*De Trinitate* 29.26.

this lifestyle in *De Bono Pudicitiae*,¹⁸⁵ he offers no hint that it is a state of life any more spiritual than the married state. In the following phrase, he wrote, “in ceteris incorrupta et incontaminata doctrinae dominicae iura custodit” (In others, he guards the laws of the master’s teaching uncorrupted and uncontaminated).¹⁸⁶ These others should be understood to be those who have not the spiritual gift of life-long continence. In these married people, the Spirit is still at work guarding uncorrupted the “the master’s teaching.” The “master” here should be understood as a reference to Jesus and his teachings. Against Tertullian,¹⁸⁷ Novatian understood that marital relations did not corrupt or hinder the Spirit’s work of keeping the teachings of Jesus “uncorrupted and uncontaminated” in the married.

Novatian returned to the work of the Spirit against those who follow the desires of the flesh. He noted that the Spirit, “haereticos destruit, perversos corrigit, infideles arguit, simulatores ostendit, improbos quoque corrigit” (destroys heretics, corrects the perverse, convicts the disloyal, reveals the pretenders, and also chastises the wicked).¹⁸⁸ It is important to notice that while the heretics are destroyed, the Spirit acts according to the other groups in ways that could be seen as leading to repentance. The terms *corrigit*, *arguit*, and *ostendit* are terms that lack the finality of *destruit*. These terms demonstrate that the Spirit’s work with the wicked non-heretical is to bring about a change in their actions which is repentance.¹⁸⁹

Keeping with Novatian’s high view of virginity, he presented the Spirit as the

¹⁸⁵In *De Bono Pudicitiae* 4, Novatian presented three types of the pure: virgins, the continent, and the married state. He called both the virginal and the continent state “a gift of God” (4.3).

¹⁸⁶*De Trinitate* 29.26.

¹⁸⁷Tertullian understood intercourse even within a first marriage to repel the Holy Spirit (*De Exhortatione Castitatis* 10.6).

¹⁸⁸*De Trinitate* 29.26.

¹⁸⁹It is possible that Novatian understood the Spirit’s work of destroying the heretics as causing them to repent of their heresy.

one who, “ecclesiam incorruptam et inviolatam perpetuae virinitatis et veritatis sanctitate custodit” (guards the church uncorrupted and inviolable in perpetual virginity and the sanctity of the truth).¹⁹⁰ Novatian is likely building upon the language of Paul in 1 Corinthians 11:2, where he wrote of presenting the Corinthian church to Christ as “a pure virgin.” Novatian followed Paul’s language and portrayed the church as a virgin whose virginity is guarded by the Holy Spirit.¹⁹¹ The Holy Spirit also guards the church in “the sanctity of truth.” The Spirit of truth is seen to guard his truth in the church and in those to whom he has been given.

Conclusion

Novatian presented the identity of the Spirit primarily through the actions of the Spirit. The same Spirit was in the Old Testament prophets, but was given by Christ in a new way to Christians. The Spirit, who was given, gives and works his gifts in the lives of Christians to perfect the church. The Spirit cannot be understood apart from Jesus. Jesus’ experience of the Spirit is completely unique and it is from this relationship that Christians, as followers of Jesus, receive the Spirit. Christians are transformed by the Spirit’s indwelling presence and by obeying the moral commands of the Spirit. Heresies and heretics are opposed by the Spirit. The true prophecy given by the Spirit does not override the true prophet’s sense of self. The Spirit guards the church’s faith and it’s faithful.

This is how Novatian identified the Holy Spirit in whom the rule of faith and the Scriptures require Christians to believe. Theological speculation and personal experience played no observable role in Novatian’s presentation of the Holy Spirit. He identified the Holy Spirit through the words and concepts of Scripture, which by the

¹⁹⁰*De Trinitate* 29.26.

¹⁹¹Novatian’s understanding of the Spirit’s work on behalf of the church is likely part of the reason for his schism and eventual refusal to allow the return of the *lapsi*.

nature of their content focus on the activity of the Spirit. The exception to the activity of the Spirit is the Spirit's relation with the Son in John's Gospel, which Novatian directly addressed. Apart from this important exception, the Spirit is known through Scripture and his activity is affirmed therein. This is what Christians must believe about the Holy Spirit to be in keeping with the faith that Novatian had received in the rule of truth.

CHAPTER 5
NOVATIAN'S ONTOLOGY OF THE SPIRIT

Introduction

It is somewhat difficult to describe an author's view on an issue that the author never directly addressed. This difficulty is compounded when the author leaves little in the way of hints and clues so as to form an answer from implications. This is the state of Novatian's ontology of the Spirit. The few hints that he provided about his understanding of the ontology of the Spirit all occur in contexts where he addressed topics other than the ontology of the Spirit. The ontology of the Spirit in Novatian's works can be glimpsed primarily through his description of the identity of the Spirit. Despite this limitation, the focus of most scholarly works regarding Novatian's pneumatology has been focused on his ontology of the Spirit.

There is no general consensus about Novatian's understanding of the Spirit's ontology. Some, such as Papandrea¹ and DeSimone,² argue that Novatian understood the Spirit to be equally divine with the Father and the Son. Others, such as Simonetti,³ have argued that Novatian viewed the Holy Spirit to be a created being.⁴ Perhaps the only

¹James L. Papandrea, *The Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome: A Study in Third-Century Orthodoxy* (New York: Edwin Mellen 2009); and James L. Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome and the Culmination of Pre-Nicene Orthodoxy* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011).

²Russell J. DeSimone, "The Holy Spirit according to Novatian *De Trinitate*," *Augustinianum* 10 (1970): 138–65.

³Manlio Simonetti, "Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano," in *Studi in onore di Angelo Monteverdi* (Modena: Società Tipografica Editrice Modenese, 1959), 2: 771–83.

⁴Stuart G. Hall also asserted Novatian presented the Holy Spirit as a creature. His points followed the arguments set forth by Simonetti in "Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano" (Stuart G. Hall, *Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church* [London: SPCK, 1991], 83).

issue upon which there is agreement is that Novatian understood the Son to be subordinated to the Father⁵ and understood the Spirit to be less than the Son.⁶ Given this agreement, there has been a tendency to view Novatian's ontology of the Spirit in the same manner in which one understands the subordination of the Son to the Father. Defining Novatian's subordination of the Son to the Father, however, is a topic that is beyond the scope of this work.⁷ Further, Novatian's subordination of the Son to the Father is of limited value for his pneumatological ontology as, at best, it can only indirectly affirm the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

Novatian wrote about the Holy Spirit in such a way that required him to have understood the Holy Spirit to be divine. He did not overtly call the Spirit God in his identification of the Holy Spirit in *De Trinitate* 29 because he carefully followed the pattern of Scripture. Nowhere in Scripture is the Holy Spirit overtly called God. Therefore, the absence of calling the Holy Spirit by the term "God" in Novatian's writings is not a basis for asserting that he did not understand the Holy Spirit to be God. He merely followed the wording of the biblical texts. As such, he implied and assumed the divinity of the Spirit. He spoke of the "divine eternity" of the Holy Spirit.⁸ In so doing, he affirmed the Spirit to be eternal, which he previously defined as an attribute of God alone.⁹ Likewise, in his argument for the Spirit being less than the Son,¹⁰ he

⁵Daniel Lloyd correctly noted that "all Novatian scholars acknowledge that Trin. teaches the Son's subordination to the Father" (Daniel Lloyd, "Ontological Subordination in Novatian of Rome's Theology of the Son" [PhD diss., Marquette University, 2012], 9).

⁶Johannes Quasten succinctly stated this very point, writing, "As the Son is less than the Father, so the Holy Spirit is less than the Son" (Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 2, *The Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus* [Utrecht, Holland: Spectrum, 1950], 230).

⁷For the most recent scholarly work on Novatian's Christology, see Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*; and Lloyd, "Ontological Subordination."

⁸*De Trinitate* 29.16.

⁹*De Trinitate* 2.2–3.

¹⁰*De Trinitate* 16.2–3.

assumed that the Spirit was divine. Additionally, Novatian's description of the work of the Holy Spirit in believers, which, while not conclusive in and of itself, does present the Spirit as intimately involved in the work of God. His Trinitarian statements demonstrate the Spirit was to be believed together with the Father and the Son. When these points are taken together, they reveal that Novatian considered the Spirit to be divine. At the same time, the nature of these statements offer no clear evidence from which to understand the exact manner of the Holy Spirit's divinity.

This chapter addresses Novatian's ontology of the Spirit by first outlining the scholarly views on Novatian's ontology of the Spirit. These views are assessed in light of Novatian's own wording and patterns of thought. This chapter demonstrates that Novatian understood that the Holy Spirit was uncreated, yet he did not call the Holy Spirit the creator. The ontological implications of the Spirit's relationship to the Son reveal that despite Novatian affirming the Spirit is less than the Son,¹¹ he did so in such a way that affirmed the Spirit's divinity without defining the Spirit's divinity. The activities of the Spirit show that the Spirit is intimately involved in the divine work in believers both individually and corporately. Novatian's few Trinitarian statements connected the Spirit with the Father and the Son as objects of the Christian faith to be experienced together by Christians. When Novatian spoke about the divine eternity of the Holy Spirit, he applied a term that he reserved for God alone and thus irrefutably affirmed the divinity of the Holy Spirit. When these points are taken together, it is evident that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be divine. It cannot be proven, however, that Novatian considered the Spirit to be equally divine with the Father and the Son.

¹¹*De Trinitate* 16.2–3.

Overview of Scholarship

The scholarship concerning Novatian's ontology of the Spirit has not reached any sort of a consensus. There are views ranging from the Holy Spirit being a creature to being consubstantial with the Father and the Son. Even among those who affirmed Novatian understood the Spirit to be divine, there is some diversity in the argumentation. Harnack offered that, "Novatian adopted Tertullian's formulæ 'one substance, three persons' ('una substantia, tres personæ')." ¹² His reading of Novatian suffers from the fact that Novatian never used the term *persona* to refer to the Holy Spirit nor did he write of the Spirit being a part of *una substantia*. ¹³ Due to the lack of textual support for his position, Harnack's views have not been widely adopted. Several scholars who concluded that Novatian affirmed the divinity of the Spirit have done so based upon the activity which Novatian ascribed to the Holy Spirit in *De Trinitate*. ¹⁴ D'Alès argued that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to have been divine ¹⁵ because of the activity of the

¹²Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. Neil Buchman (London: Williams & Norgate, 1896), 2: 315.

¹³Fausset rightly noted that Novatian never referred to the Holy Spirit "as 'tertia persona' or even as 'deus'" (W. York Fausset, *Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri De Trinitate Liber: Novatian's Treatise on the Trinity*, Cambridge Patristic Texts [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909], xxviii). D'Alès observed that Novatian used the term *persona* for Christ, but not for the Holy Spirit (Adhemar D'Alès, *Novatien: Étude sur la Théologie Romaine au milieu du III^e Siècle* [Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1924], 114–15).

¹⁴Fausset viewed Novatian as affirming the doctrine of "His Personality" (*Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri*, xxviii) because of the description of the activity of the Spirit in the soul of the Christian and in the church. In this manner, Fausset supported the view that Novatian understood the Spirit to be divine based upon how Novatian described the activity of the Spirit. Swete followed a similar conclusion, stating that while Novatian does not "call the Spirit God, he certainly ascribes to Him offices and properties which no creature can exercise" (Henry B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers* [London: MacMillan and Co., 1912], 109).

¹⁵D'Alès' conclusions and part of this argumentation were followed by DeSimone and Papandrea. DeSimone wrote that Novatian considered the Holy Spirit to be a "Divine Person" (Russell J. DeSimone, "The Holy Spirit according to Novatian *De Trinitate*," *Augustinianum* 10 [1970]: 142). Papandrea argued that Novatian assumed the divinity of the Holy Spirit (*Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 116).

Spirit.¹⁶ Particularly, the act of the Spirit depositing “the seed of divine life”¹⁷ in Christians and Novatian’s Trinitarian statement in *De Trinitate* 30.1¹⁸ are the points which required Novatian to have considered the Spirit divine. He viewed the Spirit’s activity in the divine work as revealing “son caractère personnel marqué.”¹⁹ Novatian’s Trinitarian statement in *De Trinitate* 30.1 is understood to show “les trois personnes divines sur le même plan,”²⁰ and that this statement “corrigerait au besoin l’indécision des pages précédentes”²¹ of *De Trinitate*. D’Alès understood Novatian to have affirmed the divinity of the Spirit while subordinating him to the Son, just as the Son is subordinated to the Father.²² Papandrea added that this subordination takes place within the relationship of the one who sends and the one who is sent.²³ Both DeSimone²⁴ and Papandrea²⁵ understood Novatian’s statement about “the divine eternity of the Holy Spirit” in *De Trinitate* 29.16, to be an important point for Novatian’s understanding of the Spirit’s divinity. Papandrea follows DeSimone and D’Alès concluding that “it is clear that Novatian treated the Holy Spirit as uncreated and consubstantial with the divine

¹⁶D’Alès, *Novatien*, 117. Papandrea likewise noted that the activity of the Spirit does more than hint that he is divine because he grants eternal life, works miracles, heals, and was the power behind the miracles of Christ (*Novatian of Rome*, 109).

¹⁷D’Alès, *Novatien*, 117.

¹⁸“Let these few things about the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit which have been superficially put forth be briefly stated and not be extended with a lengthier argument.”

¹⁹D’Alès, *Novatien*, 117: “The mark of his personal character.” DeSimone also wrote that Novatian considered the Holy Spirit to be a “Divine Person” (“The Holy Spirit,” 142).

²⁰D’Alès, *Novatien*, 118: “The three divine persons of the same plane.”

²¹D’Alès, *Novatien*, 119–20: “Would correct the necessary indecision of the preceding pages.”

²²D’Alès, *Novatien*, 118. DeSimone followed this conclusion about the subordination of the Spirit to the Son (“The Holy Spirit,” 149–52).

²³“The Father sends the Son, and so is greater than the Son. The Son gives the Spirit, and so is greater than the Spirit. This hierarchy is based, not upon an inequality of essence, but on the order of authority; ranking of the sender above the messenger” (Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 221).

²⁴DeSimone, “The Holy Spirit,” 142.

²⁵Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 244.

essence, yet a distinct divine person.”²⁶

Manlio Simonetti outlined a reading of Novatian that presented Novatian as understanding the Spirit to be a created being.²⁷ He notes that Novatian did not define the Holy Spirit “as a divine person,” nor did Novatian present a thoughtful view of the nature of the Spirit.²⁸ He noted that Novatian “never speaks of the Spirit as a divine person and he never includes him when dealing with the intra-divine relationship between the Father and the Son; he restricts himself to describing the sanctifying activity of the Spirit.”²⁹ He noted that in *De Trinitate* 7.4, Novatian concluded his discussion on why God cannot be defined by the term *spiritus* by stating, “omnis enim spiritus creatura est” (every spirit is a creature).³⁰ Simonetti takes this statement in 7.4 as a referent to the Holy Spirit because in 8.3, Novatian used *spiritus* to refer to the Holy Spirit. In light of this conclusion, he viewed Novatian’s Trinitarian statement in *De Trinitate* 30.1 as simply being part of the rule of truth and therefore having no bearing upon the ontology of the Spirit.³¹ Similarly, Simonetti critiques D’Alès’ view of the subordination of the Spirit to the Son by noting that according to his reasoning that the Spirit is less than the Son just as the Son is less than the Father, then even the angels should be considered divine persons because Novatian wrote that angels are lesser than Christ.³² Therefore, he

²⁶Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 109.

²⁷Simonetti, “Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano,” 2: 771–83.

²⁸Simonetti, “Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano,” 2: 779–80.

²⁹Manlio Simonetti, “The Beginnings of Theological Reflection in the West,” in *History of Theology: I The Patristic Period*, ed. Angelo Di Berardino and Basil Studer, trans. Matthew J. O’Connell (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1996), 217.

³⁰Simonetti, “Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano,” 2: 781.

³¹Simonetti, “Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano,” 2: 780. Noticeably absent from Simonetti’s rebuke was D’Alès assertion that the Spirit ought to be understood as divine, in Novatian’s *De Trinitate*, because the Spirit is the one who communicates the divinity of the Son to Christians.

³²Simonetti, “Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano,” 2: 780. The reason for this is that Novatian stated *angelus Christo minor est*, in *De Trinitate* 20.3.

concludes “che Novaziano ha concepito lo Spirito Santo soltanto come un dono divino che Dio ha voluto elargire agli uomini, quindi in effecti come una creatura.”³³

Briggman offered an interpretation of Novatian’s pneumatological ontology that did not affirm the Spirit to be either divine or a creature.³⁴ He asserted that Novatian did not acknowledge the Spirit’s work in creation and never argued for the eternity of the Spirit.³⁵ From this, he concludes that “Novatian does not offer a logical basis for the equal divinity of the Holy Spirit and the Father or the Son.”³⁶

The disparity in these conclusions preclude any attempt to harmonize them. Despite the discrepancies in these presented views of the Spirit’s ontology, they share one methodological weakness. None of them approached Novatian’s presentation of the Spirit in *De Trinitate* 29 as his identification of the Spirit in whom Christians ought to believe through the text of Scripture. This failure to follow Novatian’s own pattern of writing about the Spirit leads to conclusions that cannot be supported. It cannot be demonstrated that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be ontologically equal with the Father and the Son. Neither can it be shown that Novatian understood the spirit to be a creature.

