

Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

Thomas L. Humphries, Jr.

Date

That They May Learn What They Desire:
Latin Pneumatology from Cassian to Gregory the Great

By

Thomas L. Humphries, Jr.
Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Division of Religion
Historical Studies

Lewis O. Ayres, D.Phil.
Advisor

J. William Harmless, SJ, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Philip L. Reynolds, Ph.D.
Committee Member

John A. Zupko, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Accepted:

Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

Date

That They May Learn What They Desire:
Latin Pneumatology from Cassian to Gregory the Great

By

Thomas L. Humphries, Jr.
B.S. Forestry, The University of the South, 2001
B.A. Philosophy, The University of the South, 2001
M.A Systematic Theology, The Catholic University of America, 2006

Advisor: Lewis Ayres, D.Phil.

An abstract of
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
In Graduate Division of Religion
Historical Studies

2011

Abstract

That They May Learn What They Desire:
Latin Pneumatology from Cassian to Gregory the Great
By Thomas L. Humphries, Jr.

This dissertation argues that Latin pneumatology of the 5th and 6th centuries articulates various processes for the reformation of desire. Study of pneumatology from this perspective reveals two additional facets of the history of the theology of the Holy Spirit. There is development of what I call “ascetic pneumatology,” and the reception of Augustine’s theology was varied to the extent that we should speak of different “Augustinianisms” already in the 5th and 6th centuries.

That They May Learn What They Desire:
Latin Pneumatology from Cassian to Gregory the Great

By

Thomas L. Humphries, Jr.
B.S. Forestry, The University of the South, 2001
B.A. Philosophy, The University of the South, 2001
M.A Systematic Theology, The Catholic University of America, 2006

Advisor: Lewis Ayres, D.Phil.

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
In Graduate Division of Religion
Historical Studies

2011

*Dedicated to my grandparents,
Marion and Mary Ann Kowalski, Roger and Alice Humphries,
may we be reunited in the life to come.*

Writing a dissertation turned out to be like a second adolescence: I gained many new skills, found new dimensions in my academic personality, and was able to try them out against the same scholars who taught me. I am happy to have had wonderful professors to guide me through this process. Lewis Ayres knows that all good boy scouts keep their knives sharp because a sharp tool makes a clean cut. His ability to sharpen and cut cleanly is evident in this project, as is his keenness for theological arguments and analysis of sources. His friendship and direction have been invaluable. Fr. Bill Harmless, SJ, knows the art of telling a good story and making historical theology as entertaining as it is informative. His encouragement and fine eye for the details of argument and style can be seen on nearly every page of this work. Jack Zupko knows the joy and importance of searching out arguments wherever they lie. His intellectual curiosity and support is apparent in my work. Mark DelCogliano has been a trusted friend and mentor, both as a reader of patristic theology and a squash player. His comments have given me new insight into my own thoughts. Sadly, Steve Strange died while I was writing. Only the beginnings of my arguments benefited from his questions. I hope he is pleased with how it turned out. Just as the theologians I study found it difficult to articulate the different roles their own thoughts and desires played and the roles the Holy Spirit played in their lives, so also I find it is impossible to say clearly where my advisors shaped my thoughts and where I stand alone. The work is mine, but it is significantly better for their contributions. Indeed, it would not have been possible without them.

During the time that was dedicated to writing this dissertation I moved quite a bit. My family and friends in Little Rock, AR, and Irving, TX, supported me with encouragement, diversions, and places to stay when I needed it most. The wonderful community of St. Cuthbert's parish in Durham, UK, welcomed me with hospitality that kept me warm even in the cold English winter. My parish in Atlanta, Immaculate Heart of Mary, has helped me remain focused and creative as a theologian. Lewis and Medi extended their family to me both while we were together in Atlanta and in Durham. Michael, Rachel, and Maggie gave me room, board, remodeling projects, and hours of entertainment in Dallas, as did my Dad, Mom, and Ben in Little Rock. Jack extended his house to me in Atlanta. While away from my home library at Emory, the University of Dallas, the University of Durham, and the Abbey of Ampleforth extended much needed library privileges to me. Several scholars made their unpublished work accessible to me, including my advisors, Matt Crawford, Mark DelCogliano, Fr. Luke Dysinger, OSB, Junghoo Kwon, James O'Donnell, and Andrew Radde-Gallwitz. Patricia Kelly, Mark DelCogliano, and Garth Tissol offered special assistance in rendering various languages successfully and accurately into English when I was stumped. It is hard to account for the freedom and support I have been given in the present which has enabled me to study the past. Thank you!

In the wee hours of the morning and the long hours of the afternoon, I have been accompanied by marvelous individuals who were happy to listen to me work out my thoughts or have me listen to theirs. Thanks, Charlie, Col. Blanton, Guy, Johnny, Loretta, Loop, Lil, Norah, and Steve. In the words of Clint Eastwood's Preacher, "that Spirit ain't worth spit without a little exercise." Thanks for helping me get to work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Abbreviations</i>	1
<i>Introduction</i>	2
<i>I. Cassian’s Catholic Ascetic Pneumatology</i>	11
A Nicene Catholic: The Holy Spirit as <i>Index</i>	14
Spirit as Author of Scripture and Tradition	25
The Spiritual Meaning of Scripture	30
The Holy Spirit is the former of ascetic virtue.....	40
<i>II. Cassian’s Ascetic Synthesis: the Spirit in Love and Contemplation</i>	48
Love and Thoughts: Purity of Heart	50
Affectus, desiderium, et amor	59
The Holy Spirit Reforms the Origins of Human Thoughts.....	66
“full of broken thoughts I cannot repair”	74
Ecstatic Contemplation.....	80
The Spirit at every turn	85
<i>III. Ascetic Pneumatology for the Laity</i>	88
Prayer, Fasting, and Almsgiving.....	91
If it ain’t broke... ..	94
The Holy Spirit in the Holy Sacraments	98
Ordering the Church in Worship and Ordination.....	101
The Spirit in the Sacrament of the Eucharist	105
Bishops and Abbots under the Same Spirit.....	109
<i>IV. Led by the Spirit: Augustinian Responses to Pelagianism and Predestination</i>	112
Augustine’s basic insight: the Spirit is the divine love by which we love	116
Led by the Spirit, but not yet (Prosper’s early thought).....	118
Prosper Understands Augustine’s use of Romans when Responding to Cassian	121
The Spiritual Will (Prosper’s mature pneumatology).....	125
The Sacrament of Regeneration <i>in the Spirit</i>	130
The Spirit at the Synod of Orange	135
The Spirit from Pelagius to Predestination	144
<i>V. Off the Map at Lérins: an Augustinian Response to Arianism</i>	147
The non-essential Augustine.....	150
Knowledge of Augustine’s first rule.....	157
Ignorance of Augustine’s Second Rule.....	163
The <i>Breviarium Fidei Adversus Arianos Haereticos</i>	170
Anti-Arian arguments of Ambrose through the <i>Breviary</i>	175
“By” but not “for” ascetics	182
<i>VI. Displaced Ascetics: Fulgentius and Maxentius, an Augustinian Synthesis</i>	185
Solutions to an already resolved problem.....	188
The working of the Holy Spirit deep within	192
Capitula sancti Augustini.....	199
Christ and the Spirit – What is not said	202
Beyond Scythia from Ruspe - Fulgentius on the Spirit and the Incarnation	208
Beyond Lérins from Ruspe – Fulgentius on Missions and Processions.....	214
Beyond Aquitania from Ruspe – Fulgentius on reformation and the Trinity	221
Synthesis.....	224

<i>VII. Dialogue of Desire: Gregory's Ascetic Pneumatology</i>	227
Ascetic Conversion by the Spirit of Adoption	230
The Spirit reforms thoughts and desires	234
The Spirit forms virtues	237
The Seven Gifts of the Spirit	242
Jesus and the Seven Gifts.....	245
Visitation of the Spirit.....	248
God speaking within	251
The dialogue of desire.....	257
<i>VIII. The Spirit in Contemplation and Allegory</i>	260
The figurative interpretation of Scripture	262
Contemplation in this life and the next	267
Contemplative Reading of Scripture.....	272
Gregory and Cassian on Ecstatic Contemplation in this Life	277
Excursus: Augustine on contemplation, the eternal fullness of all our Joys	282
Conclusion: The Almighty hears my desire.....	288
<i>Bibliography</i>	294

ABBREVIATIONS

ACO	<i>Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum</i>	<i>Tome.Vol.Part</i>
ACW	<i>Ancient Christian Writers</i>	<i>Volume.Page</i>
ANF	<i>Ante Nicene Fathers</i>	<i>Volume.Page</i>
<i>Aug. St.</i>	<i>Augustinian Studies</i>	
CCSL	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Series Latina</i>	<i>Volume.Page.Line</i>
CS	<i>Cistercian Studies</i>	<i>Volume.Page</i>
CSCO	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</i>	<i>Volume.Page</i>
CSEL	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>	<i>Volume.Page.Line</i>
CWS	<i>Classics of Western Spirituality (Paulist Press)</i>	<i>Page</i>
FOTC	<i>Fathers of the Church (CUA Press)</i>	<i>Volume.Page</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>Journal of Ecclesial History</i>	
LCL	<i>Loeb Classical Library</i>	<i>Volume.Page</i>
LFHCC	<i>Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church</i>	
LXX	<i>Septuagint – the Greek version of the Old Testament</i>	
ML	<i>Modern Library</i>	
<i>Mon. Stud.</i>	<i>Monastic Studies</i>	
NAB	<i>New American Bible</i>	
NPNF	<i>Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers</i>	<i>Series.Volume.Page</i>
OCP	<i>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</i>	
OECS	<i>Oxford Early Christian Studies</i>	
OWC	<i>Oxford World Classics</i>	
PC	<i>Penguin Classics</i>	
PG	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i>	<i>Volume.Column</i>
PL	<i>Patrologia Latina</i>	<i>Volume.Column</i>
PO	<i>Patrologia Orientalis</i>	<i>Volume.Page.Line</i>
SC	<i>Sources Chr�tiennes</i>	<i>Volume.Page.Line</i>
SVC	<i>Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae (formerly Philosophia Patrum)</i>	<i>Volume.Page.Line</i>
SVS	<i>Saint Vladimir’s Seminary Press, Popular Patristics Series</i>	
TTH	<i>Translated Texts for Historians</i>	
VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>	
WSA	<i>The Works of Saint Augustine, a translation for the 21st century</i>	<i>Volume.Page</i>

Abbreviations for primary sources are listed in the bibliography.

In many instances the translations provided in NPNF are outstanding in their grasp of the Latin grammar, but use terms which are no longer current English. When I have only updated translations of Scripture, altered “Holy Ghost” to “Holy Spirit,” or rendered “thee” and “thou” as “you,” I have not noted this in the footnotes.

Two practices for handling Scripture quotations are standard: using quotation marks and using italics. Where I quote a modern translation, I have adopted the style of that translation.

INTRODUCTION

The story of the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit has been told as a fairly simple progression. It starts with uncertainty about the divinity of the Holy Spirit and moves toward the teaching that the Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and the Son. Nicene Catholic Christianity defined belief in the full divinity of the Holy Spirit late in the 4th century. Sometimes as an afterthought and sometimes as the central issue of that narrative, modern scholars include the *filioque*, the teaching that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father *and* the Son, in contrast to the earlier language that the Spirit proceeds from the Father *through* the Son. Scholars debate the exact beginning of this teaching, but the double procession finds definitive sources already in St. Augustine of Hippo (d. 430) and became a source of widespread schism in the 11th century. This general story suggests that pneumatology peaked in the 5th century, and then began a decline into characteristically “Eastern” and “Western” forms. Pneumatology is concerned with defining the relationship between the Father, Son, and Spirit. Here, I add another line to this story. Pneumatology also included theological anthropology. Theologians discussed the Spirit not only as an aspect of Trinitarian theology (e.g. full divinity, missions, and processions), but also as an aspect of theological anthropology (e.g. Christian initiation, formation, and perfection). Latin pneumatology of the 5th and 6th centuries focused on the Holy Spirit as the divine agent who reforms humanity; this pneumatology was especially concerned with the reformation of desire.

One of the principal questions of pneumatology concerns the Spirit’s relation to the Father and the Son. The work of theologians from the early 4th century, like Didymus the Blind and St. Athanasius of Alexandria, bore fruit in later theologians of the same

century, like Sts. Ambrose of Milan, Basil the Great, and Gregory of Nazianzus. They argued that the Son and the Spirit are divine in the same way that the Father is divine.¹ Arguments for the divinity of the Spirit often moved from the activities of the Spirit in the life of the Church to belief in the divinity of the Spirit. A classic example uses Christian Baptism, which is performed “in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.” (Mt 28:19) Baptism is the work of God. The Spirit works in the sacraments just as the Father and Son do. Thus, the Spirit is God, just as the Father and Son. In the 4th century, most Nicene Catholic theologians felt an acute need to argue positively for the full divinity of the Holy Spirit; while many 5th century theologians took the issue to be settled.² The theologians I discuss here understood the divinity of the Holy Spirit as a firmly established element of Christianity; the faith is defined by this Trinitarian belief. This left “room” to revisit the work of the Spirit for different reasons. For many theologians, the operations of the Spirit no longer needed to be invoked to defend and develop belief in the full divinity of the Spirit; instead, they could be studied specifically

¹ Literature on 4th century theology abounds. For a recent treatment of theological camps vis-à-vis the council of Nicaea, see L. Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*. The most relevant works for Latin theology are L. Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity*; L. Ayres and M.R. Barnes, "Pneumatology: historical and methodological considerations"; D.H. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*. See also L. Ayres and A. Radde-Gallwitz, "Doctrine of God"; J.P. Burns and G.M. Fagin, *The Holy Spirit*; M. DelCogliano, A. Radde-Gallwitz, and L. Ayres, *Works on the Holy Spirit: Athanasius and Didymus*, introduction; L. Doutreleau, *Traité du Saint-Esprit*, (SC 386); W.G. Rusch, *The Trinitarian Controversy*; T.G. Weinandy, *Athanasius*. On the Cappadocians in general, see J.A. McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus*; A. Meredith, *The Cappadocians*; A. Meredith, *Gregory of Nyssa*; A. Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil, Gregory, and the Transformation*; P. Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*.

² I capitalize “Catholic” in the sense that these Christians understood the “Catholic Church” as the one, true, holy, and apostolic Church in opposition to various heretical sects. It is both a proper and descriptive name for these theologians; there is a Christian Church called “Catholic,” and that Church is “universal.” The question of whether this is the “Roman Catholic Church” we know today is a separate issue, as is our contemporary attempts to use “catholic” to denote Christianity around the world. The theologians I discuss here think of themselves as members of a particular Church which is distinct from groups like the Arians, Nestorians, and Pelagians. E.g. Augustine, *Conf.* 7.5 (CCSL 27.In45); Gregory the Great, *Mor.* 35.8.13 (CCSL 143b.1781-1782).

for their significance in bringing about transformation of the inner life.³ If 4th century theologians found it helpful to answer the question, “what does it mean that the Spirit is operative in Baptism?” with the reply, “it means that the Spirit is fully divine, just like the Father and the Son,” then 5th century theologians often found it helpful to reply, “it means that God works within us in particular ways.” For theologians like Cassian (d. c. 435), St. Leo the Great (d. 461), and Prosper of Aquitaine (d. c. 463), the focus of pneumatology shifted because the divinity of the Spirit was no longer the most pressing question.

The key questions of pneumatology in the 5th century included the ways in which the Holy Spirit brings about human transformation and self-transcendence. The primary categories of that discussion were grace and the human will, thoughts, and desires. When understood from this perspective, Gregory the Great (d 604), the “doctor of desire,” offers the climactic pneumatology; he teaches that Christians engage in a dialogue of desire with the Holy Spirit. Understanding that pneumatology was involved in debates about theological anthropology allows us to link scholarship about the Holy Spirit with scholarship about grace and free will in the generations before Gregory. Latin theology of the 5th and 6th centuries entertained a series of great debates about how best to think of grace and free will. Some theologians were interested in the question as a matter of intellectual precision. Some were interested as a matter of the legacy of Augustine’s theology. Many were interested as a matter of ascetic formation for Christians. When theologians invoked pneumatological doctrines to explain aspects of their ascetic systems, I call what developed “ascetic pneumatology.” This neologism is intended to denote the fact that theologians applied their belief in the Holy Spirit to their ascetic

³ Y. Congar, *Je crois en l'Esprit Saint*, is a key study of pneumatology from this perspective.

systems and thereby developed particular reflections on the work of the Holy Spirit within the lives of Christians. Ascetic pneumatology is a significant aspect of Latin pneumatology in this period, though it is not the only mode of pneumatological reflection. In this study I use Cassian as the archetypical theologian of ascetic pneumatology, but it seems to me that Ambrose and Basil, among others, also make significant contributions in this regard. They, however, are more directly involved with the initial arguments about the full divinity of the Holy Spirit and are not directly relevant to a study that ends with Gregory, and so, I begin with Cassian. I do not deny that ascetic pneumatology existed before Cassian and after Gregory, but I have not studied it here. Ascetic pneumatology addresses sacramental and anthropological concerns by appealing to doctrines of the Holy Spirit, as we see especially with Cassian, Leo, and Gregory. Prosper, the well-known defender of Augustinianism and a contemporary of Cassian and Leo, wrote extensively about grace and free will, though not in the service of a system of formation. He, too, found pneumatology helpful in his discussions of anthropology. Together, these three theologians demonstrate that a significant aspect of Latin pneumatology in the 5th century concerned the reformation of desire, as I argue in chapters 1-4. Gregory offers evidence of the same pneumatological project in the 6th century, as I argue in chapters 7-8.

Historians have long pointed to the Council of Orange (529) as a significant point in the history of the doctrines of grace and free will. Scholars have been divided about how to characterize the theology adopted there and about which sources were used. Studying the pneumatology at play reveals details about the sources of the texts adopted at Orange. In opposition to some scholarship, I argue that Orange's decrees do not depend on

Caesarius' pneumatology, but rather, on two different groups of Augustinian theologians: one represented by Prosper and another represented by John Maxentius and the other Scythian monks. Both sources developed a pneumatology that answered questions about the reformation of desire. In contrast, the pneumatology of the president and leading figure at the synod, Caesarius of Arles (d. 542), has a different lineage and answers a different set of questions. Caesarius' pneumatology traces its roots through Faustus of Riez (d. c. 490) and Vincent of Lérins (d. *ante* 450) to Augustine and Ambrose.

Caesarius, Faustus, and Vincent share a common formation at the monastery in Lérins. They also opposed Prosper's early characterization of the controversy over grace and free will, an argument which did not appeal to the Holy Spirit. Instead, they share a common interest in anti-Arian arguments, perhaps because of their prominence in social and ecclesial matters with Arian "barbarian" society.⁴ From the perspective of pneumatology, Orange forces us to discuss at least three different strains of thought. Caesarius, the president of the synod, had been involved in anti-Arian pneumatological projects which relied, in part, on Augustine. Prosper of Aquitaine had been involved in anti-Pelagian projects which eventually appealed to aspects of Augustine's pneumatology. One of Prosper's summaries of Augustine's theology was quoted by the council. John Maxentius and the Scythian monks had used pneumatology in their response to yet another controversy, the condemnation of the "Three Chapters," which, to their minds, involved

⁴ Arius and "Arianism" have been the subject of much scholarly debate, as has "barbarian." The monolithic categories do not do justice to the various theological, social, and political alliances which we can detect in the 4th century. In the context of my arguments, however, "Arianism" is significantly more simple. The relevant Latin Arian theologies are more sophisticated in Vandal North Africa than in the largely Gothic Gaul, but both are committed to defending ranks of divinity that subordinate the Spirit and the Son to the Father. Though responding to different particular arguments, Faustus of Riez and Fulgentius of Ruspe have this subordinationism in mind when they write against "Arians." "Barbarian" is helpful only to the extent that it names various groups of people who were understood as outsiders, though the structures which were adopted in 5th and 6th century Gaul are more or less sophisticated and Roman. For more detailed references and discussion, see chapter 5 below.

Nestorianism and Pelagianism. Their work was also a significant source for the synod's decree on predestination, grace, and free will. Until making use of material from Prosper and from Maxentius at the synod of Orange, Caesarius had not used pneumatology to address the reformation of desire, though he had used Augustine's pneumatology in other contexts.

Study of the ways in which these theologians used pneumatology reveals three different strains of Augustinianism already in the century immediately after Augustine's death. I argue in chapter 5 that Lérinian pneumatology used traditional Latin, Catholic Nicene Trinitarian theology found in Ambrose and Augustine. Prosper, on the other hand, used different aspects of Augustine's pneumatology in his anti-Pelagian and predestinarian arguments. Prosper's mature theology teaches that the Spirit's work is primarily reformation of the will. In fact, Prosper streamlined Augustine's analysis of the reformation of memory, intellect, and will to an almost exclusive focus on the interaction between the human and divine wills, as I argue in chapter 4. The Scythian monks used Augustinian anti-Pelagian material in their response to contemporary 6th century issues which they argued were Nestorian. When the Scythian monks included Fulgentius of Ruspe in their discussions, they opened up a vibrant stream of Augustinian theology in response to 6th-century Nestorianism that differs from both the Lérinian and Prosperian lines in its Augustinian breadth and depth, as I argue in chapter 6. If the story of late-antique pneumatology were simply a matter of the reception of Augustine, Fulgentius would mark the end of this study. His use of Augustine's pneumatology is complete in a way that few, if any, are. Fulgentius uses Augustine's theology not only in his responses to anthropological and soteriological questions raised especially by Pelagianism, but also

his responses to Arianism and his development of Catholic Nicene Trinitarian theology. Fulgentius also responded to the new questions about the Spirit which were raised indirectly by controversies over Christology, soteriology, and the Liturgy. Much more should be said about Fulgentius' Augustinian pneumatology, but in the context of my study of the reformation of desire as a major theme of Latin pneumatology, it is sufficient to show how Fulgentius is part of an Augustinian project that differs from Prosper and the Lérinian theologians.

When pneumatology is considered according to the possibilities for self-transformation through ascetical practices, Gregory the Great is the most significant Latin figure in the 6th century. Gregory, like Cassian and Leo before him, appeals to pneumatology to explain Christian asceticism. His theology is explicitly concerned to form Christians, and so, I argue that he presents an ascetic pneumatology. Furthermore, this ascetic pneumatology is a synthesis of Augustine's and Cassian's theology. Gregory follows Cassian's analysis of the interior life and, therefore, understands the work of the Holy Spirit as reforming human thoughts and desires through particular ascetical practices. But Gregory also follows Augustine's analysis of the fallen human will. Gregory uses many of Augustine's mature reflections on the Trinity, but never writes to explain Trinitarian theology in a doctrinal controversy, as did Fulgentius. Rather, Gregory's genius lies in his reflections on the human condition and the reformation of desire, as well as the relationship between contemplation and allegory. Gregory's theology, as I argue in chapters 7-8, reveals that the reformation of desire was a primary concern of Latin pneumatology in the 6th century.

In arguing that one of the principal reasons pneumatology includes the reformation of desire, I have characterized many theological projects as “ascetic” (from the Greek term for training in holiness, *askêsis*, rendered in English as “ascesis” or “asceticism”). There is some danger in using this term. On the one hand, we have the recent trend to separate “ascetic” and “mystical” from “doctrinal.”⁵ On the other hand, it is not entirely clear where to draw the lines between “ascetic” and “monastic.”⁶ There are also recent attempts to use the category “asceticism” to study diverse religions from a single perspective.⁷ I do not intend to contrast “ascetic” with “doctrinal” as though a question about the procession of the Holy Spirit is any more or less important than the question of how God reforms the inner life of Christians. Rather, I use the term to call attention to the fact that the topics which were most gripping in late antiquity were written from theologians who were committed to a series of practices which had been carefully worked out according to their own understandings of human existence and transformation of that existence as part of salvation. Theologians like Cassian and Gregory are “ascetic” not simply because they practiced rigorous ascesis or because many suppose that they avoided systematic treatises about doctrinal matters.⁸ Their theology is ascetic because it is concerned with explaining how Christian asceticism works and is aimed at forming ascetics. Their answer, put simply, is that Christian ascesis works because the Holy Spirit

⁵ For a review and critique of this issues, see B. McGinn, *The Presence of God*, 1.265-343, and the more recent discussion in W. Harmless, *Mystics*, 10-18, 225-264.

⁶ For an overview, see W. Harmless, “Monasticism,” 493-517.

⁷ The two best overviews of these attempts to develop a theory of asceticism that encompasses various world religions and modern theoretical analyses are R. Krawiec, “Asceticism,” 764-785; V.L. Wimbush, “Introduction to Asceticism,” xix-xxxiii.

⁸ Cassian did, of course, write a systematic treatise (*De Incarn.*), and many sections of Gregory’s *Mor.* read as treatises on a particular topic, as with bodily resurrection at *Mor.* 14.55.68-59.79. See C.E. Straw, “Much ado about nothing,” 121-160.

operates within ascetics to reform what has been perverted, to heal what has been broken, and to bring to perfection what has been begun in creation and baptism. Latin pneumatology is not simply a march towards and justification of the *filioque*, though this is certainly a significant development within Latin pneumatology.⁹ Rather, the theologians who considered the Holy Spirit were interested both in understanding and experiencing the renewal of life brought about by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. They were interested in the reformation of their thoughts, desires, and wills. The contours of pneumatology change when these sets of concerns are considered. When understood as a question of problems and solutions raised by the traditional doctrines of inseparable operations, irreducible persons, missions, and processions, Fulgentius is the key Latin theologian of the 6th century. When understood as a question of the reformation of desire, Gregory the Great stands at the apex of a pneumatological project which I trace to Cassian in Gaul and Augustine in Africa. Cassian and Gregory serve as “bookends” to my study because they stand at either end of a period of relatively stable commitment to the full divinity of the Holy Spirit that allowed new emphases within pneumatology. They mark a period in which the key questions about the Holy Spirit articulate how the Spirit, in Gregory’s words, teaches “that they may learn what they desire.”¹⁰

⁹ On the *filioque* in the theologians considered here, see Bliss, *Morals on Job*, 3.359-360; A.E. Sicienski, *The Filioque*, 51-71; H.B. Swete, *The Procession of the Holy Spirit*. See also, L. Ayres, "Into the Cloud of Witnesses; L. Ayres, "*Sempiternae Spiritus Donum*," 127-152; B. Daley, "Revisiting the 'Filioque': Part Two: Contemporary Catholic Approaches," 195-212; B. Daley, "Revisiting the 'Filioque': Roots and Branches of an Old Debate: Part One," 31-62; Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, "Procession of the Spirit," 3-6; T.G. Weinandy, *The Father's Spirit of Sonship: Reconceiving the Trinity*.

¹⁰ Gregory, *Hom. Ez.* 1.5.12 (SC 327.188; Tomkinson, 91).

I. CASSIAN'S CATHOLIC ASCETIC PNEUMATOLOGY

Late in the 6th century, St. Gregory the Great wrote a manual for fellow pastors. He had just been made a bishop himself, and wanted to bridge the life he knew as a monk with the life he was coming to know as Pope. The ideal he adopted has strong roots in the theology of one of his spiritual heroes, John Cassian:

[The pastor] must devote himself entirely to setting an ideal of living. He must die to all passions of the flesh and... lead a spiritual life. He must have put aside worldly prosperity; he must fear no adversity, desire only what is interior... He is not led to covet the goods of others, but is bounteous in giving of his own. He is quickly moved by a compassionate heart to forgive, yet never so diverted from perfect rectitude as to forgive beyond what is proper. He does no unlawful act himself... In the affection of his own heart he sympathizes with the frailties of others, and so rejoices in the good done by his neighbor, as though the progress made were his own... [Such men] are unspotted in their zeal for chastity, strong in the vigor of their abstinence, full on the feasts of knowledge, humble in their long-suffering patience, upright in strength of authority, gentle in the grace of loving-kindness, and strict and unbending in justice.¹

But one does not simply arrive at this kind of holiness. Gregory developed a particular theory with specific practices designed to reform the inner and outer life of the Christian. He relied on Cassian's theology of the training needed for this life of holiness, a training which was intended to reshape a Christian's most intimate desires. Gregory was not the

¹ Gregory, *Reg. Past.* 1.10, 1.5 (PL 77.23, 18; ACW 11.38-39, 29, modified). Gregory thinks of Cassian as a saint (*Ep.* 7.12 (CCSL 140.461)). Later Popes canonized him officially, though his feast is not currently a universal feast in the Roman Rite. His feast day is celebrated on leap year day (29 Feb) in the Eastern Church, though it is transferred in non-leap years, and on 23 July in the ancient practice of the Western Church in Marseille. P. Guran, "Le culte de Cassien," 239-242, collects the references. See also the note at PL 58.1093ff.

first to teach that Holy Spirit plays a significant role in this process. Cassian explored this territory in the 5th century.

Gregory (c540-604) knew a doctrinal stability in the 6th century which had just begun in Cassian's lifetime (c360- c435), two and a half centuries earlier. Late in the 4th century, St. Jerome lamented that "the whole world groaned and marveled that it was Arian."² For decades Christians had been debating the relationship between the Father, Son, and Spirit in a bitter battle to define orthodoxy. Jerome noted that theologians had fallen prey to a theory which subordinated the Spirit to the Son and the Son to the Father. But the situation changed by the 5th century, when Cassian was writing. Cassian knew a time of relative stability in belief in the full divinity of the Holy Spirit. He was one of the first to apply this belief to an ascetic system at a time when ascetic systems were burgeoning. The list of practices included in Christian asceticism was extensive; fasting, vigils, purity of heart, chastity and other virtues, meditating on Scripture, reciting the Psalms, and contemplative prayer were all common themes. Cassian included the Holy Spirit in his explanation of why Christian asceticism works and thereby developed what I term an "ascetic pneumatology." His ascetical theology is a pneumatology because he teaches that the Spirit is a necessary part of ascetic formation.

Cassian had been trained as an ascetic at the feet of the Desert Fathers and was received as a monastic father himself by both Latin- and Greek-speaking Christians.³ He was familiar with the best of Greek and Latin theology from around the Roman empire.

² Jerome, *Altercatio* 19 (CCSL 79b.48; my trans.). Jerome references the synod which met at Ariminum at 359. On Jerome, see J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome*. I discuss Latin Arianism in more detail in chapter 5.

³ Greek epitomes of the *Inst.* and *Conf.* are described in Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 197. See *Philokalia*, "Cassianus," 656, CSEL 17.xcv-civ, PG 28.849-905, and Stewart, *Cassian the Monk*, 25 n 238. St. Benedict of Nursia commends Cassian already in the 6th century, Benedict of Nursia, *RB* 73. See A. de Vogüé, "Les mentions des oeuvres de Cassien," 275-285; S.M. Lake, "Knowledge of the writings of John Cassian," 27-41; P. Rousseau, "Cassian's Apophthegmata," 19-34.

When Cassian wrote for theologians debating Christological doctrines on the eve of the Council of Ephesus (431), he demonstrated his commitment to the Councils of Nicaea (325) and Constantinople (381) as normative for Trinitarian theology. Christians like Cassian called themselves “Catholic” to distinguish their universal scope from other groups who followed condemned doctrines. Mostly in his last work, *On the Incarnation*, Cassian has pointed things to say about the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Incarnate Christ, but only in response to particular controversies. Instead of arguing *that* and *how* the Spirit is fully divine, Cassian uses the divinity of the Spirit as a fundamental principle from which to make other arguments. When he uses previous ascetic material, he reshapes it slightly to make clear that the Holy Spirit is the divine agent of human reform. In his other works, the *Institutes*, and the *Conferences*, Cassian employs pneumatology in the service of formation for professional ascetics. When his intended audience includes those who have renounced the world in order to follow Christ, Cassian develops an archetypical ascetic pneumatology. I argue that it has 6 elements: (1) it is Nicene Catholic; and teaches that (2) the Holy Spirit is the guide for reading Scripture; (3) the Holy Spirit is the former of virtues in the monk; (4) the Holy Spirit is the reformer of affections in the monk; (5) the Holy Spirit is the reformer of thoughts; and (6) the Holy Spirit is the giver of ecstatic contemplation. Points 1-3 are common to many other theologians. Cassian is a well-informed theologian, but not a gifted innovator when it comes to the doctrine of God; rather, his genius lies in applying the newly affirmed orthodoxy to an extensive ascetic theology. As I argue in this chapter, points 1-3 demonstrate that Cassian applies what he took to be Catholic pneumatology to basic elements of asceticism. My second chapter addresses points 4-6, elements of Cassian’s

ascetic pneumatology which constitute his synthesis of the love-centered and knowledge-centered anthropological foundations of other ascetic systems. Together, chapters 1 and 2 provide a presentation of ascetic pneumatology as that kind of pneumatology which teaches that the indwelling Spirit is an essential part of all Christian asceticism and which stands at the head of a tradition eventually adopted by Gregory the Great. Pneumatology helped explain how the inner life of Christians, our very thoughts and desires, are reformed.

A NICENE CATHOLIC: THE HOLY SPIRIT AS *INDEX*

Early in the 5th century, Leo the Great (c395-461), archdeacon and then Bishop of Rome, asked John Cassian to demonstrate the errors of Nestorius' Christology.⁴ Cassian accepted the request and produced a treatise that links the Greek theology of Nestorius to the Latin heresy of Pelagius.⁵ This was Cassian's last treatise, and he wrote it very quickly in preparation for a meeting in Rome convened by Celestine. Before then, he had lived near the Black Sea (born c360), been a monk in Bethlehem, traveled throughout the Egyptian desert with his friend and fellow monk, Germanus, left Egypt (c399), befriended and defended John Chrysostom, been sent to Rome as an official emissary

⁴ Cassian, *De incarn.* pref. Cf. Gennadius, *scrip. ecc.* 61 (PL 58.1095). CSEL 13.cxvi reprints Gennadius' entry with a critical edition as chapter 62. Leo is the subject of my third chapter.

⁵ For Pelagius, see esp. *De incarn.* 1. Cassian has sometimes come under criticism for making the connection between Nestorius and Pelagius. In addition to the arguments about the similarities between Nestorian and Pelagian emphases on Christ as *solitarius homo*, Cassian's argument also draws on Nestorius' requests on behalf of the condemned Pelagians, Julianus, Florus, Orontius, and Fabius. See Nestorius, *Ep. ad Caelestinum* 1 & 2 (Loofs, 165 & 170). Scholars also puzzle over Cassian's knowledge of Antioch, leading some to think that he was ordained a priest there and is the Cassian who is mentioned as a delegate between Antioch and Rome. One of the best arguments that Cassian lived in Antioch continues to be P. Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church*, 174-175. C. Stewart, *Cassian the Monk*, 13-15, argues that Cassian was not a member of the Antiochene clergy. Nevertheless, Stewart argues that Cassian may have shared a common source with or been familiar with some of the Syriac authors such as Ps-Macarius. I support Stewart's thesis in my arguments below.

from Constantinople (404), and settled in Gaul near the port town of Marseilles (c415).⁶ Castor, one of the nearby bishops in Gaul, had asked Cassian to write a treatise which would explain the foundations of monastic life. Sometime before 426 Cassian wrote the *Institutes of the Cenobia and the Remedies for the Eight Principal Vices* in response to this request.⁷ Around the same time, he wrote a collection of talks or “conferences” which report his experiences with various figures he had met on his travels. These first ten *Conferences* were well received, and so he published two other groups of seven *Conferences* between the years 426 and 429, for a total of twenty-four *Conferences*. When Cassian wrote *On the Incarnation* (429/430), he was widely traveled, well-read, and established as an authority on Christian asceticism.

I start with his last work because it shows how Cassian took basic beliefs as foundational. This is especially important when we remember that many of the sources for Cassian’s theology, such as Origen and Evagrius, wrote treatises which at least seem at odds with orthodox Trinitarian theology as it was defined in Cassian’s lifetime.

Cassian is the first monk to explore an ascetic pneumatology in an age when Catholics

⁶ Cassian tells us very little about himself, and so, dating these events is often a matter of speculation. The clearest exposition of dating events of Cassian’s life is P. Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church*, 169-176. See also O. Chadwick, *John Cassian*, 1-36; T. Damian, "Some critical considerations," 149-170; K.S. Frank, "John Cassian on John Cassian," 418-433; E. Griffe, "Cassien a-t-il été prêtre d'Antioche?," 240-244; J.-C. Guy, *Jean Cassien: vie et doctrine spirituelle*, 11-28; H.I. Marrou, "Jean Cassien à Marseille," 5-26; H.I. Marrou, "La patrie de Jean Cassien," 588-596; C. Stewart, *Cassian the Monk*, 3-26. Much of the evidence that Cassian left Egypt in 399 is based on his partisanship with those who defended Origen’s notion of pure prayer. On this, see M. DelCogliano, "Situation Sarapion's sorrow," 377-421; A. Golitzin, "The vision of God and the form of glory," 273-297.

⁷ Cassian wrote three works: *Institutiones* = *Inst.*; *Collationes* = *Coll.*; *De incarnatione contra Nestorium* = *De incarn.* They are edited in CSEL 13 & 17 and translated into English in ACW 57-58 and NPNF 2.11. See my bibliography for details. The notes and introductions of Ramsey (ACW), Guy and Pichery (SC 42, 54, 64, & 109), and Gazaeus (PL 49-50) are most helpful for *Inst.* and *Coll.* M.-A. Vannier and J. Cassian, *Traité de l'Incarnation*, is the best modern work on that treatise. In English, the current studies include A.M. Casiday, *Tradition and Theology*; S.D. Driver, *John Cassian and Reading*; R.J. Goodrich, *Contextualizing Cassian*; C. Stewart, *Cassian the Monk*. Short introductions to Cassian’s work include W. Harmless, *Desert Christians*, 373-413; B. McGinn and P.F. McGinn, *Early Christian Mystics*, 59-75.

were unquestionably committed to the full divinity of the Holy Spirit. He premises his ascetic pneumatology on the Catholic belief in the full divinity of the Holy Spirit. In this regard, he presents the Holy Spirit in the overarching role of “guide” or “pointer;” Cassian’s term for this in Latin is *index*.⁸ The Spirit is the *index* of Christian revelation and God’s presence among us.

Cassian recounts a series of heretical positions to which Nestorius was accused of subscribing in new ways at the beginning of *On the Incarnation*. Of particular note for Cassian’s pneumatology are the heresies of Sabellius, Arius, Eunomius, and Macedonius. Against these, the Catholic position maintains the full divinity of the Holy Spirit and the distinction of the persons of the Trinity.⁹ While few scholars have taken it seriously, I argue that this is significant for three aspects of Cassian’s pneumatology: his use of inseparable operations, the Spirit as witness to Christ’s divinity, and the Spirit as guarantor of Christ’s divinity. In arguing against Nestorius in this way, Cassian identified what he took to be the Catholic belief in the Holy Spirit, the belief which is foundational for his ascetic pneumatology.

Nestorius attempted to separate the human from the divine in Jesus by attributing human things to one subject and divine things to another.¹⁰ In reply, Cassian argues that

⁸ Cassian, *De incarn.* 7.21 (CSEL 17.379).

⁹ Cassian, *De incarn.* 1.2.2-3 (CSEL 17.238). “However, after this, the schism of Sabellius broke forth from the disagreement with the previous heresy. When he contended that there is no distinction (*distantiam nullam*) between the Father or Son and Holy Spirit, he confounded, as far as was possible, the holy and ineffable Trinity (*sacram et ineffabilem trinitatem*) by blasphemously blending. Following after this, which we just described, was the impious perversity of the Arians, who, lest they seem to mix the holy Persons, said that they are diverse and even dissimilar substances in the Trinity. Sometime after this, though much like him in depravity, was Eunomius, asserted that the divine Trinity is like itself, while at the same time contended that it is diverse from itself; admitting similitude, but excluding equality (*parilitatem*). Macedonius, who blasphemed an unforgivable impiety against the Holy Spirit, said that the Father and Son are the same substance while calling the Holy Spirit a creature. Thus, he is convicted by the whole Trinity because he cannot wound one of the Trinity without injuring the whole Trinity.”

¹⁰ This is the basic terminology adopted in J. McGuckin, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria*.

there is only one Christ, both human and divine. One key passage for Cassian is Christ's comment at Mt 16:16: "Blessed are you, Simon Barjonah, for flesh and blood has not revealed this to you but the Spirit of My Father who is in heaven." Cassian directs Nestorius to this event as an obvious conviction of the error of his two-subject Christology: "In the words of the Apostle you have the testimony of the Holy Spirit, of the Son who was present, and of God the Father... The Son commended; the Father was present; the Holy Spirit revealed."¹¹ As recorded in Scripture, these words belong to the Spirit's inspiration of the Evangelist Matthew. In addition to the telling of the event (i.e. Scripture), the event itself (i.e. Peter's profession of Christ as the Son of God) was the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit revealed this to Peter and now reveals it to those who read Scripture. Furthermore, Christ's response to Peter highlights the role of the Spirit as witness to the fact of the Incarnation and the divine source of inspiration. Similarly, Cassian teaches that other professions of faith rely on spiritual sight, linked to revelation from the Holy Spirit.¹² As we will see below, Cassian consistently reflects on this role of the Holy Spirit. The implication for Nestorius is two-fold, but simple: he ignores the plain revelation of the Spirit through Scripture, and, in his perverted Christology, he refuses to be inspired. In the latter he is the opposite of saints like Peter; in the former he is author of a story that differs from Scripture.

If [you say Christ is] Son of man only, then the apostles cry out against you, the prophets cry out, even the Holy Spirit himself, by whom the conception was brought about, cries

¹¹ Cassian, *De incarn.* 3.13 (CSEL 17.279; NPNF 2.11.570, slightly modified). The point is repeated at *De incarn.* 6.19. Peter's profession of Christ's divinity is the direct inspiration of the Spirit. In addition, we should note the basic appeal to inseparable operations demonstrated in Cassian's explanation.

¹² Cassian considers Martha's profession at the resurrection of Lazarus (Jn 11:27) and Thomas' profession after the Resurrection (Jn. 20:28) along with Peter's confession (Mt. 16:16) at *De incarn.* 6.19. (CSEL 17.345.23ff).

against you. Your most shameless mouth is shut... by sacred writings and holy witnesses.¹³

Nestorius' error is just as much one of theological imprecision as it is ascetic failure: he neither follows the teaching of the Spirit in the Church nor allows the Spirit to dwell within him.

In the second place, the conception of Christ reveals the importance Cassian places on the Spirit and the way in which the Spirit and Son are related. Nestorius, using Jn 3:6 ("that which is born of the flesh is flesh") had argued that what was born from Mary was strictly human. Cassian responds with the citation of another verse, Mt. 1:20, the angel's words of comfort to Joseph: "that which is born from her is from the Holy Spirit." Cassian argues that distinguishing the person born of Mary from the one begotten by the Father adds a fourth person to the Trinity. Christians, however, know that the one born of Mary is the same one who is from the Spirit. Since the Spirit is divine, we know that Christ, also, is divine.

For when the Virgin Mary was to bring forth the Lord she conceived owing to the descent of the Holy Spirit upon her and the co-operation of the Power of the Most High. And from this you can see that the origin of our Lord and Savior comes from the same place as his conception; and since he was born by the descent of the complete fullness of Divinity on the Virgin, he could not be the Son of Man unless he had first been the Son of God... Jesus Christ is therefore the Son of God because he was begotten of God and conceived of God.¹⁴

¹³ Cassian, *De incarn.* 2.6.3-4 (CSEL 17.259; my trans.).

¹⁴ Cassian, *De incarn.* 2.6.4-5 (CSEL 17.259; NPNF 2.11.562, modified). The final clause actually reads: *quia et a divinitate genitus et a divinitate conceptus*. However, "begotten of God" is more natural in English

We might miss the historical nuance that this argument only works if everyone is already committed to the full divinity of the Spirit. Cassian starts from a position that assumes the arguments of the previous generations. Indeed, he admits that Nestorius understands the Father and the Spirit appropriately.¹⁵ Cassian did not need to defend the divinity of the Holy Spirit, but rather to show how this proves that Christ is fully human and fully divine. His appeal to the Spirit reveals his understanding that the Spirit is the mark of things genuinely Christian. In a sense, the Spirit guarantees and indicates the divinity of Christ, just as the Spirit guarantees the authenticity of Scripture and tradition, the vices, and holy thoughts and desires, as discussed further below.

The use of the Spirit as the guarantee of the Son's divinity is distinctive in patristic sources. Cassian argues from the divinity of the Spirit to the divinity of the Son. Though he was not responding directly to Sts. Hilary or Ambrose, comparison with their arguments is helpful. Hilary of Poitiers had argued for the Son's full divinity because he shares the same divine operations as the Father. Ambrose uses a similar argument for the divinity of the Spirit, namely, that the Holy Spirit shares the divine operations, including having a role in the Incarnation. Thus, some fifty years before Cassian, Ambrose had argued for the divinity of the Spirit based on the Spirit's role in the Incarnation:

than "begotten from the divinity," and there does not appear to be any difference between the two for Cassian.

¹⁵ Cassian, *De incarn.* 6.16. cf. *De incarn.* 7.23

The Lord himself... was begotten when the Spirit came upon the Virgin... So the birth from the Virgin is the work of the Spirit... So we cannot doubt that the Spirit is Creator, whom we know as the Author of the Lord's Incarnation.¹⁶

Cassian's argument runs in the other direction by arguing for the divinity of the Son based on the divinity of the Spirit and the Spirit's role in the Incarnation. Cassian and Ambrose both understand the Spirit to have a key role as co-author of the Incarnation, but use that fact to different ends in their arguments. Ambrose opposed those who subordinated the Spirit; Cassian opposed those who separated the divinity from the humanity of Christ. For Cassian, the Spirit assures us of Christ's full divinity.

The role of the Spirit in the Incarnation also separates Cassian from his African contemporary, St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430). Though Augustine uses the Spirit's role in the Incarnation to separate Christ from other men, he never uses the fact that Christ is *ex spiritu sancto* to argue that Christ is divine.¹⁷ Rather, Mt. 1:20 is often paired with Lk 1:35, either to discuss the agreement of the Gospel accounts of Jesus' birth, or to respond to slightly troubling questions about the use of terms, especially *natus* and *pater*.¹⁸ While

¹⁶ Ambrose, *Spir.* 2.5.37, 38, & 41 (CSEL 79.100-102; FoC 44.109, 110). It does not seem that Cassian had this passage in mind, if he even knew it at all. Cassian does know Ambrose and Hilary. *De incarn.* 7.24-25 cites Hilary's *De trin.* and a lost work on Matthew, as well as Ambrose's *De virg.* In *De sp. sanc.*, Ambrose interprets Mt. 1:20 (the verse which Cassian also uses) by appeal to the rod of Jesse (Is. 11:1), which he fits with the flower imagery of Cant. 2:1. Ambrose also mentions a translation issue in detail: most Latin manuscripts have *de spiritu*. He preferred *ex spiritu sancto* because it correctly translates the nuance of the Greek ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου. (Ambrose, *Spir.* 2.5.42.) Cassian's only mention of the rod of Jesse (*Coll.* 14.10.3) is unrelated to his explanation of Mt. 1:20. Cassian uses *de spiritu* (*De incarn.* 6.16 & 7.17) without note. He would not have missed the opportunity to explain the issues involved in Greek and Latin prepositions if he had seen the argument from Ambrose. J.P. Burns and G.M. Fagin, *The Holy Spirit*, 142, call attention to these arguments in Hilary and Ambrose.

¹⁷ For example, Augustine separates Christ from John precisely along the lines of the Spirit: Christ was not given the Spirit according to measure (Jn 3:34) because the fullness of divinity dwells in him; while John the Baptist was given the Spirit according to measure. (Augustine, *Io. ev. tr.* 74.3.)

¹⁸ For the discussion of Mt and Lk, who offer angelic proclamations about the Son's birth in relation to the Spirit (to Mary in Lk and to Joseph in Mt), see Augustine, *cons. Ev.* 2.5.14-2.5.17; Augustine, *s.* 51.8-

Cassian and Augustine share a belief in the unified Christ who is both fully human and fully divine, Cassian does not take up a defense of the divinity of the Trinity, as does Augustine. Nor does he share interest in questions about whether the Spirit can also be the father of the Son or other issues raised by Mt 1:20 which Augustine found interesting. Augustine explicitly argues for the full divinity of the Trinity in ways that Cassian never did. As we will see in later chapters, Augustine's arguments against subordinationist positions were used by other Latin theologians around the Mediterranean. Cassian writes as a Catholic at a time when this clearly meant commitment to the full divinity of the Spirit.

Arguing from the Spirit's divinity to Christ's divinity not only reverses the traditional order of the argument, but could introduce a kind of subordination of the Son or allow for a distinction between the flesh created for Christ by the Spirit and the Son of God who was begotten from the Father. Indeed, Nestorius was understood to argue precisely for this separation between what the Spirit did for Christ and who the Son of God was. Against this, Cassian invokes the principle of inseparable operations, the third traditional element of his Trinitarian theology. While the flesh of the Lord was conceived by the Holy Spirit, this does not mean that the Son of God was inactive. Rather, this involved cooperation in such a way that the Son's humanity was also created for himself by the Son of God. No division can be introduced between the humanity and the divinity of Christ.

...what was conceived by the Holy Spirit was built and perfected by the Son of God. Not that the work of the Son of God is one thing and the work of the Holy Spirit another, but

51.18. At *Ep.* 187.10.33 & *En. Ps.* 57.5, Augustine address the sense of *to bear* with respect to Mary's motherhood of Christ. Similarly, Joseph's paternity of Jesus is addressed at s. 51.16-51.30. Cf. Augustine, *ench.* 12.40.

through the unity and glory of the Godhead the operation of the Spirit is the building of the Son of God, and the building of the Son of God is the cooperation of the Holy Spirit.¹⁹

The Spirit and Son have the same *opus* and *virtus* (work and power); the *aedificatio* (building) of the Son occurs with the *cooperatio* of the Spirit, and the *operatio* of the Spirit is the *aedificatio* of the Son. The phrase *cooperatio spiritus sanctus* is unique to Cassian in Latin, but related to Greek texts that respond to Nestorius.²⁰ Similarly, Cassian critiqued Nestorius' conception of Christ's life on earth by appeal to the doctrine of inseparable operations:

The whole of your blasphemy, then, is this: that Christ had nothing through himself, nor did he, as you say, 'the mere man,' receive anything from the Word, i.e. the Son of God; rather, everything in Him was the gift of the Spirit.²¹

¹⁹ Cassian, *De incarn.* 7.17 (CSEL 17.373; NPNF 2.11.613 with modifications). That the Incarnation is the work of the entire Trinity must be kept in mind when evaluating Cassian's use of the phrase *homo assumptus* (e.g. *Inst.* 12.17; *Coll.* 7.22, 9.34.10; *De incarn.* 1.5.4). Casiday rightly calls attention to the fact that Augustine and other Gallic bishops approved of the statement of faith given by Leporius (*De Incarn.* 1.5), and that figures such as Hilary of Poitiers (e.g. *Trin.* 1.11, 1.13, 1.16, 2.25) and Augustine (e.g. *Trin.* 2.6.11) use the phrase. See A.M. Casiday, *Tradition and Theology*, 108-110, 255-256. It should be apparent that my study of his pneumatology calls further attention to why such a phrase cannot indicate the kind of adoptionism for which Cassian critiqued Nestorius (e.g. *De Incarn.* 2.6.1, 7.17).

²⁰ Augustine speaks of *cooperatio* of the divine persons at s. 71.26-27 (critical edition in P.-P. Verbraken, "Le sermon LXXI," 65-108.). Cf. Augustine, *Ep.* 169.2. Spurious texts attributed to Athanasius use the phrase συνεργεία τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος along with the phrase goodwill (either from βούλομαι or in parallel to the dative construction, with εὐδοκία τοῦ Πατρὸς). See Athanasius (spurius), *Q. al.* 18 (PG 28.788-789); Athanasius (spurius), *qeum. pol.* (PG 28.1405); Athanasius (spurius), *Serm. in annun.* 5 (PG 28.924), 11 (PG 28.933). Outside of the context of the work of the Spirit and the Son, the use of the term *cooperatio* is widespread because of Rom 8:28: scimus autem quoniam diligentibus Deum omnia cooperantur in bonum. Cf. Augustine, *Trin.* 13.16; Cassian, *Coll.* 6.9; Origen, *Comm. Rom.* 7.5. Cassian uses *ad* instead of *in* for the preposition with *bonum*, indicating that he was likely working from his own translation of a Greek text of Scripture.

²¹ Cassian, *De incarn.* 7.17 (CSEL 17.373; my trans.).

Cassian presents Nestorius as arguing that the Spirit bestowed something extra on the humanity of Christ, so that the divinity of Christ could remain a separate agent from the humanity of Christ. Instead, Cassian argues that everything Nestorius attributes to the Spirit in Jesus actually belongs to Jesus himself as well as the Spirit. For example, in opposition to Nestorius' claim that the Spirit filled the created man with *justitia* (justice or righteousness), which follows 1 Tim 3:16 ("he appeared in the flesh and was justified in the Spirit"), Cassian argues that justification is the work of both Christ and the Spirit.²² The doctrine of inseparable operations allows Cassian to accept all the passages which suggested to Nestorius that the Spirit was the operative divine power in the human Christ, but to deny that the Spirit alone was operative.

No one is able to think of anything in one person of the divinity which can be separated from the fullness of divinity... [Nestorius says that the Spirit worked the miracles in Jesus. Cassian denies this] not because we are to believe that in all these things which he himself did the unity and co-operation of the Spirit was absent. The Godhead is never absent to itself, and the power of the Trinity was ever present in the Savior's works. Rather, you think that the Holy Spirit gave assistance to the Lord Jesus Christ as if he had been feeble and powerless, and that [the Spirit] enabled him to do things which he was unable to do for himself.²³

Instead, the Incarnate Christ lacks nothing of divinity, nor does he lack cooperation with the Spirit.

²² Cassian, *De incarn.* 7.18. The history of interpreting *justitia* is a complicated one that involves the much later concerns of the Reformation. For the purposes of this study of Cassian's pneumatology, it suffices to note that "justify/justice" and "make righteous/righteousness" both translate the term. Cassian places importance on the term to note that the work of being made perfect belongs both to the Son and the Spirit.

²³ Cassian, *De incarn.* 7.17.5-7 (CSEL 17.374; my translation). Cf. *De incarn.* 2.2, *Coll.* 11.13.

The understanding of the Trinity that allows Cassian to claim that the persons are equal also allows him to argue that they possess divine glory equally. To the claim that Christ was endowed with glory by the Spirit and did not possess it on his own, Cassian responds with two basic arguments: the generosity of the giver does not necessarily demonstrate the need of the receiver, and the glory of God is possessed fully by each person of the Trinity.

We maintain that he has his own glory in such a way that we do not deny that his very property of glory is common to him with the Father and the Holy Spirit. For whatever God possesses belongs to the Godhead; and the kingdom of glory belongs to the Son of God in such a way that it is not kept back from belonging to the entire Godhead.²⁴

Coequality and co-possession of the fullness of divinity among the divine persons are closely tied to their inseparable operations. No one person possesses divinity any more than the others or the whole. Furthermore, Cassian argues, all that is attributed to the second person of the Trinity is attributed to the Incarnate Christ, and not to some divine presence imposed on a particular man.

Closely tied to arguments from the inseparable operations of the divine persons are arguments about their equality. To the claim that Christ's flesh was made a temple of the Holy Spirit by the descent of the Spirit at his baptism, Cassian responds by direct appeal to equality of the persons of the Trinity.

When should the one whose dignity is revealed be thought less than the one who made the revelation (*index fuerit*)? But believing in or making a distinction in the divinity is cast aside, for one and the same deity and equal power exclude the thought of impious

²⁴ Cassian, *De incarn.* 7.23 (CSEL 17.382; NPNF 2.11.617).

inequality from within. Likewise in this matter, when the person of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit is there [i.e. the baptism of Jesus]... none has more honor, none receives any injury, but the equality of the divinity remains entire in its fullness, for each person in the Trinity contains in himself the entirety of the Trinity.²⁵

Cassian argues that the descent of the Holy Spirit reveals the dignity of Christ in much the same way that the Holy Spirit's role in the Incarnation proves the divinity of Christ.

We expect that Cassian, a well-traveled theologian who was connected to the highest ecclesial circles, would be committed to the 5th cent. Catholic understanding of the divinity of the Holy Spirit and familiar with the theological principles employed in his arguments against Nestorius. Unlike Augustine, Cassian's contemporary, Cassian provides no arguments for these doctrines. Rather, he takes them as unquestioned aspects of the universal belief of Christianity. Similarly, Cassian takes it as self-evident that the Holy Spirit authors Scripture and guarantees not only the truth presented in it, but Christian understanding of that truth. Just as the Spirit is the *index* of Christ's divinity, the Spirit is the *index* of Scripture and tradition, as I argue immediately below, and the *index* of appropriate thoughts and desires, as I argue in chapter 2.

SPIRIT AS AUTHOR OF SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

As Cassian narrates it, late in the 4th century, he and his best friend, Germanus, took an extended trip through the deserts of Egypt to visit with the various spiritual masters (called "abbas") who were living there. Together, they puzzled over many matters of

²⁵ Cassian, *De incarn.* 7.21 (CSEL 17.379; my trans.). Gazaeus (PL 50.242-243) notes the parallel with Gregory, *Mor.* 2.56.92 (CCSL 143.113). Augustine, *Trin.* 7.5.11, makes a similar point, though a claim about textual dependency seems unwarranted.

holiness with the abbas they met on their desert sojourn. Before his time in Egypt he lived in Bethlehem; afterwards, he lived in Constantinople; throughout, he learned various strains of thought that had been developed by previous ascetic masters. Cassian's *Institutes*, his plan for how to run a monastery, and his *Conferences*, his literary presentation of the themes discussed with various abbas of the desert, won him a status similar to the fathers under whom he had studied.²⁶ He learned the common belief that the Spirit inspires, reveals, and points to the Christian truth. This became a foundational aspect of his ascetic pneumatology. The Spirit is the *index* of Scripture and tradition, and therefore the guide for ascetics who read Scripture.

Cassian links the Spirit to God's self-revelation in both the Old and New Testaments by making the Spirit the author of Scripture.²⁷ In this, Acts 21:11, in which the prophet Agabus speaks for the Holy Spirit, provides a clear precedent for Christians to understand the Holy Spirit as the inspiration of prophets and Scripture as a whole.²⁸ For Cassian, as for many others, this principle of divine authorship has direct implications for how Christians are to read Scripture: no detail is inconsequential.²⁹ For example, when recounting his conference with Abba Isaac about prayer, Cassian tells that Isaac prefaced the discussion with a direct statement of this principle: "This last suggestion," that words of Paul should be considered to have been set forth in a careless manner so that we should not pay careful attention to their order, "seems quite absurd to me. For it ought not

²⁶ Cassian made it into the collections of *Apophthegmata* and the *Philiokalia*. His texts were used in Latin and Greek epitomes. See P. Guran, "Le culte de Cassien," 242-255.

²⁷ E.g. Cassian, *De incarn.* 3.13; *Inst.* 3.3.6.

²⁸ Agabus begins his conversation with Paul by saying, "Thus says the Holy Spirit." Cassian cites this at the beginning of his writing career, *Inst.* 1.1.5.

²⁹ E.g. *AP Poemen*, 136; Cyprian of Carthage, *de dom. orat.* 35; Evagrius Ponticus, *Gn.* 18 & 34; Evagrius Ponticus, *Mal. Cog.* 18; Origen, *De prin.* 4.2.7 (14), in both the Greek and Rufinus' Latin; Palladius, *Dial. vit. Chrys.* 20; Palladius, *HL* 17.1.

to be believed that the Holy Spirit would have said something through the Apostle in passing and for no reason.”³⁰ In another *Conference*, Cassian goes to some length to defend the principle that one can refuse to fulfill a promise when some greater good is found after the promise was given.³¹ After explaining several Scriptural examples, Abba Joseph remarks “that the Holy Spirit inserted these things in the sacred volumes for no other reason than that we might be instructed by these examples not to hold obstinately to our promises.”³² Cassian follows the general Christian understanding that the Holy Spirit has authored a text which speaks to all situations in which Christians find themselves.

For Cassian the Spirit is both the author of Scripture and the one who maintains orthodoxy in the tradition which authenticates and interprets Scripture. One of the central teachings for Cassian, that God is the source of perfection, was handed down from the Fathers “in deed and work and in the power of the Spirit.”³³ Much has been written recently about Cassian’s appropriation and subtle shifting of centers of authority from the lone charismatic figure to a kind of fraternal council of fathers.³⁴ Here, I need only call

³⁰ Cassian, *Coll.* 9.10 (CSEL 12.260; ACW 57.337).

³¹ Cassian and Germanus had promised to return shortly to their monastery in Palestine, but had found greater spiritual teachers in the Desert than at their monastery of profession. Many see the entirety of *Coll.* 17 as a justification of their decision not to return according to their promise. O. Chadwick, *John Cassian*, 17, argues that it is unclear whether Cassian had a particularly troubled conscience or whether he had recently been attacked for breaking the pledge when he wrote. Prosper of Aquitaine, *c. coll.* 5.2, attacks Cassian for this doctrine.

³² Cassian, *Coll.* 17.25.9 (CSEL 13.492; ACW 57.607). This theme is common in Cassian. The Holy Spirit inspired Scripture so that it is replete with meaning. Often, a teaching on virtue begins with some reference to what the Spirit has set forth in Scripture (e.g. *Inst.* 9.2, 9.3, *Coll.* 12.11.2).

³³ Cassian, *Inst.* 12.13 (CSEL 17.214; ACW 58.260). The teaching is succinctly stated earlier, at *Inst.* 12.11.2: “Likewise, when we examine the origin of that call and salvation by which we human beings have been saved, not, according to the Apostle, thanks to ourselves or to our works but by the gift and grace of God, we shall be able to see clearly how the whole of perfection ‘is not of the one who wills or of the one who runs, but of God who is merciful.’” (CSEL 17.213; ACW 58.260)

³⁴ Especially noteworthy in this regard are the arguments of Philip Rousseau and Robert Markus: R.A. Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity*; P. Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church*; P. Rousseau, “Cassian, contemplation and the cenobitic life,” 113-126. See also, S.D. Driver, *John Cassian and Reading*; R.J. Goodrich, *Contextualizing Cassian*; R.J. Goodrich, “John Cassian on community,” 23-30;

attention to the role of the Spirit in the wisdom of the collective whole. Just as Christians can learn from Scripture, so can we also learn from tradition. Cassian provides several examples: the monk Helladius was inspired by the Holy Spirit to learn from the tradition instead of relying on his own speculation; Paul was sent to Ananias for further instruction before preaching the Gospel with the aid of the Holy Spirit; the virtue of *discretio* develops into inspired judgment under the formation of the elders.³⁵ Cassian and Germanus experienced this directly; Cassian relates that the breath of the divine Spirit (*flatus divini spiritus*) guided a conference which lasted two nights and left them inflamed to achieve the perfection of love.³⁶ This particular language was influential for Gregory the Great, who also reflected on the role of the Spirit in maintaining orthodoxy, as I discuss below.³⁷ Cassian invokes the Holy Spirit not only when explaining orthodoxy to those who seek it, but also to those who have gone astray. When rehearsing the nature of heresy in general in order to apply it to Nestorius in particular, Cassian turns to the Spirit as the defender of orthodoxy.

R.J. Goodrich, "Underpinning the text," 411-436; M. Sheridan, "John Cassian and the formation of authoritative tradition," 157-173; M.-A. Vannier, "Jean Cassien, historiographe du monachisme Égyptien?," 149-158. More recently, S.D. Driver, *John Cassian and Reading*, has called attention to the way in which Cassian attempts to recreate the oral and aural experience of sitting at the feet of the masters through written texts.

³⁵ Cassian, *Coll.* first pref. 3, 2.15, 2.2. P. Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church*, 192-193, discusses these passages in his arguments about Cassian's sense of authority. On *discretio* as a virtue that always has reference to the community, see S.C. Alexe, "Le discernement selon Saint Jean Cassien," 129-135; L.S. Cunningham, "Cassian's Hero," 231-243; M. Djuth, "Cassian's use of the figure uia regia in *Collatio* II "On discretion", " 167-175; J.J. Levko, "The relationship of prayer to discretion," 155-171. For a discussion of discretion and charisms in general belonging to the one Spirit, see *Coll.* 2.1.3, & *Inst.* 6.18.

³⁶ Cassian, *Coll.* 8.25.5-6. (CSEL 13.247) uses *divini spiritus flatus*. See also *spiritalis meditationis adflatus* at *Coll.* 9.4. Antony, *Ep.* 1, makes particular use of the theme of the Spirit as teacher. Though lacking the breathing language, Evagrius also mentions having learned things through the grace of the Holy Spirit. (*Prak. prol.*; *Ep. fid.* [3].13; & *Mal. Cog.* 43).

³⁷ C.f. Gregory, *Mor.* pref. 1.3 (CCSL 143.10), 9.58.88 (CCSL 143.519). On the use of *flatus* language with the Spirit, see my discussion below, in chapter 7, p. 165.

The tales of the poets tell that the hydra, when decapitated, grew back even more numerous heads because of its curse... That horrific fertility doubled whatever the sword cut until... by applying fire, as the poets tell, [Hercules] cut off the multiple offspring of that monstrous body with a burning sword. Thus, by searing the heart of the matter, he scorched the veins of that vile fertility which kept rising up and at last stopped the monstrous births. Similarly, heresies in the Churches bear a resemblance to the Hydra... [and] what the fictions of the pagans said about the death of the hydra, the truth can effect in ecclesiastical battle. Accordingly, may the Holy Spirit burn the very heart of the toxic generation in the new heresy which ought to be obliterated so that the horrific fertility may cease to be reborn from its dying veins.³⁸

The Holy Spirit guides Christian understanding of Scripture through theological argument and ascetic formation.

Scripture has multiple layers of meaning which demand careful study and purity on the part of the reader for at least two reasons. On the one hand, our sinfulness hinders the process of understanding. On the other hand, God is able to author a complex story on many levels. Cassian's ascetic pneumatology has something to say on both accounts. He not only argues that reading Scripture is an ascetic practice, but that asceticism is a necessary part of reading Scripture. As we overcome sin by progressing in virtue, we gain a deeper understanding of the mysteries which the Spirit has inspired.

As soon as these [vices related to gluttony] have been driven out and the veil of the passions has been lifted, the eyes of his heart will naturally contemplate the mysteries of Scripture, since it was not in order to be unknown and obscure that they were delivered to

³⁸ Cassian, *De incarn.* 1.1.1-2 (CSEL 17.287; my trans.).

us by the grace of the Holy Spirit; rather they are made obscure by our vices, when the veil of our sinfulness clouds over the eyes of our heart...³⁹

Growing closer to the Spirit means that ascetics gain new intellectual and emotional abilities, and so, can contemplate various senses of Scripture. Cassian's insistence on purity of heart and the relationship between Scripture and contemplation demands further discussion, which I take up in chapter 2. As I have outlined it, points 3 (virtue) and 6 (contemplation) are complementary to point 2 (Scripture). In order to understand fully what it means for Cassian to teach that the Holy Spirit is the *index* of Scripture and tradition, and therefore, the guide for the ascetic who reads Scripture, we must see what Cassian teaches about interpreting the multiple senses of Scripture. Purity of thoughts and desire, a state brought about by the Holy Spirit through asceticism, is needed to understand the depths of Scripture.

THE SPIRITUAL MEANING OF SCRIPTURE

Cassian was not the first to elaborate and catalogue the hidden meanings of Scripture. He follows themes from earlier theologians whom he likely read in Greek: Origen (died c254), Didymus the Blind (died c395), and Evagrius Ponticus (died 399).⁴⁰ While he developed themes from these three theologians, the key point for my argument about Cassian's ascetic pneumatology is that he outlines a specific role for the Holy Spirit in *lectio*, the practice which leads to contemplation. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit is essential for understanding the hidden meanings of Scripture. Considering Cassian's

³⁹ Cassian, *Inst.* 5.34.1 (CSEL 17.107; ACW 58.136-137). See further discussion of Scripture, contemplation, and the Spirit below, beginning at p. 46. S. Marsili, *Giovanni Cassiano*, 89, has suggested that this passage parallels Evagrius. (*Ep. Fid.* 12)

⁴⁰ On Cassian's knowledge of Greek, see C. Stewart, "From logos to verbum," 5-31.

sources and how they understood the relationship between contemplation and the hidden meanings of Scripture reveals the importance of the Holy Spirit in Cassian's understanding of the matter. Cassian relies on earlier treatments of the spiritual meanings of Scripture, but his pneumatology allows him to make these aspects of the illumination of the Holy Spirit. For Cassian, the Holy Spirit is the guide for reading Scripture.

Though it is not certain whether Cassian met Evagrius Ponticus in person, it is clear that Cassian was familiar with Evagrius' theology. Evagrius had been a theologian in the court of Gregory of Nazianzus in Constantinople before fleeing the city under suspicion of having engaged in an affair with a noblewoman. He eventually became a monk under the tutelage of Melania the Elder in Palestine, and then moved to the Egyptian desert before Cassian and Germanus arrived there. Evagrius lived in the manner of the desert fathers and became a member of a very influential circle of ascetic theologians.⁴¹ He grounded his ascetic system in a theory that embraced grades of contemplation which included coming to see through the material world to the spiritual world and to see through the literal meaning of Scripture to deeper meanings. Cassian, too, teaches that reading Scripture with the Spirit can lead to contemplation, a theme I develop in chapter 2. Here I want to focus on Cassian's teaching that the Spirit enables the ascetic to understand the multiple meanings of Scripture. That the Holy Spirit comes to dwell within monks is the key to Cassian's understanding of interpreting Scripture.

⁴¹ See Palladius, *HL* 38. Cf. the discussions in A.M. Casiday, *Evagrius Ponticus*, 5-13; L. Dysinger, *Prayer and Psalmody*, 7-17; W. Harmless, *Desert Christians*, 311-316; A. Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition*, 100-113; B. McGinn and P.F. McGinn, *Early Christian Mystics*, 41-58; R.E. Sinkewicz, *Evagrius of Pontus*, xvii-xxi. I mostly follow Bunge's abbreviations and Sinkewicz' translations. The principal Evagrian works mentioned here are: *Ep. fid.* = *Letter on the Faith* (=Basil the Great, *Ep.* 8); *Gn.* = *Gnostikos*; *In Prov.* = *Scholia in Proverbia*; *In Ps.* = *Scholia in Proverbia*; *In Ps.* = *Scholia in Psalmos*; *KG* = *Kephalia Gnostica*; *Mal. Cog.* = *On Thoughts*; *O. Sp.* = *On the Eight Thoughts*; *Prak.* = *Treatise on the Practical Life*. Not all of Evagrius works have published critical editions. An easy reference list is provided in G. Bunge, *Dragon's Wine and Angel's Bread*, 139-142; W. Harmless, *Desert Christians*, 333-336.

Evagrius had a highly refined ascetic system that was full of technical terms and distinctions. A monk progresses through stages: first through the practical process of purification (called *praktiké* in Greek), then through freedom from emotion (*apatheia*) and love (*agapé*) into the stage of knowledge (*gnostiké*). Knowledge is further divided into the natural (*physiké*) and contemplative (*theória*). Evagrius also teaches that there are grades of contemplation.⁴² For Evagrius, exegesis is the affair of the Christian gnostic (i.e. one who has achieved *apatheia* through the life of *praktiké*). The gnostic must discern to which of the three grades of the ascetic life a verse of Scripture applies. A passage might inform *praktiké* by treating issues of virtue and vice; or it might inform *physiké* by offering insight into the nature of created being. Allegorical passages concern theology, that is, the Trinity.⁴³ It seems to be the case that Evagrius thought each verse had exclusively one application to the ascetic life.⁴⁴ In this, he differs from one of his key sources, Origen, who taught that each text could have at least a triple reading and that the reading of the text corresponds to the reader. Origen found Prov 22:20 helpful in this regard:

By Solomon in the Proverbs we find some such rule as this enjoined respecting the divine doctrines of Scripture: ‘And portray them in a threefold manner...’ The individual ought, then, to portray the ideas of holy Scripture in a threefold manner upon his own soul; in order that the simple man may be edified by the ‘flesh,’ as it were, of the Scripture, for so

⁴² For a presentation of this scheme, see W. Harmless, *Desert Christians*, 345-354; A. Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition*, 100-113; B. McGinn, *The Presence of God*, 1.144-157.

⁴³ Evagrius Ponticus, *Gn.* 18. A little further in the text (*Gn.* 21 & 34), Evagrius places limits on allegorical reading such that one should not seek spiritual meanings in the words of evil men. Gregory the Great clearly disagrees, as a *Mor.* 5.19.38-5.36.66, which interprets the words of Eliphaz, who is taken to be a heretic, in at least the literal and allegorical senses.

⁴⁴ Géhin understands this to be a significant departure from Origen. (SC 304.30)

we name the obvious sense; while he who has ascended a certain way (may be edified) by the ‘soul,’ as it were. The perfect man... from the spiritual law.⁴⁵

Cassian certainly follows Origen’s teaching that each verse of Scripture can potentially have multiple meanings, though he adopts much of Evagrius’ terminology in *Coll.* 14, on spiritual knowledge. Cassian agrees that interpretation of Scripture is a matter of *theoretiké*, but offers four possible interpretations.

So we said previously the *πρακτικη* is dispersed among many professions and pursuits. The *θεωρητικη*, on the other hand, is divided into two parts-that is, into historical interpretation and spiritual understanding. Hence, when Solomon had enumerated the different forms of grace in the Church, he added: ‘all who are with her are double clothed.’ [Prov 31:21 LXX] Now there are three kinds of spiritual knowledge-tropology, allegory, and anagogy-about which it is said in Proverbs: ‘But you describe those things for yourself in threefold fashion according to the largeness of your heart.’ [Prov 22:20 LXX]⁴⁶

Furthermore, Cassian offers four meanings of the same verse in Scripture as an example of this principle before stating it succinctly: “For its form is also adapted to the capacity of the human intelligence... all the heavenly commands are shaped for the whole human race according to the measure of our condition.”⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Origen, *De prin.* 4.2.4 (11) (SC 268.310; ANF 4.359). Rufinus easily connects the bodily sense to the historical sense in his translation, at *De prin.* 4.2.5. (12) (SC 268.316.185-186). Origen thinks that all texts could have a three-fold meaning (cf. Origen, *In Lev. Hom.* 5.5. & *Hom. Gen.* 10.2 (SC 7 bis.26))

⁴⁶ Cassian, *Coll.* 14.8.1 (CSEL 13.407; ACW 57.509).

⁴⁷ Cassian, *Coll.* 14.11.1 (CSEL 13.411; ACW 57.515). The fourfold interpretation of Jerusalem is offered at *Coll.* 14.8.4.

Cassian explores new exegetical territory in prefacing the interpretation of Prov 22:20 with an interpretation of Prov 31:21. For Evagrius, the verse from Proverbs also suggests a way to connect three stages of the spiritual life with the three divisions of philosophy and the three books of Solomon:

The one who *widens his heart* through purity understands the *logoi* of God which are *praktiké*, *physiké*, and *theologiké*. For every commentary on scripture is divided into three parts: ethical, physical, and theological. And to the first corresponds the Proverbs, to the second Ecclesiastes, and to the third the Song of Songs.⁴⁸

Because the ethical sense is coordinated to the ascetic stage of *praktiké*, Evagrius calls our attention to the moral sense of Scripture, which is important for instruction in virtue. This so-called “physical” sense of Scripture refers not to our contemporary sense of physics, but to Evagrius’ sense of the contemplation of the created order, which is the first stage of *gnostiké* or *theoretiké*. The theological sense coordinates to the final stage of the ascetic life, contemplation of the divine Trinity. Noticeably missing from this condensed scheme is the historical sense, which Origen had included in his explanation of the verse from Proverbs. In another text, however, Evagrius includes the historical sense based on Ps 76:21; he cites Clement of Alexandria:

v. 21. You guided your people like sheep, by the hand of Moses and Aaron.

15. According to Moses, philosophy is divided into four [parts]: [first,] into the historical; and [second,] that properly called the legislative (cf. Ex.24:12), which [both] pertain to

⁴⁸ Evagrius Ponticus, *In Prov.* 247 (Prov 22:20) (SC 340.342; trans. Dysinger, 68). J. Driscoll, "Apatheia and purity of heart in Evagrius Ponticus," 151, argues that the concept of purity of heart extends to the entirety of the monastic life, based on this passage. L. Dysinger, *Prayer and Psalmody*, 68-69, notes that Evagrius generally follows this correlation between type of exposition and these particular books in his treatment of the texts.

ethical matters; the third is the liturgical, which is the contemplation of nature; and the fourth concerns the whole expression of *theologiké*.

We are to take the purpose of the law in a certain fourfold sense: [1] as indicating a type; [2] or as revealing a sign; [3] or as confirming a commandment for proper living; [4] or foretelling, like a prophecy. By this method did *Moses and Aaron lead the people* journeying from vice to virtue.⁴⁹

Evagrius takes Prov 22:20 to indicate the grades of the ascetic life. Cassian takes Prov 22:20 to mean the three elements of spiritual knowledge, though he uses terms more familiar to Origen than Evagrius: tropology, allegory, and anagogy.

For Cassian, this use of two verses from Proverbs to indicate four meanings of Scripture parallels the larger discussion taking place within the fourteenth *Conference* in general, where Cassian shows familiarity with Evagrius' terminology, but adds the Holy Spirit as a necessary part of the process. Abba Nesteros opens with a discussion about the *scientia* (knowledge) appropriate to various arts (*artes*) and skills (*disciplinae*). The knowledge of our religion is bifurcated into *praktiké* and *theorétiké*. That is, there is a knowledge appropriate to both aspects of the ascetic life. The knowledge of *praktiké* (Cassian sometimes calls this *actualis scientia*) concerns both the purgation of vice and the acquisition of virtue. Cassian teaches that the Spirit is an integral part of this process, as I argue in this chapter. The knowledge of *theorétiké* involves contemplation of divine things and understanding spiritual meanings. It is bifurcated into historical interpretation and spiritual understanding, both of which rely on the Holy Spirit. One struggles to make this journey to contemplation “in vain” if he does not reject vice, “,or the Spirit of God

⁴⁹ Evagrius Ponticus, *In Ps.* 15. (Ps 76:21) (Greek provided with trans. Dysinger, 63-64). Dysinger suggests parallels to Origen, *Comm. Cant.* through Basil or Didymus the Blind.

hates deception, and it does not dwell in a body subject to sin. [Wis 1:4-5]”⁵⁰ Without the indwelling Spirit, one will not progress and will never achieve the vision of God. Cassian is so convinced that this is a key principle, that he repeats the same verse later in the conference (14.16.1). The “big picture,” then, is simply that whenever Cassian uses an established framework, he includes a role for the Holy Spirit. This separates him from his predecessors.

It is tempting to read the three-fold distinction Cassian offers as relying on the previous three-fold distinctions such as found in Evagrius and Didymus. The matter, however, is not that simple. Cassian is distinct from his sources. One might take the four-fold division Evagrius repeats from Clement as the precursor to the four senses of Scripture in Cassian. Elsewhere, Cassian connects the three books of Solomon to three renunciations of the ascetic life (worldly desires, vices, and visible things), and not to the three senses of Scripture that Evagrius expounds.⁵¹ While there is some parallel between what Evagrius means by the ethical and what Cassian means by the tropological sense, they use allegory in different manners. Allegory, Evagrius tells us, applies to contemplation of the Trinity.⁵² Cassian explains allegory more generally; it is the prefiguring of another mystery. Anagogy mounts from spiritual mysteries to even more sublime secrets.⁵³ We could expect these more sublime secrets to concern the Trinity. Cassian’s example of the four senses of Jerusalem more closely follows a passage from

⁵⁰ Cassian, *Coll.* 14.2 (CSEL 13.399; ACW 57.505).

