

***Power in Unity, Diversity in Rank:
Subordination and the Trinity in the Fathers of the Early Church***

Michael J. Svigel
Dallas Theological Seminary

A Paper Presented to the 56th Annual Meeting of
the Evangelical Theological Society,
November 18, 2004, San Antonio, Texas

INTRODUCTION: SUBORDINATION AND THE TRINITY

In a 1989 article, John Dahms argued that the doctrine of eternal generation of the Son provides an ontological basis for the eternal subordination of the Son to the Father: "The view that this subordination is only an economic subordination and originates solely in a mutual agreement among the members of the Godhead implies that the divine persons can choose and do what is contrary to their nature."¹ Yet Dahms explicitly retained an essential equality of divinity in the Godhead: "Of course orthodoxy . . . requires us to maintain the essential equality of the Son with the Father but, as we have seen, there are serious consequences if we do not also hold to the existential inequality of the Son with the Father."² His view of the "existential inequality" of the Son based on eternal generation then formed a basis for maintaining a particular Trinitarian social order, for "the Scriptures teach that Christians are to recognize the authority of those who are over them in the state, the Church, the home. . . . Because the Son is begotten (and the Spirit spirated) this recognition of human authorities has a theological basis."³

This matter of social order—especially gender roles—proved to be a trigger for heated debate over the question of eternal subordination of the Son to the Father.⁴ Gilbert Bilezikian wrote, "Some proponents of a hierarchical order between male and female attempt to use, as a divine model for their proposal at the human level, an alleged relationship of authority/subordination between Father and Son."⁵ Bilezikian then urged that such a concept of the relationship between Father and Son (and Spirit) is in error. His understanding of orthodox Trinitarianism excluded any form of "ontological hierarchy, order or ranking among them that would pertain to their eternal state."⁶

Supporters of an eternal functional subordination of the Son to the Father have amassed much Scripture in support of their views,⁷ as have those who challenged the notion of eternal functional subordination.⁸ Due to the alleged stalemate over the teaching of Scripture on this matter, Kevin Giles recently suggested that this debate "cannot be resolved simply by quoting texts," so, to bring resolution to the matter, "we need to determine who is in fact accurately reflecting historical orthodoxy."⁹ However, Giles quickly dismissed the early fathers between the age of the apostles to Athanasius as subordinationist and inappropriate for a serious consideration of the development of "orthodoxy."

It is generally conceded that the ante-Nicene Fathers were subordinationists. This is clearly evident in the writings of the second-century "Apologists." . . . The ante-Nicene Fathers did their best to explain how the one God could be a Trinity of three persons. It was the way they approached this dilemma that caused them insoluble problems and led them into subordinationism. They began with the premise that there was one God

¹ John V. Dahms, "The Generation of the Son," *JETS* 32, (1989): 497.

² *Ibid.*, 498.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Cf. Stanley J. Grenz, "Theological Foundations for Male-Female Relationships," *JETS* 41 (1998): 615-30.

⁵ Gilbert Bilezikian, "Hermeneutical Bungee-Jumping: Subordination in the Godhead," *JETS* 40 (1997): 58.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ John V. Dahms, "The Subordination of the Son," *JETS* 37 (1994): 351-64; Stephen D. Kovach and Peter R. Schemm, Jr., "A Defense of the Doctrine of the Eternal Subordination of the Son," *JETS* 42 (1999): 461-76; J. Scott Horrell, "Toward a Biblical Model of the Social Trinity: Avoiding Equivocation of Nature and Order," *JETS* 47 (2004): 399-421.

⁸ Gilbert Bilezikian, "Hermeneutical Bungee-Jumping," 57-68.

⁹ Kevin Giles, *The Trinity and Subordinationism: The Doctrine of God and the Contemporary Gender Debate* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002), 5-6.

who was the Father, and then they tried to explain how the Son and the Spirit could also be God.¹⁰

Giles's labeling of the second century fathers as "subordinationists" and his suggestion that they "were doing their best" may seem strange when one considers that these writers—some of whom were later regarded as "saints"—were viewed as consistent with and the basis for the orthodox faith.¹¹ In fact, the definition of Chalcedon (451) begins, "Following, then, the holy fathers" and ends with "Thus have the prophets of old testified; thus the Lord Jesus Christ himself taught us; thus the Symbol of the Fathers has handed down to us."

What, then, did the first and second century fathers hand down to Nicaea and Chalcedon? Was it a Trinity of interpersonal mutuality and temporary incarnational submission of the Son to the Father? Or was it a consistent presentation of the Father, Son, and Spirit in ordered, hierarchical relationships, either extending into eternity or spanning the economy of creation?¹²

A survey of works on Trinitarianism itself reveals that a large number virtually ignore the first century after the apostolic age as they attempt to reconstruct the development of Trinitarian thought.¹³ While some may begin their history of Trinitarianism in the later second century, either with Irenaeus¹⁴ or Justin Martyr,¹⁵ others start in the third century with Origen's controversial treatments of the Logos.¹⁶ Still others skip the first two centuries altogether and begin their discussions with Athanasius¹⁷ or the Cappadocians.¹⁸ One author even begins with Augustine, for which he actually apologized.¹⁹

There are other scholars who attempt to take the contributions of the first two centuries seriously, but they often provide what I consider to be rather random, vague, or even unhelpful summaries.²⁰ There are

¹⁰ Ibid., 60, 62.

¹¹ Cf. Robert M. Grant, *Jesus after the Gospels: The Christ of the Second Century*, The Hale Memorial Lectures of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990), 66–67.

¹² In this paper I use the terms "economy" and "economic" in its general sense as the outworking of the divine plan, that is, any activities of God toward any external object for any purpose. When limited by modifiers such as "economy of creation," "of salvation" or "of the incarnation," the activities are limited to these particular works. Various authors—both ancient and modern—will not always share my use of these terms.

¹³ Cf. Philip W. Butin, *The Trinity*, Foundations of Christian Faith (Louisville: Geneva, 2001), 18–23; Bruno Forte, *The Trinity as History: Saga of the Christian God*, trans. Paul Rotondi from the 3d Italian ed. (New York: Alba House, 1989), 45–52; Catherine Mowry LaCugna, *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1991), 24–30, 53–79; Gerald O'Collins, *The Trinitarian God: Understanding and Interpreting the Trinity* (New York: Paulist, 1999), 85–103.

¹⁴ Bertrand de Margerie, *La Trinité Chrétienne dans L'histoire*, ed. Charles Kannengiesser, *Théologie Historique* 31 (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1975), 91–172. Gunton writes, "I continue to believe that Irenaeus provides an essential biblically-based starting point for discussion" (Colin E. Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology*, 2nd ed. [Edinburgh: Clark, 1997], xxi).

¹⁵ Colin E. Gunton, *The Triune Creator: A Historical and Systematic Study*, ed. Philip D. Clayton, *Edinburgh Studies in Constructive Theology* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998), 47–50; Levi Leonard Paine, *A Critical History of the Evolution of Trinitarianism and Its Outcome in the New Christology* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1900), 24.

¹⁶ Leonard Hodgson, *The Doctrine of the Trinity*, Croall Lectures (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), 142–75; Norman Pittenger, *The Divine Trinity* (Philadelphia: United Church Press, 1977), 39–43.

¹⁷ Gordon H. Clark, *The Trinity*, 2d ed. (Jefferson, MD: Trinity Foundation, 1990), 17–28. Giles disregards the first two centuries and starts with Athanasius, promising that in the next chapter he will "discuss earlier attempts at constructing a doctrine of the Trinity that proved to be inadequate" (Giles, *Trinity and Subordinationism*, 32). However, he skips the apostolic fathers and begins with Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Tertullian before contending with Arianism (ibid., 60–62).

¹⁸ Mary Ann Fatula, *The Triune God of Christian Faith*, ed. Monika Hellwig, *Zacchaeus Studies: Theology* (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 1990), 62–64.

¹⁹ E. L. Mascall, *The Triune God: An Ecumenical Study* (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick, 1986), 8, 11.

²⁰ Elijah Bailey, *Primitive Trinitarianism, Examined and Defended* (Bennington: Darius Clark, 1826), 260–64; E. Calvin Beisner, *God in Three Persons* (Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1984), 46–49; J. R. Illingworth, *The Doctrine of the Trinity Apologetically Considered* (London: Macmillan, 1907), 102–25; K. E. Kirk, "The Evolution of the Doctrine of the Trinity," in *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, ed. A. E. J. Rawlinson (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1933), 208–19; Abbe Felix Klein, *The Doctrine of the Trinity*, trans. Daniel J. Sullivan (New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1940), 85–94; Jules Lebreton, *Histoire du Dogme de la Trinité*, 7th ed., 2 vols., *Bibliothèque de Théologie Historique*, vol. 1, *Les Origines* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1927), 560–67; Jürgen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom: The Doctrine of God*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 130; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 268–71; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 381–82; Hugh H. Stannus, *A History of the Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity in the Christian Church* (London: Christian Life Publishing, 1882), 28.

a few, however, who attend to the writings of the earliest fathers in some detail with helpful and sometimes thorough treatments of the most relevant Trinitarian or Christological passages.²¹

I find several problems with an approach that skips or scans a whole era of Christian theological contributions—especially those as seminal as the fathers of the first and second centuries. First, it could suggest that Trinitarianism is a late invention divorced from the intent of the apostles and their followers, implying that the original heirs of apostolic teaching (both oral and written) were either non-Trinitarian or so proto-Trinitarian that their fetal theology was not viable outside either the womb of the New Testament or the incubator of Athanasius. Second, it downplays the role of the early fathers as the “trend-setters” who set the tone and trajectory of later Trinitarian thought. Third, it injects an uncontrollable subjective element into any historical approach to Trinitarian thought, for it is not difficult to find one’s theological preferences or emphases in later periods of the history of Trinitarian theology.

It would seem reasonable that evangelicals—who tend toward a biblical approach to theology amidst a more restrained progressivism—would naturally turn to the earliest stages of theological development to confirm their reading of Scripture. Olson and Hall warned, “We would err . . . if we passed over the post-apostolic period too quickly. For it is during these early years of the church’s life, roughly 100–150 CE, that many trinitarian questions, issues, and problems begin to bubble to the surface of the church’s thinking.”²² Therefore, to an evangelical who values Scripture, central orthodox commitments, and the Spirit-led unfolding of the theology of the Church, the writings of the early fathers seem to be an appropriate—if not necessary—collection in which to begin a search for the “traditional” and “orthodox” doctrine of intratrinitarian relationships between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

What exactly did the earliest fathers believe about subordination and the Trinity? The following paper presents the results of an exhaustive compilation, analysis, and summary of every text that mentioned intratrinitarian relationships from the fathers of the first and second centuries, followed by a conclusion and application to current debates over subordination and the Trinity.²³

SUBORDINATION AND THE TRINITY FROM DIDACHE TO IRENAEUS

*Through Jesus Your Servant: Didache (c. 50–125)*²⁴

The *Didache* adopted the Matthean formula “in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” in its section on proper baptism and thus prescribed a trinitarian formula for all new converts (*Did.* 7:1, 3). However, this baptismal formula does not clarify the particular relationships between the three persons, and the remainder of *Didache* is rather slender in this regard. The possibility

²¹ Grant, *Jesus after the Gospels*, 54–67. In summary of his findings in the apostolic fathers, Grant suggests that they were “chiefly concerned with morality, not a doctrine of Christ,” and that “there is nothing complete, shaped, logically significant about their Christologies. Each one seems to be trying to express either a personal conviction or the faith of a local church” (ibid., 58). Olson and Hall have also presented a helpful, though short, survey of the second century and conclude, “As we might expect, we do not find the developed trinitarian language or theology that will blossom from the fourth century on. We do, however, uncover evidence that early second-century writers were already noticing, analyzing, and struggling with the implications of the Hebrew scriptures, apostolic testimony, and the church’s worship in their attempt to understand God’s nature and work” (Roger E. Olson and Christopher A. Hall, *The Trinity*, ed. Iain R. Torrance, Guides to Theology [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002], 16).

²² E.g. Olson and Hall, *The Trinity*, 20.

²³ This paper includes the following writings: *Didache*, 1 Clement, Barnabas, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp, 2 Clement, Hermas, Aristides, Justin Martyr, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Melito of Sardis, Tatian, Theophilus of Antioch, Athenagoras, Epistle to Diognetus, and Irenaeus.

²⁴ Editions and translations of the apostolic fathers include Joseph A. Fischer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 8th ed., Schriften des Urchristentums 1 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981); F. X. Glimm, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers* (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1969); E. J. Goodspeed, *The Apostolic Fathers: An American Translation* (New York: Harper, 1950); Robert M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary* (New York: Nelson, 1964); Kirsop Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945); J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1885); Cyril Charles Richardson, ed., *Early Christian Fathers* (New York: Macmillan, 1970). The Greek and English translation used in this paper is Michael W. Holmes, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 2d updated ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999).

that the name “God of David” (10:6) refers to Christ as θεός is unlikely.²⁵

We find in the various prayers for Eucharistic worship a repetition of Jesus as Servant of God (παῖς).²⁶ In several passages Jesus is portrayed as the one through whom (διό) God mediates his saving knowledge and gifts of grace.²⁷ Also, God’s glory and power are “through Jesus Christ forever,” indicating either a movement toward God in worship or a demonstration of God’s power and glory through the mediation of Christ (*Did.* 10:4).

Except for the baptismal formula, the Holy Spirit is rather left in the background, though he is not proscribed to complete obscurity. The Didachist said the Holy Spirit prepares those whom God will later call (*Did.* 4:10; cf. *1 Clem.* 22:1; *Barn.* 19:7). There is also a possibility that the Spirit is in mind when he wrote, “We give you thanks, Holy Father, for your holy name which you have caused to dwell in our hearts” (*Did.* 10:2). If this is the case, all three persons of the Trinity are at work in the salvation described here.

***Summary:** In Didache, the Son as “Servant of God” is seen in a role of submission to the Father’s will, at least in the incarnation (*Did.* 9:2, 3; 10:2, 3). Though direct evidence of the essential equality of the Son and the Spirit with the Father is lacking, the echoes of Matthew’s baptismal formula may possibly indicate a presupposition of such unity (7:1, 3). Nevertheless, Didache at least provides enough evidence to show that the Son was clearly seen in a subordinate role to the Father in the incarnation.

One God, One Christ, One Spirit of Grace: 1 Clement (c. 95–97)

Clement prayed, “Let all the nations know that you are the only God,’ that Jesus Christ is your servant, and that ‘we are your people and the sheep of your pasture’” (*1 Clem.* 59:4). This statement need not be regarded as a denial of the deity of Christ in preservation of a monadic monotheism, but rather the addition of “Jesus Christ” to this “pastiche of Old Testament quotations and allusions”²⁸ appears to actually incorporate the Son into the monotheistic confession while emphasizing his role in submission to the Father.

This role of subordination is used consistently throughout *1 Clement* when expressing the relationship between the Father and the Son. In many instances Clement ascribed the primary will to God the Father, which is then put into action “through Jesus Christ” (διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, e.g. *1 Clem.* Pro) or “in Christ” (ἐν Χριστῷ, 32:4).²⁹ So, for example, Christians are “called and sanctified by the will of God through our Lord Jesus Christ,” and “chosen by God through Jesus Christ” (Pro, 50:7).

Language indicating the Son’s submission is used consistently. Thus, quoting Hebrews 1:3-4, Clement wrote, “Through him the Master has willed that we should taste immortal knowledge, for ‘he, being the radiance of his majesty, is as much superior to angels as the name he has inherited is more excellent’” (*1 Clem.* 36:2). Furthermore, the Father raised Christ from the dead (24:1) and also chose him (64:1). However, with regard to his relationship to creation, the Son is far superior (36:2). His humble state during his earthly life was not by compulsion, but by grace (16:2).

Christ is also seen as mediator of the Father’s rule. He is called “the majestic scepter of God” (*1 Clem.* 16:2), and on a few occasions he is the “Servant” (παῖς) of God,³⁰ a name also ascribed to him in the New Testament,³¹ from which *1 Clement* itself quoted extensively (*1 Clem.* 16).

Actions directed toward creation or humanity are through Christ,³² who himself is said to operate through the Holy Spirit (*1 Clem.* 22:1). Actions from creation toward God—especially worship—are

²⁵ Cf. Ben Witherington, III, *The Many Faces of the Christ: The Christologies of the New Testament and Beyond*, Companions to the New Testament, (New York: Crossroad, 1998), 229. Assuming θεός is original here (see variant readings), there is no reason to conclude that the “God of David” refers to Christ rather than to the Father, as it does in Psalm 118:25.

²⁶ *Did.* 9:2, 3; 10:2, 3; cf. *1 Clem.* 59:2, 3, 4; Acts 4:27; Isa 41:8-9; 42:1; 44:1-2; 49:6; 52:13.

²⁷ *Did.* 9:2, 3; 10:2, 3.

²⁸ Cf. Holmes, 97. He suggests Clement drew from the following passages: Num 27; Deut 32; 1 Sam 2; 1 Kings 8; 2 Kings 5, 19; Job 5; Psalm 32, 79, 95, 100, 119 (LXX 31, 78, 94, 99, 118); Isa 13; 57; Ezek 36; Judith 9; Sir 16; Eph 1.

²⁹ Cf. also *1 Clem.* 36:2; 49:6.

³⁰ *1 Clem.* 59:2; 59:3; 59:4; cf. *Did.* 9:2, 3; 10:2, 3.

³¹ Cf. Acts 4:27, reminiscent of the Servant Songs of Isaiah 41:8-9; 42:1; 44:1-2; 49:6; and 52:13.

³² *1 Clem.* Pro; 36:2; 58:2; 59:2; 59:3; 64:1.

also through Christ.³³ Thus, Christ serves as mediator between God and humans, and the Holy Spirit is seen operating among humankind in general and the Church in particular. The three persons are also mentioned together in equal terms: “Do we not have one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace which was poured out upon us” (46:6) and “For as God lives, and as the Lord Jesus Christ lives, and the Holy Spirit (who are the faith and the hope of the elect)” (58:2).³⁴

Through *1 Clement* we also catch a glimpse of the concept of the ordering of the Father and Son as a model of order within the Church—a concept developed more fully by Ignatius. In *1 Clement* 42:1 we read, “The apostles received the gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus the Christ was sent forth from God. So then Christ is from God, and the apostles are from Christ. Both, therefore, came of the will of God in good order.” This ordering extends chronologically beyond the apostles in Clement’s thinking because the leadership structure of bishops (presbyters) and deacons was established by the apostles and given “a permanent character” in the churches (44:1-6). However, for Clement the ordering of ecclesiastical structures was not explicitly tied to an eternal role in the Godhead but to the sending of the Son in the incarnation.

***Summary:** Language indicating a role of subordination is used consistently throughout *1 Clement*. The Son is seen as subordinate to the will of the Father (*1 Clem.* 32:4), and the Spirit is subordinate to both the Father and the Son. However, the Father, Son, and Spirit are kept in close association and described in exalted terms that could be understood as presupposing a unity of being (36:2; 46:6; 58:2; 59:4).

From the Riches of the Lord’s Fountain: Barnabas (c. 75–125)

Barnabas made it clear that the Son was equally involved with the Father in creation, though the Father is portrayed as taking the leading role (*Barn.* 5:5; 6:12). Also, to Barnabas the title “Son of God” indicates his divinity in distinction to his humanity.³⁵ Although he is Lord of all, Christ submitted to suffering on our behalf. In fact, by quoting Isaiah 42:6–7, Barnabas portrayed the Father commanding the Son to redeem mankind from darkness (*Barn.* 14:6). Barnabas made it clear, however, that this suffering was voluntary, not compulsory, and was, in fact, an act of grace (5:5; 7:2).

Not only is the Son at work with the Father as mediator in the preparation of those who are to believe (*Barn.* 3:6), but so is the Holy Spirit (19:7). The Spirit’s origin, though, is with the Lord as the fount (1:3), and by the same Spirit God inscribed the Law (14:2).³⁶

***Summary:** Though he is Lord of all, the Son is in a role of submission to the Father not only in the incarnation, but also in the act of creation (*Barn.* 5:5; 6:12). The Spirit comes from the Father as the “fount,” and operates in submission to his will (1:3; 14:2).

Hoisted to the Heights: Ignatius of Antioch (c. 110–117)

In the writings of Ignatius of Antioch we find some lucid Trinitarian formulae. One well-known passage is the “crane illustration” where the united activity of the three persons is illustrated. Perhaps drawing on the New Testament analogy of the Church as a temple, Ignatius said his Ephesian readers are “stones of a temple, prepared beforehand for the building of God the Father, hoisted up to the heights by the crane of Jesus Christ, which is the cross, using as a rope the Holy Spirit” (*Eph.* 9:1). The three persons are mentioned as three distinct actors in the work of salvation. God the Father appears to be the master builder or the foreman; the Son and the Spirit are both more direct actors.³⁷

³³ *1 Clem.* 20:11-12; 36:2; 58:2; 61:3; 64:1.

³⁴ Olson and Hall are correct in calling this “a striking phrase” (Olson and Hall, *The Trinity*, 17), and Kirk points to Clement (*1 Clem.* 46:6; 58:2) as one father who sets forth a Trinitarian as opposed to Binitarian concept of God (Kirk, “Evolution of the Doctrine of the Trinity,” 216).

³⁵ *Barn.* 5:9, 11; 7:2; 13:10.

³⁶ A possible interpretation of this phrase is that the whole trinity is seen as inscribing of the Law. Barnabas wrote, “And Moses received from the Lord the two tablets which were inscribed by the finger of the hand of the Lord in the Spirit” (τῷ δακτύλῳ τῆς χειρὸς κυρίου ἐν πνεύματι). It may be that the “hand of the Lord” is meant as a reference to the Son while the “finger” refers to the Spirit, concepts that will be later developed in Irenaeus (*A.H.* 3.21.10; 4.Pref.4; 4.20.1; 5.5.2; 5.6.1; 5.15.2; *Dem.* 26).

³⁷ It is no wonder that Olson and Hall call this passage Ignatius’s “most striking statement regarding the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit” (Olson and Hall, *The Trinity*, 18). Also, Kirk identifies Ignatius as one of the apostolic fathers who sets forth a Trinitarian as opposed to Binitarian concept of God (Kirk, “Evolution of the Doctrine of the Trinity,” 216).

Another clear Trinitarian passage says: “Be eager, therefore, to be firmly grounded in the precepts of the Lord and the apostles, in order that ‘in whatever you do, you may prosper,’ physically and spiritually, in faith and love, in the Son and the Father and in the Spirit (ἐν υἱῷ καὶ πατρὶ καὶ ἐν πνεύματι), in the beginning and at the end” (*Magn.* 13:1). Although the order is Son–Father–Spirit, what is particularly odd is the use of a single preposition ἐν for the Son and Father, but a second ἐν for the Spirit. This may be in keeping with the dichotomies in the immediate context: physical–spiritual, faith–love, Son/Father–Spirit, beginning–end.³⁸

Besides these clear Trinitarian passages, there are others in Ignatius emphasizing the relationships between only two persons, especially the Father and Son (*Eph.* 21:2; *Magn.* Pro). Sometimes a single attribute is shared by both Father and Son, such as one will (*Eph.* Pro) or one majesty (*Rom.* Pro). Other times the Father and Son have joint possession of something (*Phld.* 3:2), e.g., the church (*Phld.* Pro; *Smyr.* Pro) or a common love (*Phld.* 1:1).

Ignatius also affirmed what appears to be an intimate unity of Father and Son.³⁹ *Magnesians* 7:1-2 says, “Therefore as the Lord did nothing without the Father⁴⁰ either by himself or through the apostles (for he was united with him),⁴¹ so you must not do anything without the bishop and the presbyters. . . . Let all of you run together as to one temple of God, as to one altar, to one Jesus Christ, who came forth from one Father and remained with the One and returned to the One.”⁴² In 7:1 Ignatius emphasized the unity of Father and Son as a paradigm for unity in the church. However, to Ignatius unity did not mean functional equality. In the second verse he backed away from such an egalitarian understanding. In the incarnation the Son came forth from the Father, remained always with the Father, and returned to the Father. The unity of Father and Son is affirmed even amidst the assertion of the Son’s submission to the Father. That the Son ended in the same place he began is significant. Whereas one could argue that Ignatius had in mind a relationship of equality prior to the voluntary incarnation that changed at his appearance and continues in its functional role, *Magnesians* 7:2 suggests that whatever type of relationship Father and Son enjoyed prior to the incarnation, it was re-established at the return of the Son to the Father. Not only this, but with the words καὶ εἰς ἓνα ὄντα, the unity amidst the distinction is affirmed for the duration of the earthly ministry. The relationship of Father and Son is seen as follows:

Prior to Incarnation:	Father united with Son
During earthly ministry:	Father united with Son
After Ascension:	Father united with Son

Therefore, any description of functional subordination during the incarnation was consistent with the unity the Father and Son enjoyed both prior to the incarnation and after the resurrection and ascension.⁴³ Another passage discussing the Son’s relationship to the Father prior to the incarnation is *Magnesians* 6:1. Here Christ is described in the following way: “who before the ages was with the Father and appeared at the end of time.”⁴⁴

However, amidst this unity, Christ is portrayed as submitting to the Father, at the very least in the

³⁸ This is particularly interesting since some suggest that many of the apostolic fathers are Binitarian in their theology, confounding the works and persons of the Son and the Spirit. Here, on the other hand, the *Father and Son* are united and grammatically distinguished from the Spirit.

³⁹ God is described as the Father of Jesus Christ (or its equivalent) several times, and the reciprocal description of Christ as the Son of the Father is found on a number of occasions (*Eph.* 2:1; *Magn.* 3:1; *Rom.* Pro [μόνου υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ]; *Rom.* Pro).

⁴⁰ = ὡς περ οὖν ὁ κύριος ἄνευ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ἐποίησεν.

⁴¹ = ἡνωμένος ὢν. This phrase asserting that Christ was united with the Father stands on shaky textual grounds. It is not certain whether it is original to Ignatius or not.

⁴² = ἐπὶ ἓνα Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν ἀφ’ ἑνὸς πατρὸς προελθόντα καὶ εἰς ἓνα ὄντα καὶ χωρήσαντα.

⁴³ Ignatius reiterated this ontological unity of Father and Son on a number of occasions (*Magn.* 1:2; *Smyrn.* 3:3; *Rom.* 3:3).

⁴⁴ = ὃς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ πατρὶ ἦν καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφάνη.

incarnation (*Magn.* 13:2).⁴⁵ We also see this same relationship of the Son to the Father in a number of passages portraying their work together: “Stay away from the evil plants, which are not cultivated by Jesus Christ, because they are not the Father’s planting” (*Phld.* 3:1). The Father is the initial planter (φυτεῖον) while Christ is portrayed in the subsequent role of “cultivator” (γεωργεῖ). This type of relationship is also seen when Ignatius asserted that Christ is an imitator of the Father (*Phld.* 7:2).⁴⁶ Yet at the same time he did not hesitate to call Christ “God” (θεός),⁴⁷ nor shy away from ascribing to him terms of worship (*Eph.* 2:2). However, the Son is clearly distinguished from the Father in his origination,⁴⁸ placing Christ in a subordinate role of mediator. God moves toward humanity through Christ (*Magn.* Pro; 8:2; *Rom.* 8:2), and through Christ humanity approaches God (*Eph.* 4:2).

The relationship of the Spirit to the Father and Son is not always clear in Ignatius. In the miracle of the incarnation, the Son is described as originating “from the seed of David and of the Holy Spirit.”⁴⁹ Ignatius also stated that the church leaders have been “appointed by the mind of Jesus Christ, whom he, in accordance with his own will, securely established by his Holy Spirit” (*Phld.* Pro).⁵⁰ While Christ alone establishes the officials, it is the Spirit who then confirms the ordination (ἐν βεβαιωσύνῃ) by sealing, empowering or special gifting (cf. 2 Tim 1:6). Though the work itself is the same, the functions are ordered. The Son’s will is primary, while the Spirit’s role is secondary.

Though the Spirit is said to originate from the Father, he is described in personal terms: “For even though certain people wanted to deceive me, humanly speaking, nevertheless the Spirit is not deceived, because it is from God (ἀπὸ θεοῦ ὄν); for it knows from where it comes and where it is going, and exposes the hidden things” (*Phld.* 7:1).⁵¹ Since the Spirit was never incarnate, his role clarifies the functional subordination between the persons of the Godhead. One cannot dismiss the submissive role of the Spirit as a result of an incarnation as some do with the Son. The Spirit is never portrayed in the New Testament as undergoing a *kenosis* or voluntary submission. In Ignatius’s thinking the Father is the ultimate authority, the *monarchia* of the Godhead, and this relationship seems to precede and transcend the limits of the incarnation. Thus, a model of functional subordination of the Spirit to the Father (and the Son) at least in the economy of creation would seem to be consistent with Ignatian Trinitarianism.

A final and important consideration from Ignatius is his use of order in the Godhead (specifically between Father and Son) to justify and strengthen order and unity in the church. The church was to be united not by some general agreement with principles of doctrine or Spirit-led consensus of the masses.⁵² The unity of the church meant being united to the bishop.⁵³ Ignatius’s view of the Godhead

⁴⁵ Here the qualifier κατὰ σάρκα is likely a gloss and Ignatius’s words were merely “as Jesus Christ to the Father.” However, I believe the gloss accurately interprets Ignatius’s wording, since the term “Jesus Christ” may refer here to the Son’s incarnate state, not to his pre-incarnate place with the Father as the Word or Son.

⁴⁶ Cf. *Smyr.* 8:1; *Poly.* Pro.

⁴⁷ He is explicitly called θεός five times: *Eph.* Pro; 1:1 (“blood of God,” ἐν αἵματι θεοῦ); 18:2; *Rom.* Pro (2x).

⁴⁸ *Eph.* 7:2; *Magn.* 7:2; 8:2.

⁴⁹ *Eph.* 18:2—ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαυὶδ πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου. Because of the μέν . . . δέ construction, the force of the ἐκ can be seen as distributed to both σπέρματος and πνεύματος, so the origin of Jesus Christ is both human (from Mary) and divine (from the Holy Spirit).

⁵⁰ = ἀποδεδει γμένοις ἐν γνώμῃ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὓς κατὰ τὸ ἴδιον θέλημα ἐστήριξεν ἐν βεβαιωσύνῃ τῷ ἁγίῳ αὐτοῦ πνεύματι.

⁵¹ = ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ πλανᾶται, ἀπὸ θεοῦ ὄν· οἶδεν γὰρ πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει, καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἐλέηχει.

⁵² However, Volf reads into the NT—against Ignatius—his egalitarian and communitarian unity by spiritual consensus. Citing *Phld.* 8:1 and *Magn.* 6:1, he writes, “Not until the letters of Ignatius does the preservation of unity become a specific task of the bishop. Here, the συνέδριον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου (“council of the bishop”) corresponds to the ἐνότης θεοῦ (“unity of God”). The bishop is thereby in a position to preside within the church εἰς τόπον θεοῦ (“in the place of God”) and thus to ensure its unity. The New Testament itself does not yet attest this understanding. There, the unity of the church seems especially to come about through the indwelling of the *one Spirit* (and with it of the entire holy triunity) *in every person*. Accordingly, and in analogy to the Trinity, *every person* as a bearer of the Spirit participates in the constitution of unity” (Miroslav Volf, *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity*, ed. Alan G. Padgett, *Sacra Doctrina: Christian Theology for a Postmodern Age* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 219). However, Volf does not point out that Spirit-filled unity is in fact expressed in Paul’s writings through submission to the established order (*Eph.* 4:11–16; 5:18–6:9). Ignatius thus appears to be more in line with Pauline thought than Volf.

⁵³ Moltmann’s portrayal of Ignatius is exaggerated. Coming from an egalitarian perspective, Moltmann reads Ignatius in the following way: “It was at that time that Ignatius of Antioch formulated the principle of the episcopate which has remained valid in

reflected this same notion as seen in the following passages.

Ephesians 3:2. “For Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the mind of the Father, just as the bishops appointed throughout the world are in the mind of Christ.”⁵⁴ The word γνώμη is used eight times in the New Testament and is rather unique as a title for Christ. Paul asked the Corinthians to be of the same “mind” (γνώμη) (1 Cor 1:10) and he gave them his “mind” on the issue of virgins (1 Cor 7:25; cf. 7:4; 2 Cor 8:10). In Philemon the word means “consent” (Phile 14). In Revelation it means plan or purpose (Rev 17:13, 17). The word basically means not merely cognition, but active mind, firm opinion, resolve, or purposeful intent. Thus, Christ is seen as the purpose of God the Father, one in mind and purpose just as the bishops are united “in the mind of Christ.” This is similar to the thought that both the Father and the Son have the same will (*Eph. Pro*).

Ephesians 5:1. “I congratulate you who are united with him [the bishop], as the church is with Jesus Christ and as Jesus Christ is with the Father,⁵⁵ that all things might be harmonious in unity.” In Ignatius’s concept of “harmonious unity” (ἐνότητι σύμφωνα), there is distinction in rank. As the bishops are set over the Church, so also Ignatius pictures the Father set over Jesus Christ, yet all are in harmony by virtue of their one mind and will. There is no conflict in such a scheme, though there is no exact equality of function. That Ignatius had an ordinate–subordinate rather than congregational–democratic view of local church order seems rather clear.⁵⁶ It would be odd for Ignatius to draw an analogy between such church order and the order of the Godhead if he did not view the relationship between Father and Son as one of authority and submission. Pfleiderer is correct, however, when he writes, “We must not press these figures too closely; they vary considerably (in one case it is the deacons who are compared to Christ while the bishop is described as the representative of God, while in other passages he, as the head of the individual church, is paralleled with Christ as the Head of the Church universal); they are not intended to embody dogmatic or ecclesiastical definitions, but serve to commend Church-order to popular respect as a copy of the heavenly order.”⁵⁷ However, these and similar passages from Ignatius do serve to inform us of his concept of order and *monarchia* in the relationship of Father and Son, whatever else they might tell us about second century church order.

***Summary:** In Ignatius, Father, Son, and Spirit are united in their work (*Ign. Eph.* 9:1), but the Son, though clearly “God” (*Ign. Eph. Pro*; 1:1), is consistently portrayed as functioning in a role of submission to the Father in the economy of creation (*Ign. Magn.* 13:2; *Phld.* 7:2). The Spirit, too, functions in a role of submission to the Father and the Son (*Ign. Phld. Pro*).

By the Will of God through Jesus Christ: Polycarp (c. 110–117)

In his prologue Polycarp said that mercy and peace come from both the Father and the Son, but he regarded the Father as “God Almighty” (θεοῦ παντοκράτορος) while Jesus Christ is “our Savior” (*Phil. Pro*). For Polycarp the Father and the Son’s work of election is at one level indistinguishable (1:1), but at another level believers are saved by the will of God through Jesus Christ (1:3).

The Father raised Jesus from the dead, gave him glory (quoting 1 Pet 1:21) and a throne (*Phil.* 2:1, 2; 12:2). However, Polycarp also said that although Jesus is in a role subordinate to the Father, his relationship to the created realm is of unparalleled superiority. We are to love and serve God and Christ together without distinction (3:3; 5:2). A final passage begins with their united movement toward humanity and ends with humanity’s movement toward Father and Son:

many churches until the present day: one bishop – one church. He founded this Episcopal unity of the church by means of the following theological hierarchy: one God – one Christ – one bishop – one church. The bishop represents Christ to his church just as Christ represents God” (Moltmann, *Trinity and the Kingdom*, 200). However, Moltmann overlooks the call to submission to the entire Presbytery, and also the dynamic ways in which church structure is associated with divine and heavenly order.

⁵⁴ = καὶ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός . . . τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ γνώμη, ὡς καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὀρίσθέντες ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ γνώμῃ εἰσίν.

⁵⁵ = ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρί.

⁵⁶ *Eph.* 2:2; 5:3; 6:1; *Magn.* 2:1; 3:1; 3:2; 4:1; 6:1-2; 7:1; 13:2; *Tral.* 2:1-2; 3:1; 7:1-2; 13:2; *Phld. Pro*; 2:1; 3:2; 7:1; 7:2; 8:1; *Smyr.* 8:1; *Poly.* 5:1; 5:2; 6:1.

⁵⁷ Otto Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity: Its Writings and Teachings in Their Historical Connections*, trans. W. Montgomery, vol. 3 (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1910), 356.

Now may the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the eternal High Priest himself, the Son of God Jesus Christ, build you up [*aedificet*, singular] in faith and truth and in all gentleness and in all freedom from anger and forbearance and steadfastness and patient endurance and purity and may he give [*det*, singular] you a share and place among his saints, and to us with you, and to all those under heaven who will yet believe in our Lord and God Jesus Christ and in his Father who raised him from the dead.⁵⁸

***Summary:** As with Ignatius, Polycarp portrayed God and Christ as united in work but distinct in functions (*Phil.* 1:1), the Son being subject to the Father's will. In relation to one another, there is distinction and order, but in their relation to creation the divine unity is emphasized (3:3; 5:2).

Think of Christ as We Do of God: 2 Clement (c. 100–140)

Although *2 Clement* is rather short on statements regarding the relationship of Father, Son, and Spirit, we do find the assertion that believers are to regard both God and Christ without distinction (*2 Clem.* 1:1), although in the work of salvation it is God who saves “through Christ” as the mediator (3:1; 3:3; 20:5). It was, after all, God who sent the Son for this purpose (20:5).

One of the more enigmatic phrases in the apostolic fathers is *2 Clement* 14:4, where the Spirit is equated with Christ. Clement wrote, “Now if we say that the flesh is the church and the Spirit is Christ, then the one who abuses the flesh abuses the church. Consequently such a person will not receive the Spirit, which is Christ.” Was the author binitarian, regarding the Spirit as merely the resurrected Christ, or modalistic, regarding the Father, Son, and Spirit as one person in different modes at different stages in history? Olson and Hall offer up a negative appraisal: “He seems . . . to blur the distinction between Christ and the Spirit in his moral exhortations to his listeners. . . . Again, we sense an early Christian writer attempting to understand coherently the complex biblical, liturgical, and devotional testimony he had received concerning Father, Son, and Spirit. High marks on the relationship between Father and Son. Less so on the Son and Spirit.”⁵⁹ Whatever we conclude about *2 Clement* 14:4, the equating of Son and Spirit, for all its problems, indicates two things: they share the same subordinate relationship under the Father, and the Spirit is conceived of as personal and divine rather than impersonal and created.

***Summary:** In *Second Clement*, the work of the Son and Spirit is always in submission to the Father (*2 Clem.* 3:1; 3:3; 14:4). However, the Son and Father are regarded as equals in worship (*2 Clem.* 1:1) and because of the Spirit's close association with Christ, he, too, appears to be regarded as divine (*2 Clem.* 14:4).

Master, Slave, and Son: Hermas (c. A.D. 100–150)⁶⁰

The presentation of the relationships between Father, Son, and Spirit in the *Shepherd of Hermas* is extremely complex, possibly due to the redaction of several contradictory segments into the final edition of the work,⁶¹ though Henne suggests the final redactor was more or less successful in unifying the various layers into an internally coherent Christology.⁶² Yet a survey of *Hermas* does reveal the author's general conception of intratrinitarian relationships, and this section will attempt to wade through the perplexity to isolate clear assertions based on unequivocal passages.

While there are some places where the relationships between Father, Son, and Spirit are less than

⁵⁸ *Phil.* 12:2 = “Deus autem et pater domini nostri Iesu Christi et ipse sempiternus pontifex, dei filius Iesus Christus, aedificet . . . et det . . . in dominum nostrum et deum Iesum Christum et in ipsius patrem qui resuscitavit eum a mortuis.”

⁵⁹ Olson and Hall, *The Trinity*, 20.

⁶⁰ I take the writing and editing of the *Shepherd* to have extended from about A.D. 100 to 150. On the dating of this work, see Carolyn Osiek, *The Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary*, ed. Helmut Koester, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 18–20.

⁶¹ Philippe Henne, *La christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*, ed. Dirk van Damme and Otto Wermelinger, Paradosis: Etudes de littérature et de théologie anciennes (Freiburg: Editions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 1992), 149–55; Philippe Henne, *L'unité du Pasteur d'Hermas: Tradition et rédaction* (Paris: Gabalda, 1992); Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 9–10.

⁶² He writes, “Notre étude montrera que les différences en matière de christologie sont moins grandes qu'il n'y paraît à première vue,” and suggests that even the most extreme theories of redaction do not preclude a study of a unified Christology in Hermas (Henne, *La christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*, 150, 55).

explicit,⁶³ there are many more where the assertions are clear. In *Herm.* 6:8 (*Vis.* 2.2.8)⁶⁴ the Father is said to have sworn “by his Son” (κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ), a strange assertion by any measure. The author of Hebrews makes the point that God swears by himself (καθ’ ἑαυτοῦ) “since He could swear by no one greater” (Heb 6:13, NASB), drawing on the general principle that “men swear by one greater [than themselves]” (ἄνθρωποι γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ μείζονος ὁμνύουσιν) (Heb 6:16). It is doubtful that the author of *Hermas* had this passage or principle in mind, intending to imply that the Son is greater than the Father, but the very strangeness of the phrase implies a high Christology in the mind of the author and may imply a relationship of equality, either ontological or functional, or both.⁶⁵

The “Son of God” is given that particular name numerous times in *Hermas*.⁶⁶ Clearly portrayed as preexisting,⁶⁷ he functions at times in a role of cooperation with the Father, though the Father’s will is primary (59:7 [*Sim.* 5.6.7]; 89:2 [*Sim.* 9.12.2]). Thus, the Son functions in submission to the Father’s will (69:2 [*Sim.* 8.3.2]) and in return the Son is loved by the Father (89:5 [*Sim.* 9.12.5]).

In one passage of Christological importance,⁶⁸ the parable of the field, slave, and son, the “slave” in the vision is interpreted as the Son of God in reality, while the “son” of the vision is interpreted as the Holy Spirit. Commentators have expressed shock at this strange mixing of metaphors,⁶⁹ beginning with *Hermas* himself: “‘Why, sir,’ I said, ‘is the Son of God presented in the parable in the guise of a slave?’” (58:5 [*Sim.* 5.5.5]). Numerous attempts have been made to sort out this knot, but the most satisfactory explanation seems to be that the parabolic vision is presenting Christ in earthly ministry as a model of faithfulness. The *persons* of the Son and Holy Spirit are not equated,⁷⁰ but their normal roles seem to be reversed. This is not a sub-orthodox Christology, for these descriptions are actually consistent with the roles of the Son and Spirit in the earthly ministry of Christ presented in the canonical Gospels.⁷¹

As we see in both the New Testament and other first and second century Christian literature, in *Hermas* the Father operates in the economy of creation through the personal mediation of his Son. While God sent commandments through his Son (*Herm.* 58:3 [*Sim.* 5.5.3]), the Son’s power and authority are consistently presented as coming from the Father (59:4 [*Sim.* 5.6.4]), and it was God who gave the Son those who are part of his new creation (59:3 [*Sim.* 5.6.3]).