Some of the difficulty with the scholarly assessment of Novatian’s

³³Simonetti, “Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano,” 2: 782: “that Novatian had conceived of the Holy Spirit only as a divine gift that God willed to bestow upon humanity, so in fact, as a creature.”

³⁴Quasten could likely be included alongside Briggman. He viewed Novatian’s pneumatological ontology as brief and undefined. Although he did not go so far as to posit that Novatian left no basis to understand the Spirit as divine, he hinted that Novatian’s Trinitarian theology was lacking: “Novatian’s treatment of the personality of the Holy Spirit is very brief and lacking in preciseness. He does not describe the relations of the Holy Spirit to the Father and to the Son, as he does for the two latter, although Tertullian, whom he follows, makes at least an attempt at it. It is significant that he calls the Son *secundum post patrem personam* but fails to call the Holy Spirit *tertiam personam*, which Tertullian had done” (Quasten, *Patrology* 2: 230).

³⁵Anthony Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 213–14.

³⁶Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 214. Briggman asserts that Novatian’s failure to identify the Spirit as one of the “hands of God” or as “Wisdom” are the reasons for his failure to affirm the divinity of the Holy Spirit (*Irenaeus of Lyons*, 214).

pneumatology stems from a tendency to view his pneumatology outside of his historical context. Some authors have contrasted Novatian with Tertullian and Hippolytus, and in this manner have found his pneumatology lacking.³⁷ The act of comparing Novatian with his predecessors can be quite helpful and illuminate the issues and discussions of their time. However, there is a tendency to view Tertullian's Trinitarian formula "one substance three persons" from the perspective of the present, at which time this statement has been recognized as one of the best ways to affirm an orthodox understanding of the Trinity. Novatian's failure to follow Tertullian's wording and theology then is judged in terms of a regression in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In this manner, the comparison of Novatian with Tertullian is quite unhelpful. This dissertation avoids such pitfalls by using Novatian's own terminology to assess his ontology of the Spirit.

Neither a Creature nor the Creator

Novatian did not present the Spirit as a creature in *De Trinitate*. Simonetti's assertion that Novatian presented the Holy Spirit as a creature is based upon several misinterpretations of Novatian's statements. One of Simonetti's errors is in his

³⁷Harnack improperly concluded that Novatian followed Tertullian's wording, "one substance, three persons" (*History of Dogma* 2: 315). This led him to conclude that Novatian simply followed Tertullian's ontology of the Spirit. Quasten wrote that "Novatian's treatment of the personality of the Holy Spirit is very brief and lacking in preciseness. He does not describe the relations of the Holy Spirit to the Father and to the Son, as he does for the two latter, although Tertullian, whom he follows, makes at least an attempt at it. It is significant that he calls the Son *secundum post patrem personam* but fails to call the Holy Spirit *tertiam personam*, which Tertullian had done." (Quasten, *Patrology* 2: 230). D'Alès assessed that Novatian's terminology did not make any progress beyond Tertullian's terminology (*Novatien*, 114). Indeed, he viewed Novatian as presenting much less clarity on the Trinity and the person of the Holy Spirit than Tertullian had shown (*Novatien*, 132).

Simonetti noted that Novatian avoided using the terminology of Hippolytus and Tertullian ("Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano," 2: 779). Therefore, he concluded that Novatian's conception of the Holy Spirit was a "remarkable regression from Tertullian" ("Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano," 2: 782). DeSimone was a little more generous in his assessment, "We have here a certain retrogression, nevertheless, I do not think it is scientifically correct to completely evacuate, to completely annihilate Novatian's doctrine of the person of the Holy Spirit and the Trinity as Simonetti does" ("The Holy Spirit," 158). Papandrea took the opposite view and stated, "in Novatian's explanation of the Trinity, he made an advance from Tertullian and Hippolytus and set the stage for the Council of Nicaea" (*On the Trinity, Letters to Cyprian of Carthage, Ethical Treatises*, Corpus Christianorum in Translation 22, ed. and trans. James Papandrea [Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2015], 19). Papandrea stated this because he looked beyond Novatian's terminology to some of Novatian's theological positions that were affirmed as orthodox at Nicaea.

interpretation of *De Trinitate* 7.4, “Omnis enim spiritus creatura est” (For every spirit is a creature). Simonetti understood this statement to include the Holy Spirit because Novatian used the same term *spiritus* in chapter eight in reference to the Holy Spirit within a context of outlining God’s providence and goodness towards his creation. Seeing this term *spiritus* used in adjacent chapters, Simonetti stated, “È piuttosto arduo sostenere che in due capitoli contigui Novaziano abbia adoperato le stessa parola con due significati completamente diversi senza sentire affatto la necessità di chiarire la differenza.”³⁸ The difficulty with Simonetti’s argument is that he assumes, based upon proximity, that Novatian used *spiritus* to mean the same thing in two different contexts. He does not take into account the different context of each use of *spiritus* and thus unduly limited the semantic range of *spiritus*. In particular, the statement in 7.4 takes place within a context in which Novatian was explaining how the ability to know and define the very being of God is impossible for humans.³⁹ Lloyd noted this exact same thing about this passage saying, “Novatian makes the impossibility of grasping or knowing the substance of God a centerpiece of his theology, the terms love, light, and spirit can only point toward God. No term can name God’s nature.”⁴⁰ Therefore, Novatian’s statement that “every spirit is a creature” was not addressing the ontology of the Spirit, but the figurative language used in Scripture to speak about God.⁴¹

Novatian clearly did not present the Spirit as created, but he also did not write

³⁸Simonetti, “Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano,” 2: 782: “It is rather difficult to argue that in two adjacent chapters Novatian has employed the same word with two completely different meanings, without any feeling that he needed to clarify the difference.”

³⁹Novatian quoted John 4:24 “God is spirit” and from this affirmation concluded that God “is simplex, meaning that He is not made up of distinguishable parts, and therefore He is incorruptible and immutable” (Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 167). Of course, Novatian was careful to note that *spiritus* “spirit” is not a term that can adequately describe God (*De Trinitate* 7).

⁴⁰Lloyd, “Ontological Subordination,” 57.

⁴¹Novatian understood the descriptions of God in Scripture as ‘fire’ or as ‘spirit’ were used figuratively of God to describe something about God to strike fear or to be known through his mercy (*De Trinitate* 7.4–5).

about the Spirit as the creator. Novatian presented the Father as the creator.⁴² He also argued for the divinity of the Son because the Son shared in the work of creation.⁴³ Briggman viewed Novatian's failure to mention the creative agency of the Spirit as clearly pointing towards Novatian understanding the Spirit to be other than divine.⁴⁴ This conclusion overstates the importance of the Spirit as creator in the pneumatology prior to Novatian. Apart from Irenaeus,⁴⁵ the role of the Holy Spirit in creation was rarely mentioned in the Christian authors prior to Novatian. Hermas spoke about the Spirit as the creator,⁴⁶ and Tertullian at least once spoke of the Holy Spirit as the creator in his interpretation of Genesis 1:26.⁴⁷ It should then come as no surprise to find that Novatian did not speak about the Holy Spirit as the creator because this was not a common theme in the pneumatological tradition that Novatian had received. The absence of the Spirit's work as creator in Novatian should not be understood to be a definitive point to determine his ontology of the Spirit. If Novatian had overtly stated that the Spirit was not the creator, then this topic would have great bearing upon his pneumatological ontology. As it stands, the creative agency of the Spirit was not mentioned by Novatian. Therefore, Novatian did not consider the Holy Spirit to be a creature, nor did he affirm the Spirit to be the creator.

⁴²*De Trinitate* 1.1–8.

⁴³*De Trinitate* 13.7; 14.6.

⁴⁴Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 213.

⁴⁵“For God did not need these [angels] to do what he himself had determined beforehand as if he did not possess his hands. For The Word and Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, were always present with him by whom and in whom he made all things. To whom he also speaks saying, ‘Let us make man after our image and likeness’” (*Adversus Haereses* 4.20.1).

⁴⁶*Pastor Hermae* 59.5.

⁴⁷*Adversus Praxean* 7. It is possible that Tertullian had a larger understanding of the Holy Spirit's role in creation. Because of his tendency to speak of the Son as *Spiritus Dei*, it is somewhat difficult to discern if his statements about the *Spiritus Dei* as creator are a reference to the Son or to the Holy Spirit.

The Ontology of the Spirit from His Relation to the Son

The argument for understanding the subordination of the Spirit to the Son as functioning in the same manner as the subordination of the Son to the Father is not an adequate basis from which to address the ontology of the Spirit. If one were to follow Lloyd's⁴⁸ understanding that the Son has a lesser divinity than the Father, then the Spirit would be viewed as divine, yet having a lesser divinity than the Son. If one were to follow Papandrea,⁴⁹ then the Spirit would be divine and sharing the same divinity as the Father and the Son. Despite the differences of these two views on Novatian's Christology, both conclude that Novatian understood the Son to be divine. Indeed, the ability to discern the ontology of the Spirit through the Spirit's relationship to the Son in Novatian is limited to merely affirming the divinity of the Spirit. An attempt to define the Spirit as equally divine with the Father and the Son based upon the Spirit's subordination to the Son would need to be based upon Trinitarian assumptions that Novatian might not have shared.

Less than Christ

Novatian's understanding of the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the Son is important for rightly understanding the divinity of the Spirit. Novatian affirmed that the Spirit is less than the Son, "maior ergo iam paraclete Christus est, quoniam nec paracletus a Christo acciperet, nisi minor Christo esset" (therefore now Christ is greater than the Advocate. Because the Advocate would not receive from Christ, unless he was less than Christ).⁵⁰ D'Alès interpreted this statement to mark the Spirit's "place marquée au-

⁴⁸Lloyd, "Ontological Subordination." Lloyd did not directly address the ontology of the Spirit. However, by following his conclusion that the Son is ontologically less than the Father, it would appear, given Novatian's statement that the Spirit is less than the Son, that the Spirit could be considered to be ontologically inferior to the Son in the same manner that the Son is ontologically inferior to the Father.

⁴⁹Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 109.

⁵⁰*De Trinitate* 16.3.

dessous du Christ, non par sa nature, mais par sa fonction.”⁵¹ He understands Novatian’s subordination of the Spirit to the Son in the same manner as the Son is subordinate to the Father.⁵²

Papandrea followed D’Alès’ conclusion with some addition. He stated that there was a pattern in Novatian’s thought,

Here we see the completion of Novatian’s understanding of the divine hierarchy within the Trinity. The Father sends the Son, and so is greater than the Son. The Son gives the Spirit, and so is greater than the Spirit. This hierarchy is based, not on an inequality of essence, but on the order of authority; the ranking of the sender above the messenger.⁵³

According to Papandrea then, Novatian understood subordination to be based upon the understanding that the one who sends is greater than the one who is sent. Therefore, the Spirit is less than the Son because the Son sends the Spirit.

Simonetti understood this inferiority to affirm that the Holy Spirit was a creature. He noted that in *De Trinitate* 20.3 Novatian stated “angelus Christo minor est” (an angel is less than Christ). Simonetti then compared this with Novatian’s statement affirming the Spirit is less than Christ in *De Trinitate* 16.3. He then pointed out a flaw in D’Alès line of reasoning by stating, “concludere che anche gli angeli, minori di Christo come minore è lo Spirito Santo e come Christo è minore del Padre, sono stati concepiti da Novaziano come persone divine.”⁵⁴ Simonetti rightly pointed out a problem in the logic of affirming that Novatian viewed the Spirit as divine based upon the Spirit being less than Christ. Following his reasoning, if angels are less than Christ and they can rightly

⁵¹D’Alès, *Novatien*, 118: “Place marked below Christ, not according to his nature, but according to his function.”

⁵²D’Alès, *Novatien*, 119.

⁵³Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 221.

⁵⁴Simonetti, “Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano,” 2:780: “One should conclude that even as the angels are lesser than Christ, so also the Holy Spirit is lesser than Christ as Christ is lesser than the Father, so the angels are divine persons to Novatian.” DeSimone’s rebuttal of Simonetti does not contain any comments about *De Trinitate* 16.3 and Simonetti’s interpretation of this passage (DeSimone, “The Holy Spirit,” 154–64).

be called gods,⁵⁵ then Novatian's affirmation that the Spirit is less than Christ cannot be used to affirm the divinity of the Holy Spirit. However correct Simonetti's logic may appear, when confronted with the context of the passages he referenced his argument is far less convincing.

In *De Trinitate* 16, Novatian argued for the divinity of the Son on the basis that the Son was greater than the Holy Spirit.

Sed si a Christo accepit quae nuntiet, maior ergo iam paracletus Christus est, quoniam nec paracletus a Christo acciperet, nisi minor Christo esset. Minor autem Christo paracletus Christum etiam Deum esse hoc ipso probat, a quo accepit quae nuntiat, ut testimonium Christi divinitatis grande sit, dum minor Christo paracletus repertus ab illo sumit quae ceteris tradit.

But if he [the Holy Spirit] receives from Christ what he would make known to us, therefore now Christ is greater than the Advocate. Because the Advocate would not receive from Christ, unless he was less than Christ. But the Advocate is less than Christ and this by itself proves Christ to be God, from whom he receives what he announces, so that it might be a great testimony of Christ's divinity. While less than Christ, the Advocate takes from him what he delivers to others.⁵⁶

Novatian understood that Christ is greater than the Spirit because the Spirit receives from Christ what he makes known to humans. He understood that the Spirit being lesser than Christ by itself proved the divinity of Christ. This is a very important point regarding Novatian's ontology of the Spirit. If the Spirit being lesser than the Son proves the divinity of the Son, then the Spirit must be divine. For if Novatian considered the Spirit to be a creature, then Christ being greater than the Spirit would prove nothing about the state of the Son's divinity.

In *De Trinitate* 20.3, Novatian's assertion that Christ is God because he is greater than the angels take place within a different context than Novatian's comments regarding the Holy Spirit in *De Trinitate* 16.3. In *De Trinitate* 19, Novatian presented how God is called an angel throughout Scripture and argued that these refer to Christ.

⁵⁵*De Trinitate* 20.2–3.

⁵⁶*De Trinitate* 16.3.

Then, in *De Trinitate* 20, Novatian stated, “Nam si omnibus caelestibus, terrenis et infernis Christo subditis etiam ipsi angeli cum omnibus ceteris quaecumque subiecta sunt Christo dicuntur dii, iure et Deus Christus” (For if all things in heaven, on the earth, and under the earth are subordinate to Christ, even the angels themselves have been subjected to Christ with all others whatsoever, if they are called gods, then Christ is rightly God).⁵⁷ It is important to note that Novatian categorized the angels along with all other things as being subordinated to Christ. This is an important distinction that Novatian did not use when he wrote of the Holy Spirit being less than Christ in *De Trinitate* 16.2–3. Then, when Novatian wrote that “angelus Christo minor est” (an angel is lesser than Christ),⁵⁸ he wrote this in a context which he had identified Christ as an angel, angels as gods, and affirmed that all angels are subordinated to Christ along with all other things. Within this context, Novatian presented that Christ’s superiority to any and all angels is an argument for his divinity. This is quite different from Novatian’s discussion of the Holy Spirit being lesser than Christ. It is apparent that Novatian understood the Spirit to be in a different class than the angels as Christ merely being greater than the Spirit proved his divinity for Novatian. If the divinity of the Son can be proven through the Son being shown to be greater than the Spirit, then Novatian implicitly affirmed and indeed assumed that the Spirit is no mere creature. Therefore, while Simonetti’s assertions have a certain logic, this logic does not account for the context of Novatian’s statements regarding the Spirit being lesser than Christ.

Novatian’s discussion on the Spirit being less than Christ is better understood by D’Alès and Papandrea. D’Alès argued that Novatian subordinated the Spirit to the Son in terms of the economic Trinity. He begins this discussion by noting that “Novatian

⁵⁷*De Trinitate* 20.2.