⁵¹ Cassian, *Coll.* 3.7.1-2. It is significant that Cassian teaches that one arrives at ecstasy of mind after having made these renunciations. See the more detailed discussion of ecstatic contemplation below.

⁵² Evagrius Ponticus, *Gn.* 18. The Guillaumonts note that the Syriac versions offer different readings of the explanation of how a passage might apply to the Trinity. (SC 356.117-118) The confusion seems to revolve around understanding Evagrius’ terminology of monad and henad.

⁵³ Cassian, *Coll.* 14.8.2.

Didymus the Blind than from Evagrius. Didymus was an Alexandrian who wrote in Greek and was translated into Latin in Cassian's lifetime.⁵⁴ Cassian explains,

the four figures that have been mentioned converge in such a way that, if we want, one and the same Jerusalem can be understood in a fourfold manner. According to history it is the city of the Jews. According to allegory it is the Church of Christ. According to anagogy it is that heavenly city of God 'which is the mother of us all.' [Gal 4:26] According to tropology it is the soul of the human being, which under this name is frequently either reproached or praised by the Lord. Of these four kinds of interpretation the blessed Apostle says thus: 'Now, brothers, if I come to you speaking in tongues, what use will it be to you unless I speak to you by revelation or by knowledge or by prophecy or by instruction?' [1 Cor 14:6]⁵⁵

Didymus writes,

Jerusalem has often received a threefold allegorical interpretation: it is either the soul established in virtue, or the Church glorious, which has neither spot nor wrinkle..., or the heavenly city of the living God.⁵⁶

Cassian and Didymus agree on the spiritual senses of Jerusalem. Cassian, more than depending on any single text or even author, is familiar with the broad tradition of multiple senses of Scripture, but articulates it in his own way. Cassian's four senses of

⁵⁴ Didymus the Blind was a 4th century theologian in Alexandria who was condemned for Origenistic theology in the 6th century. On his life and works, see G. Bardy, *Didyme l'aveugle*; M. DelCogliano, A. Radde-Gallwitz, and L. Ayres, *Works on the Holy Spirit: Athanasius and Didymus*.

⁵⁵ Cassian, *Coll.* 14.8.4 (CSEL 13.405; ACW 57.510).

⁵⁶ Didymus the Blind, *Comm. Zech.* 1.110 (SC 83.251). This passage is cited in De Lubac, *Exégèse Médiéval*, 1.645, and translated at *Medieval Exegesis*, 199. Didymus offers similar multiple interpretations of Jerusalem as the Church and individual souls throughout. (Cf. *Comm. Zech.* 1.48 & 1.72) De Lubac traces parallels between Didymus and Origen.

Scripture later became established as a common way of considering the meaning of Scripture, but here my concern lies with the role of the Holy Spirit in interpreting Scripture, a role Cassian emphasizes as part of his ascetic pneumatology.

The dialogue of the *Conference* in which these four senses of Scripture are expounded quickly concerns the role of the Holy Spirit in these spiritual meanings of Scripture. Germanus directly questions the link between the Spirit and understanding sacred Scripture; it seems that there are many who are not even Christian who understand Scripture, and there are many holy men who are illiterate. Non-Christians seemingly understand Scripture apart from having the Spirit dwell within. Abba Nestoros' response underscores not only the importance of indwelling Spirit, but also the importance of appropriate worship and devotion (*cultus*):

People of this kind only have skill in disputation and an ornate style, but... they are unable to penetrate the depths of Scripture and the secrets of spiritual meanings. True knowledge is possessed only by true worshippers of God... For when it is said that 'all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden' [Col 2:3] in Christ, how can a person who has scorned to find Christ or who blasphemes him with sacrilegious tongue when he is found or who has at least stained the Catholic faith with unclean works be believed to have acquired true knowledge? 'For the Spirit of God will flee from deception, and it does not dwell in a body subject to sin.' [Wis 1:4-5]⁵⁷

⁵⁷ Cassian, *Coll.* 14.16.1-2 (CSEL 13.418; ACW 57.520). Wis 1:4-5 is also used at *Coll.* 14.2. The verb *penetrare* has a military connotation in 1st cent. BC and AD Latin usage. There, it quite obviously means to break through defenses or into territory. It also comes to have a cognitional sense. Seneca, *De Beneficia*, 1.3.8, uses the term to indicate the acumen of Chrysippus, who was able to penetrate the depths of truth. *Shepherd of Hermas* speaks of things penetrating or piercing into the heart (4.1.2, 5.2.2, 6.2.4). The Vulgate of Heb 4:12 provides a reference to the penetrating word of God which exercises discretion of thoughts. Ambrose, *Exameron*, 6.1.2 speaks of penetrating divine providence and other holy matters as a form of discernment and learning. Cf. *De interpellatione Iob et David*, 3.7.19, *Exp. Ps.* 1.16, 8.60, 15.20. Augustine, *Serm.* 350 speaks of penetrating all the secrets of Scripture. Cf. *Ep.* 143.7, 119.2. Cf. Gregory, *Mor.* 16.18 & 17.26, in this regard.

Nesteros reiterates the teaching that Scriptural interpretation is intimately tied to proper asceticism. In this, 2 Cor 6:5-6 proves helpful, for it articulates the transition from being a novice monk to being an elder who is able to hand on the faith to the next generation with the aid of the Holy Spirit.

The blessed Apostle also teaches that by following this order... spiritual knowledge can be acquired... 'In watching, in fasting, in chastity, in knowledge, in long-suffering, in gentleness, in the Holy Spirit, in unfeigned love.' [2 Cor 6:5-6] With this concatenation of virtues he very obviously wished to teach us that one proceeds from watching and fasting to chastity, from chastity to knowledge, from knowledge to long-suffering, from long-suffering to gentleness, from gentleness to the Holy Spirit, and from the Holy Spirit to the reward of unfeigned love. When, therefore, ...you yourself attain to spiritual knowledge ...thereupon an abundant downpour of the Holy Spirit will germinate the seed of the saving word that has been commended by you to the hearts of your hearers.⁵⁸

Cassian's system melds "asceticism and biblical interpretation [so] that they [become] one indivisible process."⁵⁹ This is not because Scripture is obscurely written by the Spirit (there is no apology for the poor style of Scripture in Cassian), but because Scripture mediates the mysteries of God, and the mysteries of God reform the life of the Christian.

⁵⁸ Cassian, *Coll.* 14.16.8-9 (CSEL 13.421; ACW 57.522). Cf. *Inst.* 2.3.

⁵⁹ R.H. Weaver, "Scripture," 368. For this point and some implications for orienting monasticism to the episcopacy via teaching (*doctrina*) and preaching, see R.A. Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity*, 186-189. Markus, in particular reference to *Coll.* 14.16.2, suggests that this might be related to the fact that many Gallic monks became bishops and, therefore, preachers. To this, I add that monks might also become abbots and give their own conferences, as well. The whole discussion of *Coll.* 14 aims at producing the kind of old monk who can faithfully pass on the tradition from the young monk who is more eager than experienced. Cassian taught that this process was guided by the Holy Spirit, e.g. *Inst.* 2.3.

As we shall see in chapter 8, Gregory the Great has the same understanding of how one penetrates Scripture with the aid of the Spirit through asceticism.

Cassian's understanding of the spiritual senses of Scripture follows the tradition that runs through Origen, Didymus the Blind, and Evagrius. For Cassian, moreover, understanding the spiritual senses of Scripture requires the indwelling Spirit. Inspiration, according to Cassian, includes the presence of the Spirit in the daily activities of reading Scripture and speaking with other monks. The Spirit guarantees truth in Scripture, both when it was inspired and when the Church hands on interpretations of Scripture, and thus, is the guide for reading Scripture. This is the same role for the Spirit Cassian uses in his discussion of the Incarnation and in his discussions of monastic life, suggesting more than a superficial link between the theology presented in his *Institutes*, *Conferences*, and *On the Incarnation*. The same Spirit who assures Christological orthodoxy and interpretation of Scripture enables us to behold and participate in the salvific mysteries of Christ. The gifts of the Holy Spirit, "namely the beauty of faith and holiness," are given that we "may... behold the great and life-giving mystery of [Christ's] Incarnation."⁶⁰ Christian asceticism "is nothing else than a manifestation of the cross and of a dying."⁶¹ Such a manifestation of Christ in the life of the monk requires the Spirit, because the Spirit also serves as guide to the monk in his pursuit of virtue.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IS THE FORMER OF ASCETIC VIRTUE

For Cassian, asceticism brings about a radical transformation of the monk's life. This transformation shows up in the external actions of the monk and in the internal

⁶⁰ Cassian, *De incarn.* 7.1.5 (CSEL 17.353; NPNF 2.11.604).

⁶¹ Cassian, *Inst.* 4.34 (CSEL 17.72; ACW 58.97). Cassian refers to the ascetic as one who renounces this world at *Inst.* 4.1, and the theme permeates this *Institute*.

motivations of the monk, his thoughts and desires. It requires God's assistance, and in particular, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Cassian is not novel in claiming that the Spirit plays a role in monastic life.⁶² Rather, his distinction lies in his firm commitment that the work of the Holy Spirit is the work of God.⁶³ In his teaching that the Holy Spirit is the former of virtues in the monk, Cassian reorients the previous traditions with which he was familiar. His ascetic pneumatology brings the monastic tradition in conformity with his belief in the full divinity of the Spirit under his theme of the Spirit as *index*. This is part of Cassian's identification with what he took to be the settled Catholic doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, but it is also a reason that his pneumatology is ascetic. The work of the Holy Spirit, according to Cassian, is the work of Christian asceticism. As we have already seen, the Spirit is the lynch-pin in the traditional ascetic practice of reading and meditating on Scripture; as I argue here, the Spirit is also the foundation of ascetic virtue.

Cassian has two ways of indicating the Spirit's role in virtue. According to one explanation, the Holy Spirit is the condition for living virtuously. A monk can only approach ascesis through the grace of the Spirit. According to another explanation, the Holy Spirit is the reward for having achieved some degree of proficiency in ascesis. The reward for virtue is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Taken together, the two explanations seem to introduce a fundamental problem in Cassian's theology: either the Spirit precedes virtue or is the crown of virtue. Cassian thinks that both are the case.

⁶² E.g. the desert literature relates many examples of holiness that involve the Spirit: *AP* Anthony the Great, 30; Aresnius, 42; an Abba of Rome (Arsenius?), 1; & Zacharias, 2. Cf. *First Sahidic Life of Pachomius*, frag. 1.3; *Tenth Sahidic Life of Pachomius*, frag 2.2.

⁶³ E.g. the desert literature mentioned directly above speaks of angels in the same role as the Spirit: *AP* Poemen, 60; Anthony the Great, 30; Aresnius, 42; an Abba of Rome (Arsenius?), 1; and Zacharias, 2; Palladius, *Dial. vit. Chrys.* 8.

When we consider that a monk grows in virtue by deepening his familiarity with the Spirit, we understand that Cassian's is not a system devoted to the dichotomy of before and after, but a system premised on the work of the Spirit throughout. The virtuous life is a way of existence delineated by the Holy Spirit.

Cassian follows an extensively developed tradition of correlating vices to particular virtues. For Cassian, virtues are the remedies to particular vices. In his analysis of the vices, Cassian follows Evagrius. They have a scheme of eight principle vices with associated virtues:

These are, first, gluttony, which is understood as the desire to gormandize; second, fornication; third, filargyria, which means avarice or, better expressed, the love of money; fourth anger; fifth, sadness; sixth, acedia, which is anxiety or weariness of heart; seventh, cenodoxia, which means vain or empty glory; eighth, pride.⁶⁴

Looking farther ahead, we should note that Gregory the Great revised Cassian's list of eight vices into what we know today as "the seven deadly sins." Gregory follows Cassian not only in the basics of the list of sins, but also in the pneumatological element of their remedies.⁶⁵ The importance of the Holy Spirit as the former of virtues is thus a difference between Cassian and his sources (i.e. Evagrius and the desert literature in general) and a notable similarity with his followers (i.e. Gregory). The vices prevent the ascetic from being perfectly permeated by the Holy Spirit. Successfully fighting against the vices

⁶⁴ Cassian, *Inst.* 5.1.1 (CSEL 17.81; ACW 58.117). See D. Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk*, 48-77; I. Hausheer, "L'Origine des huit pechés," 164-175; C. Stewart, "Evagrius Ponticus and the Eight Generic Logismoi," 3-34; C. Stewart, "Cassian's schema," 48-77.

⁶⁵ Gregory reduced the number to seven by amalgamating vainglory and pride, amalgamating melancholy and accidie, adding envy, and then re-focusing the list on pride. He also pushed the two carnal sins to the end of the list. See my discussion in chapter 7, beginning on p. 158.

brings the ascetic into a closer relationship with the Spirit. Cassian teaches, for example, that the monk who sets out to combat gluttony and overcome anger will come to contemplation, which is given by the Holy Spirit.⁶⁶ Anger retained in one's heart shields the radiance of the Holy Spirit.⁶⁷ Vainglory prevents insight into spiritual matters, which comes about through familiarity with the Spirit.⁶⁸ Vice destroys the relationship between the Spirit and the ascetic which virtue fosters. As Cassian teaches, "the willing and the running of no one, however fervent and desirous he might be, could be sufficient for one who is girded with a flesh that resists the Spirit."⁶⁹

The virtues are connected in many ways, but they are all aimed at allowing the Holy Spirit to dwell within the monk.

Hence, if we wish the summit of our edifice to rise up perfect and pleasing to God, we must strive to lay its foundations not in keeping with our own willful desires but in keeping with strict gospel teaching. These cannot be other than the fear of God and humility, which originates in gentleness and simplicity of heart. Humility, though, can never be acquired without poverty. When this is absent, neither the good of obedience nor the strength of patience nor the tranquility of gentleness nor the perfection of love can be laid hold of, and without these our heart will never be able to be the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit, as the Lord declares by way of the prophet: 'Upon whom shall my Spirit rest except upon the one who is peaceful and humble and trembles at my word?' or, according

⁶⁶ For gluttony, see *Inst.* 5.34.1; for anger, *Inst.* 8.18.1.

⁶⁷ Cassian, *Inst.* 8.12.1. Cf. Evagrius Ponticus, *O. Sp.* 10 [4.11-4.12].

⁶⁸ Cassian, *Inst.* 11.18. Cf. *Apoph.* Ephrem, 2, on the Spirit's role in developing insight.

⁶⁹ Cassian, *Inst.* 12.10 (CSEL 17.212; ACW 58.259). Here, I make a slight modification to Ramsey's translation: I have capitalized "Spirit," because it refers to the Holy Spirit as well as the human spirit, as with *Inst.* 1.11.3. See my note 74 in this chapter.

to the copies that express the Hebrew truth: ‘To whom shall I look except to the one who is poor and contrite of spirit and trembles at my words?’⁷⁰

Cassian not only makes the indwelling of the Holy Spirit the goal of ascetic endeavor, but he also adds a personal, experiential dimension to his theology. Obedience, patience, gentleness, and the perfection of love are not simply names for virtues; they are ways of life that are essentially responses to other monks. The novice monk cultivates obedience to his elders. All monks must be patient with each other. Elder monks must be gentle with the less experienced. In my next chapter, I explore this experiential element of Cassian’s theology in more depth and argue that Cassian’s theology synthesizes heart-centered and intellect-centered understandings of asceticism. Here, we see that when Cassian describes a chain of virtues which are focused on actions towards others, he teaches that this entire way of life develops the heart as the dwelling place for the Holy Spirit. We are not yet to the prayerful ecstatic experiences in the fire of the Holy Spirit which Cassian describes, but we can already see the foundations of this teaching. In Cassian’s ascetic pneumatology, the Holy Spirit is present throughout the life of the monk, and that begins with the monk’s renunciation of vice and pursuit of virtue. This is especially clear in his teaching on chastity.

⁷⁰ Cassian, *Inst.* 12.31 (CSEL 17.229; ACW 58.272). At *Inst.* 12.13, Cassian claims that this teaching is held on the authority of the Holy Spirit. Ramsey notes that the first citation of Is 66:2 is from an older Latin translation of the LXX, while the second quotes Jerome’s version, the Vulgate. *Hebraicam veritatem* is a phrase dear to Jerome: *Ep.* 48.19, 57.7, 82.8, 112.20, 122.2. Cf. *Coll.* 23.8.2, where Cassian also seems to know Jerome’s translation. Oddly enough, the verse Cassian cites “according to the Hebrew truth” is slightly different from what the Vulgate reads. Cassian has *ad quem autem respiciam nisi ad pauperculum et contritum spiritu et trementem verba mea*; whereas the Vulgate ends the clause with *sermones meos*. Augustine, *Spec.* 19 (CSEL 12.94.16), follows the Vulgate. Ambrose, *Exam.* 6.8.49 (CSEL 32.240), 6.10.75 (CSEL 32.261), follow the reading Cassian offers. Cassian, *Inst.* 9.3, also notes the importance of preparing oneself to be a temple of God where the Spirit can dwell. Connecting this verse to becoming the dwelling for God dates at least to Origen, *Comm. Cant.* 2.8.38-39. For the connection between the Spirit and fear of God, see *AP*, Poemen, 136; John the Dwarf, 10. Cf. *Coll.* 21.33.1 on reformation of desire. For further parallels, see the discussion below, p. 35.

Chastity holds pride of place as a *sine qua non* for spiritual advancement. As one of the principle virtues, chastity is a sure indication of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

[Paul] refers to it again as holiness and says: ‘God has not called us to shamefulfulness but to holiness. And so the one who spurns this spurns not man but God, who has also given us his Holy Spirit’ [1 Thes 4:7-8]. He joins an inviolable authority to this precept of his when he says: ‘The one who spurns this’ (that is, what I said about holiness) ‘spurns not man’ (meaning me who command this) ‘but God, who speaks in me,’ [2 Cor 13:3] who has also designated our heart as a dwelling for his Holy Spirit. You see with what simple and pure words and with what great commendations and praises he extols it. First he attributes sanctification to this virtue in particular... finally he points out that in this way the Holy Spirit will dwell in our heart, which is the highest and perfect reward and the recompense of blessedness.⁷¹

Here, Cassian presents the indwelling of the Spirit as a reward for chastity, but he also speaks of the indwelling Spirit as a cause of chastity. The lack of self-control, especially with regard to sexuality, wrapped into the fallen human condition, is the cause for much embarrassment for Cassian as for Augustine.⁷² Sin removes areas of man’s own self from

⁷¹ Cassian, *Inst.* 6.15.2 (CSEL 17.124; ACW 58.160). Ramsey (ACW) and Petschenig (CSEL) also see a reference to Eph 2:22 in this passage. On the importance of chastity for Cassian, see A.M. Casiday, "Apatheia and Sexuality," 359-394; C. Stewart, *Cassian the Monk*, 62-84. This theological tenet (reliance upon God for practicing chastity) is important to bear in mind in light of the scholarship which has rightly called attention to the importance of the body and sexuality in Late Antiquity. Cassian is likely translating the verse from the LXX of 1 Thess. The Vulgate uses *inmunditia* and *sanctificatione* where Cassian has *ignominiam* and *sanctimoniam* (a difference in term and case). Augustine, *Spec.* 36 (CSEL 12.240.9); Didymus the Blind, *Spir.* (trans. Jerome) 222 (SC 386.344); Jerome, *Comm. Ephes.* 2 (PL 26.537.49), follow the Vulgate reading.

⁷² The embarrassment has not been limited to 5th century theologians. *Coll.* 22, on nocturnal illusions, proved too embarrassing for publication in NPNF 2.11, published in 1894 and reprinted in 1995. Cassian and Augustine run parallel in their analysis of sexuality as a locus for the fallen lack of self-control. In refuting Manichaean theology as represented by Julian of Eclanum and the rigorist position espoused by Jerome, Augustine argued that created nature, including sexuality and marriage, is good, but subject to the fallen condition. “The experience of sexuality – man’s and woman’s – now became Augustine’s model for the understanding of fallen human nature, and its typical instance.” (R.A. Markus, *The End of Ancient*

his control, but with the aid of God, we can reclaim some control over ourselves. This lack of self-control is nowhere more evident than in struggles with anger and sexuality.

It is thus that the furnace of our flesh, which the Babylonian king does not cease to heat up with the impulses of carnal suggestions, will be extinguished when the dew of the Holy Spirit descends into our hearts.⁷³

Again, the teaching seems contradictory if we try to imagine Cassian's understanding as an exclusive dichotomy: either the Spirit descends into an ascetic's heart to enable chastity, or once the ascetic has gained chastity, the Spirit comes as a reward. But the point of Cassian's ascetic pneumatology is that the Holy Spirit is the constant companion and source of renewal for the ascetic.

Those who achieve virtue live by the power of the Spirit. "Because once their flesh has been purged of vices from within, they can stretch the dead skin of the outer man in the power of the Spirit," those who have girded themselves with chastity will be able to freeze the movements of the outer man and even the impulses of nature to the extent that, according to the Apostle, they do not permit the reign of sin in their mortal bodies or carry about a flesh that resists the Spirit.⁷⁴

Christianity, 60.) Cf. Augustine, *civ. Dei* 14.26; Augustine, *Conf.* 10.30.41-42. Cassian also uses the experience of sexuality as a key indicator of the degree to which the inner and outer lives have become one, integrated existence. See D. Brakke, "Problematization of nocturnal emissions," esp. 446-449. Cf. P. Brown, *Body and Society*, 420-423; C. Stewart, *Cassian the Monk*, 82-83.

⁷³ Cassian, *Inst.* 6.17 (CSEL 17.125; ACW 58.160). Ramsey notes the general allusion to Dn 3 and the parallel with *Inst.* 5.14.2. The Babylonian king is a relatively common reference in Patristic literature. The dew of the Holy Spirit (*ros sancti spiritus*) is a phrase peculiar to Cassian. Note that he also associates the dew with the Spirit at *Inst.* 5.14.2.

⁷⁴ Cassian, *Inst.* 1.11.3 (CSEL 17.16; ACW 58.27). The phrase *spiritus virtute* (CSEL 17.16.8) indicates that Cassian means the Holy Spirit, and not simply the human spirit, as at *Inst.* 12.13. This allows the interpretation of *spiritui* at In 30 as Holy Spirit. Ramsey, then, has correctly capitalized "Spirit" in his translation. Guy does not offer the same reading, using "l'esprit" at both lines in *Inst.* 1, though he does translate "la vertu de l'Esprit" at *Inst.* 12.13. (SC 109.53, 55, 467) Sadly, the text provided in PL ends with chapter 9, which is numbered 10 in PL, so we do not have the commentary of Gazaenus. The reference is

The radical transformation effected by Christian monasticism involves the Spirit dwelling within, restoring harmony between body and spirit. The Spirit is, as Cassian's ascetic pneumatology teaches, the former of virtue. This much was fairly standard for the tradition Cassian inherited. When it comes to explaining the details of the inner life, however, Cassian does more than add a Catholic doctrine of the Holy Spirit to older theologies; he formulates a new synthesis of ascetic theologies in which the Holy Spirit is the divine agent who reforms human thoughts and desires.

clear at *Coll.* 7.26, where health is bestowed to Abba Paul *spiritus sancti virtute*. Cassian does use the phrase *virtus animi* to refer to the virtues/powers of the human soul (e.g. *Coll.* 6.3, 6.17, & 20.7). Cassian also uses the phrase *virtute altissima* to refer to the work of the Holy Spirit in Mary's conception of the Incarnation (e.g. *De incarn.* 2.6, 3.16, & 7.17; *Coll.* 5.5). It is noteworthy that Cassian uses the same phrase to discuss the grace and virtue by which a monk may conquer vices: "In fact it is a greater virtue and a sublimer grace to extinguish the inner lust of the flesh than by a miracle of the Lord and by the power of the Most High (*virtutis altissimae*) to subdue the wicked attacks of the demons and to expel them from the bodies of the possessed by invoking the divine name." (*Coll.* 15.10 (CSEL 13.436; ACW 544-545)).

II. CASSIAN'S ASCETIC SYNTHESIS: THE SPIRIT IN LOVE AND CONTEMPLATION

When Gregory became pope in 590, he remained a monk at heart. He proved to be a gifted preacher, and he brought his ascetic spirituality to his congregation in Rome. Preaching on Ezekiel, the Spirit-charged prophet *par excellence*, Gregory captivated his audience with his ascetic pneumatology:

And the living creatures ran and returned like flashes of lightning [Ez. 1:14] – “Running” and “returning” distinguish the two ways of life: the active and contemplative... The living creatures ran and *then* returned because holy men do not run headlong from the active life to acts of injustice, rather they go from the active life to the contemplative, and *then* return to the active. They go in order to learn what they desire; they return in order to know where they are presently.¹

Like so many of the ascetics before him, Gregory understands that the glimpses of God we gain in this life, our moments of contemplation, are bound up with our desires. Gregory, like Cassian, wants his hearers to become to become “all flame,” to become “flashes of lightning,” to be Christians whose lives shine with divine brilliance in their thoughts and desires. He follows Cassian in teaching that this happens through the work of the Holy Spirit within the ascetic.

Gregory stands at the end of a long tradition. Cassian stands at the beginning, at least for Gregory's sources. For Cassian, as with so many other Christian theologians, contemplation is *the* end of human rationality, but it is also the *the* end of human desire. Cassian struggles with how best to understand the nature of human desire and thought

¹ Cf. Gregory, *Hom. Ez.* 1.5.12 (SC 327.186-188; my trans.).

and how desire and thought can be reordered so that fiery contemplation may become a regular part of human life. Both Cassian and Gregory taught not only that Christians should adopt certain practices that reorder desires and focus thoughts, but also that contemplative experience itself gives a new shape to desire. Furthermore, they teach that the Holy Spirit is the divine agent who reorders human thoughts and desires. Gregory relies on Cassian for this understanding of human interiority. Cassian, in turn, relies on earlier ascetic traditions. Cassian not only critiques and synthesizes previous models of philosophical anthropology adopted by other ascetic theologians, but he is the first Nicene Catholic to articulate a role for the Holy Spirit as the reformer of thoughts and desires and the giver of ecstatic contemplation.

Cassian's first *Conference* is an extended presentation of how to weave an intellect-centered asceticism with a heart-centered asceticism. His explanation of purity of heart in terms of love and contemplation marks a special achievement in ascetic theology. In this chapter, I argue that Cassian assigns a particular role to the Holy Spirit in both love and contemplation based on his understanding of the inner life of an ascetic. His anthropology shapes his pneumatology. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit reforms not only the monk's thoughts, but also his desires. These are the fourth and fifth elements of Cassian's ascetic pneumatology, as I outline it. Reformation of desire allows the monk to cling to God in love (the height of emotional and willful clinging) and contemplation (the height of intellectual clinging), the sixth and final aspect of Cassian's ascetic pneumatology. The indwelling Spirit replaces base desires with heavenly desires and is the mark of genuine Christian joy. In his thoughts, the monk experiences God by the illumination of the Holy Spirit. Thus, *affectus*, *desiderium*, and *cogitatio* (emotion, desire, and thought) are the

primary places of encounter with the Holy Spirit in Cassian's theology. Chapter 1 showed how Cassian's ascetic pneumatology argues from the position of a 5th century Nicene Catholic. Cassian teaches that the Holy Spirit is present in every aspect of Christian asceticism, especially in reading and understanding Scripture, learning from the tradition, and in the virtuous life. His teaching remains the same for the more advanced ascetic: the Holy Spirit reforms the inner life of the ascetic. When we analyze Cassian's system, we see that his ascetic pneumatology was shaped by his philosophical anthropology. Cassian applies the basic belief that the Holy Spirit is the agent of reform to his understanding of human interiority, which he articulates in terms of thoughts and desires. As we will see in later chapters, other theologians applied the same belief that the Spirit is the agent of reform to different anthropological models.

LOVE AND THOUGHTS: PURITY OF HEART

Because Cassian traveled so widely, he learned things from diverse schools throughout the Roman Empire. Much recent scholarship has focused on Cassian's use of material from Origen and Evagrius, especially following Salvatore Marsili's analysis from 1936.² Cassian adopts and adapts Evagrius' theology, as we already saw with the eight principal vices. In addition to furthering the arguments that Cassian carefully used Evagrius' theology, Columba Stewart has also called attention to the parallels between Cassian and Syrian sources represented by Ps-Macarius.³ Macarius was a well-known desert father, and a body of literature grew up around his name.⁴ Some of those texts

² S. Marsili, *Giovanni Cassiano*.

³ C. Stewart, *Cassian the Monk*, 114-130. See my discussion below, beginning p. 51.

⁴ On Ps-Macarius, see A. Golitzin, "Temple and throne of the divine glory; W.W. Jaeger, *Two Rediscovered Works*; A. Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition*, 113-125; G.A. Maloney,

have been highlighted by modern scholars as representative of the Syrian school; they present a heart-centered focus on human existence which stands in some distinction to Evagrius' intellect-centered anthropology. At the same time that Marsili argued for Cassian's dependence on Evagrius, he also called attention to the way Cassian weaves love and contemplation together in his analysis of ascetic endeavors, separating Cassian from Evagrius. Cassian is distinct from both schools because he combines and synthesizes them. Because both schools come together in Cassian's understanding of purity of heart, Cassian creates a new context in which to develop his understanding of the Holy Spirit. Here, I argue that Cassian synthesizes other ascetic traditions by explaining purity of heart as both *caritas-amor* and *theoria-contemplatio*. As he synthesizes previous traditions, he uses the Spirit in the role of guarantor or *index* of genuine Christianity, a characteristic theme we saw in the previous chapter. Cassian teaches that the Holy Spirit reforms both human desire and thought, leading to purity of heart. Purity of heart culminates in ecstatic contemplation. That is, Cassian teaches that the Holy Spirit guides us into an ecstasy of mind which is repeatedly described as "fiery prayer."

Cassian's first and second *Conferences* recount the initial meetings he and Germanus had with Abba Moses, who was renowned for his virtue in both practical and contemplative matters. Because the *Conferences* are written as dramatic events between younger monks and venerable elders, we should be as attentive to the "staging" of the discussions as to the theological principles stated directly in them. The *Conferences* are not simply treatises with transparent arguments, but narratives that present certain issues

The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter; C. Stewart, *Working the Earth of the Heart*, 70-240. The homilies are collected in SC 275 and partially translated in CWS.

and Cassian's strategies for resolving them. In the first *Conference*, Cassian sets out many of the important terms which he later explains in more detail in other *Conferences*. His introduction to Abba Moses signals that Cassian intends to offer a complete and balanced account of monasticism, for Moses is hailed as master of both practical and theoretical aspects of asceticism. In order to make sense of monastic life and to order the various practices associated with asceticism, Cassian distinguishes the final goal (Grk. *telos*, Lat. *finis*) from the immediate goal (Grk. *skopos*, Lat. *destinatio*).⁵ After an explanation of the difference between the two, Abba Moses demands of Germanus and Cassian, "what is your goal and what is your end?" to which they respond "the kingdom of heaven."⁶ Moses approves and then notes that they should learn the *skopos* to which they must cling (*inhaerere*) in order to arrive at their goal. This *skopos* will be the goal of their souls and the constant intention of their minds (*animae destinatio sive inaccessibilis mentis intentio*) which will demand their *studium* (commitment or zeal) and perseverance.⁷ Cassian narrates the conversation:

As we listened in amazement, the old man continued: 'The end of our profession, as we have said, is the kingdom of God or the kingdom of heaven; but the goal or scopos is purity of heart, without which it is impossible for anyone to reach that end.'⁸

⁵ Cassian has a great command of both Latin and Greek. Though his texts were written in Latin, he often makes reference to important Greek terms in the original language both in Greek characters and transliterated forms. Here, he notes the Greek of Phil. 3:13-14, which uses the term *skopos*. For a survey of his use of Greek terms, see C. Stewart, "From logos to verbum," 5-31. For a reading of this schema in pedagogical practice, see L. Pristas, "Unity of composition," 438-443. *Inst.* 5, on gluttony, has a discernable doctrinal and structural unity that follows Cassian's monastic schema of subordinating all other virtues to charity. This argument responds to and corrects Chadwick's argument that this book suffered from early tampering in the manuscript tradition. (O. Chadwick, *John Cassian*, 43.)

⁶ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.2.3-1.3 (CSEL 13.8-9).

⁷ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.4.1 (CSEL 13.9.12-17). I mark *studium* here because it is used regularly in Rufinus' translation of Origen's *De prin.* and becomes a common term in ascetic literature.

⁸ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.4.3 (CSEL 13.9-10; ACW 57.43).

Cassian casually identifies the two phrases, *kingdom of God* and *kingdom of heaven*, though earlier authors articulated a distinction between the two.⁹ For Cassian, both refer to eternal life.¹⁰ Collapsing speculative distinctions between the two Scriptural phrases, however, is only the beginning of the way he reshapes the previous ascetic tradition.

After establishing the broad division between *finis* and *skopos*, Cassian provides a series of distinctions that help explain the monastic *skopos*. Purity of heart is understood as love (*caritas* and *amor*) and as knowledge (*scientia*).¹¹ This is a key move in Cassian's argument because it allows him to treat both aspects of the inner life (thoughts and desires) together; for his ascetic pneumatology, it means that the same Spirit who reforms thoughts also reforms desires. Again, attention to the dramatic detail is instructive, for Cassian first references love, and then adds contemplation to the discussion of purity of heart. In order to make the initial connection between purity and love, Cassian provides a brief analysis of detachment from physical goods: one can give away vast wealth, but still retain *affectus* (emotional attachment) for little things. Even this little attachment keeps

⁹ While Evagrius separated and subordinated the reign of Heaven to the reign of God, Cassian uses the terms synonymously. (e.g. cf. Evagrius Ponticus, *Ep. fid.* 7, and Cassian, *Coll.* 1.4.3, where they share the sense of the Kingdom as the *télos*, but Evagrius makes other distinctions) On this, see S. Marsili, *Giovanni Cassiano*, 106-108; C. Stewart, *Cassian the Monk*, 40-61, 98-99.

¹⁰ "Thus, indeed, the end of our chosen orientation is eternal life, according to the very words of the Apostle: 'Having your reward, indeed, in holiness, but your end in eternal life.' [Rom 6:22] But the *scopos* is purity of heart, which has not undeservedly been called holiness. Without this the aforesaid end will not be able to be seized. It is as if he had said in other words: Having your *scopos*, indeed, in purity of heart, but your end in eternal life." (Cassian, *Coll.* 1.5.2 (ACW 57.44).) Further in the same passage, Cassian finds scriptural warrant for his use of the term *scopos* in Phil 3:13-14.

¹¹ S. Marsili, *Giovanni Cassiano*, clearly understands these two aspects as key to Cassian. For love and purity of heart, see esp. his 15-16ff. Marsili's basic argument begins by noting the severe problem that arises if we identify *praktikê* with charity and make these a level below *theorêtikê*, understood as contemplation of God. He then discusses how both charity and contemplation extend from the practical to the eschatological. I agree with both of these points, but instead of setting the problem in a kind of dialectical mode that drives an entire book, I argue directly from Cassian's text that he understands love and contemplation as intimately related and equally helpful methods of explaining asceticism.

us from the fullness of Christ's love. Paul is said to have understood this "in the Spirit," and so, taught that "if I gave all my goods to feed the poor and handed my body over to be burned, but I did not have love, it would profit me nothing."¹² Actions performed without love are not the actions of one who is pure in heart. Thus, all the zeal, perseverance, and dedication that are required to perform fasts, vigils, readings, and virtue in general (the work of attaining purity of heart) aim at love, "so that by taking these steps we may be able to ascend to the perfection of love."¹³ In this way, Cassian is able to separate primary from secondary goods. The secondary goods, like fasting, vigils, reading Scripture, and solitude, are only the means to the end of love, which we have seen are explained by appeal to the Holy Spirit.¹⁴ Things like fasting and vigils are tools to be used when appropriate.

The language of *puritas cordis*, *amor*, and *inhaerere* (purity of heart, love, and clinging) blends with the language of *mentis intentio* and *animae destinatio* (mind's intention and soul's destination) in interesting ways. The connection between heart, mind, and soul is common in Cassian, but in this first *Conference*, it allows him to move from purity of heart as love to the heart's intention to the mind's purity to the heart's destination (*intentio cordis*, *mentis puritas*, *destinatio cordis*), so that he can speak of the

¹² Cassian, *Coll.* 1.6.2 (CSEL 13.2), citing 1 Cor. 13:3.

¹³ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.7.1 (CSEL 13.13; ACW 57.45). Cf. *Inst.* 4.43 and the comments of B. Guevin, "Beginning and end of purity of heart," 209-210.

¹⁴ Cassian repeats this basic principle when providing a teaching on the appropriate attitude toward signs and miracles. "It is clearly evident that the whole of perfection and blessedness consists not in the working of those wonders but in the purity of love. Rightly so. For all those things are going to be abolished and destroyed, but love will remain forever." (*Coll.* 15.2.3; ACW 538-539) J. Raasch, "Monastic concept IV," 274, rightly understands the principle at play here, but wrongly notes that Cassian subordinated the secondary goods to contemplation (alone). Rather, Cassian subordinates secondary goods to love and contemplation. D. Burton-Christie, *The Word in the Desert*, 261-295, has argued that there is a strong desert tradition which subordinates these practices to the commandment to love. Significantly, one of the first passages he considers in detail is AP Cassian, 1.

mind clinging to God in the same way that a lover clings to the beloved.¹⁵ This gives him the vocabulary to introduce the well-rehearsed story of Martha and Mary (Lk 10:40ff) because Mary clings (*inhaerere*) to Jesus' feet in contemplation.¹⁶ Cassian's linguistic gymnastics show that he understands this contemplation as a matter of both the mind and heart, both thoughts and desires. The ease with which Cassian alternates between love and contemplation in this discussion demonstrates the way Cassian sees the perfection of each in the other.

Because Mary's part will not be taken from her, that is, contemplation will last eternally, a chasm seems to open between those who achieve salvation through contemplation, and those who do good works but do not experience God in contemplation. Germanus raises the obvious problem with this notion by citing Jesus'

¹⁵ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.7.2-1.8.1 (CSEL 13.13-14). Marsili admits a sense of contemplation that occurs within the present life of the monk, and so revises in general his earlier statement of the problem in *Giovanni Cassiano*. However, recounting his first discussion of the matter is illustrative of the trap into which many fall when reading Cassian through the lens of Evagrius. Marsili identifies love with purity of heart as the skopos and then identifies contemplation with the telos so that love is the way to contemplation. This is Evagrius' position on the matter, but not Cassian's. Thus, Marsili reads the action of *mens inhaereat* as *contemplatio*, which would be natural if we separate *cordis* from *mens* and *inhaere* from *amore*. (See his page 40, citing *Coll.* 1.8.1, where he supplies τέλος and *contemplazione* as a gloss, though it is not in Cassian's text). Marsili then has to explain the two senses of contemplation, one of which can be had in this life and one of which can only be had in the life to come. Once it is admitted that Cassian uses contemplation with various senses, the distinction upon which love and contemplation are separated is dissolved, and Marsili is able to state the position as I have above: Cassian understands love and contemplation as equally valid modes of explaining Christian asceticism.

¹⁶ The use of Martha and Mary to speak about the active (*praktikê*) and contemplative (*theorêtikê*) aspects of Christian life finds Christian roots in Origen. E.g. Origen, in *Jn.* frag. 80 (GCS 4.547-548); Origen, in *Lk.* frag. 171 (GCS 9.298). Scripture scholars have seen four variants of this verse. Gordon Fee argues that the traditional four can be reduced to two, of which he prefers Cassian's reading. (G.D. Fee, "One thing is needful"? Luke 10:42," 61-75.) Fee notes the Old Latin Codex Mulling; Origen, in *Lk. Frag.* (GCS 9.298); Basil, *Reg. mor.* 38.1 (PG 31.760.3); Basil, *Reg. fus. tract.* 20.3 (PG 31.973.24); and Jerome *Ep.* 22.24 (*ad Eustoch.*) as direct parallels. Chrysostom, Evagrius, Ps-Macarius, Augustine, and several old Latin versions have a different reading, which omits the few things which are necessary. Cassian has slight variations, all of which include the "few things are necessary, or even one:" Martha Martha sollicita es et turbaris erga plurima paucis vero opus est aut etiam uno (*Coll.* 1.7.2 (CSEL 13.15.7-8)); erga multa paucis vero (*Coll.* 1.7.2 (CSEL 13.15.14-15)); circa multa paucis vero (*Coll.* 23.3.1 (CSEL 13.642.9)). The variations in the prepositional phrase might indicate that Cassian was citing the verse from memory, in which case, he was most likely dealing with the same version of the text that Basil had. Both use a phrasal verb that takes an oblique case (paucis opus est, ὀλίγων ἔστιν χρεία), unlike Jerome, *Ep.* 22.24: circa plurima pauca autem necessaria sunt aut unum. (CSEL 54.178.1)

promise of the Kingdom of Heaven as a reward for those who serve the poor.¹⁷ It seems that those who are active achieve the same reward as those who are contemplative. Abba Moses responds with a helpful distinction: the reward of serving remains, while the actions of serving will pass. All the “works of piety and mercy are necessary in this age, as long as inequity continues to dominate.”¹⁸ Still, in the perfected order to come, only love and contemplation remain:

But this will cease in the world to come, where equity will rule and when there will no longer exist the inequity that made these things obligatory. Then everyone will pass over from this multiform or practical activity to the love of God and contemplation of divine things in perpetual purity of heart.¹⁹

The transition outlined previously, from the pair *animae destinatio* and *mentis intentio* through purity of heart to purity of mind and the goal of the heart, has come to completion in Cassian’s description of the world to come. We are going *ad caritatem dei et divinarum rerum contemplationem perpetua cordis puritate* (to the love of God... in purity of heart). Underneath this sense of motion lies a theological principle that bears explicit mention: love and contemplation are already regular aspects of Christian existence; in this life they are impermanent, while in the life to come they will be permanent.

In reference to the issue of why certain good activities will pass away, Abba Moses pushes Germanus to consider the matter more deeply:

¹⁷ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.9.

¹⁸ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.10.4 (CSEL 13.17; ACW 57.49).

¹⁹ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.10.5 (CSEL 13.17; ACW 57.49). I have corrected the ACW translation to include the phrase *ad caritatem dei* (CSEL 13.17.28), which was otherwise missing. The connection between love and contemplation is essential to understanding Cassian’s interaction with Origen and Evagrius.

And why should you be surprised if those duties that were previously mentioned will pass away, when the holy Apostle can describe the still more sublime charisms of the Holy Spirit as transitory but indicates that love alone will abide without end? ‘Whether there are prophecies,’ he says, ‘they shall come to naught; or tongues, they shall cease; or knowledge, it shall be destroyed... but love never disappears.’ [1 Cor 13:8]²⁰

Cassian does not make the charisms of the Spirit a central aspect of his theology in the way Gregory does.²¹ Nevertheless, no slight to the Spirit is indicated by teaching that these charisms are transitory, for love, too, is a gift of the Spirit. Moreover, Cassian shows that Germanus understands the connection between love and contemplation very well. In response to Moses’ discussion of *love*, Germanus asks if anyone can remain fixed on *theoria*. If one were following the themes as though they were separate, there would appear to be something missing, for there was no middle term between love and contemplation. Moses speaks of the permanence of *love*, even after knowledge is destroyed, while Germanus asks if it is possible for *theoria* to remain permanent. Moses’ response further establishes the intricate connection between love and contemplation: It is impossible to remain inseparably united to God while enclosed in perishable flesh, but Germanus and Cassian should recall their *mentis intentio* and *animae destinatio* in order to understand the ascetic life.²² Christian ascetics are headed where only the Spirit can lead.

²⁰ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.11.1 (CSEL 13.18; ACW 57.50). It is illustrative to note that Cassian has room in this description of monastic life to subordinate these gifts of the Holy Spirit to something else (e.g. the Kingdom of God or love). He placed the charisms of the Holy Spirit, which we experience as part of daily life, below the love which lasts into eternity.

²¹ See my discussion, beginning p. 161.

²² Cassian, *Coll.* 1.11-1.13.1 (CSEL 13.18-19).

Cassian's restructuring of Christian ascesis is almost completely presented in his first *Conference*: ascesis begins with renunciation of vice and pursuit of virtue; through acquiring virtue, with the aid of the Holy Spirit, the monk approaches purity of heart; purity of heart is explained by adopting and adapting at least two divergent strains of thought – purity of heart involves both the intellect and the heart; the Holy Spirit reforms both. The final movement in Cassian's understanding of ascesis is the ecstatic contemplation brought about by the Holy Spirit. Cassian's teaching that Christian ascesis has a final end (Heaven) and a proximate goal (purity of heart) is not without precedent, nor is the explanation of purity of heart by appeal to contemplation or to love without precedent. His insistence that purity of heart involves both love and contemplation is, however, a new synthesis of previous ascetic traditions. He does not place contemplation after love (or vice versa), as though they were stages of development. Rather, he describes a kind of contemplation which is full of affect and desire, a kind of love which involves the complete commitment of the intellect. Because love and contemplation require the Holy Spirit, as separate aspects of purity of heart and in the combination of ecstatic contemplation, Cassian's ascetic synthesis is a pneumatology, an ascetic pneumatology. Love develops especially through virtue, which is fostered by the Spirit. Contemplation is inspired by divine illumination.²³ Both love and contemplation are manners of clinging to God in a way that is transitory now, but will be permanent in the eschatological fulfillment. Having seen Cassian's grand vision of Christian asceticism, we turn in detail to the remaining three points of his ascetic pneumatology: first, the Holy

²³ In addition to the arguments made above, Marsili's discussion is also relevant. He links contemplation to *oratio ignita* and notes that the Spirit works in the monk with *gemitibus inenarrabilibus*. (*Giovanni Cassiano*, 33-37).

Spirit as the reformer of affect and desire, then the Holy Spirit as reformer of thoughts, and finally, the Holy Spirit as giver of ecstatic contemplation.

AFFECTUS, DESIDERIUM, ET AMOR

Because temptations involve thoughts, passion, and desire, these four are never far from each other in ascetic literature. Still, discussion of desire is more naturally related to love than to contemplation. Where contemplation and love are separated, so also are desire and thought. For Cassian, however, the language of emotional attachment (*affectus*) and desire (*desiderare, cupere, and cognates*) is especially important for the related themes of purity, love, contemplation, and the Holy Spirit. Love and contemplation are not separated. The Spirit is the mark of the genuine and joyful presence of the Kingdom of God dwelling within the monk. Following Rom 14:17 (“The kingdom of God is not food and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit”), Cassian makes the Holy Spirit the point of distinction between the Kingdom which lasts forever, and all else. “The blessed Apostle does not declare in a general or vague way that any joy whatsoever is the kingdom of God, but pointedly and precisely that only what is in the Holy Spirit is such.”²⁴ The Holy Spirit provides the authentic *affective* mark of the Kingdom of God. This is to be expected within a pneumatology that understands the Spirit as the guarantor of Christian truth, a theme established in my previous chapter. In this section, I argue that Cassian teaches that the Holy Spirit is the reformer of desire and emotion. The Pauline verse offers three potential marks of the Kingdom, righteousness, peace, and joy. Cassian emphasizes joy, an *affectus*, as the

²⁴ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.13.6 (CSEL 13.20; ACW 57.52). Cf. *Coll.* 3.12.4 where Ps 94:19 is interpreted to mean that the highest joy is brought about by divine inspiration and contemplation.

distinguishing mark of Christianity.²⁵ The work of the Spirit affects human emotion and desire.

When oriented away from God, desire can bind the ascetic to the wrong things, but desire itself is not bad. In fact, desire is needed to enter the world of asceticism. Abba Moses “would never consent to open the portal of perfection except to those who faithfully desired it and who sought it in utter contrition of heart (*fideliter desiderantibus et cum omni cordis contritione quaerentibus*).”²⁶ It is not right for an Abba to teach one who is unwilling (*nolentibus*) or of tepid thirst to offer a word of instruction or consolation; rather, an Abba can properly disclose monastic teaching only to those who desire perfection (*perfectionem cupientibus*).²⁷ Even the tiniest *affectus* of the heart for material goods can prevent one from the fullness of Christ’s love.²⁸ More directly, God is grasped in

accordance with the character of our life and the purity of our heart. Certainly no one in whom there still dwells something of carnal desire (*in quo adhuc aliquid carnalium vivit affectuum*) will lay hold of these things eternally, because, as the Lord says: ‘You shall not be able to see my face, for no one shall see me and live’-namely, to this world and to earthly desires.²⁹

²⁵ Contemplation, both in this life and the next, is joyful and sweet. S. Marsili, *Giovanni Cassiano*, 31-32. The connection to Ps-Macarius, noted above, has been well rehearsed along the lines of the experience of contemplation in this life, though discussion of the eschatological fulfillment seems to separate the two. (C. Stewart, *Cassian the Monk*, 121-122.)

²⁶ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.1 (CSEL 13.7.24ff; ACW 57.41).

²⁷ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.1 (CSEL 13.7.27ff).

²⁸ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.6.2.

²⁹ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.15.3 (CSEL 13.26.2-6; ACW 57.56). The Scripture citation is Ex 33:20.

Earthly and *carnal* desires prevent contemplation, but desire itself is not contrary to spiritual progress. In fact, their ardor for cultivating “the earth of [their] heart with the gospel plow” allows Cassian and Germanus to learn that discretion which leads to contemplation.³⁰

As we listened in stupefaction to these things and were inflamed with an insatiable love by what he was saying, the old man looked at us and, having stopped speaking for a short while out of amazement at our desire, finally added: ‘My sons, your zeal has provoked us to a long discourse and, in proportion to your desire, a kind of fire is producing a warmer reception of our conference. From this very fact I can see that you are truly thirsty for the teaching of perfection, and I want to tell you a little more.’³¹

Cassian appeals to fire imagery, implying that the Spirit is active in both the abba who speaks and the monk who listens. Without mentioning the Spirit directly, Cassian hints that the Spirit’s embers heat the desire of speaker and hearer alike. Thus, at the beginning and end of his first *Conference*, Cassian outlines the importance of rightly ordered desires. In itself, the need for rightly ordered desires is not striking. Philosophical systems all the way back to Plato had articulated a need for desires to be rightly ordered, as with the classic image of the charioteer who uses rationality to steer his chariot by pitting one set of desires against another.³² Cassian’s presentation of the matter is striking because he teaches that the Holy Spirit is involved in reforming some desires and in replacing others with good desires.

³⁰ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.22.2 (CSEL 13.34).

³¹ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.23.1 (CSEL 13.35; ACW 57.63). Cassian discusses the pursuit of perfection in more detail at *Coll.* 11. Boniface Ramsey notes in his introduction to *Coll.* 11 that this evidences Cassian’s familiarity with the prologue of Basil of Caesarea, *reg. fus. tract.* (ACW 58.404)

³² Cf. Plato, *Phaedrus* 246ff.

In discussing how the Spirit replaces bad desires with good desires, Cassian explores the specific issues of sexuality and friendship. Sexuality lies at the center of many desires, and so Cassian's analysis of desire is particularly acute when he addresses chastity. He clearly teaches that some desires are replaced and others are reshaped so that we come to long for the right things.

Desires (*desideria*) for present things cannot be oppressed or plucked out unless salutary dispositions (*affectus*) have been introduced to replace the harmful ones that we want (*cupimus*) to cut off. In no way can the mind's vitality subsist without some feeling of desire (*absque affectione desiderii*) or fear, joy or sadness, which must be turned to good use. Therefore, if we want (*desideramus*) to cast carnal desires (*caruales concupiscentias*) from our hearts, we should at once plant spiritual pleasures (*spirituales voluptates*) in their place, so that our mind, always bound to them, might have the wherewithal to abide in them constantly and might spurn the allurements of present and temporal joys.³³

Just as Cassian and Germanus asked, "How?" so too do we ask, "How do we plant spiritual desires in place of carnal desires? How do we gain the proper affect? How do we

³³ Cassian, *Coll.* 12.5.3 (CSEL 13.340; ACW 58.439). A brief word should be said about *apatheia* here. It is very common to note that purity of heart in Cassian contains the content, though not the term, of the sophisticated understanding of *apatheia* that had developed in monastic literature. (See the summary of the scholarly consensus in W. Harmless, *Desert Christians*, 391 & n 72-73.) Far from being some kind of imposition of an alien concept, Mark Sheridan has argued that "the concept of *apatheia* had long been associated with purification and purity of heart...Cassian was not substituting a biblical term for a philosophical one. The equation of the two concepts was firmly established in the previous tradition, at least in Greek." (M. Sheridan, "The controversy over *apatheia*: Cassian's sources and his use of them," 305-306.) Sheridan cites Ambrose as a close parallel to Cassian in their knowledge of Greek, but exclusion of the term *apatheia*. It should be clear that whatever sense of *apatheia* Cassian retains without actually using the term, it most certainly does not involve lack of desire and affect, but rather their appropriate ordering through asceticism and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. See also, A.M. Casiday, "Apatheia and Sexuality," 359-394; J. Driscoll, "Apatheia and purity of heart in Evagrius Ponticus," 141-159.

cast off the dominion of sin?" Cassian teaches that the love which is poured out by the Holy Spirit does this.

Whoever, then, mounts to this summit of gospel perfection is, by reason of his great virtuousness, raised far above the whole of the law... Sin, then, has no dominion over him, 'because the love of God that has been poured out in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, who has been given to us,' [Rom 5:5] excludes every disposition (*adfectum*) of any other kind. Nor can he desire (*concupiscere*) forbidden things or disdain things that are commanded, since all his concentration and all his longing (*desiderium*) are constantly fixed upon the divine love, and to such a degree does he not take delight in base things that he does not even make use of those things that have been conceded him.³⁴

The indwelling Spirit reorients and displaces perverted desires so that the monk can be devoted to God's love. Christian asceticism is a training which reforms desires under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Cassian offers the same analysis of human thought: asceticism is a training which reforms our minds under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, as I show below. Moreover, his analysis of desire, emotion, and love is not limited to his analysis of the zeal monks have for purity which is expressed in chastity.

Cassian's understanding of friendship, *affectus*, and desire is also part of his understanding of love and is also explained by appeal to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Rightly ordered love includes rightly ordered *affectus*. The most explicit teaching Cassian offers on this is framed within a discussion of the beautiful friendship he shared with Germanus. Abba Joseph understood the spiritual brotherhood of Cassian and Germanus, and so, offered a detailed exposition of the fellowship of love (*dilectionis societas*) in one

³⁴ Cassian, *Coll.* 21.33.1 (CSEL 13.608; ACW 57.744). Cf. *Inst.* 5.34.1, 8.12.1, 12.31.

of their conferences.³⁵ The kind of friendship that is indestructible is rooted in the love which is based on similarity of virtue. Friends share unity in orientation, desire, and willing.³⁶ In parallel with his discussion in *Coll.* 1, Cassian offers an insight into harmony as part of ordering all monastic practices to the virtue of love:

in order to maintain an enduring and undivided love, it is of no value to have removed the first cause of dissension, which usually springs from vain and worldly things, to have despised everything carnal, and to have allowed our brothers complete access to everything that we need unless we have also cut off the second cause, which usually appears under the guise of spiritual thoughts, and in every respect acquired humble thoughts and harmonious wills.³⁷

Just as Cassian explained in the very first *Conference*, there is great need for careful discernment about one's intentions because we can be misled even in our innermost thoughts. For this reason, Cassian emphasizes the role of the community in helping to maintain appropriate perspective, citing Paul's meeting in Jerusalem in order to deliberate with other Christians about preaching to the Gentiles. The pinnacle of the teaching on love immediately follows the example of Paul.

the virtue of love is so greatly extolled that blessed John the apostle declares that it is not merely something belonging to God but is in fact God himself when he says: 'God is love. The one who abides in love abides in God and God in him.' [1 Jn 4:16. This allows Cassian to teach that] it is possible for this *caritas*, then, which is called ἀγάπη, to be

³⁵ Cassian, *Coll.* 16.1-2.

³⁶ Cassian, *Coll.* 16.3.1-4.

³⁷ Cassian, *Coll.* 16.9 (CSEL 13.446; ACW 57.562-563).

shown to all... But *διάθεσις*, or *adfectio*, is shown to very few, to those who are linked by a similarity of behavior and by the fellowship of virtue.³⁸

The virtuous retain affect for each other on Cassian's understanding. The love which can and must be shown to all need not involve affect, but love which does involve affect is not necessarily a lesser love. In fact, it is a greater love, as Jesus' love for John the evangelist demonstrates. Virtuous love is properly ordered so that the affective elements only attach to appropriate relationships.³⁹ Affect remains and helps us cling to what is truly lovable.

This discussion of the proper affect that belongs to the virtue of love contains important pneumatological elements. To return to the passage cited immediately above, where Cassian connects the statement *Deus caritas est* to an analysis of love as *agapé* and *diathesis*, we see that he also relies on the Holy Spirit. John recognizes that love

is in fact God himself when he says: 'God is love. The one who abides in love abides in God and God in him.' [1 Jn 4:16] To such an extent do we experience its divinity that we clearly see flourishing in us what the Apostle speaks of: 'The love of God has been poured out in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, who dwells in us.' [Rom 5:5] It is as if he were saying that God has been poured out in our hearts by the Holy Spirit who dwells in

³⁸ Cassian, *Coll.* 16.13-14 (CSEL 13.448-449; ACW 57.564-565). For a brief discussion of the Greek terms and potential parallels with Theodore of Cyrus, see S. Marsili, *Giovanni Cassiano*, 4-5. Cf. Evagrius Ponticus, *Prak.* 100: "It is not possible to love all the brothers equally, but it is possible to conduct our relationships with all without passion and free from resentment and hatred." (trans. Sinkewicz, 113) Cassian agrees with Evagrius that all relationships should be free from resentment and hatred. The extent to which Cassian's sense of proper *affect* in love is different from Evagrius' sense of love as *apatheis*, is best left to other discussions.

³⁹ The verse "set in order love in me" (Song 2:4) was commonly used to discuss the proper ordering of love. In his exegesis of Song 2:4 at *Coll.* 16.14.4, Cassian follows Origen, *Comm. Cant.* 3.7 (SC 376.547-565), as Ramsey notes. (Cf. Origen, *Hom. Cant.* 2.8.) Origen's basic argument is that love is disordered in most people, but the saints have properly ordered love. Cassian argues that holiness can include more or less affection for certain people as long as this does not result in hate for anyone.

us. He himself, even when we do not know what we ought to pray, ‘intercedes for us with unspeakable groans. But he who searches hearts knows what the Spirit desires, because he asks on behalf of the holy ones according to God.’ [Rom 8:26-27]⁴⁰

Loving genuinely, then, is a clear indication that the Holy Spirit dwells within us and that we are acting in a Godly way. Furthermore, this does not involve the excision of desire and affect, but their proper order. As we have seen, the love which is poured out by the Holy Spirit excludes all other affects.⁴¹ The indwelling Spirit reorients and displaces perverted desires so that the monk can be devoted to God’s love. Christian asceticism is training in the kind of love which reforms desires under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. This establishes a role for the Holy Spirit in purity of heart by arguing that the Spirit is needed to order desires and affect into genuine love. Cassian argues a similar point concerning asceticism and thought. Just as Cassian teaches that the Spirit is at work in the reformation of desires, so also he teaches that the Spirit is at work in the reformation of thoughts.

THE HOLY SPIRIT REFORMS THE ORIGINS OF HUMAN THOUGHTS

Humans are not simply a cluster of emotions and desires, but also intelligent and autonomous beings. Because thoughts are the primary locus of temptation and distraction, ascetic theorists analyzed them intensely. Cassian, as we have seen, follows Evagrius’ theology on thoughts and adds the agency of the Holy Spirit as a condition and reward for virtue. This enables deeper understanding of the mysteries of God in Scripture. Cassian offers a detailed mechanism for this process in his analysis of other

⁴⁰ Cassian, *Coll.* 16.13 (CSEL 13.448; ACW 57.564).

⁴¹ Cf. Cassian, *Coll.* 21.33.1; *Inst.* 5.34.1, 8.12.1, 12.31.

thoughts. Just as the Spirit works throughout the monk's struggle with vice, so also the Spirit works at both the beginning and end of human thoughts. Again, we can see the subtlety of Cassian's ascetic pneumatology. Earlier theorists (e.g. Origen and Evagrius) had appealed to angels in explaining good thoughts; Cassian, by contrast, emphasizes the role of the Holy Spirit in reforming human thought. Cassian argues that the Spirit is involved at the beginning of human thought, when we are faintly aware of something, and the end, when we contemplate God. In this section, I show how Cassian sets the foundation for the Spirit's involvement in contemplation (the final end of human thought) by articulating a role for the Spirit in the origin of human thoughts.

Germanus, Cassian's close friend and travel companion, poses the issue directly in a question to Abba Moses: why do "superfluous thoughts insinuate themselves into us so subtly and hiddenly when we do not even want them, and indeed do not even know of them?"⁴² It is difficult to understand how our thoughts work, and this leads Germanus to wonder whether we can ever avoid being distracted and tempted by superfluous thoughts. In response, Abba Moses teaches a standard Christian monastic position that has Stoic roots: "it is, indeed, impossible for the mind not to be troubled by thoughts, but accepting them or rejecting them is possible for everyone who makes an effort."⁴³ In order that the young monks might learn to discern which thoughts to accept and which to reject, Abba Moses teaches that there are three sources of thoughts: God, the devil, and ourselves. This, in itself, is a fairly traditional teaching that derives from Origen's treatment of the

⁴² Cassian, *Coll.* 1.16 (CSEL 13.26; ACW 57.56).

⁴³ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.17.1 (CSEL 13.26; ACW 57.56). Petschenig (CSEL) rightly notes the parallel with Evagrius Ponticus, *Mal. Cog.* 1 (PG 40.1272). On Cassian's Stoicism, see M.L. Colish, *Stoic Tradition*, 2.114-122.

matter in the early 3rd century. Cassian's contribution, I argue, is to emphasize and focus the role of the Holy Spirit in human thought.

There is a long tradition of describing inner struggle as one of two opposing forces. Either the Holy Spirit or an angel combat an evil spirit for possession of the monk's inner world, typically described as the heart, mind, or thoughts.⁴⁴ One of the clearest examples of this two-spirit understanding comes from the *Life of Pachomius*. Pachomius was hailed as one of the 4th century founders of organized Christian monasticism, though his role as founder is more accurately hagiographical than historical.⁴⁵ Upon seeing him, the demons say,

Since there is no place for us in him, undoubtedly it is because the Spirit of God will dwell in him; like a field purged of cockle, which the passers-by see and say, 'Such a field, purged of cockle, will be sown with good grain.' It is thus that there are two spirits in man, one from God and the other from the devil; and the spirit towards which a man inclines and which he adopts in his actions dwells within him.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ E.g. the *Const. Ap.* 6.5.27, opposes the spirit to the devil; *Vies Pach. Sah.* second life, 3, opposes angels and demons. The work of Juana Raasch outlines and highlights the two spirits tradition, though many errors in her often harsh delineation of Greek philosophy and biblical spirituality need to be corrected. J. Raasch, "Monastic Concept I," 7-33; J. Raasch, "Monastic Concept II," 183-213; J. Raasch, "Monastic concept III," 7-55; J. Raasch, "Monastic concept IV," 269-314; J. Raasch, "Monastic Concept V," 7-41. As I mention further below, Cassian follows Origen in outlining three (not two) sources of thoughts and more clearly separates the role of the Spirit from the role of angels. Guillaumont helpfully traces the Scriptural language and the Stoic relationship between heart and *hègèmonikon* without asserting an opposition between the "philosophical" and "scriptural." (*Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, s.v. "Cor et cordis affectus," 2281-2288.) Ps-Macarius emphasizes the reception of the Spirit in baptism, as does the later Syriac translation, *Didasc. ap. Syr.* 26. See S.P. Brock, *The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition*, 34-42; K. McDonnell, *The Baptism of Jesus in the Jordan*, 252-258; C. Stewart, *Working the Earth of the Heart*, 213-214.

⁴⁵ For discussion of Pachomius as a *pioneer* but not *founder*, see W. Harmless, *Desert Christians*, 115-150, 423-425. See also, W. Harmless, "Monasticism," 493-517; P. Rousseau, *Pachomius*.

⁴⁶ This passage is listed as "vies Coptes 43" in L.T. Lefort, *Les vies coptes*. The translation is from J. Raasch, "Monastic concept IV," 301. A. Veilleux (CS 45-47) does not translate it.

The status of the spirit which is from God and the spirit which is from the devil is ambiguous in this passage. We know that there were many people in the 4th century and later who thought the Holy Spirit was the highest angel. For example, St. Athanasius even records his arguments against the “Tropici,” who asserted that the Holy Spirit “is not only a creature, but actually one of the ministering spirits, and differs from the angels only in degree.”⁴⁷ The confusion about the Holy Spirit and angels is significant for Cassian’s pneumatology by way of contrast. The spirit and an angel are often interchangeable as agents in the ascetic literature from before Cassian’s time. Cassian, however, is certain that the Spirit is a divine person and not interchangeable with an angel. Though angels occur often in Cassian’s other stories, the Holy Spirit is the principal divine agent in the reformation of human thoughts and desires. That is, Cassian is clear that nothing less than a divine person is operative in the reformation of human thoughts. Christians do not choose between two *equal* spirits, one good and one evil. Nor do Christians even choose between *two* spirits for Cassian. That is, he separates himself from the earlier two-spirit theory by articulating three sources of thoughts. In this, he follows Origen’s analysis.

When we compare Cassian’s analysis of human thoughts to Origen’s, it is clear that Cassian depends on Origen’s account. Because there is such strong dependence, it is also clear that Cassian has reworked the material in light of his conviction that the Holy Spirit is fully divine. Thus, Cassian’s ascetic pneumatology articulates a role for God in the

⁴⁷ Athanasius, *Serap.* 1 (PG 26.529; Shapland, 58). The passage is repeated with brief discussion in J.P. Burns and G.M. Fagin, *The Holy Spirit*, 101. K. Anatolios, *Athanasius*, 212-233, introduces and provides a translation of the second half of this letter. On Athanasius’ theology of the Holy Spirit, see M. DelCogliano, A. Radde-Gallwitz, and L. Ayres, *Works on the Holy Spirit: Athanasius and Didymus*; R.P.C. Hanson, *Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 748-760; T.G. Weinandy, *Athanasius*, 103-120. See also, K. Anatolios, *Athanasius: the Coherence of his Thought*.

reformation of human thoughts. At *On First Principles* 3.2, Origen argues against those who had understood temptation on the model of two spirits (one good and one bad).

Instead, he responds that we have responsibility for our thoughts and actions. When he comes to name the role thoughts play in human actions, he teaches that

with respect to the thoughts which proceed from our heart, or the recollection of things which we have done, or the contemplation of any things or causes whatever, we find that they sometimes proceed from ourselves, and sometimes are originated by the opposing power; not seldom are they suggested by God, or by the holy angels.⁴⁸

Cassian follows this analysis at *Coll.* 1.19. In his Scriptural evidence for God as a source of thoughts, Cassian provides many of the same examples that Origen uses: King Ahasuerus was chastised by the Lord (Est 6:1ff), the prophets speak of hearing what God has to say within us (Ps 85:8) and of hearing an angel speaking within (Zech 1:14), Jesus promises to dwell within us (Jn 14:23) and tells Peter that the Spirit of his Father speaks

⁴⁸ Origen, *De prin.* (transl. Rufinus) 3.2.4. (SC 268.168; ANF 4.331). Cf. *De prin.* 3.3.4 for the way Origen easily equates the role of good spirits, holy angels, and God himself in human thoughts. Ramsay, ACW 57.72 notes the parallel to Origen and Basil, though there does not seem to be a strong textual connection between Cassian and Basil of Caesarea, *Reg. brev. tract.* 75. Basil is likely following Origen, since both make the argument that there are motions natural to humans, like hunger, in which the Devil has no role, as well as perverted passions. Mt 4:3 is cited as an example of the former by both Basil (*Reg. brev. tract.* 75 (PG 31:1133)) and Origen (*De Prin.* 3.2.1 (SC 268.156)), while the example of Judas' betrayal is used as an example of the latter in the same passage from Basil, and further in the same argument from Origen (*De prin.* 3.2.4). Apart from the reference to Judas and the general scheme of sources of thoughts, Basil and Cassian do not share strong parallels in these passages. The three-fold distinction that Antony, *Ep.* 1, offers between the motions that arise from nature, from the self, and from demons does involve the implicit argument that humans cannot claim to be inculpable, but does not include God as a source of these motions. Cf. the discussion at D. Brakke, "Problematization of nocturnal emissions," 436-437. Still, the idea of the Spirit affecting human thoughts is not far from this discussion in Antony, as the letter continues by noting "and now, my beloved children, in these three types of motion, if the soul exerts itself and perseveres in the testimony which the Spirit bears within the mind, both soul and body are purified from this kind of sickness." (trans. Chitty, 3) Origen's line of thought was known in the desert, as attested by Abba Ammonas. He speaks of the temptations and trials, in the form of thoughts (*logismoi*), which God uses to test the faithful. Ammonas names the Spirit as the divine person who administers such tests, which are also associated with temporary abandonment. In such cases, it is the Spirit who abandons the Christian. (*Ep.* 4.1-6) This is because "the Spirit dwells in those with an upright heart." (Ammonas, *Ep.* 4.9 (PO 11.449.12-13).) Additionally, Ammonas is keen to argue that the devil can only tempt us when God allows it. (*Ep.* 7.5) As discussed below, the parallels between Cassian and Evagrius on this matter are slim.

in him (Mt 10:20), and, as the final example, Christ speaks in Paul (2 Cor 13:3). For Cassian, thoughts

are from God when he deigns to visit us by the illumination of the Holy Spirit (*cum spiritus sancti inlustratione*), which raises us up to a higher level of progress; and when we have made little gain or have acted lazily and been overcome and he chastens us with a most salutary compunction; and when he opens to us the heavenly sacraments and changes our chosen orientation to better acts and to a better will.⁴⁹

Both Cassian and Origen agree that thoughts present an image to the monk who can accept or refuse them. Both are concerned to present the issue in such a way as to retain human free will, even in the face of demonic temptations which can seem as though they spring from our own thoughts. Both reference many of the same Scripture passages as examples of various sources of thoughts.⁵⁰ Cassian, however, calls attention to the role of the Holy Spirit in this interaction between God and man.

It is noteworthy that Cassian connects the phrase from Zechariah to these other Scripture verses. The order in which he presents the material helps him to place angels in an appropriate relationship to divine activity. As noted above, literature prior to Cassian

⁴⁹ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.19.1 (CSEL 13.27-28; ACW 57.57-58). Est. 6:1-10:3, Ps 85:8, Zec. 1:14, Jn 14:23, Mt 10:20, Acts 9:15, 2 Cor 13:3 are cited in reference to Holy Spirit. See also, *Coll.* 13.3.5, 4.3-4.4, where a similar trichotomous distinction of possibilities is given. Note that the monk must manifest yearning of heart and earnestness of prayer in awaiting the visitation of the Holy Spirit. The term *inlustratio* is not a common term in 3rd and 4th century texts. It is equivalent to *illustratio*, a making vivid, but the neither term is particularly associated with the Holy Spirit in other Latin authors. Cassian uses the term at *Coll.* 10.10.12, where it is also associated with the visitation of the Holy Spirit and the joy which comes from the heights of prayer. (CSEL 13.301.10-15) Augustine uses the term most often when imagery of light and darkness are used and, particularly, in the phrase *inlustrione veritas* (*Gn. litt.*, 2.8, *civ. Dei*, 11.19, & *Trin.* 12.8).

⁵⁰ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.19 and Origen, *De prin.* 3.2 share Est 6:1ff, Zec 1:14, Acts 9:15, 5:2, Jn 13:2, Eccl 10:4, 3 Kings 27:22. *De prin.* 3.3.2-3 and *Coll.* 1.20.2 also share a concern to prevent Christians from being taken with worldly philosophy. Cassian also teaches human responsibility for what we do with these thoughts at *Inst.* 7.4-5. Despite this dependence, I can find no evidence to help decide if Cassian knew Origen from a Greek text or from Rufinus' Latin translation.

is often ambiguous about the roles of angels and the Spirit in human thought.⁵¹ We see some of that ambiguity in Origen's *On First Principles*, which parallels the actions of God and angels in the realm of human thought. For Evagrius the matter is even more clear: angels play a prominent role in reforming human thoughts: "When the angel of God is present, with a single word he puts an end to every opposing activity within us and moves the light of the mind to an unerring activity."⁵² Indeed, it is part of Evagrius' system that a higher level of creation cares for the next lower level, and so, it is natural for the angels to play a prominent role in human affairs. Cassian's emphasis on the activity of the Holy Spirit in this regard is distinct from previous treatments of the same theme, and this is characteristic of his ascetic pneumatology. His choice of the phrase "an angel speaking within me," which is repeated often in Zechariah, is significant because that phrase had caused particular controversy in arguments about the divinity of the

⁵¹ E.g. *AP* Arsenius, 38; Antony, 1; Ammonas, 30; Isaac the Theban, 1; Macarius the Great, 33; Moses, 1; Paul the Simple, 1; Sisoës, 33; Palladius, *HL* 29.3, 31.2, 38.4-5. Athanasius, *Serap.*, attempts to clarify many of these roles, as does Didymus the Blind, *Trin.* (See n.53 below) Nevertheless, someone like Evagrius follows the thought of Clement of Alexandria, whose ambiguities on the matter have been well discussed in recent scholarly literature: B.G. Bucur, "Revisiting " 381-413. Evagrius does not give us a short or easy list of potential origins of thoughts, though they most often arise from demons, angels, or our own thoughts. Cf. the discussion of the Guillamonts (SC 170.56-63) & Evagrius Ponticus, *O. Sp.* 31. Evagrius does discuss the mechanisms through which images are presented to the human mind. In this regard, he teaches that God can visit the mind directly, both to see and judge human thoughts and to present images, whereas demons must discern human thoughts from human actions, and can only affect thoughts through alterations in the body. See *Or.* 74, *Gn.* 4. Still, Cassian seems to work directly from Origen, as argued above.

⁵² Evagrius Ponticus, *Or.* 74 (Sinkewicz, 201). Cf. *Or.* 75, 81. Cf. *In Ps.* 7 (Ps 16:13), *KG* 5.4 & 24. See also L. Dysinger, *Prayer and Psalmody*, 185. Evagrius does speak of the Holy Spirit visiting us, but the visitation is something of a judgment. If the mind is found in prayer, the Spirit will come to the mind's aid. If not, the Spirit will condemn the monk: "the Holy Spirit says to those who succumb to human thoughts: 'I have said: You are all gods and sons of the Most High; but you shall die as human beings and fall as one of the princes' (Ps 81:6-7). And to those who are moved in the manner of an irrational animal, what does he say? 'Do not be as the horse and mule, which have no understanding: with bit and bridle you must restrain their mouths else they will not approach you' (Ps 31:9). If it is true that 'the sinful soul shall die' (Ez 18:4, 20), it is quite clear that human beings who die like human beings will be buried by humans (cf. Mt 8:22); whereas those who die or fall like irrational animals will be devoured by vultures or 'crows, whose young either cry out to the Lord' (cf. Ps 146:9) or 'gorge themselves on blood' (cf. Job 39:30). 'He that has ears to hear, let him hear' (Mt. 11:15, etc.)." (*O. Sp.* 18. Sinkewicz 165. Cf. *Or.* 62) See also the brief, but helpful, discussion of the relationship between Evagrius' cosmology and understanding of contemplation at J.E. Bamberger, *The praktikos: chapters on prayer*, lxxv-lxxix.

Spirit. One argument for the Spirit's divinity had been based on acceptance that the Spirit speaks through the prophets, a position widely accepted among Christians. Since God speaks through the prophets, the Spirit who speaks in the prophets must be divine. But the text of Zechariah makes several references to an angel speaking in the prophet. Didymus the Blind, another theologian from Alexandria, responded to arguments that used this angelic speech to question the connection between the role of speaking in the prophets and being divine.⁵³ Cassian is untroubled by such an objection. He is certain of the Spirit's divinity, and so, easily subordinates a reference to angelic activity, a reference which had been prevalent in prior discussions, to divine activity in general within his discussion. In his presentation of the material, use of *loquator* connects the verses and allows him to string together two other verses that had also been frequently used in arguments for the Spirit's divinity, Mt. 10:20 and 2 Cor 13:3.⁵⁴ We have already seen Cassian's deep commitment to the divinity of the Holy Spirit, and here we can see that Cassian makes use of passages that had proven helpful in arguing for the full divinity of the Spirit within his reconstruction of Origen's position.

⁵³ See Didymus the Blind, *Trin.* 2.8.3 (PG 39:625-629), where the objection is raised on behalf of heretics and rejected on the grounds that the Spirit speaks for himself, while the angels speak on behalf of God. Cassian does something similar in moving certain stories of angels into a discussion of divine agency. (e.g. *Coll.* 7.2 recounts Abba Serenus' vision of an angel removing the fiery tumor of bodily passion from his belly, which Cassian attributes directly to the grace of God.)

⁵⁴ Cf. Athanasius (dubious), *De Incarn. c. Arianos* 14 (PG 26.1008); Athanasius (dubious), *De sanc. trin.* 3.21 (PG 28:1236); Basil of Caesarea, *De sp. sanc.* 26.61-62; Didymus the Blind, *Trin.* 1.21 (PG 39.373). The authorship of these texts attributed to Athanasius has been the subject of much debate. See A. Heron, "The Pseudo-Athanasian works " 281-298; J.T. Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum*, 232-239. Note that Athanasius also mentions the phrase from Zech in close proximity (*De sanc. trin.* 3.23). See also Didymus, *Spir.* 19, and Athanasius, *De sanc. trin.* 1.15 (PG 28.1141), & *Serap.* 1.6 (PG 26.541ff), which use Mt. 10:20 in a similar argument about the Spirit's divinity. Eusebius of Caesaria, *Comm. Ps.* 83.6-7 (PG 23.1009ff) seems to be the only other author to mention *logismoi* rising from evil spirits and good thoughts coming from God. Cassian also uses 2 Cor 13:3 at *Inst.* 6.15.2, where he explicitly connects this passage to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The passage is quoted above, p. 24.

The Holy Spirit is not the only source of thoughts, however. We are responsible for the origins of some our thoughts, and demons are responsible for other thoughts. The fact that even our innermost thoughts have mysterious origins means that we should subject them to the careful scrutiny of discretion.⁵⁵ In his first discussion of the matter, Cassian is particularly concerned that we not fall prey to false doctrines and worldly philosophy. Thus, “we should carefully scrutinize whatever enters our hearts... to see if it has been purified by the divine and heavenly fire of the Holy Spirit.”⁵⁶ The familiar role of the Spirit as guarantor of truth or the mark of genuine Christian tradition lies behind this advice. It also recalls the mechanism by which the Spirit works in the life of the monk. Naming God as a source of human thoughts provides a particular answer to a question of the form “how does the Spirit work within the monk?” The Spirit works within the monk to reform the inner world of his thoughts by suggesting correct thoughts and, as we see below, through the ascetic practice of meditation on Scripture.

“FULL OF BROKEN THOUGHTS I CANNOT REPAIR”⁵⁷

Now that we have seen how Cassian articulates a role for the Spirit at the beginning of human thought, we can see a second mechanism by which the Spirit repairs the monk’s broken thoughts, through meditation on Scripture. At the beginning of human thought we find mysterious origins of our own deliberations and aspirations. At the other

⁵⁵ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.20.1. Cf. *Coll.* 23.17.1. Origen suggests roughly the same at *De prin.* 3.3. For an argument that Evagrius considers discernment of spirits not only in regard to demons and their role in thoughts and passions, but also in regard to the truth and falsity of teachings, see G. Bunge, *Paternité Spirituelle*, 32.

