

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:

Micah M. Miller

Date

Origen of Alexandria and the Theology of Holy Spirit

By

Micah M. Miller
Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Division of Religion
Historical Studies in Theology and Religion

Anthony A. Briggman
Advisor

Kevin Corrigan
Committee Member

Andrew Radde-Gallwitz
Committee Member

Philip Lyndon Reynolds
Committee Member

Accepted:

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

Date

Origen of Alexandria and the Theology of the Holy Spirit

By

Micah M. Miller
M.A., Saint Louis University, 2013
B.A., Saint Louis University, 2011

Advisor: Anthony A. Briggman, Ph.D.

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 Religion
2019

Abstract

Origen of Alexandria and the Theology of the Holy Spirit

By Micah M. Miller

This dissertation is the first comprehensive examination of Origen of Alexandria's pneumatology. As such, it surveys Origen's entire corpus in order to elucidate the Spirit's identity (who the Spirit is) and activity (what the Spirit does). I will argue that Origen finds the Holy Spirit to be dependent on the Father and Son, a relationship that ranks the Spirit below the Father and Son and serves as the foundation for the Spirit's salvific activity of mediating gifts to believers. I will pursue this thesis in five chapters. In Chapter One, I argue that the Son is dependent on the Father with respect to both his being and his attributes, a schema that ranks the Son below the Father. Furthermore, this relationship informs Origen's theology of creation, with creative activity beginning in the Father and flowing through the Son to all created beings. Chapter One serves as a foundation for Chapter Two, where I argue that, while Origen groups the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit together and considers them to be distinct from creation, he ranks the Spirit below the Father and Son by describing the Spirit's generation in the same way as all other created beings—by the Father through the Son. In Chapter Three I argue that Origen interprets the traditional understanding of the Holy Spirit as one and seven in terms of a philosophical notion of power, which allows him to explain how the Holy Spirit can be a single being but bestow many different spiritual gifts. I argue in Chapter Four that Origen conceives of the Spirit's activities as a common operation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a logic that supports his hierarchical understanding of the Trinity and explains how he is able to attribute the Spirit's activities to the Father and Son. In Chapter Five I argue that the Spirit's relationship to Christ serves as an archetype for the Spirit's relationship to humans, whose goal is to increase in the participation of the Spirit until they reach perfection.

Origen of Alexandria and the Theology of the Holy Spirit

By

Micah M. Miller
M.A., Saint Louis University, 2013
B.A., Saint Louis University, 2011

Advisor: Anthony A. Briggman, Ph.D.

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 Religion
2019

Acknowledgments

The completion of this dissertation grants me the opportunity to express my gratitude to those without whom I could not have finished it.

I wish to thank my advisor, Anthony Briggman, who has been both a mentor and a friend over these last few years. He has challenged me in the best possible way to become a better scholar and a better writer. I owe much to him.

Throughout my time at Emory I have been blessed to have good teachers, such as Philip Reynolds and Kevin Corrigan, both of whom also agreed to serve on my dissertation committee. I also wish to thank Andrew Radde-Gallwitz for serving as my external reader.

I have not only had good professors, but good colleagues. My friendships with Brian Gronewoller, Jared Jones, and especially Brendan Harris granted me respite from my work. Whether over a cup of coffee or a pint of beer, I enjoyed our conversations.

I am thankful that my in-laws, Ron and Peggy Lewis, have supported me throughout my doctoral studies. They have encouraged me and have always been interested in my work.

My mom and dad, Michael and Jennifer Miller, were my first theology teachers and have continued to offer me their wisdom and guidance. They taught me to love learning and have helped me throughout my pursuit of education. I am always grateful for their love and support.

Finally, I wish to thank my wife, Margaret. I met her shortly before I began my doctoral studies, and her boundless love and support have meant more to me than I could write. I have been blessed to marry the love of my life. She has been my constant companion throughout this journey, celebrating my successes and lifting me up during hard times. She also helped me edit this entire dissertation. I dedicate this dissertation to her.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Introductory Remarks and Thesis.....	1
Examination of Scholarship.....	2
Methodology.....	6
Chapter Summary and Outline.....	11
Chapter One: The Father and the Son.....	13
1.1: The Father's <i>Auto-X</i> Attributes.....	13
1.2: The Son's <i>Auto-X</i> Attributes.....	29
1.3: The Son's Attributes as His <i>Epinoiai</i>	43
Chapter Conclusion.....	47
Chapter Two: The Father, the Son, and the Generation of the Holy Spirit.....	49
2.1: The Holy Spirit's Existence.....	49
2.1.1: The Holy Spirit, with the Father and Son.....	51
2.1.2: The Father, the Son, and the Generation of the Holy Spirit.....	58
2.1.2.1: The Generation of the Holy Spirit in <i>PArch</i>	59
2.1.2.2: The Generation of the Holy Spirit in <i>ComJn</i>	60
<i>Origen's Anti-Monarchian Polemic</i>	60
<i>The Generation of the Holy Spirit</i>	63
<i>The Eternality of the Spirit</i>	71
<i>The Spirit as Third in Rank of All Things</i>	75
Conclusion.....	81
2.2: The Holy Spirit's Attributes.....	81
2.2.1: The Spirit's Participation in the Son.....	82
2.2.2: The Spirit's Essential Attributes?.....	87
2.3: Chapter Conclusion.....	93
Chapter Three: The Unity and Multiplicity of the Holy Spirit.....	95
3.1: The Sevenfold Spirit.....	97
3.2: Power Language and the Sevenfold Spirit.....	106

Chapter Conclusion.....	116
Chapter Four: The Activity of the Holy Spirit.....	117
4.1: The Holy Spirit as the Giver of Gifts.....	118
4.1.1: The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit and the Giving of Gifts.....	119
4.1.2: The Gifts of the Spirit and the Son.....	127
4.2: The Gift of Holiness.....	134
4.3: The Inspiration and Interpretation of Scripture.....	139
Chapter Conclusion.....	145
Chapter Five: The Holy Spirit and the Human Person.....	147
5.1: The Holy Spirit and the Incarnate Christ.....	147
5.2: The Holy Spirit and the Saints.....	157
5.2.1: The Moment of the Reception of the Holy Spirit.....	157
5.2.2: The Holy Spirit's Role in Salvation.....	162
5.2.3: The Loss of the Spirit.....	170
Chapter Conclusion.....	173
Conclusion.....	174
Appendix A: Primary Source Abbreviations.....	177
Bibliography.....	179

Introduction

Introductory Remarks and Thesis

I arrived at my decision to study Origen's pneumatology after taking a class on the development of early Christian pneumatology, from its background in Jewish and philosophical thought to the recognition that the Holy Spirit was one God, with the Father and Son. Within this class, we noted that Origen, along with his contemporary Tertullian, appeared to spurn certain Jewish sources utilized by previous thinkers, such as Irenaeus of Lyons, that supported the Holy Spirit's creative activity and equality with the Father and Son.¹ Instead, Origen ranked the Spirit below the Father and Son in order to secure the distinction of the three in the face of Monarchian theology. In an initial examination of Origen's thought for the class's term paper, I found that Origen did, in fact, emphasize the distinction of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit over their unity. However, I also discovered his use of several aspects of Jewish thought within his pneumatology. My short paper convinced me that an investigation of Origen's theology of the Holy Spirit would shed some much needed light on the subject, as well as elucidate the development of early Christian pneumatology. I decided, then, to explore the entirety of Origen's pneumatological thought as the subject of my dissertation.

This dissertation offers the first comprehensive study of Origen's pneumatology. In addition to a general lack of research on this topic, the small body of scholarship devoted to the matter has privileged *Peri Archon* and the *Commentary on John* and given insufficient attention to the other writings of Origen's extant corpus. As a result, summaries of Origen's pneumatology overemphasize the Spirit's relationship to the Father and Son as described in *PArch* 1.3, 2.7 and *ComJn* 1-2,² as well as the Spirit's role in revelation and sanctification. Furthermore, scholarship

¹ See Michel R. Barnes, "The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology," *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008), 169-186.

² For a list of abbreviations of primary sources, see Appendix A.

has often read Origen's pneumatology, as well as his Trinitarian theology, through the lens of later doctrinal decisions, resulting in anachronistic attempts to vindicate him of a heterodox teaching of subordination—a teaching that was not, in Origen's time, yet deemed heterodox. This study, on the other hand, takes into account Origen's context and entire extant corpus in order to examine the Spirit's identity (who the Spirit is) and activity (what the Spirit does). This analysis will show that Origen grounds his pneumatology in Scripture, using Jewish, philosophical, and earlier Christian teachings in order to explain the Biblical passages he believes pertain to the Holy Spirit. I will argue that Origen finds the Holy Spirit to be dependent on the Father and Son, a relationship that ranks the Spirit below the Father and Son and serves as the foundation for the Spirit's salvific activity of mediating gifts to believers. Before outlining how I will pursue this thesis, we must first examine scholarship pertaining to Origen's pneumatology.

Examination of Scholarship

As stated above, little work has been done on Origen's pneumatology. This small body of scholarship is often brief and contains little analysis, with arguments resting on limited evidence that fails to account for the ambiguities in Origen's teaching. Furthermore, scholarship has focused an inordinate amount of attention on whether or not Origen's theology accords with later orthodox teaching. As a result, scholars too often allow pro-Nicene theology to influence judgments of Origen's thought. Therefore, the subject of Origen's pneumatology suffers not only from a lack of scholarship, but a lack of quality scholarship that analyzes his theology on its own terms and in its own context.

The lack of scholarship on Origen's pneumatology can be explained, in part, by the idea offered by Adolf von Harnack and maintained by others that Origen has little place for the Holy

Spirit within his theological account.³ These scholars argue that the Logos fulfills all of the functions Origen associates with the Holy Spirit. As a result, the Spirit is superfluous to Origen's theology.⁴ Against these claims, other scholars have argued the opposite. In demonstrating that Origen is concerned with the subject of the Holy Spirit, scholars have attempted to describe the Spirit's relation to the Father and Son, as well as the activities associated with the Spirit.

Regarding the former, scholars have offered a range of opinions—the result of the ambiguities present in Origen's thought—which can be divided into three categories.⁵ Some maintain that there is a hierarchical relationship between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.⁶ Others have

³ Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. Neil Buchanan (New York: Dover Publications, 1961), 2.357-8; 4.108-111. Hal Koch, *Pronoia und Paideusis: Studien über Origenes und sein Verhältnis zum Platonismus* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1932), 18, n. 1. Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, *Gottes Geist und der Mensch: Studien zur frühchristlichen Pneumatologie* (München: C. Kaiser Verlag, 1972).

⁴ For example, Harnack writes, "In order to comply with the rule of faith, and for this reason alone, for his speculation did not require a Spirit in addition to the Logos, Origen also placed the Spirit alongside of Father and Son." *History of Dogma*, 2.357. See also *History of Dogma*, 4.110.

⁵ Origen's thought is ambiguous because statements of equality between the Father, Son, and Spirit occur alongside statements that indicate a difference in ontological standing or power, especially in the passages most scholars devote attention to—*PArch* 1.3 and *ComJn* 2.73-88. Any attempt at reconciling these ambiguous statements involves privileging certain statements above others and/or attempting to explain certain texts that could have several different meanings. For example, compare the following passages: "The Holy Spirit is united in honor and dignity with the Father and the Son" (*PArch* Pref.4; trans. from Butterworth 3), and "The working of the power of God the Father and God the Son is spread indiscriminately over all created beings, but a share in the Holy Spirit is possessed, we find, by the saints alone" (*PArch* 1.3.7; trans. from Butterworth 36-37), implying that the Spirit has less power than the Father and Son. This problem is exacerbated in *PArch* by the textual problems regarding Rufinus's translation, especially the question of whether or not he interpolated Origen's thought by making it more pro-Nicene (see below for more on this topic). As a result, any attempt to offer a complete explanation of the ambiguities in *PArch* and *ComJn* must be a reading of the texts and is, therefore, easily susceptible to criticism.

⁶ Alasdair Heron, *The Holy Spirit: The Holy Spirit in the Bible, the History of Christian thought, and recent theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983); Williamina Macaulay, "The Nature of Christ in Origen's *Commentary on John*," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 19 (1966): 176-187. While they focus on the relationship between the Father and Son, the following scholars also claim that Origen's theology is hierarchical: T.E. Pollard, "Logos and Son in Origen, Arius and Athanasius," *Studia Patristica* 2 (1957): 282-287; Nigel Rowe, "Origen's Subordinationism as illustrated in his *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*," *Studia Patristica* 11.2

recognized the ambiguities in Origen's thought and have developed strategies to downplay the hierarchical relationship between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.⁷ Still others argue that Origen's theology is similar to or even corresponds with later orthodoxy.⁸ With respect to the Spirit's activities, scholars have offered cursory explanations of the Spirit's role in revelation and the giving of spiritual gifts, accentuating the Spirit's role in sanctification.⁹

(1972): 222-228; and A.H.B. Logan, "Origen and Alexandrian Wisdom Christology," in *Origeniana Tertia: The Third International Colloquium for Origen Studies, University of Manchester, September 7th-11th, 1981*, eds. Richard Hanson and Henri Crouzel (Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1985), 123-129.

⁷ Some have argued that Origen lacked the language and tools to properly elaborate his thought. For example, see Henri Crouzel, *Origen*, trans. A.S. Worrall (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989), 188; Kilian McDonnell, "Does Origen Have a Trinitarian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit?," *Gregorianum* 75.1 (1994): 13, 18-19, 34; and Philip Tite, "The Holy Spirit's Role in Origen's Trinitarian System: A Comparison with Valentinian Pneumatology," *Theoforum* 32 (2001): 144.

Others have stated that Origen's Trinitarian thought espouses an ontological equality and an economic subordination, or vice versa. See Henry Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers* (London: MacMillan, 1912), 127-135; Crouzel, *Origen*, 198-204; George Berthold, "Origen and the Holy Spirit," in *Origeniana Quinta*, ed. Robert Daly (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 446-447; McDonnell, "Does Origen Have a Trinitarian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit?," 18, 34; and Christoph Bruns, *Trinität und Kosmos: Zur Gotteslehre des Origenes*, Adamantiana 3 (Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 2013). As is visible from the above lists, some scholars have utilized both strategies of downplaying Origen's hierarchical Trinitarian theology.

⁸ Henning Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele: Das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 84 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 248-257; Christoph Marksches, "Der Heilige Geist im *Johanneskommentar* des Origenes," in *Origenes und sein Erbe: Gesammelte Studien* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 114-120; and Ilaria Ramelli, "Origen's Anti-Subordinationism and Its Heritage in the Nicene and Cappadocian Line," *Vigiliae Christianae* 65.1 (2011): 21-49. Although his concern is the relationship between the Father and the Son, see also Christopher Beeley, *The Unity of Christ: Continuity and Conflict in Patristic Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 3-45.

⁹ Berthold, "Origen and the Holy Spirit," 444-448; Michael Haykin, "'The Spirit of God': The Exegesis of 1 Cor. 2:10-12 by Origen and Athanasius," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 35 (1982): 513-528; Pablo Argarate, "The Holy Spirit in Prin I,3," in *Origeniana Nona: Origen and the Religious Practice of His Time*, eds. G. Heidl and R. Somos (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 25-48; Tite, "The Holy Spirit's Role in Origen's Trinitarian System," 131-164; McDonnell, "Does Origen Have a Trinitarian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit?," 5-35; Crouzel, *Origen*, 198-204; and Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, 127-135.

There are a few exceptions to these general scholarly appraisals. Miguel María Garijo Guembe and Maureen Moser have provided the most detailed analyses of Origen's pneumatology, although both focus only on parts of his corpus, rather than its entirety.¹⁰ Although they do not have his pneumatology as their sole focus, several recent studies examine aspects of Origen's theology of the Holy Spirit with attention to the sources upon which he is drawing and the doctrinal concerns that influence his thought, especially his anti-Monarchian polemic.¹¹

¹⁰ Garijo wrote a series of articles that constitute the most systematic study of Origen's pneumatology to date, though he focuses on Origen's early works. Garijo compiled all of the relevant passages on the Holy Spirit and attempted to explain the different facets of Origen's theology of the Holy Spirit. Garijo has some valuable observations, but he rarely engages in an analysis of the sources beyond Origen's own writings and does not discuss certain aspects of Origen's thought. See Miguel María Garijo Guembe, "Vocabulario origeniano sobre el Espíritu Divino," *Scriptorium Victoriense* 11.3 (1964): 320-358; Miguel María Garijo Guembe, "Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana," *Scriptorium Victoriense* 13.1 (1966), 65-86; Miguel María Garijo Guembe, "Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana," *Scriptorium Victoriense* 13.2 (1966), 173-216; Miguel María Garijo Guembe, "Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana III: Carácter ontológico del Espíritu Santo," *Scriptorium Victoriense* 13.3 (1966), 297-324; Miguel María Garijo Guembe, "Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana IV: Relación del Espíritu Santo con ambos testamentos," *Scriptorium Victoriense* 17.1 (1970), 65-93; and Miguel María Garijo Guembe, "Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana IV: Relación del Espíritu Santo con ambos testamentos [B]," *Scriptorium Victoriense* 17.3 (1970), 283-319.

Maureen Moser's work on the Holy Spirit in Origen's *Commentary on Romans* is significant in that it takes seriously Origen's statements on the Spirit outside of *PArch* and *ComJn* 1-2. Moser, however, continues to frame her discussion in terms of *PArch* and *ComJn* 1-2 and is just as much trying to reclaim Origen's thought for today as provide a historical account of his thought. See Maureen Beyer Moser, *Teacher of Holiness: The Holy Spirit in Origen's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2005).

¹¹ Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, "The Holy Spirit as Agent, not Activity: Origen's Argument with Modalism and its Afterlife in Didymus, Eunomius, and Gregory of Nazianus." *Vigiliae Christianae* 65 (2011): 227-248; Stephen Waers, "Monarchianism and Origen's Early Trinitarian Theology" (PhD diss., Marquette University, 2016); and Kellen Plaxco, "Didymus the Blind, Origen, and the Trinity" (PhD diss., Marquette University, 2016). See also Lewis Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver': Didymus the Blind's *De spiritu sancto* and the development of Nicene Pneumatology," in *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church: The Proceedings of the Seventh International Patristic Conference, Maynooth, 2008*, edited by D. Vincent Twomey and Janet Rutherford (Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2010), 57-72.

My dissertation will engage in the scholarship noted above, while adding to our understanding of Origen's pneumatology. I will offer a reading different than the narratives common in previous scholarship by showing the importance of the Spirit to Origen's thought, by engaging in a more comprehensive analysis of all relevant texts, by drawing attention to the previous thought that influences his own work, and by establishing his theology based on his own writings and context, rather than how well he conforms to or anticipates pro-Nicene theology. Furthermore, my dissertation will be a part of a recent re-examination of the development of pneumatology in early Christianity.¹² While my focus will be on Origen, this study will help establish the previous Jewish and Christian sources he chooses to accept and reject, as well as provide a foundation for future studies that analyze the influence Origen exerted on later pneumatologies.

Methodology

Having discussed the previous scholarship related to my dissertation topic, it is important to lay out several aspects of my methodology. I will proceed thematically, rather than pursuing a chronological approach, because we gain a more nuanced account of Origen's pneumatology by examining relevant passages together. And, as I have stated, my study will utilize Origen's entire extant corpus in order to gain as comprehensive a picture of his thought as possible. These elements of my study, however, can also lead to problems for which I must account. These

¹² See Lewis Ayres, "Innovation and *Ressourcement* in Pro-Nicene Pneumatology," *Augustinian Studies* 39.2 (2008): 187-205; Michel R. Barnes, "The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39.2 (2008): 169-186; Bogdan Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses* (Leiden: Brill, 2009); and Anthony Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

problems are, namely, the question of any kind of development in Origen's thought and the question of the reliability of the Latin translations of his work.

Regarding the first question, my thematic approach makes it more difficult to ascertain whether or not Origen's thought has developed. Where possible, I have looked for development in his thought, and I have noted a few occasions where Origen does appear to change his mind on a particular topic. On the whole, however, I have found Origen to be consistent in his teaching. Although it is the case that his most expansive discussions of the Holy Spirit occur in earlier writings, his presentation of the Spirit in later writings remains consistent with his previous thought—the best interpretation of the later material fits with his earlier teaching. This is logical, for the reason that Peter Martens notes: “Much of Origen's surviving corpus stems from a period of relative intellectual maturity (for example, one of the earliest surviving works, *On First Principles*, was probably written when Origen was already 44 or 45 years old).”¹³

With respect to the second question, much of Origen's work has been lost, in part due to his later condemnation,¹⁴ and what is extant is often available only in Latin translations. Much ink has been spilled on the reliability, or unreliability, of these translations. While it is difficult, if not impossible, to perfectly determine where Origen's thought has been altered—barring the discovery of these sources in the original Greek—Rufinus gives some indication of what he has changed in his preface to *PArch*. There, he writes that he is following the pattern of translation

¹³ Peter Martens, *Origen and Scripture: Contours of the Exegetical Life*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 19, n. 60, with reference to Pierre Nautin, *Origène: Sa vie et son oeuvre* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977), 410.

¹⁴ For an introduction to the anti-Origenist statements of Justinian and the Council of Constantinople in 553, see Richard Price, ed., *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553 with related texts on the Three Chapters Controversy*, 2 vols., Translated Texts for Historians 51 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009), 2.270-286. For more on this topic, see Elizabeth Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

carried out by Jerome,¹⁵ who “smoothed over and emended” passages that are “likely to cause offense” so that “a Latin reader would find in them [the translations of Origen’s work] nothing out of harmony with our faith.”¹⁶ Rufinus goes on to say that Origen’s work has been interpolated by others, and he describes what he has done to correct these interpolations:

Wherever, therefore, I have found in his [Origen’s] books anything contrary to the reverent statements made by him about the Trinity in other places, I have either omitted it as a corrupt and interpolated passage, or reproduced it in a form that agrees with the doctrine which I have often found him affirming elsewhere.¹⁷

Rufinus claims here that he has found Origen offering “reverent statements” about the Trinity elsewhere, using these other teachings as a model for the teachings that he has added. However, scholars have concluded that Rufinus’s source for these “reverent statements” is the *Dialogue of Adamantius on the Orthodox Faith*—a work spuriously attributed to Origen and exhibiting pro-Nicene Trinitarian theology.¹⁸ As Thomas Scheck describes, Rufinus used the *Dialogue of*

¹⁵ Elsewhere, Rufinus describes Jerome’s translation practice in the *Homilies on Isaiah*. He writes in *Apology of Rufinus* 2.27a, “In previous cases you took out what was unedifying in matters of faith, though you did so in such a way as not to excise them wholly nor in all cases. For instance, in the Homilies on Isaiah, at the Vision of God Origen refers the words to the Son and the Holy Spirit; and so you have translated, adding, however, words of your own which would make the passage have a more acceptable sense” (trans. from NPNF Second Series 3:472). Rufinus admits to this same practice: “The same thing I have done in a great many cases, either cutting out words or bending them into a sounder meaning” (trans. from NPNF Second Series 3:472).

¹⁶ Rufinus, Pref.2 of *PArch* (trans. from Butterworth lxiii). Rufinus says similar things elsewhere. For example, in his preface to the *Commentary on Romans*, he explains that the commentary had “been tampered with” and that books were missing (Preface of Rufinus 2; trans. from FOTC 103:51). As a result, he had to “fill in these things and restore complete continuity to the Latin work” (Preface of Rufinus 2; trans. from FOTC 103:51).

¹⁷ Rufinus, Pref.3 of *PArch* (trans. from Butterworth lxiii).

¹⁸ Rufinus, Pref.3 of *PArch* (trans. from Butterworth lxiii). See Thomas Scheck, introduction to *Apology for Origen with the Letter of Rufinus on the Falsification of the Books of Origen*, by Pamphilus, trans. Thomas Scheck, Fathers of the Church 120 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010), 16-17; and Ronald Heine, introduction to *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*, by Origen, trans. Ronald Heine, Fathers of the Church 71 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1982), 28-29, 34. For an English translation see Robert Pretty, ed. and trans., *Adamantius: Dialogue on the True Faith in God*, Gnostica 1 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997). For the critical edition, see Adamantius, *Der Dialog des Adamantius: ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΝ ΟΡΘΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ*, ed. Willem Hendrik van de Sande Bakhuyzen,

Adamantius as Origen's own thought, placing the thought of the *Dialogue* into Origen's own work "whenever he was convinced that heretics had inserted their own corruptions into Origen's original text."¹⁹ Importantly, Rufinus singles out Trinitarian theology as the subject of his alterations, a point that is especially significant for the present study because the study of Origen's pneumatology necessarily engages his Trinitarian theology.²⁰ Since there are questions surrounding the Latin translations of Origen's work, I have attempted to use Greek texts wherever possible. However, it would be a mistake to simply dismiss the Latin translations from a study of Origen's thought. Therefore, I have exercised caution in my selection of Latin texts, especially when using passages that speak of the Trinity, and noted occasions where a translation is suspect.²¹

Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 4 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901). Vinzenz Buchheit, Rufinus von Aquileia als Fälscher des Adamantiosdialogs," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 51 (1958): 314-328, claims that Rufinus knew the *Dialogue* was not written by Origen, while C.P. Hammond, "The Last Ten Years of Rufinus' Life and the Date of his Move South from Aquileia," *Journal of Theological Studies* 28.2 (1977): 372-429, refutes this claim, showing that Rufinus believed the document to be Origen's genuine work.

¹⁹ Scheck, introduction to *Apology for Origen*, 17.

²⁰ Heine, introduction to *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*, 38, writes, "One may say that, on the whole, the substance [of Rufinus's Latin translations] can be regarded as representing Origen's thought. The major exception to this statement is theological statements regarding the Trinity and the resurrection of the body. Whenever statements on these subjects agree with the doctrines of the fourth-century Church they should be regarded with suspicion." Given the problems with Trinitarian statements found in Latin translations, I prefer accounts of the Trinity that are found in Origen's works preserved in Greek.

²¹ For a good overview of the scholarly appraisal of the Latin translations of Origen's work, as well as Rufinus's translation method, see Heine, introduction to *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*, 27-39. For more on this topic, see Gustave Bardy, *Recherches sur l'histoire du texte et des versions latines du De Principiis d'Origène* (Paris: É. Champion, 1923); Henry Chadwick, "Rufinus and the Tura Papyrus of Origen's Commentary on Romans," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 10 (1959), 19-37; G.W. Butterworth, introduction to *On First Principles*, by Origen, trans. and ed. G.W. Butterworth (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), xxxi-lii; Basile Studer, "À propos des traductions d'Origène par Jérôme et Rufin," *Vetera Christianorum* 5 (1968): 137-154; F. Winkelmann, "Einige Bemerkungen zu den Aussagen des Rufinus von Aquileia und des Hieronymus über ihre Übersetzungstheorie und -methode," in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, ed. P. Granfield and J. Jungmann, vol. 2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1970), 532-547; Pierre Nautin, *Origène: sa vie et son oeuvre* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977), 150-153.

There is one final methodological concern that we must discuss—Origen’s use of the term “spirit.” Passages throughout his corpus reference the “Holy Spirit,” but Origen also names the Holy Spirit in other ways.²² In addition, Origen uses the term “spirit” to refer to other things—he calls God “spirit,”²³ the Lord “spirit,”²⁴ and a part of the human being “spirit.”²⁵ He is

²² For example, he calls the Holy Spirit simply “Spirit,” “Spirit of God,” and “Spirit of Christ.” See *PArch* 1.3.4; *PEuch* 22.3; and *ComRm* 7.1.1-2.

²³ Origen bases this assessment on John 4:24, where it is said that “God is spirit.” See *ComJn* 13.124; *ComJn* 13.140; and *HomLc* 26.1.

²⁴ Origen finds this evaluation on 2 Cor 3:17, where it is written that “the Lord is Spirit.” The Lord refers to Christ, as demonstrated by *HomLc* 26.1, where Origen writes that “our Lord and Savior” is spirit (trans. from FOTC 94:109). See *HomLc* 26.1-2 and *HomEx* 12.4.

²⁵ Origen describes the human being as trichotomous; he provides a succinct explanation of his anthropology in *ComRm* 1.18.5, writing, “We frequently find in the Scriptures, and we have often discussed this topic, that man may be said to be spirit, body, and soul. And when it is said, ‘The flesh desires contrary to the spirit, and the spirit desires contrary to the flesh’ (Gal 5:17), the soul is undoubtedly placed in the middle. Either it gives assent to the desires of the spirit or it is inclined toward the lusts of the flesh. If it joins itself to the flesh it becomes one body with it in its lust and sinful desires; but if it should associate itself with the spirit it shall be one spirit with it. It is after all for this reason that the Lord says in the Scriptures concerning those whose souls had been untied completely with the flesh, ‘My Spirit shall no longer abide in these men, for they are flesh’ (Gen 6:3). But concerning those whose soul had united with the spirit the Apostle says, ‘But you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit’ (Rom 8:9)” (trans. from FOTC 103:94). Origen explains that the human person is made up of three parts, with the soul being between the flesh and the spirit, the former evil and the latter good. In explaining this idea elsewhere, Origen adds that Paul often “does not explicitly designate the soul but only the flesh and the spirit. For he knows that the soul inevitably attaches itself to one of these two aspects” (*ComRm* 1.5.3; trans. from FOTC 103:71). This helps to explain Origen’s frequent juxtaposition of the flesh and spirit—because the soul necessarily moves to either good or evil, he sometimes speaks as of a dichotomous anthropology, dropping the soul (While the contrast between the flesh and the spirit is not speaking of the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit does have a role in helping humans move from the flesh toward the spirit, as we will examine in chapter four).

In any event, it is important to note that the spirit, which is a part of human nature, is not the Holy Spirit, but refers specifically to the human spirit, as Origen makes clear in *DialHer* 6: “We have learned from the holy Scriptures that the human being is a composite. For the Apostle says: ‘May God sanctify your spirit and your soul and your body,’ and also: ‘May the God of peace sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ’ (1 Thess 5:23). This spirit is not the Holy Spirit, but a part of the human composite, as the same Apostle teaches us when he says: ‘The Spirit bears witness with our spirit’ (Rom 8:16) for if it were the Holy Spirit, he would not have said: ‘The Spirit bears witness with our spirit’” (trans. from ACW 54:62). Origen interprets the two references to spirit in Rom 8:16 to refer to two different spirits: the human spirit and the Holy Spirit (see also *ComRm* 7.3.2 and *ComJn* 32.218). The human spirit, therefore, is one of the three parts of the human being, along with the body and the soul.

also able to designate any number of other beings, both good and evil, as “spirits.”²⁶ Because Origen uses the term in so many different ways, it is sometimes difficult to determine its referent. In making this judgment, the context in which Origen uses the term “spirit” is often key. For example, when using the term “spirit” of the Holy Spirit, he may speak of the Holy Spirit earlier in the passage, or use a Scriptural passage mentioning the Holy Spirit within his exegesis. For this reason, it is often clear—as long as one examines the entirety of Origen’s thought in a passage—when he is referring to the Holy Spirit. Still, one must never assume and always determine the referent for the term “spirit.”

Chapter Summary and Outline

Having dispensed with some necessary methodological points, it is now time to lay out a summary of the chapters of this dissertation. Since the relationship between the Father and Son is important for understanding both the Spirit’s identity and activity, I will begin this study by examining the relationship that exists between the Father and Son. This chapter does not attempt to be exhaustive, but rather examines the points of this relationship necessary for detailing the Holy Spirit’s relationship to the Father and Son—the distribution of existence and attributes from the Father to the Son, as well as the relationship of both to creation.

Chapter One serves as the foundation for Chapter Two, since the Holy Spirit’s existence and attributes are dependent on the Father and the Son. The first part of the chapter is an analysis of the Spirit’s generation from the Father and through the Son; the second part investigates the

²⁶ In *ComRm* 7.1.2 after mentioning the Holy Spirit, Origen writes, “But that there are more spirits, this same Paul also declares when writing to the Hebrews, stating, ‘Are they not all ministering spirits sent to serve for the sake of those who will inherit salvation?’ (Heb 1:14). Moreover, David says, ‘Who makes his angels spirits’ (Ps 104:4)” (trans. from FOTC 104:61). Origen adds just after this in *ComRm* 7.1.3 that “spirits are labeled ‘evil’ and angels [are labeled] ‘evil’” (trans. from FOTC 104:61).

Spirit's reception of attributes, which he also receives from the Father and through the Son. This ranks the Holy Spirit below the Father and Son ontologically. Furthermore, the Spirit's reliance on the Father and Son is instrumental for understanding the subject of the remaining chapters of this study, the Spirit's activity, for which the Spirit remains dependent on the Father and Son.

Chapter Three examines how the Spirit's activity informs Origen's descriptions of the Holy Spirit as both one and seven. By uniting the idea of the sevenfold Spirit with power language, Origen establishes how the Holy Spirit can be both one and many and associates the Spirit's multiplicity with the different gifts that the Spirit bestows. This provides the background for an understanding of the Spirit's activity of giving gifts to believers, the content of Chapter Four. There, I explore the many gifts the Spirit gives to believers and his continued dependence on the Father and Son, ranking him below the Father and Son economically—just as the Spirit is reliant on the Father and Son for his existence and attributes, so he is dependent on the Father and Son in order to distribute the spiritual gifts. Chapter Five investigates the Holy Spirit's economic role, first with respect to the incarnate Christ, then with respect to believers. I detail the Spirit's dwelling in Christ in order to cooperate in salvation; then, I explain the Spirit's part in helping believers progress to perfection.

Chapter One: The Father and the Son

Before discussing Origen’s pneumatology, we must first examine the relationship that exists between the Father and Son concerning both the Son’s being and his attributes. This will allow us to understand how the Spirit is generated and receives its attributes, the subject of chapter two. The current chapter will proceed as an analysis of the *auto-X* attributes of the Father and Son,²⁷ which will establish that the Father is the source of all that the Son is and, as such, is ranked above the Son ontologically. First, I will offer an analysis of the Father’s *auto-X* attributes and their relationship to the Son, placing Origen’s thought within the context of his anti-Monarchian polemic. Then, I will examine the Son’s *auto-X* attributes, following the work of several scholars in arguing that Origen uses the prefix *auto-* of the Son to denote his relationship to creation, not his relationship with the Father. However, I will add to previous scholarship by providing a more thorough analysis of the Son’s attributes and arguing that scholars have downplayed the hierarchical nature of Origen’s comments on the Son’s *auto-X* attributes. This chapter, therefore, will establish Origen’s hierarchical understanding of the Father, the Son, and creation, which will allow us to grasp the Spirit’s rank within this hierarchy.

1.1: The Father’s *Auto-X* Attributes

Origen predicates two *auto-X* attributes of the Father—*auto-God* and *auto-Good*. His expositions of these titles utilize a constellation of terms—source [πηγή], image [εικόν], participation [μετοχή/μετέχω/μεταδίδωμι], and eminence [ὑπερέχω/ὑπεροχή]—by which he

²⁷ As Robert Grant, “The Prefix *Auto-* in Early Christian Theology,” in *The Impact of the Church upon Its Culture: Reappraisals of the History of Christianity*, ed. Jerald Brauer (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1968), 6-7, observes, the prefix *auto-* was first used of the Ideas as a way of denoting X itself, rather than a quality that participated in X, and later used to characterize the highest being. For Grant’s comments on Origen’s use of the prefix *auto-*, see p. 7-11.

further defines what it means to possess an *auto-X* attribute. Grasping the significance of these terms allows us to recognize other qualities the Father possesses as *auto-X* attributes. More importantly, it demonstrates that Origen ranks the Father above the Son, a hierarchical schema which functions as a means to combat Monarchian theology.²⁸ In addition to providing an

²⁸ Many scholars have pointed out that Origen is concerned with Monarchianism, but few have situated his theology within this context, the most important being Ronald Heine, Stephen Waers, and Kellen Plaxco. Heine has discussed Origen's relationship to Monarchian theology in several works, but see especially "The Christology of Callistus," *Journal of Theological Studies* 49 (1998): 56-91, where he offers a reconstruction of Monarchian theology and shows the ways in which Origen's language aligns with the descriptions of Monarchian theology in other sources. Heine's later work *Origen: Scholarship in the Service of the Church*, Christian Theology in Context (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 97-103, also deals with this topic. Plaxco, "Didymus the Blind, Origen, and the Trinity" (PhD diss., Marquette University, 2016), especially 42-109, examines Origen's participatory language as a response, in part, to Monarchian theology. Waers, "Monarchianism and Origen's Early Trinitarian Theology" (PhD diss., Marquette University, 2016), offers the most detailed examination of Monarchian theology in English to date, along with how this informs our reading of Origen's Trinitarian theology.

Several other recent works have examined the role of Monarchian theology within the context of the development of Trinitarian doctrine and have touched on Origen's interaction with Monarchian theology: Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, "The Holy Spirit as Agent, not Activity: Origen's Argument with Modalism and its Afterlife in Didymus, Eunomius, and Gregory of Nazianzus," *Vigiliae Christianae* 64 (2010): 227-248, esp. 232-233; Mark DelCogliano, "The Interpretation of John 10:30 in the Third Century: Antimonarchian Polemics and the Rise of Grammatical Reading Techniques," *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 6.1 (2012): 117-138; Matthew Crawford, "The Triumph of Pro-Nicene Theology over Anti-Monarchian Exegesis: Cyril of Alexandria and Theodore of Heraclea on John 14:10-11," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 21.4 (2013): 537-68.

For scholars who acknowledge Origen's concern with Monarchianism, but spend little time on how this might influence his thought, see the following: Miguel Maria Garijo Guembe, "Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana," *Scriptorium Victoriense* 13.1 (1966): 85-86; Miguel Maria Garijo Guembe, "Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana III: Carácter ontológico del Espíritu Santo," *Scriptorium Victoriense* 13.3 (1966): 301-302; Josep Rius-Camps, *El dinamismo trinitario en la divinización de los seres racionales según Orígenes* (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1970), esp. 157-158; A.H.B. Logan, "Origen and the Development of Trinitarian Theology," in *Origeniana Quarta*, ed. Lothar Lies (Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1987), 424-429; Antonio Orbe, "Orígenes y los monarquianos," *Gregorianum* (1991): 39-72; George Berthold, "Origen and the Holy Spirit," in *Origeniana Quinta*, ed. Robert Daly (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 446; Beeley, *The Unity of Christ*, 20-22; and Christoph Bruns, *Trinität und Kosmos: Zur Gotteslehre des Origenes*, Adamantina 3 (Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 2013), especially 126 and 263-4.

explanation of the Father's *auto-X* attributes, then, this section will serve as a foundation for discussing the Son's *auto-X* attributes, the subject of the following section.

In his exposition of John 1:1 Origen observes that in one place the Gospel of John uses *theos* with an article, but omits the article in another place. He explains this difference by stating that the author "adds the article when the noun 'God' stands for the uncreated cause of the universe, but he omits it when the Word is referred to as 'God.'"²⁹ He goes on to write of the significance of this variation:

We must say to them that at one time God, with the article, is very God, wherefore also the Savior says in his prayer to the Father, "That they may know you the only true God" (John 17:3). On the other hand, everything, besides the very God [τὸ αὐτόθεος], which is made God by participation [μετοχή] in his divinity, would more properly not be said to be "the God," but "God." To be sure, his "firstborn of every creature," inasmuch as he was the first to be with God and has drawn divinity into himself, is more honored [τιμιώτερος] than the other gods beside him (of whom God is God as it is said, "The God of gods, the Lord has spoken, and he has called the earth"). It was by his ministry [διακονήσας] that they became gods, for he drew from God that they might be deified, sharing [μεταδιδούς] ungrudgingly also with them according to his goodness.³⁰

²⁹ *ComJn* 2.14 (trans. from FOTC 98). Compare Philo's interpretation of Gen 31:13 in *Somn.* 1.227-230, where he differentiates God from his Logos based on the presence of the article when referring to God. See also Waers, "Monarchianism," 282-283.

For the relationship between Philo and Origen more generally, see David Runia, "Philo and Origen: A Preliminary Survey," in *Origeniana Quinta*, ed. Robert Daly (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 333-339; David Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993), 157-183; and Annewies van den Hoek, "Philo and Origen: A Descriptive Catalogue of Their Relationship," *The Studia Philonica Annual* 12 (2000): 44-121.

³⁰ *ComJn* 2.17 (trans. from FOTC 80:98-99; Greek from GCS 10:54-55). πᾶν δὲ τὸ παρὰ τὸ αὐτόθεος μετοχή τῆς ἐκείνου θεότητος θεοποιούμενον οὐχ, ὁ θεὸς ἀλλὰ θεὸς κυριώτερον ἂν λέγοιτο, οὗ πάντως ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, ἅτε πρῶτος τῷ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εἶναι σπάσας τῆς θεότητος εἰς ἑαυτὸν, ἐστὶ τιμιώτερος, τοῖς λοιποῖς παρ' αὐτὸν θεοῖς (ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸ λεγόμενον· Θεὸς θεῶν κύριος ἐλάλησε, καὶ ἐκάλεσε τὴν γῆν) διακονήσας τὸ γενέσθαι θεοῖς, ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρυσά<μενος> εἰς τὸ θεοποιηθῆναι αὐτούς, ἀφθόνως κἀκείνοις κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ χρηστότητα μεταδιδούς. Cf. *ComRm* 7.13.9: "But both are one God, since there is no other source of deity for the Son than the Father; but of that one paternal fountain, as wisdom says, the Son is 'the purest emanation' (Wisd. 7:25)" (trans. from FOTC 104:109).

See also the expositions of Plaxco, "Didymus the Blind," 57-65, and Waers, "Monarchianism," 280-299.

Based on a grammatical reading of John 1:1, along with support from John 17:3, Origen writes that all those who are “gods” receive their divinity through participation [μετοχή] in the Father,³¹ because the Father is “the very God” [τὸ αὐτόθεος]. This includes the Son, “his ‘firstborn of every creature.’”³² Yet, the Son is distinguished from all the other gods as more honored

³¹ For the idea of participation and its importance in Origen’s thought more generally, see René Cadiou, *Origen: His Life at Alexandria*, trans. John Southwell (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1944), 329; Jacques Dupuis, *L’Esprit de l’Homme: étude sur l’anthropologie religieuse d’Origène* (Desclée de Brouwer, 1967), 97-98; Josep Rius-Camps, *El dinamismo trinitario en la divinización de los seres racionales según Orígenes* (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1970); David Balas, “The Idea of Participation in the Structure of Origen’s Thought. Christian Transposition of a Theme of the Platonic Tradition,” in *Origeniana: Premier colloque international des études origéniennes*, eds. Henri Crouzel, Gennaro Lomiento, and Josep Rius-Camps (Bari: Istituto di Letteratura Cristiana Antica, 1975), 257-275; Norman Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 140-154; and Dmitry Biriukov, “Paradigms of Participation in Origen,” *Scrinium* 13 (2017): 277-290.

³² It should be noted that Origen once says that the Son possesses divinity essentially [οὐσιωδῶς], a term he uses in *CCels* 6.44 to juxtapose what a being possesses by its own nature and what a being possesses accidentally. In *DialHer* 5 Origen says that he has maintained the “substantial [οὐσιωδῶς] divinity of Jesus Christ” even though he has also taught that Christ had a body. Plaxco, “Didymus the Blind,” 90-96, 143-150, provides the argument that Origen is speaking of the Son as a divine, individual being as a part of his anti-Monarchian polemic, not as possessing divinity in the same way as the Father. Other passages in Origen’s corpus, such as *ComJn* 6.188, attest to the use of οὐσιωδῶς as referring to an individual existence. I am in agreement with Plaxco’s argument, and there is more evidence to support his claim.

DialHer 1-2 includes a dialogue between Origen and Heraclides, where Origen emphasizes the distinctness between the Father and Son, while maintaining their unity, and explains in what way it is proper to speak of both one God and two Gods. After the dialogue is concluded, Origen gives examples from Scripture of two things that are one, such as a husband and wife who become one flesh and a just person who becomes one spirit with Christ. Regarding the latter example, Origen even addresses the fact that Christ is superior to believers, asking whether or not this negates the unity of the two. He answers his own question by writing: “But is not one of these of a lower or diminished and inferior nature, while Christ is of a more divine and glorious and blessed nature? Are they therefore no longer two? Yes, ‘for the man and the woman are no longer two [δύο] but one [μία] flesh’ (Matt 19:6), and the just person and Christ are ‘one spirit [πνεῦμα ἓν]’” (*DialHer* 3; trans. from ACW 54:59; Greek from SC 67:60). Origen goes on to note that the Father and Christ are also one God. The fact that Origen would address how two things can be one when one of the two is of a lesser status suggests that the participatory scheme from *ComJn* 2.17 remains true in the *DialHer*. This would mean that the Son does not possess divinity essentially since He receives it through participation from the Father.

The context of the *DialHer* can also help us determine that Origen is using οὐσιωδῶς to accentuate the Son’s real divine existence. In addition to writing against the Monarchians—those who “have fallen prey to the illusory notion of unicity [μοναρχία]” (trans. from ACW 54:60;

[τιμιώτερος] than them because “he was the first to be with God and has drawn divinity into himself,” before mediating it to all the other gods. Rather than receiving their divinity from the Father, all the other gods receive their divinity through the ministry of the Son, a relationship that Origen describes as a “sharing [μεταδιδούς],” which reveals that the ministry of the Son involves participation in the Son.³³

Greek from SC 67:60)—Origen is also combatting those who deny the divinity of Christ, as he specifies in *DialHer* 4, where he writes, “Nor do we fall into the other impious doctrine which denies the divinity of Christ” (trans. from ACW 54:60). Within this context, Origen’s description of Christ as a divine, individual being serves the additional purpose of underscoring the Son’s possession of divinity.

³³ *CCels* 6.64 shows that Origen considers the term μεταδίωμι to express the same relationship as μετοχή/μετέχω. Origen writes, “God does not even participate [μετέχει] in being. For He is participated in [μετέχεται], rather than participates [μετέχει]” (trans. from Chadwick 379; Greek from SC 147:338). Just below this, Origen details how one participates in being, but uses the term μεταδίωμι, demonstrating that he considers μεταδίωμι to refer to the same relationship as μετοχή/μετέχω: “We would have to discover whether God ‘transcends being [ουσίας] in rank and power’, and grants a share [μεταδιδούς] in being [ουσίας] to those whose participation [μεταδίωσι] is according to His Logos [λόγον]...” (trans. from Chadwick 379; Greek from SC 147:340).

Origen does not specify whether or not the Son possesses divinity eternally, but Waers, “Monarchianism,” 293, has proposed an answer to this problem. In *ComJn* 2.18 Origen writes, “The God, therefore, is the true God. The others are gods formed according to him as images of the prototype. But again, the archetypal image of the many images is *the* Word with *the* God, who was ‘in the beginning.’ By being ‘with *the* God’ he always continues to be ‘God.’ But he would not have this if he were not with God, and he would not remain God if he did not continue in unceasing contemplation of the depth of the Father” (trans. from FOTC 80:99). Prior to this, in *ComJn* 2.8-9, Origen offers an exegesis of John 1:1 in which he explains that the Son does not come to be, but always is with God, securing the Son’s eternality (see Ronald Heine, *Origen: Scholarship in the Service of the Church*, Christian Theology in Context (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 97). Origen adds here that the Son is God by always remaining with God. Yet, he adds that the Son must remain in “unceasing contemplation of the depth of the Father” in order to continue to participate in the Father’s divinity, which appears to make his divinity contingent on this action. Waers, “Monarchianism,” 293, fn. 144, writes, “There is a tension in Origen’s thought.... The tension lies in the fact that Origen seems to be bending philosophy’s schema so that he can account for the Christian faith. Normally, a trait that is possessed by participation can be lost; but Origen claims that this is not the case with regard to Jesus’ possession of divinity by participation.” While Origen believes that the Son has received his divinity from the Father and is positioned below Him, he also believes that the Son will always continue to be with God and contemplate Him. For this reason, the Son cannot lose his divinity. This logic can explain Origen’s comments about the Son’s other attributes that he receives by participating in the Father—the Son cannot lose these attributes because he always

As both Stephen Waers and Kellen Plaxco have observed, we can understand Origen's use of *auto-X* and participatory language through Numenius, who writes of the first and second gods:

For if the Second (Divinity) is good, not from itself but from the First, how then would it be possible that he (the First) is not good, if the latter derives his goodness from participation [μετουσίας] with the (other, the First), especially as the Second participates [μεταλαχὼν] in him (the First) specially because he is the good? So Plato taught the sharply observant (auditor) by his statement, 'That the Good is one.' That this is so, Plato has expressed in different ways; for in the *Timaeus* (10) he used the popular manner of expression, and said that he was 'good;' but in his Republic (vii.14), he speaks of the 'Idea of the Good.' Thus the Good would also be the Idea of the Creator, because he appears to us good through participation [μετουσία] in the First and only. Just as one says, that men are formed according to the Idea of Man, and cattle after the Idea of Cattle, and the horses, after the Idea of the Horse, so is it also probably with the Creator; for if the latter is good only because of his participation [μετουσία] in the goodness of the First Good, then would the First Mind, as the Good-In-Itself [αὐτοαγαθόν], be its Idea (or model).³⁴

Here we see the same *auto-X*—in this case, *autoagathon*—and participatory language that we see in *ComJn* 2.17. Numenius explains that the second god is good because it participates [μετουσίας] in the goodness of the first god, who is absolute goodness [αὐτοαγαθόν]. He reiterates this point through an analogy, saying that, just as visible things participate in the Ideas—for example, cattle participate in the Idea of cattle—so the first god, as absolute goodness, is the Idea of the second god, who participates in absolute goodness. The particular language used in Numenius and Origen indicates that one being is ranked above the other, because the lower being is reliant on the higher being for the possession of a certain characteristic.³⁵

remains with the Father. The Son is eternal and eternally with God; therefore, his possession of the attributes is also eternal.

³⁴ Numenius, *Fragments* 19-20 (trans. from Kenneth Guthrie, trans., *The Neoplatonic Writings of Numenius* (Lawrence, KS: Selene Books, 1987), 34-36; Greek from Numenius, *Fragments*, ed. Édouard des Places (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1973), 59-60).

³⁵ Waers, "Monarchianism," 278, writes, "In the fragments where Numenius uses αὐτοαγαθός, two things are clear: (1) there is a hierarchy with the principal possessor (the First)

The hierarchical structure of Origen’s thought—the Son’s reception of divinity from the Father—can best be understood in the context of his anti-Monarchian polemic.³⁶ In order to understand how this aspect of Origen’s theology addressed Monarchianism, it is useful to examine two of the hallmarks of Monarchian thought, a summary of which Waers offers in his recent study:

The most foundational tenet of monarchian theology, and the one that remains stable across all witnesses, is the strong affirmation that there is only one God. At the beginning of the third century, such claims were common. Both the monarchians and their opponents claimed to believe in only one God. The distinctive thing about the monarchian commitment to belief in only one God was that it interpreted the oneness of God in a manner that rejected the position held by their opponents, namely, that Jesus and the father were distinct realities and both God.³⁷

All extant descriptions of Monarchian thought are, unfortunately, contained within polemical writings, but Waers argues that these texts are able to reveal some of the Monarchians’ beliefs. Because Monarchians maintained both that God is one and that Christ is divine, they concluded that the Father and Son are to be identified.³⁸ The author of *Contra Noetum* offers the following succinct account of this teaching:

It is these who are even trying to show how the doctrine is established by saying, “He said in the Law: ‘I am the God of your fathers; you shall have no other gods besides me’ (Ex. 3:6; 20:3). And again elsewhere, ‘I am the first’, he says, ‘and I am the last, and in addition to me there is no one’” (Is. 44:6). This is the way they are claiming to establish a

of an attribute (ὄντο-X) at the top; and (2) that the Second possesses the attribute through reception of a share of what the principal possessor has.”

For more on Origen’s ties to Numenius’s thought, see Plaxco, “Didymus the Blind,” 46-70; Waers, “Monarchianism,” 270-280. Waers, “Monarchianism,” 282-283, also draws attention to the parallels between this passage and Philo’s *Somn.* 2.228-229, where Philo distinguishes between the word “God” with the definite article and the word without the definite article.

³⁶ Origen never mentions the Monarchians as his opponents, but, as Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 57, observes, we know from Eusebius that Origen visited Rome at a time when Monarchianism was probably popular there (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 6.14.10). Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 58, also writes that the first two books of the *ComJn* were probably written shortly after Origen returned from Rome, noting that the books “are largely structured by the modalist question. ...the modalist problem appears several times in his exegetical comments on John 1:1-5, and appears to have been much on his mind.”

³⁷ Waers, “Monarchianism,” 213-214.

³⁸ Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 82; Waers, “Monarchianism,” 213-214.

single God. They reply to queries by saying, “Well, if I maintain that Christ is God, then he is the Father in person [αὐτὸς...ἔστιν ὁ Πατήρ]—if in fact he is God at all. But Christ, who is personally God, suffered. Then was it not the Father who suffered? After all, he was the Father in person [<Πατήρ> γὰρ αὐτὸς ἦν].”³⁹

This description of Monarchian theology suggests that they used several passages from the Old Testament in order to establish that there was one God. It also indicates, however, that they claimed that Christ is God and should be identified as God the Father.⁴⁰

Later Monarchians equated the Father and the Spirit, and maintained that the Father/Spirit indwelt the flesh of the human Jesus, explaining this relationship using Stoic mixture theory.⁴¹ This differentiated the Son, as Jesus’ humanity, from the Father/Spirit. But as Heine notes, the indwelling Father/Spirit within the human Jesus allowed Monarchians “to designate the Son ‘one God’ along with the Father.”⁴² Later attestations of Monarchian theology confirm the importance of the two tenets of Monarchianism—the beliefs in one God and that the Son of God (insofar as Jesus’ humanity is deified) is identified with the Father. Tertullian says throughout *Adversus Praxean* 2-3 that the Monarchians believe in one God—the confession of Tertullian himself—but he also writes that the Monarchians identify both the Father and the Son as that same one God: “They will have it that the two are one, so that the Father and the Son are

³⁹ *Contra Noetum* 2.1-3 (trans. and Greek from Hippolytus, *Contra Noetum*, ed. and trans. Robert Butterworth (London: Heythrop Monographs, 1977), 44-45). The issue of Patripassianism is not relevant to the topic at hand, but it should be noted that some Monarchians, by identifying the Son with the Father, made the logical conclusion that the Father suffered. This appears to have been an earlier form of Monarchianism. For more on the theology of Noetus, see Waers, “Monarchianism,” 129-131; and Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 82-83.

⁴⁰ The author of *Contra Noetum* does not cite any Scripture here indicating what passages Monarchians may have used to support their insistence that Christ should be identified as the Father. Based on the author’s refutation of the Monarchian position, however, it appears that the Monarchians appealed to John 10:30 and John 14:8-10 as evidence that Christ should be identified as the Father. See Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 83-84; and Waers, “Monarchianism,” 126-129.

⁴¹ Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 68-78, 89-91.

⁴² Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 71.

to be considered identical [*duos unum volunt esse ut idem Pater et Filius habeatur*].”⁴³ The *Refutatio omnium haeresium* attests to the same belief. There, the author describes Noetus as claiming that the Father and Son are “one and the same, not one individual produced from a different one.”⁴⁴

Although Origen does not mention the Monarchians by name, *ComJn* 2.16 provides a good example of his awareness of, and concern with, Monarchian theology:

Many people who wish to be pious are troubled because they are afraid that they may proclaim two Gods and, for this reason, they fall into false and impious beliefs. They either deny that the individual nature of the Son is other than that of the Father by confessing him to be God whom they refer to as “Son” in name at least, or they deny the divinity of the Son and make his individual nature and essence as an individual to be different from the Father.⁴⁵

As both Waers and Plaxco have observed, the first impious belief Origen lists describes the Monarchian positions we outlined above—they maintain that the Son does not have an individual nature apart from the Father.⁴⁶ This passage also states that many people have this impious belief for fear of proclaiming two gods, an accusation Monarchians made against their opponents.⁴⁷

⁴³ Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* 5.1 (trans. from Evans 134; Latin from CCSL 2:1163). Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 70-71, notes that Tertullian appears to be familiar with the later instantiations of Monarchianism that we discussed above.

⁴⁴ *Refutatio* 9.10.11 (trans. from ANF 5:128). For a longer exposition of the theology of the *Refutatio* and how it differs from that found in the *Contra Noetum*, see Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 68-78, 89-91. See chapter two for more detail on the developments in Monarchianism, which is important for understanding Origen’s pneumatology.

⁴⁵ *ComJn* 2.16 (trans. from FOTC 80:98; Greek from GCS 10:54). Cf. *ComRm* 7.13.9 and 8.5.9.

⁴⁶ The second impious belief refers to those who believe that the Son is not divine and is, therefore, distinct from the Father. Some Monarchians, instead of teaching that the Son was divine and was, therefore, identical to the Father, taught a form of adoptianism, differentiating the Son from the Father but refusing to grant him divinity. See Waers, “Monarchianism,” 284-285; Plaxco, “Didymus the Blind,” 86-87.

⁴⁷ For the accusation that Christians who teach that the Father and Son are distinct profess two gods, see Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* 3.1 and *Refutatio* 9.12.16. See Waers, “Monarchianism,” 168, 283-284.