In the direction of humanity toward God, *Hermas*’s descriptions are similar to those of earlier

⁶³ These include the hymn of *Herm.* 3:4 (*Vis.* 1.3.4): “Behold, the God of hosts, who by his invisible and mighty power and by his great wisdom created the world (ὁ ἁωράτω δυνάμει καὶ κραταῖα καὶ τῇ μεγάλῃ συνέσει αὐτοῦ κτίσας τὸν κόσμον), and by his glorious purpose clothed his creation with beauty, and by his mighty word fixed the heaven and set the earth’s foundations upon the waters (καὶ τῷ ἰσχυρῷ ῥήματι πῆξας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ θεμελιώσας τὴν γῆν ἐπὶ ὑδάτων), and by his own wisdom and providence created his holy church (καὶ τῇ ἰδίᾳ σοφίᾳ καὶ προνοίᾳ κτίσας τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν αὐτοῦ), which he also blessed.” Although by no means clear, it may be that this passage refers to the creation by God through the means mediators, not simply in conformity to the Father’s power and character. Certain terms are used with reference to the Son and Spirit in other Christian literature at approximately the same period. “Mighty power,” “great wisdom,” “glorious purpose,” “mighty word,” and “wisdom” are terms often applied to the Son and the Spirit. However, this passage cannot be taken as primary evidence of the relationships between Father, Son, and Spirit in *Hermas* itself.

⁶⁴ For references in *Hermas*, I have given the consecutive numbering system along with the traditional system in parentheses.

⁶⁵ Martin Dibelius, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament; Die Apostolischen Väter 4 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1923), 448; Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 56.

⁶⁶ *Herm.* 58:2 (*Sim.* 5.5.2); 58:5 (5.5.5); 59:1 (5.6.1); 69:2 (8.3.2); 89:1 (9.12.1); 89:2 (9.12.2); 89:6 (9.12.6); 89:8 (9.12.8); 90:2 (9.13.2); 90:3 (9.13.3); 90:7 (9.13.7); 91:5 (9.14.5) (3x); 92:2 (9.15.2); 92:4 (9.15.4); 93:3 (9.16.3) (2x); 93:5 (9.16.5) (2x); 93:7 (9.16.7); 94:1 (9.17.1); 94:4 (9.17.1); 101:4 (9.24.4); 105:3 (9.28.3).

⁶⁷ *Herm.* 89:2 (*Sim.* 9.12.2) states: “The Son of God is far older than all his creation (ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ προγενέστερός ἐστιν), with the result that he was the Father’s counselor in his creation (ὥστε σύμβουλον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι τῷ πατρὶ τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ).” However, Osiek rightly points out a caveat here: “The preexistence of the Son is clearly stated in v. 2, but he is in good company: previously the church and the great angel are also said to be preexistent,” for which she cites *Vis.* 2.4.1 and 3.4.1 (Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 233).

⁶⁸ Henne, *La christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d’Hermas*, 157. Henne writes, “La Cinquième Similitude est une des pièces les plus célèbres de toute la littérature patristique du deuxième siècle.”

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*; Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 177.

⁷⁰ Henne writes, “Ici, il n’y a pas didentification «essentielle», mais elle est purement allégorique: le rôle joué par l’Esprit Saint est le même que celui joué par le fils dans la parabole. . . . En effet, en HSim V, 5, 2, il s’agit d’une interprétation allégorique, qui ne préjuge en rien de la nature du Fils de Dieu.” (Henne, *La christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d’Hermas*, 189, 90).

⁷¹ Matt 3:16 (=Mark 1:10; Luke 3:22; John 1:32); Matt 4:1 (=Luke 4:1); Matt 12:18, 28; Luke 4:14, 18; 10:21.

writers. Christians are called through the Son (77:1 [*Sim.* 8.11.1]), believe in God through the Son (90:5 [*Sim.* 9.13.5]), and enter the Kingdom by means of his Son (89:3 [*Sim.* 9.12.3]; 89:4-6 [*Sim.* 9.12.4-6]). In fact, even angels cannot enter the presence of God without the Son (89:8 [*Sim.* 9.12.8]).⁷²

The appellation “Spirit of God” (*Herm.* 41:6 [*Man.* 10.2.6]) may indicate his origin from the Father, a notion that is spelled out explicitly in 43:17 (*Man.* 11.17),⁷³ though this origination elsewhere is clearly limited to his role in the economy of creation.⁷⁴ He is also repeatedly called the “divine Spirit” (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ θεῖον) or “Spirit of the Deity” (τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς θεότητος) in a context pointing to the Spirit’s origin (*Herm.* 43 [*Man.* 11]). Perhaps the most stunning and exalted attribution to the Spirit is when he is portrayed as directly creating the universe, an act that is elsewhere reserved for the Father who acts through the personal mediation of the Son and Spirit: “The preexistent Holy Spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ προόν), which created the whole creation (τὸ κτίσαν πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν).” The Spirit functions at other times in a role of cooperation with the Father, though by his primary will (59:4 [*Sim.* 5.6.4]).⁷⁵ By far, though, the Spirit’s relationship to the Father is seen as one of personal mediating agent under his will and direction,⁷⁶ and the Father acts toward creation through his Spirit (78:2 [*Sim.* 9.1.2])

As mentioned earlier, the Spirit’s role appears to be above the Son in the incarnation. In the much-debated *Fifth Similitude*, the “slave” is identified as the Son of God in his earthly ministry while the “son” in the parable is identified with the Spirit.⁷⁷ We have mentioned, however, that this ordering during Christ’s ministry is consistent with the Gospels’ relationship between the Son and the Spirit.

In the *Ninth Similitude*, we find newer and more puzzling assertions regarding the Spirit. The angel of repentance told Hermas, “I want to explain to you what the Holy Spirit, which spoke with you in the form of the Church, showed you; for that Spirit is the Son of God” (78:1 [*Sim.* 9.1.1]).⁷⁸ Osiek writes:

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. Rather here, a deeper meaning is assigned to the apparition of the woman, beyond that of church. Just as the incarnate Son is “the perfect dwelling of the Holy Spirit in flesh,” so the church is the “perfect dwelling of the Spirit” in the human community. The fact that this new meaning comes only here is typical of the additive style of the author, whereby new meanings are given to old images almost as an after-thought.⁷⁹

Whatever the author was asserting, we can be certain that he was not ontologically equating the persons of the Spirit, the woman of the earlier visions, the Church, and the Son of God. Henne even urges that in many places the phrase “holy spirit” is not to be taken as the third person of the Trinity, but in a non-technical sense, as in the vision of the twelve virgins, who are symbols of twelve “holy spirits” of God. These are personifications of the moral effects or virtues of the Spirit, like Paul’s “fruit of the Spirit”

⁷² Whether the Son of God is the same as the “glorious angel” or “most venerable angel” introduced in *Herm.* 25:2 (*Vis.* 5.2), mentioned repeatedly throughout the work (*Man.* 5.1.7; *Sim.* 7.1-3; 9.1.3), and perhaps called “Michael” in *Sim.* 8.3.3, is complex and not free from debate. Since this paper is not specifically on Christology, I cannot settle this issue here. For discussions on this issue, see S. Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs: Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963), 227-28; Henne, *La christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*, 234-43; Halvor Moxnes, “God and His Angel in the Shepherd of Hermas,” in *Early Christianity and Judaism*, ed. Everett Ferguson, *Studies in Early Christianity: A Collection of Scholarly Essays* (New York: Garland, 1993), 49-56; Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 34-35.

⁷³ πνεύματι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. Two other passages may communicate this same sense, though it is uncertain whether they refer to the Father or Son (101:4 [*Sim.* 9.24.4]; 109:4 [*Sim.* 9.32.4] cf. *Herm.* 28:2 [*Man.* 3.2]).

⁷⁴ *Herm.* 43:21 (*Man.* 11.21) refers to “the divine Spirit that comes from above” (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ θεῖον ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενον).

⁷⁵ There are several passages in book of *Mandates* that could be referring to the Holy Spirit, but may also be understood as anthropomorphisms of personifications of Christian virtues (*Herm.* 28:1-2 [*Man.* 3.1-2]; 33:2-3 (5.1.2-3); 41:5 [*Man.* 10.2.5]). See Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 107, 119.

⁷⁶ *Herm.* 59:5 (*Sim.* 5.6.5); 72:1 (*Sim.* 8.6.1); 109:4 (*Sim.* 9.32.4) cf. 28:2 (*Man.* 3.2). Another debatable reference includes *Herm.* 41:5 (*Man.* 10.2.5), where it seems on the surface that the Holy Spirit is in view, but a reading of the preceding context forces one to doubt this understanding.

⁷⁷ *Herm.* 58:2 (*Sim.* 5.5.2).

⁷⁸ Θέλω σοι δεῖξαι ὅσα σοὶ ἔδειξε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ λαλήσαν μετὰ σοῦ ἐν μορφῇ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας· ἐκεῖνο γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν.

⁷⁹ Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 212.

(Gal 5:22-23; cf. *Herm.* 90:2-5 [*Sim.* 9.13.2-5]). Thus, Henne concludes (and I am inclined to agree):

Nous avons pu établir que la *Neuvième Similitude* ne parlait pas d'un esprit doué d'une volonté et d'un agir propres. De plus, l'expression «esprit saint» ne désigne par un esprit particulier, supérieur aux autres. Enfin, l'esprit préexistant dont parle la *Cinquième Similitude*, ne remplit pas la même fonction dans la création que le Fils de Dieu dans la *Neuvième Similitude* et ne saurait être confondu avec Lui.

L'Esprit Saint identifié au Fils de Dieu ne peut donc être une réalité divine indépendante. Le terme «esprit» désigne la présence active d'une réalité céleste dans la «figure» de l'Eglise. L'identification au Fils de Dieu est d'ordre fonctionnelle et non ontologique.⁸⁰

Even if Henne is correct that the association of “Son” and “Spirit” is “d'ordre fonctionnelle” rather than “ontologique,” the uncertainty of this matter places these passages on the fringe of this present study, which seeks to determine the intratrinitarian relationships based on clear passages.

***Summary:** In *Hermas*, the Father operates in the economy of creation through the personal mediation of his Son, who submits to the Father's will (*Herm.* 58:3 [*Sim.* 5.5.2]; 90:5 [*Sim.* 9.13.5]). The “divine” Holy Spirit also operates in submission to the Father (43:17 [*Man.* 11.17]), but during Christ's earthly ministry we catch a glimpse of the Spirit apparently operating in authority over the Son (58:5 [*Sim.* 5.5.5]).

God Came Down: Aristides (c. 125)⁸¹

The *Apology* of Aristides offers very little to a study of the interpersonal relationships between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the Godhead. There are only two passages relevant to this discussion: *Apol.* 15 (Syriac, 2) and 17. As this is the extent of our primary data, I will discuss each of these in turn.

According to the Syriac version, Aristides wrote in *Apol.* 2.4, “The Christians, then, reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ, who is named the Son of God most High (ܐܒܢܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ); and it is said that God came down from heaven (ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ) and from a Hebrew virgin took and clad Himself with flesh, and in a daughter of man there dwelt the Son of God (ܐܒܢܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ).” It is clear from this passage that Jesus Christ is called “Son of God,” as this title appears once in both the Syriac and Greek versions (ܐܒܢܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ = ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ). In this case all that is asserted is a relationship of sonship, though the context of this relationship clearly indicates a heavenly—not earthly—origin. However, the most striking phrase, “God came down from heaven” (ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ) is different in the Greek (where the passage is found in 15.1), which reads either “he came down from heaven by the Holy Spirit” (ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς) or, if the punctuation is altered, “who is named the Son of God Most High by the Holy Spirit.”⁸² Robinson writes on the textual difficulties of this passage: “The most serious change is that in the Syriac, where the word ‘God’ is inserted as the subject of the verbs which follow. The passage is one which was more likely than any other in the whole piece to tempt later writers to make changes of their own. It is to be noted that here the Greek in spite of its additions represents the original *Apology* much more faithfully than the Syriac does.”⁸³ If the Greek version is correct, we have the Holy Spirit acting in some way in the incarnation of the Son of God; if

⁸⁰ Henne, *La christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*, 254.

⁸¹ Greek and Syriac texts are from Bernard Pouderon and others, *Aristide: Apologie*, Sources Chrétiennes (Paris: Cerf, 2003). The English translation is that of J. Rendel Harris, ed., *The Apology of Aristides on Behalf of the Christians*, ed. J. Armitage Robinson, 2d ed., Texts and Studies, vol. 1/1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893). The date of Aristides's *Apology*, though not certain, is most likely 124–125, though Pouderon writes, “même si nous ne rejetons pas entièrement l'hypothèse d'une seconde rédaction contemporaine du principat d'Antonin (138-161)” (Pouderon, *Aristide: Apologie*, 37).

⁸² This latter punctuation is followed by Pouderon, *Aristide: Apologie*, 286-87: “On reconnaît en lui le Fils du Dieu Très-Haut dans le Saint-Esprit; descendu du ciel pour le salut des hommes et engendré d'une vierge sainte.”

⁸³ Harris, ed., *Apology of Aristides*, 79. Since both the Greek and Armenian versions agree against the Syriac in omitting “God” as the subject of the descent from heaven, I will conclude that the Greek reading (or something like it) was the original penned by Aristides (for the Armenian text and French translation, see Pouderon, *Aristide: Apologie*, 310-11). It is suggested that the Syriac and Armenian versions had a common Greek source, while the Greek version preserved in the Oxyrhynchus papyri had a tradition independent of the others, rendering an agreement between the Greek and Armenian versions rather significant, despite the high regard for the version preserved in the Syriac as a whole (Pouderon, *Aristide: Apologie*, 143-72).

the Syriac is correct, we have an instance where the Son of God is himself called “God.” Either assertion is consistent with other statements from approximately the same time as Aristides’s writing.

Aristides concluded his *Apology* with the following call to repentance: “Let all those then approach thereunto who do not know God, and let them receive incorruptible words, those which are so always and from eternity: let them, therefore, anticipate the dread judgment which is to come by Jesus the Messiah (ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ) upon the whole race of men” (*Apol.* 17.3). Unfortunately, this last phrase is missing from the Greek version. If it is authentic, then we see here another example of God exercising his judgment on the world by means of (ܝܫܘܥ)⁸⁴ Jesus Christ.

***Summary:** If we follow the Syriac version of Aristides, we are told that Christ—who is explicitly called “God”—is the Son of the Most High God who came down from heaven to become incarnate (*Apol.* 2.4), and who operates in submission to the Father’s will (17.3). If we follow the Greek and Armenian versions, however, Christ is still called “Son of the Most High God,” but comes down from heaven “by the Holy Spirit.” In any case, the Son and the Spirit are seen functioning in submission to the Father.

Second Place and Third Rank: Justin Martyr (c. 150-160)⁸⁵

An understanding of Justin’s concept of Christ begins with his view of God the Father,⁸⁶ illustrated for us in *Dialogue with Trypho* 127.1-3:

You should not imagine that the Unbegotten God himself went down or went up from any place. For, the ineffable Father and Lord of all neither comes to any place, nor walks, nor sleeps, nor arises, but always remains in his place, wherever it may be, acutely seeing and hearing, not with eyes or ears, but with a power beyond description. Yet he surveys all things, knows all things, and none of us has escaped his notice. Nor is he moved who cannot be contained in any place, not even in the whole universe, for he existed even before the universe was created. How, then, could he converse with anyone, or be seen by anyone, or appear in the smallest place of the world?

Justin’s answer to this philosophical dilemma was not to remove these attributes of transcendence from God, but to complement them with the mediation of “another God”—God the Son—who reveals all that the Father is. Continuing in that same chapter (*Dial.* 127:4-5), Justin wrote:

Thus, neither Abraham, nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any other man saw the Father and ineffable Lord of all creatures and of Christ himself, but [they saw] him who, according to God’s will, is God the Son, and his angel because of his serving the Father’s will; him who, by his will, became man through a virgin; who also became fire when he talked to Moses from the bush. Unless we understand the Scriptures in this manner, we would have to conclude that the Father and Lord of all was not in heaven when what Moses thus described took place.

⁸⁴ The ܐ (*d-*) prefixed to the preposition ܠ is a relative pronoun referring to the coming judgment.

⁸⁵ Although there are several extant writings falsely attributed to Justin, the writings generally regarded as authentic today are *Apology* and *2 Apology* (though these actually comprise two parts of one work) and *Dialogue with Trypho* (Craig D. Allert, *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, vol. 64 [Leiden: Brill, 2002], 32). The English translation used for the *Apologies* is Leslie W. Barnard, ed., *St. Justin Martyr: The First and Second Apologies*, Ancient Christian Writers, vol. 56 (New York: Paulist, 1997). The Greek text of *Apologies* is Miroslav Marcovich, ed., *Iustini Martyris Apologiae pro Christianis*, ed. Kurt Aland and E. Mühlenberg, Patristische Texte und Studien, vol. 38 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994). For *Dialogue*, the English translation is Thomas B. Falls, Michael Slusser, and Thomas P. Halton, eds., *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*, Selections from the Fathers of the Church (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2003). The Greek text for this work is from Miroslav Marcovich, ed., *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone*, ed. H. Christian Brennecke and E. Mühlenberg, Patristische Texte und Studien, vol. 47 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997).

⁸⁶ I part ways with Barnard when he states, “Justin’s starting point is that the logos is the personal reason of God in which all men partake” (Leslie W. Barnard, *Athenagoras: A Study in Second Century Christian Apologetic*, Théologie historique, vol. 18 [Paris: Beauchesne, 1972], 95. Goodenough rightly urges that Christianity did not begin with philosophical speculation, but with a religious experience of Jesus Christ, Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr: An Investigation into the Conceptions of Early Christian Literature and Its Hellenistic and Judaistic Influences*, reprint ed. (Amsterdam: Philo, 1968), 140. Given Justin’s self-confessed philosophical background in his pursuit of true philosophy (*Dial.* 1–8), it seems most likely that his speculation about the Logos and Christ as the immanent representative of the Godhead leaned heavily on his philosophical and theological notion of the transcendent God (cf. Allert, *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation*, 79-84).

This entire section is important in that it demonstrates Justin's concern to preserve God's transcendence while asserting the possibility of a relationship with God.⁸⁷ This may be (and has been) regarded as a product of Middle Platonic, Philonic, or Hellenistic Jewish influences,⁸⁸ but this concept of a transcendent God is also suggested in both the Old and New Testaments,⁸⁹ especially in John's Gospel.⁹⁰ The function of the Son, then, is to act as mediator not merely in salvation, but in all interaction between God and his creation.⁹¹ Thus, we begin with Justin's concept of God the Father as the highest being (*Dial.* 56.4; 56.11; 60.5), the "begetter of all things" (*1 Apol.* 13.4).⁹² Yet the gulf between transcendence and immanence is bridged by the Son of God (*1 Apol.* 63.15),⁹³ who himself is described as "proceeding"⁹⁴ (*Dial.* 100.4) or "begotten"⁹⁵ from God by his will.⁹⁶ In this sense he is called the "Son" of God,⁹⁷ who was previously "with the Father"⁹⁸ (*2 Apol.* 6.3), even conferring with him prior to creation (*Dial.* 62.4).⁹⁹

For Justin, as with his predecessors and contemporaries "Father" and "Son" imply an ordered relationship. While he clearly presented the Son as with the Father at creation (*Dial.* 62.3-4), Justin indicated that the roles in the Godhead were distinct and used terms of mediation with regard to the planning and execution of creation. Not only did God conceive of and make the world through (διὰ) the Logos (*1 Apol.* 64.5),¹⁰⁰ he also ordered all things through him (*2 Apol.* 6.3; *Dial.* 84.2).

⁸⁷ Goodenough writes, "Justin's object in securing the remote location of God is thus twofold, he is trying to impress his readers with God's transcendence, but particularly with a view to the impossibility of God's being able to appear in theophanies" (Goodenough, *Theology of Justin Martyr*, 126). At the same time Justin struggled with the need to present Jesus as "God with us."

⁸⁸ Discussion of the influences of Greek philosophy on Justin's thought is beyond the scope of this paper. For a critical history of the debate see Charles Nahm, "The Debate on the Platonism of Justin Martyr," *Second Century* 9, no. 3 (1992): 129-51. In short, my own view is similar to what Nahm describes as a "partial assimilation with a critical reserve" of Middle Platonic language and categories (Nahm, "Debate on the Platonism of Justin Martyr," 150).

⁸⁹ See M. J. Edwards, "Justin's Logos and the Word of God," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3, (1995): 261-80.

⁹⁰ John 1:18 states, "No man has seen God at any time; the only begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him" (Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο).

⁹¹ Cf. Gerald O'Collins, *Christology: A Biblical, Historical, and Systematic Study of Jesus Christ* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1995), 170-171.

⁹² = γεννήτορα τῶν πάντων.

⁹³ One passage also calls the Son the "offspring" (γέννημα) of God (*Dial.* 62.4).

⁹⁴ = προέρχομαι.

⁹⁵ = γεννάω. In one place Justin uses the uncouth πρῶτοτόκος for Christ (*1 Apol.* 58.3), a Philonic term with more philosophical affinities than the biblical πρῶτότοκος, which Justin favors for just that reason (*1 Apol.* 23.21; 46.2; 53.2; 63.15; *Dial.* 100.2; 116.3; *Dial.* 125.3). Justin favors the biblical term πρῶτότοκος ("first-born"), on several occasions independent of direct quotations from the Colossian hymn (*1 Apol.* 23.2; 33.6; 46.2; 53.2; 63.15; *Dial.* 100.2; 116.3; 125.3).

⁹⁶ *1 Apol.* 12.7; 21.1; 22.2; 23.21; *2 Apol.* 6.3; *Dial.* 34.2; 61.1, 3; 62.4; 105.1; 128.4; cf. Justin, *Against Marcion*, in Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 4.6.2. Only in *Dial.* 64.1 is the Son said to have been "created" by God (ποιήσαντος), but this comes from the mouth of Trypho, not Justin. This Creator-creature relationship between Father and Son is not used by Justin, who avoided using the term with regard to Christ. It is often assumed that Justin conceived of the Son (Logos) as having a definite point of origin by procession, generation, or emanation from the very being of the Father sometime prior to creation (Barnard, *Athenagoras*, 95; Goodenough, *Theology of Justin Martyr*, 153-55; Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, trans. J. S. Bowden (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965), 130). However, the actual evidence supporting this is unclear and, as Goodenough points out, "Justin has apparently made no attempt to speculate about events in the timeless eternity which lay behind creation" (Goodenough, *Theology of Justin Martyr*, 154-55). Justin did not advance a theory of "eternal generation" (though he did not deny it); nor did he suggest a creation *ex nihilo*. Rather, whatever the timing of the Son's generation (if one can speak of "timing" in an eternity without creation), it is a generation *ex deo*.

⁹⁷ Christ is called "Son of God," "his Son," or simply "Son" quite frequently in Justin: *1 Apol.* 12.9; 13.3; 14.1; 22.1 (2x); 30.1; 31.7; 32.9; 40.7; 54.7 (2x); 58.1; 63.4, 10, 14; *2 Apol.* 6.3 (2x); *Dial.* 7.3; 23.3; 43.1; 45.4; 48.2; 85.2; 100.4(2x); 100.5; 102.7; 103.8; 108.2; 113.4; 115.4; 116.2; 117.3; 118.2; 126.1, 2; 128.1; 132.1; 137.2.

⁹⁸ = πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων [καὶ] συνῶν.

⁹⁹ Witherington suggests that "for Justin the *logos* was defined impersonally before the incarnation as the Father's rational thought or intelligence, which became personal only when the *logos* took on human flesh" (Witherington, *The Many Faces of Christ*, 236). Since it is clear that Justin believed the Logos was a personal mediator of the Father prior to the incarnation, as this paper shows, Witherington's comments indicate a misreading of Justin's Christology.

¹⁰⁰ = ἐπειδὴ ἐννοηθέντα τὸν θεὸν διὰ λόγου τὸν κόσμον ποιῆσαι. It is interesting that not only is the act of creation itself executed from the Father and through the Logos, but Justin said the pre-creative conceptualizing itself followed the same order. Similarly in *1 Apol.* 59.5, Justin employed a dative of agency to convey the mediating role of the Logos in creation since the

Justin also asserted that between the creation and incarnation, the Son submitted to the will of the Father: “I have proved that it was Jesus who appeared to and talked with Moses, Abraham, and, in short, with all the patriarchs, doing the will of the Father” (*Dial.* 113.4). Accordingly, it was the Son who was sent by the Father to judge Sodom (*Dial.* 56.23; 60.2); indeed, he appeared in whatever forms the Father willed (128.2). The Son thus delivered messages to mankind according to the Father’s will as the Angel of the Lord (56.10; 128.2; 140.4), and Justin even said he served or ministered to the Father in the economy of creation prior to the incarnation.¹⁰¹ It is in this connection that Justin described the Son as occupying the second place (ἐν δευτέρῳ χώρῳ) to God in rule and power.¹⁰² Yet as Word, Wisdom, Power, and Glory of God (61.3) the Son is the object of Christian worship (2 *Apol.* 13.4).

In the incarnation, the submission of the Son to the Father is in harmony with his role prior to the incarnation. The Son was sent by the Father,¹⁰³ conceived by the power of God (1 *Apol.* 32.14; *Dial.* 63.3), and became incarnate and was born of a virgin by the will of the Father.¹⁰⁴

During his earthly ministry Christ did nothing by his own will or power (*Dial.* 101.1), but did all things according to the will of the Father (56.11; 60.2) in order that he might please God (92.6). Christ submitted to the Law of Moses perfectly according to the plan and purpose of the Father (67.6), and it is through (διό) Christ that God taught Christians.¹⁰⁵ On numerous occasions the incarnate Son is called “the Christ of God” or simply “His Christ.”¹⁰⁶ Likewise, the passion occurred precisely as planned and decreed by God. Christ not only suffered,¹⁰⁷ but also died by according to God’s will.¹⁰⁸ And God intervened to save the Son (101.1; 102.7), miraculously raising him from the dead.¹⁰⁹ In this manner the Father’s plan of redemption was fulfilled by Christ (103.3).

For Justin, this same ordered relationship between Father and Son endures after Christ’s resurrection and glorification. In fact, it was the Father who brought Christ to heaven (1 *Apol.* 45.1; *Dial.* 32.3; 85.4) and bestowed upon him power, authority, titles, and offices,¹¹⁰ so that God is said to have subdued all Christ’s enemies under him (1 *Apol.* 40.7). In this way God gives glory only to Christ (*Dial.* 65.3).

In his present session at the right hand of the Father, Christ is portrayed as having been endowed by God with the power both to save and to judge (*Dial.* 100.6; 116.1). The Father grants all of the Son’s requests (106.1) and the Son offers up all things to the Father, whom he reveres (*Dial.* 98.1). At the end of the age God will destroy his enemies through Christ,¹¹¹ and through the Son he will raise believers and renew creation (46.7; 113.4). Therefore, Justin presented the Son as second in rank to the Father in the economy of creation, incarnation, and even the present and future ages.

Yet amidst this clear and consistent portrayal of the Son’s submission to the will of the Father, there are many indications of the Son’s equality with God. Justin repeatedly called Christ “God”¹¹² and “another God” besides the Father,¹¹³ urging that he should be worshipped (1 *Apol.* 13.3; *Dial.* 68.9). In other passages Justin described the Father and Son as sharing authority (1 *Apol.* 40.7), being worshipped

preceding context has God (the Father) as the ultimate agent of creation (see Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996], 162-66).

¹⁰¹ *Dial.* 58.3; 60.2; 60.5; 61.1; 125.3 126.5.

¹⁰² 1 *Apol.* 12.7; 13.3-4; 32.9; 60.5-7.

¹⁰³ 1 *Apol.* 12.9; 63.5; *Dial.* 7.3; 16.4; 91.4; 126.6; 128.2; 136.3; 139.4; 140.4.

¹⁰⁴ 1 *Apol.* 63.10, 16; 2 *Apol.* 6.5; *Dial.* 23.3; 48.3; 63.1; 75.4; 76.1, 7; 84.2; 87.2; cf. Justin, *Against Marcion*, cited in Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 4.6.2.

¹⁰⁵ 1 *Apol.* 19.8; 2 *Apol.* 9.2; *Dial.* 76.3; *Dial.* 105.5.

¹⁰⁶ *Dial.* 8.2; 39.5; 42.1; 46.1, 7; 47.3; 48.2, 3; 56.15; 65.3; 94.5; 133.1; 136.3; 142.2, 3.

¹⁰⁷ *Dial.* 41.1; 95.2, 3; 102.5; 103.8.

¹⁰⁸ *Dial.* 63.2; 91.4; 95.2; 102.2.

¹⁰⁹ 1 *Apol.* 45.1; *Dial.* 32.3; 95.2; 100.1; 106.1.

¹¹⁰ *Dial.* 30.3; 46.1; 74.3; 85.1; 86.3; 92.6; 96.1; 118.2; 126.5.

¹¹¹ *Dial.* 41.1; 58.1; 60.2; 131.5.

¹¹² 1 *Apol.* 63.15; *Dial.* 34.2; 48.1; 48.2; 56.1, 4, 10, 11, 15; 58.3; 60.2, 5; 61.1, 3; 68.3, 9; 71.2; 73.2; 75.4; 87.2; 113.4; 115.4; 125.3; 126.1, 2, 5, 6; 128.1, 4. Whether Justin meant to distinguish between θεός and ὁ θεός is interesting to Christology, but only mildly relevant to this current study which places less emphasis on names and titles and more on interpersonal relationships within the Godhead (however, see the brief discussion in Goodenough, *Theology of Justin Martyr*, 157-59).

¹¹³ We see this appellation both in the words of Trypho (*Dial.* 50.1; 55.1) and of Justin (*Dial.* 56.4), though it was by no means Justin’s preferred mode of thought or expression of the relationship between Father and Son.

and honored together (*Dial.* 39.5; 68.3), sharing glory and grace (42.1), exercising mercy toward mankind (133.1), and planting the people of God together (110.4). Justin also described actions that are either directed toward or affect Father and Son equally. Demons attempt to snatch believers from both (*I Apol.* 58.3). Humans are said to either know or be ignorant of both Father and Son.¹¹⁴ And those who hate or blaspheme Christ also hate and blaspheme God (*Dial.* 35.5; 136.3).

However, amidst these assertions of apparent unity, Justin emphasized the distinction between Father and Son. He used the famous illustration of the generation of the Son as a new flame enkindled from a primary flame—neither is less than the other and both have equality of essence and brilliance. However, the second flame is just that—second (*Dial.* 61.2). Though the Son is equal to the Father in some essential way, he is no mere contingent emanation as light from the flame (128.3). Whatever we can say about the unity of God in Justin, he made it clear that the Son is not the Father.¹¹⁵

In God's relationship with believers, Christ is also seen as fulfilling the role of mediator both in the direction of humanity toward God and God toward humanity. Justin described Christians as coming to God through Christ,¹¹⁶ and as loving, worshipping, glorifying, and serving the Father through the Son.¹¹⁷ In the direction of God toward humanity, Justin said Christians are called and regenerated by God through Christ (*I Apol.* 61.1; *Dial.* 131.2), blessings are given through Christ (*Dial.* 96.2), the Spirit is sent by God through Christ (116.1), and therefore Christian virtues are imparted from the Father through the Son (110.3). In the eschaton God will also raise believers through Christ (46.7).

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Justin, as in the apostolic fathers and other second century apologists, is less developed. It is clear that Justin distinguished between Father, Son, and Spirit,¹¹⁸ though the distinction between the Spirit and the Word is sometimes blurred—at least at the level of terms and function. In one classic example πνεῦμα is actually identified with the Son. Justin wrote, “The Spirit and the Power from God cannot therefore be understood as anything else than the Word, who is also the First-begotten of God¹¹⁹ . . . and it was this which, when it came upon the virgin and overshadowed her, caused her to conceive not by intercourse, but by power” (*I Apol.* 33.6). On this passage Barnard writes: “This seems decisive proof, at least on the surface, that for Justin Spirit and logos were two names for the same person. However, in Justin's theory of the Incarnation the coming down of the logos and entry into the womb of Mary was central. As however the traditional account spoke of the Spirit and Power Justin was forced to identify them as regards function.”¹²⁰ However, Goodenough, drawing on the broader history of debate on this passage, presents us with a better understanding: “Justin has been speaking of the δύναμις καὶ πνεῦμα which Luke records overpowered Mary with his glory as the result of which she became pregnant. . . . Accordingly Justin insists that the Spirit and Power mentioned in the traditional account of the Incarnation was the Logos. Since the Logos was of course a Spirit and a Power of God, such an identification was perfectly legitimate, and in no way effects the fact that Justin might have believed in another Spirit which was properly *the* Spirit.”¹²¹

¹¹⁴ *I Apol.* 63.31; 63.14; *Dial.* 28.4; 136.3.

¹¹⁵ *I Apol.* 63.15; *Dial.* 56.11; 61.2; 128.4; 129.1-3.

¹¹⁶ *I Apol.* 49.5; *Dial.* 11.5; 17.1; 30.3; 34.7; 43.2; 83.4; 92.4; 116.3; 125.5; 131.2; 133.6.

¹¹⁷ *I Apol.* 14.1; *Dial.* 29.1; 30.3; 110.4; 114.4; 117.5.

¹¹⁸ The persons of the Trinity are mentioned in association with Christian worship in *I Apol.* 6.2; 61.3, 10-13; 65.3; 67.2.

¹¹⁹ = τὸ πνεῦμα οὖν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδὲν ἄλλο νοῆσαι θέμις ἢ τὸν Λόγον (ὅς καὶ πρωτότοκος τῷ θεῷ ἐστι).

¹²⁰ Leslie W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr, His Life and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 104. Cf. Eric Francis Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, vol. 47 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1973), 33.

¹²¹ Goodenough, *Theology of Justin Martyr*, 181-82. When one realizes that Justin was here expositing the prophecy of Gabriel in Luke 1:35, Goodenough's explanation appears more probable than the alternative. Luke writes, “The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; and for that reason the holy offspring shall be called the Son of God” (πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ). While this text should probably be understood as πνεῦμα and δύναμις referring to the Holy Spirit proper, Justin was intentionally setting forth an alternative interpretation. He asserted that even though the term πνεῦμα ἅγιον is used (though he conspicuously drops ἅγιον from his exposition), the passage actually refers to the λόγος, that is, the Son, and thus πνεῦμα ἅγιον is read by Justin in a general rather than technical sense (cf. similar general use of πνεῦμα for the pre-incarnate Son in Melito, *Frag.* 15; Irenaeus, *A.H.* 3.10.3; *Dem.* 71). This may, in fact, explain why Justin writes, “The Spirit and the power from God *cannot*

Needless to say, how we understand Justin at this particular point will determine how we understand his other uses of these same terms in passages addressing the virgin conception of Christ.¹²²

In another example of the blurring of terms, the Spirit appears to be called the “Word” (λόγος). While the prophets are inspired by the “prophetic Spirit” (*1 Apol.* 35.3), they are also moved by the Divine Word (*1 Apol.* 33.9). It is unclear whether this passage has two persons doing the same work of inspiration (both use θεοφορέομαι),¹²³ or if the person of the Spirit (who in Justin has a distinctive role inspiring the prophets)¹²⁴ is simply called λόγος in a less technical sense as revelator. In *1 Apol.* 36.2, it appears that the person of the Holy Spirit is referred to as the “divine Word.” Justin wrote, “You must not suppose that they [the prophecies] are spoken by the inspired persons themselves, but by the divine Word who moves them (ἀπὸ τοῦ κινουντος αὐτοὺς θείου Λόγου). For sometimes He speaks things that are to happen, in the manner of one who foretells the future; sometimes He speaks as in the person of God the Master and Father of all; sometimes as in the person of Christ; sometimes as in the person of the people answering the Lord or His Father.” On this matter Barnard writes, “Justin’s ideas of prophetic inspiration is undeveloped and he should not be accused of Sabellianism.”¹²⁵ Fair enough, but it may also be that the “divine word” used here is actually the revelatory λόγος, who is the holy prophetic Spirit in Justin’s thought, for the Word of God, who is the Son, need not be said to have spoken “as from Christ” (as in *1 Apol.* 38.1) but could be described as speaking merely “from himself” in such a case.¹²⁶

The Holy Spirit is thought of as having the nature of divinity—at least enough to be called “the divine and holy prophetic Spirit” (τοῦ θείου ἁγίου προφητικοῦ πνεύματος) (*1 Apol.* 32.2, cf. 32.8). In his position in the Godhead, the Holy Spirit is described as occupying the “third rank” (πνευμά τε προφητικὸν ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει) (*1 Apol.* 13.3) and is the third “power” of the Godhead (*1 Apol.* 60.5-7). As such, he is worshipped and honored together with the Father and Son (*1 Apol.* 6.2).¹²⁷

The Spirit is called the “the power of God which was sent to us through Jesus Christ” who has authority over even the Devil (*Dial.* 116.1).¹²⁸ So, in relationship to God the Father, the Holy Spirit is the means through which (διὰ) God sets forth prophecies (*1 Apol.* 33.2), functioning in the name of the

therefore be understood as anything else than (οὐδὲν ἄλλο νοῆσαι θέμις ἢ) the Word.” This same negation of νοέω in Justin’s *Apologies* is, in fact, used exclusively in reference to circumstances in which others misunderstood a text or mystery that Justin aims to correctly expound (e.g., *1 Apol.* 33.3; 36.3; 44.10; 54.4; 55.1, 7; 60.5; *2 Apol.* 7.4). Since the text under consideration in *1 Apol.* 33.6 is from the Gospel of Luke, it would not be unreasonable to assume that Justin had in mind fellow Christians who understood this passage differently than he. Justin’s own view appears to be in flux, for at times he maintained that it is the Logos himself who effectuates the virgin conception and thereby begets Jesus Christ (*1 Apol.* 46.5), while at other times he echoed biblical imagery of Jesus being conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit (*Dial.* 78.3).

¹²² Thus, in *1 Apol.* 32.10 and 33.4, δύναμις would refer to the Son. However, in *1 Apol.* 39.3 and *Dial.* 116.1 “power” rather clearly refers to the Holy Spirit. It is interesting that the title δύναμις is actually ascribed in *1 Apol.* 60.5-6 to the Father, Son, and Spirit, since Christ is called the “power after the first,” implying he is the second of two powers; and the Spirit is then described as a “third,” where “power” is still the antecedent. Thus, we should not be surprised that we find fluidity in the use of δύναμις in Justin.

¹²³ Cf. Irenaeus, *A.H.* 2.28.2, where Word and Spirit both operate in the writing of Scripture.

¹²⁴ E.g., *1 Apol.* 6.2; 13.3; 31.1, etc.

¹²⁵ Barnard, ed., *Justin Martyr: Apologies*, 152, n. 244.

¹²⁶ Even if this refers to the Spirit, the charge of modalism is still not sustainable since the revelatory λόγος is speaking “as from” (ὡς ἀπὸ) either the Father or the Christ or even the people. It also appears that Justin used the term προσώπων intentionally, since the Spirit takes on certain roles like an actor in a drama when he inspires the prophecies of Holy Scripture.

¹²⁷ “But we worship and adore both Him and the Son who came from Him, and taught us these things, and the army of the other good angels, who follow Him and are made like Him, and the prophetic Spirit, giving honor [to Him] in reason and truth” (ἀλλ’ ἐκεῖνόν τε καὶ τὸν παρ’ αὐτοῦ υἱόν, ἐλθόντα καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, καὶ τὸν τῶν αὐτῶ ἐπομένων καὶ ἔξομοιούμενων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατόν, πνευμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν). In reference to this passage and its connection to Athenagoras, *Embassy* 10.5, Crehan writes, “The mention of angels immediately after the Trinity . . . shows that they were considered to belong to the θεολογίαν, whereas all that concerned the Incarnation and God’s plan of salvation belonged to the οἰκονομία [sic] or dispensation. An embarrassing passage of Justin (*1 Apol.* 6.2), where angels are named before the Holy Spirit, is cleared up by this clear statement of Athenagoras” (Joseph Hugh Crehan, ed., *Athenagoras: Embassy for the Christians, The Resurrection of the Dead*, ed. Johannes Quasten and Joseph C. Plumpe, *Ancient Christian Writers*, vol. 23 [Westminster, MD: Newman, 1956], 134, n. 64). Crehan is probably being a bit too optimistic if he believes Athenagoras clarified Justin’s “embarrassing” passage (cf. Goodenough, *Theology of Justin Martyr*, 193-94).

¹²⁸ The Holy Spirit is also called “Spirit of God” in *1 Apol.* 64.4 (referring to Gen 1:2) and *Dial.* 49.6; 88.1. Also, Justin may possibly be referring to the Holy Spirit as the “power of Christ” (τῆς δυνάμεως . . . Χριστοῦ) in *Dial.* 42.1.

Father or even in his own name (*Dial.* 36.6). In fact, the prophetic Spirit is described as taking on various dramatic roles in prophetic Scripture (including those of the Father and Son) as he speaks in the first person for the Father, Son, and even human respondents (*I Apol.* 36.2; 38.1).

With regard to his relationship to the Son, the Spirit was in some sense active in the miracle of the incarnation (*Dial.* 78.3), and Christ is said to have already had the fullness of the Spirit during his earthly life and had no need of any subsequent filling or empowerment by the Spirit (*Dial.* 87.3; 88.1, 4). After his ascension, Christ sent the Spirit from heaven to his disciples (*I Apol.* 50.12; cf. *Dial.* 116.1) and it is Christ who mediates the dispensing of the gifts of the Spirit (*Dial.* 87.5).

Finally, amidst his sometimes startling descriptions of diversity and his groping for language and images to communicate unity, Justin presented his readers with some important Trinitarian references. Father, Son, and Spirit are together the object of worship (*I Apol.* 6.2) and, of course, they play an important role in the Christian rite of initiation as converts are baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (*I Apol.* 61.3, 10-13). The bishop of the church likewise offers “praise and glory to the Father of the Universe through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (*I Apol.* 65.3, cf. 67.2).

Yet amidst all these considerations, Barnard still writes, “Justin had no real doctrine of the Trinity. He worshipped the Father as supreme in the Universe; he worshipped the logos or Son as divine but in the second place; he worshipped the Holy Spirit in the third place. This is the language of Christian experience rather than theological reflection.”¹²⁹ Goodenough concludes, “Doctrine of the Trinity Justin had none. Justin believed in One God the Father, and neither the Logos nor the Holy Spirit nor any other power could be ranked with the Father. The Logos was divine, but in the second place; the Holy Spirit was worthy of worship, but in the third place. Such words are entirely incompatible with a doctrine of the Trinity.”¹³⁰

But are they really? Does order and rank in the Godhead—at least as we see it unfold in the economy of creation—contradict the doctrine of the Trinity as it would later be formulated?¹³¹ It appears from our survey of the intratrinitarian relationships in Justin that his struggle to adequately communicate Christian truth to both Greek and Jewish audiences is in keeping with his predecessors and contemporaries. Justin’s Trinity of “second place and third rank” echoes the types of functional relationships in both the apostolic fathers and other apologists, and, it seems, even the New Testament itself. In short, one relegates Justin to heterodoxy or heresy by Nicene standards only if one first rejects the notion of an economic functional subordination in the Godhead. To be sure, Justin’s Trinitarian theology was less precise and calculated than Nicene orthodoxy, but I do not believe it can be equated with the Arian dogma that would develop in the following centuries.

***Summary:** Justin presented the Son and Spirit as “second place” and “third rank” not only in the incarnation, but in the entire economy of creation (*I Apol.* 13.3; 60.5–7). However, Christ is repeatedly referred to as “God” (*I Apol.* 63.15; *Dial.* 34.2, *passim*), and the Spirit is also considered divine (*I Apol.* 32.2; 32.8). Thus, Justin seems to present the Father, Son, and Spirit relationship in terms of economic functional subordination and ontological equality.

Glory to God with the Son and Spirit: Martyrdom of Polycarp (c. 155-165)

Indicating some level of Trinitarian awareness, Polycarp prayed before his martyrdom, “I bless you [God the Father] because you have considered me worthy of this day and hour, that I might receive a place among the number of the martyrs in the cup of your Christ, to the resurrection to eternal life, both of soul and of body, in the incorruptibility of the Holy Spirit” (*Mart. Poly.* 14.2). Besides this economic association, Father and Son are said to be united in their work toward humankind (*Mart. Poly.* Pro) and are also objects of worship (17.3; 19.2; 22.1). However, the Father alone is regarded as “almighty God”

¹²⁹ Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 105.