⁵⁸*De Trinitate* 20.3.

revendique la divinité pour le Paraclet.”⁵⁹ The subordination can be seen in that the Spirit receives “le du divin du Christ.”⁶⁰ In this way, Novatian marks the Spirit’s “place marquée au-dessous du Christ, non par sa nature, mais par sa fonction”⁶¹ He applies this interpretation to Novatian’s statement in *De Trinitate* 16.3 *Minor autem Christo paracletus* saying, “au commentaire donné par Novatien à la parole du Seigneur: ‘Pater major me est’ Tout est commun entre le Père et le Fils, sauf que l’un donne et l’autre reçoit.”⁶² From this, D’Alès concludes that Novatian’s description of the role and subordination of the Spirit does not imply an inferiority of being. Therefore, he understands Novatian to have presented the Spirit as divine and only subordinated to the Son in terms of activity. Papandrea followed the general thrust of D’Alès argument. He noted that “The Father sends the Son, and so is greater than the Son. The Son gives the Spirit, and so is greater than the Spirit. This hierarchy is based, not upon an inequality of essence, but on the order of authority; ranking of the sender above the messenger.”⁶³ Therefore, in this thought, the subordination of the Spirit has no hint of ontological inferiority, but is simply related to the activity of the Trinity.⁶⁴ The conclusions of

⁵⁹D’Alès, *Novatien*, 118: “Novatian claimed divinity for the Paraclete.”

⁶⁰D’Alès, *Novatien*, 118: “The gift of the divinity from Christ.”

⁶¹D’Alès, *Novatien*, 118: “Place beneath Christ, not according to his nature, but according to His function.”

⁶²D’Alès, *Novatien*, 119: “The comment given by Novatian must be viewed with the speech of the Lord, ‘The Father is greater than me.’ While it is mutual between the Father and the Son, except that the one gives and the other receives, it is no different between the Son and the Paraclete.”

⁶³Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 221.

⁶⁴Papandrea rightly noted Novatian referred to the *patrocinio Spiritus* “patronage of the Spirit” (*De Trinitate* 29.3). He then wrote, “It is probable that Novatian’s Trinitarian hierarchy was influenced by the social system of patronage which was prevalent in Rome. Novatian apparently borrowed from the Roman social order which conceived of people as substantially equal, but which ranked people by relationships of giving and receiving favors” (*Trinitarian Theology of Novatian or Rome*, 357). It is certainly possible that Novatian’s understanding of hierarchy was either overtly or implicitly influenced by his cultural milieu. The difficulty with applying the patronage system to the ontology of the Spirit is that the Spirit is called the patron of believers. Therefore, if one applies the system of patronage as Papandrea presented, the Spirit then could be understood as ontologically equal to humans. This is clearly not how Novatian presented the Spirit elsewhere, and thus the patronage system does not adequately help one to rightly address the ontology of the Spirit.

Papandrea and D'Alès go too far on one point. They share the same view that Novatian understood the Spirit to be equally divine with the Father and the Son. It is quite possible that this is how Novatian understood the Spirit's ontology and divinity. Yet, it cannot clearly be proven from his writing that he held this view. Novatian placed the Spirit in the category of the divine, yet this does not necessitate that he understood the Holy Spirit to be equally divine with the Father and the Son.

The exact nature of the Son's subordination to the Father is now worth examining in brief. If, as D'Alès and Papandrea have affirmed, the Spirit's subordination to the Son is the same as the Son's subordination to the Father, then it is important to understand the nature of the subordination of the Son to the Father in Novatian's thought. Novatian's exact understanding of the subordination of the Son to the Father is a matter of no small debate. Papandrea termed Novatian's subordination of the Son "dynamic subordinationism." With this term, Papandrea signifies that "the subordination of the Son to the Father is not ontological, but is rather a subordination of power that is both relational and voluntary."⁶⁵ When applying this understanding of subordination to the Holy Spirit, then the Spirit would be understood to be ontologically equally divine with the Father and the Son, only voluntarily subordinating himself to the Son within the relationship of the Son sending the Spirit.

Lloyd argues that Novatian presented the Son as ontologically subordinated to the Father. He defines this subordination as "the Son as having a divine nature or divine attributes which are unequal to those of the Father, the Supreme God."⁶⁶ Applying Lloyd's view of subordination to the Holy Spirit, the Spirit would be divine, yet somehow not sharing as fully of the divine attributes as the Son does not fully possess the

⁶⁵James L. Papandrea, *Reading the Early Church Fathers: From the Didache to Nicaea* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2012), 117.

⁶⁶Lloyd, "Ontological Subordination," 1.

divine attributes of the Father. It is beyond the scope of this work to present an argument for either position on the subordination of the Son to the Father. Indeed, if either understanding of the subordination of the Son to the Father is applied to the Holy Spirit, the result is that one views Novatian as understanding the Holy Spirit to be divine. Given the lack of Novatian's statements about the Spirit's ontology, his divinity is all that can be affirmed with any certainty from the nature of the subordination of the Spirit to the Son.

Novatian's Trinitarian Statements

There are only three Trinitarian formulas in Novatian's corpus. He did not use Trinitarian formulas in any of his extant greetings or farewells.⁶⁷ This absence of a Trinitarian formulae does not necessarily reveal anything concerning his Trinitarian theology, but this absence does point to a manner of writing that might have made use of Trinitarian formulae infrequently. Indeed, the one place in *De Trinitate* where Novatian provided a Trinitarian statement, it is little more than a summary of the rule of faith which he had presented.

Et haec quidem de Patre et de Filio et de Spiritu Sancto breviter sint nobis dicta et strictim posita et non longa disputatione porrecta. Latius enim potuerunt porrigi et propensiore disputatione produci, quandoquidem ad testimonium, quod ita se habeat fides vera, totum et vetus et novum testamentum possit adduci.

Let these few things about the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit which have been superficially put forth be briefly stated and not be extended with a lengthier argument. For they could be extended more broadly and prolonged by even more weighty arguments since for testimony one might have the true faith supported by the whole of both the New and the Old Testaments.⁶⁸

As it regards the Novatian's Trinitarian theology, this statement does not offer much in the way of definition. It does demonstrate that the rule of Faith included the Father, the

⁶⁷Novatian concludes *De Spectaculis* (10.4), and *De Cibis Iudiacis* (7.2) with a mention of the Father and the Son in his farewell.

⁶⁸*De Trinitate* 30.1.

Son, and the Holy Spirit. Further, Novatian understood that he could have included more content with scriptural support regarding the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. This means that Novatian did not consider *De Trinitate* to approximate in any manner a full exposition of the faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Novatian's other two Trinitarian statements occur in the same passage of *De Bono Pudicitiae*.

scientes templum esse vos Domini, membra Christi, habitationem Spiritus Sancti, electos ad spem, consecratos ad fidem, destinatos ad salute, filios Dei, fratres Christi, consortes Spiritus Sancti, nihil iam carni debentes, qua renatos ex aqua.

You know that you are to be the temple of the Lord, members of Christ, the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit, called to hope, consecrated to the faith, destined for salvation, sons of God, brothers of Christ, sharers of the Holy Spirit, you now owe nothing to the flesh, because you have been born again from water.⁶⁹

These two Trinitarian statements present biblical metaphors for believers' relationships with the Trinity. In each statement, the relationship of the believer is different with each member of the Trinity. This is most likely due to Novatian's compilation of biblical statements about how Christians relate to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. This act of compilation required Novatian to assemble these Trinitarian statements from various passages of Scripture. This reveals that Novatian viewed the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit to be a unified entity with whom believers interacted in different ways. In his first Trinitarian metaphor, in *De Bono Pudicitiae*, he used biblical metaphors with the idea of a physical connection. In the second metaphor, he used relational metaphors. In this manner, he presented a very brief Trinitarian theology. Novatian's brief Trinitarian statements imply that he understood the Holy Spirit to be divine.

Ontological Implications from the Spirit's Activity

At the end of Novatian's explanation of how the Spirit is lesser than Christ, he

⁶⁹*De Bono Pudicitiae* 2.1.

makes a fairly important statement, “While less than Christ, the Advocate takes from him what he delivers to others.”⁷⁰ Just as the Spirit being lesser than Christ proves the divinity of Christ, so there are hints at the divinity of the Spirit in the work of the Spirit receiving things from Christ and delivering them to others. There are several aspects of the Spirit’s work which hint at his divinity. Two of these are the Spirit as the giver of knowledge about God, and the Spirit as the agent of spiritual transformation.

The most important aspect of the Spirit’s work for glimpsing Novatian’s ontology of the Spirit is how he presented the Spirit as the one who gives humans the knowledge of God. He supported this view from Isaiah 66:2, “‘Et super quem requiescat spiritus meus, nisi super humilem et quietem et trementem verba mea?’ ut Deum aliquatenus quantues sit possit agnoscere, dum illum per spiritum collatum discit timere” (‘And upon whom will my Spirit rest, except upon the humble, the quiet, and the one who trembles at my words?’ so that he might be able to know to some degree how great is God, while he learns to fear Him through this Spirit).⁷¹ Lloyd rightly noted,

A critical phrase in the above passage is to some degree (aliquatenus), implying the limited capacity for mankind to speak about God. Novatian does not suggest that a deepened relationship with God, as well as a developed sense of God’s greatness, negates the limits he imposes on conceptualizing God.⁷²

Novatian then understood the Spirit to be the means through which a human could come to a knowledge of God. This knowledge is of course incomplete because the fullness of God cannot be grasped. The Spirit also allows the believer to understand God through negation because, for Novatian, God cannot be adequately described even in biblical

⁷⁰*De Trinitate* 16.3.

⁷¹*De Trinitate* 3.4. DeSimone’s translation does not capitalize “Spirit,” and therefore it appears as though he does not see Novatian making a reference to the Holy Spirit in this passage (Russell J. De Simone, *Novatian the Presbyter*, Fathers of the Church 67 [Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press Inc., 1974], 30). The context of the Isaiah quote supports the interpretation that this is the Holy Spirit because the “spirit” here is described as God’s “spirit” being given to certain humans. Papandrea rightly understood this to be a reference to the Holy Spirit in his translation (*Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 374).

⁷²Lloyd, “Ontological Subordination,” 85.

terms. After noting how God's being called spirit does not state all that God is, Novatian wrote, "dum mens hominum intellegendo usque ad ipsum proficit spiritum, conserva iam ipsa in spiritualius quid amplius per spiritum conivere Deum esse possit" (While the mind of humans progresses with understanding towards the Spirit himself, by now itself repenting in the Spirit, it may be able to conclude that God is more than spirit, love, or light).⁷³ In this way, the Spirit works to enable a human to come to a limited understanding of God. While Novatian did not give any hints that the revelation of the knowledge of God could only come from God himself, the work of the Spirit in making known the nature of God strongly hints at the Spirit doing something that only God could do.

The Spirit and Spiritual Transformation

Novatian's description of the Holy Spirit's work of spiritual transformation is crucial to understanding his ontology of the Holy Spirit. DeSimone rightly understood this point and argued extensively that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be divine based upon Novatian's descriptions of the Holy Spirit's activities. Sadly, many of DeSimone's arguments are invalid and do not require the conclusion that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be divine.

DeSimone's argument for the "intellect" and the personality of the Holy Spirit are not invalid arguments, even if they are not convincing. He asserted that *De Trinitate* 29.9 affirms that the Holy Spirit "possesses an intellectual nature."⁷⁴ "Hic est enim qui ipsorum animos mentesque firmavit, qui evangelica sacramenta distinxit, qui in ipsis illuminator rerum divinarum fuit" (For it is the Holy Spirit who strengthened their hearts and minds, who made clear the mysteries of the gospel, who in them was the illuminator

⁷³*De Trinitate* 7.2

⁷⁴DeSimone, "The Holy Spirit," 155.

of divine things). He stated that as a possessor of “an intellectual nature,” the “Holy Spirit is not a corporeal creature.”⁷⁵ Further, he argued that this passage also demonstrates that Novatian did not view the Holy Spirit as a spiritual creature, “No spiritual creature is infused into the inner most parts of another creature, since a creature is not participated in but is rather a participant.”⁷⁶ DeSimone’s conclusions here led him to postulate the syllogism, “If the Novatian Holy Spirit is neither a corporeal creature nor a spiritual creature, He must be God.”⁷⁷ The difficulty with this assertion is that Novatian did not offer any clear statement that the Holy Spirit was “infused into the inner most parts of another creature.” Novatian stated that the Holy Spirit, “who in them was the illuminator of divine things.”⁷⁸ The wording of being “in them” could possibly be used of demonic possession and would then refer to a “spiritual creature.” This possibility weakens DeSimone’s conclusion from this passage that the Holy Spirit is not a creature.⁷⁹ DeSimone imposed his own set of terms and concepts upon Novatian and thus his conclusion did not follow from what Novatian had necessarily said. Therefore, his syllogism fails to prove Novatian presented the Holy Spirit as divine.

In advancing his argument that Novatian considered the Holy Spirit to be divine, DeSimone produced several other short syllogisms. As with his first syllogism, most of his other syllogisms do not prove that Novatian considered the Holy Spirit to be divine. DeSimone supplied his own starting premises instead of relying upon Novatian’s premises for what constituted divinity. This results in several fallacious arguments. These arguments are examined in brief because they constitute arguments for

⁷⁵DeSimone, “The Holy Spirit,” 155.

⁷⁶DeSimone, “The Holy Spirit,” 155.

⁷⁷DeSimone, “The Holy Spirit,” 156.

⁷⁸*De Trinitate* 29.9.

⁷⁹There is no recorded instance in which Novatian discussed demonic possession. This was simply used as a point to illustrate that Novatian’s wording does not necessitate DeSimone’s conclusion.

understanding the ontology of the Spirit from the activity of the Spirit.

DeSimone offers the syllogism, “If only God can perform miracles and the Novatian Holy Spirit ‘effects cures and miracles, does wondrous deeds,’ then the Novatian Holy Spirit is God.”⁸⁰ This fails because Novatian did not affirm that God alone could work miracles.⁸¹ Likewise, the syllogism, “If it is God’s privilege to dwell in the souls of the saints, then the Novatian Holy Spirit is God,”⁸² suffers the same fate. Novatian did not state that indwelling the souls of saints is a distinct divine privilege. In a similar manner, the syllogism, “If God alone is the *causa efficiens principalis gratiae*: the divine work *par excellence*, and the Novatian Holy Spirit ‘keeps the church uncorrupted and inviolate in the holiness of perpetual virginity and truth’ then the Novatian Holy Spirit is God,”⁸³ fails on its first premise.⁸⁴ Novatian did not assert that God alone is the principal cause effecting grace. This is an anachronistic argument. DeSimone applied a later theological conclusion to Novatian’s thought when there was no evidence that Novatian ever understood that God alone is the *causa efficiens principalis gratiae*. This results in yet another faulty first premise which invalidates the syllogism.

DeSimone presented two syllogisms that rested upon the Spirit’s relation to

⁸⁰DeSimone, “The Holy Spirit,” 156. Here, DeSimone quoted *De Trinitate* 29.10.

⁸¹Papandrea commented, “In addition, the Holy Spirit is said to be the power behind healings and miracles. Novatian is speaking specifically of healings and miracles in the church, though it is implied that the Spirit is also the power behind the miracles of Christ. Thus, it is clear that Novatian treated the Holy Spirit as uncreated and consubstantial with the divine essence, yet a distinct divine person” (Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 109). Papandrea is correct that Novatian here was making reference to miracles performed in the church. However, there is no clear basis from Novatian that the working of miracles necessarily requires the worker of miracles to be divine.

⁸²DeSimone, “The Holy Spirit,” 157. Here, DeSimone quoted *De Trinitate* 29.16.

⁸³DeSimone, “The Holy Spirit,” 157. Here, DeSimone quoted *De Trinitate* 29.26.

⁸⁴Earlier, DeSimone had commented upon *De Trinitate* 29.11, “In this passage, please note the Novatian Holy Spirit is intimately associated with Christ in the bestowal of grace, the divine work *par excellence*” (“The Holy Spirit,” 155). The Holy Spirit’s association with Christ in the giving of grace does not mean that the Holy Spirit himself is the giver of grace.

sins. His first syllogism assumes that the lack of forgiveness for blasphemy against the Spirit is proof of the Spirit's divinity. "If whoever blasphemes against the Novatian Holy Spirit, 'does not have forgiveness, not only in this world but also in the world to come,' then the Novatian Holy Spirit is God."⁸⁵ Once again, Novatian offered no reason to understand the lack of forgiveness of sins against one as support for that one's divinity.⁸⁶ Therefore, the first premise is faulty and the syllogism does not prove the divinity of the Holy Spirit. The second syllogism fares little better. "If only God can forgive sins and the Novatian Holy Spirit is bestowed by Christ for just that purpose: 'Receive the Holy Spirit; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained,' then the Novatian Holy Spirit is God."⁸⁷ In *De Trinitate* 13.6, Novatian did affirm that Christ was God because he could forgive sins. However, the bestowal of the Spirit for the purpose of forgiving sins does not necessarily imply that Novatian affirmed that the Holy Spirit actually forgave sins. Further, there is no textual evidence that Novatian understood John 20:22–23 as referring to the Holy Spirit as the one who forgives sins. On this point, Papandrea astutely observed that "Novatian's emphasis is not on the forgiveness of sins, but on the opening words of Jesus; that it is from Him that the apostles, 'receive the Holy Spirit.'"⁸⁸ The context of *De Trinitate* 29.25 supports Papandrea's observation. Therefore, Novatian's purpose in quoting John 20:22–23 was to prove that the Holy Spirit was given by Christ just as he promised, not to demonstrate that the Holy Spirit forgives sins. Thus, this syllogism is faulty as well.