ComJn 2.16, therefore, places what follows it, *ComJn* 2.17, firmly within the context of Origen's anti-Monarchian polemic, which allows us to better apprehend the significance of his use of participatory and *auto-X* language. When Origen says that the Son is said to participate in the Father's divinity because the Father is *auto-God*, while the Son is God, he means to differentiate the Father and the Son by making the Son, as a separate being, reliant on the Father.⁴⁸ Plaxco makes clear the value participatory language has for Origen's anti-Monarchian polemic when he writes that participation "provides a way of speaking about the Son's distinction from the Father, and the Holy Spirit's distinction from the Son, which prevents the distinctions between the three from collapsing."⁴⁹

ComJn 2.20 clarifies Origen's use of *auto-X* language in *ComJn* 2.17 by using the terms source [πηγή] and image [εικόν] to describe the relationship between the Father and Son, terms which further highlight the Father's rank above the Son:

For as the Father is very God [αὐτόθεος] and true God [ἀληθινὸς θεὸς] in relation to the image [εἰκόνα] and images of the image [εἰκόνας τῆς εἰκόνας] (wherefore also men are said to be "according to the image [κατ' εἰκόνα]," not "images [εἰκόνας]"), so is the very Word in relation to the reason in each one. For both hold the place of a source [πηγῆς]; the Father, that of divinity [θεότητος], the Son, that of reason.⁵⁰

The Father's role as *auto-God* in relation to other beings, Origen says, makes Him the source [πηγή] of their divinity.⁵¹ Source [πηγή], therefore, further defines Origen's use of *auto-X*

⁴⁸ Balas, "The Idea of Participation," 261, explains, "As in the Platonic tradition, in Origen's works, too, participation expresses the relationship of a lower degree within the hierarchy of beings to the higher." See also Dupuis, *L'Esprit de l'Homme*, 97, who writes, "Le terme μετοχή, selon Origène, indique...la supériorité du participé sur le participant."

⁴⁹ Plaxco, "Didymus the Blind," 84. We will discuss the Holy Spirit's position in relation to the Father and the Son in the following chapter.

⁵⁰ *ComJn* 2.20 (trans. from FOTC 99-100; Greek from GCS 10:55). We will discuss this passage in regards to the Son as source of reason below.

⁵¹ This relationship is similar to Philo, who uses it to describe God as the source of reason in *Det.* 82-83: "Of the power of reasoning God is, not indeed partaker, but originator, being the source of archetypal reasoning [τῆς δὲ λογικῆς οὐ μετέχει μὲν, ἄρχει δὲ ὁ θεός, ἢ τοῦ πρεσβυτάτου λόγου πηγῆ]" (trans. and Greek from LCL 227:256-259). Philo uses πηγῆ in order to illustrate the fact that God is the origin of a trait, rather than participates in that trait. See also

language—the prefix *auto-* denotes that a given being is the source of the quality then named. Rather than describe the relationship between divinity’s source and its participants in terms of the Son’s mediatorial role as he does in *ComJn* 2.17, Origen here uses image language to express the difference between the Son and all other beings. The Son is the Father’s image because he directly participates in the Father’s divinity; all others are “according to the image,” since they receive divinity from the image, the Son. Origen offers a more detailed explanation of the relationship between the Father, His image, and the images of the image in *ComJn* 1.104-105:

Since the firstborn of all creation is the image [εἰκὼν] of the invisible God, the Father is his beginning [ἀρχὴ]. And likewise also Christ is the beginning [ἀρχὴ] of those made according to the image of God [τῶν κατ’ εἰκόνα...θεοῦ]. For if men are “according to the image [κατ’ εἰκόνα],” and the image [εἰκὼν] according to the Father, the “according to which [καθ’ ὃ]” of Christ, on the one hand, is the Father, his beginning but, on the other hand, Christ is the “according to which [καθ’ ὃ]” of men, who are made, not according to that of which Christ is the image [εἰκὼν], but according to the image [κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα].⁵²

Post. 69, where Philo says that “God is the source of reason [ὁ δὲ θεὸς πηγὴ λόγου]” (trans. and Greek from LCL 227:364-365).

⁵² *ComJn* 1.104-105 (trans. from FOTC 55; Greek from GCS 10:22). Origen is here using image language of all that the Son is, and all that created beings are, while in *ComJn* 2.20 he applies this principle to divinity specifically.

Origen’s approach is, again, similar to Philo. According to Philo, “the image of God is the Word through whom the whole universe was framed [λόγος δ’ ἐστὶν θεοῦ, δι’ οὗ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο]” (*Spec.* 1.16.81). Humans, on the other hand, are “the glorious cast of a glorious image, shaped according to the pattern of the archetypal form of the Word [παγκάλῃς εἰκόνας πάγκαλον ἐκμαγεῖον ἀρχετύπου λογικῆς ιδέας παραδείγματι τυπωθέν]” (*Special Laws* 3.15.83). Philo even emphasizes the fact that those “according to the image” hold the third place of this causal chain in *Her.* 48.230-232: “Moses continues, ‘the birds He did not divide’ (Gen. 15:10). He gives the name of birds to the two words or forms of reason [λόγους], both of which are winged and of a soaring nature. One is the archetypal reason [ἀρχετύπων] above us, the other the copy [μίμημα] of it which we possess. Moses calls the first the ‘image of God [εἰκόνα θεοῦ],’ the second the cast of that image [τῆς εἰκόνας ἐκμαγεῖον]. For God, he says, made man not ‘the image of God [εἰκόνα θεοῦ]’ but ‘after the image [κατ’ εἰκόνα]’ (Gen. 1:27). And thus the mind in each of us, which in the true and full sense is the ‘man,’ is an expression at third hand [τρίτον] from the Maker, while between them is the Reason which serves as model [παραδείγμα] for our reason, but itself is the effigies or presentment of God.” See also *Opif.* 25; *Leg.* 2.2, 3.31; *Conf.* 20, 28; *Fug.* 19; and *QG* 2.62.

While elaborating the significance of the term “beginning” [ἀρχή],⁵³ Origen relates one meaning of the word to image language, a meaning that reflects the relationship we have observed between the Father and Son. Those made “according to the image” have the Son as their beginning [ἀρχή], while the Son, as the image of the Father, has his beginning [ἀρχή] in the Father. When it comes to divinity, image language indicates that the Father is the beginning of the Son’s divinity, and the Son is the beginning of divinity for all other divine beings.⁵⁴

We have so far examined the way Origen presents the Father as the source of divinity, even of the Son, in *ComJn*, but this same reasoning is operative in Origen’s other works and regarding other attributes. Waers and Plaxco have also drawn attention to an extant fragment of *PArch*,⁵⁵ where Origen writes that the Son possesses a lesser goodness than the Father:

In the same way, therefore, I consider that in the case of the Savior it would be right to say that he is “an image of God’s goodness [εἰκὼν ἀγαθότητος θεοῦ]” (Wisd 7:26), but not goodness itself [αὐτοαγαθόν]. And perhaps also the Son, while being good, is yet not good purely and simply [ἀπλῶς ἀγαθός]. And just as he is the image of the invisible God, and in virtue of this is himself God [θεός], and yet is not he of whom Christ himself says,

⁵³ See Heine, *Origen*, 93-95, for a brief exposition of Origen’s account of the term “beginning” [ἀρχή].

⁵⁴ Origen also uses source and image language in *ComRm* 2.5.5, where he writes, “In fact it is even said in Exodus that the glory of God filled the tabernacle of testimony; and no less again at the dedication of the temple the glory of God descended and filled the house with a dark smoke and clouds, in which, it is scarcely to be doubted, the very presence of God is indicated as having arrived. In these passages, this must be considered to be the glory about which the Apostle is speaking when writing to the Hebrews concerning the Son, “For he is the splendor of his glory [*splendor gloriae*] and the express image of his substance [*imago expressa substantiae eius*]” (Heb. 1:3). In these things it is made clear that the source of glory [*fontem gloriae*] is the Father himself, from whom the splendor of that glory [*splendor gloriae*], the Son, is generated, by participation [*participatione*] in whom all creatures are said to have glory” (trans. from FOTC 103:115; Latin from Bammel 1:115). Here, Origen uses Heb. 1:3 as support for distinguishing between the Father, who is the source [*fontem*] of glory, and the Son, who is called the “splendor” of the Father’s glory, but is not the source. The Son is, however, the glory in which created beings participate. The scheme laid out here is the same as we have seen above—the Father is the source of a certain attribute for the Son, while the Son shares the attribute with created beings through participation.

⁵⁵ See Waers, “Monarchianism,” 270-280, and Plaxco, “Didymus the Blind,” 130-132, for their expositions of this passage.

“that they may know you, the only true God”; so he is the image of the goodness, and yet not, as the Father is, good without qualification [ἀπαραλλάκτως ἀγαθός].⁵⁶

Origen, again, draws a distinction between the Father and Son using *auto-X* language, this time speaking of goodness. The Father is absolute goodness [αὐτοαγαθόν], while the Son is an image [εἰκὼν] of this goodness, based on the description of Wisdom found in Wisd 7:26.⁵⁷ Origen even draws an analogy between the way the Son possesses divinity and the way He possesses goodness, indicating that the relationship between the Father and Son in *ComJn* 2.17 is the same as is portrayed in this passage.

⁵⁶ Justinian, *Epistula ad Mennam* (trans. from Butterworth 27; Greek from Mario Amelotti and Livia Migliardi Zingale, eds., *Scritti teologici ed ecclesiastici di Giustiniano*, Legum Iustiniani imperatoris vocabularium 3 (Milano: A. Giuffrè, 1977), 110). Both Henri Crouzel and Manlio Simonetti, ed., Origen, *Traité des principes*, Sources chrétiennes 253 (Paris: Cerf, 1978), 54, claim that the fragment is probably authentic. See also Jerome, *Epistula 124 ad Avitum* 2, which reads, “God the Father almighty he [Origen] calls good, and of perfect goodness. The Son is not good, but is a kind of breath [*auram*] and image of goodness [*imaginem bonitatis*], so that he is not called good absolutely [*absolute bonus*], but with an addition [*additamento*], such as the good shepherd, etc.” (trans. from Butterworth 27, n. 3; Latin from CSEL 56:97).

⁵⁷ The distinction between the goodness of the Father and the goodness of the Son is not a part of Rufinus’s translation of this passage. He writes in *PArch* 1.2.13, “For there is no other second goodness existing in the Son, besides that which is in the Father. So the Savior himself rightly says in the Gospel that ‘none is good save one, God the Father’ (Mark 10:18), the purpose of this statement being to make it understood that the Son is not of some other ‘goodness’, but of that alone which is in the Father; whose image he is rightly called, because he neither springs from any other source than from original goodness itself,—for if that were so, there would seem to be a different goodness in the Son from that which is in the Father—nor has the goodness that is in him any dissimilarity or divergence from that of the Father” (trans. from Butterworth 27). As Waers, “Monarchianism,” 279, fn. 107, observes, “Rufinus has not completely distorted Origen’s thought. In all extant attestation, the Father is the source of goodness. Rufinus preserves this feature of Origen’s thought. Furthermore, Rufinus also attests to the fact that Origen thought that the Father and Son had the same goodness. This, too, seems to be authentically Origenian, although he would want to stress that they had it in a dissimilar manner; and this is something that Rufinus explicitly sought to deny.”

For more on Wisd 7:25-26 and its role in Origen’s Christology, see A.H.B. Logan, “Origen and Alexandrian Wisdom Christology,” in *Origeniana Tertia: The Third International Colloquium for Origen Studies, University of Manchester, September 7th-11th, 1981*, eds. Richard Hanson and Henri Crouzel (Roma: Edizioni dell’Ateneo, 1985), 123-129.

The relationship between the Father and Son with respect to goodness is further explored by a passage from Origen's corpus that is less contentious than the above fragment. Origen does not use the term *auto*-goodness in this passage, but he achieves the same effect by using image language and by referring to the possession of goodness by higher and lower beings utilizing the term ὑπερέχω:

The Savior is the image of the invisible God [εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου], and in the same way, he is the “image of God's goodness” (Wisd 7:26) [οὕτως καὶ τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ εἰκὼν]. Whenever the word “good” is applied to a lesser being [ὑποδεεστέρου], it has another meaning. Considered in relation to the Father, the Son is the image of the Father's goodness [τὸν πατέρα εἰκὼν...ἀγαθότητος]; considered in relation to other beings, he is to them what the Father's goodness is to him. And it can even be said that the analogy [ἀναλογίαν] between God's goodness and the goodness of the Saviour, who is the image of God's goodness, is closer than the analogy between the Saviour and a good man, and good deed or a good tree. The fact that he is the “image of God's goodness” (Wisd 7:26) sets the Saviour higher [ὑπεροχῇ] above the lesser beings [ὑποδεέστερα] than the fact of being good sets God above [ἢ ὑπεροχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ὄντος ἀγαθοῦ] the Saviour.⁵⁸

The Son is the image of God's goodness, as he is described in the fragment from *PArch*, which means that he does not possess goodness in the same way as the Father. In order to illustrate this relationship, Origen draws an analogy with the goodness of the Son compared to other beings. Just as the Son's goodness is higher [ὑπερέχω] than other beings, so the Father's goodness is higher [ὑπερέχω] than the Son's. Waers writes of this relationship: “The verb ὑπερέχω suggests that something on a higher level ‘rises above’ those on a lower level; and this would seem to

⁵⁸ *ComMt* 15.10 (trans. Jean Daniélou, *Origen*, trans. Walter Mitchell (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955), 255; Greek from GCS 40:375-6). Καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ δὲ ὡς ἔστιν »εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου«, οὕτως καὶ »τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ εἰκὼν«· καὶ <ἐπὶ> παντὸς δὲ τοῦ ὑποδεεστέρου, ᾧ ἐφαρμόζεται ἢ »ἀγαθός« φωνῇ, ἄλλο σημαίνομενον ἔχει τὸ ἐφ' αὐτοῦ λεγόμενον, εἴπερ ὡς μὲν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα »εἰκὼν« ἔστιν »ἀγαθότητος«, ὡς δὲ πρὸς τὰ λοιπὰ ὅπερ ἢ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀγαθότητος πρὸς αὐτόν. ἢ καὶ μᾶλλον ἔστι τινὰ ἀναλογίαν προσεχῆ ἰδεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγαθότητος τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς τὸν σωτῆρα ὄντα εἰκόνα »τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ«, ἥπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος πρὸς ἀγαθὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἀγαθὸν ἔργον καὶ ἀγαθὸν δένδρον. πλειὸν γὰρ ἢ ὑπεροχῇ πρὸς τὰ ὑποδεέστερα ἀγαθὰ ἐν τῷ σωτῆρι, καθὼς ἔστιν »εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος« αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἥπερ ἢ ὑπεροχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ὄντος ἀγαθοῦ πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα σωτῆρα. Cf. *ComJn* 13.151-153.

imply that there is some sort of distance that separates them.”⁵⁹ By using the term *ὑπερέχω* Origen draws out the implications of image language and, by extension, *auto-X* and source language—the being who is the source is “higher” than the being who draws from the source. The term *ὑπερέχω*, therefore, functions as a way of ranking the Father above the Son, and the Son above all other beings.⁶⁰

The same relationship that exists between the Father and Son in regard to divinity and goodness applies also to the Son’s being. In *Contra Celsum* 6.64 Origen writes, “God does not even participate [*μετέχει*] in being [*ουσίας*]. For He is participated in [*μετέχεται*], rather than participates [*μετέχει*].”⁶¹ What follows is a speculative passage in which Origen asks, but does not answer, whether the Father is being itself or beyond being. In the midst of asking whether the Father is beyond being, Origen provides a statement that describes the relationship between the Father, Son, and other beings:

We would have to discover whether God ‘transcends being [*ουσίας*] in rank and power’, and grants a share [*μεταδιδους*] in being [*ουσίας*] to those whose participation [*μεταδιδωσι*] is according to His Logos [*λογον*], and to the Logos himself [*αυτῷ λογῳ*], or whether He is Himself being [*ουσία*], in spite of the fact that He is said to be invisible by nature in the words that say of the Saviour: ‘Who is the image of the invisible God.’ That He is incorporeal is indicated by the word ‘invisible’. We would also inquire whether we ought to say that the only-begotten and firstborn of all creation is being of beings [*ουσιαν...ουσιων*], and idea of ideas, and beginning, and that his Father and God transcends all these.⁶²

⁵⁹ Waers, “Monarchianism,” 275-276.

⁶⁰ Origen’s language indicates that the Son is closer to the Father than other beings are to the Son, suggesting that the Father and Son are similar and are a part of a grouping. However, compare *ComJn* 13.151, in which Origen writes, “The Father exceeds the Savior as much (or even more) as the Savior himself and the Holy Spirit exceed the rest” (trans. from FOTC 89:100).

⁶¹ *CCels* 6.64 (trans. from Chadwick 379; Greek from SC 147:338).

⁶² *CCels* 6.64 (trans. from Chadwick 379-380; Greek from SC 147:340). Balas, “The Idea of Participation,” 262, draws attention to this text when he writes, “The Son is God and good only by participation in the Divinity and Goodness of the Father, and it is the Father who imparts being not only through him but also to him.”

Origen writes that God grants a share of being to the Son, who participates in Him, and that all other beings receive a share of being from God in accordance with the Logos. Although he makes this statement when discussing whether or not the Father is beyond being, two factors indicate that this schema applies whether the Father is being or beyond being. First, this passage occurs after Origen has said that God “is participated in [μετέχεται],” indicating that in Origen’s mind the participatory relationship between the Father and other beings is not contingent on whether the Father is being itself or beyond being. Second, the relationship described in this passage echoes what we have seen above with regard to the Father’s divinity and goodness—the Son receives it from the Father and mediates it to all other beings.⁶³

Auto-X language denotes the Father’s position as source [πηγή] of all things—the being in whom all others participate [μετοχή/μετέχω/μεταδίδωμι]—which places the Father above [ὑπερέχω/ὑπεροχή] all others. This includes the Son, the Father’s image [εἰκών]. By describing the Son’s relationship to the Father in these terms, Origen differentiates the Son from the Father by making him dependent on the Father.⁶⁴ This constellation of terms, therefore, functions as a

⁶³ In *ComJn* 1.115 Origen describes the creation of all things, and his wording indicates a difference between the creation of being and of all other things. *ComJn* 1.115 reads, “And we must say that after God had created [κτίσας] living wisdom, if I may put it this way, from the models in her he entrusted to her [to present] to the things which exist and to matter [both] their conformation and forms, but I stop short of saying their essences [οὐσίας].” Here, Origen could be highlighting the Father’s role in bestowing being, or essence, on all things through the Son. He is not suggesting that the Father creates in a way other than through the Son or that the Father is not ultimately responsible for the creation of all things, as is demonstrated by *CCels* 6.60, where he calls the Father the “primary Creator” and the Son the “immediate Creator.” See the preceding discussion on the characteristics of the Son and their relationship to the Father.

⁶⁴ In addition to elucidating Origen’s anti-Monarchian thought, Waers, “Monarchianism,” 184-202, 254-263, has also pointed out that Novatian uses similar strategies in his own polemic against the Monarchians. For example, Novatian writes in *De Trinitate* 27.11-12 : “Here again He [Christ] said that He had a Father. He is therefore the Son, not the Father [*Filius est ergo, non Pater*]; for He would have acknowledged Himself to be the Father had He had it in mind that He was the Father. Furthermore, He declares that He has been made holy by His Father [*Et sanctificatum se a suo Patre esse proponit*]. Since, then, He receives sanctification from the Father, He is less than the Father [*Dum ergo accipit sanctificationem a Patre, minor Patre est*]. Because He is less than the Father, He is consequently <not the Father>, but the Son [*minor*

means by which Origen ranks the Son below the Father, thereby ensuring their distinction and serving as a useful polemic against Monarchian theologies. Furthermore, recognizing Origen's use of these words can help us understand their application to the Son, the subject of the following section.

1.2: The Son's *Auto-X* Attributes

In the previous section we analyzed how Origen ranks the Father above the Son by predicating certain *auto-X* attributes of the Father and by having the Son participate in the Father, his source, in order to receive these attributes. While the Son is dependent on the Father for divinity and goodness—the Father's *auto-X* attributes—Origen also predicates certain *auto-X* attributes of the Son. The Son, for example, is *auto-Wisdom*, *auto-Power*, *auto-Logos*, and *auto-Righteousness*.⁶⁵ Origen never describes the Son as participating in any of these attributes, and even explicitly states in *CCels* 6.64 that the Son does not participate in righteousness,⁶⁶ one of

autem Patre consequenter <non Pater> est, sed Filius]. For if He had been the Father, He would have given [*dedisset*], not received [*non accepisset*] sanctification. By openly acknowledging that He receives [*accepisse*] sanctification from the Father, He proves, by the very fact that He receives [*accipiendo*] sanctification from the Father, that He is less [*minorem*] than the Father” (trans. from FOTC 67:94; Latin from CCSL 4:65). Novatian here positions the Son below the Father by emphasizing the fact that the Son receives certain attributes, in this case sanctification, from the Father. Such a strategy is similar to that employed by Origen—both highlight the Father's role as source of certain attributes, and the Son's reception of those attributes, as evidence that the Son is distinct from the Father, since a greater and a lesser, a giver and a receiver, require two separate beings.

⁶⁵ Origen predicates a number of *auto-X* attributes of the Son throughout his corpus. Although this list is not exhaustive, they include: *auto-Wisdom* (*ComJn* 32.347; *ComMt* 14.7; *CCels* 3.41; *CCels* 5.39; *CCels* 6.47; *CCels* 6.63; *CCels* 7.17); *auto-Logos* (*ComJn* 2.20; *ComMt* 12.39; *ComMt* 16.16; *CCels* 2.31; *CCels* 3.41; *CCels* 5.39; *CCels* 6.47; *CCels* 6.63; *CCels* 7.17; *Mart* 10.17); *auto-Truth* (*ComJn* 6.38; *ComMt* 14.7; *CCels* 3.41; *CCels* 6.47; *CCels* 6.63; *HomJr* 17.4.2; *Mart* 10.17); *auto-Righteousness* (*ComJn* 1.59; *ComJn* 2.51; *ComMt* 14.7; *CCels* 5.39; *CCels* 6.47; *HomJr* 15.6.1); *auto-Power* (*ComJn* 1.241); and *auto-Sanctification* (*ComJn* 1.59; *HomJr* 17.4.2).

⁶⁶ “Our Saviour also does not participate in righteousness; but being righteous, he is participated in by the righteous” (trans. from Chadwick 379).

his *auto-X* attributes, suggesting that the Son possesses these attributes as their source and not as one who receives them from another being.

Several scholars have argued that the Son remains dependent on the Father for even his *auto-X* attributes—a reading which I will follow—by pointing to a number of passages that maintain that the Father is superior to and the source of the Son.⁶⁷ However, few scholars have

⁶⁷ Peter Nemeshegyi, *La Paternité de Dieu chez Origène* (Tournai, Belgium: Desclée, 1960), 76-77, has written that Origen uses *auto-X* titles of the Son to show that he possesses attributes perfectly, but he maintains that the Father is still the source of all the Son's attributes. He downplays the hierarchical consequences of this language, choosing to interpret the Son's being the "image of goodness" as merely denoting the difference between an original goodness and a derived goodness. Christoph Bruns, *Trinität und Kosmos: Zur Gotteslehre des Origenes*, Adamantiana 3 (Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 2013), 73-74, follows Nemeshegyi and argues that the Son's *auto-X* titles do not possess the same meaning as the Father's, since the Father is the ultimate source of all that is. Gerhard Gruber, *ZQH: Wesen, Stufen und Mitteilung des wahren Lebens bei Origenes* (München: Max Hueber Verlag, 1962), 98-120, esp. 98-108, has offered the most thorough analysis of the *auto-X* attributes. He divides the attributes into two different kinds—the Father possesses goodness and divinity, while the Son possesses all other attributes (except holiness, which belongs to the Holy Spirit) as his *ousia*. With respect to the Son's attributes, the Father is their source but is "beyond" them, based on the Platonic idea that the highest being is above the essences.

Others have commented on Origen's use of the prefix *auto-*, but have provided less thorough analyses. Antonio Orbe, *La Epinoia: Algunos preliminares históricos de la distinción κατ' ἐπίνοιαν* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1955), 25-27, discusses the difference between Christ's *epinoiai* for us and those for himself. He concludes, based on this difference and the ambiguity of the prefix *auto-*, that the prefix denotes Christ as the ultimate source of the *epinoiai* he possesses for himself, and the immediate source of the *epinoiai* he possesses for others. Balas, "The Idea of Participation," 263, points to the Son's *auto-X* titles and writes, "The Son too...has His essential attributes, even though He has received all that He is from the Father." Balas does not, however, expand on what he means with this statement. J. Rebecca Lyman, *Christology and Cosmology: Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 73, says that "the *αὐτο-* prefixes describe the Son as the bridge between the noetic and sensible worlds," suggesting that she understands the *auto-* prefix to denote the Son's intermediate role between the Father and creation, but she offers no additional insight. Kellen Plaxco, "Didymus the Blind, Origen, and the Trinity" (PhD diss., Marquette University, 2016), 68-69, 146-147, has also offered a reading of Origen's participation, source, and *auto-X* language. While he writes in "Didymus the Blind," 72, that the "Father *alone* is the primary principle of a triadic hierarchy," he does not discuss how the Son possesses his *auto-X* attributes or examine the ambiguities that exist between Origen's use of the prefix *auto-* with regard to the Father and with regard to the Son. Biriukov, "Paradigms of Participation in Origen," 281, follows Balas in saying that, although receiving them from the Father, the Son's *auto-X* titles indicate the possession of attributes in "a substantial and not in an accidental way."

attempted a detailed analysis of the relationship between the Father and Son with respect to *auto-X* attributes; those that have provide insufficient accounts of how the Son receives his attributes from the Father and downplay the hierarchical implications of Origen's thought. Gruber claims that *auto-X* attributes are predicated of the Son's essence, while the Father is beyond essence and, therefore, beyond the attributes.⁶⁸ Bruns has suggested that the Father is superior to the Son only insofar as He is the Son's source—the Father is not ontologically greater than the Son.⁶⁹

In this section I will argue that Origen's language demonstrates that the Son remains ranked below the Father with regard to all of his attributes, not just those which the Father possesses as *auto-X* attributes. I will proceed by examining how the Son receives his *auto-X* attributes from the Father, demonstrating how this informs Origen's theology of creation and supports the idea that the Son is ranked below the Father. This hierarchical relationship that exists between the Father and the Son, especially in terms of their creative activity, will serve as the foundation for our study of the Holy Spirit's relationship to the Father and Son.

Origen does not offer many comments on the relationship between the Father and Son with respect to the Son's *auto-X* attributes. However, his description in *PArch* 1.2.9 of the Son as

⁶⁸ Gruber, *ZQH*, 100-103. Gruber maintains that Origen's teaching is based on the Platonic idea that "Gott steht über dem Reich der Wesenheiten" (103). It should be noted that Gruber does admit that Origen sometimes predicates essence of God (102), but he, in general, operates from the assumption that God is beyond essence. Gruber, however, overstates the extent to which Origen says that God is beyond being and neglects passages in which God is said to possess attributes.

⁶⁹ Bruns, *Trinität und Kosmos*, 75-89, offers a long exposition on whether or not Origen's language ranks the Father above the Son ontologically. He concludes that Origen is ambiguous, admitting that some language appears to rank the Son below the Father ontologically, while maintaining that these passages can be interpreted "im Sinn späterer nizänischer Trinitätstheologie" (78). As this chapter will show, there is less ambiguity than Bruns would have there be, especially if one places Origen's theology within the context of his entire corpus and his anti-Monarchian polemic instead of interpreting his theology looking backwards from pro-Nicene theology.

power, one of the *auto-X* attributes predicated of the Son,⁷⁰ reveals how he conceives of this relationship:

Let us now see what is the meaning of that passage which we find written in the Wisdom of Solomon, who speaks of wisdom as follows: “She is a breath of the power of God and a pure effluence (that is, emanation) of the glory of the Almighty and the brightness of the eternal light and an unspotted mirror of the working or power of God and an image of his goodness” (Wisd 8:25-26). He gives here five definitions of God and from each of them in turn he indicates a certain characteristic belonging to God’s wisdom; for he speaks of God’s “power” and “glory” and “eternal light” and “working” and “goodness”. He says, however, that wisdom is a breath not of the glory of the Almighty, nor of the eternal light, nor of the working of the Father, nor of his goodness, since it was not suitable to apply the term breath to any one of these; but in all appropriateness he says that wisdom is a breath of the “power” of God. Now the power of God must mean that by which he is strong, that by which he both established and also preserves and controls all things visible and invisible, and that by which he is sufficient for all things which are the objects of his providence and with all of which he is present as if they were joined in one. The breath, then, or if I may so call it, the strength of all this power, so great and so immense, comes to have a subsistence of its own [*in propria subsistentia*]; and although it proceeds from the power itself [*ipsa virtute*] as will proceeding from mind, yet nevertheless the will of God comes itself to be a power of God. There comes into existence, therefore, another power [*virtus altera*], subsisting in its own proper nature [*in sua proprietate subsistens*], a kind of breath, as the passage of Scripture calls it, of the first and unbegotten power of God [*primae et ingenitae virtutis dei*], drawing from this source whatever existence it has; and there is no time when it did not exist. For if anyone is inclined to describe it as being non-existent at first but coming into existence afterwards, let him tell us why the Father who caused it to exist did not do so before. And if he lays it down that there was one definite beginning when this “breath” first proceeded from the power of God, we shall ask again why it did not so proceed before this beginning of which he has spoken. Thus by ever inquiring what happened before and going further back with our questions, we shall reach the conclusion that, since God always had both the power and the will, there was never the slightest reason or possibility that he should not always have had this good thing that he desired. This proves that there always has existed that breath of the power of God, having no beginning but God himself. Nor indeed could it have fitly had any other beginning except him from whom it takes its existence and birth, that is, God. And in regard to the apostle’s saying that “Christ is the power of God” (1 Cor 1:24), this power must be called not merely a breath of the power of God but a power proceeding from the power.⁷¹

After defining the term “power” Origen writes that the breath of the power of God comes into existence “as will proceeding from the mind,” a generation which involves no separation or

⁷⁰ See *ComJn* 1.241.

⁷¹ *PArch* 1.2.9 (trans. from Butterworth 22-23; Latin from Görgemanns 142).

division in God.⁷² Nevertheless, this breath of the power of God becomes a second power with an independent existence,⁷³ which it draws from the “power itself [*ipsa virtute*],” the “first and unbegotten power of God [*primae et ingenitae virtutis dei*].” Michel R. Barnes provides this summary of Origen’s theology: “The power that the second Person is identified with is thus not the very power of God—that is, the power God has in his own existence—but a second produced or generated power: a power from a power.”⁷⁴ Despite its independent existence, however, this second power is eternal, since God never lacked the will or power to beget this power. There exist, therefore, two eternal powers, with the first begetting the second. This means that, even though the second power is called *auto-Power*, the Father is power Himself and the source of this second power. The Father, therefore, remains above this second power.

Origen’s characterization of power can serve as a model for understanding his comments on the Son’s other *auto-X* attributes, such as Wisdom.⁷⁵ Just as he differentiates the Son’s

⁷² See *PArch* 1.2.6, which reads, “Rather must we suppose that as an act of will proceeds from the mind without either cutting off any part of the mind or being separated or divided from it, in some similar fashion has the Father begotten the Son, who is indeed his image” (trans. from Butterworth 19).

⁷³ Origen provides a similar explanation for Wisdom in *PArch* 1.2.2 and *ComJn* 1.243-244. Both of these passages emphasize the fact that Wisdom has a hypostatic existence separate from the Father.

⁷⁴ Barnes, *Power of God*, 119. Barnes, *The Power of God*, 120-124, argues that this “X from X causality” is hierarchical in Origen’s thought, pointing to two pieces of evidence in Origen’s corpus. First, his emphasis is on the generateness of the Son in order to secure the Son’s individuality, as opposed to his unity with the Father. Second, his exegesis of Wisd 8:25-26 in *ComJn* stresses the fact that the Son comes from God’s attributes, not His being, which again highlights the Son’s independent existence.

⁷⁵ Wisdom is the best attribute to examine as it is the first of the Son’s *epinoiai*, as Origen explains in *ComJn* 1.118: “And if we should carefully consider all the concepts [*ἐπινοίας*] applied to him, he is the beginning only insofar as he is wisdom. He is not even the beginning insofar as he is the Word, since ‘the Word’ was ‘in the beginning’ (John 1:1), so that someone might say boldly that wisdom is older than all the concepts [*ἐπινοουμένων*] in the names of the firstborn of all creation” (trans. from FOTC 80:58; Greek from GCS 10:24). It is important to note, however, that the term “first” should be understood in a logical sense, not a chronological one, as Origen makes clear in *ComJn* 2.131 when discussing Christ’s *epinoiai*: “Now let no one censure us because he thinks we are describing these things in reference to time. The logical order demands a first, second, and following, even if no time be found when the things put

independent existence as power from the Father in *PArch* 1.2.9, Origen does the same with Wisdom in both *ComJn* and *PArch*:

[God's] wisdom does not exist merely in the mental images of the God and Father of the universe in a way analogous to the images in human thoughts. But if someone is able to comprehend an incorporeal existence comprised of the various ideas which embrace the principles of the universe, which is living and animate, as it were, he will understand the wisdom of God which precedes all creation.⁷⁶

Let no one think, however, that when we give him the name "wisdom of God" we mean anything without hypostatic existence, that is, to take an illustration, that we understand him to be not as it were some wise living being, but a certain thing which makes men wise by revealing and imparting itself to the minds of such as are able to receive its influence and intelligence. If then it is once rightly accepted that the only-begotten Son of God is God's wisdom hypostatically existing, I do not think that our mind ought to stray beyond this to the suspicion that this hypostasis or substance could possibly possess bodily characteristics.⁷⁷

Origen makes clear to his readers that Wisdom does not exist only within God, but that Wisdom is an independent *hypostasis* apart from the Father. This Wisdom, though, like Power, is still dependent on the Father:

Among men each is called wise by participation [*participatione*] in wisdom. But God is called wise [*sapiens*] not as one who is made wise [*sapiens*] by wisdom [*sapientia*], but as the one who is himself the author [*auctor*] and begetter [*genitor*] of wisdom [*sapientiae*]. For, as we have said, the wise [*sapiens*] God does not proceed from wisdom [*sapientia*], but wisdom [*sapientia*] proceeds from the wise [*sapiente*] God. Now deservedly [it is said], 'to the only wise God.' For God alone is so wise [*sapiens*] that he himself, to a greater extent, has begotten wisdom [*sapientiam*] rather than having been made wise [*sapiens*] from wisdom [*sapientia*]. And rightly is splendor through Jesus Christ referred to him, because God alone is so wise that he himself has begotten wisdom; Christ Jesus, who is "the power of God and the wisdom of God" (1 Cor 1:24), has made it known.⁷⁸

forward by the argument as third and fourth did not exist at all" (trans. from FOTC 80:129). We will discuss the Son's *epinoiai* in section 1.3 of this chapter.

⁷⁶ *ComJn* 1.243-244 (trans. from FOTC 80:83).

⁷⁷ *PArch* 1.2.2 (trans. from Butterworth 15).

⁷⁸ *ComRm* 10.43.6 (trans. from FOTC 104:310, altered; Latin from Bammel 3:858-859).

Origen offers a straightforward statement of the this difference in *CCels* 8.12, where he assigns worship to both the Father and Son, recognizing their distinct existences, but calls the Father the "Father of the truth" while describing the Son as the one "who is the truth" (trans. from Chadwick 460).

Origen does not refuse to attribute wisdom to the Father or describe him as being beyond wisdom; rather, he describes the Father as wise insofar as He has begotten Wisdom, who reveals the Father to creation.⁷⁹ The Father, therefore, is both wise Himself and the source of Wisdom. *ComJn* 2.151 confirms that the Father is the source of Wisdom and draws out the implications of this relationship during a discussion in which Origen emphasizes the distinction between the Father and the Son:

God, the Father of the Truth [ὁ πατήρ τῆς ἀληθείας], is more than [πλείων], and greater than [μείζων], the Truth [ἡ ἀλήθεια] and, being the Father of Wisdom [ὁ πατήρ...σοφίας], is greater than [κρείττων] and surpasses [διαφέρων] Wisdom [ἡ σοφία].⁸⁰

As the Father of Wisdom, God is both greater than [κρείττων] and surpasses [διαφέρων] Wisdom. Gruber interprets this passage as saying that the Son is the substance of wisdom, while the Father is beyond wisdom, basing his conclusion on the Platonic idea that “Gott steht über dem Reich der Wesenheiten.”⁸¹ Two factors mitigate this possibility. First, Origen does not often place the Father above being.⁸² Second, our examination of the Son as the Power of God shows that Origen conceived of the Son’s power as an X from X attribute, rather than as the Power of God itself. This means that the Father and Son each possess power, with the Father acting as the

⁷⁹ See also *PArch* 1.2.8, which reads, “See, then, whether the Son of God, who is called God’s word and wisdom, and who alone knows the Father and reveals him to whom he will, to those, namely, who become capable of receiving his word and wisdom, may not perhaps be said to express the image of God’s substance or subsistence for this reason, that he makes God understood and known; that is, when wisdom outlines first in herself the things which she wishes to reveal to others, by means of which they are to know and understand God, then she herself may be called the express image of God’s substance” (trans. from Butterworth 21).

⁸⁰ *ComJn* 2.151 (trans. from FOTC 80:134; Greek from GCS 10:77).

⁸¹ Gruber, *ZQH*, 103. See also Josep Rius-Camps, “Comunicabilidad de la naturaleza de Dios según Orígenes,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 34 (1968), 5-37, here 31-32, who likewise maintains that the Father is beyond being and attributes.

⁸² While it is true that Origen occasionally uses language that places the Father beyond being or other attributes (Origen debates this point in a passage we examined earlier, *CCels* 6.64), Origen more often predicates being of God. See, for example, *ComJn* 2.96. See also the discussion in Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Transformation of Divine Simplicity*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 63-64, where he contrasts Origen’s view with that of his predecessor, Clement.

source of the Son. Like power, Origen predicates wisdom of the Father in *ComRm* 10.43.6 by calling Him “wise,” so *ComJn* 2.151 does not place the Father beyond wisdom.⁸³ Rather, it emphasizes the Father’s role as the source of wisdom and draws this language to its conclusion—it ranks the Father above the Son. Origen achieves this by using two comparatives, which serve to differentiate the Father from the Son and to show that the Father, in his position as the source of Wisdom, surpasses the Son all while identifying the Son as *auto*-Wisdom.⁸⁴

⁸³ Origen predicates other attributes of the Father, rather than placing Him beyond them. For example, in *CCels* 4.85 he says that the Father “probably” possesses reason: “But when he looks at the rational beings [τοῖς λογικοῖς], he will see reason [λόγον] which is common to men and to divine and heavenly beings, and probably also to the supreme God Himself [αὐτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεόν]. This explains why he is said to have been made in the image of God [κατ’ εἰκόνα... τοῦ θεοῦ]; for the image of the supreme God is His reason [εἰκὼν γὰρ τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεοῦ ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ]” (trans. from Chadwick 251; Greek from SC 136:396). Those made in the image of God possess reason because the image of God is His reason. If the image of God possesses reason, it is logical that the origin of the image, the Father, would also possess reason. Origen also predicates truth of God. In *ComJn* 1.187 he writes, “But someone may inquire if our Savior understands everything known by the Father in the depth of his wealth and wisdom and knowledge, and in the delusion of glorifying the Father, he may declare that something known by the Father is not known by the Son who refuses to be made equal to the perceptions of the unbegotten God. If this inquiry should be made, we must consider that he is the Savior on the basis that he is truth, and we must apply the consideration that if the truth is complete, he is ignorant of nothing true, lest the truth stumble because it lacks those things which it does not know, which, according to those, are in the Father alone. Or let someone show that there are things which are known which do not belong to the appellation truth, but are beyond [ὑπὲρ] it” (trans. from FOTC 80:71; Greek from GCS 10:34). Origen is here responding to those who think that, in order to preserve the dignity of the Father, there are things which only the Father knows. This, Origen says, cannot be the case, since, if the Son is truth, the Son must know all that the Father knows. Although Origen is more interested in the Son’s possession of truth, his characterization of truth also reveals something about the Father—if truth is the Father’s complete knowledge, then the Father is also truth, not just the Son. In other words, the Son is truth because he comes from the Father’s truth.

⁸⁴ Origen writes similarly of the Word as Truth, using a comparative and the participle διαφέρω, which both differentiates and places one being above another, to demonstrate the Father’s position relative to the Son. Another passage, *ComJn* 6.38, confirms that truth comes ultimately from the Father, even though the Son is called *auto*-truth: “For one does not himself come into existence through himself. We must understand, however, that the ultimate truth itself [ἡ ἀντοαλήθεια ἢ οὐσιώδης] and, if I may put it this way, the archetype [πρωτότυπος] of the truth in rational souls, from which images of that truth, as it were, have been impressed on those who understand the truth, did not come [ἐγένετο] through [διὰ] Jesus Christ nor through anyone at all, but came [ἐγένετο] from [ὑπὸ] God. Just as the Word which was in the beginning with God did not come through someone, and wisdom, which ‘God created as the beginning of his

We have so far seen that, for the Son's *auto-X* attributes, the Father remains the source of the Son and that Origen continues to rank the Father above the Son.⁸⁵ A passage from *ComMt*

ways,' did not come through someone, so neither did the truth come through someone" (trans. from FOTC 80:179, altered; Greek from GCS 10:114). It is also important to note that, at the end of the passage, Origen indicates that we should think the same way regarding Logos and wisdom.

⁸⁵ One passage, *ComJn* 1.248-252, implies that the Father might not be the source of all the Son's attributes. It reads, "But consider if the Apostle uses the expression 'for us' [ἡμῖν] in vain when he says, 'Who became for us wisdom from God, and justice, and sanctification, and redemption' (1 Cor 1:30). And consider if, in other statements about the Christ, insofar as he is 'wisdom' and 'power,' the statement is not made absolutely [ἀπολελυμένως] that 'Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God,' even if we have assumed that he was not absolutely [καθάπαξ] the 'wisdom' and 'power of God,' but was such 'for us [ἡμῖν].' Now, however, in the case of 'wisdom' and 'power,' we have the unqualified [ἀπόλυτον] expression recorded in addition to the qualification 'for us [ἡμῖν].' The same expression, however, has not been used in the case of 'sanctification' and 'redemption.' For this reason, since 'he who sanctifies and they who are sanctified are all of one,' consider if [ὄρα...εἰ] the Father is the 'sanctification' of our sanctification himself, in the same way as the Father is the head of Christ, while Christ is our head. And Christ is our redemption, because we have been taken captive and need redemption. I do not ask, however, about the redemption of him who has been tempted 'in all things as we are, without sin,' and has never been taken into captivity by his enemies. But once the distinction has been made between 'for us' [ἡμῖν] and the unqualified state [ἀπλῶς], 'sanctification' and 'redemption,' on the one hand, being 'for us' [ἡμῖν] and qualified [οὐχ ἀπλῶς], and 'wisdom' and 'power' being both 'for us' [ἡμῖν] and unqualified [ἀπλῶς], we must not leave unexamined the statements concerning 'justice.' It is clear, on the one hand, that Christ is justice 'for us [ἡμῖν],' from the text, 'Who became wisdom for us from God, and justice, and sanctification, and redemption.' But if we should not find that he is 'justice' absolutely [ἀπλῶς], just as he is 'wisdom' and the 'power of God' absolutely [ἀπλῶς], we must examine if [βασανιστέον εἰ] the Father is 'justice' for Christ himself also, just as he is his 'sanctification.' For there is, indeed, no injustice with God; he is both a just and holy Lord; his judgments are in justice, and being just, he manages all things justly" (trans. from FOTC 80: 83-84; Greek from GCS 10:44). Origen makes a distinction between Christ's attributes—those that he possesses only "for us," which he took on because of human sinfulness, and those that he possesses both "for us" and for himself, which Christ would have possessed even if we had not fallen into sin (cf. *ComJn* 1.123). *ComJn* 1.248-252 reveals that Origen groups sanctification and redemption among the attributes for us and wisdom and power among those for himself and for us. Finally, he says that it must still be determined to which category justice belongs. The statement in *ComJn* 1.252 that, if Christ is not justice absolutely, "we must examine if the Father is 'justice' for Christ himself," suggests that one of the differences between Christ's attributes for himself and for us is that the Father is not the source of Christ's attributes for himself. He also implies that the Father is not the redemption of Christ because Christ had no need for redemption as a sinless human being. In *CCels* 5.39, however, Origen offers an exegesis of 1 Cor 1:30 that applies the verse to the Son and calls him the "virtue which includes all virtues" (trans. from Chadwick 296). Importantly, Origen says just before this in *CCels* 5.39 that virtue has been made by God and is the Son, confirming that the Father is indeed the source of the Son and his attributes, including those mentioned in 1 Cor

will serve as the final piece of evidence to explain Origen’s particular use of *auto-X* terminology of the Son, as well as provide further confirmation that the Father is ranked above the Son. In

ComMt 12.9 Origen writes:

The saying of Peter to the Saviour, “Thou art the Christ,” when the Jews did not know that He was Christ, was indeed a great thing, but greater that he knew Him not only to be Christ, but also “the Son of the living God [υἰὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος]” (Matt. 16:16), who had also said through the prophets, “I live [ζῶ ἐγώ]” (Jer. 22:24), and “They have forsaken Me the spring of living water [πηγὴν ὕδατος ζῶντος]” (Jer. 2:13); —and He is life [ζωή] also, as from the Father the spring of life [πηγῆς ζωῆς], who said, “I am the Life [ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ζωή]” (John 14:6); and consider carefully, whether, as the spring of the river [πηγὴ ποταμοῦ] is not the same thing as the river [ποταμός], the spring of life [πηγὴ ζωῆς] is not the same as life [ζωή]. And these things we have added because to the saying, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of God,” was subjoined the word “living [ζῶντος]” (Matt. 16:16); for it was necessary to set forth something noteworthy in regard to that which is said about God and the Father of all things as living [ζῶντος], both in relation to His absolute life [αὐτοζωὴν], and in relation to those things which participate [μετέχοντα] in it.⁸⁶

Origen’s exegesis begins with a problem—how can the Son say that he is life, while the Father is also said to be living? In order to solve this exegetical dilemma, Origen applies Jer 22:24 and, importantly, Jer 2:13 to the Father, differentiating between life, the Son, and the source of life, the Father.⁸⁷ At the end of the passage, Origen connects both the *auto-life* and those who

1:30. Given this, it appears Origen may be inconsistent in *ComJn* 1.248-252, or it is possible that he is simply emphasizing the Son’s possession of wisdom and power apart from his possession of them for salvation, as well as Christ’s sinlessness, rather than saying that the Son does not receive all that he is from the Father—one need not read this passage as saying that the Son is not dependent on the Father.

⁸⁶ *ComMt* 12.9 (trans. from ANF 9:455; Greek from GCS 40:82-83). Cf. *ComJn* 13.18-19: “Here the fountain that appears in the one who drinks of the water that Jesus gives leaps into eternal life. And after eternal life, perhaps it will also leap into the Father who is beyond eternal life. For Christ is life; but he who is greater than Christ is greater than life.”

⁸⁷ As in *ComRm* 10.43.6 Matt 16:16 implies that the Father is also life, rather than beyond it, by calling Him “living.” Another passage from *ComRm* confirms this. In *ComRm* 10.38.1 Origen writes, “The grace of God and the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ should be taken to be one and the same grace. Just as the Father gives life to whom he wills and the Son gives life to whom he wills, and just as the Father has life in himself and he has granted to the Son to have life in himself, so also the grace that the Father gives, this the Son also gives” (trans. from FOTC 104:303-304). Origen writes that the grace of God and the grace of Christ are one grace and compares this to the life that the Father and Son give, implying the life of the Father and Son is also one. But, Origen adds that the life of the Son was given to him by the Father. The Father is

participate in life to the Father, which means that he at one and the same time calls the Son “*auto-life*” and names the Father as his source.

Since the Father remains the source of the Son’s *auto-X* attributes, scholars have maintained that Origen uses the *auto-X* attributes as a way of highlighting the Son’s status as the immediate source of all created things, while the Father remains the ultimate source.⁸⁸ Origen’s descriptions of the Father’s and Son’s roles in creation support this interpretation. In *CCels* 6.60 Origen writes:

The immediate Creator [προσεχῶς δημιουργόν] and, as it were, direct Maker [αὐτουργόν] of the world was the Son of God, the Logos, but...the Father of the Logos was the primary Creator [πρώτως δημιουργόν] because He commanded His Son, the Logos, to make the world.⁸⁹

the source of life and shares this same life with the Son, who gives life to created beings. Importantly, both the Father and Son are said to give this life since the life is one and passes from the Father to the Son before coming to other created beings. In this way, Origen is able to predicate the giving of life to both the Father and the Son. The result is a type of causal chain, which begins in the Father, flows to the Son, and from the Son to all other created beings, with each level ranked below the one preceding it.

⁸⁸ Gruber, *ZQH*, 98-108; and Bruns, *Trinität und Kosmos*, 73-75. For Gruber’s exposition of *ComMt* 12.9, see *ZQH*, 103-104. For Bruns’, see *Trinität und Kosmos*, 77-78. See also Josep Rius-Camps, “Comunicabilidad de la naturaleza de Dios según Orígenes,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 36 (1970), 201-247, here 225-226.

⁸⁹ *CCels* 6.60 (trans. from Chadwick 375; Greek from SC 147:328). Origen describes the Father’s and Son’s roles in creation elsewhere using prepositional metaphysics, the idea that different causes can be conveyed through the use of particular prepositions. In *ComJn* 2.70 he explains that “the expression ‘through whom’ never has the first position, but always the second” (trans. from FOTC 80:112). Then, he goes on to say in *ComJn* 2.72: “God has made [πεποίηκε] the worlds through the son [διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ] since the only begotten had the ‘through whom’ [δι’ οὗ] when the worlds were made [γίνεσθαι]. So here too, therefore, if all things were made [ἐγένετο] through the Word [διὰ τοῦ λόγου], they were not made [ἐγένετο] by the Word [ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου], but by [ὑπὸ] one better [κρείττονος] and greater [μείζονος] than the Word. And who would this other one be except the Father?” (trans. from FOTC 80:113; Greek from GCS 10:). The Son is only the instrumental cause, while the Father, who is “better [κρείττονος] and greater [μείζονος],” is in the first position. Origen uses both comparatives—better [κρείττονος] and greater [μείζονος]—in *ComJn* 2.151, which we examined above. As we mentioned above, and as we will discuss further below, these terms, coupled with other language that Origen utilizes, rank the Father above the Son. For more on prepositional metaphysics, see John Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977), 138. For more on the Son as instrumental cause, see Henri Crouzel, “L’image de Dieu dans la théologie d’Origène,” *Studia Patristica* 2 (1957): 194.

Here, the Father is presented as the primary or first creator [πρώτως δημιουργόν], the ultimate source of creation, while the Son is described as the proximate or immediate creator [προσεχῶς δημιουργόν].⁹⁰ This relationship mirrors the one that exists between the Father and Son in regard to the Son's attributes—the Father is the source of all things, including of the Son, while the Son is a mediator between the Father and all created things. Importantly, Origen describes the Son in his role as immediate creator with the term αὐτουργόν. By using *auto-X* language of the Son's role as immediate creator, Origen, again, demonstrates that he is comfortable using *auto-X* language of the Son to describe his particular work, even though he is not the ultimate creator or source of all things.

Scholars have correctly interpreted *ComMt* 12.9 as a means of demonstrating that Origen's *auto-X* language of the Son is used as a way of denoting that he is the immediate source of all created things, rather than the ultimate source. However, scholars have overlooked the significance of the language Origen uses of the Father in *ComMt* 12.9. In the previous section we observed that Origen's *auto-X* language of the Father is defined by the fact that the Father is the

It is also worth noting the observations of Waers, "Monarchianism," 245-254, who has analyzed the similar strategies both Origen and Tertullian used to refute Monarchian theology. For example, compare *ComJn* 2.72 to Tertullian's *Adversus Praxean* 9.2, where he states that the Father is greater than the Son, an argument based in part by juxtaposing the one who creates with the one through whom something is created: "For the Father is the whole substance [*tota substantia*], while the Son is an outflow and assignment of the whole [*derivatio totius et portio*], as he himself professes, 'Because my Father is greater [*maior*] than I' (John 14:28): and by him, it is sung in the psalm, he has also been made less, 'a little on this side of the angels' (Ps. 8:6). The Father is other than the Son as being greater than the Son, as he who begets is other than he who is begotten, as he who sends is other than he who is sent, as he who makes is other than he through whom a thing is made [*Sic et Pater alius a Filio dum Filio maior, dum alius qui generat, alius qui generatur, dum alius qui mittit, alius qui mittitur, dum alius qui facit, alius per quem fit.*]" (trans. from Evans 140; Latin from CCSL 2:1168). Such a statement is similar to Origen's that the "through whom" holds the second position, not the first. And, like Origen, Tertullian draws out the consequences of this thinking—the Father is greater than the Son.

⁹⁰ Macaulay, "The Nature of Christ," 178, describes the relationship between the Father, Son, and creation as a "descending scale of transmission and participation."

source of those particular attributes for all beings. The same is true of the Son's *auto-X* attributes, albeit with the caveat that he is the immediate source, not the ultimate source. As the immediate source, the Son still has a source himself, the Father, which Origen makes clear in *ComMt* 12.9 using the same term [πηγή] as he uses when discussing the Father's *auto-X* attributes. Since the Father is the source of the Son's *auto-X* attributes, the Father remains ranked above the Son with respect to all of the Son's attributes, as demonstrated in *ComJn* 2.151.⁹¹ One more passage will clarify this relationship:

But we are obedient to the Savior who says, "The Father who sent me is greater than I" (cf. John 14:28), and who, for this reason, did not permit himself to accept the title "good" (cf. Mark 10:18) when it was offered to him, although it was perfectly legitimate and true. Instead, he graciously offered it up to the Father, and rebuked the one who wished to praise the Son excessively. This is why we say the Savior and the Holy Spirit transcend [ὑπερέχειν] all created beings, not by comparison, but by their exceeding pre-eminence [ὑπεροχή]. The Father exceeds [ὑπερεχόμενον] the Savior as much (or even more) as the Savior himself and the Holy Spirit exceed [ὑπερέχει] the rest. And by "the rest" I do not mean ordinary beings, for how great is the praise ascribed to him who transcends thrones, dominions, principalities, powers, and every name that is named not only in this world but also in that which is to come (cf. Eph 1:21)? And in addition to these [what must we] say also of holy angels, spirits, and just souls? But although the Savior transcends [ὑπερέχων] in his essence [οὐσία], rank [πρεσβεία], power [δυνάμει], divinity [θειότητα] (for the Word is living), and wisdom [σοφία], beings that are so great and of such antiquity, nevertheless, he is not comparable [οὐ συγκρίνεται] with the Father in any way [κατ' οὐδέν].⁹²

Origen says that the Son and Holy Spirit stand above all other beings using the same term [ὑπερέχω/ὑπεροχή] he uses to depict different levels of goodness in *ComMt* 15.10. Then, he uses the same term to classify the Father's position above the Son and the Holy Spirit. After an aside explaining what he means by the term "the rest," Origen again explains that the Son transcends

⁹¹ Gruber's remark is apt that Origen could have used *auto-life* of the Father, rather than the Son. However, he explains that Origen always thought of life in terms of the participation of creation, hence the reason why he uses the prefix *auto-* of the Son. See Gruber, *ZQH*, 105. Rius-Camps, "Comunicabilidad," (1970), 226, agrees with Gruber's assessment, writing that Origen does not predicate life of the Father using the prefix *auto-* "porque considera siempre la Vida en función de su 'participabilidad' a la creatura."