⁵⁶ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.20.2 (CSEL 13.30; ACW 57.59). This passage in Cassian basically summarizes Origen, *De prin.* 3.3.2-5. It also seems to separate Cassian further from Evagrius, who never mentions the Spirit in conjunction with discretion. His advice at *Eul.* 13.12 is typical: “whenever there arises in the heart a thought that is difficult to discern, then ignite all the more against it intense ascetic labours.” (Sinkewicz, 38) Cf. *Eul.* 20.21 & 23.24, *O. Sp.* 26, *Or.* 144 & 147.

⁵⁷ J. Cash, "Hurt," *Unearthed*, CD, (Legacy, 2003).

end of thought, we find the heights of inspired contemplation. Such contemplation comes about largely through the monk's Spirit-inspired practice of reading Scripture and pondering the activity of God in the history of salvation. In my previous chapter, I called attention to the fact that Cassian thinks that humans need the Holy Spirit in order to understand the depth of meaning in Scripture. The Spirit is the guide in the practice of *lectio* because the Spirit authors Scripture and guarantees its interpretation. There, I treated the ascetic relation to Scripture as an aspect of the second point in my outline of Cassian's ascetic pneumatology. Here, I treat it as an aspect of the fifth element of Cassian's ascetic pneumatology. Here we see how the practice of meditating on Scripture heals broken thoughts. Finally, this will lead to the sixth element of Cassian's system. Cassian's ascetic pneumatology teaches that the Spirit reforms the ascetic's broken thoughts as preparation for ecstatic contemplation.

Philip Rousseau has called our attention to the distinction between contemplation as a theological ideal and contemplation as an ascetic practice.⁵⁸ Cassian's use of *contemplatio* revolves at least around these two poles of meaning. On the one hand there is the contemplative experience of beholding God in perfected simplicity. Christians aspire to this form of existence, though we know we cannot achieve it prior to the radical change brought about by death and perfect union with God. On the other hand there is a long tradition of holy men and women approximating this stability and achieving a deep understanding of the mysteries of God, especially through their ascetical endeavors. The two senses are not opposed, though confusion can result because *contemplatio* can refer to either. Cassian includes both poles in his understanding of contemplation:

⁵⁸ P. Rousseau, "Cassian, contemplation and the cenobitic life," 113-126. This paragraph owes much to Rousseau's work.

But contemplation of God is conceived in many ways: For God is known (*cognoscitur*) not through admiration alone of his incomprehensible substance, a thing which nevertheless is still hidden in the hope of the promise, but also God is seen (*pervidetur*) through the greatness of his creatures, through consideration of his fairness, or the aid of a daily dispensation.⁵⁹

Only in the life to come will we have that kind of knowledge that is direct (*cognoscere*) and pertains to the incomprehensible substance of God himself. Here, however, God can be seen through (*pervidere*) various aspects of the world which are directly related to him. In the first *Conference*, Abba Moses details these aspects as an explanation of what we can contemplate in this life. Creation, considered from many angles, is cause for marvel, as are the immense powers of God, all of which culminate in “the dispensation of his incarnation,” which God accepted “for our salvation” and by which he “extended the marvels of his mysteries to all peoples.”⁶⁰

One diagnosis of the fallen human situation is that our thoughts are scattered. We wish to be “focused” instead of distracted. Part of gaining purity of heart involves recollection of the mind.

The νοῦς, therefore, which is the mind (*mens*), is understood as ἀεὶκίνητος καὶ πολὺκίνητος—that is, as always changeable and as manifoldly changeable... because of its nature, then, it can never stand idle but, unless it has some foresight into where it will move and what will preoccupy it, it will inevitably run about and fly everywhere due to its own changeableness until...[it] learns with what things to equip its memory, to what

⁵⁹ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.15 (CSEL 13.25; my translation). For the parallel to Evagrius and further discussion, see below, p. 50. Emory’s Professor Garth Tissol offered expert and friendly conversation about this passage.

⁶⁰ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.15.3 (CSEL 13.25-26; ACW 57.56).

purpose it should direct its unceasing flights, and why it should acquire the power to remain fixed in one place.⁶¹

Collecting one's thoughts on a particular verse of Scripture proved to be one invaluable aide in combating the mutability of the human mind. The practice is well attested in desert literature, and Douglas Burton-Christie argues that Cassian is a teacher of the same school of thought.⁶²

The *Conferences* take for granted the consensus developed among the desert fathers regarding the efficacy of memorization and meditation upon Scripture. Yet, they push the issue further, bringing subtle psychological insight to the discussion of the role Scripture plays in reducing the inner chaos experienced by the monk, integrating the self and helping one discover God in contemplation.⁶³

Burton-Christie argues that meditation and contemplative recitation of a Scripture verse are helpful in collecting the mind because they focus and reduce the scope of one's attention: "The saving power of Scripture thus lies in large part in its capacity to unify the

⁶¹ Cassian, *Coll.* 7.4.2 (CSEL 13.183; ACW 57.249). I have replaced the Latin 's' with the Greek sigma, and added breathing and stress marks. See, also, the lament of this lack of focus at *Coll.* 7.3 and 4.2 and the expectation of the 'visitation of the Holy Spirit' (4.4.2). Ramsey, in his notes to the translation, admits finding no direct parallels to this phrase. S. Marsili, *Giovanni Cassiano*, 53, n. 2, suggests two. Nilus of Ancyra, *De monach. praes.* 23 (PG 79.1088) uses $\phi\epsilon\acute{\kappa}\iota\eta\eta\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\iota}$ of $\eta\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\iota}$ in a passage which speaks of growing by the gift of God from the always moving mind to finding something of a cure through prayer, reading Scripture, reflecting on creation, and discerning the reasons for temptations and passions. Evagrius Ponticus *Prak.* 48 (SC 171.608.6) uses $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\iota\eta\eta\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\iota}$ to describe $\eta\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\iota}$. The Guillamonts (SC 171.610) note the parallel to this passage in Cassian, as well as the history of the term back to Thales. In addition, Basil, *Ep* 233.1 (PG 32.864), uses $\phi\epsilon\acute{\kappa}\iota\eta\eta\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\iota}$ of $\eta\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\iota}$. Basil speaks of the need for the mind to remain within itself (PG 32.865a) and addresses three states of activities as bad, indifferent, or good. While there are parallels, and Evagrius and Basil are likely sources, there is no evidence of direct dependency.

⁶² E.g. Evagrius Ponticus, *Eul.* 20 [19]. In addition to the citations provided by D. Burton-Christie, *The Word in the Desert*, 122-129, we can add Evagrius Ponticus, *Eul.* 20 [19]. See also, W. Harmless, *Desert Christians*, 244-247, 305-306.

⁶³ D. Burton-Christie, "Scripture, self-knowledge and contemplation," 343.

mind, to help one overcome the chronic dissipation and distraction that left one vulnerable to every kind of inner suggestion or prompting.”⁶⁴ The nature of meditation is, after all, focus on one thing.

For Cassian, moreover, meditation on Scripture relies not only on the practice of focusing the mind, but also on encountering the saving mysteries described in Scripture, an encounter that happens according to the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. Burton-Christie’s point is well taken, but Cassian adds a significant point to the traditional ascetic focus on collecting one’s thoughts.

This continual meditation will bestow on us double fruit. First, inasmuch as the mind’s attention is occupied with reading and with preparing to read, it cannot be taken captive in the entrapments of harmful thoughts. Then, the things that we have not be able to understand... we shall see more clearly... Thus, while we are at rest and as it were immersed in the stupor of sleep, there will be revealed an understanding of hidden meanings that we did not grasp even slightly when we were awake.⁶⁵

Cassian includes the Holy Spirit in his treatment of this traditional ascetic practice by teaching that the Holy Spirit is required to understand the hidden meanings.

For it is one thing to speak with ease and beauty and another to enter deeply into heavenly sayings and to contemplate profound and hidden mysteries with the most pure eye of the heart, because certainly neither human teaching nor worldly learning but only purity of mind will possess this, through the enlightenment (*inluminationem*) of the Holy Spirit.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ D. Burton-Christie, "Scripture, self-knowledge and contemplation," 343. He cites *Coll.* 14.11 and 10.11.

⁶⁵ Cassian, *Coll.* 14.10.4 (CSEL 13.411; ACW 57.514-515).

⁶⁶ Cassian, *Coll.* 14.9.7 (CSEL 13.409-410; ACW 57.513).

The *inluminatio sancti spiritus* here recalls the *spiritus sancti inlustratio* of *Coll.* 1.19.1, which describes God's activity in reordering the thoughts of the monk.⁶⁷ The theological concept which Cassian uses to mate the spheres of interpretation, morality, and contemplation is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Cassian's ascetic pneumatology connects morality and reading practices. The monk, on his own, cannot completely reorder his thoughts. This is why the virtues are necessary. The virtues are the particular steps by which the Spirit aids the monk in his struggle against various classes of thoughts, allowing him to restructure his thoughts and desires:

If you wish to attain to a true knowledge of Scripture, then, you must first hasten to acquire a steadfast humility of heart which will, by the perfection of love, bring you not to the knowledge which puffs up but to that which enlightens (*inluminat*).⁶⁸

This illumination of the Holy Spirit is part of the re-ordering of the monk's heart and mind, at first simply to combat thoughts which arise from the devil and from the disordered self, but eventually as enlightenment about the mysteries of the faith in the form of contemplation. The Spirit is at work at the heart of the ascetic interaction with Scripture. Meditation on Scripture works not simply because the practice involves focusing on one thing. Meditation on Scripture works because the Spirit enlightens those

⁶⁷ See the discussion above, beginning at p. 46.

⁶⁸ Cassian, *Coll.* 14.10.1 (CSEL 13.410; ACW 57.513-514). The entirety of the *Institutes* can be taken as one description of how this process of restructuring one's 'inner world' occurs. His reliance on Evagrius and Origen is well documented in this regard. See, most recently, C. Stewart, "Cassian's schema," 205-219. Evagrius and Origen discussed the temptation of bad thoughts (*logismoi*) as passions (*pathes*), demons (*daimones*), and spirits (*pneuma*). Cassian used the Latin correlatives: *cogitationes*, *passiones*, and *spiritus*, as well as *vitium* (vice) in his discussion. Stewart is careful to note that even though Cassian relied heavily on the teachings of Origen and Evagrius, Cassian did not explicitly embrace the *apokatastasis* and two creation doctrines for which Origenism was held suspect and later condemned.

who encounter the mysteries hidden within it. This is the contemplative climax of Cassian's ascetic pneumatology. As we shall see in chapter 8, Gregory has the same understanding of how one encounters the Spirit in Scripture. Gregory also follows Cassian's analysis of meditation as a mechanism by which the Spirit reorders an ascetic's thoughts. Finally, Gregory follows Cassian's analysis that this leads to ecstatic contemplation.

ECSTATIC CONTEMPLATION

Cassian's teachings about how the Spirit reforms human thoughts (at their origins and through meditation on Scripture) naturally lead to his teaching that the Holy Spirit gives contemplation. His teaching that the Holy Spirit reforms human affect and desire naturally leads to the teaching that this contemplation is *ecstatic*. Thus, points 4 and 5 of my outline of Cassian's ascetic pneumatology naturally lead to point 6: the Holy Spirit is the giver of ecstatic contemplation.

One obvious source for Cassian's understanding of contemplation as the fulfillment of human thought is the work of Evagrius Ponticus. Cassian's teaching that one begins to contemplate God through creation and salvation before eventually arriving at knowledge of God has close parallels. After love has led to the state of *gnostiké*, Evagrius teaches that the monk contemplates various aspects of the world. Contemplation of the second (i.e. material) nature involves contemplating "the visible beauty and order of created beings and of nature as a whole;" while it is through contemplation of the first nature that "the monk's contemplation pierces through the visible magnificence to grasp invisible

created beings and the whole invisible order of creation.”⁶⁹ Eventually, one hopes to move from the multiplicity of thoughts about the created order to a unified thought about the uncreated Trinity. But contemplation, both for Evagrius and Cassian, runs the gamut from understanding God’s action in creation and salvation to beholding the most blessed Trinity. For Evagrius, creation is a multi-layered reality which “exists like a letter: through [God’s] power and his wisdom (that is, by his Son and his Spirit), he made known abroad his love for [us] so that [we] might be aware of it and drawn near.”⁷⁰ We have already seen that Cassian has this same understanding of being able to contemplate the divine economic activity in his first *Conference*.⁷¹ Similarly, we have seen how Cassian advances Evagrius’ teaching on allegory and contemplation. Allegory and contemplation both “look beyond” or “through” a text to find a deeper meaning.⁷² Cassian follows much of what Evagrius taught about the possibility of contemplation. Still, Cassian does not adopt Evagrius’ more strict hierarchies of contemplation. Instead, Cassian developed a radically different notion of the role of affect in contemplation. Cassian thinks contemplation is an ecstasy of the mind in a way that seems to be a direct response to Evagrius and an appropriation of Syrian sources.

⁶⁹ W. Harmless, *Desert Christians*, 349. The fullest set of divisions Evagrius offers on contemplation actually divides *gnostikê-theologia* into five ranks of contemplation: contemplation of the Holy Trinity, of incorporeals, of corporeals, of judgment, and of providence. (e.g. *KG* 1.27, 1.70) On contemplation in Evagrius, see the recent discussion, J. Konstantinovsky, *Evagrius Ponticus: the Making of a Gnostic*, 47-107.

⁷⁰ Evagrius Ponticus, *Ep. Mel.* [1] 5 (trans. Casiday, 65). *Prak.* 92 records a similar idea from St. Antony: “My book, philosopher, is the nature of beings, and it is there when I want to read the words of God.” (SC 171.695; trans. Sinkewicz, 112) Cf. *In Ps.* 8 (Ps 138:16).

⁷¹ Cassian, *Coll.* 1.15. The passage is provided above, p. 46.

⁷² A. Guillaumont, “Un philosophe au désert,” 45. “Allegorical exegesis is not only, in effect, a part of spiritual contemplation by which the Gnostic discovers the true nature of things. The second natural contemplation is not only the perception of *logoi* of each of the natures which constitute the material world: it is also the perception of that which Evagrius calls the ‘*logoi* of providence and judgement,’ that is to say, the reasons which explain the existence of the material world and end for which it was created.”

Cassian's treatment of prayer as an ecstatic experience has received careful treatment by Columba Stewart, who notes the similarities between Cassian and the Syrian tradition represented by the Ps-Macarius.⁷³ To Stewart's discussion I wish to add an understanding of Cassian's ascetic pneumatology. The same Spirit reforms thoughts and desires; the Spirit brings about ecstatic contemplation. The role of affect in contemplation separates Cassian from Evagrius, who leaves no room for affect in *theoria*. Cassian teaches that prayer is not only joyful, but ecstatic, because it is the culmination of his understanding of human life. Human interiority revolves around the two poles of heart and mind. It makes sense for Cassian's system that the highest and purest prayer we can experience in this life is ecstatic contemplation. Furthermore, just as we have seen a role for the Holy Spirit throughout Cassian's treatment of Christian asceticism, the Holy Spirit has a definite role in its climax. The Holy Spirit gives ecstatic contemplation to the ascetic. When cataloguing various occasions in prayer and the constant need for the monk to return to the simple dependence on God summarized in the words of Ps 70, Cassian explains,

If on the other hand, I feel that, thanks to the Holy Spirit's visitation, I have attained direction of soul, steadfastness of thought, and joy of heart, along with an unspeakable gladness and ecstasy of mind, and if with an abundance of spiritual thoughts I have, due to a sudden illumination from the Lord, perceived an overflow of very holy ideas which had been completely hidden from me before, then, in order that I might deserve to abide

⁷³ C. Stewart, *Cassian the Monk*, 114-130. On Cassian's teachings about prayer in general, see M. Casey, "The journey from fear to love: John Cassian's road map," 181-195; J. Levko, "Inside prayer with John Cassian," 165-173; J. Levko, "Patience in a life of prayer for John Cassian," 167-172; J. Levko, "Self-Control in a life of prayer for John Cassian," 142-154; J.J. Levko, *Cassian's prayer for the 21st century*, (which collects and edits some of the material in his articles).

longer in these, I should frequently and anxiously cry, ‘O God come to my assistance; O Lord, make haste to help me.’ [Ps 70:1]⁷⁴

The familiar roles of the Spirit in providing genuine joy, gladness, and spiritual thoughts through illumination are part of Cassian’s larger ascetic pneumatology, which I have already discussed. But Cassian takes us at least one fervent step farther. The Spirit guides us into an ecstasy of heart and mind which is repeatedly described as “fiery prayer.”

Prayer is brought about by the indwelling and illuminating Spirit. For example, Abba Isaac responds to Germanus’ worry that he can never seem to hold onto a recollected mind by saying, “I do not think that all the different kinds of prayer can be grasped without great purity of heart and soul and the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit (*inluminatione sancti spiritus*).”⁷⁵ During the “fiery prayer which can be neither seized nor expressed by the mouth of man,” the mind “pours out to God wordless prayers for the purest vigor. These the Spirit itself makes to God as it intervenes with unutterable groans...”⁷⁶ The pneumatological element of Cassian’s discussion of prayer is apparent. Indeed, if we include terms for illumination and fire as pneumatological terms, (which they do seem to be), then nearly every page of the *Conferences* dedicated to prayer makes a reference to the Holy Spirit. As Abba Isaac explains, “this, I say, is the end of all perfection – that the mind purged of every carnal desire may daily be elevated to spiritual things, until one’s whole way of life and all the yearnings of one’s heart become a single

⁷⁴ Cassian, *Coll.* 10.10.12 (CSEL 13.301; ACW 57.382).

⁷⁵ Cassian, *Coll.* 9.8.1 (CSEL 13.259; ACW 57.335).

⁷⁶ Cassian, *Coll.* 9.15.1-2 (CSEL 13.263; ACW 57.338-339).

and continuous prayer.”⁷⁷ Under the direction of the Spirit, the ascetic ascends to the knowledge of God through illumination,⁷⁸ is set ablaze “in an unspeakable ecstasy of heart and with an insatiable gladness of spirit,”⁷⁹ and

breaks forth into shouts because of a joy that is too vast to be repressed... [or] is hidden by such silence within the bounds of a profound speechlessness that the stupor brought on by a sudden illumination completely prevents the forming of words, and the stunned spirit either keeps every expression within or releases and pours out its desires to God in unutterable groans.⁸⁰

Cassian’s ascetic pneumatology climaxes in the experience of a fully emotional blaze of the mind and heart. It is the Holy Spirit who sets fire to the ascetic, burning away impurities and setting fire to thoughts and desires so that they rise to God in heaven.

The focal point of Cassian’s teaching on the heights of contemplation in this life is the Latin *ecstasis mentis/cordis*. Columba Stewart notes that *excessus*

signifies a blissful experience in which one is ‘rapt’ or ‘awestruck’... [suggesting] the ‘departure of the mind or heart’ from bodily constraining and ordinary experience... but there are also suggestions of another kind of ecstasy... when the ‘mind on fire’ cannot contain the prayers inspired in it by grace. This seems to be a kind of spiritual ravishment, in which the resulting prayers burst the limits of human understanding and expression.⁸¹

⁷⁷ Cassian, *Coll.* 10.7.3 (CSEL 13.293; ACW 57.376).

⁷⁸ Cassian, *Coll.* 10.11.2.

⁷⁹ Cassian, *Coll.* 10.11.6 (CSEL 13.305-306; ACW 57.385).

⁸⁰ Cassian, *Coll.* 9.27 (CSEL 13.273-274; ACW 57.346-347).

⁸¹ C. Stewart, *Cassian the Monk*, 117. “*Excessus mentis*: *Inst.* 2.10.1, and see 3.3.4 and 3.3.7 on Peter; *Coll.* 6.10.2, 9.31, 10.10.12, 19.4.2; *excessus cordis*: *Coll.* 10.11.6, 12.12.6; *excessus spiritus*: *Coll.* 4.5; *excessus* without specification: *Coll.* 3.7.3, 19.4.1, 19.5.1-2. In other contexts, Cassian uses *excessus* in a nonstatic

Cassian teaches that the Holy Spirit fulfills both the rational and the emotional aspects of human existence in contemplation. The teaching that the Holy Spirit reforms an ascetic's thoughts and desires comes to completion in Cassian's teaching on ecstatic contemplation. The Spirit is present at the beginning and the end of the human thought process. Not only does the Spirit help us by giving us the beginnings of good thoughts, but the Spirit also brings our thoughts into the mysteries of God which are contained in the Scriptures. The Spirit reforms our desires, allowing us to cling to heavenly realities with appropriate affect. What began for the ascetic as mastery of hunger and gluttony, ends in the experience of being completely swept up in the Holy Spirit. Pneumatology, for Cassian, includes the experiential elements of Christian struggle with vice and victory in understanding the mysteries veiled in Scripture. Pneumatology, for Cassian, includes reformation of thoughts and desires. A rightly ordered mind coupled with a rightly ordered heart can regularly enter into an ecstatic contemplative experience, according to Cassian. Not only are the mind and heart ordered with the aid of the Spirit, but they are driven to wild fulfillment in the highest ecstatic contemplation at the prompting of the Holy Spirit. Pneumatology, for Cassian, concerns the fullness of human rationality and desire.

THE SPIRIT AT EVERY TURN

Cassian's ascetic pneumatology is the careful application of a Nicene Catholic pneumatology to his synthesis of the ascetic systems he knew. The Spirit is the divine

or even negative sense, reflecting a traditional ambivalence about language suggestive of [the Greek] *ekstasis*: as "amazement" at God's mercy: *Coll.* 1.15.2; as dangerous imbalance of mind or imprudence: *Coll.* 2.2.4, 2.16.1, 4.2, 4.12.6, 7.26.4, 22.3.1, 22.3.5." (note 17 of the same page).

agent who works within humans to point the way to ecstatic contemplation through acquiring virtue, reforming thoughts, and reforming desires. Christian asceticism begins with the renunciation of vice and pursuit of virtue, a process which is premised on the action of the Holy Spirit both as a condition and reward for virtue. The monk's target in this life is purity of heart, a state which is the culmination of the dense nexus of virtues which reorder the monk's inner life, understood in terms of both desires and thoughts. The Holy Spirit works with the monk not only to root out, but also to reform perverted thoughts and desires, leaving the monk free to be truly spiritual, that is, a Christian filled with the Holy Spirit. The Spirit reorders the monk's daily thoughts and inspires contemplation, especially through revealing the hidden meanings of Scripture. Just as the Spirit reveals the divinity of Christ in the accounts of the Incarnation, the Spirit reveals all the mysteries of God in Scripture and tradition. The epitome of rightly ordered thoughts and desires is an ecstatic contemplative experience which is nothing short of a foretaste of Heaven in which the Spirit illumines the ascetic with fiery joy, fervent love, and unspeakable groans.

Cassian articulates these roles for the Holy Spirit because he has a particular understanding of human interiority. His pneumatology is wed to his theological anthropology. His theological anthropology is the background for his synthesis of ascetic traditions. Cassian's ascetic pneumatology is aimed at monks who can devote their entire lives to a pattern of asceticism that will regularly involve fiery, ecstatic prayer. Other theologians had slightly different concerns. Their teachings were premised on different understandings of the human condition. As we will see in chapter 4, theologians like Prosper of Aquitaine who share Cassian's belief in the Holy Spirit as the divine agent of

reform, but do not share his ascetic theology, articulate different roles for the Holy Spirit. Other theologians, like the bishops of Cassian's era, were great supporters of Christian asceticism, but they needed to apply asceticism to the situation of the laity, the "regular" Christians who were baptized, but not ascetic renunciants in a monastery. Where Cassian was concerned with professional monks who devoted their entire lives to monastic renunciation, Pope Leo the Great was concerned with general practitioners who had to adopt different emphases within their asceticism. Nevertheless, that they also understood the work of the Holy Spirit to be the work of transforming the lives of Christians is clear, as I show in the following chapter.

III. ASCETIC PNEUMATOLOGY FOR THE LAITY

When Gregory was ordained bishop of Rome in 590, he joined the ranks of only a few other men who had held that position. When he was given the title “the Great,” he became one of only two first millennium popes to have that title. The other is his predecessor, St. Leo the Great. This is the same Leo who asked Cassian to write against Nestorius and who rode out to meet Attila the Hun.¹ Leo was a consummate pontiff, and he consistently endorsed ascetic practices, but neither Leo himself nor the people he addressed were professional ascetics like John Cassian. Nor had Leo been a professed monk prior to his ordination as bishop, as would be the case with Gregory. Leo’s context is different from Cassian’s, but we can still see an ascetic pneumatology at play in his sermons. There are differences between the ascetic pneumatology Leo preached for the laity and the ascetic pneumatology Cassian taught his monks.² Nevertheless, these differences are mainly of intensity, though there are certain practices, like almsgiving, which are more characteristic of the asceticism recommended for lay life than for monastic life. Nevertheless, for the history of pneumatology, the point remains: Latin pneumatology intersects with anthropology. Leo, like Cassian, was in that generation of Christians who knew relative stability in the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Spirit; where

¹ The story of Leo and Attila has been told by many. Prosper of Aquitaine, *Chronicum*, (PL 51.603), is the earliest. See J.H. Robinson, *Readings*, 49-51.

² On the use of *laicus* to mean the people of God in general (as opposed to pagans) and to mean the regular people of God (as opposed to the clergy), see, e.g., *Conc. Gal. Aquileia* 51-52 (CCSL 82.3.357-358); Ambrose, *Ep.* 10.75.4 (CSEL 82.3.75); Augustine, *Ep.* 76.4 (CSEL 34.2.328); Augustine, *retract.* 2.11 (CCSL 57.ln2); Caesarius, *Serm.* 1.8 (CCSL 103.ln7); Maximus of Turin, *Serm.* 48 (CCSL 23.ln69); Sulpicius Severus, *chron.* 2.47.2 (CSEL 1.100); Tertullian, *Praescr.* 41.8 (CCSL 1.222). Leo, like Cyprian, still prefers *plebs* to *laicus*, e.g. Cyprian of Carthage, *Ep.* 52.1.2 (CCSL 3(a).ln7); Leo the Great, *Tract.* 5 (CCSL 138.ln1). For discussion, see Y. Congar, *Jalons pour une Théologie du Laïcat*, esp. 19-45; J. Fontaine, "The practice of Christian life: the birth of the laity," 453-491; I.d.l. Potterie, "L'origine et le sens primitif du mot 'laïc'," 840-853.

he applied this belief to his teaching on asceticism for the laity he developed an ascetic pneumatology for the laity, a pneumatology which explains how human life is reformed from within through the regular practices of lay Christians.

As a bishop of Rome, Leo serves as point of comparison for Gregory. Both were concerned with the formation of Roman Christians and the leadership of the Church. Born around 400, Leo was made Pope in 440, after working as a deacon for Pope Celestine (bishop of Rome from 422-432) and Sixtus III (432-440).³ He was a consummate negotiator, a skilled administrator, and a popular preacher. Under Celestine, Leo had asked Cassian to write against Nestorius and had participated in the Roman council which pronounced Nestorius' positions heretical, a judgment that was also upheld in Alexandria and at the Council of Ephesus in 431. Early in Leo's career under Pope Sixtus III, Rome officially received the teaching that Mary is the "Mother of God" (Greek *theotokos*; Latin *mater Dei*) into liturgical architecture at the basilica of Sancta Maria Maior. As Pope, Leo continued to be involved in the controversies over Christology raised by Nestorius and then Eutyches. He is rightly remembered for his role in these debates, though scholars disagree on the sophistication of his theology on the matter.

Much like Cassian, Leo's pneumatology has not been the focus of major studies. Like Cassian, much of his pneumatology is implicit in his understanding of Christian life. His understanding of the Holy Spirit serves as an example of another theologian whose pneumatology was employed in the service of explaining how Christian asceticism

³ The classic study of Leo in English is T. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great*. See more recently, P.L. Barclift, "Pope Leo's Soteriology: Sacramental Recapitulation," 14-249; B. Green, *The Soteriology of Leo the Great*; B. Neil, *Leo the Great*; S. Wessel, *Leo the Great*. The works of Leo cited here are edited in CCSL 138a and translated in NPNF 2.12 and FOTC 93 & 34. See the bibliography for details. *Ep.* = *Letters*; *Tract.* = *Sermons*.

works: the Holy Spirit works in the Holy Sacraments, prayer, and worship. These concerns are somewhat different from the concerns of monks like Cassian. Cassian wrote for professional ascetics, whom he called “renunciants.” Their baptism was lived out in the context of renouncing themselves and the world in favor of a monastic community. The twin poles of human existence on Cassian’s analysis are thoughts and desires. Accordingly, he articulates the Spirit’s work as reforming thoughts and desires through specific ascetical practices. Cassian’s pneumatology was part of his program for the training of monks; his system relies on his understanding of asceticism as progression in virtue through purity of heart to ecstatic contemplation. Alternatively, Leo wrote and delivered homilies for baptized laity, i.e. non-professional ascetics. Their asceticism progresses from baptism to active participation in the community and the liturgy. There was no need to develop a particularly acute anthropology in this situation. Rather, the common ecclesial experience of liturgy and sacraments served as a better locus of discussion with Christian congregations. Leo and Cassian differ in their emphases on the major practices of Christian asceticism, and so, develop different ascetic pneumatologies. Where Cassian focuses on the practices of a professional monk, like keeping vigils, chastity, chanting the Psalms with other monks, and meditating on Scripture, Leo focuses on attending the Eucharistic Liturgy, baptism, fasting, and almsgiving. Accordingly, Leo’s pneumatology articulates a role for the Holy Spirit in these aspects of Christian life. But these ascetic pneumatologies are not mutually exclusive; rather, they spring from differences in focus between ascetics like Cassian and bishops like Leo. Where theologians differed on how to describe the inner life, they differed on describing how the Holy Spirit works within that life, but even their differences show that pneumatology was

aimed at explaining the Holy Spirit as the divine agent of human reform. Latin pneumatology of the 5th century was concerned with articulating how the Holy Spirit works within human life.

PRAYER, FASTING, AND ALMSGIVING

Commitment to the efficacy of asceticism was not novel in Leo's home town. Rome had many different kinds of ascetic schools in late antiquity. Before Leo, Jerome had counseled many upper-class ascetics. Pelagius, despite being condemned for his theology, had been popular precisely because of his ascetic teaching. Cassian had come to Rome with a group of ascetics to plead the case of John Chrysostom. While Chrysostom was deposed, Rome was friendly to the party who interceded on his behalf. Leo personally endorsed Cassian when he asked the monk to develop a Western response to Nestorius in 430. Leo preached about general themes of ascetic pneumatology in which the Spirit is the companion of the Christian who fasts and prays. Indeed, Leo adds almsgiving to these traditional practices, and thus shows his episcopal concerns in an ascetic pneumatology aimed at the laity.

Christian asceticism is intended as a formation in this life which leads to eternal life. Though theologians disagreed on how best to understand the kind of assistance God offers us, all agreed that God's action is necessary for this process. As preparation for eternal life, asceticism brings about a transformation in the present life. Leo says it well:

The protection of divine grace and the teaching of the Gospel doctrine make these wiles of the devil ineffective and harmless. Those who have received the Holy Spirit and in whom the fear of the Lord has been roused, not from dread of punishment but from the love of God, have broken the snares of such deceptions with the unharmed strength of

their faith. They use the beauty of all creatures to the glory and praise of their Creator, and love above all things him 'through whom all things were made.' [Jn 1:3]⁴

The Holy Spirit releases Christians from fear and deceptions and frees us to love genuinely. Without developing a detailed anthropology, Leo was committed to the efficacy of traditional ascetic practices in conjunction with the sacraments. Traditional ascetic practices are a basic aspect of post-baptismal life. Leo's concern for Trinitarian orthodoxy and Christian asceticism can be seen in nearly every sermon he delivered, especially since the conclusions of Leo's sermons are quite formulaic. One pattern concludes with the doxology, a prayerful reminder of the Trinitarian faith of the Church.⁵ Another pattern is an exhortation to fasting, typically prescribed for Wednesdays and Fridays.⁶ Though others are not as formulaic as Leo, there is consistency in preaching about the importance of fasting, prayer, and almsgiving.⁷ Leo gives expression to what lies implicit in most of his contemporaries: the Christian life is one lived under the direction and influence of the Holy Spirit within the sacraments, liturgy, private devotions, and care for the poor.

Ascetic practices are central to Christian life because they unite us to the Holy Spirit.

As Leo taught,

⁴ Leo, *Tract.* 89.3 (CCSL 138a.553; FOTC 93.377)

⁵ E.g. Leo, *Tract.* 4, 9, 12, 19, 22b, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 55, 58, 59b, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76b, 79, 82b, 84b, 85, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95.

⁶ E.g. Leo, *Tract.* 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 41, 42a, 42b, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 68, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 86, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94.

⁷ E.g. Augustine, *s.* 9; Caesarius, *serm.* 56.3, 67.3, 89.5, 107.4, 146.3, 150.5, 179.4, 199.7, 209.4, 227.2; Maximus of Turin, *Serm.* 81; Quodvultdeus, *Lib. prom. Et praed. Dei* 2.2. On almsgiving in antiquity, see L.W. Countryman, *The Rich Christian*; R.D. Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*; A. Fitzgerald, "Almsgiving in the works of Saint Augustine," 445-459; B. Ramsey, "Almsgiving in the Latin Church," 226-259.

Three things especially pertain to acts of religion: ‘prayer, fasting and almsgiving.’ [Tb 12:8] ... Propitiation of God is sought by prayer, concupiscence of the flesh is extinguished by fasting, and ‘sins are redeemed by almsgiving.’ [Cf. Dan 4:24] ... This three-fold observance, dearly beloved, encompasses the effects of all virtues. It brings us to the image and likeness of God and makes us inseparable from the Holy Spirit.⁸

While Leo is the first bishop to connect the verses from Tobit and Daniel directly to the action of the Holy Spirit, the connection between almsgiving and forgiving sins is common.⁹ This is very much the same kind of ascetic pneumatology which Cassian articulated: the indwelling Spirit is present in the virtuous. Nevertheless, while Cassian also emphasized prayer and fasting, he did not emphasize almsgiving. This difference, however, is consistent with the difference in their audiences. Cassian wrote for professional monks who renounced property as an entrance requirement for their monastic life. Leo preached to Christian laity who gathered at least weekly in the cathedral in Rome. Almsgiving takes on a different meaning for professional monks who do not have possessions to give away, for example, it is associated with detachment and generosity in general at *Coll.* 21.33, though, like all ascetic practices, it can be abused. Leo, on the other hand, regularly preached to Christians who had significant wealth which could be distributed to the poor. The case is similar for Caesarius at the beginning

⁸ Leo, *Tract.* 12.4 (CCSL 138.53; FOTC 93.53).

⁹ For example, Dan 4:24, which uses *redimere* for forgiving sins, is used at Gaudentius of Brescia, *Tract.* 13.30 (CSEL 68.123 = PL 20.941); Augustine, *s.* 389 (RevBen 58.50); Quodvultdeus, *Lib. prom. Et praed. Dei* 2.34.75 (CCSL 60.141). Jerome also comments on the verse at *in Hier. proph.* 2.23.3 (CCSL 74.71), *Ep.* 108.16 (CSEL 55.328). Eccl 3:33, which uses *restare* in a similar context, was also used to make the same argument.

of the 6th century in Gaul, and Gregory at the end of the 6th century in Rome.¹⁰ Bishops cannot ask that the faithful renounce all their property, but they can and did ask that the faithful have particular concern for the poor. The difference in emphasis among ascetic practices is easy to understand. For both the bishop and the abbot, the teaching is remarkably similar: the Holy Spirit works within Christians to foster virtue and is both the condition and reward for asceticism. Bishops like Leo differ from Cassian not in the general principle *that* the Spirit works through asceticism, but in the detail of their explanation of *how* the Spirit works through asceticism.

IF IT AIN'T BROKE...

Leo never developed an explicit anthropology in which he discussed the role of desire in human volition the way Augustine or Cassian did. Nor did he develop a series of exercises for various stages of development, as Cassian did. Leo does not have a well developed theory of human desire, and so, does not have a well developed sense of the role of the Holy Spirit in the reformation of desire. The case is the same with other aspects of human interiority like rationality. Leo was convinced that asceticism works as a system, but was seldom asked to explain why. General connections between ascetic practices and the Holy Spirit were sufficient to motivate the faithful to deepen their practice of the faith. The case was different for monks like Cassian, who found it very helpful to diagnose particular problems and schematize many elements of development for his monks. Leo saw a system which worked, and did not push it any further. Other

¹⁰ On Caesarius and the poor, see W. Klingshirn, "Charity and Power," 183-203; W.E. Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles*. On Gregory and sacrifices for the poor, see Gregory, *Hom. Ev.* 40; J. Richards, *Consul of God*, 88-100; C.E. Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, 181-182, 252. More generally, see L.W. Countryman, *The Rich Christian*; R.D. Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*; A. Fitzgerald, "Almsgiving in the works of Saint Augustine," 445-459; B. Ramsey, "Almsgiving in the Latin Church," 226-259.

theologians entered specific debates about anthropological principles and notions of God's salvific will which impacted their understandings of ascetic pneumatology.

Even without a refined ascetical system, Leo does often exhort his listeners to fast because it helps to control wayward desires. This conclusion to a sermon focused on allowing genuine love to conquer perverted love is typical for Leo:

When our three devotions come together into one design, that is 'prayer, alms, and fasting,' the grace of God furnishes us with a restraint in desires, the granting of our prayers, and forgiveness of sins, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who, with the Father and with the Holy Spirit, lives and reigns for ever and ever. Amen.¹¹

The ascetic practices which were commonly exhorted are remedies both for spiritual and carnal desires. For Leo, this relies on a principle similar to what Cassian articulated explicitly: the Holy Spirit replaces bad desires with good desires. At the beginning of one of Leo's sermons, he explains why fasting works.

The soul is more often free from bodily desires and can devote itself to divine wisdom in the palace of the mind where, when all noise of earthly care is silent, it may rejoice in holy meditations and in eternal delights. Even though in this life it is difficult to sustain this, it can often happen that we are occupied in spiritual matters more often and longer than in bodily matters... The usefulness of this observance, dearly beloved, is established especially in the Church's fasts, which, by the teaching of the Holy Spirit, are so distributed throughout the whole year that the law of abstinence is assigned to all seasons.¹²

¹¹ Leo, *Tract.*93.3 (CCSL 138a.575-576; FOTC 93.390).

¹² Leo, *Tract.* 19.1-2 (CCSL 138.76-77; FOTC 93.70, modified). I have changed "spirit" to mind because the Latin is *in aula mentis*, and we should avoid the confusion that this is a hidden reference to the Holy Spirit.

Fasting, especially the fasts associated with Liturgical seasons, free the soul from bodily desires. That this is taught by the Holy Spirit is part of Leo's teaching that the Holy Spirit directly inspires these good desires.

To distinguish the desires that come from God, it has been well said to us, 'do not follow your lusts,' [Sir 18:30] so that we might know that we should avoid what we recognize as our own. The Lord then, quite rightly, in the prayer he gave us, did not want us to say to God, 'Our will be done,' but 'Your will be done;' [Mt 6:10] that is, not what the flesh arouses but what the Holy Spirit inspires.¹³

The parallels with Cassian are striking, though not sufficient to argue for direct dependency. Both Leo and Cassian teach that bad desires are replaced with good desires at the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and this is especially connected to fasting. Cassian's *Institutes* address gluttony as the first vice with which a monk should struggle. Fasting is the key practice in this struggle. The promised reward for overcoming gluttony is a renewal of the mind that enables contemplation.¹⁴ We have seen in detail above how Cassian articulated particular mechanisms by which the Holy Spirit works within the monk, especially by inspiring good desires and enlightening thoughts. Leo teaches something similar, though not in a system as developed as Cassian's. There are no levels of progression or analysis of desires in Leo's theology. Nevertheless, Leo teaches that the Spirit is at work in ascetic practices. The reformatin of desire was a focal point of pneumatology.

¹³ Leo, *Tract.* 93.1 (CCSL 138a.573; FOTC 93.389). I have inserted "Holy," which is in the Latin, but not in the FOTC translation. Cf. *Tract.* 89.4, concerning fasting, spiritual delights, and virtue.

¹⁴ Cassian, *Inst.* 5.34.1.

The traditional role for the Spirit as the companion of the ascetic is also evident in Leo's teaching that fasting and vigils allow one to become the dwelling of the Spirit.¹⁵ Leo even foreshadows some of the concerns that arose with John Maxentius and took canonical form in Gaul in 529, as we will see in subsequent chapters. Leo connects the inspiration of a good will and good deeds with the virtues which are gifts of the Holy Spirit:

according to the teaching of the Holy Spirit, through whom the gifts of all the virtues have been bestowed upon the Church of God, let us undertake the solemn fast with prompt faith. In his commands, as far as we can, let us guard ourselves from the puffing up of pride, referring everything to the glory of God who is both the inspirer of good will and the author of good deeds.¹⁶

Leo's insistence on the role of the Holy Spirit in fasting and prayer is in the same vein of thought as Cassian's. Prosper of Aquitaine, a Gallic controversialist who became one of Leo's advisors, developed particular reflections on the Holy Spirit and the human will, as I argue in the next chapter. All agree that the Spirit is at work in ascetic practices, though explanations of how the Spirit is at work differed. Again, these differences in ascetic pneumatology are rooted more in differing audiences and anthropological concerns than in differences of belief about the Holy Spirit *per se*.

¹⁵ E.g. Leo, *Tract.* 42.6 (recension a), & 43.1.

¹⁶ Leo, *Tract.* 79.4 (CCSL 138a.500; FOTC 93.349). Cf. *The Rule of Benedict*, where the steps of humility conclude: "All this the Lord will by the Holy Spirit graciously manifest in his workman now cleansed of vices and sins." (Benedict of Nursia, *RB* 7 (RB 1980, 202-203).)

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE HOLY SACRAMENTS

It has sometimes amused scholars to suppose that there was a great divide between the lay monks who pursued asceticism rigorously in their cells and the hierarchical bishops who attempted to control the ascetics from their cathedrals. This was certainly not the case in Gaul, where the leading bishops of late antiquity were chosen from the ranks of the monks. Nor is it the case in Italy, where late antique preaching often endorsed traditional ascetic practices. There was no great divide between monks and bishops. Nevertheless, there is a particular episcopal emphasis on almsgiving and the rites of Baptism, chrismation, Eucharist, and ordination which is not typical of monks like Cassian.¹⁷ Two aspects of this ascetic pneumatology are significant: asceticism only makes sense in the context of the life of a Christian who is infused with the Holy Spirit from the moment of baptism, and almsgiving is an ascetic practice which is as beneficial as fasting for fostering communion with the indwelling Spirit. These differ mostly in degree from an ascetic theology like the one presented by Cassian. No Christian of the 5th century would deny the efficacy of baptism as a regeneration in the Holy Spirit; nor would anyone deny the importance of genuine Christian concern for the poor. Ascetics like Cassian, however, emphasize the role of renunciation in monastic profession where ascetics like Leo emphasize the role of baptism. Both teach that the Holy Spirit plays a key role in asceticism, even if they differ about which elements are more significant. At

¹⁷ I consider baptism and confirmation together for this chapter because these early sources speak of them as distinguishable, but undivided movements within a unified ritual which later theologians understood as distinct and separate sacraments. It does not belong to my argument here to separate or unite them, but see the following on this issue: R. Béraudy, "L'Église en Prière," 566-579; J.A. Jungmann, *The Early Liturgy*, 84; A. Stewart-Sykes, "Manumission and Baptism," 129-149; P. Turner, "The origins of confirmation," 320-336; G. Winkler, "Confirmation or Chrismation," 2-17; E. Yarnold, *The Awe-Inspiring Rites*, esp. 30-33. On the origin of Christian Baptism see: P.F. Bradshaw, *Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, 59-61; A.Y. Collins, "The origin of Christian Baptism," 28-46; L. Hartman, *Into the Name*; K. McDonnell, *The Baptism of Jesus in the Jordan*, 171-187.

the same time that Cassian developed his ascetic pneumatology for professional monks, Leo was developing something quite similar for the Christian laity.

Like most bishops, Leo is especially concerned with the liturgy and the sacraments.¹⁸ These define the Christian Church, for through them Christians participate in the mysteries of salvation. Leo teaches that the Holy Spirit comes to dwell in the baptized and remains with the faithful throughout their lives. Furthermore, this constitutes the nature of baptism, for baptism is regeneration *in the Spirit*.¹⁹ Baptism does not imply a one-time gift of the Spirit. Rather, the Holy Spirit is joined to the baptized and continues to work in the lives of the faithful. Indeed, instead of using 1 Cor 6:19 as an argument that the Spirit is fully divine, which others before him had done, Leo makes this verse central to explaining the Spirit's operation in the sacrament: "Through the Sacrament of Baptism you were made 'a temple of the Holy Spirit.'"²⁰ As we will see in chapter 5, this was often coupled with the phrase "temple of God," to make an argument that the Holy Spirit is fully divine. Leo, however, is interested more in the new life brought about by the Spirit in baptism than in arguments about the divinity of the Spirit. Other bishops taught the same. For example, Chromatius, a 4th century bishop in Italy, speaks of being given a power or ability (*potestas*) when receiving the Spirit at the laying on of hands

¹⁸ T. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great*, 399-410, provides an introduction to Leo and worship. More generally, see E. Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church*; P.-M. Gy, "Sacraments and Liturgy in Latin Christianity," 365-381; W. Harmless, *Augustine and the Catechumenate*, 39-382; K. McDonnell and G.T. Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit*.

¹⁹ E.g. Leo, *Tract.* 45.1, 57.5.2, 69.4, 70.4. Cf. Faustus, *Spir.* 1.8 (CSEL 21.114), 2.5 (CSL 21.145), 2.7 (CSEL 21.149); Faustus of Riez, *de sp. sanct.* 1.8 (CSEL 21.114), 2.5 (CSL 21.145), 2.7 (CSEL 21.149). Bishops were not the only ones to use this argument, either, e.g. *Brev. fid.* (Morin, 2.195); Arnobius Iunior, *c. cum. Ser.* 2.32 (CCSL 25a.173); Cassiodorus, *Exp. Ps.* 84.9 (CCSL 98.2); Didymus the Blind, *Spir.* 98-102 (SC 386.236-240).

²⁰ Leo, *Tract.* 21.3 (CCSL 138.88; FOTC 93.79), quoting 1 Cor 6:19. Cf. *Tract.* 35.2.1.

which was part of the baptismal rite.²¹ Eucherius of Lyons, a 5th century bishop in Gaul, and his contemporary Italian bishop, Maximus of Turin, wrote of the Spirit's action in baptism as a burning fire which purifies sins and rouses the faithful to love.²² Eucherius' interpretation of Mt 3:11, "he will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire," is common among Latin bishops: "On account of the Holy Spirit the sins in us are burned away, sanctification is bestowed, and the fervor of love is enkindled to bear the passions."²³ Across the Mediterranean, the African bishop Quodvultdeus also preached about the forgiveness of sins offered through the Holy Spirit in the sacrament.²⁴ This new life opened in the Spirit enables and requires certain things of the faithful. Late-antique bishops taught that baptism opened a new life for Christians which was maintained by participation in the sacraments. They taught this as part of their pneumatology, for the Spirit is active in the sacramental life.

Leo teaches that the Holy Spirit continues to be active in the life of lay Christians after coming to dwell in them through baptism. The Spirit has the roles of illuminating (*illuminare*), encouraging (*exhortare*), and instructing (*instruere*) the faithful.²⁵ Prophets and other theologians teach "in the Spirit."²⁶ The Spirit speaks through Scripture.²⁷ The

²¹ Chromatius of Aquileia, *Serm.* 2.3 (CCSL 9a.9). Cf. *Tract. in Mt.* 11.5 (CCSL 9.241-242)

²² Eucherius of Lyons, *Inst. ad Sal.* 1. *de ps.* 24 (CCSL 66.120-121), *Inst. ad Sal.* 1. *de act. Apost.* 2 (CCSL 66.176-177); Maximus of Turin *Serm.* 35.3 (CCSL 23.138).

²³ Eucherius of Lyons *Inst. ad Sal.* 1. *De Ev. Mt.* 5 (CCSL 66.142; my translation)

²⁴ Quodvultdeus, *c. Iud. pag. et Ar.* 19.5-6 (CCSL 60.254-255). He appropriates Jn 20:33 (Jesus breathing the Spirit on the Apostles and noting 'if you forgive sins, they are forgiven') to baptism.

²⁵ For *exhortare* and *instruere*, see Leo, *Tract.* 30.3 (CCSL 138.154). Cf. *Tract.* 41.2, 42.4, 47.1, 66.1.1, 96.3.2; For *illuminare* and derivatives, see *Tract.* 23.5 (CCSL 138.107). Cf. *Tract.* 66.1.1.

²⁶ E.g. Leo, *Tract.* 25.2, 19.1-2

²⁷ E.g. Leo, *Tract.* 27.1.2, 28.2, 30.3, 67.1.2, 72.3, 92.2.

Holy Spirit drives away sin and darkness in the hearts of the faithful.²⁸ Much like Cassian, Leo wrote outside of the context of an explicit defense of the divinity of the Spirit. Much like other bishops, Leo focuses the role of the Spirit in the life of Christians on the liturgy and sacraments. Most Christians are called to other sacraments after baptism, especially weekly Eucharist, according to Leo. Some are also called to Ordination. In both, Leo teaches that the Holy Spirit is operative.

ORDERING THE CHURCH IN WORSHIP AND ORDINATION

The Spirit guides the Church in appropriate worship along several avenues for Leo. From the general perspective, the Spirit is instrumental in determining the correct patterns of worship through the calendar of feasts and the order of particular prayers. The yearly cycle of worship is inspired by the Holy Spirit. In particular liturgical events, the Spirit works in and through the priests who offer Christian sacrifice. This priesthood, Leo teaches, is established through the sacrament of ordination, in which the Spirit is operative. The Spirit is also key in establishing practices which surround liturgical celebrations: “the major fasts [preparations for the major feasts] have been ordained by the holy apostles through the direction of the Holy Spirit.”²⁹ The fasting done in private is preparation for the liturgy offered in public. Fasting is one among many ascetic practices which are part of the system of sacraments and liturgy according to Leo’s theology. Leo, like many others who were responsible for administering the sacraments and preaching to the faithful, teaches the importance of the Spirit in the sacramental life of the Church and the presence of the Spirit in traditional ascetic practices as aspects of Christian life.

²⁸ E.g. Leo, *Tract.* 50.2.

²⁹ Leo, *Tract.* 47.1 (CCSL 138a.274; FOTC 93.202).

Sunday is the key day of the week, for the day of the Lord's resurrection "is a day which has been hallowed by such great mysteries in the divine plan of events that whatever of major importance the Lord decided on was carried out on this honored day."³⁰ To Leo's mind, the greatest events in salvation history have come on Sundays. These include the creation of the world, the Resurrection, and the command to baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as well as the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. Indeed, in the history of the development of Pentecost as a feast of the Holy Spirit, Leo is the first Latin bishop to appeal explicitly to a Trinitarian doctrinal formula to explain the importance of the Sunday of Pentecost. That is, Leo states explicitly what is more or less implicit in other sermons:

the very Son of God, the Only-begotten, wished that there be no distinction between Himself and the Holy Spirit, either in what the faithful believed about them or in the power of their works, since there is no difference in their nature. [Jn 24:16, 24:26, 16:13 are quoted] Since Christ is truth and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth and the title 'Advocate' is proper to both, there is no difference in the feast [Pentecost and Easter] where there is but one mystery.³¹

It is worth noting the obvious as an indication of the Catholic understanding of the full divinity of the Holy Spirit; Leo considers the gift and missions of the Spirit as equally

³⁰ Leo, *Ep.* 9 (to Dioscoros, Bp of Alexandria – 21 June 445) (FOTC 34.35).

³¹ Leo, *Ep.* 16.3 (to all bishops in Sicily – 21 Oct 447) (FOTC 34.73) In this letter Leo exhorts the bishops to limit baptisms to Easter and Pentecost, opposing the practice of baptizing on feast days of various saints. Cf. Leo, *Ep.* 163 & Cabié, *La Pentecôte*, 205. While Pentecost was popular for baptisms in the West, it was not in the East. (Cabié, *La Pentecôte*, 202) On the development of Pentecost as a feast celebrating the Spirit in distinction to Ascension as feast celebrating the Son, see in addition to Cabié, I. Biffi and P. Re, "La cinquantina pasquale," 324-333; J. Daniélou, *Bible et Liturgie*; J. Daniélou, "Nysse et la fête de l'Ascension," 663-666; G. Kretschmar, "Himmelfahrt und Pfingsten," 209-253; T.J. Talley, *Origins*, 409-448.

important to other major events in salvation history. All three divine persons are operative in the world, and especially so in the sacraments. The saving death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ holds pride of place in Leo's understanding of worship, and even this is not removed from the action of the Holy Spirit. Leo preaches that

we must not doubt, dearly beloved, that every Christian observance comes from the divine teaching, and whatever has been received by the Church into its customs of worship arises from the apostolic tradition and the teaching of the Holy Spirit.³²

The Spirit guides the Church in appropriate worship. Worship is part of the Christian ascetical system for Leo, and so, his pneumatology is concerned with formation in holiness.

In the same letter in which Leo establishes the principle that the important events of salvation history happen on Sunday, Leo also considers ordination. Two things are of note in this: the sacraments themselves are events in salvation history, and the Holy Spirit is important for these events. After detailing the major events of salvation history, Leo continues:

Thus we know through some divine plan the custom was introduced and became traditional whereby the rites for the laying of hands on priests are to be celebrated on that day on which all the gifts of grace were conferred.³³

Leo taught similarly in his homilies: "The Church accepts for her rulers those whom the Holy Spirit has prepared."³⁴ Leo is not alone in following Scripture for this teaching;

³² Leo, *Tract. 79* (CCSL 138a.498; FOTC 93.347).

³³ Leo, *Ep. 9.1* (to Dioscoros, Bp of Alexandria – 21 June 445) (PL 54.625; FOTC 34.35). The fact that Mt. 28:16-17 and Mk 16:14-16 give no justification for thinking that the command to baptize was given on Sunday does not trouble Leo.

Acts 20:28 records that the Holy Spirit has established bishops in the Church for this purpose. As with baptism, others used this verse to argue for the divinity of the Spirit, while Leo references the notion in order to preach about the new life opened by the presence of the Spirit in the Church.³⁵ Neither was Leo the only one to teach that the Spirit establishes order in the Church through appropriate Liturgical practices and the sacrament of ordination.³⁶ The point remains the same for ordination as for baptism: Leo understood that the Holy Spirit is operative in the sacraments. The sacraments mutually support each other and form an important part of the ascetical endeavors of the Christian faithful. As Leo explains, “all who have been regenerated in Christ are made kings by the sign of the cross and consecrated priests by the anointing of the Holy Spirit.”³⁷ The anointing of the Spirit brings about priestly ministry and fosters new growth within the Christian, but Leo does not envision Christian life simply as the action of God in the life of the Christian. Christians have a role to play, as well.

Leo teaches that Christians must also participate wholeheartedly in the new life brought about especially through baptism. Christians must dedicate themselves to particular practices that will make us inseparable from the Holy Spirit. These practices are innately tied to the sacraments for bishops like Leo. In particular, Leo teaches that prayer, fasting, and almsgiving help to foster growth in the Spirit after baptism. Other bishops explicitly included the sacrament of the Eucharist as part of how the Spirit continues to work in the lives of the faithful. The normative practice of baptism and

³⁴ Leo, *Tract.* 3.1 (CCSL 138.11; FOTC 93.21).

³⁵ For Acts 20:27-28 used in an anti-Arian argument, see, e.g., Ambrose, *Spir.* 2.152-153, Faustus, *Spir.* 1.11 (CSEL 21.123).

³⁶ E.g. Ambrose, *Spir.* 2.155-157; Didymus the Blind, *Spir.* 104-105.

³⁷ Leo, *Tract.* 4.1 (CCSL 138.16; FOTC 93.25).

regular cycles of worship include weekly Eucharist and frequent extra-liturgical prayers, fasts, and taking care of the poor.

THE SPIRIT IN THE SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST

There is one sacrament in which other bishops commonly articulated a role for the Holy Spirit, but which never seems to have occupied Leo's preaching directly, the Eucharist. Since the Eucharist plays an important role in Gregory's theology, and Leo serves as an introduction to the kinds of issues which a bishop like Gregory might address in his ascetic pneumatology, I briefly consider the point here.³⁸ The general point remains the same for Eucharist as for the other sacraments: ascetic pneumatology aimed at the laity was concerned with the role of liturgy and the sacraments in reforming human life. This ascetic pneumatology has a different focus than Cassian's, but both show the common interest of Latin pneumatology in exploring the role of the Holy Spirit as the divine agent of human reform.

Chromatius, the bishop of Aquileia at the turn of the 5th century, was an eloquent preacher. He enjoyed weaving several images together so that categories which are often thought to be distinct are placed side by side in his preaching. This is the case with the standard Christological reflections on the Eucharist (i.e. "Body of Christ") and pneumatological reflections on baptism (e.g. "baptized in the Spirit"). In explaining the meaning of the bread and wine, for example, Chromatius tells the people gathered with him for Liturgy: "It is understood that the congregation of the regular, common 'Gospel-people' is signified in the bread, is made new through faith in Christ and the grace of

³⁸ E.g. Gregory, *Mor.* 23.23.49-50; *Hom. Ez.* 2.6; *Dial.* 4.57-61. See A. de Vogüé, "Eucharist and monastic life," 503-510.

baptism, and is woven together by the Holy Spirit.”³⁹ Similarly, a fellow north Italian bishop, Gaudentius of Brescia recognized the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist. While discussing the relationship between Christ and the Gentiles before and after the Resurrection, Gaudentius explains the importance of the Eucharist. Christ

did not want to carry off this heavenly bread, the principle of life, and give it to the Gentiles immediately... After his Resurrection, [however,] he went to the nations, to whom he gave himself as the bread of life itself and to whom he offered the cup of the Holy Spirit through the water of baptism.⁴⁰

Here, Gaudentius unites the bread and the cup of the Eucharist with the action of Christ and the Spirit in baptism. Leo was not the only 5th century Italian bishop to reflect on the importance of the Holy Spirit in the holy sacraments.

Augustine’s theology of the Eucharist has puzzled many of his students and even led to controversy.⁴¹ Nevertheless, that he understands the Holy Spirit to be a crucial part of the Body of Christ, both in the sense of the sacrament and the Church, is clear. For example, Augustine preached

The faithful will know the body of Christ if they do not neglect to be the body of Christ.

Let them become the body of Christ if they wish to live from the Spirit of Christ. Nothing

³⁹ Chromatius, *Tract. in Mt.* 46.3 (CCSL 9a.424) “regular, common Gospel-people” translates *rudi plebis euangelicae congregatio*. Cf. the close parallel of Gregory of Elvira, *Tract. Orig. de s.s.* 2.30 (CCSL 69.19).

⁴⁰ Gaudentius of Brescia, *Tract.* 9.21 (CSEL 68.80; my translation).

⁴¹ For an introduction to these issues, see G. Bonner, “Augustine’s Understanding of the Church as a Eucharistic Community,” 36-63; J.P. Burns, “2000 St Augustine Lecture: The Eucharist as the Foundation of Christian Unity in North African Theology,” 1-25; T.L. Humphries, “These words are spirit and life,” forthcoming; G. Lecordier, *La Doctrine de l’Eucharistie chez Saint Augustin*; H.d. Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum*; G. Macy, *Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period*.

lives from the Spirit of Christ except the body of Christ... Do you want to live from the Spirit of Christ? Be in the body of Christ.⁴²

The relevant point here is simple: Augustine teaches that the Holy Spirit is operative in the Eucharist as a source of new life.

The action of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist was not only a focus of preaching in the 5th and 6th centuries, it was also the source of a critique of Trinitarian theology leveled by Vandal Arians against African Catholics. Fulgentius of Ruspe, a 6th century African bishop whom I discuss in more detail in chapter 6, was asked directly, “If a sacrifice is offered to the Holy Trinity, why is only the sending of the Holy Spirit sought?”⁴³

Monimus, who posed this question to Fulgentius because he could not answer it on his own, referred to the fact that in the epiclesis within the Eucharistic prayer, the Church asks that the Spirit be sent to sanctify the gifts which will become the sacrament of the Eucharist. Fulgentius responds to several issues at play in this discussion before explaining that we ask God to send the Holy Spirit to sanctify the gifts at the altar because “under the name of the Holy Spirit, the gifts of the Holy Spirit are designated,” and the principle gift of the Holy Spirit is love.⁴⁴

Therefore, when the coming of the Holy Spirit is sought for the sanctifying of the sacrifice of the whole Church, nothing else is being sought for, it seems to me, than that through the spiritual grace in the Body of Christ (which is the Church) the unity of

⁴² Augustine, *Io. ev. tr.* 26.13.1-2 (CCSL 36.266; FOTC 79.271, modified).

⁴³ Fulgentius, *ad Mon.* 2.6.1 (CCSL 91.39; my translation).

⁴⁴ Fulgentius, *ad Mon.* 2.7.4 (CCSL 91.42; FOTC 95.245). Of particular note is Fulgentius’ response to subordinationism and his sophisticated understanding of missions and processions in this response (esp. *ad Mon.* 2.6.4).

charity may be preserved endlessly unbroken. For this is the principal gift of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁵

Fulgentius relies on his Augustinian theology. He appeals to the fact that the same Spirit who is the love of God (i.e. the love between the Father and Son) is the love which binds the Church as the Body of Christ to Christ the head of the body.

And, therefore, we ask that by that very grace by which it comes about that the Church becomes the Body of Christ, it may happen that all the members of charity, with the binding framework [of the Spirit] remaining, persevere in the unity of the Body. Worthily do we seek that this be worked in ourselves by the gift of that Spirit who is the one Spirit of both the Father and the Son because the Holy Trinity, which is by nature unity, equality, and love, which is the one, only, and true God, sanctifies in complete harmony those whom it adopts.⁴⁶

Just as the Father and Son are one in the unity of the Holy Spirit, so are Christians one Body of Christ in the unity of the Holy Spirit. God is united in love; Christians are united in the same love through the Holy Spirit. Fulgentius' pneumatology illuminates the Spirit's role in the liturgy and the Church. While Leo did not reflect on these issues directly, we can still see a common concern to explore the role of the Spirit in forming the laity through the sacraments.

Bishops reflected deeply on the sacraments and liturgy. The overwhelming majority of these reflections are explicitly Christological. In calling attention to the role of the Holy Spirit in the sacraments and liturgy, I do not deny the importance of the Incarnation.

⁴⁵ Fulgentius, *ad Mon.* 2.9.1 (CCSL 91.43; FOTC 95.246).

⁴⁶ Fulgentius, *ad Mon.* 2.11.2 (CCSL 91.46; FOTC 95.251, modified).

Rather, I argue that there is a discernable focus within these reflections that associates the Spirit with Christian worship and sacraments. Leo teaches that regular worship and participation in the sacraments are key parts of Christian ascesis for the laity. The Spirit is at work to reform humanity through the sacraments and liturgy. This is the key focus of Leo's ascetic pneumatology.

BISHOPS AND ABBOTS UNDER THE SAME SPIRIT

The ascetic pneumatology of Cassian is separated from the ascetic pneumatology of someone like Leo on several fronts. On the one hand, Cassian has a well-developed theological anthropology which he employs in his system. Leo never developed such an anthropology. Nor did he develop such a comprehensive vision of asceticism. Rather, Leo was focused on the catechesis appropriate for the lay Christians to whom he was entrusted as priest. Nevertheless, Leo makes use of the belief that the Holy Spirit reforms humans through ascetical practices. His theology is shaped by the concerns of a bishop, concerns which differ from the concerns of an abbot. Leo states the formation of the laity well: prayer, fasting, and almsgiving are key practices which support and nurture the gift of the Holy Spirit bestowed in the sacraments. A monk like Cassian understands the heart of ascesis as renunciation of vice and acceptance of virtue. The pneumatology developed within Cassian's ascetical theology understands the Spirit at work in reforming thoughts and desires, leading to momentary contemplation in this life. Leo teaches that the heart of ascesis springs from the sacrament of baptism, in which Christians are given new life in the Holy Spirit. Such a life is fostered by participation in the other sacraments, and so, we see a kind of ascetic pneumatology that realizes the action of the Spirit in the sacraments and the liturgy. The concerns of Leo did not run contrary to the concerns of Cassian; nor

did they exhort Christians to vastly different ascetical practices. The difference is mostly one of emphasis. Leo and, if we may generalize, other bishops like him emphasized participation in the sacraments, where they saw the Spirit at work. Cassian emphasized reformation of thoughts and desires, where he saw the Spirit at work. Just as Cassian articulated roles for the Spirit in particular ascetical practices which foster appropriate development for the monk, Leo articulated roles for the Holy Spirit in particular practices which foster appropriate development for the laity and ministers entrusted to their care. The differences in these systems show us the remarkable consistency in the general principle that the Holy Spirit works within Christians to excise what is bad and reform what is perverted. Cassian and Leo offer ascetic pneumatologies based on a consistent belief not only in the divinity of the Holy Spirit, but also on the belief that the Holy Spirit works within Christians to bring about transformation.

The differences between Leo and Cassian demonstrate that discussions of pneumatology were shaped largely by their intended audience: in the case of Cassian, professional ascetics; in the case of Leo and other bishops, the baptized, for whom asceticism took a different form and was less intense. Already we have seen the application of Nicene Catholic pneumatological doctrines to the specific concerns of two forms of asceticism, that of professed ascetics and that of the general Christian laity. Audience is an important determiner of differences in Latin pneumatology in this period. When we consider another contemporary of Leo and Cassian, Prosper, we see the same. As we look farther ahead to the final figure of this work, Gregory the Great, we can already see that Leo serves as a point of comparison with Gregory as the bishop of Rome concerned with preaching to the baptized, while Cassian serves as a point of reference for

Gregory as a monk. Gregory preaches to the laity as though they were monks. But before Gregory was preaching, Latin theology entertained a great debate about the role of grace in free will. Prosper of Aquitaine was a key theologian in these discussions, and he, too, articulated roles for the Holy Spirit in the reformation of human life as he understood it.

IV. LED BY THE SPIRIT: AUGUSTINIAN RESPONSES TO PELAGIANISM AND PREDESTINATION

Prosper of Aquitaine, a contemporary of Cassian and Leo, used pneumatology to develop his response to Pelagian theology and the controversy over predestination. At the end of his career, after having settled in Rome, he reflected deeply on the work of the Spirit throughout the world; he reflected on the Spirit's intimate relationship with humans who are called to paradise by having the law of God written into their very hearts. Using the adulterous woman saved by Jesus from death by stoning (Jn 8:6) as an image of each of us, Prosper wrote:

He, bowing down – that is, stooping down to our human level and intent on the work of our reformation – ‘wrote with His finger on the ground,’ [Jn 8:6] in order to repeal the Law of the commandments with the decrees of His grace and to reveal Himself as the One who has said, ‘I will give my laws in their understanding and I will write them in their heart.’ [Jer 31:33] This indeed He does every day when He infuses His will into the hearts of those who are called, and when, with the pen of the Holy Spirit, the Truth mercifully rewrites on the pages of their souls all that the devil enviously falsified.¹

Prosper's pneumatology shows that Latin theology of the Holy Spirit was concerned with the reformation of human desire understood especially as the human will.

Prosper was a layman who had been taken captive by Arian Visigoths early in his life. When he returned to Catholic territories in Gaul (c415), he began his writing career. Before that, he had been educated where he was born (c390), in the region of western

¹ Prosper of Aquitaine, *voc. om. gen.* 1.8.12 (CSEL 47.90; ACW 14.38).

Gaul known as Aquitaine. Early in his career, he wrote a defense *On the Providence of God*, but then changed tack and wrote against theological threats he perceived in Gaul, arguing that they were forms of Pelagianism.² The history of Pelagianism is quite involved, but the center of the controversy is easy to identify: Pelagius was taken to deny the necessity of grace for human salvation and to teach that the human will was sufficient on its own to do good.³ By 427, Prosper was writing from Marseilles (where Cassian was a popular ascetic figure) to Augustine, who was on the other side of the Mediterranean, in North Africa.⁴ Prosper's understanding of Augustine's pneumatology developed significantly during his exchange with other Gallic theologians. He was sought for his expertise on Augustine's theology and wrote many responses that attempt to summarize Augustine's theology, even to the point of producing *florilegia* from works of Augustine.⁵ At some point, it seems that Leo the Great took Prosper to Rome to be his secretary.⁶ Prosper outlived Leo, who died in 461, by a couple of years.

² The works of Prosper are collected in PL 51. Many are edited in CCSL 68a, CSEL 47 & 57. English translations of select works are available in ACW 14 & 32, *Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae*, and FOTC 7. The works cited here are abbreviated as follows: *prov. Dei* = *On the Providence of God*; *Ep. ad Aug.* = *Letter to Augustine*; *Ep. ad Ruf.* = *Letter to Rufinus*; *c. coll.* = *On Grace and Free Will Against the Conferencer [i.e. Cassian]*; *voc. om. gen.* = *The Call of All Nations*; *gr. et lib. arb.* = *On the Grace of God and the Free Choice of the Will*. See the bibliography for details. The most recent biography and theological discussion of Prosper is A.Y. Hwang, *Intrepid Lover*. For current critique of Prosper's analysis of Cassian, see A.M. Casiday, "Rehabilitating John Cassian," 270-284. See also M. Cappuyns, "Le premier représentant," 309-337; R.W. Mathisen, "For specialists only," 29-42; S. Muhlberger, *Fifth-Century Chroniclers*, 48-135; L. Valentin, *Saint Prosper d'Aquitaine*.

³ On Pelagianism and its history, see especially G. Bonner, "Augustine and Pelagianism," 27-49; G. Bonner, "Pelagianism and Augustine," 33-51; G. Bonner, *St Augustine of Hippo*, 312-393; M. Lamberigts, "Pelagius and Pelagians," 258-279; R.A. Markus, "The Legacy of Pelagius," 214-234.

⁴ On dating these letters, see O. Chadwick, "Euladius of Arles," 200-205. Augustine's responses, *praed. sanct.* and *perserv.*, are well known and discussed below. Hwang, 37-38, argues that Prosper had been in Marseilles since 416 and had already written his *de prov. Dei* from there.

⁵ *Pro Aug. responsiones ad exc. Genuensium* (PL 51), *Expositio Psalmorum* (CCSL 68a.3-211), *Liber sententiarum* (CCSL 68a.257-365). Prosper is reported to have compiled excerpts from Augustine's *On the Trinity*. However, we do not possess this text, and the same 9th century report indicates that Prosper wrote a book on the contemplative life, which matches the work by Julianus Pomerius, and the explanation of the excerpts on the Trinity match other summaries of the original work. See G.H. Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui*, numbers 36-37, p 102-105; É. Dekkers, "Quelques notes sur des florilèges," 28-29;

Prosper used pneumatology in response to a set of concerns that differed from Cassian and Leo. He wrote not to form ascetics, lay or monastic, but to develop answers to a specific set of questions about human and divine will. Where Prosper disagrees with Cassian, and Prosper explicitly attacks Cassian, Prosper does not differ on belief about the Holy Spirit so much as he differs about how to describe human interiority and agency. Prosper fought Cassian over grace, predestination, and how to describe the human condition. Despite their different anthropological models, both employed pneumatology to explain the reformation of desire. Cassian's system links desire to thoughts and provides a series of practices which serve as remedies through which the Holy Spirit comes to dwell in the ascetic. Prosper's system links desires to the human will and discusses the necessity of the agency of the Holy Spirit in reforming the will. In Prosper and Cassian we can see that Latin pneumatology was concerned with the reformation of desire.

Prosper was a controversialist early in his career, but he mellowed as he matured.⁷ He also came to understand Augustine's pneumatology more deeply as he matured. Early in his career, he attacked Cassian's writings for subscribing to the heresy of Pelagius,

Mountain and Glorie (CCSL 50.3-22); J.T. Lienhard, "The earliest florilegia of Augustine," 26-28; *Augustine Through the Ages*, s.v. "Florilegia," 370.

⁶ For the influence of Prosper on some of Leo's works, see P.L. Barclift, "Leo on predestination," 5-21; P.L. Barclift, "Shifting tones," 221-239; N.W. James, "Leo the Great and Prosper of Aquitaine," 554-584. More generally, see S. Muhlberger, *Fifth-Century Chroniclers*, 110-135.

⁷ There has been debate over how to understand Prosper's career on at least two fronts. In the first place, many of the works attributed to Prosper today have not always been attributed to him, creating very different pictures of Prosper at different times. In the second place, some scholars have taken Prosper to represent Augustine's theology fairly and entirely, for example, O'Donnell (FOTC 7.337). More recent scholarship has questioned this for two reasons. Hwang, *Intrepid Lover*, argues that Prosper changed his mind about whether Augustine's theology entirely defined Christian orthodoxy. Instead, Prosper and came to accept that Augustine was one among many who presented the genuine faith. Casiday (see n 29, below) has questioned the validity of a monolithic "Augustinianism," arguing for multiple and sometimes divergent readings of Augustine. The argument of my chapters 4-6 supports this reading of the 5th and 6th centuries.

though Cassian was never condemned by a synod for such beliefs and even attacked Pelagian doctrines in his writings.⁸ Still, the controversy over Augustinianism and predestination continued in political and ecclesial battles that occupied some of the greatest minds of 5th and 6th century Latin-speaking Christians. Prosper was not the only theologian to espouse Augustine's teachings explicitly. A significant moment for Augustinian theology in the debates over Pelagianism and predestination is the Council of Orange (529), which relies in part on Prosper's formulation of Augustinianism. The council also depends on texts from the other authors who can only be treated fairly in additional chapters. Here, I argue that the pneumatology which developed in response to Pelagianism and predestination reveals another kind of Latin pneumatology concerned with the reformation of desire. Prosper was not a professed monk, though he engaged his debate with professional ascetics. Nor was he a bishop, though he was a key advisor to Leo. Prosper's pneumatology develops not as part of a system of ascetical formation, but as an answer to particular questions about the human will and salvation. Thus, I argue that Prosper's pneumatology is not an ascetic pneumatology, but is nevertheless concerned to articulate how the Spirit reforms human interiority against the theological background of Pelagianism and predestination. Since Prosper defended what he took to be Augustine's position, Prosper's pneumatology is the first in a series of "Augustinianisms" that came to life even as Augustine came to his death.

⁸ Cassian also seems to have played a role in the affair of Leporius, who was sent from Gaul to Africa in order to reform his Pelagian mentality under the tutelage of Augustine. See Cassian, *Incarn.* 1.3-6.

AUGUSTINE'S BASIC INSIGHT: THE SPIRIT IS THE DIVINE LOVE BY WHICH WE LOVE

Augustine's reflections on what lies within the field of possibility for humans and how God expands the horizon of possibility began before he responded to Pelagius' teachings on the matter, but the exchange with Pelagian theologians at the beginning of the 5th century helped Augustine sharpen his analysis of the human condition. For Augustine, that analysis always revolved around the human will and its expression in thoughts, desires, and actions. His observation that the Holy Spirit is the love with which the Father and Son love, and that this is the same love which is offered to Christians, is one of his most significant contributions to Christian theology. The Holy Spirit reforms the human will, giving it not only true freedom, but also enabling it to love with God's love. New possibilities are opened for the human will because it is no longer bound by an existence subject to sin, but can truly love with God's love, which is given through the Holy Spirit. Review of two of Augustine's "anti-Pelagian" texts reveals the importance of two passages from Romans in Augustine's pneumatological "solution" to problems raised by Pelagianism.

Augustine's *On Rebuke and Grace* was written for the monks at Hadrumetum in North Africa after he had already been in conversation with them. In response to initial questions from these monks, Augustine sent letters 214, 215, and *On Grace and Free Will* to Hadrumetum. Upon Augustine's request, the monk Florus arrived in Hippo with a letter from his abbot, Valentine, and Augustine sent him back with *On Rebuke and Grace*. The opening claim of Augustine's missive is that God "helps us to turn away from

evil and to do good, something which no one can do without the Spirit of grace.”⁹ Rom 8:14 quickly enters the discussion:

But let them, rather, understand that, if they are the children of God, they are led by the Spirit of God so that they do what they should do and so that, when they have done it, they give thanks to him by whom they are led. For they are led in order to act, not in order that they may themselves do nothing.¹⁰

This idea became central to Prosper’s mature argument in *On the Call of All Nations*, though it is a strategy he did not employ early in his career, as I argue below.

Additionally, Augustine argues, had they not fallen, Adam and Eve could have received the highest blessing, “they would have received so great an abundance of the love of God through the Holy Spirit that they could by no means fall in the future.”¹¹ In response to the brokenness of the will, which can neither accurately perceive the good nor act on it, God sends his Holy Spirit to work in the hearts of Christians. “Their will is, of course, set afire by the Holy Spirit to the point that they are able because they will to so strongly, but they will to so strongly because God makes them will.”¹² Furthermore, for those who are responsible for preaching and correcting others, Augustine argues,

God, then, commands us who do not know who are going to be saved to will that all to whom we preach this peace be saved, and he produces in us this will, pouring out his love

⁹ Augustine, *corr. et gr.* 1.2 (CSEL 92.219; WSA 1.26.109). In this chapter, I refer to the following works of Augustine: *corr. et gr.* = *On Rebuke and Grace*; *Io. ev. tr.* = *Tractates on the Gospel of John*; *persev.* = *On the Gift of Perseverance*; *praed. sanct.* = *On the Predestination of the Saints*. On Augustine’s analysis of the will, see especially R.J. O’Connell, *St. Augustine’s early theory of man, A.D. 386-391*; J.M. Rist, *Augustine: Ancient Thought Baptized*, 148-202; J. Wetzel, *Augustine and the Limits of Virtue*.

¹⁰ Augustine, *corr. et gr.* 2.4 (CSEL 92.221; WSA 1.26.110, slightly modified). Augustine is able to play on the verb *agere* because it is used in various constructions for *to give thanks*, *to be led*, and *to do*.

¹¹ Augustine, *corr. et gr.* 10.27 (CSEL 92.252; WSA 1.26.128).

¹² Augustine, *corr. et gr.* 12.38 (CSEL 92.266; WSA 1.26.135). Cf. *corr. et gr.* 14.44.

in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us... just as the words ‘He sent the Spirit of his Son, crying, “Abba, Father” [Gal 4:6]’ ... Elsewhere, in fact, he says of this Spirit that ‘we have received the Spirit of adoption as children in whom we cry out, “Abba, Father!” [Rom 8:15]’¹³

This, also, will become a key aspect of Prosper’s later arguments. By the 420s, Augustine had made Rom 8:14-15 and Rom 5:5 key passages for understanding the role of the Spirit in the reformation of the human will. In the same decade, Prosper had not come to understand this aspect of Augustine’s thought, though he would make it the center-piece of his theology two decades later.

LED BY THE SPIRIT, BUT NOT YET (PROSPER’S EARLY THOUGHT)

The controversies over Pelagianism and predestination forced some theologians to wrestle with weighty problems about human and divine agency. The Holy Spirit’s role as *guide* was articulated according to different senses of *being led by the Spirit*. (Rom 8:14) Ascetic literature used a non-technical sense of being led by the Spirit and the gifts of the Spirit.¹⁴ Holy men and women are led by the Holy Spirit. This generic sense can be separated from the technical sense of the phrase which Augustine developed partially in response to Pelagianism, and which Prosper of Aquitaine championed across the Mediterranean in Italy and Gaul. But Prosper did not always make use of this technical sense. One of Prosper’s first works, *On the Providence of God*, adopted positions on the freedom of the human will which Prosper himself later denied. Prosper later accepted

¹³ Augustine, *corr. et gr.* 15.47 (CSEL 92.277; WSA 1.26.142).