DeSimone once again allowed an anachronism into his syllogism, "If the

⁸⁵DeSimone, "The Holy Spirit," 156. Here, DeSimone quoted *De Trinitate* 29.25.

⁸⁶If the lack of forgiveness could be viewed as a support for the divinity of the Spirit, then the context of Matt 12:31 and Mark 3:29 would hint that the Spirit and the Son do not share the same divinity since sins against them are treated differently.

⁸⁷DeSimone, "The Holy Spirit," 156–57. Here, DeSimone quoted *De Trinitate* 29.2.

⁸⁸Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 229.

revelation of mysteries belongs properly to God, as Scripture tells us, and the Novatian Holy Spirit ‘clearly brought out for them the mysteries of the Gospel, who was within them the enlightener of divine things,’ then the Novatian Holy Spirit is God.”⁸⁹ Novatian did not state that the revelation of mysteries belonged properly to God. Therefore, this syllogism has an assumption in its first premise that Novatian did not clearly affirm. Thus, this syllogism is not a valid means to prove Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be God.

While none of DeSimone’s syllogisms that have been hitherto examined have proved Novatian to have understood the Holy Spirit to be divine, they have often rightly presented aspects of the Holy Spirit’s work that hint at his divinity. In this manner, Novatian hints at the divinity of the Holy Spirit when he wrote that the Holy Spirit is the one “who strengthened their hearts and minds, who made clear the mysteries of the gospel, who in them was the illuminator of divine things.”⁹⁰ This hints at the divinity of the Holy Spirit in Novatian’s thought because he is the illuminator of divine things and so is closely connected with the divine. Likewise, the Spirit’s making of miracles, wonders,⁹¹ and his guarding of the church⁹² could hint that Novatian considered the Holy Spirit to be divine. These actions, however, do not necessarily prove that Novatian considered the Holy Spirit to be divine.

The Giver of Life

There is one of DeSimone’s syllogistic arguments for the divinity of the Holy Spirit in the writing of Novatian that escapes the critiques of his other syllogisms.

⁸⁹DeSimone, “The Holy Spirit,” 156. Here, DeSimone quoted *De Trinitate* 29.9.

⁹⁰*De Trinitate* 29.9.

⁹¹*De Trinitate* 29.10.

⁹²*De Trinitate* 29.26.

DeSimone wrote, “If it appertains to God alone to infuse supernatural life and the Novatian Holy Spirit ‘effects from water a second birth, the seed, as it were, of a divine generation... the consecrator of a second birth,’ then the Novatian Holy Spirit is God.”⁹³ His quotation of *De Trinitate* 29.16 escapes the fallacies of his other premises by virtue of the fact that Novatian argued that the Son was God because the Son gives spiritual life. While, sadly, DeSimone did not mention this fact to support his syllogism, it does affirm that his syllogism was correct. Papandrea affirmed this same point noting, “The divinity of the Holy Spirit is demonstrated in the Spirit’s role in the regeneration of baptism. If part of the proof for the divinity of Christ is that he is able to grant eternal life, it is assumed that the Holy Spirit is also divine because he ‘works a second birth.’”⁹⁴ In this, Papandrea successfully noted the parallel between Novatian’s argument for the divinity of the Son and his statement about the Spirit’s work of giving life.

Novatian’s argument for the Son’s divinity based upon the Son’s giving of life is clearly seen in *De Trinitate* 15.7.⁹⁵

Immortalitas autem divinitati social est, quia et divinitas immortalitas est et immortalitas divinitatis fructus est. Sed enim omnis homo mortalis est, immortalitas autem ex mortali non potest esse. Ergo ex Christo homine mortali immortalitas non potest nasci. Sed qui verbum custodierit, inquit, meum, mortem non videbit in aeternum. Ergo verbum Christi praestat immortalitatem et per immortalitatem praestat divinitatem. Quodsi non potest exhibere ut immortalem alterum faciat ipse mortalis, hoc autem Christi verbum exhibit pariter et praestat immortalitatem, non utique homo tantum est qui praestat immortalitatem, quam, si tantummodo homo esset, praestare non posset; praestando autem divinitatem per immortalitatem Deum se probat divinitatem porrigendo, quam, nisi Deus esset, praestare non posset.

However, immortality has been joined to divinity, because divinity is immortal and immortality is the fruit of divinity. But every human is mortal, and it is not possible to get immortality from a mortal. Therefore it is not possible to be thought that immortality comes from Christ as a mortal man. For he said, “He who will keep my word, will not see death into eternity” (John 8:51). Therefore the word of Christ

⁹³DeSimone, “The Holy Spirit,” 157.

⁹⁴Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 109.

⁹⁵Further arguments for the divinity of the Son, because the Son is the giver of life, can be found in *De Trinitate* 14.13–14; 15.9; 16.1.

offers immortality and through immortality offers divinity. And a man while mortal himself is not able to produce immortality so that he may make another immortal. But this word of Christ shows equally to produce and to offer immortality. He is certainly not such a man who offers immortality, for, if he might be merely human, he is not able to offer (immortality). But by offering divinity through immortality, he proves that he is God by granting divinity, for, unless he was God, he could not offer (immortality).⁹⁶

Novatian understood immortality and divinity to be intimately joined, and that Christ's giving immortality to mortal humans proved that Christ is divine. Following Novatian's argument and logic regarding Christ being divine because he gives immortality, it is worthwhile to examine his statement about the work of the Spirit in giving life.

Hic est qui operatur ex aquis secundam nativitatem, semen quoddam divini generis et consecrator caelestis nativitatis, pignus promissae hereditatis et quasi chirographum quoddam aeternae salutis. . . . inhabitator corporibus nostris datus et sanctitatis effector, qui id agens in nobis ad aeternitatem et ad resurrectionem immortalitatis corpora nostra producat.

It is he who works a second birth from the waters (of baptism), he is a sort of seed of the divine birth and he consecrates the heavenly birth. He is a pledge of the promise of inheritance and a kind of written bond of eternal salvation. . . . He has been given to inhabit our bodies and to effect our holiness, bringing this into us, he leads our bodies to eternity and to the resurrection of immortality.⁹⁷

Novatian presented the Holy Spirit as the one who gives spiritual life through baptism. As the Son is the giver of spiritual life and the one who sent the Spirit, then the Spirit is both the giver of life and the agent through whom the Son gives spiritual life. This is alluded to in Novatian's description of the Holy Spirit as a "seed of the divine birth." Therefore, if, as has been shown, Novatian argued the Son is divine because he gives spiritual life, then Novatian implicitly affirmed the Holy Spirit is divine because the Holy Spirit is also the giver of spiritual life.

D'Alès argued for the divinity of the Holy Spirit from these same passages, although he used different aspects of Novatian's terminology. Instead of focusing on the work of giving life, he focused on the aspect of sharing divinity which Novatian viewed

⁹⁶*De Trinitate* 15.7.

⁹⁷*De Trinitate* 29.16.

as taking place alongside the giving of spiritual life,

On sait du reste que Novatien revendique pour le Christ la divinité. Cette divinité qu'il possède au sens strict, le Christ la communique, au sens large à ses fidèles. . . . Ces considérations s'appliquent également au Paraclet, qui par sa venue dépose dans les âmes une semence de vie divine. C'est encore au sens propre que Novatien revendique la divinité pour le Paraclet. S'il ne lui donne pas expressément le nom de Dieu, il ne pas de faire entendre clairement que le Paraclet reçoit de Christ le don divin, et il prouve par là-même la divinité du Christ.

We know moreover that Novatian claimed divinity for Christ. This divinity which he possesses in the strict sense, Christ communicates, broadly to his faithful. . . . These considerations apply also to the Paraclete, who by his coming deposited the seed of divine life in souls. That is, still in the proper sense, Novatian claimed divinity for the Paraclete. Even if He is not expressly given the name of God, he clearly says the Paraclete receives the gift of divinity from Christ, and this demonstrates the same divinity as Christ.⁹⁸

D'Alès correctly noted that Novatian presented the Son and the Spirit as both communicating deity to the faithful. The giving of spiritual life and the communication of divinity are intertwined in Novatian's presentation. It appears that he viewed them to take place simultaneously, and indeed they appear to be the same act. Thus, Novatian presented that union with divinity as spiritual life, and that the Son and the Holy Spirit both unite believers with divinity and give spiritual life. Novatian spoke of the Spirit's work of uniting believers with divinity, "While in our bodies he makes them accustomed to combine with the heavenly power, uniting them with the divine eternity of the Holy Spirit."⁹⁹ By affirming that the Holy Spirit does the same work as Christ in giving believers spiritual life through uniting them with divinity demonstrates that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit is God.

The Divine Eternity of the Holy Spirit

In Novatian's identification of the Holy Spirit in *De Trinitate* 29, one statement requires the conclusion that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be divine, "dum illa

⁹⁸D'Alès, *Novatien*, 118.

⁹⁹*De Trinitate* 29.16.

in se assuefacit cum caelesti virtute misceri et cum Spiritus Sancti divina aeternitate sociari” (While in our bodies he makes them accustomed to combine with the heavenly power, uniting them with the divine eternity of the Holy Spirit).¹⁰⁰ The phrase *Spiritus Sancti divina aeternitate* clearly affirms that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be divine when it is viewed in the context of Novatian’s view of eternity and the divinity.

Novatian presented eternity as an attribute of God without which God would not be God.¹⁰¹ Lloyd’s conclusions upon this topic are important to consider. He wrote,

Novatian defined the Father’s nature as eternal (*aeternus*) by asserting that the Father lacks a beginning or birth. The *aeternus* Father, by definition, cannot have a *principium, originum, initium, or natum*; Novatian accepts this principle of theological philosophy and presents it in a manner comparable to both Cicero and Tertullian. I also showed that Novatian treats the Father’s eternity as related to the Father’s lack of time.¹⁰²

Lloyd’s conclusion that Novatian treated the Father’s eternity as without a beginning and outside of time are clearly seen in Novatian’s affirmation that the Father “is always eternal, because nothing is older than him. For that which is without beginning is not able to be preceded by anything, since it does not have time. For this reason he is immortal, not suffering a final ending. . . . He is outside the bounds of time.”¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰*De Trinitate* 29.16.

¹⁰¹Novatian also included infinity as an attribute that God must have to be God. The clearest example of Novatian arguing for how God (the Father) must necessarily be both eternal and infinite is in *De Trinitate* 2.2–3, “For we read that he contains all things and therefore nothing can be outside of him. Of course seeing that he does not have a beginning at all, as a result he experiences no end, unless perhaps by chance (far be it from us to affirm this) at a certain time he began to exist and is not above all things, but if he began to exist after something, then he would be found to be of less power than that thing which was before him, since he is observed to be after it in time. Therefore, for this reason he is always infinite, because nothing is greater than him. He is always eternal, because nothing is older than him. For that which is without beginning is not able to be preceded by anything, since it does not have time. For this reason he is immortal, not suffering a final ending. And because whatever is without a beginning is without law. He is outside the bounds of time, while he understands himself to be a debtor to no one.”

¹⁰²Lloyd, “Ontological Subordination,” 252–53.

¹⁰³*De Trinitate* 2.3. Lloyd commented on this passage saying, “Novatian also takes up the argument that God’s unique eternal status is equal to a lack of beginning and end. However, some references to time (*tempus*) set him apart from Cicero’s speakers and more clearly in dependence of Tertullian. He identifies the Father as eternal, not only by claiming that God has neither beginning nor end, but by concluding from this that God lacks time. According to Novatian, God is, ever eternal (*semper aeternus*), because nothing is more ancient than He. In fact, that which is without a beginning (*origine*) can be preceded (*praecedi*) by nothing, because it lacks time (*dum non habet tempus*). Novatian identifies the applicability of time (*tempus*) only to those things which have a beginning (*origine*). His justification for

Novatian understood the eternity of God to consist of more than having no beginning or end, and being outside of time. He affirmed that part of God's eternity is that God cannot change, in *De Trinitate* 4.4–5. Lloyd rightly noted that, “Novatian makes the possibility of divine change a logical paradox, since he defines eternity as the inability to change.”¹⁰⁴ Therefore, Novatian affirmed that eternity is only rightly an attribute of God. The eternity of the Father included atemporality, being without beginning or end, and being unchangeable.

When Novatian's pneumatology is viewed in light of his discussions on eternity, it becomes clear that Novatian unequivocally presented the Holy Spirit as God. Novatian began his discussion about the Spirit in *De Trinitate* 29, by noting that the Spirit was not new, although he was given in a new way.¹⁰⁵ He likewise observed that even though the Spirit acted differently in different times, he was the same.¹⁰⁶ Novatian then took pains to demonstrate that the Spirit is not new and that the Spirit has not changed in his being. These affirmations about the Spirit are important because they demonstrate that Novatian's discussion of the Holy Spirit is coherent with his later affirmation of the eternity of the Holy Spirit in the same chapter. Novatian not only affirmed the eternity of the Spirit, but also defined the eternity of the Spirit as a divine eternity, *Spiritus Sancti divina aeternitate*.¹⁰⁷ Thus, there can be no confusion whether Novatian affirmed the Holy Spirit to be eternal in the same manner as the Son. Thus, Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be both eternal and divine. Papandrea commented on this passage that “Here the divinity of the Spirit is also hinted, in the phrase, ‘the divine

denying the Father's contact with time derives from his position that the Father cannot have a beginning (*origo*)” (“Ontological Subordination,” 115).

¹⁰⁴Lloyd, “Ontological Subordination,” 123.

¹⁰⁵*De Trinitate* 29.3.

¹⁰⁶*De Trinitate* 29.4–6.

¹⁰⁷*De Trinitate* 29.16.

eternity of the Holy Spirit.”¹⁰⁸ If anything, Papandrea understated the importance of this passage for understanding the divinity of the Holy Spirit in Novatian’s writings. When understood in the context of Novatian’s understanding of eternity, this phrase subtly proclaims the divinity of the Spirit. Yet, despite this, Novatian’s use of the phrase “the divine eternity of the Holy Spirit” did not argue for the divinity of the Holy Spirit.¹⁰⁹ He appears to have assumed the divinity of the Holy Spirit and felt no compulsion to present an argument for the divinity of the Spirit.

There are some possible implications for the subordination of the Spirit to the Father and the Son in Novatian’s understanding of the Spirit’s divine eternity. The Holy Spirit possesses “divine eternity,” and by saying this, Novatian clearly presented the Holy Spirit as divine. Yet, the divine Holy Spirit could still be viewed as ontologically subordinated to the Father. Novatian argued that anything which follows another is lesser than that which was first.

Hunc enim legimus omnia continere et ideo nihil extra ipsum esse potuiss, quippe cum originem omnino non habeat, consequenter nec exitum sentiat, nisi forte, quod absit, aliquando esse coeperit nec super omnia sit, sed dum post aliquid esse coeperit, infra id sit quod ante ipsum fuerit, minor inventus potestate, dum posterior denotatus etiam ipso tempore.

For we read that he contains all things and therefore nothing can be outside of him. Of course seeing that he does not have a beginning at all, as a result he experiences no end, unless perhaps by chance (far be it from us to affirm this) at a certain time he began to exist and is not above all things, but if he began to exist after something, then he would be found to be of less power than that thing which was before him, since he is observed to be after it in time.¹¹⁰

This then leaves room for Novatian to have understood the Holy Spirit to have been of lesser power than the Father if he understood the procession of the Spirit within this

¹⁰⁸Papandrea, *Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome*, 244.

¹⁰⁹Briggman was technically correct in his assessment that “Novatian never argues for the divinity or eternality of the Holy Spirit” (*Irenaeus of Lyons*, 214). Yet, Novatian clearly affirmed the eternality and thus also the divinity of the Spirit apart from arguments to support his assertion.

¹¹⁰*De Trinitate* 2.2.

framework. The closest Novatian came to addressing the eternal procession of the Spirit is in his quotation of John 15:26: “cum venerit advocatus ille quem ego missurus sum vobis a Patre meo, Spiritum veritatis qui de Patre meo procedit” (‘when the Advocate has come, whom I will send to you from my Father, the Spirit of Truth who proceeds from my Father’).¹¹¹ This quotation occurred between two other quotes from the Gospel of John (John 14:16–17 and John 16:7) which Novatian used to address the coming of the Spirit after the departure of Jesus.¹¹² Therefore, Novatian did not interpret John 15:26 to refer to the eternal procession of the Spirit from the Father. Thus, it is possible that Novatian could have understood the Spirit to be of lesser power than the Father by virtue of the Father being the first.¹¹³ Yet, it is also quite possible that Novatian would have offered greater nuance if he had intended his discussion of the preexistence of the Father as proof that the Father is greater than all, or if he had meant these words to address the inter-trinitarian relationship.