¹³⁰ Goodenough, *Theology of Justin Martyr*, 186.

¹³¹ Little responds emphatically in the negative: “But when Logos operates in the world as the Father’s Agent, and is found in a ‘place’ upon the earth, then personally, economically, and officially, He is less than the Supreme God, and subordinate to Him. It is necessary, then, to distinguish between these two aspects of Deity, that is, between essential Divinity on the one hand, and Divinity in a functional, official sense on the other. . . . Logos as to Essence is Divine absolutely like the Father, but secondary to Him as to personality and functions” (V. A. Spence Little, *The Christology of the Apologists* [London: Duckworth, 1934], 166-67).

(19:2) and divine actions toward creation are mediated through the Son (14:1; 20:2).

***Summary:** In *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, Father, Son, and Spirit are together regarded as divine (17:3; 19:2; 22:1). However, they are also regarded as distinct in their activities within creation, with the Father as the ultimate authority who acts through the Son and Spirit (14:1–2; 19:2; 20:2).

Word of His Father, Spirit of His Power: Melito (c. 160–170)¹³²

Melito's extant work, *On Pascha*, is not an apology or theological treatise, but a work of Greek Christian rhetoric—a homily utilizing “exclamation, question, anaphora, repetition, antithesis, oxymoron, and paronomasia.”¹³³ Therefore, we must be careful to allow the writer certain literary, stylistic, and poetic liberties not granted to the authors of theological treatises. Indeed, we will see that Melito offers us some short, clever statements concerning Christ that appeal more to the ear than to the brain, but nevertheless give us a glimpse of his Trinitarian theology.

We begin our examination of Melito with the relationship of Father and Son. As expected, Melito thought of the Son as begotten from the Father (*On Pascha* 9), the “firstborn of God,” begotten “before the morning star” (*On Pascha* 82; Frag. 15).¹³⁴ He is therefore both the “Son” in his relationship to God the Father,¹³⁵ and “God” in his relationship to all creation.¹³⁶ He is also “Word” of God the Father (Frag. 15; New Frag. II.1; II.20) before the ages (Frag. 2).¹³⁷

With regard to divine actions in the economy of creation, Melito said that the Father did his works through Christ “from the beginning to eternity” (*On Pascha* 104).¹³⁸ All things were created by God through the Word (*On Pascha* 47),¹³⁹ and the Son can therefore be called “creator of creatures” (New Frag. II.18). God later sent his Son from heaven to become incarnate (Frag. 13; New Frag. II.4; II.22). In this sense “the almighty God has made his dwelling through Christ Jesus” (*On Pascha* 45)¹⁴⁰ and visited

¹³² Both the Greek text and English translation for Melito's *On Pascha* and the Fragments are from Stuart George Hall, *Melito of Sardis: On Pascha and Fragments*, ed. Henry Chadwick, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), who dates the work between 160–170 (Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, xxi–xxii). My study follows Hall's versification of not only *On Pascha*, but also his numbering of the Fragments (abbreviated Frag.)

¹³³ Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, xxiii.

¹³⁴ Hall points to Psalm 110 (109 LXX):3 as the source of the “morning star” reference (Ibid., 45). The Psalm is often used with reference to the Davidic Messiah, and in conjunction with the term πρωτότοκος, this hymn may be remnants of an earlier Christian hymn reflecting an early Davidic Christology. The term πρωτότοκος is used in Psalm 89:27–28 (LXX 88:28–29) in terms of Davidic kingship: “I also shall establish him my firstborn, the highest among the kings of the earth. My lovingkindness for him I will maintain forever, and My covenant shall be established for him” (καὶ γὰρ πρωτότοκον θήσομαι αὐτὸν ὑψηλὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν τῆς γῆς. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα φυλάξω αὐτῷ τὸ ἔλεός μου καὶ ἡ διαθήκη μου πιστὴ αὐτῷ). This same sense is echoed in the Apocalypse of John: “Jesus Christ, the faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, and the ruler of the kings of the earth,” which itself echoes an early Christian hymn of Colossians 1:15–18: “And He is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως). For by Him all things were created, both in the heavens and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities—all things have been created by Him and for Him. And He is before all things, and in Him all things hold together. He is also head of the body, the church; and He is the beginning, the first-born from the dead (πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν); so that He Himself might come to have first place in everything.” It appears to me that in the development of Christology from the first to second century, the original meaning for the term πρωτότοκος as pointing out the fulfillment of the promised Davidic Messiah with authority over Israel and the Kings of the Earth was gradually expanded to include authority over the entire cosmos under the Father. From here the more philosophical sense was gradually adopted and πρωτότοκος became a term used to describe not merely Christ's authority, but his ontological relationship to the Father.

¹³⁵ *On Pascha* 44; 76; 14; Frag. 15 (2x).

¹³⁶ *On Pascha* 9; Frag. 15; New Frag. II.4; II.21; II.22 (5x). In fact, in Frag. 15, the Son is called “God from God,” which, of course, was adopted by Nicaea.

¹³⁷ = θεοῦ λόγου πρὸ αἰώνων ἔσμεν.

¹³⁸ = δι' οὗ ἐποίησεν ὁ πατὴρ τὰ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι αἰώνων.

¹³⁹ = διὰ τοῦ λόγου. Hall writes, “By his word is best taken with what precedes, contrasting creation by mere fiat with the privileged creation of man, as in Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum* 2. 18. . . . One might find here the personal divine Logos, associated with what precedes . . . or with what follows . . . but the text does not require it” (Hall, *Melito of Sardis*, 25, n. 14). While it is certainly possible that the divine personal Logos was not in view, the concept and language of the world being made by the Father through (διὰ) the Son was so prevalent in Christian Scripture and confession by this time that it seems improbable that Melito would have uttered the words διὰ τοῦ λόγου without intending them to refer to the pre-incarnate Son, or at least that he would be unaware that his words would be taken this way.

¹⁴⁰ = ἐνταῦθα κατεσκήνωκεν ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς διὰ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

his own creation (New Frag. II.4), for the Son was “carried in the womb by Mary, and clothed with his Father” (Frag. 14). It was also by the Father’s will that the Son suffered his passion (*On Pascha* 76), so Melito could even describe in vivid terms, “He carried the wood on his shoulders as He was led up to be slain like Isaac by his Father” (Frag. 9). In the Son’s resurrection and ascension, the Son offered the Father a gift (New Frag. II.17) and presently sits at the Father’s right hand.¹⁴¹ In his current state the Son is made judge by the Father (New Frag. II.18) and has been glorified in and exalted by God.¹⁴²

But there are other passages that suggest some sort of equality of Father and Son—especially in their relationship to creation. As creatures, Christians worship both God and Christ (Frag. 2).¹⁴³ In one controversial passage, *On Pascha* 9, we read, “For he is all things: inasmuch as he judges, Law; inasmuch as he teaches, Word; inasmuch as he saves, Grace; inasmuch as he begets, Father; inasmuch as he is begotten, Son (καθ’ ὃ γεννᾷ πατήρ, καθ’ ὃ γεννᾶται υἱός); inasmuch as he suffers, Sheep; inasmuch as he is buried, Man; inasmuch as he is raised, God (καθ’ ὃ ἀνίσταται θεός).” This language is sometimes understood as implying a “naive modalism.”¹⁴⁴ However, we must recall the genre of *On Pascha* as a rhetorical work, a Paschal homily. Given Melito’s other statements that consistently distinguish the persons of Father and Son, a better explanation for the title “Father” (πατήρ) applied to Christ is that the Son is “father” figuratively in his relationship to creation, which was made through him and by him (Frag. 15). This, however, should not be understood as diminishing the relevance of this passage for our present study, for even if Melito was not confusing the persons of Father and Son, he was at least placing them in an equal relationship to the created order, since both the Father and the Son can be said to have “begotten” (γεννάω) the universe.

Another passage that implies equality between Father and Son is *On Pascha* 105: “He is the one who sits at the Father’s right hand; he carries the Father and is carried by the Father” (φορεῖ τὸν πατέρα καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς φορεῖται). Melito’s metaphor of “carrying” (φέρω) may mean “to support” or “uphold,” as in Hebrews 1:3—“And He is the radiance of His glory and the exact representation of His nature, and upholds all things by the word of His power (φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ).” This would suggest that the two persons of Father and Son “uphold” each other in some sense. Or, Melito could have simply been using the common meaning of “to carry” or “to transport,” so Christ was said to mediate the Father to the world, and Christ himself is mediated to the world by the Father. In this sense the functioning of Father and Son in revelation to the world would be reciprocal and Melito would be attempting to raise the person and position of Christ by demonstrating the mutual dependency of the Father and Son. A final option would incorporate both of the above understandings, which I believe fits the context of enthronement and also the Christology we find elsewhere in Melito and in other second century fathers. That is, we are told that the Son is given his power and authority in his enthronement by the Father (Frag. 15; New Frag. II.18). We are also told that through the Son’s incarnation the Father is revealed on earth (*On Pascha* 45; Frag. 14, New Frag. II.4). Melito was perhaps summarizing his past exposition in *On Pascha* 102–104 where he described the coming of Christ in power for salvation, dying and rising again, who does the works of the Father and is God’s Messiah and King. In this sense, the Son is carried by the Father (upheld in his exalted position) and the Father is carried by the Son (in revealing the Father to the world in the economy of the incarnation).¹⁴⁵ If this is the case, there is still a relationship of mutuality and interdependence, though the roles are distinct and the primary source of authority in the relationship is God the Father.

¹⁴¹ *On Pascha* 104; 105; Frag. 14; 15; New Frag. II.18.

¹⁴² Frag. 15; 16b; New Frag. II.18; II.22.

¹⁴³ “We are worshippers of the only God who is before all and over all, and of his Christ who is the Word of God before the ages” (Frag. 2).

¹⁴⁴ Stewart-Sykes offers up this apologetic for Melito: “In time modalism became recognized as heretical because of its inadequacies, but it would be unreasonable to apply such a title to Melito, in whose period the complexities of Trinitarian relationships had not been discussed” (Alistair Stewart-Sykes, *The Lamb’s High Feast: Melito, Peri Pascha and the Quartodeciman Paschal Liturgy at Sardis* [Leiden: Brill, 1998], 39).

¹⁴⁵ Melito called the Son “Word” (λόγος) in both a revelatory sense (*On Pascha* 9) and philosophical sense (Frag. 15; 16b; New Frag. II.4), though the emphasis appears to be on representing and communicating God’s inner-most being to creation.

Although the Son is called “a spirit” (Frag. 15),¹⁴⁶ he is distinguished in both person and function from the Holy Spirit, as the Son is called the “giver of Holy Spirit of the prophets” (New Frag. II.20). The Spirit himself is called the “Spirit of the Lord” with reference to Christ (*On Pascha* 32; 44).¹⁴⁷

Though no explicit Trinitarian formulae are used in Melito, a survey of his references to the interpersonal relationships of Father, Son, and Spirit still reveals a view of the Godhead in which the Father is primary and the Son and Spirit function as mediators in accordance with his will. Depending on our interpretation of various pneumatological passages, it may also be that the Spirit acts as the mediator of the Son, though this is less certain. However, there are other places in Melito where Father and Son are regarded as equal in relationship to creation and inter-dependent in the incarnation.

***Summary:** In Melito’s paschal homily, we can discern a view of the Godhead in which the Father is primary and the Son and Spirit function as his mediators in accordance with his will (*On Pascha* 76; 104; Frag. 13). However, the Son is regarded as divine (*On Pascha* 9), and even referred to as “God from God” (Frag. 15). If the title “Word of God” implies functional subordination, as appears to be the case in other fathers, Melito may have also implied such an eternal relationship to the Father “before the ages” (Frag. 2).

By His Mere Will the Word Sprang Forth: Tatian (c. 165-172)¹⁴⁸

Among the various writers of the second century, Tatian is perhaps the most “marginal,”¹⁴⁹ and I hesitate even to include him. Nevertheless, however harsh his Christology may sound to ears attuned to the harmonies of Nicaea, his presentation of intratrinitarian relationships—especially as they touch upon the question of functional subordination—are still insightful.

Tatian began rather early in his apology by presenting God in terms of utter transcendence:

Our God has no origin in time, (Θεὸς <γὰρ> ὁ καθ’ ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἔχει σύστασιν ἐν χρόνῳ), since he alone is without beginning (μόνος ἀναρχος ὢν) and himself is the beginning of all things (καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπάρχων τῶν ὅλων ἀρχή). ‘God is a spirit’ (Πενῦμα ὁ θεός),¹⁵⁰ not pervading matter, but the constructor of material spirits and the shapes that are in matter (οὐ διήκων διὰ τῆς ὕλης, πνευμάτων δὲ ὕλικῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν

¹⁴⁶ = “He is . . . among spirits a Spirit.” In New Frag. II.20 Melito described Christ as “Word of his Father, and the Spirit of his power,” which may either be “spirit” in general, as in Frag. 15, or, if the personal Holy Spirit is meant, the Son and the Spirit are equated in a modalistic fashion. Yet we must recall that Melito distinguished between the Son and Spirit two lines later: “giver of Holy Spirit of the prophets.” In a similarly ambiguous text, *On Pascha* 66, we are told that “by the Spirit which could not die (τῷ δὲ θανεῖν μὴ δυναμένῳ πνεύματι) he [Christ] killed death the killer of men.” We cannot be certain whether the personal Holy Spirit was meant here, since the contrast in the passage seems to be between the body which was able to suffer and die and the spirit that was unable to die. In this case, it would be Christ’s dual natures being expressed. Of course, we cannot completely rule out the possibility of a Spirit-Son modalism, though such a concept would be mere conjecture if based upon this passage alone. However, if we construe this present passage with the following in § 67, it seems that the personal Holy Spirit may be in view: “And he marked our souls with his own Spirit and the members of our body with his own blood (καὶ ἐφράγισεν ἡμῶν τὰς ψυχὰς τῷ ἰδίῳ πνεύματι καὶ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι).” Apparently drawing on the language and imagery of the previous paragraph, it seems the Holy Spirit as the one who seals believers in baptism is possibly in view (cf. Eph 1:13).

¹⁴⁷ The title “Lord” (κύριος) is used thirty-nine times in *On Pascha*, only 2 times does it refer to God the Father (*On Pascha* 13 and 98, both in Old Testament quotations). In every other discernible instance the title refers to Christ. However, in *On Pascha* 32 and 44 the term “Spirit of the Lord” may mean “Spirit of Christ” or “Spirit of God the Father.” The former is more probable because of the overwhelming use of κύριος as a designation of Christ. Thus, the Spirit is somehow associated with the work of the pre-incarnate Son, who is seen in some sort of primary relationship to the Spirit. It may be that the term “spirit” here refers simply to the pre-incarnate Lord’s incorporeal existence, and the NT person of the Holy Spirit is not in view.

¹⁴⁸ Unless noted, the English translation is that of Molly Whittaker, *Tatian: Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments*, ed. Henry Chadwick, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982). The Greek text is from the edition of Miroslav Marcovich, ed., *Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos*, ed. H. Christian Brennecke and E. Mühlenberg, Patristische Texte und Studien, vol. 43 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995). Tatian wrote his *Address to the Greeks* sometime between 165-172 (Marcovich, ed., *Oratio ad Graecos*, 2-3).

¹⁴⁹ Of all the writers considered in this paper, Tatian is the only schismatic who eventually broke away from the “catholic” church and formed a sect of his own, the Encratites (Whittaker, *Oratio ad Graecos*, x).

¹⁵⁰ Elze is probably correct when he takes πνεῦμα here in a more philosophical than theological sense. He writes, “Gott ist der Ursprung des Weltalls, insofern er, seiner Substanz nach, reines Pneuma ist,” tying this understanding back to God as ἀρχή in the sense of the “Ursprung” or “Seinsgrund” of all things (Martin Elze, *Tatian und seine Theologie*, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, vol. 9 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960], 68, cf. 66-67).

θῦτῃ σχηματῶν κατασκευαστῆς);¹⁵¹ he is both invisible and impalpable and has himself become the father of things perceptible and visible (αἰσθητῶν καὶ ὁρατῶν αὐτὸς γεγωνὼς πατήρ).¹⁵²

Here Tatian presented God as completely outside the universe of time and space while at the same time being (or “becoming”)¹⁵³ the “Father” (πατήρ) of all that is in time and space. However, time and space themselves are begotten by God through the mediation of the Logos.

Tatian gave us an obscure glimpse of his notion of the presence of the Logos with or within God prior to his actual generation by the will of the Father in *To the Greeks* 5.1: “God ‘was in the beginning’ and we have received the tradition that the beginning was the power of the Word.”¹⁵⁴ The Lord of all things who was himself the foundation of the whole was alone in relation to the creation which had not yet come into being. In so far as all power over things visible and invisible was with him, he with himself and the Word which was in him established all things through the power of the Word.”¹⁵⁵ We cannot be sure if Tatian regarded the presence of the Logos within God prior to his coming forth in creative action as personal. However, we are told that prior to the beginning of the economy of creation, the Logos “sprang forth” by God’s will (5.2), so the Logos became a spirit from the spirit and inner-Logos of God (7.1), begotten from the Father “in the beginning” (5.5-6).¹⁵⁶

Tatian clarified that this coming forth (προελθὼν) from the Father’s power (*To the Greeks* 5.4) was not by being “cut off” or “separated” from the Father. Apparently struggling to find language that would render the Logos distinct from the Father, yet never separated from him, Tatian explained that the begetting of the Son was “by partition” (μερισμός) rather than by “section” (ἀποκόπτω) (*To the Greeks* 5.3).¹⁵⁷ Regardless of the mysterious dynamics of this generation, the Son thus became the “‘firstborn’ work of the Father” (5.2),¹⁵⁸ and the light of God (13.2). Tatian did not hesitate to call the Son “God” (21.1),¹⁵⁹ but attributed to the Son the begetting of raw, unstructured matter and the creation of the

¹⁵¹ Again Elze suggests that Tatian is navigating among Stoic and Platonic philosophies here, on the one hand preserving God’s transcendence and ultimate πνεῦμα, while on the other hand granting the Stoic notion of the “Lehre von dem Pneuma, das in der Materie waltet und ihr die Formen gibt, in denen sie sich konkretisiert” (Ibid., 68).

¹⁵² *To the Greeks* 4.3. Cf. 5.7.

¹⁵³ It is not clear from Tatian’s thought that God has always been “Father.” The use of γίνομαι here is a perfect active participle meaning “having become,” not simply “being” in an ontological sense. This is an important use of the term applied to God the Father, since Tatian will also apply this to the Son. The emphasis is on coming into a particular type of functional relationship, not on coming into being or altering the divine nature.

¹⁵⁴ = Θεὸς ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ, τὴν δ’ ἀρχὴν Λόγου δύναμιν παρειλήφαμεν. Little interprets this phrase thus: “That is to say, the beginning marks the period when the Internal Logos, hitherto quiescent, assumes another character, becoming the potentiality of creation. This rational potentiality is the exact relationship with Logos, when Internal only, bears to the Father, no activity *ad extra* yet being ascribed to Him” (Little, *Christology of the Apologists*, 182).

¹⁵⁵ = ἦν σὺν αὐτῷ, τὰ πάντα [σὺν αὐτῷ] διὰ λογικῆς δυνάμεως αὐτὸς [καὶ ὁ Λόγος, ὃς ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ,] ὑπέστησε.

¹⁵⁶ = Cf. *To the Greeks* 5.4; 7.1.

¹⁵⁷ Little renders μερισμός as “shared” or “distributed” and ἀποκόπτω as “severance” (Little, *Christology of the Apologists*, 183), while J. E. Ryland’s translation has “participation” and “abscission” respectively (Alexander Roberts and others, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, American reprint of the Edinburgh ed., vol. 2 [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962]).

¹⁵⁸ = ἔργον πρωτότοκον τοῦ πατρὸς γίνεται. The term γίνομαι here does not necessarily mean the Logos was nonexistent prior to his coming forth from the Father. God himself is said to “become” the Father when he creates the universe (cf. *To the Greeks* 4.3). Here the Logos becomes “the first-begotten work” of the Father, and it is uncertain from this passage if the Logos actually came into being as the first creature of God, or that the Logos’s status changed from inner-Logos to “Son” as he went forth from within the Father for the economy of creation. If the former, Tatian held to an ontological subordination of the Son to the Father because the Son would be for all practical purposes a creature. If the latter, Tatian may have held to the eternity of the Logos and the ontological equality of Father and Son, while at the same time believing the Son *became* functionally subordinate to the Father only upon his generation from within the Father. Prior to this time, he would have been equal to the Father in all respects, ontological and functional. Nevertheless, we must not overlook the fact that Tatian said the Logos springs forth “by God’s simple will.” The Son’s function of submission to the Father, then, would be initiated by the will of God, implying submission on the part of the Son.

¹⁵⁹ Another passage where the Son may be referred to as God is 21.1, where Tatian wrote, “Do not abhor us who have made this attainment, but, repudiating the demons, follow the one God. ‘All things were made by Him, and without Him not one thing was made.’” Although this quote from John 1:3 originally referred to the Word, Jesus Christ, Tatian have simply reapplied this assertion to God the Father since he changed the original διὰ τοῦ ὑπὸ.

universe (5.5-6), and even the making of the angels (7.2).

We see in Tatian, as in other second century writers, a functioning of the Logos or “Word” that preserves the transcendence of God and still maintains an intimate immanence. In fact, in Tatian the immanence of God’s presence is expressed in more explicit terms than other writers, and the most pervasive and intimate relationship between God and man is achieved through the function of the Spirit. The Spirit is called “divine” (*To the Greeks* 4.4; 13.3) and the “Spirit of God” (13.5), yet he suggested that “souls which were obedient to wisdom attracted to themselves the kindred spirit” (13.6),¹⁶⁰ so the Spirit of God dwells only in some (15.7). This uniting of the soul to the Spirit brings unity with God (15.1),¹⁶¹ so God himself dwells in the temple of the flesh by the Spirit, who is his representative in the human body (15.4-5).¹⁶² But those who reject the Spirit of God are said to have rejected God (13.6).

In Tatian we have no explicit Trinitarian assertions, though we can recognize the persons and works of the Father, Son, and Spirit and their relationships to one another. The Father is the source and principal in Tatian’s concept of the Godhead, at the very least in a functional capacity beginning with the coming forth of the Logos,¹⁶³ and perhaps even in an ontological sense if Tatian regarded the Logos as having had a beginning.¹⁶⁴ Either way, it is clear that the Son (and the Spirit) are regarded by Tatian as functionally subordinate to the Father’s will.¹⁶⁵

***Summary:** Of all the fathers studied in this paper, Tatian is the only one who eventually left the catholic church and founded his own sect. Like his predecessors, he presented the Son and Spirit as submissive to the Father’s will, but unlike the other fathers he spoke in terms that could be understood as teaching that the Logos had a beginning (*To the Greeks* 5.2). Tatian thus represents the fringe of second century Christology.

God, Word, and Wisdom: Theophilus (c. 170–185)¹⁶⁶

Theophilus of Antioch presented the intratrinitarian relationships in terms consistent with his second century predecessors. However, probably as points of contact with his pagan reader, Autolycus, Theophilus most often used the terms σοφία and λόγος for the Spirit and Son. This was not unique in the development of Trinitarian reflection, though, and through these terms we are still given a picture of his views concerning the functional relationships in the Godhead.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁰ = Καὶ αἱ μὲν πειθόμεναι <τῇ θεοῦ> σοφία σφίσιν αὐταῖς ἐφέλκον τὸ πνεῦμα συγγενές.

¹⁶¹ Elze argues that in chapter 13 and 15, Tatian referred not to the lower spirit that organizes matter, but the “höheren, göttlichen Pneuma” (Elze, *Tatian und seine Theologie*, 86). This seems to fit the context best.

¹⁶² = κατοικεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ θεὸς βούλεται διὰ τοῦ πρεσβεύοντος πνεύματος.

¹⁶³ Perhaps reading Tatian with far more grace that is actually merited, Little suggests that “the secondary character of the Logos relates only to His functions and activities in the universe, and not to His essential nature” (Little, *Christology of the Apologists*, 192).

¹⁶⁴ Since we are left with no clear statement concerning Tatian’s concept of God, time, and eternity, or whether he even had developed such a concept, we cannot be sure if the “event” of the Son’s generation ought to be regarded as a time event or an eternal, timeless generation.

¹⁶⁵ Little writes, “In fact, the whole relationship of Logos to the Father is suggestive of the secondary position of the former. . . . Likewise the Logos, identical in essence with the Father, is subordinate in an economic sense, since He was prolated by the will and initiative of a senior Divine Person” (Little, *Christology of the Apologists*, 191).

¹⁶⁶ The Greek text for Theophilus is from Miroslav Marcovich, ed., *Theophili Antiocheni Ad Autolycum*, ed. H. Christian Brennecke and E. Mühlenberg, *Patristische Texte und Studien*, vol. 44 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995). The English translation is that is Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe, eds., *Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria*, 1926 American ed., *The Ante-nicene Fathers*, vol. 2 (New York: Scribner’s, 1926). On the date of Theophilus’s writings, the range from 170 to 185 is probably as narrow as we can get, though we can be rather certain the writings are no earlier or later than this window, Rick Rogers, *Theophilus of Antioch: The Life and Thought of a Second-Century Bishop* (Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2000), 7.

¹⁶⁷ I am aware of Rick Rogers’s thesis that these terms are used in Theophilus’s rhetoric as “personified agents with anthropomorphic characteristics.” He writes, “In talking about these divine agents, I do not think he took them to be real self-sustaining entities, that is, angels or demigods. Rather, I think it is much more likely that he saw them as literary fictions useful in describing God’s power, God’s revelation of himself and God’s actions in the world” (Rogers, *Theophilus of Antioch*, 74). Rogers does not, however, rule out the possibility that Theophilus himself viewed the personifications as objective entities or personal intermediaries. Without denying the possibility of Rogers’s thesis, there are several reasons why I believe it to be improbable. Among the various fathers and apologists of the second century the terms λόγος and σοφία already enjoyed a rich and stable history of application as names for the objective personal entities, the Son and Spirit. We have seen this already in Justin, and we shall see it again in Athenagoras and Irenaeus, who both wrote within a few years after Theophilus. It is improbable that Theophilus

Regarding the relationship between Father and Son, Theophilus said that prior to the begetting of the Word he was present within God. He “always exists, residing within the heart of God. For before anything came into being, He had Him as a counselor, being His own mind and thought” (*Autolycus* 2.22.3).¹⁶⁸ In fact, Theophilus even wrote, “At first God was alone, and the Word in Him” (2.22.5).¹⁶⁹ It was from this state of eternal and internal existence that the λόγος was sent forth: “God, then, having His own Word internal within His own bowels,¹⁷⁰ begat Him (ἐγέννησεν αὐτόν), emitting Him along with His own wisdom before all things” (2.10.2).¹⁷¹ Similarly, *Autolycus* 2.22.4 says, “But when God wished to make all that He determined on, He begot this Word (τοῦτον τὸν Λόγον ἐγέννησεν).” But in the same passage he made it clear that a part of God was not lost in this begetting or emitting: “not Himself being emptied of the Word (οὐ κενωθείς αὐτὸς τοῦ Λόγου).”¹⁷² Thus, the Word is a divine being distinct—not separate—from the Father who begot him.¹⁷³ As such he is called the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) of all creation (2.22.4) whose nature is from (ἐκ) God, and who is thus divine (2.22.6).¹⁷⁴

It is difficult for Theophilus to conceive of the begetting of the Word from his immanent and intimate relationship with the Father as anything other than a functional expression of the divine being for the purpose of carrying out the Father’s will in the economy of creation. Thus, at the begetting of the Word, he was the “helper” in creation (*Autolycus* 2.10.3); that is, all things were made through (διὰ)

sought to retreat from this biblical and theological tradition toward a modalistic monotheism in the midst of a community narrative and liturgy that reinforced distinct divine persons in almost “crude” terms. Furthermore, Rogers’s thesis seems awkward and unnecessary. It is perhaps best to see Theophilus as presenting the Christian concept of Father, Son, and Spirit in philosophical terms that would both communicate and appeal to a Greek reader. Even if Rogers’s qualified thesis is correct that Theophilus presented the λόγος and σοφία as impersonal agents for rhetorical purposes, it seems more likely to me that in his own mind these represented the personal divine agents of Son and Spirit, and as we see in Irenaeus, his readers certainly understood them this way.

¹⁶⁸ = τὸν Λόγον τὸν ὄντα διὰ παντὸς ἐνδιάθετον ἐν καρδίᾳ Θεοῦ. Πρὸ γὰρ τι γίνεσθαι τοῦτον εἶχεν σύμβουλον, ἑαυτοῦ νοῦν καὶ φρόνησιν ὄντα.

¹⁶⁹ “And hence the holy writings teach us, and all the spirit-bearing [inspired] men, one of whom, John, says, ‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,’ showing that at first God was alone, and the Word in Him (δεικνύς ὅτι ἐν πρώτοις μόνος ἦν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ Λόγος).”

¹⁷⁰ = ἔχων οὖν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Λόγον ἐνδιάθετον ἐν τοῖς ἰδίῳις σπλάγχνοις. This physiological analogy is, perhaps, as crude an illustration as we find in the second century.

¹⁷¹ = μετὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ Σοφίας, ἐξερευζάμενος πρὸ πᾶν ὅλων. For ἐρεῦγομαι BAGD gives the meaning “orig. ‘belch’, then utter, proclaim” (Walter Bauer and others, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2d English ed. [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979]). Unfortunately, given the analogy of σπλάγχνον (“inward parts,” “entrails”), the original meaning could very well be Theophilus’s intention, but this seems unlikely. The word σπλάγχνον may also have a figurative meaning as “heart” or the innermost part of a person’s immaterial being. If this is the case, then ἐξερευζομαι could mean “utter” or “proclaim.” I favor this understanding since the object of ἐξερευζομαι is λόγος and σοφία, implying a more immaterial, intellectual illustration. Rogers’s question, “are we dealing with an oral or vaginal delivery of God’s agent?” (Rogers, *Theophilus of Antioch*, 94), certainly presses the figure toward absurd extremes, even though his question is how to take the metaphor. His decision to embrace a pregnancy metaphor would make sense if the object were the υἱός, but since it is λόγος in this passage, and since Theophilus qualified the image with an assertion that God maintained his own λόγος in himself, the metaphor of utterance makes the most sense. A possible source of this thought is found in Justin, *Dial.* 61.2, on the begetting of the λόγος: “But, does not something similar happen also with us humans? When we utter a word, it can be said that we beget the word, but not by cutting it off, in the sense that our power of uttering words would thereby be diminished.” Grant misses this parallel in his discussion of this passage, suggesting rather a dependence on contemporary Greek mythology (Robert M. Grant, *Jesus after the Gospels: The Christ of the Second Century*, 1st ed. [Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990], 72-74).

¹⁷² Unless Theophilus intended his λόγος to be understood as having his own hypostasis rather than merely a personification of a divine attribute, there would be no reason for him to assert that God begat him without emptying himself of his λόγος. A close analysis of Theophilus’s writings makes Rogers’s thesis increasingly untenable (Rogers, *Theophilus of Antioch*, 93-103). His explanation of this passage runs as follows: “When Theophilus says that the logos is always innate in the heart of God, this is to be taken figuratively to mean the logos is constantly conversing with God” (Rogers, *Theophilus of Antioch*, 102). It seems more likely that Theophilus is rather addressing the same tension as Justin’s analogy of the enkindled flame in *Dial.* 61.2. Following his analogy of the spoken word, Justin wrote, “We can observe a similar example in nature when one fire kindles another without losing anything, but remaining the same; yet the enkindled fire seems to exist of itself and to shine without lessening the brilliancy of the first fire.” Therefore, Theophilus most likely presented the λόγος as a *dependent hypostasis* who is distinct in number, not merely a contingent extension of God’s being or attributes.

¹⁷³ The Word is expressly called “God” in *Autolycus* 2.22.6: Θεὸς οὖν ὢν ὁ Λόγος.

¹⁷⁴ The Son is identified with λόγος in *Autolycus* 2.22.3, and is occasionally called “Word of God,” implying some sort of relationship of origin (e.g., *Autolycus* 2.10.7; 2.13.6).

him (2.10.3; 2.13.8; 2.22.2) or by him (2.10.8; 2.18.1). In this role the Son is Lord of all things (2.10.4). After creation, the Son continues in this relationship of mediator. he is sent wherever the Father wills (2.22.6), as demonstrated by the Son's personal representation of the Father in conversing with Adam (2.22.2). Through the Son and Spirit (=σοφία and λόγος)¹⁷⁵ God "heals and makes alive" (1.7.3).

It is through this same pair of mediators—Word and Wisdom—that God the Father performs all his actions in the economy of creation. These two are so closely related in function that at times the terminology used to describe them is blurred. In *Autolycus* 2.10.5, Theophilus wrote, "He, then, being Spirit of God (Πνεῦμα θεοῦ), and governing principle (ἀρχή), and wisdom (Σοφία), and power of the highest (δύναμις ὑψίστου), came down upon the prophets, and through them spoke of the creation of the world and of all other things."¹⁷⁶ Yet the persons of the Son (Word) and Spirit (Wisdom) are clearly distinguished in other passages of Theophilus. In *Autolycus* 2.10.6, he wrote of "the wisdom of God which was in Him, and His holy Word which was always present with Him."¹⁷⁷

The Spirit of God himself¹⁷⁸ is seen in a role superior to creation, but in submission to the will of the Father. Thus, the creation is said to be contained (περιέχεται) by the Spirit while at the same time both the creation and the Spirit are contained (περιέχον) by the hand of God (*Autolycus* 1.5.4). Similarly, it is God who gives his breath (πνεῦμα) to the whole world to animate creation (1.7.1; 2.13.3).¹⁷⁹ The prophets are inspired and made wise by the Spirit who is from God (2.9.1). In all cases the Spirit (Wisdom) is portrayed in a role as mediator of God the Father.

Theophilus referred to the three persons of the Trinity in several instances. In fact, in *Autolycus* 2.15.4 he wrote, "In like manner also the three days which were before the luminaries, are types of the Trinity (τριάδος) of God, and His Word, and His wisdom."¹⁸⁰ According to Theophilus God's Word and Wisdom were "emitted" from within himself before creation (2.10.2), and all three were active in the formation of the universe. It is with this Trinitarian model that he explained Genesis 1:26: "Moreover, God is found, as if needing help, to say, 'Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness.' But to no one else than to His own Word and wisdom did He say, 'Let Us make'" (2.18.2).¹⁸¹ Also, we have seen this same ordering of function present in the activities of God subsequent to creation in the economy of salvation, as God heals and makes alive through his Word and Wisdom (1.7.3).

Although Theophilus has been regarded as sub-orthodox—even as denying the incarnation and being influenced by Ebionite teachings—I find it difficult to agree with Grant who points to Theophilus as an example of "the startling diversity in Christological doctrines even toward the end of the second century."¹⁸² Theophilus did mostly neglect the incarnation of Jesus. It is also true that his descriptions of Christian doctrine are embellished with both philosophical and Jewish terms and concepts. However, an analysis of his presentation of intratrinitarian relationships between God, Word, and Wisdom are not so startling when set in the context of developing Trinitarian thought in the second century. Regardless of whether or not Theophilus would have been comfortable with the later expressions of Nicaea, his presentation of the headship of the Father and the functional subordination of the Son and Spirit in the

¹⁷⁵ The Spirit is identified with σοφία in *Autolycus* 2.9.1.

¹⁷⁶ Although the context suggests the Word is still being discussed, Theophilus described actions here that are normally attributed to the Spirit. Like others in the second century, he was not careful to distinguish the persons of Son and Spirit from their works, and this passage only muddles things, now distinguishing, now confusing the two both in name and function. On the surface this same nominal blurring is seen in *Autolycus* 2.22.2, when he said the Word is God's "power and wisdom," terms usually ascribed to the Spirit in the fathers but explicitly applied to Christ in 1 Cor 1:24. On the confusion of these terms and concepts, and on possible Jewish backgrounds, see Grant, *Jesus after the Gospels*, 71-72.

¹⁷⁷ = ἡ Σοφία ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡ ἐν αὐτῷ οὐσα καὶ ὁ Λόγος ὁ ἅγιος αὐτοῦ, ὁ ἀεὶ συμπαρόν αὐτῷ

¹⁷⁸ The term "Spirit of God" is used by Theophilus in *Autolycus* 1.5.4; 1.14.1; 3.12.1 and 3.17.4.

¹⁷⁹ This assumes πνεῦμα is intended by Theophilus to refer to the Holy Spirit and not to some impersonal, energizing force.

¹⁸⁰ = τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς Σοφίας αὐτοῦ.

¹⁸¹ = οὐκ ἄλλω δὴ τινι . . . ἀλλ' ἢ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ Λόγῳ καὶ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ Σοφίᾳ.

¹⁸² Grant, *Jesus after the Gospels*, 82. I believe Grant transgresses the bounds of evidence from Theophilus's writings, which simply do not provide the data required for his assertion that "Theophilus seems to believe in the virginal conception but not the incarnation" (ibid., 77). We simply have no indication about what Theophilus believed about the incarnation, as it seems not to have been his purpose in writing to Autolycus. Personally, I believe we owe Theophilus either grace or silence.

economy of creation was consistent with other second century thinkers.

***Summary:** In Theophilus we see a presentation of the relationships between Father, Son, and Spirit in terms consistent with his second century predecessors. The Word is distinct, but not separate, from the Father, and is thus regarded as “divine” (*Autolycus* 2.22.6), though he consistently functions in accordance with the Father’s will (2.22.6). Similarly, the Holy Spirit operates in submission to the Father (1.7.3; 2.9.1; 2.10.2; 2.18.2). Theophilus also has the distinction of being the first to explicitly point out the “threeness” of God with a term often translated “Trinity,” τριάδος (2.15.4).

Power in Unity, Diversity in Rank: Athenagoras (c. 177–180)¹⁸³

Near the beginning of his *Embassy for the Christians* Athenagoras described an absolute distinction between Creator and creature. He wrote in *Embassy* 4.1:

Now when we make a distinction between matter and God (διαίρουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ὕλης τὸν θεόν) and show that matter is one being while God is quite other (ἕτερον μὲν τι εἶναι τὴν ὕλην, ἄλλο δὲ τὸν θεόν), completely separated from the former (καὶ τὸ διὰ μέσου πολύ)—for the divine is unbegotten and invisible (θεῖον ἀγέννητον εἶναι καὶ ἀίδιον), beheld only by mind and thought (νῶ νόνῳ καὶ λόγῳ θεωρούμενον), while matter is subject to generation and corruption (γενητὴν καὶ φθαρτὴν)—surely it is unreasonable of them to charge us with atheism.

In light of this stark contrast between God on the one hand and all created things on the other, it is significant that Athenagoras included λόγος and πνεῦμα on the side of the Creator by virtue of their unity with him. He wrote in *Embassy* 6.5:

The Stoic school even though they amass a multitude of names for the divine being, according as it has to be named to suit the changes of matter through which they say that the “Breath” of God (τὸ πνεῦμα . . . τοῦ θεοῦ) passes, do in reality reckon God to be one (ἓνα νομίζουσι τὸν θεόν). For if God is that artisan fire which, making its way towards the production of the universe, embraces all the “seminal reasons” (τοὺς σπερματικούς λόγους) after the pattern of which each group of things comes to be in its appointed order, and if the Spirit of God pervades the whole universe (τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ διήκει δι’ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου), then God is one in their philosophy (ὁ θεὸς εἷς κατ’ αὐτούς).

Athenagoras demonstrated that the Stoics conceived of God as one (ἓνα νομίζουσι τὸν θεόν) and suggested that they may not consent to this reading of their doctrine (they agree “even against their will”—cf. 7.1). It is apparent that Athenagoras was reading the philosophers in conformity with his own Christian doctrine and toward whatever end would strengthen his apology. Because he did this, though, his interpretation of the Stoic beliefs reflected his own, though we must always correct the language and concepts with Athenagoras’s more explicit positive statements of Christian doctrine. Here Athenagoras intentionally used the terms λόγος and πνεῦμα from Stoic philosophy to point out parallels with Christian concepts of the unity of God, who also works in creation with λόγος and πνεῦμα. This strongly suggests that Athenagoras regarded all three persons of the Trinity as being on the side of the uncreated order rather than the created realm.

In this vein, Athenagoras expressly declared that “the Father and Son are one” (*Embassy* 10.2).¹⁸⁴

¹⁸³ English translation was adopted from Crehan, ed., *Athenagoras*, while the Greek text is taken from Miroslav Marcovich, ed., *Athenagoras: Legatio Pro Christianis*, ed. Miroslav Marcovich, Patristische Texte und Studien, vol. 31 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990). Athenagoras wrote his *Embassy* sometime between 177 and 180 (Crehan, ed., *Athenagoras*, 6). *The Resurrection of the Dead* attributed to Athenagoras was written c. 176–180, and although Athenagoras’s authorship of the work has often been challenged, either conclusion could only be held with a delicate grip (see the discussion and summary of recent scholarship on the authorship of *Resurrectio* in Miroslav Marcovich, ed., *Athenagorae Qui Fertur De Resurrectione Mortuorum*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae [Leiden: Brill, 2000], 1–3). However, *Resurrection of the Dead* has no explicit Trinitarian or intratrinitarian references, though one cannot rule out the possibility that he had the Son and Spirit in mind when he occasionally mentioned the “power and wisdom” of God (δύναμις καὶ σοφία) related in some sense to creation (3.3; 5.1; 8.4; 12.6; but cf. 18.2, “wisdom and justice”).

Thus all things are subject to one God and his word, just as in Athenagoras's time the known world was subject to the emperor and his son (18.2).¹⁸⁵ Their dual supremacy over creation is also seen in the fact that Christians are guided by the Spirit "to know the true God and His Word (ὕπὸ μόνου δὲ παραπεμπόμενοι τοῦ τὸν ὄντως θεὸν καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγον εἰδέναι), to know what is the unity of the Son with the Father (τίς ἡ τοῦ παιδὸς τὸν πατέρα ἐνότης)" (12.2). Because of this status of the Son in union with the Father, Christians revere God as "the maker of this universe and the Word that comes from Him" (30.3).

Similarly, the Holy Spirit has the same unity with the Father and Son. Expressing for the first time a theory of divine unity that anticipated later development in the West especially by Augustine,¹⁸⁶ Athenagoras wrote that the Son is "in the Father and the Father in the Son by the powerful union of the Spirit" (*Embassy* 10.2).¹⁸⁷ The Father, Son, and Spirit—being thus united "according to power"¹⁸⁸ (24.1)—are the objects of Christian faith and confession (12.2, 4).

Yet amidst some of the strongest statements indicating intrapersonal unity of the divine persons, Athenagoras asserted with equal strength their diversity. In a key statement, he noted that Christians call God "Father and Son and Holy Spirit, proclaiming their power in unity and in rank their diversity" (*Embassy* 10.4).¹⁸⁹ The term τάξις, appropriately translated here as "rank," indicates a consistent ordering of authority in function, though in this very sentence Athenagoras asserted their equality of power (δύναμις).¹⁹⁰ In fact, this notion of unity and diversity was regarded by Athenagoras as part of the basic Christian faith and confession, for Christians are led by the Spirit "to know what is the unity and division of these three great ones thus united (τίς ἡ τῶν τοιούτων ἔνωσις καὶ διαίρεσις ἐνουμένων)—Spirit, Son, and Father (τοῦ πνεύματος, τοῦ παιδός, τοῦ πατρὸς)" (12.2).