¹⁴ E.g. *V. pat. jur.* 1.16, 1.41, 3.149; Cyprianus, *v. Caesarii* 1.45, 2.34; Eucherius of Lyons, *de laud. herem.* 22; Sulpicius Severus, *v. s. Martini* 7 (PL 20.164).

Augustine's understanding of the human will and used it to oppose Cassian's anthropology in his *Against the Conferencer* (i.e. Cassian). Indeed, precisely in this work, after Prosper came to profess the limited freedom of the human will, he came to understand the importance of pneumatology in Augustine's discussion of the issue. Thus, Prosper offers the first of the definitively Augustinian pneumatologies (after St. Augustine himself) which I present in this work.¹⁵ He is an example not only of the focus of Latin pneumatology on the reformation of desire, but also of a particular kind of Augustinianism which developed in late antiquity.

Prosper follows the general tradition which freely speaks of the Spirit as having inspired Scripture, both the Old and New Testaments, and as continuing to inspire interpretation of Scripture.¹⁶ Much like Cassian, Prosper is not interested in writing about divine processions or attempting to describe the relations between divine persons.¹⁷ Rather, Prosper's pneumatology enters his theology of divine grace and human will. This theology developed over Prosper's career in close conjunction with his growing understanding of Augustine. What Augustine was able to connect in the 420s, Prosper did not fully connect until the 440s or later. Prosper developed a role for the Holy Spirit as the divine agent of human reform in his mature theology. The most distinctive element of this is the three-fold schema for advancement of the human will presented in *On the Call of All Nations*.

¹⁵ I consider Vincent of Lérins, another early excerptor of Augustine, in chapter 5.

¹⁶ E.g. Prosper of Aquitaine, *voc. om. gen.* 1.9.16; 2.15; 2.18.33; 2.18.34.

¹⁷ There is some controversy about which of Leo's letters should be attributed to Prosper, who served as an advisor to Leo during his Papacy. Whatever one decides was Prosper's role with Leo, it remains the case that the only theological controversy Prosper entered on his own is the Pelagian controversy, which he attempted to extend to Cassian and Vincent. Additionally, nothing in the Leonine corpus addresses the procession of the Holy Spirit in any technical depth. Cassian does discuss the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Son in *De incarn.*, but does not discuss Trinitarian processions.

Every human soul... is endowed with a will manifesting itself in some manner or other. It desires what is pleasing and turns away from what displeases. With regard to its natural impulses now weakened by the infection of the first sin, this will is of two kinds, either sensual or animal (*aut sensualis aut animalis*). But when God's grace is present, a third kind is added by the gift of the Spirit (*donum spiritus*). The will then becomes spiritual, and thanks to this higher impulse, it rules all its affections (*omnes affectus*), from wherever they may arise, according to the law of a higher wisdom.¹⁸

The third degree is called "spiritual" because of the direct influence of the Holy Spirit. Using the language of Rom 8:14, Prosper frequently notes that the spiritual will is led by the Spirit of God (*spiritu dei agatur*).¹⁹ This central role for the Spirit is not present in Prosper's earlier works. He comes to understand the Holy Spirit as the central agent in the reformation of the human will largely through his closer study of Augustine. In this, he correctly understands that the Spirit is central to Augustine's arguments concerning what is possible for the human will, and he differs from Cassian's analysis of the human condition.

At the beginning of the controversy, Prosper framed the issue neither in terms of the Spirit nor in terms of God's universal salvific will. His earliest defense of Augustine, his *Letter to Rufinus*, shows an emphasis on grace with no connection to a doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Prosper analyzes the Pelagian error as deriving from the claim that grace is

¹⁸ Prosper of Aquitaine, *voc. om. gen.* 1.2.3 (CSEL 47.80; ACW 14.27). I have altered De Letter's translation. De Letter translates *sensualis* as "animal" and *animalis* as "natural" in order to accord with his understanding of later English and French scholastic terminology. The basic sensitive appetite belongs to animals, while the rational faculties of humans are natural. As such, this is a specifically anthropocentric system and does not intend to address the sense in which plants or animals might have souls, indicating Prosper's lack of engagement with earlier philosophical treatments of the soul.

¹⁹ Prosper of Aquitaine, *voc. om. gen.* 1.4.5 (CSEL 47.81). Cf. *voc. om. gen.* 1.8.10 (CSEL 47.87)

merited by human activity.²⁰ To support his claim that “free will obeys the invitation of God... only when His grace has aroused... the desire to believe and obey,” Prosper only cites Scripture texts which reference the Son and Father.²¹ After writing to Rufinus, Prosper wrote a letter to Augustine.²² He asked Augustine to “explain how the freedom of our will is not impeded by this pre-operating and co-operating grace.”²³ Discussion of the Holy Spirit is entirely lacking in Prosper’s letter to Augustine, even though Prosper explicitly refers to Augustine’s *On Rebuke and Grace* which does rely on a connection between the Holy Spirit and grace, as I noted above. Whatever Prosper had learned from reading Augustine’s text, he had not learned the importance of the Spirit and appeal to Rom 8:14. Instead, Prosper frames the problem in terms of competing agencies: he asks how the agency of God (Prosper uses the technical language of pre- and co-operating grace) does not undermine the agency of human will. Not until Prosper specifically wrote against Cassian did he adopt Augustine’s pneumatology.

PROSPER UNDERSTANDS AUGUSTINE’S USE OF ROMANS WHEN RESPONDING TO CASSIAN

Prosper began to use Rom 8:14-15 in his arguments against Cassian, which he published around 432. In his *Against the Conferencer*, Prosper cites a decree of the

²⁰ Prosper of Aquitaine, *Ep. ad Ruf.* 1.

²¹ Prosper of Aquitaine, *Ep. ad Ruf.* 5-6 (PL 51.1796). He cites Jn 15:5, 6:44, 6:66, 5:21; Lk 10:22; Prov 8:35; & Phil 2:13. The few references to the Holy Spirit in this letter are separate from each other and do not reveal a connection between Prosper’s doctrine of grace and the Spirit. Prosper argues that some obey the Gospel and some do not because “believers are led by the Spirit of God; unbelievers turn away of their own free will.” (*Ep. ad Ruf.* 6 (ACW 32.26) Later, at *Ep. ad Ruf.* 8, Rom 5:5 is used in an argument about the charity which is needed for faith, but the brunt of the argument is carried by passages that refer to Christ and love. Similarly, Acts 16:6 is cited at *Ep. ad Ruf.* 14 and Eph 3:5ff & Acts 10:45 at *Ep. ad Ruf.* 16, but only as examples of a restricted salvific will.

²² On dating these letters, see n 4, above.

²³ Prosper of Aquitaine, *Ep. ad Augustinum* 8 (CSEL 57.466; my translation). *quo modo per istam praeoperantem et cooperantem gratiam liberum non impediatur arbitrium*. Prosper seems to be the first to use the term *praeoperans*. The term does not occur again until John Scotus translates Ps-Dionysius in the 9th century.

African bishops which uses the paired verses Prov 8:35 and Rom 8:14. Shortly thereafter he uses Rom 8:14 in his own argument:

The grace of God does not endanger free will nor take away its volition when it produces in the will a good desire. For if our wills were no longer ours when they are perfected and ruled and guided and animated by grace, then we should have to say that the sons of God *who are led by the Spirit of God* are deprived of their freedom.²⁴

Prosper's argument now includes the Holy Spirit where before he had only discussed grace. A little further in the same treatise, Prosper claims that Cassian argues for a human free will that precedes grace, and so, he cites several Scriptural verses, including Rom 8:15, in response.²⁵ Where he had earlier appealed only to the Father and the Son, Prosper now includes the Spirit. In direct response to Cassian's claim that Adam did not lose knowledge of what is good, Prosper makes the argument that the law which teaches knowledge of the good is written anew on the hearts of men by the Holy Spirit. Prosper argues that if the law has to be rewritten, knowledge of good was lost. Furthermore, the law requires charity for its fulfillment.²⁶ He easily connects charity to the Holy Spirit by appeal to Rom 5:5, exactly as Augustine had done before. Prosper's use of Rom 5:5 and Rom 8:14-15 demonstrates a new level of understanding Augustine's arguments.

Prosper's treatment of Job suffices as a final example of his understanding of the centrality of the Spirit in the lives of holy Christians. The basic line of argument which Prosper employs against Cassian involves accepting the initial principle that the

²⁴ Prosper of Aquitaine, *c. coll.* 6 (PL 51.229; ACW 32.84-85). The passage from the African synod is cited in section 5.

²⁵ Prosper of Aquitaine, *c. coll.* 9.1. Prosper quotes Cassian, *Coll.* 13.11.5.

²⁶ Prosper of Aquitaine, *c. coll.* 10.1-3. A similar argument using Rom 5:5 is made at *c. coll.* 13.6.

beginning of virtue and merit come from grace, and then pointing out where Cassian allegedly contradicts this principle. The case of Job is one such point for Prosper.

I ask you, therefore, do you think that this holy man, when tried by the torments we read in Holy Scripture, had the Holy Spirit within himself? If you say he had, then God, whom he did not forsake, certainly did help him. But if you say the Holy Spirit had forsaken him, you err, as is apparent from the prophetic words of Job himself: *For I know that my Redeemer lives...* [Job 19:25-27]²⁷

In addition to arguing that the Holy Spirit was operative in Job's good works, Prosper understands Job's prophecy to promise the coming of the Incarnate Lord and launches into a lengthy discussion of the fulfillment of God's promise in Jesus Christ. This comes to a culmination in Prosper's argument about the action of the Holy Spirit within the life of Christians. Instead of speaking only of grace in opposition to human will, Prosper argues,

divine grace helps by strengthening the human will. Of our own free will we pray (*volentes oramus*), yet *God sent His Spirit into our hearts, crying Abba, Father.* [Gal 4:6] Of our own free will we speak, and yet, if what we say is devout, it is not we who speak but the Spirit of our Father who speaks in us.[Mt 10:20] Of our own free will we work our salvation, and yet *it is God who works in us both to will and to accomplish.*[Phil 2:13] Of our own free will we love God and our neighbor, and yet *charity is from God,*[1 Jn 4:7] *poured forth in our hearts through the Holy Spirit, who is given us.*[Rom 5:5]²⁸

²⁷ Prosper of Aquitaine, *c. coll.* 15.2 (PL 51.256; ACW 32.115 modified).

²⁸ Prosper of Aquitaine, *c. coll.* 18.3 (PL 51.265; ACW 32.126).

Prosper came to use pneumatology in his presentation of human volition as a response to Cassian. Moreover, he developed the point even further in later arguments by adopting the technical language of a “spiritual will.”

In *Against the Conferencer*, Prosper fails to argue that the will is transformed by the Holy Spirit so that one may properly speak of the human will as the agent who does good. The juxtaposition of the participle *volentes* and the finite verbs (“willingly we did...”) with the Scripture passages preceded by *et tamen* (“and yet”) indicate that Prosper continues to think in terms of a model of competing agencies. Even though *we will*, the Holy Spirit acts. This assumes that our willing should normally exclude the action of the Holy Spirit. On this model, if a human will directs an action, the human is responsible and God is not; conversely, if the divine will directs an action, God is responsible and the human is not. Such a model of competing agencies drives much of the Pelagian concern to argue that human agency is prior to grace. Where there are two agents, one must be the “real” actor, while the other sits aside. Pelagians were concerned to argue that humans are the “real” actors in our own lives. Prosper argued directly against this as though God were the “real” actor in the life of holy men and women. In his arguments against Cassian, he continues to operate from this model of competing agencies. He attempts to overcome this problem, but does not find a suitable solution until later. While Prosper realized that exegesis of Scriptural passages that refer to the action of the Holy Spirit in the lives of Christians was important for his theology of grace, he had not yet developed the argument that the will itself is transformed by the indwelling Spirit. Where the will is transformed, there is no opposition between human and divine action, for the will acts freely in the Spirit. Though there are two agents, since

they will the same thing, there is no competition. Augustine presents this model of a transformed human will in harmony with God's will. Prosper comes to understand and schematize this in his most mature work, *The Call of All Nations*. There, Prosper moves beyond the model of competing agencies and speaks of a human will which is enabled by the Holy Spirit to perform good actions.

THE SPIRITUAL WILL (PROSPER'S MATURE PNEUMATOLOGY)

Many have understood the debate that Prosper raised with Cassian to be a conflict between Augustine's theology and Cassian's alternative. This has too easily accepted two problematic points: first, that Prosper offers a pristine Augustinianism; and second that Cassian represents a kind of middle ground between Pelagius and Augustine. The second is often based on some slippery notion of Eastern anthropological optimism. A more careful consideration of Prosper reveals that his understanding of Augustine deepens throughout the controversy he raised in Gaul. Similarly, recent scholarship rejects the identification of Prosper's early understanding of Augustine with "Augustinianism," as though there was only one way of reading Augustine in the mid-fifth century. Scholars have begun to focus on the ways in which Prosper separates himself from what they take to be Augustine's position and the ways in which others read Augustine differently from Prosper.²⁹ In reality, Prosper's contemporaries were reading Augustine with Ambrose and other theologians to respond to entirely different concerns than those of Prosper, as we will see in the following chapter. Similarly, Cassian's genuine opposition to Pelagian

²⁹ Augustine Casiday is leading the investigation of the way in which authors like Vincent of Lérins were genuinely "Augustinian" without following the program Prosper outlined early in his career. Cf. P.L. Barclift, "Leo on predestination," 5-21; A.M. Casiday, "Grace and humanity," 298-314; A.M. Casiday, "Rehabilitating John Cassian," 270-284; A.M. Casiday, *Tradition and Theology*. Others have suggested that Cassian is more Augustinian than he first appears: B. Ramsey, "John Cassian: Student of Augustine," 5-15.

theology has been recognized, so that what remains of the debate is the way Prosper and Cassian differ on how God acts to reform human lives. I argue that pneumatology is a key part of the solutions that each developed.

Scholars have focused on earlier and more contentious works to the neglect of Prosper's more mature work. Though there is debate about whether an earlier work, such as Prosper's *Against the Conferencer*, presents his mature position on grace, it is clear that the most mature presentation of pneumatology comes in his later work. In fact, for Prosper, the issue of grace and will became one which was not directly focused on discerning where grace "prevenes" (is prior to) nature, but on how to understand God's universal salvific will.³⁰ The debate was not about whether grace or nature is first or more powerful, but about how to understand God's plan for salvation. If God desires the salvation of all, as 1 Tim 2:4 claims, then how are we to explain the failure of many? Either the earthly failings of humanity do not result in eternal damnation (and thus, God's will is brought about) or some humans are damned eternally (and thus, God's will is thwarted by human choices). Obviously, if God's will is not absolute and his divine plan for salvation can be overwritten by human choices, God's power is lessened. God is subject to the human will, at least in regards to salvation. This raises other problems for a doctrine of God. The issue is vicious unless it includes some other argument, such as a different interpretation of the verse from Timothy. The point for my investigation of pneumatology is, however, far less complex: the controversy over predestination was not simply about nature and grace, but also about the execution of God's will. In this lies a subtle critique of placing too much emphasis on Cassian's *anthropology* as "optimistic:"

³⁰ Prosper of Aquitaine, *voc. om. gen.* 1.1.1.

the debate was more properly about God's salvific will.³¹ Placing the debate in proper theological relief allows us to understand the importance of pneumatology in Prosper's response to Pelagianism and his understanding of predestination. The Holy Spirit plays the key role in calling all nations to salvation. The Holy Spirit effects God's will for salvation. Attention to Prosper's mature work from c. 450, *On the Call of All Nations*, demonstrates one thoroughly Augustinian stream of thought that developed in southern Gaul and central Italy.³²

Prosper's understanding of the Spirit's role in reforming the human will reaches its culmination in his schema of the sensual, animal, and spiritual human will, which I have already introduced above. The term *voluntas spiritualis* finds two precursors in Augustine, but the systematization of the concept belongs to Prosper.³³ For Prosper, the spiritual will is that will by which an agent acts for himself. This is the mechanism which allows him to overcome the model of competing agencies. Earlier in his career, Prosper had adopted the Pelagian model of competing agencies, and so, argued simply that grace is prior to

³¹ Pace R.H. Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*. Alternatively, see D. Ogliari, *Gratia et Certamen*.

³² Until recently, Prosperian authorship of this text was debated. M. Cappuyns, "L'auteur," 198-226, is taken to have settled the issue of authorship. He also argues for 450 as the date at which it was written, which has been accepted by scholarly consensus. See A.Y. Hwang, *Intrepid Lover*, 19-20; R. Teske, "The Augustinianism of Prosper of Aquitaine Revisited," 491-503.

³³ De Letter (ACW 14.172 n 13) suggests that Augustine has the same conception. There is an error in his citation of *de civ. Dei*. 13.2 & 13.4. The Latin text De Letter provides in his note is from the following chapter, 14.2 & 14.4. There, Augustine juxtaposes manners of living (*vivere secundum qq.*). Though thematically related, these are not discussions of the will. In *Ep.* 98.1 (CCSL 31a.227), Augustine responds to a question concerning baptism of children. Eugippius, *thes. ex s. Aug.* 230 (PL 62.893), quotes this passage from Augustine. Knoell did not retain this passage in CSEL 9.1, though Quesnell did in PL 62. Children are baptized on the faith of their parents and not on their own faith. Augustine's response contrasts the carnal pleasures of some (*per aliorum carnalem voluptatem*), pleasures through which all men are sinners, with the spiritual will of others (*per aliorum spiritalem voluntatem*) through which children come to baptism. The spiritual will is contrasted with carnal pleasures in a helpful rhetorical turn, but the issue of agency with which Augustine is concerned differs from Prosper's understanding of the spiritual will. Infants are baptized by the agency of another's will. More closely related, then, is the use of the phrase at *div. qu.* 49. A child begins life dependent on his mother, and then grows until he reaches an age at which he is able not to know carnally, but to be converted to a spiritual will and regenerated within. Augustine, however, goes no farther with the concept under this term. Prosper gives the term a technical meaning.

human agency. In his later work *The Call of All Nations*, however, Prosper directly combats this understanding:

And if he does seek victory, he should not doubt that he has received this very desire of seeking it from Him whom he is seeking. And he should not think that, because he is led by the Spirit of God, he no longer has free will.³⁴

The spiritual will desires the good, and so, good can be attributed to that will. Instead of attributing good to a prior grace, as Prosper had argued early in his career, he argues that good can be attributed to the spiritual will. There is no competition of wills where the will is transformed by the Spirit. The problem of competing agencies dissolves, and with it, the motivation for Pelagian anthropology. One need no longer argue that a human will is somehow independent of grace in order to exhort Christians to ascetic activity and good moral behavior. God's action does not preclude human action. Rather, one can exhort the reformed will of Christians to perform good actions according to the new source of activity found in the Holy Spirit. Cassian had argued something akin to this in *Conference 13*, though Prosper could not have understood it when he attacked Cassian, and Cassian lacked the ability to present the underlying assumption about competing agencies. Nevertheless, as discussed below, Cassian's sense of compatibilism between grace and will did not include explicit reference to the Holy Spirit in *Conference 13*. For all his insight into asceticism as cooperation with the Holy Spirit, Cassian did not use this to his advantage in his explicit discussion of grace and free will. Even though Prosper realized the importance of pneumatology only in his debate with Cassian, it was

³⁴ Prosper of Aquitaine, *voc. om. gen.* 1.8.10 (CSEL 47.87; ACW 14.35). Cf. *voc. om. gen.* 1.9.15-16; 2.10. De Letter notes Augustine, *de pecc. mer.* 2.17.26, in this context. There, Augustine begins his argument against the Pelagians that a good will is a gift from God.

Augustine's use of verses from Romans which left their mark on Prosper's mature pneumatology, and not Cassian's arguments.

Following Augustine, Prosper argues that it is not the human will which was lost, but rather, freedom which was lost in the Fall. Conversely, God's action does not destroy the human will, but heals its wound by restoring freedom. We cannot come to this healing or "new birth" except through regeneration in the Holy Spirit (*spiritu sancto regente*).³⁵ Similarly, in Christ, God comes to heal the will so that it can work properly.

And for that reason He, bowing down-that is, stooping down to our human level and intent on the work of our reformation (*opus nostrae reformationis*)-wrote with His finger on the ground, in order to repeal the Law of the commandments with the decrees of His grace and to reveal Himself as the One who had said, 'I will give my laws in their understanding and I will write them in their heart.' This indeed He does every day when He infuses His will into the hearts of those who are called, and when with the pen of the Holy Spirit the Truth mercifully rewrites on the pages of their souls all that the devil enviously falsified.³⁶

The term *reformatio* is not common in Prosper's vocabulary; instead he prefers to speak of the will rising from one stage to another.³⁷ Nevertheless, it is precisely this sense of becoming spiritual which is the reformation of the will for Prosper. The issue of grace as prior or posterior to free will shifted ever so subtly to the issue of the reformation of the human will, so that Prosper came to teach that reformation of the will is the Spirit's

³⁵ Prosper of Aquitaine, *voc. om. gen.* 1.8.11 (CSEL 47.88).

³⁶ Prosper of Aquitaine, *voc. om. gen.* 1.8.12 (CSEL 47.90; ACW 14.38).

³⁷ Cf. Prosper, *voc. om. gen.* 1.1-1.4. *Reformatio* is also used at *c. Coll.* 6.1 (PL 51.229) as an explanation of receiving the grace of the seven-fold Spirit. The only other usage, at *Carmen.* 3, links the term to *transformatio*.

primary work in the life of a Christian. What began for Prosper as a controversy about grace preceding human will ends with a characterization of the reformation of the human will brought about by the Holy Spirit working within. It is not that Prosper abandons the notion of prevenient grace, but that he realizes that the more significant arguments lie in coming to describe how the Holy Spirit works within to reorient the will. Still, Prosper never analyzed the Spirit's work in traditional ascetic practices as Cassian had done. Cassian's *Conferences* offered particular practices through which the Spirit reorients a Christian's thoughts and desires, as we have seen. Prosper offers none of that reflection. The Holy Spirit simply reforms a Christian's will. In that his scheme speaks of the reformation of the will and argues that human cooperation is a necessary part of this transformation, Prosper's pneumatology is concerned with the manner in which one is transformed. In that his scheme never offers particular practices or even an analysis of the pitfalls of certain vices and their correction by certain virtues, Prosper's pneumatology is not ascetic, not even in the very modest way Leo's is, let alone the robust way Cassian's is. Prosper does, however, speak of one particular Christian practice in the transformation of the Christian. He discusses the sacrament of regeneration, and in this it is easy to see the influence of his patron, Leo the Great.

THE SACRAMENT OF REGENERATION *IN THE SPIRIT*

Baptism became a flashpoint for several controversies in late antiquity; whether one should be re-baptized when converting from a heretical sect to the Catholic Church, what role the will plays in being baptized, and whether baptism is necessary for salvation were all hotly debated topics. The notion of baptism as the sacrament of regeneration in Latin literature goes back at least to Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258), though Prosper must have

taken his position from Augustine. Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration which overcomes much of what Adam lost in the Fall.³⁸ What interests us directly is that Prosper teaches that the Spirit is particularly active in baptism. This stands in distinction to Cassian. While Cassian does discuss baptism in the life of a Christian, he does not place much emphasis on it and does not develop the sacrament as one of Spirit's operations in the life of a Christian.³⁹ Ascetic authors commonly assume baptism as a pre-condition for monastic renunciation of the world, and this renunciation takes the central place in Cassian's understanding of Christian life.⁴⁰ That is, Cassian's ascetic pneumatology focused on the Spirit's roles in activities like reading Scripture, meditation, vigils, and fasting, in which the Spirit works through the mechanisms of human thoughts and desires. Prosper articulated the role of the Spirit in the sacraments, but did not develop a teaching on the Spirit's role in traditional ascetic practices. New birth in baptism is a necessary condition for salvation in Prosper's understanding. It is the first step towards a spiritual will. Thus, the Spirit's work in baptism is the beginning of human reformation in Prosper's account. As Prosper argued, "Mortal man... cannot come to the spiritual dignity of the new birth except through the guidance of the Holy Spirit."⁴¹ The Spirit is necessary before, during, and after baptism. Indeed, baptism is not only a necessary, but a sufficient condition for salvation in the case both of infants and adults

³⁸ E.g. Cyprian of Carthage, *Ep.* 63.8.1 (CCSL 3c.398), 73.21.3 (CCSL 3c.55-556). Augustine, *gr. et lib. arb.* (PL 44.889); *corr. et gr.* (PL 44.923); *persev.* (PL 45.1004); Prosper, *gr. et lib. arb.* 8 [11] (PL 51.209), 9 [12] (PL 51.210); *c. Coll.* 9.3 (PL 51.237), 13.6 (PL 51.251).

³⁹ See Cassian, *Coll.* 5.22, 20.89, 21.31, 21.34, & 23.15.

⁴⁰ Ascetic literature also speaks of another kind of baptism in the Spirit. See K. McDonnell and G.T. Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit*.

⁴¹ Prosper, *voc. om. gen.* 1.8.11 (CSEL 47.88; ACW 14.36).

who are baptized just before death.⁴² The contrast between Prosper and Cassian in this regard is simple. Though both understand that the Spirit plays an important role in reforming the human will, Prosper's explanation for how this happens is typically general and vague, while Cassian's explanations rely on several complex anthropological systems. When Prosper names a particular locus for the Spirit's activity, he specifically names baptism. Cassian, on the other hand, thinks that the primary mechanism for human transformation is the work of the Spirit in reforming thoughts and desires through fasting, prayer, and reading Scripture, in short, the monastic institutes.

It would be difficult to over-emphasize the importance of baptism for many of the theologians who took up positions in the debates about predestination. Prosper, however, is somewhat unique in his emphasis on the pneumatological importance of baptism for the doctrine of predestination. Instead of dwelling on the Spirit's role in baptism, other theologians reflected on the need for post-baptismal asceticism. The importance of these ascetic practices was crucial in the debates about predestination, for the predestinarian position seemed to rob these practices of all efficacy. To appreciate how unique Prosper's baptism-focused pneumatology is within the controversy over predestination, let me contrast it briefly with two other leading theologians in this debate, the monk-turned-bishop Faustus of Riez, and his leading proponent in the next generation, St. Caesarius of Arles.

Faustus of Riez (d c 490), is a particularly good example of the line of thought which is alternate to Prosper as well as this line's lack of pneumatological reflection in the issues of predestination. When he wrote his *On Grace* in response to the predestinarian

⁴² Prosper, *voc. om. gen.* 1.16, 1.17, 2.20, cf. 1.22.

positions of the priest Lucidus, he did not make use of Prosper's system of the sensual, animal, and spiritual will. Nor did he make use of the key verses of Rom 8:14-15 in his explanation of grace and free will.⁴³ Nor did he articulate the Spirit's role in baptism. Rather, he attempted to argue for a kind of compatibilism between grace and free will. The terms of the debate for Faustus were set by Cassian's *Conference* 13 and Prosper's early attack on it.⁴⁴ Faustus only mentions the Holy Spirit in *On Grace* when discussing the Trinity according to the formula, "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" or when discussing the illumination of the Spirit in teaching and Scripture.⁴⁵ Faustus' letters concerning baptism and grace do not mention the Holy Spirit at all.⁴⁶ There, his emphasis is not on the reformation offered by the Spirit, but on the ability of the human will to choose and the degree to which that is impinged by original sin and upheld by graces available through creation and the sacraments. Similarly, Caesarius of Arles (d 542), another monk-turned-bishop, does not make use of Prosper's gradations of the will, the key verses of Rom 8:14-15 or 5:5, or the role of the Spirit in baptism in his treatise *On Grace*.⁴⁷ Indeed, with the single exception of certain canons from the Council of Orange

⁴³ Faustus, *de sp. sanct.* 2.7 (CSEL 21.150) uses the reference to the Holy Spirit's ability to forgive sins as an argument for the divinity of the Spirit. Faustus is considered in detail in my chapter 5.

⁴⁴ E.g. Faustus, *de grat.* 1.13 (CSEL 21.44-46) closely follows Cassian, *Coll.* 13.9-10 (CSEL 13.372-375). Cassian's main point is simply that Scripture presents us with different models: in some cases, God acts first; in others, humans act first.

⁴⁵ For the Trinity, see *grat.* 2.9 (CSEL 21.78). For Spirit and teaching, see Faustus, *de grat.* 1.1 (CSEL 21.6), 2.11 (CSEL 21.89). Similarly, Faustus cites Acts 7:51, concerning those who resist the Holy Spirit, and explains this as those who close their eyes to the truth, at *de grat.* 2.5 (CSEL 21.70), and the language of "temple of God" and "Spirit of God dwells within you" from 1 Cor 3:16 shows that we can freely reject grace at *de grat.* 1.11 (CSEL 21.39).

⁴⁶ Faustus, *Ep.* 1 & 2 (CSEL 21.161-168).

⁴⁷ I refer to Caesarius, *de grat.* (ed. Morin 2). Caesarius, *Serm.* 237.3, uses the reference to being led by the Spirit of God (Rom 8:14-15) to separate two kinds of persons: those who do good works, and those who have careless souls. At *Serm.* 97, Caesarius also uses the verse to explain Ex 14:15, in which God hears the cries of the Israelites at the Red Sea, even though they did not speak out loud. Morin (*Opera Omnia*) notes that this sermon follows Origen's *Hom. Ex.* Caesarius is considered in detail in my chapter 5.

(529), pneumatology did not enter the debates about predestination in any significant way for these theologians. Instead, other forms of pneumatology developed in response to different issues, as I discuss in the next chapter. Those theologians who were most sympathetic to Cassian lost sight of the pneumatology that was part of his ascetical theology. The atmosphere of controversy allowed these theologians to focus narrowly on particular proof texts and to ignore developments in Prosper's theology, to which they were opposed.

Prosper's theology developed as a particular reflection on Augustine's anti-Pelagian works, almost to the exclusion of other aspects of Augustine's theology. The entirety of Prosper's pneumatology develops from his involvement with the controversy which grew from opposition to Pelagianism to consideration of predestinarianism.⁴⁸ The unique contribution he made to pneumatology through his system of the sensual, animal, and spiritual wills remained quietly tucked away in his treatise until the 9th century.⁴⁹ Prosper's *Call of all Nations* is, in the final analysis, a kind of dead end for the history of pneumatology relevant to Gregory the Great. In Gaul, the issue of grace and free will quickly became a controversy focused on predestination and God's universal salvific will, and the debate was fought on terms of divine grace and human will, despite Prosper's mature efforts to include pneumatology.

⁴⁸ Even Prosper's series of excerpts from Augustine make few mentions of pneumatology in any other context. See p. 102, n. 20.

⁴⁹ Pope Gelasius cites one line from Prosper favorably at the end of the 5th century, but the arguments are not taken up again wholesale until Ratramnus of Corbie and Hincmar of Reims in the 9th century. For full details and a brief discussion, see CSEL 47.42 & 70.

THE SPIRIT AT THE SYNOD OF ORANGE

In July of 529 the Gallic bishops met in Orange under the leadership of the archbishop of Arles, St. Caesarius. The new basilica in the town needed to be dedicated, and the bishops needed to discuss the controversial topics of grace, free will, and predestination. Their presentation of the matter used pneumatology to discuss even more than Prosper's focus on baptism and God's call to all nations. They taught that the Spirit is involved in all the issues relevant to predestination. The synod issued twenty five canons and a short statement of faith which were later ratified by Pope Boniface II in 531 and then reissued with additional excerpts.⁵⁰ That is, there was an explicit move to name this theology as *Catholic* even beyond Augustine. Nearly all scholars agree with Robert Markus that "the work of Caesarius of Arles and of the second Council of Orange are the final act in the dramatic encounter of traditions which began with the struggle between Pelagius and Augustine."⁵¹ And yet, scholars disagree to a great extent about the history of the texts involved and what traditions they represent.

The discussions of predestination in late antiquity involve all of the complexities of differing theological insights and abilities, political maneuvering, and anonymous texts. The range of theological opinion is matched only by the number of issues involved in the discussion: the source of faith (*initium fidei*), the extent of the natural good (*bona natura*), the extent to which there is a weakened will (*arbitrium infirmatum* or *adtinuatum*), the relationship between predestination and foreknowledge, whether

⁵⁰ See Glorié (CCSL 85a.243-246); J.P. Burns, *Theological Anthropology*, 109-128; M. Cappuyns, "L'origine des 'Captiula' d'Orange 529," 130-134; C.J. Hefele, *History of the Councils*, 152-168.

⁵¹ Markus, "the legacy of Pelagius," 226. D.W. Johnson, "The myth of the Augustinian synthesis," 157-169, argues that Orange does not play such a significant role. Much of this is based on the absence of discernable influence from these canons until the Reformation. Johnson notes Thomas Aquinas, but overlooks Hincmar of Reims and Ratramnus of Corbie from the 9th century.

predestination involves damnation, and the extent of God's salvific will. Here, I must bracket many of the important discussions about these issues in order to maintain focus on the pneumatology that develops within this complex discussion. Between Prosper and Orange there is a period of nearly 80 years in which references to the Spirit were reserved almost exclusively for anti-Arian works in Italy and Gaul. I will discuss these in detail in the following chapter. At Orange, however, pneumatology was linked to the contentious issue of predestination. The pneumatology invoked at Orange in 529 is both traditional and unique. It is traditional in that it understands grace as the work of the Spirit and that it associates the Spirit with the constant struggles of the Christian. It is unique in the terminology it uses to explain the work of the Spirit. Furthermore, Orange marks a special achievement in Gaul because it associates the Spirit most fully with the questions of predestination which had vexed multiple generations of theologians. That is, when the controversies over predestination are understood to involve all of the issues listed above, Orange appeals to the Holy Spirit in explaining every aspect of the controversy, and this is unique in Gaul; it marks an advancement on Cassian's treatment of similar issues in *Conference 13* and Prosper's *Call of All Nations*; and it combines many of the issues concerning virtue and perseverance that were typical of Cassian's ascetic pneumatology with the sacramental issues which were typical of Leo's and Prosper's ascetic pneumatologies.

It is well known that of the twenty-five canons promulgated at Orange, twenty-four of them are direct citations of other texts. Canons 1-8 quote from the anonymous *Chapters from Saint Augustine transmitted in(to) the city of Rome*. Canons 9-25 cite from Prosper's *Book of Sentences*, with one exception. Canon 10 has no direct textual

dependencies.⁵² The pneumatology at play in the conciliar canons is dependent on other sources. Since I have already discussed Prosper's pneumatology and his work is relatively easy to date and less problematic than the *Chapters from Saint Augustine*, I will start with the pneumatology appropriated from his collection.

Prosper was probably in Marseilles when Cassian died around the year 435. By the early 440s, Prosper had moved to Rome and was on extremely good terms with Pope Leo, probably serving as a special advisor to the Roman bishop.⁵³ In Rome, Prosper would have been exposed to Arnobius Iunior's *Commentary on the Psalms* and his *Praedestinatus*.⁵⁴ Prosper seems to have written his own *Commentary on the Psalms*, as well as his *Sentences from Augustine* and the *Epigramatta* in response to Arnobius.⁵⁵ Prosper's *Sentences* is notable for its careful avoidance of the term "predestination," which marks a shift in his theology away from the controversy. It also would have made the collection more palatable to wider range of theological camps. We have already seen that Prosper realized the importance of the Holy Spirit in developing a theology of the

⁵² The common suggestion that this canon relies on Prosper, *c. coll.* 34 is unhelpful, since Prosper there treats a specific claim from Cassian which is not the subject of the canon. Prosper is concerned with Cassian's claim that we must not think of human nature so as only to assign evil to it. For Prosper, this denies the need for grace in each and every good action, and thus, is Pelagian. Canon 10 discusses the need for God's aid in perseverance. While related, the debates about the fundamental goodness of post-lapsarian human nature and the need for a grace of perseverance were different technical discussions for at least 75 years prior to this council, making the connection between *c. coll.* 34 and canon 10 tenuous.

⁵³ See N.W. James, "Leo the Great and Prosper of Aquitaine," 554-584.

⁵⁴ Arnobius Iunior made use of Augustine's theology and Cassian's *De Incarn.* in his *c. cum. Ser.*, which attacks Monophysitism, Nestorianism, and Pelagianism. The *praed.* has recently been assigned to Arnobius, though it is anonymous in many mss. Gori (CCSL 25b) includes it in the works of Arnobius Iunior. Demeulenaere (CSEL 64.133) is happy to attribute it to Arnobius and not to Vincent. See M. Abel, "Le *Praedestinatus* et le pélagianisme," 5-25; G. Morin, "Etude d'ensemble sur Arnobe le Jeune," 154-190. *Praed.* attacks Augustine's doctrine of predestination, and Prosper would have opposed this. Arnobius Iunior's works are edited in CCSL 25-25b.

⁵⁵ Hwang, *Intrepid Lover*, 198-205. Hwang argues that Prosper limits his commentary only to Psalms 100-150 because he was responding to claims made by Arnobius in his commentary on those same Psalms. Hwang also notes that the *Capt. S. Aug.* were likely written at this time and influenced Prosper. For more discussion of this text, see chapter 6, esp. p. 132ff.

transformation of the will in his *Against the Conferencer*, written in the early 430s, and further developed this theme in his *Call of All Nations*. The two citations from the *Sentences* that occur in the text from Orange demonstrate the same pneumatology, but without any indication of Prosper's later solution to the problem of competing agencies. Canon 17 quotes Prosper, who quotes Augustine:

Worldly desire produces Gentile courage; while love of God (which *is poured out in our hearts* not through the decision of will, which is from us, but *through the Holy Spirit who is given to us*) produces Christian courage.⁵⁶

The concern to contrast the sources of non-Christian and Christian virtues is typical of Prosper's discussions about the possibilities for human agency. It delineates a firm boundary between those who are baptized and those who are not. The gloss on *caritas* by appeal to Rom 5:5 was a hallmark of Augustinian theology well before Augustine wrote his *Against Julian, an Unfinished Work*, from which Prosper cites, and had become central to Prosper's understanding by the time he compiled the *Sentences*. In the context of drawing the boundary between baptized and non-baptized, it has the effect of attributing responsibility for the election of the baptized to God. However, it contrasts human nature with the Holy Spirit, ignoring the notion of union between human and divine wills, indicating an earlier phase in Prosper's understanding of the problem that lies underneath many of the issues of Pelagianism. Nevertheless, the point is clear: it is the love provided by the Spirit which forms a Christian. Beyond this, the reference to the Spirit is significant in the context of Orange only because Caesarius does not otherwise

⁵⁶ Orange, can. 17 (CCSL 148a.60) = Prosper, *Sent.* 297 [295] (CCSL 68a.330 / PL 51.472) = Augustine, *c. Jul. imp.* 1.83 (CSEL 85.96; my translation). The Scripture verse cited is Rom 5:5.

use the associated Scripture.⁵⁷ There was no recent Gallic history of exegesis of Rom 5:5. The same is seen in canon 25, which also quotes Prosper, who partially quotes and then paraphrases a passage from Augustine:

To love God is entirely the gift of God. He gave [it] in order that he might be loved. He, though unloved, loves. We, though displeasing, are loved so that he makes us pleasing. For the Spirit of the Father and the Son – the Spirit whom we love with the Father and the Son - pours out love in our hearts.⁵⁸

Prosper summarizes Augustine's development of our love *for* the Father and Son which is from the Spirit who is *of* the Father and Son, but much of the quotation is verbatim from Augustine. Augustine connects this discussion to a discussion of his Trinitarian theology. Prosper partially conceals this reference, and the text from Orange gives no indication that the Gallic bishops want to address Trinitarian theology along with predestination. Orange's use of the Augustinian material collected in Prosper's *Sentences* shows the same kind of pneumatology as that which Prosper developed in his response to Cassian nearly a century earlier.

The first eight canons of Orange are much more interesting for the development of pneumatology. They quote, verbatim, from a collection of *capitula* known as the *Chapters from Saint Augustine transmitted in(to) the city of Rome*. The history of these

⁵⁷ Caesarius, *Serm.* 39.6 (CCSL 103.177) is the only other text attributed to Caesarius which uses the verse, but Caesarius quotes Augustine there, as well. It occurs in a section which Caesarius announces is from Augustine, who uses Rom 5:5 in conjunction with the same passage from John which concerns Caesarius' *Serm.* 39. See Augustine, *Io. ev. tr.* 17.6.2; CCSL 103.175 erroneously prints *Io. ev. tr.* 18 as the source.

⁵⁸ *Conc. Gal. Orange* (529), can. 25 (CCSL 148a.62) = *Sent.* 372 [370] (CCSL 68a.356 / PL 51.489) excerpts from Augustine, *Io. ev. tr.* 102.5 (CCSL 36.597); my translation.

Chapters has been the source of great speculation among scholars.⁵⁹ Not only is their author unknown, but the current critical edition lists a collection of twenty-nine chapters, though some manuscripts have as few as five of them in a collection, and previous editions have compiled only nineteen. That is, the collection appears to have been redacted at least once. Additionally, the *Chapters* are not actually quotations from Augustine's corpus. Rather, they are new statements of theological positions which were highly contentious in Gaul, Italy, and beyond during the 5th-6th centuries. They synthesize and summarize texts from Augustine, but they are not quotations of his extant works. The council at Orange (529) is the earliest source to quote directly from this collection, and only gives evidence of material that would have been from the first recension of the *Chapters*. A fuller discussion of their creation and circulation must wait for my chapter 6; they are rightfully discussed in conjunction with John Maxentius and the other Scythian monks. The *Chapters* are mentioned here only because the canons issued by the Council of Orange under the presidency of Caesarius of Arles interest us as a kind of return to a pneumatology which is both Augustinian and ascetic.

Canons 4-8 are concerned with predestination in five specific sets of concerns: how God is said to wait upon our will; the beginning and increase of faith; God's mercy in response to believing, willing, and acting; human choices which relate to eternal life; and the motivation for seeking baptism. Since the first two canons of Orange outline the extent of Adam's sin, and this is a preamble to discussions of grace and predestination, only one canon from the *Chapters* does *not* mention the Holy Spirit where we would expect it. The Holy Spirit is absent from the discussion of prayer in canon 3. The

⁵⁹ For detailed discussion and bibliography, see chapter 6, esp. p. 132.

remaining canons excerpted from the *Chapters* appeal to the Holy Spirit in establishing a theology of predestination:

Can. 4: If anyone contends that God waits for our decision to cleanse us from sin and does not confess that the bestowal of the Spirit and his action in us [*per sancti Spiritus infusionem et operationem in nos*] moves us to will to be cleansed, he opposes this Holy Spirit who says through Solomon, “The will is prepared by the Lord” [Prov 8:35 LXX], and the salutary preaching of the Apostle, “It is God who works in you both to will and to accomplish for good will” [Phil 2:13].⁶⁰

Can. 5: If anyone says that, like its growth, the beginning of faith and the willingness to trust by which we believe in him who justifies the ungodly and attain the regeneration of holy baptism is present in us naturally and not through the gift of grace, that is, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit who corrects [*per inspirationem Spiritus sancti corrigentem*] our will from its infidelity to faith, from ungodliness to piety, then he is convicted...⁶¹

Can. 6: If anyone says that mercy is divinely bestowed on us when without God’s grace we believe, will, desire, try, labor, pray, watch, apply ourselves, ask, seek, and knock, but does not confess that the bestowal and inspiration of the Holy Spirit [*per infusionem et inspirationem sancti Spiritus*] brings us the strength to believe, to will, or to do all these things as we ought... then he opposes the Apostle...⁶²

⁶⁰ *Conc. Gal. Orange* (529) can 4 (CCSL 148a.56; Burns, 114). I read *infusionem* and not *infusione*. Can 4 = *Cap. S. Aug.* 6.6 (CCSL 85a.255).

⁶¹ *Conc. Gal. Orange* (529) can 5 (CCSL 148a.56-57; Burns, 114). Can 5 = *Cap. S. Aug.* 7.7-8 (CCSL 85a.255-256).

⁶² *Conc. Gal. Orange* (529) can 6 (CCSL 148a.57; Burns, 114). I read *infusionem* and not *infusione*. Can 6 = *Cap. S. Aug.* 8.9 (CCSL 85a.256-257).

Can. 7: If anyone affirms that any good which belongs to the salvation of eternal life can be thought of or chosen in a profitable way, or that consent can be given to the salvific... preaching [of the Gospel] through the strength of nature without the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit [*absque inluminacione et inspiratione Spiritus sancti*] who gives everyone delight in consenting to the truth, then he is deceived by a heretical spirit...⁶³

Can. 8: If anyone maintains that some come to the grace of baptism by mercy but others can attain it through free choice... he is shown to be a stranger to the true faith. In saying this, he either asserts that not everyone's free choice is weakened through the [sin of Adam], or he obviously thinks it is wounded, but only in a way that still allows them the strength to search out the mystery of eternal salvation by themselves without God's revelation. The Lord himself showed how false this is... Similarly the Apostle says, "No one can proclaim Jesus Lord except in the Holy Spirit" [1 Cor. 12:3].⁶⁴

The association between grace and the Holy Spirit is nearly unremarkable except for the fact that when Caesarius and other Gallic bishops discuss grace, they do not gloss the matter by reference to the Holy Spirit. This is not because they deny that grace is the work of the Holy Spirit, but rather because they understand the controversies over grace and predestination as separate from the controversies over the Holy Spirit. This is how the issues had been treated by Faustus of Riez in the generation before Caesarius, and

⁶³ *Conc. Gal. Orange* (529) can 7 (CCSL 148a.57-58; Burns, 114-115). Can 7 = *Cap. S. Aug.* 9.10 (CCSL 85a.257-258).

⁶⁴ *Conc. Gal. Orange* (529) can 8 (CCSL 148a.58; Burns, 115). Can 8 = *Cap. S. Aug.* 10.11-12 (CCSL 85a.258-259).

how Caesarius had discussed the issue before Orange. Moreover, the canons of Orange not only appeal to pneumatology as part of understanding predestination, they appeal to pneumatology at almost every conceivable turn. That is, the Holy Spirit is understood as the constant companion of the Christian. The Spirit acts within a person before and after baptism. The Spirit is a necessary part of attaining salvation. God's assistance to those who seek redemption comes in the form of the Spirit inspiring, illuminating, and working within.

It is too much to demand of a set of conciliar canons that they develop a complex pneumatology or betray much in the way of an underlying theological anthropology. Indeed, the canonical form in general is limited in this way. Thus, it is remarkable that such a strong pneumatology is present. Additionally, the only Gallic author to have reflected seriously on pneumatology within the controversy over grace, free will, and predestination was Prosper. But Prosper had only made three real contributions to the discussion: the role of the Spirit in drawing people to baptism, the role of the Spirit in inspiring the love which defines Christians, and the need to speak of a spiritual will which operates on the combined agency of a particular human and the Holy Spirit. The inspiration and infusion of the Holy Spirit is central to the understanding of Christian life offered in the canons of Orange, and offer terminology that I argue helps us determine that John Maxentius and the Scythian monks formulated the *Chapters* which the canons quote. Nevertheless, no mechanism is offered for how the Spirit reforms the will or orders thoughts and desires. *That* the Spirit is operative in reforming the human will is clear, but the lengthy reflections offered by Cassian are not part of the 6th century discussion, nor are many of the concerns of Leo or Prosper evident. The pneumatology

here offers a slight advantage over Prosper's discussions because it makes the Holy Spirit directly involved in a list of particular activities, such as believing, willing, desiring, laboring, and praying. The reader of these canons knows where to expect the Holy Spirit in a way that is not evident from Prosper's work. But the canons lack any attempt explain how this works or how one can foster the life of the Spirit within, a concern that was central to Cassian's pneumatology, and which sometimes concerned Leo's sermons.

THE SPIRIT FROM PELAGIUS TO PREDESTINATION

At the turn of the 5th century, Christians were certain that we are led from within by the Holy Spirit, who reforms our desires. Ascetic teachers like Cassian were able to wed this role of leading from within to the Spirit's role in the Incarnation and in revelation: the Spirit indicates which things are genuinely Christian and guides the ascetic to holiness. Cassian was also able to articulate particular mechanisms by which the Spirit reforms human thoughts and desires, but these reflections remained separated from his treatment of the problem of grace and free will presented by Pelagius. Prosper roused a controversy with Cassian over precisely this issue, which he initially thought centered around how divine grace could precede human will without destroying the human will. As he responded to Cassian's treatment of Pelagianism, Prosper realized the importance of Augustine's pneumatology as a component of the response to Pelagianism. But Prosper also realized that the controversy included God's salvific will. Thus, as he matured, he shied away from direct discussions of predestination, and focused more on justifying belief in God's salvific will with belief in the damnation of some people. Prosper's mature pneumatology developed a mechanism to deal with personal growth according to a model that was focused on the individual will. A person may advance from

a *voluntas sensualis* to *animalis* to *spiritalis* (sensual to animal to spiritual will). Prosper also highlighted the importance of baptism as regeneration in the Holy Spirit, much like Pope Leo the Great. Where Prosper articulated roles for the Holy Spirit in reforming the lives of Christians, Prosper relied on the Augustinian analysis of the human condition as one fundamentally centered on the freedom of the will. Thus, where Prosper and Cassian can most easily be compared, we see that they articulate different roles for the Spirit because they understand human interiority differently. Prosper focuses on the reformation of the will; Cassian focuses on purity of heart in terms of reformation of thoughts and desires. Prosper's pneumatology develops not as part of a system of ascetical formation, but as an answer to particular questions about the human will and salvation. It develops as a school of Augustinianism.

As the controversy over predestination drew to a head in the 6th century, Gallic bishops responded by offering a selection of texts which were associated with Augustine and which presented a role for the Spirit intimately involved in every aspect of Christian conversion. While the *Chapters of Saint Augustine* do not offer reflections on the mechanism for reformation of the will, thoughts, and desires which comprise the inner life of Christians, they do clearly articulate a role for the Spirit in every aspect of the Christian life. The circuitous route that this pneumatology took will be the subject of more detailed discussion when we consider Fulgentius of Ruspe and the Scythian monks in chapter 6, where I show that this pneumatology actually arose in response to Nestorianism and represents a strain of Augustinianism different from Prosper's. Nevertheless, this pneumatology entered Gaul early in the 6th century and was used as a solution to the predestination controversy.

Pneumatology went in several directions in the years prior to the council of Orange. On the one hand, we have the ascetic pneumatology presented by Cassian. This pneumatology articulates a role for the Holy Spirit in turning away from vice, pursuing virtue, reforming desires, and reforming thoughts, all of which leads to an ecstatic contemplation in this life. On the other hand, Prosper of Aquitaine articulated a pneumatology that focused on the central issue of his career: reformation of the human will. Between these different systems of theological anthropology, we see that Leo emphasized almsgiving and frequent participation in liturgy and reception of the sacraments as particular ascetic practices which involve the Holy Spirit. Parallel with developments in ascetic pneumatology, Prosper applied pneumatology in his response to Pelagianism and predestination. For many other Gallic theologians, however, pneumatology was part of a different theological debate, a debate with neighboring Arians, as we see in the next chapter.

V. OFF THE MAP AT LÉRINS: AN AUGUSTINIAN RESPONSE TO ARIANISM

Faustus of Riez (c408 - c490) was born at the beginning of the 5th century in northern France. Barely twenty years old, he moved south, all the way to the Mediterranean coast, to join a growing monastic community on the island of Lérins. He was elected their third abbot (433) and served in that capacity before returning north to be bishop at Riez (c451). In Riez, he became an exceptionally influential man and wrote vigorously against theological positions he found to be in error. In the previous chapter, we saw briefly how he opposed some of the positions adopted by Prosper. While Faustus did not use pneumatology in those discussions, he did write extensively about the Spirit in another theological context. He wrote in defense of the Catholic belief in the divinity of the Holy Spirit:

“I believe,” I say, “in the Holy Spirit.” *We* know the privilege of these words. *You* are able to believe in whichever men you please, and yet you have not come to see that you ought to believe in him [i.e. the Holy Spirit] for his majesty alone. It is one thing to “believe God” and another to “believe in God.” The devil is said to believe that God exists, according to the Apostle: *now demons believe and tremble*. [Jam 2:19] One is not proven to believe in God unless he piously hopes in him. Thus, to believe is to seek him faithfully and to transfer all delight onto him.¹ To say, “I believe in him” is to say, “I confess him, I care for him, I adore him, I hand over and transfer my entirety to his law and his dominion.” The obedience owed to the divine name is found in complete reverence for this tenet of faith.²

¹ Eusebius Gallicanus, *Hom.* 10.2 (*in symb.* 2) (CCSL 103.114-115) is parallel to this passage.

² Faustus, *Spir.* 1.1 (CSEL 21.103; my trans.). The principal works of Faustus are edited in CSEL 21. Those cited here are: *Spir.* = *On the Holy Spirit*; *de grat.* = *On the Grace of God and Free Will*; *Ep.* = *Letters*.

Faustus does not have a single kind word for those who oppose the Trinitarian faith of the Church. After leaving his monastery at Lérins in order to become the bishop of Riez, he was exiled from his see by the Arian Visigoths for eight years because of his faith.³ His experience was not unique. Faustus was one of many bishops who had to negotiate with various tribes who professed Arianism, and he was one of many bishops selected from the monks of Lérins.

Faustus serves as a spokesman for generations of his monastic brethren. The pneumatology that developed at Lérins draws heavily on Augustine and Ambrose in response to Arian subordination of the Holy Spirit.⁴ On its own, this claim is relatively unsurprising; Latin theology north of the Mediterranean remained in contact with the Arian theology of various Gothic tribes and the Nicene Catholic responses from Hilary, Ambrose, and Augustine. However, in a study that reveals that pneumatology was applied to questions concerning the reformation of desire, Lérins appears off the map.⁵ Study of the Lérinians shows that they did not adopt an ascetic pneumatology like Cassian's; nor did they incorporate Prosper's pneumatological strategies in the

Recent studies include: R.W. Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism, 235-272*; M. Simonetti, "Le fonti," 413-425; T.A. Smith, *De gratia: Faustus of Riez's Treatise on Grace*; G. Weigel, *Faustus of Riez: an Historical Introduction*.

³ Scholars now shy away from "barbarian" as a simple label for groups like the Visigoths, though it is difficult to avoid the term. In general, see T.S. Burns, *Rome and the Barbarians: 100 B.C.-A.D. 400*; S. Dill, *Roman Society in Gaul*; G. Halsall, *Barbarian Migrations*; R.W. Mathisen, *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul*. On the Goths in particular, see P.J. Heather, *The Goths*; P.J. Heather, *Goths and Romans*.

⁴ For an overview of the scholarship on Arianism, see J.R. Lyman, "Arius and Arians," 237-257. Fuller English discussions of 4th century Arianism and response to it include: L. Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*; M.R. Barnes and D.H. Williams, *Arianism after Arius*; R. Williams, *Arius*. The more specific discussions of Latin Arianism in the 4th - 6th centuries include: *Op. Imp. in Mt*; C. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique, 289-310*; R. Gryson, *Scripta Arriana Latina*; P.-M. Hombert, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini contra Arrianos Opera*; J.R.C. Martyn, *Arians and Vandals of the 4th-6th Centuries*; J. Moorhead, *Victor of Vita*, ix-xx; D.H. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*.

⁵ Homage should be paid to G. Clark, "Off the Map," *The Dark*, CD, (Sugar Hill, 2002), which is the inspiration for my title.

controversies over grace and free will. This is surprising because they were friendly towards Cassian and opposed to Prosper, but neither seems to have influenced their pneumatology. Rather, their pneumatology remained focused on responding to Arian claims. Furthermore, as I noted in the previous chapter, Caesarius of Arles (c470 - 542) presided at the synod at Orange in 529, where pneumatology was applied to the major concerns of the doctrine of predestination and was employed to explain how Christians are transformed. Lérins was the theological cradle for Caesarius, but in 529 he relied on a pneumatological system he received via a document from Rome, not from Lérins. We have already seen how Orange adopted two pneumatological tenets *verbatim* from Prosper, who relied heavily on Augustine, and we have been introduced to the *Chapters of Saint Augustine*, which were used as a source at Orange. I argue here that the Lérinians present a different kind of Augustinian pneumatology. This does two things for my overall argument concerning Latin pneumatology. First, it shows that Caesarius was not the author of the pneumatology used at Orange, a pneumatology that is concerned with the reformation of human interiority. Second, it reveals a type of Augustinianism that differs from Prosper's anti-Pelagian concerns because it is focused on anti-Arian concerns. Lérinian pneumatology was written *by* but not *for* ascetics. The audience for Cassian's ascetic pneumatology was other professional ascetics; for Leo's it was the laity; for Prosper's it was other theologians discussing Pelagianism and predestination; for Faustus and Caesarius, the audience was yet another theological circle, those interested in Arianism. In 529, Caesarius called the bishops to Orange to address issues of grace, free will, and asceticism in a slightly irregular council.⁶ The response they

⁶ See R.W. Mathisen, "Caesarius of Arles, prevenient grace, and the second council of Orange." R.W. Mathisen, "The "second council of Arles" and the Spirit of Compilation and Codification in late Roman

produced depended on theology that had developed far outside of Lérins, and requires still a third chapter in my treatment of the issue. Here, we study the pneumatology that developed in response to the Arian barbarians of Gaul and the curious relationship these theologians had with Augustine's theology.

THE NON-ESSENTIAL AUGUSTINE

While Gaul knew other forms of monasticism, the most powerful monastic faction developed from the community founded by Honoratus at Lérins around the year 410. Far from the wonder-workers presented by other Gallic authors, and more effectual in producing bishops than the communities at Marseilles and other important cities, Lérins was highly successful in forming ascetics who became important bishops throughout Gaul.⁷ Lérins held a special relationship with Arles since Honoratus, the founder and first Abbot of Lérins, became Archbishop at Arles in 426 or 427. Several monks from Lérins followed as successors in that see, including Caesarius. Caesarius, in fact, had moved from Lérins to Arles, where he became abbot and then archbishop in the early 6th century.⁸ He was a devoted disciple of Faustus' pneumatology, and could have even met Faustus in person, though we have no record of this. Faustus, as noted above, was the

Gaul," 511-554, provides information on many patterns we can observe in relevant Gallic councils.

⁷ For accounts of Lérins and other monastic endeavors in Gaul, see *V. pat. jur.*; Eugippius, *Eug. reg.*; Eugippius, *v. s. Severini*; Sulpicius Severus, *v. s. Martini*. See also discussions in D. Bertrand, *Césaire d'Arles et la Christianisation de la Provence*; J.-C. Giraud, C. Lavant, and A.G. Hamman, *La Gaule Chrétienne*, 8-17, 24-28; M. Labrousse, *Saint Honorat, fondateur de Lérins et Évêque d'Arles*, 19-36; J. Leclercq, "Christian Spirituality," 116-123; R.W. Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism*; P. Rousseau, "Spiritual authority of the monk-bishop," 380-419.

⁸ The principal works of Caesarius cited here are *De myst. s. Trin.* = *The Mystery of the Sacred Trinity*; *de grat.* = *On Grace*; *Serm.* = *Sermons*. The *Brev. fid.* = *Breviary of Faith against the Arian Heretics* has been assigned to Caesarius, but I argue that it does not belong to him. Caesarius' works were edited by G. Morin under the title *Opera Omnia* (1937-1942). CCSL 103-104 offer Morin's critical edition of the *Sermons*. Recent work on Caesarius includes M. Dorenkemper, *Trinitarian Doctrine of St. Caesarius*; W. Klingshirn, "Charity and Power," 183-203; W.E. Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles*. The older biography is still helpful, though does not take into account recent critical editions: A. Malnory, *Saint Césaire, Évêque d'Arles (503-543)*. See also, the introduction by Mueller in FOTC 31.v-xxvii.

third abbot at Lérins in the 430s-440s until he became bishop of Riez. While Faustus was abbot, one of the other monks at Lérins undertook detailed study of Augustine's theology. Vincent provides the literary source of the Augustinianism of Lérins. I argue here that this Augustinianism runs through Faustus and Caesarius. They are united by their collective ignorance of certain material from Augustine. The argument is somewhat unconventional, but it shows that Augustinian material which Vincent did not highlight in his work never appears in Faustus and Caesarius. In fact, Faustus and Caesarius contradict Augustine on certain points, but these are points which Vincent never recorded for his Lérinian brothers. As I say, Vincent provides the literary source of the Augustinianism of Lérins.

Not much is known about the life of Vincent of Lérins outside of his literary activity from the island monastery for which he is remembered.⁹ He was likely a monk at Lérins before Faustus arrived there. Vincent is the first theologian from the monastery at Lérins to offer serious theological reflection in a way definitively shaped by Augustine, and he is the first to compile a *florigelium* from Augustine's works.¹⁰ Nevertheless, Vincent's presentation of Augustine's pneumatology is limited; the *Excerpts from St. Augustine* and the *Commonitories* are mostly concerned with Christology.¹¹ In recent scholarship

⁹ Gennadius, *scrip. ecc.* 54, discusses Vincent. Eucherius of Lyons, *Inst. ad Sal.* 2.1 (CCSL 66.77), tells that Vincent is superior as much for his eloquence as for his learning. The principal works of Vincent cited here are *Exc. s. Aug.* = *Excerpts from Saint Augustine*; *Comm.* = *Commonitories*. Vincent's work is edited in CCSL 64 and partially translated in FOTC 7. Many associate Vincent of Lérins with the Vincent against whom Prosper wrote the *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Vincentianarum* (PL 51.177-186), adding the *Obiectiones* to Vincent's corpus. See J.-P. Bouhot, "La transmission d'Hippone à Rome des oeuvres de saint Augustin," 26-27; L. Valentin, *Saint Prosper d'Aquitaine*, 177-186. Recent studies of Vincent include: G. O'Connor, *St. Vincent of Lerins and St. Augustine*.

¹⁰ J.-P. Bouhot, "La transmission d'Hippone à Rome des oeuvres de saint Augustin," 26; J.T. Lienhard, "The earliest florilegia of Augustine," 21-31.

¹¹ Thus, Vincent leaves citations of Augustine when Augustine continues by discussing the Spirit. *Exc. S. Aug.* 1.5 (CCSL 64.213) quotes Augustine, *Trin.* 2.5.8, but stops at *in hunc mundum missus advenit*. Augustine (CCSL 50.89) continues, *proinde mitti a patre sine spiritu sancto non potuit*. Less directly,

Vincent is typically mentioned in relation to Prosper of Aquitaine and the controversy over grace, free will, and predestination. Prosper was highly critical of Vincent early in his career as a controversialist. Focus on this controversy tends to place a disproportionate emphasis on Cassian and Augustine as opposed authorities. Thus, two seeming oddities about Vincent's *Excerpts* have gone unnoticed in recent presentations. The first is that Vincent uses Cassian's understanding of Nestorianism to frame the project of compiling excerpts from Augustine.¹² In direct contrast with how Prosper cast the parties, Vincent did not think his explicit Augustinianism conflicted with his respect for Cassian. The second observation is that Vincent ignores key aspects of Augustine's mature Trinitarian theology.¹³ Together with the emphasis on Augustine's anti-Arian theology, these observations lay the groundwork for my claim that the Augustinianism of Lérins is different from that of Prosper, who focused on Augustine's anti-Pelagian works, and is also different from the pneumatology adopted at Orange.

Two of Augustine's texts were particularly useful for Lérinian pneumatology: *On the Trinity*, and *Answer to Maximinus the Arian*.¹⁴ These were excerpted by Vincent, and so, we know that these texts were available in Lérins. There are also many strong parallels with Augustine's *Answer to the Arian Sermon*, which circulated with *Answer to*

Vincent, *Exc. S. Aug.* 2.8 (CCSL 64.222), quotes Augustine, *c. Max. Ar.* 1.19, a passage which is broadly about the Holy Spirit, but which Vincent focuses on the reality of Christ's dual natures. These do not indicate that Vincent thinks less of the Spirit, but that he is focused on Christology.

¹² Thus, Vincent uses the phrase *solitarius homo* and *homousios matri* in the prologue to the *Exc. S. Aug.* (CCSL 64.199-201), phrases which belong to Cassian's argument in *De Incarn.* Nor is Vincent's pairing of Cassian and Augustine unique. Cassian himself mentioned Augustine favorably at *De Incarn.* 7.27. See A.M. Casiday, "Cassian, Augustine, and *De Incarnatione*," 41-47.

¹³ Most note Vincent's editing with regard to predestination, as at *Exc. s. Aug.* 2.8 (CCSL 64.224), where Vincent omits the term which is otherwise found in the passage from Augustine he is citing (*praed.* 15.30 (PL 44.981-982)). See A.M. Casiday, "Grace and humanity," 298-314.

¹⁴ Augustine, *Trin.* = *On the Trinity*; *c. Max.* = *Answer to Maximinus the Arian*; *conl. Max.* = *Debate with Maximus*; *c. s. Ar.* = *Answer to the Arian Sermon*. I use McKenna's translation of *Trin.* (FOTC 45), and Teske's translation of the rest (WSA 1.18). See the bibliography for further details.

Maximinus. We can fairly suppose that this text was also available in Lérins. Nevertheless, Vincent cites only from the first four books of Augustine's *On the Trinity*, and there is reason to believe that other Lérinian theologians such as Faustus and Caesarius used only these books of *On the Trinity*, perhaps even exclusively from Vincent's *Excerpts*. The line of theology developed from Vincent through Faustus and Caesarius shares a particular *partial* understanding of these Augustinian texts. Gallic theologians wholeheartedly endorsed Augustine as an authority on Trinitarian theology, as far as they knew his theology. Nevertheless, the Lérinians did not speculate on the inner relations of the Trinity as Augustine did. I suggest that this is not because they *disagreed* with Augustine, but rather, they *did not understand* Augustine's mature position.¹⁵ Their partial understanding of Augustine's pneumatology is dependent on four inter-related facets of Lérinian theology. First, only books 1-4 of Augustine's *On the Trinity* were used at Lérins. Second, Vincent provided select excerpts from Augustine's texts, which focused on a particular theme and were instrumental for later theologians who studied Augustine. Third, these theologians only understood the first exegetical rule Augustine offered in his *On the Trinity*. Fourth, Ambrose's *On the Holy Spirit* also shapes much of the discussion found in Faustus. These explain how the pneumatology of Lérins was not focused on the reformation of desire, in contrast to the pneumatology of their contemporaries. The oddity of Lérins not only helps us locate them on the map of Latin pneumatology, but it also helps us understand the sources used at Orange, where we might expect Lérinian theology to have dominated the discussion. It also gives us insight into the varied reception of Augustine's theology, for the Lérinian theologians are

¹⁵ It is difficult to determine whether they simply did not have access to complete texts or whether they simply ignored important sections of the relevant works. See the next section of this chapter for more detailed discussion of Gallic knowledge of sections of Augustine's *Trin*.

interested in different kinds of pneumatological arguments than Prosper, though both use Augustine.

The clearest argument that Lérins used Augustine's *On the Trinity* selectively is the curious use of *essentia* we find in Faustus, which is repeated by Caesarius in a direct quotation. Because the meaning of the terms is part of my argument, I leave them in Latin. For Faustus, *essentia* is a synonym for *subsistentia* (a relatively uncommon term that usually means *individuality*), both of which name what is three in the Trinity. This was not the common use of the term *essentia*. Augustine tells us, in book 5 of his work, that *essentia* is interchangeable with *substantia* and *natura* (*substance* and *nature*) in the context of Trinitarian theology, and that there is only one *essentia* in the Trinity.¹⁶ Faustus, however, explains that “there are three in one deity; three names not three kingships, three titles not three powers, three *essentiae* or *subsistentiae* but not three substances.”¹⁷ The same use of *essentia* can be seen in Faustus' arguments for the full divinity of the Spirit. Faustus notes that we describe Father, Son, and Spirit as a mutual infusion and mixture. The very ability of the persons to mix with each other demonstrates that they are distinct. “For mixture exalts the proper existence of the triple essence; mutual infusion shows distinct *essentiae*.”¹⁸ For Faustus, *essentia* could be rendered *being* in English; while *substantia* is *kind of being*. There are three beings in the Trinity,

¹⁶ Augustine, *Trin.* 5.8.9-5.10.11 explains the Latin terminology by appeal to Greek terminology and concludes that it is proper to say that God is one essence or substance and three persons. Cf. Augustine, *Trin.* 7.5.10. Boethius, *c. Eut. Et Nest.* 3 also explains the terminology similarly. Faustus certainly did not know Boethius' work, as that text was written after Faustus' death. Though Faustus knew sections of Augustine's *Trin.*, we only have evidence that Faustus knew material from books 1-4 of Augustine's work. That Faustus contradicts what Augustine teaches supports the conclusion that Faustus did not know this section of Augustine's *Trin.*

¹⁷ Faustus, *Spir.* 1.5 (CSEL 21.107; my translation). tria nunc in una deitate doceamus, tria nomina non tria regna, tres appellationes sed non tres potestates, tres essentias vel subsistentias sed non tres substantias.

¹⁸ Faustus, *Spir.* 1.11 (CSEL 21.122; my translation). permixtio enim tollit essentiae triplicis proprietatem, infusione vero nota distinctam ostendit essentiam.

but only one kind of being. Caesarius of Arles is the only other figure who follows Faustus' use of the term: "in order to distinguish His *essentia*, He declared that he proceeded from the Father, as we read: *The Paraclete comes from the Father.*[Jn 15:26]"¹⁹ The Holy Spirit is his own *essentia*, his own being. Use of *essentia* as a generic term for *being* reveals Faustus and Caesarius as a distinct group of theologians who did not know Augustine's use of the term, for Augustine explains that there is only one divine *essentia*.

When we consider that Vincent did not use the term *essentia* either in his *Excerpts* or in his *Commonitoria*, we can place him in this group with Faustus and Caesarius. The Lérinian use of *essentia* is surprising, but grouping Vincent, Faustus, and Caesarius is not. Faustus was at Lérins while Vincent was compiling the *Excerpts*. Faustus, studying Vincent's text, would have lacked guidance on the usage of *essentia* in the 420s, as would Caesarius during his time there some years later (probably the late 480s). Vincent's *lack* of using the term accounts for Faustus' curious use of the term and places them in the same theological milieu because it shows that Faustus and Caesarius would not have known what the term meant to other Latin theologians who did know Augustine's use of the term. The question then remains why Vincent did not use the term. One could assume that Vincent knew Augustine's definition and rejected it. However, when we observe that Augustine's discussion of the term takes new precision only in book 5 of his *On the Trinity*, we have reason to believe that only selections from books 1-

¹⁹ Caesarius, *Serm.* 213.1 (Morin 1.2.804; FoC 66.107). Caesarius repeats Faustus, *Spir.* 1.9 (CSEL 21.115). "sed ad essentiae distinctionem procedere eum ex patre testatus est..." There is a typographical error in Morin's notes, which suggests section 8 of Faustus' treatise, instead of 9. Caesarius, *Serm.* 212-213 are mostly quotations from Faustus, *Spir.* 1.6-9. This is the only use of *essentia* recorded in Caesarius' works.

4 were used at Lérins.²⁰ That Vincent only quotes from Books 1, 2, and 4 of Augustine's *On the Trinity*, also provides evidence of the same. It is more likely that Vincent did not know Augustine's use of the term than that Vincent knew and disagreed with it.

Similarly, Caesarius' and Faustus' use of *essentia* is evidence that they did not know the later parts of *On the Trinity*.²¹ This alerts us not to a disagreement with Augustine, but to the issue of which texts were used in southern Gaul. Thus, we can draw one theological line from Vincent through Faustus to Caesarius according to the non-standard use of *essentia* as something which names what is three in God. Vocabulary, moreover, is not the only element of pneumatology that unites these Lérinian theologians: they share specific knowledge of Augustine's explanation of the double procession of the Holy Spirit, as well as knowledge of Augustine's first exegetical rule, but ignorance of his second. The double procession and the first exegetical rule were helpful in responding to the claims of the neighboring Arians, but Augustine's second rule was never put to use.

²⁰ Vincent, Faustus, the *Quicumque*, and Caesarius do not make use of the arguments about intellect and will as models of the Trinity, which figure in the later parts of Augustine's *Trin.* and s. 52.20-22. See L. Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity*, 303-317; L. Ayres, "It's not for eatin' - it's for lookin' through," 37-64. Similarly, Caesarius argues for the coeternity of the Son with the Father from Paul's sense of the Son as the wisdom and power of God. Augustine made this argument early in his career (e.g. *f. et symb.* 4.5), but later argued that this point is misleading and rejected it (e.g. *Retrac.* 1.26 (CCSL 57.76); *Trin.* 6.1.1). Dorenkemper, *Trinitarian Doctrine of St. Caesarius*, 152-168, discusses this particular issue. Finally, Augustine, *Ep.* 174, complains that some people had only the first few books of *Trin.* The Lérinians could have been in that group. Additionally, their contemporary, Prosper, does not make use of these arguments, though he does cite from later books of Augustine's *Trin.* Prosper, *Sent.* 60-63, quotes a few lines from Augustine *Trin.* 6.8, 8.2, 13.5, 12.6, & 14.12, which concern man's beatitude. Fulgentius' exile to Sardinia sparked new interest in Augustine's works in the 520s, as did the Scythian monks' time in Rome. On the new interest in Augustine which spilled into Gaul from Eugippius (Northern Italian abbot) and Fulgentius (in exile in Sardinia), see J.-P. Bouhot, "La transmission d'Hippone à Rome des oeuvres de saint Augustin," 30-31; A. de Vogüé, "Césaire et le monachisme prébenédicte," 118-119.

²¹ Caesarius appears to be the only other Gallic author to use *essentia* as a synonym for *subsistentia*. Dorenkemper has also argued that Caesarius might not have known the later books of Augustine's *On the Trinity*. (M. Dorenkemper, *Trinitarian Doctrine of St. Caesarius*, 166-168.) On the difficulty of obtaining complete works of Augustine, see Eugippius, *Ep. ad Proba* (CSEL 64.1.2).

KNOWLEDGE OF AUGUSTINE'S FIRST RULE

Similar to their unique use of *essentia*, we can also be shocked by the way this Lérinian line discusses the missions of the Son and Spirit. Caesarius provides the clearest example of a 6th century Latin author who differs with Augustine's mature Trinitarian theology. Caesarius teaches that missions exclusively describe created realities, and thus, missions do not reveal processions. Since Augustine not only teaches that there is a connection between missions and processions, but also uses this connection to great advantage in his theology, Caesarius' position merits explanation. One assumes a later Latin theologian would follow such an important part of Augustine's mature arguments. For the Lérinian theologians, the same argument that elucidates their use of *essentia* also accounts for their understanding of the relationship between missions and processions. Just as these theologians did not know how others used *essentia*, they did not know Augustine's exegetical principle for connecting missions and processions, nor did they feel a need for it. That is, they were never pressured by their theological opponents to look for such a strategy. Much relies on the difficult arguments from what is *not* said. Nevertheless, once we see that Caesarius remains faithful to Augustine's first rule for reading certain Scripture passages, but avoids Augustine's second rule, we can properly see that what unites these theologians is their reading of Augustine through the selections compiled by Vincent.

Caesarius teaches that the proper use of the term *missio*, or as he prefers to phrase it, "that the Spirit is said to be sent," refers only to the *terminus ad quem* of a created reality. That is, the mission of the Son is the Incarnation, and the missions of the Spirit are the

tongues of fire at Pentecost and the dove at the baptism of the Lord.²² For Caesarius, the verb *mittere* always implies movement from one location to another. Omnipresence makes such motion nonsensical for a divine person because someone who is present everywhere cannot be sent from one place to another.²³ Thus, divine persons are not properly said to be sent. “In other words, a mission of the Holy Spirit is nothing else than the manifestation of His presence by the greatness of His works,” but says nothing about his eternal relationship to the Father or the Son.²⁴ To put it simply, the language of mission always entails a created reality for Caesarius. Divine processions, however, refer to uncreated realities, about which Caesarius prefers not to speak. Scripture gives us fairly technical language about the Son’s generation from the Father and the Spirit’s procession from the Father and the Son, but Caesarius, like Faustus, refuses to speculate further.

One of the questions which vexed Faustus was whether the Spirit can be said to be unbegotten (*ingenitus*), like the Father, or begotten (*genitus*), like the Son. Faustus consistently responds that Scripture is silent on the matter and that we should observe the same silence. Caesarius followed Faustus in this teaching:

You ask whether he is unbegotten or begotten. The Sacred Eloquence [i.e. Scripture] has offered nothing about this matter, and it is wrong to disrupt the divine silence. God did

²² For arguments about the mission of the Son related to his omnipresence, see Caesarius, *De Trin.* (Morin 2.168) and the discussion in Dorenkemper, *Trinitarian Doctrine of St. Caesarius*, 101-106. Cf. *Brev. fid.* (Morin 2.183-184, 196).

²³ This is an argument that Faustus had developed in large part as a response to Mamertus Cladianus’ position on the soul, as discussed further below.

²⁴ M. Dorenkemper, *Trinitarian Doctrine of St. Caesarius*, 108. For arguments about the mission of the Spirit related to his omnipresence, see Caesarius, *De Trin* (Morin 2.170).

not think that this should be indicated in his Scriptures, thus, he did not want you to understand or question this in idle curiosity.²⁵

For Faustus, as for Caesarius, the Catholic faith requires that we uphold three distinct persons in the one Trinity, but not speculate on the inner workings of God.

The fact that he proceeds from the Father witnesses to a distinction of essence, as we read: *the paraclete, who proceeds from the Father*. [Jn 15:26] From this you should understand that the Holy Spirit has his own person... There is no denying that he is God... The reason may be hidden, but the truth is not... Because the Holy Spirit proceeds from both, Scripture says: *whoever does not have the Spirit of the Lord does not belong to him*. [Rom 8:9] And in another place: *he breathed on them and said, "Receive the Holy Spirit."* [Jn 20:22]²⁶

Faustus repeats the same teaching in a sermon on the Holy Spirit, appealing only to the same two verses to justify the double procession.²⁷

Augustine's treatment of the Holy Spirit's procession from the Father and the Son is complex and develops in different directions in different texts. Faustus' use of Rom 8:9 and Jn 20:22 is consistent with his ignorance of much of Augustine's *Trin.*, as is his use of the phrase "distinction of essence." Faustus is simply following an exegetical pattern, rather than speculating on his own. Augustine discusses the double procession of the Spirit in three potentially relevant passages: *On the Trinity* 15.26, *Tractates on John* 99, and *Against Maximinus*. There is a slight, but important divide between the exegetical

²⁵ Faustus, *Spir.* 1.9 (CSEL 21.116; my translation) = Caesarius, *Serm.* 213.2 (CCSL 104.847-848).

²⁶ Faustus, *Spir.* 1.9 (CSEL 21.115-116; my translation) = Caesarius, *Serm.* 213.2 (CCSL 104.848).

²⁷ Faustus, *Serm.* 31 (CSEL 21.345).

strategies of his treatment of the double procession in *On the Trinity*, and that adopted in other texts.²⁸ Augustine does not employ Rom 8:9 in his argument at *On the Trinity* 15.26. Other sources follow this pattern. Eugippius, in his late 5th century excerpts of Augustine's works, recounted this argument.²⁹ The 11th book of the anonymous *On the Trinity*, also follows this exegesis of Jn 20:22 as revealing the double procession without appeal to Rom 8:9.³⁰ Elsewhere, Augustine does link Rom 8:9 and Jn 20:22. Faustus is among those who follow this pattern.³¹ This suggests that Faustus did not rely on the later books of Augustine's *On the Trinity*, which is consistent with other facets of Lérinian pneumatology discussed here. Faustus' point is simply that the Spirit is said to belong to both the Father and Son. That Caesarius and Faustus refuse to connect the missions (e.g.