¹¹¹*De Trinitate* 29.7

¹¹²D’Alès saw in Novatian an early support for the filioque insertion into the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. He stated, “Novatian is not only a witness to the third person of the Divine, but a witness to the Latin tradition about the Spirit’s procession from the Son. This testimony would not have been worthless the day the issue of the *Filioque* was raised” (D’Alès, *Novatien*, 119). This comment appears to have been based upon Novatian’s description of the “entire fount of the Holy Spirit remains in Christ, so that the stream of gifts and works might be brought forth from the Holy Spirit who dwells abundantly in Christ” (*De Trinitate* 29.11). Papandrea likewise commented that “Novatian implied that the Spirit also proceeds from the Son, anticipating the Western addition of *filioque* to the creed” (*Novatian of Rome*, 109). DeSimone (“The Holy Spirit,” 152) concurred with Fausset’s interpretation that Novatian was “not speaking of the eternal procession of the Spirit from the Son but of the gift bestowed upon Christ at His baptism for the benefit of men.” (Fausset, *Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri*, 108n10). Fausset and DeSimone undoubtedly have the better reading of Novatian at this point because Novatian did not address the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit. If the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed’s statements about the procession of the Holy Spirit are understood as a temporal procession, then Novatian would clearly support the *filioque*. However, if, as the context of the Creed supports, the Creed refers to the eternal procession of the Spirit then Novatian cannot be viewed in support of the *filioque*.

¹¹³Lloyd argued that “Novatian’s theology follows just such principles in that the Father shares his substance with the Son and also that the Son is ontologically subordinate to the Father” (“Ontological Subordination,” 276). Thus if one were to apply Lloyd’s reading of Novatian’s theology to the question of the Spirit’s ontology, the Spirit would be ontologically subordinated to the Father. This conclusion is possible, but because Novatian did not address the eternal procession of the Spirit, such conclusions would be quite speculative.

Conclusion

Despite never setting forth an argument for the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Novatian clearly understood the Holy Spirit to be divine. The divinity of the Holy Spirit can be seen in his Trinitarian statements, his description of the Holy Spirit as possessing divine eternity, and the work of the Holy Spirit giving spiritual life and divinity to believers. Novatian's Trinitarian statements along with his affirmation that the Holy Spirit was to be believed along with the Father and the Son clearly place the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son and strongly hint that the Spirit is divine.¹¹⁴ The Spirit's work of giving spiritual life and divinity mirror the works of the Son that Novatian asserted, proved the Son to be divine.¹¹⁵ Likewise, the Spirit's divine eternity demonstrates that the Holy Spirit possessed something that Novatian understood to belong only to God.¹¹⁶ Following Novatian's logic, if an act proved the divinity of the Son, then the Holy Spirit performing the same act demonstrates the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

While Novatian clearly considered the Holy Spirit to be divine, his lack of addressing the ontology of the Holy Spirit precludes a firm conclusion on the exact nature of Holy Spirit's divinity in Novatian's works. He affirmed that the Holy Spirit was to be believed in along with the Father and the Son.¹¹⁷ This could be understood within a latter theological framework and one could conclude that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be a divine person and equal with the Father and the Son. However, Novatian's silence does not allow for one to state with certainty that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be ontologically equal with the Father and the Son. Novatian understood the

¹¹⁴*De Trinitate* 30.1 and *De Bono Pudicitiae* 2.1.

¹¹⁵*De Trinitate* 14.13–14; 15.7; 15.9; 16.1.

¹¹⁶*De Trinitate* 4.4–5.

¹¹⁷*De Trinitate* 29.1.

Son to be lesser than the Father and the Holy Spirit to be lesser than the Son. Novatian could have understood this as a relational subordination or as an ontological subordination.

The question of the Spirit's subordination cannot be answered from Novatian's writings. There are several areas in which Novatian's silence overshadows the question so powerfully that clarity on this subject cannot be obtained. Foremost among these is that Novatian never affirmed the Holy Spirit is the creator. He affirmed that the Father and the Son shared in the work of creation,¹¹⁸ yet there is no hint of the Spirit's activity in the work of creation. Likewise, he never referred to the Holy Spirit as a "third person" in the same way the Son is called a "second person."¹¹⁹ This silence clearly rules out DeSimone's assessment that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be "a Divine Person."¹²⁰ When he did use *persona* to refer to the Son in *De Trinitate* 31.5, it was used to distinguish the Son as a second person after the Father. The Father is implied to be a *persona* in this statement, but there is no evidence that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be a *persona* or that he used the term *persona* as a technical term. Finally, Novatian made no mention of the Holy Spirit in *De Trinitate* 31 during his explanation of how the Father and the Son are two while being one God. These points do not necessitate that Novatian considered the Spirit to be ontologically inferior to the Son and the Father. There are enough gaps in Novatian's discussion of the Spirit that it is not possible to demonstrate with great certainty that Novatian understood the Spirit to be ontologically equal with the Father and the Son even if this is what he actually might have believed.

Therefore, Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be God. The Holy Spirit is

¹¹⁸*De Trinitate* 9.1; 11.2.

¹¹⁹*De Trinitate* 31.5.

¹²⁰DeSimone, "The Holy Spirit," 142. For a more robust critique of DeSimone's tendency to read Novatian through the lenses of later events, see Geoffrey D. Dunn, "The Diversity and Unity of God in Novatian's *De Trinitate*," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 78, no. 4 (2002): 385–409.

described with terms that Novatian would only use of God. The Holy Spirit does actions that Novatian argued proved the Son's divinity. Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be believed in and experienced with the Father and the Son by Christians. However, Novatian did not clearly present the Spirit as ontologically equal with the Father and the Son. In this way, Novatian did not define the exact nature of the Holy Spirit's divinity. Thus Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be divine.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This dissertation examined Novatian of Rome's pneumatology in light of his own historical context and his pneumatological predecessors in the Christian faith. Novatian's pneumatology was focused on the Spirit as an object of the Christian faith. He understood the Holy Spirit to be closely connected to Christ as the one whom Christ left to care for the church. Although he did not overtly address the question of the ontology of the Holy Spirit, he implicitly affirmed the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Novatian was the first Christian author to discuss the Holy Spirit at length in a continuous passage. This provides a unique opportunity to see how the Spirit, together with the Father and the Son, was understood as an object of the Christian faith by an author who did not use the term "God" for the Holy Spirit as he did with the Father and the Son.

Review of Main Arguments

Novatian's pneumatology in *De Trinitate* focused on the Holy Spirit as the object of the Christian faith. He drew heavily from Scripture to define what must be believed about the Holy Spirit. The connection of the Holy Spirit to the Son is the center point of Novatian's pneumatology. The Holy Spirit is identified through his connection to the Son. The Spirit is present with the church because he has been sent by the Son. Believers receive the Holy Spirit through the Son. Christ left the Holy Spirit to remain with and to perfect the church through his activities and gifts. Just as the Son gives spiritual life, so also the Holy Spirit gives spiritual life and produces holiness within believers.

Novatian did not directly address the ontology of the Holy Spirit. His ontology of the Holy Spirit has suffered at the hands of several scholars who have failed to follow Novatian's own arguments and noted his historical context when determining his view of the ontology of the Holy Spirit. He implicitly affirmed the divinity of the Holy Spirit through his description of the Spirit as possessing divine eternity. This implicit affirmation of the Holy Spirit's divinity in no way demands the conclusion that Novatian viewed the Holy Spirit as ontologically equal with the Father and the Son. Novatian subordinated the Holy Spirit to the Son. It is likely that he viewed the Spirit's subordination ontologically, but there is insufficient evidence to completely deny the possibility that he viewed this subordination in an economic manner.

Chapter 1 introduced the pneumatology of Novatian. It showed that this dissertation seeks to understand Novatian's pneumatology primarily by following Novatian's own emphases in his pneumatology. The scope of this study focused primarily on Novatian's largest work *De Trinitate* because it contains the bulk of Novatian's statements about the Holy Spirit. This chapter also provided a brief outline of the state of pneumatology at the time of Novatian, as well the scholarship regarding his pneumatological ontology.

Chapter 2 presented a brief biography of Novatian. He was baptized as an adult and quickly rose to prominence within the church at Rome. His education and gifts are evident in *De Trinitate* and in his role as the church secretary after the martyrdom of bishop Fabian of Rome. Novatian's rigorist position of how to deal with the *lapsi* led him into a schism of which he became the leader.¹ Novatian died for his faith while still

¹It is possible to glimpse how Novatian's remarks concerning the Holy Spirit in *De Trinitate* 29.24–26 could be part of the reason for his final position that the lapsed could not be restored. "In this Spirit no one is ever able to say 'anathema to Jesus,' no one can have denied Christ is the Son of God or have rejected God as the creator, no one has brought out against Scripture some of its own words, no one has written other and sacrilegious commands. Whoever has blasphemed against him, 'does not have forgiveness, either in this age, or even in the future.' He gives testimony to Christ in the apostles. He demonstrates the firm faith of our religion in the martyrs. He encloses admirable continence of sealed love in the virgins. In others, he guards the laws of the master's teaching uncorrupted and uncontaminated. He

in schism.

Chapter 3 outlined the pneumatologies of seven Christian figures: Ignatius of Antioch, Hermas, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus of Rome, and Tertullian. These figures were chosen because Novatian was aware of their writings either directly or indirectly. The pneumatologies of these men provide historical context for understanding Novatian's pneumatology within the tradition he had received.

Chapter 4 presented how Novatian understood the identity of the Holy Spirit through his activities. Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be the same despite the different ways in which the Spirit operated. He identified the Holy Spirit through the Holy Spirit's connection to Christ. The Holy Spirit is the one who descended upon Christ at his baptism. It is through Christ that believers receive the Holy Spirit. Christ left the Holy Spirit with the church to perfect the church through his gifts. As Christ gives spiritual life, so also the Spirit gives spiritual life to believers and enables them to know God. The Spirit preserves the church by guarding the faith, protecting the faith of those within the church, and acting against those who threaten the church.

Chapter 5 examined Novatian's ontology of the Holy Spirit. It demonstrated that Novatian subordinated the Holy Spirit to the Son. This subordination may even have been ontological in nature. Further, this chapter demonstrated that the majority of the arguments in favor of Novatian understanding the Holy Spirit to be divine were fallacious. Despite the error of most of the arguments, there are two points that require the conclusion that Novatian understood the Holy Spirit to be divine. First, Novatian's description of the Holy Spirit as the giver of spiritual life in *De Trinitate* 29.16 affirms

destroys heretics, corrects the perverse, convicts the disloyal, reveals the pretenders, and also chastises the wicked. He guards the church uncorrupted and inviolable in perpetual virginity and the sanctity of the truth.”

that he understood the Holy Spirit to be divine because he had previously argued that the Son is divine because he gives spiritual life in *De Trinitate* 15.7. Second, based upon Novatian's earlier definition of eternity in *De Trinitate* 2.3, his description of the Holy Spirit as having a divine eternity in *De Trinitate* 29.16 requires the conclusion that he viewed the Holy Spirit as divine.

Novatian and his Pneumatological Predecessors

If the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed² is an accurate measure of the progress of theology and pneumatology in the first, second, and third centuries, then Novatian demonstrates both progression and retrogression. However, it is rather difficult to accurately assess Novatian's pneumatology with a definition that was written over 100 years after his death. At that time, the pneumatological issues and discussions had changed completely and were focused upon topics which Novatian did not address (such as the ontology of the Holy Spirit). Therefore, it is better to evaluate Novatian in the context of Pre-Nicene pneumatology. If Pre-Nicene pneumatology is judged by the vocabulary and problems of his own era, then Novatian's pneumatology both follows the patterns of his nearest contemporaries (Tertullian and Hippolytus) and picks up aspects from earlier writers.

The influence of first and second-century pneumatology can be seen in Novatian's discussion of how the Father and the Son are both God without being two gods. This takes place in *De Trinitate* 31, without mention of the Holy Spirit. Tertullian³ and Hippolytus⁴ had both discussed how there are three (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) who are one God. Novatian's silence on this topic is quite in keeping with the

²That is the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed when interpreted as affirming the Holy Spirit is divine and is ontologically equal with Father and the Son.

³*Adversus Praxean* 2.3–4.

⁴*Contra Noetum* 8.1–2.

pneumatology from Christians of the first and second centuries.⁵ Novatian's reason(s) for omitting the Holy Spirit from his discussion in *De Trinitate* 31 is unknown. Regardless of his reasons, he did not address an issue that authors in the previous generation had already attempted to answer.

Novatian's understanding of the coming of the Spirit at baptism also follows the pneumatology of the second century. Irenaeus hinted that the Spirit was given at baptism.⁶ Clement of Alexandria clearly affirmed that the Spirit was given at baptism.⁷ Both Irenaeus⁸ and Clement⁹ viewed Christ's baptism as the model which Christians follow in relation to the reception of the Holy Spirit. Novatian affirmed that the Spirit dwells fully in Jesus alone. He asserted this based upon the Spirit's descent upon Jesus at his baptism.¹⁰ For Novatian, Jesus is the fount of the Spirit from whom the Spirit flows to those who follow Jesus.¹¹ Novatian understood the Spirit to work a second birth in baptism making Christians a part of God's family.¹² He appears to follow the earlier view of Irenaeus and Clement that the Spirit was received at baptism.¹³ Hippolytus¹⁴ and

⁵Irenaeus' writing about the Holy Spirit reveals that he understood the Holy Spirit to be ontologically equal with the Father and the Son. See *Adversus Haereses* 4.20.1.

⁶Irenaeus wrote that the apostles were sent to the Gentiles for "purifying their souls and their bodies through the baptism of the water and of the Holy Spirit" (*Epideixis* 41). In a similar way he wrote that "our bodies received unity through that laver which leads to incorruptibility, but our souls through the Spirit" (*Adversus Haereses* 3.17.2). These two passages could be interpreted to support the idea that the Spirit was given at baptism because both connect the work of the Spirit with the act of baptism.

⁷*Paidagogos* 1.6.25–28.

⁸*Adversus Haereses* 3.17.1; *Adversus Haereses* 3.9.3.

⁹*Paidagogos* 2.8.65.

¹⁰*De Trinitate* 29.11.

¹¹*De Trinitate*, 29.11.

¹²*De Trinitate* 29.16.

¹³Novatian's use of *ex aquis secundum natiuitatem* (*De Trinitate* 29.16) supports the view that he understood the Spirit to be present in a believer during the act of baptism.

¹⁴*In Daniele* 1.17.5 and *Traditio Apostolica* 21.21.

Tertullian¹⁵ both affirmed that the Spirit was given at the anointing with oil and laying on of hands in the baptismal service.¹⁶ This reveals that Novatian was not following the practices of his near contemporaries, but followed an older view.

Novatian continued the tradition of viewing martyrdom as part of the Holy Spirit's work. He stated that the Holy Spirit "in martyribus constantem fidem religionis ostendit" (demonstrates the firm faith of our religion in the martyrs).¹⁷ The tradition was unified that the Spirit was active in martyrdom, but the activity of the Holy Spirit was understood in slightly different ways. Novatian presents martyrdom as a work of the Spirit directed to those who are not martyred. He spoke of the work of the Spirit in martyrdom as a demonstration of the faith in the martyrs. Thus, Novatian spoke of martyrdom more as a gift to the church than a gift to the martyr. This is somewhat different than how his predecessors viewed the work of the Spirit in martyrdom. Ignatius understood his martyrdom to be a personal calling from the Holy Spirit.¹⁸ Irenaeus of Lyons viewed martyrdom as a gift of the Holy Spirit to the martyr.¹⁹ Likewise, Clement understood martyrdom as a gift of the Spirit to the martyr.²⁰ Tertullian presented the Spirit as the one who prepares martyrs for their martyrdom, and thus martyrdom is a work of the Spirit within the martyr.²¹ Similarly, Hippolytus viewed the Spirit as the one who urges and empowers martyrs for their martyrdom.²² It is possible that the relative

¹⁵*De Baptismo* 7.1–2.

¹⁶They also both affirmed that the Spirit sanctified the waters of baptism even though the Spirit was given after the act of baptism (Tertullian, *De Baptismo* 4.4; and Hippolytus, *In Canticum Canticorum* 2.8).

¹⁷*De Trinitate* 29.26.

¹⁸*Romans* 7.2

¹⁹*Adversus Haereses* 5.9.2.

²⁰*Stromateis* 4.9.73; 4.21.132.

²¹*De Fuga in Persecutione* 8.2; 9.4; *Ad Martyras* 1.3; 3.3; and 3.4.

²²*In Daniele* 2.21.1–2.

peace that the church had experienced around the time Novatian penned *De Trinitate* could have had an influence upon how he viewed the Spirit's work in martyrdom.