⁹² *ComJn* 13.151-152 (trans. from FOTC 89:100; Greek from GCS 10:249).

all other beings, but clarifies how he transcends other beings—with respect to “essence [οὐσία], rank [πρεσβεία], power [δυνάμει], divinity [θειότητα], and wisdom [σοφία].” He goes on to say that, despite his relationship to all other beings, the Son “is not comparable [οὐ συγκρίνεται] with the Father in any way [κατ’ οὐδέν].” The qualifier “in any way [κατ’ οὐδέν]” is absolute and, therefore, encompasses both being and other attributes. However, the fact that Origen has just referenced essence [οὐσία], rank [πρεσβεία], power [δυνάμει], divinity [θειότητα], and wisdom [σοφία] suggests that he is thinking of these traits in particular when making this statement—the Son’s essence [οὐσία], rank [πρεσβεία], power [δυνάμει], divinity [θειότητα], and wisdom [σοφία] are not comparable to the Father’s. This passage supports our reading that the Father is ranked above the Son both in regard to the Father’s *auto-X* attributes (being and divinity are mentioned here) and to the Son’s *auto-X* attributes (power and wisdom are mentioned here).⁹³

The Son receives all of his attributes from the Father. Some of these the Father possesses as *auto-X* attributes; others the Son possesses as *auto-X* attributes. While Origen does not describe the Son as receiving his own *auto-X* attributes through participation in the Father, the difference between the two kinds of attributes the Son receives appears more semantic than real. Origen uses the same source language of the Father and ranks the Father above the Son with respect to both sets of attributes. This is not because the Father is beyond the Son’s *auto-X* attributes, as Gruber argues, but because Origen conceives of the Son’s attributes as x from X attributes, with the Father serving as the source of the Son and his attributes. This hierarchical schema is reflected in creation, where the Father serves as the ultimate source of all things, while the Son is the immediate source of all things, resulting in a causal chain in which being and

⁹³ Cf. *CCels* 8.15, which reads, “We affirm that the Saviour, especially when we think of him as divine Logos, Wisdom, Righteousness, and Truth, is Lord of all that has been subjected to him, in so far as he is these things, but not that he is also lord of the God and Father who is mightier [κρατοῦντος] than he” (trans. from Chadwick 463; Greek from SC 150:208).

attributes begin in the Father and flow through the Son to all things. Because he receives all things from the Father, the Son is ranked below the Father and, therefore, differentiated from Him with respect to his being and his attributes. Furthermore, this hierarchical schema corresponds to Origen's goal of showing the Father and Son to be independent *hypostases* in the face of Monarchian theology.

1.3: The Son's Attributes as His *Epinoiai*

The final section of this chapter continues our discussion of the Son's attributes by examining one final term Origen uses to describe them—the word *epinoiai*—and how this term informs our understanding of the Son's position as the mediator between the Father and creation. I will begin by providing an examination of the concepts of unity and multiplicity as they relate to the Father and Son, contrasting the simple unity of the Father with the unity and multiplicity of the Son. This discussion will serve as the foundation for our subsequent analysis of the term *epinoiai* as it applies to the Son, which will further clarify how the Son is a mediator between the Father and all other created beings, as well as set the stage for our discussion of Origen's theology of the Holy Spirit, who receives his attributes by participating in the Son's *epinoiai*.

Andrew Radde-Gallwitz has observed that Origen follows Clement of Alexandria in distinguishing between a “simple unity” and a “complex unity,”⁹⁴ as demonstrated by *ComJn*

1.119:

God, therefore, is altogether one and simple. Our Savior, however, because of the many things, since God “set” him “forth as a propitiation” (cf. Rom. 3:25) and firstfruits of all

⁹⁴ Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil of Caesarea*, 59. Radde-Gallwitz draws comparisons between Origen and *Strom.* 4.25.156-157, which reads: “God, then, being not a subject for demonstration, cannot be the object of science. But the Son is wisdom, and knowledge, and truth, and all else that has affinity thereto. ...And the Son is neither simply one thing, nor many things as parts, but one thing as all things; whence also He is all things. For He is the circle of all powers rolled and united into one unity” (trans. from ANF 2:438).

creation (cf. Jas 1:18), becomes many things, or perhaps even all these things, as the whole creation which can be made free needs him (cf. Rom. 8:21).⁹⁵

While Origen predicates various attributes of the Father, here he calls the Father both one and simple. Radde-Gallwitz has argued that this contradiction can be explained by the fact that Origen appears to hold that these attributes are identical for the Father, pointing to *PEuch* 24.2 to support this conclusion:

In the case of God, however, who is Himself unchangeable and always remains unaltered, there is always a single name—that, we may say, spoken of Him in Exodus, “I AM” (Ex. 3:14) or something that would have the same significance.⁹⁶

The phrase “something that would have the same significance” suggests that other names can be predicated of God if they have the same meaning as His single name, “I AM.” *ComJn* 2.96 supports this point. There, Origen equates goodness with being: “‘The one who is good’ (cf. Mark 10:18; Luke 18:19), therefore, is the same as ‘the one who is.’”⁹⁷ Although Origen does not speak of the relationship between being or goodness and the other attributes, the passages here suggest that Origen understood each attribute to be identical with the other attributes.⁹⁸

The Father’s unity and simplicity differentiates Him from the Son, who has become many different things because of the multiplicity of creation. This is not to say, however, that the Son is simply “many things,” for he remains a single being:

[Christ] is the wisdom of God, he is the power of God, he is the righteousness of God, he is sanctification, he is redemption. In this way he is the prudence of God. But though there is one substance [ὑποκείμενον ἓν], for differences in the aspects [ἐπινοίας] the names [ὀνόματα] are many.⁹⁹

⁹⁵ *ComJn* 1.119 (trans. from FOTC 80:58). This passage is part of Origen’s longest exposition of Christ’s *epinoiai*, *ComJn* 1.112-288, so the reference to the many things Christ becomes concerns his *epinoiai*.

⁹⁶ *PEuch* 24.2 (trans. from CWS 129).

⁹⁷ *ComJn* 2.96 (trans. from FOTC 80:119).

⁹⁸ Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil of Caesarea*, 64, mentions the fact that, while Origen may occasionally call God “beyond being” or “beyond X,” as we saw above in *CCels* 6.64, he does not follow Clement in consistently or often predicating this of God.

⁹⁹ *HomJr* 8.2.1 (trans. from FOTC 97:76-77; Greek from SC 232:358). σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτός, δύναμις θεοῦ αὐτός, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ αὐτός, ἁγιασμὸς αὐτός, ἀπολύτρωσις αὐτός, οὕτως

Origen makes an important distinction in this passage—Christ is one in substance [ὑποκείμενον],¹⁰⁰ but has many names, each of which corresponds to a different aspect [*epinoia*] of Christ. In fact, Origen warns his readers against reading Christ’s many *epinoiai* as dividing his substance in *ComJn* 1.200: “But let no one take offense when we distinguish the aspects [ἐπινοίας] in the Savior, thinking that we also do the same with his essence [οὐσία].”¹⁰¹ Origen maintains that the Son has a multitude of *epinoiai*, but only one *ousia*.

As we saw above, it appears that Origen conceives of the Father’s attributes as identical. This is not the case with the Son. As Radde-Gallwitz notes, Origen never argues that the Son’s *epinoiai* are identical, and the Son’s possession of many *epinoiai* is predicated on the multiplicity of creation.¹⁰² This suggests that the Son’s *epinoiai* are real distinctions, rather than conceptual ones, since they are founded on the Son’s multiplicity.¹⁰³ Origen is unclear, however, because he

φρόνησις αὐτός ἐστιν θεοῦ. Ἄλλα τὸ μὲν ὑποκείμενον ἓν ἐστίν, ταῖς δὲ ἐπινοίαις τὰ πολλὰ ὀνόματα ἐπὶ διαφόρων ἐστίν.

¹⁰⁰ Origen uses the word *hypokeimenon* to express the individuality of the Son in this passage, a term Origen uses as a synonym for *ousia* and *hypostasis*. Origen, however, uses *hypokeimenon* in the same way as *ousia* and *hypostasis*. See Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 24-25; Manlio Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia del II e III secolo* (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1993), 109-110; Henning Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele: Das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 84 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 228-233. For an overview of these terms in early Christianity and in Late Antiquity, see Christopher Stead, *Divine Substance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), especially 131-189.

¹⁰¹ *ComJn* 1.200 (trans. from FOTC 80:74; Greek from GCS 10:36). See also *CCels* 2.64. As detailed in fn. 42, Stead, *Divine Substance*, 122, has observed that *ousia* and *hypokeimenon* can be used as synonyms “without discernible difference in meaning.” See also Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia*, 109-110.

¹⁰² Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil of Caesarea*, 62. In addition, it should be noted that Origen contrasts the Father’s simplicity with the Son’s multiplicity in *ComJn* 1.119, further supporting the fact that the Son’s *epinoiai* are not to be identified with each other.

¹⁰³ As Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil of Caesarea*, 64, writes, “Since Origen bases his account of conceptualizations on the complexity of the Son, it would seem that he takes these in a profoundly realist manner. That is, a conceptualization must have an ‘objective’, mind-independent referent in the Son. A conceptualization therefore is true because it ‘corresponds’ with the Son’s being.”

also uses the term *epinoia* to refer to conceptual differences. For example, Origen speaks of those who incorrectly interpret John 2:19 as proving “that the Son does not differ from the Father in number, but that both being one [ἐν], not only in essence [οὐσία], but also in substance [ὕποκειμένῳ], they are said to be Father and Son in relation to certain differing aspects [τινας ἐπινοίας διαφόρους], not in relation to their reality [ὑπόστασιν].”¹⁰⁴ Here, Origen contrasts *epinoia* with *hypostasis*, suggesting that the former signifies a conceptual difference, as opposed to the latter, which expresses a real difference. Radde-Gallwitz concludes that it is unclear whether or not Origen views the *epinoiai* as real or conceptual differences, but also states:

In a sense it does not matter. What matters is the practice that accompanies the use of *epinoia*, a practice of reflecting on diverse terms *as diverse*: “You do not think the same thing about Christ when you consider him as wisdom and when you consider him as justice” (*HomJr* 8.2.1). The exegete is to focus on each conceptualization individually, that is, on what that conceptualization means and what it means to predicate that conceptualization of Christ. ...Conceptualizations, then, for Origen, are ways of thinking about Christ that are distinct in meaning, yet equally true. Each of these scripturally based conceptualizations provides some vantage point that the others do not.¹⁰⁵

The *epinoiai* refer to the multiple attributes Christ becomes as a result of the plurality of creation. For this reason, the Son is both one and many, a mediator between the unity and simplicity of the Father and the multiplicity of creation. This role as mediator corresponds to the Son’s position as the immediate creator and source of all created beings, which places the Son between the ultimate source, the Father, and creation.

¹⁰⁴ *ComJn* 10.246 (trans. from 309). See Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2002), 131-132; and Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil of Caesarea*, 64-65.

Origen also uses *epinoia* in *ComJn* 19.26 to differentiate between “one aspect of [God] in accordance with which he is Father, and another in accordance with which he is God” (trans. from 173). Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil of Caesarea*, 65, writes of this passage, “These terms are diverse *epinoiai* which tell us different things about God without saying anything, positive or negative, about God’s simplicity.”

¹⁰⁵ Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil of Caesarea*, 65-66.

One more passage related to Christ's *epinoiai* will confirm this. In addition to referring to Christ's attributes as *epinoiai*, Origen calls them "good things" in *ComJn* 1.52.¹⁰⁶ He then proceeds to name several of Christ's "good things,"¹⁰⁷ after which he writes:

It is the same thing, therefore, to say that the apostles preach the Savior and that they preach good things. For he is the one who received from the good Father that he be good things [οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ πατρὸς τὸ ἀγαθὰ εἶναι λαβών], in order that each one who received through Jesus the thing or things he is capable of, might engage in good things.¹⁰⁸

Here, Origen states that the Son receives all good things from the Father and gives those good things to created beings. This description of Christ's *epinoiai*, then, corresponds to our previous observations on the relationship between the Father, the Son, and creation—the Son, as the immediate creator, receives from the Father and bestows on all other created beings what he has received.

Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter we have examined the relationship of the Father and Son through the lens of their respective *auto-X* attributes, establishing that the Father is the source of the Son's being and all of his attributes. As his source, the Father is ranked above the Son, a hierarchical schema that serves as an anti-Monarchian polemic by ensuring that the Father and Son cannot be conflated. The relationship that exists between the Father and the Son corresponds to Origen's theology of creation—the Father is the ultimate creator, who creates through His Son, the immediate creator. The result is a causal chain that begins in the Father and flows through the

¹⁰⁶ *ComJn* 1.52 (trans. from FOTC 80:45). In *ComJn* 1.112, Origen explicitly identifies Christ's "good things" with his *epinoiai* using the verbal form of *epinoia*. Origen writes, "And it is not extraordinary if, as we have said before, the Savior being many good things [πολλὰ...ἀγαθὰ] has conceived [ἐνεπινοοῦμενα] in himself things which are first and second and third" (trans. from FOTC 80:57).

¹⁰⁷ *ComJn* 1.52-60. See also Radde-Gallwitz, *Basil of Caesarea*, 62.

¹⁰⁸ *ComJn* 1.62 (trans. from FOTC 80:46; Greek from GCS 10:15).

Son to all other created beings. As we saw in our exposition of the Son's *epinoiai*, this relationship can be further understood as the movement from simple unity, the Father, to the many, with the Son as both one and many serving as the mediator. This hierarchical relationship that exists between the Father and Son, as well as their relationship to all created things, is essential for understanding the Spirit's generation, the subject of chapter two, and the Spirit's reception of his attributes, the subject of chapter three. It is to the Spirit's generation that we now turn.

Chapter Two: The Father, the Son, and the Generation of the Holy Spirit

In chapter one we analyzed the relationship between the Father and the Son, concluding that the Father is the source of the Son for both his existence and his attributes. This relationship, furthermore, corresponds to Origen's theology of creation—he believes that all created things have their ultimate source in the Father and their immediate source in the Son. With these conclusions from chapter one serving as a foundation, we turn to the subject of the current chapter. Here, we examine the generation of the Holy Spirit and how this informs our understanding of the Spirit's relationship to the Father and Son, as well as with creation. I will argue that Origen ranks the Holy Spirit below the Father and Son with respect to both his being and his attributes, but above all other created beings. In order to investigate this subject, I will break this chapter into two distinct, but related, parts. In the first part, I will explore Origen's conception of the Spirit's generation with respect to the Spirit's being, arguing that Origen ranks the Spirit below the Father and Son but above all other created beings. In the second part, I will investigate the Spirit's generation with respect to the Spirit's attributes, such as wisdom and reason. This section will confirm our finding from the first part of the chapter, that the Spirit is ranked below the Father and Son.

2.1: The Holy Spirit's Existence

The first part of this chapter is an analysis of the generation of the Spirit's being, which will function as a way to apprehend the Spirit's relationship to the Father and Son. Scholars have offered several different interpretations of the Spirit's relationship to the Father and Son, often reading Origen through later teachings. Some scholars have argued that the Spirit is ontologically

equal to the Father and Son, though not economically equal.¹⁰⁹ Others approach his thought through the lens of pro-Nicene theology, arguing that, despite some problematic passages, Origen should not be considered heterodox because he lacked the proper language and tools to elaborate his thought.¹¹⁰ Still others have argued that Origen offers an account of the relations of the three that is similar to or corresponds with later orthodoxy.¹¹¹

In this part, I will provide a different reading of Origen’s pneumatology, one that places his thought within the greater context of his writings and takes account of both his sources and those against whom he is writing. I will argue that, while Origen groups the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit together and considers them to be distinct from creation, he ranks the Spirit below the Father and Son by describing the Spirit’s generation in the same way as all other created beings—by the Father through the Son. In order to demonstrate this thesis, I will break this part into two sections. The first section will pertain to the first part of my thesis. I will argue that

¹⁰⁹ Henry Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers* (London: MacMillan, 1912), 127-135; Henri Crouzel, *Origen*, trans. A.S. Worrall (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989), 198-204; George Berthold, “Origen and the Holy Spirit,” in *Origeniana Quinta*, ed. Robert Daly (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 446-447; Kilian McDonnell, “Does Origen Have a Trinitarian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit?,” *Gregorianum* 75.1 (1994): 5-35, especially 18, 34.

¹¹⁰ Crouzel, *Origen*, 188; Kilian McDonnell, “Does Origen Have a Trinitarian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit?,” *Gregorianum* 75.1 (1994): 13, 18-19, 34; P.L. Tite, “The Holy Spirit’s Role in Origen’s Trinitarian System: A Comparison with Valentinian Pneumatology,” *Theoforum* 32 (2001): 144.

¹¹¹ Henning Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele: Das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 84 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 248-257, claims that Origen believes in a common nature of the Trinity but never explicitly makes this connection. Ziebritzki predicates this belief on the essential properties that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit possess, although he admits that Origen’s belief in a common nature is not the same as later thinkers. Christoph Marksches, “Der Heilige Geist im Johanneskommentar des Origenes,” in *Origenes und sein Erbe: Gesammelte Studien* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 114-120, admits that there are some problematic passages but claims that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are unified and that there is only a logical subordination between them, not an actual one, as later theologians would argue. Ilaria Ramelli, “Origen’s Anti-Subordinationism and Its Heritage in the Nicene and Cappadocian Line,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 65.1 (2011): 21–49, argues that Origen’s thought aligns with later orthodox Trinitarian theology.

Origen uses three strategies to separate the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit from the rest of creation, although I will also note that these three strategies do not describe the Spirit's relationship to the Father and Son, but only group the three together. In the second section of the chapter, I will analyze Origen's account of the Spirit's generation, arguing that Origen ranks the Spirit below the Father and Son but above the rest of creation. These two sections will demonstrate, therefore, that Origen groups the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit together, but arranges them hierarchically.

2.1.1: The Holy Spirit, with the Father and Son

In the Latin translations of his writings Origen often speaks of the Trinity [*Trinitas*], but the term *Trias* is rare in his writings preserved in their original Greek.¹¹² This might indicate that references to the Trinity in the Latin translations are editorial interpolations,¹¹³ but this does not mean that Origen does not group the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit together.¹¹⁴ In fact, Origen distinguishes the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit from the rest of creation using three strategies: first, he speaks of the distance that separates the three from creation; second, he shows the three to have certain attributes that created beings do not possess; third, he portrays the three as

¹¹² To my knowledge, excluding references in fragments and the *catenae*, the term *Trias* appears only four times in Origen's corpus: *ComJn* 6.145; *ComJn* 6.166; *ComJn* 10.270; and *ComMt* 15.31.

¹¹³ Because of the textual concerns we noted in the introduction, especially with respect to Trinitarian topics, I have omitted a discussion here of passages that include overt pro-Nicene theology. As we saw in the previous chapter, and as we will see in the current one, these passages contradict Origen's theology as found in his works preserved in Greek.

¹¹⁴ Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia*, 134-139, has pointed out that many passages in their original Greek speak of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit together, with some passages even juxtaposing the three against all other beings. Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia*, 127-131, also describes a "triangular scheme," in which the Son and Holy Spirit are equal and are arranged like an isosceles triangle underneath the Father.

See also Charles Kannengiesser, "Divine Trinity and Structure of Peri Archon," in *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy*, eds. Charles Kannengiesser and William Petersen (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988), 231-249, who argues that Origen grounds the structure of *On First Principles* on the Trinity.

performing an activity together that could not be accomplished without any one of the three. In what follows, I will offer examples of each of these points in order to demonstrate that Origen considers the Holy Spirit, along with the Father and Son, to be separate from the rest of creation. It will also show, however, that Origen does not explain via these strategies how the Holy Spirit relates to the Father and Son beyond grouping them together. This section, therefore, will provide a more complete understanding of Origen's Trinitarian theology when we consider his statements about the generation of the Holy Spirit found elsewhere in his corpus.

In *ComJn* 13.151 Origen offers a statement on the position of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit relative to all other created beings:

The Savior and the Holy Spirit transcend [ὑπερέχειν] all created beings [πάντων...τῶν γενητῶν], not by comparison, but by their exceeding pre-eminence [ὑπεροχῆ]. The Father exceeds [ὑπερεχόμενον] the Savior as much (or even more) as the Savior himself and the Holy Spirit exceed [ὑπερέχει] the rest.¹¹⁵

Using the verb ὑπερέχω, a term he uses to rank one being above another,¹¹⁶ Origen groups the Son and Holy Spirit together and ranks the two above all created beings. He goes on to say that the extent to which the Son and Holy Spirit are ranked above all created beings is equal to, or even less than, the extent to which the Father is ranked above the Son. While *ComJn* 13.151 expresses the degree to which the Son and Holy Spirit are ranked below the Father, Origen separates the Son and Holy Spirit from creation because of their transcendence over all created things.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ *ComJn* 13.151 (trans. from FOTC 89:100; Greek from GCS 10:249). πάντων μὲν τῶν γενητῶν ὑπερέχειν οὐ συγκρίσει ἀλλ' ὑπερβαλλούση ὑπεροχῆ...τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὑπερεχόμενον τοσοῦτον ἢ καὶ πλέον ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός, ὅσῳ ὑπερέχει αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τῶν λοιπῶν, οὐ τῶν τυχόντων ὄντων.

¹¹⁶ See our discussion of the term ὑπερέχω in chapter one.

¹¹⁷ See also *ComJn* 32.187-189, where Origen mentions the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in what J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 3rd ed. (1972; repr., London and New York: Routledge, 2014), 92, says "looks like a formal creed."

Other passages in Origen's corpus delineate the ways in which the Son and Holy Spirit transcend all created beings by assigning them certain characteristics that no other beings have. For example, Origen presents the Son and Holy Spirit as two seraphim, who possess a knowledge of God that separates them from the rest of creation.¹¹⁸ He draws this image in *PArch* 1.3.4, where he reveals that he considers the Son and Holy Spirit to be the two seraphim of Isa 6:2 and the two living creatures of Hab 3:2:¹¹⁹

¹¹⁸ Several scholars have noted that Origen's representation of the Son and Spirit as two seraphim imply that the two are on the same level, if not equal. See Hauschild, *Gottes Geist und der Mensch*, 141-142; McDonnell, "Does Origen Have a Trinitarian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit?," 26; Bruns, *Trinität und Kosmos*, 129-130; and Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele*, 246-247. Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele*, 247, argues that Origen's interpretation suggests that the Spirit has a direct relationship with the Father, but the passages above only detail the knowledge the Holy Spirit possesses, not the manner in which the Spirit has received this knowledge. *PArch* 1.3.4 records that the Spirit does receive knowledge directly from the Father, but relying on this passage as evidence is tenuous for two reasons. First, there are textual problems with Rufinus's translation. Second, *PArch* 1.3.4 contradicts what is found elsewhere in Origen's Greek corpus. In *ComJn* 2.76 the Holy Spirit is said to receive all that it is from the Son. *ComJn* 2.127 supports this in regards to the Holy Spirit's knowledge specifically: "We must not leave this matter unexamined because of reverence for the Holy Spirit. For that the Holy Spirit also is instructed by him is clear from what is said about the comforter and the Holy Spirit: 'Because he will receive from me and will announce it to you' (John 16:14). Now we must inquire very carefully if the Spirit, by being instructed, contains all things which the son, who is from the beginning, knows by contemplating the Father" (trans. from FOTC 80:128). Although Origen does not pursue his inquiry of whether or not the Spirit knows all that the Son knows, this passage reveals that Origen believed the Spirit received all knowledge through the Son and at least thought it possible that the Spirit had the same knowledge as the Son. His use of the image of the seraphim in *PArch* and *HomIs* and the cherubim in *ComRm* implies that Origen elsewhere answered his inquiry by stating that the Spirit did, in fact, know all that the Son knows.

¹¹⁹ Although establishing direct influences is difficult, scholars have argued that the roots of Origen's interpretation are found in Jewish thought and have pointed to several Jewish and Jewish-Christian texts that may have influenced Origen's exegesis. Jean Danielou, *The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea. Volume I: The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, translated by J. Baker (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), 134-136; Georg Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 21 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1956), 64-68; and Daryl Hannah, "Isaiah's Vision in the Ascension of Isaiah," *Journal of Theological Studies* 50 (1999), 93, have noted the similarities between Origen's interpretation and Philo's discussion of two seraphim in *Deo* 6-10. On the fragment *De Deo*, see Folker Siegert, "The Philonian Fragment *De Deo*. First English Translation," *The Studia Philonica Annual: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*, vol. 10 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998): 1-33. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 134-135; Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie*, 71-78; and Hannah, "Isaiah's Vision in the Ascension of

My Hebrew master used to say that the two seraphim, which are described in Isaiah as having six wings each and as crying one to another and saying, ‘Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts’ [Isa 6:3], were to be understood to mean the only-begotten Son of God and the Holy Spirit. And we ourselves think that the expression in the song of Habakkuk, ‘In the midst of the two animals’ (or the two living creatures) ‘thou shalt be known’ [Hab 3:2], should be understood to refer to Christ and the Holy Spirit. For all knowledge of the Father, when the Son reveals him, is made known to us through the Holy Spirit. So that both of these, who in the words of the prophet are called “animals” or “living beings” [Hab 3:2], are the cause of our knowledge of God the Father. For as it is said of the Son that “no one knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal him” [Matt 11:27], so in the same way does the apostle speak of the Holy Spirit; “God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God” [1 Cor 2:10]. Again, when in the gospel the Saviour is referring to the divine and deeper doctrines which his disciples could not yet receive, he speaks to the apostles as follows: “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot receive them now; howbeit when the comforter is come, even the Holy Spirit, who proceedeth from the Father, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I have said unto you” [John 16:12-13]. So then we must understand that as the Son, who alone knows the Father, reveals him to whom he will, in the same way also the Holy Spirit, who alone “searcheth even the deep things of God” [1 Cor 2:10], reveals God to whom he will. For “the Spirit breathes where he willeth” [John 3:8].¹²⁰

Through his exegesis of the two seraphim Origen expounds how the Son and Holy Spirit engage in an activity unique to them—the Son and Holy Spirit reveal the Father to others. He justifies his exegesis by appealing to Matt 11:27, 1 Cor 2:10,¹²¹ John 16:12-13, and John 3:8 in order to establish that the Son and Holy Spirit possess special knowledge of God and share this knowledge with others.¹²² While Origen’s emphasis is on the revelatory activity of the Son and

Isaiah,” 80, have also suggested that Ascension of Isaiah informed Origen’s interpretation. Finally, Danielou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 140, and Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie*, 99, have drawn attention to the account of a man named Elchasai who spoke of two enormous angels named the Son of God and the Holy Spirit. This account is found in *Refutatio omnium haeresium* 9.13.2-3. See also Hannah, “Isaiah’s Vision in the Ascension of Isaiah,” 97-98.

¹²⁰ *Arch* 1.3.4 (trans. from Butterworth 32-33).

¹²¹ Origen utilizes Matt 11:27 and 1 Cor 2:10 apart from the image of the two seraphim to make the same point—that the Son and Holy Spirit possess a knowledge that no other beings possess. See *ComRm* 8.13.6 and *HomNum* 18.2.2.

¹²² Michael Haykin, “‘The Spirit of God’: The Exegesis of 1 Cor. 2:10-12 by Origen and Athanasius,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 35 (1982), 515, provides a good statement of the value Matt 11:27 and 1 Cor 2:10 have in *Arch* 1.3.4. He writes, “Matt 11:27 affirms that the Son has an intimate knowledge of the Father and that the Father has given him the task of revealing this knowledge to whom he will. Other NT texts—1 Cor. 2:10, John 16:12-13, John

Holy Spirit in this passage, in *PArch* 4.3.14 he further explains the nature of the special knowledge that the Son and Holy Spirit possess:

Isaiah, knowing that the beginnings of things could not be discovered by mortal nature, no, and not even by those natures which, though diviner than man's nature, are yet themselves made and created, knowing, I say, that none of these could discover either the beginning or the end says; "Tell ye the former things, what they were, and we shall know that ye are gods; or declare the last things, what they are, and then shall we see that ye are gods" [Isa 41:22-23]. My Hebrew teacher also used to teach as follows, that since the beginning or the end of all things could not be comprehended by any except our Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, this was the reason why Isaiah spoke of there being in the vision that appeared to him two seraphim only, who with two wings cover the face of God, with two cover his feet, and with two fly, crying one to another and saying, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of thy glory" [Isa 6:3]. For because the two seraphim alone have their wings over the face of God and over his feet, we may venture to declare that neither the armies of the holy angels, nor the holy thrones, nor the dominions, nor principalities, nor powers can wholly know the beginnings of all things and the ends of the universe.¹²³

The two seraphim of Isa 6 are the Son and Holy Spirit, because they alone are able to comprehend and have knowledge of the beginning and end of all things, which is further supported by the image of the two seraphim covering God's face and feet. Since the Son and Holy Spirit alone have this knowledge, Origen's citation of Isa 41:22-23 suggests that they are able to be called "gods."¹²⁴

15:26, John 14:26, John 3:8—are now cited to show that the Holy Spirit also participates in this activity of revelation. 1 Cor. 2:10 is cited as a parallel to the affirmation of Matt 11:27 that the Son has an intimate knowledge of the Father." However, Haykin goes on to say that *PArch* 1.3.4 and *PArch* 4.4.8 show that the Holy Spirit receives knowledge directly from the Father, a stance that does not take into consideration Origen's statement in *ComJn* 2.76 that the Spirit receives all that it is from the Son and fails to address the textual issues in Rufinus's translation of *PArch* (for our own discussion of this issue, see the introduction). See also Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele*, 247.

¹²³ *PArch* 4.3.14 (trans. from Butterworth 311).

¹²⁴ Origen provides the same interpretation of the two seraphim in two other passages in the *HomIs*, but adds more detailed explanation of the elements of Isa 6. In *HomIs* 1.2 Origen discusses the knowledge of God's beginning and end, which closely approximates the knowledge of the beginning and end of all things mentioned in *PArch* 4.3.14. He adds that creation only knows God from what is visible, that is, what is between the beginning and the end (the area of God left uncovered by the wings of the seraphim). Origen also asks two rhetorical questions in this passage. After citing Isa 41:22-23 and explaining that any being who speaks of the first and last things is called a god, he asks "Who then besides the seraphim can say this?"

Taken together, *PArch* 1.3.4 and 4.3.14 show that the Son and Holy Spirit possess unique knowledge of the Father and, therefore, are the only beings capable of revealing the Father to others.¹²⁵ As they are the only beings able to reveal the “former things” and “last things,” as Isa

Who can say, ‘Holy, Holy, Holy!’ [Isa 6:3] besides the seraphim?” (*HomIs* 1.2; trans. from ACW 68:887). The rhetorical nature of the first question indicates that only the Son and Spirit can speak of God’s beginning and end, which means that only they can be called “gods.” The second question implies that the seraphims’ cry is equivalent to their knowledge.

HomIs 4.1 follows the exegesis of *HomIs* 1.2, but allows the possibility that certain angels—the angels who “always beheld the face of the Father who is in heaven” [Matt 18:10]—see the Father’s face, which means they may have been able to see the beginnings of things. Origen does not indicate that they can see the ends of things, however, so there is still a sharp division between the knowledge of the Son and Spirit versus the knowledge of other beings. The separation between the Son and Spirit and all other beings is reaffirmed near the end of *HomIs* 4.1, where Origen says that the reason why “‘one cried to the other’ [Isa 6:3], not ‘one’ to several” (trans. from ACW 68:899), is because only the two seraphim can understand each other. He writes, “For in accordance with the dignity of the matter, no one but the Holy Spirit is able to hear of the sanctity of God that is announced by the Savior; just as, on the other hand, no one but the Savior alone is able to inhabit the sacredness of God that is announced by the Holy Spirit. This is why “one cried out to the other and they said: Holy, Holy, Holy!” [Isa 6:3]” (trans. from ACW 68:899).

¹²⁵ Origen also refers to the Son and Holy Spirit as two cherubim in *ComRm* 3.8.5, where he uses the image to make the same point as his interpretation of the two seraphim—the Son and Spirit possess knowledge that separates them from the rest of creation. Origen defines the word “cherubim” as meaning “the fullness of knowledge [Latin],” then he explains... According to Origen, the Word possesses fullness of knowledge, based on the interpretation of Col 2:3; likewise, 1 Cor 2:10 demonstrates that the Holy Spirit possesses fullness of knowledge. The fact that there are only two cherubim on the Ark, along with Origen’s interpretation of the two seraphim elsewhere, suggests that only the two cherubim, the Son and the Holy Spirit, possess the fullness of knowledge. *ComRm* 3.8.5, therefore, functions as a way for Origen to show that the Son and Holy Spirit possess a certain knowledge that no other being has, thereby illustrating the status the Son and the Spirit enjoy relative to all other beings. It is important to note that Origen’s definition of “cherubim” follows that of Philo, who offers a reading of the two cherubim on the propitiatory similar to that of Origen in *Mos.* 2.97-99. See Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 136-138; Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie*, 82-93. See also Stroumsa, “Le Couple de l’Ange et de l’Esprit,” 42-47, who compares Origen’s thought to other conceptions of two highest angels and later concludes (p. 55) that Origen represents one way of interpreting earlier Jewish-Christian traditions—especially those about two cherubim and attested to by Philo and Josephus—while other texts, such as the *Ascension of Isaiah* and the accounts of the *Elchasai*, represent another way of interpretation. Stroumsa focuses on Origen’s use of the cherubim, but he does mention his interpretation of the seraphim as well.

41:22-23 records, it follows that they are the only beings that can be called “gods.”¹²⁶ By highlighting the special knowledge that the Son and Holy Spirit possess, Origen’s exegesis of the two seraphim in Isa 6 functions as a means of distinguishing the Son and Holy Spirit from the rest of creation.¹²⁷

In addition to distinguishing the Son and Holy Spirit from the rest of creation by virtue of their knowledge of the Father, Origen also presents the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as together performing an activity that could not be completed without any of the three. In *HomJr* 8.1.2 Origen writes that a soul can only be considered “inhabited” rather than “deserted” when it is filled by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit:

I know the inhabited soul, I know the “deserted” soul. For if a soul does not have God, if it does not have the Christ who said, “I and my Father; we will come to him and we will make our dwelling with him” (John 14:23), if it does not have the Holy Spirit, it is a desert. But it is inhabited when it is filled with God, when it has Christ, when the Holy Spirit is in it. Yet that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are in the soul of man is said variously and diversely in the Scriptures. So David, in the psalm of the confession concerning these spirits, asks the Father, when he says, “with a governing spirit uphold me” (Ps 50:13), “a right spirit renew in me” (Ps 50:12), “and take not your holy spirit from me” (Ps 50:13). What three spirits are these? The Father is the governing spirit, Christ is the right spirit, and the Holy Spirit is the holy spirit.¹²⁸

¹²⁶ While the Son and Holy Spirit have a special knowledge of God, it is unclear if they had complete knowledge of the Father. Regarding the Holy Spirit, see *PEuch* 2.4, where Origen writes that the Spirit searches and understands the depths of God “as far as He is able” (trans. from CWS 85), implying that there is a limit to the Spirit’s capacity for understanding God. See also *ComJn* 2.127 and *CCels* 6.17. Regarding the Son’s knowledge of God, see Rowan Williams, “The Son’s Knowledge of the Father in Origen,” in *Origeniana Quarta: Die Referate 4. Internationalen Origeneskongresses*, ed. Lothar Lies, 146-153 (Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1987).

¹²⁷ For other passages that show the Son and Holy Spirit to be on the same level, perform the same activity, or possess the same name or attribute, see *HomLev* 4.3; *HomNum* 18.2.2; *HomNum* 27.5.1; *HomNum* 27.12.11; *HomJos* 15.7; *HomIs* 1.2; *HomIs* 4.1; *ComCt* 3.1.11; *HomLc* 23.7; *ComRm* 3.8.5; *ComRm* 9.3.9; *PArch* 4.3.14. Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia*, 127-131, lists several of these passages in his explanation of the “triangular scheme” that we noted above.

¹²⁸ *HomJr* 8.1.2 (trans. from FOTC 97:75).

Origen considers Ps 50:12-13 to name three different spirits, which refer to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In order for a person's soul to be filled, all three must be present. This description, therefore, groups the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit together and shows that each one is integral in order to partake in God.¹²⁹

These three different types of passages group the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit together and separate the three from creation. However, none of these passages address the precise nature of the relationship between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. So it is not yet clear if Origen regards them as equal to each other or as arranged in a hierarchy. Origen's comments with regard to the generation of the Spirit reveal how he grasps the relationship of the Spirit to the Father and Son. It is to these comments that we now turn.

2.1.2: The Father, the Son, and the Generation of the Holy Spirit

Only three passages in Origen's extant corpus discuss the generation of the Holy Spirit—*PArch* Pref.4, *PArch* 1.3.3, and *ComJn* 2.73-88. In this section I will offer an exegesis of these passages, beginning with the two found in *PArch*, which I believe ante-date *ComJn*. I will then provide an exegesis of *ComJn* 2.73-88 that understands this passage as Origen's mature theological position on the generation of the Holy Spirit.¹³⁰ In the course of this exegesis, I will demonstrate why this passage should be taken as Origen's mature position and how the passage reflects Origen's concern with Monarchian theology. I will argue that Origen considered the Holy Spirit to be ranked below the Father and Son, but above all other created beings. An examination of the Holy Spirit's generation will, therefore, not only explain how the Spirit

¹²⁹ See also *PArch* 1.3.8, where Origen maintains that one must partake in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in order to progress toward perfection; and *PEuch* 2.6, where he says that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are all necessary in order to discuss the topic of prayer.

¹³⁰ The exegesis in this chapter will focus on *ComJn* 2.73-76 and 2.79-88; *ComJn* 2.76-78 will be the focus of following chapters.

comes to be, but also provide an account of the Spirit's hierarchical relationship with the Father and Son.

2.1.2.1: The Generation of the Holy Spirit in *PArch*

Origen explains in the preface of *PArch* that it is unclear how the Holy Spirit was generated, assigning the topic to the category of teachings that must be investigated:

The apostles delivered this doctrine, that the Holy Spirit is united in honour and dignity with the Father and the Son. In regard to [the Holy Spirit] it is not yet clearly known whether he is to be thought of as begotten or unbegotten, or as being himself also a Son of God or not; but these are matters which we must investigate to the best of our power from holy scripture, inquiring with wisdom and diligence.¹³¹

The statement that the Holy Spirit is “united in honor and dignity with the Father and the Son” corresponds to Origen’s other statements that group the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit together, as we observed in the previous section. The remainder of the passage makes clear that Origen views the generation and the status of the Spirit as open questions. In his investigation of the Holy Spirit later in *PArch*, Origen addresses these questions:

But up to the present we have been able to find no passage in the holy scriptures which would warrant us in saying that the Holy Spirit was a being made or created [*spiritus sanctus factura esse vel creatura*], not even in that manner in which we have shown above that Solomon speaks of wisdom, nor in the manner in which the expressions we have dealt with, such as life, or word, or other titles of the Son of God, are to be understood.¹³²

¹³¹ *PArch* Pref.4 (trans. from Butterworth 3; Latin from Görgemanns 90). *Tum deinde honore ac dignitate patri ac filio sociatum tradiderunt spiritum sanctum. In hoc non iam manifeste discernitur, utrum natus aut innatus, vel filius etiam ipse dei habendus sit necne; sed inquirenda iam ista pro viribus sunt de sancta scriptura et sagaci perquisitione investiganda.*

¹³² *PArch* 1.3.3 (trans. from Butterworth 31; Latin from Görgemanns 162). *Verum tamen usque ad praesens nullum sermonem in scripturis sanctis invenire potuimus, per quem spiritus sanctus factura esse vel creatura diceretur, ne eo quidem modo quo de sapientia referre Salomonem supra edocuimus, vel quae de vita vel verbo aliisque appellationibus filii dei intellegenda esse tractavimus.*

Origen explains that at the time of his writing his attempts at discerning the Holy Spirit's generation have not yielded any answers. Still, this effort appears to be a topic of concern—the phrase “up to the present,” Plaxco notes, “suggests an ongoing search, as though Origen were reporting on his work-in-progress.”¹³³ Importantly, Origen notes where he is looking for a solution to his questions—the holy scriptures.

2.1.2.2: The Generation of the Holy Spirit in *ComJn*

Origen's account of the Holy Spirit's generation in *ComJn* 2.73-88 suggests that he has found the scriptural evidence he sought in order to establish how the Holy Spirit is generated—John 1:3. Before examining Origen's own exposition of the Spirit's generation, however, we must look at the context within which he offers his exegesis of John 1:3. There, he lists four different possibilities as to how the Spirit is generated, three of which reflect Monarchian theological positions. By recognizing these positions as Monarchian, we can better understand Origen's own account of the generation of the Holy Spirit.

Origen's Anti-Monarchian Polemic

Origen begins his discussion of the Holy Spirit in *ComJn* 2.73-74, where he offers four different possibilities as to how the Spirit came into being:

But if it is true that “all things were made through him [Πάντα διὰ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο]” (John 1:3), we must investigate if the Holy Spirit [τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον], too, was made through him [διὰ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο]. I think that one who declares that he was made and who advances the statement, “All things were made through him” (John 1:3), must accept that the Holy Spirit too was made through the Word [τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο], since the Word is older [πρεσβυτέρου] than he. But it follows that one who does not wish the Holy Spirit to have been made through the Christ, if he judges the things in this Gospel to be true, says he is “unbegotten [ἀγέννητον].” But there will be a third person also besides these two, I mean besides the one who accepts that the Holy Spirit was made

¹³³ Plaxco, “Didymus the Blind,” 121. For Plaxco's comments on this topic, see “Didymus the Blind,” 118-121.

through the Word, and the one who supposes him to be unbegotten. This third person teaches that the Holy Spirit has no distinctive essence different from the Father and the Son [δογματίζων μηδὲ οὐσίαν τινὰ ἰδίαν ὑφεστάναι τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑτέραν παρὰ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν]. But he may perhaps propose rather, if he thinks the Son is different [ἕτερον] from the Father, that the Spirit is the same with the Father [τῷ τὸ αὐτὸ αὐτὸ τυγγάνειν τῷ πατρὶ], since a commonly acknowledged distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Son is revealed in the statement, “Whoever speaks a word against the Son of man shall be forgiven, but whoever blasphemes the Holy Spirit will not have forgiveness in this world or in the world to come” (Matt 12:32; Mark 3:29).¹³⁴

The four possible explanations of the origin of the Holy Spirit are as follows: (1) the Holy Spirit was made through the Word; (2) the Holy Spirit is unbegotten; (3) the Holy Spirit has the same essence as the Father and the Son; (4) the Holy Spirit has the same essence as the Father, while the Son is a different essence.¹³⁵ We have already examined Monarchian theology above, but a few additional comments will help provide a better understanding of three of the four beliefs Origen lists, as well as the anti-Monarchian utility of Origen’s own belief.¹³⁶

In chapter one we discussed the fact that Monarchian theology is predicated on the belief that there is only one God. Early Monarchians upheld this belief by identifying the Father and the Son as the same being.¹³⁷ Later Monarchians, in order to avoid patripassianism,¹³⁸ distinguished the Father and the Son, as the following passage from the *Refutatio omnium haeresium* attests:

[Callistus] says that the Logos himself is Son. [The Logos] is also given the name Father, but is one indivisible spirit. Father and Son are not distinct, but are one and the same, even as all things are full of the divine spirit above and below. And the spirit which was made flesh in the virgin is not different from the Father, but is one and the same. And this is what has been said, “Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father in me?” (John 14:10). For that which is seen, which is man, is the Son, but the spirit contained in

¹³⁴ *ComJn* 2.73-74 (trans. from FOTC 80:113-114; Greek from GCS 10:64-65).

¹³⁵ Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, “The Holy Spirit as Agent, not Activity: Origen’s Argument with Modalism and its Afterlife in Didymus, Eunomius, and Gregory of Nazianus,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 65 (2011): 232-233, has observed that this fourth point “reverts back” to the second.

¹³⁶ See section 1.3 of chapter one for scholarship on the relationship between Origen and Monarchianism.

¹³⁷ See, for example, *Contra Noetum* 2.1-3. For more on Noetus’ views, see Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 78-84; and Waers, “Monarchianism,” 117-132.

¹³⁸ Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 74-78.

the Son is the Father. For I will not, he says, speak of two Gods, Father and Son, but of one. For the Father who was in him assumed the flesh and made it God by uniting it with himself, and made it one, so that Father and Son are designated one God.¹³⁹

These Roman Monarchians named the human part of Jesus “Son,” and equated the divine with the Father or spirit. This perspective aligns with the fourth belief in Origen’s list above: “the Son is differentiated from the Father, and the spirit is equated with the Father.”¹⁴⁰ Since the Father is unbegotten, and the Spirit is equated with the Father, the Spirit is also equated with the unbegotten. As a result, this viewpoint could also correspond with the second belief listed above.¹⁴¹ However, Monarchians could also refer to the Son as one God with the Father/Spirit because the Father “assumed the flesh and made it God by uniting it with himself.”¹⁴² Since the divine nature of the Son is the Father/Spirit, it is possible to refer this position to the third belief Origen lists in this passage.¹⁴³

¹³⁹ *Ref.* 9.12.16-18 (trans. from Ronald Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 49.1 (1998): 62-63). I am aware of the authorial questions regarding this text. For a summary of these issues, see Ronald Heine, “Hippolytus, Ps.-Hippolytus and the Early Canons,” in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, eds. Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth, 142-151 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). As Stephen Waers, “Monarchianism and Origen’s Early Trinitarian Theology” (PhD diss., Marquette University, 2016), 157-159, cautions, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* is imbued with polemical vitriol, so it is sometimes difficult to determine what is representative of Monarchian thought. However, it is an important source for our knowledge of Monarchian theology, and the ideas presented in the passages here are also attested in other texts containing Monarchian theology.

¹⁴⁰ Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 70.

¹⁴¹ It would also be possible, however, to read the second belief in *ComJn* 2.73-74 as espousing two unbegottens, the Father and the Spirit.

¹⁴² See Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 69-71. Along these lines, Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 64, writes, “It is the concept of spirit...which links Father and Son. Father and Son are one inseparable spirit.”

¹⁴³ In *Adversus Praxean* 2.3 Tertullian also notes that Monarchians identified the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as one. Waers, “Monarchianism,” 143, n. 161, suggests that Tertullian “has inserted the Spirit into a standard formula,” because Monarchians seem more concerned with the relationship between the Father and Son. Yet, he does speculate that Montanists, who were also Monarchians, paid more attention to the Spirit. It should be noted that, by equating the Father with spirit, it would have been easy for those such as Origen and Tertullian to read this spirit as the Holy Spirit, even if this was not what Monarchians had in mind.

The Generation of the Holy Spirit

Having examined how three of the four positions listed in *ComJn* 2.73-74 relate to Monarchian theology, we can now turn to Origen's own account of the generation of the Spirit in *ComJn* 2.75-76. An exegesis of this account will not only reveal that Origen ranks the Holy Spirit below the Father and Son, but also demonstrate that his exposition of the Spirit's generation addresses both the open questions of *PArch* and the Monarchian positions he lists in *ComJn* 2.73-74. Rather than uphold one of the Monarchian positions, Origen prefers the first of the four opinions he lays out in *ComJn* 2.73-74:

We, however, are persuaded that there are three hypostases, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and we believe that only the Father is unbegotten. We admit, as more pious and as true, that the Holy Spirit is the most honored of all things made through the Word, and that he is [first] in rank of all the things which have been made by the Father through Christ. Perhaps this is the reason the Spirit too is not called son of God, since the only begotten alone is by nature a son from the beginning.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴ *ComJn* 2.75-76 (trans. from FOTC 80:114).

Origen maintains that the Holy Spirit has its own *hypostasis*,¹⁴⁵ ensuring his distinction between the separate *hypostases* of the Father and Son.¹⁴⁶ He further distinguishes the Holy Spirit from

¹⁴⁵ Cf. *HomLc* 25.5, where Origen writes, “Others read the passage, ‘I shall send you an advocate, the Spirit of Truth’ (John 14:16-17), and are unwilling to understand a third person besides the Father and the Son, a divine and exalted nature” (trans. from FOTC 94:107).

Josep Rius-Camps, *El dinamismo trinitario en la divinización de los seres racionales según Orígenes* (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1970), 158-163, believes the Holy Spirit is the hypostatization of the underlying substrate of spirit, common to the Father and the Son. However, Rius-Camps is incorrect. Origen never discusses a common, impersonal spirit between the Father and Son, which emphasizes a unity between the two that is absent from Origen’s thought. Origen’s exegesis of John 4:24, which says that “God is spirit,” also speaks against Rius-Camps’ explanation. Instead of discussing the possibility of God’s essence being spirit, Origen chooses to read the verse allegorically. He first observes in *ComJn* 13.124, “In this passage it is stated as if [God’s] essence were spirit, for it says, ‘God is spirit’” (trans. from FOTC 89:93). Then, he explains in *ComJn* 13.131, “First we must say that just as when we find it written that God has eyes, eyelids, ears, hands, arms, feet, and even wings, we change what is written into an allegory, despising those who bestow on God a form resembling men, and we do this with good reason, so also must we act consistently with our practice in the case of the names mentioned above” (trans. from FOTC 89:95). As Origen proclaims here, he does not understand God to have an essence of spirit, instead reading this verse as offering an allegorical explanation for God (Origen also offers this opinion in *PArch* 1.1.1-9 and *CCels* 6.70). This explanation itself might be a response to Monarchian readings of this passage as attesting to the one spirit of Father and Son, according to Heine, “The Christology of Callistus,” 70 (see especially fn. 55 on the same page). This being the case, the Holy Spirit cannot be the *hypostasis* of the impersonal spirit that makes up the Father and Son. Instead, the Holy Spirit is a distinct *hypostasis*, part of the anti-Monarchian polemic that makes up Origen’s thought.

¹⁴⁶ See Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 24-25; Manlio Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia del II e III secolo* (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1993), 109-110; Henning Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele: Das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 84 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 228-233. Simonetti and Ziebritzki both emphasize that Origen uses a number of terms, such as *ousia*, *hypostasis*, and *hypokeimenon*, as synonyms to denote the individual existence of and distinguish from each other the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. For an overview of these terms in early Christianity and in Late Antiquity, see Christopher Stead, *Divine Substance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), especially 131-189. See also Volker Drecoll, “Der Begriff Hypostasis bei Origenes bemerkungen zum *Johanneskommentar* II,10,” in *Origeniana Octava*, ed. Lorenzo Perrone, 479-487 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 485, where Drecoll writes that, in *ComJn* 2.75 (the first occurrence of the term *hypostasis* in *ComJn* 2.75-78), Origen uses *hypostasis* in a way similar to the term *ousia*.

Drecoll, “Der Begriff Hypostasis bei Origenes,” 479-487, and Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele*, 232, have noted that Origen’s use of *hypostasis* also emphasizes the causative relationship that exists between the Son and the Holy Spirit, a relationship that we will examine more below.

the Father and Son by describing the Spirit's generation in terms of John 1:3.¹⁴⁷ This makes the Spirit one of the "all things" made through the Son¹⁴⁸—Origen writes that the Spirit is "made

¹⁴⁷ Origen's interpretation of this verse also serves as a polemic against Heracleon, as Ronald Heine has observed. In *ComJn* 2.100 Origen writes, "Heracleon, who is said to be a disciple of Valentinus, in explaining the statement, 'All things were made through him' (John 1:3), has, in my opinion, violently and without proof understood 'all things' to mean the cosmos and what is in it. At the same time, to suit his own purpose, he excludes from 'all things,' those things which exceed the world and the things in it. For he says: 'Neither the aeon nor the things in the aeon have been made through the Word'" (trans. from FOTC 80:120). Origen's interpretation does not exclude from the "all things" what is beyond the world. See Ronald Heine, introduction to *Commentary on the Gospel according to John: Books 1-10*, trans. Ronald Heine, *Fathers of the Church* 80 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989), 23-26.

¹⁴⁸ This is not the only place in Origen's corpus where he groups the Holy Spirit among other created beings. Origen calls the Holy Spirit the "chief" [*principalis*] or "first-fruits" [*primitiae*] of many spirits on three occasions, thereby grouping the Spirit with lesser spiritual beings. In *ComRm* 7.1.2, Origen writes, "I believe that he [the Holy Spirit] is called the governing Spirit (*principalem spiritum*) that it might be shown that indeed there are many spirits but among them the Holy Spirit, who is named "governing" (*principalis*) [Ps 51 (50):11-12], holds sovereignty and dominion (*principatum et dominationem*)" (trans. from FOTC 104:61; Latin from Bammel 3:554). This passage appears to group all spirits together, with the Holy Spirit as the principal of these spirits. In *ComRm* 7.5.3, Origen reaffirms this interpretation in an exegesis of Rom 12:15, which references "the firstfruits (*primitiae*) of many spirits." Origen offers three different interpretations of the phrase, two of which echo Origen's statements in *ComRm* 7.1.2. In one of these, Origen explains, "The firstfruits of the threshing floor and the firstfruits of the wine press are composed of the same fruit or fluid from which the rest comes, whether the grain from the threshing floor or the liquid from the press. Will it not also seem so in the case of what he calls the firstfruits of the Spirit, that, from the many other holy and blessed spirits, one is preeminent over the other?" (trans. from FOTC 104:74; Latin from Bammel 3:571). Origen begins his exegesis by pointing out that the firstfruits of the threshing floor or the winepress are the same as everything else that comes from the floor or the press. Origen then asks whether or not this is the case regarding the "firstfruits of the Spirit," implying that the firstfruits of the Spirit are the same as other spirits, even though they are also preeminent over them. In *ComRm* 7.5.5, Origen establishes that the "firstfruits of the Spirit" are the same as the gift of the Holy Spirit, which means that, in *ComRm* 7.5.3, Origen considers the Holy Spirit to be the same as other spirits, while also being their chief. Both *ComRm* 7.1.2 and 7.5.3, then, parallel Origen's account of the Spirit in *ComJn* 2.75—the Spirit is simultaneously grouped with all created beings and said to be preeminent among them. See also *ComRm* 7.5.7, which offers the same reading as the previous two passages. The idea that the Spirit is the principal spirit may be influenced by Jewish speculations on the chief of the angels, usually associated with the archangel Michael. For more on Michael's position as the chief of the angels, see Darrell Hannah, *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*, WUNT 2/109 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 48-51.

through the Word” [διὰ τοῦ λόγου γενομένων] and “made by the Father through Christ” [ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ Χριστοῦ γεγενημένων].¹⁴⁹ The Spirit’s existence, therefore, is dependent on the Son.

The Holy Spirit’s dependence on the Father and Son further suggests that the Spirit is ranked below them.¹⁵⁰ Indeed, Origen goes to such great lengths to make this point that he devotes *ComJn* 2.79-88 to explaining why scriptural passages that appear to rank the Spirit above the Son do not, in fact, do so. He writes:

There is an additional problem, however, both because of the statement, “All things were made through him” (John 1:3), and the consequence that the Spirit [τὸ πνεῦμα], having an origin [γενητὸν ὄν], has been made through the Word [διὰ τοῦ λόγου γεγονέναι]. How is the Spirit honored, as it were, above the Christ in some Scriptures?¹⁵¹

In what follows, he examines three passages: Isa 48:16, Matt 12:32, and a passage from the Gospel to the Hebrews.¹⁵² In each case he offers a reading that explains why the Spirit might

¹⁴⁹ His description of this creation corresponds to the hierarchical schema that we examined in the previous chapter, as Origen makes clear just before this passage in *ComJn* 2.70, where he explains that “the expression ‘through whom’ never has the first position, but always the second” (trans. from FOTC 80:112). He further defines what this means when he adds, “If all things were made through [διὰ] the Word, they were not made by [ὑπὸ] the Word, but by [ὑπὸ] one better [κρείττονος] and greater [μείζονος] than the Word. And who would this other one be except the Father?” (trans. from FOTC 80:113; Greek from GCS 10:64). In *ComJn* 2.70-72 Origen reiterates his theology of creation by using prepositional metaphysics—the Father, as the ultimate source of creation, creates through the Son, who is the instrumental cause and immediate source of creation. Prepositional metaphysics is the idea that certain prepositions indicate different types of causes. Origen provides a more detailed account of the difference between the prepositions “from” and “through” in *ComRm* 3.10.3, writing, “When ‘from him [*ex ipso*]’ is said, something originative [*principale*] seems to be indicated under the token of this preposition [*praepositionis*]. But when ‘through him [*per illum*]’ is said, the intelligence of a secondary cause [*sequentis causae*], that is to say, one which is after the principal cause [*post principalem*], is designated” (trans. from FOTC 103:231; Latin from Bammel 1:254). For more on the topic of prepositional metaphysics, see Dillon, *The Middle Platonists*, 138.

¹⁵⁰ Miguel María Garijo Guembe, “Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana III: Carácter ontológico del Espíritu Santo,” *Scriptorium Victoriense* 13.3 (1966): 302, notes that the Spirit’s creation from the Father through the Son both differentiates the Spirit from the Father and Son and places the Spirit beneath the Son.

¹⁵¹ *ComJn* 2.79 (trans. from FOTC 80:114; Greek from GCS 10:66).

¹⁵² Isa 48:16 reads, “And now the Lord has sent me, and his Spirit.” Matt 12:32 reads, “Anyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but anyone who speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come” (cf. Mark 3:29 and Luke 12:10). The Gospel according to the Hebrews reads, “My mother, the Holy Spirit,

appear to be above the Son, even though this is not the case.¹⁵³ Such readings are only necessary if the Spirit is not, in fact, greater than the Son, as Origen makes clear during his examination of these problematic passages:

Now these things have been examined extensively because we have wished to see more clearly how, if all things were made through him [πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο], and the Spirit was made through the Word [διὰ τοῦ λόγου], the Spirit is one of the “all things”

took me just now by one of my hairs and carried me off to the great mountain Thabor.” For more on this last passage, see *New Testament Apocrypha*, 2nd ed., ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, English translation ed. Robert McLachlan Wilson (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), 172-178. For more on the Gospel according to the Hebrews and its use in early Christianity, see István Pásztori-Kupán, “The Holy Spirit as the Mother of the Son?: Origen’s Interpretation of a Surviving Fragment from *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*,” in *Origeniana Nona*, eds. G. Heidl and R. Somos (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2009), 285-291.