The specific character of the τάξις of Father and Son is developed throughout the *Embassy*. Though the Son is the Word, mind, thought, and power of the Father (10.2), who had the Word within himself

¹⁸⁴ = ἐνὸς ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ. Crehan notes that "ἐνότης is a favourite word with Ignatius, but even in *Eph.* 14.1 and *Smyrn.* 12.2 the unity is rather of men with God than of the Persons of the Trinity among themselves. "ἔνωσις and διαίρεσις are likewise proper to Athenagoras among Christians" (Crehan, ed., *Athenagoras*, 137, n. 81).

¹⁸⁵ Athenagoras wrote, "Just as all is subject to you two, father and son, who have received the kingdom from God (ὥς γὰρ ὑμῖν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ πάντα κεχείρωται) . . . , even so to the one God and to His Word (οὕτως ἔι τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγῳ), Son by intellectual generation and inseparable (υἱὸν νοουμένῳ ἀμπερίστω), all has been made subject (πάντα ὑποτέτακται)."

¹⁸⁶ Barnard, *Athenagoras*, 98.

¹⁸⁷ = "ὄντος δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐν πατρὶ καὶ πατρὸς ἐν υἱῷ ἐνότητι καὶ δυνάμει πνεύματος. Crehan writes, "The idea of considering the Spirit as the uniting power of the Father and the Son is here set forth for the first time in Christian theology. No doubt one can derive it from certain Johannine phrases, but Athenagoras has supplied it with its first technical terms" (Crehan, ed., *Athenagoras*, 132, n. 59).

¹⁸⁸ = κατὰ δύναμιν.

¹⁸⁹ = δεικνύντας αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐνώσει δύναμιν καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει διαίρεσιν.

¹⁹⁰ Crehan writes in an earlier footnote, "Richardson has no justification for translating τάξις here as rank instead of the correct word *order* and so making Athenagoras reduce the Spirit to a lower level than the Father and the Son. Elsewhere in the work τάξις undoubtedly means order rather than rank" (Crehan, ed., *Athenagoras*, 133, n. 62). Besides the obvious attempt by Crehan to rescue Athenagoras from what he sees as an errant view of the Spirit, there are several problems with his comment here. First, I wonder what the real difference is between "rank" and "order" in English, as any dictionary demonstrates that the two terms overlap in their semantic domains. I am uncertain what nuances of "rank" Crehan is excluding and what nuances of "order" he is embracing. Second, his fear of reducing the Spirit "to a lower level than the Father and the Son" does not serve as an adequate explanation, for it is clear that the Son and Spirit are overwhelmingly presented in second century literature as operating under the will and direction of the Father and at least in this functional sense are at a lower level without necessarily compromising equality in divine power. Third, his own English translation renders τάξις as "rank" in *Embassy* 10.4: "their power in unity and in rank their diversity." Fourth, even if we were to consistently render the term as "order," this would still not negate the fact that for Athenagoras (and, in fact, for all of the writers of the second century), the *monarchia* of the Godhead rests with the Father while the Son and Spirit operate in submission to the Father's will. Thus, since the concept of rank is already clearly established in the second century, I can see no reason for Crehan to prevent τάξις from communicating this concept explicitly. Barnard, who sides with Crehan on the distinction between "rank" and "order," concedes in the end, "The logos has two relationships with the Father, immanent in the Godhead, and expressed in procession when He presides over the ordering of the universe. This is a difference of function rather than nature and, properly understood, does not lend itself to a subordinationist interpretation" (Barnard, *Athenagoras*, 101).

for eternity (10.3),¹⁹¹ the Word comes forth from (παρά) the Father (4.2; 30.3) and is described as “first begotten” to God (πρῶτον γέννημα εἶναι τῷ πατρί).¹⁹² With respect to this relationship to the Father, the Word is called “Son of God” (10.2 [4x], 3). However, Athenagoras specifically denies that this implies the Word is a creature. He wrote, “He did not indeed come to be (οὐχ ὥς γενόμενον).”¹⁹³ Rather, the Son comes forth “by intellectual generation” and is “inseparable” from the Father (οὐ χωρὶς νοουμένῳ ἀμπερίστω). In relationship to the work of creation, then, the Son, being divine, is of an utterly different nature than creatures. But God the Father made all things through (διὰ) and by the Word (ὅφ’ οὗ λογῷ δεδημιούργηται) (4.2; 6.3; 10.1, 2).¹⁹⁴

Likewise, the Spirit is described as an emanation or effluence from God (ἀπόρροιαν εἶναι φάμεν τοῦ θεοῦ), both flowing out and returning (ἀπορρέον καὶ ἐπαναφερόμενον) “like a ray of the sun” (*Embassy* 10.4) or “light from a fire” (24.1).¹⁹⁵ He is thus the divine Spirit of God (6.5; 9.2) who, while pervading the whole universe (6.5), holds all things in being (6.3) and governs all creation (5.2).

So, we see in Athenagoras a concept of God that is virtually defined by his actions through the Son and Spirit. He wrote, “We know and cherish that being as God by whose Word all things are made and by whose Spirit all things are held in being” (*Embassy* 6.3). Again, Athenagoras declined an opportunity to place Son and Spirit on the side of creation, though he clearly used terms in relation to creation indicating order in the Godhead where the Father is always primary.

It is important to note, however, that the functional distinction and even subordination (τάξις implies both) is not limited merely to the incarnation or earthly ministry of the Son. Rather, this functional rank is associated with every activity of God beginning with creation and includes both the Son and Spirit. What is most provocative about the description of the intratrinitarian relationships between Father, Son, and Spirit is not merely that Athenagoras asserted that the persons are equal in power but distinct in rank (*Embassy* 10.4), but that he told his pagan readers in 11.1 that he was “reproducing exactly the account customary amongst us” (εἰ δὲ ἀριβῶς διέξειμι τὸν καθ’ ἡμᾶς λόγον, μὴ θαυμάσητι).

***Summary:** In a key summary statement Athenagoras noted that Christians call God “Father and Son and holy Spirit, proclaiming their power in unity and in rank (τάξις) their diversity” (*Embassy* 10.4). In fact,

¹⁹¹ = εἶχεν αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λόγον, αἰδίῳς λογικὸς ὢν.

¹⁹² Crehan notes, “The Pauline πρῶτότοκος is not used, but a more philosophical paraphrase, πρῶτον γέννημα” (Crehan, ed., *Athenagoras*, 133, n. 60). Though I am doubtful that the biblical πρῶτότοκος was meant to communicate the thought of the philosophical πρωτογόνος, or πρῶτον γέννημα, Crehan is probably correct that this is the way πρῶτότοκος was read by most second century Christians. Its Old Testament and Jewish Messianic connotations, especially as it relates to the LXX of Psalm 88:28 (κἀγὼ πρωτότοκον θήσομαι αὐτὸν ὑψηλὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν τῆς γῆς), is perhaps too distant a notion for most apologists, including the Samaritan Justin Martyr. Though space does not permit a development of this idea here, it is my own conviction that the New Testament references to Christ as πρῶτότοκος derive their meaning from the Messianic use in Psalm 88:28 and thus communicate not the ontological relationship between the Father and the Son, but Christ’s Messianic authority in God’s economies of creation and salvation (Col 1:15, 18; Heb 1:6; 12:23; Rev 1:5). I hope to develop and defend this thesis more formally in a later study, tracing the shift from a Hebrew Davidic Christology in the first century to a Hellenistic Logos Christology in the second, wherein terms pregnant with Messianic meaning were re-read and paraphrased according to Greek philosophical understandings.

¹⁹³ Crehan writes, “What Athenagoras wants to say is obviously that the Son is eternal although begotten and hence pre-existent to all creation” (Ibid., 133, n. 61).

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Barnard, *Athenagoras*, 100.

¹⁹⁵ Crehan writes, “There is no trace of this exact image in the Apostolic Fathers or in the earlier Apologists. Tertullian has it in full, *Apol.* 21, and elaborates it in *Adv. Prax.* 8. . . Justin indeed has the Philonic comparison of the fire and the torch (*Dial.* 61.2 and 128.4) and speaks *ibid.* 128.3 of the Logos coming from the Father like the ray coming down from the sun while remaining indivisibly united to its source and departing again at sunset. . . . The originality of Athenagoras lies in his applying this image to the Spirit and in finding a distinctive word for it” (Crehan, ed., *Athenagoras*, 133-34, n. 63). Crehan errs in his reading of Justin, however, in that Justin’s discussion of the light from the sun is used as an illustration of a view he is refuting. Justin wrote in full: “But some teach that this power is indivisible and inseparable from the Father, just as the light of the sun on earth is indivisible and inseparable from the sun in the skies; for, when the sun sets, its light disappears from the earth. So, they claim, the Father by his will can cause his power to go forth and, whenever he wishes, to return again. In this manner, they declare, God also made the angels. But it has been demonstrated that the angels always exist and are not reduced again into that form which they were created. It has also been shown at length that this power which the prophetic Word also calls *God* and *Angel* not only is numbered as different by its name (as is the light of the sun), but is something distinct in real number” (*Dial.* 128.3-4).

Athenagoras regarded this notion of unity and diversity as part of the basic Christian faith and confession, for Christians are led by the Spirit “to know what is the unity and division of these three great ones thus united—Spirit, Son, and Father” (12.2). Besides this statement, Athenagoras’s references to the relationships between Father, Son, and Spirit are consistent with the other fathers of the second century.

He Sent Him as God: Epistle to Diognetus (c. 150-225)

In the letter to Diognetus the repeated emphasis was that God sent his Son.¹⁹⁶ Even though God is said to have sent his Son to us for the purpose of revelation and grace (*Diogn.* 8:11; 11:5), the author suggested that God actually reveals himself, almost as if unmediated (8:5). It is from God the Father that the plan of redemption originates (8:9; 9:1). By the Father’s will he gave up his own Son (9:2). However, the mediation of the Son is reciprocal, for the Father is also glorified through the Son (12:9). This reciprocal relationship of mutual revelation is consistent with the second century idea that God approaches the world from the Father, through the Son, and in the Holy Spirit, while the world approaches God by the Spirit, through the Son, and to the Father.

With Him Were Always the Word and Wisdom: Irenaeus (c. 180–190)¹⁹⁷

Like Justin before him, Irenaeus presented a view of God the Father as utterly transcendent. As God and Lord (*A.H.* 3.6.2; 3.8.3; 3.9.1), he is above all (4.38.3; 5.18.2), uncreated, unbegotten (4.38.1, 3; *Dem.* 5), the “first of all things” (πρῶτος τῶν ἀπάντων) (*A.H.* 4.38.3), who has nothing above or after him (*A.H.* 2.Pref.1; *Dem.* 5). He is perfect (*A.H.* 4.38.3), being himself all mind, all word, all spirit, all light (2.28.2). He is infinite (4.6.3), invisible spirit,¹⁹⁸ unapproachable by created things (*Dem.* 47). Thus, he is also indescribable, unspeakable, and immeasurable (*Dem.* 70; *A.H.* 4.4.2), which means he is unknown to his creation except by his own voluntary self-revelation (4.6.3, 4).

This Father is therefore the “first and most important head” (*A.H.* 2.1.1), the Creator (δημιουργός) and Maker (ποιητής) of the universe,¹⁹⁹ and as such “all other things remain under God’s subjection” (4.38.3). He planned everything and gives commands (4.38.3). In contrast to the Gnostic idea of emanations and mediating powers, Irenaeus argued that God has no need for other, lesser instruments of creation;²⁰⁰ and in contrast to the dueling gods of the Marcionites, “there was no other God besides Him who made and fashioned us” (4.32.1). All created things are ontologically inferior to him who created them (4.38.1).

This ontological distance between God the Father and creation meant to Irenaeus, as it did to Justin,

¹⁹⁶ *Diogn.* 7:2, 3, 4, 5, 6; 10:2; 11:3.

¹⁹⁷ The critical editions of *Against Heresies* and *Demonstration* are Adelin Rousseau, ed., *Irénée de Lyon, Démonstration de la prédication apostolique*, Sources chrétiennes 46 (Paris: Cerf, 1995), Adelin Rousseau and L. Doutreleau, eds., *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les hérésies, Livre 3*, vol. 2: Texte et traduction, Sources chrétiennes 211 (Paris: Cerf, 1974), Adelin Rousseau and L. Doutreleau, eds., *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les hérésies, Livre 1*, vol. 2: Texte et traduction, Sources chrétiennes 264 (Paris: Cerf, 1979), Adelin Rousseau and L. Doutreleau, eds., *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les hérésies, Livre 2*, vol. 2: Texte et traduction, Sources chrétiennes 294 (Paris: Cerf, 1982), Adelin Rousseau et al., eds., *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les hérésies, Livre 4*, vol. 2: Texte et traduction, Sources chrétiennes 100 (Paris: Cerf, 1965), Adelin Rousseau, C. Mercier, and L. Doutreleau, eds., *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les hérésies, Livre 5*, vol. 2: Texte et traduction, Sources chrétiennes 153 (Paris: Cerf, 1969). The English translation for *Against Heresies*, Book 1, is Dominic J. Unger and John J. Dillon, eds., *St. Irenaeus of Lyons, Adversus haeresis 1/1*, Ancient Christian Writers 53 (New York: Newman, 1992) For Books 2–5 the translation is from Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1: The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus (Edinburgh: Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1885; reprint, New York: Scribner’s, 1899), with the occasional use of Robert M. Grant, *Irenaeus of Lyons, The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 1997) For *Demonstration* the English translation is from Iain M. MacKenzie, *Irenaeus’s Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching: A Theological Commentary and Translation*, trans. J. Armitage Robinson (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002). Since a text-critical study of the Irenaeus corpus is far beyond the scope of this paper, Greek citations rely upon either the recension of the text based on manuscript evidence, or upon the reconstruction of the Greek text based on the evidence from the Latin and other ancient versions, trusting the general reliability of the editors’ scholarship. Where there are discrepancies between paragraph numbering between the critical editions and English translations, I have cited the passages according to the editions. Although the authenticity of several fragments is disputed, I have included them here, and advise the reader to use caution in handling the evidence they provide.

¹⁹⁸ *A.H.* 1.10.1; 1.19.2; 3.11.6; 4.6.3; *Dem.* 5, 45, 47.

¹⁹⁹ *A.H.* 1.10.3; 1.19.2; 1.31.3; 2.25.1; 3.12.11; 4.24.1; 4.38.3.

²⁰⁰ *A.H.* 2.2.5; 4.7.4; 4.32.1; 4.36.1.

that the transcendent Father himself did not speak to men in history, but the mediating Word of God preserved the invisibility of the Father (*A.H.* 4.20.7; *Dem.* 45). Though the Father's will is timeless and all things are foreknown by him, the Son accomplishes this will within the flow of history (*A.H.* 3.16.7). At the end of time in the kingdom of heaven, however, Irenaeus suggested that the Father will finally be seen by men in their immortal condition (4.20.5; 4.20.9).²⁰¹

From this concept of the utterly transcendent Father flowed Irenaeus's doctrine of the Word of God. He wrote in *Against Heresies* 2.28.5:

God being all Mind and all Logos says what he things and thinks what he says; for his Reasoning is Logos and Logos is Mind and all-containing Mind is the Father himself.²⁰² If then one speaks of the Mind of God and gives its own emission to the Mind, one calls him composite, since in this case God is one thing and the directing Mind is another. Similarly in giving the Word a third rank in emission from the Father (which would explain why the Word is ignorant of the Father's greatness) one deeply separates the Word from God. And indeed the prophet says of him, "Who will recount his generation?" (Is. 53:8). But when you scrutinize his generation from the Father and transfer the expression of the human word, made with the tongue, to the Word of God, you yourselves rightly reveal that you know neither human nor divine matters.

Here we see a very well-developed theology of the Word's relationship to the Father,²⁰³ though couched in anti-Gnostic terms. To Irenaeus, the Word is not a third-class emission that is "deeply separated" from the source. In fact, one cannot conceive of the Word's "generation" from the Father in human terms; generation to Irenaeus is more an imperfect term used to describe *relationship* between Father and Son, not means or manner of *origination*.

It is clear that Irenaeus regarded the Word as *uncreated* (*A.H.* 2.25.3),²⁰⁴ and thus incomparable and superior to created things.²⁰⁵ As the Father stood in need of no lesser intermediaries in creation,²⁰⁶ he made all things with "His own hands," a metaphorical reference to the Son and Holy Spirit (4.20.1).²⁰⁷ Although, as we have seen, the Son is described as "generated" from the Father,²⁰⁸ for Irenaeus this generation is unknowable, indescribable, and unspeakable.²⁰⁹ Irenaeus wrote, "Since therefore His

²⁰¹ It is likely that for Irenaeus created beings will be able to see the Father as a result of the process of deification, wherein mortal humans are transformed into immortality and given the ability to participate in things that are by nature unattainable by creatures in a mortal state.

²⁰² = *Cogitatio enim eius Logos, et Logos Mens, et omnia concludens Mens, ipse est Pater.*

²⁰³ In keeping with his emphasis on sonship and Fatherhood, Irenaeus referred to the relationship between the Word and the Father with "Word of God" or "his Word" on numerous occasions. (*A.H.* 1.9.2, 3 [3x]; 10.3; 15.5; 22.1; 2.2.4 [2x]; 2.5 [2x]; 11.1; 27.2; 28.5 [2x]; 28.7; 30.9; 3.8.2; 8.3; 9.1; 9.3 [2x]; 10.3; 11.1; 11.3 [2x]; 11.8; 15.3; 16.2; 16.7; 16.9; 17.4; 18.2; 18.5; 18.6; 18.7 [2x]; 19.1 [4x]; 19.3; 20.2; 21.10; 22.1; 4.2.6; 5.1; 5.2; 5.3; 5.4 [2x]; 5.5; 6.1; 6.2; 6.3 [3x]; 6.5; 7.4 [2x]; 8.3; 9.1; 11.2; 12.4 [2x]; 13.4 [5x]; 20.1; 20.4 [2x]; 20.6; 20.11 [3x]; 24.1; 24.2 [2x]; 25.1; 25.3; 28.2 [3x]; 28.3; 31.2; 33.10 [2x]; 33.11; 33.15 [2x]; 36.8; 38.1; 5.Pref.; 1.1 [2x]; 2.2; 2.3 [2x]; 9.3; 10.1; 14.1; 15.3; 16.2 [2x]; 16.3 [2x]; 17.1; 17.4 [2x]; 18.1 [3x]; 18.2; 18.3 [3x]; 21.3; 22.1; 24.4; 28.1; 28.4; 36.2; *Frag.* 28; 52; *Dem.* 6; 7; 10; 12; 30; 33; 34; 35; 37; 39; 40; 46; 53; 68; 94; 96)

²⁰⁴ MacKenzie correctly points to *A.H.* 4.20.1 as well as 4.20.3, as evidence that Irenaeus held that the Son and Spirit are not creatures, but co-eternal with the Father (MacKenzie, *Irenaeus's Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, 30). O'Collins notes, "In passing, Irenaeus upheld the Son's eternal pre-existence with the Father (*Adversus haereses*, 2.30.9; 3.18.1), but he was much more concerned with the economy of salvation" (O'Collins, *Christology*, 172).

²⁰⁵ *A.H.* 3.8.2; 3.8.3; 4.38.1; 5.22.1. J. Armitage Robinson's unfortunate translation of *Dem.* 48—"He came into being before all"—should be disregarded. Rousseau suggests that the Greek text originally underlying the Armenian version read προϋπάρχειν for ἐξηύηκε and should be translated "existe avant toutes choses." He writes, "Telle est, d'ailleurs, la doctrine constante d'Irénée, formulée avec toute la clarté voulue en *Dém.* 43. . . . One ne peut donc accepter, comme exprimant la pensée d'Irénée, les traductions que Smith et Froidevaux donnent de la présente phrase de *Dém.* 48 : «...He declared that He came into being long before...», «...il a annoncé qu'il est venu à l'existence le premier...», traductions qui supposent γίνομαι comme substrat de ἐξηύηκε" (Adelin Rousseau, ed., *Irénée de Lyon, Démonstration de la prédication apostolique*, Sources chrétiennes 46 [Paris: Cerf, 1995], 305).

²⁰⁶ *A.H.* 2.2.5; 4.7.4; 4.32.1; 4.36.1.

²⁰⁷ Cf. Theophilus, *Autolycus* 2.18.2.

²⁰⁸ *A.H.* 3.11.8; 4.6.6; *Frag.* 53; *Dem.* 30, 39. On several occasions Irenaeus referred to the Son as "only-begotten," μονογενής (*A.H.* 1.9.2 [2x]; 1.9.3 [2x]; 1.10.3; 3.16.2; 3.16.6; 3.16.7; 3.16.9; 3.17.4; 4.5.4; 5.17.2) or as "firstborn," πρωτότοκος, (4.21.3; 5.19.1; 5.36.3; *Frag.* 52, 54).

²⁰⁹ *A.H.* 2.28.5; 2.28.6; 4.33.11; *Dem.* 70.

generation is unspeakable, those who strive to set forth generations and productions cannot be in their right mind, inasmuch as they undertake to describe things which are indescribable” (2.28.6). The nature of this generation is, however, known by the Father and Son (2.28.6). We are merely told that the Son had a “pre-eminent birth which is from the Most High Father”²¹⁰ (3.19.2), that Christ was Son of God “before the ages” (*Frag.* 39), that whatever is so begotten of God is God (*Frag.* 54; *Dem.* 47).²¹¹ It is therefore understandable that Irenaeus, like many before him, did not hesitate to call Jesus “God.”²¹²

In Book 2 of *Against Heresis* (17.1–7), Irenaeus provided an insight into various concepts of emanation and generation of beings. Though this passage does not help us understand how we should conceive of the Son’s generation from the Father before the ages, it does help us to know how we should *not* regard such a generation. Irenaeus’s point seems to be that all these types of generation in the created world fall short of describing the indescribable (*A.H.* 2.13.8; 2.28.5; *Frag.* 54).

Irenaeus suggested that one type of generation is *radiation*, as solar rays from the sun, whereby the thing generated is united with the source, has no separate existence, shares in its substance, but emanates from it naturally (*A.H.* 2.17.7). Another form is *enkindling*, as the flame of a torch is produced from another torch. In such a case the flames differ in generation and size, but share the same substance with the original and, in fact, none of the subsequent flames are older or more recent since the same flame is simply distributed, neither diminished nor changed (2.17.4).²¹³ Another form of generation is *organic reproduction*, such as man from man or beast from beast. In this case the thing generated is actual (*efficabiliter*), separate (*partiliter*), and possessing an independent existence and its own special form (2.17.3). A final type of generation is *bifurcation*, as branches sprouting from a tree, whereby all share the same substance and nature but differ in size, being composite parts of the whole (2.17.6).

Irenaeus wrote, “I am not aware that, besides these productions, they [the heretics] are able to speak of any other; indeed, they have not been known to me (although I have had very frequent discussions with them concerning forms of this kind) as ever setting forth any other peculiar kind of being as produced” (*A.H.* 2.17.9). He thus intended to relay all possible types of generation or production. By doing so, he demonstrated that the Gnostics’ doctrines of deteriorating emanations is logically inconsistent, since in all these types of generation the offspring must necessarily be of the same nature and quality as the source, and can certainly not be superior. Yet his catalogue of types of generation also shows us the various ways a person could conceive of the Son’s generation from the Father.

As to this question in particular, Irenaeus wrote in *Against Heresies* 2.28.6:

If any one, therefore, says to us, “How then was the Son produced by the Father?” we reply to him, that no man understands that production, or generation, or calling or revelation,²¹⁴ or by whatever name one may describe His generation, which is in fact altogether indescribable. Neither Valentinus, nor Marcion, nor

²¹⁰ = τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὑψίστου Πατρὸς γενεάν.

²¹¹ Language indicating the paternal and filial relationships in the Godhead is used innumerable times by Irenaeus. God is called the “Father of the Lord” or “Lord Jesus Christ” or at least 16 times (*A.H.* 1.22.1; 1.27.1; 1.27.2; 2.30.9; 3.3.3; 3.6.4; 3.9.1; 3.10.6; 3.11.7; 3.12.11; 3.25.7; 4.5.5; 4.36.6 [2x]; 5.17.2; 5.25.2) and “his Father” in no less than 30 instances (1.27.2; 3.5.1; 3.5.3; 3.6.1; 3.12.13; 3.16.6; 3.16.9; 3.20.2; 4.2.2; 4.2.6; 4.6.3; 4.9.1; 4.9.3; 4.11.3; 4.20.11; 4.33.1; 4.33.11; 4.36.1 [2x]; 5.21.2; 5.22.1 [2x]; 5.23.2; 5.26.2; 5.27.1 [3x]; 5.36.3; *Frag.* 39; *Dem.* 70). The Son is of course called “Son of God,” “Son of the Father,” or “his Son” innumerable times (*A.H.* 1.3.6; 1.9.3 [2x]; 1.10.1 [2x]; 1.10.3; 2.26.1; 2.28.6; 2.30.9; 2.32.4; 2.35.2; 3.1.2; 3.4.2; 3.5.3 [2x]; 3.6.1; 3.9.2; 3.10.2; 3.12.13; 3.10.2; 3.10.3 [3x]; 3.11.4; 3.11.8 [2x]; 3.12.2; 3.12.3; 3.12.4 [2x]; 3.12.6; 3.12.7 [4x]; 3.12.8; 3.12.13; 3.13.1; 3.16.2; 3.16.3 [5x]; 3.16.4; 3.16.5; 3.16.7; 3.16.8; 3.16.9 [3x]; 3.17.1; 3.17.4; 3.18.1; 3.18.2; 3.18.3; 3.18.4 [2x]; 3.18.6; 3.19.1; 3.19.2; 3.19.3; 3.20.2; 3.20.4; 3.21.3; 3.21.3; 3.21.7; 3.22.3; 4.Pref.4; 4.1.1; 4.2.4 [2x]; 4.2.6; 4.2.7; 4.6.4; 4.7.1; 4.9.2 [2x]; 4.10.1 [3x]; 4.11.3; 4.13.1; 4.14.1; 4.17.6 [2x]; 4.18.4; 4.20.7; 4.20.8 [2x]; 4.20.12; 4.23.1; 4.23.2 [3x]; 4.24.1; 4.24.2; 4.25.2; 4.26.1; 4.26.5; 4.27.1 [2x]; 4.27.2; 4.28.2; 4.30.4; 4.33.3; 4.33.4 [2x]; 4.33.7 [2x]; 4.33.9; 4.33.11; 4.33.15; 4.34.3; 4.35.4; 4.36.1; 4.36.2 [3x]; 4.36.4; 4.36.5 [3x]; 4.36.6 [2x]; 4.36.7; 4.37.7; 4.38.2; 5.5.2; 5.6.1; 5.9.2; 5.12.5; 5.14.4; 5.17.2; 5.20.1; 5.21.2; 5.26.2; 5.36.3 [2x]; *Frag.* 39; 52; 53; *Dem.* 3; 5; 6; 7 [2x]; 9; 10; 30; 34; 36; 37; 40; 43 [2x]; 44 [3x]; 45; 49 [4x]; 51 [2x]; 52; 56 [2x]; 57; 58; 61 [2x]; 62; 64; 66; 67; 72; 86 [2x]; 89; 92; 95 [2x]; 96; 97; 99.

²¹² *A.H.* 1.10.1; 3.6.1; 3.6.2; 3.8.3; 3.9.1; 3.9.2; 3.9.3; 3.11.5; 3.11.8; 3.12.9; 3.16.7; 3.19.2; 3.20.4; 3.21.1; 3.21.4; 4.6.6; 4.6.7; 4.9.3; 4.20.4; 4.33.4; 4.33.11; 5.1.1; 5.14.4; 5.17.3; *Frag.* 40; 47; 52; 53; 54; 55; 60; 61; 62.

²¹³ Cf. Justin, *Dial.* 61.2. Justin rejected the “light from fire” analogy (Justin, *Dial.* 28.3), but favored the “flame of flame” illustration, while Irenaeus rejected all earthly analogies of generation (*A.H.* 2.28.6).

²¹⁴ = *dicimus ei quia prolationem istam, siue generationem, siue nuncupationem, siue adapertionem.*

Saturninus, nor Basilides, nor angels, nor archangels, nor principalities, nor powers [possess this knowledge], but the Father only who begat, and the Son who was begotten. Since therefore His generation is unspeakable (*inenarrabilis*), those who strive to set forth generations and productions cannot be in their right mind, inasmuch as they undertake to describe things which are indescribable.

The Word eternally co-exists with the Father,²¹⁵ was with God apart from and at the commencement of creation (cf. John 1:1),²¹⁶ and communed with the Father prior to his incarnation.²¹⁷ The Son is therefore greater than angels and all other created powers. Irenaeus made it clear that it was not angels, some power “remotely distant from the Father,” nor even some “other God” (ἄλλον Θεόν) who made us, but the Word of God (*A.H.* 4.20.1; 4.32.1; 5.18.2).

On numerous occasions Irenaeus referred to the Son with language suggesting ontological equality with the Father (*A.H.* 3.11.6; 3.11.8). He is emphatically *not* a power separate from God (2.11.1; 2.28.5), but Father and Son are said to indwell each other,²¹⁸ and relate to each other in a reciprocal relationship (4.6.3; 4.14.1). We are also told that the Son has fellowship with the Father in all things (2.28.8), and, drawing from the language of John’s Gospel, to see the Son is to see the Father (3.13.2). Besides these, the Father and Son receive identical titles and are mutual objects of faith, worship, and preaching.²¹⁹ Irenaeus also noted that Father and Son share in the rule over all things (4.1.1).

In *Demonstration* 47, Irenaeus even used language that foreshadowed later discussions concerning divine substance: “And so in the substance and power of His being there is shown forth one God; but there is also according to the economy of our redemption both Son and Father. Because to created things the Father of all is invisible and unapproachable, therefore those who are to draw near to God must have their access to the Father through the Son.” Thus, Father and Son, though equal in power and substance, have distinct roles in God’s work of creation and salvation. Regarding God’s eternal existence apart from the creation of time and space, Irenaeus described the relationship between Father and Son in terms of reciprocal glorification: “For not alone antecedently to Adam, but also before all creation, the Word glorified His Father, remaining in Him; and was Himself glorified by the Father, as He did Himself declare, ‘Father, glorify Thou Me with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was’” (*A.H.* 4.14.1²²⁰; cf. 4.35.2).

Although the Father and Son appear to enjoy a mutual equality apart from creation, when God takes action in creation there is distinct and consistent order among the persons of the Godhead (*Dem.* 47), so Irenaeus could say categorically that “the Son performs the good pleasure of the Father” (*A.H.* 4.6.3; 4.38.3). In the initial creation of the world, the Father is the primary will, while the Son is the mediator.²²¹ Irenaeus indicated that all things were created by the Father through the Son (Gk διὰ / Latin

²¹⁵ *A.H.* 2.25.3; 3.18.1; 4.20.1; 4.20.3; *Dem.* 10. In one passage Irenaeus suggests there was a different relationship between Father and Son prior to the generation of the Son. He notes that the Gospel of John refers to the Word’s “original, effectual, and glorious generation from the Father” (= τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἡγεμονικὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ πρακτικὴν καὶ ἔνδοξον γενεὰν διηγείται). In this passage *πρακτικὴν* (“effectual”) seems to suggest the generation was related to divine activity. Prior to this, the Son is conceived of as simply co-existing with the Godhead in the bosom of the Father (*A.H.* 3.11.5; 4.14.1). Thus, one could say that while the Son is eternally God of God, he had two generations related to creation—the first from the Father in order to serve as mediator of creation (*A.H.* 3.11.8), the second from Mary to serve as mediator of salvation (*Dem.* 40).

²¹⁶ *A.H.* 3.11.2; 3.18.1; 4.14.1; 5.1.1; 5.15.4; *Frag.* 39, 53, 54; *Dem.* 43, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56.

²¹⁷ *Dem.* 49, 50, 51, 53, 55.

²¹⁸ *A.H.* 3.6.2; 3.11.5; 3.11.6; 4.14.1.

²¹⁹ *A.H.* 1.3.6; 1.9.2; 1.10.1; 3.6.1; 3.6.2; 3.8.3; 3.9.1; 3.12.7; 3.12.13; 3.15.3; 4.1.1; 4.5.2; 4.6.2; 4.6.4; 4.6.6; 4.6.7; 4.13.1; 5.8.4; *Dem.* 47.

²²⁰ Although some may point to this passage as demonstrating that the Father and Son had both ontological and *functional* equality prior to creation, this goes beyond what the passage actually says. Although strongly supporting a notion of what we call ontological equality, all actions of the persons of the Godhead are seen as acts of the Son and Spirit in submission to the will of the Father. In an eternal state apart from activities in creation, there is no actual *function* (a term which implies activity). The most we can say is that the functions of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are consistent with the indescribable eternal relationships between the Father, Son and Spirit (*A.H.* 4.7.4).

²²¹ *A.H.* 4.38.3; 5.15.3; 5.18.2; *Dem.* 39; 5; 6; 43; 53. While the Son as mediator of the Father’s act of creation is the norm, on several occasions Irenaeus used language regarding the Son as the direct agent of creation. Thus, he can be called the Maker (Ποιητής) Creator (Κτίστης) and Framer (Δημιουργός) and Artificer (Τεχνίτης) of creation (*A.H.* 1.9.2; 1.15.5; 3.11.8; 3.22.3;

per),²²² or by means of the Son (ἐν or dative of means).²²³ Thus, the Son and Spirit were called the two hands of God with regard to the Father's creative activity.²²⁴

Between the initial creation and the incarnation, the Son also submits to the will of the Father, carrying out God's eternal plan and decree in history. He wrote:

For all these things were foreknown by the Father; but the Son works them out at the proper time in perfect order and sequence. . . . By which is made manifest, that all things which had been foreknown of the Father, our Lord did accomplish in their order, season, and hour, foreknown and fitting, being indeed one and the same, but rich and great. For He fulfils the bountiful and comprehensive will of His Father.²²⁵

The Son also reveals the invisible Father to visible creation,²²⁶ while the Son himself is revealed to humankind according to the Father's will.²²⁷ The invisible and unmeasurable Father is subjected to measure by the manifestation of the Son,²²⁸ who is the "image of God" (*Dem.* 22) and "mediator" between God and men (*A.H.* 3.18.7). Through him the Father not only gives commands and teaches men to know God,²²⁹ but in fact he reveals *all* things through the Word.²³⁰

In keeping with the notion that the Son is the Word and revealer of the invisible God, Irenaeus—like Justin before him—taught that the Son was the one who interacted with mankind in Old Testament history and through the Scriptures (*A.H.* 4.6.6). It was the Son who walked with Adam in the Garden of Eden (*Dem.* 12) and spoke with Abraham and the patriarchs.²³¹ He received power from the Father to judge Sodom (*A.H.* 3.6.1; *Dem.* 44) and sat in glory between the cherubim of the Ark (*A.H.* 3.11.8). In short, the Son or Logos of God—not the Father (*Dem.* 45)—was the person of the Godhead who was always present with the human race according to the Father's will (*A.H.* 3.16.6).

With regard to the incarnation, the Son also submits to the Father's direction. Having existed with the Father as a divine, invisible spirit (*A.H.* 4.24.2; *Dem.* 30²³²), at the time appointed by the Father and according to his good pleasure,²³³ the Son became incarnate.²³⁴ It is in this sense that the Son was sent into the world by the Father.²³⁵

Likewise, during the earthly ministry of Jesus, he did all things according to the will of the Father.²³⁶

4.20.1; 5.12.6; 5.18.3; 5.24.4; *Frag.* 53; 54; *Dem.* 34; 39), who formed all things ancient and recent (*A.H.* 2.25.1). Like the Father, he contains all things in an invisible manner (*A.H.* 3.11.8; 5.18.3) and thus always co-existed with creation (*A.H.* 4.6.2; 5.18.3; *Dem.* 45). On occasion Irenaeus said created things were made "by" (ὕπό) the Son, rather than "through" (διὰ) or "be means of" (ἐν) (*A.H.* 3.16.6; 4.32.1), though this act of creation is still said to be "according to the Father's will" (*A.H.* 5.18.2; 5.18.3).

²²² *A.H.* 1.9.2; 1.22.1; 1.22.1; 2.2.5; 2.27.2; 2.30.9; 3.4.2; 3.8.2; 3.8.3; 3.11.1; 3.11.2; 3.18.1; 4.Pref.4; 4.18.4; 4.20.1; 4.20.4; 4.24.1; 5.18.2.

²²³ *A.H.* 2.2.4; 2.2.5; 2.11.1; 2.30.9; 3.24.2; 4.20.2; 4.20.4; 4.32.1.

²²⁴ *A.H.* 3.21.10; 4.Pref.4; 4.20.1; 5.5.2; 5.6.1; 5.15.2.

²²⁵ *A.H.* 3.16.7.

²²⁶ *A.H.* 3.6.2; 3.11.6; 4.2.5; 4.6.3; 4.6.4; 4.6.5; 4.6.6; 4.6.7; 4.7.3; 4.11.4; 4.20.4; 4.20.6; 4.20.7; 4.20.11; 5.1.1; 5.15.2; 5.16.3; 5.25.5; *Dem.* 7; 24; 34; 45; 56.

²²⁷ *A.H.* 3.5.3; 3.6.2; 3.11.6; 3.13.2; 3.18.4; 3.19.2; 4.2.5; 4.6.5; 4.9.3; 4.35.4; *Dem.* 51. Though the Father is said as revealing the Son, Irenaeus believed this was achieved by the mediation of the Holy Spirit (*Dem.* 7), thus preserving the Father's transcendence.

²²⁸ *A.H.* 4.4.2; 4.6.5; 4.6.6; 4.20.7; 4.24.2; 5.17.1.

²²⁹ *A.H.* 4.5.1; 4.6.1; 4.7.3; 4.20.6.

²³⁰ *A.H.* 4.6.3; 4.11.1; 5.17.1; 5.17.2.

²³¹ *A.H.* 3.6.1; 3.11.8; 4.5.2; 4.5.3; 4.7.1; 4.8.1; 4.36.8; *Dem.* 44.

²³² Adelin Rousseau writes, "Il n'est donc nullement question de la Personne de l'Esprit Saint, mais de la «Réalité spirituelle» que sont toutes et chacune des Personnes de la Trinité divine" (Rousseau, ed., *Irénée de Lyon, Démonstration de la prédication apostolique*, 264).

²³³ *A.H.* 3.17.4; 3.18.1; 3.20.2.

²³⁴ *A.H.* 1.9.3; 3.9.1; 3.16.6; 3.18.2; 3.21.7; 4.17.6; 4.20.4; *Dem.* 40; 51; 53. Robinson's English translation of *Dem.* 53 is somewhat unclear here. Rousseau's reconstruction of the Greek text posits ἐχρίσθη τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Πνεύματι, which I would render, "He was anointed with the Spirit of his God and Father." In contrast to Robinson's translation, this makes it clear that Christ was not anointed with the Spirit and the Father (Rousseau, ed., *Irénée de Lyon, Démonstration de la prédication apostolique*, 311).

²³⁵ *A.H.* 2.10.2; 3.12.2; 4.6.3; 4.36.1; 4.36.2; 4.36.5; 4.41.4; 5.17.2; 5.21.2; 5.21.3; 5.26.2; *Frag.* 52; *Dem.* 38; 97.

²³⁶ *A.H.* 2.32.5; 3.12.3; 4.20.6; 5.14.2; 5.21.2; 5.26.2; 5.36.3.

The Son was anointed by the Father with the Holy Spirit.²³⁷ God overcame his adversaries by means of the Son (*A.H.* 3.23.1; 5.22.1). And the Son carried out the New Covenant according to the Father's good pleasure (4.9.3; 5.26.2), having received the power to forgive sins from God (5.17.3). The suffering and death of Christ are also according to the Father's will,²³⁸ through which the Father accomplished his work of salvation.²³⁹ Finally, the Son was raised from the dead according to the will of the Father.²⁴⁰

Even after his glorification, the Son still submits to the Fathers' will. Having ascended to the Father to offer up his humanity (*A.H.* 3.19.3; 5.31.2; *Frag.* 50), the Son now rules at the Father's right hand over a dominion received from God.²⁴¹ Through the Son, God presently calls believers to a knowledge of him (*A.H.* 3.9.1) and reveals himself to mankind (3.10.6). God also gives blessings through the Son (3.11.5), and the Spirit is granted by the Son according to the Father's will (5.18.2; *Dem.* 7).

Regarding the coming judgment, Irenaeus taught that when the Son comes again, he will do so according to the Father's will (*A.H.* 1.10.1) and in the Father's power and glory.²⁴² At that time the Son will grant resurrection of the dead and execute judgment over mankind and angels according to God's command and for his glory.²⁴³ From creation through the end of the ages, the Father is glorified through the Son (4.17.6; *Dem.* 10), while the Son receives his glory from the Father (4.20.11; 4.33.11; *Frag.* 53).

The Son's consistent submissive relationship to the Father is sometimes expressed by Irenaeus in terms that sound like the Son is of a lesser nature than the Father. If we were to read these passages apart from the context of all his teachings, we might be tempted to interpret them in a sense that implies an Arian ontological subordination. For example, Irenaeus said the Father is the "head of Christ" and "bears the creation and His own Word simultaneously" (*A.H.* 5.18.2).²⁴⁴ Also, by the Son's confession that only the Father knows the day and hour of the judgment we learn that the Father is above all things (2.28.6). Irenaeus wrote, "The Father, therefore, has been declared by our Lord to excel with respect to knowledge; for this reason, that we, too, as long as we are connected with the scheme of things in the world, should leave perfect knowledge" (2.28.8).²⁴⁵ Also, Irenaeus told his readers that both the Son and the Spirit "minister to Him in every respect" (4.7.4; cf. 5.26.2).²⁴⁶ Besides this, there are the expected and rather innocuous instances during the earthly ministry we see the Son praying to the Father and acknowledging him as God, a pattern also found in the canonical writings.²⁴⁷ None of these, however, are irreconcilable with the theanthropic Christology Irenaeus himself seems to have held.

One significant passage that summarizes Irenaeus's concept of the Son of God and the relationship implied by the Father–Son language is *Demonstration* 51:

Here [in Isaiah 49:5–6], first of all, is seen that the Son of God pre-existed, from the fact that the Father spake with Him, and before He was born revealed Him to men: and next, that He must needs be born a man among men; and that the same God *forms* Him *from the womb*, that is, that of the Spirit of God He should be born; and that He is Lord of all men. . . . And that the Son of the Father calls Himself *servant*, [this is] on account of His subjection to the Father: for among men also every son is the servant of his father.

²³⁷ *A.H.* 3.9.3; 3.12.4; 3.18.3; *Dem.* 40; 53.

²³⁸ *A.H.* 4.5.4; 4.38.1; 5.23.2; *Dem.* 34; 69; 75.

²³⁹ *A.H.* 3.20.1; 4.17.6; 5.21.3; 5.36.3; *Dem.* 97.

²⁴⁰ *A.H.* 3.12.2; 3.12.4; 4.33.13; *Frag.* 54.

²⁴¹ *A.H.* 3.6.1; 3.10.6; 3.12.9; 3.12.13; 3.16.3; 3.16.9; 4.6.7; 4.21.3; 4.33.11; 5.18.3; 5.36.3; *Frag.* 54; *Dem.* 41; 47; 52; 85; 97).

²⁴² *A.H.* 1.10.1; 3.5.3; 3.16.6; 3.16.8; 4.27.2; 5.30.4.

²⁴³ *A.H.* 4.33.13; 4.40.2; 5.2.3; 5.31.2; *Dem.* 85.