²⁸ The most important difference for discussion of Faustus' sources is that *Trin.* 15.26 does not use Rom 8:9 to explain the double procession of the Holy Spirit. Additionally, Augustine's discussion at *Trin.* 15.26 makes an argument about the double procession of the Spirit (i.e. from the Father and the Son) and the double gift of the Spirit (i.e. Pentecost and when Jesus breathed on the Apostles). The two events of giving the Spirit are meant to teach the two-fold love of God and neighbor, according to Augustine's explanation in *Trin.* 15.26. This an argument Faustus does not employ. On the other hand, Augustine does not consider the double gift of the Holy Spirit in his *Io. ev. tr.* 99 or in his *c. Max. Ar.*, but he does use Jn 20:22 and Rom 8:9 in tandem to argue that the Spirit is the Spirit of both the Father and the Son. This is the strategy Faustus employs.

²⁹ Eugippius, *thes. ex s. Aug.* 250 (PL 62.930). On Eugippius, see J.-P. Bouhot, "La transmission d'Hippone à Rome des oeuvres de saint Augustin," 23-33; A.K. Gometz, "Eugippius of Lucullanum," 1-215; M. Gorman, "The manuscript tradition of Eugippius," 229-265; J.T. Lienhard, "The earliest florilegia of Augustine," 21-31.

³⁰ Anon., *De Trin.* 11.8.18 (CCSL 9.152). There is consensus that the latter books of this work were not written by author of the earlier books of this work. Bulhart, who edited Eusebius Vercelli's works in CCSL 9, assigned the first seven books to Eusebius (CCSL 9.1-99), but kept books 8-12 as an appendix (CCSL 9.115-205). Various MSS assign the first seven books to Athanasius and Ambrose. Editors have assigned it to Vigilius Thapsensis and Eusebius Vercelli. J. Kwon, "The Pseudo-Athanasian *De Trin.*," introduction & chapter 1 (currently p. 1-80, helpfully reviews and evaluates the scholarship. See esp.: CCSL 9.xxx-xxxi; G. Morin, "Autour des *Tractatus Origenis*," 225-245; G. Morin, "Les Douze Livres sur la Trinité attribués à Vigile de Thapse," 1-10; G. Morin, "Les nouveaux *Tractatus Origenis*," 145-161; D.H. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan*, 96-102, 239-242.

³¹ Cf. *Trin. et unit.* 1 (PL 42.1193); Quodvultdeus, *Serm.* 7.5 (De Cataclysmo) (CCSL 60.417-418 = PL 40.698). Quodvultdeus was an African bishop in the generation between Augustine and Faustus. As a deacon in Carthage, he corresponded with Augustine. The *Trin. et unit.* likely dates to Faustus' lifetime, but since it is mostly a compilation of sentences from Augustine's work, it sheds little light on the issue other than to show that very few theologians paired these two verses to argue along the lines of Augustine's explanation of the double procession of the Holy Spirit.

Pentecost or the descent at the Baptism of Jesus) to the processions follows from their understanding that one refers to created and the other to uncreated realities. Thus, Caesarius and Faustus interpret mission texts and texts which discuss relative status (e.g. the Father is greater than the Son) according to the same principle: statements of grade refer to the lower status of created realities associated with the Son and the Spirit.³² According to divinity, all three are equal. According to created reality, Son and Spirit are less than the Father.

This response to Arian critiques splits Scripture texts into two basic categories: those which are meant to teach the full divinity of Father and Son, and those which are meant to show the ontologically inferior, human reality of the Son. The principle is easily extended to the Spirit, who is sometimes shown to be equally divine with the Father and Son, and sometimes shown to be less through the created realities used by the Spirit. Such a strategy is able to speak of the Father, Son, and Spirit sending the Son in the Incarnation, and the Father, Son, and Spirit sending the Spirit at Pentecost. In this way, the missions imply nothing about the inner existence of God, for while both the Father and the Spirit send the Son, the Son is not begotten from both. By the mid 6th century, when Caesarius was making these arguments, they were well-rehearsed and had lineage in Latin at least to Ambrose.³³ Augustine, in particular, had emphasized the strategy as an exegetical rule, and Vincent had highlighted this in his *Excerpts*. As the conclusion to the opening section concerning the unity of the Trinity, Vincent quotes Augustine:

³² Caesarius, *Serm.* 213.1 (CCSL 104.848), follows Faustus, *Spir.* 1.9 (CSEL 21.115): procedentem ex deo non esse ordine vel gradu tertium monstrat unitas maiestatis. M. Dorenkemper, *Trinitarian Doctrine of St. Caesarius*, 98, correctly argues that this does not deny that the Trinity is ordered, but rather, that there are no grades of divinity. On *ordo* as a term needing clarification in this context, cf. Augustine, *c. Max.* 2 (PL 42.775); Caesarius, *Serm.* 213.4 (CCSL 104.849-850) = Eusebius Gallicanus, *Hom.* 10.10 (CSEL 101.121).

³³ The most recent treatment of Augustine's development of this exegetical strategy is L. Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity*, 177-198.

It is not without reason, therefore, that Scripture mentions both, that the Son is equal to the Father and that the Father is greater than the Son, for without any confusion, the first is understood of the form of God, but the second of the form of man.³⁴

The Latin terminology used in stating this rule is important to note. The terms *forma Dei* (form of God) and *forma servi* (form of a servant) are overwhelmingly preferred by Augustine, Vincent, Faustus, and Caesarius, though the phrases *secundum divinitatem* (according to divinity) and *secundum humanitatem* (according to humanity) or *secundum carnem* (according to the flesh) are also common. Vincent follows Augustine's terminology. Faustus knew Augustine through Vincent. Caesarius knew Augustine's terminology through both Faustus and Vincent. The Lérinian line of theologians used the logic of this argument in responding to the Arians they knew in Gaul. Some Scripture texts speak about Christ or the Spirit according to their divinity, while others speak according to Christ's assumed humanity or the Spirit's use of the dove and fire. All the texts which suggest subordination to the Arians are, in fact, only statements about the Son according to his mission under the form of humanity or about the Spirit according to his mission in the world through a created reality.

Caesarius follows this logic to the point of associating all discussion of missions with the created reality used by the Spirit or assumed by the Son. This, however, does not prevent him from making statements about the divine processions where Scripture and tradition have already provided certain formulas. It does mean that he never argues from missions to processions. That the Son is *sent* does not show that the Son is *begotten from the Father*. Caesarius thinks of the Spirit similarly. That the Spirit is *sent* does not show

³⁴ Vincent, *Exc. s. Aug.* 1.2 (CCSL 64.206), citing Augustine, *Trin.* 1.7.14 (CCSL 50.44; FOTC 45.19).

that the Spirit is *from the Father and/or the Son*. Rather, that the Spirit *proceeds* shows his relationship to the Father and the Son. In this, Faustus and Caesarius simply follow Augustine's first exegetical rule, which outlines two basic categories. The fact that Caesarius and Faustus never felt the need to move from missions to processions is an indication of the kind of opposition they encountered from the Arians they knew: the Arians in Gaul were not as sophisticated as those in Africa. As we will see in the next chapter, Fulgentius of Ruspe did face more sophisticated Arians and knew all of Augustine's mature Trinitarian theology, unlike his fellow Gallic Catholics. Study of Gallic ignorance of Augustine's second rule sheds light on the reception of Augustine's texts as well as the anti-(Gallic)Arian interests of the Lérinian theologians.

IGNORANCE OF AUGUSTINE'S SECOND RULE

Augustine frequently reflects on the fact that the Father is not sent. For Augustine, this shows the Father's *principium*. Such a reflection develops from an exegetical concern that Faustus and Caesarius did not share with Augustine. Rather, they follow the earlier Latin tradition, even to the exclusion of understanding external missions as demonstrative of internal processions. I argue that these theologians did not understand Augustine's second exegetical rule in the same way that they did not know Augustine's use of *essentia*. The Lérinian theologians never state this second rule; nor do they apply it to the passages for which it was intended. This demonstrates their ignorance of the rule.

We have already seen above that Augustine's first exegetical rule provided a way to categorize seemingly subordinationist verses of Scripture: they refer only to the created reality. Somewhat later in his career, Augustine came to realize that certain texts did not completely fit this rule. The second exegetical rule he developed admits that some texts

demonstrate the relationships within the Trinity. That is, some texts speak according to the divinity, but do not show the equality of the persons; rather, they show that the Son and the Spirit are from the Father, and that the Spirit is also from the Son. Thus, in addition to the rule of interpretation that divides Scripture verses according to the *forma Dei* and the *forma servi*, Augustine added a second rule:

Some things in the Scriptures concerning the Father and the Son are, therefore, put in such a way as to indicate the unity and equality of the substance of the Father and the Son... but some are so put as to show that the Son is less on account of the form of a slave, that is, on account of the creature with a changeable and human substance that He assumed... Furthermore, some are so put, not that He may be then shown to be either less or equal, but only to intimate that He is of the Father.³⁵

This rule is further explained in terms that link the *sending* of the Son to the Son's relation to the Father:

That is to say that the Word is not only to be understood as the man sent, but also that the Word was sent in order to become man. For He was sent not in respect to any unlikeness either in power or substance or of anything in Him which is not equal to the Father, but in respect to this, that the Son is of the Father, not the Father of the Son.³⁶

³⁵ Augustine, *Trin.* 2.1.3 (CCSL 50.82; FOTC 45.53). The general scholarly consensus is that this second exegetical rule was a later insight that Augustine developed no earlier than 415. For the most recent discussion of the issues involved in detecting and dating redactional layers in Augustine's *Trin.*, see L. Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity*, 118-120. I have already argued that Lérins used only books 1-4 of *Trin.* The extent to which my argument about their ignorance of the second exegetical rule offers further evidence for theories about dating Augustine's editions must be left for another discussion. Is it possible that Vincent made his *Exc. s. Aug.* from an early version of Augustine's *Trin.* which did not include the second exegetical rule?

³⁶ Augustine, *Trin.* 4.20.27 (CCSL 50.196; FOTC 45.164).

Augustine offers the insight that certain texts may speak not only to the created reality, which is less than the Father, but also to the relationship between the Father and Son, who are co-equal, but distinct. The principle, though largely developed for Christology, also extends to pneumatology. The notion has become so popular that we often use the short phrase “missions reveal processions” as a summary of Augustine’s legacy. It also means that when we say “the Father sends the Son,” we can refer either to the Incarnation or to the relation between the Father and the Son. Caesarius and Faustus explicitly limit the meaning of “the Father sends the Son” to the Incarnation.

Augustine offers examples of which texts can be interpreted according to this second rule. He appeals to two verses when he first states the second rule before summarizing its worth:

[Jn 5:26] - As the Father has life in himself, so he has given to the Son to have life in himself;

[Jn 5:19] - For neither can the Son do anything of himself, but only what he sees the Father doing;

From this rule, then, by which the interpreters so speak, not as giving us to understand that one is less than the other, but only who is from whom, some have drawn another meaning, as though it were said that the Son were less. But certain ones among ourselves, more unlearned and the least instructed in these matters, will be disturbed as long as they try to explain these texts according to the form of a slave, and so fail to grasp their true meaning. To avoid this, the rule we have just mentioned is to be observed, whereby it is intimated that the Son is not less, but that He is of the Father: in these words not His

inequality but his birth is made known (*quibus uerbis non inaequalitas sed natiuitas eius ostenditur*).³⁷

Two aspects of Augustine's second rule are crucial for understanding Lérinian pneumatology. The first is that he offers specific texts which are to be interpreted according to this second rule. The second is that such texts are associated with the *natiuitas* of the Son from the Father. After having stated this rule and provided two texts which should always be interpreted according to it, Augustine discusses an ambiguous text which is open to interpretation according to both rules:

And if it is ambiguous in such a way as to make it impossible to disentangle and to discern the one from the other, then, to me at least, it seems that it can be understood without danger according to either rule, as for example, when it is said: [Jn 7:16] 'My teaching is not my own, but his who sent me.' For this can be applied to the form of a slave... as well as to the form of God, in which He is thus equal to the Father, but yet that He is of the Father (*de Patre*)... [it] is correctly understood as signifying that He begot the Son who is the teaching... this is to be understood as though it were said, I am not from myself but from Him who sent me.³⁸

Thus, interpretation of the three verses from John can reveal whether one employs Augustine's second exegetical rule. Additionally, the language of the Son not being from himself (*non a me ipso*), which is extended to the Spirit in the very next line of Augustine's argument, is an indicator of familiarity with this passage.

³⁷ Augustine, *Trin.* 2.1.3 (CCSL 50.84; FOTC 45.55). Cf. Augustine, *Trin.* 2.3.5.

³⁸ Augustine, *Trin.* 2.2.4 (CCSL 50.84-85; FOTC 45.55-56). By way of contrast with the Lérinians, Eugippius, a later (6th cent.) excerptor of Augustine, quotes this passage: Eugippius, *thes. ex s. Aug.* 230 (CSEL 64.1.755).

The observation that Vincent never records Augustine's second exegetical rule, but does reiterate the first rule now takes even greater significance. Neither Vincent, Faustus, nor Caesarius offer an interpretation of Jn 5:26, Jn 5:19, or Jn 7:16 according to the second rule.³⁹ Indeed, Faustus does not even use any of these verses to discuss Trinitarian theology.⁴⁰ Vincent cites both verses in close proximity, but in a quotation from Augustine which do not make use of the second exegetical rule. Augustine's *The Harmony of the Gospels*, 1.4.7 offers Jn 5:19 as one text which teaches the divinity of Christ as coequal to the Father; while *On the Trinity* 1.11.22 offers a series of texts which are categorized according to the first exegetical rule, and Jn 5:26 is to be interpreted according to the form of God.⁴¹ The first exegetical rule, in fact, provides much of the structure of Vincent's exposition of Christology from selections of Augustine's works. Only Caesarius' use of Jn 5:19 remains to be discussed.

Caesarius' use of Jn 5:19 in his *The Mystery of the Sacred Trinity*, like Vincent's use in the *Excerpts*, does not follow Augustine's second rule. For Caesarius, the verse is

³⁹ Additionally, the Eusebius Gallicanus collection, which is related to Faustus and Caesarius, does not offer an interpretation of these verses according to Augustine's second rule. For the argument that the collection predates Caesarius, see G. Morin, "La collection gallicane," 92-115. For a response that it post-dates Caesarius, see Glorie, CCSL 101.ix. Again by contrast (see n 38 above), Eugippius does quote Augustine's use of these verses in the context of the second exegetical rule: *thes. exc. s. Aug.* 230 (CSEL 64.1.755, quoting *Trin.* 2.2.4; 228 (CSEL 64.1.742), quoting *Trin.* 1.11.22; 228-229 (CSEL 64.1.747-75), quoting *Trin.* 1.11.22-1.13.31; 245 (CSEL 64.1.800), citing *Trin.* 15.27.48; 231 (CSEL 64.1.756-757), quoting *Trin.* 2.3.5. The other excerptors of Augustine (Prosper, *Lib.Sent.* (CCSL 68a) and the anonymous *Contra Philosophos* (CCSL 58a)) do not quote any of the relevant material from *Trin.* or reference the three Jn verses, nor does Eucherius of Lyons (a fellow Lérinian) make use the material from Jn. Prosper is reported to have compiled excerpts from Augustine's *Trin.*, which, by the titles of the chapters, would likely have contained relevant material on missions, processions, and the second exegetical rule. See G.H. Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui*, entries 36-37, p. 102-105. However, there is no other evidence of this text, and there are texts assigned to Prosper in that catalogue which seem not to belong to him, as with a work entitled *de contemplativa vita*, which could easily match Julianus Pomerius' work.

⁴⁰ The same is the case for Eusebius Gallicanus, though the complicated authorship of the collection of texts gathered under this name does not allow me to include him in the Lérinian line.

⁴¹ Vincent, *Exc. s. Aug.* 1.3 (CCSL 64.207-208) cites Augustine, *de cons. Evang.* 1.4.7 (CSEL 43.6-7); *Exc. s. Aug.* 1.4 (CCSL 64.209) cites Augustine, *Trin.* 1.11.22-1.12.23 (CCSL 50.61ff).

invoked to explain how to understand the Resurrection, which 1 Cor 15:15 suggests happens at the agency of the Father, but Jn 2:19 suggests happens at the agency of the Son. That the Son does what he sees the Father doing demonstrates “that there is one operation of the Father and Son.”⁴² This is further glossed by appeal to an argument about the Son as the wisdom of the Father. That is, the verse is used to explain that the Son is fully divine, but it is not used to show that the Son is from or of the Father. Nor does it refer to his *nativitas*; nor does it argue that the Son is *non a se ipso*. Rather, it argues for the equality between the Son and the Father. Thus, Caesarius only uses the strategy of the first exegetical rule. This is not surprising since Caesarius is explicit when discussing the mission of the Son in this work. He argues that the Son

is not sent except according to the flesh... Know, therefore, that the Son, according to divinity, neither was nor is less, nor was he sent except through the mystery of the Incarnation... [Furthermore] the mission of the Holy Spirit cannot be rightly understood in any other way than an apparition or declaration of his work... therefore, when the mission of the Holy Spirit is discussed, nothing other than the greatness of his works is shown.⁴³

Caesarius’ understanding of what it means for the Son and the Spirit to be sent uses the exact terms of Augustine’s first rule, which were repeated in Vincent of Lérins’

⁴² Caesarius, *De myst. s. Trin.* 15 (Morin, 2.176; my translation). Cf. Ambrose, *de fide* 1.17.109 & 2.10.85 (CSEL 78.47 & 88).

⁴³ Caesarius, *De myst. s. Trin.* 6 (Morin, 2.169-170; my translation): “non esse missum nisi secundum carnem... Agnosce ergo, Filium secundum deitatem minorem nec fuisse nec esse, nec mitti nisi per incarnationis mysterium... Missio Spiritus sancti non aliter recte potest intellegi, nisi apparitio vel declaratio operum eius... It et quando Spiritus sancti missio dicitur, non aliud quam magnitudo operum eius ostenditur.” Caesarius is unique in his use of *apparitio* and *declaratio* here. Isidore’s Breviary for the feast of the Apparition of the Lord (PL 86.181) is the only other text to use the terms together. While Isidore’s language may be influenced by Caesarius, the prayer in the Breviary is not a discussion of Trinitarian missions.

Excerpts.⁴⁴ He applies the same understanding to the mission of the Holy Spirit.

“Mission” strictly refers to the created realities associated with the Spirit and the Son.

To the insightful scholarship of Mark Dorenkemper, Caesarius’ refusal to state a connection between the missions and processions was a significant *departure* from Augustine. Though not using the language of “exegetical rule,” Dorenkemper assumes that Caesarius would have understood both the first and the second exegetical rules, and therefore, puzzles over how to explain Caesarius’ *disagreement* with the second rule. Coupled with a general trend in certain scholarship to accept Prosper’s characterization of Vincent as anti-Augustinian, this assumption seems natural. I, however, am arguing against this trend. The Lérinians are Augustinian, but they do not agree with Prosper over grace and predestination; nor do they completely understand Augustine’s mature Trinitarian theology. It is noteworthy that Prosper does not give evidence of understanding Augustine’s mature Trinitarian theology, either.⁴⁵ Dorenkemper assumed that Faustus of Riez, who is the principal source for Caesarius’ Trinitarian theology, understood both exegetical principles, leaving Caesarius with no excuse.⁴⁶ This led Dorenkemper to consider that Caesarius may have rejected the principle, and to wonder

⁴⁴ Indeed, Caesarius, *de myst. s. Trin.* 4-5 (Morin 2.167-169) generally follows Vincent, *Exc. s. Aug.* 1-4 (CCSL 64.202-210).

⁴⁵ See n. 39 above.

⁴⁶ M. Dorenkemper, *Trinitarian Doctrine of St. Caesarius*, 113 & 179, claim that Faustus “clearly teaches that the mission texts are to be explained in connection with the inner divine processions.” Dorenkemper only cites Faustus, *Spir.* 1.13 (CSEL 21.128): “The Spirit is said to be sent by the Father and Son; he is known to proceed from their substance and to perform one work with them and for this reason the Son said about him, *the Paraclete, who proceeds from the Father*. [Jn 15:26] He did not say, “he was created by the Father,” but *he proceeds from the Father*.” While Faustus does use the verbs *mittere* and *procedere* in close proximity, he does not argue that mission texts are explained by or reveal processions. Rather, he argues that the Spirit is fully divine because the Spirit is from the Father’s substance. Faustus continues his argument by comparing the ‘being born’ (*nascens*) of the Son and the proceeding (*procedens*) of the Spirit, which demonstrate that each divine person subsists on his own. These arguments fit within Faustus’ general argument that while the Spirit is said to be sent, the Spirit does not have local presence and is not subject to local motion.

why he would have done so. If this were the case, Dorenkemper's understanding of the problem would be particularly astute, as would his attempts at solving the problem. However, we need not understand Caesarius in this way. If we reconsider the Augustinian line from Vincent through Faustus to Caesarius, we see that this line of Augustinianism never understood Augustine's second exegetical rule. It is not that Caesarius *rejects* this aspect of Augustine's thought, but that he *never understood* it as part of Augustine's system. This also helps to explain the influence of Ambrose and Hilary of Poitiers that Dorenkemper argues can be found in Caesarius: Augustine's first exegetical rule was a summary of previous Latin theology on the matter, and Faustus relies on Ambrose for certain arguments, as we see below. The Lérinians simply did not understand the principle that missions reveal processions because they did not know Augustine's second exegetical rule. It was "off the map," to use the colloquialism.

THE BREVIARIUM FIDEI ADVERSUS ARIANOS HAERETICOS

There is a single use of Jn 5:19 among the Gallic literature associated with Lérins which offers one phrase that might seem to follow Augustine's second exegetical rule. If this were the case, it could damage my claim that the Lérinian faction did not know Augustine's second exegetical rule, especially since this text has recently been attributed to Caesarius. In order to prove my claim about ignorance of the second rule, I will briefly consider the relevant passage of this text here, even though it entirely concerns Christology. My argument has two prongs: first, the text does not demonstrate knowledge of the second exegetical rule; second, there is reason to deny that Caesarius wrote it.

Almost halfway through the *Breviary of the Faith against the Arians* the author provides a short list of passages which are interpreted according to Augustine's first rule,

using the terminology *secundum hominem* (according to the man) and *secundum deum* (according to the God). This list concludes with Jn 5:19:

Thus, the liars are accustomed to accept the occasion on which the Lord said in the Gospel, *The Son is not able to do anything except what he sees the Father doing.*

[However,] not understanding this with the carnal senses, the statement clarifies the issue because it shows that he is from the Father (*ex patre*) inasmuch as he is both Son and God.⁴⁷

Two things are notable. The first is that Jn 5:19, a text rarely used in 5th and 6th century Gallic literature, is quoted. The only other Gallic author to have noted Arian use of Jn 5:19 is Caesarius, whom we have already seen employs the first exegetical rule in his response. The second notable aspect of this argument is its conclusion, namely, that the verse demonstrates that the Son is *ex Patre*. This certainly follows the logic of Augustine's second rule, as though Jn 5:19 says something about the eternal relationship between the Father and the Son; Dorenkemper took it in this way.⁴⁸ However, one phrase is not sufficient to claim that this interpretation relies on a rule stated in Augustine, but otherwise not known in Gaul. This language could rely on creedal statements that the Son is *ex patre natus*. Additionally, the phrase *ex patre* is completed by explaining that the Son is God. Such explanation follows the sense of the first exegetical rule: some things apply to the man, while others apply to God. There is no reason to construe this as

⁴⁷ *Brev. fid.* (PL 13.659b = Morin 2.190; my translation): Hinc etiam occasionem accipere calumniandi solent, quod Dominus in Evangelio dixerit: *Non potest Filius aliud facere quidquam, nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem.* Quod carnalis sensus non intelligens, ideo dictum putat ut se ex Patre esse ostenderet, utpote et Deum et Filium.

⁴⁸ Dorenkemper's opening chapter relies on the *Brev. fid.* to establish a certain reading of Jn 5:19, which he then unknowingly demonstrates is contradicted in his later explanation of the missions of the Son and Holy Spirit. Cf. M. Dorenkemper, *Trinitarian Doctrine of St. Caesarius*, 67-70 & 106-114. As I argue here, the passage from *Brev. fid.* need not be construed in this way.

evidence for knowledge of the second exegetical rule in the absence of any other use of the second exegetical rule and the interpretation of the Son as equal to the Father. The first exegetical rule is sufficient to explain the interpretation offered in the *Breviary*

Since the text has been most recently attributed to Caesarius, the question of authorship merits discussion. There is reason to doubt that the text belongs to Caesarius. We have already seen that Caesarius used Jn 5:19 to demonstrate the common operation of the Father and Son. That is, *The Mystery of the Sacred Trinity* argued that this verse belongs to the category *secundum deitatem* and shows the equality of Father and Son. The same argument is effective here in the *Breviary*, for it comes at the end of a list of pairs of texts which are to be interpreted according to the first exegetical rule. The natural reading of the progression in the *Breviary* would interpret Jn 5:19 in the same way, according to the divinity, and not the humanity of Christ. Nevertheless, if we read this passage in terms of the second rule and attribute the text to Caesarius, then we must explain Caesarius' different interpretation of the same verse in *The Mystery of the Sacred Trinity*. If Caesarius knew that this verse demonstrates that the Son is from the Father according to the second rule, it is odd that he would treat it according to the first rule elsewhere. This is doubly troublesome when we consider that this verse was a key example for Augustine's demonstration of the need for a second rule. Understanding Augustine's second exegetical rule would involve knowing his argument that this particular verse presents difficulties for the first rule. The very need for a second rule was demonstrated by this verse and gave Augustine reason to develop it. One could potentially argue that Caesarius learned the second exegetical rule only after having written *The Mystery of the Sacred Trinity* and before the *Breviary*, but this is an

unsatisfactory solution because the *Breviary* has always been considered to be a much earlier text. To my mind, it belongs to the generation of Faustus, not Caesarius.

In addition to the difficulties already noted, the vocabulary used in this passage is distinctive and does not belong to Caesarius. The *Breviary* continues by using the language of *artifex* (Creator/ Maker):

...inasmuch as the Son is God. The way in which he is accustomed to be among men is just as the Father, who is the *artifex*, teaches his Son, who is his *artificium* (created/ made thing), so that what the Son sees the Father doing he especially imitates.⁴⁹

Within 5th and 6th century Gallic literature the term *pater artifex* is unique to this text. Neither Caesarius, Faustus, nor Vincent use the term. Additionally, neither Faustus nor Caesarius use the concrete nouns *deus* and *homo* as the object of the preposition *secundum* in order to label the categories for Augustine's first exegetical rule.⁵⁰ Rather, when Caesarius uses this construction, he uses the abstract nouns *divinitas* or *deitas* and *humanitas*.⁵¹ Thus, in addition to the explanation of Jn 5:19 as demonstrating that the Son is *ex Patre* in the context of the first exegetical rule, the vocabulary of the *Breviary* raises significant difficulties for Caesarian authorship.

The most recent authorities have assigned the *Breviary* to Caesarius. Morin's critical edition of Caesarius includes it, and this attribution was accepted by Dorenkemper.

⁴⁹ *Brev. fid.* (Morin 2.190 = PL 13.659b).

⁵⁰ Similarly, the Eusebius Gallicanus collection does not use *pater artifex* or *secundum deum/hominem*.

⁵¹ Vincent, *Exc. s. Aug.* 2.7 (CSEL 64.219) does use the phrases *secundum hominem* and *secundum deum*, following Augustine, *Ep.* 187.3 (CSEL 57.87-88). Cf. Vincent, *Exc. s. Aug.* 2.8 (CSEL 62.226), quoting Augustine, *de dono pers.* 24.67 (PL 45.1033-1034). For Caesarius' use of *secundum humanitatem* and *secundum divinitatem*, see *Serm.* 3.1 (CCSL 103.21, quoting *Quicumque*), 10.1 (CCSL 103.51), 149.3 (CSEL 104.610), *Exp. Apoc.* 4 (Morin 2.223). Caesarius, *Serm.* 3 follows the *Quicumque*; v. 31 is of note for these phrases. Caesarius, *de myst. s. trin.* (Morin, 2.169) uses the phrase *secundum deitatem*, as noted above.

Though both drew attention to parallels between Caesarius' work on the Trinity and the *Breviary*, neither compared the use of Jn 5:19 and the vocabulary used to discuss the exegetical rule invoked. Much of Morin's argument for Caesarian authorship of the *Breviary* rests on similarities of vocabulary between the *Breviary* and Caesarius' treatise on the Trinity, but most of this technical language can also be found in other sources.⁵² On the other hand, I have argued that some of the technical language used by *Breviary* does not belong to Caesarius.⁵³ The internal evidence is, at best, ambiguous, but if any weight must be assigned to technical vocabulary, the differences between the two outweigh the similarities noted by Morin. The external evidence is even more troublesome for asserting Caesarian authorship. Morin helpfully reviewed the history of authors to whom this text has been attributed in his original publication of the text.⁵⁴ As he noted, scholars have considered arguments that the text belongs to Leo the Great and Faustus of Riez, among others, though these theories have been rejected. While I cannot suggest an alternative author for the *Breviary*, I have cast significant doubts on attributing it to Caesarius. In the next section of this chapter, I argue that the *Breviary* fits between Ambrose and Faustus because it is dependent on Ambrose's *On the Holy Spirit*, further discrediting Caesarian authorship of this text because Caesarius would not have been able to write the text before Faustus was writing. To return to the broader point, this is not evidence that Caesarius rejected Augustine. Rather, Caesarius belongs to a school that

⁵² E.g. Ambrose, *Spir.* 1.1.22 (CSEL 79.25), Anon. *De Trin.* 3.95 (CCSL 9.55); *Quicumque* (Kelly, 19).

⁵³ In addition to the technical language about the Trinity, there is also the explanation of the baptismal rite which observes that salt comes from water and is specific to the *Brev. fid.* and Fulgentius, *Abcdearium*. Additionally, the *Brev. fid.* knows the procession of the Spirit from the Father, and does not speak of the Spirit proceeding from both the Father and the Son. Faustus and Caesarius, however, are certain that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.

⁵⁴ G. Morin, "Breviarum Fidei," 35-53.

employed Augustine's first exegetical rule to their great advantage, but was unaware of the second rule.

Refusing to speculate on the inner Trinitarian existence apart from what Scripture says was an effective response to Gallic Arianism. In reply to Arian readings of Scripture verses which imply relative status between Father, Son, and Spirit, the Lérinian theologians can always show how Arians categorically misunderstand Scripture. The first exegetical rule is sufficient for this. If the Arians push further, the Lérinians can rely on the need for humility and reverence before the mystery of God. This tells us something about the theological reflection of Gallic Arians. They never pushed Jn 5:19 as part of their opposition to Catholic Trinitarian theology. The lack of sophisticated Arian arguments did not force the Lérinian theologians to develop pneumatology much beyond what they found in Ambrose and Augustine, nor did the controversies on grace and free will push the Lérinian theologians to develop their pneumatology along those lines. Before the council of Orange, the pneumatology of the Lérinian school was focused on anti-Arian arguments found in Ambrose and Augustine.

ANTI-ARIAN ARGUMENTS OF AMBROSE THROUGH THE *BREVIARY*

When the young Caesarius arrived at Lérins to take up his habit, Gaul was being divided between various "barbarian" families who were largely Roman in their way of life. While the names of the families were changing and the governments were less centralized, the way of life remained essentially Roman.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, with few exceptions, the barbarians were Arian in their faith, though they were less violent in their

⁵⁵ See S. Dill, *Roman Society in Gaul*; J.F. Drinkwater and H. Elton, *Fifth-century Gaul: a Crisis of Identity*; R.W. Mathisen, *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul*; G. Woolf, *Becoming Roman*.

persecutions of Catholics and less intellectual about their objections than the Vandals who ruled Africa. Mid 5th century Gaul had an almost ubiquitous presence of Arians. Just the same, mid 5th century Gaul had large number of treatises which had highly developed anti-Arian arguments. One thinks of the works of Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Jerome, Rufinus, and Augustine. Catholic theologians continued to repeat and develop these arguments in response to later controversies. Vincent's *Commonitorium* and *Excerpts* remain decidedly focused on anti-Nestorian Christology with a preface on Trinitarian theology. Faustus' *On the Holy Spirit* employed traditional arguments for the divinity of the Spirit in the context of a contemporary Gallic debate about the materiality of created souls. Faustus' use of Ambrose and Augustine is influenced by his debate with Mamertus Claudianus and his use of the *Breviary*. Faustus' pneumatology relies on Ambrose and Augustine in response to certain Arian claims.

As noted above, the *Breviary* has troubled scholars for generations. It has been assigned to Caesarius, Faustus, and Leo the Great because it shares affinity with many of the better known Italo-Gallic authors of this era. I argue here that this treatise fits well with an earlier date along this timeline because it is best explained as an intermediary between Ambrose and Faustus. The pneumatology of the *Breviary* relies heavily on Ambrose's *On the Holy Spirit*. In turn, both Faustus' *On the Holy Spirit* and Caesarius' *On the Mystery of the Sacred Trinity* depend on the *Breviary*. The treatise has three basic sections: the first is concerned with Christology, and in particular, how to read Scripture verses which suggest that the Son is less than the Father. I have already discussed this section above, where I noted some terms which are peculiar to this treatise and argued that Caesarius is not its author. The second section argues for the divinity of the Holy

Spirit, and so, concerns my arguments presently. The third section is a series of short chapters, each of which names a particular operation of the Trinity and then provides at least one Scripture verse which demonstrates that each person of the Trinity performs this operation. The transitions between each section are illustrative of the author's understanding of the issues:

Now, provided that the Lord helps us, we will soon show the equality of the operations of the Trinity, that is, of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, from the Holy Scriptures.⁵⁶

Whoever has clean eyes of the heart is easily able to see that he [i.e. the Holy Spirit] is God from the equality of operations, as we will demonstrate below.⁵⁷

The overarching argument for the divinity of the Holy Spirit rests on proving that the Spirit is an actor in salvation history equal to the Father and Son. While this general form of the argument is not unique to Ambrose, in this context it is an indication of the author's dependence on Ambrose. Demonstration of the Spirit's divinity by parallel operations with the Father and Son is a principal concern of 4th century Latin pneumatology. Later Gallic pneumatology is not so heavily concerned with proving that the Spirit shares equally in the operations of the Trinity, but that the Spirit has other divine "qualities," such as omnipresence.

After a short discussion of the *potestas* of the Spirit, the *Breviary* takes up the argument that the Spirit can be called both "Lord," and "God." The pattern of Scripture citations and form of the argument mimic Ambrose's treatment of the same theme.⁵⁸ The

⁵⁶ *Brev. fid.* (Morin 2.193 = PL 13.661; my translation).

⁵⁷ *Brev. fid.* (Morin 2.199 = PL 13.665; my translation).

⁵⁸ *Brev. fid.* (Morin 2.193-194 = PL 13.661c-662b) follows Ambrose, *Spir.* 2.13.151-157 (CSEL 79.146-149) with the addition of a short section from 3.12.90 (CSEL 79.187-188). *Brev. fid.* and Ambrose share

author of the *Breviary* clearly pulls two sections of Ambrose' text together and adds a few supporting Scripture quotations. Faustus then uses the order of citations and arguments established by the *Breviary* when he treats the same issue at the end of his treatise.⁵⁹ Caesarius' only direct argument for the divinity of the Holy Spirit also depends on this passage from the *Breviary*, but independently of Faustus.⁶⁰ All four authors share the argument for the divinity of the Holy Spirit according to material from 1 Cor 12: the same Spirit gives diverse graces because the same God works all things. Ambrose, the *Breviary*, and Faustus share the argument that the Holy Spirit is God because we are called the "temple of God" when the Holy Spirit dwells within us, according to various passages from 1 Cor. This temple argument is curiously missing from Caesarius' treatment of the matter in his *The Mystery of the Holy Trinity*. The single paragraph he devotes to the divinity of the Holy Spirit focuses on clear Scripture quotations which name the Spirit as "Lord," or "God." In sum, the use of titles that indicate the divinity of the Holy Spirit show that the *Breviary* is dependent on Ambrose, and that Faustus and Caesarius are dependent on the *Breviary*

The *Breviary* argues that the Holy Spirit is God based on a variant reading of Is 40:12 which Faustus follows. Jerome tells us that the Hebrew passage includes the phrase

the ordered use of 1 Cor 12:8, Acts 5:3, Acts 13:2, Acts 20:28, with the inclusion of 1 Cor 3:16-17 & 1 Cor 3:19 after 1 Cor 12:8 in *Brev. fid.* Additionally, the use of Acts 28:25 in the *Brev. fid.* as the conclusion of this argument fits the prominence Ambrose gives the passage in his conclusion to the entire treatise, 3.21.159-3.22.167 (CSEL 79.216-220).

⁵⁹ Faustus, *Spir.* 2.10-2.12 (CSEL 21.153-157) follows the order of *Brev. fid.*: 1 Cor 12:4, 1 Cor 12:8, 1 Cor 12:11, Rom 12:3, 1 Cor 3:16-17, 1 Cor 6:19, 1 Cor 6:20. The addition of 1 Cor 12:11 and Rom 12:3 indicate that Faustus uses the Ambrosian material as it was reworked in *Brev. fid.* Additionally, Faustus slightly reorders his use of Acts 20:28 & 1 Cor 12:28, but includes them in the same discussion.

⁶⁰ Caesarius, *de myst. s. Trin.* 6 (Morin 2.169-170), uses ten verses to argue for the divinity of the Spirit. Four of these verses are used in this passage of *Brev. fid.*: Jn 3:8, 1 Cor 12:11, Acts 5:3, Acts 20:28. The use of Jn 3:8 in this connection is otherwise unique to the *Brev. fid.* and could indicate that Caesarius used the *Brev. fid.* independently of Faustus' texts.

appendit tribus digitis molem terrae et liberavit in pondere montes, while the Septuagint reads *quis mensus est manu aquam et caelum palmo*.⁶¹ Use of the Hebrew reading in Latin literature is extremely limited. The *Breviary* is the first text (excluding Jerome's work) to make use of this variant. It uses the three fingers as an indication of the inseparable operations of the Trinity, thus taking a variant verse which Ambrose does not seem to know, but using it in an argument that is very familiar to Ambrose. The *Breviary* makes the connection between these three fingers and the Holy Spirit by using Ambrose's reading of Lk 11:20 with Mt 12:28:

So that you might believe in the one substance and deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, listen to the prophet Isaiah: *who has weighed the bulk of the earth in three fingers?* Now, we find in the Scriptures that the Holy Spirit individually is called "finger," as in the Gospel which says, *If I cast out demons by the finger of God*, where another Evangelist declares, *If I cast out demons by the Spirit of God*.⁶²

Faustus reverses the argument so that it moves from the fact that the Spirit is the finger of God (Lk 11:20) to other uses of "finger" which also indicate God's activity. He is explicitly concerned that someone will think that it slights the Holy Spirit to call him a "finger," but this is resolved for Faustus by appeal to the variant of Is 40:12. Faustus even notes, "What is more evident with regard to the unity of the Trinity? What could be more clear? Doesn't *in three fingers* balance the equality of one power on some mysterious scale?"⁶³ Because we can think of many passages which more clearly show the unity of

⁶¹ Jerome, *Comm. Esaiam* 11 (Is 40:12) (CCSL 73.459-460).

⁶² *Brev. fid.* (Morin 2.195-196 = PL 13.662-663; my translation). The Scripture verses cited are, respectively, Is. 40:12 (Heb), Lk 11:20, & Mt 12:28. Cf. Ambrose, *Spir.* 3.3.11 (CSEL 79.155)

⁶³ Faustus, *Spir.* 1.8 (CSEL 21.113-114; my translation).

the Trinity, this rhetorical flourish calls our attention to the fact that this argument was common enough for Faustus that he did not feel he was claiming an extraordinary interpretation. One needs a very specific context in order for this variant of Is 40:12 to shed light on Trinitarian theology. That context is provided by the discussion in the *Breviary*. Similarly, Faustus does not seem to have included appeal to Mt 12:28 in order to explain that the “finger of God” is the “Spirit of God.”⁶⁴ The author of the *Breviary*, however, did feel the need to make this argument explicit. Again, Faustus assumes the arguments already made in the text of the *Breviary*. Thus, I suggest that Ambrose and the *Breviary* were sources for Faustus’ pneumatology. Since Caesarius repeats many sections from Faustus, he absorbed many of the same arguments, and comment on them is not necessary.

Faustus engaged in a wide-ranging debate about the state of the human soul with Mamertus Claudianus. Claudianus upheld, on the authority of Augustine, the incorporeality of the soul; while Faustus upheld, on the authority of Cassian, the corporeality of the soul. Faustus’ argument that the Holy Spirit is divine because the Holy Spirit is incorporeal is also a critique of Mamertius’ position on the soul.⁶⁵ Though Mamertus goes unmentioned by name, this debate about the soul drives many of the arguments which are unique to Faustus’ pneumatology. Thus, there are two basic layers of Faustus’ arguments in *On the Holy Spirit*: the first is the very traditional series of arguments which defend the full divinity of the Holy Spirit. For these, Faustus is largely

⁶⁴ One MS does include *in spiritu dei vel digito dei* for Faustus, but Engelbrecht (CSEL 21) took this as exceptional. Caesarius included the reference to Mt 12:28 when he cited this passage in *serm.* 212.5 (CCSL 104.846)

⁶⁵ See R.W. Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism*, 235-244; R.W. Mathisen, "For specialists only," 29-42; R.W. Mathisen, "PLRE II: Suggested *addenda* and *corrigenda*," 372-373.

dependent on Ambrose and Augustine through the *Breviary* and Vincent's *Excerpts*. These arguments are aimed at Arians in general, though we can detect a few specific arguments which may have belonged to particular Arian theologians Faustus knew. The second layer of his pneumatology stems from his response to contemporary debates within the Gallic Church. That these arguments set the tone for Faustus is perhaps nowhere better indicated than in his introduction. Where earlier treatises on the Holy Spirit explicitly began with Old and then New Testament references to the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Faustus begins with the Creed. One argues over the meaning of *Scripture* with Arians who have a different creed. One argues over the meaning of the *Creed* with fellow Catholics.

The fact that Faustus devotes the most lengthy section of his work to the argument that the Holy Spirit does not have the kind of presence that bodies have (*localem non esse spiritum sanctum*), and that this argument concludes his first book indicates that this work was, in part, intended to discredit Claudianus' position on the soul. Disagreement with Claudianus explains Faustus' insistence that the Holy Spirit does not have the kind of local presence which is subject to spatial finitude. The basic argument is simple: creatures are subject to space because they have corporeal, "local" presence. The Holy Spirit does not have this kind of presence because the Holy Spirit is unbounded and present everywhere. Thus, the Holy Spirit is divine. The argument requires that creatures and only creatures have corporeal, "local" presence, and that only God has incorporeal, "non-local" presence. If souls are incorporeal, then there is a category of created, but non-local presence, and the argument for the divinity of the Spirit does not work. The Spirit turns out to be like the human soul. Faustus made this argument both in his *On the Holy Spirit*

and in a letter he wrote in response to questions from other bishops concerning the Catholic response to Arianism.⁶⁶ The intent was the same, namely, to discredit the incorporealist position about the human soul. Faustus' argument, while perhaps prevailing in his day, ultimately lost within the Church, but his understanding of incorporeal presence as not spatially limited has remained.⁶⁷ Caesarius did not openly endorse Faustus' position on the soul, but he did endorse Faustus' arguments about the mission of the Spirit which are related to Faustus' arguments about the soul. That is, Caesarius' understanding of created-uncreated division between missions and processions relies on Faustus' argument about the non-local presence of the Holy Spirit, but Caesarius gives no indication that he has Claudianus in mind. He simply follows Faustus. The issue was a hot controversy towards the end of the 5th century, but apparently not worth explicit mention to Caesarius in the 6th century.

“BY” BUT NOT “FOR” ASCETICS

It remains the case that while the Lérinian theologians reflected deeply on the mystery of the Trinity and wrote treatises about the Trinitarian faith of Catholicism and about the Holy Spirit in particular, they did not link this pneumatology to their ascetical theology. Lérinian pneumatology is intended almost exclusively for specialists concerned with the doctrine of the Trinity. Where someone like Cassian had the intellectual room to explore new conclusions from old premises about the roles of the Holy Spirit in the life of Christians, the Lérinian theologians focused these premises into arguments for the

⁶⁶ Faustus, *Spir.* 1.13 (CSEL 21.125-129) & *Ep.* 3 (CSEL 21.168-181). M. Simonetti, "Le fonti," 416, makes the same observation in relation to Faustus' use of Lk 4:1. (cf. *Spir.* 2.1 (CSEL 21.131).)

⁶⁷ Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism*, 235-244, provides reasons to associate Gennadius of Marseilles, Julianus Pomerius, and Caesarius, among others, with Faustus' position, though Caesarius never makes the claim directly. Cf. *Brev. fid.* (Morin 2. = PL 13.664d).

divinity of the Holy Spirit. They were regularly in contact with people who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Their audience shaped the way they employed pneumatology. Despite the fact that bishops like Caesarius and Faustus were trained specifically as monks at a monastery that was on very friendly terms with Cassian and his writings, the Lérinians did not adopt his ascetic pneumatology. The closest Faustus comes to connecting his pneumatology with his understanding of Christian life is in a discussion of Pentecost. There is a fervor of activity associated with the Spirit who fills the entire world:

The power of the Holy Spirit... excites multitudes by the grace of the divine generosity... The Apostles, filled with the Holy Spirit, went throughout the world distributing the treasure of salvation, and they transferred this office to others by the imposition of hands... On that most especially sacred night of regeneration [Pentecost] the same Spirit operates everywhere whole and entire, from the East to the West, from the rising of the sun to its setting, from the north wind and the sea.⁶⁸

Nevertheless, for Faustus all of this serves the anti-Arian argument that the Spirit is fully divine because the Spirit is omnipresent.

Neither Faustus, Caesarius, nor Victor provide a list of activities one can do to foster the indwelling of the Spirit, as did Cassian. Nor do they articulate a role for the Holy Spirit in their reformation of human thoughts and desires, as Cassian did before them and Gregory does after them. When Faustus entered the debate with Prosper on grace, free will, and predestination, he did not appropriate Prosper's sense of the Spirit's reformation of the human will. When Caesarius addressed fellow ascetics, as with his *Letter to Nuns*, or

⁶⁸ Faustus, *Spir.* 1.7 (CSEL 21.169-170; my translation).

when he wrote his treatise *On Grace*, he wrote in much the same vein as Faustus. The Lérinain theologians felt that their belief in the Holy Spirit was under attack, and so, repeated and refined arguments that move from the activities of the Holy Spirit to the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Despite presiding at the council which promulgated several of the so-called *Chapters from Saint Augustine* which define necessary roles for the Holy Spirit within human salvation, Caesarius never explored the mechanisms for this transformation in his theological works. The Lérinian theologians are convinced that ascetic practices work, but they do not connect their pneumatology to their asceticism. Instead, their pneumatology remains isolated to their anti-Arian treatises. Gaul and Italy had to wait for transplants from their neighbors to the south of the Mediterranean and to the north of the Black Sea to appropriate Augustine's pneumatology more fully and wed belief in the divinity of the Holy Spirit to ascetical concerns. In the Lérinian line, we see a pneumatology that developed in response to Arian theology and adopted their own strain of Augustinianism.

VI. DISPLACED ASCETICS: FULGENTIUS AND MAXENTIUS, AN AUGUSTINIAN SYNTHESIS

All of a sudden, the blessed Fulgentius, reading the admirable lives of the Egyptian monks, as well as being inspired by meditating on the *Institutes* and *Conferences*, decided to set out by ship for these lands...he immediately sought an opportunity to go to Carthage...[and] he boarded a ship headed for Alexandria... They quickly arrived at Siracusa...where the blessed Pope Eulalius then led the Catholic Church... After the dinner, during the afternoon hours, as the bishop was walking through his house, looking out the window, he saw the blessed Fulgentius... He called him aside, ‘You had begun to speak of the *Institutes* and the *Conferences* during our dinner; I would like you to bring me these books, if you have them with you.’ ... [Fulgentius did, and the bishop questioned him.] He said that he was going to the furthest desert region of the Thebaid, where, as the text urged, he would live, dead to the world, where the larger number of ascetics would pose no obstacle to his progress, but, rather, would offer examples. ‘You are doing well,’ the bishop answered, ‘in seeking to follow the better things, but you know that *it is impossible to please God without faith*. [Heb 11:6] A wicked schism has severed those lands to which you want to go from the communion of blessed Peter; all those monks, whose marvelous acts of self-denial are made widely known, will not share with you the Sacrament of the altar... Go back home, my son, lest, by the desire for a higher life, you put your orthodox faith in danger. Once, when I was a young man, before the grace of the honor of being a bishop came to me, however unworthy, I thought a long

time about seeking to follow this very holy calling in the monasteries of that province, but this same reason kept me from carrying out my intention.’¹

Bishop Eulalius was referring to the Acacian Schism when he told Fulgentius that neither of them could celebrate communion with the monks in the Egyptian desert. Since 484, Rome and Constantinople had been in schism. After the Council of Chalcedon in 451, Rome and Constantinople had both supported pro-Chalcedonian bishops in Antioch and Alexandria, but there had been several varieties of anti-Chalcedonian parties who continued to claim authority in the Church. The Emperor Zeno tried his hand at resolving the tension by proposing his *Henotikon*, which was meant to reconcile opposed parties, but was met with suspicion in the West. Upon election as bishop of Rome in 483, Pope St. Felix III sent delegates to visit Acacius, the archbishop of Constantinople, only to find that he had recently entered communion with anti-Chalcedonian bishops.² That is, three centuries before Fulgentius was with Eulalius, Acacius entered communion with the anti-Chalcedonian claimant to the see of Alexandria. On 28 July 484 a synod held in Rome announced that Acacius was no longer in communion with Rome.³ The Emperors and bishops of Constantinople maintained communion with anti-Chalcedonian parties, continuing the schism until the two sees were reconciled in 519. By that time, Fulgentius

¹ v. *Fulg.* 8 (Lappeyre; FOTC 95.21-23). This work was attributed to Ferrandus, deacon of Carthage, by the 17th century editor of Fulgentius’ works, Pierre-François Chifflet even though none of the manuscripts lists Ferrandus as the author of the *vita Fulgentii*. This has recently been called into question, and most scholars follow Antonito Isola in referring to the author as “ps-Ferrandus.” See Robert Eno’s helpful review at FOTC 95.3-4 and C. Leyser, “A wall protecting the city,” 177-178. Isola is right to call attention to the problems associated with attributing authorship to Ferrandus, but the title “ps-Ferrandus” makes it seem as though the author purported to be Ferrandus, which, in fact, he did not. The treatise is anonymous.

² After the death of Timothy, the pro-Chalcedonian archbishop of Alexandria, Acacius began to include the Alexandrine anti-Chalcedonian rivals, Peter Mongus and his predecessor Timothy Aelurus, at Liturgy in Constantinople.

³ Tensions had also arisen when Acacius had Calendio elected archbishop of Antioch without convening a synod. See the letter from the synod, Simplicius, *Ep.* 70.3-14 (CSEL 35.1.156-161).

had been persuaded not to continue his journey to Egypt. He had returned to Africa only to be exiled by the Arian Vandals. When the Acacian schism was healed, Fulgentius was in exile for a second time. During that second exile, a group of monks from the region of Scythia (modern Romania, and supposed birthplace of Cassian) exchanged letters with Fulgentius.⁴ That exchange pushed both parties to develop their theology. In one way of thinking the Acacian schism was already resolved; in another way of thinking, the response to it had just begun. In their response to the issues raised by the Acacian schism, the Scythian monks, together with Fulgentius, made a significant contribution to pneumatology. The Scythian formulation of solutions to the controversies over predestination and free will were adopted as the capstone for the Gallic discussions of the controversy at Orange in 529. The Scythian monks had traveled to Rome, the African bishop to Sardinia; their theology ended up with Caesarius in Gaul.

At the same time that Gaul accepted the Scythian formulation of the Holy Spirit's role in reforming Christians, Fulgentius developed the most sophisticated Augustinian pneumatology of the 6th century, combining mature reflections on the procession and mission of the Holy Spirit with responses to the concerns of the 6th century about Christology and about the reformation of desire. Fulgentius followed the Scythians in

⁴ All the texts, including these letters, are collected and edited by Glorie in CCSL 85a. Some are assigned specifically to the leader of the Scythians, John Maxentius: *dial. c. Nest.* = *Dialogue Against the Nestorians*; *lib. fid.* = *Booklet on the Faith*; *Max. cap.* = *Chapters against Nestorians and Pelagians*. *Max. cap.* is translated in F. Gumerlock, *Fulgentius of Ruspe*, 155-157. The rest are attributed to the monks collectively: *disp. 12 cap.* = *Disputation of the 12 Chapters of Cyril of Alexandria with the Sayings of the Nestorius against the Anathemas*; *Ep. ad episc.* = *Letter to the Bishops*; *ref. Nest. dict.* = *Refutation of the Sayings of Nestorius*. Only the *Ep. ad episc.* is translated into English: J.A. McGuckin, "Theopaschite Confession," 239-255. Fulgentius' works are edited by Fraipont in CCSL 91-91a. The principle works of Fulgentius treated here are: *ad Pet. de fide* = *To Peter on the Faith*; *c. Fab. Frag.* = *Fragments against Fabian*; *c. serm. Fast. Ar.* = *Against the Sermon of the Arian Fastidiosus*; & *Ep.* = *Letters*. T.S. Ferguson, *Visita Nos*, esp. 16-24, argues that Fulgentius is the author of a series of African collects. Approximately half of Fulgentius' works are translated into English by Eno in FOTC 95. The most recent studies of Fulgentius are H.-J. Diesner, *Fulgentius von Ruspe als Theologe und Kirchenpolitiker*; F. Gumerlock, *Fulgentius of Ruspe*.

their pneumatological solution to the predestination controversy. Together, they mark a family of Augustinianism different from Prosper, who also offered a pneumatological solution to aspects of the predestination controversy. But Fulgentius advanced beyond the Scythian awareness of problems in Christology by clarifying the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Incarnation. Fulgentius applied his Augustinianism to Nestorianism and Eutychianism, especially as the Scythian monks made him aware of these issues. Furthermore, Fulgentius faced critiques from savvy Arians back home in Africa; his responses to them develop Augustine's anti-Arian arguments. Where the Lérinian theologians had responded to Arian threats as an issue separate from Pelagianism and predestinarianism, Fulgentius understood all of the issues as a complete whole.

Fulgentius is one of those rare theologians who was able to reflect simultaneously on the mystery of God in terms of the relations between the Father, Son, and Spirit, as well as the mystery of salvation God offers to Christians. Study of the Scythians and Fulgentius reveals that Fulgentius is the apogee of Augustinian pneumatology in the two centuries after Augustine himself. It also closes my argument about the sources of the pneumatology adopted at Orange because their pneumatology reveals that the Scythians authored the *Chapters of Saint Augustine* which were used at Orange to offer a pneumatological solution to their concerns with predestination. Study of the pneumatology used by these displaced monks reveals that Latin pneumatology of the 6th century was concerned with the reformation of human desire, will, and actions.

SOLUTIONS TO AN ALREADY RESOLVED PROBLEM

The resolution of the Acacian Schism explains a great deal of the situation in which the Scythian monks found themselves when they arrived in Constantinople in the winter

of 518-519.⁵ The 34 years of schism saw several attempts to restore communion and achieve a theological compromise between various readings of Cyril, Leo, and Chalcedon. Rome required adherence to Chalcedon and rejection of Acacius, taking as watchwords the claim expressed by the deacon Dioscorus, “we can neither add to nor say what is not defined in the four councils and in the letters of the Blessed Pope Leo.”⁶ In the Fall of 518, letters sent to Pope St. Hormisdas from the Emperor Justin, his nephew Justinian, and the Patriarch of Constantinople John brought about reconciliation between Rome and Constantinople. Thus, John Maxentius arrived with his Scythian monks in Constantinople just as the schism was coming to a close.⁷ When they suggested a series of short chapters meant to safeguard Chalcedonian Christology and soteriology from the errors of Eutyches, Nestorius, and Pelagius, they seemed to be disturbing rather than furthering the communion among Christians. The schism had been healed. No new formulation was needed. Similarly, when some of the Scythian monks came to Rome to plead their case directly with the Pope, Hormisdas’ lack of fondness for them is understandable. They were simply in need of Paul’s old advice for troublemakers: “stop disputing about words.”⁸ But they were not simply trouble-makers.

⁵ We date their arrival from the evidence of the Papal legates who arrived in Constantinople in 519 and reported that the monks were already in Constantinople. See Dioscorus, *Suggestio* apud Hormisdas, *Ep.* 216 (CSEL 35.2.675-676).

⁶ Dioscorus, *Suggestio ad Horm.* (PL 63.478; my translation). Dioscorus was the Roman deacon reporting on the affairs in Constantinople in Oct. 519 concerning meetings with the Scythian monks and the Constantinopolitan deacon Victor. Cf. Glorié’s notes at CCSL 85a.xxv; Justinian I, apud Hormisdas, *Ep.* 187 (CSEL 35.2.644-645).

⁷ J.A. McGuckin, "Theopaschite Confession," 239-249, helpfully sets the stage. McGuckin, however, neglects the importance of Acacius’ leaving communion with Rome in favor of the anti-Chalcedonians in Alexandria, as well as the concerns with his appointment of the Patriarch of Antioch. See W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, 807-813, for discussion of these events.

⁸ 1 Tim 2:14, cited in Hormisdas, *Ep.* 70.6 (to Possessor) (CCSL 85a.117 = PL 63.491).

The Scythian monks' first action in Constantinople certainly won them a reputation as trouble-makers. Under the leadership of John Maxentius, they accused the local deacon of heresy because Victor would not subscribe to the set of twelve chapters the Scythians had devised to safeguard against Nestorianism and Pelagianism.⁹ When the Papal legates arrived to negotiate restoration of communion with Constantinople, Maxentius submitted an explanation of the twelve chapters in the form of a booklet on the faith.¹⁰ Refused by Victor and the legates, several of the monks traveled to Rome to plead their case with Pope Hormisdas directly. Justinian initially wrote to Hormisdas suggesting that he immediately send the monks back to Constantinople, but then changed his mind and wrote to Hormisdas many times to ask for a judgment about the theology proposed by the Scythian monks, especially as encapsulated in *Chapters of Maxentius*.¹¹ As a solution to the division in the Church over Christology, the Scythian monks offered little that had not already been accomplished. However, as readers of Cyril, Leo, and the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, the Scythian monks pushed for new theological insights, not the least of which involves a powerful ascetic pneumatology within the Augustinian tradition.

The points at stake for the Scythian monks were explicitly Christological in two senses. First, the implications of the Incarnation for statements about God's (im)passibility prove to be difficult, but directly address some of Nestorius' claims. Second, the implications of the Incarnation for salvation must be related to the way the first problem is addressed and to a theological anthropology. Most scholarship has

⁹ John Maxentius, *Max. cap.* (CCSL 85a.29-30).

¹⁰ John Maxentius, *lib. fid.* (CCSL 85a.5-25).

¹¹ Justinian apud Hormisdas, *Ep.* 187, 188, 191 (CSEL 35.2.644-646, 648-649).

focused on the first problem, which is encapsulated in Scythians' insistence on the statement "one of the Trinity was crucified." Because divinity is impassible, but humanity is not, theologians seem forced into the dilemma of separating the two in Christ or sacrificing one for the other. When this first aspect of Christology is taken to the exclusion of the second set of soteriological concerns, we misunderstand the Scythian theology and entirely neglect their pneumatology. Those in Constantinople and Rome in the early 6th century seem to have ignored this second aspect of their theology, perhaps because they felt the issue had already been resolved. Recently, David Maxwell has shown the importance of understanding that Christology and grace are "cut from the same cloth" for the Scythians. Discussions of grace are always found alongside discussions of Christology, even from the very beginning of the controversy (i.e. in the *Chapters of Maxentius* and the *Booklet on the Faith*). Second, Christology includes a definition of the human condition, allowing a comparison between the interaction of the human and divine in Christ and the interaction of humans with God in the life of Christians.¹² It is precisely in their discussions of the interaction between God and humans that the Scythian monks develop an ascetic pneumatology which is derived from Augustine's sense of the working of the Holy Spirit within Christians. The Scythians were not the first to respond to Nestorianism, nor were they the first to reflect on grace as the work of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, it is the Scythian formulation of the work of the Spirit in reforming free will that made the greatest impact on Gaul and their particular formulation of the relationship between Christology and soteriology that pushed Fulgentius to develop his theology even beyond what the Scythians were able to achieve.

¹² D. Maxwell, "Christology and Grace," 137-161.

THE WORKING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT DEEP WITHIN

By the time Maxentius was using his *Chapters* as a statement of orthodoxy in 518, the connection between Nestorian and Pelagian Christologies had been asserted for almost a century. John Cassian had written his *On the Incarnation* in 430 as an *instrumenta* for the Roman synod which met to condemn Nestorius' teachings and authorize Cyril to negotiate with Nestorius. Politically, Nestorius had aligned himself with Pelagianism by allowing four bishops who had been excommunicated for Pelagianism to remain in Constantinople. Nestorius even asked Pope Celestine to clarify his judgments against the Pelagian bishops, as though the matter needed review.¹³ Theologically, Nestorius' insistence that Christians could speak of human agency apart from divine agency in the incarnate Christ had deep parallels with Pelagius' insistence that Christ was the holiest of men who somehow deserved to become the Son of God. Both Nestorius and Pelagius were able to speak of the human Jesus apart from the second person of the Trinity. To other theologians of late antiquity this amounted to adoptionism in Christology and a rejection of the need for grace in soteriology. Modern scholars disagree on the extent to which Nestorius' separation of the human and the divine in Christ was intended to parallel Pelagius' own understanding of Christ and the implications for how grace works with humans. Ancient scholars, however, were convinced of the connection. Maxentius' uniqueness does not lie in claiming that there is a connection between Nestorianism and Pelagianism. Nor was this simply a political move on the part of the Scythian monks to gain support from Rome by appealing to some

¹³ Cassian, *De incarn.* 1.3. Nestorius, *Ep. ad Caelestinum* 1 (Loofs, 165), asks about Julianus, Florus, Orontius, and Fabius, who had been condemned for Pelagianism by Celestine, but had arrived in Constantinople and claimed to have been falsely condemned. Julian and Orontius are similarly mentioned in *Ep. ad Caelestinum* 2 (Loofs, 170).

form of Augustinianism against “Greek” theologians.¹⁴ From the perspective of many 5th and 6th century theologians, Nestorius’ Christology, though more sophisticated than Pelagius’ Christology, was subject to the same critiques: humans can never achieve heavenly things without help from God. As I discussed in chapter 1, John Cassian critiqued Nestorius for exactly this problem and discussed the role of pneumatology in the Incarnation. Maxentius’ uniqueness lies in wedding Augustinian themes of reformation of the fallen human will with Cyril’s concern to name the Word of God as the subject of the Incarnation. In explaining these connections, Maxentius marshaled a pneumatology that reached well beyond the old and new capitals of the Roman Empire, for his formulation of how and where the Spirit works within humans was adopted in Gaul in 529.

Any theologian who agrees that Christ is perfectly human and perfectly divine will give an account of theological anthropology as part of Christology. The claim that Christ is perfectly human and perfectly divine requires an explanation of what it means to be human and what it means to be divine. Similarly, the relationship between the human and the divine in Christ tells a great deal about one’s understanding of redemption. In both his Christology and his soteriology, Maxentius argues consistently that human nature, of its own, is unable to achieve holiness. This is why he argues that the Incarnation must be the Word of God taking up humanity. The Word is the sole agent of incarnate actions because a human agent would be unable to do the things Jesus did. Reciprocally, salvation must be a yielding of the weakness of human nature to the strength of God. When he explains this transformation, which he calls “recreation and renewal (*recreate*,

¹⁴ E.g. F. Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz*, 181; R.H. Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*. I accept Maxwell’s argument that grace and Christology are related for the Scythians. (“Christology and Grace,” 8-20).

renovare)” Maxentius argues that the Holy Spirit is the divine agent who recreates and renews fallen human nature.¹⁵ His contemporary and correspondent, Fulgentius, agrees.¹⁶

As a fundamental principle, Maxentius argues that human nature is created good: “If anyone says that sin is natural, madly ascribing the cause of sin to the maker of natures, let him be anathema.”¹⁷ Sin entered the world through Adam’s transgression, not God’s creation.¹⁸

Accordingly, the strength of [human] nature is weakened through the evil of temptation. It is not strong enough to rise where it might be led by the will. Thus, we believe that all the way from Adam to the present no one can be saved through the strength of nature, unless he has faith in the name of Jesus through the gift of the grace of the Holy Spirit, for *there is no other name under heaven given to man by which he can be saved except the name of Jesus Christ.*¹⁹

Human nature not only cannot achieve Heaven on its own, but it is severely weakened by sin so that it often fails to achieve lesser goods. Humans are restored, however, through faith in Jesus. Since Christ is the *only* savior, humans cannot save themselves, but faith establishes the necessary connection to Christ.²⁰ Even the faith through which we are saved in Christ comes through grace, given in the Holy Spirit.

¹⁵ John Maxentius, *lib. fid.* 15.29 (CCSL 85a.23).

¹⁶ E.g. Fulgentius, *Ep.* 17.19.39-20.40 (CCSL 91a.593).

¹⁷ John Maxentius, *Max. cap.* 10 (CCSL 85a.30; my translation).

¹⁸ John Maxentius, *Max. cap.* 11 (CCSL 85a.30).

¹⁹ John Maxentius, *lib. fid.* 16.33 (CSEL 85a.24; my translation). The Scripture citation is Acts 4:12. Cf. Fulgentius, *c. Fab. frag.* 37.15 (CCSL 91a.865).

²⁰ Cf. John Maxentius, *lib. fid.* 33-34 (CCSL 85a.24-25); D. Maxwell, "Christology and Grace," 140-142.

Following the general Augustinian analysis of the human condition, Maxentius explains that without God's aid, free will is not sufficient to choose or act on the good. The will requires the action of the Holy Spirit if it is to pursue and achieve the good.

Moreover, we believe that natural free will has strength for nothing else except for discerning and desiring carnal or secular things, which might seem glorious in the sight of men, but not of God. For the will can neither consider, choose, desire, nor bring to perfection those things which pertain to eternal life unless it does so through the infusion and operation of the Holy Spirit deep within (*per infusionem et inoperationem intrinsecus spiritus sancti*). This Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, and *He who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to Christ*. [Rom 8:9] If one who believes in Christ belongs to Christ (which is entirely true), then this is not through the gift of nature, but through the Holy Spirit. For he who *believes in the one who justifies the impious* [Rom 4:5] belongs to Christ, since he confesses that *Jesus is Lord*, which *no one is able to say except in the Holy Spirit*. [1 Cor 12:3]²¹

The basic argument is clear and works backwards from 1 Cor 12:3: no one can profess Christ apart from the working of the Holy Spirit; no one can enter eternal life without professing Christ; thus, no one can enter eternal life apart from the working of the Holy Spirit. Within Christian life here and now, this has several implications. Entering eternal life requires human choice and desire, which are initiated and brought to perfection by the working of the Holy Spirit. Both at the beginning and the end humans require divine aid. That aid comes in the form of the Holy Spirit acting within Christians.

²¹ John Maxentius, *lib. fid.* 17.34 (CSEL 85a.24-25; my translation). On the limited ability of free will, Cf. e.g. Fulgentius *Ep.* 17.13.26-27 (CCSL 91a.582-583). On the Holy Spirit as the divine agent who reforms the will, cf. e.g. Fulgentius, *Ep.* 19.4 (ad Faustinum) (CCSL 91a.628-629) & *De Remissione* 1.3.1-2 (CCSL 91a.650-651).

When the Scythian monks departed to plead their case directly to Pope Hormisdas in Rome, John Maxentius remained in Constantinople. The Scythian monks took the *Booklet on the Faith* with them to Rome, where they did not gain an endorsement from Hormisdas, and so, they wrote to other bishops for support. They found a willing respondent in Fulgentius of Ruspe, who was exiled to Sardinia along with several other African bishops. The letter they wrote (*To the Bishops*) explained the *Booklet* in even greater detail. The Scythian monks characterized their opponents' position with the slogans "It is mine is to will to believe; God's, however, is the grace to assist," and "Unless I first will, grace will not come to me."²² Their response is the standard Augustinian response: even the will to believe is from God. That is, the letter written by the Scythian monks to the exiled African bishops demonstrates the same Augustinian analysis of the will that they had learned from Maxentius, as well as his characteristic phrase describing the Spirit's work.

We, however, follow the same Apostle [Rom 11:33-36 is quoted immediately before this passage]; we say that the origin of every good thought as well as the consent and will to follow them is from God, through God, and in God. For God forgives and corrects (*absolvit et corrigit*) the wills of men, which are warped and implicated in earthly actions, through the infusion and operation of the Holy Spirit deep within, as is written: *the will is prepared by the Lord*. [Prov 8:35]²³

²² Scythian Monks, *Ep. ad episc.* 6.19 & 7.23 (CCSL 85a.167 & 169). Cf. Maxentius, *Lib. fid.* 18.35 & Fulgentius, *Ep.* 17.17.35.

²³ Scythian Monks, *Ep. ad episc.* 8.24 (CCSL 85a.169; my translation). The Scripture verse cited is a Latin translation of the LXX Prov 8:35. This verse has a special history, for the LXX version differs greatly from others, which I discuss in more detail below. Analysis of the human condition as a *voluntas prava* is a standard Augustinian position, as is the notion that the entire process of the will offering consent to thoughts is implicated in the original sin of Adam. E.g. Augustine, *corr. et gr.* 6.9 (PL 44.921).

The monks did not add new arguments to the position they had developed with Maxentius so much as they shared them with the Africans who were exiled by the Vandals. Indeed, the structure of this letter shows that this passage is intended as a summary statement of the Scythian monks' position. All that follows it in their letter is a catena of passages from respected Fathers which is intended to prove that they hold the traditional position.²⁴ The Scythian monks argue from an Augustinian anthropology that God forgives and corrects human wills through the Holy Spirit. Fulgentius' response demonstrates agreement from the African bishops exiled in Sardinia concerning this Augustinian analysis of the human will.²⁵

The Scythian argument displays two characteristics of Augustinian theology: the analysis of the human condition focuses on human will; and God's activity has priority both at the beginning and throughout the process. This focus on the will is also characteristic of Prosper's Augustinianism, though it was not part of the Lérinian Augustinianism. For Prosper, the reformation offered by the Holy Spirit is primarily reformation of the *will*. For Cassian, the reformation offered by the Holy Spirit is primarily reformation of *thoughts* and *desires*. There is a difference in anthropological systems. Maxentius definitely follows the Augustinian analysis of the human condition which rises and falls on the human will. Maxentius also includes the spheres of human thought and desire, but he includes them as activities of the will. Maxentius and Prosper share the Augustinian analysis of the will, but Maxentius does not follow Prosper's

²⁴ It is likely that the monks knew about this collection of texts from Dionysius Exiguus, whom they befriended in Rome. Dionysius collected and translated a series of texts in the early 6th century, including the so-called Ps-Celestine *Capitula*, which were originally collected by Prosper of Aquitaine between 435 and 450. See M. Cappelain, "L'origine des *Capitula* pseudo-Célestiniens," 156-170. The passage from Basil, which is lacking in Prosper's collection, was likely added by Dionysius, and thus available to the Scythian monks in Latin translation from the Greek.

²⁵ E.g. Fulgentius, *Ep.* 17.13.25-31.66 (CCSL 91a.582-615).

schema of the sensual, animal, and spiritual will. Prosper's stages of development helped him explain the good actions of those outside the Church: they have an animal will, which can achieve certain things, but will always fall short of salvation. His system of stages accounted for seemingly good choices made by the non-Baptized. Prosper was willing to admit different types of grace which were operative at the general and particular levels. Maxentius critiqued such a notion as he found it in Faustus, preferring to speak only of the work of the Holy Spirit before, during, and after certain decisions. There are no stages of development for Maxentius because he has no need to explain good actions that occur outside of the Church. Where Prosper's debates forced him to mediate between God's will for human salvation and human damnation, Maxentius' debates allowed him to see the Spirit's work of reforming human will as a seamless process of perfection. Maxentius and the Scythians are committed to the existence of a *massa perditionis*, a selection of humans who will not be saved, but they never feel the need to offer any theodicy for this. Rather, this is simply left to the incomprehensible judgments of God.²⁶ Prosper, on the other hand, did attempt a systematized explanation of salvation and a justification between the mass of the damned and God's salvific will. Nevertheless, both Maxentius and Prosper are committed to Augustine's analysis of humanity as most fundamentally a problem of the will, and both see the operation of the Holy Spirit in the restoration of the will.

²⁶ E.g. Scythian Monks, *Ep. ad episc.* 7.20-23. Tellingly, this is the only citation of 1 Tim 2:4 on the universal salvific will of God in the corpus of Maxentius and the Scythian monks. The notable exceptions, *cap. S. Aug.* 26.28 (CCSL 85a.265), & 27.28 (CCSL 85a.270-271), are in sections of that compilation which seem not to belong to the original collection made by the Scythian school and which are dependent on other texts.

CAPITULA SANCTI AUGUSTINI

That the Spirit reforms the will and its desires was a common belief, as I have argued throughout, but the formulation of this belief that was used in Gaul belongs entirely to Maxentius and his Scythian monks. Particular phrases and strings of Scripture verses help to establish that the *Chapters* which Caesarius used at the Council of Orange (529) came from Maxentius' Scythian school. There are three aspects of the pneumatology that Maxentius and the Scythian monks developed which are significant to my study: use of select Pauline Scripture verses; the unique phrase for the Spirit's work in human life, and use of the Septuagint version of a particular proverb. As noted above, Maxentius used a passage from 1 Corinthians and two passages from Romans to argue that the Holy Spirit is required for confessing the Lordship of Jesus Christ, and so, the Holy Spirit is required not only to achieve eternal life, but to think, desire, or chose what will lead to that life.²⁷ Use of Romans 4:5 (belief in the one who justifies) is relatively limited in the first six centuries of Christian theology; Maxentius is the only author to connect it to the confession that "Jesus is Lord." A great many of his contemporaries would have readily agreed, but Maxentius is the first to make this argument. Similarly, the phrase *per infusionem et inoperationem intrinsecus spiritus sancti* belongs only to Maxentius and those who depended on his work.²⁸ This unique phrase characterizes the Scythian

²⁷ For the text and discussion, see above, p. 130.

²⁸ The term *inoperatio* appears to be a Latin equivalent to the Greek ἐνέργεια, leaving *operatio* parallel to ἔργον, as synonyms which allow a play on the prefix "in" when discussing the work of the Spirit within, which Maximus highlights by using the adverb *intrinsecus* in conjunction with *inoperatio*. Rufinus translates *inoperatio* for ἐνέργεια at Origen, [tr. Rufinus] *De prin.* 1.2.12. Cf. *De prin.* 1.2.3, & 1.3. At Maxentius, *Lib. fid.* 8.12 (CCSL 85a.13) *inoperatio* translates ἐνέργεια from Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 101.22 (PG 37.180 = SC 208.46). The translation from Greek to Latin could belong to Dionysius Exiguus, but pairing with the Holy Spirit's work within belongs to Maxentius and the Scythian monks. This passage is repeated in the letter of the Scythian monks to the Bishops, *Ep. ad episc.* 3.5 (CCSL 85.160 = Fulgentius, *Ep.* 16.5 (CCSL 91a.553)). Similarly, *Ep. ad episc.* 3.6 (CCSL 85a.161) = Fulgentius, *Ep.* 16.6 (CCSL

understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit in renewing and recreating Christians. Again, few would disagree with their point, but their unique phrase demonstrates the relationship between the *Chapters of Saint Augustine* and their other works. Additionally, the Scythian monks connected this phrase directly to the Septuagint verse of Prov 8:35 in Latin translation, “The will is prepared by the Lord.” Use of this verse indicates a strong Augustinian heritage; Augustine, Prosper, and Fulgentius are the only other authors to cite this verse in their own arguments.²⁹ The verse is notably different in Jerome’s Vulgate because the older Latin versions reflect the Septuagint, while the Vulgate reflects the Hebrew, which says nothing about the will.³⁰ The Latin translation of the Greek is distinctive. The *Chapters of Saint Augustine*, which Caesarius used at the Council of Orange in 529, bear the marks of this same pneumatology.

Though Fr. Glorié, the recent editor of the critical edition of Maxentius and the Scythian monks, disagrees with Cappuyns that the *Chapters of Saint Augustine* belong to the Scythian school, it is evident that the particular chapters Caesarius used came directly from the Scythians.³¹ The later lines of the *Chapters* which trouble Glorié need not have been written by the same theologians. That is, Caesarius did not have the *Chapters* in the

91a.554), cites a text purported to be from Athanasius, *Quod unus sit Christus*, but which is not currently thought to be Athanasian (ed. H. Lietzmann, *Apollinarius von Laodicea*, 294-302).

²⁹ Augustine, e.g.: *Ep* 217.2 & 217.6 (CSEL 57.406 & 420); & *c. duas ep. Pel.* 1.18.36 (CSEL 60.453); Prosper, e.g.: *ep. ad Ruf.* 5.6 (PL 51.81), & *c. Coll.* 5.1 & 5.3 (PL 51.226 & 228); Fulgentius, e.g.: *ad. Mon.* 1.8.2 & 1.9.3 (CCSL 91.8 & 9), & *Ep.* 17.17.35 (CCSL 91a.590). Others use the verse in citations of Augustine, Prosper, Maxentius, and Fulgentius. Caesarius, *serm.* 226.1 (CCSL 104) excerpts Augustine. Boniface II’s letter in reply to the council of Orange (CCSL 148a.69) has the obvious source of the council documents, but would also have the *Cap. S. Aug.* available in Rome, as well as several of Augustine’s works. Celestine cites it in his response to Prosper and Hilary, *Ep. Apostolici verba* 8.9 (to Venerius, Marinus, Leontius, Auconius Carcadius, Filtanius, etc Gall. Epis. 8 (PL 45.1758). There, it is in conjunction with Rom 8:14. Celestine notes Pope Zosimus as a reference, but we do not have an independent copy of Zosimus’ letter with this verse.

³⁰ Thus, the Vulgate reads, *qui me invenerit inveniet vitam et hauriet salutem a Domino*, for Prov 8:35. Augustine, *Spec.* 7 (CSEL 12.54), knows this reading.

³¹ Glorié, CCSL 85a.243-246; M. Cappuyns, "L'origine des 'Captiula' d'Orange 529," 130-134.

form which is provided in the current critical edition because the critical edition includes later additions. Indeed, the manuscript evidence suggests that some versions of the *Chapters* have been compiled by many hands across multiple generations. Later authors could have added material to the chapters written by the Scythian monks which Caesarius had available in 529.³² Use of the Latin translation of Prov 8:35 from the Septuagint suggests a small number of theologians; Augustine, Prosper, Maxentius, and Fulgentius are the likely candidates. It is highly unlikely that Augustine or Fulgentius would have written this text. The suggestion that Prosper or another Gallic theologian compiled the *Chapters* cannot account for the phrase *per infusionem et inoperationem intrinsecus spiritus sancti*.³³ Maxentius is the first to use this phrase. His *Booklet*, written in 519, and the Scythian monks followed his usage in their *Letter to the Bishops* within a year. Similarly, the *Chapters of Saint Augustine* address many issues raised in Faustus' *On Grace*, a text against which Maxentius and the Scythian monks wrote other documents.³⁴ Additionally, the Scythians wrote chapters in the form of anathemas, a style which does not belong to Prosper. When Prosper compiled chapters from Augustine, he very much preferred to provide quotations from Augustine. Only rarely does Prosper provide his own summary of Augustine's texts. The *Chapters*, however, are independent of other sources in their exact phrasing, with the sole exception of the works of Maxentius and the

³² CCSL 85a.248-249 provides the evidence that the first several of the chapters circulated together, and Glorié edits the first 18 as such.