¹⁵³ In *ComJn* 2.81 Origen references Isaiah 48:16, writing that it presents Christ as being sent by both the Father and the Spirit. Origen explains this passage by saying that the Spirit “does not excel him [Christ] in nature [οὐχ ὡς φύσει διαφέροντος], but that the Savior was made less than him because of the plan of the incarnation” (trans. from FOTC 80:115; Greek from GCS 10:66). Origen also adds a second explanation, that the Spirit was at first appointed to save humanity, but was unable to perform the task. As a result, the Spirit joins with the Father in sending the Son and promises “to descend to the Son of God at the right time and to cooperate in the salvation of men” (*ComJn* 2.83; trans. from FOTC 80:116). In the midst of this discussion, Origen raises the second problematic passage, Matt. 12:32, where it is written that the blasphemy against Christ will be forgiven, but a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven. Origen explains that it is not because the Spirit is “more honored [τιμιώτερον] than the Christ that there is no forgiveness” (*ComJn* 2.80; trans. from FOTC 80:115; Greek from GCS 10:66), but because the Spirit is given only to those who are worthy, as opposed to Christ, who is given to all beings. Origen explains, “It is reasonable that there is no pardon for those who have been considered worthy of the Holy Spirit when, with such a great help toward the good, they still fall away and turn from the counsels of the Spirit which is in them” (*ComJn* 2.80; trans. from FOTC 80:115). Finally, Origen references the Gospel of the Hebrews, where the Holy Spirit is called the mother of Christ. He explains that, if each one who does the will of the Father is called Christ’s brother or sister or mother, as written in Matt. 12:50, then it is possible that the same could be said of the Holy Spirit.

It should be noted that Origen also deals with this issue in *PArch* 1.3.7. After describing the Holy Spirit’s work among the saints, Origen cautions, “Let no one indeed imagine from what we have said about the Holy Spirit being bestowed on the saints alone, while the blessings and activities of the Father and the Son extend to both good and evil, just and unjust, that we are hereby exalting [*praetulisse*] the Holy Spirit above the Father and the Son or claiming that his dignity is greater than theirs [*maiolem eius per hoc asserere dignitatem*]; for this by no means follows. What we have been describing is the peculiar grace and work of the Holy Spirit” (trans. from Butterworth 37; Latin from G6rgemanns 176-178). Here, Origen addresses those who think that the Spirit is superior to the Father and Son because of the dignity of the subjects on whom the Spirit acts. Rather than indicating the status of the Holy Spirit, Origen argues, the Spirit’s role among the saints merely denotes its particular work.

considered to be inferior [ὑποδεέστερον] to him through whom he was made, although some texts seem to draw us to the opposite views.¹⁵⁴

This passage affirms that the Spirit is one of the “all things” created through the Word, despite how some scriptural passages could be read. Origen explicitly adds here what his theological position implies in *ComJn* 2.75—the Spirit is inferior [ὑποδεέστερον] to the Word.¹⁵⁵ Therefore, in being created by the Father through the Son—just like all other created beings—the Holy Spirit is ranked below the Father and Son ontologically.

In the course of this explanation of the Holy Spirit’s generation, Origen answers all of the open questions of *PArch*, as well as refutes the three positions listed in *ComJn* 2.73-74 with which he disagrees. In *PArch* Origen asked if the Holy Spirit was made, if he was unbegotten, and if he should be considered a son of God. Between those questions and *ComJn* 2.73-88 he apparently determined that John 1:3 could provide the answers. According to his account in *ComJn* 2.73-88, the Holy Spirit is not unbegotten as the Father, nor is he a son of God, rather he is made. The views expressed in *ComJn* 2.73-88, therefore, represent a more mature theological position and should take precedence over Origen’s opinion in *PArch*.¹⁵⁶ Origen’s account of the

¹⁵⁴ *ComJn* 2.86 (trans. from FOTC 80:116; Greek from GCS 10:67).

¹⁵⁵ This also serves to refute hyper-pneumatologies, as Michel R. Barnes has argued. See Barnes, “The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology,” *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008), 169-186, here 180-184.

¹⁵⁶ For a development to have taken place, *ComJn* 2, at least Origen’s comments on the Holy Spirit, must have been written after *PArch*. Unfortunately, the dating of these two works is subject to debate. Scholars place the writing of *PArch* anytime from 212 up until Origen left Alexandria, although many scholars prefer a later date in the late 220s-early 230s. See, for example, G.W. Butterworth, introduction to *On First Principles*, by Origen, trans. G.W. Butterworth (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), xxix; Pierre Nautin, *Origène: Sa vie et son oeuvre* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977), 371; and Heine, *Origen*, 130. With respect to *ComJn*, Heine, *Origen*, 86-89, has offered a persuasive argument that Origen began the work around 217. Heine bases his argument on Origen’s absence from Alexandria, which he mentions in *ComJn* 1.13, and his understanding of Eusebius’s reference in *H.E.* 6.19.16 to the “warfare” that caused Origen to leave the city. Nautin, *Origène*, 377, believes that this event refers to Origen’s problems with his bishop Demetrius, but Heine argues that the term “warfare” refers to the massacre of Caracalla in Alexandria in 215. Heine bases his argument on two points. First, Eusebius says that the warfare was “in the city,” and Heine thinks it unlikely that a disagreement

generation of the Holy Spirit also addresses each of the beliefs he lays out in *ComJn* 2.73-74. He explicitly states that only the Father is unbegotten and distinguishes the Spirit from the Father and Son in two ways. First, he assigns the Spirit an independent existence using the term *hypostasis*; second, he makes the Spirit's generation dependent on the Father and Son, thereby ranking the Spirit below them.¹⁵⁷ Because the beliefs mentioned in *ComJn* 2.73-74 are associated

between Origen and his bishop would affect the whole city. Second, Heine draws attention to the verb Eusebius uses to describe how Origen left Alexandria, which implies a secret escape. Heine argues this would be unnecessary if Origen were trying to leave Demetrius, but would make sense if he were trying to escape a massacre in the city. Heine notes that Preuschen, *Origenes Werke* (1903), lxxix, was the first to maintain that Origen's absence from Alexandria refers to his escape during Caracalla's massacre. However, it is unclear how long it took Origen to write *ComJn* 1-2, and the pneumatological development between *PArch* and *ComJn*—insofar as Origen discovers a reference to a verse in Scripture that speaks of the Holy Spirit's origin—suggests that *ComJn*, at least *ComJn* 2.73ff., was written after *PArch*.

There is another piece of evidence that supports the idea that *ComJn* was written after *PArch*. In *PArch* 1.2.13, Origen writes, “And it would be a long business, demanding another time and another work, to collect all the titles of the Son of God, such for example as the true light, or the door, or righteousness, or sanctification, or redemption, and countless others” (trans. from Butterworth 28). Origen provides such a list in *ComJn* 1.112-288. If he had already written this list, he would not have recorded the statement in *PArch* implying that he had not yet compiled such a list.

If there is a development in Origen's thinking, it should not be read as incompatible with the fact that Origen inherited at least part of his pneumatological thinking from Clement, a point we will examine below. For example, Origen may have initially been cautious about accepting Clement's position without having found a Scriptural passage that discussed the Spirit's generation (which may also explain the fact that Origen uses the term “persuaded” [πειθόμενοι] in *ComJn* 2.75).

¹⁵⁷ The Spirit's rank in relation to the Father and Son is similar to a strategy used by Tertullian to combat Monarchian theology, as Waers has observed. In *Adversus Praxean* 2.4 Tertullian details in what way the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit should be considered three: “Three however not in quality but in sequence [*gradu*], not in substance but in aspect, not in power but in <its> manifestation, yet of one substance and one quality and one power, seeing it is one God from whom those sequences and aspects and manifestations are reckoned out in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit” (trans. from Evans 132; Latin from CCSL 2:1161). Waers, “Monarchianism,” 247, explains that Tertullian distinguishes the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit using the term *gradus*, which is a Latin equivalent of the term *taxis* and “implies a gradation of the three Trinitarian persons.” In *Adversus Praxean* 9.3 Tertullian explicitly classifies this gradation as one in which the Son is second in order after the Father, while the Holy Spirit is third: “Thus <he calls> the Paraclete other than himself, as we say the Son is other than the Father, so as to display the third sequence [*tertium gradum*] in the Paraclete as we the second [*secundum*] in the Son” (trans. from Evans 140-141; Latin from CCSL 2:1169). It should be noted that I do not wish to suggest that there is any direct influence between Origen and

with Monarchian theology, Origen's account of the generation of the Holy Spirit serves to refute Monarchian beliefs.¹⁵⁸ It also helps us better understand Origen's theology. It is not the case that Origen lacked the necessary language to lay out his Trinitarian beliefs; rather, the ranking of the Spirit below the Father and Son was intentional.¹⁵⁹ It should also be pointed out that, since Origen goes to great lengths to distinguish the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, readings that claim that Origen upholds both multiplicity *and* unity within the Trinity are unfounded.¹⁶⁰ Origen not

Tertullian, but merely to point out that the two authors employ similar strategies to combat Monarchian theology.

¹⁵⁸ Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, "The Holy Spirit as Agent, not Activity," 229-235, examines fragment 37 of *ComJn* and offers a convincing argument that the pneumatological content of this fragment, which argues for the Spirit's real substance based on the Spirit's possession of a will, is also aimed at Monarchians.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Waers, "Monarchianism," 299. Although he makes this comment of Origen's belief that the Father is *auto*-God, while the Son is God, his statement is apt here: "The subordination of the Son to the Father with regard to divinity is not an oversight or mistake, nor is it a corner into which Origen is backed or a shoal he fails to avoid despite his best efforts. Origen intentionally employs the framework of participation, with its concomitant subordinationism, in order to refute monarchian assertions that the Father and Son are one and the same."

¹⁶⁰ This includes all those who maintain that there is a common substance or substrate between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, although Ilaria Ramelli's work merits special attention. Ramelli, "Origen's Anti-Subordinationism," 21-49, claims that Origen taught that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were one *ousia* and three *hypostases*. As we observed above, Origen teaches in *ComJn* 2.75 that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit each possess an individual *hypostasis*, but Origen does not maintain that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one *ousia*. Ramelli bases her conclusions on several pieces of evidence, each of which is problematic. Throughout her account of Origen's Trinitarian theology, Ramelli appeals to Latin translations and Greek fragments of Origen's work, but she does not fully take into account the textual difficulties inherent in these writings (see the introduction for my own comments on this topic). Ramelli also appeals to the positive reception Origen enjoyed by later theologians, such as Athanasius and the Cappadocians; she claims that this positive reception attests to Origen's orthodoxy. Yet, as Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy*, 21, has observed, "No theologian adopted Origen's system wholesale." Basil demonstrates this in regards to Origen's teaching on the Holy Spirit when he acknowledges Origen's positive statements, but adds that "he is a man who does not have perfectly sound notions in all respects about the Spirit" (*On the Holy Spirit* 29,73; trans. from PPS 42:113). Finally, Ramelli also misreads passages from Origen's corpus and interprets them out of their context. For example, she claims that, in *ComJn* 2.74, "Origen details that the οὐσία of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit is common" ("Origen's Anti-Subordinationism," 27). Yet, as we just observed, Origen is listing others' opinions of the Holy Spirit in *ComJn* 2.74, not his own. This he gives in *ComJn* 2.75, where he writes that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit each have a distinct *hypostasis*. Ramelli also misreads *CCels* 8.12; she

only emphasizes the distinction between the three, but ranks the Spirit below the Father and Son ontologically.¹⁶¹

The Eternality of the Spirit

Having determined that Origen ranks the Spirit below the Son by making his existence dependent on the Son, we must examine whether or not Origen's specific language—that the Spirit is made [γίγνομαι]¹⁶²—indicates that the Spirit is generated in time. Although the term γίγνομαι could be read as saying that the Spirit's generation occurs in time, I will suggest that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that Origen views the Holy Spirit as eternal. Heine points to the significance of the verb γίγνομαι and its relation to time in an exegesis of *ComJn* 2.1-3. There, Origen juxtaposes the statements made about the Word's coming to be [γίγνομαι] with

claims that, in this passage, “Origen explains that God's essence (οὐσία) is one and the same, but the Father and the Son are two distinct entities in their subsistence or individual substance” (“Origen's Anti-Subordinationism,” 27). Not only does Origen never mention the term *ousia*, but he lists the ways in which the Father and Son are one, none of which includes being one in essence. *CCels* 8.12 reads: “Therefore we worship the Father of the truth and the Son who is the truth; they are two distinct existences, but one in mental unity, in agreement, and in identity of will [Θρησκεύομεν οὖν τὸν πατέρα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὄντα δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα, ἐν δὲ τῇ ὁμοιοῖα καὶ τῇ συμφωνία καὶ τῇ ταυτότητι τοῦ βουλήματος]” (trans. from Chadwick 460-461; Greek from SC 150:200). Origen makes clear that the Father and Son are one in certain ways, emphasizing a oneness of mind and will, but he maintains that they are distinct existences. Not only does Ramelli's reading of Origen run contrary to his account of the Trinity, but she fails to consider Origen's entire corpus, the textual problems with some of his extant work, and the context within which he is writing.

¹⁶¹ Because the Spirit is below the Father and Son ontologically, scholars who claim that there is an ontological equality between the three are incorrect. See fn. 109.

¹⁶² See *ComJn* 2.75 and *ComJn* 2.79. Although Origen uses the term γίγνομαι of the Holy Spirit's origin, it is important to note that the term had not yet acquired the technical definition it would have in later centuries. See George Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (London: SPCK, 1952), 37-54; Jules Lebreton, “ΑΓΕΝΝΗΤΟΣ dans la tradition philosophique et dans la littérature chrétienne du II Siècle,” *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 16 (1926): 431-443. In regards to this passage in Origen, see Miguel María Garijo Guembe, “Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana,” *Scriptorium Victoriense* 13.1 (1966): 82-83; Josep Rius-Camps, *El dinamismo trinitario en la divinización de los seres racionales según Orígenes* (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1970), 156-157.

certain Old Testament prophets with those statements about the Word being [εἰμί] with God.¹⁶³

By distinguishing between these two verbs, γίγνομαι and εἰμί, Origen interprets John 1:1 as saying that the Son is always with God, as opposed to coming to be with God. He writes:

The word *comes to be* [γίνεται], however, with men who could not previously receive the sojourn of the Son of God who is the Word. On the other hand, he does not *come to be* [οὐ γίνεται] “with God” (John 1:1) as though previously he were not with him, but because he is always with the Father, it is said, “And the Word *was* [ἦν] with God” (John 1:1), for he did not “*come to be* [ἐγένετο] with God.”¹⁶⁴

In this passage the word γίγνομαι designates what is not eternal, what comes into being at some point in time. Heine explains it this way: “Origen’s argument runs along the lines that what ‘comes to be’ has a beginning; what ‘is’ has no beginning.”¹⁶⁵ The use of the term γίγνομαι here would seem to indicate that the Spirit’s generation occurs in time.

Although Origen uses the term γίγνομαι to denote a beginning in time in the passages above, he also uses the same verb when describing how the Word becomes God: “Perhaps he says, ‘And the Word was with God,’ then, ‘And the Word was God,’ that we might understand that the Word has become [γινόμενος] God because he is ‘with God.’”¹⁶⁶ If one reads this statement according to the previous use of γίγνομαι, then the Word becomes God at some point in time—the Word is not always God. This contradicts what we noted in chapter one—the Word receives divinity through participation in the Father, but because he is always with God, he possesses this divinity eternally.¹⁶⁷ The term γίγνομαι, therefore, does not have to refer to a

¹⁶³ Origen explains in *ComJn* 2.10, “Since, then, to discover the meaning of the statement, ‘and the Word was with God’ (John 1:1), we compared prophetic texts relating how the word came to Osee and Isaias and Jeremias, and we observed the significant difference between the expressions ‘he has come to be [Ἐγενήθη]’ or ‘he came to be [Ἐγένετο],’ compared with ‘he was [ἦν]’” (trans. from FOTC 80:97; Greek from GCS 10:53).

¹⁶⁴ *ComJn* 2.8 (trans. from FOTC 80:96-97; Greek from GCS 10:53).

¹⁶⁵ Ronald Heine, *Origen: Scholarship in the Service of the Church*, Christian Theology in Context (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 97.

¹⁶⁶ *ComJn* 2.12 (trans. from FOTC 80:98; Greek from GCS 10:54).

¹⁶⁷ See fn. 33 in Chapter One.

beginning in time, but can be used to denote a beginning outside of time.¹⁶⁸ For this reason, it is unclear based on the use of γίγνομαι whether the Spirit is eternal or not. We must look elsewhere to answer this question.

There is little in Origen's extant Greek corpus to indicate whether or not the Holy Spirit is eternal.¹⁶⁹ Several passages in Latin translations of Origen's corpus claim that the Holy Spirit is eternal,¹⁷⁰ but these often contain overt pro-Nicene statements that suggest that they have been

¹⁶⁸ This is supported further by the fact that Origen elsewhere uses temporal language (or, at least, language which could be conceived as temporal) to describe things he considers to be outside of time. When speaking of Christ's *epinoiai* in *ComJn* 2.131, Origen writes, "Now let no one censure us because he thinks we are describing these things in reference to time. The logical order demands a first, second, and following, even if no time be found when the things put forward by the argument as third and fourth did not exist at all" (trans. from FOTC 80:129).

¹⁶⁹ Passages that deal with the topic are more suggestive than explicit. For example, in *ComMt* 12.20 Origen writes that baptism is performed in "the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, which represent the three days eternally present at the same time to those who by means of them are sons of light [... »ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος«, ἅπερ τρεῖς ἡμέραι εἰσὶν ἅμα ἐνεστηκυῖαι αἰωνίως τοῖς δι' αὐτὰς <γενομένοις> υἱοῖς τοῦ φωτός]" (trans. from ANF 10:462; Greek from GCS 40:115). While this passage could be speaking of the Spirit's eternity, it could simply mean that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are with a person from the moment of baptism to eternity.

Two other passages are similarly ambiguous. Origen writes in *ComMt* 15.31, "And see if we are able to say that the whole present age is a certain day, which on the one hand is long for us, but on the other hand small and a thing short-lived for the life of God, and of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit." Origen juxtaposes the length of the present age from humans' perspective and the shortness of the present age from the perspective of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. By grouping the Holy Spirit with the Father and Son, Origen may be suggesting that the Holy Spirit, like them, is eternal. However, Origen never says whether or not the Holy Spirit is eternal, and he could be saying only that the Spirit has existed for a much longer period of time than other created beings. *ComJn* 10.270 includes a reference to "the Triad in eternity [...ἐν αἰωνίῳ τῆς τριάδι...]" (trans. from FOTC 80:316; Greek from GCS 10:216). This phrase suggests that the Holy Spirit might be eternal, but with no other information available in the passage, it is unclear how this phrase should be understood.

¹⁷⁰ See, for example, *ComRm* 6.7.19, which reads, "For the Spirit is in the law, he is in the Gospels, he is always with the Father and the Son" (trans. from FOTC 104:29). However, Rufinus writes in his preface to his translation of *ComRm* that the commentary had "been tampered with" and that books were missing (Preface of Rufinus 2; trans. from FOTC 103:51). As a result, he had to "fill in these things and restore complete continuity to the Latin work" (Preface of Rufinus 2; trans. from FOTC 103:51).

interpolated.¹⁷¹ Other passages in Latin translations, however, do not contain such pro-Nicene statements. For example, *PArch* 2.2.1 does not mention the Trinity or equality between the Father, Son, and Spirit. This passage even speaks of the Father as source, reflecting Origen's thought as we saw in chapter one: "The Father begets an only begotten Son and brings forth a Holy Spirit, not as beings who did not exist before, but in the sense that the Father is the origin and source of the Son or the Holy Spirit."¹⁷² While this and similar passages should still be used cautiously, the lack of any pro-Nicene statements suggest that it could reflect Origen's true

¹⁷¹ See, for example, *PArch* 1.3.4: "The Holy Spirit would never have been included in the unity of the Trinity [*unitatem trinitatis*], that is, along with God the unchangeable Father and with his Son, unless he had always been the Holy Spirit. Of course, these terms that we use, such as 'always' or 'has been,' or any similar ones that bear a temporal significance, must be interpreted with reservations and not pressed; for they relate to time, but the matters of which we are now speaking, though described in temporal language for the purposes of discussion, in their essential nature transcend all idea of time" (trans. from Butterworth 33; Latin from Görgemanns 168). Origen explains that there was never a time when the Holy Spirit was not the Spirit, then says that temporal language must be used "with reservations" since matters related to the Trinity transcend time. The reference to the "unity of the Trinity," however, renders this passage suspect since Origen elsewhere emphasizes the distinction of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, rather than their unity. See also *PArch* 4.4.1. A passage of Origen that Pamphilus cites in *Apol* 48 also suggests that the Holy Spirit is eternal, but this work exists only in the translation of Rufinus. We have already noted the problems with Rufinus's translations in the introduction.

¹⁷² *PArch* 2.2.1 (trans. from Butterworth 81). See also *HomIs* 4.1, which includes Origen's exegesis of the two seraphim of Isa 6: "It is impossible to find the beginning of God. You never understand the beginning of movement in God, neither you nor anyone else nor any other kind of existing being. Only the Savior and the Holy Spirit, *who always were with God*, see his 'face'" (emphasis added; trans. from ACW 68:898). However, this passage should still be used cautiously, since Rufinus accuses Jerome of changing or omitting certain parts of Origen's *HomIs* in *Apology of Rufinus* 2.27a: "In previous cases you took out what was unedifying in matters of faith, though you did so in such a way as not to excise them wholly nor in all cases. For instance, in the Homilies on Isaiah, at the Vision of God Origen refers the words to the Son and the Holy Spirit; and so you have translated, adding, however, words of your own which would make the passage have a more acceptable sense" (trans. from NPNF Second Series 3:472). Rufinus admits to this same practice: "The same thing I have done in a great many cases, either cutting out words or bending them into a sounder meaning" (trans. from NPNF Second Series 3:472). For a brief discussion of this topic, see Thomas Scheck, translator's introduction to Origen's Homilies 1-9 on Isaiah, in *Commentary on Isaiah*, trans. Thomas Scheck (New York: Newman Press, 2015), 881-884. For a longer discussion, see Alfons Fürst, "Jerome Keeping Silent: Origen and His Exegesis of Isaiah," in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*, eds. Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2009), 141-152, which examines this and other occasions on which Jerome altered Origen's thought.

thought. Coupled with Origen’s statements that group the Holy Spirit with the Father and Son,¹⁷³ I believe these passages offer enough evidence to say that Origen considers the Holy Spirit to be eternal. This does not, however, imply that the Spirit is equal to the Father and Son, as the Spirit remains ranked below the Father and Son.

The Spirit as Third in Rank of All Things

Our discussion to this point has focused on the ways that Origen ranks the Holy Spirit below the Father and Son. As we saw in the first section of this chapter, however, Origen also groups the Holy Spirit with the Father and Son. He does this in *ComJn* 2.75 by speaking of the three *hypostases* of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, which implies that the Holy Spirit should be categorized with the Father and Son. Two other phrases in this passage support the fact that he views the Holy Spirit as third in rank behind the Father and Son—he calls the Spirit the “most-honored [τιμιώτερον]” and “first in rank [τάξει]” of all the things made through the Word. In this section I will examine these two phrases, offering an exegesis of each in order to demonstrate that Origen considers the Holy Spirit to be ranked above all other created beings.

When Origen relates that the Spirit is one of the “all things” made through the Word in *ComJn* 2.75, he also calls the Spirit the “most-honored [τιμιώτερον]” of these things. Origen uses the epithet “most-honored [τιμιώτερον]” of the Son in *ComJn* 2.17 to establish the Son’s preeminence over all other divine beings: “[God’s] ‘firstborn of every creature’ (Col 1:15), inasmuch as he was the first to be with God and has drawn divinity into himself, is more honored [τιμιώτερος] than the other gods beside him.”¹⁷⁴ All “gods” who receive divinity participate in divinity in varying degrees, and Origen uses the term “most-honored [τιμιώτερον]” in order to

¹⁷³ See the first section of this chapter.

¹⁷⁴ *ComJn* 2.17 (trans. from FOTC 80:99; Greek from GCS 10:54).

position the Son above all those who participate in the Father's divinity. This suggests that his use of the same term of the Holy Spirit indicates that the Spirit stands above all created beings.¹⁷⁵

The Holy Spirit's title of being the "first in rank [τάξει]" of all things made through the Son also places the Spirit before all other created beings. We can better understand this phrase by examining Clement of Alexandria's pneumatology and his understanding of the cosmic hierarchy. Clement utilizes the term τάξις to describe different levels of being within the cosmic hierarchy. For example, he speaks in *Strom* 7.3.13 of "the mode of life of each of the holy ranks (ἐκάστης ἁγίας τάξεως τὴν πολιτείαν)."¹⁷⁶ One of these "holy ranks" is the seven first-created angels, the *protoctists*. Two particular passages in which Clement elaborates on the *protoctists* and their standing within the cosmic hierarchy can help illuminate Origen's thought. First, he writes in *Exc* 10.3-6:

The First-Created [Πρωτόκτιστοι] even though numerically distinct and susceptible of separate distinction and definition, nevertheless, are shown by the similarity of their state to have unity, equality and similarity. For among the Seven there is neither inferiority nor superiority and no advance is left for them, since they have received perfection from the beginning, at the time of the first creation from God through the Son. [The Only-Begotten] shall not be found either among the First-Created or among men,—but they 'always behold the face of the Father' (Matt 18:10) and the face of the Father is the Son, through whom the Father is known. Yet that which sees and is seen cannot be formless or incorporeal. But they see not with an eye of sense, but with the eye of mind, such as the Father provided.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁵ The similar use of the title "most-honored" does not mean that the Son and Spirit both participate in the Father in the same way—the Son participates in the Father, while the Spirit participates in the Son, as described in *ComJn* 2.76. The title highlights the status of each in relation to other beings. In the Son's case, the Son is more-honored than the other divine beings. In the Spirit's case, the Spirit is more-honored than the other created beings made through the Word.

¹⁷⁶ *Strom* 7.3.13.1 (trans. from ANF 2:526; Greek from GCS 17:10). See Christian Oeyen, "Eine frühchristliche Engelpneumatologie bei Klemens von Alexandrien." *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 55 (1965): 110.

¹⁷⁷ *Exc* 10.3-6 (trans. from Clement of Alexandria, *The Excerpta ex Theodoto*, ed. and trans. Robert Casey (London: Christophers, 1934), 49; Greek from SC 23:78-80). οἱ δὲ Πρωτόκτιστοι, εἰ καὶ ἀριθμῶ διάφοροι καὶ ὁ καθ' ἕκαστον περιώριστα καὶ περιγέγραπται, ἀλλ' ἢ ὁμοίότης τῶν πραγμάτων ἐνότητα καὶ ἰσότητα καὶ ὁμοιότητα ἐνδείκνυται. Οὐ γὰρ τῷδε μὲν πλέον, τῷδε δὲ ἥττον παρέσχηται τῶν Ἑπτά, οὐδ' ὑπολείπεται τις αὐτοῖς προκοπή· ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀπειληφότων τὸ τέλειον ἅμα τῇ πρώτῃ γενέσει παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. Καὶ ὁ μὲν <Φῶς

Clement numbers the *protoctists* as seven, but adds that they can be considered one through their equality and similarity. Along with establishing the unity and diversity of the *protoctists*, Bogdan Bucur has argued that this passage reveals where Clement ranks the *protoctists* within the heavenly hierarchy—the *protoctists* look at the face of the Father, which is the Son.¹⁷⁸ Below the *protoctists* are the lower levels of angels, as Clement records in *Exc* 12.1: “Therefore the First-Created behold both the Son and each other and the inferior orders of being, as also the archangels behold the First-Created.”¹⁷⁹ Clement’s hierarchy could be conceived of, then, as Father-Son-*protoctists*-archangels.¹⁸⁰ Lower orders of angels and humans are placed even lower in this hierarchy.¹⁸¹ Therefore, among the different classes of beings created by the Father through the Son (*protoctists*-archangels-angels-humans), it could be said that Clement places the *protoctists* in the first τάξις.¹⁸²

ἀπρόσιτον> εἶρηται, ὡς <Μονογενῆς> καὶ <Πρωτότοκος>, <ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσεν οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη>, οὐδὲ ἔσται τις τοιοῦτος, οὔτε τῶν Πρωτοκτίστων οὔτε ἀνθρώπων· οἱ δὲ <διὰ παντὸς τὸ Πρόσωπον τοῦ Πατρὸς βλέπουσιν>· Πρόσωπον δὲ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱός, δι’ οὗ γνωρίζεται ὁ Πατήρ. —Τὸ τοίνυν ὁρῶν καὶ ὁρώμενον ἀσχημάτιστον εἶναι οὐ δύναται οὐδὲ ἀσώματον· ὁρῶσι δὲ ὀφθαλμῶ οὐκ αἰσθητῶ, ἀλλ’ οἷω παρέσχεν ὁ Πατήρ, νοερῶ.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. *Paed* 1.57; *Strom* 7.10.58. For a more detailed discussion of Clement’s cosmic hierarchy, see Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 36-41.

¹⁷⁹ *Exc* 12.1 (trans. from Clement of Alexandria, *The Excerpta ex Theodoto*, ed. and trans. Robert Casey (London: Christophers, 1934), 51; Greek from SC 23:82). Οἱ Πρωτόκτιστοι οὖν τὸν τε Υἱὸν ὁρῶσι καὶ ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τὰ ὑποβεβηκότα, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ Ἀρχάγγελοι τοὺς Πρωτοκτίστους. Immediately following this statement, Clement again writes that the Son is the face of the Father: “But the Son is the beginning of the vision of the Father, being called the ‘face’ of the Father” [Ο δὲ Υἱὸς ἀρχὴ τῆς πατρικῆς ὑπάρχει θέας, Πρόσωπον τοῦ Πατρὸς λεγόμενος].

¹⁸⁰ Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 32. Several other passages in Clement suggest that he conceives of a cosmic hierarchy in which the *protoctists* are below the Son but above all other beings. See *Exc* 12.1 and *Ecl* 51-52, 56-57.

¹⁸¹ For the rank of angels and humans, see especially *Ecl* 56-57 and *Adumbr* 1 John 2:1.

¹⁸² In *Ecl* 57.1 (trans. altered from ANF 8:50; Greek from GCS 17:153), Clement says that there are “those on the summit, the *protoctists*” (οἱ ἐν τῇ ἄκρᾳ...πρωτόκτιστοι). *Ecl* 56-57 describes Clement’s cosmic hierarchy, where humans, angels, archangels, and *protoctists* are all instructed for a thousand years before ascending the hierarchy. Clement describes the ascent in *Ecl* 56.7 (trans. from ANF 8:50; Greek from GCS 17:153): “The first-created angels shall no longer, according to providence, exercise a definite ministry, but may be in repose, and devoted

While Clement and Origen rank the *protoctists* and the Holy Spirit, respectively, above all other created beings, Clement's conception of the seven *protoctists* appears much different than Origen's depiction of the Holy Spirit. Their respective theologies are not as different as they appear, however. As Bucur has argued,¹⁸³ Clement considers the *protoctists* to be a representation of the Holy Spirit. Two examples will help illustrate this idea. First, Clement speaks of the Holy Spirit's role in prophecy in *Adumbrationes* 1 Pet 1:12, but his comments also lead him to speak about the Spirit's role within the cosmic hierarchy:

The things of old that were wrought through the prophets, and are concealed from most, are now revealed to you through the evangelists. "For to you," it says, "have these things been revealed through the Holy Spirit who was sent" [1 Pet 1:12], that is, the paraclete, of whom the Lord said, "Unless I depart, he will not come" [John 16:7]; "unto whom," it is said, "the angels desire to look" [1 Pet 1:12]—not the fallen angels, as most suspect; rather, as is true and godly, the angels who desire to attain to the sight of his perfection.¹⁸⁴

to the contemplation of God alone; while those next to them shall be promoted to the post which they have left; and so those beneath them similarly" [τὸς [τε] πρωτοκτίστους ἀγγέλους εἰς τὸ μηκέτι κατὰ τὴν πρόνοιαν τῷ ὀρισμένῳ λειτουργεῖν, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν ἀναπαύσει καὶ πρὸς μόνῃ τῇ θεωρίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ· οἱ δὲ προσεχέστεροι τούτοις προκόψουσιν εἰς ἣν ἐκεῖνοι ἀπολελοίπασι τάξιν, καὶ οὕτως οἱ ὑποβεβηκότες ἀναλόγως].

The fact that the *protoctists* in *Ecl* 56 advance, whereas in *Exc* 10 they are described as being at rest because there is no advancement left for them, does not go unnoticed by Bucur. He, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 43, argues that "the so-called 'noetic exegesis,' which Clement, following Philo, routinely applies to authoritative (biblical and 'Greek') texts, has as its result the internalization of the cosmic ladder and of the associated experience of ascent and transformation." The result is that specific intervals of time and space should not be taken literally. Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 44, explains, "It seems that all imagistic details, such as specific intervals of space or time are emptied of the literal meaning they had had in the apocalyptic cosmology of the 'elders.' Whether 'seven days,' or 'one thousand years,' or 'seven heavens,' or 'archangels,' or 'protoctists,' the details of the cosmic-ladder imagery become images of interior transformation. This is why the inconsistencies in Clement's account about the *protoctists* are only apparent."

¹⁸³ Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 51, writes, "In the case of Clement, the cosmic ladder described above seems to reserve no place to the Holy Spirit: in descending order, one reads about the Father, the Son/Logos as principle of all things, and the *protoctists*, the level where multiplicity sets in. One may wonder what place this account leaves for the Holy Spirit." See also Oeyen, "Eine frühchristliche Engelpneumatologie," 27-28. Bucur's work contrasts that of Johannes Frangoulis, who says that the *protoctists* serve as mediators of the Son and Holy Spirit. See Frangoulis, *Der Begriff des Geistes Πνεῦμα bei Clemens Alexandrinus* (Leipzig: Robert Noske, 1936), 18.

¹⁸⁴ *Adumbr* 1 Pet 1:12 (trans. from Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 56; Greek from GCS 17:204). *Vetera, inquit, quae per prophetas facta sunt et plurimos latent, nunc vobis*

After calling the Holy Spirit the “paraclete,” Clement says that the angels look to the Spirit and the Spirit’s perfection. This corresponds with Clement’s statement in *Exc* 10.4 that the *protoctists* are perfect; it also places the Holy Spirit as the object of the angels’ gaze, just as the archangels look at the *protoctists* in *Exc* 12.1. The description of the Holy Spirit/paraclete in *Adumbr* 1 Pet 1:12, therefore, matches the descriptions of the *protoctists* in the *Excerpta*.

The second example that shows Clement considered the *protoctists* to refer to the Holy Spirit is recorded in the *Paedagogus*, where Clement writes:

And by one God are many treasures dispensed; some are disclosed through the Law, others through the prophets; some by the divine mouth, another by the heptad of the spirit (τοῦ πνεύματος τῆ ἑπτάδι) singing in accompaniment. And the Lord being one, is the same Instructor in all of these.¹⁸⁵

While Clement does not here explicitly link the Holy Spirit with the *protoctists*, this passage suggests that Clement conceives of the Spirit as both one and seven. Indeed, Bucur reads the phrase “heptad of the spirit” to refer to the Holy Spirit, with the term “heptad” connecting the Spirit to the *protoctists*.¹⁸⁶ Bucur summarizes Clement’s conception of the Holy Spirit by saying, “Clement equates the seven *protoctists* with the seven gifts of the Spirit and interprets them as the ‘heptad of the Spirit.’”¹⁸⁷

revelata sunt per evangelistas. Vobis enim, inquit, manifestata sunt >per spiritum sanctum, qui missus est<, hoc est paracletum, de quo dominus dixit: >nisi ego abiero, ille non veniet.< >In quem concupiscunt<, inquit, >angeli prospicere<, non angeli apostatae, sicut plurimi suspicantur, sed quod verum est ac divinum, angeli qui desiderant profectum perfectionis illius indipisci.

¹⁸⁵ *Paed* 3.12.87.4 (trans. from Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 60; Greek from GCS 12:284). θησαυροὶ δὲ ὑφ’ ἐνὸς πολλοὶ χορηγούμενοι θεοῦ, οἱ μὲν διὰ τοῦ νόμου, οἱ δὲ διὰ προφητῶν ἀποκαλύπτονται, οἱ δὲ τῷ θεῷ στόματι, ἄλλος δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος τῆ ἑπτάδι ἐπάδων· εἷς δὲ ὢν ὁ κύριος διὰ πάντων τούτων ὁ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν παιδαγωγός.

¹⁸⁶ Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 59-60.

¹⁸⁷ Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 61. Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 83, explains further in his conclusion, “Whether one chooses to say that for Clement the Holy Spirit is a plural entity consisting of the seven highest angels, or that the hypostasis of the Spirit is functionally absorbed and replaced by the *protoctists*, or, as I am inclined to think, that Clement simultaneously transmits and ‘sabotages’ the apocalyptic imagery of his predecessors, by

Having now shown that Clement's seven *protocists* can be understood as an angelomorphic representation of the Holy Spirit, we turn to Origen. Although Origen emphasizes the unity of the Holy Spirit by speaking of his independent *hypostasis*, he is also comfortable referring to the Spirit's multiplicity, as he does in *HomIs* 3.1. There, Origen offers an exegesis of Isa 4:1, which speaks of seven women. He writes, "The seven women are one; for they are the Spirit of God. And those seven are one; for the Spirit of God is 'the spirit of wisdom and of understanding, the spirit of counsel and of virtue, the spirit of knowledge and of piety, the spirit of the fear of the Lord' (Isa 11:2)."¹⁸⁸ Both Clement and Origen, therefore, refer to the Holy Spirit as both one and seven. By recognizing the possible influence of Clement on Origen, we can better understand the meaning behind Origen's statement that the Holy Spirit is "first in rank [τάξει]." The Holy Spirit, though below the Father and Son, is ranked above all other orders of being. For this reason, the Holy Spirit is ranked third within the cosmic hierarchy above all other created beings.¹⁸⁹

interpreting the *protocists* as an angelomorphic representation of Spirit, there is abundant proof to confirm the thesis proposed by Christian Oeyen in 1966." See also Oeyen, "Eine frühchristliche Engelpneumatologie," 32. Cf. Gilles Quispel, "Genius and Spirit," in *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Pahor Lahib*, ed. Martin Krause, Nag Hammadi Studies 6 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 158, where Quispel points to Oeyen's research and says, "It is completely clear that these seven protoktistoi represented the Holy Spirit."

¹⁸⁸ *HomIs* 3.1 (trans. from ACW 68:894; Latin from GCS 33:253). *Septem mulieres una sunt; spiritus enim Dei sunt. Et ista una septem sunt; Spiritus enim Dei est spiritus sapientiae et intellectus, spiritus consilii et virtutis, spiritus scientiae et pietatis, spiritus timoris Domini.* We will discuss this and other passages related to the multiplicity of the Holy Spirit in the following chapter.

¹⁸⁹ Origen emphasizes the distance between the Spirit and the rest of creation in *ComJn* 13.151-152: "The Savior and the Holy Spirit transcend [ὑπερέχειν] all created beings, not by comparison, but by their exceeding pre-eminence [ὑπεροχή]" (trans. from FOTC 89:100; Greek from GCS 10:249). As we noted in chapter one, the term ὑπερέχω/ὑπεροχή is used to speak of one being's eminence over another.

Conclusion

In his account of the generation of the Holy Spirit, Origen refutes Monarchian theologies by making the Spirit dependent on the Father and the Son, describing his generation in the same manner as the creation of all other beings—by the Father through the Son. By making the Spirit’s existence dependent on the Father and Son, Origen ranks the Spirit below them, a point confirmed by Origen’s discussion of the correct interpretation of biblical passages that appear to portray the Spirit as above the Son. While his description of the Spirit’s generation ranks the Spirit below the Father and Son, placing the Spirit in the third rank also locates the Spirit above all other created beings. Taken with his comments grouping the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit together, we are able to come to a better understanding of Origen’s Trinitarian theology—he arranges the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit hierarchically, but separates the three from creation. Now that we have considered the Spirit’s generation and how this informs our understanding of Origen’s Trinitarian theology, we will turn to the Spirit’s reception of his attributes.

2.2: The Holy Spirit’s Attributes

Part 2 of this chapter continues our examination of the Holy Spirit’s existence and how this informs our understanding of Origen’s conception of the relationship of the Spirit to the Father and Son. In part 1, we analyzed the generation of the Holy Spirit; in part 2, we will look at the Spirit’s reception of his attributes. Scholars have interpreted Origen as teaching that the Holy Spirit possesses essentially at least some of his attributes, especially sanctification and goodness,¹⁹⁰ meaning that the Spirit possesses these attributes as a part of his being, rather than

¹⁹⁰ Bruns, *Trinität und Kosmos*, 132; Miguel María Garijo Guembe, “Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana.” *Scriptorium Victoriense* 13.2 (1966): 174-177; Garijo Guembe, “Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana III,” 303-306; Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia*, 117-121; Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele*, 224. It should be noted that, while Garijo Guembe, “Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana III,” 304-306, highlights the hierarchical nature of

receiving them from outside of himself.¹⁹¹ However, these scholars have not considered the entirety of Origen’s pneumatological thought, nor have they taken into account the textual problems in the Latin translations of his work. Against these scholars I will argue that the Holy Spirit receives all of his attributes from outside himself—from the Father through the Son—by means of participation, a relationship that reaffirms that the Spirit is ranked below the Father and Son. In order to demonstrate this thesis, I will break this part into two sections. First, I will provide an exegesis of *ComJn* 2.76, where Origen details the Spirit’s reception of attributes from the Father through the Son, a scheme that mirrors the description of the Spirit’s generation. Then, I will examine passages that speak of the Spirit’s possession of essential attributes. I will argue that these passages contradict our findings that the Spirit is dependent on the Father and Son, suggesting that these passages are, most likely, later interpolations.

2.2.1: The Spirit’s Participation in the Son

Origen provides his most descriptive account of the Spirit’s reception of his attributes in *ComJn* 2.76. While this passage may not give as much detail as we would like, Henning Ziebritzki and Christoph Marksches have written that the information in this passage on the whole does not inform Origen’s pneumatology.¹⁹² However, when read in the context of the

Origen’s Trinitarian theology, including the Spirit’s position below the Son, he uses the Spirit’s essential attributes to emphasize the Spirit’s place alongside the Father and Son, distinct from all other creatures.

¹⁹¹ As we will see below, the Spirit’s essential possession of certain attributes is predicated on the idea of substantial or essential attributes versus accidental attributes, which refers to the possession of attributes necessarily and in one’s self versus the possession of attributes without necessity and from outside one’s self. See Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics* 74b5-12, 75a19-37; *Metaphysics* 1025a15-34.

¹⁹² Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele*, 245, writes, “The teaching of the designations of Christ play no role for the explication of the concept of the Spirit. Origen, therefore, could indeed justify the properties of the Holy Spirit by the participation in the *epinoiai* of Christ, but does not really draw the possible consequences for the teaching of the Holy Spirit.” Christoph Marksches, “Der Heilige Geist im *Johanneskommentar* des Origenes,”

Spirit's relationship to the Father and Son, as well as the Son's reception of attributes from the Father, this passage reveals more about Origen's pneumatology than Ziebritzki and Marksches allow. Indeed, *ComJn* 2.76 shows that the Holy Spirit participates in the Son in order to receive all of his attributes, a schema that corresponds to the Spirit's dependence on, and rank below, the Father and Son.

In *ComJn* 2.76 Origen echoes what he established in *ComJn* 2.75—that the Spirit receives his being through the Son—but he also adds that the Spirit receives all of his attributes from the Son:

Perhaps this is the reason the Spirit too is not called son of God, since the only begotten alone is by nature a son from the beginning. The Holy Spirit seems to have need of the Son ministering [διακονοῦντος] to his hypostasis [ὑποστάσει], not only for it to exist, but also for it to be wise, and rational, and just, and whatever other thing we ought to understand it to be by participation [μετοχήν] in the aspects of Christ [Χριστοῦ ἐπινοιών] which we mentioned previously.¹⁹³

Along with his existence, the Holy Spirit requires the Son to be, for example, wise, rational, and just—the Spirit's attributes. Origen utilizes two terms to describe the Spirit's reception of attributes from the Son—he says that the Son ministers [διακονέω] to the Holy Spirit's *hypostasis* and that the Spirit participates [μετέχω, n. μετοχή] in the *epinoiai* of Christ. Both of these descriptions can be illuminated by their use in *ComJn* 2.17, which we previously discussed in terms of the Son's reception of his attributes and the manner in which he distributes these attributes to created beings. It is worth quoting the passage again here:

in *Origenes und sein Erbe: Gesammelte Studien* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 117, offers a similar judgment, writing, “It is unfortunate that Origen does not utilize more strongly this idea [the participation of the Spirit in the *epinoiai* of Christ] in his preserved work for the explanation of the Spirit; rather, if I see correctly, here he introduces it very concisely and obviously, that one would think that he explained this elsewhere more clearly.”

¹⁹³ *ComJn* 2.76 (trans. from FOTC 80:114; Greek from GCS 10:65). καὶ τάχα αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ μὴ καὶ αὐτὸ υἱὸν χρηματίζειν τοῦ θεοῦ, μόνου τοῦ μονογενοῦς φύσει υἱοῦ ἀρχῆθεν τυγχάνοντος, οὗ χρήζειν ἔοικε τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διακονοῦντος αὐτοῦ τῇ ὑποστάσει, οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφὸν εἶναι καὶ λογικὸν καὶ δίκαιον καὶ πᾶν ὅτιποτοῦν χρή αὐτὸ ωσεὶν τυγχάνειν κατὰ μετοχὴν τῶν προειρημένων ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ ἐπινοιών.

On the other hand, everything besides the very God [τὸ αὐτόθεος], which is made God by participation [μετοχή] in his divinity, would more properly not be said to be “the God,” but “God.” To be sure, his “firstborn of every creature,” inasmuch as he was the first to be with God and has drawn divinity into himself, is more honored than the other gods beside him (of whom God is God as it is said, “The God of gods, the Lord has spoken, and he has called the earth”). It was by his ministry [διακονήσας] that they became gods, for he drew from God that they might be deified, sharing [μεταδιδούς] ungrudgingly also with them according to his goodness.¹⁹⁴

In *ComJn* 2.76 Origen describes the Son as ministering [διακονοῦντος] to the Holy Spirit’s *hypostasis* in order for the Spirit to have existence, wisdom, reason, and other qualities. Here, earlier in *ComJn*, Origen uses the same term when he writes that all “gods” (aside from the Son) become divine by participating in the Father, through the ministry [διακονήσας] of the Son. The Son also receives divinity from the Father, but the Son is “more honored than the other gods beside him” because he receives divinity directly from the Father, while the other gods receive divinity through the mediation, or ministry, of the Son. In this relationship, the Son is placed above all the other gods because he ministers a particular attribute to them.

Origen also describes the Son’s ministry to other gods as “sharing [μεταδιδούς].” This term evokes the concept of participation [μετέχω, n. μετοχή],¹⁹⁵ the other term he uses to describe the Spirit’s relationship to the Son in *ComJn* 2.76. As we saw in chapter one, Origen often utilizes the idea of participation in order to denote the relationship between a lower being and a higher being, including the relationship between the Son and all other created beings,

¹⁹⁴ *ComJn* 2.17 (trans. from FOTC 80:98-99; Greek from GCS 10:54-55). πᾶν δὲ τὸ παρὰ τὸ αὐτόθεος μετοχή τῆς ἐκείνου θεότητος θεοποιούμενον οὐχ, ὁ θεὸς ἀλλὰ θεὸς κυριώτερον ἂν λέγοιτο, οὗ πάντως ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, ἅτε πρῶτος τῷ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εἶναι σπάσας τῆς θεότητος εἰς ἑαυτὸν, ἐστὶ τιμιώτερος, τοῖς λοιποῖς παρ’ αὐτὸν θεοῖς (ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸ λεγόμενον· Θεὸς θεῶν κύριος ἐλάλησε, καὶ ἐκάλεσε τὴν γῆν) διακονήσας τὸ γενέσθαι θεοῖς, ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρυσά<μενος> εἰς τὸ θεοποιηθῆναι αὐτούς, ἀφθόνως κἀκείνοις κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ χρηστότητα μεταδιδούς.

¹⁹⁵ For example, see *CCels* 6.64. See also Plaxco, “Didymus the Blind,” 59, where he writes of *ComJn* 2.17, “[The Son] receives divinity from the Father, and the ‘gods’—presumably the totality of rational creatures—participate in the Son, the chief participant, as he shares with them.”

among whom is the Holy Spirit as one of the “all things” created through the Son.¹⁹⁶ Therefore, both the term “ministers” [διακονέω] and the term “participation” [μετέχω, n. μετοχή] are used to describe a relationship in which a lower being is dependent on a higher being. Thus, the relationship Origen describes here is the same as the one we explored in the previous chapter—Origen’s description of the Spirit groups the Spirit with all other beings, making the Spirit dependent on the Son and, thereby, ranking the Spirit below him.

This relationship applies to the Spirit’s existence, which corresponds to our findings in part one of this chapter,¹⁹⁷ but also involves all the attributes that the Spirit possesses—the Holy Spirit receives wisdom, reason, justice, “and whatever other thing we ought to understand it to be by participation [μετοχήν] in the aspects of Christ [Χριστοῦ ἐπινοιών].”¹⁹⁸ Origen specifically mentions wisdom, reason, and justice as things in which the Spirit participates, but he also writes that the Holy Spirit participates in the Son for “whatever other thing we ought to understand it to be.” Origen does not elaborate on what these other things are, but he does explain that the Spirit participates specifically in the *epinoiai* of Christ, giving an indication as to what he means by the phrase “whatever other thing we ought to understand [the Holy Spirit] to be.” As we saw in chapter one, Christ’s *epinoiai* are the many things he becomes because of the multiplicity of creation, with each *epinoia* revealing something different about him.¹⁹⁹ Here, the Holy Spirit is

¹⁹⁶ See *ComJn* 1.246-247; *PArch* 1.3.8.

¹⁹⁷ Although Origen only mentions the Son when discussing the fact that the Spirit receives his existence, this should not be read as saying that the Spirit does not also receive existence from the Father. First, Origen says just before this in *ComJn* 2.75 that the Holy Spirit is made “by the Father through Christ” (trans. from FOTC 80:114), confirming that the Spirit receives existence from the Son *and* the Father. Second, the Son is immediate source of all things, which sometimes leads Origen to emphasize the Son’s nature as a source. This does not, however, negate the fact that the Son also has a source, the Father, who is the ultimate source of all things. On this second point, see chapter one.

¹⁹⁸ *ComJn* 2.76 (trans. from FOTC 80:114; Greek from 10:65).

¹⁹⁹ See *HomJr* 8.2.1, where Origen writes, “You do not understand the same thing about Christ when you understand him as wisdom and when you understand him as righteousness. For when he is wisdom, you mean the knowledge of things divine and human, but when he is

said to participate in these *epinoiai*, and, since wisdom, reason, and justice are all *epinoiai* of Christ,²⁰⁰ the phrase “whatever other thing we ought to understand it to be” can be understood to mean that the Holy Spirit’s other attributes are to be found among Christ’s *epinoiai*. While Origen never provides a list of which of Christ’s *epinoiai* apply to the Holy Spirit,²⁰¹ it is important to note that, whatever *epinoiai* it participates in, the Holy Spirit receives all of its attributes from the Son.²⁰²

Although Origen does not mention the Father’s role in the Holy Spirit’s reception of attributes in *ComJn* 2.76, our conclusions from chapter one can help provide an explanation for

righteousness, he is that power which allots to every person according to worth” (trans. from FOTC 97:77).

²⁰⁰ Origen mentions all three of these as *epinoiai* of Christ in his longest exposition of Christ’s *epinoiai* in *ComJn* 1.112-288.

²⁰¹ Some indication of the Spirit’s other attributes can be ascertained through the particular gifts the Holy Spirit distributes to others, a topic we will discuss in chapters four and five.

²⁰² Because the Spirit possesses his attributes through participation, these attributes can be gained or lost. However, similar to the way in which the Son possesses divinity, for example, I suggest that the Holy Spirit possesses these attributes eternally. Because Origen groups the Spirit with the Father and Son, I think it likely that the Spirit does not become the Spirit, but always is the Spirit. One other piece of evidence supports this idea. We noted in chapter one that the Son’s eternal possession of divinity is based on the fact that he always remains with God because he remains in “unceasing contemplation of the depth of the Father [τοῦ πατρικοῦ βάθους]” (*ComJn* 2.18; trans. From FOTC 80:99; Greek from GCS 10:55). Unfortunately, Origen does not say that the Holy Spirit is always with God, but he does say that the Spirit searches “the depths of God [τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ]” on several occasions (*ComRm* 3.8.5; *ComRm* 8.11.7; *ComRm* 8.13.6; *PArch* 1.3.4; *PEuch* 2.4), a phrase similar to the one we find used of the Son in *ComJn* 2.18. Origen bases the Spirit’s ability to search the depths of God on 1 Cor 2:10, a verse Origen often uses to highlight the special knowledge the Spirit has of the Father (see our discussion of this topic in section 2.1 of chapter two). Importantly, Origen says that only the Son and the Holy Spirit are able to have this special knowledge. Because only the Son and Spirit possess this knowledge, the possession of which is tied to their contemplation of God, I suggest that the Holy Spirit also possesses his attributes eternally.

Garijo Guembe, “Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana III,” 319-322, also observes that the Son remains what he is because of His continuous contemplation of the Father and assumes that the same must be true of the Holy Spirit. However, he bases this assumption on the Spirit’s possession of essential attributes and the statement found in *PArch* 1.3.4 that the Spirit always possesses knowledge of the Father. We will show below, however, the problems with both the Spirit’s possession of essential attributes and the passage on the Spirit’s knowledge in *PArch* 1.3.4.

this omission. Origen sometimes emphasizes the Son's role as a source, as we observed with his use of the prefix *auto-* with respect to the Son. The Son, however, is the intermediate source of all things and has his own source, the Father, who is the ultimate source of all things, including the source of all of the Son's attributes. This being the case, it would make sense to think of the Father as the ultimate source of the Holy Spirit's being and attributes, and the Son as the Spirit's immediate source. Such a hierarchical schema would correspond to Origen's pneumatology with respect to the Spirit's generation—the Spirit is dependent on the Father and Son for his attributes, in addition to his being, which ranks the Spirit below the Father and Son.²⁰³

2.2.2: The Spirit's Essential Attributes?

Based on his description in *ComJn* 2.76, we have shown that Origen considered the Holy Spirit to be dependent on the Father and Son not only for his existence, but also for his attributes. However, this reading contradicts several occasions in Origen's corpus where the Holy Spirit is said to possess certain essential attributes. Still, preference should be given to the account found in *ComJn* 2.76 for two reasons. First, the hierarchical relationship in *ComJn* 2.76 corresponds to

²⁰³ Because the Spirit's dependence and rank distinguish the Spirit from the Father and Son, this aspect of Origen's pneumatology also serves as an anti-Monarchian polemic. This is similar to a strategy Novatian employs against Monarchian theology. I do not wish to imply any sort of dependence between Origen and Novatian, but a comparison with Novatian's thought will underscore the anti-Monarchian function of Origen's pneumatology. In an exegesis of John 16:14, Novatian writes, "If He [the Holy Spirit] received from Christ the things which He will make known, then surely Christ is greater than the Paraclete, since the Paraclete would not receive from Christ unless He were less than Christ [*Sed si a Christo accepit quae nuntiet, maior ergo iam paraclete Christus est, quoniam nec paracletus a Christo acciperet, nisi minor Christo esset*]" (*De Trinitate* 16.3; trans. from FOTC 67:62; Latin from CCSL 4:40). Here, Novatian describes a lesser being receiving certain characteristics from a higher being. The Holy Spirit receives characteristics from the Son, a relationship that necessitates the Spirit being less than the Son. Origen's own descriptions of the Holy Spirit's reception of its attributes from the Son accomplishes the same purpose, ranking the Spirit below the Son and, as a result, distinct from him. I am indebted to Waers, "Monarchianism," 254-263, especially 258, for the similarities between the anti-Monarchian polemics of Origen and Novatian.

Origen's thought elsewhere in his corpus. Second, by preferring *ComJn* we rely on the original Greek of Origen's writings and not the Latin translations which are suspect. In what follows I will offer arguments in support of these reasons. In so doing I will stand against those scholars who have upheld the Spirit's possession of essential attributes as Origen's authentic thought.²⁰⁴ I will proceed by examining the passages in which Origen appears to predicate essential attributes of the Holy Spirit, demonstrating the ways these passages contradict our findings from previous sections. These passages, however, occur only in Latin, which suggests they are interpolations.