Novatian also connected the Spirit with Scripture. In *De Trinitate* 8.3, he spoke of how the Father instructed the prophets with the Spirit and through them promised his Son. In *De Trinitate* 29.24, he also wrote of how, in the Spirit, no one can speak against Scripture. Compared with his pneumatological predecessors, this is a paltry number of places that connects the Spirit with Scripture. Notably absent from Novatian's writings is any mention of the Spirit speaking through Scripture. He did not write about the Spirit as the author and the voice that is heard in Scripture, as many of his pneumatological predecessors had already done. Justin Martyr wrote about the Holy Spirit as the speaker of Scripture.²³ Irenaeus understood that the Spirit was the one who spoke in Scripture.²⁴ Clement of Alexandria viewed the Spirit as the author of Scripture.²⁵ Tertullian viewed the Holy Spirit as the one who spoke through Scripture,²⁶ that Scripture belonged to the Holy Spirit,²⁷ and that the Spirit was necessary to rightly understand Scripture.²⁸ Hippolytus understood the Holy Spirit to be both the author of Scripture and the voice speaking in Scripture, without annulling the role of the human authors of Scripture.²⁹ In contrast with his predecessors, Novatian did not emphasize the role of the Spirit in Scripture. If anything, he appears to have significantly downplayed the role of the Spirit in inspiring and speaking through Scripture.

²³*Dialogus cum Tryphone* 74.2 and 124.1.

²⁴*Epideixis* 24; *Adversus Haereses* 2.28.2.

²⁵*Protrepitkos* 9.68; *Paidagogos* 1.5.12–15.

²⁶*Adversus Hermogenem* 22.1.

²⁷*De Idololatria* 4.5; 14.6.

²⁸*De Resurrectione Carnis* 63.9. Tertullian understood the work of the Spirit in explaining Scripture within the context of the ongoing prophetic work of the Spirit (*De Fuga in Persecutione* 1.1).

²⁹*In Canticum Cantorum* 1.3; *Contra Noetum* 17.1; *In Danielelem* 1.5.3–4. Likewise the Spirit was necessary for one to rightly interpret Scripture (*In Danielelem* 2.2.4).

Novatian's pneumatology also contained elements which are best viewed as a continuation of the pneumatological tradition which he received. He presents another example of a Trinitarian confession with binitarian emphases in his theological method, just as can be seen in Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and to a lesser extent Tertullian. Novatian placed the Holy Spirit in the same category as the Father and the Son as the object of the Christian faith. He devoted an entire chapter of *De Trinitate* to explaining what a Christian must believe about the Holy Spirit. He also affirmed that the Holy Spirit was divine. Despite all of these points, in *De Trinitate* 31, he did not include the Holy Spirit in his explanation of how the Father and the Son are one God. Further, in all the works of Novatian, there are only two places in which he mentions all three members of the Trinity.³⁰ When viewed together, these points indicate that Novatian understood the Christian faith to be Trinitarian. Yet, his theological method was primarily binitarian, in that he focused on the Father and the Son without wrestling with the place and person of the Holy Spirit within his theological method. Similar practices are evident in Ignatius of Antioch, Hermas, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and to a far lesser extent in Tertullian.

Novatian also avoided confusing the Holy Spirit with the Son in both his theology and terminology. He consistently presented the Holy Spirit as an entity distinct from the Son. He did this despite the practice of some of his predecessors. Hermas,³¹ Justin Martyr,³² and Clement of Alexandria,³³ wrote in various ways that appeared to confuse the identity of the Spirit with the Son. Tertullian used terminology (particularly *Spiritus Dei*) that could cause confusion as to whether he was referring to the Spirit or to

³⁰These are *De Trinitate* 30.1 and *De Bono Pudicitiae* 2.1.

³¹*Pastor Hermae* 59.5–6.

³²*I Apologia* 33.9.

³³*Paidagogos* 1.6.43.

the Son.³⁴ Novatian avoided this issue completely, despite not addressing the issue of how the Spirit is divine together with the Father and the Son.

Novatian's presentation of the ontology of the Spirit is distinct from his predecessors. He avoided the more recent practices of Tertullian and Hippolytus, who directly addressed the ontology of the Holy Spirit. In this respect, Novatian followed an older paradigm that did not address this issue. At the same time, he also avoided any discussion of the Spirit as the creator, as Irenaeus had so clearly articulated, but which Hippolytus had not mentioned and Tertullian had mentioned only once.³⁵ Despite not directly addressing the ontology of the Holy Spirit, Novatian clearly understood the Holy Spirit to be divine through both his giving of spiritual life and his possession of divine eternity. These points demonstrate that Novatian followed an older paradigm for speaking about the ontology of the Spirit, while at the same time avoiding aspects of those older pneumatologies.

Novatian's Unique Contribution

Novatian's most unique contribution to the pneumatological tradition which he inherited was his presentation of the Holy Spirit as the object of the Christian faith. While his predecessors had made many statements about the Holy Spirit, and clearly understood the Holy Spirit to be an integral part of the Christian faith, none of them devoted an entire section of their work to explaining what Christians ought to believe about the Holy Spirit. Novatian's work, in this regard, provides a glimpse at how other Christians of that time could have understood the Holy Spirit as an object of the Christian faith, even while focusing on the Son and the Father in their writings. It provides an opportunity to see how belief in the Holy Spirit was understood to be a part of the faith in

³⁴*Adversus Marcionem* 5.8.4.

³⁵See Tertullian's interpretation of Gen 1:26 in *Adversus Praxean* 7.

the middle of the third century. In particular, it reveals what Novatian considered to be the essential points of belief about the Holy Spirit. While he placed the Holy Spirit alongside the Father and the Son as an object of the Christian faith, he did not discuss the ontology of the Holy Spirit as he did with his treatment of the Father and the Son. Rather, Novatian presented what must be believed about the Holy Spirit through the lens of Scripture, and focused on the actions of the Holy Spirit.

Novatian's presentation of the activity of the Holy Spirit was not an attempt to argue for the divinity of the Spirit through his actions. His concern appears to lie with explaining the identity of the Holy Spirit who is to be believed upon by Christians. Therefore, he defined the Spirit through the Spirit's relationship with Christ. This connection with Christ is important because he noted that the Spirit acted differently with different peoples in different times. Therefore, he saw the practical need to begin not merely with the activity of the Holy Spirit, but with the Spirit as the *paracletus* whom Christ has given to the church. The reception of the Spirit by a believer is made possible by the descent of the Spirit upon Christ who remains the fount of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit gives spiritual life to Christians and perfects the church through establishing leaders and giving gifts. He upholds the Christian faith and the faithful. The Spirit does these things as part of His role as the *paracletus* whom Christ has left to lead the church.

Novatian's Pneumatological Ontology

Novatian's focus on the Spirit as the object of the Christian faith apart from a discussion of the Spirit's ontology has led to some rather diverse and erroneous assertions about how Novatian understood the Spirit's being. These errors appear to stem from a failure to carefully read what Novatian wrote in his own context. For reasons unknown, Novatian did not directly address the ontology of the Holy Spirit in *De Trinitate*. In doing so, he did not follow in the path of Tertullian and Hippolytus before him. Novatian's description of the Spirit as the giver of spiritual life and possessing divine

eternity clearly require the conclusion that he viewed the Holy Spirit as divine. His description of the Holy Spirit as less than the Son leaves open the possibility that he understood the Holy Spirit to be both divine and ontologically subordinate to the Son. There is no way to determine with certainty in what manner Novatian understood the subordination of the Holy Spirit to the Son. It is likely that he understood this subordination to be ontological, but his language leaves open the possibility for an economic interpretation of this subordination. Even though he did not directly address the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Novatian identified the Holy Spirit as a distinct individual and object of the Christian faith. In doing so, he presented an aspect of the Spirit's ontology that had been presented with far less clarity by some of his predecessors. Despite his clarity on the identity of the Holy Spirit, Novatian's implicit affirmation of the Holy Spirit's divinity along with his subordinationism were not well suited to address the pneumatological issues which arose one hundred years after he penned *De Trinitate*.

Novatian's Pneumatological Legacy

Novatian's theological legacy is primarily evident in his Christological formulations and the pro-Nicene arguments during the Arian controversy.³⁶ His pneumatological legacy is far more limited and difficult to assess. Within a century of his writing *De Trinitate*, the issue of the Spirit's ontology had become very important and a center of controversy. In *De Trinitate*, Novatian had avoided directly addressing the ontology of the Holy Spirit. This curtailed the usefulness of his work for this latter debate. However, his pneumatology can be seen in two diverse places: the teaching of Gregory bishop of Elvira (d. 395)³⁷ and the Pneumatomachi at Constantinople.

³⁶Mark Weedman, *The Trinitarian Theology of Hilary of Poitiers* (Boston: Brill, 2007), 51–53; 127–35. James L. Papandrea correctly noted, “Novatian's true legacy is his theology” (*On the Trinity, Letters to Cyprian of Carthage, Ethical Treatises*, Corpus Christianorum in Translation 22, trans. James L. Papandrea [Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2015], 18).

³⁷Jerome thought that Gregory was still alive when he wrote *Liber De Viris Illustribus* (105.1).

Novatian's legacy in the Pneumatomachian controversy is known only through a passing mention made by Jerome. He recorded that Novatian's *De Trinitate* was circulated under the name of Cyprian by the Pneumatomachi in Constantinople.³⁸ Jerome did not mention the reason why the Pneumatomachi were passing *De Trinitate* off under the name of Cyprian.³⁹ W. York Fausset speculated that, "The doctrine of the Holy Ghost is so slightly handled, that certain heretics claimed the treatise in support of their own views."⁴⁰ Russell J. DeSimone, took a different view: "Macedonian heretics... hawked Novatian's treatise about the streets of Constantinople because of such statements as the one in question: *the Paraclete is less than Christ*."⁴¹ It is also possible that one of the reasons for the Pneumatomachi passing around *De Trinitate* was because it was a tome on the Trinity that did not call the Holy Spirit by the term "God" nor overtly discussed the Holy Spirit in the inter-divine relations. Despite these speculations, there is no clear reason as to why the Pneumatomachi were passing around Novatian's *De Trinitate* in Constantinople. Regardless of the reasons, in the middle of the fourth century, Novatian's *De Trinitate* was used as a support by those who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

DeSimone correctly observed that "much of Novatian's teaching on the Spirit

³⁸Jerome, *Apologia Adversus Libros Rufini* 2.19. Jerome's reason for this comment was to prove that Rufinus was incorrect when he asserted that the Pneumatomachi were passing around Tertullian's treatise *De Trinitate*, which Rufinus had stated was not written by Tertullian, but by Cyprian.

³⁹Adhemar D'Alès downplayed the use of *De Trinitate* by the Pneumatomachi: "Cependant l'hérésie macédonienne qui, cent ans après Novatien, s'attaquait à la divinité du Saint-Esprit, devait s'efforcer de trier à elle cette page, comme l'hérésie arienne tirait à elle les pages relatives au Verbe. Et pour donner au livre plus d'autorité, elle essayait de le faire passer sous nom vénéré de saint Cyprien. C'est ce qu'atteste Rufin. La tactique macédonienne était favorisée par l'extrême effacement de la personne de Saint-Esprit dans le *De Trinitate*" (Adhemar D'Alès, *Novatien: Etude sur la Théologie Romaine au milieu du III^e Siècle* [Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1924], 119).

⁴⁰W. York Fausset, *Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri De Trinitate Liber: Novatian's Treatise on the Trinity*, Cambridge Patristic Texts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), xxvii.

⁴¹Russell J. DeSimone, "The Holy Spirit according to Novatian *De Trinitate*," *Augustinianum* 10 (1970): 151.

was taken over by Gregory, bishop of Elvira near Granada.”⁴² Gregory incorporated much of Novatian’s affirmations about the Spirit, complete with his proof texts, into his book on the Acts of the Apostles in *Tractus Originises*. The influence of Novatian is keenly felt in Gregory’s descriptions of the Spirit in 20.12–20. Gregory added few of his own words and quoted from Novatian at great length.⁴³ It is important to notice that the context in which Gregory utilized Novatian was centered upon the work of the Spirit in the apostles and the church. Novatian’s presentation of the activity of the Spirit in *De Trinitate* was utilized by Gregory at approximately the same time that the Pneumatomachi were employing *De Trinitate* regarding the issue of the Spirit’s ontology.

In this manner, Novatian’s pneumatology was used in two very different contexts. His silence concerning the ontology of the Holy Spirit was central to the Pneumatomachian use of *De Trinitate* as a part of their arguing against the divinity of the Holy Spirit. At the same time, Novatian compiled a significant amount of Scriptural references in his attempt to explain what Christians ought to believe about the Holy Spirit. Gregory found Novatian’s trove of Scripture references so helpful that he quoted it at great length. Thus, Novatian’s silence on the ontology of the Holy Spirit was used to support heresy, and his use of Scripture to explain the Holy Spirit was used to support orthodoxy. In either case, the influence of his pneumatology was limited and did not form a central point for attacking the divinity of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁴ Likewise, it was not widely utilized as a source of scriptural quotation to support an orthodox reading of the Holy Spirit’s activities for and in the church.

⁴²Russell J. DeSimone, *Novatian the Presbyter*, The Fathers of the Church 67 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University Press, 1974), 18.

⁴³See appendix for a comparison of Novatian’s text of *De Trinitate* with Gregory’s text of *Tractus Originises*.

⁴⁴If Novatian’s *De Trinitate* had formed a central point in the Pneumatomachian arguments, then it would have certainly been mentioned more than the one time by Jerome in a passing comment.

APPENDIX

GREGORY OF ELVIRA'S APPROPRIATION OF NOVATIAN'S PNEUMATOLOGY

Gregory of Elvira (300-395) was clearly influenced by Novatian's statements about the Holy Spirit. He quoted from chapter 29 of Novatian's *De Trinitate* at great length. Gregory's appropriation of Novatian's statements regarding the Holy Spirit is the clearest example of the influence of Novatian's pneumatology by later orthodox writers. Gregory did not mention the author from which he was quoting when he quoted from Novatian. It is possible that he knew these words were penned by Novatian. It is more likely, however, that he had a copy of *De Trinitate* that did not have Novatian named as the author. Below is a table comparing the passages from Novatian's *De Trinitate* with Gregory's appropriation of these passages in *Tractus Originises*.

Table A1. A comparison of Novatian and Gregory of Elvira

Novatian, <i>De Trinitate</i> ¹	Gregory, <i>Tractus Originises</i> ²
29.10 . . . sunt charismatum dona componit et digerit et ideo ecclesiam Domini undique et in omnibus perfectam et consummatam facit. 29.11 . . . Habitans in solo Christo plenus et totus nec in aliqua mensural aut portione mutilatus, sed cum tota sua redundantia sumulate distributes et missus, ut ex illo	20.12 Et ideo tota plenitudo sancti spiritus in Xpisto avenit, quia ipse et corpus integrum totius ecclesiae; in nobis autem singular ejusdem spiritus carismatum dona sunt distribute, qui deputamur in membris, ut delibationem quondam gratiraum ceteris consequentibus quasi de fonte Xpisti donorum atque operum ad nos benae ejusdem spiritus ducerentur

¹Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 4, ed. G. F. Diercks (Turnholt, Belgium: Brepols, 1972).

²Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 69, ed. V. Bulhart, J. Fraipont, and M. Simonetti (Turnholt, Belgium: Brepols, 1967).