²⁴⁴ See the full context of this passage for a clearer understanding of Irenaeus's meaning, which appears to preclude ontological subordinationism.

²⁴⁵ Irenaeus seems to have suggested that during the time he was "connected with the scheme of things in the world" (*A.H.* 2.28.8) even Christ's knowledge was subject to operation according to the Father's will. In an anti-Gnostic polemical context, the bishop was urging his readers to not be anxious about their lack of knowledge (gnosis), an anxiety that could lead them to pursue gnosis from among the Gnostic heretics. The argument is one of Christopraxis—if even Christ, the Son of God, put off knowledge according to the Father's will, how much more should we follow his example and be content with what has been certainly revealed in his perfect timing.

²⁴⁶ = διακονεῖ γὰρ αὐτῷ.

²⁴⁷ *A.H.* 1.27.2; 2.28.4; 3.16.9; 4.2.2; 4.2.5; 4.5.1; 4.9.3; 4.11.3; 4.11.4; 5.17.2; 5.21.2; 5.21.3; 5.22.1; 5.36.2; *Frag.* 52.

It seems that Irenaeus believed the relationship of sonship implies not the manner of *generation* from the Father, but the manner of *relationship*, illustrated in this case by the human son's submission to his earthly father. In this passage Irenaeus did not tie sonship to the incarnation or resurrection but said the "Son of God pre-existed," implying the relationship of submission at least precedes the incarnation.²⁴⁸

As we move from the Son of God to the Spirit of God,²⁴⁹ we notice far fewer words devoted to the Spirit, but the doctrine is nevertheless present and remarkably lucid. We are told that the Spirit was always present with God and the Word (*A.H.* 4.20.1; 4.20.3) and, like the Son, he was "from the beginning" (4.33.1). Irenaeus also referred to the Spirit as "divine,"²⁵⁰ "heavenly" (3.11.8), and "peculiar to God" (5.12.2), and is regarded not as a "lesser" being, but as equal to the Father (4.20.1). Though apparently conceived of as eternal and divine, the Spirit is never explicitly or directly called "God." Furthermore, Irenaeus appears to have regarded the Spirit as the most pervasively immanent person of the Godhead, the "living water" (5.18.2) who contains all things (5.2.3), who nourishes and increases creation (4.38.3), and dwells with every generation of man (3.17.1; 4.33.7).

Irenaeus also consistently described the Holy Spirit in terms of functional submission to the will of the Father. With regard to creation, we are told that all things are made not only through the mediation of the Word, but also through the Spirit.²⁵¹ After creation and prior to the incarnation, the Spirit also acted in concert with the Father's will, revealing messages for the Father prophetically,²⁵² and pointing men to him (*A.H.* 4.1.1; *Dem.* 8). In fact, without the Holy Spirit, humans would have no knowledge of the Creator (*Frag.* 26). It was even the Holy Spirit, the "finger of God," who wrote the Ten Commandments in stone (*Dem.* 26).

In the earthly life of Christ the Spirit is active under the direction of the Father,²⁵³ including the miraculous conception by the Virgin Mary and the formation of the human Jesus (*Dem.* 32). After the ascension, the Spirit was sent by God at the appointed time, being received by the Son as a gift,²⁵⁴ and given to men according to the Father's good pleasure.²⁵⁵ With the Son, the Spirit is regarded as a minister to God (*A.H.* 4.7.4). He calls out to the Father as "Abba" (*Dem.* 5) and will conform us to God and thus accomplish the will of the Father in our ultimate redemption (*A.H.* 5.8.1; cf. 5.36.3). In fact, God himself is glorified by the work of the Holy Spirit (*Dem.* 10).

We have already seen that in Irenaeus the Holy Spirit participates in the act of creation together with the Word—the two hands of God.²⁵⁶ Irenaeus expressed this distinction between the Son and Spirit,²⁵⁷ as

²⁴⁸ Since Irenaeus was commenting on the "servant" language of Isaiah 49:5–6, which focuses on the earthly ministry, it seems most likely that he had the incarnate Christ in mind, not primarily Son of God in the absolute, eternal sense. However, by using the analogy of the human son as "servant of his father" to explain the servant relationship of the "Son of the Father," it seems that Irenaeus may not be making the sharp distinction of later theologians between the Father–Son relationship before the incarnation and that same relationship after the incarnation. It seems that merely calling the Word of God "Son of the Father" in any sense may imply subjection to the Father's will as a human son would be in subjection to the human father. So, if the sonship is an eternal relationship, so is the relationship of submission.

²⁴⁹ The phrase "Spirit of God," "his Spirit," or "Spirit of the Father" is used often in Irenaeus (*A.H.* 3.9.3 [2x]; 3.11.9; 3.12.1; 3.12.15; 3.17.1; 3.17.3; 3.21.4; 3.24.1 [3x]; 4.14.2; 4.20.4; 4.20.6; 4.20.8; 4.20.10; 4.31.2; 4.33.1; 4.33.7; 4.33.10; 4.33.15; 4.36.6; 4.36.7; 4.38.1; 4.38.2 [2x]; 5.2.3; 5.6.1 [4x]; 5.6.2; 5.8.1 [2x]; 5.8.2 [2x]; 5.9.1; 5.9.2 [2x]; 5.9.3 [4x]; 5.9.4 [2x]; 5.10.1; 5.10.2; 5.11.1 [2x]; 5.20.2; *Frag.* 25; 45; *Dem.* 3; 7; 9; 41; 42; 49; 51; 56; 67; 73 [although this may refer to Christ's pre-incarnate spirit]; 97). The Spirit is also called the "Dew of God" (*A.H.* 3.17.3) and "Seed of the Father of all" (*A.H.* 4.31.2). Whether all these imply or complement a belief in the Spirit's functional submission to the will of the Father is not clear by the phrase itself, a matter which must be determined by Irenaeus's general doctrine of the Spirit.

²⁵⁰ *A.H.* 5.8.2; 5.8.4; 5.9.3; *Frag.* 36.

²⁵¹ *A.H.* 1.22.1; 2.30.9; 3.24.2; 4.4.Pref.4; 4.20.1; 4.20.2; 4.20.4; *Dem.* 5; 32. In *A.H.* 2.30.9 Irenaeus wrote, "He is Father, He is God, He the Founder, He the Maker, He the Creator, who made those things by Himself, that is, through His Word and His Wisdom" (*hoc est per Verbum et per Sapientiam suam*).

²⁵² *A.H.* 4.20.5; 4.33.7; *Dem.* 6; 24; 30; 49.

²⁵³ *A.H.* 3.9.3; 3.18.3; 4.33.7.

²⁵⁴ *A.H.* 3.17.2; 3.17.3; 3.17.4; 3.24.1.

²⁵⁵ *A.H.* 3.11.9; 3.12.1; 3.17.1; 3.24.1; 4.33.7; 5.8.1; 5.12.2; 5.18.2; *Dem.* 7; 42.

²⁵⁶ *A.H.* 4.Pref.4; 5.1.3; 5.17.4; 5.28.4.

²⁵⁷ Not all uses of πνεῦμα, of course, refer to the Holy Spirit. MacKenzie rightly discerns the use of "Spirit" in *Dem.* 71 as a reference to the "nature of God," that is, the Son's godhead (cf. *Dem.* 73, "Spirit of Christ"). While suggesting a close relationship between the Word and Spirit in the act of the incarnation, MacKenzie refers to a similar distinctive use of "spirit" in *Against Heresies*

well as their similar submission to the will of the Father in creation and salvation, in numerous ways. One common means of describing the relationship between Father, Son, and Spirit was in terms of God's "Word" and "Wisdom," a use also common in Theophilus of Antioch who wrote at about the same time as Irenaeus (Theophilus, *Autolycus* 2.10.5–6).²⁵⁸ Thus, in many places the work of the Son and Spirit is portrayed in terms of equality, not only in their equal relationship to the Father,²⁵⁹ but also in their relationship to created things.²⁶⁰ Likewise, Irenaeus taught that the "scriptures are perfect, since they were spoken by God's Word and his Spirit" (*A.H.* 2.28.2).

Though the Son and Spirit were often presented by Irenaeus as equals, in several passages the Spirit appears to operate in submission to the Son's direction.²⁶¹ For example, the Son can be called the "the head of the Spirit" who gives the Spirit as the "head of man" (*A.H.* 5.20.2). One occasion the Son is even called the "fount of the Spirit" (*Frag.* 21; cf. *Dem.* 5; 57). Thus, the Son and Spirit are equal in their relationship in submission to the Father and their superiority over all created things, but in their relationship to each other they function according to an order of the Spirit in submission to the Son. With regard to the original creative act, Irenaeus wrote, "The Word establishes, that is to say, gives body and grants the reality of being, and the Spirit gives order and form to the diversity of the powers" (*Dem.* 5). Prior to the incarnation the Spirit of God set forth the dispensations of the Father and Son (*A.H.* 4.33.7), often speaking on their behalf (*Dem.* 49),²⁶² so that the pre-incarnate Word of God visited the patriarchs "through the prophetic Spirit" (*A.H.* 4.36.8).

Irenaeus also said that since his resurrection and ascension the Son imparts "God to men by means of the Spirit" (*A.H.* 5.1.1), unites man to the Spirit (5.20.2), and, in fact, has authority to send the Holy Spirit upon the church and into the whole world.²⁶³ The Spirit is also seen as the means of communion with Christ (3.24.1), revealing the Word to humans (*Dem.* 5; 7) and preparing people for salvation in the Son of God (*A.H.* 4.20.5).

In what appears to be a temporary role-reversal, however, Irenaeus described the Spirit as functioning at least as a partner during the course of Christ's earthly ministry.²⁶⁴ The Spirit functioned in the incarnation of the Son, forming the human body in the womb of the Virgin.²⁶⁵ Later, the Spirit rested upon Christ at baptism, anointing him to preach.²⁶⁶

3.10.3, writing, "The distinction is explicitly in the text if Irenaeus's general and constant, double use of 'Spirit' is borne in mind. He has written of the divine nature of Christ, being the Son and Word" (MacKenzie, *Irenaeus's Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, 203-204). I must agree with MacKenzie here, that to take "Spirit of God" consistently as the Holy Spirit as distinct from the Son rather than as another term describing the Son's pre-incarnate divine nature would generate contradictions in Irenaeus's own assertion that the Son and Holy Spirit are distinct. Wherever possible, we should extend to Irenaeus the grace of assuming he was at least consistent with himself in major centers of doctrine. Cf. Melito, New Frag. II.20.

²⁵⁸ Irenaeus referred to the Holy Spirit as "Wisdom" in many passages. Compare the common pairing of "Word" and "Wisdom" (*A.H.* 2.30.9; 4.20.1; 4.20.2; 4.20.4), as well as "Word" and "Spirit" (*A.H.* 1.22.1; 2.28.2). In other passages it is uncertain whether Irenaeus was referring to wisdom as the personal Holy Spirit or as the personified principle, though we might not be surprised if in Irenaeus's thinking these two ideas were united (*A.H.* 3.21.7). Nevertheless, "Wisdom" is clearly identified as the personal "Spirit" in several instances (*A.H.* 4.7.4; 4.20.1; *Dem.* 5; 10).

²⁵⁹ *A.H.* 2.30.9; 4.7.4; 4.20.1; 4.20.4; 5.6.1; 5.17.4; 5.28.4. Irenaeus wrote, "For His *offspring* and His *similitude* do minister to Him in every respect (διακονεῖ γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸ ἴδιον γέννημα πρὸς τὰ πάντα καὶ αἱ ἴδιαι χεῖρες); that is, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Word and Wisdom (τούτέστιν ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὁ Λόγος καὶ ἡ Σοφία); whom all the angels serve, and to whom they are subject (οἷς ὑπουργοῦσι καὶ ὑποχειριοί εἰσι πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι)" (*A.H.* 4.7.4).

²⁶⁰ *A.H.* 1.22.1; 4.7.4; 5.1.3; 5.6.1; 5.11.1.

²⁶¹ It cannot be known for certain whether the term "His [Christ's] Spirit" indicates the Spirit's submission to the Son, and it is sometimes difficult to discern whether the Holy Spirit is meant or Christ's own spiritual being, or the pre-incarnate Son (*A.H.* 2.28.7; 5.11.2; *Dem.* 57; 71).

²⁶² Cf. Justin, *I Apol.* 36.2 where the Spirit is described as speaking sometimes as the Son and sometimes as the Father.

²⁶³ *A.H.* 3.11.8; 3.11.9; 3.17.2; 3.17.3; 4.21.3; 4.31.2; 5.1.1; 5.18.2; *Frag.* 52; *Dem.* 7; 41; 57; 89.

²⁶⁴ Cf. *Herm.* 58:5 (*Sim.* 5.5.5) and the same concept in the canonical Gospels: Matt 3:16 (=Mark 1:10; Luke 3:22; John 1:32); Matt 4:1 (=Luke 4:1); Matt 12:18, 28; Luke 4:14, 18; 10:21.

²⁶⁵ *Frag.* 8; *Dem.* 40; 51; 59; 71; cf. *Dem.* 32. Irenaeus says that from the Spirit the body of Christ "budded forth" (*Dem.* 59). Although Robinson's translation renders this "from spirit it budded forth," perhaps implying an impersonal and immaterial force, Rousseau has "*quoniam a Spiritu fuit germinate*" and notes "S'est épanouie par l'action de l'Esprit" (*Ibid.*, 170-171).

²⁶⁶ *A.H.* 3.9.3; 3.12.7; 3.17.1; 3.17.3; 3.18.3; 5.1.2; *Dem.* 9; 41; 53.

Irenaeus mentioned the three members of the Godhead at many points throughout his writings,²⁶⁷ several of which provide insight into his views on the intratrinitarian relationships. There is but one God—Father, Son, and Spirit (*A.H.* 4.6.7; 4.9.2), who are prefigured symbolically in the Old Testament (4.20.12), and are together objects of faith (4.33.7; 5.9.2). However, amidst this unity of the Godhead, there is also order in their functioning (3.9.3). Irenaeus explicitly stated as much in 4.38.3:

But being in subjection to God is continuance in immortality, and immortality is the glory of the uncreated One. By this arrangement (τάξεως), therefore, and these harmonies (ῥυθμῶν), and a sequence of this nature (ἀγωγῆς ὁ γενητός), man, a created and organized being, is rendered after the image and likeness of the uncreated God,—the Father planning everything well and giving His commands (τοῦ μὲν Πατρὸς εὐδοκοῦντος καὶ κελεύοντος), the Son carrying these into execution and performing the work of creating (τοῦ δὲ Υἱοῦ ὑπουργοῦντος καὶ πλάσσοντος), and the Spirit nourishing and increasing [what is made] (τοῦ δὲ Πνεύματος τρέφοντος καὶ αὐξοντος), but man making progress day by day, and ascending towards the perfect, that is, approximating to the uncreated One. For the Uncreated is perfect, that is, God.

In another passage, *Demonstration* 6, the clear, dynamic, and advanced Trinitarian thought was also expressed in terms of the church's three points of the rule of faith:

This then is the order of the rule of our faith, and the foundation of the building, and the stability of our conversation: God, the Father, not made, not material, invisible; one God, the creator of all things: this is the first point of our faith. The second point is: The Word of God, Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord, who was manifested to the prophets according to the form of their prophesying and according to the method of the dispensation of the Father: through whom all things were made; who also at the end of the times, to complete and gather up all things, was made man among men, visible and tangible, in order to abolish death and show forth life and produce a community of union between God and man. And the third point is: The Holy Spirit, through whom the prophets prophesied, and the fathers learned the things of God, and the righteous were led forth into the way of righteousness; and who in the end of the times was poured out in a new way upon mankind in all the earth, renewing man unto God.

We have already seen that the Father created all things by the Word and Wisdom,²⁶⁸ but there also appears to be a distinct order with regard to fellowship and interaction between God and humans. When God reaches out to humanity in blessing or salvation, the order is from the Father, through the Son, and in the Holy Spirit.²⁶⁹ When humans respond to God in prayer, worship, faith, or obedience the ascent is most often to the Father, through the Son, and by (or in) the Holy Spirit.²⁷⁰ An example of this concept is found in *Against Heresies* 5.36.2, where Irenaeus noted that believers “ascend through the Spirit to the Son, and through the Son to the Father” (*A.H.* 5.36.2; cf. *Dem.* 7).

It is precisely with the Triune God that Irenaeus ended his *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, and it is also where we end our examination of his writings. He pointed out the various errant notions of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit prevalent among the heretics of his age:

So then in respect of the three points of our seal error has strayed widely from the truth. For either they reject the Father, or they accept not the Son and speak against the dispensation of His incarnation; or else they receive not the Spirit, that is, they reject prophecy. And of all such must we beware, and shun their ways, if in very truth we desire to be well-pleasing to God and to attain the redemption that is from Him.²⁷¹

²⁶⁷ A modification of the Matthean baptismal formula is actually found in *Dem.* 3: “First of all it bids us bear in mind that we have received baptism for the remission of sins, in the name of God the Father, and in the name of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was incarnate and died and rose again, and in the Holy Spirit of God.”

²⁶⁸ *A.H.* 2.30.9; 4.20.1; 4.20.2; 4.20.4.

²⁶⁹ *A.H.* 3.17.3; 3.18.7; 3.19.1; 4.11.1; 4.20.6; 4.20.7; 5.1.1; 5.1.1; 5.2.1.

²⁷⁰ *A.H.* 1.23.1; 2.11.1; 3.4.2; 3.6.4; 3.9.1; 3.11.6; 3.12.14; 3.13.2; 3.16.3; 3.17.1; 3.17.2; 3.18.7; 3.19.3; 3.24.1; 3.24.1; 4.5.1; 4.6.5; 4.7.1; 4.7.3; 4.13.1; 4.17.6; 4.18.4; 4.20.1; 4.20.4; 4.20.5; 4.20.7; 4.20.9; 4.33.7; 5.14.3; 5.16.2; 5.32.2; *Frag.* 26; 39; *Dem.* 5; 7; 40; 47; 94; 95.

²⁷¹ *Dem.* 100.

Irenaeus had a wide and lasting influence on the formation of orthodoxy at the ecumenical councils from Nicaea to Chalcedon, and through him the earlier apostolic fathers and apologists established the center and source of orthodox Christology. MacKenzie writes, “There is little, if anything, in the Nicene formulae which is not present in embryonic or directional form in the works of Irenaeus.”²⁷² Nicaea was not, then, a correction of the fathers of the second century, but their heir.

***Summary:** Drawing liberally from his predecessors, but avoiding much of their imprecise language and idiosyncrasies, Irenaeus presented the Father, Son, and Spirit as eternally existing as divine, but functioning in the economy of creation in ordered roles with the Father as the head (*A.H.* 2.25.3; 4.20.1; *Frag.* 39; *Dem.* 47; 51, *passim*).

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions

Based on the preceding analyses, we can make the following conclusions regarding the relationships of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the writings of the earliest fathers.

No Clear Arian Ontological Subordination. There is no clear example of an Arian ontological subordinationism in which the Son is a created being or has an inferior divinity to the Father, though Tatian’s concept of the *Logos* may come close. When their language was clear, the early fathers’ concept of subordination was functional, not ontological. LaCugna rightly stated that “we should not regard this economic subordinationism as heretical or even as an inferior or incoherent Christian theology of God and Christ.”²⁷³ Rather, just the opposite is true: where there *was* opportunity given by the context, Christ was called “God,” “eternal,” or the essential mediator of the Father’s will.

No Functional Egalitarianism. There is no discernible tradition whatsoever of what is today described as ontological and functional equality or a “communitarian” or “democratic” model of the Trinity. Nor is there clear evidence of a view which states that the persons of the Godhead could have agreed to take on different roles than what has unfolded in the economy of creation (e.g. that the Father could have become incarnate or the Son could have indwelt believers rather than the Holy Spirit).

Ontological Equality and Functional Subordination. There is an overwhelming tradition of what is today described as ontological equality and functional subordination within the Trinity that emphasizes the *monarchia* of the Father. While the Son and Spirit are not creatures, the Father is their head, meaning that all activities conform to his will.

Possible Drift toward Ontological Subordinationism. While the later second century fathers began to speculate more on the specific nature of the generation of the Son,²⁷⁴ we begin to discern language implying an eternal functional subordination while still maintaining essential (ontological) equality. However, with Tatian the language becomes fuzzy, and the stage appears to be set for greater deviation away from ontological equality toward Arian ontological subordinationism.

Implications

If, for the sake of argument, we were to regard the fathers of the first and second centuries as our canon of orthodoxy and the proper understanding of Scripture, then our judgments on various views of subordination and the Trinity become rather clear.

Eternal Functional Equality and Ontological Equality. Modern day advocates of what I call “eternal functional equality” suggest that “there can be no separation between the being and the acts of God, between the one divine nature of the three persons and their functions.”²⁷⁵ Therefore, orthodox ontological equality is said to demand functional equality as well, and distinctions in rank between the

²⁷² MacKenzie, *Irenaeus's Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, 29. For a brief summary of the themes in Irenaeus that are later developed in Nicene orthodoxy, see MacKenzie, *Irenaeus's Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, 29-30. For a simple and brief summary of Irenaeus’s incorporation of the theology of the apostolic fathers and apologists, see Grant, *Jesus after the Gospels*, 91-93; 98-103.

²⁷³ LaCugna, *God for Us*, 26.

²⁷⁴ This may have been the impetus for Irenaeus to assert that the generation of the Son is unknowable (*A.H.* 2.28.6).

²⁷⁵ Giles, *The Trinity and Subordinationism*, 93.

Father, Son, and Spirit are rejected. Instead, the Father, Son, and Spirit are regarded as functioning in a co-equal fellowship, with one mind and will. Though each member of the Triune community performs distinct activities, these activities are not ordered in rank or hierarchy.²⁷⁶ Instead of the Son and Spirit functioning in submission to the Father, the three persons are said to function in mutual submission to each other. In light of this study, the problem with such a view is that no extant Christian writings of the first and second centuries suggest anything remotely close to such a model, but rather consistently present the Father as the head and the Son and Spirit as functioning in submission to the Father.

Incarnational Functional Subordination and Ontological Equality. Advocates of a temporary or voluntary subordination of the Son to the Father limit the submission of the Son to the time of his earthly ministry or commencing with the incarnation. Thus, the Son's role of submission to God is a result of his taking on full human nature and living in obedience to the law. However, in light of the early fathers, limiting the functional subordination of the Son to the incarnation would be too narrow. In the first and second century writers, the Son and Spirit consistently submit to the Father's will, even prior to the Son's incarnation and Spirit's sending into the world. Also, such a view of incarnational subordination does not explain why the Holy Spirit is presented by the fathers as functioning in submission to the will of the Father without having become incarnate.

Eternal Functional Subordination and Ontological Equality. If we were to employ first and second century Christian teaching as a standard, the advocates of an *eternal* functional subordination of the Son to the Father would have little clear evidence to support their view. The descriptions of the relationships between Father, Son, and Spirit in the early fathers refer to activities of the Godhead in relation to the created order. Apart from actual activities in creation, the nature of the relationships is vague. This does not preclude the existence of an ordered relationship based on fatherhood, sonship, and spiration, but the actual evidence is minimal and unclear. In this sense, complaints against the language of "eternal functional subordination" seem to be valid, and evangelicals should probably cease using such terms.²⁷⁷

*Economic Functional Subordination and Ontological Equality.*²⁷⁸ The view of the earliest post-apostolic fathers is best described as one in which Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are co-eternal and co-equal with regard to deity and power, but in extra-Trinitarian actions the Father is the head, the Son is the mediator, and the Spirit is the pervasive active presence of God. While we can not logically project this economic functional subordination into an eternal state apart from creation, this τῶςις would be consistent with the interpersonal relationships implied by the names "Father," "Son," and "Spirit."

Eternal Functional Subordination and Ontological Subordination. The fathers' consistent subordination of the Son to the Father in their will and works has sometimes been mistaken for an ontological subordination relegating either the Son or the Spirit to the realm of finite creation rather than eternal deity. For example, in his polemic against Trinitarianism in favor of Unitarianism, Stannus, citing Polycarp's prayer on the pyre as evidence of non-trinitarianism in the second century, writes, "The ante-Nicene fathers invariably spoke of Christ as subordinate to the Father."²⁷⁹ Although he is correct in this assertion, his conclusion that this necessarily implies an inequality of divinity is an unfounded exaggeration. His error is similar to that of modern assertions that subordination in function necessarily means inequality of eternal nature. Where the early fathers are not silent, they illustrate that

²⁷⁶ Ibid., 92–96.

²⁷⁷ In my current thinking on this matter, the second century fathers' adamant insistence on the utter distinction of Creator and creature, with the latter a creation *ex nihilo*, makes the notion of *eternal* functional subordination a problematic description. Subordination or submission to the will of the Father implies some sort of activity or function. Without a creation in which and toward which such actions are aimed, can we really speak about "subordination?" Unless we argue for a subordination of essential nature, we cannot speak of subordination in a timeless, eternal state. My view, of course, assumes a notion of creation *ex nihilo*, and that apart from creation God is timeless and unchanging. However, if one advances a doctrine of God and time that includes God's "own time" or some pre-creational activity, then the term "eternal functional subordination" could be a legitimate category. On historical and contemporary issues of God, time, and creation, see William Lane Craig, *God, Time, and Eternity—The Coherence of Theism II: Eternity* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 2001).

²⁷⁸ My use of the term "economic" here refers to any divine activity in the economy of creation. That is, in all extra-Trinitarian works of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It does not apply to whatever inconceivable and unknowable relationship the Father, Son, and Spirit had in their existence apart from creation.

²⁷⁹ Stannus, *Doctrine of the Trinity*, 28.

one can hold simultaneously to both functional subordination and ontological equality of being. Therefore, attempts by groups such as Jehovah's Witnesses who seek sympathetic theology in the early fathers are misguided.²⁸⁰

Two Final Questions

Does Economic Functional Subordination Prescribe a Particular Social Order? The ordering of ecclesiastical leadership suggested in *1 Clement* and stated explicitly and repeatedly in the Letters of Ignatius was not tied to an *eternal* role in the Godhead, but to the sending of the Son in the economy of salvation. This ordering is independent of questions regarding the eternal relationships between Father, Son, and Spirit. In the context of contemporary egalitarian and complementarian debates—whether in the home, government, society, or church—the debate concerning *eternal* functional subordination is irrelevant as far as the early fathers are concerned. There appears to have been enough justification for ecclesiastical ordering in the simple fact that the Son was sent into the world. However, we must recognize that the fathers do not extend this divine ordering beyond that of ecclesiastical structures. Although *1 Clement* addressed the issue of God's establishment of human government on earth to which all men are to submit, he linked such authority to his divine decree, not to a Trinitarian model (*1 Clem.* 61:1). However, one could suggest that the ways in which God orders society in general should be consistent with his work. In short, functional subordination in the Trinity need not be eternal to serve as a basis for social structures, but this type of application of Trinitarian theology outside church order is not found in the early fathers.

*Are the Early Fathers "Orthodox" or "Heretical"?*²⁸¹ Based on an exhaustive analysis of the primary evidence summarized in this paper, the fathers' teaching can be summed up in Athenagoras's statement, "power in unity, diversity in rank." For a moment, allow me a brief fit of rhetoric. Those who want to define historical orthodoxy as discerning no functional distinction in rank between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are forced into one of three solutions with regard to the first and second century fathers. They must either a) anathematize the early fathers as heretics; b) twist their writings to conform to an egalitarian standard; or c) simply ignore them. It appears that most have chosen the final option. I reject this move. Instead, I believe we ought to embrace the early fathers as a solid, though developing, orthodox link in the chain of Trinitarian tradition handed down from the apostles in Scripture, subsequently taught by catechesis and liturgy, and guided in its growth and development by the teaching ministry of the Holy Spirit. If this is the case, orthodoxy must not only grudgingly accept the concept of ontological equality and functional subordination as merely an acceptable option, but perhaps it should cheerfully embrace it as most accurately reflecting the faith "once for all delivered to the saints" (Jude 3) and handed down to "faithful men" who were "able to teach others also" (2 Tim 2:2).

²⁸⁰ Cf. for example, Greg Stafford, *Jehovah's Witnesses Defended: An Answer to Scholars and Critics*, 2d ed. (Huntington Beach, CA: Elihu, 2000), 215.

²⁸¹ This assumes, of course, that we can meaningfully use these terms in their normal sense with reference to the early fathers who precede the ecumenical councils of the fourth and fifth centuries. While historians shy away from them, evangelicals may use these terms because of their belief in a transcendent standard of doctrinal truth against which teachings of every age can be measured.

**APPENDIX 1:
SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS**

DESCRIPTIONS		Eternal Functional Equality —— Ontological Equality	Incarnational Functional Subordination —— Ontological Equality	Economic Functional Subordination —— Ontological Equality	Eternal Functional Subordination —— Ontological Equality	Eternal Functional Subordination —— Ontological Subordination
DEFINITIONS	Intratrinitarian Relationships	Father, Son, and Spirit eternally equal by nature and action with no distinction in order either in time or eternity.	Father, Son, and Spirit eternally equal by nature, but Son and Spirit submit to Father at incarnation (or earthly ministry).	Father, Son, and Spirit eternally equal by nature, but Son and Spirit submit to Father in all extra-Trinitarian activities.	Father, Son, and Spirit eternally equal by nature, but Son and Spirit submit to Father in both time and eternity.	Son and Spirit inferior to Father by nature, and necessarily submit to Father in all activities.
Didache	Son Holy Spirit			<i>Did. 10.4</i>		
1 Clement	S H					
Ignatius	S H					
Polycarp	S H					
Barnabas	S H					
2 Clement	S H					
Hermas	S H					
Aristides	S H			<i>Apol. 15.1 (Gk)</i>		
Justin	S H				<i>1 Apol. 64.5</i>	
M. Polycarp	S H					
Melito	S H				<i>Pascha 105; Frag. 2</i>	
Tatian	S H				<i>To Greeks 5.1</i>	<i>To Greeks 5.2; 7.1</i>
Theophilus	S H					
Athenagoras	S H					
To Diognetus	S H					
Irenaeus	S H				<i>Dem. 51</i>	

KEY

**Probable
(clear evidence)**

**Possible
(unclear evidence)**

**Improbable
(poor evidence)**

**Inapplicable
(no evidence)**

APPENDIX 2: INDEX OF PASSAGES

(passages marked with * are unclear or authenticity is debated)

Didache (50-125)

- Did. 4:10.* For he [God] comes to call not with regard to reputation but upon those whom the Spirit has prepared.
- Did. 7:1.* Now concerning baptism, baptize as follows: after you have reviewed all these things, baptize “in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” in running water.
- Did. 7:3.* But if you have neither, then pour water on the head three times “in the name of Father and Son and Holy Spirit.”
- Did. 9:2.* We give you thanks, our Father, for the holy vine of David your servant, which you have made known to us through Jesus, your servant; to you be the glory forever.
- Did. 9:3.* We give you thanks, our Father, for the life and knowledge which you have made known to us through Jesus, your servant;
- Did. 9:4.* for yours is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever.
- Did. 10:2.* We give you thanks, Holy Father, for your holy name which you have caused to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which you have made known to us through Jesus your servant; to you be the glory forever.
- Did. 10:3.* . . . but to us you have graciously given spiritual food and drink, and eternal life through your servant.

First Clement (95–97)

- 1 Clem. Pro.* To those who are called and sanctified by the will of God through our Lord Jesus Christ. May grace and peace from almighty God through Jesus Christ be yours in abundance.
- 1 Clem. 7:4.* Let us fix our eyes on the blood of Christ and understand how precious it is to his Father, because, being poured out for our salvation, it won for the whole world the grace of repentance.
- 1 Clem. 16:2.* The majestic scepter of God, our Lord Christ Jesus, did not come with the pomp of arrogance or pride (though he could have done so), but in humility, just as the Holy Spirit spoke concerning him.
- 1 Clem. 20:11-12.* All these things the great Creator and Master of the universe ordered to exist in peace and harmony, thus doing good to all things, but especially abundantly to us who have taken refuge in his compassionate mercies through our Lord Jesus Christ, (12) to whom be the glory and the majesty for ever and ever. Amen.
- 1 Clem. 22:1.* Now faith in Christ confirms all these things, for he himself through the Holy Spirit thus calls us:
- 1 Clem. 24:1.* Let us consider, dear friends, how the Master continually points out to us the coming resurrection of which he made the Lord Jesus Christ the firstfruit when he raised him from the dead.
- 1 Clem. 32:4.* And so we, having been called through his will in Christ Jesus . . .
- 1 Clem. 36:2.* Through him let us look steadily into the heights of heaven; through him we see as in a mirror his faultless and transcendent face; through him the eyes of our hearts have been opened; through him our foolish and darkened mind springs up into the light; through him the Master has willed that we should taste immortal knowledge, for “he, being the radiance of his majesty, is as much superior to angels as the name he has inherited is more excellent.”
- 1 Clem. 36:4.* But of his Son the Master spoke thus: “You are my Son; today I have begotten you.”
- 1 Clem. 42:1.* The apostles received the gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus the Christ was sent forth from God. (2) So then Christ is from God, and the apostles are from Christ. Both, therefore, came of the will of God in good order.
- 1 Clem. 46:6.* Do we not have one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace which was poured out upon us? And is there not one calling in Christ?
- 1 Clem. 49:6.* In love the Master received us. Because of the love he had for us, Jesus Christ our Lord, in accordance with God’s will, gave his blood for us, and his flesh for our flesh, and his life for our lives.
- 1 Clem. 50:7.* This declaration of blessedness was pronounced upon those who have been chosen by God through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen.
- 1 Clem. 58:2.* Accept our advice and you will have nothing to regret. For as God lives, and as the Lord Jesus Christ lives, and the Holy Spirit (who are the faith and the hope of the elect), so surely will the one who with humility and constant gentleness has kept without regret the ordinances and commandments given by God be enrolled and included among the number of those who are saved through Jesus Christ, through whom is the glory to him for ever and ever. Amen.
- 1 Clem. 59:2.* . . . that the Creator of the universe may keep intact the specified number of his elect throughout the whole world, through his beloved servant Jesus Christ, through whom he called us from darkness to light, from ignorance to the knowledge for the glory of his name.
- 1 Clem. 59:3.* . . . the Creator and Guardian of every spirit, who multiplies the nations upon the earth, and from among all of them have chosen those who love you through Jesus Christ, your beloved Servant, through whom you instructed us, sanctified us, honored us.
- 1 Clem. 59:4.* . . . “Let all the nations know that you are the only God,” that Jesus Christ is your servant, and that “we are your people and the sheep of your pasture.”
- 1 Clem. 61:3.* You, who alone are able to do these and even greater good things for us, we praise through the high priest and guardian of our souls, Jesus Christ, through whom be the glory and the majesty to you both now and for all generations

and for ever and ever. Amen.

1 Clem. 64:1a. Finally, may the all-seeing God and Master of spirits and Lord of all flesh, who chose the Lord Jesus Christ, and us through him to be his own special people, . . .

1 Clem. 64:1b. . . . that they may be pleasing to his name through our high priest and guardian, Jesus Christ, through whom be glory and majesty, might and honor to him, both now and for ever and ever. Amen.

1 Clem. 65:2. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you and with all people everywhere who have been called by God through him, through whom be glory, honor, power, majesty, and eternal dominion to him, from everlasting to everlasting. Amen.

Barnabas (75-125)

Barn. 1:3. Therefore I, who also am hoping to be saved, congratulate myself all the more because among you I truly see that the Spirit has been poured out upon you from the riches of the Lord's fountain.

Barn. 3:6. So for this reason, brothers, he who is very patient, when he foresaw how the people whom he had prepared in his Beloved would believe in all purity . . .

Barn. 5:5. And furthermore, my brothers: if the Lord submitted to suffer for our souls, even though he is Lord of the whole world, to whom God said at the foundation of the world, "Let us make man according to our image and likeness," how is it, then, that he submitted to suffer at the hands of men?

Barn. 5:9. . . . then he revealed himself to be God's Son.

Barn. 5:11. Therefore the Son of God came in the flesh for this reason, . . .

Barn. 6:12. For the Scripture speaks about us when he says to the Son: "Let us make man according to our image and likeness, and let them rule over the beasts of the earth and the birds of the air and the fish of the sea." And when he saw that our creation was good, the Lord said: "Increase and multiply and fill the earth." These things he said to the Son.

Barn. 7:2. If, therefore, the Son of God, who is Lord and is destined to judge the living and the dead, suffered in order that his wounds might give us life, let us believe that the Son of God could not suffer except for our sake.

Barn. 13:8-10. Again, what does Moses say to "Jesus" the son of Nun when he gave him this name, since he was a prophet, for the sole purpose that all the people might hear that the Father was revealing everything about his Son Jesus? . . . (9) . . . in the last days the Son of God will cut off by its roots all the house of Amalek." (10) Observe again that it is Jesus, not a son of man but the Son of God, and revealed in the flesh by a symbol.

Barn. 14:2. ". . . And Moses received from the Lord the two tablets which were inscribed by the finger of the hand of the Lord in the spirit."

Barn. 14:6. For it is written how the Father commands him to redeem us from darkness and to prepare a holy people for himself

Barn. 19:7. . . . You must not give orders to your slave or servant girl, who hope in the same God as you, when you are angry, lest they cease to fear the God who is over you both, because he came to call not with regard to reputation but upon those whom the Spirit has prepared.

Ignatius (110-117)

Eph. Pro. The church at Ephesus is "predestined before the ages for lasting and unchangeable glory forever, united and elect through genuine suffering by the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God.

Eph. 1:1. Being as you are imitators of God, once you took on new life through the blood of God . . .

Eph. 2:1. may the Father of Jesus Christ likewise refresh him. . .

Eph. 2:2. It is proper, therefore, in every way to glorify Jesus Christ, who has glorified you.

Eph. 3:2. For Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the mind of the Father, just as the bishops appointed throughout the world are in the mind of Christ. . .

Eph. 4:2. . . . you may sing in unison with one voice through Jesus Christ to the Father.

Eph. 5:1. I congratulate you who are united with him [the bishop], as the church is with Jesus Christ and as Jesus Christ is with the Father, that all things might be harmonious in unity.

Eph. 7:2. "There is only one physician, who is both flesh and spirit, born and unborn, God in man, true life in death, both from Mary and from God, first subject to suffering and then beyond it, Jesus Christ our Lord."

Eph. 9:1. . . . because you are stones of a temple, prepared beforehand for the building of God the Father, hoisted up to the heights by the crane of Jesus Christ, which is the cross, using as a rope the Holy Spirit;

Eph. 18:2. For our God, Jesus the Christ, was conceived by Mary according to God's plan, both from the seed of David and of the Holy Spirit.

Eph. 21:2. Farewell in God the Father and in Jesus Christ, our common hope.

Magn. Pro. . . . to the church at Magnesia on the Maeander, which has been blessed through the grace of God the Father in Christ Jesus our Savior, in whom I greet her and wish her heartiest greetings in God the Father and in Jesus Christ.

Magn. 1:2. . . . and I pray that in them [the churches] there may be a union of flesh and spirit that comes from Jesus Christ, our never-failing life, and of faith and love, to which nothing is preferable, and—what is more important—of Jesus and the Father.

Magn. 3:1. but [yield] to the Father of Jesus Christ, the Bishop of all.

Magn. 6:1. Be eager to do everything in godly harmony, the bishop presiding in the place of God and the presbyters in the place of the council of the apostles and the deacons, who are most dear to me, having been entrusted with the service of Jesus Christ, who before the ages was with the Father and appeared at the end of time.

Magn. 7:1. Therefore as the Lord did nothing without the Father, either by himself or through the apostles (for he was united with him), so you must not do anything without the bishop and the presbyters.

Magn. 7:2. Let all of you run together as to one temple of God, as to one altar, to one Jesus Christ, who came forth from one Father and remained with the One and returned to the One.

Magn. 8:2. . . . that those who are disobedient might be fully convinced that there is one God who revealed himself through Jesus Christ his Son, who is his Word which came forth from silence, who in every respect pleased him who sent him.

Magn. 13:1. Be eager, therefore, to be firmly grounded in the precepts of the Lord and the apostles, in order that “in whatever you do, you may prosper,” physically and spiritually, in faith and love, in the Son and the Father and in the Spirit, in the beginning and at the end . . .

Magn. 13:2. Be subject to the bishop and to one another, as Jesus Christ in the flesh was to the Father, and as the apostles were to Christ and to the Father, that there might be unity, both physical and spiritual.

Tral. 3:1. Similarly, let everyone respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, just as they should respect the bishop, who is a model of the Father, and the presbyters as God’s council and as the band of the apostles. Without these no group can be called a church.

Rom. Pro. Ignatius . . . to the church that has found mercy in the majesty of the Father Most High and Jesus Christ his only Son, beloved and enlightened through the will of him who willed all things that exist, in accordance with faith in and love for Jesus Christ our God. . .

Rom. Pro. . . . bearing the name of the Father, which I also greet in the name of Jesus Christ, Son of the Father;

Rom. Pro. . . . heartiest greetings blamelessly in Jesus Christ our God.

Rom. 3:3. Nothing that is visible is good. For our God Jesus Christ is more visible now that he is in the Father.

Rom. 8:2. And Jesus Christ, the unerring mouth by whom the Father has spoken truly, will make it clear to you that I am speaking truly.

Phld. Pro. . . . to the church of God the Father and of Jesus Christ . . .

Phld. Pro. . . . especially if they are at one with the bishop and the presbyters and deacons who are with him, who have been appointed by the mind of Jesus Christ, whom he, in accordance with his own will, securely established by his Holy Spirit.

Phld. 1:1. . . . the bishop obtained a ministry . . . not by his own efforts nor through men nor out of vanity, but in the love of God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

Phld. 3:1. Stay away from the evil plants, which are not cultivated by Jesus Christ, because they are not the Father’s planting.

Phld. 3:2. For all those who belong to God and Jesus Christ are with the bishop. . .

Phld. 7:1. For even though certain people wanted to deceive me, humanly speaking, nevertheless the Spirit is not deceived, because it is from God; for it knows from where it comes and where it is going, and exposes the hidden things.

Phld. 7:2. Become imitators of Jesus Christ, just as he is of his Father.

Smyr. Pro. . . . to the church of God the Father and of the beloved Jesus Christ. . .

Smyr. 3:3. And after his resurrection he ate and drank with them like one who is composed of flesh, although spiritually he was united with the Father.

Smyr. 8:1. You must all follow the bishop, as Jesus Christ followed the Father.

Poly. Pro. Ignatius . . . to Polycarp, bishop of the church of the Smyrnaeans, or rather who has God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ as his bishop. . . [Better English rendering: “rather being watched over by God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.”]

Polycarp (110-117)

Phil. Pro. . . . may mercy and peace from God Almighty and Jesus Christ our Savior be yours in abundance.

Phil. 1:1. . . . diadems of those who are truly chosen by God and our Lord.

Phil. 1:3. . . . knowing that “by grace you have been saved, not because of works,” but by the will of God through Jesus Christ.

Phil. 2:1. . . . and “believing in him who raised” our Lord Jesus Christ “from the dead and gave him glory” and a throne at his right hand; to whom all things in heaven and on earth were subjected, whom every breathing creature serves, who is coming as “Judge of the living and the dead,” for whose blood God will hold responsible those who disobey him.

Phil. 2:2. But “he who raised him from the dead will raise us also.”

Phil. 3:3. . . . while hope follows and love for God and Christ and for our neighbor leads the way.

Phil. 5:2. Similarly, deacons must be blameless in the presence of his righteousness, as deacons of God and Christ and not of men:

Phil. 12:2. Now may the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the eternal High Priest himself, the Son of God Jesus Christ, build you up in faith and truth and in all gentleness and in all freedom from anger and forbearance and steadfastness and patient endurance and purity and may he give to you a share and place among his saints, and to us with you, and to all those under heaven who will yet believe in our Lord and God Jesus Christ and in his Father who raised him from the dead.