Twice in *PArch* and once in *HomNum* Origen declares that the Holy Spirit possesses sanctification essentially:

But to be stainless [*inmaculatum*] is a quality which belongs essentially [*substantialiter*] to none except the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; for holiness [*sanctitas*] is in every created being an accidental [*accidens*] quality, and what is accidental [*accidit*] may also be lost [*decidere*].²⁰⁵

There is therefore no nature which may not admit good or evil, except the nature of God, which is the source of all good, and that of Christ; for Christ is wisdom, and wisdom certainly cannot admit folly; and he is righteousness, and assuredly righteousness will never receive unrighteousness; and he is word or reason, which certainly cannot become irrational; further, he is light, and we are sure that 'darkness does not comprehend' (John 1:5) the light. In like manner also the nature of the Holy Spirit [*natura spiritus sancti*], which is holy [*sancta*], does not admit pollution, for it is holy [*sancta*] by nature [*naturaliter*] or essence [*substantialiter*]. But if any other nature [*natura*] is holy [*sancta*], it is so because it is made holy by the reception or inspiration of the Holy Spirit; the possession of this quality does not arise from its own nature [*ex sua natura*], but is an accidental [*accidens*] addition to it, and being an addition it can also become separated and lost.²⁰⁶

Now I think that the Holy Spirit is so holy that he has not been sanctified; for to him no sanctification has come in addition and from elsewhere [*non enim ei extrinsecus et*

²⁰⁴ See fn. 109 above. Some of these scholars also base the Spirit's essential possession of attributes on the fact that the Holy Spirit is participated in; however, the Spirit's being participated in does not mean that he does not also participate, according to Origen. For example, in *ComJn* 2.17 the Son is said to both participate in divinity and be participated in by others in order to receive divinity (see section 1.1 of chapter one for more on this passage). As the case of the Son demonstrates, participation in the Spirit does not necessitate the Spirit's possession of attributes essentially.

²⁰⁵ *PArch* 1.5.5 (trans. from Butterworth 50; Latin from Görgemanns 212).

²⁰⁶ *PArch* 1.8.3 (trans. from Butterworth 70-71; Latin from Görgemanns 258).

aliunde accessit sanctificatio], which was not there previously [*quae ante non fuerat*]. On the contrary, he was always holy [*semper fuit sanctus*]. His sanctity did not have a beginning. In a similar manner one should understand concerning the Father and the Son; for the substance of the Trinity [*Trinitatis substantia*] is unique in that it did not receive its sanctification from the outside [*extrinsecus*], but its own nature is holy [*sui natura sit sancta*]. But every creature will be called “holy sanctified things” either by privilege of the Holy Spirit or by reason of its merits. So then we also read that it is written: “Be holy, for I am holy, says the Lord God.” One should not immediately posit a likeness of sanctity in God and in human beings; for it is said of God, that he *is* [*est*] holy, but people are commanded to *become* [*fiant*] holy, as if they were not always so.²⁰⁷

These passages portray the Holy Spirit as possessing holiness in the same way as the Father and Son—the Holy Spirit has not received any holiness from outside himself. This contradicts Origen’s teaching in *ComJn* 2.76 that the Spirit receives all of its attributes from the Son. These passages also suggest, or even say explicitly, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are a single substance. This, too, contradicts what Origen says elsewhere.²⁰⁸

In addition to sanctification, Rufinus’s translation of *PArch* also twice presents the Holy Spirit as possessing goodness essentially, as opposed to the accidental possession of goodness by created beings:²⁰⁹

How can we fail to come to a similar conclusion in regard to the good and holy powers, namely, that goodness is not in them as part of their essence [*substantiale*]. Essential goodness is found, as we have plainly shown, solely in Christ and the Holy Spirit, and of

²⁰⁷ *HomNum* 11.8.1 (trans. from Scheck 60; Latin from GCS 30:90).

²⁰⁸ In *ComJn* 13.151-152 Origen says that the Son is not comparable to the Father in any way. Just before this, Origen mentions the Son’s essence [οὐσία], suggesting that Origen is thinking of essence when saying that the Son is not comparable to the Father. If the essences are incomparable, then they cannot be the same. For more on this passage, see section 1.2 of Chapter One. In *CCels* 6.64 Origen says that the Son participates in the Father’s being. As we saw in Chapter One, participation implies a lower rank. For more on this passage, see section 1.1 of Chapter One. Finally, in *CCels* 8.12 Origen distinguishes the existences [ὑποστάσεις] of the Father and Son and says that they are only one “in mental unity, in agreement, and in identity of will” (trans. from Chadwick 461). By distinguishing between the ways that they are one and the way they are distinct, Origen makes it clear that they are not one in substance. It is important to note that Origen does not yet use *hypostasis* with its later technical meaning (see fn. 182 above).

²⁰⁹ I am indebted to the discussion found in Waers, “Monarchianism,” 270-280, with which I am in complete agreement. Waers’ discussion concerns the relationship between the Father and Son, although his conclusions are applicable for the Holy Spirit and demonstrate the likelihood that the passages found in *PArch* which refer to the Holy Spirit as possessing essential goodness are interpolations by Rufinus.

course in the Father also. For the nature of the Trinity [*trinitatis natura*] has been shown to contain nothing that is compound [*conpositionis*], which might appear to allow these good qualities to belong to it as accidental [*accidere*] consequences.²¹⁰

These are they who dwell ‘in heaven and on earth and under the earth’ (Phil 2:10), the three terms indicating the entire universe, that is, all those beings who started from one beginning but were drawn in various directions by their own individual impulses and were distributed throughout the different ranks of existence in accordance with their merit; for in them goodness does not reside essentially [*substantialiter*], as it does in God and his Christ and in the Holy Spirit. For only in this Trinity [*trinitate*], which is the source of all things [*est auctor omnium*], does goodness reside essentially [*bonitas substantialiter inest*]. Others possess it as an accident [*accidentem*], liable to be lost [*decidentem*], and only then do they live in blessedness, when they participate in holiness and wisdom and in the divine nature itself.”²¹¹

Like the statements on sanctification above, these passages present the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as a single nature possessing an essential attribute, in this case, goodness. The idea that the three share one nature, again, contradicts statements Origen makes elsewhere.²¹² The reference to essential goodness specifically differs from Origen’s expositions of goodness in his works extant in Greek. For instance, *ComMt* 15.10, which we examined in the first chapter, illustrates the discrepancies between Rufinus’s translation of *PArch* and Origen’s statements elsewhere:

The Savior is the image of the invisible God [εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου], and in the same way, he is the “image of God’s goodness” (Wisd 7:26) [οὕτως καὶ τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ εἰκὼν]. Whenever the word “good” is applied to a lesser being [ὑποδεεστέρου], it has another meaning. Considered in relation to the Father, the Son is the image of the Father’s goodness [τὸν πατέρα εἰκὼν...ἀγαθότητος]; considered in relation to other beings, he is to them what the Father’s goodness is to him. And it can even be said that the analogy [ἀναλογία] between God’s goodness and the goodness of the Saviour, who is the image of God’s goodness, is closer than the analogy between the Saviour and a good man, and good deed or a good tree. The fact that he is the “image of God’s goodness” (Wisd 7:26) sets the Saviour higher [ὑπεροχῇ] above the lesser beings [ὑποδεέστερα] than the fact of being good sets God above [ἡ ὑπεροχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ὄντος ἀγαθοῦ] the Saviour.²¹³

²¹⁰ *PArch* 1.5.3 (trans. from Butterworth 47; Latin from Görgemanns 200).

²¹¹ *PArch* 1.6.2 (trans. from Butterworth 53; Latin from Görgemanns 218-220). To these two passages could be added a third, *PArch* 1.2.13, which focuses primarily on goodness in relation to the Father and Son, but also mentions the goodness of the Holy Spirit.

²¹² See fn. 208 above.

²¹³ *ComMt* 15.10 (trans. Daniélou, *Origen*, 255; Greek from GCS 40:375-6). Καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ δὲ ὡς ἔστιν »εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου«, οὕτως καὶ »τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ εἰκὼν« καὶ <ἐπὶ> παντὸς δὲ τοῦ ὑποδεεστέρου, ᾧ ἐφαρμόζεται ἡ »ἀγαθὸς« φωνή, ἄλλο σημαίνομενον ἔχει τὸ ἐφ’

The Son does not possess goodness in the same way as the Father, because the Son is only the image of goodness, rather than goodness itself.²¹⁴ This means that the Father is above [ὑπεροχή] the Son, a lesser being than the Father.²¹⁵ These points strongly suggest that *PArch* 1.5.3 and *PArch* 1.6.2 have been interpolated and should not, therefore, be used in an assessment of Origen's pneumatology.

A final passage from *PArch* bears mentioning. In *PArch* 1.3.4 Origen claims the Holy Spirit has always possessed a particular kind of knowledge, which secures the Spirit's place within the Trinity. Origen does not call this knowledge an essential attribute, but the Spirit's eternal possession of this knowledge implies that Origen understands this knowledge in a similar way. The passage reads:

We must not suppose, however, that the Spirit knows God as we do, through the revelation of the Son. For if the Holy Spirit knows the Father by this means, he passes from ignorance to knowledge; and it is certainly as impious as it is foolish to confess that he is the Holy Spirit and then to ascribe ignorance to him. For even if we grant that something else existed before the Holy Spirit, yet it was not by a process of development that he came to be the Holy Spirit; as if one should dare to say that at the time when he was not yet the Holy Spirit he did not know the Father, but that after he had gained this knowledge he became the Holy Spirit. That could not be, for the Holy Spirit would never have been included in the unity of the Trinity, that is, along with God the unchangeable Father and with his Son, unless he had always been the Holy Spirit.²¹⁶

Two aspects of this passage contradict Origen's teaching in *ComJn* 2.76. First, the passage states that the Holy Spirit did not receive his knowledge through the Son, because he always had this

αὐτοῦ λεγόμενον, εἶπερ ὡς μὲν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα »εἰκῶν« ἐστιν »ἀγαθότητος«, ὡς δὲ πρὸς τὰ λοιπὰ ὅπερ ἢ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀγαθότης πρὸς αὐτόν. ἢ καὶ μᾶλλον ἔστι τινα ἀναλογίαν προσεχῆ ἰδεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγαθότητος τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς τὸν σωτήρα ὄντα εἰκόνα »τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ«, ἢπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ σωτήρος πρὸς ἀγαθὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἀγαθὸν ἔργον καὶ ἀγαθὸν δένδρον. πλειὸν γὰρ ἢ ὑπεροχῆ πρὸς τὰ ὑποδεέστερα ἀγαθὰ ἐν τῷ σωτήρι, καθὼ ἐστιν »εἰκῶν τῆς ἀγαθότητος« αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢπερ ἢ ὑπεροχῆ τοῦ θεοῦ ὄντος ἀγαθοῦ πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα σωτήρα.

²¹⁴ To the two passages above could be added a third, *PArch* 1.2.13, which discusses goodness in relation to the Father and Son, where mention is made of the Holy Spirit.

²¹⁵ For a longer exposition of this passage, as well as two fragments that attest to the same relationship as can be found in *ComMt* 15.10, see section 1.1 of chapter one.

²¹⁶ *PArch* 1.3.4 (trans. from Butterworth 33).

knowledge—he did not receive it from outside himself and undergo a process of development. Indeed, *ComJn* 2.76 states the opposite: the Spirit received its knowledge, as well as its being and other attributes, through the Son—the same way that other created beings receive their knowledge and attributes. Second, the passage concludes by stating that the Spirit’s possession of its knowledge ensures its inclusion in the unity of the Trinity. As above, the emphasis on the unity of Trinity contradicts Origen’s statements elsewhere that differentiate the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—if Origen had upheld such a strong statement of the unity of the three, it would have been difficult to differentiate his position from that of Monarchians.

Because of their emphasis on the unity of the Trinity and the Spirit’s self-sufficiency, the passages that speak of the Holy Spirit’s essential possession of attributes contradict Origen’s pneumatology found in the original Greek. Because Rufinus admits to altering Origen’s thought,²¹⁷ it is likely that the passages that maintain the Holy Spirit’s possession of essential attributes are interpolations.²¹⁸ Therefore, the account of the Holy Spirit’s attributes found in

²¹⁷ As we noted in the introduction, Rufinus writes in the preface to his translation of *PArch* that he has followed the example of his predecessors who “so smoothed over and emended” offensive statements found in Origen’s works that “a Latin reader would find in them nothing out of harmony with our faith” (Pref.2; trans. from Butterworth lxiii). He adds, “Wherever, therefore, I have found in his books anything contrary to the reverent statements made by him about the Trinity in other places, I have either omitted it as a corrupt and interpolated passage, or reproduced it in a form that agrees with the doctrine which I have often found him affirming elsewhere” (Pref. 2; trans. from Butterworth lxiii). As this passage shows, not only does Rufinus admit to altering passages, but passages pertaining to the Trinity were a particular focus of his interpolations.

²¹⁸ Plaxco, “Didymus the Blind,” 143-150, esp. 149-150, has observed that some of these passages bear a resemblance to others found in Didymus the Blind, whom he sees as the inspiration for Rufinus’s interpolations in these passages. Plaxco compares the language used in *PArch* 1.6.2 to Didymus’s *On the Holy Spirit* 13. *On the Holy Spirit* 13 (trans. from PPS 43:147; Latin from SC 386:154) reads: “Moreover, that which is essentially [*substantialiter*] good cannot be capable of participating in an external [*extraneae*] goodness, since it is what bestows goodness on other things. Therefore, it is clear that the Holy Spirit is distinct from not only corporeal but also incorporeal creatures because other substances receive this substance for their sanctification.” As Plaxco points out, the same term *substantialiter* is used in both passages to describe what the Holy Spirit possesses.

ComJn 2.76 should be preferred to those found in the Latin translations of Rufinus. Origen, then, should be understood as presenting the Holy Spirit as receiving his attributes by participating in the Son. This corresponds to the Son's relationship to the "all things" created through him—as one of these "all things," the Holy Spirit is dependent on the Son and, therefore, ranked below him.

2.3: Chapter Conclusion

I have argued in this chapter that Origen ranks the Holy Spirit below the Father and Son with respect to both his being and his attributes, but above all other created beings. In the first part of the chapter, I focused on the Spirit's generation regarding his existence. I first demonstrated that Origen groups the Holy Spirit with the Father and Son using three different strategies, but does not elaborate on the Spirit's generation via these strategies. I then turned to three passages in which Origen discusses the Spirit's generation. Of these three I suggested that one, *ComJn* 2.73-88, should be understood as Origen's mature theological position. After examining *PArch* Pref.4 and 1.3.3, I exegeted *ComJn* 2.73-88, during which I laid out why this passage should take precedence over the two passages from *PArch*. I set *ComJn* 2.73-88 within the context of Origen's concern with Monarchian theology, arguing that he believes the Spirit to be dependent on the Father and Son for his existence, thereby ranking the Spirit below them. Although Origen ranks the Spirit below the Father and Son, I also argued that he ranks him above all other created beings. This corresponds to our conclusions from the first section—Origen groups the Trinity together, but arranges the three hierarchically.

In the second part of this chapter, I examined the Spirit's generation with respect to his attributes. I argued that the Holy Spirit receives all of his attributes from outside himself—from the Father through the Son—by means of participation, a relationship that reaffirms that the

Spirit is ranked below the Father and Son. In demonstrating the Spirit's dependence on the Father and Son, I suggested that contradictory accounts found in Latin translations do not represent Origen's true thought. This chapter, therefore, has not only elucidated Origen's conception of the Holy Spirit's generation, but has also helped us better understand his Trinitarian theology. Origen considers the Holy Spirit to be third in rank among all things—he is below the Father and Son, but above and in some way separate from all other created beings. Having now looked at the Holy Spirit's generation, we turn now to an examination of the Spirit's unity and multiplicity, which is related to the Spirit's activities and the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter Three: The Unity and Multiplicity of the Holy Spirit

In his 2009 monograph *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, Bogdan Bucur provides an account of early Christian conceptions of the Holy Spirit that utilize angelomorphic traditions inherited from Jewish angelology.²¹⁹ Scholars had long recognized the importance of Jewish angelology in the development of Christology and pneumatology,²²⁰ but Bucur's work was the first wide-ranging study on how early Christians applied Jewish angelology and angelomorphic

²¹⁹ Bogdan Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses*, Supplements to VC 95 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

²²⁰ Scholarship on this topic covers a range of material, from Jewish antecedents to the New Testament to the development of ante and post Nicene Christianity. See Joseph Barbel, *Christos Angelos: Die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des christlichen Altertums* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1941); Georg Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 21 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1956); Jean Daniélou, *The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea. Volume I: The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, translated by J. Baker (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), 117-146; Christian Oeyen, "Eine frühchristliche Engelpneumatologie bei Klemens von Alexandrien," *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 55 (1965): 102-120; 56 (1966): 27-47; Richard Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1970); Christian Oeyen, "Die Lehre der göttlichen Kräfte bei Justin," *Studia Patristica* 11.2 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1972): 215-221; Gilles Quispel, "Genius and Spirit," in *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts*, ed. M. Krause, 155-169, NHS 6 (Leiden: Brill, 1975); Christopher Rowland, "The Vision of the Risen Christ in Rev. i.13 ff.: The Debt of an Early Christology to an Aspect of Jewish Angelology," *JTS* 31 (1980): 1-11; Gedaliahu Stroumsa, "Le couple de l'ange et de l'esprit: traditions juives et chrétiennes," *Revue Biblique* 88 (1981): 42-61; Jarl Fossum, "Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism," *VC* 37 (1983): 260-287; Robert Gundry, "Angelomorphic Christology in the Book of Revelation," *SBLSP* 33 (1994): 662-678; John Levison, "The Angelic Spirit in Early Judaism," in *Society for Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene Lovering, Jr. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 464-493; Loren Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*, WUNT 2/70 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995); Jonathan Knight, *Disciples of the Beloved One: The Christology, Social Setting and Theological Context of the Ascension of Isaiah*, JSPSup 18 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); Crispin Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, WUNT 2/94 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); Peter Carrell, *Jesus and the Angels: Angelology and the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*, SNTSMS 95 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Charles Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 42 (Leiden: Brill, 1998); Darrell Hannah, *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*, WUNT 2/109 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999); Mehrdad Fatehi, *The Spirit's Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul: An Examination of Its Christological Implications*, WUNT 2/128 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

traditions to the Holy Spirit.²²¹ Bucur's study is valuable, in part, because his examination encompasses traditions designated "angelomorphic," a term which describes "wherever there are signs that an individual or community possesses specifically angelic characteristics or status, though for whom identity cannot be reduced to that of an angel."²²² Using this definition as his foundation, Bucur shows that many early Christians characterized the Holy Spirit using angelomorphic traditions.

Bucur chronologically ends his study with Clement of Alexandria, but he notes the implications of his work for a study on Origen's pneumatology. At the conclusion of his section on Clement, Bucur writes, "A generation later, Origen was clearly aware of, although not satisfied with, this [i.e., Clement's] theological tradition."²²³ In the page that Bucur devotes to Origen, he draws attention to some of the works he sees as influencing him, such as the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the *Testament of Reuben*, and concludes, "The more important element, however, is to be located in the surviving fragments from Clement's *Hypotyposes*, where an elaborated angelomorphic pneumatology is embedded in the tradition of Bible exegesis to which Origen is the direct heir."²²⁴

In the previous chapter we drew attention to Origen's use of Clement's pneumatology insofar as Origen's descriptions of the Holy Spirit mirror those Clement makes of the seven

²²¹ Some of the previous scholarship noted this lacuna. For example, Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 6, writes, "Ignorance concerning the influence of angelomorphic traditions has also plagued scholarship on early Pneumatology."

²²² Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 14-15. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 27-28, provides a similar definition when he writes, "Angelomorphic is an inclusive adjective which describes a phenomenon that has the variegated form and functions of an angel, even though the figure may not be explicitly identified as an angel." Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, xxvi, utilizes Fletcher-Louis's definition and explains its value by saying, "The virtue of this definition...is that it signals the use of angelic characteristics in descriptions of God or humans, while not necessarily implying that either are angels *stricto sensu*." I will follow Bucur in using Fletcher-Louis's definition in this work.

²²³ Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 81.

²²⁴ Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 82-83.

protoctists, which refer, as Oeyen and Bucur have demonstrated, to the Holy Spirit. While Origen secures the unity of the Holy Spirit to a greater extent than Clement—he says the Holy Spirit is an individual *hypostasis*, while Clement says the *protoctists* have unity because of their similarity²²⁵—he also refers to the multiplicity of the Spirit. Therefore, this chapter takes up Bucur’s claim and provides the first examination of Origen’s pneumatology in light of previous research on early Christian angelomorphic traditions. I will argue that Origen interprets the traditional understanding of the Holy Spirit as one and seven in terms of a philosophical notion of power, which allows him to explain how a single being can distribute many different spiritual gifts. I will proceed by examining the passages in which Origen refers to the Spirit as sevenfold, paying close attention to the language Origen uses and connecting this language to earlier Christian pneumatology. Then, I will supply an overview of a philosophical notion of power, showing how Origen uses this idea of power to explain how the one Holy Spirit can provide a multitude of gifts.

3.1: The Sevenfold Spirit

In the first part of this chapter, I will exegete the passages in which Origen refers to the Holy Spirit as sevenfold.²²⁶ This exegesis will reveal that Origen thinks of the Spirit as both one and more than one, which places him within an early Christian tradition indebted to Jewish angelology. Furthermore, I will demonstrate that he describes the Spirit’s unity and multiplicity

²²⁵ For Origen, see *ComJn* 2.75; for Clement, *Exc.* 10.3.

²²⁶ To my knowledge, Karl Schlütz is the only scholar to draw attention to Origen’s conception of the sevenfold Spirit. Schlütz associates references to the Spirit’s multiplicity with the seven spirits, or gifts, of Isa 11:2, emphasizing the opposition of these gifts to the seven evil spirits that cause sin. Schlütz does not, however, interpret the multiplicity of the Spirit within the Christian tradition of angelomorphic pneumatology, nor does he realize the link between the gifts and power language. See Schlütz, *Isaias 11,2 (Die sieben Gaben des hl. Geistes) in den ersten vier christlichen Jahrhunderten* (Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932), 81-100.

using four terms—power, spirit, gift, and grace—which he understands as synonyms. This will serve as the foundation of the following part, because Origen’s language allows us to recognize that he interprets the earlier Christian tradition in terms of the philosophical notion of power.

Origen’s clearest statement on the Spirit’s unity and multiplicity is found in *Homilies on Isaiah* 3. In this homily Origen exegetes Isa 4:1, which speaks of “seven women who will take hold of one man.” After a short discussion of the appearance of these women, Origen explains:

The seven women are one; for they are the Spirit of God. And those seven are one; for the Spirit of God is “the spirit of wisdom and of understanding, the spirit of counsel and of virtue, the spirit of knowledge and of piety, the spirit of the fear of the Lord” (Isa 11:2).²²⁷

Origen identifies the seven women as the one Holy Spirit, a reading he supports with Isa 11:2.

Throughout the rest of the homily, he explains that the “one man” whom the seven women take hold of is Christ, providing him the occasion to discuss the descent of the Holy Spirit onto Christ at Jesus’s baptism.²²⁸ At the end of his homily, Origen writes:

Let us rise up and pray to God, who sent this “man” and the Spirit of seven women rested in him, so that this “man” might grant to us, too, communion with these “women” and by receiving them we might become wise and understanding in God, and the other powers [*virtutes*] might adorn our soul in Christ Jesus.²²⁹

Origen explains that, just as the “seven women” came on Christ, Christ grants these women to others. Because the references to becoming “wise” and “understanding” are taken from Isa 11:2, the “other powers [*virtutes*]” must refer to the five other spirits mentioned there. This means that Origen not only refers to the Holy Spirit as seven spirits, but as seven powers.

²²⁷ *HomIs* 3.1 (trans. from ACW 68:894; Latin from GCS 33:253). *Septem mulieres una sunt; spiritus enim Dei sunt. Et ista una septem sunt; Spiritus enim Dei est spiritus sapientiae et intellectus, spiritus consilii et virtutis, spiritus scientiae et pietatis, spiritus timoris Domini.*

²²⁸ We will discuss the Holy Spirit’s descent on Christ further in Chapter Five.

²²⁹ *HomIs* 3.3 (trans. from ACW 68:898; Latin from GCS 33:257). *Idcirco surgentes oremus Deum, qui hunc misit “hominem” et “septem mulierum spiritus in eo requievit”, ut et nobis iste “homo” tribuat communionem harum “mulierum” et adsumentes eas fiamus sapientes et intelligentes in Deo ceteraque virtutes exornent animam nostram in in Christo Iesu.*

Origen's use of power language and Isa 11:2 connect his thought, again, to Clement of Alexandria's pneumatology. As we observed in the previous chapter, Clement understands the seven highest angels, the *protoctists*, to represent the Holy Spirit.²³⁰ Clement identifies the *protoctists* as the seven spirits of Isa 11:2,²³¹ and he also refers to them as powers, writing, "There are then, according to the apostle, those on the summit, the first-created [πρωτόκτιστοι]. And they are thrones, although powers [δυνάμεις], being the first-created [πρωτόκτιστοι], inasmuch as God rests in them."²³² The association of pneumatology with power language, as

²³⁰ The association of pneumatological content with the seven highest angels is also attested by the *Shepherd of Hermas*, which offers a variation of this tradition. In *Herm. Vis.* 3.4.1 Hermas is told that the six young men who are escorting the figure of the church are "the holy angels of God who were created first [οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ οἱ πρῶτοι κτισθέντες], to whom the Lord turned over all his creation, to increase, build up, and govern all creation" (trans. from Osiek 65; Greek from Körtner 166). Later, in *Herm. Sim.* 9.1.1, the Shepherd explains to Hermas that the one who had appeared in the form of the church is the Son of God. The six first-created angels, therefore, escort the seventh, the Son of God. Despite the difference in the number of first-created angels, Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 136, explains that "Clement of Alexandria's *protoctists* are an exact analogy to the *Shepherd's* πρῶτοι κτισθέντες in echoing angelological speculations common in Second Temple Judaism." See also Hauschild, *Gottes Geist und der Mensch*, 82. Oeyen, "Eine frühchristliche Engelpneumatologie," 42, even offers the suggestion that Clement's use of the term *protoctists* comes from the *Shepherd's* use of the phrase πρῶτοι κτισθέντες.

This early Christian tradition can be traced to Jewish traditions. As many scholars have now pointed out, the concept of the sevenfold spirit appears to derive from Jewish ideas of the seven highest angels, as exemplified by Tob 12:15, where Raphael introduces himself as "one of the seven angels who stand in the glorious presence of the Lord." See also *1 En.* 20, 81.5, 90.21; *2 En.* 19.6; *T. Levi* 7.4-8.3; *Jub.* 2.2, 15.27. For Christian appropriations of this material, see Barbel, *Christos Angelos*, 192-223; Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 121-124; Quispel, "Genius and Spirit," 158; Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 124-125; Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary*, 69; Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 39-40. For information on the Jewish origins of the seven angels, see Gregory Dix, "The Seven Archangels and the Seven Spirits," *Journal of Theological Studies* 28 (1926): 233-250.

²³¹ See *Strom.* 5.6.35, which reads, "The golden lamp conveys another enigma as a symbol of Christ...in his casting light, "at sundry times and diverse manners" (Heb 1:1), on those who believe in him and hope and see by means of the ministry of the *protoctists*. And they say that the seven eyes of the Lord (Zech 3:9) are the seven spirits resting on the rod that springs from the root of Jesse (Isa 11:1-2)" (trans. from Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 31-32). For more on this passage, see Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 30-32.

²³² *Ecl* 57.1. (trans. from ANF 8:50; Greek from GCS 17:153). Εἰσὶν οὖν κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον οἱ ἐν τῇ ἄκρᾳ ἀποκαταστάσει πρωτόκτιστοι >θρόνοι< δ' ἂν εἶεν, καίτοι δυνάμεις

demonstrated by Clement and Origen, is also attested by the *Shepherd of Hermas*. In *Herm. Sim.* 9 Hermas sees twelve young women who help build a tower and later serve as his companions.

When he asks who these women are, he is told:

“These are holy spirits [ἅγια πνεύματα]. One cannot be found in the reign of God unless they clothe you with their garments. If you only receive the name, but do not receive the clothing from them, it profits nothing. These young women are powers [δυνάμεις] of the Son of God. If you bear the name but do not bear his power [δύναμιν], you bear the name uselessly. The rejected stones that you see,” he said, “these carried the name, but were not clothed with the garments of the young women.” “What kind of garment is theirs, sir?” I asked. “Their own names are their clothing,” he said. “Whoever wears the name of the Son of God must also wear their names. The son himself wears the names of these young women.”²³³

The young women are called both spirits and powers, but they also have a kind of unity. These “powers [δυνάμεις] of the Son of God” are referred to collectively as “his power [δύναμιν],” and in *Herm. Sim.* 9.24.2, certain believers are said to be “clothed with the holy spirit [τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον] of these young women.”²³⁴ The *Shepherd* uses the singular and plural of both “spirit” and “power” in characterizing the young women, which indicates that the women are thought of both

ὄντες, οἱ πρωτόκτιστοι διὰ τὸ ἀναπαύεσθαι ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸν θεόν. It is important to note that the translation in ANF incorrectly lists the work as the *Excerpta ex Theodoto*.

Another passage more closely connects the seven powers with the Holy Spirit. In *Adumbr* 1 John 2:1, Clement writes, “Just as the Lord is a paraclete for us with the Father, so also is he a paraclete whom he has deigned to send after his ascension. For these primitive and first-created powers [virtutes], unchangeable according to substance, effect divine operations together with the subordinate angels and archangels whose names they share” (trans. from Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 56; Greek from GCS 17:211). Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 56-59, argues that the “primitive and first-created powers” (which he renders in Greek as πρωτόγονοι καὶ πρωτόκτιστοι δυνάμεις on p. 57) are the *protoctists* because they are described in a similar manner. As Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 58, notes, the powers “being ‘first-created’ (πρωτόκτιστοι), ‘primitive’ (πρωτόγονοι), and ‘immutable,’ perfectly matches the description [of the *protoctists*] in *Exc* 10.” While some scholars have argued that the powers refer to the two paracletes, the Son and Holy Spirit, Bucur argues persuasively that the powers refer to the *protoctists*. See Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 56-59. Bucur’s assessment of the passage follows Oeyen’s; his comments can be found in Oeyen, “Eine frühchristliche Engelpneumatologie,” 37-40.

²³³ *Herm. Sim.* 9.13.2-3 (trans. from Osiek 230; Greek from Körtner 324).

²³⁴ *Herm. Sim.* 9.24.2 (trans. from Osiek 241; Greek from Körtner 340). While she does not offer any explanation of the reason behind the use of the singular, Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 248, does note the singular of πνεῦμα in her commentary on this passage.

as a unit and as individual beings. As Bucur writes, “It would seem that these ‘holy spirits’ are an angelomorphic representation of the activity of the Son. At the same time, the use of clothing and baptismal language suggests that the virgins can be seen as a plural designation of the Holy Spirit.”²³⁵

As both the *Shepherd* and Clement attest, Origen stands within a tradition that understood the Holy Spirit to be pluriform, explaining both the Spirit’s unity and multiplicity with power language. However, Origen emphasizes the unity of the Holy Spirit to a greater extent than the *Shepherd* and Clement, as demonstrated by *HomNum* 6.3.2. *Homilies on Numbers* 6 contains Origen’s exegesis of Num 11:16-25, which relates the distribution of the spirit that rested on Moses to the seventy elders. Origen’s explanation of the Spirit’s distribution leads him to discuss the Spirit’s descent on Christ. He describes the unique way the Spirit came to Christ by writing:

So on all who have prophesied, the Holy Spirit has rested, yet on none of these has he rested as he did on the Savior. This is why it is written of him that: “A shoot shall arise from the root of Jesse, and a flower shall grow from his root. The Spirit of God will rest on him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and fortitude, the Spirit of knowledge and of piety; and the Spirit of the fear of God will fill him” (Isa 11:1-2). But perhaps someone says: You have shown nothing more written about Christ than is written about the rest of men; for just as it is said about the others, that “the Spirit rested on them,” so also it is said about the Savior: “The Spirit of God will rest on him.” But notice that on no other is the Spirit of God described as having rested with this sevenfold power [*septemplici hac virtute*]. Doubtless this is because the prophecy concerns the very substance of the divine Spirit [*ipsa illa divini spiritus substantia*], which “rests on the shoot that was proceeding from the stock of Jesse.” Because that substance could not be explained under one term [*uno nomine*], it is set forth under diverse designations [*diversis vocabulis*].²³⁶

²³⁵ Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 123. John Christian Wilson also considers the holy spirits to be a plural designation of the Holy Spirit, which Wilson says Hermas understands in ethical terms. It appears that Wilson bases the connection between the young women and the Holy Spirit because the Holy Spirit is said in other places of the *Shepherd* to bestow some of the same virtues that the women are called; likewise, the Holy Spirit is opposed to the evil spirit in other places of the *Shepherd*. See Wilson, “Toward a Reassessment of the Milieu of the Shepherd of Hermas,” 239-257.

²³⁶ *HomNum* 6.3.2 (trans. from ACT 22, slightly altered; Latin from GCS 30:33).

As in *HomIs* 3 Origen's discussion of the sevenfold Spirit occurs in conjunction with a reference to Christ's baptism and Isa 11:2. The prophecy contained in Isa 11:1-3 describes "the very substance of the divine spirit" [*ipsa illa divini spiritus substantia*], which implies that Isa 11:2 refers to one Spirit, based on the singular of the term "substance." At the end of the passage, Origen makes clear that the Spirit cannot be called by one name, indicating that the Spirit's diversity is a matter of title, not of substance. However, Origen also describes the Spirit of God as possessing diverse power when he explains that the Spirit rested on Christ with "this sevenfold power" [*septemplici hac virtute*],²³⁷ suggesting a connection between the Spirit's different names and his power. Origen's use of the demonstrative *hac* indicates that he has previously referred to the sevenfold power in the passage. Because the power is sevenfold, it logically must be equated with the seven spirits of Isa 11:2, so the sevenfold power of the Spirit denotes the seven spirits of Isa 11:2. Just as he does in *HomIs* 3, Origen here refers to the seven spirits of Isa 11:2 using the term "power" [*virtus*], but now he elaborates upon his meaning by using the term "sevenfold power." This "sevenfold power" describes the different names that characterize the Spirit, since one name cannot adequately designate the single substance of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, Origen maintains that the Spirit is one in substance, but at the same time makes clear that the Spirit possesses many powers.

²³⁷ Origen does not explain what he means by this statement, but the implication is that the Spirit rested in the prophets in a way that did not include the sevenfold virtue. Given the fact that Origen's explanation of Isa 11:2 in relation to Christ's baptism is similar to that of Justin Martyr, Origen may mean something along the lines of what Justin records in *Dial* 87.4 (trans. from Selections from the FOTC 3:136): "Furthermore, please pay careful attention to my words, so you may understand that each of your prophets, by receiving one or two powers from God, did and said those things which we have learned from the Scriptures. Solomon had the spirit of wisdom; Daniel, that of understanding and counsel; Moses, that of strength and piety; Elijah, that of fear; Isaiah, that of knowledge; and the others likewise had one or two gifts, as had Jeremiah, and the twelve prophets, and David, and, in short, all your other prophets." Justin says in this passage that each person received a particular gift or two from the Spirit rather than all seven gifts or powers. Origen may envision something similar—that believers receive certain gifts, but not the fulness of gifts, as Christ receives.

Origen utilizes two other terms—grace and gift—to describe the unity and multiplicity of the Holy Spirit. Both will help us to better understand his attribution of multiplicity to the Spirit.

In *HomLev* 8 Origen is discussing purification as part of an exegesis of Lev 13-14; Lev 14:16 leads him to refer to the sevenfold power of the Spirit. He writes:

Moreover, “the priest sprinkles some of the oil before the Lord seven times” (Lev 14:16). For after all these rites which were celebrated for purification, after he was converted and reconciled to God, after the sacrifices of offerings, the order was that he call the sevenfold power of the Holy Spirit [*virtutem...septemplicem sancti Spiritus*] upon him, as he said, “Return to me the joy of your salvation and strengthen me with a princely spirit” (Ps 50:12). Or at least since the Lord in the gospel testifies that the hearts of sinners are besieged by “seven demons” (Lk 11:26) “the priest” appropriately “sprinkles seven times before the Lord” in purification that the expulsion “of the seven evil spirits” from the heart of the person purified may be shown by “the oil shaken seven times from the fingers.” Thus therefore, to those converted from sin, purification is indeed given through all this which we said above, but the gift of the grace of the Spirit [*donum...gratiae spiritus*] is designated through the image of “oil” that this one who is converted from sin, not only can attain cleansing but also be filled with the Holy Spirit.²³⁸

The reference to the sprinkling of the oil leads Origen to associate it with the “sevenfold power of the Holy Spirit” [*virtutem...septemplicem sancti Spiritus*], the same terminology Origen uses in *HomNum* 6.3.2. However, Origen also describes the sprinkled oil as “the gift of the grace of the Spirit” [*donum...gratiae spiritus*]. The fact that Origen describes the oil using both phrases—“the sevenfold power of the Holy Spirit” and “the gift of the grace of the Spirit”—demonstrates that Origen believes the two expressions refer to the same thing, which means that the sevenfold power can be referred to as both a gift [*donum*] and a grace [*gratia*]. Indeed, Origen writes in his *Commentary on Romans*: “We read in the writings of the Apostle Paul himself that the gifts [*dona*] or graces [*gratias*] of the Holy Spirit are designated ‘many spirits’ [*multos spiritus*].”²³⁹ With the conjunction “or [*vel*],” Origen implies that the gifts and graces of the Spirit are the same thing. He confirms this to be the case when he says that the term “spirit” refers to these

²³⁸ *HomLev* 8.11.14-15 (trans. from FOTC 83:175; Latin from GCS 29:417).

²³⁹ *ComRm* 7.5.4 (trans. from FOTC 104:75; Latin from Bammel 3:572). *Legimus apud ipsum apostolum Paulum dona vel gratias Sancti Spiritus multos spiritus nominari.*

gifts/graces. Since the seven spirits of Isa 11:2, which could be called “many spirits,” refer to the sevenfold power of the Holy Spirit, then Origen is able to refer to the sevenfold power using the terms spirit, gift, and grace.²⁴⁰

²⁴⁰ While we have demonstrated that Origen’s association of power language with respect to the Spirit’s diversity places him within an early Christian tradition, the use of all four terms—power, spirit, grace, and gift—within a pneumatological context is similarly attested in Justin Martyr. Anthony Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 25-31, and Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 148-155, have both demonstrated that Justin depicts the Holy Spirit as both one and seven in *Dial* 87-88. This itself illustrates that Origen is, again, working within an early Christian tradition by portraying the Holy Spirit as one and seven, but the language Justin uses in *Dial* 87-88 establishes a constellation of terms which Justin uses to refer to the Holy Spirit. In *Dial* 87.2 Trypho asks Justin, “Explain to me the following words of Isaiah: ‘A shoot shall sprout from the root of Jesse, and a flower shall blossom out of his root. And a spirit of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] shall rest upon him, a spirit [πνεῦμα] of wisdom and understanding, a spirit [πνεῦμα] of counsel and fortitude, a spirit [πνεῦμα] of knowledge and piety; and he shall be filled with a spirit [πνεῦμα] of the fear of the Lord’ [Isa 11:1-2]. Now you have admitted that these words were spoken of Christ, who, you claim already existed as God, and, becoming incarnate by the will of God, was born of a virgin. This, then, is my question: How can you prove that Christ already existed, since he is endowed with those powers of the Holy Spirit [τῶν δυνάμεων τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου] which the above-quoted passages of Isaiah attribute to him as though he had lacked them?” (trans. from Selections from the FOTC 3:135-136; Greek from Marcovich 221). Trypho here equates the “powers of the Holy Spirit” [τῶν δυνάμεων τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου] with the seven spirits [πνεύματα] listed in Isa 11:2. Justin accepts Trypho’s characterization of the seven spirits [πνεύματα] of Isa 11:2 as “powers of the Spirit” [τοῦ πνεύματος δυνάμεις], using the phrase himself in his answer to Trypho’s question when he explains that the Holy Spirit rested on Christ in the sense that the Holy Spirit was “to come to an end with him” (*Dial* 87.3; trans. from Selections from the FOTC 3:136). In the course of his reply to Trypho, Justin also writes the following, “‘The Spirit,’ therefore, ‘rested’, that is, ceased, when Christ came. For, after man’s redemption was accomplished by him, these gifts [δόματα] were to cease among you, and, having come to an end in him, should again be given, as was foretold, by him, from the grace of his Spirit’s power [τῆς χάριτος τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ πνεύματος ἐκείνου], to all his believers in accordance with their merits” (*Dial* 87.5; trans. from Selections from the FOTC 3:136; Greek from Marcovich 222). As Briggman and Bucur explain, within the context of Trypho’s question and Justin’s reply, the spirits [πνεύματα] of Isa 11:2, equated with the Holy Spirit, are called “powers” [δυνάμεις] and “gifts” [δόματα], and the term “grace” [χάρις] is used to describe the “Spirit’s power.” The original Greek of Origen’s references to the sevenfold Spirit, unfortunately, are no longer extant; however, the four terms Origen uses of the sevenfold Spirit in *HomIs* 3, *HomNum* 6.3.2, and *HomLev* 8.11.14-15 [*spiritus*, *virtus*, *donum*, and *gratia*] are Latin equivalents of the four terms Justin uses in *Dial* 87-88 of the spirits of Isa 11:2 [πνεῦμα, δύναμις, δόμα, χάρις]. The fact that all four of these terms occur in relation to the sevenfold Spirit and Isa 11:2 suggests that Origen is working within the same tradition as attested in *Dial* 87-88.

Recognizing Origen's use of these four terms with reference to the Spirit's unity and diversity helps us understand the fourth and final reference to the sevenfold Spirit in Origen's corpus. The passage comes from *HomLev* 3.5.1, where Origen is giving several miscellaneous comments on the different offerings recorded in Leviticus. Origen writes:

But because 'the high priest' is reminded 'to sprinkle some of the blood of the sacrifice before the Lord seven times' (Lev 4:16-17), the power of the sevenfold grace of the Holy Spirit [*sancti Spiritus virtus septemplicis gratiae*] is evidently designated under the mystery.²⁴¹

As in *HomLev* 8.11.14-15, the sevenfold sprinkling is the catalyst that drives Origen's interpretation. Here, it is the sprinkling of the blood in Lev 4:16-17 that leads Origen to interpret the seven sprinklings with reference to the Holy Spirit. On this occasion he refers to the singular power [*virtus*] of the "sevenfold grace" [*septemplicis gratiae*] of the Spirit, speaking of both the Spirit's unity, with the term "power," and the Spirit's multiplicity, with the term "grace." Here, he departs from his usage of "power" in the previous passages by using the term to refer to the Spirit's unity rather than his diversity.

Origen is comfortable speaking of both the Spirit's unity and multiplicity, which places him within an early Christian tradition that considers the Holy Spirit to be both one and many. As we have seen in the above passages, he uses a variety of terms to speak of the Spirit's unity and diversity—"power," "spirit," "grace," and "gift"—each of which he considers to be synonyms. Origen's use of the singular and plural of "power," as well as of the terms "spirit," "grace," and "gift," can be explained by recognizing his use of a philosophical notion of power to elucidate the Spirit's unity and diversity. We turn now to this topic.

²⁴¹ *HomLev* 3.5.1 (altered trans. from FOTC 83:62; Latin from GCS 29:309).

3.2: Power Language and the Sevenfold Spirit

Origen employs four different terms to describe the Holy Spirit's unity and multiplicity, but his use of the word "power" grants insight into the way he uses all four terms. In this part of the chapter I will argue that Origen re-interprets an early Christian tradition by means of a philosophical notion of power. This allows him to explain how the Holy Spirit can both be one and possess many different gifts. I will begin this part with a review of the salient elements of the pertinent philosophical notion of power. Then, I will show how this corresponds to Origen's attribution of unity and multiplicity to the Spirit by demonstrating that he conceives of the Spirit as a singular power and as possessing many different powers, which he equates with the gifts of the Spirit.

Michel R. Barnes has argued that a proper understanding of the term δύναμις must begin with ancient medical theory.²⁴² The Hippocratics believed that everything that exists has a δύναμις, a term Barnes explains as follows: "Among the medical authors – belonging predominantly to the Hippocratic school – *power* means the affective capacity (or capacities) of any given existent distinctive to the identity of that existent."²⁴³ Each thing that exists possesses an affective capacity or capacities, and each of these powers, when it acts, reproduces itself in the existent receiving the action, an idea Barnes describes as "like from like causality."²⁴⁴

The connection between existents and powers is further understood by grasping the Hippocratics' belief that "everything that exists above the level of the powers, exists as a

²⁴² See Michel R. Barnes, *The Power of God: Δύναμις in Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Theology* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2001), 21-53.

²⁴³ Barnes, *The Power of God*, 7.

²⁴⁴ Barnes, *The Power of God*, 31. Barnes, *The Power of God*, 29, gives a longer definition of this idea when he writes, "The activity or effect peculiar to a δύναμις is that it reproduces itself or gives its nature to whatever it is near to or added to: the best example of a δύναμις reproducing itself or giving its nature is the hot (or more accurately, the hot [thing]) of fire transforming wood into (the hot of) fire."

mixture.”²⁴⁵ In other words, every existent thing, as a mixture, possesses multiple powers, because each part of a mixture possesses its own power. *On Ancient Medicine* 13 describes such a conception: “For a thing which has been exposed to fire and to water, and has been made by many other things, each of which has its own individual power [δύναμιν] and nature [φύσιν], has lost some of its qualities and has been mixed and combined with others.”²⁴⁶ Each existent is made up of many different things, and each part of the whole has its own power or powers. As a result, each existent possesses a number of different powers corresponding to the parts making up the whole. *On Ancient Medicine* 14 provides an example of an existent and its multiple powers by describing the different kinds of bread that exist: “The powers [δυνάμεις] too of each variety are powerful, and no one is like to any other.”²⁴⁷ Different kinds of bread are made with different ingredients. For example, the author of *On Ancient Medicine* mentions bolted or unbolted flour, winnowed or unwinnowed wheat, and the use of much or little water.²⁴⁸ Since each ingredient has its own power or powers, every loaf of bread has several powers.

The Hippocratics referred to the union of multiple powers in existent things using the term “nature” [φύσις],²⁴⁹ and they often used the phrase “power and nature” when speaking of the existent as a whole, as the quote from *On Ancient Medicine* 13 above demonstrates.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁵ Barnes, *The Power of God*, 34. For more on this subject, see Barnes, *The Power of God*, 34-37. Harold Miller, “*Dynamis and Physis in On Ancient Medicine*,” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 83 (1952), 189, describes this concept in *On Ancient Medicine* by saying, “For the author, then, the *physis* [of a thing] is composed of an indefinite number of simple real constituents, each of which he conceives primarily as a *dynamis*.”

²⁴⁶ *On Ancient Medicine* 13 (altered trans. and Greek from LCL 147:35-37). ὁ γὰρ πυρὶ καὶ ὕδατι δέδοται καὶ ἄλλοις πολλοῖσι ἤργασται, ὧν ἕκαστον ἰδίην δύναμιν καὶ φύσιν ἔχει, τὰ μὲν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀποβέβληκε, ἄλλοισι δὲ κέκρηται τε καὶ μέμικται.

²⁴⁷ *On Ancient Medicine* 14 (altered trans. and Greek from LCL 147:36-37). καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις μεγάλαι τε ἐκάστου καὶ οὐδὲν ἢ ἐτέρῃ τῇ ἐτέρῃ ἐοικυῖα.

²⁴⁸ *On Ancient Medicine* 14.

²⁴⁹ See Barnes, *The Power of God*, 37-40.

²⁵⁰ See also *Nature of Man* 5, which says of the “constituents of man” that “each of them has its own power and its own nature [ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἔχει δύναμιν τε καὶ φύσιν τὴν ἐωυτοῦ]”

However, this phrase includes the singular of the term “power,” which would appear to contradict the idea that all existent things possess multiple powers. Barnes maintains that this is not a contradiction, but “expresses an understanding of the affective capacity of the existent as a whole or as a unit.”²⁵¹ Therefore, the Hippocratics were able to speak of an existent’s powers in the plural—the individual powers that coordinate with the ingredients in the existent’s mixture—and an existent’s power in the singular—the affective capacity of the existent’s nature as constituted by its mixture of powers.

Barnes argues that the Hippocratic understanding of power was fundamental for Plato’s own thinking. A good example of Plato’s appropriation of Hippocratic power language is found in *Phaedrus* 270C-D:

Consider, then, what both Hippocrates and true argument say about nature. Isn’t this the way to think systematically about the nature of anything? First, we must consider whether the object regarding which we intend to become experts and capable of transmitting our expertise is simple or complex. Then, if it is simple, we must investigate its power [δύναμιν]. . . . If, on the other hand, it takes many forms, we must enumerate them all and, as we did in the simple case, investigate how each is naturally able to act upon what and how it has a natural disposition to be acted upon by what.²⁵²

Plato understands each existent thing to have its own power or powers, just as the Hippocratics.²⁵³ One specific example of power language in Plato is instructive for

(trans. and Greek from LCL 150:12-15). Similarly, *The Sacred Disease* 21 reads, “Each [disease] has a nature and power of its own [φύσιν δὲ ἕκαστον ἔχει καὶ δύναμιν ἐφ’ ἑωυτοῦ]” (trans. and Greek from LCL 148:182-183).

²⁵¹ Barnes, *The Power of God*, 43. For more on this topic, see Barnes, *The Power of God*, 42-43.

²⁵² Plato, *Phaedrus* 270C-D (trans. from John Cooper, ed., *Plato: Complete Works* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997), 547; Greek from *Platonis opera*, ed. John Burnet [Oxford, 1900-1907]).

²⁵³ The Hippocratic understanding of power language was materialistic. Plato, however, developed an understanding of power causality to explain immaterial ideas, such as virtue, language, and, eventually, his theory of the forms. Barnes, *The Power of God*, 54-93, provides a detailed exposition of Plato’s appropriation and development of power language, but see also H.C. Baldry, “Plato’s ‘Technical Terms’,” *The Classical Quarterly* 31 (1937), 141-150; and Joseph Souilhé, *Étude sur le Terme Δύναμις dans les Dialogues de Platon* (Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1919).

understanding Origen’s use of the idea. In a passage from the *Cratylus*, Plato explains why the name “Apollo” is a suitable name for the god using power language: “In my view, however, the name [Apollo] is most beautifully suited to the power [δύναμιν] of the god. ...I think no single name [ὄνομα] could be more in keeping with the four powers [δυνάμεις] of the god.”²⁵⁴

According to this statement, Apollo possesses both power [δύναμις] in the singular, as well as four different powers [δυνάμεις].²⁵⁵ As did the Hippocratics, Plato refers to the individual powers that an existent possesses, but also speaks of that existent’s singular power.²⁵⁶

Origen demonstrates a similar use of “power” in his theology of the Holy Spirit,²⁵⁷ referring both to a singular power of the Holy Spirit and to the Spirit’s many powers. Two passages will show how Origen uses the term of the Spirit in both the singular and the plural. With respect to the Spirit’s singular power,²⁵⁸ he writes:

²⁵⁴ *Cratylus* 404E-405A (trans. from Cooper, *Plato*, 123; Greek from *Platonis opera*).

²⁵⁵ Plato goes on to say that Apollo’s powers are in music, prophecy, medicine, and archery (*Cratylus* 405A).

²⁵⁶ For another example, see Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* VII.147, which reads, “The deity...is called many names according to its various powers (δύναμεις). They give the name Dia because all things are due to him; Zeus in so far as he is the cause of life or pervades all life; the name Athena is given because the ruling part of the divinity extends to the aether; the name Hera marks its extension to the air; he is called Hephaestus since it spreads to the creative fire; Poseidon, since it stretches to the sea; Demeter, since it reaches to the earth. Similarly men have given the deity his other titles, fastening, as best they can, on some one or other of his peculiar attributes” (trans. and Greek from LCL 185:250-253). The Stoics considered the Logos, their deity, to be a power, as is attested in Sextus Empiricus *Adversus mathematicos* 9.75-76 (*SVF* 2.311). Yet, in *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* VII.147, Diogenes Laertius enumerates the many different powers that the deity possesses, demonstrating the same understanding of “power” as we have detailed above. For the significance of this passage in relation to Justin Martyr’s names for Christ and power language, see my “What’s in a Name?: Titles of Christ in Justin Martyr,” *Studia Patristica* 93 (2017): 155-164.

²⁵⁷ Origen is familiar with the type of power language we have delineated above, as a quotation from *Homilies on Exodus* demonstrates. In *HomEx* 13.4 Origen writes, “Fire, however, has a double power [*duplicem...virtutem*]: one by which it enlightens, another by which it burns” (trans. from FOTC 71:382; Latin from SC 321:388). Although they are different powers, *Regimen* I, 4 mentions two powers of fire, “the hot and the dry” (trans. from LCL 150:233).

²⁵⁸ For other passages that speak of the Spirit’s singular power, see *HomNum* 1.1.4; *ComRm* 4.8.10; *ComRm* 10.9.2. See also *FragmEz* 7.15-16 and *FragmEz* 16.11.

For I think that just as those who accept the death of Christ and mortify their members upon earth are made partakers of the likeness of His death, so also those who receive the power of the Holy Spirit [*virtutem Sancti Spiritus*] and are sanctified by Him and filled with His gifts [*donis*], themselves become doves, even as He Himself appeared in the form of a dove.²⁵⁹

Here, Origen refers to the singular power of the Spirit,²⁶⁰ while at the same time speaking of the Spirit's many gifts, a term which we have already established as a synonym for power with respect to the Spirit's diversity.²⁶¹ As we have seen, Origen also refers to the many different powers of the Spirit, for example, in *HomIs* 3. In this homily, which we examined above, he equates "seven women" with the Holy Spirit, based on a reading of Isa 11:2. Later in the homily he writes that believers should pray so that "this 'man' [i.e., Christ] might grant to us, too, communion with these 'women' and by receiving them we might become wise and understanding in God, and the other powers [*virtutes*] might adorn our soul in Christ Jesus."²⁶² As we established, the "seven women" are the seven spirits of Isa 11:2. Since wisdom and understanding are two of the spirits mentioned in Isa 11:2, then the "other powers [*virtutes*]" must denote the five other spirits in that verse—by calling the different spirits "powers," Origen

²⁵⁹ *ComCt* 3.15 (trans. from ACW 26:240; Latin from GCS 33:224).

²⁶⁰ In addition to speaking of the Holy Spirit as possessing a singular power, Origen also says that the Spirit *is* a power. In a passage of the *Commentary on John* that discusses the salvific mission of Christ, Origen writes, "Or perhaps it is also possible to say that the creation (but also the human race), in order to be set free from the slavery of corruption, was in need of an incarnate, blessed, and divine power [θείας δυνάμεως] which would also restore the things on earth to order. This activity fell, as it were, in some way to the Holy Spirit. Since the Spirit cannot bear it, he sends forth the Savior because he alone is able to bear such a great conflict" (*ComJn* 2.83; trans. from FOTC 80:115-116; Greek from GCS 10:66). Even though the Holy Spirit was not able to save humanity, the task of savior was initially given to the Spirit. This means that the Holy Spirit is a divine power, otherwise the task would have never been assigned to the Spirit. A second passage from *ComJn* also indicates that the Holy Spirit is a power. In a discussion of how sinners are able to prophesy, Origen attempts to discern "whether they [sinners] prophesy by the Holy Spirit, or from some other power [ἄλλης δυνάμεως] that is not false in so far, at least, as it bears witness to the truth" (*ComJn* 28.146; trans. from FOTC 89:370; Greek from GCS 10:411). The presence of the word "other" [ἄλλης] implies that the Spirit is also thought to be a power.

²⁶¹ See the previous part of this chapter.

²⁶² *HomIs* 3.3 (trans. from ACW 68:898; Latin from GCS 33:257).

attributes seven powers to the Holy Spirit.²⁶³ This demonstrates Origen’s use of power language to refer to the diversity of the Holy Spirit. Just as Plato is able to refer to the singular power of Apollo and several of his individual powers, Origen can speak of the singular power of the Holy Spirit while also saying that he possesses powers.