Table A1, continued

Novatian, <i>De Trinitate</i>	Gregory, <i>Tractus Originises</i>
<p>delibationem quondam gratiarum ceteri consequi possint, totius Sancti Spiritus in Christo fonte remanente, ut ex illo donorum atque operum uenae ducerentur, Spiritu Sancto in Christo affluenter habitante</p>	
<p>29.16 Hic est qui operatur ex aquis secundam natiuitatem, semen quoddam diuini generis et consecrator caelestis natiuitatis... qui nos Dei faciat templum et nos eius efficiat domum, qui interpellat diuinas aures pro nobis gemitibus ineloquacibus, aduocationis implens officia et defensionis exhibens munera, inhabitator corporibus nostris datus est sanctitatis effector, qui id agens in nobis ad aeternitatem et ad resurrectionem immortalitatis corpora nostra producat, dum illa in se assuefacit cum caelesti uirtutue misceri et cum Spiritus Sancti diuina aeternitate sociari</p>	<p>20.13 Hic est, inquam, spiritus qui operatur aqua secundam natiuitatem, semen quodam diuini generis et consecratur caelistis natiuitatis, qui nos Dei facit templum et nos sanctamefficit domum, qui inter diuinas aures pro nobis gemitibus inenarrabilibus aduocationis implens officia et defensionis exhibens munera; inhabitator corporibus nostris datus est, sanctitatis testis effectus, id agens in nobis, ut ad diuinitatem et ad resurrectionis immortalitatem corpora nostra perducat, dum illa adsuefacit cum caelesti uirtute misceri et cum spiritu diuinae aeternitatis sociari.</p>
<p>29.18 Hic est enim qui contra carnem desiderat, quia caro contra ipsum repugnat.</p> <p>29.19 Hic est qui inexplebiles cupiditates coercet, immoderatas libidines frangit, illicitos ardores extinguit, flagrantes impetus unicit, ebrietates reicit, auaritas repellit, luxuriosas comissiones fugit, caritates nectit, affectiones constringit, sectas repellit, regulam ueritatis expedit, haereticos reuincit, impobos foras expuit, euangelica custodit.</p>	<p>20.14 Hic est inquam, spiritus qui desiderat aduersus carnem, quia caro aduersus eum repugnat;</p> <p>hic inexplebiles cupiditates coercit et immoderatas libidinis frangit, illicitos ardores extinguit et flagrantes inpetus vincit, ebrietates eiecit, auaritiam compremit, luxuriae comissiones refugit, caritatem nectit, affectiones stringit, sectas repellit, regulam ueritatis expedit, hereticos conuincit, improbos foras expuit, euangelica custodit.</p>

Table A1, continued

Novatian, <i>De Trinitate</i>	Gregory, <i>Tractus Originises</i>
<p>29.20 De hoc item Apostolus: Non enim spiritum mundi accepimus, sed spiritum qui ex Deo est</p> <p>29.21 De hoc exultat et dicit: Puto autem quia spiritum Dei habeo . . .</p> <p>29.23 De hoc refert: Spiritus autem . . .</p>	<p>20.15 De hoc spiritu apostolus dicit: Non enim, inquit, spiritum huius mundi accepimus sed spiritum qui ex deo est;</p> <p>de hoc exultat et dicit: Puto et ergo quod spiritum dei habeo; (ellipsis)</p> <p>de hoc refert Spiritus autem (ellipsis)</p> <p>De hoc autem spiritu manifeste dicit, (ellipsis) feste dicit, (ellipsis) quia in novissimis iebus recedent quidam a fide adtendentes spiritalibus doctrinis daemoniorum, in hypocrisin mendaciilocorum, cauteriatam habentes conscientiam suam.</p>
<p>29.24 In hoc spiritus positus nemo umquam dicit anathema Iesum, nemo negavit Christum Dei Filium aut repudiavit creatorem Deum, nemo contra scripturas ulla, sua uerba depromit, nemo alia et sacrilege decretal constituit, nemo diueras iura conscribit</p> <p>29.25 In hunc quisquis blasphemauerit remissionem non habet, non tantum in isto saecula, uerum etiam nec in futuro.</p>	<p>20.16 In hoc spiritu positus nemo negat Xpistum uerum deum et uerum dei filium unigentium de ingenito natum, nemo repudiat creatorem Deum, nemo contra scripturas ulla sua uerba diuersa iura conscribit, nemo fidem praeuaricatur,</p> <p>quia in hoc spiritu quisque blasphemauerit, remissionem non habet neque in hoc saeculo neque in futuro.</p>
<p>29.26 Hic in apostolis Christo testimonium reddit, in martyribus constantem fidem religionis ostendit, in uirginibus admirabilem contentiam signatae caritatis includit, in ceteris incorrupta et incontaminata doctrinae dominicae iura custodit, hereticos destruit, peruersos corrigit, infideles arguit, simulatores ostendit, improbos quoque corrigit, ecclesiam incorruptam et inuolatam perpetuae uirginitatis et ueritatis sanctitate custodit.</p>	<p>20.17 Hic enim spiritus in apostolis Xpisto testimonium peribet, in martiribus excitantem fidem religionis ostendit, in uirginibus admiabilem contentiam signatae carnis includit, in ceteris incorrupta haec et incontaminata dominicae doctrinae iura custodit, hereticos destruit, peruersos corrigit, infideles arguit, simulatores ostendit, improbos quosque comprimit, ecclesiam incorruptam, immaculatam, perpetuae uirginitatis custodit.</p>

Table A1, continued

Novatian, <i>De Trinitate</i>	Gregory, <i>Tractus Originises</i>
	<p>20.18 Hic, inquam spiritus, qui hac die, id est pentecosten a deo ecclesiae missus est, qui non aetates discernit, non sexus separat, non personas accepit sed unicuique pro fide merito sese praestat et tribuit; non enim aetatem aut personam sed animam eligit, in qua se libens inferat.</p>
<p>29.27 Rogabo enim, aiebat, Patrem et alium aduocatum dabit uobis, ut uobiscum sit in aeternum, Spiritum ueritatis. Et cum uenerit aduocatus ille quem ego missurus sum uobis a Patre meo, Spiritum ueritatis qui de Patre meo procedit.</p>	<p>20.19 Omnia enim et in omnibus unus atque idem operatur spiritus. Propter hoc ergo dominus dicebat: Cum habiero, rogabo patrem meum et alium aduocatum dabit uobis ut nobiscum sit in aeternum. Cum uenerit aduocatus ille, quem ego mittam uobis a partre meo, spiritum ueritatis, qui de patre me procedit, et de meo accepit et ispe uos docebit omnia.</p>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Alan, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce Metzger. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th ed. Edited by New York: United Bible Societies, 1998.
- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Metzger, and Allen Wikgren. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.
- Athanasius the Great and Didymus the Blind. *Works on the Spirit*. Popular Patristics Series, edited and translated by Mark DelCogliano, Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, and Lewis Ayers, vol. 43, Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011.
- Clement of Alexandria. *Le Pédagogue: I*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Henri-Irénée Marrou and Marguerite Harl, vol. 70. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1976.
- _____. *Le Pédagogue: II*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Henri-Irénée Marrou, Marguerite Harl, and Otto Staehlin, vol. 108. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1976.
- _____. *Le Pédagogue: III*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Chantal Matray, Claude Mondésert, Henri-Irénée Marrou, and Jean Irigoien, volume 158. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1976.
- _____. *Le Protreptique*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by André Plassart and Claude Mondésert, vol. 2. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2004.
- _____. *Les Stromates: I*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Claude Mondésert and Marcel Caster, vol. 30. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2006.
- _____. *Les Stromates: II*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Claude Mondésert and Pierre-Thomas Camelot, vol. 38. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2006.
- _____. *Les Stromates: IV*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Annewies Van den Hoek and Claude Mondésert, vol. 463. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2001.
- _____. *Les Stromates: V-1*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Alain Le Boulluec, Pierre Voulet, vol. 278. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2006.
- _____. *Les Stromates: V-2*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Alain Le Boulluec, vol. 279. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2009.

- _____. *Les Stromates: VI. Sources chrétiennes*, edited by Patrick Descourtieux, vol. 446. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1999.
- _____. *Les Stromates: VII. Sources chrétiennes*, edited by Alain Le Boulluec, vol. 428. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997.
- _____. *Quel riche sera sauvé? Sources chrétiennes*, edited by Carlo Nardi, Ludwig Früchtel, Otto Stählin, and Patrick Descourtieux, vol. 537. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2011.
- Cureton, William. *The Ancient Syriac Version of the Epistles of Saint Ignatius*. London: Rivingtons, 1845.
- Cyprian. *Epistularum: Epistulae 1–57*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, vol. 3b, edited by G. F. Diercks. Turnholt, Belgium: Brepols, 1994.
- _____. *Epistularum: Epistulae 58–81*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, vol. 3c, edited by G. F. Diercks. Turnholt, Belgium: Brepols, 1996.
- Eusebius of Caesarea. *Histoire ecclésiastique, I*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Eduard Schwartz and Gustave Bardy, vol. 31. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1986.
- _____. *Histoire ecclésiastique, II*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Gustave Bardy, vol. 41. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994.
- _____. *Histoire ecclésiastique, III*. Sources chrétiennes, Edited by Gustave Bardy, vol. 55. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1976.
- _____. *Histoire ecclésiastique, IV*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Gustave Bardy and Pierre Périchon, vol. 73. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1987.
- Gregory of Nazianzus. *On God and Christ*. Translated by Frederick Williams and Lionel Wickham. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002.
- Heffernan, Thomas J. *The Passion of Perpetua and Felicity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Hippolytus of Rome. *Commentaire sur Daniel*. Sources chrétiennes, edited and translated by M. Lefèvre, vol. 14. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1947.
- _____. *Contra Noetum*. Edited by R. Butterworth. London: Heythrop College, 1977.
- _____. *On the Apostolic Tradition*. Popular Patristics Series 22. Translated by Alistair Stewart-Sykes. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.
- _____. *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*. Edited by M. Marcovich. Patristische Texte und Studien 25. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986.
- Holmes, Michael W. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Irenaeus. *Contre les hérésies: livre I-1*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Adelin Rousseau and Louis Doutreleau, vol. 263. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1979.

- _____. *Contre les hérésies: livre I-2*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Adelin Rousseau and Louis Doutreleau, vol. 264. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1979.
- _____. *Contre les hérésies: livre II-1*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Adelin Rousseau and Louis Doutreleau, vol. 293. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1982.
- _____. *Contre les hérésies: livre II-2*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Adelin Rousseau and Louis Doutreleau, vol. 294. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1982.
- _____. *Contre les hérésies: livre III-1*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Adelin Rousseau and Louis Doutreleau, vol. 210. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2002.
- _____. *Contre les hérésies: livre III-2*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Adelin Rousseau and Louis Doutreleau, vol. 211. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2002.
- _____. *Contre les hérésies: livre IV-1*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Adelin Rousseau, Bertrand Hemmerdinger, Charles Mercier, and Louis Doutreleau, vol. 100. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2006.
- _____. *Contre les hérésies: livre IV-2*. Sources chrétiennes, edited by Adelin Rousseau, Bertrand Hemmerdinger, Charles Mercier, and Louis Doutreleau, vol. 100. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2006.
- _____. *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*. Translated by J. Armitage Robinson. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1920.
- _____. *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*. Translated by Joseph P. Smith. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1952.
- Jerome. *Apologia Adversus Libros Rufini*. Edited by J. P. Migne. Patrologia Latinae cursus completus 23: 415–514. Paris, 1883.
- _____. *Liber De Viris Illustribus*. Edited by J. P. Migne. Patrologia Latinae cursus completus 23: 631–760. Paris, 1883.
- Justin Martyr. *Dialogue with Trypho*. Translated by Thomas B. Falls and Thomas P. Hamilton, edited by Michael Slusser. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003.
- _____. *Die ältesten Apologeten*. Edited by E. J. Goodspeed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915.
- _____. *The First and Second Apologies*. Ancient Christian Writers 56. Translated by Leslie Barnard. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1997.
- Kliest, James K. *The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch*, Edited by Johannes Quasten and Joseph Plumpe. Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1946.
- Labriolle, Pierre de. *Les sources de l'histoire du montanisme: Textes grecs, latins, syriaques*. Paris: Leroux, 1913.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Part 2, *Ignatius & Polycarp*, vol. 2. London: Macmillan, 1899.

- Nautin, Pierre. *Hippolyte contre les hérésies*. Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1949.
- Novatian. *De Trinitate, Text und Übersetzung*. Edited and translated by Hans Weyer. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1962.
- _____. *Novatiani Opera*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, edited by G. F. Diercks, vol. 4. Turnholt, Belgium: Brepols, 1972.
- _____. *Novatiani Romanae urbis presbyteri De Trinitate Liber: Novatian's Treatise on the Trinity*. Translated by W. York Fausset. Cambridge Patristic Texts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- _____. *On the Trinity, Letters to Cyprian of Carthage, Ethical Treatises*. Corpus Christianorum in Translation, edited and translated by James Papandrea, vol 22. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2015.
- _____. *Patres et Scriptores Seculi III complectens ecclesiae latinae*. Edited by Michael Permanederi. Landshut, Germany: J. G. Wölfle, 1844.
- _____. *The Treatise of Novatian on the Trinity*. Translated by Herbert Moore. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919.
- Payton, James R., Jr. *Irenaeus on the Christian Faith: A Condensation of Against Heresies*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011.
- Philostorgius. *Church History*. Translated by Philip R. Amidon. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.
- Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson. *Clement of Alexandria. Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. 3. Edinburgh: Murray and Gibb, 1867.
- Robinson, Joseph A. *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache*. New York: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1920.
- Snyder, Grandon F. *The Apostolic Fathers. Vol. 6, The Shepherd of Hermas*. Edited by Robert M. Grant. Camden, NJ: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1968.
- Socrates Scholasticus. *Socratis Scholastici et Hermiae Sozomeni Historia Ecclesiastica*. Edited and translated by Henricus de Valesius. Paris: Christian Gerlach & Simon Beckenstein, 1677.
- Tertullian. *Opera I*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, edited by E. Dekkers, J. G. P. Borleffs, R. Willems, R. F. Refoulé, G. F. Diercks, and A. Kroymann, vol. 2. Turnholt, Belgium: Brepols, 1954.
- _____. *Opera II*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, edited by A. Gerlo, A. Kroymann, R. Willems, J. H. Waszink, J. G. P. Borleffs, A. Reifferscheid, G. Wissowa, E. Dekkers, J. J. Thierry, E. Evans, A. Harnack Borleffs, R. Willems, R. F. Refoulé, G. F. Diercks, and A. Kroymann, vol. 2. Turnholt, Belgium: Brepols, 1996.

- _____. *Tertullian: Disciplinary, Moral, and Ascetical Works*. Fathers of the Church 40. Translated by Rudolph Arbesman, Emily Joseph Daly, and Edwin A. Quain. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1959.
- _____. *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas*. Translated by Ernest Evans. London: SPCK, 1948.
- Weber, Robert, and Roger Gryson. *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.
- Wood, Simon P. *Clement of Alexandria: Christ the Educator*. Fathers of the Church 23. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1954.
- Wright, F. A. *Fathers of the Church: A Selection from the Writings of the Latin Fathers*. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1928.

Secondary Sources

- Ådna, Jostein. *The Formation of the Early Church*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Alexander, J. S. "Novatian/ Novatianer." *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 24 (1994): 678–82.
- Allison, Gregg R. *Historical Theology: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.
- Amann, Émile. "Novatien et novatianism." *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 11 (1931): 816–49.
- Arnold, Eberhard. *The Early Christians*. Rifton, NY: Plough Publishing House, 1970.
- Ashwin-Siejkowski, Piotr. *Clement of Alexandria: A Project of Christian Perfection*. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Ayers, Lewis, and Michel René Barnes. "Conclusions." *Augustinian Studies* 39, no. 2 (2008): 235–36.
- _____. "Innovation and *Ressourcement* in Pro-Nicene Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39 no. 2 (2008): 187–205.
- _____. "Introduction and Acknowledgements." *Augustinian Studies* 39, no. 2 (2008): 165–67.
- Baldovin, John F. "Hippolytus and the *Apostolic Tradition*: Recent Research and Commentary." *Theological Studies* 64 (2003): 520–42.
- Barnard, L. W. *Justin Martyr, His Life and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Barnes, Michel René. "The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39 no. 2 (2008): 169–86.

- _____. "Irenaeus's Trinitarian Theology." *Nova et Vetera* 7, no. 1 (2009): 67–106.
- Barnes, Timothy D. *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Survey*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Behr, John. *Aesceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement*. Edited by A. Louth and G. Clark. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- _____. *Irenaeus of Lyons: Identifying Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Bilbao, Gabino Uríbarri. *Monarquía y Trinidad*. Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas, 1996.
- Blumell, Lincoln. "A Note on Dionysius of Alexandria's Letter to Novatian in Light of Third-Century Papyri." *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 2 (2010): 356–61.
- Bobertz, C.A. "The Historical Context of Cyprian's *De Unitate*." *Journal of Theological Studies* (1990): 107–11.
- Boeft, J. den. "Vergil im frühen Christentum: Untersuchungen zu den vergilzitataten bei Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Novatian, Cyprian und Ambrose." *Vigiliae Christianae* 56, no. 3 (2002): 316–19.
- Bonweetsch, Gottlieb, *Die Geschichte des Montanismus*. Hildeshiem, Germany: Verlag von Andreas Deichert, 1881.
- Botte, Bernard. "L'Espirt-Saint el l'Église dans la 'Tradition apostolique' de Saint Hippolyte." *Didaskalia* 2 (1972): 221–33.
- _____. "Un passage difficile de la 'Tradition apostolique' sur le signe de croix." *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 27 (1960): 5–19.
- Bradshaw, Paul F., Maxwell E. Johnson, and L. Edward Phillips. *The Apostolic Tradition*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 2002.
- Brent, Allen. *Cyprian and Roman Carthage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- _____. *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch Bishop*. Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 31. New York: Brill, 1995.
- _____. *Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origin of Episcopacy*. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Briggman, Anthony. *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- _____. "Measuring Justin's Approach to the Spirit: Trinitarian Conviction and Binitarian Orientation." *Vigiliae Christianae* 63 (2009): 107–37.