³³ Markus, "Legacy of Pelagius," 225, and Hwang, *Intrepid Lover*, 179-182 do not account for this phrase. Nor could they account for use of the Latin term, *inoperatio*, which Prosper does not otherwise use. (see above, p. 133, n. 28.)

³⁴ Cf. *Cap. S. Aug.* 3.3 with Faustus, *de grat.* 1.1 (CSEL 21.7.6-7), *Cap. S. Aug.* 4.4 with Faustus, *de grat.* 1.1 (CSEL 21.10.15-17), & *Cap. S. Aug.* 6.6 with Faustus, *de grat.* 1.8 (CSEL 21.56.5).

Scythians.³⁵ Finally, the *Chapters* reference Rom 4:5 in an argument which belongs to Maxentius, for it parallels his use of the verse as we have seen in the *Booklet*.³⁶ Thus, Maxentius or his Scythian monks wrote at least the first ten chapters of the *Chapters*, eight of which were quoted in the texts issued by the Council of Orange which met in 529 under Caesarius. This means that the theology which was eventually invoked to solidify the Catholic understanding of grace and free will in Gaul is Augustinian, but that it came to Gaul from Scythia through Rome, where the monks and their texts arrived in 519.

CHRIST AND THE SPIRIT – WHAT IS NOT SAID

Though the Scythians critique Nestorians for failing to grasp the appropriate relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Incarnate Christ, they fail to offer a substantial solution to the problem. This is curious because Cassian, Augustine, and Fulgentius all addressed the issue with similar responses. They appealed to the doctrine of inseparable operations and irreducible persons to argue that the Holy Spirit is involved in the Incarnation without having to argue, as the Pelagians did, that Christ was simply an inspired man. To say it colloquially, there is room in the Incarnation for the Son of God to assume human nature, and for the entire Trinity to be present and active. The Scythians understood that there was a problem with the Nestorian and Pelagian accounts, but they never seemed to have employed the traditional solutions. The Nestorian account of miracles relied especially on the agency of the Holy Spirit as separate from the human

³⁵ To the phrase *per infusionem et inoperationem intrinsecus spiritus sancti*, we can also add the phrase *naturae vigor* as indicative of the Scythian language. See *Cap. S. Aug.* 9.10 (CCSL 85a.257) & John Maxentius, *lib. fid.* 16.33 (CCSL 85a.24). Cf. Augustine, *En. Ps.* 118.3.1 (CCSL 40.1672). Prosper never uses either phrase.

³⁶ Cf. *Cap. S. Aug.* 7.7 (CCSL 85a.255) and John Maxentius, *lib. fid.* 17.34 (CSEL 85a.24-25). Glorié correctly notes the parallel with Augustine, *praed. sanct.* 1.2-21.43 (PL 44.961-962), in his notes to the *Cap. S. Aug.*, but does not note that Augustine makes no reference to Rom 4:5 there, while Maxentius does.

Christ. In response, the Scythians argued that the agency of the Son of God was sufficient to explain the miracles, but in their haste to correct the errors they perceived, they neglected to account for any role of the Holy Spirit in the Incarnate Christ. This can easily be explained by their focused interest in the Christological problems, but their arguments remain without much pneumatological sophistication.

When Cyril was charged (early in 431) with the task of approaching Nestorius for a final attempt at allowing him to recant his errors, Cyril composed a series of twelve anathemas which Nestorius could affirm and remain orthodox. Nestorians, in fact, wrote against the anathemas, proclaiming Cyril to be heretical. The anathemas were adopted at Ephesus in 431 under Cyril, but continued to be the source of intense debate. The Scythian monks record Cyril's anathemas, responses they claim Nestorius made, and a Catholic response which they wrote in a work called the *Disputation of the Twelve Chapters*. This is further explained by a short treatise entitled *Refutation of the Sayings of Nestorius*. Cyril's ninth anathema addresses the role of the Spirit in casting out demons and working miracles. The collection from the Scythian monks records:

Cyril said: If anyone says that the one Lord Jesus Christ was able to cast out unclean spirits and fulfill divine signs by the Spirit as though by a foreign power which worked through him, since he was glorified by the Holy Spirit, and does not say that this is his own Spirit (and also the Spirit of the Father) through whom he works wonders, let him be anathema.³⁷

³⁷ Scythian Monks, *disp. 12 cap. Θ* (CCSL 85a.206; my translation). The Scythians use Dionysius Exiguus' translation of Cyril's anathemas, which differs slightly in grammar, but not in sense, from other Latin translations associated with the canons of the Council of Ephesus.

Cyril's intention is clear for the Scythians: the Spirit is not an outside force that performs miracles while the human Christ is a spectator. Nestorius' response rightly questions those who imagine an incarnation of the Spirit, but refers to an awkward mediation of the Spirit to the Son of the God.

Nestorius said: If anyone says that the Holy Spirit is consubstantial with the form of a slave and claims from this there is a power to cast out spirits, and does not, rather, say that the union or conjunction (*copulationem seu coniunctionem*) through which he has sometimes worked in mankind wonderful deeds occurs through his [the Spirit's] mediation to God the Word from his [Christ's] very conception, let him be anathema.³⁸

The Nestorians are concerned to show that miracles are performed by the Holy Spirit, not by the human agency of the Incarnate Christ. In reply, the Scythians are quick to attack the notion of the Spirit as mediator and to claim that the Incarnate Christ is able to work miracles. But this has the result of assigning no role at all to the Spirit:

The Catholics respond: We are unable to understand what this unheard of mediation between God the Word and the Holy Spirit brings to all ages and all men when the divine Scriptures testify through the words of the Apostle Paul that there is one mediator: *For there is one mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ*, et al. [1 Tim 2:5] *For he is making peace who made both one and broke down the dividing wall of enmity through his flesh, abolishing the law of the commandments in decrees, so that he might bring the two into himself in one new person* [Eph 2:14-15] and the rest, which is too long to include here. What, therefore, does this unheard of novelty mean except that in order to

³⁸ Scythian Monks, *disp. 12 cap. Θ* (CCSL 85a.207; my translation). It is worth noting that neither the Nestorian response nor the Scythian response to this anathema are concerned with the procession of the Spirit from the Son. Theodoret of Cyrus, *Refutation of Cyril's Anathemas*, 9, (ACO 1.1.6.136; I. Pásztori-Kupán, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, 183), is concerned that Cyril's position speaks of the Spirit as being "out of the Son, or as having [his] origin through the Son."

separate Christ from the substance of the Holy Spirit, it claims that he is not able to work signs and wonders on his own, without the Spirit, without mediation, or even without any aid?³⁹

It is clear that the Scythians are concerned to make the Son of God the sole subject of the Incarnate Christ. This was the main force behind their insistence on the phrase “one of the Trinity was crucified.” In this vein, “to separate Christ from the substance of the Holy Spirit” is to think of the human Christ apart from God, which the Scythians always found heretical. The Nestorian attempt to articulate a role for the Holy Spirit displaces the agency of the Son of God and assumes a divine agency apart from the human agency. The Scythians do not allow this kind of division within the Incarnate Christ, but their response simply displaces the Spirit with the Son. That is, their response assumes that the Incarnate Christ can work miracles on his own because the Son of God is the agent in the Incarnate Christ, but leaves no room for the Holy Spirit. Fulgentius, as we will see, argues differently.

In the *Refutation*, the short explanatory treatise associated with the *Disputation*, the Scythians do not address this anathema directly, but they do address the manner in which the Son of God is present in the Incarnate Christ. The Scythians develop a technical vocabulary in which it is appropriate to say that the Son of God “assumes (*suscipere*)” human nature. In order to introduce the topic, they consider angels who have appeared as humans:

Thus, we also believe that angels were sent to certain holy men often and in many times, as we read. In order that they could be visible to those to whom they were sent, they bore

³⁹ Scythian Monks, *disp. 12 cap.* © (CCSL 85a.207; my translation).

human appearance by taking up (*sumere*) bodies. This much is certain. But whether those holy spirits fulfilled the ministry of rational souls by dwelling for a time in so many bodies "assumed (*suscipere*)" by them, or whether they inspired the bodies they animated from outside as happens with soothsayers, either of these possibilities must not easily or rashly be affirmed.⁴⁰

The various ways in which an angel could take on human appearance, namely by replacing the human soul from within or by influencing the human from without, are unfit descriptions of the way the Son of God assumes humanity in the Incarnation. In their argument, the Scythians recount the traditional problem with Apollinarius: thinking that Christ had a human body, but not a human soul. The Scythians argue that it is wrong to think that "Christ, the Son of God, assumed the body of a man, but not the soul, and instead, that God the Spirit, the Son of God, [or] the Word of the Father dwelt in the assumed body in the place of a soul."⁴¹ The Scythian refutation immediately pronounces the error and stupidity of thinking that the way angels took up human appearance is parallel to the Incarnation, but they never offer more than negative statements. Some clarity is brought to this issue in the *Dialogue Against the Nestorians*, which the Scythians also wrote as part of their campaign against heretical notions of Christ.

In the *Dialogue*, the Scythians have the character Nestorius raise a question from Col 2:9, "for the whole fullness of deity dwells corporeally in him." The Nestorian character

⁴⁰ Scythian Monks, *ref. Nest. dict.* 4b.37b.5 (CCSL 85a.222; my translation). Mark DeCogliano gave me great assistance in rendering this passage into English.

⁴¹ Scythian Monks, *ref. Nest. dict.* 4b.37b.5 (CCSL 85a.223; my translation). We can see behind the somewhat odd list of Spirit, Son, and Word, various attempts by others to separate the Holy Spirit from the Son of God, and even to separate the Son of God from the Word of the Father, but the Scythians offer no further discussion of these alternate explanations of the Incarnation. Perhaps for this reason PL 48.931c omits *spiritum deum*.

asserts that this must mean that the entire Trinity dwells in Christ, but the Catholic responds that this cannot be the case.

Cath. – What do you mean by ‘the fullness of deity dwells in Christ?’

Nest. – Without a doubt, ‘the entire Trinity.’

Cath. – But Christ, in whom the entire Trinity dwells, is then a fourth.

Nest. – Then we would make Paul a liar, for he asserts this.

Cath. – Paul is not a liar, for he does not say that the Trinity dwells in Christ since he does not think that Christ is an addition to the Trinity...Now, when the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are the Trinity (as is certainly the case), Christ is understood as a fourth if the Trinity dwells in him. Thus, Paul does not teach that the Trinity dwells in Christ.⁴²

Rather, the Scythians have the Catholic respond with a fairly traditional statement of the irreducibility and equality of the persons of the Trinity.

Just as [the Father] is the fullness [of divinity], so also the Son is the fullness, and the Holy Spirit is the fullness, and all at once [are the fullness], that is, the entire Trinity is not three, but one fullness of divinity. The Father is perfect, the Son is perfect, and the Holy Spirit is perfect, and all together are not three perfections, but one perfection.⁴³

This argument, that Christ himself is the fullness of divinity because each of the persons is the fullness of divinity is sufficient to this particular question, but it ignores the issue of how the Spirit is present in the Incarnate Christ. The Scythians are consistent in arguing that the Son of God is the subject of the Incarnation. The Incarnate Christ has the fullness of deity because the Son is incarnate and the Son is the fullness of deity. The Incarnate

⁴² John Maxentius, *dial. c. Nest.* 2.16 (CCSL 85a.97; my translation).

⁴³ John Maxentius, *dial. c. Nest.* 2.16 (CCSL 85a.98; my translation).

Christ works miracles because the Son is incarnate and the Son can work miracles. Their emphasis, however, on Christology, allowed them to neglect the interface between pneumatology and Christology. Fulgentius, however, relying on Augustinian principles of Trinitarian theology, argued that the Spirit is operative in the Incarnation.

BEYOND SCYTHIA FROM RUSPE - FULGENTIUS ON THE SPIRIT AND THE INCARNATION

A professed monk who was made bishop of Ruspe, Fulgentius was exiled from his native Africa twice by Arian Vandal kings in the early 6th century. He was also allowed to return to Africa after both exiles. During his second exile, the Scythian monks contacted him, and they exchanged letters. We have already seen how Fulgentius reflected on the role of the Spirit in Christian life in ways similar to the Scythian monks. Though it was the Scythian formulation which was adopted at Orange in 529, Fulgentius' understanding of the Spirit's work in reforming the human will was not substantially different. His understanding of the relationship between the Son and the Spirit, however, was significantly different. Fulgentius was able to apply Augustine's understanding of Trinitarian missions, inseparable operations, and irreducible persons to various questions of his own day. This allows Fulgentius to argue three points which were not articulated by the Scythians: the Holy Spirit is operative in creating the human Christ; the Holy Spirit is given in his fullness to the human Christ; and wherever the Son is operative, so also are the Father and Spirit.

On his second return to Africa, in the final period of his life, Fulgentius exchanged letters with a certain Deacon Ferrandus and the layman Victor. Fulgentius' answers to their questions reveal the advances he was able to make concerning the interaction between the Spirit and the Son in the Incarnate Christ. Two related lines of thought are

relevant here: the creation of the man assumed by the Son and the knowledge that the soul of Christ has about his divinity. The man whom the Son assumed was created by the Trinity, for a human is a creature, and the Trinity acts inseparably to create. Fulgentius says it succinctly: “The entire Trinity made the humanity of the Son, but, though it made it as a whole, the entire Trinity did not assume it, for that person which the Son does not have in common with the Father and Son is, itself, both divine and human.”⁴⁴ This allows Fulgentius to articulate one way in which the Holy Spirit participates in the Incarnation without becoming incarnate. The Spirit creates the man Jesus Christ. This also has implications for missions, which I will discuss further below. Here it suffices to note the simple point that in arguing that the entire Trinity creates the human Jesus Christ, Fulgentius provides a specific role for the Spirit in the Incarnation which escaped mention by the Scythians, but is relevant to their critique of Nestorianism. Similarly, in responding to the question about the knowledge Christ’s human soul has of his divinity Fulgentius articulates a role for the Spirit where the Scythians simply ignored any activity of the Spirit in the Incarnation.

Fulgentius treats the question of the Spirit’s role in the knowledge of the soul of Christ differently from other questions Ferrandus asks, for he thinks the answer to it is less clear than the other issues of the inseparability of the Trinity and the relationship between the Incarnation and the Trinity. This question is “something that we are not able to think of sufficiently and worthily. For the distinction being considered between Creator and

⁴⁴ Fulgentius, *c. serm. Fast. Ar.* 14.2 (CCSL 91.299; my translation).

creature demonstrates the incomprehensible and inexplicable greatness of the Creator to the created intellect.”⁴⁵ Nevertheless, there are two reasons why

it is extremely hard and thoroughly foreign to a healthy faith to say that the soul of Christ... does not have full knowledge of his own deity... When we speak of the soul of Christ, we are speaking about that rational spirit to whom not only God came by grace but whom the divinity itself took up in the unity of the person.⁴⁶

Fulgentius offers an extended discussion of the grace which visits the Incarnate Christ under pneumatological terms. Thus, in the Incarnation, there is the Son of God joined to a man, and the fullness of the Holy Spirit present as a singular gift to Christ. In both aspects the Incarnate Christ is different from other humans, for the Son of God does not assume any other human, nor is the *fullness* of the Holy Spirit given to other Christians. Rather, the Son of God and the Holy Spirit visit, infuse, and reform other Christians in ways that are parallel, but not identical to the Incarnation.

Two Scripture verses are crucial to Fulgentius’ understanding of the difference between the gift of the Spirit to Christ and the gift of the Spirit to other Christians: Jn 3:34, “[God] does not ration his gift of the Spirit,” and Joel 2:28, “I will pour out of my Spirit.” Christ received the Spirit without measure, while we receive the Spirit according to measure.

Fulgentius relies on Ambrose’s interpretation of Joel to make the point:

Saint Ambrose, showing that we receive not the fullness, but of the fullness of the Spirit, that he may show that Christ has received the entire fullness of the Spirit...says, ‘the Father says that he pours out of the Holy Spirit upon all flesh; for he did not pour him

⁴⁵ Fulgentius, *Ep.* 14.26 (CCSL 91.416; FOTC 95.534).

⁴⁶ Fulgentius, *Ep.* 14.26 (CCSL 91.417; FOTC 95.535). I have rearranged Fulgentius’ order of presenting the material so that it reads as a direct statement.

forth entirely...therefore, it was poured upon us of the Spirit, but in truth the Spirit abode over the Lord Jesus when he was in the form of man.'⁴⁷

Fulgentius relies on Augustine for the interpretation of John.

The blessed Augustine, by the same illumination of the Holy Spirit...affirms that it must be accepted only in the case of the person of Christ. For when he expounded the same text of the Gospel...Augustine added this: '*What does this mean: For [God] does not ration his gift of the Spirit?*[Jn 3:34] We find that God does give the Spirit by measure...He gives to men by measure; he does not give to the only Son by measure...So too there are various gifts of the faithful, distributed [to them] as to members according to the measure proper to each. But Christ, who gives, does not receive according to measure...*For not according to measure does God give the Spirit. The Father loves the Son and has handed over all things to him.*'[Jn 3:34-35]⁴⁸

Moreover, Fulgentius adds a further refinement to the discussion: the fullness of the Spirit is given to Christ's human soul, not his divinity.

No one of the three persons has anything less than the two where in each person the divinity is full in such a way that it is both one in the three persons and full in each of them. Therefore, the divinity of the Son could not receive the Holy Spirit since the Holy Spirit itself proceeds from the Son just as it proceeds from the Father...the divinity of the

⁴⁷ Fulgentius, *Ep.* 14.27 (CCSL 91.417; FOTC 95.536), citing Ambrose, *De sp. sanct.* 1.8.92-93 (CSEL 79.55; FOTC 44.69).

⁴⁸ Fulgentius, *Ep.* 14.27 (CCSL 91.418; FOTC 95.536), citing Augustine, *Io. ev. tr.* 14.10-11 (CCSL 36.148-149; FOTC 79.74-75). The issue must have interested Fulgentius, for he knows the history of Augustine's exegesis of the passage. Fulgentius explains that Augustine had explained the verse differently in his *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, but corrected the interpretation in the *Retractions*. Augustine referenced the story of Elisha and Elijah, in which Elisha asks for a double portion of the Spirit. This shows that the Spirit is given to other humans according to measure; whereas the fullness of the Spirit is given to Christ.

Son did not receive the Holy Spirit with which the Holy Spirit is of one nature and from which it has whatever it has, indeed, from which it is that which it is; because what it has by nature, that it is. Therefore, it remains that the soul of Christ receives the Spirit which still has not received according to measure and so has received as a whole.⁴⁹

This final refinement guards against something similar to what troubled the Scythian monks in their *Refutation*: there is no special mediation between the Spirit and the Son. But Fulgentius still argues that the Spirit is given completely to the Incarnate Christ. The case of Christ is unique because the Spirit is offered in his fullness, but there is still a parallel between Christ and other humans in this regard. Fulgentius articulates a role for the Spirit in the Incarnation which the Scythians were unable to articulate; this allows a parallel between the Incarnate Christ and other Christians which the Scythians could not articulate. But articulating a role for the Spirit in the Incarnation was not only effective against Nestorian concerns. Coupled with arguments about the inseparability of the persons of the Trinity, it also provided a response to Arian concerns.

As part of their critique of the Catholics, Arians attacked the doctrine of the inseparability of the Trinity. The Arian Fastidiosus posed the problem in a particularly gripping way:

And if the Son of God, concerning whom the Evangelist says, *the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us*, [Jn 1:14] the power of his Divinity hidden for a little while, alone entered the bridal chamber of the virginal womb, without a doubt he was separated from the Father and the Holy Spirit.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Fulgentius, *Ep.* 14.28 (CCSL 91.420; FOTC 95.538-539).

⁵⁰ Fastidiosus *Sermo* 3, *apud* Fulgentius, *Ep.* 9.*serm.*3 (CCSL 91.281-282; FOTC 95.390).

Fulgentius' first response is simply to argue that "the Holy Trinity works inseparably," according to the standard Catholic position.⁵¹ He then picks up a discussion of the Arian claim that there is a difference and subordination between the one *in whom* something is done and the one *who* does it. The Arians argue that if Christ casts out demons in the Spirit, Christ is less than the Spirit. The Nestorian treatment of this issue vexed the Scythians because it seemed to separate Christ from the Spirit, as though the Incarnate Christ could not perform miracles on his own authority. The Arian claim was specifically concerned not only to separate, but also to subordinate the created Christ to the Spirit of God because Christ casts out demons "in the Spirit." Fulgentius, however, is happy to say that "what the Son does, he does in the Holy Spirit."⁵² He responds quickly to the semantic claim about the difference between the one *in whom* and the one *who* does something. Since humans are said to do good "in God," as in Jn 3:21, this would mean that God is less than humans, which Fulgentius argues is patently absurd.⁵³ It is simply not the case that *who* designates one greater than *in whom*. But Fulgentius' argument is not limited to semantics. He returns to the theme of the inseparability of the Father, Son, and Spirit with another sense of separation.

Fulgentius argues that the Arians are guilty of thinking of separation in spatial terms, but nothing can be separated from God in space because God fills all things. This marks an advance over the arguments of the Scythian monks. Fulgentius' basic argument is that God is not present part in the part, but whole in the part, and so, we can never be

⁵¹ Fulgentius, *c. serm. Fast. Ar.* 2.2 (CCSL 91.285; FOTC 95.393).

⁵² Fulgentius, *c. serm. Fast. Ar.* 2.4 (CCSL 91.286; FOTC 95.395).

⁵³ Fulgentius, *c. serm. Fast. Ar.* 3.1.

separated from God because God is always wholly present.⁵⁴ To think of the Incarnate Christ as somehow separate from the Father and the Spirit is to make a categorical error about the way God is present. God is not separated from others by space or time, but by sin. Since Christ is without sin, the Trinity is in no way separated from Christ. But the inseparability of the Trinity raises other questions. Most notably, the fear that was expressed in the Nestorian response to Cyril's ninth anathema, that the Spirit is somehow made incarnate, seems to follow from the inseparability of the Trinity. If Father, Son, and Spirit cannot be separated, then Fulgentius seems committed to an incarnation of the Trinity, and not the Incarnation of the Son. Indeed, the Vandal Arians raised this question directly. For the Scythians, this was never a significant issue because they always addressed the Incarnation as a matter of the second person of the Trinity, and seldom discussed the role of the Spirit or the Father in the Incarnation. The weakness in their account, namely that they do not articulate a role for the Spirit in the Incarnate Christ, at least prevents them from falling under this critique which was raised against Fulgentius. In his defense of the irreducibility of the Father, Son, and Spirit, Fulgentius shows a grasp of Augustine's theology which eluded even the Lérinian theologians who addressed the topic in their consideration of pneumatology. As I argue below, this is because Fulgentius follows Augustine in understanding multiple senses of *missio*.

BEYOND LÉRINS FROM RUSPE – FULGENTIUS ON MISSIONS AND PROCESSIONS

We saw in chapter 5 that Caesarius and Faustus thought that the verb *mittere* always implies movement from one location to another. Because God does not have spatial location, divine persons are not properly said to be sent. Faustus and Caesarius are

⁵⁴ Fulgentius, *c. serm. Fast. Ar.* 4.1.-7.3. cf. Fulgentius, *Ad Pet. de fide* 3.27, & *Ep.* 10.7.

comfortable discussing the missions of the Son and the Spirit only to the extent that they discuss created realities. This does not mean that they say nothing about divine processions, but rather that they limit what can be said to what has already been said in Scripture and creedal statements. One implication of this is their refusal to speculate about whether the Spirit is *genitus* or *ingenitus*. Scripture is silent about such a question, and, as Faustus and Caesarius make clear, we should remain silent about the question, as well. In chapter 5, I argued that we can make sense of their position by considering two facets of their theological milieu. On the one hand, they had restricted access to Augustine's mature Trinitarian theology; on the other hand they did not encounter sophisticated arguments from the Gallic Arians with whom they interacted. On both accounts Fulgentius was in a very different situation. He had access to a large collection of Augustine's material, and he made use of it. Fulgentius was also summoned to debate in person with sophisticated Arian theologians within the Vandal royal court. Additionally, he corresponded with many theologians who posed intricate questions. Because he understood the principles of inseparable operations and irreducible persons as Augustine had articulated them with respect to missions and processions, Fulgentius was able to make sense of mission in a way that never occurred to the Lérinian theologians, and he was able to articulate roles for the Holy Spirit in a way that never occurred to the Scythians. Fulgentius is a kind of "super star" in the history of the reception of Augustine's pneumatology.

The doctrine of inseparable operations developed in the 4th century as a way of arguing positively for the full divinity of the Son and the Spirit. Catholic theologians called attention to passages of Scripture which showed the Son and the Spirit performing

some activity that only God can perform, and thus, argued that the Son and the Spirit are fully divine. But this means that all three persons perform every divine action. In order to safeguard against collapsing the Trinity into one person (a single agent), theologians argued that the Father, Son, and Spirit are irreducible persons. Part of Augustine's genius on this score was to articulate rules for reading Scripture, as I discussed in chapter 5. Following Ambrose and Hilary, Augustine argued that some passages speak in terms of lesser and greater because they show that the Son became human, and as such, is less than the Father. Though the Spirit assumes created realities without making an additional incarnation, the case is still the same for Scriptural language which speaks of the Spirit as somehow less. In their created realities, the dove and flames are less than God, but this does not mean that the Spirit is a lesser divinity than the Father. But Augustine also articulated a second principle that helped to make sense of the language of sending (i.e. "being from," "being sent," and "coming"): some passages reveal the relationships that the Father, Son, and Spirit have with each other. These relationships show us that the Father, Son, and Spirit are distinct and irreducible persons, even apart from the mission of the Son in the Incarnation and the missions of the Spirit in the dove and the tongues of fire. Fulgentius states the position plainly:

Just as the Son is neither later nor less than the Father, so neither is the Holy Spirit later or less than the Son. The Son is eternal and without beginning, because the Son, born from the nature of the Father, has always existed. And the Holy Spirit is eternal and without beginning, because the Holy Spirit proceeds from the nature of the Father and the Son.⁵⁵

⁵⁵ Fulgentius, *ad Pet. de fide* 1.6 (CCSL 91a.715-716; FOTC 95.62). Cf. *ad Pet. de fide* 10.53; *Ep.* 14.28.

Generation and procession distinguish the Father, Son, and Spirit. “Because generating is different from being born and proceeding is something different again from generating and being born, it is obvious that the Father is different, the Son is different, and the Holy Spirit is different.”⁵⁶ This maintains an order within the Trinity which is not a subordination of the Spirit or Son to the Father. It also allows for the Son and not the whole Trinity to be incarnate.

The entire Trinity did not take on flesh nor did the entire Trinity feel the injuries of the passion, nor did the entire Trinity lie in the tomb, nor did the entire Trinity descend into Hell, nor did the entire Trinity rise from the dead on the third day, and if there are any other things which are found in the mystery of his Incarnation, they belong to the person of the Son alone...[for] the Catholic Church, divinely-inspired, holding the truth of the faith, just as it knows how to assert the one nature of the Holy Trinity, so most carefully it attributes to each person its own.⁵⁷

This much the Lérinians would have asserted, were they asked, and the Scythians did assert in opposition to critiques of their theology. But we have already seen that the Scythians were unable to articulate any role for the Father or the Spirit in the Incarnation. They seldom even questioned the Incarnation farther than to argue that the Son, and the Son alone, is the subject of the Incarnation. For the Lérinian theologians, one could not speak of the Spirit sending the Son because the language of mission was generally to be avoided, and the traditional language speaks only of the Father sending the Son.

⁵⁶ Fulgentius, *ad Pet. de fide* 2.7 (CCSL 91a.716; FOTC 95.64). Cf. *ad Pet. de fide* 5.

⁵⁷ Fulgentius, *c. serm. Fast. Ar.* (FOTC 95.407-408). Cf. *Ep.* 13.15-24.

Fulgentius' understanding of mission, however, allows him to argue that the Spirit sends the Son in the Incarnation.

When arguing that the man whom the Son assumed was created by the Trinity, Fulgentius found the language of person and nature helpful: "The only-begotten God took up the flesh and the soul into a unity of person, not into a unity of nature."⁵⁸ Earlier in this chapter, we saw how this allowed Fulgentius to articulate a role for the Spirit in the Incarnation without also teaching that the Spirit became incarnate. This teaching also means that, in the Incarnation, the Son is sent by the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Similarly, at Pentecost, the Spirit is sent by the Father and the Son.

The Son is sent by the Father, but the Father is not sent by the Son because the Son is born from the Father, not the Father from the Son. Similarly, the Holy Spirit, as we read, is sent by the Father and the Son, because the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. But because there is more than one way of using *missio* in Sacred Scripture, in the mystery of the Incarnation the Son is sent not only from the Father, but indeed from the Holy Spirit, as well; *the man Christ Jesus, the mediator of God and man* is formed by the operation of the entire Trinity.⁵⁹ However, in another way the Holy Spirit, who proceeds naturally from the Father and Son, is sent by the Father and Son. Again, the Holy Spirit is sent by the Father and the Son when the effect of spiritual grace is given by the one God, the Trinity itself. In a still different way the Son is sent by the Father and the Holy Spirit when, emptying himself, he took the form of a slave.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Fulgentius, *Ep.* 9.12 (CCSL 91.297; FOTC 95.408). Cf. *Ep.* 14.22.

⁵⁹ 1 Tim 2:5.

⁶⁰ Fulgentius, *c. Fab. frag.* 29.18-19 (CCSL 91a.823; my translation). Cf. Fulgentius, *c. serm. Fast. Ar.* 8.3; *ad Pet. de fide* 15.58.

Fulgentius argues for multiple senses of the term *missio*. Within the Trinity, the Father sends the Son because the Father begets the Son; similarly, the Father and the Son send the Spirit, because the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. When considering the act of creating the man Jesus Christ, however, the entire Trinity works to create, and so, the Father and the Spirit send the Son. *Missio*, within the Trinity, helps to distinguish the divine persons. The Father sends the Son eternally. When considering the work of the Trinity, however, *missio* distinguishes the divine nature from created realities. The entire Trinity sends the Incarnate Son in time. The language of sending bothered Faustus and Caesarius because they always thought *missio* entailed traveling through space. Since God does not travel through space, divine persons are not properly sent, only the created realities associated with the Son and the Spirit can be subject to motion in space.

Fulgentius, however, understands that *missio* reveals several things about God because it has different senses. Since the language of sending involves the language of arriving, Fulgentius expands the understanding of *missio* even further when we consider what he says about the meaning of the coming of the Son and the Spirit.

Just as the Son is said to come (*venire*) in two ways, so also the Spirit is said to come in two ways. The Son comes when he is sent *by* the Father and the Spirit in the Incarnation, and the Son comes *with* the Father and the Holy Spirit to dwell in those who love God. Similarly,

The Holy Spirit is also said to come since it too is one God with the Father and the Son, by nature, eternal and infinite, without whom neither can the Father come nor the Son. He who has charity in his heart can love the Father and the Son. *The love of God has been poured out into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us.*[Rom 5:5]

Therefore, the Father and the Son never come to their lover without the Holy Spirit;

because, in order that they come, they are given the charity by which they are loved by the gift of the Holy Spirit.⁶¹

In another way the Spirit is said to come in the form or appearance of a dove.

The Holy Spirit, coming in the form of a dove, did not become a dove, as the Son became a human being; but, through the form of a dove, he showed that love is to be given to us by his gift. For *the love of God has been poured out...*[Rom 5:5] Later he also appeared in tongues of flame but this too he did as a sign of that very charity which he granted us.⁶²

In considering the way God works in and among us, Fulgentius teaches that the language of sending offers a further distinction: between the coming of the Son and Spirit which are associated with their created realities (i.e. the man, the dove, and the flames) and the coming of the Trinity into the lives of Christians. That Fulgentius naturally associates the second sense of the coming of the Holy Spirit with love shows his Augustinian roots in a way that is even more complete than Prosper of Aquitaine, who also reflected on the Holy Spirit as love. The associated reflections that support the notion that the coming of the Holy Spirit is a matter of love are bound up with Fulgentius' understanding of mission. In those reflections, he understood Augustine's pneumatology far better than the Lérinian theologians and was able to articulate a role for the Holy Spirit in the Incarnation in ways that never occurred to the Scythians. Fulgentius links the reformation of desire with his doctrine of God through his understanding *missio*. On the one hand, the

⁶¹ Fulgentius, *Ep.* 10.12 (CCSL 91.321; FOTC 95.435).

⁶² Fulgentius, *Ep.* 10.13 (CCSL 91.323; FOTC 95.436).

Spirit's *missio* helps distinguish the divine persons, safeguarding Fulgentius' Trinitarian theology and helping to argue for the full divinity of each person against Arian claims of subordination. On the other than, the Spirit's *missio* among humans reorients human interiority and offers a new possibility for humans to love with God's love. The Spirit who is the love between Father and Son brings about human self-transcendence in love.

BEYOND AQUITAINIA FROM RUSPE – FULGENTIUS ON REFORMATION AND THE TRINITY

I argued in chapter 4 that Prosper's understanding of the role of the Spirit in clarifying issues of free will developed throughout his career. At first, he did not articulate a role for the Holy Spirit in human will. The categories that defined his discussion were will and grace, and these were often understood as though they are opposed forces. However, in responding to Cassian, Prosper came to a deeper understanding of Augustine's principle that the Holy Spirit reorients the human will. Prosper appropriated this to such an extent that he formalized a schema which spoke of a "spiritual will." This helped him to overcome the assumption that human and divine will are opposed forces, for a spiritual will is truly a human will which has been given new freedom and new power to choose the good. Fulgentius, without adopting the terminology of "spiritual will," argued much the same. Both Fulgentius and Prosper followed Augustine in arguing that both faith and love are gifts from God and that love is the fulfillment of both law and faith. The subtle advance Fulgentius makes beyond Prosper is that Fulgentius is able to connect his explanations of how the human will comes to believe and to love with his understanding of the Trinity. Fulgentius makes use of Augustine's principle that the Holy Spirit, as the love between the Father and Son, is also the love between God and humans, and the love which Christians have for others.

Fulgentius is able to synthesize his Trinitarian theology with his understanding of the reformation of the will because of his Augustinian pneumatology.

Fulgentius defines faith as the beginning of a good will.⁶³ This allows him to correlate love as the completion of a good will.⁶⁴ As David Maxwell has argued, this means that Fulgentius can explain Phil 2:13, that God works in us both to will and to do, in terms of faith and love.⁶⁵ Faith enables Christians to become “sons of God,” but this requires the Holy Spirit.

Moreover, one cannot possess this peace without the love and faith of Christ; because *we have been justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ through whom we have access through faith in his grace in which we stand, and we rejoice in the hope of the glory of sons of God.*[Rom 5:1-2] And this hope is not confounded, for *the love of God has been poured out in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us.*[Rom 5:5] For we accept the *spirit of adoption as sons in whom we cry out, ‘Abba, Father.’*[Rom 8:15]⁶⁶

Love, which is given by the Holy Spirit, is the fulfillment of faith and hope. It is also the fulfillment of the law.

This is the law which God wrote in every heart, not through the condition of nature, but through the largess of grace, not through the free will of men, but through the ministry of preaching the Gospel, not in “stone” (according to the language of the Old Testament), but in the “heart by the Spirit of the living God.” This is what blessed Paul evidently

⁶³ E.g. Fulgentius, *de ver. praed.* 1.36 (CCSL 91a.481).

⁶⁴ E.g. Fulgentius, *de ver. praed.* 2.17 (CCSL 91a.500).

⁶⁵ D. Maxwell, "Christology and Grace," 235-236.

⁶⁶ Fulgentius, *Ep.* 17.26.51 (CCSL 91a.604; my translation). Cf. Fulgentius *ad Mon.* 2.11.3 (CCSL 91.46) for explanation of Rom 5:5 by appeal to the spirit of adoption.

implied when he said, *you are letters of Christ administered by us, written not in ink, but by the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone, but on tables that are hearts of flesh.*[2 Cor 3:3] Therefore, God wrote this in human hearts through his Spirit, who then removes the evil of the Devil, through whom death entered the world. He wrote the law of faith, through which God justifies the nations so that by giving grace he renews nature. For he pours out love, which is the fullness of the law, through his Spirit so that he fulfills what he foretold.⁶⁷ For this reason he lavishes the grace of illumination through a spirit of faith so that faith, which is pleasing to God, may operate through charity.⁶⁸

Correlating love as the fulfillment of the law to the Spirit's work of renewing the law on the tablet of human hearts and the Spirit of adoption allows Fulgentius to make a final theological connection between the Spirit's activity within humans and the Spirit as the third person of the Trinity. Fulgentius makes the Augustinian connection between the Holy Spirit and the love with which God loves and with which we love.

He who has charity in his heart can love the Father and the Son. 'The love of God has been poured out into our hearts through the Holy Spirit that has been given to us.' [Rom 5:5] Therefore, the Father and the Son never come to their lover without the Holy Spirit; because, in order that they come, they are given the charity by which they are loved by the gift of the Holy Spirit.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ This is a conflation of Rom 5:5 and Rom 13:10.

⁶⁸ Fulgentius, *Ep.* 17.27.54 (CCSL 91a.605-606; my translation). The final sentence contains a reference to Heb 11:6, which he quotes shortly thereafter.

⁶⁹ CCSL 91.321 –Fulgentius, *Ep.* 12 (ad Scarilam) (CCSL 91.321; FOTC 95.435). This letter is also known as *Liber ad Sacarilam de Incarnatione Filii Dei*.

Fulgentius, having worked out a sophisticated Trinitarian theology against Arian and Nestorian concerns, connects this to his understanding of the reformation of human desire and love. The principal is the same whether discussion the Spirit in relation to the Father and Son or in relation to human existence: “The Holy Spirit, like the love and holiness... [and also] the communion, is consubstantial and co-eternal.”⁷⁰

SYNTHESIS

In the 5th century, theologians like John Cassian applied their belief in the full divinity of the Holy Spirit to various questions of the reformation of human life. The dominant themes of such a pneumatology are provided by the underlying anthropological models. This is a large part of why Prosper and Cassian differ in explaining the roles of the Holy Spirit in reforming Christians. They agree that the Spirit reforms humans, but they differ on which elements of human existence are most fundamental. This pneumatological concern was not limited to the debate between Prosper and Cassian. Leo, for one, applied his belief in the divinity of the Holy Spirit to his understanding of the main elements of Christian life. Sacraments and liturgy are the core of Christian life, and so, Leo articulated roles for the Holy Spirit in the sacraments and the liturgy. Like many of the theologians I have discussed so far, the Scythians were not interested in exploring or even explaining the missions and processions of the Spirit, though they were interested in questions about the divine nature and divine persons as they relate to Christology. Solidly based in Augustine’s anthropology, they used the principle that grace is the operation of the Holy Spirit within human existence to formulate particularly clear statements about the transformation of Christians with respect to predestination. They articulated a role for

⁷⁰Fulgentius, *Ep.* 14 (ad Ferrandum) (CCSL 91.433; FOTC 95.553).

the Holy Spirit at every point which had been under discussion in the controversy over predestination: God's call to faith, baptism, and perseverance. Caesarius and the bishops at Orange gave official approval to this theology in 529. Fulgentius also agreed, as we see in his letters. He, too, applied his belief in the Holy Spirit to the various questions which were asked of him, but his articulation of the Catholic faith concerning the Holy Spirit had been honed by studying Augustine's mature Trinitarian theology in many different contexts. Like everyone else studied here, Fulgentius applied the Catholic belief in the Spirit to the questions of his day. But, whereas others generally applied a belief in the full divinity of the Holy Spirit and one or two aspects of the way the Spirit works within Christians to their particular understandings of human existence, Fulgentius does more. He was able to answer intricate questions about the Trinity and intricate questions about grace from a single perspective. He demonstrates a kind of Augustinianism that is more sophisticated than that of Prosper or the Scythians. The reception of Augustine in the 5th and 6th centuries was not uniform, even among those who wanted to be Augustinian. Unlike other theologians of his day, he was able to hold all of his observations together by the principles his African predecessor had articulated: inseparable operations, irreducible persons, multiple senses of *missio*, and the central observation that the Holy Spirit is the Love of God. For Fulgentius, the reformation of human interiority was one more aspect of pneumatology that demanded the careful attention of theologians. The Latin pneumatology developed by the Scythians and Fulgentius was concerned with the reformation of desire. The Scythians advanced their arguments mostly in terms of predestination and critiques of Nestorianism. Fulgentius advanced his arguments by appeal to his understanding of the Spirit's relation to the Father and Son as love, allowing

him to make parallel arguments for the Spirit's action within humans. Gregory the Great, who was born just as Fulgentius died, also thought that the reformation of desire demanded careful attention, and devoted much of his pneumatology to studying how the Spirit reforms human desire, as we see in the remaining chapters.

VII. DIALOGUE OF DESIRE: GREGORY'S ASCETIC PNEUMATOLOGY

St. Gregory the Great (c540-604) never wrote a treatise aimed directly at forming professional ascetics in the way Cassian wrote his *Institutes* and *Conferences*. Rather, Gregory gave regular presentations and homilies to his monastic brothers and then to the clergy and laity entrusted to his care in Rome.¹ In these homilies and commentaries, he provides an ascetic pneumatology that supplements Cassian's system with Augustinian insights. For example, in a homily on Pentecost, Gregory explains:

[The Holy Spirit] was revealed in fiery tongues because the Spirit is coeternal with the Son, and the tongue has the closest connection with the word. The Son is the Father's Word, and because the Spirit and the Son, the Word, are of one substance, the Spirit had to be revealed as a tongue. Or since a word is produced by a tongue, the Spirit appeared in tongues because whoever is touched by the Holy Spirit confesses the Word of God, his only-begotten Son; one who possesses the tongue of the Holy Spirit cannot deny the Word of God. Or the Spirit appeared in tongues because it causes all it fills both to burn and to speak. Teachers possess fiery tongues, because when they preach out of love of

¹ The works of Gregory are collected in PL 75-79. Modern critical editions are mostly in CCSL 140-144. Gregory's works are translated into modern languages. *Ep.* = *Letters*; *In Cant.* = *Exposition on the Song of Songs*; *Reg. Past.* = *Pastoral Care*; *Mor.* = *Moralia on Job*; *Hom. Ev.* = *Gospel Homilies*; *Hom. Ez.* = *Homilies on Ezekiel*; *Dial.* = *Dialogues* (Book 2 of the *Dial.* is the *Life of St. Benedict*); *In I Reg.* = *Exposition on the First Book of Kings*. For translations and critical editions, see the bibliography. For the most recent debate on the authenticity of *Dial.*, see, F. Clark, *The "Gregorian" Dialogues*. On *In Cant.*, see DelCogliano's forthcoming translation of *Exposition on the Song of Songs*. On *Reg. Exp.*, see P. Meyvaert, "The date of Gregory the Great's Commentaries," 191-216; P.-P. Verbraken, "Le Commentaire de saint Grégoire sur le Premier Livre des Rois " 159-217; P.-P. Verbraken, "Le text du Commentaire sur les Rois," 39-62; A.d. Vogüé, SC 351.32-61; A.d. Vogüé, "Les Vues de Grégoire le Grand," 17-63. The second book of *Dial.* is the life of St. Benedict, and has garnered significant discussion. For discussion and bibliography, see P. Cusack, *Interpretation of the Second Dialogue*; A.d. Vogüé, *The life of St. Benedict--Gregory the Great*. Several edited volumes are worth consultation: S. Boesch Gajano, ed. *Gregorio Magno: alle Origini del Medioevo*; C. Cavadini John, ed. *Gregory the Great: a Symposium*; J. Fontaine, R. Gillet, and S. Pellistrandi, eds., *Grégoire le Grand*. Monographs are mentioned where relevant. In the notes to this chapter I have mentioned the author of a text only when he is not Gregory the Great.

God they enflame the hearts of their hearers... and their hearts glow within them and are consumed by the flames of inner delight.²

Gregory preached those words as Bishop of Rome on the feast of Pentecost. Like Leo, Gregory saw the importance of the feast in the liturgical life of the Church. Gregory was not, of course, always a bishop. He grew up in Rome in a powerful family, worked as a very high administrator for the Eternal City, and then left his civil career to be a monk. Unlike many other wealthy men, Gregory took up the novice' habit and professed himself under Abbot Hilarion at the monastery Gregory himself had founded and dedicated to St. Andrew.³ Later, Pope Pelagius ordained him deacon and then sent him to Constantinople as his official delegate. Gregory insisted on bringing some of his fellow monks with him to the other capital of the Empire. When he returned to Rome, he was reluctantly, but universally elected Bishop, and therefore made Pope.⁴

Gregory's work is mostly exegetical (like his *Homilies*) or administrative (like his *Letters*). Thus, we must piece together his ascetic system from his exhortations to fellow Christians in much the same way as with his predecessor St. Leo the Great. This is not as difficult as it might seem. Gregory lived and died as a professed ascetic. There is consensus among scholars that Gregory is an ascetic in the tradition of Cassian, even

² *Hom. Ev.* 30.5 (CCSL 141.260; CS 123.240-241).

³ John the Deacon, *Vita Greg.* 1.6.7, gives the name Hilarion as the first abbot and Maximian as the second. However, Gregory, *Dial.* 4.22, mentions Abbot Valentius without mentioning Hilarion or Maximian. Cf. F. Clark, *The "Gregorian" Dialogues*, 132-134.

⁴ A nearly contemporary account is given at Gregory of Tours, *HF* 10.1. The primary reference for modern biographies of Gregory continues to be the multi-volume study, F.H. Dudden, *Gregory the Great*. More recent biographies include S. Boesch Gajano, *Gregorio Magno: alle origini del Medioevo*; B. Müller, *Führung im Denken und Handeln Gregors des Grossen*; J. Richards, *Consul of God*. For a typology of the various ways in which Gregory is presented in modern scholarship, see J.J. O'Donnell, "The holiness of Gregory," 62-81.

though he never wrote a rule for monastic life.⁵ Gregory is also an Augustinian theologian. Like Vincent of Lérins and Julianus Pomerius, Gregory is more concerned to synthesize Cassian and Augustine than to force a dichotomy between the two.⁶ I argue in the following two chapters that Gregory has an ascetic pneumatology, and that it follows Cassian's system: Gregory teaches that the Spirit is (1) the reformer of desires and affections, (2) the reformer of thoughts, (3) the former of virtues, (4) the guide for reading Scripture, and (5) the giver of ecstatic contemplation. The other element of Cassian's ascetic pneumatology, his status as a Nicene Catholic, is not untrue of Gregory, but it is not relevant for the 6th century in the way it is relevant for the early 5th century. Cassian's sources were under scrutiny for their orthodoxy; Gregory's are not. Additionally, Gregory expands the discussion of the Spirit as former of virtues into the theme of the Spirit as giver of gifts. This theme is present in Cassian, but not prevalent in the way it is for Gregory. Establishing the basics of Gregory's ascetic pneumatology and its similarities to Cassian's is the work of this chapter, which argues that Gregory's ascetic pneumatology presents the overarching structure of a "dialogue of desire." Unlike Fulgentius', Gregory's pneumatology is almost entirely dominated by this issue. Latin pneumatology in the 5th and 6th centuries was concerned with the reformation of desire, and Gregory is a leading theologian in this regard. The next chapter allows us to examine

⁵ See C. Dagens, *Saint Grégoire le Grand*, esp. 416, 133-163; G.E. Demacopoulos, *Five Models*, 127-164; Gillet, SC 212.81-109; J. Leclercq, *L'amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu*, 33; B. McGinn, *The Presence of God*, 2.39; P. Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church*, 235-239; C.E. Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, esp. 128-146.

⁶ On Vincent, see my discussion of Lérins above, throughout chapter 5. Julianus Pomerius was an African transplant to Arles who tutored Caesarius of Arles. His *de vita contemplativa* (PL 59; ACW 4) attempts to advise pastors to adopt a spirituality that is both active and contemplative. R.A. Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity*, 19, notes, "there is so much in Gregory's writing that is reminiscent of Julianus's that it is hard to suppose he had not read it; but there is no conclusive evidence that he had." See also C. Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism*, 65-80.

the final two points of Gregory's ascetic pneumatology and see how Gregory builds Cassian's *Conferences* 9, 10, and 14 into an extended teaching on allegory and contemplation which incorporates much of Augustine's theology.

ASCETIC CONVERSION BY THE SPIRIT OF ADOPTION

Ascetic endeavor is necessitated by the Fall according to Gregory. He follows Augustine in teaching that the first sin of Adam and Eve has disrupted human existence and left us unable to pull ourselves back from sin.⁷ Gregory makes the point directly:

Many qualities which were not necessary in Paradise must now be displayed. For now we require the virtue of patience, laborious instruction in learning, chastening of the body, assiduity in prayer, confession of faults, a deluge of tears; none of which man wanted in truth on his creation because by his very creation he enjoyed the blessing of salvation.⁸

Moreover, Gregory's Augustinianism with regard to the "mass of sinners" and the punishment of Hell is well known.⁹ He even relates stories of particular men who are known to be in Hell.¹⁰ Cassian avoided the issue of the number of souls in Hell entirely. Conversely, Gregory teaches a doctrine of the Elect and predestination in terms dependent on Augustine.¹¹ In no way can Gregory be mistaken for a Pelagian, though his

⁷ E.g. Gregory, *Mor.* 4.1.4-5, 4.24.44, 4.28.54, 4.31.62, 5.34.61, 9.33.50, 13.45.50, 24.4.7, and Augustine, *corr. et grat.* 28-34. See F.H. Dudden, *Gregory the Great*, 2.374-392; C. Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism*, 33-61, 131-187.

⁸ *Mor.* 35.17.44 (CCSL 143b.1805; trans. Parker, modified).

⁹ E.g. *Mor.* 15.29.35, 15.57.68, 18.23.43, 33.21.38-40, 34.8.17, *Dial.* 4.29-30; Augustine, *Simpl.* 1.2.16, 1.19.20, *civ. Dei*, 21.9-13. See F.H. Dudden, *Gregory the Great*, 2.400-404; I. Fonash, *The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment; Augustine Through the Ages: an Encyclopedia*, s.v. "massa," 545-547.

¹⁰ E.g. *Dial.* 4.19, 4.31-33. Clark has questioned the eschatology of the *Dial.* in relation to the eschatology in other Gregorian works. Nevertheless, Gregory positively teaches that certain monks have gone to Hell in various works. This is something Augustine never did.

¹¹ E.g. *Mor.* 24.10.24, 29.30.63, 34.2.3

teaching on predestination is perhaps less sophisticated than we might hope.¹² Gregory's "Augustinianism" in regard to the Fall, the Elect, and the *massa peccata* is clear.

Nevertheless, Gregory's vision of human interiority and its reformation follows Cassian more closely than Augustine, as I argue here.

Originally created for union with God in a restful and contemplative state, we must now struggle with the miseries of mortal life. Humanity's fallen state is most evident in our inner lives, where we struggle to find tranquility.

Man was created for this end, that, with mind standing firm, he might rise to the citadel of contemplation, and that no touch of corruption should cause him to swerve from the love of his Maker. Since, however, he moved the foot of his will away from the natural firmness of his stance, he immediately fell away from the love of his Creator into himself. Moreover, in forsaking the love of God...he could not stand fast in himself either... and now, because he is no longer fixed in that firmness of his nature, he is constantly swayed by the motive of alternating desires, with the result that he longs for action while at rest, and while busy, pants for leisure... In forsaking the contemplation of his Creator, he lost the strength of its health.¹³

Gregory understands asceticism as a part of the history of salvation, a part in which all who wish to be saved must participate. But humans are not left alone to their own devices. In the Incarnation, God fundamentally alters the structure of the fallen world and offers new possibilities for human existence.¹⁴ In the period of time after the Ascension

¹² For example, at *Mor.* 6.16.21, Gregory begins to address how God calls "people from every class," but does not develop this in any of the ways Prosper did later in his career.

¹³ *Mor.* 8.10.19 (CCSL 143.395-396; trans. Parker, modified). Cf. *Mor.* 4.28.54, 7.2.2, 8.18.34, 11.43.59.

¹⁴ C.E. Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, esp. 147-178, remains the reference point in English on Gregory's Christology., esp. Chapters 7 and 8, remains the reference point in English on

of Christ, the period in which the Christian Church is living in the world now, we have the assurance and guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Gregory is certain that the Holy Spirit both creates and renews humans, and that this renewal brings about freedom in the Spirit.¹⁵ Conversion into and within Christianity is brought about by the Holy Spirit working within humans. Gregory often uses powerful and contrasting images for this conversion, like a cold heart glowing when touched by the breath of the Holy Spirit or a dry and barren land being watered by the Holy Spirit. The warmth of the Spirit melts hardened hearts, strengthens the resolve of the mind, and replaces earthly desires with heavenly desires.¹⁶ Gregory's ascetic system consists of practices in which the Spirit moves Christians from fear to love, from vice to virtue, from ignorance to knowledge, and finally, to ecstatic contemplation and understanding of allegories in Scripture. Because Gregory appeals to the work of the Spirit within his ascetic system we can say that Gregory has an ascetic pneumatology.

All of the Spirit's work in reforming thoughts and desires and forming virtues fits within Gregory's theme of conversion. Conversion takes place under the Spirit of adoption (Rom 8:15), who guides Christians through the process of training their external and internal lives in order to be prepared to see and love the Creator himself as the eternal

Gregory's Christology. R. Bélanger, "La dialectique Parole-Chair dans la christologie de Grégoire le Grand," 82-93, expands Straw's work by focusing on the Word-made-flesh as the ultimate expression of God's redemptive love for man. Bélanger takes special note Gregory's use of *kenosis* (Phil 2:6-7) at *In Cant.* 21. Bélanger calls Gregory's Christology "radicalement nouvelle," but qualifies this by reference to Straw and Leo the Great. (p 87) S. Zimdars-Swartz, "Confluence of imagery," 327-335, argues for a certain unity within Gregory's Christology, ecclesiology, and eschatology. Her argument develops from the images used in *Hom. Ez.* 1.2, though they certainly apply more broadly.

¹⁵ E.g. *Mor.* 20.15.41-42 & 23.15.28. See, generally, P. Catry, "Les voies de L'Esprit chez Grégoire," 207-214.

¹⁶ E.g. *Mor.* 31.46.92.

reward for their temporal struggles.¹⁷ The Spirit moves Christians from fear of punishment to love of God in stages. In his *Moralia on Job*, Gregory discusses these “stages of merit” in the Christian life:

The more we ourselves learn what we should fear, the more what we should love is infused in us through inner grace from God. And so, our contempt, little by little, turns into fear and our fear turns into charity... so that we might be joined to Him by love alone.¹⁸

These little steps pass through the first elements of virtue in faith and wisdom to the fullness of virtue, and finally to contemplation.¹⁹ “For having achieved perfection in deeds, one comes to contemplation.”²⁰ The work of Christian asceticism, according to Gregory, is conversion from fear to love. This conversion happens as the Spirit draws us away from vice and into virtue, regardless of whether we are professional ascetics, clergy, or laity.²¹ The conversion brought about by the Spirit of adoption is manifest in a person’s thoughts and desires. Indeed, the real battles of Christian asceticism are fought on the interior landscape of a person’s thoughts and desires.

¹⁷ E.g. *Mor.* 7.11.13, 9.39.62, 11.41.55, *Hm. Ez.* 2.9.4, *Reg. Past.* 3.13.14. Cf. Cassian, *Coll.* 11.13.

¹⁸ *Mor.* 22.20.48 (CCSL 143a.1127; my trans.). Cf. the interpretation of Dan 10:9-12 at *Mor.* 22.20.47 and Ez. 47:3-5 at *Mor.* 22.20.50. For the parallel with Cassian, see M. Casey, “The journey from fear to love: John Cassian’s road map,” 181-195.

¹⁹ *Mor.* 22.20.49-50.

²⁰ *Mor.* 22.20.50 (CCSL 143a.1129; my trans.)

²¹ Gregory teaches that the Spirit works within the married, the monks, and the clergy in the same ways: e.g. *Mor.* 1.14.20, 9.8.8-9.9.10, 23.1.8, 28.6.15, 32.20.35, 32.20.39, 35.6.10. G.R. Evans, *Thought of Gregory the Great*, 112-116, makes too much of the difference between clergy and monks.

THE SPIRIT REFORMS THOUGHTS AND DESIRES

In previous chapters I argued that Cassian's analysis of the inner life revolves around thoughts and desires. This contrasts with Prosper, who typically characterizes human interiority in terms of the decisions of the will. Neither would exclude the categories of the other, but the relative emphases delineate different anthropological models. We can see that Gregory follows Cassian: human interiority consists of thoughts and desires.²² He knows and uses Augustine's analysis of the fallen will, but his teaching on the Spirit's work of reformation within humans follows Cassian's analysis of human interiority. Victory over perverted desires and straying thoughts is realized in new thoughts and desires which are focused on God: "The soul which is inspired by the Spirit from above desires as highest the things which it had despised, and condemns as lowest what it used to desire."²³ Bent and deformed desires are straightened. Similarly, a mind inspired by the Holy Spirit has humble thoughts.²⁴ The Spirit is the reformer of thoughts and desires in Gregory's ascetic pneumatology.

For Gregory, the mind approaches nearer to God through good motions (*bonis motibus*). These *motus* are explained as *cogitationes* and *affectus*, both of which are reformed by the Holy Spirit.²⁵ In general, thoughts are articulated in expressible words, while desires are a kind of inexpressible word. Thus, the heart has thoughts when it speaks and desires when it feels, though Gregory never adopts a technical schema of

²² E.g. the dust from Is 47:1 is understood as thoughts at *Mor.* 14.17.21, and similarly, roots from Job 18:16 indicate thoughts at *Mor.* 14.19.24. Cf. *Mor.* 2.52.84, 4.29.56-58, 7.37.60, 8.10.22, 8.44.72, 9.34.52, 9.55.84, 11.39.52, 12.42.47, 12.46.52, 12.53.60, 13.28.32, 13.41.46, 25.7.14, 29.26.53, 30.3.10, & 30.10.41.

²³ *Mor.* 27.22.42 (CCSL 143b.1363; trans. Parker, modified).

²⁴ *Mor.* 33.3.7. Cf. *Mor.* 22.12.25, & 31.1.1.

²⁵ *Mor.* 25.5.7 (CCSL 143b.1234). See M. Casey, "Spiritual Desire," 297-314.

terms.²⁶ The mind can also love and the heart can also think. Knowledge leads to love. In fact, holy Christians guard their thoughts “so that they skillfully confine themselves to the thought by which they love God.”²⁷ Collecting the mind in a single thought about God is to love God alone. Since thought is fulfilled in love, thoughts and desires are not as far apart for Gregory as they are for other thinkers. The categories rational and irrational are not coextensive with thought and desire in Gregory’s theology. The motions of the mind and heart overlap, and the Spirit reforms them all.

Just as Gregory does not need a technical division between thoughts and desires as though the rational were to control the irrational, Gregory does not need to consider all affections or emotions as evil. Rather, just like Cassian, Gregory teaches that *affectus* is a way of clinging to something. The goal of Christian asceticism is to learn to cling to God. Gregory teaches that we should learn to place our affections in heavenly realities “so that affection may fill the inner parts of the mind, but not turn it from a spiritual intention.”²⁸ Desire, which is the principle cause of affection, is a kind of heat which should be kindled into a flame that reaches to heaven.²⁹ “Divine love, though born through fear, is changed by growing in affect (*in affectum*).”³⁰ This change is brought about by the Holy Spirit, who warms the affection of the ascetic towards God.³¹

²⁶ For analysis of the heart’s thoughts, see *Mor.* 15.11.13, 15.56.67, 18.5.10-11, & 19.27.50. M.L. Colish, *Stoic Tradition*, 2.252-266, sees Gregory as adopting a Christianized Stoicism. Her argument focus on what she calls “cosmetic theology” and Gregory’s analysis of the virtues. To this should also be added a discussion of the relation between thought and desire, a mainstay of both Augustine’s and Cassian’s interaction with Stoic positions.

²⁷ *Mor.* 26.44.80 (CCSL 143b.1326; my trans.). Cf. *Mor.* 8.45.74.

²⁸ *Mor.* 7.30.42 (CCSL 143.366; my trans.)

²⁹ E.g. *Mor.* 4.23.42, 14.12.14.

³⁰ *Mor.* 7.24.28 (CCSL 143.353; my trans.)

³¹ E.g. *Mor.* 18.27.45, 33.28.49.

Earthly desires hold us captive because affect attaches us to the objects of thought and desire. When we desire earthly things, our fondness binds us to them. Similarly, when we are occupied by thoughts about earthly matters, we grow attached to them. However, when we are no longer bound by affect for earthly things, they lose their power over us. “If anyone has freed the neck of his mind from the dominion of temporal desires once and for all, even in this life he already enjoys a kind of liberty, for he is not bothered by desire for happiness and is not constrained by fear of adversity.”³² This is the freedom offered by the Spirit to the Christian ascetic who learns to focus his thoughts and desires on God. It involves untangling the aspects of interiority which are entangled with false and sinful things before focusing entirely on the divine.³³ The standard practices of fasting, almsgiving, and reading Scripture, as well as listening to it preached, are commended in this process.³⁴

Gregory not only agrees with Cassian’s analysis of human interiority and the Spirit’s role in reforming thoughts and desires, but he also agrees with Cassian’s basic structure of Christian asceticism in which the reformation of thoughts and desires leads through virtue to contemplation in this life. Gregory teaches that holy Christians subject their thoughts to the Holy Spirit so as “to expand the wings of [their] thoughts at the breath of the Holy Spirit in order to cast off the weight of the old way of life and assume the feathers of virtues to take flight.”³⁵ Before arriving at contemplation, however, the Spirit

³² *Mor.* 30.15.50 (CCSL 143b.1525; trans. Parker, modified). Cf. *Mor.* 31.13.21.

³³ *Mor.* 8.42.69, 8.44.72, 22.16.35

³⁴ E.g. *Mor.* 18.36.57 teaches that sacred preaching can help empty earthly thoughts from a mind and fill it with heavenly gifts. On fasting, almsgiving, reading Scripture, and offering prayers see e.g. *In Cant.* 1.2.18; *Dial.* 2.28.1, 4.9.8, 4.38.16; *Ep.* 3.61, 4.26, 5.41.

³⁵ *Mor.* 31.46.92 (CCSL 143b.1613; trans. Parker, modified). Gregory makes a reference to the language of Eph 4:22.

guides the ascetic away from vice and into virtue, the habit of having good thoughts and desires.

THE SPIRIT FORMS VIRTUES

Gregory holds the common belief that humanity is flawed, but that we can be healed through God's action. Virtue is that which enables us to overcome our weakness. We are rotten by sin, but

some, when aided by the gift of the Spirit, are made strong against the weakness of their flesh, sprout virtues, and also mix miracles with signs. There is no one, however, who is without fault in this life as long as he bears the flesh of corruption.³⁶

For Gregory, asceticism brings about conversion from the vices of the corrupted flesh to the virtues.³⁷ Gregory's analysis of vice and virtue closely follows Cassian's, and has been well studied in recent secondary literature.³⁸ To this already established link, I want to add the key observation for my argument about ascetic pneumatology: Gregory teaches that one progresses in virtue only with the help of the Spirit. For Gregory, the Holy Spirit is the former of virtues.

³⁶ *Mor.* 17.16.22 (CCSL 143a.864; my trans.).

³⁷ E.g. *Mor.* 3.21.60-3.37.70, 22.20.46, & 27.38.64.

³⁸ M. Baasten, *Pride According to Gregory*. On the vices in Gregory and his influence, see the collection of essays in R. Newhauser and Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, *In the Garden of Evil*. Baasten (e.g. 77-78) overstates the difference between Gregory and Cassian on pride; Cassian also teaches that pride is the most significant and detrimental vice; see C.E. Straw, "Gregory, Cassian, and the Cardinal Vices," 35-58.

Gregory, like Cassian, teaches that vices are inspired by evil spirits which often suggest bad thoughts and desires to humans.³⁹ His language is sometimes reminiscent of the two-spirits tradition with which Cassian was familiar. Recall that Cassian, writing in the period immediately after a series of debates about the divinity of the Holy Spirit, clarified the role of the Holy Spirit as a divine agent in these discussions.⁴⁰ Gregory did not feel such a controversy pressing on him, and so, was more relaxed in his terminology. For example, much like the Holy Spirit, evil spirits are said to “infuse” bad thoughts and desires into the hearts and minds of Christians.⁴¹ The fact that Cassian would not have used the same verbs to describe the actions of demons and the Holy Spirit is not an indication that Gregory follows another line of thought, but rather that Cassian’s context in the early 5th century required more attention to professing the divinity of the Spirit than Gregory’s context in the late 6th century. Just like Cassian, Gregory teaches that vices are often brought about by the temptation of evil spirits, but the inclination to follow these vices is muted by the Holy Spirit. Having already studied Cassian’s sense of the role of the Holy Spirit in pruning vices from the ascetic and fostering virtues, it is no surprise to find that Gregory teaches that the Holy Spirit holds vices like anger and vanity in check or that the correction of pride is a gift of the Spirit.⁴² Nor is it surprising that Gregory teaches that “wisdom is born in the hearts of the elect before the other goods, as though

³⁹ E.g. *Mor.* 6.32.50, 8.24.43, 10.16.32, 10.30.50, 12.36.41, 14.17.21, 15.15.19, 15.26.32-33, 16.18.23, 16.42.53, 19.30.53, 20.25.53, 25.10.27, 31.38.79, 31.47.94, 32.19.33, 33.2.4, 33.37.63, 33.37.66-68, & 34.2.3.

⁴⁰ See my discussion in Chapter 1-2.

⁴¹ Gregory uses *fundare* with cognates (*infundare*, *perfundare*) and *mittere* with cognates (*immittere*) of both evil spirits (e.g. *Mor.* 14.37.45-46 (CCSL 143a.725), & 34.19.38 (CCSL 143b.1761)) and the Holy Spirit (e.g. *Mor.* 11.10.16 (CCSL 143a.595), 1.22.30 (CCSL 143.41)).

⁴² E.g. *Mor.* 7.35.53, 20.38.74, 32.1.1. For Cassian, see my chapter 1, beginning p. 21.

the firstborn offspring which comes about through the gift of the Spirit.”⁴³ Wisdom includes not only positive knowledge, but also recognition of personal ignorance, all of which is dependent on the action of the Holy Spirit in the ascetic.⁴⁴ In short, Gregory’s follows Cassian’s analysis both of the structures of virtue and vice, and the role of the Holy Spirit as the former of virtue.

One of Gregory’s favorite images for the growth of virtue is that Holy Spirit waters the virtues. As a negative example, Gregory teaches that because hypocrites follow the suggestions of evil spirits, they are not watered by the gifts of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁵ In explaining Job 20:16, “He shall not see the streams of the rushing river of honey and butter,” Gregory interprets the hypocrites’ lack of ability to see the river as an indication that they are not watered by the Holy Spirit. Gregory appeals to Jn 7:38-39, which concerns the streams of living water that will flow from believers, in order to make the connection between water and the Spirit. Under this analysis, the “streams of the rushing river” are the theological virtues of faith, hope, and love, none of which are possessed by the hypocrites. Gregory details the ways in which the hypocrites are not faithful, hopeful, and loving in order to show that they are in no way living a life nurtured by the Holy Spirit. He then continues his analysis by separating the watering of the Spirit (virtues and gifts) from the Spirit himself. If the “streams” are the gifts of the Spirit, Gregory argues, then the

rushing river is the inundation of the Holy Spirit himself, which, in an exuberant infusion, is gathered into the soul of one contemplating when the mind is filled with more than it

⁴³ *Mor.* 2.46.71 (CCSL 143.101; my trans.)

⁴⁴ *Mor.* 27.37.62.

⁴⁵ *Mor.* 15.15.19-20.

can understand. And we must know that when the grace of the Holy Spirit infuses us, it fills us equally with honey and butter... because the Spirit of Christ causes the soul which it has replenished to rejoice both in the sweetness of his divinity and in faith in his incarnation.⁴⁶

It will take a second chapter to consider Gregory's teaching on contemplation in detail, but we can already see that he follows the basic pattern established with Cassian: ascetical endeavor leads to contemplation in this life because it is the same Spirit who guides the ascetic and who inspires contemplation.

Gregory speaks of the virtues as a subset of the gifts of the Spirit in general. He does separate the theological virtues (faith, hope, and love) from the cardinal virtues (justice, temperance, fortitude, and prudence), and he separates all virtues from the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit listed in Is 11:2 and the charisms discussed in 1 Cor 12. When considered specifically, the different categories of the seven virtues and the seven gifts of the Spirit are not in themselves interchangeable. Nevertheless, they are all of a kind because they all come from the same Spirit. Gregory teaches:

there is no reason why what we have said about the virtues should not also be said of those gifts of the Holy Spirit that declare virtue to the world. To some is given prophecy, to some speaking in tongues, while to others the power to heal. But because these gifts are not always present in the mind in the same way, it is clear that they are sometimes taken away for our benefit, lest the mind should swell with presumption.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ *Mor.* 15.16.20 (CCSL 143a.761; my trans.). Cf. *Mor.* 12.5.6.

⁴⁷ *Mor.* 2.56.89 (CCSL 143.111-112; trans. O'Donnell).

The feeling of the absence of God is a lesson in humility. Even this absence is a sort of gift of the Holy Spirit, for it brings about virtue. This reinforces the broader point: Gregory thinks of the virtues and gifts together because they are aspects of Christian life which are nurtured by the Holy Spirit. The same teaching is detailed with regard to those gifts of the Spirit which are necessary for salvation and those which are not.

There are some gifts of the Spirit without which we never come to life at all, and others by which the holiness of our life is publicly revealed for the benefit of others. Gentleness, for example, and humility and patience, faith and hope and charity, these are the Spirit's gifts, but they are the kind without which human beings can never truly attain to life itself. But prophecy, and the power to cure, and the gift of tongues, and the ability to interpret what has been said in tongues, these are also gifts of the Spirit, but are the kind that display the presence of his power to inspire... Through those gifts without which life is impossible, the Holy Spirit remains forever in all the elect, or at least in those who preach the word. But through those gifts that are given not to save our life but to reach out to others, the Spirit does not remain forever even in his preachers, for he constantly rules their hearts to live well, but does not always show the signs of his power through them. Sometimes, indeed, he withdraws the signs of his power from them, so that they may be cherished all the more humbly for being impossible to possess fully.⁴⁸

The fluidity with which Gregory moves from different virtues to different gifts of the Spirit does not indicate that he denies their difference. Rather, this indicates that the central concept of virtue, charisms, and gifts is the indwelling Spirit. Gregory expands the theme of the Spirit as the former of virtue into the theme of the giver of gifts.

⁴⁸ *Mor.* 2.56.91 (CCSL 143.113; trans. O'Donnell). Cf. *Mor.* 11.16.25.

THE SEVEN GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT

Gregory offers a more extensive analysis of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit than does Cassian. The “sevenfold Spirit” becomes a significant title in Gregory’s consideration pneumatology because the seven gifts are prominent in his understanding of the life of a Christian ascetic. Additionally, Gregory is fascinated by numbers; relating the seven gifts of the Spirit to other sets of seven in Scripture was irresistible to him. Thus, Elisha’s seven breaths over the dead child, the seven stars of Pleiades, the seven pillars of the house of wisdom, and the seven letters of the book of Revelation all indicate the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁹ Gregory simply likes the number: “the number seven is perfect because every good work is performed with seven virtues through the Spirit in order that both faith and works may be perfected at the same time.”⁵⁰ Nevertheless, there is more to his consideration of the seven gifts than an interest in numerology. The “sevenfold Spirit” is a common epithet for Gregory because one of the main roles of the Holy Spirit in Gregory’s ascetic pneumatology is the giver of gifts.

Perhaps the most complete and compact teaching Gregory offers on the interconnection of the virtues, gifts, and Holy Spirit comes in his exegesis of Job’s seven sons and three daughters (Job 1:2). They represent the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit and the three theological virtues.

⁴⁹ Elisha – *Mor.* 35.8.18; Pleiades – *Mor.* 29.31.68-73; pillars of wisdom (Prov 9:1) – *Morl.* 23.1.6; seven letters – *Mor.* 9.11.13, 17.29.43; *Hom. Ez.* 2.3.12. The sevenfold Spirit has a long history of use in regards to Christian initiation, either with the water or the oil used at Baptism-Confirmation or in post-baptismal catechesis, e.g.: the *Explanatio fidei* (PL 13.373-374) from a Roman synod under Pope Damasus includes a discussion of the seven-fold Spirit; Siricius, *Ep.* 1.1.2 (PL 13.1153); Innocent, *Ep.* 16.5 (PL 20.523), Sylvester, *Edictum a Constantini* (PL 8.573); Gaudentius of Brescia, *Serm.* 3.4 (CSEL 68.33), Arnobius Junior, *comm. Ps.* 78 (CCSL 25.118). Ambrose, *Exp. Ev. Lc.* 6.82 (CCSL 14.204), 7.95 & 98 (CCSL 14.246 & 247), 9.18 (CCSL 14.337), use the term. Augustine also uses the term, e.g. *c. Faust.* 12.15 (CSEL 25.358)

⁵⁰ *Mor.* 35.16.42 (CCSL 143b.1802; trans. Parker). Cf. *Mor.* 35.8.15-18; *Hom. Ez.* 2.7.7, 2.8.2-4.

Seven sons are born for us when the seven virtues of the Holy Spirit rise in us through the conception of good thoughts. The prophet enumerates this inner progeny when the Spirit makes his mind fertile: [Is 11:2-3 is quoted]. Thus, when wisdom, understanding, counsel, fortitude, knowledge, piety, and fear of the Lord are born in us through the coming of the Spirit (*adventum Spiritus*), it is as though the offspring to come [i.e. heavenly life] is born in our minds.⁵¹

The experience of the coming (*adventus*) or visitation (*visitatio*) of the Spirit is another significant theme in Gregory's ascetic pneumatology which I discuss further below. Here, we see the fluidity of the concept of "virtue" and "gift" in Gregory, a fluidity based on Gregory's understanding of the Spirit as the giver of gifts and former of virtues. His exegesis of Job's children continues:

These seven sons have three sisters in our hearts because whatever these virtues generate is joined to the three theological virtues of hope, faith, and charity. The seven sons cannot achieve the perfection of the number ten unless everything they do is done in hope, faith, and charity.⁵²

The gifts and virtues are interdependent because they depend on the action of the Spirit in the life of the ascetic.

The Spirit of the seven-fold grace is bestowed on those who die to sin. They are brought back to life by the Spirit of love.⁵³ Throughout its history, "the one Catholic

⁵¹ *Mor.* 1.27.28 (CCSL 143.45; my trans.).

⁵² *Mor.* 1.27.38 (CCSL 143.45-46; trans. O'Donnell).

⁵³ *Mor.* 9.40.63 (CCSL 143.502).

Church [is] replenished with the Spirit of sevenfold grace.”⁵⁴ At the very beginning of the Church’s ministry, the twelve Apostles were filled with the seven-fold grace.⁵⁵ Currently, those whom the Spirit of sevenfold grace has filled, it makes perfect, and [the Spirit] imparts to them not merely the knowledge of the Trinity, but also the performance of the four virtues, that is, prudence, temperance, fortitude, and justice... but the performance of the four virtues is received through the knowledge of the Trinity and, by the performance of the four virtues, we come all the way to the plain sight (*manifestam speciem*) of the Trinity.⁵⁶

Nor is this work of the Spirit limited to the conversion of Christians within the Church.

Heretics, too, can be reconciled to the Church through the same Spirit. When heretics return to the Church, their pride is expiated by seven sacrifices (Job 42:8) because

on returning the Church, [they] receive through the offering of humility the gifts of the Spirit of sevenfold grace, in order that they who had wasted away through their old habit of pride, may be formed afresh by the newness of grace.⁵⁷

Heretics are not washed of their guilt, “unless by the Spirit of the sevenfold grace they are united to that universal peace from which they had been cut off.”⁵⁸ Gregory thinks of the Holy Spirit as the giver of gifts even to those outside the Church on their way to holiness in the Church.

⁵⁴ *Mor.* 17.29.43 (CCSL 143a.875; trans. Parker). Cf. *Mor.* 1.8.12, & 9.11.13.

⁵⁵ E.g. *Mor.* 1.14.19, & 35.8.15.

⁵⁶ *Mor.* 35.8.15 (CCSL 143b.1783; trans. Parker, modified).

⁵⁷ *Mor.* 35.8.14 (CCSL 143b.1783; trans. Parker). Cf. *Mor.* pref. 7.17.

⁵⁸ *Mor.* 35.8.18 (CCSL 143b.1786; trans. Parker).

JESUS AND THE SEVEN GIFTS

Gregory teaches that Jesus is the only man who possesses all seven gifts of the Spirit continuously and without fail. In the previous chapter, I discussed the technical problems concerning the relationship between the Incarnate Christ and the Holy Spirit as they were raised by Nestorians and answered by Fulgentius and Cassian.⁵⁹ Jesus' full possession of the Spirit and the gifts of the Spirit is also found in Cassian's teaching about monastic life, and it is this tradition which Gregory develops. Fulgentius uses his Augustinian theology to answer a technical theological question posed by Nestorian theology. Gregory weds his understanding of the Trinity with his understanding of asceticism. He offers a teaching to ascetics about Jesus as the goal of human perfection in much the same way that Cassian did in the *Conferences*. The Father, Son, and Spirit can never be separated, and so, Jesus always fully possesses the Spirit. Just the same, Jesus had no need of ascetic training, and so, there was no need for the Spirit to withhold some gifts in order to train Jesus' desire in the "absence makes love grow fonder" model that Gregory suggests for all other Christians. But Gregory makes an additional step beyond Cassian: Gregory creates internal symmetry in conforming the eight traditional vices to a list of seven. This allows the Incarnate Christ to stand exactly and completely in opposition to the vices. Christ possesses all seven gifts over and against the seven vices. As with most of Gregory's understanding of asceticism and the role of the Holy Spirit in asceticism, I argue that Gregory's theology is an expansion of a basic principle in Cassian.

⁵⁹ E.g. Fulgentius, *Ep.* 14.26-27. See my discussion in chapter 6, starting on p. 139. Cassian, *De Incarn.* 7.17-23, also makes this argument, which I discuss briefly in chapter 1. Gregory expands Cassian's teaching from *Coll.* 11.13, without reference to the argument of *De Incarn.*

In the context of the ascetic conversion from fear to love, Cassian taught the traditional belief that Jesus possesses all seven gifts of the Spirit:

For he is instructing us to pass from the fear of punishment to the fullest freedom of love and to the confidence of the friends and sons of God... Those who burned with perfect love of the heavenly Father and whom, from slaves, the divine adoption had already made sons he also exhorts in these words: "...you have received a Spirit of adoption... [Rom 8:15]." When the prophet was describing the sevenfold spirit that without a doubt came down upon the Lord in human form, according to the plan of the incarnation, he said... [Is 11:2-3].⁶⁰

For Cassian, this is part of the discussion of the kind of perfection which is attainable in this life through ascetic practice. Perfect love excludes fear, and since Jesus possesses the perfection of love, he does not have a fear of punishment. Elsewhere, Cassian teaches that no individual ascetic possesses all the virtues and gifts of the Holy Spirit.⁶¹ Gregory condenses the argument and uses Is 11:2-3 directly to distinguish Christ from all others. He states the case succinctly: "But no man ever possessed all the operations of the Holy Spirit at once, except the sole Mediator between God and man, whose Spirit is the same as [the Spirit] who proceeds from the Father before all ages."⁶² Gregory's focal point in these discussions is the limits of human existence in this life, not the concerns raised by

⁶⁰ Cassian, *Coll.* 11.13.5-7 (CSEL 13.330-331; ACW 57.420-421). Cf. Basil of Caesarea, *Mor.* 60 (PG 31.793); Caesarius, *Serm.* 9 & 128.8.