Recognizing how Origen connects power language to the unity and multiplicity of the Spirit can help us further grasp his use of the terms “spirit,” “grace,” and “gift.” Just as he uses “power” to refer to the Spirit’s unity and multiplicity, so, too, does he use the singular and plural of spirit, grace, and gift. For example, in *ComCt* 2.9 Origen writes:

The odour of the teaching that proceeds from Christ, and the fragrance of the Holy Spirit have filled the whole house of the world, or else the whole house of the Church. Or, indeed, it has filled the whole house of the soul, who has received a share in the odour of Christ, in the first place, by offering Him the gift of her faith as the ointment of spikenard, and then receiving back the grace of the Holy Spirit [*gratiam Spiritus sancti*] and the fragrance of spiritual teaching.²⁶⁴

Here, Origen speaks of the reception of the “grace of the Holy Spirit” in the singular; yet, later in *ComCt* he refers to the “graces” of the Spirit:

“The fawn of graces [*gratiarum*],” however, can be taken as denoting the Holy Spirit from whom those who thirst and long for God win spiritual graces and celestial gifts [*spirituales gratias et dona caelestia*].²⁶⁵

By understanding Origen’s use of the philosophical notion of power with respect to the Spirit’s unity and multiplicity, we can interpret his use of the singular and plural of the term “grace” in

²⁶³ This is confirmed by *HomNum* 6.3.2, for example, where Origen refers to the sevenfold power of the Holy Spirit. This passage also corresponds to the philosophical notion of power we have been discussing insofar as a power makes its recipient like the power itself. Origen explains that, if believers receive these powers, they might become wise or understanding, indicating that, for example, the spirit of wisdom from Isa 11:2 makes its recipient wise. This is a perfect example of, to use Barnes’s language, “like from like causality.” Garijo, “Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana,” 77, notes that the Spirit’s particular names “indica que el Espíritu comunica la cualidad que posee,” but he does not discuss this within the context of power language.

²⁶⁴ *ComCt* 2.9 (trans. from ACW 26:160-161; Latin from GCS 33:166).

²⁶⁵ *ComCt* 3.13 (trans. from ACW 26:225; Latin from GCS 33:214).

the same way we understand his use of “power.” The “grace of the Holy Spirit” refers to the singular grace, or power, of the Spirit; the phrase “spiritual graces” denotes the many different graces, or powers, the Spirit bestows on believers.²⁶⁶

We have demonstrated that Origen refers to the Spirit’s powers as gifts, linking the Spirit’s multiplicity with the gifts of the Spirit, but an examination of one more passage will be helpful in order to show the connection between the Spirit’s activity of giving gifts and his unity and multiplicity. In *PArch* 2.7.3 Origen writes:

But just as there are many ways of apprehending Christ, who although he is wisdom, does not exert or possess the power of wisdom in all men, but only in those who apply themselves to wisdom in him; nor, although he is called a physician, does he act as such towards all men, but only towards those who have realised their feeble and sick condition and fly to his compassion in the hope of obtaining health; so, too, I think, is it the case with the Holy Spirit, in whom is every manner of gift. For to some is granted by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to others the word of knowledge, to others faith (1 Cor 12:8-9); and thus to each individual man who is able to receive him the same Spirit becomes and is apprehended as the very thing of which he, who has been deemed worthy to partake of him, stands in need.²⁶⁷

First, Origen describes how Christ becomes different things to different people, which he elsewhere describes in terms of Christ’s *epinoiai*. As we examined in chapter one, the *epinoiai*

²⁶⁶ In addition to these examples of the singular and plural uses of the term “grace,” Origen uses the singular and plural of both “spirit” and “gift.” Any use of the title “Holy Spirit” uses the singular of “spirit,” while references to Isa 11:2, such as in *HomIs* 3.1, speak of the Holy Spirit with the plural of “spirit.” *HomLev* 8.11.15 speaks of the “gift of the grace of the Spirit [*donum...gratiae spiritus*]” (trans. from FOTC 83:175; Latin from GCS 29:417), while *ComRm* 6.14.2 utilizes the plural of “gift” when it is said that “the gifts of the Spirit [*dona spiritus*] have been shared with us” (trans. from FOTC 104:58; Latin from Bammel 2:538).

²⁶⁷ *PArch* 2.7.3 (trans. from Butterworth 118; Latin from Görgemanns 376). *Sicut autem multi sunt intellectus de Christo, qui utique quamvis ‘sapientia’ sit, non tamen in omnibus sapientiae agit aut obtinet vim nisi in his, qui in ipso sapientiae student, neque cum ‘medicus’ dicatur, erga omnes quasi medicus agit, sed erga illos tantum, qui aegritudinis suae intellecto languore confugiunt ad misericordiam eius, ut possint consequi sanitatem: ita arbitror etiam de spiritu sancto, in quo omnis est natura donorum. ‘Aliis namque praebetur per spiritum sermo sapientiae, aliis sermo scientiae, aliis fides’; et ita per singulos, qui eum capere possunt, hoc efficitur vel hoc intellegitur ipse spiritus, quo indiget ille, qui eum participare meruerit.*

refer to the many different things Christ becomes for creation,²⁶⁸ even though Christ remains a single being.²⁶⁹ Origen goes on to say that the Holy Spirit should be thought of in the same way with respect to his gifts—the Spirit becomes many things to many different people, so the Spirit’s multiplicity correlates to the many gifts he offers to believers. The analogy with Christ, though, indicates that Origen also views the Spirit as one, which corresponds to the fact that the Spirit possesses an individual *hypostasis*.²⁷⁰ Origen’s use of the philosophical notion of power, therefore, enables him to describe the Spirit’s unity and multiplicity—the Holy Spirit, as a single being, possesses a singular power, but also possesses many powers according to the different gifts he distributes to believers.

Although he employs power language to describe the Spirit’s unity and multiplicity, Origen utilizes only the elements of the philosophical notion of power that he thinks are useful. He does not ascribe to the Hippocratic belief that each being is also a mixture of powers, at least with respect to the Holy Spirit. Two pieces of evidence show this to be the case. First, *PArch* 2.7.3 states that the Holy Spirit should be understood in the same way as the Son, and the Son’s multiplicity does not pertain to his substance, which is one.²⁷¹ Origen says this same thing about

²⁶⁸ See *ComJn* 1.119, which reads, “Our Savior...because of the many things, since God ‘set’ him ‘forth as a propitiation’ (cf. Rom. 3:25) and firstfruits of all creation (cf. Jas 1:18), becomes many things, or perhaps even all these things, as the whole creation which can be made free needs him (cf. Rom. 8:21)” (trans. from FOTC 80:58).

²⁶⁹ See *ComJn* 1.200, which reads, “But let no one take offense when we distinguish the aspects [ἐπινοίας] in the Savior, thinking that we also do the same with his essence [οὐσία]” (trans. from FOTC 80:74; Greek from GCS 10:36).

²⁷⁰ The similarity between the Son’s unity and multiplicity and the Spirit’s is even closer than *PArch* 2.7.3 indicates, because Origen also uses the singular and plural forms of “power” to refer to the Son’s unity and multiplicity. For example, Origen says in *ComJn* 1.242 that Christ “is truly the ‘power of God’ (1 Cor 1:24) [ἀληθῶς εἶναι >δύναμιν θεοῦ<]” (trans. from FOTC 80:82; Greek from GCS 10:43), but elsewhere describes Christ’s many *epinoiai* as powers: “Christ is indeed one in essence [*unum...per substantiam*] but may be designated in many ways [*multa*] according to his powers [*virtutibus*] and operations [*operationibus*]” (*ComRm* 5.6.7; trans. from FOTC 103:348, altered; Latin from Bammel 2.416).

²⁷¹ *ComJn* 1.200. See fn. 269 above.

the Spirit in *HomNum* 6.3.2, when he indicates that the Spirit’s diversity is a matter of names, not of substance.²⁷² Second, Origen says that the Holy Spirit cannot be divided as a material substance, because the Spirit is incorporeal.²⁷³

Because Origen views the Holy Spirit as a single being who cannot be divided, the individual powers of the Spirit should be understood as the whole Spirit, not parts of a whole. Origen offers an analogy for how to think of the distribution of the Spirit in *HomNum* 6.3.2. There, he explains that the Spirit is like a lamp which lights other lamps—the source is not diminished, while each lamp is lit.²⁷⁴ Origen’s description of the Spirit’s unity and diversity in *HomIs* 3.1 supports this point. Origen makes clear that the seven spirits, or powers, are one, but also says that “the Spirit of God is [*est*] ‘the spirit of wisdom and of understanding, the spirit of counsel and of virtue, the spirit of knowledge and of piety, the spirit of the fear of the Lord [Isa 11:2].’”²⁷⁵ By using the term “is [*est*],” Origen establishes that the powers of the Spirit are the Spirit itself. Therefore, when he speaks of a single power of the Holy Spirit, he is at the same time denoting the whole Spirit.

By re-interpreting the traditional understanding of the sevenfold Spirit in terms of a philosophical notion of power, Origen has preserved the Spirit’s unity while explaining how the Spirit can distribute many different gifts. Because he appeals to the sevenfold Spirit in explaining

²⁷² See part 3.1 above.

²⁷³ *HomNum* 6.2.1. “You should not understand the words: ‘Taking from the Spirit of Moses, he gave the Spirit to the seventy elders,’ as though God is removing some material and physical substance from Moses and dividing it into seventy portions, and as though he were giving a scanty particle to each of the elders. It is impious to understand the nature of the Holy Spirit in this way. But attend to the figure of these mysterious words in the following manner. It is as if Moses, and the Spirit who was in Moses, were the lamp of some very brilliant light from which God kindled seventy other lamps. The principal splendor of that light came to the others in such a manner that the very origin of the light suffered no loss from the sharing of its source” (trans. from ACT 21).

²⁷⁴ See the previous footnote.

²⁷⁵ *HomIs* 3.1, emphasis added (trans. from ACW 68:894; Latin from GCS 33:253).

the Spirit's multiplicity, he could be read as saying that there are only seven spiritual gifts. This, however, cannot be the case, as he refers to more than seven gifts of the Spirit throughout his corpus.²⁷⁶ A fragment from Origen's writings on Luke suggests a reason for this discrepancy.

Origen is expositing Luke 11:24, describing how Satan dwells in the unbelievers of Israel:

He [Satan] found that they no longer had anything divine in them; they were deserted, and ready for him to dwell in them. Clearly he dwelt in them with all his power. The passage seems to make this clear when it says that "seven other spirits [ἑπτὰ...ἕτερα πνεύματα]" (Luke 11:26) were with him. The divine Scripture usually applies this number to a multitude [πλήθους], as when it says that "the sterile woman bore seven [ἑπτὰ] children, and the woman with many children has grown weak" (1 Sam 2:5).²⁷⁷

According to Origen, the number seven can indicate a multitude; it does not need to be understood as indicating exactly seven things. This being the case, we can understand the Spirit's sevenfoldness to indicate the different gifts or powers of the Spirit, with the sevenfoldness designating multiplicity, rather than a literal list of seven gifts.²⁷⁸ Origen, therefore, uses a philosophical notion of power to interpret the early Christian understanding of the Holy Spirit as one and seven, doing so to explain how the Spirit can remain one while distributing many different gifts.

²⁷⁶ Origen says that there is "every manner of gift" in the Spirit in *PArch* 2.7.3 (trans. from Butterworth 118). He explicitly mentions different gifts here and elsewhere. In *PArch* 2.7.3 he references 1 Cor 12:8-9, speaking of the gifts of wisdom, knowledge, and faith. Since he applies Isa 11:2 to the Spirit's diversity, it follows that each of the spirits mentioned in Isa 11:2 are gifts. Origen mentions the gift of discernment of spirits in *HomEx* 3.2 and *HomNum* 27.11.2. In *HomISam* 28.9.1-2, the Holy Spirit is the one who grants the prophetic gift to Samuel. *ComRm* 1.1.4 mentions "knowledge and prophecy and other gifts of the Holy Spirit" (trans. from FOTC 103:62).

²⁷⁷ *FragmLc* 185 (trans. from FOTC 94:198-199; Greek from GCS 49:304).

²⁷⁸ Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 42-51, offers a similar opinion regarding Clement's descriptions of the *protocists*, arguing that certain elements of Clement's account should not be interpreted literally, but as designating an "interior transformation" (p. 44).

Chapter Conclusion

Origen understands the Holy Spirit to be one, but also to possess a number of spiritual gifts that he distributes to believers. In order to explain the Spirit's unity and multiplicity, Origen interprets the traditional understanding of the Spirit as one and seven in terms of the philosophical notion of power. By doing so, he is able to refer to the many powers, or gifts, of the Spirit while maintaining that the Spirit is a single being possessing a singular power. The philosophical notion of power, therefore, allows Origen to uphold the unity of the Holy Spirit and explain how that one being could also distribute any number of gifts that believers need. Having now shown how Origen conceives of the gifts in relation to the Spirit, we now turn to Spirit's activity of giving the gifts and how this relates to the activities of the Father and Son.

Chapter Four: The Activity of the Holy Spirit

Scholars have often pointed to the Holy Spirit's role in the giving of spiritual gifts and the inspiration of Scripture, but have not provided a detailed analysis of the Spirit's activities.²⁷⁹ As a result, scholars have overemphasized certain activities of the Spirit and neglected others. Furthermore, scholars have failed to locate the Spirit's activity within the context of his relationship with the Father and Son. This chapter offers a corrective to these previous accounts, providing a more comprehensive examination of the Spirit's activities. I will argue that Origen conceives of the Spirit's activities as a common operation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a

²⁷⁹ While many scholars mention the Spirit's role in the giving of gifts, most emphasize the Spirit's function in the sanctification of believers: Swete, *The Holy Spirit*, 130; Hauschild, *Gottes Geist*, 138; Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia*, 132; Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist*, 225-228; Berthold, "Origen and the Holy Spirit," 444; Argarate, "The Holy Spirit in *Prin I, 3*," 44-45; and Bruns, *Trinität und Kosmos*, 135-136. The focus on sanctification comes from Origen's comments in *PArch* 1.3.7-8, but such readings do not sufficiently take into account other comments in *PArch* or the rest of Origen's corpus, as we will see below. Other scholars, while emphasizing the Spirit's role in sanctification, also highlight the Spirit's activity of giving gifts: Crouzel, *Origen*, 201-202; and Rius-Camps, *El dinamismo trinitario*, 23-31, 155. Still others have focused on the Spirit's role in the giving of gifts, not just sanctification: Garijo, "Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana III," 310-316; McDonnell, "Does Origen Have a Trinitarian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit?," 22-23; and Tite, "The Holy Spirit's Role in Origen's Trinitarian System," 154-156. Finally, Ronald Kydd, "Origen and the Gifts of the Spirit," *Église et Théologie* 13 (1982): 111-116, examines only whether or not the spiritual gifts existed in Origen's time as they had during the Apostolic period.

For a selection on scholarship on the Spirit's role in Scripture, see Argarate, "The Holy Spirit in *Prin I,3*," 31-32; Berthold, "Origen and the Holy Spirit," 444; Hauschild, *Gottes Geist und der Mensch*, 128; Henri de Lubac, *History and Spirit: The Understanding of Scripture according to Origen*, trans. A.E. Nash and J. Merriell (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2007), 361; Peter Martens, *Origen and Scripture: The Contours of the Exegetical Life*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 181-186, 194-200; Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia*, 132-134; Trigg, *Origen*, 101-102; and Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele*, 225-228. For Origen's teaching on the inspiration of Scripture more generally, see Daniélou, *Origen*, 139-173; Henri de Lubac, *History and Spirit*, 337-348; R.P.C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture* (London: SCM Press, 1959), 187-258; Enrique Nardoni, "Origen's Concept of Biblical Interpretation," *The Second Century* 4 (1984): 9-23; Crouzel, *Origen*, 61-84; Karen Jo Torjesen, *Hermeneutical Procedure and Theological Method in Origen's Exegesis* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986), 108-147; Hermann Josef Vogt, "Die Lehre des Origenes von der Inspiration der Heiligen Schrift," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 170 (1990): 97-103; Martens, *Origen and Scripture*, 193-226.

logic that supports his hierarchical understanding of the Trinity and explains how he is able to attribute the Spirit's activities to the Father and Son.

In order to demonstrate this thesis, I have divided this chapter into three parts. In the first part I will argue that Origen conceives of the spiritual gifts as originating in the Father, flowing to the Son, and then to the Holy Spirit, who distributes the gifts to believers—a scheme that reflects the Holy Spirit's rank in relation to the Father and Son and corresponds to Origen's theology of creation.²⁸⁰ I will further argue that this scheme enables him to assign the giving of gifts to any one of the three, since all three are responsible for the activity. In the second part I will offer a more comprehensive understanding of the Spirit's activities by examining several activities of the Spirit that have received little scholarly attention. I will argue that these activities are aspects of the gifts of holiness, the recognition of which enables us to understand why Origen describes holiness as preceding all other gifts. Finally, in the third part I will argue that the Spirit's activities of the inspiration and interpretation of Scripture are a common operation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, which allows us to understand why Origen also predicates these activities of the Father and Son.

4.1: The Holy Spirit as the Giver of Gifts

Origen supplies two detailed accounts of the Spirit's gift-giving activity, one in *ComJn* 2.77-78 and one in *PArch* 1.3.7-8. In this part of the chapter I will provide an exegesis of each of these passages, focusing on the role that 1 Cor 12:4-6 plays in Origen's pneumatology. Scholars have drawn attention to these passages, and especially Origen's use of 1 Cor 12:4-6 in them, to point out that Origen conceives of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as having roles in the

²⁸⁰ As we saw in chapter one, creation occurs by the Father and through the Son. Gifts also begin in the Father and move to the Son, but with the Holy Spirit as a mediator between the Son and creation.

distribution of spiritual gifts.²⁸¹ However, no scholar has interpreted the Spirit’s activity in light of the Spirit’s relationship with the Father, Son, or other created beings. Doing so, I argue, helps us better understand how the gifts come to believers in a scheme that reflects the ontological rank of the three—Origen believes that the gifts begin in the Father, before flowing first to the Son, then to the Holy Spirit. By recognizing that the giving of gifts is a common operation of the three, we are able to explain why Origen attributes this activity to the Father and Son, in addition to the Holy Spirit.

4.1.1: The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit and the Giving of Gifts

Origen’s most-detailed statement on the Holy Spirit’s role in the giving of gifts occurs in *ComJn* 2.77-78, which reads:

I think, if I may put it this way, that the Holy Spirit supplies the material of the gifts from God to those who are called saints [ἁγίοις] thanks to him and because of participation [μετοχήν] in him. This material of the gifts which I mentioned is made effective from God [ἐνεργουμένης...ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ]; it is administered by Christ [διακονουμένης...ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ]; but it subsists in accordance with the Holy Spirit [ὑφεστώσης...κατὰ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα]. Paul moves me to assume that these things are this way when he writes somewhere of gifts as follows: “Now there are diversities of gifts [διαίρέσεις...χαρισμάτων], but the same Spirit; and there are diversities of ministries

²⁸¹ Several scholars have pointed to Origen’s use of 1 Cor 12:4-6 in his discussions of the spiritual gifts, usually to highlight the common operation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in bestowing the gifts on believers. See Rius-Camps, *El dinamismo trinitario*, 20-23, 28; Crouzel, *Origen*, 191-192; McDonnell, “Does Origen Have a Trinitarian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit?,” 22-23; Franz Dünzl, *Pneuma: Funktionen des theologischen Begriffs in frühchristlicher Literatur* (Münster: Aschendorffsche, 2000), 372-373; and Garijo, “Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana III,” 310-312. Garijo provides the most extensive discussion of the topic, as we will see below. He also discusses the fact that the Father is the source of all gifts in “Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana,” 199.

Three scholars have discussed the significance of 1 Cor 12:4-6 only in terms of Origen’s views of sanctification. See Simonetti, *Studi sulla cristologia*, 132-133; Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist*, 217-218; and Bruns, *Trinität und Kosmos*, 135-137, 142-153. Simonetti and Ziebritzki argue that Origen’s statement in *PArch* 1.3.7 that “nothing in the Trinity can be called greater or less” should be read within the context of the common operation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in sanctification. Bruns refutes this reading persuasively, but still concludes, along with Simonetti and Ziebritzki, that Origen’s use of 1 Cor 12:4-6 applies to the sanctification of believers.

[δαιρέσεις διακονιῶν], and the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations [δαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων], and it is the same God who works all in all” (1 Cor 12:4-6).²⁸²

Believers receive the gifts from the Holy Spirit by participating [μετοχήν] in him, a relationship Origen expresses in several other places of his corpus.²⁸³ As we examined in chapters one and two, Origen uses the term “participation” in order to express the relationship that exists when a being lower in ontological rank receives something from a higher being. By characterizing the Holy Spirit’s relationship with believers as one of participation, Origen indicates that they receive the spiritual gifts from a higher being, the Holy Spirit. Here he states that “those who are called saints [ἁγίοις]” are able to participate in the Spirit. A clearer statement of his thinking may be found in *PArch* 1.3.7 where he writes: “Thus, therefore, the working of the power of God the Father and God the Son is spread indiscriminately over all created beings [*omnem...creaturam*], but a share [*participationem*] in the Holy Spirit is possessed, we find, by the saints [*sanctis*] alone.”²⁸⁴ In addition to noting the Spirit’s work among only the saints, this passage contrasts the activity of the Holy Spirit with the activity of the Father and Son, whose actions spread to all created beings. This distinction, along with Origen’s use of participation language, reaffirms the hierarchical arrangement we observed in earlier chapters. The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are the only beings in whom others participate; all other beings participate, differentiating them from

²⁸² *ComJn* 2.77-78 (trans. from FOTC 80:114; Greek from GCS 10:65). οἶμαι δὲ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τήν, ἴν’ οὕτως εἶπω, ὕλην τῶν ἀπὸ θεοῦ χαρισμάτων παρέχειν τοῖς δι’ αὐτὸ καὶ τήν μετοχήν αὐτοῦ χρηματίζουσιν ἁγίοις, τῆς εἰρημένης ὕλης τῶν χαρισμάτων ἐνεργουμένης μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, διακονουμένης δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ, ὑφεστώσης δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. καὶ κινεῖ με εἰς τὸ ταῦθ’ οὕτως ἔχειν ὑπολαβεῖν Παῦλος περὶ χαρισμάτων οὕτω που γράφων· ‘Δαιρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ, τὸ δ’ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα· καὶ δαιρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσὶ, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος· καὶ δαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσὶ, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ἐστὶ θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν.’

²⁸³ See *PArch* 1.1.3; *PArch* 1.3.8; *ComRm* 8.13.8 (trans. from FOTC 104:189), where the Holy Spirit is called “holiness”; and *ComRm* 10.11.4 (trans. from FOTC 104:278), where the Holy Spirit is called the “fount of sanctification.”

²⁸⁴ *PArch* 1.3.7 (trans. from Butterworth 36-37; Latin from Gōrgemanns 176). Origen says or implies on three occasions that the Holy Spirit is given to all. For more on this, see fn. 369 in Chapter Five.

the Father, Son, and Spirit. Yet, only believers participate in the Spirit, while all beings participate in the Father and Son. This suggests that the Spirit is ranked below the Father and Son because his power extends to believers only, as opposed to all beings.²⁸⁵

Believers who participate in the Holy Spirit receive spiritual gifts, but the gifts do not come through the Spirit alone, as Origen relates through an exegesis of 1 Cor 12:4-6. While he writes that the material of the gifts “subsists in accordance with the Holy Spirit [ὑφ’εστώσης...κατὰ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα],”²⁸⁶ he also states that it “is made effective from God [ἐνεργουμένης...ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ]; [and] it is administered by Christ [διακονουμένης...ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ].”²⁸⁷ The importance of 1 Cor 12:4-6 to this account is illustrated by the fact that Origen cites the passage immediately after this statement, making clear that the Father’s activity of effecting [ἐνεργέω] the gifts and the Son’s activity of ministering [διακονέω] the gifts draw upon the language of the passage: “...and there are diversities of ministries [διακονιῶν], and the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations [ἐνεργημάτων], and it is the same God who works all in all” (1 Cor 12:4-6). Just as Origen describes creative activity as beginning in the Father,

²⁸⁵ Origen indicates in *PArch* 1.3.7 that some believe the Spirit to be greater than the Father and Son because the Spirit’s activity is reserved for believers, who possess a higher dignity than others. Origen explicitly denies that this is the case. For this reason, frag. 9 from Justinian’s *Epistula ad Mennam*, while contentious, accurately portrays Origen’s theology. It reads, “The God and Father, who holds the universe together, is superior to every being that exists, for he imparts to each one from his own existence that which each one is; the Son, being less than the Father, is superior to rational creatures alone (for he is second to the Father); the Holy Spirit is still less, and dwells within the saints alone. So that in this way the power of the Father is greater than that of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and that of the Son is more than that of the Holy Spirit, and in turn the power of the Holy Spirit exceeds that of every other holy being” (trans. from Butterworth 33-34). This passage reflects the hierarchical ranking we saw between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in chapters 1-3, a relationship which is reflected in the distribution of the gifts as we will see below. Since the Holy Spirit acts only on believers, based on Origen’s pneumatology and Trinitarian theology, it is logical that the Holy Spirit has less power than the Father and Son.

²⁸⁶ We will examine the phrase “material of the gifts” in the following chapter.

²⁸⁷ *ComJn* 2.77 (trans. from FOTC 80:114; Greek from GCS 10:65). τῆς εἰρημένης ὕλης τῶν χαρισμάτων ἐνεργουμένης μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, διακονουμένης δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ, ὑφ’εστώσης δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα.

moving through the Son, and then to created beings, so he describes the gifts in the same manner, with the addition of the Holy Spirit as a mediator between the Son and believers.²⁸⁸ This relationship reflects the hierarchical relationship that exists between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a relationship that Origen has just delineated in *ComJn* 2.75-76 when he established the Spirit is made by the Father through Christ.²⁸⁹

Origen follows this same pattern in *PArch* 1.3.7, where he again employs 1 Cor 12:4-6 in his explanation of the giving of gifts:

There is, however, a special activity [*inoperatio praecipua*] of God the Father, beyond that which he exercised on all things in giving them natural life [*ut essent naturaliter*]. There is also a special ministry [*praecipuum...ministerium*] of the Lord Jesus Christ towards those on whom he confers the natural gift of reason [*naturaliter ut rationabiles sint confert*], by means of which well-being is bestowed upon them in addition to mere existence. There is yet another grace [*gratia*] of the Holy Spirit bestowed upon such as are worthy, a grace ministered [*ministrata*] indeed through Christ, but put into operation [*inoperata*] by the Father in proportion to the merits of those who become capable of receiving it. This is most clearly pointed out by the apostle Paul, when he is explaining that the power of the Trinity is one and the same, in the passage where he says, “There are diversities of gifts [*donorum*], but the same spirit; and there are diversities of ministrations [*ministeriorum*], but the same Lord; and there are diversities of workings [*operationum*], but the same God, who worketh all things in all. But to each one is given the manifestation of the spirit as is profitable” (1 Cor 12:4-7). Here we are most clearly shown that there is no separation in the Trinity, but that this which is called the “gift of the spirit” [*donum spiritus*] is ministered [*ministratur*] through the Son and worked [*inoperatur*] by God the Father.²⁹⁰

²⁸⁸ Garijo, “Aspectos de la Pneumatología Origeniana III,” 316, correctly observes that, even though the Holy Spirit receives certain characteristics from the Son, “esto no excluye una mediación del Espíritu Santo para con las criaturas.”

²⁸⁹ For a larger discussion of *ComJn* 2.75-76, see chapters two and three.

²⁹⁰ *PArch* 1.3.7 (trans. from Butterworth 37-38; Latin from Görgemanns 178). The reference to “no separation in the Trinity,” Butterworth notes, is probably an interpolation by Rufinus. See Origen, *On First Principles*, trans. G.W. Butterworth (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 38, n. 2. The authenticity of the other reference to the Trinity in this passage should also be questioned. However, the rest of the passage parallels Origen’s account of the distribution of the gifts in *ComJn* 2.77-78.

In the first part of the passage, Origen writes that the Father bestows existence on all creation, while the Son bestows reason—a statement similar to the one he makes in *ComJn* 2.20.²⁹¹ This creative activity corresponds to the Father’s and Son’s roles in creation as we discussed in chapter one.²⁹² In addition to their functions with respect to creation, the Father has a special operation [*inoperatio praecipua*] and the Son a special ministry [*praecipuum...ministerium*]. Origen goes on to explain that the grace of the Holy Spirit is put into operation [*inoperata*] by the Father and ministered [*ministrata*] by the Son, after which he appeals to 1 Cor 12:4-6 for support. The special operation [*inoperatio praecipua*] of the Father and the special ministry [*praecipuum...ministerium*] of the Son refer to their functions in the giving of the grace of the Holy Spirit. As in *ComJn* 2.77-78 the activities of the Father and Son correspond to the terms in

²⁹¹ “The reason which is in each rational being has the same position in relation to the Word which is in the beginning with God, which is God the Word, which God the Word has with God. For as the Father is very God and true God in relation to the image and images of the image (wherefore also men are said to be ‘according to the image’ [cf. Gen 1:26], not ‘images’), so is the very Word in relation to the reason in each one. For both hold the place of a source; the Father, that of divinity, the Son, that of reason” (trans. from FOTC 80:99-100). Here, however, the Father grants divinity, rather than being.

²⁹² See especially part 1.2. Origen’s statement in *PArch* 1.3.7 that there is “another grace” [*alia...gratia*] of the Holy Spirit implies that the Spirit also has a role in creation and the giving of attributes, but this contradicts the fact that the Holy Spirit receives all it is through the Son, just as the rest of created beings (see chapters two and three). Given the strong emphasis on Trinitarian unity directly before and in the midst of this passage, I think it likely that this passage has been interpolated. Garijo, “Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana,” 196-198, and Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele*, 216-217, have both written that there is no distinction between the Spirit’s two different activities that the phrase “another grace” implies. The two scholars, however, differ in their reading of the passage. Garijo believes *PArch* 1.3.7 has very little value because of Rufinus’s interpolations, whereas Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele*, 216-220, reads *PArch* 1.3.7 within the context of the sanctifying work accomplished together by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. While I agree with Garijo’s assessment that this passage contains interpolations, I also believe that the passage offers more insight into Origen’s theology than he allows. Ziebritzki’s reading, though admirable, does not take seriously the possibility that Rufinus has altered this passage and, therefore, emphasizes the unity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit beyond what Origen says elsewhere. Ziebritzki also highlights the Spirit’s role in sanctification, rather than seeing that 1 Cor 12:4-6 and Origen’s other comments apply to all of the Spirit’s gifts.

1 Cor 12:4-6.²⁹³ For Origen, then, 1 Cor 12:4-6 functions as the explanation for how the gifts come to believers—he believes gifts originate in the Father, flow to the Son, then to the Holy Spirit, who distributes them.²⁹⁴

²⁹³ The phrase used of the Father—“put into operation [*inoperata*]”—refers to the Father’s position as origin of the gifts, which Origen reiterates later in *PArch* 1.3.8: “And while pointing out the distinction of each separate gift [Paul] refers them all to the fount [*fontem*] of the universe when he says, ‘There are diversities of workings, but one God, who worketh all things in all’ (1 Cor 12:6)” (trans. from Butterworth 38; Latin from Görgemanns 180). As he does elsewhere of the Father, Origen here utilizes source language in order to highlight the Father’s position as the origin of all things (see part 1.1 of Chapter One for more passages on the Father as source).

Although Origen uses the term “ministers” because of its appearance in 1 Cor 12:4-6, compare the use of the same term in *ComJn* 2.17 and 2.76. In both cases, “ministers” refers to a relationship in which the Son is ranked above another being with whom he shares certain attributes. The same understanding is present here, as the Son is ranked above the Holy Spirit and shares the gifts with him, enabling the Spirit to distribute them to creation.

²⁹⁴ In his interpretation of 1 Cor 12:4-6, Origen discusses the Holy Spirit’s gifts; he does not talk only of the gift of sanctification. Scholars who have understood Origen’s interpretation of 1 Cor 12:4-6 as applying only to the gift of sanctification, therefore, are incorrect (see fn. 281 above). In the face of such clear statements on the Spirit’s role in the giving of gifts, it is puzzling why scholars have drawn so much attention to the Spirit’s role in sanctification. Perhaps it is because Origen assigns the role of sanctification specifically to the Holy Spirit in *PArch* 1.3.8, where he writes: “God the Father bestows on all the gift of existence; and a participation in Christ, in virtue of his being the word or reason, makes them rational. From this it follows that they are worthy of praise or blame, because they are capable alike of virtue and of wickedness. Accordingly there is also available the grace of the Holy Spirit, that those beings who are not holy in essence may be made holy by participating in this grace. When therefore they obtain first of all their existence from God the Father, and secondly their rational nature from the Word, and thirdly their holiness from the Holy Spirit, they become capable of receiving Christ afresh in his character of the righteousness of God, those, that is, who have been previously sanctified through the Holy Spirit; and such as have been deemed worthy of advancing to this degree through the sanctification of the Holy Spirit obtain in addition the gift of wisdom by the power of the working of God’s Spirit. This is what I think Paul means when he says that ‘to some is given the word of wisdom, to others the word of knowledge, by the same spirit’ (1 Cor 12:8)” (trans. from Butterworth 38). Origen here appears to outline a creative and salvific causal chain in which the Father gives existence, the Son grants reason, and the Holy Spirit sanctifies believers. Yet, he also declares that those who are sanctified by the Spirit receive the gift of wisdom, referencing 1 Cor 12:8 to support his position. In fact, this section from *PArch* 1.3.8 proceeds Origen’s exegesis of 1 Cor 12:4-6, where the Holy Spirit is said to be the giver of gifts in general, with no mention of sanctification. When *PArch* 1.3.8 is read within the context of Origen’s exegesis of 1 Cor 12:4-6, then, it could be said that Origen emphasizes the Spirit’s role in sanctification in *PArch* 1.3.8, but, if so, he just emphasizes it. For he clearly states that the Spirit is responsible for the distribution of other spiritual gifts.

This account corresponds to Origen’s belief that creation also flows from its source, the Father, to the Son, then to created beings, now, however, with the addition of the Holy Spirit as a mediator between the Son and believers.²⁹⁵ This correspondence between the account of creation and the account of the gifts reveals a logical pattern fundamental to Origen’s thinking—the hierarchical arrangement of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in economic matters mirrors the ontological rank of the three. Therefore, the Holy Spirit is ranked below the Father and Son ontologically and economically.²⁹⁶

An explanation for this emphasis on sanctification can be found in an analysis of a fragment from the *Commentary on Ephesians*, which reads, “And one must investigate if the phrase ‘Holy Spirit of promise’ is used anywhere and what meaning one must take for the phrase ‘the Holy Spirit of the promise’. In my opinion, just as the Holy Spirit makes that person holy on whom he comes, and ‘the spirit of’ the ‘wisdom’ makes one wise, and the ‘spirit of’ the ‘understanding’ makes one understanding (Isa 11:2), so also the one on whom ‘the Spirit of the promise’ comes is, perhaps, already in the promise” (*ComEp* 8; trans. from Heine 103). Origen often attributes the giving of a specific gift, “X,” to the “spirit of X.” For example, in the current passage, Origen says that wisdom is given by “the spirit of the wisdom” and knowledge by “the spirit of the knowledge.” This is especially the case in passages that utilize Isa 11:2, such as *HomNum* 6.3.2 or *HomIs* 3. However, this passage reveals that Origen refers to the giving of the gift of holiness with the name “Holy Spirit,” rather than the “spirit of holiness.” This indicates that Origen associates the gift of holiness with the name “Holy Spirit,” whereas with other gifts he often designates the Holy Spirit according to the particular gift he is discussing—for example, wisdom is given by the spirit of wisdom. I suggest that this is the reason why Origen sometimes emphasizes the Spirit’s role in sanctification. Origen considers the Holy Spirit to be the giver of all gifts, but the Holy Spirit’s very name is the one that Origen associates with the gift of holiness, causing him to associate holiness with the Holy Spirit more often than other gifts, thereby explaining his occasional emphasis on sanctification.

²⁹⁵ This is similar to the distinction Balas, “The Idea of Participation,” 264-272, draws between natural and supernatural participation. Origen’s assertion that the Holy Spirit is involved with the giving of gifts but not creation is the result of his belief that only believers are able to participate in the Spirit.

²⁹⁶ While several scholars have made a distinction between an ontological subordination and an economic subordination, most maintain that Origen views the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as equal ontologically, but not economically. The exception is Bruns, *Trinität und Kosmos*, who structures his work on this distinction, but concludes, based on the common operations between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit with respect to creation, revelation, and salvation, that the three are equal economically, but not ontologically. Common operations does not, however, necessitate that the three are equal.

Recognizing this logical pattern further allows us to understand that participation in the Spirit is also a participation in the Father and Son. Origen understands the creative activity of the Father and Son to involve participation in both, as we can see in *ComJn* 2.17. There, he says that “everything, besides the very God [τὸ αὐτόθεος]” is made God “by participation [μετοχή] in his divinity.”²⁹⁷ He adds that all those who participate in God’s divinity aside from the Son also “share [μεταδίδομι]” in the Son,²⁹⁸ a term he uses elsewhere to denote participation.²⁹⁹ Because Origen’s logic with respect to the creative activity of the Father and Son is the same as his logic with respect to the gifts, albeit with the addition of the Holy Spirit, we can understand a participation in the Spirit to be a participation in the Father and Son. This can explain why Origen writes in *PArch* 1.3.5 that “he who is ‘born again through God’ to salvation has need of Father and Son and Holy Spirit and will not obtain salvation apart from the entire Trinity, and why it is impossible to become partaker [*participem*] of the Father or the Son without the Holy Spirit.”³⁰⁰ Because the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit operate in common to give spiritual gifts, then participating in the Holy Spirit necessarily involves participating in the Father and Son.³⁰¹

Based on his interpretation of 1 Cor 12:4-6, I have argued that Origen conceives of the gifts as a common operation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Furthermore, this common

²⁹⁷ *ComJn* 2.17 (trans. from FOTC 80:99; Greek from GCS 10:54).

²⁹⁸ *ComJn* 2.17 (trans. from FOTC 80:99; Greek from GCS 10:55).

²⁹⁹ See *CCels* 6.64, which demonstrates that Origen considers the term μεταδίδομι to express the same relationship as μετοχή/μετέχω. For more on this, see fn. 33 in Chapter One.

³⁰⁰ *PArch* 1.3.5 (trans. from Butterworth 33, slightly altered; Latin from Görgemanns 168). While the mention of the “Trinity” is a reason to suspect that this passage has been interpolated, it corresponds with Origen’s theology as we have elucidated it. Furthermore, passages from Origen’s corpus preserved in Greek suggest the necessity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit for salvation. See *HomJr* 8.1.2 and *HomJr* 18.9.1.

³⁰¹ This is not to say that one cannot participate in the Father and Son without the Holy Spirit in matters aside from the gifts; indeed, we have seen that this is the case in regards to creation, since the Father creates all things, including the Holy Spirit, through the Son. However, it is true that in salvific matters related to the gifts, one must participate in the Holy Spirit, which involves participation in the Father and the Son as well. For another passage that demonstrates that all three are necessary for salvation, see *HomJr* 18.9.1.

operation corresponds to his hierarchical account of the Trinity—the gifts begin in the Father, flow to the Son, then to the Holy Spirit. As a result, participating in the Spirit means participating in the Father and Son as well. Having shown that the giving of gifts is a common operation of the three, we can now explain why Origen appears to conflate the activities of the Son and the Spirit, the subject of the next section.

4.1.2: The Gifts of the Spirit and the Son

Origen's account of the distribution of the spiritual gifts—that the gifts begin in the Father, flow to the Son, and then to the Holy Spirit, who distributes the gifts to believers—can explain Origen's apparent inconsistency in attributing the spiritual gifts to the Son. Scholars have drawn attention to Origen's conflation of the activities of the Son and Holy Spirit. This has led some scholars to conclude that Origen had difficulty fitting the Holy Spirit into his system, since he was unable to differentiate the Spirit's activities from the Son.³⁰² Others have gone so far as to say that Origen's logic is binitarian in orientation since the Son performs all the activities of the Spirit, making the latter unnecessary.³⁰³ However, by understanding the distribution of spiritual

³⁰² Kilian McDonnell, "Does Origen Have a Trinitarian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit?", *Gregorianum* 75.1 (1994): 23-24, 26-30; Manlio Simonetti, "Spirito Santo," *Origene Dizionario: la cultura, il pensiero, le opere*, ed. by Adele Monaci Castagno, 450-456 (Rome: Città Nuova, 2000), 453; Joseph Trigg, *Origen: The Bible and Philosophy in the Third-Century Church* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983), 101-2.

³⁰³ Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. Neil Buchanan (New York: Dover Publications, 1961), 2.357, exemplifies this way of thinking in his statement, "In order to comply with the rule of faith, and for this reason alone, for his speculation did not require a Spirit in addition to the Logos, Origen also placed the Spirit alongside of Father and Son." Harnack adds on 2.358, "As the third hypostasis, Origen reckoned him part of the constant divine essence and so treated him after the analogy of the Son, without producing an impressive proof of the necessity of this hypostasis." See also Hal Koch, *Pronoia und Paideusis: Studien über Origenes und sein Verhältnis zum Platonismus* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1932), 18, n. 1; and Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, *Gottes Geist und der Mensch: Studien zur frühchristlichen Pneumatologie*, Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 63 (München: C. Kaiser Verlag, 1972), 136-8, although Hauschild concedes that the Holy Spirit did essential work for salvation. Henning Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele: Das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern*,

gifts as involving all three members of the Trinity, I will argue that Origen is able to attribute the giving of spiritual gifts to any one of the three without excluding the others, since each is, in part, responsible for the gifts.³⁰⁴ In order to demonstrate this reading, I will review passages in which Origen assigns the giving of gifts to the Son, while also looking at how these passages support the reading of a single activity that flows from the Father to the Son, then to the Holy Spirit. This will show that accusations of binitarianism fail to grasp Origen's theology of the spiritual gifts, which can account for his practice of associating the gifts with either the Son or the Holy Spirit.

As we have seen, the Holy Spirit grants gifts to believers, such as wisdom and understanding. Yet, Origen assigns this same activity to the Son, for example, in the following passage from *ComCt*:

The Word of God is called wisdom and power and the treasure of knowledge, and many other things...He makes those to be wise and understanding and strong in virtue, for whom He is made to be wisdom and understanding, but does so not all at once, but by certain stages and steps, according to the diligence and application and faith of these sharers [*participantur*] in His wisdom and knowledge and power.³⁰⁵

Although Origen does not use the term “gift” here, the Son's activity is the same as that of the Spirit.³⁰⁶ Just as the Word of God makes certain beings wise and knowledgeable through

Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 84 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 223-224, says that the Holy Spirit is not necessary for salvation in Origen's thought, but concludes the opposite of the scholars above, saying that this shows how seriously Origen took the Holy Spirit, since he fits him into his scheme even though he is not necessary.

³⁰⁴ We have already seen that Origen does this insofar as Origen predicates creation of both the Father and Son, since both are responsible for it, even though the Father is the ultimate creator and, therefore, ranked above the Son, the immediate creator. See chapter one.

³⁰⁵ *ComCt* 2.11 (trans. from ACW 26:167; Latin from GCS 33:171). *Verbum Dei accipimus sicut 'sapientiam' et 'virtutem' et 'thesaurum scientiae' alia que multa...his, quibus efficitur 'sapientia' et 'scientia', non ad subitum, sed per profectus quosdam et gradus, pro studiis et intentione ac fide eorum, qui ei vel in sapientia vel in scientia vel in virtute participantur, sapientes eos et scientes reddit vigentes que virtutibus.*

This passage also shows that Origen believes the Son's attributes give that same attribute to believers, just as the gifts of the Spirit make the recipient like the gift.

³⁰⁶ Markschies and Hauschild have proposed that Origen distinguishes the activities of the Son and the Spirit. Markschies, “Der Heilige Geist,” 125, writes that the Holy Spirit sanctifies inwardly and acts on believers, while the Son sanctifies outwardly and acts on non-

participation, so believers participate in the Holy Spirit for gifts of wisdom and knowledge. Since Origen refers to the faith of those who receive these gifts from the Word, these gifts are given to believers specifically, a task that is elsewhere assigned to the Holy Spirit.

The conflation of the Son's and Spirit's activities is perhaps most apparent in *PArch*

1.3.8, where Origen assigns the giving of wisdom, knowledge, and sanctification to both the Son and the Holy Spirit:

God the Father bestows on all the gift of existence; and a participation in Christ, in virtue of his being the word or reason, makes them rational. From this it follows that they are worthy of praise or blame, because they are capable alike of virtue and of wickedness. Accordingly there is also available the grace of the Holy Spirit, that those beings who are not holy in essence may be made holy by participating in this grace. When therefore they obtain first of all their existence from God the Father, and secondly their rational nature from the Word, and thirdly their holiness from the Holy Spirit, they become capable of receiving Christ afresh in his character of the righteousness of God, those, that is, who have been previously sanctified through the Holy Spirit; and such as have been deemed worthy of advancing to this degree through the sanctification of the Holy Spirit obtain in addition the gift of wisdom by the power of the working of God's Spirit. This is what I think Paul means when he says that "to some is given the word of wisdom, to others the word of knowledge, by the same spirit" (1 Cor 12:8). And while pointing out the distinction of each separate gift he refers them all to the fount of the universe when he says, "There are diversities of workings, but one God, who worketh all things in all" (1 Cor 12:6). Thus the working of the Father, which endows all with existence, is found to be more glorious and splendid, when each one, through participation in Christ in his character of wisdom and knowledge and sanctification, advances and comes to higher degrees of perfection; and when a man, by being sanctified through participation in the Holy Spirit, is made purer and holier, he becomes more worthy to receive the grace of wisdom and knowledge, in order that all stains of pollution and ignorance may be purged and removed and that he may make so great an advance in holiness and purity that the

believers. Hauschild, *Gottes Geist und der Mensch*, 138, believes the Spirit works as an inwardly transformative power, whereas the Son intervenes in a person's moral impulses. But Origen never makes these distinctions, and, in fact, describes how both the Son and the Holy Spirit make believers like the characteristic that each imparts. Dupuis, *L'Esprit de l'Homme*, 246-251, has observed this same thing, arguing that, despite the different terminology that Origen uses of the Son and the Holy Spirit, both confer on their subjects certain characteristics by coming on each person in their substance. Dupuis, however, does not fully grasp Origen's references to the unity and multiplicity of the Spirit, so he sometimes differentiates the gifts of the Spirit and the Spirit itself, whereas chapter three has shown that Origen considers the gifts of the Spirit to designate the Holy Spirit. However, Dupuis is correct in observing that both the Son and the Holy Spirit come upon believers and give them certain characteristics.

life which he received from God shall be such as is worthy of God, who gave it to be pure and perfect, and that that which exists shall be as worthy as he who caused it to exist.³⁰⁷

Origen explains that the Holy Spirit grants sanctification, after which a person might receive the gift of wisdom through the Spirit, a reading based on 1 Cor 12:8. He appears to reiterate this point near the end of the passage, when he writes that those who are sanctified through participation in the Spirit become “more worthy to receive the grace of wisdom and knowledge.” Yet, Origen also says that one participates in the wisdom, knowledge, and sanctification of Christ. Within this short passage, then, Origen assigns the giving of sanctification, wisdom, and knowledge to both the Son and the Holy Spirit.

This ambiguity could be read as a mutually entailing relationship in which a believer, by increasing participation in the Holy Spirit, increases participation in the Son, which again increases participation in the Spirit, *ad infinitum*.³⁰⁸ However, this ambiguity evaporates when these statements are read in the context of Origen’s comments on 1 Cor 12:4-6, which occur just before this passage. All gifts have their ultimate source in the Father, as Origen’s use of 1 Cor 12:6 indicates. These gifts flow from the Father to the Son, who ministers these gifts, and then to the Holy Spirit, who distributes the gifts to believers. Because the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit each have a role in granting the gifts, Origen seems able to assign the activity to each of the three—Origen’s account of the distribution of gifts allows him to attribute the same gift to the Son at one time, and to the Holy Spirit at another, because believers are dependent on both to receive spiritual gifts.

³⁰⁷ *PArch* 1.3.8 (trans. from Butterworth 38-39; Latin from Görgemanns 180-182).

³⁰⁸ This is the reading that Guembe, “Aspectos 2,” 199, offers. He describes the relationship between the two as a “reciprocidad.”

Although Origen often assigns the giving of gifts to the Son or the Spirit, a passage from *ComRm* 6.11.3 confirms that both are involved in gift-giving and further reveals the logic supporting his attribution of gift-giving to the Son and Spirit:

We should not overlook the fact that, certainly here, the one who sets one free from the law of sin and death is called the Spirit of life, whereas in the Gospel according to John it is written that the Lord says, “If you continue in my word, you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free” (John 8:31-32). To me, at any rate, it seems that, although they may appear to be different from one another in deed or in name, nevertheless in reality they are one. For Christ is life, and it is he who sets free; and here [it says that] the Spirit of life sets free. And why is it not one freedom in each? For what the Spirit does, Christ also does; and the things that are Christ’s the Spirit does. For just as those whom the Holy Spirit sanctifies Christ sanctifies, so also those whom the Spirit of life sets free life also sets free. It is such that, once we have been set free by the law of the Spirit of life, let us abide in Christ and no longer be found to serve the law of sin. For just as he who is set free by the law of the Spirit of life abides in Christ, who is life, so he who serves the law of sin abides in death, which comes from the condemnation of sin.³⁰⁹

Origen begins with an exegetical problem. The Spirit of life, which is mentioned in Rom 8:1-2 (the verse Origen is exegeting in *ComRm* 6.11), sets people free. Yet, he notes that Christ says that his word, the truth, sets people free in John 8:31-32. Origen concludes that, even though the two things mentioned appear to be different, they are one.

The subject of Origen’s statement that the two things are one is unclear—he could be referring to the activity of setting people free or the subjects who set people free, in which case he would be saying that the Son and Holy Spirit are one. That Origen, however, means the

³⁰⁹ *ComRm* 6.11.3 (trans. from FOTC 104:46-47, slightly altered; Latin from Bammel 2:522-523). *Sed et illud non omittamus quod hic quidem qui liberat a lege peccati et mortis spiritus vitae dicitur, in evangelio autem secundum Iohanem scriptum est Domino dicente: ‘si manseritis in verbo meo agnosceitis veritatem et veritas liberabit vos.’ In quo mihi quidem videtur quod quamuis opere haec a se diversa videantur vel nomine re tamen ipsa unum sint. Christus enim vita est et ipse est qui liberat; et hic spiritus vitae liberat; et quomodo non in utroque una libertas est? Quae enim agit spiritus haec et Christus agit, et quae Christi sunt spiritus agit. Sicut enim quos sanctificat Spiritus Sanctus sanctificat Christus, ita et quos liberat spiritus vitae liberat et vita. Tantum est ut liberati a lege spiritus vitae in Christo maneamus nec ultra inveniamur servire legi peccati; quia sicut is qui liberatur a lege spiritus vitae permanet in Christo qui est vita, ita qui servit legi peccati permanet in morte quae venit ex condemnatione peccati.*

former, is evident when he asks rhetorically, “And why is it not one freedom in each [*et quomodo non in utroque una libertas est*]?” The use of “in each [*in utroque*]” implies two subjects, demonstrating that the freedom is one, while the Son and Spirit remain distinct. We can understand how the freedom is one in light of Origen’s interpretation of 1 Cor 12:4-6—the Son and Spirit, along with the Father, engage in a common operation that results in one freedom flowing through all three believers. This understanding of freedom, moreover, applies to other gifts as well. Origen writes, for example, that “those whom the Holy Spirit sanctifies, Christ sanctifies [*quos sanctificat Spirit Sanctus sanctificat Christus*],” reiterating that the Son and Holy Spirit do not perform their activities—here, the activity of sanctification—independently.³¹⁰

After establishing that the Son and Holy Spirit perform the same activity, Origen further clarifies the relationship between the Son and Holy Spirit. He writes, “For what the Spirit does, Christ also does; and the things that are Christ’s the Spirit does [*Quae enim agit spiritus haec et Christus agit, et quae Christi sunt spiritus agit*].” Origen first specifies that the Holy Spirit’s activities are also performed by the Son. Then, he repeats the phrase from the Son’s perspective, but changes the verb from “does [*agit*]” to “are [*sunt*].” This distinction reflects the difference in

³¹⁰ As in earlier examples of the Son’s role in, for example, the generation of the Holy Spirit, the fact that Origen does not mention the Father in this passage should not be read as indicating that the gifts begin in the Son and not the Father; in this case, I would suggest that Origen is emphasizing the relationship between the Son and the Spirit without negating the Father’s role as ultimate source of the gifts. For example, in addition to his emphasis on the Father as the source of gifts in *PArch* 1.3.8, Origen highlights the fact that the gifts come ultimately from God in *CCels* 3.46 and *HomNum* 12.3.3. See also *ComRm* 10.38.1, in which Origen says that both the Father and Son give life, but that the Father has given life to the Son. The passage reads, “Just as the Father gives life to whom he wills and the Son gives life to whom he wills, and just as the Father has life in himself and he has granted to the Son to have life in himself, so also the grace that the Father gives, this the Son also gives. One should know, of course, that all that human beings have from God is grace. For they have nothing as a debt. For who has first given to him and it will be paid back to him? Therefore, whatever he who was not and is has, by receiving it from him who always was and is and will be forever, is of grace” (trans. from FOTC 104:303-304). This passage supports the idea that the Father is the source of all things, even to the Son, but because gifts flow from the Father through the Son, Origen is able to assign the giving of gifts to both the Father and Son.

Christ's possession of attributes versus the Spirit's—Origen uses “is” of the Son because he possesses these attributes; he does not use “is” of the Holy Spirit, because the Spirit is dependent on his participation in the Son for these attributes.³¹¹ While the Son and Holy Spirit operate in common, the Son remains superior to the Holy Spirit as the one on whom the Spirit is dependent for his attributes.³¹²

³¹¹ For the Son's possession of his attributes, see chapter one. For the Spirit's attributes, see chapter two.

³¹² The apparent conflation between the activities of the Son and Holy Spirit occasionally results in a confusion of their identities. One such case occurs in *ComRm* 6.13, where Origen is exegeting Rom 8:9-11. In *ComRm* 6.13.3, Origen asks if the “Spirit of God,” the “Spirit of Christ,” “Christ,” and the “Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead” refer to one spirit or to different spirits. Using several scriptural passages—John 15:26, John 16:14, John 17:10, and John 16:15—he concludes that the Spirit of God is the Spirit of Christ. Finally, both of these names refer to the Holy Spirit, as Origen's references to John 15:26 and John 16:14 demonstrate. *ComRm* 7.1.2 supports this conclusion; there, Origen writes, “So then, the Spirit of God is the same as the Spirit of Christ, who is himself the same as the Holy Spirit” (trans. from FOTC 104:60-61).

After he establishes that the Holy Spirit is both the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ, Origen says that the Spirit of Christ is Christ himself in *ComRm* 6.13.5. This appears to be the result, at least in part, of a spirit Christology, as Origen applies 2 Cor 3:17 to the Son and, therefore, calls him a “spirit” on occasion (see, for example, *HomEx* 12.4). Coupled with his statement in *ComRm* 6.13.3, Origen's logic is: Christ = Spirit of Christ = Spirit of God = Holy Spirit. In *ComRm* 6.13.7 Origen confirms his logic. There, he asks the meaning in the statement that “the Spirit of Christ, or the Spirit of God, or even Christ himself, dwells in us” (trans. from FOTC 104:56). Then, he references several scriptural passages in his explanation of this statement, including Acts 2:3 and John 20:22, both of which speak of the Holy Spirit. By using these passages, Origen equates the indwelling of the Holy Spirit with the indwelling of the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, and Christ himself.

This conflation of the Son's and Spirit's identities accompanies a confusion in their activities. In *ComRm* 6.13.9, Origen writes of the distribution of the gifts: “Moreover, each person shall be tested to see if he has the Spirit of Christ within him. Christ is wisdom; if he is wise according to Christ and sets his mind on the things of Christ, he has the Spirit of Christ in himself through wisdom. Christ is righteousness; if anyone has Christ's righteousness in himself, through righteousness he possesses the Spirit of Christ in himself. Christ is peace; if anyone possesses the peace of Christ in himself, through the Spirit of peace he has the Spirit of Christ in himself. So also love, so also sanctification, so also each particular thing that Christ is said to be. It must be believed that the one who possesses these qualities has the Spirit of Christ in himself and hopes that his own mortal body will be made alive because of the Spirit of Christ that dwells within him” (trans. from FOTC 104:57). Origen describes that, for each thing Christ is, the Spirit of Christ dwells in the person who possesses that quality of Christ. Since Origen equates the Spirit of Christ with both Christ and the Holy Spirit just before this, *ComRm* 6.13.9 could be read as saying that a person possesses certain qualities through the Son, through the Holy Spirit, or

Origen understands the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to operate in common in the giving of spiritual gifts. Recognizing this common operation allows us to grasp how Origen is able to predicate the giving of gifts to any one of the three—each of the three is responsible for giving gifts. Origen, therefore, is not confused or inconsistent when he says that the Son and Holy Spirit are responsible for giving gifts to believers—he is merely emphasizing the Son’s role at one time, the Holy Spirit’s at another. For this reason, accusations of binitarianism are inaccurate and fail to understand Origen’s theology. Origen does not conflate the Holy Spirit’s activity with the Son’s; rather, he considers both to perform the same activity inasmuch as they, along with the Father, give gifts in a common operation.