- Brown, Milton P. *The Authentic Writings of Ignatius*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1963.
- Bucur, Bogdan G. *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses*. Supplements to *Vigilae Christianae* 95. Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Burgess, Stanley M. *Christian Peoples of the Spirit: A Documentary of Pentecostal Spirituality from the Early Church to the Present*. New York: New York University Press, 2011.
- _____. *The Holy Spirit: Ancient Christian Traditions*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishing, 1984.
- Butler, Rex D. *The New Prophecy & New Visions*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006.
- Butterworth, G. W. *Clement of Alexandria*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.
- Cameron, Ron, and Merrill P. Miller. *Redescribing Christian Origins*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature 2004.
- Cerrato, J. A. *Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Choufrine, Arkadi. *Gnosis, Theophany, Theosis: Studies in Clement of Alexandria's Appropriation of His Background*. New York: Peter Lang, 2002.
- Coleborne, W. "A Linguistic Approach to the Problem of the Structure and Composition of the Shepherd of Hermas." *Colloquium* 3 (1969): 133–42.
- Corwin, Virginia. *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1960.
- Cross, F. L. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- D'Alès, Adhemar. *La Théologie de Saint Hippolyte*. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1906.
- _____. "Le corpus de Novatien." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 10 (1919): 293–323.
- _____. *Novatien: Étude sur la Théologie Romaine au milieu du III^e Siècle*. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1924.
- Daly, Cahal B. "Novatian and Tertullian: A Chapter in the History of Puritanism." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 19 (1952): 33–43.
- _____. *Tertullian the Puritan and His Influence*. Dublin: Four Court Press, 1993.

- Daniélou, Jean. *The Origins of Latin Christianity*. Vol 3, *A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea*. Translated by David Smith and John Austin Baker. Edited by John Austin Baker. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1977.
- _____. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. Translated by J. A. Baker. London: Danton, Longman, and Todd, 1964.
- DeSimone, Russell J. “Against the Kenosis of Phil 2,6–11 Novatian, Trin. 22.” *Augustinianum* 32 (1992): 91–104.
- _____. “Christ the True God and the True Man according to Novatian *De Trinitate*.” *Augustinianum* 10 (1970): 42–117.
- _____. “The Holy Spirit according to Novatian *De Trinitate*.” *Augustinianum* 10 (1970): 138–65.
- _____. *Novatian the Presbyter*. The Fathers of the Church 67. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press Inc., 1974.
- _____. “The Treatise of Novatian the Roman Presbyter on the Trinity: A Study of the Text and the Doctrine.” *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 4 (1970): 1–197.
- Diercks, G. F. “Some Critical Notes on Novatian’s *De Bono Pudicitiae* and the Anonymous *Ad Novatianum*.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 25 (June 1971): 121–30.
- Drobner, Hubertus. *The Fathers of the Church*. Translated by Siegfried S. Schatzman. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2007.
- Dunn, Geoffrey D. “The Diversity and Unity of God in Novatian’s *De Trinitate*.” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 78, no. 4 (2002): 385–409.
- _____. *Tertullian*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Ferguson, Everett. *Studies in Early Christianity*. Vol. 4, *Orthodoxy, Heresy, and Schism in Early Christianity*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1993.
- Ferguson, John. *Clement of Alexandria*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1974.
- Foster, Paul, and Sara Parvis. *Irenaeus: Life, Scripture, Legacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- Frend, W. H. C. *The Rise of Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Grant, Robert M. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Vol. 1, *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*. 2nd ed. Translated by John Bowden. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.
- Goodspeed, Edgar. *A History of Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1966.
- Hall, Stuart G. *Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church*. London: SPCK, 1991.

- Harman, Allan M. "Speech about the Trinity: With Special Reference to Novatian, Hilary, and Calvin." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 26 (1973): 385–400.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *History of Dogma*, vol. 2. Translated by Neil Buchman. London: Williams & Norgate, 1896.
- _____. "Novatian, Novatianism." In *The New Schaff Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1952.
- Haykin, Michael A. G. "'Come to the Father': Ignatius of Antioch and His Calling to be a Martyr." *Themelios* 3 (May 2007): 26–39.
- _____. *Defense of the Truth*. Darlington, England: Evangelical Press, 2004.
- _____. *The Spirit of God: The Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- Heine, Ronald E. "Cyprian and Novatian." In *The Cambridge History of Early Christianity*. Edited by Francis Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Hillar, Marian. *From Logos to Trinity: The Evolution of Religious Beliefs from Pythagoras to Tertullian*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Hultgren, Arland J., and Steven A. Haggmark. *The Earliest Heretics: Readings from Their Opponents*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1996.
- Itter, Andrew C. *Esoteric Teaching in the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria*. Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Jedin, Hubert. *History of the Church*. Vol. 1, *From the Apostolic Community to Constantine*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1980.
- Jeffers, James S. *Conflict at Rome: Social Order and Hierarchy in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1991.
- Jefford, Clayton N. *Reading the Apostolic Fathers: A Student's Introduction*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012.
- Jurgens, W. A. *The Faith of the Early Fathers*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1970.
- Kannegiesser, Charles. *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*. Edited by D. Jeffery Bingham. Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Karavites, Peter. *Evil, Freedom, and the Road to Perfection in Clement of Alexandria*. Boston: Brill, 1999.
- Keilbach, Gulielmus. "Divinitas Filii eisque Patri subordinatio in Novatiani libro De Trinitate." *Bogoslovska Smorta* 21 (1933): 193–24.

- Kelly, Douglas F. "The Beneficial Influence of Stoic Logic and Epistemology on Early Christian Theology: With Particular Reference to Novatian." *Miscillanea Mediaevalia* 13, no. 2 (1981): 817–25
- Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1978.
- Keresztes, Paul. "Two Edicts of the Emperor Valerian." *Vigiliae Christianae* 29 (1975): 81–95.
- Kraft, H. *Early Christian Thinkers: An Introduction to Clement of Alexandria and Origen*. New York: Association Press, 1964.
- Kreidler, Mary Jane. "Montanism and Monasticism: Charism and Authority in the Early Church." *Studia Patristica* 18 (1989): 229–34.
- Kydd, Ronald. "Novatian's De Trinitate, 29: Evidence of the Charismatic?" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 30 (1977): 313–18.
- Labriolle, Pierre de. *History and Literature of Christianity from Tertullian to Boethius*. Translated by Herbert Wilson. New York: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1924.
- Lampe, Peter. *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*. Translated by Michael Stienhauser. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Lashier, Jackson. *Irenaeus on the Trinity*. Boston: Brill, 2014.
- Lilla, Salvatore, R. C. *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Livingstone, Elizabeth A., ed. *Papers Presented to the International Conference on Patristic Studies*. *Studia Patristica* 29. Louvain, Belgium: Peeters Publishers, 1997.
- Lupiere, Edmondo F. "Contributo per un'analisi delle citazioni veterotestamentarie nel *De Trinitate* di Novaziano." *Augustinianum* 22 (1982): 211–17.
- MacKenzie Iain M. *Irenaeus' Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching: A Theological Commentary and Translation*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002.
- Mader, Heidrun Elisabeth. *Montanistische Orakel und kirchliche Opposition*. Bristol, CT: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Mattei, Paul. "Novatien, *De Trinitate* 31. Texte et Traduction. Commentair philologique et doctrinal." *Memoire dell'Accademia delle scieze di Torino* 20 (1996): 159–257.
- _____. "Novatien précurseur à la fois D'apollinaire et de Nestorius? Équivoques retrospectives et portée réelle de la formule christologique dans le *De Trinitate*." In *Chartae caritatis: Études de Patristique et d'antiquité en hommage à Yves-Marie Duval*. Edited by Benoît Gain, Pierre Jay, and Gérard Nauroy. Collection des études Augustiniennes, sérei Antiquité 173 (2004): 449–66.
- Minns, Denis. *Irenaeus*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2007.

- Minns, Denis, and Paul Parvis. *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*. Edited by Henry Chadwick. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Moreschini, Claudio, and Enrico Norelli. *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature: A Literary History*. Vol. 1, *From Paul to the Age of Constantine*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005.
- Morgan-Wynne, J. E. “‘The Delicacy’ of the Holy Spirit in the Shepherd of Hermas and in Tertullian.” *Studia Patristica* 21 (1989): 154–57.
- _____. “The Holy Spirit and Christian Experience in Justin Martyr.” *Vigilae Christianae* 38 (1984): 172–77.
- Neander, Augustus. *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*. Vol. 1, *Comprising the First Great Division of History*. Translated by Joseph Torrey. London: Crocker and Brewster, 1859.
- Osborn, Eric F. *Clement of Alexandria*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- _____. *The Emergence of Christian Theology*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- _____. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- _____. *Justin Martyr*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1973.
- _____. *The Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
- _____. *Tertullian, First Theologian of the West*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Osiek, Carolyn. *Shepherd of Hermas*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
- Papandrea, James L. “Between Two Thieves: Novatian of Rome and Kenosis Christology.” In *Studies on Patristic Texts and Archaeology: If These Stones Could Speak, Essays in honor of Dennis Edward Groh*. Edited by George Kalantzis and Thomas F. Martin. New York: Edwin Mellen, 2009.
- _____. *Novatian of Rome and the Culmination of Pre-Nicene Orthodoxy*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011.
- _____. *Reading the Early Church Fathers: From the Didache to Nicaea*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2012.
- _____. *The Trinitarian Theology of Novatian of Rome: A Study in Third-Century Orthodoxy*. New York: Edwin Mellen, 2009.
- Parvis, Sara, and Paul Foster. *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*. Vol. 1, *The Emergence of Catholic Tradition (100–600)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Pernveden, Lage. *Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*. Studia Theologica Lundensia 27. Lund, Sweden: Gleerup, 1966.
- Piana, George La. “The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century.” In *Studies in Early Christianity: Orthodoxy, Heresy, and Schism in Early Christianity*, edited by Everett Ferguson. New York: Garland Publishing, 1993.
- Purves, George T. *The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity*. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph and Company, 1889.
- Quarry, J. “Novatiani De Trinitate liber: it’s probable history.” *Hermathena* 10 (1899): 36–70.
- Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. Vol. 1, *From the Apostles Creed to Irenaeus*. Utrecht, Holland: Spectrum, 1950.
- _____. *Patrology*. Vol. 2, *The Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*. Utrecht, Holland: Spectrum, 1950.
- Rankin, David. *Tertullian and the Church*. New York: Cambridge University, 1995.
- Reiling, J. *Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 37. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- Rocco, Anita. “La Tomba del Martire Novaziano.” *Vetera Christianorum* 45 (2008): 323–41.
- Schoedel, William R. *Ignatius of Antioch*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- _____. “A Neglected Motive for Trinitarianism.” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 31 (1980): 356–67.
- Shelton, W. Brian. *Martyrdom from Exegesis in Hippolytus: An Early Church Presbyter’s Commentary on Daniel*. Colorado Springs, CO: Paternoster, 2008.
- Simonetti, Manlio. “Alcune osservazioni sul *De Trinitate* di Novaziano.” In *Studi in onore di Angelo Monteverdi*, 2:771–83. Modena: Società Tipografica Editrice Modenese, 1959.
- _____. “The Beginnings of Theological Reflection in the West.” In *History of Theology: I The Patristic Period*. Edited by Angelo Di Berardino and Basil Studer. Translated by Matthew J. O’Connell. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1996.
- _____. *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*. Translated by John A. Hughes. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- _____. “Illario e Navaziano.” *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 7 (1965): 1034–47.

- Stanton, Graham N., Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton. *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Steenburg, M. C. *Irenaeus on Creation: The Cosmic Christ and the Saga of Redemption*. Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Steinmann, Jean. *Tertullien*. Paris: Éditions du Chalet, 1967.
- Stewart-Sykes, Alastair. "The Original Condemnation of Asian Montanism." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 50 (1999): 1–22.
- Stobel, August. *Das heilige Land der Montanisten*. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.
- Stokes, George. "Novatian and Novatianism." In *A Dictionary of Early Christian Biography and Literature to the End of the Sixth Century A.D.: with an Account of the Principal Sects and Heresies*. Edited by Henry Wace and William Piercy. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Swete, Henry B. *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1912.
- Tabbernee, William. *Fake Prophecy and Polluted Sacraments: Ecclesiastical and Imperial Reactions to Montanism*. Supplements to *Vigilae Christianae* 84. Boston: Brill, 2007.
- _____. *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphic Sources Illustrating the History of Montanism*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997.
- _____. "Recognizing the Spirit: Second-generation Montanist Oracles." *Studia Patristica* 40 (2006): 521–26.
- _____. "Remnants of the New Prophecy: Literary and Epigraphical Sources on the Montanist Movement." *Studia Patristica* 21 (1989): 193–98.
- Taylor, Charles. *The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1892.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The Holy Spirit—In Biblical Teaching, through the Centuries, and Today*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Tillich, Paul. *A History of Christian Thought*. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Tixeront, Joseph. *A Handbook of Patrology*. Translated by S. A. Raemers. St. Louis: Herder Book Company, 1920.
- Trevett, Christine. *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- _____. *A Study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 29. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992.

- Twomey, D. Vincent, and Lewis Ayers. *The Mystery of the Holy Trinity in the Fathers of the Church*. Portland, OR: Four Court Press, 2007.
- Twomey, D. Vincent, and Janet E. Rutherford. *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church*. Portland, OR: Four Court Press, 2010.
- Urbainczyk, Theresa, *Socrates of Constantinople: Historian of Church and State*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1997.
- van den Hoek, Annewies. *Clement of Alexandria and his use of Philo in the Stromateis: An Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish Model*. Supplements to *Vigilae Christianae* 3. New York: Brill, 1988.
- Wallraff, Martin. "Socrates Scholasticus on the History of the Novatianists." In *Papers Presented to the International Conference on Patristic Studies*. Studia Patristica, Edited by Elizabeth A. Livingstone, vol. 29. Louvain, Belgium: Peeters Publishers, 1997.
- Warfield, Benjamin, B. *Studies in Tertullian and Augustine*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1930.
- Weedman, Mark. *The Trinitarian Theology of Hilary of Poitiers*. Supplements to *Vigilae Christianae* 89. Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Weyer, Hans. *Novatianus: "De Trinitate" Über den dreifaltigen Gott*. Testimonia, vol. 2. Dusseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1962.
- Wilhite, David. "The Spirit of Prophecy: Tertullian's Pauline Pneumatology." In *Tertullian and Paul*. Edited by Todd D. Still and David E. Wilhite. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013.
- Wilson, J. Christian. *Five Problems in the Interpretation of the Shepherd of Hermas*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1995.
- _____. *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and Its Pneumatology*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1993.
- Woodsworth, Christopher. *St. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome*. London: Rivingtons, 1880.
- Young, Frances. *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Dissertations and Theses

- Humberto, Raul Treiyer. "An Investigation into the Possible Influence of Montanism in the Development of the Theology of Tertullian." Th.D. thesis, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1974.

- Jennings, Craig P. "Aspects of Ante-Nicene Pneumatology: Modern Pneumatological Controversies in Light of Patristic Theology." Ph.D. diss., Bob Jones University, 1985.
- Kelly, D. F. "Novatian of Rome." Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1975.
- Lloyd, Daniel. "Ontological Subordination in Novatian of Rome's Theology of the Son." Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 2012.
- Smith, Yancy W. "Hippolytus' Commentary on the Song of Songs in Social and Critical Context." Ph.D. diss., Brite Divinity School, 2009.
- Stegmann, Claire. "The Development of Tertullian's Doctrine of *Spiritus Sanctus*." Ph.D. diss., Southern Methodist University, 1978.

ABSTRACT

DE SPIRITU SANCTO: NOVATIAN OF ROME'S PNEUMATOLOGY IN DE TRINITATE

JohnMark Bennett Beazley, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016
Chair: Dr. Michael A. G. Haykin

This dissertation evaluates the pneumatology of Novatian of Rome.

Novatian's pneumatology in *De Trinitate* is marked by a profound Biblicism and seeks to describe the Holy Spirit as an object of the Christian faith. This approach severely limits how he addresses the ontology of the Holy Spirit, but it does provide a broad scope of how he understood the activity of the Holy Spirit.

Chapter 1 sets the context of pneumatology in the third century and describes how Novatian's pneumatology should be viewed in this context. Chapter 2 provides a biographical sketch of Novatian. It places him in his historical and ecclesiastical context.

Chapter 3 examines the pneumatology of those Christian writers who preceded Novatian and whose writings would have been known to him. This chapter provides a context from which to understand how Novatian's pneumatology fits with those who preceded him.

Chapters 4 and 5 examine Novatian's pneumatology in detail. Chapter 4 demonstrates that Novatian was primarily concerned with describing the Holy Spirit as the object of Christian belief through the biblical language about the Holy Spirit, which focused upon the activity of the Holy Spirit within the church on behalf of the Son. Chapter 5 shows that while Novatian did not call the Holy Spirit by the term "God," he implicitly and inescapably affirmed the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

Chapter 6 briefly addresses Novatian's pneumatology in light of his

predecessors along with the legacy of his pneumatology in *De Trinitate*. This chapter demonstrates that Novatian's pneumatology was used by both orthodox (Gregory of Elvira) and heretics (Pneumatomachi).

VITA

JohnMark Bennett Beazley

EDUCATION

Certificate, Montana Wilderness School of the Bible, 2001
B.A., Briercrest College, 2004
M.A., Western Theological Seminary, 2006
Th.M. Western Theological Seminary, 2009

ACADEMIC

Latin Teacher, Highlands Latin School, Louisville Kentucky, 2015-