⁶¹ Cassian, *Inst.* 5.4.2-4, *Coll.* 14.6. Cassian's argument is exegetically tied to other lists of gifts of the Holy Spirit, especially Pauline discussions of charisms at Rom 12:6-8 and 1 Cor 12:28-31. This is part of Cassian's understanding of the need for individual ascetics to be part of the community which is the Body of Christ. Catherine Chin's NAPS 2009 Paper, "Cassian, Cognition and the Common Life," which she has graciously shared and discussed with me has been of immense help in thinking about this point. Gregory also connects the gifts of the Spirit to the Pauline lists (e.g. *Mor.* 16.5.6).

⁶² *Mor.* 29.31.74 (CCSL 143b.1486; trans. Parker, modified). Cf. *Mor.* 31.45.87.

the Nestorians. Gregory's concern is ascetic formation and not doctrinal clarification; he follows the tradition of Cassian's *Conferences*.

Gregory uses Christ's full possession of the gifts of the Spirit to resolve a related exegetical problem. At Jn 1:33, John the Baptist claims that a sure sign of the expected Christ is that the Spirit will descend and remain with him. However, at Jn 14:17, Jesus tells his disciples that the Spirit will come upon them and remain with them. Gregory notes that these seem to be in contradiction: "If the master's voice says that the Spirit abides in the disciples, how can it be a unique sign that it abides with the Mediator? We can solve this puzzle quickly if we consider the gifts of the Spirit."⁶³

The Mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, has the Spirit always and continually present to him in all things, because the same Spirit is brought forth from Christ in his substantial nature. So it is right to say that though [the Spirit] abides in his holy preachers, he remains uniquely in the Mediator. He remains in his preachers through grace for some specific purpose, but in Christ he remains substantially for all things... The Spirit abides naturally in Christ in a different way, never drawing back. The gifts of the Spirit by which one reaches for life cannot be lost without danger; but the gifts by which holiness of life is made manifest are very often, as we say, taken away without any loss...⁶⁴

Gregory certainly invokes a basic understanding of the inseparability of the divine persons and the procession of the Spirit from the Son, but this is at the service of another concern. He is not explaining Trinitarian relations, but attempting to explain the exegetical problem raised from the passages in John's Gospel and the basic experience of

⁶³ *Mor.* 2.56.90 (CCSL 143.112-113; trans. O'Donnell).

⁶⁴ *Mor.* 2.56.92 (CCSL 143.113-114; trans. O'Donnell).

feeling that the Spirit has abandoned us. The solution to the exegetical problem is fairly obvious: the Spirit remains with the disciples only in the sense of those virtues which are absolutely necessary for perseverance in good, while the Spirit remains with Christ in all things. Thus, unlike the treatments of Nestorianism from Cassian and, later, Fulgentius, Gregory does not use the teaching on the gifts of the Spirit in the Incarnate Christ as a means to resolve a Christological dilemma. Rather, like Cassian in the *Conferences*, Gregory uses this teaching to further his understanding of the relationship between the ascetic and the Spirit.

VISITATION OF THE SPIRIT

If Gregory has a strong teaching about the perceived *absence* of the Spirit in the basic Christian experience of everyone except Christ, he has an even stronger teaching about the *presence* of the Spirit. Gregory has three primary terms for the experience of the presence of the Spirit: judgment (*animadversio*), visitation (*visitatio*), and coming (*adventus*). The visitation of the Spirit as judgment is an experience in which the ascetic is accused and convicted of his sins.⁶⁵ People do not fare well in this experience. On the other hand, the *visitatio* or *adventus* of the Spirit, even when pointing out human faults, is a generally positive experience of growth. Gregory describes the visitation of the Holy Spirit as an extraordinary, though somewhat regular event in the life of the ascetic. The Spirit first turns us from our sins and then inspires us with desire for heavenly realities. This is the core of asceticism for Gregory, the conversion from fear to love, from entanglement with earthly things to a firm grasp of heavenly things, and from scattered thoughts to ecstatic contemplation.

⁶⁵ E.g. *Mor.* 2.7.9, 2.15.25, 4.13.24, 4.22.41.

Gregory often speaks of the breath (*afflatus*) of the Holy Spirit blowing on the soul or the mind as a central aspect of the ascetic's encounter with God.

If [the mind] is touched by the breath of the Holy Spirit, it wakes up and immediately considers its own evil, shudders at the thought of heavenly questions, glows in the heat of the love for the highest one, considers the sufferings which surround it, and the mind which was perishing in indulgence, advances and weeps.⁶⁶

Gregory also considers this conversion in light of Job 30:16, which notes God's presence throughout the created world.

For God, then, "to walk in the lowest parts of the abyss" is to convert the hearts of even the most wicked men, and, by touching them, wonderfully refashion minds which had despaired at traces of his visitation. For when anyone feels compunction after enormous sins, what else is beheld but God walking in the lowest parts of the abyss? For God walks in the abyss, as it were, when he penetrates the gloomy heart and tramples down the invisible waves of sins.⁶⁷

In addition to turning us from sinful ways, the visitation of God teaches our intellect and sparks our desire for heaven. "The Lord enlightens us with his visitation... His coming in our heart is gratuitous, and the longing of desire for him is not the same as the rest of the desires in our thought."⁶⁸ God's visitation calms us when we are troubled and inflames us when we have gone cold, a theme we have seen already in Gregory and Cassian. In fact, where Cassian offered a robust analysis of the Spirit's role in the beginning and end

⁶⁶ *Mor.* 9.58.88 (CCSL 143.519; my trans.). Cf. *Mor.* pref. 1.3 (CCSL 143.10), 22.12.25 (CCSL 143a.1110); *Hom. Ez.* 2.1.6 (SC 347.62).

⁶⁷ *Mor.* 29.15.28 (CCSL 143b.1453; my trans.).

⁶⁸ *Mor.* 20.4.11-20.5.12 (CCSL 143a.1009-1010; my trans.).

of human thoughts as part of his discussion of how thoughts and desires are reformed, Gregory more often relies on the visitation of the Spirit as the explanation for how thoughts are reformed.

Gregory contrasts our normal experiences with those that involve the Holy Spirit: “In a corporeal visitation, we progress towards our neighbor by steps, but in a spiritual visitation we are led not by steps, but by affection (*affectu*).”⁶⁹ Thus, we walk the footsteps of love.⁷⁰ Connecting the footsteps of God to the visitation of the Holy Spirit, Gregory ponders,

What does he call “footsteps of God” (Job 11:7) except the blessing of his visitation? By these [footsteps] we are provoked to progress to things above when we are touched by the breath of his Spirit; elevated beyond the worries of the flesh, we learn to contemplate the beauty of our Creator through love, so that we may follow that beauty.⁷¹

The visitation of the Spirit shifts the aspect of thoughts and desires: “The grace of the Spirit which is poured into our hearts lifts the soul from carnal aims and elevates it to contempt for transitory things.”⁷² Nevertheless, the experience of this visitation is fleeting. Reflecting on Job 4:15, “when the Spirit passed by in my presence, the hair of my flesh stood on end,” Gregory writes

the Spirit passes by in our presence when we come to know what is invisible, yet still see these things not solidly, but just at a glance. Nor does the mind stay fixed in the sweetness of inner contemplation for a long time because it is driven back by the

⁶⁹ *Mor.* 6.35.54 (CCSL 143.323; my trans.)

⁷⁰ *Mor.* 6.35.54 (CCSL 143.323).

⁷¹ *Mor.* 10.8.13 (CCSL 143.545-546; my trans.). Cf. *Mor.* 5.28.50.

⁷² *Mor.* 10.8.13 (CCSL 143.546; trans. Parker, modified).

magnitude of that light and comes to itself. When it tastes the sweetness within, it burns with love and it struggles to go above itself, but it breaks and falls back to the darkness of its weakness. As it goes on, full of great virtues, it sees that it cannot see what it loves ardently, though it would not love so ardently if it did not see just a little. So, the Spirit does not stand still but passes by because our contemplation opens a line to the light above for our eagerness and just as quickly hides it from our weakness. However much progress virtue makes in this life, it still feels the sting of its own corruption.⁷³

The movement into contemplation is expected for an ascetic author like Gregory, and will be treated in more depth in the following chapter. Gregory closely follows Cassian's map of ascetic progress. But this is not the only phenomenon Gregory catalogues. Gregory also teaches about the experience of God speaking within, an experience which Cassian did not discuss.

GOD SPEAKING WITHIN

One of the most noteworthy aspects of Cassian's ascetic pneumatology is his descriptive phenomenology of fiery prayer. Earlier I discussed this in some detail, noting Columba Stewart's observation that this suggests that Cassian was familiar with the tradition represented by Ps-Macarius. Gregory teaches much the same sense of fiery, ecstatic prayer, which he must have derived from his own experience and from studying Cassian. But Gregory offers another noteworthy addition to the descriptive and theoretical analysis of the heights of ascetic experience. Gregory discusses the phenomenon of God's speech within the human mind. This speech gives us insight into

⁷³ *Mor.* 5.33.58 (CCSL 143.259-260; trans. O'Donnell).

two important aspects of Gregory's thought: the reformation of desire and the experience of contemplation. Here, I will address desire, saving contemplation for the next chapter.

Grover Zinn has summarized one aspect of this divine speech well:

Gregory's clearest ideas on this topic are found in his association of the divine voice with the Holy Spirit in interpreting verses that refer to whispering or a gentle breeze. The most general thing that can be said about God's speech is that it is totally internal, completely silent, and can be described as a kind of speech that is uncircumscribed and incorporeal.⁷⁴

Zinn correctly outlines the nature of divine speech, which is a paradox for Gregory because God's speech is the fulfillment of human rationality, but exceeds our understanding. The language of desire proved helpful in this regard. Desire is not necessarily irrational for Gregory, as I argued above, though it is not always expressed in the way of an articulate thought. The "silent speech" of the Holy Spirit and the ascetic's reply are intelligible for Gregory as a dialogue of desire, the culmination of Gregory's ascetic pneumatology.

Gregory's sense of human interiority includes what we would call a "review of conscience," in which one thinks about her actions and tries to determine her motives.⁷⁵ Most often these thoughts are secret (they are not expressed in audible words to others), but they are still a conversation because we talk with ourselves.⁷⁶ These are discursive processes for which Gregory uses the Latin *colloquor*. It makes sense to speak of

⁷⁴ G. Zinn, "Sound, Silence and Word in the Spirituality of Gregory the Great," 371. Zinn refers to *Moralia* 27.16.34 and notes that Gregory also understands the "voice of God" as his "consubstantial Son" at *Moralia* 32.5.7. It is important to remember that speech can spark a Christological and a pneumatological reflection for Gregory.

⁷⁵ E.g. *Mor.* 8.22.38 (CCSL 143.409).

⁷⁶ *Mor.* 8.24.81 (CCSL 143.413).

“hearing” this conversation even though it is not spoken with the tongue or heard with the ears because the thoughts are articulated with grammatical structure. God is said to speak to humans in a similar way through the words of Scripture and through angels.⁷⁷ But God also speaks to humans by visiting them personally. This speech is not conveyed in propositions with syntax, but in power and impulse, resulting in compunction and contemplation.⁷⁸ Gregory calls it “silent” or “internal speech,” speech conveyed in desire.⁷⁹

While there are suggestions of a doctrine of God’s nature (e.g. ineffable, mysterious, transcendent) behind Gregory’s descriptions of this kind of experience, the focus of his teaching is the human experience, not the divine nature.⁸⁰ Gregory’s intent is not to write a treatise on the nature of God, but to form ascetics who will be prepared for such experiences. This point is even clearer when we see Gregory reflect on a passage of Scripture which had been used by Augustine and others to develop a precise teaching on Trinitarian theology. Gregory notes,

By the ‘mouth of God’ [Job 37:2] can be designated the Only-Begotten Son... by the ‘sound of his mouth’ can be designated the Holy Spirit of the same Lord. At other times, [a passage] is also written with this meaning, i.e. about the same Spirit: *Suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a mighty wind approaching.* [Acts 2:2] A sound, therefore, proceeds from the Mouth of the Lord when his consubstantial Spirit, coming to

⁷⁷ E.g. *Mor.* 5.18.37, 28.1.2.

⁷⁸ E.g. *Mor.* 28.8.1-4.

⁷⁹ E.g. *Mor.* 2.7.8-12, 6.26.44.

⁸⁰ *Pace* Butler. See note 56 above. The question about whether Gregory thinks contemplative experience in this life is unmediated in the way it is in eternal life is worth posing, but it is not one Gregory asked in a technical way. Thus, Gregory’s solutions are not technical. There are unmediated experiences of God in this life, but they fall short of the glory of Heaven. The difference is not God’s unmediated contact with humans, but the change brought by death and resurrection for humans.

us through his Son, breaks through the deafness of our insensibility. The Mouth of the Lord speaks of this same uncircumscribed and incorporeal sound, and says, *He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it to you.* [Jn 16:14]⁸¹

The passage continues by outlining stages of growth the ascetic can expect:

By the “terror of his voice” [Job 37:2], then, can be understood the power of fear, and by the “sound of his mouth” [Job 37:2] the sweetness of consolation; for those whom the Holy Spirit fills, He first alarms at their earthly doings, and afterwards consoles with the hope of heavenly objects... Hence, Paul speaks of this Spirit... [Rom 8:15]... the Truth says by his own mouth, [Jn 20:22-23].⁸²

Recall that Jn 16:14 had played a role in Augustine’s discussions with the Arians over Trinitarian theology and that Faustus followed Augustine in using Jn 20:22 to argue for the double procession of the Holy Spirit.⁸³ Gregory’s concern is not the procession of the Spirit; rather, his pneumatology is at the service of his ascetic theology. Furthermore, this ascetic theology is discussed in terms of desire. The “power of fear,” the “sweetness of consolation,” alarm, hope, repulsion at sin, and attachment to God are the categories Gregory uses. These are not irrational, but they are not formulated thoughts within the ascetic. Rather, they are dispositions of desire.

⁸¹ *Mor.* 27.17.34 (CCSL 143b.1356; trans. Parker, modified).

⁸² *Mor.* 27.17.34 (CCSL 143b.1356-1357; trans. Parker).

⁸³ See my discussion above, p. 104ff.

When God communicates directly to us, we do not see or hear him like we do when communicating with others. The process is not one of discursive thought, but of renewed desire. The Holy Spirit simply impresses the precepts of grace in our hearts and minds.⁸⁴

When [God] speaks by himself, this is apparent to us only by the force of internal inspiration. When he speaks by himself, the heart is taught about his Word without words and syllables because his power is known by a kind of inward elevation (*intima sublevatione*)... It is an incorporeal light which both fills the inner parts and surrounds from without what is filled. These are words without noise... For it is written about the Holy Spirit: *Suddenly, there was a sound from Heaven as of a mighty wind approaching, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. And there appeared to them tongues of fire, which sat on each of them.*[Acts 2:2-3] The Lord appeared through fire, but he spoke interiorly through himself. Furthermore, neither the fire nor the sound were God, but through what happens exteriorly, he shows what was brought to life interiorly.⁸⁵

The virtues, the gifts of the Spirit, and the ability to perform miracles are brought to life interiorly, as we have already seen. The Spirit brings about a change in inner disposition, which Gregory calls *intima sublevatione* here. The phrase recalls his discussions of contemplation and allegory as a kind of “rising,” but also points to the same change in disposition that is marked by the conversion from fear to love. Gregory does not describe the visitation of the Spirit according to a scale of rational and irrational, but rather in terms of desire. Gregory’s is not the system of Evagrius, in which we move along a scale of rationality expressed in knowledge. Rather, Gregory’s system is Cassian’s, in which thoughts and desires, intellect and affect are ever more tightly bound to God by the Holy

⁸⁴ *Mor.* 22.12.25, 30.1.4.

⁸⁵ *Mor.* 28.1.2 (CCSL 143b.1396; my trans.).

Spirit. Gregory's treatment of illumination demonstrates the same teaching about reformation of both thoughts and desires.

The voice of the Lord is heard when the breathing (*aspiratio*) of his grace is conceived within the mind, when the insensibility of our inward deafness is broken... and the heart, excited to zeal for the noblest love, is pierced by the cry of inner virtue. But even the mind which has been enlightened by the voice of the Spirit who lights upon him, who works (*insinuat*) himself into the ears of the heart, does not trace it out. For it is unable to consider by what openings this invisible power flows into it, in what ways it comes to or recedes from it. Thus, it is well said by John that "The wind blows where it will"... for to hear the voice of the Spirit is to rise up to the love of the invisible Creator by the power of inward compunction.⁸⁶

The Spirit "works his way into" (*insinuare*) the ascetic's thoughts and desires, shattering false images we have of ourselves, freeing us to love God in purity.

For the Spirit of God... intimate[s] by his hidden power what is to be done and ... in an instant, works his way in without the medium of sound or the slowness of speech... while he insinuates himself without the delay of words, he illumines the darkness of our ignorance by his sudden light.⁸⁷

In the paradoxes which arise when considering the work of the infinite God within finite humans, Gregory found the language of transformation of desire most helpful. The speech of the Spirit within the ascetic is not the speech of articulate thoughts, but the conversation of desire in which the ascetic learns to love God all the more.

⁸⁶ *Mor.* 27.21.41 (CCSL 143b.1361; trans. Parker, modified). Cf. *Mor.* 5.29.51.

⁸⁷ *Mor.* 28.1.2 (CCSL 143b.1396-1397; trans. Parker, modified).

THE DIALOGUE OF DESIRE

Jean Leclercq famously called Gregory “the doctor of desire.”⁸⁸ Leclercq argued that asceticism is essentially a training of desire for Gregory. By calling attention to the fact that the training of desire happens under the tutelage of the Holy Spirit, I have argued that Gregory offers an ascetic pneumatology. The Holy Spirit reforms thoughts and desires, forms virtue, and gives various gifts to the Christian ascetic. Gregory’s ascetic pneumatology can be characterized as a dialogue of desire because the first movement in the conversation between the ascetic and God is the Spirit’s action of reforming the ascetic’s desires, while the second movement is the ascetic’s return to God in love. With a broader historical view, we can see not only how Gregory builds on Cassian’s system, but also how his pneumatology participates in a project that was common to many other Latin theologians of the 5th and 6th centuries. Latin pneumatology articulates how the Holy Spirit reforms human desire.

Gregory’s sense of this dialogue of desire is all the more striking when we consider that he turns to the Spirit in passages that have obvious Christological significance, like the hidden word of Job 4:16. He admits that the phrase has an obvious reference to Christ, for Christ is the Word of God revealed in the Incarnation.⁸⁹ Nevertheless, Gregory passes over the Christological meaning in order to pursue the pneumatological. He develops another sense of “hidden word,” that of *allocutio intimae aspirationis* (the speech of an intimate inspiration).

⁸⁸ J. Leclercq, *L’amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu*, 30-39.

⁸⁹ *Mor.* 5.28.50.

This inspiration touches the human mind and by touching lifts it up and represses temporal thoughts, inflaming it with eternal desires... so that to hear the hidden word is to conceive the speech of the Holy Spirit in the heart.⁹⁰

Gregory returns to the Fourth Gospel to note that Christ sends the second Paraclete. Then, he combines Christological and pneumatological concerns by referring to the prologue of John's Gospel, but noting that the *second* paraclete is not accepted by the world. In John's Gospel, the Incarnate Word is not accepted. Gregory consciously moves the discussion into a reflection on the Holy Spirit, consistent with his ascetic pneumatology. The Spirit's speech within the ascetic transforms his thoughts and desires, making him compassionate towards others, sorry for sins, and desirous of God. The ascetic's response in this dialogue is the prayer of desire.

Great is their clamor; great is their desire. For the less each one cries out, the less he desires; and the greater the voice each one sends up to the ears of the boundless Spirit, the more fully he pours himself out in his desire. These words of the souls, therefore, are their desires.⁹¹

Desire itself becomes the means of communication and communion between God and Christians.

⁹⁰ *Mor.* 5.28.50 (CCSL 143.252-253; my trans.). *Aspiratio* has the basic meaning of breath, but here it especially includes the notion of inspiration. Breath seems to be appropriate at *Moralia* Ep.1.1 (*aspiratio compunctionis animabat*) and 9.52.78 (*aspiratio vivificationis*). On Gregory's Christology, see R. Bélanger, "Anthropologie et Parole de Dieu dans le commentaire de Grégoire le Grand sur le Cantique des Cantiques," 245-254; R. Bélanger, "La dialectique Parole-Chair dans la christologie de Grégoire le Grand," 82-93; C.E. Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, 147-178; S. Zimdars-Swartz, "Confluence of imagery," 327-335.

⁹¹ *Mor.* 2.7.11 (CCSL 143.66; my trans.).

Christian asceticism is a dialogue of desire in which the Holy Spirit forms virtues and reforms human thoughts and desires so that the ascetic can respond with appropriate desire. Furthermore, while Gregory follows Augustine's analysis of the fallen human will and the repercussions of the Fall on the rest of the world, Gregory follows Cassian in the major moves of ascetic pneumatology. This is clear in the case of Gregory's teaching about the Holy Spirit as the former of virtues and the reformer of thoughts and desires. It is even more clear when we understand the role the Holy Spirit plays in allegory and contemplation.

VIII. THE SPIRIT IN CONTEMPLATION AND ALLEGORY

As pastor of the diocese of Rome, Gregory the Great preached before the laity, clergy, and monks in the Eternal City as often as his health would allow. For one series of sermons, he chose the lofty visions of the prophet Ezekiel. Speaking about Sacred Scripture and its role in prayer and worship, Gregory taught

the outer threshold of Sacred Scripture is the history, and the inner surely is allegory. For it leads through history to allegory, as if we come from the threshold which is outside to that which is inside. And there are many things in it which so edify the mind according to history that the mind of the hearer is drawn inside... so that... if we can, we may stretch out the foot of our mind to the inner threshold, *i.e.* the mystic understanding of inward contemplation.¹

Gregory's ascetic pneumatology teaches that the Holy Spirit guides Christians through reading Scripture into ecstatic contemplation as the culmination of Christian asceticism. The reformation of desire leads to understanding the allegorical meanings of Scripture and union with God in contemplation.

Gregory follows Augustine's analysis of the Fall and its effect on our inability both to know and choose the good. He follows Augustine's teaching on the need for grace, on the relationship between love and knowledge, and on the need for a bishop to live a life that is neither completely active nor completely contemplative. But Gregory also relies on Cassian for his understanding of how to be a Christian, as I argue in the case of Gregory's ascetic pneumatology. Nowhere is this seen more clearly than in Gregory's teaching

¹ *Hom. Ez.* 2.3.18 (SC 360.160-162; trans. Tomkinson, 307, modified).

about Scripture, allegory, and contemplation. Cassian weds the interpretation of Scripture to contemplation. Augustine does not link the figurative interpretation of Scripture directly to contemplation. Augustine and Cassian also differ on the experience of contemplation in this life. Cassian thinks that Christian ascetics can expect regular contemplative experiences. Augustine does not. Moreover, Cassian teaches that contemplation in this life is ecstatic. Augustine agrees that contemplation is supremely joyful, though ecstasy is not the primary model he adopts. For Cassian, the link between ecstatic contemplation and reading Scripture is pneumatology: the same Spirit guides the ascetic in reading and in contemplation. Gregory follows Cassian's pneumatological link, and thus, adopts Cassian's ascetic pneumatology. The final two points of Gregory's ascetic pneumatology, that the Holy Spirit is (4) the guide for reading Scripture, and (5) the giver of ecstatic contemplation, are intimately related and show his dependence on Cassian's system.

Given Gregory's use of both Augustine and Cassian, this chapter shows that Gregory provides a kind of synthesis. Gregory weaves his Augustinianism into the fabric of the system he adopts from Cassian. Thus, two threads of my overall argument come together in this chapter. First, Gregory's pneumatology is concerned with the reformation of desire. Only when the process of reorienting desires has begun can the Christian understand allegorical meanings of Scripture and arrive at contemplation. These experiences, in turn, further shape desire and orient it toward God. Second, Gregory is a different kind of Augustinian from what we have seen before. He is not interested in the anti-Arian pneumatology of Lérinian theologians; nor is he interested in the gradations of the will taught by Prosper; nor does he make use of the nuances of Trinitarian theology in

the ways that came so easily to Fulgentius. Gregory is Augustinian in many of his commitments, but not in the ways others were Augustinian. Gregory is also a student of Cassian's ascetic pneumatology. Because Gregory has affinities with Augustine's theology and the prevailing assumption in scholarship has been that Gregory more or less follows Augustine, I start with Augustine's teaching on figurative interpretation. We can see that Gregory follows and expands Augustine's basic insights. Next, I consider the extent of contemplation in this life; Augustine thinks it is very limited, while Cassian and Gregory think it is extensive. This allows us to see that Cassian connects figurative interpretation and contemplation, while Augustine does not. Gregory follows Cassian in connecting allegory and contemplation. Finally, I argue that while Gregory uses Augustine's characterization of contemplation as joyful, he does this only as a supplement to Cassian's characterization of contemplation as ecstatic. Where Gregory found language of ecstasy in Augustine, this made it easier for him to synthesize Augustine and Cassian, but it is Cassian's ascetic pneumatology which frames Gregory's understanding of the Spirit's role in contemplation and allegorical reading. Gregory's ascetic pneumatology teaches that Christianity is a school of desire in which the Holy Spirit is the primary teacher. The advanced teachings of the Holy Spirit come through allegory and contemplation.

THE FIGURATIVE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE

Augustine's account of the process of his conversion in his *Confessions* is full of ironic "hindsight." Looking back on his life, he tells how God was calling him into the Catholic faith, though he could not understand it as it was happening. One intellectual hang-up that tortured Augustine centered on the interpretation of Scripture. Scripture

seems crude. When, at his mother's bidding, he encountered the powerful and articulate bishop of Milan, St. Augustine heard St. Ambrose resolve many of his problems.

Augustine notes that the Scriptures

were no longer read with an eye to which they had previously looked absurd... I was delighted to hear Ambrose in his sermons to the people saying, as if he were most carefully enunciating a principle of exegesis: 'The letter kills, the spirit gives life.' [2 Cor 3:6] Those texts which, taken literally, seemed to contain perverse teaching he would expound spiritually, removing the mystical veil.²

This was a turning point for Augustine. When he made one of his first attempts as a Christian exegete, he returned to the principle he learned from Ambrose. Discussing Augustine's *On Genesis Against the Manichees*, Roland Teske has recently followed Jean Pépin in articulating this basic principle of figurative reading: an absurd literal text is the sign for a needed allegorical interpretation.³ Following Henri Marrou and Augustine's *On Christian Teaching*, Teske has also articulated a second principle of figurative reading in Augustine: "whatever in the word of God cannot in the proper sense be referred to the goodness of morals or the truth of the faith is figurative."⁴ These two principles seem to be in tension. Teske argues, however, that they are not in direct contradiction.⁵ The first

² Augustine, *Conf.* 6.4.6 (CSEL 33.119; Chadwick, 94). Chadwick notes Ambrose, *Serm.* 19 for parallel use of 2 Cor 3:6.

³ R. Teske, "Criteria for figurative interpretation," 109-114. Cf. J. Pépin, "A propos de l'histoire de l'exégèse allégorique," 400-404. Literature on Augustine abounds. On his life and works in general, the standard is P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*. See also, G. Bonner, *St Augustine of Hippo*; T.F. Martin and A. Fitzgerald, *Augustine of Hippo: Faithful Servant, Spiritual Leader*.

⁴ Augustine, *doc. Chr.* 3.10.14 (CCSL 32.86, trans. Teske). The translation is provided in R. Teske, "Criteria for figurative interpretation," 110. Cf. H.I. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la Fin de la Culture Antique*, 478-494.

⁵ This is a slight correction of his earlier introduction to the translation of *On Genesis Against the Manichees*; Teske's introduction in FOTC 84 is updated by his "Criteria for figurative interpretation."

does not minimize what the second maximizes because “Scripture contains only a few truths to be believed and a few moral precepts to be followed.”⁶ As Augustine argues, “the only thing [Scripture] ever asserts is Catholic faith, with reference to things in the past and in the future and in the present... but all these things are of value for nourishing and fortifying charity or love, and overcoming and extinguishing cupidity or greed.”⁷ Once one understands the principle of two-fold love for God and neighbor, one has understood Scripture. “Augustine repeatedly insists that the very meaning of Scripture is its capacity to move the soul in love toward God and one’s neighbor.”⁸ The point of allegory, for Augustine, is to show the Christian meaning of love; when a passage speaks of something else in the literal sense, there is always an allegorical meaning that will teach us about the center of Christianity. Love is the meaning behind every verse of Scripture.⁹ When something else is taught, Augustine claims this indicates a need for allegorical interpretation.

Cassian offered no such criteria about interpreting passages figuratively. Recall that Cassian teaches that every passage of Scripture can have four meanings.¹⁰ With such a theory of multiple meanings for each verse, there is no obvious reason to offer a rule that determines when to take one sense as the primary meaning. That is, while Augustine was troubled that some passages have a poor or absurd literal meaning, Cassian records no such trouble; the farther one progresses in ascesis, the more one understands the multiple

⁶ R. Teske, "Criteria for figurative interpretation," 118.

⁷ Augustine, *doc. Chr.* 3.10.15 (CCSL 32.87; WSA 1.11.176).

⁸ D. Dawson, "Sign, allegory, and the motions," 124. Cf. Augustine, *doc. Chr.* 4.25.55; I. Bochet, *Le Firmament de l'Écriture*, 15-19, 159-264.

⁹ W. Babcock, "*Caritas* and signification," 145-163.

¹⁰ See my discussion above, p. 16ff.

mysteries of Scripture. Gregory, on the other hand, was not only troubled by the more obvious contradictions, but he worked to find them. One of Gregory's favorite means of raising the need for a spiritual interpretation comes not from the literal sense of a single passage, but from contrasting passages from different books of Scripture.¹¹ Gregory has a hyper-sensitivity for problem-based exegesis: he searches out potential problems in order to motivate an extended discussion of hidden meanings.¹² Gregory even plays on Augustine's statement of the exegetical principle about faith and morals in his homilies: "Since allegory sometimes builds up faith, and the history [i.e. literal meaning] morals, I, who am now speaking to the faithful..., do not think it is wrong if I postpone the regular order of speaking, since you who already hold firmly to the faith ought to hear something briefly about the allegory."¹³ Augustine's principle that the figurative meaning must be sought where the literal meaning does not foster faith and morals is evident in Gregory's justification of the structure of his homily. Gregory gives an allegorical interpretation to passages which do not teach something about morals, as Augustine indicates. But Gregory also gives allegorical interpretations to passages which do teach about morals in the literal meaning, as Cassian indicates. Gregory uses Augustine's principle that Scripture should always teach about the two-fold love of God and neighbor to justify

¹¹ E.g. Gregory, *Hom. Ev.* 7.1. The Gospel reading for the day is Jn 1:19-27, which Gregory paraphrases to include John the Baptist denying that he is Elijah. Gregory then contrasts this with Mt 11:14, which affirms that John is Elijah. See also *Hom. Ev.* 33.8. Conversely, it does not bother Gregory to give multiple interpretations of the same verse, as with Job's daughters (Job 1:2) at *Mor.* 1.14.20 & 1.27.38. G. Cremascoli, *L'esegesi biblica di Gregorio Magno*, 6, refers to Gregory's understanding of Scripture as an immense mosaic of related links and references which gives hints for understanding. See also A.R. Christman, "The Spirit and the Wheels: Gregory the Great on Reading Scripture," 395-407; C. Dagens, *Saint Grégoire le Grand*, 55-81; G. Zinn, "Exegesis and spirituality in the writings of Gregory the Great," 168-180.

¹² This greatly troubled some scholars who otherwise liked Gregory, e.g. F.H. Dudden, *Gregory the Great*, 2.307-310.

¹³ Gregory, *Hom. Ev.* 40.1 (CCSL 141.394; my trans.). Cf. *Mor.* 3.28.55, 15.51.57, 16.59.72, 18.1.1

figurative readings of Scripture, but he also uses Cassian's framework that a single passage has multiple meanings which are accessible to the advanced ascetic.¹⁴ Gregory formulated the rule in his *Exposition on the First Book of Kings*: "When prophets narrate historical details, they signify spiritual things; they speak of exterior things, but they intimate intimate things [*intima innuunt*]; they lay out earthly things so that heavenly things might be explained."¹⁵ The whole structure of Gregory's *Moralia* is based on this; he begins by offering three interpretations (he calls them historical, allegorical, and moral) for each verse of Job.¹⁶ He also adopts this structure in his homilies.¹⁷ Gregory looks for hidden meanings even in passages which teach something about faith and morals in the literal sense. In short, Gregory follows both Cassian's and Augustine's articulation of how and when Christians should read Scripture figuratively. The Spirit is the divine agent who not only inspires Scripture as it is written, but also as it is read. When we consider the connection between allegorical reading and contemplation, however, we see that Gregory follows Cassian; Augustine does not connect the reading of Scripture to ecstatic contemplative experience, while Gregory and Cassian do. Gregory, like Cassian, understands contemplation of Scripture to be a regular part of Spirit's activity in the Christian life that is often begun through allegorical interpretation of Scripture.

¹⁴ The most recent treatment of allegorical reading in Gregory is G. Cremascoli, *L'esegesi biblica di Gregorio Magno*, 35-51.

¹⁵ Gregory, *In I Reg.* prol. 4 (CCSL 144.52; my trans.).

¹⁶ E.g. Gregory, *Ep. ad Leander* 1, which was appended to *Mor.* as an explanation. On the three senses of Scripture in Gregory, see also H.d. Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale*, 1.187-189.

¹⁷ E.g. Gregory, *Hom. Ev.* 33.5.

CONTEMPLATION IN THIS LIFE AND THE NEXT

As he was converting to Catholic Christianity, Augustine spent time in a kind of academic retreat with a small community of friends in Italy at Cassiciacum. When he moved back to Africa he tried to maintain a similar lifestyle, but was quickly caught up in the business of being a leader in the African Church.¹⁸ His understanding of contemplation and of the contemplative life changed during these experiences. Early in Augustine's career he entertained the notion of contemplation as a kind of knowledge attainable for a select few who lived a life of intellectual leisure, but he quickly came to see that contemplation was not a matter of individual achievement. Augustine emphasized the need for God's action in the life of Christians, especially in the form of faith and love.¹⁹ He also situated contemplation firmly in an ecclesial context.²⁰ Augustine moved from understanding contemplation as a matter of private speculative thought to understanding contemplation as a central aspect of eschatological fulfillment. Similarly, Augustine's understanding of the contemplative life moved from a life of leisure (*otium*) devoted to theoretical concerns to eternal life with God.²¹ The tension

¹⁸ Augustine, *Conf.* 9; Augustine, s. 355.2; G. Bonner, *St Augustine of Hippo*, 93-127; P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, 108-138.

¹⁹ For a brief account of this in philosophers prior to Augustine and in Augustine's early works, see the discussion in *Augustinus-Lexikon*, s.v. "Actio-Contemplatio," 58-63. At *De ord.* 2.8.25-2.9.26, Augustine teaches that contemplative knowledge is not surpassed, even in the next life. Similarly, *quant.* 33.76 makes no indication that contemplative knowledge differs between this life and the next. For discussion of this development, see F.V. Fleteren, "Mysticism in the *Confessiones*: a controversy revisited," 309-336; J.P. Kenney, "Confession and the contemplative," 133-146; R.J. O'Connell, "Action and contemplation," 38-58; J. Quinn, *Mysticism in the Confessiones: for passages reconsidered*, 251-286. These address some of the concerns about "mysticism vs Platonism" expressed by E.C. Butler, *Western Mysticism*, 19-62.

²⁰ This case is made especially clear by B. McGinn, *The Presence of God*, 1.248-262. For example, see Augustine, *En. Ps.* 32.2.8 (CCL 38:253-254); translated and discussed in W. Harmless, *Augustine in His Own Words*, 199-200.

²¹ Augustine (e.g. *lib. arb.* 2.25) links *otium* and contemplation directly. Cassian does not. C.f. C. Chin, "Prayer and *otium* in Cassian's Institutes," 24-29; G. Lawless, *Augustine's Monastic Rule*, 51-52. Cassian does seem to rely on a general understanding of *otium* in discussions of praying the Psalms; still, he does

between the contemplative and active lives presented itself to Augustine as a kind of forced dichotomy between loving God and loving neighbor. “While the love of truth (*caritas veritatis*) seeks the “sanctified leisure” (*otium sanctum*) of contemplation, the necessity of love (*necessitas caritatis*) demands a willing acceptance of our social and ecclesiastical obligations.”²² Augustine’s basic solution to this dichotomy was that in this life we cannot expect to contemplate God continually, but rather, we must love God by caring for our neighbors. Gregory, too, recognized the tension between the contemplative life as a life of rest and the active life, which excludes rest. When Gregory follows Augustine’s basic solution to this problem, he admits that this life should be a healthy alternation between action and contemplation. But Gregory thinks that contemplation is a regular facet of this life for Christian ascetics, and in this, we see the influence of Cassian. Cassian’s entire plan for Christian asceticism was a progression through particular practices into a pattern of prayer that regularly involves contemplation, and this lies underneath Gregory’s discussions of contemplation.

When the mature Augustine thinks of contemplation, he thinks of the genuine human happiness and joy that come in the eschatological fulfillment. “As the perfection of knowledge, contemplation satisfies the human quest for happiness.”²³ Such happiness can only be experienced in heaven, where God can be enjoyed.²⁴ Speaking of this future experience, Augustine writes, “in that contemplation, therefore, God will be all in all, because nothing else outside of Himself will be required, but to be enlightened by

not use *otium* to explain *contemplatio*. Rather, *contemplatio* is most fully a matter of understanding the mysteries of Scripture in ecstatic union with God.

²² *Augustine Through the Ages: an Encyclopedia*, s.v. “contemplation and action,” 233. Torchia cites *civ. Dei* 19.19.

²³ *Augustine Through the Ages: an Encyclopedia*, s.v. “contemplation and action,” 234.

²⁴ A classic statement of Augustine’s principle is *doc. Chr.* 1.3.7-1.5.10.

(*inlustrari*) and enjoy Him alone will be sufficient.”²⁵ In this eschatological context, Christ brings the faithful to contemplation:

The man Christ Jesus, the Mediator between God and men, [2 Cor 5:7] reigns now among all the just who live by faith, and shall one day bring them to that sight, which the same Apostle calls ‘face to face.’ [1 Cor 13:12]... But before that is realized: ‘We see now through a mirror in an obscure manner,’ that is, in likenesses: ‘but then face to face.’ This contemplation is promised to us as the end of all our labors and the eternal fullness of our joys.²⁶

Because contemplation is a matter of eschatological fulfillment, Augustine thinks that contemplation in this life reveals our sinfulness and our instability. Though Augustine does think that humans can attain a certain kind of intellectual ascent from the world of senses to a momentary grasp of immutable reality, we are always in need of the mediator, Jesus Christ. When Augustine says that contemplation in this life is “through a mirror,” he means that contemplation is only barely begun (*inchoata contemplatio*), and not regular.²⁷ Contemplation is “the end of all our labors,” not a regular part of our work on earth.

The Gospel story of Martha and Mary (Lk 10:40ff) serves as a locus for discussing the active and contemplative lives. In their treatments of these figures, we see the characteristic difference between Augustine and Cassian on the attainability of

²⁵ Augustine, *Trin.* 1.10.20 (CCSL 50.57; FOTC 45.30).

²⁶ Augustine, *Trin.* 1.8.16-17 (CCSL 50. 49-50; FOTC 45.23-24).

²⁷ Augustine, *Io. ev. tr.* 124.5 (CCSL 36.686; my trans.). Augustine is also able to speak of contemplating God in this life at *civ. Dei*, 19.19: “nor has any man a right to be so immersed in active life as to neglect the contemplation of God... If no one imposes this burden upon us [i.e. governing], we are free to sift and contemplate truth.” (trans. Dods, 698) See E.C. Butler, *Western Mysticism*, 26-27. Cf. Gregory the Great, *Hom. Ez.* 2.3.7 (SC 360.138), 2.5.1 (SC 360.224) for the otherwise rare phrase, *inchoata contemplatio*.

contemplation in this life. When speaking of Martha and Mary, Augustine's emphasis lies with Mary as a type of the life to come: "Mary... has shown us a likeness of this joy beforehand... she rested from every occupation and was absorbed with the truth according to the manner of which this life is capable, and thus has foreshadowed the future life that shall last forever."²⁸ For Augustine, Martha and Mary signify types of life separated by what is possible in this life and what is possible after death. "In these two women two kinds of life are represented: present life and future life... temporal life and eternal life... In Martha was to be found the image of things present, in Mary that of things to come."²⁹ Alternatively, for Cassian, both Martha and Mary signify lives that Christians regularly lead on earth. One has to draw lines between Cassian and Augustine carefully: both Cassian and Augustine are convinced that the contemplation we will experience face to face is radically superior to the contemplation we experience now, and both are willing to consider that we progress towards that contemplation in this life. Cassian, however, is quite comfortable speaking of contemplation in this life as a regular part of the ascetic's life, as we saw in chapter 2.³⁰ Contemplation is more than barely begun in this life according to Cassian. Contemplation is a regular part of the reading of Scripture and prayer experiences of the Christian ascetic. For Augustine, on the other

²⁸ Augustine, *Trin.* 1.10.20 (CCSL 50.56; FOTC 45.30). Cf. *Jn Tr.* 124.5 (CCSL 36.685; FoC 92.90), where Augustine connects the same themes to Peter and John as types like Martha and Mary: "And so the Church knows two lives, preached and commended by Divinity to her, of which one exists in faith, the other in direct vision; one in the time of sojourning abroad, the other in an eternity of dwelling; one in toil, the other in rest... in the effort of action, the other in the reward of contemplation... This one is wholly spent here up to the end of this world and finds its end there; that other is put off to be completed after the end of this world, but it does not have an end in the world to come."

²⁹ Augustine, *s.* 104.4 (PL 34.617; WSA 3.4.83). Cf. *Io. ev. tr.* 101.5, 124.5. Bonnardière has made the argument that Mary and Martha apply as types of the Church here and to come, as well: A.-M. La Bonnardière, "Marthe et Marie figures de l'Eglise d'après Saint Augustin," 404-427. See also, F. Cayré, *La Contemplation Augustinienne*, 34-44; A.-M. La Bonnardière, "Les deux vies," 411-425.

³⁰ See Cassian, *Coll.* 1.72 & 23.3.1, and my discussion above, p. 32ff, esp. n. 16.

hand, “active” and “contemplative” most naturally name this life and the next.³¹

Contemplation is barely begun in this life, and is a rare experience, according to the mature Augustine.

When Gregory discusses Martha and Mary, he parallels Augustine’s treatment, but with Cassian’s certainty that the contemplative life is a regular part of Christian existence. Martha and Mary, as well as Leah and Rachel, signify the active and contemplative lives.³² In one of his *Homilies on Ezekiel*, Gregory outlines the standard teaching. The active life can be perfected prior to death, while the contemplative will be perfected only in eternal life.³³ But Gregory teaches that there is a regular alternation or *reverbatio* between the active and the contemplative lives.³⁴ The contemplative life informs the active life:

just as a good order of life is to strive from the active to the contemplative, so the spirit frequently reverts from the contemplative to the active, so that the active life may be lived the more perfectly because the contemplative has kindled the mind. Therefore we must pass from the active to the contemplative, yet sometimes because of what we have perceived inwardly in the mind it is better to withdraw from the contemplative to the active.³⁵

³¹ R.A. Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity*, esp. 187-189. R.H. Weaver, "Scripture," 375-376, echoes Markus.

³² Gregory, *Hom. Ez.* 2.2.9-10, *Mor.* 6.37.61. Cf. Augustine, *c. Faust.* 22.54-55. Cassian does not use Leah and Rachel to discuss the active and contemplative lives.

³³ Gregory, *Hom. Ez.* 2.2.8.

³⁴ Explication of the theme of *reverbatio* in this context belongs to C.E. Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, 224-231. See also, G.R. Evans, *Thought of Gregory the Great*, 105-111; C.E. Straw, "Adversitas et Prosperitas," 277-288.

³⁵ Gregory, *Hom. Ez.* 2.2.11 (SC 360.112; Tomkinson, 287-288). Cf. *Mor.* 10.15.31, 31.51.102; *Hom. Ez.* 1.5.12.

Gregory envisions the ideal Christian as one who frequently rises in contemplation and returns to action. Christians alternate between the lives represented by Mary and Martha here and now. Gregory can teach that Christians regularly alternate between contemplation and action because, like Cassian, he teaches that the Spirit is the giver of both virtue and contemplation; the Spirit is active in both Christian action and contemplation. This same pneumatological thread which helps Cassian tie together Biblical interpretation, morality, and contemplation, also helps Gregory tie together his understandings of virtue, contemplation, and the interpretation of Scripture.

CONTEMPLATIVE READING OF SCRIPTURE

Gregory is convinced that Christians regularly experience God's presence in that mode of prayer called "contemplation." This most naturally happens when Christians read or hear Scripture, though like Cassian, Gregory teaches that many other things can be contemplated.³⁶ Much like Cassian, Gregory teaches that the Spirit is both the author of Scripture and the divine person who aides interpretation of Scripture. In the opening to the *Moralia*, Gregory reflects on the heart of the matter:

but who wrote these words is quite a pointless question when we believe confidently that the Holy Spirit is the true author of the book. The writer is the one who dictates things to be written. The writer is the one who inspires the book and recounts through the voice of the scribe the deeds we are to imitate.³⁷

³⁶ Gregory has Cassian's wider meaning for contemplation. The inner brightness of divine illumination is contemplated at *Mor.* 9.8.8, as are, for example, what is desired (*Mor.* 28.11.30), the glory of the Majesty on high (*Mor.* 31.50.100), the justice of God (*Mor.* 11.29.40), the works of the Redeemer (*Mor.* 20.3.7). Paul contemplates his own weakness (*Mor.* 23.27.53). Job contemplate the preachers to come (*Mor.* 4.29.56).

³⁷ *Mor.* pref. 1.2 (CCSL 143.8; trans. O'Donnell). Cf. *Mor.* 9.11.12.

Gregory often calls the Holy Spirit the “spirit of prophecy” precisely because the Holy Spirit inspires prophets to write Scripture.³⁸ As Gregory teaches, this is a gift of the Spirit: “The writers of the sacred words are filled with the Holy Spirit and pulled upwards... Job, inspired by the Holy Spirit (*sancto spiritu afflatus*), could write of his own deeds, which were themselves really the gifts of the Holy Spirit from above, as if they were not his own.”³⁹ Moreover, just as Cassian linked the role of the Spirit as the inspiration for Scripture and its interpretation to the role of the Spirit in tradition in general, so also does Gregory rely on the Spirit as the guarantee for Christian teaching.⁴⁰ Because Gregory uses the Holy Spirit to explain to figurative reading of Scripture and to explain contemplation, like Cassian, Gregory can link allegory to contemplation. The same Spirit who inspires Scripture and its interpretation inspires contemplation. Indeed, contemplation arises through reading Scripture.

Gregory connects the role of prophets in the past to preachers in the present. Just as the Spirit inspired prophets and Evangelists in the past, so the Spirit inspires preachers today. The Spirit is so important for the ministry of preaching that Gregory teaches that the Apostles did not preach immediately after the Lord’s Passion because they were not yet strengthened with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, who did not come until Pentecost.⁴¹ The Lord “humbles the hearts of the Saints to the ministry of preaching for the correction of sinners by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.”⁴² But the Spirit is not only

³⁸ E.g. *Mor.* 7.9.9; 7.35.53; 8.1.1, 8.6.10, 8.25.45, 9.5.5, 9.16.25, 9.31.47, 9.32.48, 9.49.74, 11.19.30-32, 12.18.23, 14.55.71, 16.33.41, 16.43.55, 17.26.36, 17.27.39, 18.44.72, 19.2.6, 21.2.5, 22.14.27, 22.19.45, 31.51.102, 32.13.18.

³⁹ *Mor.* pref. 1.3 (CCSL 143.10; trans. O’Donnell).

⁴⁰ E.g. *Mor.* 8.28.47, 9.31.47.

⁴¹ *Mor.* 30.8.26.

⁴² *Mor.* 27.24.45 (CCSL 143b.1366; trans. Parker). Cf. *Mor.* 27.36.60

needed for the inspiration of the preacher; the Spirit is also needed for the inspiration of the listener. “Unless the Holy Spirit fills their hearts, the voice of teachers sounds in the ears of bodies in vain, for teachers can form their voice exteriorly, but cannot stamp it interiorly.”⁴³ As the prophets of their own day, preachers strengthen the people against temptation because the Holy Spirit works in preachers and listeners alike.⁴⁴ Indeed, when Gregory teaches that the Church, filled with the Holy Spirit, comes to maturity when it bears holy children through holy preaching, we are reminded of Cassian’s understanding of the fruit of spiritual knowledge:

When, by this discipline you attain to spiritual knowledge, you will certainly have a learning that is not barren and worthless but one that is alive and fruitful. An abundant downpour of the Holy Spirit will germinate the seed of the saving Word that has been commended by you to the hearts of your hearers and, according to what the prophet promised, ‘rain will be given to your seed, wherever you sow on the land, and the bread of the fruit of your land shall be most abundant and rich for you.’⁴⁵

Cassian is pointedly discussing monastic leaders, but seems to have preachers in mind, as would be the case if he were thinking of his fellow monks at Lérins, many of whom became important bishops throughout Gaul. Gregory pointedly discusses ecclesial authorities (i.e. bishops) who would be preaching regularly to the Christian faithful. But the teaching is the same: one must attain spiritual knowledge through the Holy Spirit before he can teach in the Holy Spirit. For Gregory and Cassian, this spiritual knowledge

⁴³ *Mor.* 27.38.64 (CCSL 143b.1382; my trans.).

⁴⁴ E.g. *Mor.* 29.22.46, 31.32.66

⁴⁵ Cassian, *Coll.* 14.16.9 (CSEL ; ACW). Cf. Gregory, *Mor.* 19.12.19, 23.1.8.

comes about through contemplating the mysteries presented in Scripture after a period of ascetic formation.

Cassian condensed previous teachings about the spiritual meaning of Scripture and focused his analysis around the consistent theme of the Holy Spirit as the author of Scripture who inspires the interpretation of Scripture.⁴⁶ Memorizing and meditating on Scripture is part of the ascetic routine. Cassian envisions acetic preparation for reading Scripture. “Neither human teaching nor worldly learning but only purity of mind will possess [the understanding of hidden meanings], through the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit.”⁴⁷ The enlightenment of the Spirit reorders the reader’s heart and mind, preparing it to understand the mysteries contained in Scripture. Contemplation consists in understanding these mysteries through the illumination of the Spirit. “Spiritual knowledge” derives from the contemplation which the Spirit offers to the Christian ascetic who meditates on Scripture. Gregory teaches the same concerning the preparation bishops must undergo in order to preach and which the laity must undergo in order to understand. Gregory connects contemplation and allegory directly: Contemplation penetrates the inner mysteries of Scripture.⁴⁸ We learn the inner meaning of Scripture through contemplation. The Church as a whole is fed by the mystical sense of Scripture and lifted up for contemplating the things above.⁴⁹ Indeed, it is the Christian Church’s ability to contemplate and read the Scriptures allegorically which separates it from the Jewish Synagogue, which shares many of the same Scriptures.⁵⁰ This is because Christ is

⁴⁶ See my treatment of this in chapter 1, p. 11-21.

⁴⁷ Cassian, *Coll.* 14.9.7 (CSEL 13.409-410. ACW 57.513). Cf. *Coll.* 14.10.1.

⁴⁸ Gregory, *Mor.* 6.36.55; *In Reg.* 3.148 (CCSL 144.280). Cf. B. McGinn, *The Presence of God*, 2.39-40.

⁴⁹ Cf. *Mor.* 16.19.24 & 33.1.2.

⁵⁰ E.g. *Mor.* 18.39.60 & 35.8.13.

the “corner stone” of interpretation, who offers a perfect model of action and contemplation. As Gregory explains,

The ‘corner stone’ for understanding the Sacred Eloquence [i.e. Scripture] is twofold.

When inspiration is given to someone (that is, when he is not, by strict judgment, bound by the darkness of his own ignorance, but enjoys a kind of liberty), then he yields to the precepts of God, either to do things exteriorly by following them, or to understand interior things by contemplating.⁵¹

Gregory follows Cassian in appropriating contemplation to the interpretation and understanding of the hidden meanings of Scripture.

The literature on Gregory and contemplation is immense.⁵² Similarly, treatments of Gregory’s understanding of Scripture abound.⁵³ I am not the first to understand Gregory as Augustinian, nor am I the first to articulate a link between Gregory and Cassian. I add to the discussion of Gregory’s sources the link between Gregory’s ascetic pneumatology and Cassian’s. To that point, it is important to note that Gregory teaches that both allegory and contemplation raise the mind to God. He treats both similarly because, like Cassian, he teaches that the same Spirit is active throughout the life of the Christian ascetic. In his opening remarks on the *Song of Songs*, Gregory explains that “allegory provides the soul set far below God with a kind of crane whereby she may be lifted to

⁵¹ *Mor.* 28.13.33 (CCSL 143b.1420-1421; my trans.). “Corner stone” is taken from Job 38:6 in this passage.

⁵² Contemplation is treated in nearly every major study of Gregory. See E.C. Butler, *Western Mysticism*, 171-188; B. McGinn, “Contemplation in Gregory the Great,” 146-167; B. McGinn, *The Presence of God*, 50-79; C.E. Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, 225-231. A short and very readable treatment is provided in B. McGinn and P.F. McGinn, *Early Christian Mystics*, 76-96.

⁵³ E.g. C. Dagens, *Saint Grégoire le Grand*, 55-82; G.R. Evans, *Thought of Gregory the Great*, 87-95; J. Moorhead, *Gregory the Great*, 49-67; G. Zinn, “Exegesis and spirituality in the writings of Gregory the Great,” 168-180.

God.”⁵⁴ In this way, “God lifts us up by understanding to the place from where he lowers himself by speaking.”⁵⁵ Through allegorical readings of Scripture, the soul is raised to God.⁵⁶ In just the same way, the soul and mind are raised to God in contemplation.⁵⁷ The same Holy Spirit raises the human mind in both allegory and contemplation.⁵⁸ Gregory and Cassian think of reading Scripture as part of the process which leads to contemplation and raises the Christian to God.

GREGORY AND CASSIAN ON ECSTATIC CONTEMPLATION IN THIS LIFE

In describing the process of being raised to God through allegory and contemplation, Gregory uses language of ecstasy and rapture: “The mind of the elect is snatched up on high (*in altum rapitur*) to be suffused with the rays of divine light. As it is bathed in that light, it is lifted beyond itself (*ultra se sublevatur*), suffused by the radiance of grace.”⁵⁹ Augustine agrees that contemplation is a kind of rapture of the mind, but the shape of the ascetic experience that Gregory envisions belongs to Cassian. Gregory follows Cassian’s ascetic pneumatology, as I have outlined in chapters 1-2 and 7. The Spirit reforms desires, affections, and thoughts as part of the process of forming virtue, understanding the mysteries of Scripture, and achieving contemplation. Gregory follows Cassian’s treatment of the relationship between figurative reading and contemplation: they are overlapping paths to spiritual knowledge premised on the Spirit’s activity within

⁵⁴ Gregory, *Exp. Cant.* pref. 1 (CCSL 144.3; DelCogliano, 91).

⁵⁵ Gregory, *Exp. Cant.* pref. 3 (CCSL 144.4; DelCogliano, 92).

⁵⁶ E.g. *Exp. Cant.* pref. 4; *Mor.* 20.27.56, *Ep. ad Leandrum* 3.

⁵⁷ On the soul, see *Mor.* 4.30.6, 10.10.17, 10.27.50, 12.15.19, 26.13.24, 30.17.53, 31.51.101-102. For *sublevata mens*, see *Mor.* 8.14.28 (CCSL 143.401), 8.29.48 (CCSL 143.419).

⁵⁸ E.g. *Mor.* 7.13.28, 8.10.21.

⁵⁹ *Mor.* 4.11.19 (CCSL 143.177; trans. O’Donnell)

Christians. Additionally, Gregory follows Cassian in teaching that ecstatic contemplation regularly arises from compunction. Compunction is a shift in desire that moves from recognition of sin to longing for God. Compunction is the turning point between desire for earthly pleasures and desire for heavenly joy. For Gregory and Cassian, the ecstasy of contemplation names not only a rung on the ladder of mental ascent that is beyond the normal operations of the human mind (i.e. “enlightenment” as understanding beyond normal mental abilities); it also names the happiness which results in the satisfaction of human desire for God (i.e. deliriously happy).

Compunction arises when one is convicted of his sinfulness and gripped by emotions of regret, sorrow, and firm resolve to become better. It includes elements of what Christians today call “contrition,” but Cassian and Gregory note that it often includes emotional tears. Weeping for one’s sins was long considered an authentic sign of love for God.⁶⁰ For Gregory, compunction has four modes, of which contemplation is one. Compunction arises when the Christian considers where she has been, where she will be, where she is, and where she is not. The first involves recalling one’s sins, the second judgment, the third present evils and weaknesses, and the fourth contemplation. The “blessings of the heavenly homeland are contemplated,” but not yet fully enjoyed because those of us in earthly life are separated from heavenly life.⁶¹ Still, the holy “ascend to the heights of contemplation from compunction.”⁶²

⁶⁰ E.g. Cassian, *Coll. Conf.* 9.28.1-9.30.2. Gregory, *Mor.* 23.21.40-43, 24.6.10; *Hom. Ez.* 2.10.20-21; *Dial.* 3.34.2-5; *Exp. Cant.* 18, *Hom. Ev.* 17.10-11. See also, M. Casey, *Athirst for God*, 120-129; K. Sullivan, “Compunction,” 227-235.

⁶¹ *Mor.* 23.21.41 (CCSL 143b.1175; my trans.). Cf. *Hom. Ez.* 2.2.1, *Dial.* 3.34. See J. Leclercq, *L’amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu*, 34-36; B. McGinn, *The Presence of God*, 2.49-50.

⁶² *Mor.* 9.36.58 (CCSL 143.499; my trans.)

Sometimes, one is admitted to a certain extraordinary sweetness of internal delicacy. He is suddenly renewed in ardency by the Spirit breathing [on him], and the more he stands there amazed, the more he tastes something he loves. He longs to enter there, where he feels he can taste the sweetness within because he has become vile to himself in his own sight through his love of this sweetness... because he is unable match this elegance, he considers it sweet to weep and to pour himself out in tears for his fallen weakness.⁶³

The emotional grip of compunction continues throughout contemplation, according to Gregory. This emotional grip is fully a matter of desire: where the Christian's desire had been aimed at things that were not God, it is now aimed at God. Drawing the line from compunction to contemplation highlights the emotional aspect of the ecstatic experience Gregory calls "contemplation." There is a certain sadness to contemplation because we perceive where we are not yet; nevertheless, there is also a certain joy because we also experience where we are going. For Gregory, contemplation is to be elevated in ecstasy beyond the cares of this world. The Christian transcends the world around him; the soul, "when lifted up to the grace of eternal contemplation, even transcends its very self (*semetipsam transit*)."⁶⁴ One is "rapt" or seized and carried away by contemplation (*contemplatione rapitur*).⁶⁵ "Often, a soul is suspended in ecstasy (*in excessu*) so that it can contemplate the knowledge of the Divine Presence (*cognitionem divinae praesentiae contempletur*) – a presence which it can feel, but cannot fill."⁶⁶ Sometimes, this experience takes peoples' minds out of their bodies so much "that outwardly their face

⁶³ *Mor.* 23.21.43 (CCSL 143b.1176-1177; my trans.).

⁶⁴ *Mor.* 20.27.56 (CCSL 143a.1045; trans. Parker, modified). Cf. *Mor.* 8.6.10, 22.16.36, 31.51.102.

⁶⁵ *Mor.* 31.49.99 (CCSL 143b.1619). Cf. *Mor.* 4.11.19, 5.6.9, 7.12.14, 9.19.29, 10.10.17; *Hom. Ez.* 2.2.13

⁶⁶ *Mor.* 24.6.12 (CCSL 143b.1196; my trans.)

seems to have been struck with stupefaction.”⁶⁷ According to Gregory, contemplation is an ecstatic experience, in the sense of intense joy, in the sense of being “out of body,” and in the sense of exceeding the normal rational abilities of the human mind.

In chapter 2, we saw that Cassian teaches that contemplation is an ecstatic experience. Cassian uses the term *in excessu mentis* (“in ecstasy” or “transport of mind”) to describe Antony’s prayer as a model for contemplation.⁶⁸ He links the language of ecstasy of heart and mind (*excessus mentis/ cordis*) to his descriptions of fiery prayer which are the highest expression of union between the Holy Spirit and the ascetic.⁶⁹ This experience is the climax of asceticism for Cassian. It is a goal to which Christians can aspire, even though it only comes about as a gift from the Holy Spirit. It is a prayer beyond images, explanation, and even beyond the regular abilities of mind and heart. Contemplation is the fulfillment of both affective and intellectual aspects of human interiority. “Ecstasy,” in Cassian’s description of contemplation means exceeding the normal abilities of human mind as well as exceeding the normal happiness of the human heart.

Cassian and Gregory both teach that the Holy Spirit prepares the Christian’s heart and mind for ecstatic contemplation. One must already experience some reformation of thoughts and desire in order to experience contemplation. Gregory also argues that contemplation itself further reorders desire.

For very often the mind is set on fire with the flame of Divine love and is uplifted to behold heavenly things and secret mysteries. It is transported on high (*summa rapitur*)

⁶⁷ *Mor.* 12.30.35 (CCSL 143a.649; trans. Parker).

⁶⁸ *Coll.* 9.31. See the excellent treatment by C. Stewart, *Cassian the Monk*, 114-122.

⁶⁹ See my discussion above, beginning p. 49. B. McGinn, *The Presence of God*, 2.59, also notes a connection between Cassian’s fiery prayer and Gregory’s enkindled contemplation.

and pierced with perfect desire (*perfecto desiderio compuncta*), is made a stranger to things below.⁷⁰

The experience of beholding that which is ultimately desirable reforms our desires for regular, earthly things: “the more fully the heavenly realm is contemplated, the more one is corrected even in his earthly actions.”⁷¹ Gregory teaches what Augustine so eloquently expressed: God alone satisfies human desire.⁷² But humans are not always reliable judges of what truly satisfies. In fact, because of original sin, we begin with a deficient sense of what satisfies us, according to Gregory. Asceticism is a school of desire, a training in what we should want. Desire for heavenly things replaces and even subverts desire for earthly things until desire for God alone possesses the Christian.⁷³ We saw this in the earlier points of Gregory’s ascetic pneumatology outlined in the previous chapter. Here, we see that the final movement of Christian asceticism, contemplation, continues this process. The holy man does not fear the powers of this world “because by the ecstasy of his mind (*per mentis excessum*) he tramples down the desires even of the present life itself.”⁷⁴ We are not able to remain long in contemplation, as Gregory often laments, and so, we must return to good deeds and holy desires so that “in going [we] may learn what [we] desire, and in returning, know where [we] lie.”⁷⁵

⁷⁰ *Mor.* 9.19.29 (CCSL 143.477; trans. Parker modified). Cf. *Mor.* 7.12.14.

⁷¹ *Mor.* 24.6.12 (CCSL 143b.1196; my trans.). Cf. *Mor.* 5.33.60.

⁷² *Mor.* 22.3.5. Cf. Augustine, *Conf.* 1.1.1.

⁷³ E.g. *Mor.* 4.33.67.

⁷⁴ *Mor.* 31.28.56 (CCSL 143b.1599; my trans.)

⁷⁵ Gregory, *Hom. Ez.* 1.5.12 (SC 327.188; Tomkinson, 91)

EXCURSUS: AUGUSTINE ON CONTEMPLATION, THE ETERNAL FULLNESS OF ALL OUR JOYS

Separating the senses in which Cassian and Augustine think contemplation is ecstatic proves to be difficult. Where Gregory follows Cassian's general pattern, he also relies on Augustine's vocabulary to discuss contemplation. For example, Gregory thinks that contemplation can be like dreams with visions in the mind, a theme upon which Augustine reflected.⁷⁶ Gregory also speaks of contemplation as a philosophical ascent from a few things to the many, from many to all, and even to the being beyond being, a theme common to Augustine's discussions of contemplation.⁷⁷ Augustine, Cassian, and Gregory all teach that contemplation is joyful because it is part of the eschatological fulfillment. Still, as I have argued above, Gregory uses Augustine's vocabulary and some of his insights within a system that he otherwise adopted from Cassian.

That heaven is joyful is a significant aspect of Augustine's theology. His framework for Christian morality rests on happiness.⁷⁸ People want to be happy, and Christian salvation provides this. It is no surprise that the beatific vision is a happy state for Augustine. The moments of contemplation that we experience in this life are joyful because they are a foretaste of that eternal happiness which is to come. In his later descriptions, Augustine often speaks of an extreme sweetness and joy that accompanies moments of union with God in this life.⁷⁹ The sweetness and the happiness which are part of the rare moments of incomplete contemplation in this life are beyond our normal experiences, but Augustine is reticent to characterize them as ecstatic. Cassian and

⁷⁶ E.g. Gregory, *Mor.* 23.20.29 and Augustine, *Gn. litt.* 12.2.3 & 12.15.31

⁷⁷ E.g. Gregory, *Mor.* 5.34.62, 17.9.11; Augustine, *Conf.* 7.17.23, 9.10.23-25.

⁷⁸ In relation to mysticism and the beatific vision, see E. TeSelle, "Augustine," 21-22. For a treatment of this theme in the history of moral theology, see S. Pinckaers, *Les sources de la morale chrétienne*.

⁷⁹ E.g. Augustine, *Conf.* 7.16, *En. Ps.* 41.9.10, *c. Faust.* 12.42, & 22.56.

Gregory, on the other hand, teach that advanced ascetics will regularly achieve a contemplative prayer experience which is ecstatic.

Older scholarship has characterized Augustine's mysticism as one involving ecstatic experiences.⁸⁰ Augustine freely admits that people have ecstatic experiences, but this refers primarily to certain visions which he catalogues as sometimes belonging to the contemplative ascent and sometimes belonging to delusions. I do not disagree with the scholarship that Augustine's mysticism is affective and ecstatic; but this does not mean that whatever is contemplative is affective and ecstatic for Augustine. Augustine's thoughts about contemplation remain fixed on the beatific vision. The fact that Gregory would have found key terms for describing contemplation as an ecstatic experience in Augustine is important, but it does not mean that Gregory simply follows Augustine's teaching. Rather, Gregory retains Cassian's commitment to regular ecstatic contemplation as part of the heights of Christian asceticism. Gregory envisions something very much like Cassian's ascetic pneumatology as the background and preparation for ecstatic contemplation and figurative readings of Scripture. Where he found similar terminology in Augustine, this made it all the easier to synthesize Augustine and Cassian.

The key term in Latin discussions of ecstasy is the phrase *excessus mentis* (being out of one's mind). Augustine uses *excessus* to mean the same as its English derivative, *excess*, especially in the sense of too much luxury or pleasure.⁸¹ Augustine envisions that

⁸⁰ E.C. Butler, *Western Mysticism*, 50-55; B. McGinn, *The Presence of God*, 1.228-262; E. TeSelle, "Augustine," 19-33. TeSelle tempers the claim by arguing that ecstasy is not the goal of Augustinian mysticism, rather, the central problem is the purification of the heart and mind to enable the vision of God. Similarly, others have tempered the sense in which Augustine's theology is ecstatic, e.g.: J.P. Kenney, "Confession and the contemplative," 133-146; A. Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition*, 132-158.

⁸¹ E.g. Augustine, *c. Jul.* 3.13.27 (PL 44.716-717), 4.14.75 (PL 44.775). Cf. B. McGinn, *The Presence of God*, 1.253, n 134-135.

prophets have ecstatic experiences, but inspiration of Scripture is not contemplation.⁸²

Augustine also offers significant discussions of ecstatic delusions; when someone is “out of his mind” and “alienated from his senses,” he suffers from false perceptions.⁸³

Augustine also knows the tradition, likely from Ambrose, about translating the Greek *ekstasis* as *excessus* in the Latin Psalter, where Ambrose, Augustine, and Gregory decide that the term has the meaning of fear and not happiness.⁸⁴ We might say in English “scared out of my mind” to describe this. That is, Augustine uses *excessus* to describe many things which are not contemplation.

Augustine does, however, link *excessus mentis* to contemplation in the case of Paul:

The word *ecstasy* is Greek... Ecstasy strictly means being out of one’s mind, or “being beside oneself.” [*excessus mentis*] Now, we can think of two possible reasons for this condition: one is fear; the other is the contemplation of heavenly things [*intentio ad superna*] so intense that the realities of life here below seem to slip out of the mind. The saints experienced this kind of ecstasy, all those saints at least to whom were revealed the hidden mysteries of God that transcend this world. Paul spoke about being beside oneself

⁸² Augustine, *s.* 52.16, refers again to Ps 30:23. There, Augustine claims that the inspiration of the Psalmist was ecstatic.

⁸³ E.g. *Gn. litt.* 12.2.3, 12.12.25, 12.25.52. Augustine repeatedly asserts that Peter was mistaken about the reality of the food in his vision (Acts 10:10-14). He argues that this was not a harmful delusion, but neither was it accurate perception.

⁸⁴ Augustine, *En. Ps.* 30.1.1 & 23 (CCSL 38.186 & 190) explains the verse as *pavore* and not *excessu*. Gregory knows the tradition about Ps 30:23 (*Mor.* 23.21.40 (CCSL 143b.1176), 27.16.31 (CCSL 143b.1354); *Hom. Ez.* 1.5.12 (SC 327.186-190)), and about the meaning of the term in general (*Mor.* 22.16.36 (CCSL 143a.1118)). The phrase also occurs in Ps 115.11. Jerome reads *excessu* for the LXX, but *stupore* for the Hebrew. E.g. *Tract. de Ps.* 115.11 (CCSL 78.240-242) notes the Latin reading of the LXX; Jerome’s *versio latina ex Hebraeo* Ps 115.11 (ed. Fischer et al, 2.227). Fischer et al provide notes (2.228) for other witnesses to these versions. Of note is Ambrose, *De Ab.* 2.9.61 (PL 14.508/ CSEL 32.613-614), which explains that prophets attain an *excessus mentis* when the Holy Spirit inspires them. Note that the original context is Gn 15:12, in which Abraham falls into a fearful frenzy (*excessus...timor magnus*). Ambrose cites the same verse as *in pavore meo* at *Exp. Ps* 118.8.1 (CSEL 62.149). Cassiodorus summarizes the situation well: “they could not easily come to this realisation if they were not raised to heavenly contemplation in mental ecstasy...but we must note that the phrase *ecstasy of mind* can have also a bad sense, as in [2 Kings 29:8].” (Cassiodorus, *Exp. Ps.* 115.11 (CCSL 98.1042-1043; ACW 53.156-157).)

[*mentis excessu*], being in ecstasy, and hinted that he was referring to himself, when he said, ‘Whether we are beside ourselves [*mente excessimus*], for God, or in our right mind, for you, the charity of Christ constrains us’ (2 Cor 5:13-14).⁸⁵

It is important to note that in this treatment Augustine only provides the example of Paul as one who has achieved this state. Even at that, Augustine only briefly considers the case of Paul before returning to the accepted definition of fear:

What he means is “If we choose to do nothing else, and simply contemplate [*contemplari*] what we see when we are beside ourselves [*mentis excessu*], we would not be available to you, but would be... in heavenly things [so] as to seem uncaring about you...” You notice that Paul says, *Whether we are beside ourselves for God*, because God alone sees his own mystery and only he can reveal his secrets; we only see them in ecstasy. And the man who is speaking here is the one who testifies that he was seized and carried off to the third heaven, where he heard inexpressible words, which no human being may utter. [2 Cor 12:2-4]... If the title of our psalm refers to ecstasy like this, if it envisages this mode of being beside oneself, we must certainly expect its author to have weighty and profound things to say. The author is the prophet, but more truly the Holy Spirit who spoke through the prophet. But suppose “ecstasy” means fear? The text of our psalm will have plenty of relevance to this other meaning of the word.⁸⁶

There is some debate about whether Augustine thought that being “intent upon heavenly things” [*intentio ad superna*] to the point of *excessus mentis* was experienced by anyone

⁸⁵ Augustine, *En. Ps.* 30.2.2 (CCSL 38.191; WSA 3.15.321).

⁸⁶ Augustine, *En. Ps.* 30.2.2-3 (CCSL 38.191; WSA 3.15.321-322).

other Paul and, perhaps, Moses.⁸⁷ As I discuss below, Augustine treated this theme at length in another work. Earlier, he had described his own vision at Ostia in similar terms of experiencing the ultimate truth beyond human words, but did not use the phrase *excessus mentis*.⁸⁸ Since both he and his mother, Monica, shared that vision, and Augustine wrote for a broad audience, we know that Augustine thought such an experience was not limited to men, to clergy, or to monastics.⁸⁹ Still, teaching that contemplation is potentially open to many types of people is different from teaching that many actually achieve contemplation. Cassian and Gregory anticipate that Christians who practice asceticism will regularly progress to contemplative states.

Augustine treats Paul's vision of the third Heaven and Paradise (2 Cor 12:2-4) in his *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*. His analysis of this vision and the possible states of visions has a long legacy within Western mysticism. Nevertheless, ecstasies are something which, in Augustine's words, "rarely happen to the soul," and when they do, they even more rarely describe contemplation.⁹⁰ Augustine separates three kinds of visions; he calls them "bodily," "spiritual," and "intellectual." Bodily visions are the regular kinds of sense perceptions. Spiritual visions involve seeing images or likenesses of bodies, and can be difficult to distinguish from reality. Dreams, delusions, and ecstasies are all spiritual visions. Intellectual visions are those in which we understand something which has non-bodily existence. The example Augustine gives of an intellectual vision is virtue: we "understand" or "see" love, but not in the way of a dream

⁸⁷ Augustine, *Gn. litt.* 12.27.55-12.28.56, 12.34.67; E.C. Butler, *Western Mysticism*, 55-62. Peter and Moses are discussed in this context, though Augustine tends to subordinate Peter's vision as "spiritual" and not "intellectual."

⁸⁸ Augustine, *Conf.* 9.10.23-25.

⁸⁹ B. McGinn, *The Presence of God*, 1.237-238; E. TeSelle, "Augustine," 25.

⁹⁰ Augustine, *Gn. litt.* 12.18.40 (PL 34.470-471; WCA 1.13.485).

or the perception of a beloved thing. In discussing such visions, Augustine prefers to speak of the soul being rapt away (*rapere, abripere*), but he does occasionally use the term *ecstasi* to describe the states of both a spiritual and an intellectual vision.⁹¹

Augustine suggests that Moses and Paul might have experienced an intellectual ecstasy in their encounter with God, but the suggestion is tentative, and does not indicate the kind of experience regular Christians can expect. “Being weighted down by this mortal and perishable burden, we are strangers to this vision as long as *we are walking by faith and not by sight* (2 Cor 5:6-7), even when we are living just lives here.”⁹²

The linguistic point is fairly simple for Augustine: the Greek for *ecstasy* can be translated into Latin as *excessus mentis*, but this most often refers to the kind of fear which drives us out of minds. On the rare occasion that *excessus mentis* means contemplation of God, it indicates that someone like Paul or Moses has been transported out of this life and into Heaven by the grace of God. “The fundamental issue in Augustine’s mysticism is not ecstatic vision as such, but the purification of the affections that prepares for it in this life and grants it in the next.”⁹³ Augustine and Cassian do not differ about whether contemplation is joyful. Nor do they differ that, at least on certain occasions, contemplation can be described as ecstatic. They differ on whether ecstatic contemplation is a regular experience for the Christian ascetic. On this issue, Gregory follows Cassian, and not Augustine.

⁹¹ Cf. *Gn. litt.* 12.12.25 & 12.26.53 (PL 34.463 & 476).

⁹² Augustine, *Gn. litt.* 12.28.56 (PL 34.478; WSA 1.13.497). See R. Teske, "St. Augustine and the vision of God.

⁹³ B. McGinn, *The Presence of God*, 1.261.

CONCLUSION: THE ALMIGHTY HEARS MY DESIRE

Gregory's ascetic pneumatology reveals one of the principle concerns of Latin pneumatology in late antiquity: the shape and training of Christian desire. Commenting on Job 31:35, Gregory argues,

It should also be noted that by no means was it said "my prayers," but "the Almighty hears *my desire*." Indeed, a true request is not made with a voice that sounds in the ears, but in the thoughts of the heart. For the stronger voices in the most secret ears of God are not made with our words, but with our desires (*desideria*), for if we seek eternal life with the mouth, but we do not also desire it with our heart, we shout, but say nothing at all (*clamentes tacemus*). If, however, we desire from the heart, even though we fall silent with the mouth, we shout silently (*tacentes clamamus*).⁹⁴

In order to tame the inner landscape of thoughts and desires, Gregory taught that Christians must practice asceticism: fasts, vigils, frequent participation in the sacraments, and prayerful reading of Scripture are all ways in which Christians can engage the Holy Spirit in an interior conversation that reorders their priorities. This conversation becomes a dialogue of desire in which the Holy Spirit is at once the teacher of appropriate desire, the inspiration of prayerful desires, and the divine agent who responds to human desire.

The theologians I have studied here were not the first Christians to reflect on the need for transformation in holiness. A story recorded from the desert fathers, the generation of monastic teachers whom Cassian revered, expresses this desire well.

Abba Lot went to Abba Joseph and said, "Abba, as far as I can I say my little rule of prayer, I fast a little, I pray and meditate, I live in peace and as far as I can, I purify my

⁹⁴ *Mor.* 22.17.43 (CCSL 143a.1122-1123; my trans.). Cf. *Mor.* 2.7.11.

thoughts. What else can I do?” Then the old man stood up and stretched his hands towards heaven. His fingers became like ten lamps of fire and he said to him, “If you will, you can become all flame.”⁹⁵

Christians want to become completely inflamed by God’s presence. Christians want not only to do good, but to be good. Christians want their very desire to burn for God so that their whole life is oriented toward God and consumed by love for God. Those Christians like Abbas Lot and Joseph in the 4th century Egyptian deserts developed particular practices to accomplish this goal. Later Christians followed these ascetical systems and added something particular to their exploration of how to shape desire; they added a pneumatology. Cassian was pivotal in synthesizing ascetic systems he knew from his time with the desert fathers and in “updating” them with Catholic Nicene pneumatology. Latin theologians after him, though not directly conversant with the desert tradition, continued to explore ways in which pneumatology could explain various aspects of the reformation of desire. They applied pneumatology to theological anthropology.