2 Clement (100-140)

2 Clem. 1:1. Brother, we ought to think of Jesus Christ, as we do of God, as “Judge of the living and the dead.”

2 Clem. 3:1. Seeing, then, that he has shown us such mercy . . . but through him have come to know the Father of truth—what else is knowledge with respect to him if it is not refusing to deny him through whom we have come to know him?

2 Clem. 3:3. This, then, is our reward, if we acknowledge him through whom we were saved.

2 Clem. 14:4. Now if we say that the flesh is the church and the Spirit is Christ, then the one who abuses the flesh abuses the church. Consequently such a person will not receive the Spirit, which is Christ.

2 Clem. 20:5. “To the only God, invisible,” the Father of truth, who sent forth to us the Savior and Founder of immortality, through whom he also revealed to us the truth and the heavenly life, to him be the glory forever and ever. Amen.

Hermas, 100–150

***Herm. 3:4 (Vis. 1.3.4).** “Behold, the God of hosts, who by his invisible and mighty power and by his great wisdom created the world, and by his glorious purpose clothed his creation with beauty, and by his mighty word fixed the heaven and set the earth’s foundations upon the waters, and by his own wisdom and providence created his holy church, which he also blessed. . .”

Herm. 6:8 (Vis. 2.2.8). “For the Lord has sworn by his Son that those who have denied their Lord have been rejected from their life.”

***Herm. 28:1 (Man. 3.1).** Again he spoke to me: “Love truth, and allow only the truth to come from your mouth, in order that the spirit, which God caused to live in this flesh, may prove to be true in the sight of all men; and thus will the Lord who lives in you be glorified.”

***Herm. 28:2 (Man. 3.2).** “Therefore, those who lie reject the Lord and defraud the Lord, for they do not return to him the deposit which they received. For they received from him a spirit uncontaminated by deceit.”

***Herm. 33:2 (Man. 5.1.2).** “For if you are patient, the Holy Spirit who lives in you will be pure . . . and will serve God with much cheerfulness, for it is at peace with itself.”

***Herm. 33:3 (Man. 5.1.3).** But if an angry temper approaches, immediately the Holy Spirit . . . seeks to leave the place. For it is choked by the evil spirit and does not have the room to serve the Lord the way it wants to, because it is polluted by the angry temper.”

***Herm. 41:5 (Man. 10.2.5).** “Rid yourself, therefore, of grief and do not oppress the Holy Spirit that lives in you, lest it intercede with God against you and leave you.

***Herm. 41:6 (Man. 10.2.6).** “For the Spirit of God that was given to this flesh endures neither grief nor distress.”

Herm. 43:17 (Man. 11.17). “Put your trust in the Spirit that comes from God and has power. . .”

Herm. 43:21 (Man. 11.21). “You see, then, that even the smallest things from above falling on the earth have great power; so also the divine Spirit that comes from above is powerful.”

Herm. 58:2 (Sim. 5.5.2). “The field is this world, and the lord of the field is he who created all things and perfected them and endowed them with power, and the son is the Holy Spirit, and the slave is the Son of God, and the vines are this people which he himself planted.”

Herm. 58:3 (Sim. 5.5.3). “. . . The foods which he sent to him from the feast are the commandments which he gave to his people through his Son”

Herm. 58:5 (Sim. 5.5.5). “Son of God”

Herm. 59:1 (Sim. 5.6.1). “Son of God”

Herm. 59:2 (Sim. 5.6.2). “Because,” he said, “God planted the vineyard, that is, he created the people, and turned them over to his Son.”

Herm. 59:3 (Sim. 5.6.3). “So, when he himself had cleansed the sins of the people, he showed them the paths of life, giving them the law which he received from his Father.”

Herm. 59:4 (Sim. 5.6.4). “You see,” he said, “that he is Lord of the people, having received all power from his Father. But hear why the Lord took his Son and the glorious angels as counselors concerning the inheritance of the slave. . .”

Herm. 59:5 (Sim. 5.6.5). “The preexistent Holy Spirit, which created the whole creation, God caused to live in the flesh that he wished.”

Herm. 59:7 (Sim. 5.6.7). “So he [the Lord] took the Son and the glorious angels as counselors, in order that this flesh also, having served the Spirit blamelessly, might have some place to live. . .”

Herm. 69:2 (Sim. 8.3.2). “This great tree, which overshadows plains and mountains and all the earth, is the law of God, which is given to the whole world, and this law is the Son of God, who has been proclaimed to the ends of the earth.”

Herm. 72:1 (Sim. 8.6.1). “In order that you might see,” he said, “that the abundant compassion of the Lord is great and glorious, he has also given the Spirit to those who are worthy of repentance”

Herm. 77:1 (Sim. 8.11.1). “But being patient, the Lord wants those who were called through his Son to be saved.”

Herm. 78:1 (Sim. 9.1.1). “I want to explain to you what the Holy Spirit, which spoke with you in the form of the Church, showed you; for that Spirit is the Son of God.”

Herm. 78:2 (Sim. 9.1.2). “. . . but when you were given power by the Spirit. . . . You saw all things well and reverently, as from a young girl; but now you see it from an angel, though by the same spirit.”

Herm. 89:1 (Sim. 9.12.1). "Son of God"

Herm. 89:2 (Sim. 9.12.2). "The Son of God is far older than all his creation, with the result that he was the Father's counselor in his creation. This is why the rock is old."

Herm. 89:3 (Sim. 9.12.3). "... in order that those who are going to be saved may enter the kingdom of God through it [the door = Son]."

Herm. 89:4 (Sim. 9.12.4). "In the same way," he said, "no one will enter the kingdom of God unless he receives the name of his Son."

Herm. 89:5 (Sim. 9.12.5). "... so too a man cannot enter the kingdom of God except by the name of his Son, who was loved by him."

Herm. 89:6. (Sim. 9.12.6). "... Son of God; there is only this one entrance to the Lord. No one, therefore, will enter into him in any other way than through his Son."

Herm. 89:8 (Sim. 9.12.8). "Son of God ... Not one of these glorious angels," he said, "enters God's presence without him [the Son of God]; whoever does not receive his name will not enter the kingdom of God."

Herm. 90:2 (Sim. 9.13.2). "They [the virgins]," he said, "are holy spirits; and there is no other way a man can be found in the kingdom of God other than that they clothe him with their clothes. For if you receive only the Name, but do not receive clothing from them, it does not benefit you. For these virgins are powers of the Son of God. If you bear the Name but do not bear his power, you will bear his name in vain."

Herm. 90:3. (Sim. 9.13.3). "However bears the name of the Son of God ought also to bear their names, for even the Son himself bears the names of these virgins."

Herm. 90:5. (Sim. 9.13.5). "So also those who have believed in the Lord through his Son and clothe themselves with these spirits will become one spirit and one body, and their clothes will be one color."

Herm. 90:7 (Sim. 9.13.7). "Son of God"

Herm. 91:5 (Sim. 9.14.5). "Son of God ... Son of God ... Son of God"

Herm. 92:2 (Sim. 9.15.2). "Son of God"

Herm. 92:4 (Sim. 9.15.4). "Son of God"

Herm. 93:3 (Sim. 9.16.3). "Son of God ... Son of God"

Herm. 93:5 (Sim. 9.16.5). "Son of God ... Son of God"

Herm. 93:7 (Sim. 9.16.7). "Son of God"

Herm. 94:1 (Sim. 9.17.1). "Son of God"

Herm. 94:4 (Sim. 9.17.1). "Son of God"

Herm 101:4 (Sim. 9.24.4). "Son of God ... His Spirit"

Herm. 105:3 (Sim. 9.28.3). "Son of God"

Aristides, c. 125

Apol. 2.4. (Syr) The Christians, then, reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ, who is named the Son of God most High; and it is said that God came down from heaven and from a Hebrew virgin took and clad Himself with flesh, and in a daughter of man there dwelt the Son of God.

Apol. 15.1 (Grk [=2.4 Syr]) The Christians, then, reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ, who is named the Son of God most High; who by the Holy Spirit came down from heaven.

Apol. 17.3. (Syr only) Let all those then approach thereunto who do not know God, and let them receive incorruptible words, those which are so always and from eternity: let them, therefore, anticipate the dread judgment which is to come by Jesus the Messiah upon the whole race of men

Justin Martyr (c. 150–160)

1 Apol. 6.2. But we worship and adore both Him and the Son who came from Him, and taught us these things, and the army of the other good angels, who follow Him and are made like Him, and the prophetic Spirit, giving honor [to Him] in reason and truth.

1 Apol. 10.6. For the restraint which human laws could not bring about, the logos, being divine, would have brought about, save that the evil demons, with the help of the evil desire which is in every person and which expresses itself in various ways, had scattered abroad many false and godless accusations.

1 Apol. 12.7. And that you will not succeed is shown by the Word, and after God who begat Him we know of no ruler more kingly or more just than He.

1 Apol. 12.9. who is both Son and Apostle of God the Father and Master of all, that is Jesus Christ.

1 Apol. 13.3. and we will show that we worship Him rationally, having learned that He is the Son of the true God Himself, and holding Him in the second place, and the prophetic Spirit in the third rank.

1 Apol. 13.4. For they charge our madness to consist in this, that we give to a crucified man second place after the unchangeable and eternal God, begetter of all things.

1 Apol. 14.1. and follow the only unbegotten God through His Son.

1 Apol. 14.5. for He was no sophist, but His word was the power of God

1 Apol. 19.8. those who do not believe that these things which God has taught us through Christ will come to pass.

1 Apol. 21.1. the Word, who is the First-begotten of God

- 1 Apol. 22.1.* Son of God . . . Son of God.
- 1 Apol. 22.2.* the Word of God was begotten of God in peculiar manner, different from the ordinary method of birth
- 1 Apol. 23.2.* Jesus Christ alone was really begotten as Son of God, being His Word and First-begotten and Power, and becoming man by His Will He taught us these things
- 1 Apol. 30.1.* Son of God
- 1 Apol. 31.7.* and both being and being called Son of God
- 1 Apol. 32.2.* as was predicted by the divine and holy prophetic Spirit through Moses
- 1 Apol. 32.8.* For what is called by the divine Spirit through the prophet
- 1 Apol. 32.9.* And the first Power after God the Father and Master of all is the Word, who is also Son
- 1 Apol. 32.10.* though not from human seed but by divine power
- 1 Apol. 32.14.* For by the power of God He was conceived by a virgin
- 1 Apol. 33.2.* these God predicted through the prophetic Spirit
- 1 Apol. 33.4.* but the power of God having come upon the virgin
- 1 Apol. 33.6.* The Spirit and the Power from God cannot therefore be understood as anything else than the Word, who is also the First-begotten of God . . . and it was this which, when it came upon the virgin and overshadowed her, caused her to conceive not by intercourse, but by power
- 1 Apol. 33.9.* And that the prophets are inspired by none other than the divine Word, even you, as I think will agree.
- 1 Apol. 36.2.* you must not suppose that they [the prophecies] are spoken by the inspired persons themselves, but by the divine Word who moves them. For sometimes He speaks things that are to happen, in the manner of one who foretells the future; sometimes He speaks as in the person of God the Master and Father of all; sometimes as in the person of Christ; sometimes as in the person of the people answering the Lord or His Father
- 1 Apol. 38.1.* And when the prophetic Spirit speaks in the person of Christ
- 1 Apol. 39.3.* For there went out into the world from Jerusalem men, twelve in number, and these were illiterate, not able to speak, but by the power of God they testified to every race of men and women that they were sent by Christ to teach to all the Word of God,
- 1 Apol. 40.7.* how God calls Him His Son and has promised to subdue all His enemies under Him; and how the demons try, as far as they can to escape the power of God the Father and Master of all, and the power of Christ Himself
- 1 Apol. 45.1.* And that God the Father of all would bring Christ to heaven after He had raised Him from the dead
- 1 Apol. 46.2.* We have been taught that Christ is the First-born of God
- 1 Apol. 46.5.* But for what reason He, through the power of logos and according to the will of God the Father and Lord of all, was born a virgin as a man
- 1 Apol. 49.5.* Gentiles . . . dedicated themselves to the unbegotten God through Christ.
- 1 Apol. 50.12.* [his disciples] received power which He had sent from there [heaven].
- 1 Apol. 53.2.* For with what reason should we believe of a crucified man that He is the First-begotten of the Unbegotten God
- 1 Apol. 54.7.* Son of God . . . Son of God
- 1 Apol. 58.1.* [Christ as] Son
- 1 Apol. 58.3.* For those who are called demons strive for nothing else than to take away people from God who made them and from Christ His First-begotten
- 1 Apol. 59.5.* the whole Universe came into being by the Word of God out of the substratum spoken of before by Moses.
- 1 Apol. 60.5.* Plato, reading these things and not accurately understanding, nor realizing that it was the figure of a cross, but thinking it was a *Chi*, said that the power next to the first God was placed *Chi-wise* in the universe.
- 1 Apol. 60.6.* And as to his speaking of a third, since he read, as we said before, that which was spoken by Moses, "the Spirit of God moved over the waters."
- 1 Apol. 60.7.* For he gives the second place to the logos who is with God, who, he said, was placed *Chi-wise* in the universe, and the third to the Spirit who was said to be borne over the water, saying, "And the third around the third."
- 1 Apol. 61.1.* we were made new through Christ
- 1 Apol. 61.3.* for they then receive washing in water in the name of God the Father and Master of all, and of our Savior, Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit
- 1 Apol. 61.10.* there is named at the water over him who has chosen to be born again, and has repented of his sinful acts, the name of God the Father and Master of all; they who lead to the washing the one who is to be washed call on this [name] alone.
- 1 Apol. 61.11.* For no one can give a name to the ineffable God; and if anyone should dare say there is one, he raves with a hopeless insanity.
- 1 Apol. 61.12.* And this washing is called illumination, as those who learn these things are illuminated in the mind.
- 1 Apol. 61.13.* And he who is illuminated is washed in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and in the name of the Holy Spirit, who through the prophets foretold all the things about Jesus.
- 1 Apol. 63.3.* And Jesus Christ, because the Jews did not know the nature of the Father and the Son
- 1 Apol. 63.4.* Now the Word of God is His Son, as we have said before.
- 1 Apol. 63.5.* But He is also called "Angel" and "Apostle"; for He announces whatever we ought to know, and is sent forth to testify to what is announced, as Our Lord Himself also said
- 1 Apol. 63.10.* But these words were spoken to prove that Jesus the Christ is Son of God and Apostle, being of old the logos,

and appeared now in the form of fire, now in the image of bodiless creatures; but now having become man by the will of God for the human race

1 Apol. 63.14. Therefore the Jews being throughout of the opinion that the Father of the Universe had spoken to Moses, though He who spoke to Him was the Son of God, who is called both Angel and Apostle, are rightly censured both by the prophetic Spirit and by Christ Himself, since they knew neither the Father nor the Son

1 Apol. 63.15. For those who affirm that the Son is the Father are shown neither to have known the Father, nor to know that the Father of the Universe has a Son; who being the logos and First-begotten is also God

1 Apol. 63.16. He became man of a virgin according to the will of the Father

1 Apol. 64.4. Spirit of God

1 Apol. 64.5. And likewise behaving with trickery they spoke of Athena as a daughter of Zeus, not by sexual union, but, since they knew that God conceived and made the world through the logos, they spoke of Athena as the first thought; which we consider to be very absurd, to bring forward the female form of an intellectual image.

1 Apol. 65.3. and he [the ruler of the brethren] taking them sends up praise and glory to the Father of the Universe through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and offers thanksgiving

1 Apol. 66.2. but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Savior having been incarnate by God's logos took both flesh and blood for our salvation

1 Apol. 67.2. Over all that we receive we bless the Maker of all through His Son Jesus Christ and through the Holy Spirit

2 Apol. 6.3. But His Son, who is alone properly called Son, the logos who is with God and is begotten before the creation, when in the beginning God created and set in order everything through Him, is called Christ, with reference to His being anointed and God's ordering all things through Him

2 Apol. 6.5. having been conceived according to the will of God the Father

2 Apol. 9.2. Father who teaches by the logos

2 Apol. 13.3. For each person spoke well, according to the part present in him of the divine logos

2 Apol. 13.4. For next to God we worship and love the logos who is from the unbegotten and ineffable God

Dial. 7.3. for they [the apostles] exalted God, the Father and Creator of all things, and made known Christ, his Son, who was sent by him

Dial. 8.2. Christ of God

Dial. 11.5. We have been led to God through this crucified Christ

Dial. 16.4. now you spurn those who hope in him, and in him who sent him, namely, almighty God, the Creator of all things

Dial. 17.1. through whose sufferings are healed all those who approach the Father through him

Dial. 23.3. when, in accordance with the will of God, Jesus Christ, his Son, has been born of the Virgin Mary

Dial. 28.4. knows God and his Son

Dial. 29.1. Let us come together with the Gentiles and glorify God, for he has deigned to look down upon us also. Let us glorify him through the King of glory and the Lord of hosts

Dial. 30.3. We constantly ask God through Jesus Christ . . . after our conversion to God through Christ . . . Thus it is clear to all that his Father bestowed upon him such a great power

Dial. 32.3. and that God, the Father of all, raised him up from the earth, and placed him at his right hand

Dial. 34.2. I prove from all the Scriptures that Christ is spoken of as a King, and a Priest, and God, and Lord, and an Angel, and a Man, and a Leader, and a Stone, and a Begotten Son

Dial. 34.7. the Gentiles who know God, the Creator of the world, through the crucified Jesus

Dial. 35.5. For other teach, each in his own peculiar method, how to blaspheme the Creator of the universe, and Christ, whose advent was foretold by him.

Dial. 36.6. And the Holy Spirit, either in his own name or in the Father's, answered

Dial. 39.5. for you honor God and his Christ only with your lips. We, on the other hand . . . honor them with our actions

Dial. 41.1. we should thank God . . . for the total destruction of the powers and principalities of evil through him who suffered in according with his will

Dial. 42.1. The twelve bells . . . were representative of the twelve apostles who relied upon the power of Christ. . . Through their voices the whole world is filled with the glory and grace of God and his Christ

Dial. 43.1. it was expedient that, in accordance with the will of the Father, these things should have their end in him who was born of the Virgin . . . namely, in Christ, the Son of God

Dial. 43.2. have come to God through this one have received

Dial. 45.4. Christ, the Son of God, who existed

Dial. 46.1. that the crucified Jesus is the Christ of God and that to him it has been given to judge without exception all men

Dial. 46.7. we believe that one day God will raise us up again through his Christ

Dial. 47.3. Christ of God

Dial. 48.1. TRYPHO: Your statement that this Christ existed as God before all ages

Dial. 48.2. However, Trypho, the fact that this man is the Christ of God is not to be denied, even if I were unable to prove that he, being God, pre-existed as the Son of the Creator of the universe

Dial. 48.3. he is the Christ of God . . . and consented to become man with a body and feelings like our own, according to the will of the Father. . . and evidently became the Christ by the Father's choice.

Dial. 49.6. God's prophetic Spirit

- Dial. 50.1.** TRYPHO: Tell me, then, first of all, how can you prove that there is another God besides the Creator of the world
- Dial. 55.1.** TRYPHO: prove to us that the prophetic Spirit ever admits the existence of another God, besides the Creator of all things
- Dial. 56.1.** he who appeared to Abraham under the oak tree of Mamre was God, sent, with two accompanying angels, to judge Sodom by another, who forever abides in the super-celestial regions
- Dial. 56.4.** I shall attempt to prove my assertion, namely, that there exists and is mentioned in Scripture another God and Lord under the Creator of all things, who is also called an *Angel*, because he proclaims to man whatever the Creator of the world—above whom there is no other God—wishes to reveal to them.
- Dial. 56.10.** one of these three is God, and yet is termed an *Angel* (because . . . he delivered the messages of God, the Creator of all, to whomsoever God desires. . . was in fact the God who existed before the creation of the universe.
- Dial. 56.11.** he who is said to have appeared to Abraham, Jacob, and Moses, and is called God, is distinct from God, the Creator; distinct, that is, in number, but not in mind. For I state that he never did or said anything other than what the Creator—above whom there is no other God—desired that he do or say
- Dial. 56.15.** Tell me if it is your opinion that the Holy Spirit calls another *God* and *Lord*, besides the Father of all things and his Christ.
- Dial. 56.23.** He, indeed, is the Lord who was commissioned by the Lord in heaven, that is, the Creator of all things, to inflict those dreadful punishments upon Sodom and Gomorrah
- Dial. 58.1.** at the judgment of God, the Creator of the universe, shall hold through my Lord Jesus Christ.
- Dial. 58.3.** in order that by these expressions you may recognize him as the minister of the Father of all things
- Dial. 60.2.** doing the will of the Creator of the universe, and putting into execution his will in the judgment of the people of Sodom
- Dial. 60.5.** it refers to the same person who is identified in many of our earlier quotations as the minister to God, who is above the world, and above whom there is no other God
- Dial. 61.1.** God has begotten of himself a certain rational power as a beginning before all creatures . . . he performs the Father's will and that he was begotten by an act of the Father's will
- Dial. 61.2.** But, does not something similar happen also with us humans? When we utter a word, it can be said that we beget the word, but not by cutting it off, in the sense that our power of uttering words would thereby be diminished. We can observe a similar example in nature when one fire kindles another without losing anything, but remaining the same; yet the enkindled fire seems to exist of itself and to shine without lessening the brilliancy of the first fire.
- Dial. 61.3.** the Word of Wisdom, who is this God begotten from the Father of all, and who is Word and Wisdom and Power and Glory of him who begot him.
- Dial. 62.3.** Now, the words *as one of Us* clearly shows that there were a number of persons together, numbering at least two
- Dial. 62.4.** But this offspring, who was really begotten of the Father, was with the Father and the Father talked with him before all creation as the Word through Solomon clearly showed us, saying that this Son, who is called *Wisdom* by Solomon, was begotten both as a beginning before all his works, and as his offspring
- Dial. 63.1.** TRYPHO: he condescended to become man by a virgin, in accordance with his Father's will, and to be crucified, and to die
- Dial. 63.2.** who is said to have been consigned to death by God because of the sins of the people
- Dial. 63.3.** from the outset God, the Father of all things, intended him to be begotten again and of a human womb?
- Dial. 64.1.** TRYPHO: But we Jews, who adore the God who made him, are not obliged to confess or worship him.
- Dial. 65.3.** God gives his glory to his Christ alone
- Dial. 67.6.** but simply to complete the plan of our redemption in accordance with the will of his Father, Lord and God and Creator of all things
- Dial. 68.3.** Is it your opinion that there is any other to be worshipped and called Lord and God in the Scriptures, except the Creator of the world and the Christ
- Dial. 68.9.** that Christ was to suffer, to be worshipped, and to be called God
- Dial. 71.2.** [Christ called] God
- Dial. 73.2.** [Christ called] God
- Dial. 74.3.** who, after he died on the cross, was deemed worthy by him to reign over the whole world
- Dial. 75.4.** God has appeared . . . how can we doubt and refuse to believe that, in conformity with the will of the Father of all, he could also be born man of a virgin, . . . even this has taken place according to the will of the Father?
- Dial. 76.1.** he was not a product of human activity, but of the will of God, the Father of all, who brought him forth
- Dial. 76.3.** For he alone openly taught the great counsels that the Father intended for those who either were, or shall be, pleasing to him
- Dial. 76.7.** And David proclaims that he would *be born from the womb before the sun and the moon*, in accordance with the Father's will
- Dial. 78.3.** what she had conceived was of the Holy Spirit (quoting Matt 1:20)
- Dial. 83.4.** and through him to believe in almighty God
- Dial. 84.2.** it [virgin birth] took place by the power and purpose of the Creator of the world . . . as all living beings were created by the Word of God in the beginning
- Dial. 85.1.** who is *Lord of hosts* by the will of the Father, who bestowed that honor upon him

Dial. 85.2. Son of God

Dial. 85.4. Jesus Christ, *the Lord of hosts*, *should enter* in accordance with the Father's will.

Dial. 86.3. he himself received from the Father the titles of *King* and *Christ* and *Priest* and *Angel* and all other titles of this kind which he has or had.

Dial. 87.2. TRYPHO: Christ, who, you claim, already existed as God, and, becoming incarnate by the will of God, was born of a virgin.

Dial. 87.3. The Scriptures state that these gifts of the Holy Spirit were bestowed upon him, not as though he were in need to them, but as though they were about to rest upon him, that is, to come to an end with him.

Dial. 87.5. these gifts [of the Spirit] . . . should again be given . . . by him [Christ], and from the grace of his Spirit's powers, to all his believers in accordance with their merits.

Dial. 88.1. Now, if you look around, you can see among us Christians both male and female endowed with charisms from the Spirit of God. Thus, it was not because he needed the powers enumerated by Isaiah that it was foretold that they would come upon him

Dial. 88.2. For, as soon as he was born, he possessed his powers

Dial. 88.4. he did not approach the river because he needed either the baptism or the Spirit who came down upon him in the shape of a dove

Dial. 91.4. sought protection of him who sent his Son into the world to be crucified.

Dial. 92.4. because of our belief in God through Christ

Dial. 92.6. but that you may be saved with Christ, who pleased God and was approved by him

Dial. 94.5. Christ of God

Dial. 95.2. If, then, the Father of the Universe willed that his Christ should shoulder the curses of the whole human race, fully realizing that he would raise him up again after his crucifixion and death, why do you accuse him, who endured such suffering in accordance with the Father's will . . . For, although he suffered for humankind according to the will of the Father himself

Dial. 95.3. If the Father willed him to suffer these things

Dial. 96.2. God will give us all the blessings which he promised us through Christ.

Dial. 98.1. how he [Christ] reveres his Father and how he refers all things to him

Dial. 100.1. through the Father he arose again from the dead on the third day

Dial. 100.2. we know him as the first-begotten of God before all creatures

Dial. 100.4. we have understood that this is really he and that he proceeded before all creatures from the Father by his power and will

Dial. 100.5. Son of God

Dial. 100.6. by whom God destroys both the serpent and those angels and men who have come to resemble the serpent but frees from death those who repent of their sins and believe in Christ.

Dial. 101.1. he states that he will be saved by the same God, and in his humility does not claim to do anything of his own will or power. He did the same when he was on earth.

Dial. 102.2. For it was the Father's design that his Only-begotten be put to death only after he had reached maturity

Dial. 102.5. was also a prediction of what he would do in conformity with his Father's will.

Dial. 102.7. For, if the Son of God clearly states that it is not because he is the Son, nor because he is powerful or wise, but that, even though he be sinless . . . he cannot be saved without God, how can you or others who expect to be saved without this hope, fail to realize that you are deceiving yourselves?

Dial. 103.3. Christ fulfilled by his crucifixion the Father's plan of our redemption.

Dial. 103.8. the Father wished his Son to endure in reality these severe sufferings for us . . . he was the Son of God

Dial. 105.1. I have proved that he is the Only-begotten of the Father of the universe, having been properly begotten from him as his Word and Power, and afterwards becoming man through the Virgin

Dial. 105.5. Thus God through his Son also teaches us

Dial. 106.1. The rest of the psalm shows that he knew that his Father would grant all his requests, and would raise him from the dead.

Dial. 108.2. Son of God

Dial. 110.3. and we cultivate piety, justice, brotherly charity, faith, and hope, which we derive from the Father through the crucified Savior.

Dial. 110.4. and become worshippers of God through the name of Jesus. . . For the vine planted by God and Christ the Redeemer is his people.

Dial. 113.4. Joshua indeed made the sun stand still because he had received the surname Jesus and had received the power from his Spirit. For I have proved that it was Jesus who appeared to and talked with Moses, Abraham, and, in short, with all the patriarchs, doing the will of the Father. . . After his coming the Father will, through him, renew heaven and earth.

Dial. 114.4. whence gushes forth living water for the hearts of those who through him love the Father of all

Dial. 115.4. what would be done by our priest and God and Christ, the Son of the Father of the universe.

Dial. 116.1. Although the Devil stands nearby ever ready to oppose us and anxious to ensnare all of us for himself, the angel of God (namely, the power of God which was sent to us through Jesus Christ) rebukes him, and he departs from us.

Dial. 116.2. Son of God

- Dial. 116.3.** so we, through the name of Jesus have as one man believed in God the Creator of all, have taken off our dirty clothes, that is, our sins, through the name of his first- begotten Son.
- Dial. 117.3.** Son of God
- Dial. 117.5.** There is not a single race of men . . . among whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered to the Father and Creator of the universe in the name of the crucified Jesus.
- Dial. 118.2.** for he is the chosen priest and Eternal King and the Christ, since he is the Son of God .
- Dial. 123.9.** through Christ who begot us to God
- Dial. 125.3.** Christ ministered to the will of God, yet he is God, because he is the first-begotten of all creatures
- Dial. 125.5.** announcing thereby that all who come to the Father through him are part of the blessed Israel.
- Dial. 126.1.** *God . . . Son of God . . .*
- Dial. 126.2.** you would not deny that he is God, Son of the one, unbegotten, ineffable God
- Dial. 126.5.** [the Son] was appointed by the Father and Lord, and administers to his will, and is called God.
- Dial. 126.6.** he himself, being God and angel sent by the Father . . .
- Dial. 127.1.** you should not imagine that the Unbegotten God himself went down or went up from any place.
- Dial. 127. 2.** For, the ineffable Father and Lord of all neither comes to any place, nor walks, nor sleeps, nor arises, but always remains in his place, wherever it may be, acutely seeing and hearing, not with eyes or ears, but with a power beyond description. Yet he surveys all things, knows all things, and none of us has escaped his notice. Nor is he moved who cannot be contained in any place, not even in the whole universe, for he existed even before the universe was created
- Dial. 127.3.** How, then, could he converse with anyone, or be seen by anyone, or appear in the smallest place of the world, when the people were not able to behold the glory of God's messenger at Sinai . . .
- Dial. 127.4.** Thus, neither Abraham, nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any other man saw the Father and ineffable Lord of all creatures and of Christ himself, but [they saw] him who, according to God's will, is God the Son, and his angel because of his serving the Father's will; him who, by his will, became man through a virgin; who also became fire when he talked to Moses from the bush.
- Dial. 127.5.** Unless we understand the Scriptures in this manner, we would have to conclude that the Father and Lord of all was not in heaven when what Moses thus described took place.
- Dial. 128.1.** I have shown in many previous statements that Christ is the Lord, and God the Son.
- Dial. 128.2.** the power which was sent from the Father of all and appeared to Moses . . . since by that power the Father's messages are communicated to men . . . he appears arrayed in such forms as please the Father . . . he reveals to men the discourses of the Father.
- Dial. 128.3.** But some teach that this power is indivisible and inseparable from the Father, just as the light of the sun on earth is indivisible and inseparable from the sun in the skies; for, when the sun sets, its light disappears from the earth. So, they claim, the Father by his will can cause his power to go forth and, whenever he wishes, to return again. In this manner, they declare, God also made the angels.
- Dial. 128.4.** But it has been demonstrated that the angels always exist and are not reduced again into that from which they were created. It has also been shown at length that this power which the prophetic Word also calls *God* and *Angel* not only is numbered as different by its name (as is the light of the sun), but is something distinct in real number. I have already briefly discussed, when I stated that this power was generated from the Father, by his power and will, but not by abscission, as if the substance of the Father were divided; as all other things, once they are divided and severed, are not the same as they were before the division. To illustrate this point, I cited the example of fires kindled from a fire; the enkindled fires are indeed distinct from the original fire which, though it ignites many other fires, still remains the same undiminished fire.
- Dial. 129.1.** When the prophetic Word says, *The Lord rained fire form the lord out of heaven*, it indicates that they are two in number: one on earth, who says that he came down to witness the cry of Sodom, and one in heaven, who is Lord of the lord on earth and as his Father and God was responsible for his being the mighty one and Lord and God.
- Dial. 129.3.** and everybody will admit that the Son if numerically distinct from the Father!
- Dial. 131.2.** Christ, through whom we are called to the salvation prepared for us by the Father.
- Dial. 131.5.** God makes it clear that by the crucified Jesus . . . the demons were to be destroyed.
- Dial. 132.1.** Son of God
- Dial. 133.1.** may God forgive you, and grant you mercy and salvation from himself and Christ
- Dial. 133.6.** us who through him believed in God, the Father of the universe.
- Dial. 136.3.** you did not accept his Christ. For he who is ignorant of him is likewise ignorant of God's will; and he who scorns and hates him clearly hates and scorns him also who sent him; and he who has no faith in him does not believe the words of the prophets, who preached his Gospel and proclaimed him to all men.
- Dial. 137.2.** Son of God
- Dial. 139.4.** Christ has come in his power from the almighty Father
- Dial. 140.4.** And our Lord would not have affirmed, in conformity with the will of the Father and Lord of the universe, who sent him
- Dial. 142.2.** Christ of God
- Dial. 142.3.** Christ of God
- Against Marcion** (in Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 4.6.2) In his book against Marcion, Justin does well say: "I would not have

believed the Lord Himself, if He had announced any other than He who is our framer, maker, and nourisher. But because the only-begotten Son came to us from the one God, who both made this world and formed us, and contains and administers all things, summing up His own handiwork in Himself, my faith towards Him is steadfast, and my love to the Father immovable, God bestowing both upon us.”

Martyrdom of Polycarp (c. 155-165)

Mart. Pol. Pro. . . . may mercy, peace, and love from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ be multiplied.

Mart. Pol. 14:1. “O Lord God Almighty, Father of your beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ, through whom we have received knowledge of you, the God of angels and power and of all creation . . .”

Mart. Pol. 14:2. “I bless you because you have considered me worthy of this day and hour, that I might receive a place among the number of the martyrs in the cup of your Christ, to the resurrection to eternal life, both of soul and of body, in the incorruptibility of the Holy Spirit.”

Mart. Pol. 14:3. “For this reason, indeed for all things, I praise you, I bless you, I glorify you, through the eternal and heavenly High Priest, Jesus Christ, your beloved Son, through whom to you with him and the Holy Spirit be glory both now and for the ages to come. Amen.”

Mart. Pol. 17:3. For this one, who is the Son of God, we worship, but the martyrs we love as disciples and imitators of the Lord, as they deserve, on account of their matchless devotion to their own King and Teacher.

Mart. Pol. 19:2. . . . now he rejoices with the apostles and all the righteous, and glorifies the almighty God and Father, and blessed our Lord Jesus Christ, the Savior of our souls and Helmsman of our bodies and Shepherd of the catholic church throughout the world.

Mart. Pol. 20:2. Now to him who is able to bring us all by his grace and bounty into his eternal kingdom, through his only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, be glory, honor, power, and majesty forever.

Mart. Pol. 22:1. We bid you farewell, brothers, as you walk by the word of Jesus Christ which is in accord with the gospel; with whom be glory to God for the salvation of the holy elect . . .

[The remainder of *The Martyrdom of Polycarp* was certainly added to later manuscripts.]

Melito (c. 160–170)

On Pascha 9. For he is all things: inasmuch as he judges, Law; inasmuch as he teaches, Word; inasmuch as he saves, Grace; inasmuch as he begets, Father; inasmuch as he is begotten, Son; inasmuch as he suffers, Sheep; inasmuch as he is buried, Man; inasmuch as he is raised, God

On Pascha 32. Tell me, angel, what did you respect? The slaughter of the sheep or the life of the Lord? The death of the sheep or the model of the Lord? The blood of the sheep or the Spirit of the Lord?

On Pascha 44. the blood of the sheep was precious, but it is worthless now because of the Spirit of the Lord; a speechless lamb was precious, but it is worthless now because of the spotless Son

On Pascha 45. For it is not in one place nor in a little plot that the glory of God is established, but on all the ends of the inhabited earth his bounty overflows, and there the almighty God has made his dwelling through Christ Jesus; to whom be glory for ever. Amen.

On Pascha 46. and why the Lord is present on the earth to clothe himself with the suffering one and carry him off to the heights of heaven.

On Pascha 47. When God in the beginning had made the heaven and the earth and all the things in them by his word

On Pascha 56. For man was being divided by death; for a strange disaster and captivity were enclosing him, and he was dragged off a prisoner under the shadows of death, and desolate lay the Father's image

On Pascha 66. It is he who, coming from heaven to earth because of the suffering one, and clothing himself in that same one through a virgin's womb, and coming forth a man, accepted the passions of the suffering one through the body which was able to suffer, and dissolved the passions of the flesh; and by the Spirit which could not die he killed death the killer of men.

On Pascha 67. . . . and he marked our souls with his own Spirit and the members of our body with his own blood

On Pascha 76. This is the cry, Israel, which you should have made to God: ‘Sovereign, if indeed your Son *had to suffer*, and this is your will . . .’

On Pascha 82. But you did not turn out to be ‘Israel’; you did not ‘see God’, you did not recognize the Lord. You did not know, Israel, that he is the firstborn of God, who was begotten *before the morning star* . . .

On Pascha 103. ‘I am leading you up to the heights of heaven; there I will show you the Father from ages past.’

On Pascha 104. . . . who sits at the Father's right hand, who has power to save every man, through whom the Father did his works from beginning to eternity

On Pascha 105. he is the one who sits at the Father's right hand; he carries the Father and is carried by the Father.

Fragment 2. We are not devotees of stones which have no sensation, but we are worshippers of the only God who is before all and over all, and of his Christ who is the Word of God before the ages

Fragment 9. . . . and he carried the wood on his shoulders as he was led up to be slain like Isaac by his Father

Fragment 13. For this reason the Father sent his incorporeal Son from heaven

Fragment 14. he was reputed a servant, but did not refuse the rank of Son; carried in the womb by Mary, and clothed with his Father. . . . putting on the likeness of a servant, and not changing his likeness to the Father. . . . He stood before

Pilate, and sat with the Father

Fragment 15. . . . so that we may demonstrate to your affection that he is perfect mind, the Word of God who was *begotten before the morning star*. He is the Creator [with the Father]. . . . in the utterance a Word, among spirits a Spirit, in the Father a Son, in God a God, King for ever and ever. . . . who sits at the Father's right, and by him is glorified. . . . God from God, Son from the Father, Jesus Christ.

Fragment 16b. *For who knows the mind of the Lord, or who was his counselor?*—except the Word, who was enfleshed in a virgin . . . and was glorified in the Father

New Fragment II.1. . . . from the beginning the Word of the Father, loving mankind, descended . . .

New Fragment II.4. He put on a body from a virgin because of men, he who is Word with you; and God is Word, and Word is Man, and Man is with God. For God visited his own creation, which he had made in his image and likeness. He sent out his own Son from heaven to earth incorporeal, and he took a body from a virgin.

New Fragment II.17. The Lord died for all and rose for all, and he put on humanity, [ascended] to the heights, to heaven, and offered the Father a gift

New Fragment II.18. But him the Father exalted, and has made him sit as the right of his throne in high places and abundance; and him he made judge of the people and leader of angels and prince of cherubim architect of Jerusalem and son of a virgin and king for ever, this one whom we see wholly as man with him. He is older than the morning star; he is brighter than the lightning-flash, higher than the heavens, creator of creatures.

New Fragment II.20. For he is the Word of his Father, and the Spirit of his power, and the perfecter of peace who came from heaven, and giver of Holy Spirit of the prophets.

New Fragment II.21 . . . but he rose from the dead inasmuch as he is God

New Fragment II.22. And because he was God and is God . . . scorned by men and magnified by the Father, this is the Man who was sent by the Father to the world because he is God, both Man upon earth and God in heaven, and he is God over all creation

Tatian (c. 165-172)

To the Greeks 4.3. Our God has no origin in time, since he alone is without beginning and himself is the beginning of all things. 'God is a spirit', not pervading matter, but the constructor of material spirits and the shapes that are in matter; he is both invisible and impalpable and has himself become the father of things perceptible and visible.

To the Greeks 4.4. How can I proclaim sticks and stones as gods? For the spirit that pervades matter is inferior to the more divine spirit; being on a level with matter it is not to be given equal honour with the perfect God.

To the Greeks 5.1. God 'was in the beginning' and we have received the tradition that the beginning was the power of the Word. The Lord of all things who was himself the foundation of the whole was alone in relation to the creation which had not yet come into being. In so far as all power over things visible and invisible was with him, he with himself and the Word which was in him established all things through the power of the Word.

To the Greeks 5.2. By his mere will the Word sprang forth and did not come in vain, but became the 'firstborn' work of the Father. Him we know as the beginning of the universe.

To the Greeks 5.3. He came into being by partition, not by section, for what is severed is separated from its origin, but what has been partitioned takes on a distinctive function and does not diminish the source from which it has been taken.

To the Greeks 5.4. Just as many fires may be kindled from one torch, but the light of the first torch is not diminished because of the kindling of the many, so also the Word coming forth from the power of the Father does not deprive the begetter of the power of rational speech.

To the Greeks 5.5-6. I speak and you hear: yet surely when I address you I am not myself deprived of speech through transmission of speech, but by projecting my voice my purpose is to set in order the disorderly matter in you. **6.** Just as the Word begotten in the beginning in turn begot our creation by fabricating matter for himself, so I too, in imitation of the Word, having been begotten again and obtained understanding of the truth am bringing to order the confusion in kindred matter.

To the Greeks 5.7. For matter is not without beginning like God, nor because of having beginning is it also of equal power with God; it was originated and brought into being by none other, projected by the sole creator of all that is.

To the Greeks 7.1. For celestial Word, made spirit from the Spirit and Word from power of the Word, in the likeness of the Father who begot him made man an image of immortality, so that just as incorruptibility belongs to God, in the same way man might share God's lot and have immortality also.

To the Greeks 7.2. Now the Word before he made man created angels

To the Greeks 13.2. The light comprehended the dark, in that the light of God is Word, but the ignorant soul is darkness.

To the Greeks 13.3. Because of this if it lives alone it inclines down towards matter and dies with the flesh, but if it gains union with the divine spirit it is not unaided, but mounts to the realms above where the spirit leads it; for the spirit's home is above, but the soul's birth is below.

To the Greeks 13.5. God's spirit is not given to all, but dwelling among some who behaved justly and being intimately connected with the soul it revealed by predictions to the other souls what had been hidden.

To the Greeks 13.6. The souls which were obedient to wisdom attracted to themselves the kindred spirit, but those which were disobedient and rejected the servant of the suffering God were clearly shown to be enemies of God rather than his worshippers.

To the Greeks 15.1. Well then, we ought now to search for what we once had and have lost, and link the soul to the Holy Spirit and busy ourselves with the union ordained by God.

To the Greeks 15.4-5. The bond of the flesh is the soul, but it is the flesh which contains the soul. **5.** If such a structure is like a shrine, 'God' is willing to 'dwell' in it through the 'spirit', his representative.

To the Greeks 15.7. Only those who are guarded by the spirit of God can easily perceive the bodies of demons, but the others cannot.

To the Greeks 16.8. Sometimes too they shake the body's system with a fit of their own madness, and then smitten by a word of God's power they go away in fear, and the sick man is healed.

To the Greeks 19.9. Such people are we; do not abhor us, but reject the demons and follow the only God. 'All things were made by him, and without him not a single thing has come into being'.

To the Greeks 20.6. But we have learned through prophets what we did not know, who being convinced that the spirit in conjunction with the soul would obtain the heavenly garment of immortality—used to foretell all that the rest of the souls did not know. It is possible for everyone who is naked to get his adornment, and race back to his ancient kinship.

To the Greeks 21.1. We are not fools, men of Greece, nor are we talking nonsense when we declare that God has been born in the form of man.