4.2: The Gift of Holiness

In addition to the giving of spiritual gifts, Origen describes several other activities of the Holy Spirit: granting each believer the remission of sins, making each believer spiritual, and renewing and recreating believers. By emphasizing the Spirit’s role in the giving of gifts and the inspiration of Scripture, scholars have failed to analyze these activities of the Spirit. As a result, they have not recognized that these activities further explain the Spirit’s role in sanctification. In this part I will examine each of these activities, demonstrating that they are aspects of the Spirit’s

through both. This illustrates the connection between the conflation of identities and the conflation of activities.

There are other instances where Origen appears to conflate the Son and Spirit. For example, in *HomJos* 9.2 Origen uses Rom 8:26-27 of the Son, when he elsewhere uses it of the Spirit. In *ComRm* 1.5.3, Origen says that Christ is “called the ‘Spirit of holiness’ according to the fact that he makes holiness available to all” (trans. from FOTC 103:71), the same activity and name Origen elsewhere ascribes to the Holy Spirit. Yet, while Origen conflates the activities of the Son and Holy Spirit on numerous occasions, he seldom conflates the identities of the pair. In fact, Origen is conscientious about distinguishing the two, for example, in *ComJn* 2.75, where he indicates that the Son and the Holy Spirit possess individual *hypostases*. Therefore, the occasional conflation of identities should be read as a result of Origen’s attribution of activities to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, along with a spirit Christology.

gift of holiness. By recognizing these activities as aspects of the gift of holiness, I argue, they explain why Origen sometimes presents the gift of holiness as preceding all other spiritual gifts.

In order to understand how these activities are aspects of the gift of holiness, it is first necessary to determine how Origen defines “holiness.” He provides a lengthy account of what it means to be holy in *HomLev* 11.1. He begins by looking at examples of holy animals or objects from Scripture, concluding that all of these things are holy because they are set apart for divine use and are not used for human activities. Then, he moves on to discussing how people are holy, writing, “If you have understood how either an animal or a vessel or a garment is called holy, understand too that a person is also called holy by these observances and laws.”³¹³ Origen goes on to explain:

For if anyone should devote himself to God [*Deo*], if anyone should not entangle himself in secular affairs, “in order to please him who approved him” (2 Tim 2:4), if anyone was separated and set apart from the rest of men who live carnally [*carnaliter*] and are bound with mundane affairs, and does not seek things which are upon the earth [*terram*] but which are in heaven [*coelis*], that person is deservedly called holy.³¹⁴

Origen defines a holy person as one who is devoted to God [*Deum*] and to heavenly [*coelum*] things, as opposed to earthly [*terrenus/terra*] or carnal [*carnaliter/carnis*] things. As Origen makes clear elsewhere in this passage, the act of separation from earthly things includes the commands to “separate yourself from earthly [*terrenis*] deeds” and to “separate and remove yourself from every pollution of sin [*peccati*],”³¹⁵ linking sin with earthly deeds. Holiness, therefore, describes a person who has shunned earthly and carnal things in favor of heavenly and divine things.

Origen speaks of the dichotomy between the earthly, carnal things and the heavenly, divine things in *ComRm* 6.12.10, this time using the term “spirit” rather than heavenly or Godly.

³¹³ *HomLev* 11.1.4 (trans. from FOTC 83:209).

³¹⁴ *HomLev* 11.1.4 (trans. from FOTC 83:209; Latin from GCS 29:447).

³¹⁵ *HomLev* 11.1.5 (trans. from FOTC 83:210; Latin from GCS:447-448).

Since he is still contrasting these spiritual things with carnal things, we can understand the spiritual things here to refer to the Godly and heavenly things we saw in the previous passage:

For when the remission of sins [*remissione peccatorum*] was granted to us, sin took to flight and was destroyed from our flesh, and the justification of the law began to be fulfilled in us, strictly speaking of that law that delights in the law of God, which is fulfilled at the time when the law of sin, which was in our members, no longer strives against it, if only we walk according to the Spirit [*spiritum*], not according to the flesh [*carnem*]. For as long as anyone is in the flesh [*carne*] and lives according to the flesh [*carnem*], he sets his mind on the things of the flesh [*carnis*]; but when he will have turned himself to the Spirit [*spiritum*] and has died to the law of sin [*legi peccati*] and of the flesh [*carnis*], he sets his mind on the things of the Spirit [*spiritus*]. For to set one's mind according to the flesh [*carnem*] is death [*mors*] to the soul; but [to set one's mind] according to the Spirit [*spiritum*] is life [*vita*] and peace.³¹⁶

Here, Origen contrasts living according to the flesh to living according to the Spirit. Based on Origen's definition of holiness, those who do the latter are considered holy. This passage further explains that living according to the Spirit begins with the remission of sins, since this action removes sin and allows humans to set their minds on the Spirit, rather than the flesh. Elsewhere, Origen assigns cleansing of sin to the Holy Spirit: "The presence of the Holy Spirit cleanses all filthiness by delivering remission of sins [*remissionem...peccatorum*]."³¹⁷ Since the Holy Spirit is responsible for the remission of sin, this further reveals the Spirit's role in granting holiness—he enables a person to break away from carnal things and set one's mind on spiritual things.

Origen also speaks of the Spirit's role in granting holiness—the movement from an earthly life to a spiritual life—in terms of "renewal" and making people "spiritual." In *ComRm* 6.7.19, he writes:

[The Spirit] renews [*innovat*] those who believe when he leads them from the old evils [*veteribus malis*] to the new life [*novam vitam*] and the new observance of the religion of Christ, and when he makes spiritual men [*spirituales*] out of carnal ones [*carnalibus*].³¹⁸

³¹⁶ *ComRm* 6.12.10 (trans. from FOTC 104:52-53; Latin from Bammel 2:530-531).

³¹⁷ *HomLev* 2.2.5 (trans. from FOTC 83:42; Latin from GCS 29:292).

³¹⁸ *ComRm* 6.7.19 (trans. from FOTC 104:29; Latin from Bammel 2:496).

The Spirit is responsible for leading believers from old evils to a new life, an activity Origen also describes as making spiritual people [*spiritales*] out of carnal ones [*carnalibus*].³¹⁹ By characterizing the renewal [*innovat*] of the person in this way, he is describing a process by which the Spirit makes a person holy. Origen also discusses the Spirit's activity of renewing believers in *PArch* 1.3.7 using Ps 103:30, Col 3:9, and Rom 6:4. There he explains that the Holy Spirit "creates [*creet*] for himself a new people and 'renews [*renovet*] the face of the earth' (Ps 103:30), when through the grace of the Spirit [*gratiam spiritus*] men 'put off the old man [*veterem hominem*] with his doings' (Col 3:9) and begin 'to walk in newness of life [*novitate vitae*]' (Rom 6:4)."³²⁰ When the Spirit renews and creates a new people,³²¹ he helps people move from an old life to a new one. This description corresponds to Origen's notion of holiness, which means that the Spirit's activities are aimed at making a person holy.

Granting remission of sins, making believers spiritual, and renewing and creating believers all describe actions by which a person begins to live according to the spirit as opposed to the flesh. Because living according to the spirit corresponds to Origen's definition of holiness,

³¹⁹ Since the Holy Spirit makes people spiritual, an activity that parallels what it means to be holy, Origen's statement in *PArch* 4.4.5 that "by participation in the Holy Spirit [the believer] becomes holy and spiritual" (trans. from Butterworth 320), should be read as referring to one activity, rather than two distinct activities. See also *PEuch* 28.8.

³²⁰ *PArch* 1.3.7 (trans. from Butterworth 36). Although Origen uses the verb *renovo* rather than *innovo*, the verb utilizes the same base and, in these two passages, carry the same meaning.

³²¹ See also *ComJn* 13.141, where Origen writes: "And perhaps [if] we assume that the person who is deprived of the divine Spirit [τοῦ θείου πνεύματος] becomes earthly [χουκός], but when he has made himself fit to receive the divine Spirit and has received [λαβὼν] it, he will be recreated [ἀνακτισθήσεται], and [when he has been renewed] he will be saved [σωθήσεται], we will also understand the spirit better in this way in the following statements. 'You will take away their spirit and they will fail' (Psalm 103:29), and, 'You will send forth your Spirit and they will be created [κτισθήσονται], and you will renew [ἀνακαινεῖς] the face of the earth [τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς]' (Psalm 103:30)" (trans. from FOTC 89:97-98; Greek from GCS 10:247). Here, Origen again utilizes Ps 103:30 to describe the renewal and creation of believers through the Spirit. He also adds that this activity results in the salvation of the believer. See also *ComJn* 6.169.

these activities of the Spirit should be understood as aspects of the spiritual gift of holiness.³²²

Understanding these aspects of the Spirit's gift of holiness allow us to further grasp why Origen presents sanctification as the first gift of the Spirit chronologically. Origen's understanding of holiness involves the turn from earthly things to divine things, which must precede living piously and virtuously:

First, then, we must be redeemed and no longer be under the power of the one who has captured and conquered us, so that having been freed and released from his hands (so to speak), we can profitably receive “the forgiveness of trespasses” and, having been healed from the wounds of sin, we can actively engage in piety and the other virtues.³²³

While this passage does not speak of the spiritual gifts, it does make clear that the forgiveness of sins, which we noted above was an aspect of the Spirit's gift of holiness, precedes other Christian virtues. These virtues include the possession of other spiritual gifts, such as wisdom and knowledge. Only after a person has received holiness can that person receive these other gifts, as Origen makes clear in *PArch* 1.3.8: “When a man, by being sanctified through participation in

³²² As with the giving of the gift of holiness, Origen assigns the same activities of the Holy Spirit to the Son, for example, writing in *ComJn* 1.267 that Christ “is called ‘resurrection’ because he causes those who genuinely draw near to him to put off that which is dead and, rising, to assume newness of life [ἀναλαμβάνειν καινότητα ζωῆς]” (trans. from FOTC 80:88; Greek from GCS 10:47). Origen reiterates this point in *ComRm* 9.39.2, writing, “Moreover, we do not have the pattern of life from ourselves, but we have received it from the resurrection of Christ, as the same Apostle says, ‘In order that, as Christ rose again from the dead through the glory of the Father, so also you might walk in newness of life [*novitate vitae*]’ (Rom 6:4). The newness of life [*novitas...vitae*] by which we live in Christ through faith in his resurrection is attributed to the Lord, since it receives a commencement from him, not from us” (trans. from FOTC 104:239; Latin from Bammel 3:768-769). Origen cites Rom 6:4, the same verse he uses to describe the Spirit's activity in *PArch* 1.3.7, then explains that it is Christ who grants believers newness of life. In these passages Christ is responsible for the transformation from earthly to new things, as opposed to the Holy Spirit. Likewise, Origen relates in *HomJos* 6.1 that it is Jesus who “truly cut off the pollution of the flesh [*pollutionem carnis*] from us and purged [*purgavit*] the filth of sins [*peccatorum inquinamenta*] from our heart and soul” (trans. from FOTC 105:67; Latin from GCS 30:321), and in *HomLev* 3.8.2 that, “if you offer faith as the price, you will receive the remission of sins [*remissionem...peccatorum*] from Christ” (trans. from FOTC 83:67; Latin from GCS 29:313). As with the gifts, this conflation should be understood within Origen's gift-giving schema—both the Son and Spirit are responsible for the gift of holiness.

³²³ *FragmComEp* 4 (trans. from Heine 91-92).

the Holy Spirit, is made purer and holier, he becomes more worthy to receive the grace of wisdom and knowledge.”³²⁴

The activities Origen assigns to the Spirit—granting believers remission of sins, making them spiritual, renewing and creating them—though not described as gifts, explain different actions by which a person begins to live according to heavenly, spiritual things, as opposed to carnal things. Because the term “holy” refers to someone who is no longer engaged in carnal things and is now concerned with heavenly things, these activities of the Spirit are best understood as aspects of the Spirit’s gift of holiness—these activities further define for us what the Spirit does when he gives the gift of holiness. Furthermore, grasping the different facets of the Spirit’s activity allows us to understand why Origen sometimes presents the gift of holiness as preceding all other gifts—holiness is required before the reception of higher gifts.

4.3: The Inspiration and Interpretation of Scripture

Scholars have drawn attention to the fact that the Holy Spirit inspires Scripture and helps believers interpret Scripture spiritually.³²⁵ Yet, Origen attributes these same activities to the Father and the Son. While scholars have drawn attention to this discrepancy in Origen’s thought, to my knowledge no scholar has offered an explanation of it. In this part I will argue that Origen conceives of both the inspiration and the spiritual interpretation of Scripture to be the common operation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. As with the giving of gifts, this logic allows Origen to predicate the inspiration and interpretation of Scripture to any of the three, since each is responsible for the activity.

³²⁴ *PArch* 1.3.8 (trans. from Butterworth 38).

³²⁵ See fn. 279 in this chapter for scholarship on the Holy Spirit and the inspiration and interpretation of Scripture.

Origen draws attention to the fact that the Holy Spirit inspires the writing of Scripture numerous times in his corpus.³²⁶ Two passages from *PArch* provide good examples of this teaching:

It is, however, certainly taught with the utmost clearness in the Church, that this Spirit [the Holy Spirit] inspired each one of the saints, both the prophets and the apostles, and that there was not one Spirit in the men of old and another in those who were inspired at the coming of Christ.³²⁷

Then there is the doctrine that the scriptures were composed through the Spirit of God and that they have not only that meaning which is obvious, but also another which is hidden from the majority of readers. For the contents of scripture are the outward forms of certain mysteries and the images of divine things.³²⁸

These two passages reveal that the Holy Spirit inspired all of the Scriptures, including both the Old and New Testaments,³²⁹ and that Scripture contains both an obvious meaning and a hidden

³²⁶ See *HomGen* 4.3; *HomGen* 10.2; *HomGen* 14.3; *HomEx* 2.1; *HomEx* 4.2; *HomEx* 9.1; *HomNum* 1.1.2; *HomNum* 7.1.3; *HomNum* 16.9.4; *HomNum* 26.3.2; *HomNum* 27.1.7; *HomSam* 28.4.2; *HomIs* 2.2; *HomJos* 5.1; *HomJos* 8.1; *HomLc* 1.1; *HomLc* 19.1; *ComRm* 2.4.8; *ComJn* 10.273; *ComMt* 16.12; *HomPs* 36.2.6; *ComCt* 2.4; *PArch* 1.3.1; *PArch* 4.1.1; *PArch* 4.2.1; *PArch* 4.3.14; *CCels* 1.44; *CCels* 4.17.

Related to the Spirit's role in the inspiration of Scripture is the Spirit's role in inspiring prophecy. See *HomLev* 8.3.4; *HomNum* 15.1.1; *HomNum* 15.1.3; *HomLc* 10; and *ComJn* 2.208. *ComRm* 1.1.4 and *CCels* 7.7 demonstrate that prophecy is a gift of the Spirit. Origen considers prophecy to involve a clearer mind as opposed to an ecstatic state that leads one out of his or her rational mind. See *HomEz* 6.1.1; *PArch* 3.3.4; and *CCels* 7.3. This view of prophecy and inspiration has similarities to Philo's descriptions of some kinds of prophecy, as argued by John Levison, "Two Types of Ecstatic Prophecy according to Philo," *The Studia Philonica Annual* 6 (1994), 83-89. See also John Levison, "Inspiration and the Divine Spirit in the Writings of Philo Judaeus," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 26.3 (1995), 271-323, where Levison argues that Biblical interpretation involves inspiration from the divine Spirit that sharpens a person's faculties, rather than displaces them.

³²⁷ *PArch* Pref.4 (trans. from Butterworth 3-4).

³²⁸ *PArch* Pref.8 (trans. from Butterworth 5).

³²⁹ This functions as a polemic against Origen's opponents, Marcion, Valentinus, and Basilides. See, for example, *PArch* 2.7.1, which reads, "Now just as it is the same Holy Spirit himself who was in the prophets and the apostles, that is, both in those who believed in God before the coming of Christ and in those who have taken refuge in God through Christ. We have heard of heretics who have dared to say that there are two Gods or two Christs, but we have never heard it maintained by anyone that there are two Holy Spirits. For how could they affirm this from the scriptures, or what distinction could they make between one Holy Spirit and the other, even supposing it were possible to discover any definition or description of the Holy Spirit? For granting that Marcion or Valentinus can draw distinctions in regard to deity and

meaning. Every letter of these Scriptures is important: “We cannot say of the Holy Spirit’s writings that there is anything useless or superfluous in them, even if they seem obscure to some.”³³⁰

With respect to the interpretation of Scripture, it is the goal of the biblical interpreter to seek out the many meanings of Scripture. This interpretative act should always take into account the author:

And so it is established that these things were spoken through the Holy Spirit, and for that reason it seems fitting that these things be understood in accordance with the dignity, or rather, in accordance with the majesty of the one who is speaking.³³¹

As this passage demonstrates, the Holy Spirit’s dignity should inform biblical interpretation.³³²

Yet, the Holy Spirit has not only inspired Scripture and endowed it with a hidden meaning; the

describe the nature of the good as one thing and the nature of the just as another, what reasonings or devices will warrant their introducing distinctions into the Holy Spirit? I think they can find nothing that points to any distinction whatsoever” (trans. from Butterworth 116-117). See also *HomEx* 5.3; *HomLev* 13.4.2; *ComMt* 14.4; *PArch* 1.3.1.

³³⁰ *HomNum* 27.1.7 (trans. from 169). In a particularly piquant example, Origen writes the following regarding the three men who visit Abraham at the oak of Mamre (Gen 18:1f.): “As we believe that these things were written by the Holy Spirit, I take it that it was not for nothing that the Divine Spirit saw fit to commit to the pages of Scripture even the time and hour of the vision” (*ComCt* 2.4). For another passage about the Holy Spirit and the passage recorded in Gen 18:1f., see *HomGen* 4.3. For other passages that speak of the importance of each word or letter of Scripture as written by the Holy Spirit, see especially *HomEx* 4.2 and *HomJos* 5.1.

³³¹ *HomNum* 26.3.2 (trans. from 163). See also *HomEx* 4.2; *HomNum* 16.9.4; *HomJos* 8.1; *HomLc* 9.1; and *ComJn* 10.273. For an example of interpreting according to the worthiness of the Holy Spirit as a polemic against Origen’s opponents (Marcion, Valentinus, and Basilides), see *HomJos* 12.3.

³³² Biblical interpretation should not only be carried out according to the dignity of the Holy Spirit, but of the Father and Son as well: “And so, by considering these things in the spirit, which have been written down through the Spirit, and by “comparing spiritual things with spiritual things” (1 Cor 2:13), we may explain what has been written in a way that is worthy of God and of the Holy Spirit who inspired these things, in Christ Jesus our Lord” (*HomNum* 16.9.4; trans. from 101). Grouping the Holy Spirit with the Father and Son further underscores what Origen means when he speaks of the worthiness of the Holy Spirit—this language relates the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as separate from all other beings.

Holy Spirit is also needed to interpret these hidden meanings of Scripture.³³³ The previous passage from *PArch* Pref.8 is helpful for understanding the Spirit's role in this enterprise:

Then there is the doctrine that the scriptures were composed through the Spirit of God and that they have not only that meaning which is obvious, but also another which is hidden from the majority of readers. For the contents of scripture are the outward forms of certain mysteries and the images of divine things. On this point the entire Church is unanimous, that while the whole law is spiritual, the inspired meaning is not recognized by all, but only by those who are gifted with the grace of the Holy Spirit in the word of wisdom and knowledge (1 Cor 12:8).³³⁴

Origen says that the hidden, spiritual meaning of Scripture is only accessible to those who possess the gifts of wisdom and knowledge, which he elsewhere calls the "higher" gifts.³³⁵ This means that the spiritual interpretation of Scripture is contingent on receiving these gifts. Origen reiterates this point in *HomJos* 8.1, where he writes:

We plead with you, O hearers of the sacred scrolls, not to hear with disgust or distaste those things that are read because the narration of them seems to be less pleasant. For you ought to know that those things that are read are indeed worthy of the utterance of the Holy Spirit, but in order to explain them we need the grace of the Holy Spirit, as the Apostle says, "But to one the word of wisdom is given through the Spirit, to another the word of knowledge according to the same Spirit" (1 Cor 12:8).³³⁶

After affirming that Scripture was written according to the worthiness of the Holy Spirit, Origen says that the proper interpretation of Scripture requires the Spirit's grace. As in *PArch* Pref.8, he

³³³ For passages that discuss the Spirit's role in Biblical interpretation, see *HomGen* 6.1; *HomGen* 9.1; *HomEx* 4.2; *HomEx* 4.5; *HomEx* 12.3; *HomLev* 1.1.4; *HomLev* 5.5.1; *HomNum* 26.3.5; *HomNum* 27.1.7; *HomEz* 1.11.2; *HomEz* 2.2.2; *HomEz* 11.2.4; *HomEz* 11.3.3; *ComRm* 6.7.18; *ComRm* 6.9.3; *ComJn* 1.89; *ComJn* 10.266; *PArch* Pref.3; *PArch* 2.2.2; *PArch* 2.7.2; *PArch* 4.2.3; *PArch* 4.3.14.

³³⁴ *PArch* Pref.8 (trans. from Butterworth 5). For the spiritual meaning inspired by the Holy Spirit as opposed to the literal meaning, see *ComJn* 10.300, which reads, "For how can one be said to believe the Scripture in the proper sense, when he does not perceive the meaning of the Holy Spirit in it, which God wants to be believed rather than the intent of the letter? According to this we must say that none of those who walk according to the flesh believe in the spiritual meanings of the law whose first principle they do not even imagine" (trans. from FOTC 80:322).

³³⁵ See, for example, *ComJn* 13.353-354; *PArch* Pref.3; *CCels* 3.46.

³³⁶ *HomJos* 8.1 (trans. from FOTC 85).

goes on to specify that this grace refers to the gifts of wisdom and knowledge.³³⁷ The proper interpretation of Scripture, therefore, depends on the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

As with the giving of gifts, Origen attributes the inspiration of Scripture not just to the Spirit but also to the Father and Son.³³⁸ In *PArch* 4.2.2 Origen describes the inspiration of Scripture as a Trinitarian activity that originates in the Father and flows through the Son and Spirit:

On this account we must explain to those who believe that the sacred books are not the works of men, but that they were composed and have come down to us as a result of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit by the will of the Father of the universe through Jesus Christ.³³⁹

Although Origen does not explicitly characterize the inspiration of Scripture as a spiritual gift,³⁴⁰ this passage reveals that Origen views the inspiration of Scripture to be the work of the Father,

³³⁷ See also *PArch* Pref.3, which reads, “The holy apostles, when preaching the faith of Christ, took certain doctrines, those namely which they believed to be necessary ones, and delivered them in the plainest terms to all believers, even to such as appeared to be somewhat dull in the investigation of divine knowledge. The grounds of their statements they left to be investigated by such as should merit the higher gifts of the Spirit and in particular by such as should afterwards receive through the Holy Spirit himself the graces of language, wisdom and knowledge” (trans. from Butterworth 2). See also *CCels* 1.44 and *CCels* 3.18.

³³⁸ For the Father’s role in the inspiration of Scripture, see *HomJr* 10.1.1; *HomJr* 16.6.2; *PArch* 4.1.6; and *CCels* 2.6. For the Son’s role in inspiration, see *HomLev* 1.1.1; *HomIs* 1.5; *HomJr* 9.1.1; *ComJn* 1.15; *ComJn* 1.37; *ComJn* 2.10; *ComJn* 6.24; *ComJn* 20.398; *ComRm* 2.14.21; and *PEuch* 28.8.

For the Father’s role in the interpretation of Scripture, see *HomNum* 13.4.1; *HomLc* 38.1; *ComRm* Pref.2; *PArch* 4.3.11; *CCels* 2.6; and *CCels* 4.50. For the Son’s role in interpretation, see *HomGn* 6.1; *HomGn* 7.6; *HomGn* 15.7; *HomEx* 2.4; *HomEx* 12.4; *HomLev* 13.2.1; *HomJos* 12.2; *HomIs* 5.2; *HomJr* 19.11.2; *HomEz* 11.3.3; *ComJn* 2.47; *ComJn* 13.314; *CCels* 2.24; and *CCels* 3.33.

³³⁹ *PArch* 4.2.2 (trans. from Butterworth 272).

³⁴⁰ There are indications that the inspiration of Scripture could be understood as a spiritual gift. In *PArch* 4.2.7 Origen writes, “We shall now outline the manner in which divine scripture should be understood on these several points, using such illustrations and examples as may occur to us. And in the first place we must call to mind and point out that the Holy Spirit...enlightened the servants of the truth, that is, the prophets and apostles” (trans. from Butterworth 282). The language here of the Holy Spirit “enlightening” the prophets and apostles—some of the authors of Scripture—implies that they bestow a kind of knowledge on them, which means that the inspiration of Scripture can be considered a spiritual gift of knowledge.

Son, and Holy Spirit.³⁴¹ Because he attributes the work to all three, we can understand the inspiration of Scripture in the same way that we understand the giving of gifts—the inspiration of Scripture is a common operation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

The three are also responsible for granting the ability to interpret Scripture spiritually, as two passages demonstrate:

Nevertheless, just as I think that no one denies this, so I think that to know these things clearly, that is, the things that are present and the things that are being indicated in these narratives, things in which the “figure of realities” is covered under this veil, belongs to the same Holy Spirit who inspired these things to be written, and to our Lord Jesus Christ, who said of Moses: “For he wrote about me” (John 5:46), and to the almighty God, whose ancient plan for the human race is not openly indicated, but veiled in the letters.³⁴²

Let us now ask God to work with us through Christ in the Holy Spirit to explain the mystical meaning stored up like a treasure in the words.³⁴³

In both of these passages the explanation of the meaning of Scripture belongs not to one of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, but to all three. Since the spiritual interpretation of Scripture is contingent on spiritual gifts, Origen’s statements here correspond to our earlier observations on the spiritual gifts—the giving of gifts is the common operation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Origen’s logic—that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit operate in common—with respect to the giving of gifts is also at work in his conception of the inspiration and interpretation of Scripture. Because Origen understands the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to be responsible for the

³⁴¹ Peter Martens, “Why Does Origen Refer to the Trinitarian Authorship of Scripture in Book 4 of *Peri Archon*?”, *Vigiliae Christianae* 60 (2006), 1-8, has argued that these two passages function as an argument against the Biblical interpretation of both Jews and Gnostics.

Ziebritzki, *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele*, 227, considers these phrases to suggest a “gewisse Rangfolge” within the Trinity in granting inspiration. While I have argued that Origen conceives of the gifts as coming from the Father to the Son and Spirit, Ziebritzki offers no explanation as to why he believes this is the case beyond the Trinitarian phrases in the two *Arch* passages.

³⁴² *HomNum* 26.3.5 (trans. from 164).

³⁴³ *ComJn* 1.89 (trans. from FOTC 80:51).

inspiration and interpretation of Scripture, his attributions of these activities to one of the three are best understood as highlighting the work of that individual. He is not suggesting that only the Father, Son, or Holy Spirit is responsible for the activity. Therefore, Origen's conception of the common operation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit can explain why his apparent inconsistency in naming the source of the inspiration and interpretation of Scripture.

Chapter Conclusion

When delineating the Spirit's activities within Origen's corpus, scholars have drawn attention to the Spirit's role in the inspiration of Scripture and the giving of gifts, primarily the gift of sanctification, but have not offered a comprehensive analysis of the Spirit's activities. As a result, scholars have overemphasized some of the Spirit's activities, while neglecting others, and have failed to locate the Spirit's work within the context of his relationship to the Father and Son. This chapter has attempted to address these issues. First, I have shown that Origen understands the gifts to have their source in the Father, flow to the Son, then to the Holy Spirit—the three engage in a common operation when granting gifts to believers. This shows the Spirit to be an integral part of salvation and helps to confirm the Spirit's status as a part of the Trinity. Second, I have demonstrated that the Spirit is responsible for distributing all gifts, not just sanctification; those who emphasize the Spirit's role in sanctification read only certain parts of Origen's pneumatology, rather than his entire thought. Finally, I have looked at several activities attributed to the Spirit, some of which have not received due attention, suggesting that they should be understood in the same way as the gifts insofar as they are common operations of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. By presenting such a comprehensive picture of the Spirit's gift-giving activity, we are able to understand the Spirit's role in salvation, as well as the whole Trinity's involvement in this activity. Having now examined the Spirit's gift-giving activity, we

turn now to an examination of the Spirit's economic activity in the world, with respect to both the incarnate Christ and believers.

Chapter Five: The Holy Spirit and the Human Person

The previous chapter examined the Spirit's activities. It is the goal of this final chapter to elucidate how these activities lead a person to salvation. As we saw in the previous chapter, many scholars discuss the Spirit's activities, especially the Spirit's work of sanctification. To my knowledge, however, no scholar has provided a detailed examination of the Spirit's economic activity. I will argue that the Spirit's relationship to the incarnate Christ serves as an archetype for the Spirit's relationship to humans, whose goal is to increase in the participation of the Spirit until they reach perfection. This will demonstrate that Origen views the Holy Spirit as an integral part of the salvation of humans.

5.1: The Holy Spirit and the Incarnate Christ

On several occasions Origen says that the Holy Spirit came to the incarnate Christ in order to cooperate in the salvation of humans.³⁴⁴ Scholars have not recognized the importance of

³⁴⁴ Origen describes the Holy Spirit's role in the cooperation of salvation in *ComJn* 2.83-84: "Or perhaps it is also possible to say that the creation (but also the human race), in order to be set free from the slavery of corruption, was in need of an incarnate, blessed, and divine power which would also restore the things on earth to order. This activity fell, as it were, in some way to the Holy Spirit. Since the Spirit cannot bear it, he sends forth the Savior because he alone is able to bear such a great conflict. And although it is the Father, as leader, who sends the Son, the Holy Spirit joins in sending him in advance, promising to descend to the Son of God at the right time and to cooperate [συνεργῆσαι] in the salvation of men. And this he has done when he lights upon the Savior in bodily form as a dove after his baptism, and remains and does not pass on" (trans. from FOTC 80:115-116). Origen suggests that the task of saving human beings originally belonged to the Holy Spirit. The Spirit was unable to fulfill it, so the Son was given the task instead. Yet, the Holy Spirit still cooperates [συνεργῆσαι] in the salvation of human beings by descending onto the incarnate Christ at the time of his baptism (see also *HomLc* 27.5).

Two other passages develop upon Origen's comments in *ComJn* 2.83-84. There, Origen writes that the Holy Spirit joins the Father in sending the Son, even though the Father is "the leader" in this activity. In *ComMt* 13.18 Origen repeats that the Holy Spirit is sent for the salvation of humans, but offers a different reading as to who sends the Spirit: "But to humble oneself as that little child is to imitate the Holy Spirit, who humbled Himself for the salvation of men. Now, that the Saviour and the Holy Spirit were sent by the Father for the salvation of men has been declared in Isaiah, in the person of Saviour, saying, "And now the Lord hath sent me and His Spirit" (Isa 48:16). You must know, however, that this expression is ambiguous; for

the Spirit's relationship to Christ,³⁴⁵ as it forms the basis upon which Origen discusses the Spirit's relationship to believers. I will argue that the Spirit's relationship with Christ serves as an archetype for the relationship between the Spirit and humans. The Spirit's relationship with Christ is an archetype in two ways: first, the Spirit's relationship with Christ is the same as the Spirit's relationship with humans, but greater in degree and without the possibility of losing the Spirit, providing a model for humans to follow; second, the Spirit must come to Christ before passing to humans.

In order to demonstrate that the Spirit's relationship with Christ serves as a model for humans to follow, it is first necessary to show that the Spirit comes to Christ's humanity.³⁴⁶ In order to demonstrate that the Spirit comes only to Christ's human nature, we must return to *HomIs* 3, a homily we examined previously. As we saw in chapter three, Origen interprets the seven women of Isa 4:1 as the Holy Spirit,³⁴⁷ explaining that these seven women, "seeking someone whom they might adopt, 'will take hold of one man [*hominem*]' (cf. Isa 4:1)."³⁴⁸ He

either God sent, but also the Holy Spirit sent, the Saviour; or, as we have taken it, the Father sent both—the Saviour and the Holy Spirit" (trans. from ANF 9:486). Origen declares that Isa 48:16 is ambiguous and offers two possible interpretations, favoring the one that says the Father sent both the Son and the Spirit. *CCels* 1.46 also attests to this reading: "My good man, who is the speaker in Isaiah that says "And now the Lord sent me and his spirit" (Isa 48:16)? In this text although it is doubtful whether it means that the Father and the Holy Spirit sent Jesus or that the Father sent Christ and the Holy Spirit, it is the second interpretation which is right" (trans. from Chadwick 42). Here, Origen is more certain—he says that the correct interpretation is the one which understands the Father to send the Son and Holy Spirit. Since they were written later than *ComJn* 2, Origen's position in *ComMt* and *CCels* represents a development in his thought. *ComJn* 2 was written before Origen's move to Caesarea around 234 (see Nautin, *Origène*, 431-432), while the *ComMt* and *CCels* were among the last works he wrote. Nautin, *Origène*, 375-376, dates these works to 248-249.

³⁴⁵ To my knowledge, Rius-Camps, *El dinamismo trinitario*, 79, is the only scholar who discusses the topic, and he offers only a brief analysis.

³⁴⁶ If the Spirit came to Christ's divinity only, or to Christ's humanity and divinity, then the Spirit's relationship with Christ could not serve as a model since humans do not possess both divine and human natures.

³⁴⁷ In *HomIs* 3.1 Origen writes, "The seven women are one; for they are the Spirit of God (cf. Isa 11:1)" (trans. from ACW 68:894).

³⁴⁸ *HomIs* 3.3 (trans. from ACW 68:897; Latin from GCS 33:256).

goes on to elaborate on the meaning of the term “man,” writing: “This agrees with the fact that he [Jesus Christ our Lord] is understood as a ‘man [*homo*],’ that he was born [*natus est*], that he assumed a body [*corpus*].”³⁴⁹ By interpreting the “man [*hominem*]” as Christ and the seven women as the Holy Spirit, Origen exegetes Isa 4:1 as saying that the Holy Spirit takes hold of Christ’s humanity. He confirms this reading when he emphasizes Christ’s birth and assumption of a body in his explanation of the term “man.” A second passage further supports this reading:

“He will go before Christ in the spirit and power of Elijah” (Luke 1:17). Luke does not say, “in the soul of Elijah,” but, “in the spirit and power of Elijah.” Power and spirit dwelt in Elijah as in all the prophets and, with regard to his humanity [*secundum dispensationem corporis*], in the Lord and Savior as well. A little later in the Gospel the angel says to Mary, “The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you” (Luke 1:35).³⁵⁰

Just as “spirit and power” dwelled in Elijah, so “spirit and power” dwell in Christ—in his humanity. It is at first unclear to whom or what the phrase “spirit and power” refers, but Origen’s use of Luke 1:35 explains his meaning. The “spirit” refers to the Holy Spirit, and the “power” refers to the power of the Most High. The Holy Spirit, therefore, dwells only in Christ’s humanity.³⁵¹

³⁴⁹ *HomIs* 3.3 (trans. from ACW 68:897; Latin from GCS 33:256).

³⁵⁰ *HomLc* 4.5 (trans. from FOTC 94:19; Latin from GCS 49:27).

³⁵¹ *ComRm* 3.8.5 also attests to this. There, Origen writes in an exegesis of the two cherubim over the propitiatory, “Therefore he signifies, as I think, that the Word of God, who is the only begotten Son, and his Holy Spirit always dwell in the propitiatory, that is, in the soul of Jesus, and that is what the two cherubim placed over the propitiatory indicate (Ex 28:18)” (trans. from FOTC 103:220). If the Holy Spirit dwells in Jesus’ soul, then the Spirit dwells in Christ’s human nature, since the soul is a part of human nature (see *Dial* 6-7, where Origen says that the soul is a part of human nature and that Christ, in order to save the whole human being, took on all of human nature, including the soul). See also *HomNum* 9.5.2, where Origen writes, “Behold how the true high priest Jesus Christ has taken on the censer of human flesh and placed on it the fire of the altar. Doubtless this refers to that splendid soul of his with which he was born in the flesh. He has added incense to his soul as well, namely the immaculate Spirit” (trans. from ACT 40).

Having established that the Spirit comes only to Christ's humanity, we must demonstrate that the Spirit comes to Christ in the same manner as humans, but to a greater degree and without leaving him. We return to *HomNum* 6.3.2 to demonstrate this point:

So on all who have prophesied, the Holy Spirit has rested [*requievit*], yet on none of these has he rested [*requievit*] as he did on the Savior. This is why it is written of him that: "A shoot shall arise from the root of Jesse, and a flower shall grow from his root. The Spirit of God will rest [*requiescet*] on him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and fortitude, the Spirit of knowledge and of piety; and the Spirit of the fear of God will fill him" (Isa 11:1-3). But perhaps someone says: You have shown nothing more written about Christ than is written about the rest of men; for just as it is said about the others, that "the Spirit rested [*requievit*] on them," so also it is said about the Savior: "The Spirit of God will rest [*requiescet*] on him." But notice that on no other is the Spirit of God described as having rested [*requievisse*] with this sevenfold power. Doubtless this is because the prophecy concerns the very substance of the divine Spirit, which "rests [*requiescere*] on the shoot that was proceeding from the stock of Jesse" (Isa 11:1-2). Because that substance could not be explained under one term, it is set forth under diverse designations.³⁵²

Just as the Spirit rested [*requievit*] on Christ, so the Spirit rested [*requievit*] on certain people—in both cases, the relationship is the same. But Origen differentiates the Spirit's relationship to Christ by explaining that the Spirit rested on Christ with a sevenfold power,³⁵³ unlike the Spirit's relationship with any other being. Origen, therefore, describes the Spirit's action on Christ and believers in the same way, but differentiates the degree of power with which the Spirit rests.

³⁵² *HomNum* 6.3.2 (trans. from ACT 22, slightly altered).

³⁵³ Justin Martyr can provide one way of understanding how the Spirit rests on others to a lesser degree than on Christ. In *Dial* 87.4 Justin writes, "Furthermore, please pay careful attention to my words, so you may understand that each of your prophets, by receiving one or two powers from God, did and said those things which we have learned from the Scriptures. Solomon had the spirit of wisdom; Daniel, that of understanding and counsel; Moses, that of strength and piety; Elijah, that of fear; Isaiah, that of knowledge; and the others likewise had one or two gifts, as had Jeremiah, and the twelve prophets, and David, and, in short, all your other prophets" (trans. from Selections from the FOTC 3:136). The prophets only possessed one or two of the gifts that the sevenfold Spirit bestowed. Origen might be following a similar train of thought in that Christ possesses all of the gifts of the Spirit, while all others possess only a few gifts.

Origen's teaching that the Holy Spirit comes to a person according to his or her capacity to receive the Spirit explains the difference in the degree to which the Spirit rests in a person.

HomLc 29.1 offers a good example of this teaching, especially as it relates to Christ:

Realize that Jesus, and the apostles, and any others, are full of the Holy Spirit according to the capacity of the vessel. For example, if you wish to say, "These containers are full of wine, or oil," you do not immediately indicate that they are full in an equal measure. Perhaps one can hold a *sextarius*, another an *urna*, and another an *amphora*. In the same way, both Jesus and Paul were full of the Holy Spirit. Paul's capacity was much less than Jesus'; nevertheless, according to their measure, both vessels were full.³⁵⁴

³⁵⁴ *HomLc* 29.1 (trans. from FOTC 94:119).

All who possess the Holy Spirit are filled with the Spirit, but the capacity to be filled varies.³⁵⁵ For the incarnate Jesus, this capacity is much larger than any other being,³⁵⁶ allowing Jesus to receive a fuller amount of the Spirit—the “sevenfold power.”³⁵⁷

³⁵⁵ See also *ComMt* 13.18 and *FragmComEp* 17. We will discuss how a person grows in his or her capacity to receive the Spirit in the following part of this chapter.

The idea that certain beings can only receive a particular measure of God’s gifts is similar to Philo’s notion of God’s powers, which exist in God in their fullness, but come to human beings in a lesser form. He writes in *Deus* 17.79-80: “Just in the same way if God’s knowledge and wisdom and prudence and justice and each of His other excellences were not tempered, no mortal could receive them, nay not even the whole heaven and universe. The Creator then, knowing His own surpassing excellence in all that is best and the natural weakness of His creatures, however loud they boast, wills not to dispense benefit or punishment according to His power, but according to the measure of capacity which He sees in those who are to participate in either of those dispensations” (trans. from LCL 247:51).

³⁵⁶ Origen reiterates this point in *ComRm* 3.8.5-7. This passage contains Origen’s exegesis of the two cherubim above the propitiatory, and he refers to the propitiatory as the soul of the incarnate Christ, wherein the Son and the Holy Spirit dwell. While it is possible for the Son and Holy Spirit to inhabit others aside from Jesus, Origen explains at the end of the passage that the soul of Jesus is placed before all these others, highlighting the fact that the Holy Spirit, along with the Son, dwells in Jesus’ soul to a greater degree than any other being: “Therefore he signifies, as I think, that the Word of God, who is the only begotten Son, and his Holy Spirit always dwell in the propitiatory, that is, in the soul of Jesus, and that is what the two cherubim placed over the propitiatory indicate. ...But these two cherubim are winged creatures; and not only are they furnished with wings but they even have their wings spread out. If one of the saints has merited the right to possess the supreme attestation from God, it is said that God is with him, as is said to Joshua son of Nun, ‘And God was with him just as he was with his servant Moses’ (Jos 1:5, 6:27). But if anywhere God promises an even greater reward, it is when God says, ‘I shall be among them and I shall walk among them’ (Lev 26:12). Now among men you will find no soul this blessed and this exalted except that one alone in which the Word of God and the Holy Spirit find such a great breadth and such a great volume that they are said not only to indwell [that soul] but to spread forth their wings and sometimes even fly about, according to a new institution of the mystery. ...Now, where is this soul placed which has been filled with God and in which all the fullness of deity has been pleased to dwell? It says, ‘over the ark of the covenant’ (Ex 25:21). The ark of the covenant can be understood of his holy flesh in which this blessed soul is placed, possessing within itself the testimonies of God which are understood as matters of Christ prophesied in times past by the divine testimonies as to what sufferings he would endure in the flesh. The heavenly powers can also be understood as the ark. They too are capable of containing the Word of God and the Holy Spirit; but the soul of Jesus is placed before them, and by his mediation, as it were, they receive the divinely bestowed grace” (trans. from FOTC 103:220-221).

³⁵⁷ The phrase “sevenfold power” can also explain how large Christ’s capacity is to receive the Spirit. Origen arrives at his explanation of the sevenfold power based on Isa 11:1-3, about which he writes, “The prophecy concerns the very substance of the divine Spirit [*ipsa illa divini spiritus substantia*]” (*HomNum* 6.3.2; trans. from ACT 22; Latin from GCS 30:33).

Christ's reception of the Spirit is unique not only because of the degree to which Jesus possessed the Spirit, but also because the Spirit does not leave him:

I have another testimony whereby I can show that the Holy Spirit rested on my Lord and Savior in an excessive degree and in a completely different way [*eximio quodam genere et longe aliter*] than is reported in respect to others. For John the Baptist says of him: "He who sent me to baptize in water said to me: The one on whom you see the Spirit descending and remaining in him, he is the one" (John 1:33). If he had said: "the Spirit descending," and would not have added: "and remaining in him," the Savior would seem to possess nothing remarkable over the others. But now he has added: "and remaining in him." So this was a sign of the Savior that could be shown in no other; for of no one is it written that the Holy Spirit "remained in him." And lest anyone think that I am detracting from the prophets by saying this, the prophets themselves know that I am not detracting from them when I prefer my Lord Jesus Christ. For they recall each of their own statements and find that of no other is it said: "He did not commit sin, nor was deceit found in his mouth" (Isa 53:9; 1 Pet 2:22). For since he is the only one "who did not commit sin," therefore in him alone did the Holy Spirit "remain" and continue to remain. For if he is the one of whom something unique and remarkable is said, namely what we said above, that he "did not commit sin," then it is established that all the rest were "under sin" (cf. Rom 3:9). If all of them were, then the prophets too were under it, necessarily. So how is it right for us to say that the Holy Spirit had "remained" in them at the moment of sin?³⁵⁸

Origen believes that the Holy Spirit cannot remain where sin is present.³⁵⁹ Because all people sin, the Spirit does not remain in humans. Christ does not sin, so the Spirit not only rests, but

Because he talks about the singular substance of the Holy Spirit at the same time he is discussing the sevenfold power, we can understand this sevenfold power as the full Spirit. Furthermore, because the sevenfold power refers to the various gifts of the Spirit, as we elaborated in chapter three, we can understand Christ to receive all the different gifts of the Spirit in their fullness.

³⁵⁸ *HomNum* 6.3.3-4 (trans. from ACT 22). In *HomNum* 6.3.5-6 Origen gives examples of times when prophets sinned and the Spirit subsequently left them. See also *HomIs* 3.1-2.

³⁵⁹ This is similar to the delicacy of the Spirit as described in the *Shepherd of Hermas*. In *Mand* 5.1.2-4 Hermas describes an indwelling spirit that cannot abide where there is anger and evil: "If you are courageous, the holy spirit that dwells in you will be pure, not overshadowed by another, evil spirit, but living openly, it will rejoice and be happy along with the vessel in which it resides, and it will minister to God in great joy, having within it a sense of well-being. But if any bad temper comes in, immediately the holy spirit, which is sensitive, feels claustrophobic since the place is not clean, and wants to get out, for it feels suffocated by the evil spirit, not having room to worship God as it wants, for the place is contaminated by the bad temper. The Lord is present in patient endurance, but the devil in bad temper. If both spirits live together, it is unhelpful for that person in whom they live" (trans. from Osiek 117). Hermas explains that the holy spirit that comes to a person can only remain as long as the person is free from a bad temper. Hermas also equates this bad temper with the presence of an evil spirit, who crowds out the holy spirit. While it is unclear whether Hermas is talking about a personal spirit or the Holy

“remains” on him.³⁶⁰ This distinguishes Christ’s reception of the Spirit from others, but the difference does not pertain to the manner in which the Spirit rests. Rather, the difference is in whether or not the Spirit remains, which is contingent on the presence of sin in an individual.

Having demonstrated that the Spirit’s rests on Christ in the same manner that he rests on humans, only to a greater degree and without possibility of loss, we must now show that it is the goal of humans to increase the degree to which they receive the Spirit. Although each person is

Spirit, the fact that he refers to this spirit as “holy spirit” demonstrates that this passage could be interpreted as speaking of the Holy Spirit. For a brief exposition of this theme in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, see J.E. Morgan-Wynne, “The ‘delicacy’ of the Spirit in the Shepherd of Hermas and in Tertullian,” *Studia Patristica* 21 (Leuven: Peeters Press, 1989), 154-157.

While Morgan-Wynne does not include it in his article, it should be noted that Hermas writes the following in *Sim* 10.3.1-2 about the young women who accompany him: “I sent these young women to live with you because I saw how congenial they were to you. You have them as assistants so that you can better keep his commandments, for it is not possible to keep these commandments without these young women. I also see how much they want to be with you, and I will tell them not to leave your house at all. But you, keep your house clean; they like to live in a clean house. They are clean, chaste, and industrious and have all found favor with the Lord. If they find your house pure they will stay with you; but if a little impurity comes into it they will leave right away. These young women do not in any way like impurity” (trans. from Osiek 258). These young women, as we observed in chapter four, are endowed with pneumatological content, and they display the same characteristics as the holy spirit Hermas mentions in *Mand* 5.1.2-7—they can only abide where there is no evil.

³⁶⁰ Origen also uses John 1:33 to support the fact that the Holy Spirit always remains on Christ in *ComJn* 2.84-85. Origen writes a similar statement in *HomIs* 3.2 in an explanation of Christ’s possession of the Holy Spirit: “There is affliction to any human being to whom he comes. For every human being sins, ‘there is not a just man on earth who does good and does not sin’ (Ecc 7:20); ‘no one is clean of defilements, even if his life should be only a day, and his months are numbered’ (Job 14:4-5). Therefore he rests upon no one. We can also prove from the Gospel that the Spirit came upon many and did not abide in them. A little while ago it was read, ‘And my Spirit will not remain among these men forever’ (Gen 6:3). He does not say ‘shall not be,’ but ‘shall not remain.’ John saw one alone in whom he remained, and this was the sign: ‘Upon whom you see the Spirit descending and remaining in him, that is the Son of God’ (cf. John 1:33-34). Someone has ministered to the Word of God, when the Spirit descended. But after a little while, he sins; after a little while, he speaks an idle word (cf. Matt 15:36). But I do not know whether he may continue even without sin. You don’t think that one yields to sin when the Spirit is present, do you? Therefore the Spirit of God has rested upon no one, in accordance with what is written: ‘A rod has come forth from the root of Jesse, and a flower from his root has come up, and the Spirit of God will rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom, the spirit of understanding, the spirit of counsel and of virtue’ (cf. Isa 11:1-2)” (trans. from 896). See also *HomNum* 7.2.5; *HomNum* 13.5.2; *HomNum* 16.7.7; *HomSam* 28.9.2; *ComJn* 28.122-126.

filled with the Spirit according to his or her capacity, each saint should become more filled with the Spirit in order to attain perfection. Origen details this in *ComRm* 6.14.5:

Moreover, we need to realize that this putting to death of the deeds of the flesh should come through repentance, and [it does] not [come] suddenly but gradually. First of all these deeds must grow weaker and weaker in those who are starting out; then when they begin to make progress more fervently and to be filled more fully with the Spirit [*abundantiore spiritu repleti*], not only will [the deeds of the flesh] grow weaker, but they will even begin to decay. But when they then reach the point of perfection [*perfectum*] so that no indications of sin whatsoever appear in them, either in deed or in word or in thought, then they should be believed to have put to death the deeds of the flesh and to have completely handed over these deeds unto death.³⁶¹

By progressing in putting off the flesh, the saints are “filled more fully with the Spirit [*abundantiore spiritu repleti*].” This, in turn, enables the saints to progress further, eventually reaching perfection [*perfectum*]. Becoming more filled with the Spirit—just as Christ is filled with the Spirit to such a great degree—results in perfection, the goal of each saint. By following the example of the Spirit’s relationship with Christ, the saints are encouraged to become more filled by the Spirit, which results in their eventual perfection.

The Spirit’s relationship to Christ is an archetype not only insofar as it is a model for humans, but also because the Spirit must come to Christ before passing to humans. *HomEz* 1.6.1 attests to this belief:

“And the heavens were opened” (Ez 1:1). The heavens had been closed and they are opened for the advent of Christ, so that when they are unbolted the Holy Spirit may come upon him in the form of a dove (cf. Matt 3:16). For he could not pass to us unless he first came down to one who shares in his own nature (cf. John 16:7).³⁶²

³⁶¹ *ComRm* 6.14.5 (trans. from FOTC 104:59; Latin from Bammel 2:541). Cf. *ComRm* 6.13.7, where Origen describes the Holy Spirit as follows: “Thus it seems to me that this gift [*donum*] should be sought by merits and preserved by the blamelessness of one’s life, and even grace [*gratia*] should be increased in each person according to his progress in faith. And the purer [*purior*] the soul is returned, the more generously [*largior*] the Spirit is poured into it” (trans. from FOTC 104:56; Latin from Bammel 2:536).

³⁶² *HomEz* 1.6.1 (trans. from ACW 62:36).

Origen seems to be suggesting that the two natures of Christ allow the Holy Spirit to pass first to Christ, then to believers.³⁶³ The Holy Spirit is able to come to Christ's human nature, since Christ also possesses a divine nature like the Holy Spirit.³⁶⁴ Only then is the Spirit able to pass to humans. The Spirit's relationship to Christ, therefore, is also an archetype insofar as this relationship allows the Spirit to have a relationship with each saint.³⁶⁵

³⁶³ For examples of the two natures of Christ, see *HomLc* 19.1; *CCels* 3.28; *PArch* 2.6.3.

³⁶⁴ This does not mean, however, that the Son and the Holy Spirit are divine in the same way. As we discussed in part 1.1 of Chapter One, the Son receives divinity directly from the Father, while the Holy Spirit receives divinity, as do all other beings, through the ministry of the Son. Because the Son "was the first to be with God and has drawn divinity into himself" (*ComJn* 2.17; trans. from FOTC 80:99), the Son is more honored than all others who receive their divinity through him.

³⁶⁵ This can explain why the Spirit comes to the saints after Christ. In *HomLc* 27.5, after explaining how the Spirit first comes to Christ, Origen writes, "After the Lord 'ascended on high, leading captivity captive' (Ps 68:18; Eph 4:8), he gave us the Spirit. The Spirit had come to him, and he gave the Spirit at the time of his Resurrection when he said, 'Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive anyone's sins, they will be forgiven him. If you retain them for anyone, they will be retained' (John 20:22-23)" (trans. from FOTC 94:114). Christ bestows the Spirit after the time of his resurrection (cf. *ComJn* 32.86; *ComJn* 32.399; *ComMt* 12.40). This seems to contradict the fact that Origen believes that Old Testament prophets also possessed the Holy Spirit. For instance, Origen's discussions of Old Testament figures losing the Holy Spirit because of sin necessarily mean that these figures possessed the Holy Spirit at some time (see *HomNum* 6.3.4-6; *HomIs* 3.2). But Origen explains this apparent discrepancy in *PArch* 2.7.2: "I see, however, that the special coming of the Holy Spirit to men is declared to have happened after Christ's ascension into heaven rather than before his coming into the world. Before that time the gift of the Holy Spirit was bestowed on prophets only and on a few others among the people who happened to have proved worthy of it; but after the coming of the Saviour it is written that 'the saying was fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet Joel', namely, that 'it shall come to pass in the last days, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh and they shall prophesy' (Acts 2:16, 17; Joel 2:28); which indeed is similar to that other saying, 'All nations shall serve him' (Ps 72:11)" (trans. from Butterworth 117). Origen allows that the Holy Spirit came to a few people before Christ, but maintains that the "special coming" of the Spirit comes only after Christ's ascension. He supports this belief by appealing to Acts 2:16, 17, Joel 2:28, and Ps 72:11, suggesting that the Spirit's manifestation after Christ is intended for all people, not just a few. This passage, however, does contradict *HomLc* 27.5 insofar as it maintains that Christ gives the Holy Spirit after his ascension, rather than his resurrection. While Origen does not clarify this discrepancy, it seems to exist because he does not rectify the different accounts recorded in Scripture of the coming of the Spirit (John 20:22-23 and Acts 2). In either case, though, the Holy Spirit comes to humans after Christ.

Because scholars have failed to examine the Spirit's relationship with Christ, they have not realized the importance this relationship has in Origen's theology. He conceives of the Spirit's relationship with Christ as an archetype for his relationship with humans in two ways. First, the Spirit comes to Christ in the same manner as he does to humans, only to a greater degree and without the loss of the Spirit. Because humans are to become more filled with the Spirit, the degree to which Christ is filled with the Spirit is a model for humans to follow. Second, the Spirit's relationship to Christ is an archetype inasmuch as the Spirit must come to Christ before being able to come to humans. Having detailed how the Holy Spirit's relationship with Christ is an archetype for the Spirit's relationship with humans, we now turn to the Spirit's economic activity in humans.

5.2: The Holy Spirit and the Saints

Having established that the Spirit's descent on Christ is the archetype for the saints, we turn now to the Spirit's relationship with the saints. While scholars have maintained that the Spirit is necessary for salvation, few have offered an explanation for why this is the case. In this part I will argue that it is the goal of humans to increase in participation of the Spirit until they reach perfection, demonstrating that the Spirit is an integral part of human salvation. I will proceed in two sections. First, I will examine when the Spirit comes to humans. Then, I will show how the reception of the Spirit leads a person to salvation.

5.2.1: The Moment of the Reception of the Holy Spirit

Before discussing how the Spirit leads a person to salvation, it is first necessary to explain when a person receives the Spirit. Rius-Camps has claimed that determining the moment the Spirit comes to a person is "the greatest difficulty encountered in studying the Origenian

system.”³⁶⁶ As Rius-Camps points out, this is because of the ambiguous statements Origen makes on the subject—at one time Origen says a person receives the Spirit at baptism, at another only those who are saints receive him. This subject is even more complicated than Rius-Camps suggests, because Origen is even ambiguous about what constitutes a “saint.” In this section I will examine Origen’s statements on when a person receives the Spirit, beginning with his comments on baptism, then moving to those he makes about those who are saints. I will argue that Origen’s contradictory claims about human free will and divine aid can explain his ambiguity in pinpointing the moment at which a person receives the Holy Spirit.