For Cassian, this study of the reformation of desire took the form of a grand synthesis of intellect- and heart-centered ascetic systems in which the Holy Spirit is the guide for reading Scripture, the former of virtues, the reformer of affections, the reformer of thoughts, and the giver of ecstatic contemplation. Cassian’s anthropology explored human interiority primarily in terms of thoughts and desires. Correlatively, the Holy Spirit’s role is primarily the divine agent who reforms human thoughts and desires. For Leo, this took the form of encouraging the laity to fast, pray, give alms, and participate in the sacraments and the liturgy. His structure for how the Holy Spirit reforms the inner

⁹⁵ *AP* Joseph of Panephrisis, 6 (PL 73.942; CS 59.103).

lives of Christians involves regular ascetic and liturgical practices appropriate to the laity. For Prosper, this project took the form of a close analysis of the human will and its stages of development. The human will is led by the Holy Spirit to the heights of holiness. For John Maxentius and the Scythian monks, this took the form of the Spirit's involvement in calling all peoples to salvation, providing the source of faith, strengthening the weakened human will, inspiring growth in virtue, and bringing the faithful to salvation. That is, for the Scythians, pneumatology answered many of the contentious issues involved in the controversy over predestination. Caesarius led Gallic bishops to support this pneumatology, but only after having engaged Arian theories of subordination. In this mode of pneumatological reflection, Caesarius followed his Lérinian monastic brethren in defending Catholic Nicene Trinitarianism. For Fulgentius, the interest in reformation of desire took many of the same forms as it did for the Scythians. They exchanged letters with detailed discussions of these issues. Fulgentius, however, was able to connect these issues deeply to his Christology and his Trinitarian theology. He used the basic principle that the Spirit is the love between Father and Son, the love between Christians and God, and the love between Christians and other humans to connect his Trinitarian theology and his theological anthropology. Additionally, Fulgentius was able to articulate roles for the Holy Spirit in the life of the Incarnate Christ that help to explain roles for the Holy Spirit in the lives of other humans. The relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Incarnate Christ models the relationship between the Spirit and other Christians. For Gregory, reformation of desire took center stage. He supplements Cassian's system with many of Augustine's insights. Gregory teaches that the Holy Spirit engages Christians in a

dialogue of desire in which ascetic practices move Christians through virtue to understanding the depths of Scripture and into ecstatic contemplation.

The same investigation of the focus of Latin pneumatology on the reformation of desire has revealed much about the early reception of Augustine. Augustine's contributions to pneumatology and anthropology are so extensive that few, if any, theologians were able to master all of them. Gregory's understanding of the Holy Spirit as the divine agent of reform in human lives draws heavily on both Augustine and Cassian. Gregory's language is saturated with Augustinian phrases and insights which he weds to a basic ascetical theory that springs from Cassian's synthesis of intellect- and heart-centered understandings of human existence. Gregory was not the only theologian to reflect on the works of Augustine in order to answer pneumatological questions. Fulgentius, too, engaged Augustine's theology deeply in the context of multiple issues: the reformation of desire, responses to Arian Trinitarian theology, and responses to Nestorian Christology. Fulgentius demonstrates a profound understanding of Augustine's theology. While one of the champions of the Lérinian monks, Caesarius of Arles, presided at the council of Orange in 529, the Augustinian pneumatology employed at the council comes from two independent sources. On the one, hand we see the Augustinianism of the Scythian monks which engaged Pelagianism and Nestorianism. On the other hand, we have the Augustinianism of Prosper of Aquitaine, who used Augustine's theology in response to Pelagianism and predestination. The Scythian monks outlined a role for the Holy Spirit in every aspect of the controversy over predestination, including motivation to perform good actions and perfect virtue; Prosper directly addressed the reformation of the will, creating a hierarchy of the stages of the relationship

between the Holy Spirit and the human will. In their own ways, both relied on the Holy Spirit as the divine agent who reforms human interiority. The Lérinian theologians, like Caesarius and Faustus of Riez, were otherwise interested in defending what they took to be Catholic Trinitarianism. Their brand of Augustinianism differs from that of Prosper and Fulgentius on account of their interests and their limited use of Augustine's theology. Augustine's theology was employed in various contexts by different schools of theologians to such an extent that we can say there were multiple "Augustinianisms" already in the decades that followed Augustine's death. These schools were delimited not only by their interests, but also by their use of Augustine's texts. Context determined the extent to which various Augustinian theologians engaged different aspects of Augustine's thought just as context determined to which issues various theologians applied their pneumatology.

Modern scholars of 5th and 6th century Latin pneumatology have focused on the development and justification of the doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Spirit, the *filioque*. Such an investigation is important, especially in the ecumenical efforts between modern Orthodoxy and Catholicism. Nevertheless, such an investigation can implicitly ignore other significant pneumatological conversations. I have tried to show here that Latin pneumatology of the 5th and 6th centuries is concerned with other sets of questions. The *filioque* finds much support in the theologians I have considered, as do various understandings of the processions and missions of the Trinitarian persons.⁹⁶ At the same time, these theologians were more concerned with questions about growth in the Christian life of holiness than they were interested in developing what came to be a

⁹⁶ On the *filioque* in the theologians considered here, see Bliss, *Morals on Job*, 3.359-360; A.E. Sicienski, *The Filioque*, 51-71; H.B. Swete, *The Procession of the Holy Spirit*. See also, my Introduction, p. vi n. 9.

creedal formula. Many of the important questions revolved around the personal growth and transcendence that is brought about through the interaction of God and humanity. Many of the answers were illuminated by Catholic Nicene pneumatology. Latin theologians of the 5th and 6th centuries developed pneumatologies that fit with Scripture and their understanding of theological anthropology. In their doctrinal commitments, they relied on 4th century statements about the divinity of the Holy Spirit. In their exploration of the intersection between pneumatology and anthropology, they came to new precision about the Holy Spirit as the divine agent who reforms human desire. Latin pneumatology of the 5th and 6th centuries was deeply concerned with articulating ways of life that bring about transformation; it was concerned with Christian formation in virtue and holiness. Whether theologians thought this was best accomplished by fasting, by vigils, by baptism and the Eucharist, by meditating on Scripture, or by contemplation, they agreed that the Holy Spirit reforms humans from within. They studied how the Holy Spirit reforms human cognition and motivation; they studied how the Holy Spirit teaches “that they may learn what they desire.”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

AP. *Apophthegmata Patrum (The Sayings of the Desert Fathers)*
PG 65.71-440; trans. Benedicta Ward in CS 59.

Brev. fid. *Breviarum fidei adversus arianos haereticos (Breviary of Faith against the Arian Heretics)*
Morin 2 (attributed to Caesarius), PL 13.653-672 (anonymous), PL 103 (attributed to Benedict Anianenesis).

Cap. S. Aug. *Capitula Sancti Augustini in urbem Romam transmissa (Chapters of Saint Augustine transmitted in the city of Rome)*
ed. Glorie in CCSL 85a.251-273.

Conc. Gal. *(Gallic Councils)*
ed. C. Munier in CCSL 148-148a; trans. J. Patout Burns in *Theological Anthropology*, 109-128 (translates the council of Orange).

Const. Ap. *(Apostolic Constitutions)*
ed. Marcel Metzger in SC 320, 329, & 336; ANF 7.

Didasc. ap. Syr. *Didascalia Apostolorum Syriace (The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac)*
CSCO 407.

Op. Imp. in Mt. *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaëum (Incomplete Work on Matthew)*
ed. J. van Banning in CCSL 87b.

Trin. et unit. *de Trinitate et unitate Dei (On the Trinity and Unity of God)*
PL 42.1193-1200.

v. Fulg. *vita Fulgentii (Life of Fulgentius)*
Lapeyre; trans. R. Eno in FOTC 95.4-56.

V. pat. jur. *Vitae patrum Jurensium (Lives of the Jura Fathers)*
SC 142; CS 178.

Vies Pach. Sah. *S. Pachomii vitae sahidice scriptae (Sahidic Life of Pachomius)*
ed. L. T. Lefort in CSCO 99-100; trans. Armand Veilleux in CS 45.

Ambrose

De Ab. De Abraham (On Abraham)

ed. C. Schenkl in CSEL 32.1.501-638, also PL 14.

de fide. de fide (On the Faith (Against Gratian))

ed. Otto Faller in CSEL 78.3-307.

Ep. Epistulae (Letters)

ed. Otto Faller in CSEL 82.1 & ed. Zelzer CSEL 82.2-3.

Exam. Exameron (Hexameron)

ed. C. Schenkl in CSEL 32.1.3-261, also PL 14.

Exp. Ev. Lc. Expositio Evangelii Secundum Lucam (Exposition on the Gospel of Luke)

ed. Marcus Adriaen in CCSL 14.

Exp. Ps. 118. Expositio Psalmi CXVIII (Exposition of Psalm 118)

ed. Michael Petschenig in CSEL 62.

Spir. De spiritu sancto (On the Holy Spirit)

ed. Otto Faller in CSEL 79.7-222; trans. Roy Deferrari in FOTC 44.

Ammonas

Ep. Epistolé (Letters)

PO 11.432-454; French translation by A. Vasiliev provided in PO.

Antony

Ep. (Epistulae) (Letters)

PG 40.977-1000; trans. Derwas Chitty in.

Arnobius Iunior

c. cum. Ser. conflictus cum Serapione (Conflict with Serapion)

ed. Klaus-D Daur in CCSL 25a.43-173.

in Ps. Commentarii in Psalmos (Commentary on the Psalms)

ed. Klaus-D Daur in CCSL 25.3-258.

praed. Praedestinatus (Predestined)

ed. F. Gori in CCSL 25b.8-56.

Athanasius

Serap. (Letter to Serapion)

PG 26; trans. C.R.B. Shapland in.

Athanasius (dubious)

De Incarn. c. Arianos. peri tes ensarkou epiphaneias tou theou logou kai kata areianon (de incarnatione de verbi et contra arianos) (On the Incarnation of the Word of God and Against the Arians)

PG 26.983-1028.

De sanc. trin. (On the Holy Trinity)

PG 28.

Athanasius (spurius)

Q. al. tines epôtêseis (Quaestiones aliae) (Various Questions)

PG 28.773-796.

qeum. pol. pros tiva politikon (ad quemdam politicum) (On politics)

PG 28.1395ff.

Serm. in annun. Kêrunktikon eis tun euaggelismôn tês huperagias despoinês hemôn thetokou (Sermo in annuntiationem sanctissimae dominae nostrae deiparae) (Sermon on the Annunciation of our most holy Lord to the Theotokos)

PG 28.917ff.

Augustine

c. Faust. Contra Faustum Manicheum (Against Faustus, a Manichee)

ed. J Zycha in CSEL 25.251-797, also PL 42; WSA I/20, also NPNF 1.4.

c. Jul. Contra Julianum (Answer to Julian (Against Julian))

PL 44; trans. Roland Teske in WSA I/24, FOTC 35.

c. Jul. imp. Contra Julianum opus imperfectum (Against Julian, an Unfinished Book)

PL 45, and books 1-3 in CSEL 85.1; WSA I/25.

civ. Dei. De civitate Dei (The City of God)

ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb in CCSL 47-48; trans. Marcus Dods in Modern Library.

Conf. Confessiones (Confessions)

ed. L. Verheijen in CCSL 27, also CSEL 33, PL 32; trans. Henry Chadwick in World's Classics.

cons. Ev. De consensu evangelistarum (On the Agreement among the Evangelists)

CSEL 43, also PL 34; WSA 1.15, also NPNF 1.6.

cons. Ev. de consensu Evangelistarum (The Harmony of the Gospels)

CSEL 43, PL 34; trans. Roland Teske in WSA I/15, NPNF 1.6.

corr. et gr. de correptione et gratia (On Rebuke and Grace)
PL 44; trans. Roland Teske in WSA I/26, also NPNF 1.5.

doc. Chr. De doctrina Christiana (On Christian Teaching)
ed. J. Martin in CSEL 80; trans. R.P. Green in OWC.

En. Ps. Enarratio in Psalmos (Exposition of the Psalms)
ed. Éloi Dekkers and J. Fraipont in CCSL 38-40; trans. Maria Boulding in WSA III/15-20.

ench. (Faith, Hope and Charity)
ed. E. Evans in CCSL 46.49-114; trans. Louis A. Arand in ACW 3.

Ep. Epistulae (Letters)
ed. A. Goldbacher in CSEL 34.1, 34.2, 44, 57, 58, also CCSL 31-31a; WSA II/1-2.4 (complete), also NPNF 1.1 (select letters).

f. et symb. De fide et symbolo (On Faith and the Creed)
ed. J Zycha in CSEL 41.3-32, also PL 40; WSA I/8, also in FOTC 27, NPNF 1.3.

Gn. adv. Man. De Genesi adversus Manicheos (On Genesis Against the Manichees)
CSEL 91, PL 34; trans. Roland Teske in FOTC 84.

Gn. litt. De Genesis ad litteram (On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis)
ed. J Zycha in CSEL 28.1, PL 34; trans. Edmund Hill and John Rotelle in WSA I/13, also FOTC 84, ACW 41-42.

Io. ev. tr. (Tractates on the Gospel of John)
ed. D. Radbodus Willems in CCSL 36, also PL 35; trans. J. Rettig in FOTC 78-79, 88, 92, also NPNF 1.4, & WSA III/12.

lib. arb. De libero arbitrio (On Free Will)
ed. W.M. Green in CCSL 29.211-321, also CSEL 74 & PL 32; WSA 1/3, also ACW 22 & Williams, *Earlier Writings*.

ord. De ordine (Divine Providence and the Problem of Evil)
ed. W.M. Green in CCSL 29.89-137, also CSEL 36 & PL 32; FOTC 5.

persev. de dono perseverantiae (On the Gift of Perseverance)
PL 45.933-1034; WSA I/26, also NPNF 1.5 & FOTC 86.

praed. sanct. de praedestinatione sanctorum (On the Predestination of the Saints)
PL 44.959-992; WSA I/26, also FOTC 86 & NPNF 1.5.

quant. de animae quantitate (The Greatness of the Soul)

ed. W. Hörmann in CSEL 89.131-231, also PL 32; trans. Joseph M. Colleran in ACW 9.

retract.retractationes (Revisions)

ed. A. Mutzenbecher in CCSL 57; trans. Boniface Ramsey in WSA I/2.

s. Sermones (Sermons)

ed. C. Lambot in CCSL 41-41b, also PL 38-39; trans. Edmund Hill in WSA III/6, also FOTC 38.

Simpl. Ad Simplicianum (To Simplicianus)

CCSL 44, also PL 40; WSA I/12.

Spec. Speculum (The Mirror)

ed. F. Wehrich in CSEL 12, also PL 34; WSA I/17.

Trin. De Trinitate (The Trinity)

ed. W. J. Mountain in CCSL 50-50a; trans. Stephen McKenna in FOTC 45.

Basil of Caesarea

De sp. sanc. (On the Holy Spirit)

PG 32; trans. David Anderson in SVS.

Ep. Epistolai (Epistolae) (Letters)

PG 32; LCL190, 215, 243, & 270.

Mor. archê tôn êthikôn (Initium Moraliū) (The Morals)

PG 31.699-870; trans. Monica Wagner in FOTC 9.71-205.

Reg. brev. tract. (Shorter Tractate of Rules)

PG 79.

reg. fus. tract.; trans. Monica Wagner in FOTC 9.

Benedict of Nursia

RB. Regula Sancti Benedicti (Rule of Benedict)

ed. Timothy Fry in RB 1980, with English translation and notes.

Boniface II

Ep. Epistulae (Letters)

ed. C. de Clercq in CCSL 148a, also excerpts in CCSL 148.

Caesarius

de grat. de gratia (On Grace)

ed. Germain Morin in *Opera Omnia* 2; trans. Francis Gumerlock in *Fulgentius of Ruspe*, 161-166.

De myst. s. Trin. de mysterio sanctae trinitatae (The Mystery of the Sacred Trinity)

ed. Germain Morin in *Opera Omnia*, vol. 2.

Exp. Apoc. Expositio in Apocalypsim (Exposition on the Book of Revelation)

ed. Germain Morin in *Opera Omnia*, vol. 2.210-277.

Serm. Sermones (Sermons)

ed. Germain Morin in CCSL 103-104, also SC 175, 243, & 447; trans. Mueller in FOTC 31, 47, & 66.

Cassian

Coll. Collationes (The Conferences)

ed. J. Dillon W. Burghardt in CSEL 13; SC 42, 54, 64; trans. Boniface Ramsey O.P. in ACW 57.

De incarn. De incarnatione (On the Incarnation)

ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace in CSEL 17, also PL 50; NPNF 2.11.

Inst. Institutiones (The Institutes)

ed. J. Dillon W. Burghardt in CSEL 17; SC 109; trans. Boniface Ramsey O.P. in ACW 58.

Cassiodorus

Exp. Ps. (Explanation of the Psalms)

ed. Marcus Adriaen in CCSL 97-98; trans. P. G. Walsh in ACW 51-53.

Chromatius of Aquileia

Serm. Sermones (Sermons)

ed. J. Lemarié in CCSL 9a.3-182.

Tract. in Ev. Mt. Tractates in Evangelium Matt. (Tractates on the Gospel of Matthew)

ed. J. Lemarié and R. Étaix in CCSL 9a.185-489, 9 supp. 624-636; also SC 154.

Cyprian of Carthage

de dom. orat. de dominica oratione (On the Lord's Prayer)

CCSL 3a.90-113; FoC 36.

Ep. Episutalae (Letters)

ed. G.F. Diercks in CCSL 3b-c.

Cyprianus

v. Caesarii. vita Caesarii (Life of Caesarius)
ed. G. Morin in Morin 2; trans. W. Klingshirn in TTH 19.

Didymus the Blind

Comm. Zech. Eis ton Zaxarian (Commentary on Zechariah)
SC 83-85.

Spir. De spiritu sancto (On the Holy Spirit)
PG 39, also SC 386 (ed. L. Doutreleau); trans. Mark DelCogliano, Andrew Radde-Gallwitz and Lewis Ayres in SVS (forthcoming).

Trin. (On the Trinity)
PG 39; no English translation.

Dioscorus

Suggestio ad Horm. Suggestio ad Hormisdam Papam (Brief for Pope Hormisdas)
PL 63.478-479.

Eucherius of Lyons

de laud. herem. Epistula de laude heremi (In Praise of the Desert)
CSEL 31; CS 178.

Inst. ad Sal. Instructionem ad Salonium (Instruction to Salonius)
CCSL 66.

Eugippius

Ep. ad Proba. Epistula ad Probam virginem (Letter to Proba (preface to Excerpts))
CSEL 9.1.1-4, PL 62; trans. Abigail Kathleen Gometz in *Eugippius of Lucullanum*, 86-99 (with commentary).

Eug. reg. Eugippii regula (Rule of Eugippius)
CSEL 87.

thes. ex s. Aug. thesaurus ex sancti Augustini operibus (Treasures from the Works of Saint Augustine)
ed. Pius Knoell in CSEL 9.1.34-1100, also PL 62.

v. s. Severini. vita sancti Severini (Life of Saint Severin)
CSEL 9.2; trans. Ludwig Bieler in FOTC 55.

Eusebius Gallicanus

Hom. Collectio homiliarum (Homilies)
ed. Glorié in CCSL 101-101b.

Eusebius of Caesaria

Comm. Ps. eis tas epigraphas ton psalmon (in psalorum inscriptiones)
(Commentary on the Psalms)
 PG 23.66-1396.

Evagrius Ponticus

Ep. fid. Peri pisteôs (Letter on the Faith (also Basil, Ep 8, and Evagrius, Ep 63))
 Bunge, *Evagrius Pontikos Briefe aus der Wüste* (Trier, 1986); trans. Augustine Casiday in OECS, also LCL 190.

Ep. Mel. Epistula ad Melaniam (Great Letter or Letter to Melania)
 Frankenberg (1912) and Vitestam (1964); trans. Augustine Casiday in Early Church Fathers.

Eul. (To Eulogios: On the Confession of Thoughts and Counsel in their Regard)
 PG 79, Sinkewicz appendix 2; trans. Robert E. Sinkewicz in OECS.

Gn. Gnostikos SC 356.

In Prov. Scholia eis tas paroimias (scholia in proverbias) (Scholia on Proverbs)
 SC 340.

In Ps. Scholia in Psalmos (Scholia on the Psalms)
 PG12, Rondeau "Le commentaire sur les Psaumes d'Évagre le Pontique," *OCP* 26 (1960); 307-348; Dysinger, *Psalmody and Prayer* (partial trans.).

KG. (Kephalaia Gnostika)
 PO 28.1; trans. A. Guillaumont in.

Mal. Cog. Peri Logismon (de diversis malignis cogitationibus) (On Thoughts)
 SC 438, PG 40.1271-1273; trans. Robert E. Sinkewicz in OECS.

Mn. Sententiae ad monachos (To Monks in Monasteries and Communities)
 (ed) H. Gressmann, 'Nonnenspiegel und Mönchsspiegel des Evagrius Pontikos,' *Texte und Untersuchungen* 39:4 (1913); 143-165; trans. Robert E. Sinkewicz in OECS.

O. Sp. tractatus de octo spiritibus malitiae (On the Eight Thoughts)
 PG 79.1145-1164, Muyltermans (1939); trans. Robert E. Sinkewicz in OECS.

Or. de oratione tractatus (Chapters on Prayer, also Philokalia 1.176-189)
 PG 79.1165-1200; trans. Robert E. Sinkewicz in OECS, als in CS 4.

Prak. Praktikos (The Monk: a Treatise on the Practical Life)
SC 170-171; trans. Robert E. Sinkewicz in OECS, also CS 4.

Faustus

de grat. de gratia Dei et libero arbitrio (On the Grace of God and Free Will)

CSEL 21, also PL 58; selections translated in T. Smith.

Spir. de spiritu sancto (On the Holy Spirit)

CSEL 21, also PL 58.

Faustus of Riez

de sp. sanct. de spiritu sancto CSEL 12, PL 58.

Fulgentius

ad Mon. (To Monimus)

ed. J. Fraipont in CCSL 91.1-64; trans. Eno in FOTC 95.

ad Pet. de fide. (To Peter on the Faith)

CCSL 91; trans. Eno in FOTC 95.

c. Fab. frag. (Contra Fabianum fragmenta)

CCSL 91A.

c. serm. Fast. Ar. contra sermonem Fastidiosi Ariani (Against the Sermon of the Arian Fastidiosus)

CCSL 91; trans. R. Eno in FOTC 95.

de ver. praed. de veritate praedestinationis et gratiae (On the Truth of Predestination and Grace)

ed. J. Fraipont in CCSL 91a.458-548.

Ep. Epistulae (Letters)

CCSL 91-91a; trans. Eno in FOTC 95 (letters 1-14); SC 487 (letters 1-7).

Gaudentius of Brescia

Tract. Tractates (Sermons)

ed. A. Glück in CSEL 68, also PL 20.

Gennadius

scrip. ecc. Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis (Book Concerning Ecclesial Authors)

PL 58.1059-1120.

Gregory

Dial. Dialogi (Dialogues)

Moricca, A. de Vogüé & P. Antin SC 251, 260, & 265; trans. Zimmerman in FOTC 39.

Dial. 2. Dial. 2 (The Life of St. Benedict)

SC 260; trans. H. Costello & E. de Bhaldraithe in *The Life of St. Benedict* (St. Bede's; 1993).

Exp. Cant. expositio super Cantica Canticorum (Exposition on the Song of Songs)

CCSL 144; trans. Mark DelCogliano in CS (forthcoming).

Hom. Ev. (Forty Gospel Homilies)

CCSL 141; trans. David Hurst in CS 123.

Hom. Ez. (The Homilies of St. Gregory the Great on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel)

SC 327; trans. Theodosia Tomkinson in.

In I Reg. In Librum Primum Regum Expositionum Libri VI (Exposition on the First Book of Kings)

ed. Pierre-Patrick Verbraken in CCSL 144; trans. Adalbert de Vogüé in SC 351, 391, 432, 449, 469, & 482.

Reg. Past. Regula Pastoralis (Pastoral Care)

PL 77; trans. Henry Davis in ACW 11.

Gregory of Elvira

Tract. Orig. de s.s. Tractatus Origenis de lib. sanc. scrip. (Sayings of Origen Concerning the Books of Holy Scripture)

CCSL 69.

Gregory of Nazianzus

Ep. Epistulae (Letters)

PG 37; SC 208.

Gregory of Tours

HF. (History of the Franks)

Collection de textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire; trans. Lewis Thorpe in PC.

Hormisdas

Ep. Epistulae (Letters)

CSEL 35.2; PL 63.

Jerome

Altercatio. Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi (Altercation with the Luciferians and Orthodox)

CCSL 79b, also PL 23.155-182.

Comm. Ephes. Commentarium in Epistola Paulina ad Ephesios (Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians)

PL 26; trans. Ronald E. Heine in.

Comm. Esaiam. Commentariorum in Esaiam (Commentary on Isaiah)

CCSL 73-73a.

Ep. Epistulae (Letters)

CSEL 54-56, also PL 22.

in Hier. proph. In Hieremaïam Prophetam (On the Prophet Jeremiah)

ed. S. Reiter in CCSL 74.1-347.

Tract. de Ps. Tractatus de Psalmos (Commentary on the Psalms)

CCSL 78.

John Maxentius

dial. c. Nest. dialogus contra Nestorianos (Dialogue Against the Nestorians)

CCSL 85a.51-110.

lib. fid. Libellus Fidei (Booklet on the Faith)

CSEL 85a.5-25.

Max. cap. Capitula edita contra Nestorianos et Pelagianos ad satisfactionem fratrum (Chapters against Nestorians and Pelagians)

CSEL 85a.29-30; Gumerlock, *Fulgentius of Ruspe*, 155-157.

John the Deacon

Vita Greg. (The Life of Gregory)

PL.

Leo the Great

Ep. Epistulae (Letters)

ed. Quesnell in PL 54; FOTC 34.

Tract. Tractates (Sermons)

CCSL 138-138a, also PL 54 & SC 74; FOTC 93.

Maximus of Turin

Serm. Sermones (The sermons of St. Maximus of Turin)

CCSL 23; trans. Boniface Ramsey in ACW 50.

Nestorius

Ep. (Epistulae) (Letters)

ACO 1 (vol 1 provides the Greek, vols 2-5 provide various Latin translations);
Loofs, *Nestoriana*; *Ep.* 2-3 trans. by M. DelCogliano (unpublished).

Nilus of Ancyra

De monach. praest. (De monachorum praestantia) (On the excellency of monks)

PG 79.

Origen

Comm. Cant. Commentarium in canticum canticorum (Commentary on the Song of Songs)

(Lat. trans. by Rufinus) SC 375-376; trans. R.P. Lawson in ACW 26.

Comm. Rom. Commentarii in epistolam ad Romanos (Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans)

PG 14, critical edition in *Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel* 16, 33, 34 (ed. C.P. Hammond Bammel); trans. Thomas P. Scheck in FoC 103.

De prin. Peri Archon (De Principiis)

ed. P. Schaff in SC 252-253, 268-269, 312; ANF 4.

Hom. Cant. (Homilies on the Song of Songs)

(Lat. trans. by Jerome) SC 37; ACW 26.

Hom. Gen. (Latin trans. Rufinus) (Homilies on Genesis)

SC 7 bis.

in Jn. Ton eis to kata Joannên euaggelion exêgêtikon (Commentary (and Fragments) on John)

GCS Origenes Werke 4; trans. Ronald E. Heine in FOTC 80 & 89.

In Lev. Hom. (Lat. trans. Rufinus) (Homilies on Leviticus)

SC 286-287; trans. Gary Wayne Barkley in FOTC 83.

in Lk. Homilia in Lucam, Fragmenta in Lucam (Homilies and Fragments on Luke)

SC 87, GCS Origenes Werke 9; trans. Joseph T. Lienhard in FOTC 94.

Palladius

Dial. vit. Chrys. Dialogus de vita sancti Joannis Chrysostomi (Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom)

Coleman-Norton (1928); ACW 45.

HL. Historia Lausiaca (Lausiac History)
Butler (1967); trans. Robert Meyer in ACW 34.

Plato

Phaedrus. (Phaedrus)
Platonis Opera, ed. Burnet; LCL 1; *Complete Works*, ed. Cooper.

Prosper of Aquitaine

c. coll. c. coll. (On Grace and Free Will Against the Conferencer)
PL 51; FOTC 7, also ACW 32.

Ep. ad Augustinum. Epistula ad Augustinum (Letter to Augustine)
CSEL 57 ACW 32, also (apud Augustine) FOTC 32.

Ep. ad Ruf. Epistula ad Rufinum (Letter to Rufinus)
PL 51.77-90; ACW 32.

gr. et lib. arb. de gratia dei et libero voluntatis arbitrio (On the Grace of God and the Free Choice of the Will)
PL 51.205-212.

Sent. Liber Sententiarum (Book of Sentences)
ed. M. Gastaldo in CCSL 68a.257-365.

voc. om. gen. de vocatione omnium gentium (The Call of All Nations)
CCSL 47; trans. P. de Letter in ACW 14.

Quodvultdeus

c. Iud. pag. et Ar. contra Iudaeos, paganos et Arianos (Against the Jews, Pagans, and Arians)
CCSL 60.

Lib. prom. et praed. Liber promissionum et praedictorum Dei (Book of Promises and Predictions)
ed. René Braun in CCSL 60.11-223.

Serm. (The Creedal Homilies)
CCSL 60, also PL 40; trans. Thomas M. Finn in ACW 60.

Scythian Monks

disp. 12 cap. disputatio XII capitulorum (Disputation of the 12 Chapters of Cyril of Alexandria with the sayings of Nestorius against the Anathemas)
CCSL 95a.195-213.

Ep. ad episc. Epistula ad episcopos (Letter to the Bishops)
CCSL 85a.157-172; McGuckin, "Theopaschite Confession".

ref. Nest. dict. refutatio Nestorii dictorum (Refutation of of the Sayings of Nestorius)

CCSL 85a.214-224, PL 48.924-932.

Simplicius

Ep. Epistulae (Letters)

CSEL 35.1.

Sulpicius Severus

chron. Chronicorum Libri II (Chronicals)

CSEL 1.3-105.

v. s. Martini. Vita Sancti Martini (Life of Saint Martin)

PL 20; FOTC 7.

Tertullian

Praescr. de praescriptione haereticorum (Prescription against the Heretics)

CCSL 1.

Secondary Sources

Abel, M., "Le *Praedestinatus* et le pélagianisme," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 35 (1968): 5-25.

Alexe, Stefan C., "Le discernement selon Saint Jean Cassien," *Studia Patristica* 30 (1997): 129-135.

Anatolios, Khaled, *Athanasius, The early church fathers*, (London ; New York: Routledge, 2004).

-----, *Athanasius: the Coherence of his Thought*, (London ; New York: Routledge, 1998).

Ayres, Lewis, *Augustine and the Trinity*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

-----, "Into the Cloud of Witnesses: Latin Trinitarian theology beyond its modern 'revivals'," in *Rethinking Trinitarian Theology*, ed. Robert Wozniak, (New York: Continuum, forthcoming).

-----, "'It's not for eatin' - it's for lookin' through': *memoria, intellegentia, voluntas* and the argument of Augustine's *De Trinitate IX-X*," in *The Mystery of the Holy Trinity in the Fathers of the Church: the Proceedings of the Fourth Patristic Conference, Maynooth, 1999*, ed. Vincent Twomey and Lewis Ayres, (Dublin, Ireland ; Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2007), 37-64.

- , *Nicaea and its Legacy: an Approach to Fourth-century Trinitarian Theology*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- , "Sempiternae Spiritus Donum: Augustine's Pneumatology and the Metaphysics of Spirit," in *Orthodox Readings of Augustine*, ed. George E. Demacopoulos and Aristotle Papanikolaou, (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2008), 127-152.
- Ayres, Lewis, and Michel R. Barnes, "Pneumatology: historical and methodological considerations," *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 163-236.
- Ayres, Lewis, and Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, "Doctrine of God," in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, ed. Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David G. Hunter, (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 864-885.
- Baasten, Matthew, *Pride According to Gregory the Great : a Study of the Moralia*, Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, (Lewiston, N.Y.: E. Mellen Press, 1986).
- Babcock, William, "Caritas and signification in *De doctrina Christiana* 1-3," in *De doctrina Christiana : a classic of Western culture*, ed. Duane W. H. Arnold and Pamela Bright, (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 145-163.
- Badilita, Cristian, and Attila Jakab, eds. *Jean Cassien entre l'orient et l'occident: actes du colloque international organisé par le New Europe College en collaboration avec la Ludwig Boltzman Gesellschaft, Bucarest, 27-28 septembre 2001*, (Paris: Beauchesne & Polirom, 2003).
- Bamberger, John Eudes, *The praktikos: chapters on prayer*, Cistercian studies series, (Spencer, Mass.: Cistercian Publications, 1970).
- Barclift, Philip L., "Leo on Predestination," *Church History* 62.1 (1993): 5-21.
- , "Pope Leo's Soteriology: Sacramental Recapitulation," Ph.D. dissertation, Marquette University, 1992.
- , "The shifting tones of Pope Leo the Great's Christological vocabulary," *Church History* 66.2 (1997): 221-239.
- Bardy, Gustave, *Didyme l'aveugle*, xi, 279 p. ; 24 cm. vols., Études de Théologie Historique 1, (Paris: G. Beauchense, 1910).
- Barnes, Michel R., and Daniel H. Williams, *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, (Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1993).

- Becker, Gustav Heinrich, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui*, (Bonnae: M. Cohen et filium, 1885).
- Bélangier, Rodrigue, "Anthropologie et Parole de Dieu dans le commentaire de Grégoire le Grand sur le Cantique des Cantiques," in *Grégoire le Grand*, ed. R. Gillet J. Fontaine, & S. Pellistrandi, (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1986), 245-254.
- , "La dialectique Parole-Chair dans la christologie de Grégoire le Grand," in *Gregory the Great : a Symposium*, ed. John Cavadini, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995), 82-93.
- Benedict, *RB 1980: the Rule of St. Benedict in Latin and English with Notes*, Edited by Timothy Fry, (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1981).
- Béraudy, Roger, "Initiation chrétienne," in *L'Église en Prière*, ed. Aimé Georges Martimort and Roger Béraudy, (Paris ; New York: Desclée, 1965), 528-584.
- Bertrand, D., *Césaire d'Arles et la Christianisation de la Provence: actes des journées "Césaire" (Aix-en-Provence - Arles - Lérins, 3-5 novembre, 22 avril 1989)*, Initiations aux Pères de l'Eglise, (Lyon & Paris: Institut des Sources chrétiennes les Editions du Cerf, 1994).
- Biffi, Inos, and Pietro Re, "La cincquantina pasquale nella predicazione di S. Massimo," *Ambrosio* 40 (1964): 324-333.
- Bliss, James, and Gregory the Great, *Morals on the Book of Job*, trans. J. Bliss, Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, (Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1844).
- Bochet, Isabelle, *Le Firmament de l'Écriture: L'herméneutique Augustinienne*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2004).
- Boesch Gajano, Sofia, ed. *Gregorio Magno: alle Origini del Medioevo*, Sacro/santo. Nuova serie, (Roma: Viella, 2004).
- , *Gregorio Magno: alle origini del Medioevo*, Sacro/santo. Nuova serie, (Roma: Viella, 2004).
- Bonner, Gerald, "Augustine's Understanding of the Church as a Eucharistic Community," in *Saint Augustine the Bishop, a book of essays*, ed. F. LeMoine & C. Kleinhenz, 9, (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1994), 39-63.
- , "Augustine and Pelagianism," *Augustinian Studies* 24 (1993): 27-49.
- , "Pelagianism and Augustine," *Augustinian Studies* 23 (1992): 33-51.

- , *St Augustine of Hippo: life and controversies*, 3rd edition, (Norwich: Canterbury, 2002).
- Bouhot, Jean-Paul, "La transmission d'Hippone à Rome des oeuvres de saint Augustin," in *Du Copiste au Collectionneur*, ed. Donatella Guarda, Jean Francois Genest and André Vernet, (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1998), 23-33.
- Bradshaw, Paul F., *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, 2nd edition, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Brakke, David, *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006).
- , "The Problematization of Nocturnal Emissions in Early Christian Syria, Egypt, and Gaul," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3.4 (1995): 419-460.
- Brock, Sebastian P., *The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition*, 1st Gorgias press edition, Gorgias liturgical studies, (Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2008).
- Brown, Peter, *Augustine of Hippo: a biography*, New edition, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).
- , *The Body and Society: men, women, and sexual renunciation in early Christianity*, Lectures on the history of religions new ser., no. 13, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988).
- Bucur, Bogdan G., "Revisiting Christian Oeyen: "the other Clement" on Father, Son, and the angelomorphic Spirit," *Vigiliae Christianae* 61 (2007): 381-413.
- Bunge, Gabriel, *Dragon's Wine and Angel's Bread: the teaching of Evagrius Ponticus on Anger and Meekness*, (Crestwood, N.Y: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2009).
- , *Paternité spirituelle: la Gnose chrétienne chez Evagre le Pontique*, Spiritualité Orientale, 61, (Bégrolles en Mauges (Maine-&-Loire): Abbaye de Bellefontaine, 1994).
- Burns, J. Patout, "2000 St Augustine Lecture: The Eucharist as the Foundation of Christian Unity in North African Theology," *Augustinian Studies* 32.1 (2001): 1-25.
- , *Theological Anthropology, Sources of early Christian Thought*, Edited by W. Rusch, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981).

- Burns, J. Patout, and Gerald M. Fagin, *The Holy Spirit, Message of the Fathers of the Church*, (Wilmington, Del.: M. Glazier, 1984).
- Burns, Thomas S., *Rome and the Barbarians: 100 B.C.-A.D. 400*, Ancient society and history, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003).
- Burton-Christie, Douglas, "Scripture, self-knowledge and contemplation in Cassian's Conferences," in *Studia patristica*, 25, (Louvain: Peeters, 1993), 339-345.
- , *The Word in the desert: scripture and the quest for holiness in early Christian monasticism*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- Butler, Edward Cuthbert, *Western Mysticism: the Teaching of Augustine, Gregory and Bernard on Contemplation and Contemplative Life*, 3rd edition, (London: Constable, 1967).
- Cappuyns, M., "L'auteur de *De vocatione omnium gentium*," *Revue Bénédictine* 39 (1927): 198-226.
- , "L'origine des 'Captiula' d'Orange 529," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* (1934): 130-134.
- , "L'origine des *Capitula* pseudo-Célestiniens contre le semipélagianisme," *Revue Bénédictine* 41 (1929): 156-170.
- , "Le premier représentant de l'augustinisme médiéval, Prosper d'Aquitaine," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 1 (1929): 309-337.
- Casey, Michael, *Athirst for God Spiritual Desire in Bernard of Clairvaux's Sermons on the Song of Songs*, Cistercian Studies Series 77, (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, Inc., 1988).
- , "The journey from fear to love: John Cassian's road map," in *Prayer and spirituality in the early church*, (Everton Park, Queensland, Australia: Australian Catholic Univ, 1998), 181-195.
- , "Spiritual Desire in the Gospel Homilies of St. Gregory the Great," *Cistercian Studies* 16 (1981): 297-314.
- Cash, Johnny, "Hurt," *Unearthed*, CD, (Legacy, 2003).
- Casiday, Augustine Michael, "Apatheia and Sexuality in the Thought of Augustine and Cassian," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 45.4 (2001): 359-394.
- , "Cassian, Augustine, and *De Incarnatione*," in *Studia patristica* 38, *St Augustine and his opponents, other Latin writers*, (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 41-47.

- , *Evagrius Ponticus, The Early Church Fathers*, (London; New York: Routledge, 2006).
- , "Grace and the humanity of Christ according to St Vincent of Lérins," *Vigiliae Christianae* 59.3 (2005): 298-314.
- , "Rehabilitating John Cassian: an evaluation of Prosper of Aquitaine's polemic against the 'Semipelagians'," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 58.3 (2005): 270-284.
- , *Tradition and Theology in St. John Cassian*, Oxford Early Christian studies, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Catry, Patrick, "Les voies de L'Esprit chez Grégoire," in *Grégoire le Grand*, ed. R. Gillet J. Fontaine, & S. Pellistrandi, (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1986), 207-214.
- Cavadini John, C., ed. *Gregory the Great: a Symposium*, Notre Dame Studies in Theology v. 2, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995).
- Cayré, Fulbert, *La Contemplation Augustinienne; Principes de la Spiritualité de Saint Augustin, essai d'analyse et de synthèse*, (Paris: A. Blot, 1927).
- Chadwick, Henry, *Confessions*, trans. Henry Chadwick, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).
- Chadwick, Owen, "Euladius of Arles," *Journal of Theological Studies* 46 (1945): 200-205.
- , *John Cassian*, 2nd edition, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- Chin, Catherine, "Prayer and otium in Cassian's Institutes," in *Studia Patristica XXXV, Ascetica, gnostica, liturgica, orientalia*, (Louvain: Peeters, 2001), 24-29.
- Christman, Angela Russell, "The Spirit and the Wheels: Gregory the Great on Reading Scripture," in *In Dominico Eloquio In Lordly Eloquence: Essays on Patristic Exegesis in honor of Robert Louis Wilken*, ed. A Christman P Blowers, D Hunter, R.D. Young, (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002), 395-407.
- Clark, Francis, *The "Gregorian" Dialogues and the Origins of Benedictine Monasticism*, Studies in the history of Christian thought,, (Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2003).
- Clark, Guy, "Off the Map," *The Dark*, CD, (Sugar Hill, 2002).

- Colish, Marcia L., *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, 2 vols., Studies in the history of Christian thought, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985).
- Colleran, Joseph M., and Augustine, *The Greatness of the Soul: The Teacher*, trans. Joseph M. Colleran, ACW 9, (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1950).
- Collins, A.Y., "The origin of Christian Baptism," *Studia Liturgica* 19.1 (1984): 28-46.
- Congar, Yves, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, trans. David Smith, 3 vols., (New York & London: Seabury Press & G. Chapman, 1983).
- , *Jalons pour une Théologie du Laïcat*, 2. [i. e. 3.] ©*d. [augm.] edition, Unam sanctam, 23, (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1954).
- , *Je crois en l'Esprit Saint*, 3 vols., (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1979-1980).
- Countryman, Louis William, *The Rich Christian in the Church of the Early Empire: Contradictions and Accommodations*, Texts and studies in religion, (New York: E. Mellen Press, 1980).
- Courtois, Christian, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique*, (Paris: Darmstadt, 1964).
- Cremscoli, Giuseppe, *L'esegesi biblica di Gregorio Magno*, Interpretare la Bibbia oggi. Sez. 3.: Leggere la Bibbia alla luce della riflessione teologica, (Brescia: Queriniana, 2001).
- Cunningham, Lawrence S., "Cassian's hero and discernment: some reflections," in *Finding God in all Things*, (New York: Crossroad, 1996), 231-243.
- Cusack, Pearse, *An Interpretation of the Second Dialogue of Gregory the Great: Hagiography and St. Benedict*, Studies in the Bible and early Christianity, (Lewiston, N.Y.: E. Mellen Press, 1993).
- Dagens, Claude, *Saint Grégoire le Grand: Culture et Expérience Chrétiennes*, (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1977).
- Daley, Brian, "Revisiting the 'Filioque': Part Two: Contemporary Catholic Approaches," *Pro Ecclesia* 10 (2001): 195-212.
- , "Revisiting the 'Filioque': Roots and Branches of an Old Debate: Part One," *Pro Ecclesia* 10 (2001): 31-62.
- Damian, Theodore, "Some critical considerations and new arguments reviewing the problem of St John Cassian's birthplace," *Patristic and Byzantine Review* 9.2-3 (1990): 149-170.

- Daniélou, Jean, *Bible et Liturgie; la théologie biblique des Sacrements et des fêtes d'après les Pères de l'Église*, Lex Orandi, 11, (Paris: Cerf, 1951).
- , "Grégoire de Nysse et l'origine de la fête de l'Ascension," in *Kyriakon; Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, ed. Patrick Granfield and Josef Jungmann, (Münster Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1970), 663-666.
- Dawson, David, "Sign Theory, Allegorical Reading, and the Motions of the Soul in *De doctrina christiana*," in *De doctrina Christiana : a classic of Western culture*, ed. Duane W. H. Arnold and Pamela Bright, (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 123-141.
- de Vogüé, Adalbert, "Césaire et le monachisme prébenédicтин," in *Césaire d'Arles et la Christianisation de la Provence*, ed. D. Bertrand, (Lyon & Paris: Institut des Sources Chrétiennes les Editions du Cerf, 1994), 109-132.
- , "Eucharist and monastic life," *Worship* 59.6 (1985): 498-510.
- , "Les mentions des oeuvres de Cassien chez Benoît et ses contemporains," *Studia Monastica* 20 (1978): 275-285.
- Dekkers, Éloi, "Quelques notes sur des florilèges Augustiniens anciens et médiévaux," *Augustiniana* 40 (1990): 27-44.
- DelCogliano, Mark, "Situating Sarapion's sorrow: the Anthropomorphite controversy as the historical and theological context of Cassian's tenth *Conference* on pure prayer," *Cistercian Studies* 38.4 (2003): 377-421.
- DelCogliano, Mark, and Gregory the Great, *Exposition on the Song of Songs*, trans. Mark DelCogliano, (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Studies, forthcoming).
- DelCogliano, Mark, Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, and Lewis Ayres, *Works on the Holy Spirit: Athanasius and Didymus*, Popular Patristics Series, (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, forthcoming).
- Demacopoulos, George E., *Five Models of Spiritual Direction in the Early Church*, (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007).
- Demacopoulos, George E., and Aristotle Papanikolaou, *Orthodox Readings of Augustine*, (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimirs Seminary Press, 2008).
- Diesner, Hans-Joachim, *Fulgentius von Ruspe als Theologe und Kirchenpolitiker*, Arbeiten zur Theologie : 1. Reihe, (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1966).
- Dill, Samuel, *Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian age*, (London: Macmillan, 1926).

- Djuth, Marianne, "Cassian's use of the figure *uia regia* in *Collatio II "On discretion",*" in *Studia patristica*, 30, (Louvain: Peeters, 1997), 167-175.
- Dods, Marcus, and Augustine, *The City of God*, trans. Marcus Dods, The Modern library of the world's best books. Modern Library Giants 74, (New York: Modern Library, 1950).
- Dorenkemper, Mark, *The Trinitarian Doctrine and Sources of St. Caesarius of Arles*, Paradosis 9, (Fribourg, Switzerland: The University Press, 1953).
- Doutreleau, Louis, *Traité du Saint-Esprit*, SC 386, (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1992).
- Drinkwater, J. F., and Hugh Elton, *Fifth-century Gaul: a Crisis of Identity?*, (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Driscoll, Jeremy, "Apatheia and purity of heart in Evagrius Ponticus," in *Purity of Heart in Early Ascetic and Monastic Literature: essays in honor of Juana Raasch, O.S.B.*, (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1999), 141-159.
- Driver, Steven D., *John Cassian and the Reading of Egyptian Monastic Culture*, Studies in Medieval History and Culture, (New York: Routledge, 2002).
- Dudden, F. Homes, *Gregory the Great, His Place in History and Thought*, 2 vols., (London: Longmans, Green, & co., 1905).
- Dysinger, Luke, *Psalmody and Prayer in the Writings of Evagrius Ponticus*, Oxford theological monographs, (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Eno, Robert B., and Fulgentius, *Fulgentius: selected works*, Vol. 95, Fathers of the Church, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1997).
- Evans, G. R., *The Thought of Gregory the Great*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, (Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
- Fee, Gordon D., "'One thing is needful'? Luke 10:42," in *New Testament Textual Criticism: its significance for exegesis: essays in honour of Bruce M. Metzger*, ed. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee, (Oxford/ New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 61-75.
- Ferguson, Everett, *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries*, (Cambridge, U.K. ; Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2009).

- Ferguson, Thomas S., *Visita Nos: Reception, Rhetoric, and Prayer in a North African Monastery*, American University Studies. Series VII. Theology and Religion, (New York: Peter Lang, 1999).
- Finn, R. D., *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire: Christian Promotion and Practice (313-450)*, Oxford Classical Monographs, (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- Fitzgerald, Allan, "Almsgiving in the works of Saint Augustine," in *Signum pietatis. Festgabe für Cornelius Petrus Mayer OSA*, ed. Adolar Zumkeller, (Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1989), 445-459.
- Fleteren, Frederick Van, "Mysticism in the *Confessiones*: a controversy revisited," in *Augustine: Mystic and Mystagogue*, ed. Frederick Van Fleteren, Joseph C. Schnaubelt and Joseph Reino, (New York: P. Lang, 1994), 309-336.
- Fonash, Ignatius, *The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment in the Writings of Saint Gregory the Great*, (Washington, DC: CUA Press, 1952).
- Fontaine, Jacques, "The practice of Christian life: the birth of the laity," in *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century*, ed. Bernard McGinn, John Meyendorff and Jean Leclercq, (New York: Crossroad, 1985), 453-491.
- Fontaine, Jacques, Robert Gillet, and Stan Pellistrandi, eds. *Grégoire le Grand: Chantilly, Centre Culturel Les Fontaines, 15-19 Septembre 1982*, Colloques internationaux du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1986).
- Frank, Karl Suso, "John Cassian on John Cassian," *Studia Patristica* 33 (1997): 418-433.
- Fredriksen, Paula, "massa," in *Augustine Through the Ages: an Encyclopedia*, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub., 1999).
- Frend, W. H. C., *The Rise of Christianity*, (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984).
- Géhin, Paul, *Scholies aux Proverbes*, SC 340, (Paris: Cerf, 1987).
- Géhin, Paul, Claire Guillaumont, and Antoine Guillaumont, *Sur les pensées*, Sources chrétiennes, (Paris: Cerf, 1998).
- Giraud, Jean-Clair, Claire Lavant, and A. G. Hamman, *La Gaule Chrétienne: Vie d'Hilaire d'Arles, Vie de Césaire d'Arles*, Collection Les Pères dans la Foi, (Paris: Migne: diff. Brépols, 1997).
- Golitzin, Alexander, "Temple and throne of the divine glory: 'Pseudo-Macarius' and purity of heart," in *Purity of Heart in Early Ascetic and Monastic Literature*:

essays in honor of Juana Raasch, O.S.B. (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1999), 107-130.

-----, "The vision of God and the form of glory: more reflections on the entropomorphite controversy of AD 399," in *Abba*, (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003), 273-297.

Gometz, Abigail Kathleen, "Eugippius of Lucullanum: a Biography," Ph.D. diss., University of Leeds, 2008.

Goodrich, Richard J., *Contextualizing Cassian: Aristocrats, Asceticism, and Reformation in Fifth Century Gaul*, Oxford Early Christian Studies, (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

-----, "John Cassian on community," *Crux* 38.4 (2002): 23-30.

-----, "Underpinning the text: self-justification in John Cassian's ascetic prefaces," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 13.4 (2005): 411-436.

Gorman, M., "The manuscript tradition of Eugippius' *Excerpta ex operibus sancti Augustini*," *Revue Bénédictine* 92 (1982): 229-265.

Green, Bernard, *The Soteriology of Leo the Great*, Oxford Theological Monographs, (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Griffe, E., "Cassien a-t-il été prêtre d'Antioche?," 55. Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique (1954): 240-244.

Gryson, Roger, *Scripta Arriana Latina*, CCSL 87, (Turnholti: Brepols, 1982).

Guevin, Benedict, "The beginning and end of purity of heart: from Cassian to the Master and Benedict," in *Purity of heart in early ascetic and monastic literature*, (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1999), 197-214.

Guillamont, Antoine, "Cor et cordis affectus," in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1952). Reprinted as "Le 'coeur' chez les spirituels grecs à l'époque ancienne," in A. Guillamont, *Études sur la Spiritualité de l'Orient Chrétien*, Spiritualité Orientale n. 66, (Abbaye de Bellefontaine: 1996), 69-80.

-----, *Études sur la Spiritualité de l'Orient Chrétien*, Vol. 66, Spiritualité Orientale: Abbaye de Bellefontaine, 1996).

-----, "Un philosophe au désert: Evagre le Pontique," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 181 (1972): 29-56. Reprinted as *Aux Origines de Monachisme Chrétien; pour une phénoménologie du monachisme*, Spiritualite Orientale n. 30 (Abbaye de Bellefontaine: 1979), 185-212.

- Gumerlock, Francis, *Fulgentius of Ruspe on the Saving Will of God: the development of a sixth-century African bishop's interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:4 during the Semi-Pelagian controversy*, (Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 2009).
- Guran, Petre, "Le culte de Jean Cassien dans l'Eglise d'Orient," in *Jean Cassien entre l'Orient et l'Occident*, ed. Cristian Badilita and Attila Jakab, (Paris: Beauchesne, 2003), 239-255.
- Guy, Jean-Claude, *Institutions Cénobitiques*, rev. et corr. edition, SC 109, (Paris: Cerf, 2001).
- , *Jean Cassien: vie et doctrine spirituelle*, Théologie, Pastorale et Spiritualité, Recherches et Synthèses, 9, (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1961).
- Gy, Pierre-Marie, "Sacraments and Liturgy in Latin Christianity," in *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century*, ed. Bernard McGinn, John Meyendorff and Jean Leclercq, (New York: Crossroad, 1985), 365-381.
- Halsall, Guy, *Barbarian Migrations and the Roman West, 376-568*, Cambridge medieval textbooks, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Hanson, R. P. C., *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: the Arian Controversy 318-381*, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988).
- Harmless, William, *Augustine and the Catechumenate*, (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1995).
- , *Augustine in His Own Words*, (Washington, DC: CUA Press, 2010).
- , *Desert Christians: an Introduction to the Literature of Early Monasticism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- , "Monasticism," in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, ed. Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David G. Hunter, (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 493-517.
- , *Mystics*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
- Hartman, Lars, *'Into the Name of the Lord Jesus': Baptism in the Early Church*, Studies of the New Testament and its World, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997).
- Harvey, Susan Ashbrook, and David G. Hunter, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

- Hausheer, Irénée, "L'Origine de la théorie orientale des huit pechés capitaux," *Orientalia Christiana* 30 (1933): 164-175.
- Heather, P. J., *The Goths, Peoples of Europe*, (Oxford ; Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1996).
- , *Goths and Romans, 332-489*, Oxford Historical Monographs, (Oxford/ New York: Clarendon Press/ Oxford University Press, 1991).
- Hefele, Charles J, *A History of the Councils of the Church, from the original documents*, trans. William Clark, 5 Vols., (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1972).
- Heron, Alasdair, "The Pseudo-Athanasian works *De Trinitate et Spiritu Sancto* and *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos*: a comparison," in *Aksum, Thyateira*, ed. George Dion Dragas and Methodios G. Phougiyas, (London: Thyateira House, 1985), 281-298.
- Hombert, Pierre-Marie, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini contra Arrianos Opera*, CCSL 87a, (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009).
- Humphries, Thomas L., "These words are spirit and life; Thomas' use of Augustine on the Eucharist in ST 3.73-83," *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales* (forthcoming).
- Hwang, Alexander Y., *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace: the Life and Thought of Prosper of Aquitaine*, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2009).
- Jaeger, Werner Wilhelm, *Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature: Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius*, (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1954).
- Jalland, Trevor, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great*, (New York: Macmillan, 1941).
- James, N. W., "Leo the Great and Prosper of Aquitaine: a fifth century pope and his adviser," *Journal of Theological Studies* 44 (1993): 554-584.
- Johnson, David W., "The myth of the Augustinian synthesis," *Lutheran Quarterly* 5 (1991): 157-169.
- Jungmann, Josef A., *The Early Liturgy, to the Time of Gregory the Great*, (London: Darton, 1960).
- Kelly, J. N. D., *Jerome: His Life, Writings and Controversies*, 2000 edition, (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1975).
- Kenney, John P., "Confession and the contemplative self in Augustine's early works," *Augustinian Studies* 38.1 (2007): 133-146.

- Klingshirn, W., "Charity and Power-Caesarius of Arles and the ransoming of captives in sub-Roman Gaul," *Journal of Roman Studies* 75 (1985): 183-203.
- Klingshirn, William E., *Caesarius of Arles: the Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul*, Cambridge studies in medieval life and thought, (Cambridge [England] ; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Konstantinovskiy, Julia, *Evagrius Ponticus: the Making of a Gnostic*, Ashgate New Critical Thinking in Religion, Theology, and Biblical Studies, (Farnham, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate Pub. Ltd., 2009).
- Krawiec, Rebecca, "Asceticism," in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, ed. Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David G. Hunter, (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 764-785.
- Kretschmar, Georg, "Himmelfahrt und Pfingsten," in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1954-1955), 209-253.
- Kwon, Junghoo, "The Pseudo-Athanasian *De Trin.*," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 2010.
- La Bonnardière, Anne-Marie, "Les deux vies Marthe et Marie," in *Saint Augustin et la Bible*, ed. Anne-Marie La Bonnardière, (Paris: Beauchesne, 1986), 411-425.
- , "Marthe et Marie figures de l'Eglise d'après Saint Augustin," *Vie Spirituelle* 86 (1952): 404-427.
- , ed. *Saint Augustin et la Bible*, Bible de tous les temps, 3, (Paris: Beauchesne, 1986).
- Labrousse, Mireille, *Saint Honorat, fondateur de Lérins et Évêque d'Arles: Étude et traduction de textes d'Hilaire d'Arles, Fauste de Riez et Césaire d'Arles, Vie Monastique*, (Bégrolles en Mauges (Maine-&-Loire): Abbaye de Bellefontaine, 1995).
- Lake, Stephen Marcer, "Knowledge of the writings of John Cassian in early Anglo-Saxon England," *Anglo-Saxon England* 32 (2003): 27-41.
- Lamberigts, Mathijs, "Pelagius and Pelagians," in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, ed. Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David G. Hunter, (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 258-279.
- Lapeyre, G. G., *Vie de Saint Fulgence de Ruspe de Ferrand, diacre de Carthage*, (Paris: Lethielleux, 1929).

- Lawless, George, *Augustine of Hippo and his Monastic Rule*, (Oxford [Oxfordshire] ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).
- Leclercq, Jean, *L'amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu; initiation aux auteurs monastiques du Moyen Age*, 3rd edition, (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1990).
- , "Monasticism and Asceticism," in *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century*, ed. Bernard McGinn, John Meyendorff and Jean Leclercq, (New York: Crossroad, 1985), 113-131.
- Lecordier, Gaston, *La Doctrine de l'Eucharistie chez Saint Augustin*, (Paris: Lecoffre, 1930).
- Lefort, L. T., *Les vies coptes de saint Pachôme et de ses premiers successeurs*, Bibliothèque du «Muséon», 16, (Louvain, Belgium: Peeters, 1943).
- Levko, John, "Inside prayer with John Cassian," *Diakonia* 30.2-3 (1997): 165-173.
- , "Patience in a life of prayer for John Cassian," *Diakonia* 28.3 (1995): 167-172.
- , "Self-Control in a life of prayer for John Cassian," *Diakonia* 29.2 (1996): 142-154.
- Levko, John J., *Cassian's prayer for the 21st century*, (Scranton, PA: The Univ of Scranton Pr, 2000).
- , "The relationship of prayer to discretion and spiritual direction for John Cassian," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 40.3 (1996): 155-171.
- Leyser, Conrad, *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great*, Oxford Historical Monographs, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- , "'A wall protecting the city': conflict and authority in the *Life of Fulgentius of Ruspe*," in *Foundations of Power and Conflicts of Authority in Late-Antique Monasticism*, ed. A. Camplani and G. Filoramo, (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 175-192.
- Lienhard, Joseph T., *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and fourth-century Theology*, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1999).
- , "The earliest florilegia of Augustine," *Augustinian Studies* 8 (1977): 21-31.
- , "Florilegia," in *Augustine Through the Ages*, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub., 1999).

- Lietzmann, Hans, and Apollinaris, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule; Texte und Untersuchungen*, (Hildesheim, New York: G. Olms, 1970).
- Loofs, Friedrich, *Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche. Erstes Buch, Das Leben und die polemischen Werke des Leontius von Byzanz*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur Bd. 3, Heft 1-2, (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs., 1887).
- Louth, Andrew, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition from Plato to Denys*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981).
- Lubac, Henri de, *Corpus mysticum: l'eucharistie et l'Eglise au Moyen âge: etude historique*, (Paris: Aubier, 1944).
- , *Exégèse médiévale: les quatres sens de l'écriture*, 4 vols., (Paris: Aubier, 1959).
- Lyman, J. Rebecca, "Arius and Arians," in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, ed. Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David G. Hunter, (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 237-257.
- Macy, Gary, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period: a Study of the Salvific Function of the Sacrament According to the Theologians, 1080-1220*, (Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press, 1984).
- Malnory, A., *Saint Césaire, Évêque d'Arles (503-543)*, (Paris, 1894).
- Maloney, George A., *Pseudo-Macarius: The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, CWS, (New York: Paulist Press, 1992).
- Marcovich, Miroslav, *Prosper of Aquitaine, De providentia Dei: text, translation, and commentary*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, (Leiden, Netherlands ; New York: E.J. Brill, 1989).
- Markus, R. A., *The End of Ancient Christianity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- , "The Legacy of Pelagius: Orthodoxy, heresy and Conciliation," in *The Making of Orthodoxy: essays in honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. Rowan Williams, (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 214-234.
- Marrou, H.I., "Jean Cassien à Marseille," *Revue du Moyen Âge Latin* 1 (1945): 5-26.
- , "La patrie de Jean Cassien," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 13 (1947): 588-596.

- Marrou, Henri Irénée, *Saint Augustin et la Fin de la Culture Antique*, Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1938).
- Marsili, Salvatore, *Giovanni Cassiano ed Evagrio Pontico: dottrina sulla carità e contemplazione*, Studia Anselmiana philosophica theologica, fasc. 5, (Roma: Herder, 1936).
- Martimort, Aimé Georges, and Roger Béraudy, *L'Église en Prière: Introduction à la Liturgie*, 3rd. rev. et corr. edition, (Paris ; New York: Desclée, 1965).
- Martin, Thomas F., and Allan Fitzgerald, *Augustine of Hippo: Faithful Servant, Spiritual Leader*, The library of world biography, (Boston: Prentice Hall, 2011).
- Martyn, John R. C., *Arians and Vandals of the 4th-6th Centuries: annotated translations of the historical works by Bishops Victor of Vita (Historia Persecutionis Africanae Provinciae) and Victor of Tonnena (Chronicon), and of the religious works by Bishop Victor of Cartenna (De Paenitentia) and Saints Ambrose (De Fide Orthodoxa contra Arianos), and Athanasius (Expositio Fidei)*, (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2008).
- Mathisen, Ralph W., "Caesarius of Arles, prevenient grace, and the second council of Orange," in *Semipelagianism*, ed. Alexander Y. Hwang and Augustine Casiday, (Washington, DC: CUA Press, 2011), forthcoming.
- , *Ecclesiastical Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth- Century Gaul*, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1989).
- , "For specialists only: the reception of Augustine and his teachings in fifth-century Gaul," in *Augustine: presbyter factus sum*, ed. Joseph T. Lienhard, Earl C. Muller and Roland J. Teske, (New York: P. Lang, 1993), 29-42.
- , "PLRE II: Suggested *addenda* and *corrigenda*," *Historia* 31 (1982): 364-386.
- , *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul: Strategies for Survival in an Age of Transition*, 1st edition, (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1993).
- , "The "second council of Arles" and the Spirit of Compilation and Codification in late Roman Gaul," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5.4 (1997): 511-554.
- Maxwell, David, "Christology and Grace in the Sixth-Century Latin West: The Theopaschite Controversy," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2003.
- McDonnell, Kilian, *The Baptism of Jesus in the Jordan: the Trinitarian and Cosmic Order of Salvation*, (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996).

McDonnell, Kilian, and George T. Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*, 2nd rev. edition, (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1994).

McGinn, Bernard, "Contemplation in Gregory the Great," in *Gregory the Great : a Symposium*, ed. John Cavadini, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995), 146-167.

-----, *The Presence of God: a History of Western Christian Mysticism*, (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1992).

McGinn, Bernard, and Patricia Ferris McGinn, *Early Christian Mystics: the Divine Vision of the Spiritual Masters*, (New York: Crossroad Pub., 2003).

McGuckin, J. A., "The 'Theopaschite Confession' (text and historical context): a study in the Cyrilline re-interpretation of Chalcedon," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35.2 (1984): 239-255.

McGuckin, John, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria and the Christological Controversy, its History, Theology, and Texts*, (Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004).

McGuckin, John Anthony, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus: an intellectual biography*, (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001).

Meredith, Anthony, *The Cappadocians*, (Crestwood, NY: St. Valdimir's Seminary Press, 1995).

-----, *Gregory of Nyssa, The Early Church Fathers*, (London ; New York: Routledge, 1999).

Meyvaert, P., "The date of Gregory the Great's Commentaries on the Canticle of Canticles and on 1 Kings," *Sacris Erudiri* 23 (1978-79): 191-216.

Moorhead, John, *Gregory the Great, The Early Church Fathers*, (London ; New York: Routledge, 2005).

-----, *Victor of Vita: History of the Vandal Persecution*, Translated texts for historians, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1992).

Morin, G., "Etude d'ensemble sur Arnobe le Jeune," *Revue Bénédictine* 28 (1911): 154-190.

-----, "Le 'Breviarum Fidei' contre les Ariens, Produit de l'Atelier de Césarie d'Arles?," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique* 35 (1939): 35-53.

- Morin, Germain, "Autour des *Tractatus Origenis*," *Revue Bénédictine* 19.1902 (1902): 225-245.
- , "La collection gallicane dite d'Eusèbe d'Émèse et les problèmes qui s'y rattachent," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* (1935): 92-115.
- , "Les Douze Livres sur la Trinité attribués à Vigile de Thapse," *Revue Bénédictine* 15 (1898): 1-10.
- , "Les nouveaux *Tractatus Origenis* et l'héritage littéraire de l'Évêque Espagnol Grégoire d'Illyrie," *RHLR* 2 (1900): 145-161.
- Muhlberger, Steven, *The Fifth-Century Chroniclers: Prosper, Hydatius, and the Gallic Chronicler of 452*, ARCA, classical and medieval texts, papers, and monographs,, (Leeds: F. Cairns, 1990).
- Müller, Barbara, *Führung im Denken und Handeln Gregors des Grossen*, Vol. 57, Studien und Texte su Antike und Christentum, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).
- Neil, Bronwen, *Leo the Great*, Early Church Fathers, (London & New York: Routledge, 2009).
- Newhauser, Richard, ed. *In the Garden of Evil: the Vices and Culture in the Middle Ages*, Papers in Mediaeval Studies, (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2005).
- Newhauser, Richard, and Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, *In the Garden of Evil: the Vices and Culture in the Middle Ages*, Papers in Mediaeval Studies, (Toronto: PIMS, 2005).
- O'Connell, Robert J., "Action and contemplation," in *Augustine: a Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. R. A. Markus, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1972), 38-58.
- , *St. Augustine's early theory of man, A.D. 386-391*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1968).
- O'Connor, Gulielmo, *St. Vincent of Lerins and St. Augustine: was the commonitorium of St. Vincent of Lerins intended as a polemic treatise against St. Augustine and his doctrine on predestination*: Catholic Book Agency, 1964).
- O'Donnell, J. Reginald, *Prosper's Grace and Free Will*, trans. J. Reginald O'Donnell, FOTC 7, (New York: CUA Press, 1949).

- O'Donnell, James Joseph, "The holiness of Gregory," in *Gregory the Great: a Symposium*, ed. John Cavadini, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995), 62-81.
- O'Daly, Gerard, and Luc Verheijen, "Actio-Contemplatio," in *Augustinus-Lexikon*, ([Basel:Schwabe, 1986).
- Ogliari, D., *Gratia et Certamen: the relationship between grace and free will in the discussion of Augustine with the so-called semipelagians*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003).
- Pásztori-Kupán, Istavan, *Theodoret of Cyrus, The Early Church Fathers*, (London ; New York: Routledge, 2006).
- Pépin, Jean, "A propos de l'histoire de l'exégèse allégorique: L'absurdité signe de l'allégorie," *Studia Patristica* (1955): 395-413.
- Pinckaers, Servais, *Les sources de la morale chrétienne*, (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1985).
- , *The Sources of Christian Ethics*, trans. Mary Thomas Noble, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1995).
- Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, "The Greek and Latin Traditions Regarding the Procession of the Holy Spirit," *L'Osservatore Romano*.38 (1995): 3, 6.
- Potterie, Ignace de la, "L'origine et le sens primitive du mot 'laïc'," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 80 (1958): 840-853.
- Pristas, Lauren, "The unity of composition in book V of Cassian's *De institutis*," in *Studia patristica*, 25, (Louvain: Peeters, 1993), 438-443.
- Quinn, John, *Mysticism in the Confessiones: for passages reconsidered*, Augustine: Mystic and Mystagogue, Edited by Frederick Van Fleteren, Joseph C. Schnaubelt and Joseph Reino, (New York: P. Lang, 1994).
- Raasch, Juana, "The monastic concept of purity of heart and its sources, I," *Studia Monastica* 8.1 (1966): 7-33
- , "The monastic concept of purity of heart and its sources, II. Among the second-century apologists and anti-heretical writings and in the literature of the third century, not including the Alexandrians," *Studia Monastica* 8.2 (1966): 183-213.

- , "The monastic concept of purity of heart and its sources, III. Philo, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen," *Studia Monastica* 10.1 (1968): 7-55.
- , "The monastic concept of purity of heart and its sources, IV. Early monasticism," *Studia Monastica* 11 (1969): 269-314.
- , "The monastic concept of purity of heart and its sources, V. the school of Evagrius Ponticus, and the Apophthegmata Patrum," *Studia Monastica* 12.1 (1970): 7-41.
- Radde-Gallwitz, Andrew, *Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Transformation of Divine Simplicity*, Oxford Early Christian Studies, (Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- Ramsey, Boniface, "Almsgiving in the Latin Church: the late fourth and early fifth centuries," *Theological Studies* 43 (1982): 226-259.
- , "John Cassian: Student of Augustine," *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 28 (1993): 5-15.
- Richards, Jeffrey, *Consul of God: the life and times of Gregory the Great*, (London ; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980).
- Rist, John M., *Augustine: Ancient Thought Baptized*, (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Robinson, James Harvey, *Readings in European History: a collection of extracts from the sources chosen with the purpose of illustrating the progress of culture in western Europe since the German invasions*, 2 vols., (Boston ; New York: Ginn, 1904).
- Rousseau, Philip, *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church in the Age of Jerome and Cassian*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).
- , *Basil of Caesarea, Transformation of the classical heritage*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).
- , "Cassian's Apophthegmata," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* (2006): 19-34.
- , "Cassian, contemplation and the cenobitic life," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 26.2 (1975): 113-126.
- , *Pachomius, The Transformation of the classical heritage*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).

- , "Spiritual authority of the monk-bishop: Eastern elements in some Western hagiography of the fourth and fifth centuries," *Journal of Theological Studies* 22.2 (1971): 380-419.
- Rusch, William G., *The Trinitarian Controversy, Sources of Early Christian Thought*, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980).
- Schwartz, Eduard, and Johannes Straub, eds. *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum: Iussu atque mandato societatis scientiarum argentoratensis*, (Berolini: W. de Gruyter, 1925).
- Sheridan, Mark, "The controversy over *apatheia*: Cassian's sources and his use of them," *Studia Monastica* 39 (1997): 287-310.
- , "John Cassian and the formation of authoritative tradition," in *Foundations of Power and Conflicts of Authority in late-antique Monasticism*, (Leuven; Dudley, Mass: Peeters, 2007), 157-173.
- Siecienski, A. Edward, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- Simonetti, Manlio, "Le fonti del De Spiritu Sancto di Fausto di Riez," *Siculorum Gymnasium: rassegna dell'Facolta di lettere e filosofia dell'Universita di Catania* 29 (1976): 413-425.
- Sinkewicz, Robert E., *Evagrius of Pontus: the Greek ascetic corpus*, Oxford early Christian studies, (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- Smith, Thomas A., *De gratia: Faustus of Riez's Treatise on Grace and its Place in the History of Theology*, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990).
- Stewart-Sykes, Alistair, "Manumission and Baptism in Tertullian's Africa: a search for the origin of Confirmation," *Studia Liturgica* 31.2 (2001): 129-149.
- Stewart, Columba, *Cassian the Monk*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).
- , "Evagrius Ponticus and the Eight Generic Logismoi," in *In the Garden of Evil : the Vices and Culture in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard Newhauser, (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2005), 3-34.
- , "From logos to verbum: John Cassian's use of Greek in the development of a Latin monastic vocabulary," in *Joy of Learning and the Love of God*, (Kalamazoo, Mich: Cisterican Publications, 1995), 5-31.

- , "John Cassian's schema of eight principal faults and his debt to Origen and Evagrius," in *Jean Cassien entre l'Orient et l'Occident*, ed. Cristian Badilita and Attila Jakab, (Paris: Beauchesne, 2003), 205-219.
- , *Working the Earth of the Heart: the Messalian Controversy in History, Texts, and Language to A.D. 431*, Oxford Theological Monographs, (Oxford/ New York: Clarendon Press/ Oxford University Press, 1991).
- Straw, Carole Ellen, "Adversitas et Prosperitas: une illustration du motif structurel de la complémentarité," in *Grégoire le Grand*, ed. R. Gillet J. Fontaine, & S. Pellistrandi, (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1986), 277-288.
- , *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, Transformation of the classical heritage 14, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).
- , "Gregory, Cassian, and the Cardinal Vices," in *Papers in Mediaeval Studies*, ed. Richard Newhauser and Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, (Toronto: PIMS, 2005), 35-58.
- , "Much ado about nothing: Gregory the Great's apology to the Istrians," in *The crisis of the Oikoumene : the Three Chapters and the failed quest for unity in the sixth-century Mediterranean*, ed. Celia Martin Chazelle and Catherine Cubitt, (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 121-160.
- Sullivan, Kathryn, "Compunction," *Worship* 35.4 (1961): 227-235.
- Sulpicius Severus, and Bernard M. Peebles, *Writings*, trans. Bernard M. Peebles, FOTC 7, (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1949).
- Swete, Henry Barclay, *On the History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Apostolic Age to the Death of Charlemagne*, 246 p. ; 23 cm. vols., (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, 1876). Reprinted as Wipf and Stock, 2004.
- Szarmach, Paul E., *An Introduction to the Medieval Mystics of Europe: Fourteen Original Essays*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984).
- Talley, Thomas J., *The Origins of the Liturgical Year*, 2nd, emended edition, (Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1991).
- TeSelle, Eugene, "Augustine," in *Introduction to the Medieval Mystics*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984), 19-35.
- Teske, Roland, "The Augustinianism of Prosper of Aquitaine Revisited," *Studia Patristica* 43 (2006): 491-503.

- , "Criteria for figurative interpretation in St. Augustine," in *De Doctrina Christiana: a Classic of Western culture*, ed. Duane W. H. Arnold and Pamela Bright, (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 109-122.
- , "St. Augustine and the vision of God," in *Augustine: Mystic and Mystagogue*, ed. Frederick Van Fleteren, Joseph C. Schnaubelt and Joseph Reino, (New York: P. Lang, 1994), 287-308.
- Teske, Roland J., and Augustine, *On Genesis Against the Manichees; and, On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis, an Unfinished Book*, FOTC 84, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1990).
- Torchia, N. Joseph, "contemplation and action," in *Augustine Through the Ages: an Encyclopedia*, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub., 1999).
- Turner, Paul, "The origins of confirmation: an analysis of Aidan Kavanagh's hypothesis," *Worship* 65.4 (1991): 320-336.
- Valentin, Louis, *Saint Prosper d'Aquitaine*, (Paris/ Toulouse, 1900).
- Van Fleteren, Frederick, Joseph C. Schnaubelt, and Joseph Reino, eds. *Augustine: Mystic and Mystagogue*, *Collectanea Augustiniana*, (New York: P. Lang, 1994).
- Vannier, Marie-Anne, "Jean Cassien, historiographe du monachisme Égyptien?," in *Historiographie de l'Église des Premiers Siècles*, (Paris: Beauchesne, 2001), 149-158.
- Vannier, Marie-Anne, and John Cassian, *Traité de l'Incarnation Contre Nestorius*, *Sagesses Chrétiennes*, (Paris: Cerf, 1999).
- Veilleux, Armand, *Instructions, Letters, and Other Writings (Pachonian Koinonia)*, CS 47, (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications Inc., 1982).
- , *The Life of Saint Pachomius and his Disciples (Pachonian Koinonia)*, CS 45, (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1980).
- , *Pachonian Chronicles and Rules (Pachonian Koinonia)*, CS 46, (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1981).
- Verbraken, Pierre-Patrick, "Le Commentaire de saint Grégoire sur le Premier Livre des Rois " *Revue Bénédictine* 66 (1956): 159-217.
- , "Le sermon LXXI de Saint Augustin sur le blasphème contre le Saint-Esprit," *Revue Bénédictine* 75.1 (1965): 54-108.

- , "Le text du Commentaire sur les Rois attribué à saint Grégoire," *Revue Bénédictine* 66 (1956): 39-62.
- Vivian, Tim, Kim Vivian, and Jeffrey Burton Russell, *The Lives of the Jura Fathers: the Life and Rule of the Holy Fathers Romanus, Lupicinus, and Eugendus, Abbots of the Monasteries in the Jura Mountains*, trans. et al Vivian, Vol. 178, Cistercian studies series (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1999).
- Vogüé, Adalbert de, SC 351, (Paris: Cerf, 1989).
- , "Les Vues de Grégoire le Grand sur la vie religieuse dans son Commentaire des Rois," *Studia Monastica* 20 (1978): 17-63. Reprinted as Eng. trans in *Cistercian Studies* (1982); 40-64, 212-232.
- , *The life of St. Benedict--Gregory the Great*, trans. H. Costello & E. de Bhaldraithe, (Petersham, Mass.: St. Bede's Publications, 1993).
- Weaver, Rebecca Harden, "Access to Scripture, experiencing the text," *Interpretation* 52.4 (1998): 367-379.
- , *Divine Grace and Human Agency; a study of the semi-Pelagian controversy*, Vol. 15, Patristic Monograph Series, (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1996).
- Weigel, Gustave, *Faustus of Riez: an Historical Introduction*, (Philadelphia: Dolphin Press, 1938).
- Weinandy, Thomas G., *Athanasius: a Theological Introduction*, Great Theologians Series, (Aldershot, England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007).
- , *The Father's Spirit of Sonship: Reconceiving the Trinity*, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995).
- Wessel, Susan, *Leo the Great and the Spiritual Rebuilding of a Universal Rome*, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*, 93, (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008).
- Wetzel, James, *Augustine and the Limits of Virtue*, (Cambridge England ; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Williams, Daniel H., *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Nicene-Arian Conflicts*, Oxford Early Christian Studies, (Oxford & New York: Clarendon & Oxford University Press, 1995).
- Williams, Rowan, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, Rev. edition, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 2002).

- Wimbush, Vincent L., "Introduction to Asceticism," in *Asceticism*, ed. Vincent Wimbush and Richard Valantasis, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), xix-xxxiii.
- Wimbush, Vincent L., and Richard Valantasis, eds. *Asceticism*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- Winkler, Gabriele, "Confirmation or Chrismation: a study in comparative liturgy," *Worship* 58.1 (1984): 2-17.
- Woolf, Greg, *Becoming Roman: the Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*, (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Wozniak, Robert, ed. *Rethinking Trinitarian Theology*, (New York: Continuum, forthcoming).
- Yarnold, Edward, *The Awe-Inspiring Rites of Initiation: Baptismal Homilies of the Fourth Century*, (Slough: St. Paul Publications, 1971).
- Zimdars-Swartz, Sandra, "A confluence of imagery: exegesis and Christology according to Gregory the Great," in *Grégoire le Grand*, ed. R. Gillet J. Fontaine, & S. Pellistrandi, (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1986), 327-335.
- Zinn, Grover, "Exegesis and spirituality in the writings of Gregory the Great," in *Gregory the Great : a Symposium*, ed. John Cavadini, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995), 168-180.
- , "Sound, Silence and Word in the Spirituality of Gregory the Great," in *Grégoire le Grand*, ed. R. Gillet J. Fontaine, & S. Pellistrandi, (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1986), 367-375.