Theophilus (c. 170–185)

Autol. 1.5.4. so the whole creation is contained by the spirit of God, and the containing spirit is along with the creation contained by the hand of God

Autol. 1.7.1. This is my God, the Lord of all, who alone stretched out the heaven . . . who founded the earth upon the waters, and gave a breath to nourish it; whose breath giveth light to the whole, who, if He withdraw His breath, the whole will utterly fail

Autol. 1.7.3. Who is the Physician? God, who heals and makes alive through His word and wisdom. God by His own word and wisdom made all things; for "by His word were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth." Most excellent is His wisdom. By His wisdom God founded the earth; and by knowledge He prepared the heavens, and by understanding were the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the clouds poured out their dews.

Autol. 1.13.7. And all these things does the wisdom of God effect, in order to manifest even by these things, that God is able to effect the general resurrection of all men.

Autol. 1.14.1. At the same time, I met with the sacred Scriptures of the holy prophets, who also by the Spirit of God foretold the things that have already happened.

Autol. 2.9.1. But men of God carrying in them a holy spirit and becoming prophets, being inspired and made wise by God, became God-taught, and holy, and righteous. Wherefore they were also deemed worthy of receiving this reward, that they should become instruments of God, and contain the wisdom that is from Him, through which wisdom they uttered both what regarded the creation of the world and all other things.

Autol. 2.10.2. God, then, having His own Word internal within His own bowels, begat Him, emitting Him along with His own wisdom before all things

Autol. 2.10.3. He had this Word as a helper in the things that were created by Him, and by Him He made all things

Autol. 2.10.4. He is called "governing principle," because He rules, and is Lord of all things fashioned by Him.

Autol. 2.10.5. He, then, being Spirit of God, and governing principle, and wisdom, and power of the highest, came down upon the prophets, and through them spoke of the creation of the world and of all other things.

Autol. 2.10.6. For the prophets were not when the world came into existence, but the wisdom of God which was in Him, and His holy Word which was always present with Him.

Autol. 2.10.7. And Moses, who lived many years before Solomon, or, rather, the Word of God by him as by an instrument, says

Autol. 2.10.8. In order, therefore, that the living God might be known by His works, and that [it might be known that] by His Word God created the heavens and the earth, and all that is therein, he said, "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

Autol. 2.13.3. And by the Spirit which is borne above the waters, he means that which God gave for animating the creation, as he gave life to man, mixing what is fine with what is fine. For the Spirit is fine, and the water is fine, that the Spirit may nourish the water, and the water penetrating everywhere along with the Spirit, may nourish creation.

Autol. 2.13.6. The command, then, of God, that is, His Word, shining as a lamp in an enclosed chamber, lit up all that was under heaven.

Autol. 2.13.8. The water, then, covering all the earth, and specially its hollow places, God, through His Word, next caused the waters to be collected into one collection.

Autol. 2.15.4. In like manner also the three days which were before the luminaries, are types of the Trinity of God, and His Word, and His wisdom. And the fourth is the type of man, who needs light, so that there may be God, the Word, wisdom, man.

Autol. 2.18.1. For God having made all things by His Word, and having reckoned them all mere bye-works, reckons the creation of man to be the only work worthy of His own hands.

Autol. 2.18.2. Moreover, God is found, as if needing help, to say, "Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness." But to no one else than to His own Word and wisdom did He say, "Let Us make"

Autol. 2.22.2. The God and Father, indeed, of all cannot be contained, and is not found in a place, for there is no place of His rest; but His Word, through whom He made all things, being His power and His wisdom, assuming the person of the Father and Lord of all, went to the garden in the person of God, and conversed with Adam.

Autol. 2.22.3. For the divine writing itself teaches us that Adam said that he had heard the voice. But what else is the voice but the Word of God, who is also His Son? Not as the poets and writers of myths talk of the sons of gods begotten from intercourse [with women], but as truth expounds, the Word, that always exists, residing within the heart of God. For before anything came into being, He had Him as a counselor, being His own mind and thought

Autol. 2.22.4. But when God wished to make all that He determined on, He begot this Word, uttered, the first-born of all creation, not Himself being emptied of the Word [Reason], but having begotten Reason, and always conversing with His Reason

Autol. 2.22.5. And hence the holy writings teach us, and all the spirit-bearing [inspired] men, one of whom, John, says, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,” showing that at first God was alone, and the Word in Him

Autol. 2.22.6. Then he says, “The Word was God; all things came into existence through Him; and apart from Him not one thing came into existence.” The Word, then, being God, and being naturally produced from God, whenever the Father of the universe wills, He sends Him to any place; and He, coming, is both heard and seen, being sent by Him, and is found in a place.

Autol. 3.12.1. Moreover, concerning the righteousness which the law enjoined, confirmatory utterances are found both with the prophets and in the Gospels, because they all spoke inspired by one Spirit of God.

Autol. 3.17.4. How much more, then, shall we know the truth who are instructed by the holy prophets, who were possessed by the Holy Spirit of God!

Athenagoras (c. 177–180)

Embassy 4.1. Now when we make a distinction between matter and God and show that matter is one being while God is quite other, completely separated from the former—for the divine is unbegotten and invisible, beheld only by mind and thought, while matter is subject to generation and corruption—surely it is unreasonable of them to charge us with atheism.

Embassy 4.2. But when our doctrine introduces one God, creator of all this world, Himself unbegotten (for it is not Being that is subject to Becoming, but not-Being), and says that all things are made by the Word that proceeds from Him, we are wrongfully assailed.

Embassy 5.2. The one whose works they are and whose Spirit governs all, Him he took to be God

Embassy 6.3. If now Plato is no atheist, recognizing one unbegotten God as the maker of all things, neither are we atheists, since we know and cherish that being as God by whose Word all things are made and by whose Spirit all things are held in being

Embassy 6.5. The Stoic school even though they amass a multitude of names for the divine being, according as it has to be named to suit the changes of matter through which they say that the ‘Breath’ of God passes, do in reality reckon God to be one. For if God is that artisan fire which, making its way towards the production of the universe, embraces all the ‘seminal reasons’ after the pattern of which each group of things comes to be in its appointed order, and if the Spirit of God pervades the whole universe, then God is one in their philosophy, being named Zeus in the fiery element of matter, Hera in the element of air, and having other names for the other portions of matter in which He is contained.

Embassy 9.1. I expect that you who are so learned and so eager for truth are not without some introduction to Moses, Isaiah, Jeremias, and the rest of the prophets, who, when the Divine Spirit moved them . . .

Embassy 10.1. I have given sufficient proof that we are not atheists, but hold God to be one, unbegotten, eternal, invisible, suffering nothing, comprehended by none, circumscribed by none, apprehended by mind and reasoning alone, girt about with light and beauty and spirit and power indescribable, creator of all things by His Word, their embellisher and master

Embassy 10.2. We do indeed think also that God has a Son—and please let no one laugh at the idea of God having a Son! This is not a case of the myths of the poets who make the gods out to be no better than men; we have no such ideas about God the Father or the Son. The Son of God is Word of the Father in thought and power. All things were made through Him and after His fashion. The Father and Son are one. The Son being in the Father and the Father in the Son by the powerful union of the Spirit, the Son of God is mind and Word of the Father.

Embassy 10.3. Now if, in your exceeding great sagacity, you wish to investigate what is meant by the Son, I will tell you in brief: He is the First-begotten of the Father. He did not indeed come to be, for God was from the beginning, being eternal mind, and had His Word within Himself, being from eternity possessed of a Word; but He proceeded to become thought and power over the elements of undifferentiated nature when all the material elements were like a substrate in quiescence and the heavier elements lay mixed with the lighter.

Embassy 10.4. The Spirit of prophecy agrees with this account, saying: *The Lord made me the beginning of His ways for His works.* Then again this same Holy Spirit, that works in those who utter prophecy, we call an outflow from God, flowing out and returning like a ray of the sun. Who then would not be amazed hearing those called atheists who call God Father and Son and Holy Spirit, proclaiming their power in unity and in rank their diversity?

Embassy 12.2. We are guided [by the Spirit] alone to know the true God and His Word, to know what is the unity of the Son with the Father, what the sharing of the Father with the Son, and what the Spirit, to know what is the unity and division of these three great ones thus united—Spirit, Son, and Father.

Embassy 18.2. Just as all is subject to you two, father and son, who have received the kingdom from God . . . , even so to the one God and to His Word, Son by intellectual generation and inseparable, all has been made subject.

Embassy 24.1. For we speak of His Word as God too and Son and of Holy Spirit likewise, united into one by power and divided in order thus, the Father, the Son, the Spirit, the Son being mind, word, or wisdom of the Father and the Spirit an effulgence as light from fire

Embassy 30.3. Our case has now been argued to the best of our ability, if not as it deserves, to show that we are not atheists for reverencing as God the maker of this universe and the Word that comes from Him.

***Resurrection 3.3.** It would then be the work of the same power, the same wisdom, and the same God

***Resurrection 5.1.** Such men seem to me not to realize the power and wisdom of Him who made and governs this universe.

***Resurrection 8.4.** Rather would such food be withdrawn from the nutritive faculty and scattered among those elements again from which it derived its first embodiment, being separated again from them by the power and wisdom of Him who couples the nature of each living being with its appropriate power.

***Resurrection 12.6** . . . but to those who bear in themselves the image of the creator, whose nature involves the possession of mind and who partake of rational judgment, He has set apart an eternal existence, that knowing their maker and His power and wisdom, and being guided by law and justice they may share in an undisturbed, everlasting existence along with those helps by which they mastered their preceding life, though they were in frail and earthly bodies.

***Resurrection 18.2** . . . Here one must first consider what is by nature primary and examine the account of the judgment, premising this only, out of regard for the first principle proper to the present subject matter and for right order: (a) that those who accept God as the creator of this universe must ascribe to His wisdom and justice the guardianship and oversight of all that comes to pass—at least if they are to be consistent in their first principles.

To Diognetus (c. 150-225)

Diogn. 7:2. On the contrary, the omnipotent Creator of all, the invisible God himself, established among men the truth and the holy, incomprehensible word from heaven and fixed it firmly in their hearts, not, as one might imagine, by sending to men some subordinate, or angel or ruler or one of those who manage earthly matters, or one of those entrusted with the administration of things in heaven, but the Designer and Creator of the universe himself, by whom he created the heavens, by whom he enclosed the sea within its proper bounds, whose mysteries all the elements faithfully observe, from whom the sun has received the measure of the daily courses to keep, whom the moon obeys as he commands it to shine by night, whom the stars obey as they follow the course of the moon, by whom all things have been ordered and determined and placed in subjection, including the heavens and the things in the heavens, the earth and the things in the earth, the sea and the things in the sea, fire, air, abyss, the things in the heights, the things in the depths, the things in between—this one he sent to them!

Diogn. 7:3. But perhaps he sent him, as a man might suppose, to rule by tyranny, fear, and terror?

Diogn. 7:4. . . . he sent him in gentleness and meekness, as a king might send his son who is a king; he sent him as God; he sent him as a man to men. When he sent him, he did so as one who saves by persuasion, not compulsion. . .

Diogn. 7:5. When he sent him, he did so as one calling, not pursuing; when he sent him, he did so as one loving, not judging.

Diogn. 7:6. For he will send him as Judge, and who will endure his coming? . . .

Diogn. 8:5. No one has either seen or recognized him, but he has revealed himself.

Diogn. 8:9. And after conceiving a great and marvelous plan, he communicated it to his Child alone.

Diogn. 8:11. . . . but when he revealed it through his beloved Child and made known the things prepared from the beginning, he gave us everything at once . . .

Diogn. 9:1. So then, having already planned everything in his mind together with his Child, he permitted us during the former time to be carried away by undisciplined impulses as we desired . . .

Diogn. 9:2. . . . in his mercy he took upon himself our sins; he himself gave up his own Son as a ransom for us, the holy one for the lawless, the guiltless for the guilty, “the just for the unjust,” the incorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for the mortal.

Diogn. 9:4. In whom was it possible for us, the lawless and ungodly, to be justified, except in the Son of God alone?

Diogn. 10:2. For God loved men, for whose sake he made the world . . . to them he sent his one and only Son . . .

Diogn. 11:3. This is why he sent the Word, namely, that he might appear to the world;

Diogn. 11:5. This is the Eternal One, who today is accounted a Son, through whom the church is enriched and grace is unfolded and multiplied among the saints . . .

Diogn. 12:9. . . . and the Word rejoices as he teaches the saints, the Word through whom the Father is glorified.

Irenaeus (c. 180–190)

A.H. 1.3.6. Thus they lead away from the Truth into captivity those who do not guard a firm faith in the one Father Almighty and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God. . .

A.H. 1.9.2. To be sure, John preached one God Almighty, and one Only-begotten Christ Jesus, through whom he says *all things were made*. This is the Word of God, this is the Only-begotten, this the Maker of all things, this *true Light who enlightens every man*, this the Maker of the world, this the one who *came into his own*, this the one who *became flesh and dwelt among us*.

- A.H. 1.9.3.** . . . the Word of God. . . Word of the Father . . . , namely the Only-begotten Son of the one God, who according to the Father's good pleasure became flesh for the sake of men, . . . Word of God. . . the Word and Only-begotten and Life and Light and Savior and Christ and Son of God.
- A.H. 1.10.1** . . . the faith in one God the Father Almighty, the Creator of heaven and earth . . . and in the one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was enfleshed for our salvation . . . the beloved Son, Christ Jesus our Lord, and His coming from heaven in the glory of the Father to recapitulate all things. . . in order that to Christ Jesus, our Lord and God, Savior and King, according to the invisible Father's good pleasure, *Every knee should bow* . . .
- A.H. 1.10.3.** . . . for example, by thinking up another God besides the Creator, Maker, and Nourisher of this universe, as if He were not sufficient for us; or another Christ, or another Only-begotten . . . the Word of God became flesh . . . the coming of the Son of God. . .
- A.H. 1.15.5.** Or who will put up with you who confine the Creator of all things, the Framer and Maker, the Word of God, to figures and numbers—
- A.H. 1.19.2.** That this passage: *No one shall see God and live*, was said of the invisible Father and Creator of the universe, is evident to us all.
- A.H. 1.22.1.** The Rule of the Truth that we hold is this: There is one God Almighty, who created all things through His Word . . . Now, it is the Father who made all things through Him . . . These He did not make through Angels or some Powers that were separated from His thought. . . No, He made all things by His Word and Spirit. . . This is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. . .
- A.H. 1.23.1.** . . . those who believed in God through Jesus Christ . . .
- A.H. 1.27.1.** . . . the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ . . .
- A.H. 1.27.2** . . . in which it is most clearly written that the Lord confessed His Father as the Maker of the universe. . . the God who made the world inasmuch as he is the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ.
- A.H. 1.31.3.** Perhaps, some of them can be saved if they do penance and convert to the one and only Creator and God, the Maker of the universe.
- A.H. 2.Preface.1.** I proved also that there is one God, the Creator, and that He is not the fruit of any defect, nor is there anything either above Him, or after Him.
- A.H. 2.1.1.** It is proper, then, that I should begin with the first and most important head, that is, God the Creator, who made the heaven and the earth.
- A.H. 2.2.3.** If, however, [the things referred to were done] not against His will, but with His concurrence and knowledge, as some [of these men] think, the angels, or the Former of the world [whoever that may have been], will no longer be the causes of that formation, but the will of God. For if He is the Former of the world, He too made the angels, or at least was the cause of their creation; and *He* will be regarded as having made the world who prepared the causes of its formation. Although they maintain that the angels were made by a long succession downwards, or that the Former of the world [sprang] from the Supreme Father, as Basilides asserts; nevertheless that which is the cause of those things which have been made will still be traced to Him who was the Author of such a succession. . . With justice, therefore, according to an analogous process of reasoning, the Father of all will be declared the Former of this world, and not the angels, nor any other [so-called] former of the world, other than He who is its Author, and had formerly been the cause of the preparation for a creation of this kind.
- A.H. 2.2.4.** . . . He created and made all things by His Word, while He neither required angels to assist Him in the production of those things which are made, nor of any power greatly inferior to Himself . . . He formed all things that were made by His Word that never wearies.
- A.H. 2.2.5.** For this is a peculiarity of the pre-eminence of God, not to stand in need of other instruments for the creation of those things which are summoned into existence. His own Word is both suitable and sufficient for the formation of all things. . . It [the world] too, therefore, was made by His Word, as Scripture tells us in the book of Genesis that He made all things connected with our world by His Word . . . but neither gods nor angels [had any share in the work].
- A.H. 2.10.2.** . . . they do impiously despise that God who was the Creator, and who sent Him for the salvation of men.
- A.H. 2.11.1.** They do not believe that He, who is God above all, formed by His Word . . . the various and diversified. . . But they believe that angels, or some power separate from God, and who was ignorant of Him, formed this universe. . . He [Jesus Christ] teaches that that adoption of sons pertaining to the Father, which is eternal life, takes place through Himself.
- A.H. 2.13.8** (Grant). Everyone knows that this may rightly be said about men, but in the case of the God who is above all, since he is all Mind and all Logos, as we said before, and has nothing in himself either posterior or prior, but remains as a whole equal and similar and enduring as one, an emission of this kind could not ensue. . . In speaking thus one will remain subordinate to the Father of all but use more suitable terms than those who transfer the generation of the expressed word of men to the eternal Logos of God and give the expressions a beginning and a genesis as they would give it to their own word. But how will the Logos of God, or rather God himself, since he is Logos, differ from the word of men, if it has the same order and manner of generation?
- A.H. 2.25.1.** . . . but with great wisdom and diligence, all things have clearly been made by God, fitted and prepared [for their special purpose]; and His word formed both things ancient and those belonging to the latest times.
- A.H. 2.25.3.** For thou, O man, art not an uncreated being, nor didst thou always co-exist with God, as did His own Word; but now, through His pre-eminent goodness, receiving the beginning of thy creation, thou dost gradually learn from the

Word the dispensations of God who made thee.

A.H. 2.26.1. . . . Jesus Christ, the Son of God . . .

A.H. 2.27.2. . . . they proclaim that one only God, to the exclusion of all others, formed all things by His word . . .

A.H. 2.28.2 (Grant). We must leave such matters as these to the God who made it and correctly realize that the scriptures are perfect, since they were spoken by God's Word and his Spirit, while we, as we are inferior and more recent than God's Word and his Spirit, need to receive the knowledge of his mysteries.

A.H. 2.28.4 (Grant). . . . the Lord confesses him alone as his Father and knows no other But since God is all Mind, all Word, all operative Spirit, all Light, always identical with and life himself . . .

A.H. 2.28.5 (Grant). God being all Mind and all Logos says what he things and thinks what he says; for his Reasoning is Logos and Logos is Mind and all-containing Mind is the Father himself. If then one speaks of the Mind of God and gives its own emission to the Mind, one calls him composite, since in this case God is one thing and the directing Mind is another. Similarly in giving the Word a third rank in emission from the Father (which would explain why the Word is ignorant of the Father's greatness) one deeply separates the Word from God. And indeed the prophet says of him, "Who will recount his generation?" (Is. 53:8). But when you scrutinize his generation from the Father and transfer the expression of the human word, made with the tongue, to the Word of God, you yourselves rightly reveal that you know neither human nor divine matters.

A.H. 2.28.6. . . . even the Lord, the very Son of God, allowed that the Father alone knows the very day and hour of judgment If, then, the Son was not ashamed to ascribe the knowledge of that day to the Father only If any one, therefore, says to us, "How then was the Son produced by the Father?" we reply to him, that no man understands that production, or generation, or calling or revelation, or by whatever name one may describe His generation, which is in fact altogether indescribable. Neither Valentinus, nor Marcion, nor Saturninus, nor Basilides, nor angels, nor archangels, nor principalities, nor powers [possess this knowledge], but the Father only who begat, and the Son who was begotten. Since therefore His generation is unspeakable, those who strive to set forth generations and productions cannot be in their right mind, inasmuch as they undertake to describe things which are indescribable.

A.H. 2.28.7. . . . God and His Word. . . . For although the Spirit of the Saviour that is in Him

A.H. 2.28.8. For if any one should inquire the reason why the Father, who has fellowship with the Son in all things, has been declared by the Lord alone to know the hour and the day [of judgment], . . . that we may learn through Him that the Father is above all things. . . . The Father, therefore, has been declared by our Lord to excel with respect to knowledge; for this reason, that we, too, as long as we are connected with the scheme of things in the world, should leave perfect knowledge.

A.H. 2.30.8. . . . and He [God] is truly the Spirit of God, and not an animal Demiurge, otherwise He should never have created spiritual things. . . .

A.H. 2.30.9. . . . who is the only Father founding and forming all things, visible and invisible, such as may be perceived by our senses and such as cannot, heavenly and earthly, "by the word of His power;" and He has fitted and arranged all things by His wisdom, while He contains all things, but He Himself can be contained by no one. . . . He is Father, He is God, He the Founder, He the Maker, He the Creator, who made those things by Himself, that is, through His Word and His Wisdom . . . He is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: through His Word, who is His Son, through Him he is revealed and manifested to all to whom He is revealed; for those [only] known Him to whom the Son has revealed Him. But the Son, eternally co-existing with the Father, from of old, yea, from the beginning, always reveals the Father to Angels, Archangels, Powers, Virtues, and all to whom He wills that God should be revealed.

A.H. 2.32.4. . . . He is the only Son of God.

A.H. 2.32.5. . . . when He was made man, He held fellowship with His own creation, and did all things truly through the power of God, according to the will of the Father of all . . .

A.H. 2.35.2. . . . while they [the prophets] moreover announced the advent of His Son

A.H. 3.1.2. . . . the Son of God. . .

A.H. 3.3.3. . . . the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . .

A.H. 3.4.2 . . . believing in one God, the Creator of heaven and earth, and all things therein, by means of Christ Jesus, the Son of God;; who, because of His surpassing love towards His creation, condescended to be born of the virgin, He Himself uniting man through Himself to God. . .

A.H. 3.5.1. . . . His own Father

A.H. 3.5.3. This is also made clear from the words of the Lord, who did truly reveal the Son of God to those of the circumcision. . . . and that they might look for His Son Jesus Christ . . . who shall also descend from heaven in His Father's power.

A.H. 3.6.1. . . . His Son who has received dominion from His Father over all creation . . . He [the Father] who gave Him [the Son] the inheritance of the heathen, and subjected to Him all His enemies. Since, therefore, the Father is truly Lord, and the Son truly Lord, the Holy Spirit has fitly designated them by the title of Lord. . . . the Son, who had also been talking with Abraham, had received power to judge the Sodomites for their wickedness. . . . For the Spirit designates both [of them] by the name of God—both Him who is anointed as Son, and Him who does anoint, that is, the Father. . . . For she [the church] is the synagogue of God, which God—that is, the Son Himself—has gathered by Himself.

A.H. 3.6.2. Wherefore, as I have already stated, no other is named as God, or is called Lord, except Him who is God and Lord of all and His Son Jesus Christ our Lord Therefore God has been declared through the Son, who is in the

Father, and has the Father in Himself—He WHO IS, the Father bearing witness to the Son, and the Son announcing the Father.

- A.H. 3.6.4.** Wherefore I do also call upon thee . . . who art the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . grant, by our Lord Jesus Christ, the governing power of the Holy Spirit.
- A.H. 3.8.2.** . . . not one of created and subject things, shall ever be compared to the Word of God, by whom all things were made.
- A.H. 3.8.3.** For that all things . . . were both established and created by Him who is God over all, through His Word so that He indeed who made all things can alone, together with His Word, properly be termed God and Lord: but the things which have been made cannot have this term applied to them, neither should they justly assume that appellation which belongs to the Creator
- A.H. 3.9.1.** . . . the prophets and the apostles confessing the Father and the Son; but naming no other as God, and confessing no other as Lord and Him who, by His Son Christ Jesus, has called us to the knowledge of Himself. . . . There is therefore one and the same God, the Father of our Lord, who also promised through the prophets, that He would send His forerunner; and His salvation—that is, His Word—He caused to be made visible to all flesh, [the Word] Himself being made incarnate.
- A.H. 3.9.2.** . . . His Son . . . because He was God, who also “was made known in Judea” . . .
- A.H. 3.9.3.** . . . but the Word of God . . . who did also take upon Him flesh, and was anointed by the Spirit from the Father. . . . For inasmuch as the Word of God was man from the root of Jesse, and son of Abraham, in this respect did the Spirit of God rest upon Him, and anoint Him to preach the Gospel to the lowly. But inasmuch as He was God, He did not judge according to glory, nor reprove after the manner of speech. . . . Therefore did the Spirit of God descend upon Him, [the Spirit] of Him who had promised by the prophets that He would anoint Him.
- A.H. 3.10.2.** . . . Jesus Christ our Lord, the Son of the Most High God. . . . son of God. . .
- A.H. 3.10.3** Greek (3.10.2 English) . . . Son of God . . . Son of God . . . For He is indeed Saviour, as being the Son and Word of God; but salutary, since [He is] Spirit. . . .
- A.H. 3.10.5.** Greek, (3.10.4 English). Now by all these one God is shown forth, revealing to men the new dispensation of liberty, the covenant, through the new advent of His Son.
- A.H. 3.10.6.** Greek (3.10.5 English). Him, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who had also made promise to Him, that He would send His messenger before His face, who was John.
- A.H. 3.11.1.** . . . there is but one God, who made all things by His Word . . . there is one Almighty God, who made all things by His Word
- A.H. 3.11.2.** And, according to certain of the Gnostics, this world was made by angels, and not by the Word of God . . . while the Gospel affirms plainly, that by the Word, which was in the beginning with God, all things were made . . .
- A.H. 3.11.3.** . . . Word of God . . . Word of God . . .
- A.H. 3.11.4.** . . . His Son . . .
- A.H. 3.11.5.** . . . God . . . who established the waters, and brought forth the fountains, was He who in these last times bestowed upon mankind, by His Son, the blessing of food and the favor of drink. . . . since there is none beyond Him, but He exists in the bosom of the Father.
- A.H. 3.11.6.** For He, the Son who is in His bosom, declares to all the Father who is invisible. Wherefore *they* know Him to whom the Son reveals Him; and again, the Father, by means of the Son, gives knowledge of His Son to those who love Him. . . . Son of the living God . . .
- A.H. 3.11.7.** Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . .
- A.H. 3.11.8.** From which fact, it is evident that the Word, the Artificer of all, He that sitteth upon the cherubim, and contains all things, He who was manifested to men, has given us the Gospel under four aspects, but bound together by one Spirit . . . Son of God . . . For that according to John relates His original, effectual, and glorious generation from the Father . . . And the Word of God Himself used to converse with the ante-Mosaic patriarchs. . . . Afterwards, being made man for us, He sent the gift of the celestial Spirit over all the earth, protecting us with His wings. Such, then, as was the course followed by the Son of God, so was also the form of the living creatures, so was also the character of the Gospel.
- A.H. 3.11.9.** Others, again (the Montanists), that they may set at nought the gift of the Spirit, which in the latter times has been, by the good pleasure of the Father, poured out upon the human race . . . in which the Lord promised that He would send the Paraclete . . . Sinning, therefore, in all these particulars, against the Spirit of God . . .
- A.H. 3.12.1.** Again, when the Holy Ghost had descended upon the disciples, that they all might prophesy and speak with tongues. . . . The God, therefore, who did promise by the prophet, that He would send His Spirit upon the whole human race, was he who did send . . .
- A.H. 3.12.2.** . . . Son of God . . . the Christ whom God promised to send, He sent in Jesus, whom they crucified and God raised up.
- A.H. 3.12.3.** Peter, together with John, preached to them this plain message of glad tidings, that the promise which God had made to the fathers had been fulfilled by Jesus; not certainly proclaiming another god, but the Son of God, who also was made man, and suffered; thus leading Israel into knowledge, and through Jesus preaching the resurrection of the dead, and showing, that whatever the prophets had proclaimed as to the suffering of Christ, these had God fulfilled.
- A.H. 3.12.4.** . . . whom the same God that had sent the prophets, being God Himself, raised up, and gave in Him salvation to men.

- A.H. 3.12.5.** . . . Jesus Christ His Son, whom God anointed, and who knew no other [God]. . . . Son of God . . . His Son . . .
- A.H. 3.12.6.** . . . Christ the Son of God, their eternal King.
- A.H. 3.12.7.** . . . through the blood of His Son . . . the Son . . . Son of God . . . but they [the apostles] did not bring in another god. . . . Son of God . . . Son of God, who also, having been anointed by the Holy Spirit, is called Jesus Christ But the Church throughout all the world, having its origin firm from the apostles, perseveres in one and the same opinion with regard to God and His Son.
- A.H. 3.12.8.** Son of this [God] had already made [His] appearance in human nature
- A.H. 3.12.9.** He who suffered under Pontius Pilate, the same is Lord of all, and King, and God, and Judge, receiving power from Him who is the God of all . . .
- A.H. 3.12.11.** . . . He was the maker of all things, that He was the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . .
- A.H. 3.12.13.** Stephen . . . saw the glory of God, and Jesus on His right hand. . . . To the Jews, indeed, [they proclaimed] that the Jesus who was crucified by them was the Son of God, the Judge of quick and dead, and that He has received from His Father an eternal kingdom in Israel, as I have pointed out; but to the Greeks they preached one God, who made all things, and Jesus Christ His Son.
- A.H. 3.12.14.** From all these passages, then, it is evident that they did not teach the existence of another Father, but gave the new covenant of liberty to those who had lately believed in God by the Holy Spirit.
- A.H. 3.12.15.** . . . Spirit of God . . .
- A.H. 3.13.1.** . . . dispensation of His Son.
- A.H. 3.13.2.** To these men, therefore, did the Lord bear witness, that in Himself they had both known and seen the Father. . . the Son indeed leading them to the Father, but the Father revealing to them the Son.
- A.H. 3.15.3.** . . . they who were the preachers of the truth and the apostles of liberty termed no one else God, or named him Lord, except the only true God the Father, and His Word, who has the pre-eminence in all things . . .
- A.H. 3.16.2.** John knew the one and the same Word of God, and that He was the only begotten
- A.H. 3.16.2.** . . . Son of God . . .
- A.H. 3.16.3.** . . . one God, who did by the prophets make promise of the Son Jesus Christ was appointed the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead, as being the first begotten in all the creation; the Son of God being made the Son of man, that through Him we may receive the adoption. . . . Son of God . . . Son of God . . . He who is the Son of the Highest, the same is Himself also the Son of David. And David, knowing by the Spirit the dispensation of the advent of this Person, by which He is supreme over all the living and dead, confessed Him as Lord, sitting on the right hand of the Most High Father.
- A.H. 3.16.4.** . . . Son of God . . .
- A.H. 3.16.5.** . . . Son of God . . .
- A.H. 3.16.6.** . . . their doctrine departs from Him who is truly God, being ignorant that His only-begotten Word, who is always present with the human race, united to and mingled with His own creation, according to the Father's pleasure, and who became flesh, is Himself Jesus Christ our Lord, who did also suffer for us, and rose again on our behalf, and who will come again in the glory of His Father, to raise up all flesh, and for the manifestation of salvation, and to apply the rule of just judgment to all who were made by Him. . . . Word of God . . .
- A.H. 3.16.7.** For all these things were foreknown by the Father; but the Son works them out at the proper time in perfect order and sequence. . . . By which is made manifest, that all things which had been foreknown of the Father, our Lord did accomplish in their order, season, and hour, foreknown and fitting, being indeed one and the same, but rich and great. For He fulfils the bountiful and comprehensive will of His Father, inasmuch as He is Himself the Saviour of those who are saved, and the Lord of those who are under authority, and the God of all those things which have been formed, the only-begotten of the Father, Christ who was announced, and the Word of God, who became incarnate when the fulness of time had come, at which the Son of God had to become the Son of man.
- A.H. 3.16.8.** . . . Son of God . . . who shall also come in the same flesh in which He suffered, revealing the glory of the Father.
- A.H. 3.16.9.** . . . Son of God . . . Son of God . . . Son of God . . . who is at the right hand of the Father . . . and when He underwent tyranny, He prayed His Father that He would forgive those who had crucified Him. For He did Himself truly bring in salvation: since He is Himself the Word of God, Himself the Only-begotten of the Father, Christ Jesus our Lord.
- A.H. 3.17.1.** . . . Spirit of God . . . For [God] promised, that in the last times He would pour Him [the Spirit] upon [His] servants and handmaids that they might prophesy; wherefore He did also descend upon the Son of God, made the Son of man, becoming accustomed in fellowship with Him to dwell in the human race, to rest with human beings, and to dwell in the workmanship of God, working the will of the Father in them, and renewing them from their old habits into the newness of Christ.
- A.H. 3.17.2.** the Spirit bringing distant tribes to unity, and offering to the Father the first-fruits of all nations. Wherefore also the Lord promised to send the Comforter, who should join us to God The Lord, receiving this as a gift from His Father, does Himself also confer it upon those who are partakers of Himself, sending the Holy Spirit upon all the earth.
- A.H. 3.17.3.** . . . thus indicating that they [Israel] should no longer have the Holy Spirit from God but that the dew, which is the Spirit of God, who descended upon the Lord, should be diffused throughout all the earth . . . This Spirit, again, He did confer upon the Church, sending throughout all the world the Comforter from heaven. . . . Wherefore we have need of the dew of God, that we be not consumed by fire, nor be rendered unfruitful, and that where we have an

accuser there we may have also an Advocate, the Lord commending to the Holy Spirit His own man, who had fallen among thieves, whom He Himself compassionated, and bound up his wounds, giving two royal *denaria*; so that we, receiving by the Spirit the image and superscription of the Father and the Son.

A.H. 3.17.4. The Spirit, therefore, descending under the predestined dispensation, and the Son of God, the Only-begotten, who is also the Word of the Father, coming in the fulness of time

A.H. 3.18.1. As it has been clearly demonstrated that the Word, who existed in the beginning with God, by whom all things were made, who was also always present with mankind, was in these last days, according to the time appointed by the Father, united to His own workmanship For I have shown that the Son of God did not then begin to exist, being with the Father from the beginning.

A.H. 3.18.2. . . . the Son effected both these things, being the Word of God, descending from the Father, becoming incarnate. . . . Son of God . . .

A.H. 3.18.3. . . . Son of God . . . For in the name of Christ is implied, He that anoints, He that is anointed, and the unction itself with which He is anointed. And it is the Father who anoints, but the Son who is anointed by the Spirit, who is the unction, as the Word declares by Isaiah, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me,"—pointing out both the anointing Father, the anointed Son, and the unction, which is the Spirit.

A.H. 3.18.4. . . . Son of the Living God because the Father had revealed the Son of the living God,

A.H. 3.18.5. . . . Word of God . . .

A.H. 3.18.6. . . . But as our Lord is alone truly Master, so the Son of God is truly good and patient, the Word of God the Father having been made the Son of man.

A.H. 3.18.7. For it was incumbent upon the Mediator between God and men, by His relationship to both, to bring both to friendship and concord, and present man to God, while He revealed God to man. For, in what way could we be partaken of the adoption of sons, unless we had received from Him through the Son that fellowship which refers to Himself, unless His Word, having been made flesh, had entered into communion with us? . . . Word of God . . .

A.H. 3.19.1. . . . Word of God the Father . . . receiving liberty through the Son Word of God Word of God . . . Word of God . . . Son of God . . .

A.H. 3.19.2. But he to whom the Father which is in heaven has revealed Him, knows Him this is Christ, the Son of the living God. . . . For I have shown from the Scriptures, that no one of the sons of Adam is as to everything, and absolutely, called God, or named Lord. But that He is Himself in His own right, beyond all men who ever lived, God, and Lord, and King Eternal, and the Incarnate Word, proclaimed by all the prophets, the apostles, and by the Spirit Himself, may be seen by all who have attained to even a small portion of the truth But that He had, beyond all others, in Himself that pre-eminent birth which is from the Most High Father He is the holy Lord, the Wonderful, the Counsellor, the Beautiful in appearance, and the Mighty God . . .

A.H. 3.19.3. He therefore, the Son of God, our Lord, being the Word of the Father and ascend to the height above, offering and commending to His Father that human nature which had been found . . .

A.H. 3.20.1. arranging and preparing the plan of salvation, which was accomplished by the Word

A.H. 3.20.2. . . . Son of God His Father's law the Word of God who dwelt in man, and became the Son of man, that He might accustom man to receive God, and God to dwell in man, according to the good pleasure of the Father.

A.H. 3.20.4. And that it is from that region which is towards the south of the inheritance of Judah that the Son of God shall come, who is God, and who was from Bethlehem. . . . Thus he indicates in clear terms that He is God, and that His advent was [to take place] in Bethlehem.

A.H. 3.21.1. God, then was made man . . .

A.H. 3.21.3. . . . His Son . . . Son of God . . .

A.H. 3.21.4. . . . Spirit of God . . . Carefully, then, has the Holy Ghost pointed out, by what has been said, His birth from a virgin, and His essence, that He is God (for the name Emmanuel indicates this).

A.H. 3.21.7. For this is what "without hands" means, that His coming into this world was not by the operation of human hands, that is, of those men who are accustomed to stone-cutting; that is, Joseph taking no part with regard to it, but Mary alone co-operating with the pre-arranged plan. For this stone from the earth derives existence from both the power and the wisdom of God. Wherefore also Isaiah says: "Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I deposit in the foundations of Zion a stone, precious, elect, the chief, the corner-one, to be had in honour." So, then, we understand that His advent in human nature was not by the will of a man, but by the will of God.

A.H. 3.21.8. . . . Son of the living God . . .

A.H. 3.21.10. And as the protoplast himself Adam, had his substance from untilled and as yet virgin soil . . . and was formed by the hand of God, that is, by the Word of God, for "all things were made by Him."

A.H. 3.22.1. . . . Word of God . . .

A.H. 3.22.3. Hence also was Adam himself termed by Paul "the figure of Him that was to come," because the Word, the Maker of all things, had formed beforehand for Himself the future dispensation of the human race, connected with the Son of God; God having predestined that the first man should be of an animal nature, with this view, that he might be saved by the spiritual One.

A.H. 3.23.1. . . . and by means of the second man did He bind the strong man.

A.H. 3.24.1. . . . Spirit of God . . . For this gift of God has been entrusted to the Church, as breath was to the first created man,³⁷⁸³ for this purpose, that all the members receiving it may be vivified; and the [means of] communion with Christ

has been distributed throughout it, that is, the Holy Spirit, the earnest of incorruption, the means of confirming our faith, and the ladder of ascent to God. . . . Spirit of God . . . Spirit of God.

A.H. 3.24.2. [God] . . . establishing all things by His Word, and binding them together by His Wisdom . . .

A.H. 3.25.7. . . . Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

A.H. 4.Preface.4. Now man is a mixed organization of soul and flesh, who was formed after the likeness of God, and moulded by His hands, that is, by the Son and Holy Spirit, to whom also He said, "Let Us make man." . . . Son of God.

A.H. 4.1.1. Since, therefore, this is sure and steadfast, that no other God or Lord was announced by the Spirit, except Him who, as God, rules over all, together with His Word, and those who receive the Spirit of adoption, that is, those who believe in the one and true God, and in Jesus Christ the Son of God;

A.H. 4.2.2. Again, our Lord Jesus Christ confesses this same Being as His Father . . . whom Christ, too, confesses as His Father . . .

A.H. 4.2.4. . . . Son of God . . . Son of God.

A.H. 4.2.5. For they do not receive from the Father the knowledge of the Son; neither do they learn who the Father is from the Son, who teaches clearly and without parables Him who truly is God.

A.H. 4.2.6. . . . His Father . . . And therefore the scribes and Pharisees, too, who from the times of the law had begun to despise God, did not receive His Word, that is, they did not believe on Christ. . . . Son of God . . .

A.H. 4.2.7. . . . Son of God . . .

A.H. 4.4.2. Well spake he, who said that the unmeasurable Father was Himself subjected to measure in the Son; for the Son is the measure of the Father, since He also comprehends Him.

A.H. 4.5.1. . . . whom Christ confessed as His Father. . . . but since it was impossible, without God, to come to a knowledge of God, He teaches men, through His Word, to know God.

A.H. 4.5.2. . . . and His Word is He who also spake to Moses . . . Christ Himself, therefore, together with the Father, is the God of the living, who spake to Moses, and who was also manifested to the fathers.

A.H. 4.5.3. . . . Abraham . . . followed the Word of God . . .

A.H. 4.5.4. For in Abraham man had learned beforehand, and had been accustomed to follow the Word of God. For Abraham, according to his faith, followed the command of the Word of God, and with a ready mind delivered up, as a sacrifice to God, his only-begotten and beloved son, in order that God also might be pleased to offer up for all his seed His own beloved and only-begotten Son, as a sacrifice for our redemption.

A.H. 4.5.5. . . . the Lord's Father . . . Word of the Lord . . .

A.H. 4.6.1. For the Lord, revealing Himself to His disciples, that He Himself is the Word, who imparts knowledge of the Father, and reproving the Jews, who imagined that they, had [the knowledge of] God, while they nevertheless rejected His Word, through whom God is made known . . .

A.H. 4.6.2. . . . and His Word was shown to have not always coexisted with His creatures. . . . For as we do direct our faith towards the Son, so also should we possess a firm and immoveable love towards the Father.

A.H. 4.6.3. For no one can know the Father, unless through the Word of God, that is, unless by the Son revealing [Him]; neither can he have knowledge of the Son, unless through the good pleasure of the Father. But the Son performs the good pleasure of the Father; for the Father sends, and the Son is sent, and comes. And His Word knows that His Father is, as far as regards us, invisible and infinite; and since He cannot be declared [by any one else], He does Himself declare Him to us; and, on the other hand, it is the Father alone who knows His own Word. And both these truths has our Lord declared. Wherefore the Son reveals the knowledge of the Father through His own manifestation. For the manifestation of the Son is the knowledge of the Father; for all things are manifested through the Word. In order, therefore, that we might know that the Son who came is He who imparts to those believing on Him a knowledge of the Father, He said to His disciples: "No man knoweth the Son but the Father, nor the Father but the Son, and those to whomsoever the Son shall reveal Him;" thus setting Himself forth and the Father as He [really] is, that we may not receive any other Father, except Him who is revealed by the Son.

A.H. 4.6.4. For none of these was the Son of God; but Christ Jesus our Lord [was] . . . But the Lord did not say that both the Father and the Son could not be known at all, for in that case His advent would have been superfluous. . . . For the Lord taught us that no man is capable of knowing God, unless he be taught of God; that is, that God cannot be known without God: but that this is the express will of the Father, that God should be known. For they shall know Him to whomsoever the Son has revealed Him.

A.H. 4.6.5. And for this purpose did the Father reveal the Son, that through His instrumentality He might be manifested to all, and might receive those righteous ones who believe in Him into incorruption and everlasting enjoyment. . . . The Father therefore has revealed Himself to all, by making His Word visible to all; and, conversely, the Word has declared to all the Father and the Son, since He has become visible to all.

A.H. 4.6.6. For by means of the creation itself, the Word reveals God the Creator; and by means of the world [does He declare] the Lord the Maker of the world; and by means of the formation [of man] the Artificer who formed him; and by the Son that Father who begat the Son: and these things do indeed address all men in the same manner, but all do not in the same way believe them. But by the law and the prophets did the Word preach both Himself and the Father alike [to all]; and all the people heard Him alike, but all did not alike believe. And through the Word Himself who had been made visible and palpable, was the Father shown forth, although all did not equally believe in Him; but all saw the Father in the Son: for the Father is the invisible of the Son, but the Son the visible of the Father. And for this reason all spake with

Christ when He was present [upon earth], and they named Him God. Yea, even the demons exclaimed, on beholding the Son: "We know Thee who Thou art, the Holy One of God." And the devil looking at Him, and tempting Him, said: "If Thou art the Son of God;"—all thus indeed seeing and speaking of the Son and the Father, but all not believing [in them].

A.H. 4.6.7. . . . and that the faith in the Father and Son should be approved by all, that is, that it should be established by all . . . He, therefore, who was known, was not a different being from Him who declared "No man knoweth the Father," but one and the same, the Father making all things subject to Him; while He received testimony from all that He was very man, and that He was very God, from the Father, from the Spirit, from angels, from the creation itself, from men, from apostate spirits and demons, from the enemy, and last of all, from death itself. But the Son, administering all things for the Father, works from the beginning even to the end, and without Him no man can attain the knowledge of God. For the Son is the knowledge of the Father; but the knowledge of the Son is in the Father, and has been revealed through the Son; and this was the reason why the Lord declared: "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; nor the Father, save the Son, and those to whomsoever the Son shall reveal [Him]." For "shall reveal" was said not with reference to the future alone, as if then [only] the Word had begun to manifest the Father when He was born of Mary, but it applies indifferently throughout all time. For the Son, being present with His own handiwork from the beginning, reveals the Father to all; to whom He wills, and when He wills, and as the Father wills. Wherefore, then, in all things, and through all things, there is one God, the Father, and one Word, and one Son, and one Spirit, and one salvation to all who believe in Him.

A.H. 4.7.1. Therefore Abraham also, knowing the Father through the Word, who made heaven and earth, confessed Him to be God; and having learned, by an announcement [made to him], that the Son of God would be a man among men, by whose advent his seed should be as the stars of heaven, he desired to see that day, so that he might himself also embrace Christ; and, seeing it through the spirit of prophecy, he rejoiced.

A.H. 4.7.3. But He is the Creator, who does also through Christ prepare lights in the world, [namely] those who believe from among the Gentiles. . . . Him, therefore, I have rightly shown to be known by no man, unless by the Son, and to whomsoever the Son shall reveal Him. But the Son reveals the Father to all to whom He wills that He should be known; and neither without the goodwill of the Father nor without the agency of the Son, can any man know God. . . . From these words it is evident, that He is known by the Son, that is, by the Word.

A.H. 4.7.4. Therefore have the Jews departed from God, in not receiving His Word, but imagining that they could know the Father [apart] by Himself, without the Word, that is, without the Son; they being ignorant of that God who spake in human shape to Abraham, and again to Moses, saying, "I have surely seen the affliction of My people in Egypt, and I have come down to deliver them." For the Son, who is the Word of God, arranged these things beforehand from the beginning, the Father being in no want of angels, in order that He might call the creation into being, and form man, for whom also the creation was made; nor, again, standing in need of any instrumentality for the framing of created things, or for the ordering of those things which had reference to man; while, [at the same time,] He has a vast and unspeakable number of servants. For His *offspring* and His *similitude* do minister to Him in every respect; that is, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Word and Wisdom; whom all the angels serve, and to whom they are subject. Vain, therefore, are those who, because of that declaration, "No man knoweth the Father, but the Son," do introduce another unknown Father. **A.H.**

4.8.1 . . . God, who introduces, through Jesus Christ, Abraham to the kingdom of heaven . . .

A.H. 4.8.3. . . . Word of God . . .

A.H. 4.9.1. . . . His Father . . . the Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ . . .

A.H. 4.9.2. As, therefore, when that which is perfect is come, we shall not see another Father, . . . neither shall we look for another Christ and Son of God, . . . neither do we receive another Holy Spirit, besides Him who is with us, . . . Son of God . . . Son of God.

A.H. 4.9.3. For the new covenant having been known and preached by the prophets, He who was to carry it out according to the good pleasure of the Father was also preached, having been revealed to men as God pleased. . . . Christ confessing in the plainest manner Him to be Father and God. . . . For the true God did confess the commandment of the law as the word of God, and called no one else God besides His own Father.

A.H. 4.10.1. . . . His Son . . . Son of God . . . Son of God. . .

A.H. 4.11.1. And how do the Scriptures testify of Him, unless all things had ever been revealed and shown to believers by one and the same God through the Word;

A.H. 4.11.2. . . . His Word . . .

A.H. 4.11.3. . . . Son of God . . . Christ, whose name is praised in all the earth, and who perfects praise to His Father from the mouth of babes and sucklings;

A.H. 4.11.4. . . . the Son, on His coming, did not spread the knowledge of another Father. . .

A.H. 4.12.4. . . . His Word . . . Word of God . . .

A.H. 4.13.1. In the first place, [we must] believe not only in the Father, but also in His Son now revealed; for He it is who leads man into fellowship and unity with God.

A.H. 4.13.4. . . . His Word . . . Word of God . . . Word of God . . . Word of God . . .

A.H. 4.14.1. For not alone antecedently to Adam, but also before all creation, the Word glorified His Father, remaining in Him; and was Himself glorified by the Father, as He did Himself declare, "Father, glorify Thou Me with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was." . . . Son of God . . .

A.H. 4.14.2. His [God's] Spirit . . .

A.H. 4.17.6. But what other name is there which is glorified among the Gentiles than that of our Lord, by whom the Father is glorified, and man also? And because it is [the name] of His own Son, who was made man by Him, He calls it His own. Just as a king, if he himself paints a likeness of his son, is right in calling this likeness his own, for both these reasons, because it is [the likeness] of his son, and because it is his own production; so also does the Father confess the name of Jesus Christ, which is throughout all the world glorified in the Church, to be His own, both because it is that of His Son, and because He who thus describes it gave Him for the salvation of men. Since, therefore, the name of the Son belongs to the Father, and since in the omnipotent God the Church makes offerings through Jesus Christ.

A.H. 4.18.4. . . . the Word, through whom it is offered to God. . . . the Son of the Creator of the world, that is, His Word, through whom the wood fructifies, and the fountains gush forth . . .

A.H. 4.20.1. . . . for it is impossible that the Father can be measured; but as regards His love (for this it is which leads us to God by His Word) . . . It was not angels, therefore, who made us, nor who formed us, neither had angels power to make an image of God, nor any one else, except the Word of the Lord, nor any Power remotely distant from the Father of all things. . . . For God did not stand in need of these [beings], in order to the accomplishing of what He had Himself determined with Himself beforehand should be done, as if He did not possess His own hands. For with Him were always present the Word and Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, by whom and in whom, freely and spontaneously, He made all things, to whom also He speaks, saying, "Let Us make man after Our image and likeness;"

A.H. 4.20.2. for He did not deliver to Him the things of another, but His own. But in *all things* [it is implied that] nothing has been kept back [from Him], and for this reason the same person is the Judge of the living and the dead . . . receiving power over all things from the same God who made all things by the Word, and adorned them by [His] Wisdom.

A.H. 4.20.3. . . . the Word, namely the Son, was always with the Father; and that Wisdom also, which is the Spirit, was present with Him, anterior to all creation,

A.H. 4.20.4. There is therefore one God, who by the Word and Wisdom created and arranged all things He is always known through Him by whose means He ordained all things. Now this is His Word, our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . Wherefore the prophets, receiving the prophetic gift from the same Word, announced His advent according to the flesh, by which the blending and communion of God and man took place according to the good pleasure of the Father, the Word of God foretelling from the beginning that God should be seen by men, and hold converse with them upon earth, should confer with them, and should be present with His own creation, saving it, and becoming capable of being perceived by it, and freeing us from the hands of all that hate us, that is, from every spirit of wickedness; and causing us to serve Him in holiness and righteousness all our days, in order that man, having embraced the Spirit of God, might pass into the glory of the Father.

A.H. 4.20.5. For God is powerful in all things, having been seen at that time indeed, prophetically through the Spirit, and seen, too, adoptively through the Son; and He shall also be seen paternally in the kingdom of heaven, the Spirit truly preparing man in the Son of God, and the Son leading him to the Father, while the Father, too, confers [upon him] incorruption for eternal life, which comes to every one from the fact of his seeing God.

A.H. 4.20.6. . . . His Spirit others, again, [beheld] the advent of the Lord, and that dispensation which obtained from the beginning, by which He accomplished the will of the Father with regard to things both celestial and terrestrial. . . . Thus, therefore, was God revealed; for God the Father is shown forth through all these [operations], the Spirit indeed working, and the Son ministering, while the Father was approving, and man's salvation being accomplished. . . . for all things learn through His Word that there is one God the Father.

A.H. 4.20.7. . . . Son of the Father And for this reason did the Word become the dispenser of the paternal grace for the benefit of men, for whom He made such great dispensations, revealing God indeed to men, but presenting man to God, and preserving at the same time the invisibility of the Father. . . . revealing God to men through many dispensations. . . . For if the manifestation of God which is made by means of the creation, affords life to all living in the earth, much more does that revelation of the Father which comes through the Word, give life to those who see God.

A.H. 4.20.8. . . . Spirit of God . . . Son of God . . . Son of God . . .

A.H. 4.20.9. Two facts are thus signified: that it is impossible for man to see God; and that, through the wisdom of God, man shall see Him in the last times,

A.H. 4.20.10. . . . Spirit of God . . .

A.H. 4.20.11. But His Word, as He Himself willed it, and for the benefit of those who beheld, did show the Father's brightness. . . . Word of the Father For in these words He sets forth something of the glory [which He has received] from His Father. . . . Word of God.

A.H. 4.20.12. . . . His Son . . . Thus also did Rahab the harlot, while condemning herself, inasmuch as she was a Gentile, guilty of all sins, nevertheless receive the three spies, who were spying out all the land, and hid them at her home; [which three were] doubtless [a type of] the Father and the Son, together with the Holy Spirit.

A.H. 4.21.3. . . . Christ, the first-begotten. . . . Father promised Him [the nations]. . . . indicating that Christ should raise up sons of God, both from freemen and from slaves after the flesh, bestowing upon all, in the same manner, the gift of the Spirit, who vivifies us.

A.H. 4.23.1. . . . Son of God . . .

A.H. 4.23.2. . . . Son of God . . . Son of God . . . Son of the Living God.

A.H. 4.24.1. . . . and to worship one God, the Creator of heaven and earth, and the Framer of the whole creation; and that His Son was His Word, by whom He founded all things;

- A.H. 4.24.2.* Son of God . . . His Word, invisible by nature, was made palpable and visible among men. . . Word of God . .
- A.H. 4.25.1.* . . Word of God . . .
- A.H. 4.25.2.* . . Son of God.
- A.H. 4.25.3.* . . His Word . .
- A.H. 4.26.1.* . . Son of God . .
- A.H. 4.26.5.* . . Son of God . .
- A.H. 4.27.1.* . . Son of God . . Son of God . .
- A.H. 4.27.2.* . . Son of God . . but [the Son] shall come in the glory of the Father
- A.H. 4.28.2.* . . Son of God . . Word of God . . Word of God . . His Word.
- A.H. 4.28.3.* . . Word of God . .
- A.H. 4.30.4.* . . Son of God . .
- A.H. 4.31.2.* . . Word of God . . At what time, then, did He [Christ] pour out upon the human race the life-giving seed—that is, the Spirit of the remission of sins, through means of whom we are quickened . . Now this whole matter was indicated through Lot, that the seed of the Father of all—that is, of the Spirit of God, by whom all things were made. . .
- A.H. 4.32.1.* For [he maintained] that there was no other God besides Him who made and fashioned us, and that the discourse of those men has no foundation who affirm that this world of ours was made either by angels, or by any other power whatsoever, or by another God. For if a man be once moved away from the Creator of all things, and if he grant that this creation to which we belong was formed by any other or through any other [than the one God], he must of necessity fall into much inconsistency, and many contradictions of this sort . . But if any one believes in [only] one God, who also made all things by the Word. . .
- A.H. 4.33.1.* A spiritual disciple of this sort truly receiving the Spirit of God, who was from the beginning, in all the dispensations of God. . . He gathered from the ends of the earth into His Father's fold the children who were scattered abroad.
- A.H. 4.33.3.* . . Son of God . .
- A.H. 4.33.4.* . . God has [first] passed into man. . . Son of God . . Son of God . .
- A.H. 4.33.7.* For to him [the spiritual disciple] all things are consistent: he has a full faith in one God Almighty, of whom are all things; and in the Son of God, Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom are all things, and in the dispensations connected with Him, by means of which the Son of God became man; and a firm belief in the Spirit of God, who furnishes us with a knowledge of the truth, and has set forth the dispensations of the Father and the Son, in virtue of which He dwells with every generation of men, according to the will of the Father.
- A.H. 4.33.9.* . . His Son . .
- A.H. 4.33.10.* . . Spirit of God . . Word of the Father . . His Word . .
- A.H. 4.33.11.* . . For some of them, beholding Him in glory, saw His glorious life at the Father's right hand. . . Word of God . . Son of God . . are, He [nevertheless] is the Mighty God, and possesses a generation which cannot be declared. . . who feeds the people of His Father. . .
- A.H. 4.33.13.* and of His having risen again because the Lord sustained Him, and who enjoined the principalities of heaven to set open the everlasting doors, that the King of glory might go in, proclaimed beforehand His resurrection from the dead through the Father's power. . . God shall cast down under His feet all who were opposed to Him,
- A.H. 4.33.15.* . . Son of God . . Word of God . . Spirit of God . . His Word.
- A.H. 4.34.3.* . . Son of God . .
- A.H. 4.35.2.* . . the prophets, for they preached the word of the Lord from one God, and proclaimed the advent of His Son, much more would the Lord Himself never have uttered words, on one occasion from above, but on another from degeneracy below, thus becoming the teacher at once of knowledge and of ignorance; nor would He have ever glorified as Father at one time the Founder of the world, and at another Him who is above this one, as He does Himself declare:
- A.H. 4.35.4.* . . who in these last times manifested His own Son
- A.H. 4.36.1.* Which [God] the Lord does not reject, nor does He say that the prophets [spake] from another god than His Father; nor from any other essence, but from one and the same Father ; nor that any other being made the things in the world, except His own Father. . . one God the Father, who made all things by Himself. . . and that it is the same Householder who sends at one time His servants, at another His Son. From that Father, therefore, from whom the Son was sent to those husbandmen who slew Him, from Him also were the servants [sent]. But the Son, as coming from the Father with supreme authority.
- A.H. 4.36.2.* But last of all He sent to those unbelievers His own Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. . . Son of God . . [Father] sent His own Son.
- A.H. 4.36.4.* . . Son of God . .
- A.H. 4.36.5.* . . Father, from whom also our Lord was sent. . . His Son . . His Son . . Son of God . .
- A.H. 4.36.6.* . . Spirit of God . . His Son . . His Son . . Father of our Lord . . Father of our Lord . .
- A.H. 4.36.7.* . . Spirit of God . . Son of God . .
- A.H. 4.36.8.* But since He who chose the patriarchs and those [who lived under the first covenant], is the same Word of God who did both visit them through the prophetic Spirit.
- A.H. 4.37.7.* . . His Son . .

A.H. 4.38.1. inasmuch as God is indeed always the same and unbegotten as respects Himself, all things are possible to Him. But created things must be inferior to Him who created them, from the very fact of their later origin; for it was not possible for things recently created to have been uncreated. But inasmuch as they are not uncreated, for this very reason do they come short of the perfect. . . . [Christ], who was the perfect bread of the Father Word of God Spirit of the Father. . . .

A.H. 4.38.2. . . . Spirit of the Father . . . Spirit of the Father Son of God.

A.H. 4.38.3. And thus in all things God has the pre-eminence, who alone is uncreated, the first of all things, and the primary cause of the existence of all, while all other things remain under God's subjection. But being in subjection to God is continuance in immortality, and immortality is the glory of the uncreated One. By this arrangement, therefore, and these harmonies, and a sequence of this nature, man, a created and organized being, is rendered after the image and likeness of the uncreated God,—the Father planning everything well and giving His commands, the Son carrying these into execution and performing the work of creating, and the Spirit nourishing and increasing [what is made], but man making progress day by day, and ascending towards the perfect, that is, approximating to the uncreated One. For the Uncreated is perfect, that is, God.

A.H. 4.40.2. The Father, therefore, who has prepared the kingdom for the righteous, into which the Son has received those worthy of it, is He who has also prepared the furnace of fire, into which these angels commissioned by the Son of man shall send those persons who deserve it, according to God's command.

A.H. 4.41.4. . . . it was one God the Father who spake with Abraham, who gave the law, who sent the prophets beforehand, who in the last times sent His Son.

A.H. 5.Preface. . . . the Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ . . .

A.H. 5.1.1. For in no other way could we have learned the things of God, unless our Master, existing as the Word, had become man. For no other being had the power of revealing to us the things of the Father, except His own proper Word. For what other person "knew the mind of the Lord," or who else "has become His counsellor?" . . . Him who is prior to all creation. . . . Word of God, . . . God of counsel, . . . has also poured out the Spirit of the Father for the union and communion of God and man, imparting indeed God to men by means of the Spirit, and, on the other hand, attaching man to God by His own incarnation, and bestowing upon us at His coming immortality durably and truly, by means of communion with God.

A.H. 5.1.2. . . . the Holy Spirit have rested upon Him . . .

A.H. 5.1.3. . . . Holy Ghost came upon Mary, and the power of the Most High did overshadow her: wherefore also what was generated is a holy thing, and the Son of the Most High God the Father of all, who effected the incarnation of this being, . . . the Word of the Father and the Spirit of God, having become united with the ancient substance of Adam's formation, rendered man living and perfect, receptive of the perfect Father, in order that as in the natural [Adam] we all were dead, so in the spiritual we may all be made alive. For never at any time did Adam escape the *hands* of God . . . His hands formed a living man, . . .

A.H. 5.2.1. And for this reason it was that He graciously poured Himself out, that He might gather us into the bosom of the Father.

A.H. 5.2.2. . . . Word of God . . .

A.H. 5.2.3. . . . Word of God . . . Spirit of God, who contains all things, and then, through the wisdom of God, serves for the use of men, and having received the Word of God, becomes the Eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ . . . the Word of God granting them resurrection to the glory of God, even the Father, who freely gives to this mortal immortality.

A.H. 5.5.2. . . . the hand of God was present with them . . . Now this is the Son of God, . . . by the hand of God . . .

A.H. 5.6.1. . . . His own Son. For by the hands of the Father, that is, by the Son and the Holy Spirit, man, and not [merely] a part of man, was made in the likeness of God. . . . Spirit of God, and who through the Spirit of God do speak in all languages, as he used Himself also to speak. . . . Spirit of God . . . Spirit of God

A.H. 5.6.2. . . . the Spirit of the Father . . .

A.H. 5.8.1. But we do now receive a certain portion of His Spirit . . . the Spirit of God, . . . what shall the complete grace of the Spirit effect, which shall be given to men by God? It will render us like unto Him, and accomplish the will of the Father . . .

A.H. 5.8.2. . . . Spirit of God . . . Spirit of God . . . Divine Spirit. . . .

A.H. 5.8.4. . . . Those who make their way by faith steadily towards the Father and the Son . . . the Jews, who certainly have the words of God in their mouth, but who do not fix their rooted steadfastness in the Father and in the Son; wherefore they are an unstable generation. . . . For men of this stamp do indeed say that they believe in the Father and the Son. . . . Divine Spirit, . . . the life-giving Word.

A.H. 5.9.1. . . . Spirit of God . . .

A.H. 5.9.2. . . . as many as fear God and trust in His Son's advent, and who through faith do establish the Spirit of God in their hearts . . . Spirit of the Father . . .

A.H. 5.9.3. . . . Spirit of God . . . But where the Spirit of the Father is, there is a living man . . . and adopting the quality of the Spirit, being made conformable to the Word of God. . . . Inasmuch, therefore, as without the Spirit of God we cannot be saved, the apostle exhorts us through faith and chaste conversation to preserve the Spirit of God, lest, having become non-participators of the Divine Spirit

- A.H. 5.9.4.** . . . Spirit of God . . . Spirit of God . . .
- A.H. 5.10.1.** . . . Spirit of God . . . word of God
- A.H. 5.10.2.** . . . Spirit of God . . .
- A.H. 5.11.1.** . . . being truly reckoned as carnal, because he did not receive the Spirit of God, shall not have power to inherit the kingdom of heaven. . . . Now he says that the things which save are the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of our God.
- A.H. 5.11.2.** . . . believing in the name of the Lord, and receiving His Spirit. . . .
- A.H. 5.12.2.** . . . Thus does he attribute the Spirit as peculiar to God which in the last times He pours forth upon the human race by the adoption of sons . . .
- A.H. 5.12.5.** . . . Son of God . . . preached the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God . . .
- A.H. 5.12.6.** For the Maker of all things, the Word of God, who did also from the beginning form man . . .
- A.H. 5.14.1.** . . . Word of God . . .
- A.H. 5.14.2.** . . . recapitulating in Himself not a certain other, but that original handiwork of the Father . . .
- A.H. 5.14.3.** . . . Lord has reconciled man to God the Father . . .
- A.H. 5.14.4.** . . . acknowledging the advent in the flesh of the Son of God, and [His] divinity
- A.H. 5.15.2.** . . . the Lord most plainly manifest Himself and the Father to His disciples . . . but that He might show forth the hand of God, that which at the beginning had moulded man. . . . and manifesting the hand of God . . . not be seeking out another hand by which man was fashioned, nor another Father; knowing that this hand of God which formed us at the beginning. . . .
- A.H. 5.15.3.** . . . Word of God . . . For the Lord who formed the visual powers is He who made the whole man, carrying out the will of the Father.
- A.H. 5.15.4.** . . . But He, the very same who formed Adam at the beginning, with whom also the Father spake, [saying], "Let Us make man after Our image and likeness" . . . Word of God . . .
- A.H. 5.16.2.** . . . Word of God . . . so that by means of his resemblance to the Son, man might become precious to the Father . . . Word of God . . . by assimilating man to the invisible Father through means of the visible Word . . .
- A.H. 5.16.3.** . . . His word . . . His Word; by which things He clearly shows forth God Himself
- A.H. 5.17.1.** . . . propitiating indeed for us the Father against whom we had sinned . . . the commandment was given to man by the Word . . . His Word . . . in which "He has visited us" through His Son?
- A.H. 5.17.2.** . . . the Father of our Lord; and therefore He taught men, by the evidence of their senses through those signs which He accomplished, to give glory to God. . . . But as the only-begotten Son had come for man's salvation from Him who is God, He did both stir up the incredulous by the miracles which He was in the habit of working, to give glory to the Father . . . His Son . . . He is Himself the voice of God, by which man received commandments . . .
- A.H. 5.17.3.** . . . For if no one can forgive sins but God alone, while the Lord remitted them and healed men, it is plain that He was Himself the Word of God made the Son of man, receiving from the Father the power of remission of sins; since He was man, and since He was God, in order that since as man He suffered for us, so as God He might have compassion on us, and forgive us our debts, in which we were made debtors to God our Creator. . . .
- A.H. 5.17.4.** . . . word of God . . . word of God . . . Through the extension of the hands of a divine person, gathering together the two peoples to one God." For these were two hands, because there were two peoples scattered to the ends of the earth; but there was one head in the middle, as there is but one God, who is above all, and through all, and in us all.
- A.H. 5.18.1.** . . . Word of God . . . His Word . . . which is sustained, indeed, after an invisible manner by the Father, but, on the contrary, after a visible manner it bore His Word: and this is the true [Word]. . . .
- A.H. 5.18.2.** For the Father bears the creation and His own Word simultaneously, and the Word borne by the Father grants the Spirit to all as the Father wills. . . . The Father is indeed above all, and He is the Head of Christ; but the Word is through all things, and is Himself the Head of the Church; while the Spirit is in us all, and He is the living water, which the Lord grants to those who rightly believe in Him, and love Him, and who know that "there is one Father, who is above all, and through all, and in us all." . . . there is one God, the Father over all, and one Word of God, who is through all, by whom all things have been made; and that this world belongs to Him, and was made by Him, according to the Father's will, and not by angels . . .
- A.H. 5.18.3.** For the Creator of the world is truly the Word of God . . . who in an invisible manner contains all things created, and is inherent in the entire creation, since the Word of God governs and arranges all things; and therefore He came to His own in a visible manner, and was made flesh, and hung upon the tree, that He might sum up all things in Himself. . . . For it is He who has power from the Father over all things, since He is the Word of God,
- A.H. 5.19.1.** . . . First-begotten . . .
- A.H. 5.20.1.** since all receive one and the same God the Father, and believe in the same dispensation regarding the incarnation of the Son of God, and are cognizant of the same gift of the Spirit . . .
- A.H. 5.20.2.** . . . Spirit of God . . . These things, therefore, He recapitulated in Himself: by uniting man to the Spirit, and causing the Spirit to dwell in man, He is Himself made the head of the Spirit, and gives the Spirit to be the head of man: for through Him (the Spirit) we see, and hear, and speak.
- A.H. 5.21.2.** Now the Lord would not have recapitulated in Himself that ancient and primary enmity against the serpent, fulfilling the promise of the Creator, and performing His command, if He had come from another Father. But as He is one and the same, who formed us at the beginning, and sent His Son at the end, the Lord did perform His command . . .

His Father's . . . and in regard to Himself, since He appeared in human form, [declaring] that He would not tempt the Lord his God. . . .

A.H. 5.21.3. Who, then, is this Lord God to whom Christ bears witness, . . . the law does indeed declare the Word of God from the Father . . . God the Father, who had compassion on His own handiwork, and gave to it salvation, restoring it by means of the Word—that is, by Christ . . .

A.H. 5.22.1. . . . Him whom the law proclaimed as God, the same did Christ point out as the Father . . . But the Word of God is the superior above all . . . He did both overcome the strong man by His Father's voice . . . For He did not confound the adversary by the saying of any other, but by that belonging to His own Father,

A.H. 5.23.2. . . . From this it is clear that the Lord suffered death, in obedience to His Father, upon that day on which Adam died while he disobeyed God.

A.H. 5.24.4. . . . The Word of God, however, the Maker of all things . . .

A.H. 5.25.2. . . . Him who truly is God, the Father of our Lord . . .

A.H. 5.25.5. . . . God the Father, who was declared by the prophets, but made manifest by Christ. . . . then one and the same God is most manifestly pointed out, who sent the prophets, and made promise of the Son, and called us into His knowledge.

A.H. 5.26.2. If therefore the great God showed future things by Daniel, and confirmed them by His Son . . . the same Father from whom also the Lord came . . . Christ fulfilled in the end, ministering to His Father's will, and completing His dispensations with regard to the human race. . . .

A.H. 5.27.1. . . . His Father . . . His Father . . . His Father . . .

A.H. 5.28.1. . . . Word of God . . .

A.H. 5.28.4. And therefore throughout all time, man, having been moulded at the beginning by the hands of God, that is, of the Son and of the Spirit, is made after the image and likeness of God. . . . Word of God . . .

A.H. 5.30.4. . . . then the Lord will come from heaven in the clouds, in the glory of the Father . . .

A.H. 5.31.2. . . . He thus ascended to the Father;—[if all these things occurred, I say], how must these men not be put to confusion, who allege that “the lower parts” refer to this world of ours, but that their inner man, leaving the body here, ascends into the super-celestial place? . . . awaited the time of His resurrection prescribed by the Father,

A.H. 5.32.2. . . . For his seed is the Church, which receives the adoption to God through the Lord. . . .

A.H. 5.36.2. . . . His Word . . . also that they ascend through the Spirit to the Son, and through the Son to the Father, and that in due time the Son will yield up His work to the Father, even as it is said by the apostle . . .

A.H. 5.36.3. God the Father...fulfils the promises for the kingdom of His Son . . . For there is the one Son, who accomplished His Father's will; and one human race also in which the mysteries of God are wrought, “which the angels desire to look into;” and they are not able to search out the wisdom of God, by means of which His handiwork, confirmed and incorporated with His Son, is brought to perfection; that His offspring, the First-begotten Word, should descend to the creature, that is, to what had been moulded, and that it should be contained by Him; and, on the other hand, the creature should contain the Word, and ascend to Him, passing beyond the angels, and be made after the image and likeness of God.

Frag. 8. . . . so was also the body of Christ pure and resplendent; for it was adorned within by the Word, and shielded without by the Spirit . . .

Frag. 21. But he does not give, as Christ did, by means of breathing, because he is not the fount of the Spirit.

Frag. 25. . . . Spirit of God . . .

Frag. 26. . . . For if he has not the Holy Spirit, he has no knowledge of the Creator; he has not received Jesus Christ the Life; he knows not the Father who is in heaven

Frag. 28. . . . Word of God . . .

Frag. 36. . . . Divine Spirit . . .

Frag. 39. Christ, who was called the Son of God before the ages . . . presenting us as pure sons to His Father, if we yield ourselves obediently to the chastisement of the Spirit.

Frag. 45. . . . Spirit of God . . .

Frag. 48. . . . so also is the body of Christ pure and resplendent, being adorned within by the Word, and shielded on the outside by the Spirit, in order that from both [materials] the splendour of the natures might be exhibited together.

Frag. 50. . . . when the heaven was opened, [our Lord] full of glory offered it (the flesh) to the Father. . . .

Frag. 52. . . . Word of God, and God . . . so did He also proceed from God as the First-begotten of every creature And as He was the servant of God, so is He the Son of God, and Lord of the universe. . . . also did He breathe the Holy Spirit into His disciples. . . .

Frag. 53. . . . and was glorified by the Father, and is the Eternal King; that He is the perfect Intelligence, the Word of God, who was begotten before the light; that He was the Founder of the universe, along with it (light), and the Maker of man; that He is All in all. . . . Son in the Father; God in God. . . . God of God; Son of the Father; Jesus Christ . . .

Frag. 54. He is Himself termed the Perfect Intellect, the Word of God. He is the First-begotten, after a transcendent manner, the Creator of man . . . Son in the Father; God in God. . . . sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and has been glorified by Him as the Resurrection of the dead. . . . God of God; Jesus Christ our Saviour.

Dem. 3. First of all it bids us bear in mind that we have received baptism for the remission of sins, in the name of God the Father, and in the name of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was incarnate and died and rose again, and in the Holy

Spirit of God.

Dem. 5. Thus then there is shown forth One God, the Father, not made, invisible, creator of all things; above whom there is no other God, and after whom there is no other God. And, since God is rational, therefore by [the] Word He created the things that were made; and God is Spirit, and by [the] Spirit He adorned all things. . . . Since then the Word establishes, that is to say, gives body and grants the reality of being, and the Spirit gives order and form to the diversity of the powers; rightly and fittingly is the Word called the Son, and the Spirit the Wisdom of God. Well also does Paul His apostle say: *One God, the Father, who is over all and through all and in us all*. For *over all* is the Father: and *through all* is the Son, for through Him all things were made by the Father; and *in us all* is the Spirit, who cries *Abba Father*, and fashions man into the likeness of God. Now the Spirit shows forth the Word, and therefore the prophets announced the Son of God; and the Word utters the Spirit, and therefore is Himself the announcer of the prophets, and leads and draws man to the Father.

Dem. 6. This then is the order of the rule of our faith, and the foundation of the building, and the stability of our conversation: God, the Father, not made, not material, invisible; one God, the creator of all things: this is the first point of our faith. The second point is: The Word of God, Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord, who was manifested to the prophets according to the form of their prophesying and according to the method of the dispensation of the Father: through whom all things were made; who also at the end of the times, to complete and gather up all things, was made man among men, visible and tangible, in order to abolish death and show forth life and produce a community of union between God and man. And the third point is: The Holy Spirit, through whom the prophets prophesied, and the fathers learned the things of God, and the righteous were led forth into the way of righteousness; and who in the end of the times was poured out in a new way upon mankind in all the earth, renewing man unto God.

Dem. 7. And for this reason the baptism of our regeneration proceeds through these three points: God the Father bestowing on us regeneration through His Son by the Holy Spirit. For as many as carry [in them] the Spirit of God are led to the Word, that is to the Son; and the Son brings them to the Father; and the Father causes them to possess incorruption. Without the Spirit it is not possible to behold the Word of God, nor without the Son can any draw near to the Father: for the knowledge of the Father is the Son, and the knowledge of the Son of God is through the Holy Spirit; and, according to the good pleasure of the Father, the Son ministers and dispenses the Spirit to whomsoever the Father wills and as He wills.

Dem. 8. And by the Spirit the Father is called Most High and Almighty and Lord of hosts;

Dem. 9. Wherefore also the Spirit of God is manifold in [His] indwelling, and in seven forms of service is He reckoned by the prophet Isaiah, as resting on the Son of God, that is the World, in His coming as man.

Dem. 10. Now this God is glorified by His Word who is His Son continually, and by the Holy Spirit who is the Wisdom of the Father of all: and the power(s) of these, [namely] of the Word and Wisdom, which are called Cherubim and Seraphim, with unceasing voices glorify God; and every created thing that is in the heavens offers glory to God the Father of all. He by His Word has created the whole world . . .

Dem. 12. And so fair and good was this Paradise, that the Word of God continually resorted thither, and walked and talked with the man, figuring beforehand the things that should be in the future. . . .

Dem. 22. For He made man the image of God; and the image of God is the Son, after whose image man was made. . . .

Dem. 24. . . . and He appeared unto Abraham, making Himself known by the Word, as by a beam of light. . . . And when God saw the undoubting and unwavering certainty of his spirit, He bare witness unto him by the Holy Spirit. . . .

Dem. 26. And in the wilderness Moses received the Law from God, *the Ten Words on tables of stone, written with the finger of God* (now the finger of God is that which is stretched forth from the Father in the Holy Spirit).

Dem. 30. Hither were the prophets sent by God through the Holy Spirit. . . . Son of God . . . but according to the spirit Son of God, pre-existing with the Father, begotten before all the creation of the world, and at the end of the times appearing to all the world as man, the Word of God. . . .

Dem. 31. So then He united man with God, and established a community of union between God and man. . . .

Dem. 32. Whence then is the substance of the first-formed [man]? From the Will and the Wisdom of God, and from the virgin earth. . . . So then, the Lord, summing up afresh this man, took the same dispensation of entry into flesh, being born from the Virgin by the Will and the Wisdom of God.

Dem. 33. . . . Word of God . . .

Dem. 34. And the trespass which came by the tree was undone by the tree of obedience, when, hearkening unto God, the Son of man was nailed to the tree. . . . Now seeing that He is the Word of God Almighty. . . . for by the Word of God the whole universe is ordered and disposed—in it is crucified the Son of God. . . . summoning all that are scattered in every quarter to the knowledge of the Father.

Dem. 35. . . . Word of God . . .

Dem. 36. . . . Son of God . . .

Dem. 37. . . . Son of God . . . Word of God . . .

Dem. 38. But God the Father was very merciful: He sent His creative Word. . . .

Dem. 39. . . . that the Word of God should be made flesh in order that He might manifest the resurrection of the flesh, and might have pre-eminence over all things in the heavens, as the first-born and eldest offspring of the thought of the Father, the Word, fulfilling all things, and Himself guiding and ruling upon the earth. . . . the Prince and Author of life unto God.

- Dem. 40.** Thus then the Word of God *in all things hath the pre-eminence*; for that He is true man and *Wonderful Counsellor* [sic] and *Mighty God*; calling men anew to fellowship with God. . . . Son of the Father of all; He from whom all things are. . . . generated from God by the Holy Spirit. . . . Jesus the Anointed of God. . .
- Dem. 41.** . . . declaring that He was the Christ, on whom the Spirit of God rested. . . . which Holy Spirit they [apostles] had received of the Lord. . . . the God of all had promised to grant eternal life by the resurrection of the dead; through Him who died and rose again, Jesus Christ, to whom He has delivered over the kingdom of all existing things, and the rule of quick and dead, and also the judgment.
- Dem. 42.** . . . the Holy Spirit, who was given by Him in baptism. . . . Spirit of God . . .
- Dem. 43.** . . . Now that there was a Son of God, and that He existed not only before He appeared in the world, but also before the world was made. . . . Because, for God, the Son was [as] the beginning before the creation of the world; but for us [He was] then, when He appeared; and before that He was not for us, who knew Him not. . . . the Son of God, who was with the Father before the world was made, and that all the things that were made were made by Him. . . . showing with certainty that the Word, who was in the beginning with the Father, and by whom all things were made, this is His Son.
- Dem. 44.** . . . Son of God . . . Son of God the Son, who spake with Abraham, being *Lord*, received power to punish the men of Sodom *from the Lord out of heaven*, even from the Father who rules over all. . . . Son of God. . . . should bring in the judgment from the Father, having received from Him who rules over all the power to punish the men of Sodom.
- Dem. 45.** . . . Son of God For it was not the Father of all, who is not seen by the world, the Maker of all who said . . . it was not He that came and stood in a very small space and spake with Abraham; but the Word of God, who was ever with mankind, and made known beforehand what should come to pass in the future, and taught men the things of God.
- Dem. 46.** . . . Word of God . . .
- Dem. 47.** So then the Father is Lord and the Son is Lord, and the Father is God and the Son is God; for that which is begotten of God is God. And so in the substance and power of His being there is shown forth one God; but there is also according to the economy of our redemption both Son and Father. Because to created things the Father of all is invisible and unapproachable, therefore those who are to draw near to God must have their access to the Father through the Son. And yet more plainly and evidently does David speak concerning the Father and the Son as follows: *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: thou hast loved righteousness and hated unrighteousness: therefore God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows*. For the Son, as being God, receives from the Father, that is, from God, the throne of the everlasting kingdom, and the oil of anointing above His fellows. The oil of anointing is the Spirit, wherewith He has been anointed; and His fellows are prophets and righteous men and apostles, and all who receive the fellowship of His kingdom, that is to say, His disciples.
- Dem. 48.** . . . Now hereby he proclaimed that He came into being before all, and that He rules over the Gentiles and judges all mankind and the kings who now hate Him and persecute His name. . . .
- Dem. 49.** . . . Son of God Son of God Son of God For he means [in Psalm 110:1] that the Father speaks with the Son. . . . Son of God . . . for it is not a man who speaks the prophecies; but the Spirit of God, assimilating and likening Himself to the persons represented, speaks in the prophets, and utters the words sometimes from Christ and sometimes from the Father.
- Dem. 50.** So then right fitly Christ says through David that He converses with the Father. . . .
- Dem. 51.** Here [in Isaiah 49:5–6], first of all, is seen that the Son of God pre-existed, from the fact that the Father spake with Him, and before He was born revealed Him to men: and next, that He must needs be born a man among men; and that the same God *forms* Him *from the womb*, that is, that or the Spirit of God He should be born; and that He is Lord of all men. . . . And that the Son of the Father calls Himself *servant*, [this is] on account of His subjection to the Father: for among men also every son is the servant of his father.
- Dem. 52.** That Christ, then, being Son of God before all the world, is with the Father; and being with the Father is also nigh and close and joined unto mankind; and is King of all, because the Father has subjected all things unto Him. . . .
- Dem. 53.** And that this Christ, who was with the Father, being the Word of the Father. . . . the Father of all bringing about His incarnation. . . . For he was named Christ, because through Him the Father anointed and adorned all things; and because on His coming as man He was anointed with the Spirit of God and His Father. . . .
- Dem. 54.** For this cause then is He Saviour. Now Emmanuel is, being interpreted, *With you God*. . . . and He, being God, is to be with us.
- Dem. 55.** He calls Him *Wonderful Counsellor* [sic], meaning of the Father: whereby it is declared that the Father works all things together with Him. . . . For there [Genesis 1:26] is seen in this place the Father speaking to the Son, the Wonderful Counsellor [sic] of the Father. Moreover He is also our Counsellor [sic], giving advice; not compelling as God, even though He is *Mighty God*. . . .
- Dem. 56.** . . . Son of God Son of God Spirit of God And, *Angel of great counsel*, he says [Isaiah 9:4–6]; that is, of the Father whom He hath declared unto us.
- Dem. 57.** . . . Son of God *The Lord Himself gave the sign* of the virgin, even that Emmanuel which was from the virgin; who also *maketh glad* them that drink of Him, that is to say, who receive His Spirit. . . .
- Dem. 58.** . . . Son of God . . .
- Dem. 59.** . . . for from spirit it [the flesh in the incarnation] budded forth, as we have said before.
- Dem. 60.** . . . he [Isaiah 11:3–4] the more establishes and declares His godhead. For to judge without respect of persons and partiality, and not as favouring the illustrious, but affording to the humble worthy and like and equal treatment, accords

with the height and summit of the righteousness of God: for God is influenced and moved by none, save only the righteous.

Dem. 61. . . . Son of God . . . Son of God . . . for then was He glorified as God, when He rose.

Dem. 62. For by these words he says that He who according to the flesh is of the race of David will be Christ the Son of God; and that He will die and rise again, and that He is in aspect a man, but in power God. . . .

Dem. 64. . . . Son of God . . .

Dem. 66. . . . Son of God . . .

Dem. 67. . . . Spirit of God . . . Son of God . . .

Dem. 68. . . . And again by Isaiah His Word says . . .

Dem. 69. . . . It is manifest therefore that by the will of the Father these things occurred to Him for the sake of our salvation.

Dem. 70. Then he says: *His generation who shall declare?* This was said to warn us, lest on account of His enemies and the outrage of His sufferings we should despise Him as a mean and contemptible man. For He who endured all this has an undeclarable generation; for by generation He means descent; [for] He who is His Father is undeclarable and unspeakable. Know therefore that such descent was His who endured these sufferings: and despise Him not because of the sufferings which for thy sake He of purpose endured, but fear Him because of His descent.

Dem. 71. . . . That, being [the] Spirit of God, Christ was to become a suffering man the Scripture declares. . . . For just as a shadow is made by a body, so also Christ's body was made by His Spirit. . . . the Spirit overshadowed it, as it were, with glory and covered it.

Dem. 72. . . . Son of God . . .

Dem. 73. . . . Spirit of Christ [may refer to Christ's pre-incarnate spirit]. . .

Dem. 75. . . . The He should endure these things, and that too by the will of the Father, He manifestly declared: for by the will of the Father He was to endure sufferings.

Dem. 85. And being raised from the dead and exalted at the Fathers' right hand, He awaits the time appointed by the Father for the judgment, when all enemies shall be put under Him.

Dem. 86. . . . Son of God . . . Son of God . . .

Dem. 89. . . . Son of God . . . for the Word had not passed through them [the Gentiles], nor given them the Holy Spirit to drink; who fashioned the new *way* of godliness and righteousness, and made copious *streams* to spring forth, disseminating over the earth the Holy Spirit; even as it had been promised through the prophets, that in the end of the days He should pour out the Spirit upon he [sic] face of the earth.

Dem. 91. . . . For very plainly this was said of such as have forsaken idols and believed in God our Maker through the Holy One of Israel.

Dem. 92. . . . Son of God . . .

Dem. 94. So then by the new calling a change of hearts in the Gentiles came to pass through the Word of God. . . .

Dem. 95. . . . Son of God . . . Son of God; and by faith in Him we learn to love God with all our heart. . . .

Dem. 96. . . . Word of God . . . And there is *none other name* of the Lord *given under heaven whereby men are saved*, save that of God, which is Jesus Christ the Son of God. . . .

Dem. 97. . . . God, who by His great, inscrutable and unsearchable wisdom delivered us, and proclaimed the salvation from heaven—to wit, the visible coming of our Lord, that is, His living as man. . . . Now by *Jacob* and *Israel* he means the Son of God, who received power from the Father over our life, and after having received this brought it down to us who were far off from Him, when He *appeared on earth and was conversant with men*, mingling and mixing the Spirit of God the Father with the creature formed by God, that man might be *after the image and likeness* of God.

Dem. 99. . . . Son of God . . .

Dem. 100. So then in respect of the three points of our seal error has strayed widely from the truth. For either they reject the Father, or they accept not the Son and speak against the dispensation of His incarnation; or else they receive not the Spirit, that is, they reject prophecy. And of all such must we beware, and shun their ways, if in very truth we desire to be well-pleasing to God and to attain the redemption that is from Him.