As Rius-Camps points out, Origen does indicate that baptism is the time when many people receive the Spirit. Yet, his comments regarding the reception of the Spirit at baptism are less ambiguous than Rius-Camps suggests. This is because Origen makes the reception of the Spirit contingent on the state of the individual being baptized, which he relates in *HomEz* 6.5.1:

“You were not washed with water unto salvation” (Ez 16:4). Let us see what happens to Jerusalem lest the same fate befall us. It may be said, for example: A woman has now been washed, but one asks whether this leads to salvation, in order that we too may have fear. This is why the words are added: “Unto salvation.” Not all are washed “unto salvation.” We who have received the grace of baptism in the name of Christ have been washed; but I do not know who has been “washed unto salvation.” Simon was washed, and “after being baptized he continued in the company of Philip” (cf. Acts 8:13). But because he was not washed “unto salvation,” he was condemned by him who said to him in the Holy Spirit: “Your money perish with you!” (Acts 8:20). It is immensely difficult for someone who is washed to be washed unto salvation. Pay attention and listen to what is being said here, you catechumens; prepare yourselves, and you may come to the washing and be washed “unto salvation.” May you not be washed like some who are washed but not “unto salvation.” Such a one receives the water but does not receive the Holy Spirit (cf. John 3:5). The one who is washed unto salvation receives water and the Holy Spirit.³⁶⁷

Origen differentiates between receiving only the water of baptism and receiving the Spirit in addition to the water: only the latter results in salvation. Since Origen asks the catechumens to

³⁶⁶ Rius-Camps, *El dinamismo trinitario*, 78.

³⁶⁷ *HomEz* 6.5.1 (trans. from ACW 62:90-91).

“prepare yourselves,” he believes that a certain amount of preparation is necessary to receive the washing “unto salvation.”

Origen provides a more detailed description of the reception of the Spirit in *HomNum*

3.1.2. Here, he reiterates that reception of the Spirit is dependent on the state of the individual.

For this reason, people receive the Spirit when they are worthy, even if that occurs before baptism:

I am talking about certain catechumens with whom perhaps some even of those who have already received baptism may be grouped. “For not all who are from Israel are Israelites” (Rom 9:6), nor are all who have been washed in the water immediately also washed by the Holy Spirit; just as, on the contrary, not all who are numbered among the catechumens are estranged from and devoid of the Holy Spirit. For in the holy Scriptures I find that some catechumens were worthy to be indwelt by the Holy Spirit, and others who had received baptism were unworthy of the grace of the Holy Spirit. Cornelius was a catechumen, and before he came to the waters, he merited to receive the Holy Spirit (cf. Acts 10:47). Simon had received baptism, but because he approached this grace with hypocrisy, he is rejected from the gift of the Holy Spirit (cf. Acts 8:13, 18-19).³⁶⁸

Using Scripture, Origen points out that some are worthy of the Holy Spirit before being baptized, while others are still unworthy even after baptism. Baptism, therefore, is one of the primary ways believers receive the Holy Spirit, but the reception of the Spirit remains dependent on the worthiness of each individual apart from baptism.

Origen lays out how a person is worthy of the Holy Spirit in *PArch* 1.3.5,³⁶⁹ where he explains:

³⁶⁸ *HomNum* 3.1.2 (trans. from ACT 9).

³⁶⁹ Origen twice contradicts himself on this point, writing that the Holy Spirit is given to all beings, not just to those who are worthy. In *PArch* 1.3.4 (trans. from Butterworth 32) Origen writes, “For undoubtedly every one who walks upon the earth, that is to say, every earthly and corporeal being, is a partaker of the Holy Spirit, which he receives from God.” Likewise, in *PArch* 2.7.2 (trans. from Butterworth 117) Origen writes, “Now we are of the opinion that every rational creature receives without any difference a share in the Holy Spirit just as in the wisdom of God and the word of God.” A third passage could be added to these two. In *PArch* 1.3.7 Origen implies that the Holy Spirit has a second activity in addition to the giving of gifts: “There is, however, a special activity of God the Father, beyond that which he exercised on all things in giving them natural life. There is also a special ministry of the Lord Jesus Christ towards those on whom he confers the natural gift of reason, by means of which well-being is bestowed upon

The activity of the Holy Spirit does not extend at all either to lifeless things, or to things that have life but yet are dumb, nor is it to be found in those who, though rational, still lie in wickedness and are not wholly converted to better things. Only in those who are already turning to better things and walking in the ways of Jesus Christ, that is, who are engaged in good deeds and who abide in God, is the work of the Holy Spirit, I think, to be found.³⁷⁰

This passage indicates that the Holy Spirit is not present in those who are wicked, but only in those who do good—in order to receive the Spirit, one must no longer be wicked. Yet, Origen

them in addition to mere existence. There is yet another grace of the Holy Spirit bestowed upon such as are worthy...” (trans. from Butterworth 117). This passage speaks of the activities of the Father and Son in regards to creation, and then discusses the Holy Spirit’s role in giving gifts. However, the addition of the word “another” when speaking of the Holy Spirit implies a second activity, potentially one that is aimed at a broader audience than believers.

There have been attempts at reconciling these passages to the rest of Origen’s corpus. Butterworth, in Origen, *On First Principles*, 117, n.1, proposes that the Holy Spirit is given potentially to all, but only works in those who believe. Balas, “The Idea of Participation,” 267, writes, “Origen probably maintained that the Holy Spirit has been given, in some sense (Butterworth says ‘potentially’) to all (as he also maintained that all rational beings by partaking of ‘reason’...‘have implanted within them seeds, as it were, of wisdom and righteousness, which is Christ.’)” Peter Martens in *The Westminster Handbook to Origen*, ed. by John McGuckin, *The Westminster Handbooks to Christian Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), s.v. “Holy Spirit,” suggests, “One possible reconciling approach to this problem is to consider these statements about the ministries of the Spirit that are specific (to the saints alone) and general (to all rational creatures) as ultimately complementary and not mutually exclusive. Just as the Father and Son have general and specific ministries, as he has developed earlier in his text (*PArch* 1.3.5-8), so too, perhaps, is the Spirit assigned a general ministry (*PArch* 2.7.2) that intends to correct and complement the exclusively specific ministry as Origen knows he has sufficiently discussed earlier in *PArch* 1.3.7-8. It is also important to note that in *PArch* 2.7.2 the universal ministry of the Holy Spirit is not clearly differentiated from the general distribution of the ‘Wisdom of God and the Word of God’ and this typical convergence of pneumatology and Christology might also explain the apparently conflicting statements about the scope of the Spirit’s ministry in Origen’s thought.” These suggestions are worthy attempts at explaining Origen’s meaning, but there are two other possible explanations. First, since these passages contradict so many other passages in which the Holy Spirit is given only to believers, it is possible that Origen is inconsistent on this point. Second, because Rufinus admits to altering parts of *PArch* (see the introduction for more on this topic), it is also possible that these passages have been interpolated to give the Holy Spirit a general ministry and to make it appear as though the Spirit acts in all beings, rather than just believers. Unfortunately, there is too little evidence to know if any of these possibilities are true. Given that the Holy Spirit is dependent on the Son for his existence and attributes, and is only participated in according to the spiritual gifts given to believers—and that these are the only passages in his large corpus that directly contradict these points—I think it likely that Origen considers the Holy Spirit to come only to believers, and not to all beings.

³⁷⁰ *PArch* 1.3.5 (trans. from Butterworth 34).

writes in *PArch* 1.3.7 that the Holy Spirit is responsible for helping a person put off the old things and live a new life: “The Holy Spirit...creates for himself a new people and ‘renews the face of the earth’ (Col 3:9), when through the grace of the Spirit men ‘put off the old man with his doings’ (Col 3:9) and begin ‘to walk in newness of life’ (Rom 6:4).”³⁷¹ This, too, corresponds to the aspects of the Spirit’s gift of holiness that we elaborated in the previous chapter. In these two passages, therefore, Origen’s description of who receives the Spirit is ambiguous. On the one hand, one must no longer be wicked, but be “wholly converted to better things” in order to possess the Spirit; on the other hand, the Spirit helps a person move from the old way of life to a new life.

Origen’s beliefs on free will and divine aid can explain Origen’s ambiguity in expressing who is able to receive the Holy Spirit. At the beginning of his long exposition on free will in *PArch* 3.1, Origen explains that the church’s teaching on a future judgments makes it necessary that humans are responsible for their decisions. He writes, “It lies within our own power to devote ourselves to a life worthy either of praise or of blame.”³⁷² This can explain his statement in *PArch* 1.3.5—humans are responsible for choosing what is good rather than what is evil, so humans must choose the good before they are worthy to receive the Spirit. Yet, in *PArch* 3.1.19 Origen also says:

The will of man is not by itself sufficient to the accomplishment of salvation, nor is any mortal running able to attain the heavenly promises and to receive “the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus” (Phil 3:14), unless this good will of ours and our ready purpose and whatever industry we may possess is both helped and strengthened by the divine assistance.³⁷³

This passage can help us understand Origen’s statement in *PArch* 1.3.7. Humans also stand in need of divine aid in order to achieve salvation; therefore, the Holy Spirit must help a person

³⁷¹ *PArch* 1.3.7 (trans. from Butterworth 36).

³⁷² *PArch* 3.1.3 (trans. from Butterworth 157).

³⁷³ *PArch* 3.1.19 (trans. from Butterworth 198).

move from an old life to a new one. Origen's beliefs on free will and divine aid in the process of salvation can help us grasp his contradictory statements on the moment when the Holy Spirit enters a person.

5.2.2: The Holy Spirit's Role in Salvation

Having now discussed when a person receives the Holy Spirit, I will turn to the Spirit's economic activity in the saints. This section will unfold in two parts. First, I will argue that the Holy Spirit fills the person who participates in him. Then, I will argue that it is the goal of this person to grow in participation and to be filled to a greater capacity, the eventual result of which is perfection. This latter point will not only demonstrate the Spirit's role in the salvation of the human person, but further support my thesis from the first part of this chapter that the Spirit's relationship to the Son is a model for humans to follow. In order to pursue my thesis, I will begin by returning to *ComJn 2.77* and offering a more detailed analysis of Origen's conception of participation, which will enable us to show how the Spirit is present in each person who participates in him.

We have already examined *ComJn 2.77* in the context of the Spirit's gift-giving activity. We return to the passage now in order to provide a more detailed explanation of how Origen conceives of the participation of believers in the Spirit. Doing so will show that the content of the gifts exists in each person who participates in the Spirit:

I think, if I may put it this way, that the Holy Spirit supplies the material of the gifts from God [ὑλὴν τῶν ἀπὸ θεοῦ χαρισμάτων] to those who are called saints [ἀγίοις] thanks to him and because of participation [μετοχὴν] in him. This material of the gifts [ὑλὴς τῶν χαρισμάτων] which I mentioned is made effective from God [ἐνεργουμένης...ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ]; it is administered by Christ [διακονουμένης...ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ]; but it subsists in accordance with the Holy Spirit [ὑφεστῶσης...κατὰ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα].³⁷⁴

³⁷⁴ *ComJn 2.77-78* (trans. from FOTC 80:114; Greek from GCS 10:65).

When a “saint” [ἅγιος] participates in the Holy Spirit, the Spirit gives the believer the “material of the gifts” [ὑλὴν τῶν...χαρισμάτων]. The use of the term ὑλὴ is puzzling since Origen considers the Holy Spirit to be incorporeal.³⁷⁵ His use of the term to refer to immaterial substances elsewhere can help us explain the use of the term here. For example, Origen interprets the “matter” mentioned in Isa 10:17 as the immaterial substance of sin:³⁷⁶ “For the saying of Isaiah: ‘And he shall burn up the *hyle*’, that is the matter [*materiam*], ‘like hay’ (Isa 10:17), spoken in reference to those who have been appointed for punishment, uses the terms ‘matter’ [*materiam*] to denote sins.”³⁷⁷

Origen also uses the term “matter” to refer to incorporeal substances in *HomNum* 6. This homily includes an exegesis of the seventy elders upon whom the Spirit descended, and Origen explains that the Holy Spirit came upon these seventy elders because of the “praiseworthy quality of their life as well as their virtues.”³⁷⁸ He goes on to say, “Since the Holy Spirit ‘rested’ in view of the purity of their heart, the sincerity of their mind and the capacity of their understanding, he becomes immediately active in them and he wastes no time, wherever material [*materia*] that is worthy of his action is available.”³⁷⁹ The Spirit rests on these elders because of their “purity of heart, the sincerity of their mind and the capacity of their understanding.” For this reason, the worthy “material” Origen mentions here must refer to these incorporeal characteristics rather than a real material substance.³⁸⁰ *HomNum* 6.3.1, therefore, also

³⁷⁵ See *PArch* 1.1.3; *CCels* 6.70; *HomNum* 6.2.1.

³⁷⁶ See *CCels* 6.70, which reads, “Just as if sins are said to be wood, hay, and stubble, we would not say that sins are material, and if upright conduct is said to be gold, silver and precious stone, we would not say that upright conduct is material” (trans. from Chadwick 384).

³⁷⁷ *PArch* 4.4.6 (trans. from Butterworth 321; Latin from Gorgemanns 800). See also *ComJn* 13.138-139; *ComJn* 13.267; and *HomJr* 16.6.3.

³⁷⁸ *HomNum* 6.3.1 (trans. from ACT 22).

³⁷⁹ *HomNum* 6.3.1 (trans. from ACT 22; Latin from GCS 30:33). The Latin *materia* here is the same word Rufinus uses to translate *hyle* in *PArch* 4.4.6.

³⁸⁰ Origen writes in *CCels* 6.70 that “upright conduct,” which could include purity of heart, sincerity of mind, and capacity of understanding, is immaterial: “Just as if sins are said to

demonstrates that Origen is comfortable using the term *hyle* to express an immaterial idea within the context of the Holy Spirit's activity.³⁸¹ Based on his usage of *hyle* elsewhere in his corpus, as well as his belief in the incorporeality of the Holy Spirit, we can understand Origen's use of *hyle* in *ComJn* 2.77 to designate the general (immaterial) content of the spiritual gifts.

This material of the gifts which the Holy Spirit supplies, Origen says, "subsists in accordance with the Holy Spirit [ὑφεστώσης...κατὰ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα]." The term "subsists" [ὑφίστημι] is significant for grasping how this material of the gifts comes to believers. Origen uses the verb "subsists" [ὑφίστημι] four other times in the first two chapters of his *ComJn*.³⁸² Each time he utilizes the word in order to speak of the distinct, real existence of a being. For example, in *ComJn* 1.152 Origen juxtaposes two positions. The first does not view the Word as distinct from the Father; Origen says this means that the Word "does not subsist [ὑφεστάναι] nor is he a son."³⁸³ The second considers the Word to be distinct from the Father; this means that the Word "is both separated [κεχωρισμένον] and invested with substance [οὐσιωμένον]."³⁸⁴ The

be wood, hay, and stubble, we would not say that sins are material, and if upright conduct is said to be gold, silver and precious stone, we would not say that upright conduct is material" (trans. from Chadwick 384).

³⁸¹ This particular use of the term *hyle* is not unique to Origen. Christopher Stead, *Divine Substance*, 71, has observed that, in Aristotle, "the use of this term [*hyle*] is elastic; it sometimes means little more than the medium, whatever it is, in which a form is realized." For example, Aristotle, *De Anima* ii.1, 412 b 20, says that the eye is "the matter of eyesight [ὕλη ὄψεως]" (trans. and Greek from Aristotle, *De Anima*, trans. R.D. Hicks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907), 50-51). On this passage see Stead, *Divine Substance*, 71, n. 23.

Stead, *Divine Substance*, 145, makes the same observation about *ousia*, writing, "The sense of οὐσία can be extended by metaphorical uses based on the sense 'stuff', in much the same way as Aristotle's ὕλη; it then comes to mean something like the English 'content'."

³⁸² See *ComJn* 1.152; 1.244; 2.74; 2.181. I have analyzed the use of the term in the first two books of *ComJn* since Origen completed these in Alexandria before taking up his *ComJn* again after his move to Caesarea. See Ronald Heine, introduction to *Commentary on the Gospel according to John, Books 1-10*, by Origen, trans. Ronald Heine, Fathers of the Church 80 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989), 4-5.

³⁸³ *ComJn* 1.152 (trans. from FOTC 80:65; Greek from GCS 10:29). For the anti-Monarchian function of this passage, see Plaxco, "Didymus the Blind," 85-89 and Waers, "Monarchianism," 228-231.

³⁸⁴ *ComJn* 1.152 (trans. from FOTC 80:65; Greek from GCS 10:29).

term ὑφίστημι in this context serves as a way to indicate whether or not the Son has a distinct existence apart from the Father. Since Origen uses ὑφίστημι throughout *ComJn* 1-2 as a way to denote a distinct existence, his use of the term in *ComJn* 2.77 should be understood to express his belief that the material of the gifts have a real existence in each of the believers who receive it.

Origen's use of these two terms—"matter" [ὕλη] and "subsist" [ὑφίστημι]—and their proper understanding are important for grasping the significance of participation in the Spirit. The "material" of the gifts have a real existence in each person who possesses spiritual gifts. Because each of the gifts, or powers, of the Spirit are the Holy Spirit,³⁸⁵ participating in the gifts of the Spirit means that the Spirit has a distinct, but incorporeal, existence in each believer.³⁸⁶

³⁸⁵ See part 3.2 of Chapter Three.

³⁸⁶ The Holy Spirit does not exist in each person as a part of the Spirit, as Origen elaborates in *HomNum* 6.2.1: "But let us look at another section as well where it is reported that 'Moses chose seventy men from the elders of the people and kept them before the tabernacle of testimony' (Num 11:24); and 'God, taking from the Spirit of Moses, gave to the seventy elders,' and 'when the Spirit rested on them,' it says, 'they all prophesied' (cf. Num 11:25). You should not understand the words: 'Taking from the Spirit of Moses, he gave the Spirit to the seventy elders,' as though God is removing some material and physical substance from Moses and dividing it into seventy portions, and as though he were giving a scanty particle to each of the elders. It is impious to understand the nature of the Holy Spirit in this way. But attend to the figure of these mysterious words in the following manner. It is as if Moses, and the Spirit who was in Moses, were the lamp of some very brilliant light from which God kindled seventy other lamps. The principal splendor of that light came to the others in such a manner that the very origin of the light suffered no loss from the sharing of its source" (trans. from ACT 21). The Spirit comes to each person in the same way that a lamp is lit from another lamp—in a way that the original lamp suffers no loss, while the second lamp receives the fullness of that light.

Lewis Ayres has described this concept as the "undiminished giver." For more on this idea, see Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver': Didymus the Blind's *De spiritu sancto* and the development of Nicene Pneumatology," in *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church: The Proceedings of the Seventh International Patristic Conference, Maynooth, 2008*, ed. D. Vincent Twomey and Janet Rutherford (Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2010), 57-72. As Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver,'" 59, points out, the first to present the idea of the undiminished giver clearly is Philo, whose exegesis of the seventy elders and the coming of the Spirit so closely resembles Origen's that it leaves little doubt that Origen knows of Philo's account. Philo writes in *Gig.* 24-25, "Such a divine spirit, too, is that of Moses, which visits the seventy elders that they may excel others and be brought to something better—those seventy who cannot be in real truth even elders, if they have not received a portion of that spirit

This means that participating in the Holy Spirit results in the presence of the Spirit in each person who participates.³⁸⁷

Recognizing that the Spirit is present in each person who participates can further explain why Origen says that participating in the Spirit results in being filled [πληρώω/*repleri*] with the Spirit, which will help us better understand the goal of each saint. The connection between being filled by the Spirit and participating in the Spirit is demonstrated by *PArch* 3.3.3, where Origen is juxtaposing the action of the divine powers with that of the evil powers:

Just as holy and stainless souls, when they have devoted themselves to God with entire affection and entire purity and have kept themselves apart from all contact with daemons and purified themselves by much abstinence and have been steeped in pious and religious

of perfect wisdom. For it is written, ‘I will take of the spirit that is on thee and lay it upon the seventy elders’ (Num 11:17). But think not that this taking of the spirit comes to pass as when men cut away a piece and sever it. Rather it is, as when they take fire from fire, for though the fire should kindle a thousand torches, it is still as it was and is diminished not a whit” (trans. from LCL 227:457). Philo, too, is concerned to point out that the spirit should not be thought of in a material sense, utilizing the analogy of a torch lighting other torches to provide an example of the nature of the spirit’s sharing. The Holy Spirit as an undiminished giver also places the Spirit alongside the Father and Son within a Trinitarian context. Because the idea of the undiminished giver is associated with the highest principles (see Ayres, “The Holy Spirit as the ‘Undiminished Giver,’” 60), Origen’s use of the teaching to explain the Spirit’s action can be seen as distinguishing the Spirit from the rest of creation.

³⁸⁷ If the Spirit is present in each believer through participation, this can explain why Origen frequently describes the Spirit as indwelling [οικέω/*habito*] a person. See *HomNum* 6.3.1; *ComJn* 13.143; *ComMt* 13.2; *ComRm* 6.12.8; *ComRm* 6.13.2; *ComRm* 6.13.9; *ComRm* 6.14.2; and *ComRm* 7.11.2, all of which use οικέω or *habito*, or a derivative, to refer to the Spirit’s indwelling. Many of these references to the indwelling Spirit appeal to Rom 8:9, which reads, “You, however, are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if in fact the Spirit of God dwells [οικεῖ] in you.” Origen also describes the Spirit as indwelling Christ, providing further confirmation that the Spirit’s relationship to Christ is the same as his relationship to humans. See *ComRm* 3.8.5-6.

Garijo, “Aspectos de la Pneumatología Origeniana,” (1966), 184-186, argues that the presence of the Holy Spirit is the same as participating in the Spirit, citing three different passages: *PEuch* 28.8; *PEuch* 16.3; and *Cor* 29 (I, 240). The first two passages use the verb χωρέω, the third passage, the verb παραδέχομαι. While these terms are different than those I examine in this section, they express a similar idea to the indwelling of the Spirit. In arguing that the presence of the Spirit is the same as participating in the Spirit, Garijo bases his claim on two pieces of evidence. First, he references a statement of Crouzel that Origen considers the presence of Christ to be the same as participation in Christ. Then, he argues that *ComJn* 28.124-125 shows the presence of the Holy Spirit to be the same as participation in the Spirit. While my conclusion is similar to Garijo’s, I provide a more comprehensive analysis of this idea, linking it to the way that Origen connects the spiritual gifts to the Spirit himself.

exercises, acquire thereby a communion [*participium*] with the divine nature and win the grace of prophecy and of the other divine gifts, so, too, must we think that those who show themselves fit subjects for the opposing powers, that is, those who adopt a work and manner of life and purpose agreeable to them, receive their inspiration and become participators [*participes*] in their wisdom and doctrine. The result of this is that they are filled with [*repleantur*] the operations of those spirits to whose service they have once subjected themselves.³⁸⁸

Origen says that, just as believers receive gifts, those who come under the influence of the opposing powers become “participators [*participes*] in their wisdom and doctrine.” As a result, they are filled with [*repleantur*] the operations of these spirits. This indicates that participation in the opposing powers results in being filled with them, and since Origen juxtaposes the opposing powers with the divine powers, it would seem that participation in the divine powers also results in being filled with them. *CCels* 4.5 confirms this:

We would say that the soul of the bad man who is deluged with evil is deserted by God, and would maintain that the soul of the man who desires to live virtuously, or has even made some progress, or is even already living virtuously, is filled by or shares in a divine spirit [πληροῦσθαι ἢ μετέχειν θείου πνεύματος].³⁸⁹

Although Origen uses the name “divine spirit” in this passage, we can understand the divine spirit to refer to the Holy Spirit for two reasons. First, Origen elsewhere describes the Spirit’s relationship with the saints using the terms “share [μετέχω]” and “be filled by [πληρόω],”³⁹⁰ showing that the Holy Spirit performs both of these activities. Second, our description of a “saint” above corresponds to Origen’s description here of the person who “is filled by or shares in a divine spirit.” This passage reveals, therefore, that those who are worthy can be said to

³⁸⁸ *PArch* 3.3.3 (trans. from Butterworth 226; Latin from Görgemanns 594).

³⁸⁹ *CCels* 4.5 (trans. from Chadwick 187; Greek from SC 136:198).

³⁹⁰ We have already discussed participation in the Holy Spirit in this and in previous chapters, but for the idea of being filled by the Spirit, see *HomLev* 8.11.5; *PArch* 2.6.4; *HomLc* 7.3; and *ComJn* 6.162.

possess the Holy Spirit by both sharing in [μετέχειν] the Spirit and being filled by [πληροῦσθαι] him.³⁹¹

³⁹¹ Garijo, “Aspectos de la Pneumatología Origeniana,” (1966), 182-184, has argued that Origen also uses Stoic mixture theory to describe the Spirit’s relationship with humans, a relationship that Garijo also argues is equivalent to participation. Origen uses mixture language on three occasions: *PEuch* 10.2; *Fragm1Co* 10.9; and *ComJn* 1.195-197. In the last of these Origen writes, “I think, then, that ‘king’ is used of that preeminent nature of the firstborn of all creation. Judgment is given to this nature because it transcends. And ‘the king’s son’ is used of the human nature which is assumed, which is formed and shaped in accordance with justice by that nature. And I am led to accept that this is so from the fact that both have been brought together into one Word, and the fact that the things which are added are no longer related as of two individuals, but as of one. For the Savior had made ‘both one’ (Eph 2:14), having made them according to the firstfruits of both which came to be in himself before all things. And I say ‘of both’ also in the case of men in whose case each man’s soul has been mixed [ἀνακέκραται] with the Holy Spirit and each of those who are saved has become spiritual [πνευματικός]” (trans. from FOTC 80:73; Greek from GCS 10:36). Origen is here discussing the union of the divine and human natures of Christ. He goes on to explain that the Holy Spirit and the human soul also become one, explaining both Christ’s two natures and the Spirit’s relationship to the human soul using the verb “to mix” [ἀνακεράννυμι; noun: ἀνάκρασις]. Through this term, Garijo, “Aspectos de la Pneumatología Origeniana,” (1966), 183-184, links Origen’s thought with Stoic mixture theory. Stoics believed that *krasis* referred to a particular type of mixture in which two substances “mutually coextended in their entirety,” while the substances in the mixture retained “their original substance and qualities” (Alexander of Aphrodisias, *On Mixture* 3, 216.14; trans. from Robert Todd, *Alexander of Aphrodisias on Stoic Physics*, *Philosophia Antiqua* 28 (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 117). Origen is saying, then, that the Holy Spirit mixes with the human soul in a way that the Spirit and human being become united but remain distinct.

Origen reveals the implications of this language in *ComJn* 19.22. There, he is discussing the difference between knowing something and believing in it: “But see if Scripture does not also say elsewhere that those who have been blended with [ἀνακεκραμένους] and united [ἐνωθέντας] with something know [γινώσκειν] that with which they have been blended [ἀνεκράθησαν] and have been involved [κεκοινωνήκασιν]. And before such unity [ἐνώσεως] and participation [κοινωνίας], even if they understand the explanations given about a thing, they do not know it” (trans. from FOTC 89:172, slightly altered; Greek from GCS 10:302). Origen equates blending [ἀνακεράννυμι] with unity [ἐνωσις] and participation [κοινωνέω] (although he here uses a different term to express participation, see *ComJn* 1.246 for his use of both μετέχω and κοινωνέω to refer to the same relationship). The connection between the three terms in this passage suggests that Origen understands participating in the Spirit and being blended with the Spirit to refer to the same relationship.

For more on Stoic mixture theory, see the work of Richard Sorabji, *Matter, Space and Motion: Theories in Antiquity and Their Sequel* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988). I am also indebted to the work of Anthony Briggman, *God and Christ in Irenaeus*, *Oxford Early Christian Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 140-146. For a discussion of the appropriation of Stoic mixture theory in early Christianity, as well as a discussion of how Irenaeus applies it to the union of the divine and human natures in Christ, see Briggman, *God and Christ in Irenaeus*, 146-180.

By understanding that participation in the Spirit results in being filled by him, we can better grasp the ultimate goal of a person's relationship with the Spirit—to increase in participation in order to reach perfection. Origen explains this goal with respect to participation in *PArch* 1.3.8:

And when a man, by being sanctified through participation [*participatione*] in the Holy Spirit [*spiritus sancti*], is made purer [*purior*] and holier [*sincerior*], he becomes more worthy to receive the grace [*gratiam*] of wisdom and knowledge, in order that all stains of pollution and ignorance may be purged and removed and that he may make so great an advance in holiness [*sinceritatis*] and purity [*puritatis*] that the life which he received from God shall be such as is worthy of God, who gave it to be pure [*pure*] and perfect [*perfecte*], and that that which exists shall be as worthy as he who caused it to exist. Thus, too, the man who is such as God who made him wished him to be, shall receive from God the power to exist for ever and to endure for eternity.³⁹²

Origen describes a process by which a person, through participation in the Spirit's gift of sanctification, receives the graces of wisdom and knowledge. Origen classifies these gifts elsewhere as "higher gifts,"³⁹³ which means that growing in holiness results in the reception of other, higher gifts. If one continues to progress, a person's life will be worthy of God. Since God made each life to be pure and perfect, being worthy of God means being pure and perfect. This is the eventual result of the one who continues to progress in participation in the Spirit.³⁹⁴

Origen offers a similar description of the Spirit's work in *ComRm* 6.14.5. On this occasion, however, he speaks of being filled by the Spirit:

Moreover, we need to realize that this putting to death of the deeds of the flesh should come through repentance, and [it does] not [come] suddenly but gradually. First of all these deeds must grow weaker and weaker in those who are starting out; then when they begin to make progress more fervently and to be filled more fully with the Spirit [*abundantiore spiritu repleti*], not only will [the deeds of the flesh] grow weaker, but they will even begin to decay. But when they then reach the point of perfection [*perfectum*] so that no indications of sin whatsoever appear in them, either in deed or in

³⁹² *PArch* 1.3.8 (trans. from Butterworth 38-39; Latin from Görgemanns 180-182).

³⁹³ See, for example, *ComJn* 13.353-354; *PArch* Pref.3; *CCels* 3.46.

³⁹⁴ It should be noted that this is not the work of the Spirit alone. As we saw in the previous chapter, the gifts are a common operation of the Father and Son. I focus here, however, on the work of the Spirit.

word or in thought, then they should be believed to have put to death the deeds of the flesh and to have completely handed over these deeds unto death.³⁹⁵

Those who progress in “putting to death...the deeds of the flesh”—a work that we have already discussed as pertaining to the Spirit’s gift of holiness—are “filled more fully [*abundantiore...repleri*]” with the Holy Spirit. The result of being “filled more fully” is that a person will continue to put to death the deeds of the flesh. Eventually, this will result in perfection [*perfectum*].

Because Christ is filled with the Spirit more than any other person, the goal of humans to be filled more fully with the Spirit reaffirms that Christ serves as a model for the relationship between the Spirit and humans. As a person is more filled with the Holy Spirit and increases participation to receive the higher gifts, that person progresses toward their ultimate goal, perfection. The Holy Spirit, therefore, plays an integral role in humans’ progress toward and attainment of perfection. Origen even warns that committing sin against the Spirit is unforgiveable. We explore this topic in the next section.

5.2.3: The Loss of the Spirit

Because the Holy Spirit is integral for salvation, it would seem that salvation is impossible without participating in the Spirit. Indeed, Origen says that sinning against the Spirit is unforgiveable,³⁹⁶ suggesting that a person who receives the Spirit and subsequently sins cannot be saved. This leads to a further problem—if the Spirit does not remain in anyone but Christ

³⁹⁵ *ComRm* 6.14.5 (trans. from FOTC 104:59; Latin from Bammel 2:541). Cf. *ComRm* 6.13.7, where Origen describes the Holy Spirit as follows: “Thus it seems to me that this gift [*donum*] should be sought by merits and preserved by the blamelessness of one’s life, and even grace [*gratia*] should be increased in each person according to his progress in faith. And the purer [*purior*] the soul is returned, the more generously [*largior*] the Spirit is poured into it” (trans. from FOTC 104:56; Latin from Bammel 2:536).

³⁹⁶ See *ComJn* 2.80; *ComJn* 28.124-125; and *PArch* 1.3.7.

because all others sin,³⁹⁷ the implication is that no one can be saved. In this section I will suggest the reading that the Spirit is not always present when a person sins, which means that a person does not commit sin against the Spirit. I will also argue that Origen provides recourse for those who do sin against the Spirit, enabling even them to be saved.

Although Origen says that a person who receives the Spirit and sins cannot be saved, Origen provides an account of the Spirit's relationship with humans in *HomNum* 6.3.7 that may indicate that sin after receiving the Spirit does not always necessitate that a person has committed the sin against the Spirit. In this passage he explains the term "rested" as it applies to the saints: "He operated in them at that time when it was expedient for them through whom he was working and it was useful to those to whom he was ministering."³⁹⁸ This implies that the Spirit is not always present in the believer who has been deemed worthy of receiving the Spirit, which can explain the instances in which Origen does not seem to allow for sin after receiving the Spirit. If Origen understands the Spirit to be present only at certain times, then perhaps he considers sin committed when the Spirit is absent to be excluded from the sin against the Holy Spirit.

Origen also indicates that there is a way to salvation even for those who have sinned against the Holy Spirit.³⁹⁹ He explains in *HomJr* 2.3.1-3:

³⁹⁷ See part 5.1 of this chapter. Origen emphasizes that all except Christ sin by discussing several prophets who possessed the Holy Spirit, but committed sin. See *HomNum* 6.3.4-6 and *HomIs* 3.2.

³⁹⁸ *HomNum* 6.3.7 (trans. from ACT 23).

³⁹⁹ Cf. *PEuch* 27.15, where Origen says, "And in those ages to come God will show the riches 'of His grace in kindness' (Eph 2:7), since the worst sinner, who has blasphemed the Holy Spirit and been ruled by sin from beginning to end in the whole of this present age, will afterwards in the age to come be brought to order, I know not how" (trans. from CSW 146). This indicates that Origen is unsure how those who blaspheme against the Holy Spirit will be saved, although this passage is talking about the "worst sinner," which Origen may differentiate from those who commit post-baptismal sin. It is also possible that this represents a development in Origen's thought. Nautin, *Origène*, 384-385, dates *PEuch* to 234-235. Nautin, *Origène*, 389-412, dates the homilies after this.

On this account, Jesus—now perhaps I discover the reason—baptizes “in the Holy Spirit and in fire” (Luke 3:16), not the same man “in the Holy Spirit and in fire,” but the holy man “in the Holy Spirit,” while another man, after he has believed, after he has been deemed worthy of the Holy Spirit, after he has sinned again, Jesus washes in fire, so that it is not the same man who is baptized by Jesus in the Holy Spirit and in fire. Blessed, then, is the one who is baptized in the Holy Spirit and does not need the baptism by fire, but three times unhappy is that man who has need to be baptized in fire, though Jesus takes care of both of them. For “a shoot from the stump of Jesse will come forth, and a branch will grow out of the root” (Isa 11:1), a shoot for those who are punished, a branch for the righteous. So God is a consuming fire (cf. Heb 12:29) and God is light (cf. 1 John 1:15), a consuming fire to sinners, a light to the just and holy ones. And blessed is he “who shares in the first resurrection” (Rev 20:6), he who has kept the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Who is he who is saved in another resurrection? He who needs the baptism from fire, when he comes before that fire and the fire tests him, and when that fire finds wood, hay and stubble to burn (cf. 1 Cor 3:12-13).⁴⁰⁰

Origen explains that one who has sinned after receiving the Holy Spirit will receive the baptism of fire in order to be washed again. The person who receives the baptism of fire is unhappy, but that person is still saved. Origen explains in more detail the purpose of being washed in fire in

HomLev 5.3.2:

Hear what is written: “Our God is a consuming fire” (Deut 4:24). What does the “God of fire” consume? Will we be so senseless as to think that “God” consumes “the firewood” or “straw” or “hay” (cf. 1 Cor 3:12)? But the “God of fire” consumes human sins. He consumes them, devours them, purges them, as he says in another place, “I will purge you with fire for purity” (Isa 1:25).⁴⁰¹

⁴⁰⁰ *HomJr* 2.3.1-3 (trans. from FOTC 97:26-27). Cf. *HomEz* 5.1.2. In *HomLc* 24.2 Origen is differentiating between the baptism in the Holy Spirit and the baptism in fire, writing of the latter, “In the same way, the Lord Jesus Christ will stand in the river of fire near the ‘flaming sword’ (Gen 3:24). If anyone desires to pass over to paradise after departing this life, and needs cleansing, Christ will baptize him in this river and send him across to the place he longs for. But whoever does not have the sign of earlier baptisms, him Christ will not baptize in the fiery bath. For, it is fitting that one should be baptized first in ‘water and the Spirit’ (John 3:5). Then, when he comes to the fiery river, he can show that he preserved the bathing in water and the Spirit” (trans. from FOTC 94:103-104). Origen here says that one must “preserve” the baptism in water and the Spirit, which could be interpreted as contradicting other statements in which a person must receive the baptism of fire because he or she sinned. Origen may, however, simply be differentiating between those who fall away after baptism and those who sin, but continue in faith.

⁴⁰¹ *HomLev* 5.3.2 (trans. from FOTC 83:94). See also *CCels* 4.13; *CCels* 5.15; *HomEx* 6.4; *HomEz* 5.1.2; *PArch* 2.10.4-6.

Origen makes explicit in this passage what was implicit in his reading of 1 Cor 3:12 in *HomJr* 2.3.1-3: the wood, straw, and hay that God consumes with fire refer to a person's post-baptismal sins. If a person sins after receiving baptism and the Holy Spirit, that person must be cleansed of his or her sin, which occurs through the baptism of fire leading to purification—thus, allowing a person who has sinned after receiving the Holy Spirit to be saved.

Chapter Conclusion

In this final chapter I have examined how the Spirit's economic activity leads humans to their ultimate goal, perfection. I have argued that the Spirit's relationship to the incarnate Christ serves as an archetype for the Spirit's relationship to humans, insofar as the Spirit's relationship to Christ serves as a model for humans to follow and because the Spirit must come to Christ first before coming to humans. As I have argued in the second part of this chapter, it is the goal of humans to not only receive the Holy Spirit, but to increase their participation and to be filled more fully with him. This results in perfection, demonstrating that the Holy Spirit is instrumental in helping humans attain salvation.

Conclusion

In this study I have demonstrated that Origen considers the Holy Spirit to be dependent on the Father and Son, a relationship that ranks the Spirit below the Father and Son and serves as the foundation for the Spirit's salvific activity of mediating gifts to believers. Origen craft this pneumatology by grounding his thought in Scripture, exegeting passages he believes pertain to the Holy Spirit using previous Jewish, Christian, and philosophical thought.

I began this study by examining the relationship between the Father and Son. I argued that the Son is dependent on the Father with respect to both his being and his attributes, which ranks the Son below the Father. The Son's rank informs Origen's theology of creation—the Father is the ultimate creator, the Son the immediate creator—with the creative activity beginning in the Father and flowing through the Son to all created beings. By understanding the Son's dependence on the Father and his relationship to creation, we are able to better assess Origen's theology of the Holy Spirit.

Chapter One served as a foundation for Chapter Two, where we examined the Spirit's generation with respect to his being and his attributes. I argued that Origen ranks the Holy Spirit below the Father and Son with respect to both his being and his attributes, but above all other beings. In order to demonstrate this thesis, I broke this chapter into two parts. In the first, I demonstrated three ways in which Origen groups the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit together. I pointed out, however, that Origen does not indicate via these strategies whether or not he arranges the three hierarchically. By analyzing three passages in which Origen discusses the generation of the Spirit, I concluded that one of these passages, *ComJn* 2.73-88, should be preferred as Origen's mature theological position. Through an exegesis of this passage, I demonstrated that the Holy Spirit's existence is dependent on the Father and the Son, which ranks the Spirit below them. However, I also demonstrated that Origen ranks the Spirit above all

other created beings. The second part of this chapter confirmed that Origen ranks the Spirit below the Father and Son—the Spirit participates in the Son to receive his attributes, thereby making the Spirit dependent on him.

In Chapter Three I argued that Origen interprets the traditional understanding of the Holy Spirit as one and seven in terms of a philosophical notion of power, which allows him to explain how the Holy Spirit can be a single being but bestow many different spiritual gifts. Origen refers to the sevenfold Spirit on four occasions in his corpus, placing him within an early Christian tradition indebted to Jewish angelology that associates the seven highest angels with the Holy Spirit. By interpreting the sevenfold Spirit in terms of a philosophical notion of power, Origen is able to refer both to the singular power of the Holy Spirit and his many different powers. He connects these powers to the Spirit's many gifts, thereby explaining how the Spirit can be one but also be able to distribute many different gifts.

I turned to the Spirit's activities, especially his activity of giving gifts, in Chapter Four. There, I argued that Origen conceives of the Spirit's activities as a common operation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a logic that corresponds with his hierarchical understanding of the Trinity. Based on his exegesis of 1 Cor 12:4-6, I demonstrated that he believes that the spiritual gifts begin in the Father, flow to the Son, and then to the Holy Spirit. This logical pattern reflects Origen's understanding of creative activity as flowing from the Father to the Son, which allows us to recognize that participation in the Spirit is also a participation in the Father and Son. Furthermore, this gift-giving schema allows us to explain why Origen is able to predicate the Spirit's activities, including those not explicitly called gifts, to the Father and Son.

In my fifth and final chapter, I examined how the Spirit's economic activity leads to the salvation of humans. In the first part of this chapter, I argued that the Spirit's relationship to the incarnate Christ serves as an archetype for the Spirit's relationship with humans in two ways.

First, the Spirit's relationship to Christ serves as a model for humans to follow; second, the Spirit must first come to Christ before proceeding to humans. This led to the second part of the chapter, where I argued that it is the goal of humans to increase in participation and be filled more fully with the Holy Spirit. By doing so, humans become perfect, demonstrating the Spirit's instrumental role in the salvation of the human person.

This dissertation has provided an examination of the Spirit's identity (who the Spirit is) and activity (what the Spirit does). It has demonstrated that the Holy Spirit is dependent on the Father and Son and, therefore, ranked below them. It has also demonstrated that the Spirit's relationship to the Father and Son serves as the foundation for the Spirit's activity—the Spirit's activity is dependent on the Father and Son insofar as it begins in the Father, flows through the Son, and then to the Holy Spirit. The Spirit's activity, therefore, is a common operation of the three. As a result, the Holy Spirit is integral to salvation.

In addition to providing the first comprehensive examination of Origen's theology of the Holy Spirit, this dissertation can serve as a foundation for future works on the development of pneumatology, as well as of Trinitarian theology. Because of Origen's influence within early Christianity, this examination of his pneumatology provides us with a basis for examining in what ways Origen influenced later pneumatologies. Furthermore, by looking at Trinitarian relations from the perspective of his pneumatology, this dissertation provides a new perspective from which to approach Origen's beliefs on the relationship between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Appendix A: Primary Source Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Title
Clement of Alexandria	
<i>Adumbr</i>	<i>Adumbrationes</i>
<i>Ecl</i>	<i>Eclogae propheticae</i>
<i>Exc</i>	<i>Excerpta ex Theodoto</i>
<i>Paed</i>	<i>Paedagogus</i>
<i>Strom</i>	<i>Stromata</i>
Justin	
<i>Dial</i>	<i>Dialogue with Trypho</i>
Origen	
<i>CCels</i>	<i>Against Celsus</i>
<i>ComCt</i>	<i>Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles</i>
<i>ComEp</i>	<i>Commentary on Ephesians</i>
<i>ComJn</i>	<i>Commentary on John</i>
<i>ComMt</i>	<i>Commentary on Matthew</i>
<i>ComRm</i>	<i>Commentary on Romans</i>
<i>DialHer</i>	<i>Dialogue with Heraclides</i>
<i>Fragm1Co</i>	<i>Fragments on 1 Corinthians</i>
<i>FragmEz</i>	<i>Fragments on Ezekiel</i>
<i>FragmLc</i>	<i>Fragments on Luke</i>
<i>Hom1Sam</i>	<i>Homilies on 1 Samuel</i>
<i>HomCt</i>	<i>Homilies on the Canticle of Canticles</i>
<i>HomEx</i>	<i>Homilies on Exodus</i>
<i>HomEz</i>	<i>Homilies on Ezekiel</i>
<i>HomGen</i>	<i>Homilies on Genesis</i>
<i>HomIs</i>	<i>Homilies on Isaiah</i>
<i>HomJd</i>	<i>Homilies on Judges</i>
<i>HomJos</i>	<i>Homilies on Joshua</i>
<i>HomJr</i>	<i>Homilies on Jeremiah</i>
<i>HomLc</i>	<i>Homilies on Luke</i>
<i>HomLev</i>	<i>Homilies on Leviticus</i>
<i>HomNum</i>	<i>Homilies on Numbers</i>
<i>HomPs</i>	<i>Homilies on the Psalms</i>
<i>Mart</i>	<i>Exhortation to Martyrdom</i>
<i>PArch</i>	<i>On First Principles</i>
<i>PEuch</i>	<i>On Prayer</i>
Philo	
<i>Conf.</i>	<i>On the Confusion of Tongues</i>
<i>Deo</i>	<i>On God</i>

Det.
Fug.
Her.
Leg. 1, 2, 3
Mos. 1, 2
Opif.
Post.
QG 1, 2, 3, 4
Somn. 1, 2
Spec. 1, 2, 3, 4

Shepherd of Hermas

Herm. Mand.
Herm. Sim.
Herm. Vis.

That the Worse Attacks the Better
On Flight and Finding
Who Is the Heir?
Allegorical Interpretation 1, 2, 3
On the Life of Moses 1, 2
On the Creation of the World
On the Posterity of Cain
Questions and Answers on Genesis 1, 2, 3, 4
On Dreams 1, 2
On the Special Laws 1, 2, 3, 4

Shepherd of Hermas, *Mandate*
 Shepherd of Hermas, *Similitude*
 Shepherd of Hermas, *Vision*

Bibliography

Primary Literature**Origen**

Homilies on Genesis

Baehrens, W.A., ed. *Origenes Werke 6: Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung. Teil 1: Die Homilien zu Genesis, Exodus, und Leviticus*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 29. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1920.

Origen. *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*. Translated by Ronald Heine. The Fathers of the Church 71. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1982.

Homilies on Exodus

Baehrens, W.A., ed. *Origenes Werke 6: Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung. Teil 1: Die Homilien zu Genesis, Exodus, und Leviticus*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 29. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1920.

Origen. *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*. Translated by Ronald Heine. The Fathers of the Church 71. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1982.

Homilies on Leviticus

Baehrens, W.A., ed. *Origenes Werke 6: Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung. Teil 1: Die Homilien zu Genesis, Exodus, und Leviticus*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 29. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1920.

Origen. *Homilies on Leviticus*. Translated by Gary Wayne Barkley. The Fathers of the Church 83. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1990.

Homilies on Numbers

Baehrens, W.A., ed. *Origenes Werke 7: Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung. Teil 2: Die Homilien zu Numeri, Josua und Judices*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 30. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1921.

Origen. *Homilies on Numbers*. Translated by Thomas Scheck. Edited by Christopher Hall. Ancient Christian Texts. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2009.

Homilies on Joshua

Baehrens, W.A., ed. *Origenes Werke 7: Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung. Teil 2: Die Homilien zu Numeri, Josua und Judices*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 30. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1921.

Origen. *Homilies on Joshua*. Translated by Barbara Bruce. Edited by Cynthia White. The Fathers of the Church 105. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2002.

Homilies on Judges

Baehrens, W.A., ed. *Origenes Werke 7: Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung. Teil 2: Die Homilien zu Numeri, Josua und Judices*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 30. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1921.

Origen. *Homilies on Judges*. Translated by Elizabeth Ann Dively Lauro. The Fathers of the Church 119. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010.

Homilies on Samuel

Nautin, P., and M.-T., eds. *Origène: Homélie sur Samuel*. Sources Chrétiennes 328. Paris: Cerf, 1986.

Origen. *Homilies on Jeremiah, Homily on 1 Kings 28*. Translated by John Clark Smith. The Fathers of the Church 97. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1998.

Homilies on Psalms 36-38

Prinzivalli, Emanuela, ed. *Origene, Omelie sui Salmi. Homiliae in Psalmos XXXVI-XXXVII-XXXVIII*. Florence: Nardini, 1991.

Heintz, Michael. "The Pedagogy of the Soul: Origen's *Homilies on the Psalms*." PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2008.

Homilies on the Song of Songs

Baehrens, W.A., ed. *Origenes Werke 8: Homilien zu Samuel 1, zum Hohelied und zu den Propheten, Kommentar zum Hohelied in Rufins und Hieronymus' Übersetzung*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 33. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1925.

Origen. *The Song of Songs: Commentary and Homilies*. Translated by R.P. Lawson. Ancient Christian Writers 26. New York: The Newman Press, 1957.

Commentary on the Song of Songs

Baehrens, W.A., ed. *Origenes Werke 8: Homilien zu Samuel 1, zum Hohelied und zu den Propheten, Kommentar zum Hohelied in Rufins und Hieronymus' Übersetzung*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 33. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1925.

Origen. *The Song of Songs: Commentary and Homilies*. Translated by R.P. Lawson. Ancient Christian Writers 26. New York: The Newman Press, 1957.

Homilies on Isaiah

Baehrens, W.A., ed. *Origenes Werke 8: Homilien zu Samuel 1, zum Hohelied und zu den Propheten, Kommentar zum Hohelied in Rufins und Hieronymus' Übersetzung*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 33. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1925.

Scheck, Thomas, trans. *St. Jerome: Commentary on Isaiah, including St. Jerome's Translation of Origen's Homilies 1-9 on Isaiah*. Ancient Christian Writers 68. New York: The Newman Press, 2015.

Homilies on Jeremiah

Nautin, P., ed. *Homélie sur Jérémie*. Sources Chrétiennes 232, 238. Paris: Cerf, 1976-1977.

Origen. *Homilies on Jeremiah, Homily on 1 Kings 28*. Translated by John Clark Smith. The Fathers of the Church 97. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1998.

Homilies on Ezeziel

Baehrens, W.A., ed. *Origenes Werke 8: Homilien zu Samuel 1, zum Hohelied und zu den Propheten, Kommentar zum Hohelied in Rufins und Hieronymus' Übersetzung*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 33. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1925.

Origen. *Homilies 1-14 on Ezeziel*. Translated by Thomas Scheck. Ancient Christian Writers 62. New York: The Newman Press, 2010.

Commentary on Matthew

Klostermann, Erich, and Ernst Benz, eds. *Origenes Werke 10: Origenes Matthäuserklärung 1, Die Griechisch erhaltenen Tomoi*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 40. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1935.

Origen. *Commentary on Matthew, Books 1, 2, and 10-14*. Translated by John Patrick. Ante-Nicene Fathers 9, 413-512. 1896, 1897. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995.

Homilies and Fragments on Luke

Rauer, Max, ed. *Origenes Werke 9: Die Homilien zu Lukas in der Übersetzung des Hieronymus und die griechischen Reste der Homilien und des Lukaskommentars*. 2nd ed. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 49. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959.

Origen. *Homilies on Luke*. Translated by Joseph Lienhard. The Fathers of the Church 94. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996.

Commentary on John

Preuschen, Erwin, ed. *Origenes Werke 4: Der Johanneskommentar*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 10. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1903.

Origen. *Commentary on the Gospel according to John, Books 1-10*. Translated by Ronald Heine. The Fathers of the Church 80. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989.

Origen. *Commentary on the Gospel according to John, Books 13-32*. Translated by Ronald Heine. The Fathers of the Church 89. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1993.

Commentary on Romans

Hammond Bammel, C.P. *Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes: Kritische Ausgabe der Übersetzung Rufins*. Vols. 1-3. Freiburg: Herder, 1990, 1997, 1998.

Origen. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Books 1-5*. Translated by Thomas Scheck. The Fathers of the Church 103. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2001.

Origen. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Books 6-10*. Translated by Thomas Scheck. The Fathers of the Church 104. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2002.

Commentary on 1 Corinthians

Jenkins, Claude, ed. "Origen on 1 Corinthians." *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1908): 231-247; 353-372; 500-514; 10 (1909): 29-51.

Commentary on Ephesians

Gregg, J.A.F., ed. "The Commentary of Origen upon the Epistle to the Ephesians." *Journal of Theological Studies* 3 (1902): 233-244; 398-420; 554-576.

Heine, Ronald. *The Commentaries of Origen and Jerome on St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Exhortation to Martyrdom

Koetschau, P., ed. *Origenes Werke 1: Die Schrift vom Martyrium, Buch 1-4 gegen Celsus*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 2. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899.

Origen. *Origen: An Exhortation to Martyrdom, Prayer, First Principles: Book IV, Prologue to the Commentary on the Song of Songs, Homily 27 on Numbers*. Translated by Rowan Greer. The Classics of Western Spirituality. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1979.

Against Celsus

Borret, M., ed. *Contre Celse*. Sources Chrétiennes 132, 136, 147, 150, 227. Paris: Cerf, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1969, 1976.

Origen. *Origen: Contra Celsum*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

On Prayer

Koetschau, P., ed. *Origenes Werke 1: Die Schrift vom Martyrium, Buch 1-4 gegen Celsus*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 2. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899.

Origen. *Origen: An Exhortation to Martyrdom, Prayer, First Principles: Book IV, Prologue to the Commentary on the Song of Songs, Homily 27 on Numbers*. Translated by Rowan Greer. The Classics of Western Spirituality. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1979.

Dialogue with Heraclides

Scherer, J., ed. *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide*. Sources Chrétiennes 67. Paris: Cerf, 1960.

Origen. *Treatise on the Passover and Dialogue with Heraclides and His Fellow Bishops on the Father, the Son, and the Soul*. Translated by R. J. Daly. Ancient Christian Writers 54. New York: Paulist, 1992.

On First Principles

Crouzel, Henri, and Manlio Simonetti, eds. *Origène: Traité des principes*. Sources chrétiennes 252, 253, 268, 269, 312. Paris: Cerf, 1978, 1978, 1980, 1980, 1984.

Görgemanns, H. and H. Karpp, eds. *Origenes. Vier Bücher von den Prinzipien*. 3rd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992.

Origen. *On First Principles*. Translated by G. W. Butterworth. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Other Authors

Alexander of Aphrodisias

Todd, Robert, trans. *Alexander of Aphrodisias on Stoic Physics*. Philosophia Antiqua 28. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Aristotle

Aristotle. *De Anima*. Translated by R.D. Hicks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907.

Clement of Alexandria

Sagnard, François, ed. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Extraits de Théodote*. Sources Chrétiennes 23. Paris: Cerf, 1948.

Stählin, Otto, ed. *Clemens Alexandrinus I: Protrepticus und Paedagogus*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 12. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1905.

Stählin, Otto, ed. *Clemens Alexandrinus III: Stromata Buch VII und VIII, Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae Propheticae, Quis Dives Salvetur, Fragmente*. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 17. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1909.

Casey, Robert, ed. and trans. *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria*. London: Christophers, 1934.

Clement. *Excerpts of Theodotus; or, Selections from the Prophetic Scriptures*. Translated by William Wilson. Ante-Nicene Fathers 8, 43-50. 1886. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995.

Clement. *Exhortation to the Heathen; The Instructor; The Stromata, or Miscellanies; Fragments; Who Is the Rich Man that Shall Be Saved?*. Ante-Nicene Fathers 2, 171-605. 1885. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995.

Didymus the Blind

Doutreleau, Louis, ed. and trans. *Didyme l'Aveugle: Traité du Saint-Esprit*. Sources Chrétiennes 386. Paris: Cerf, 1992.

Athanasius the Great and Didymus the Blind. *Works on the Spirit*. Translated by Mark DelCogliano, Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, and Lewis Ayres. Popular Patristics Series 43. Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011.

Diogenes Laertius

Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Translated by R.D. Hicks. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library 184 & 185. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972 & 1931.

Dialogue of Adamantius

Adamantius. *Der Dialog des Adamantius: ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΝ ΟΡΘΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ*. Edited by Willem Hendrik van de Sande Bakhuyzen. Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 4. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901.

Pretty, Robert, ed. and trans. *Adamantius: Dialogue on the True Faith in God*. Gnostica 1. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.

Eusebius

Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History: Books 6-10*. Translated by J.E.L. Oulton. Loeb Classical Library 265. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Gospel according to the Hebrews

New Testament Apocrypha. 2nd ed. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. English translation edited by Robert McLachlan Wilson. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.

Hermas

Körtner, Ulrich, and Martin Leutzsch, eds. *Papiasfragmente, Hirt des Hermas*. Schriften des Urchristentums 3. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998.

Osiek, Carolyn. *Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.

Hippocratic Works

Hippocrates. *Volume I: Ancient Medicine. Airs, Waters, Places. Epidemics 1 and 3. The Oath. Precepts. Nutriment*. Translated by W.H.S. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 147. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1923.

Hippocrates. *Volume II: Prognostic. Regimen in Acute Diseases. The Sacred Disease. The Art. Breaths. Law. Decorum. Physician (Chapter 1). Dentition*. Translated by W.H.S. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 148. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1923.

Hippocrates. *Volume IV: Nature of Man. Regimen in Health. Humours. Aphorisms. Regimen 1-3. Dreams. Heracleitus: On the Universe*. Translated by W.H.S. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 150. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.

Hippolytus

Hippolytus. *Contra Noetum*. Edited and translated by Robert Butterworth. London: Heythrop Monographs, 1977.

Jerome

Hilberg, Isidorus, ed. *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae, Pars III: Epistulae CXXI-CLIV*. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 56. Vindobonae: F. Tempsky; Lipsiae: G. Freytag, 1918.

Justin

Justin. *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone*. Edited by Miroslav Marcovich. Patristische Texte und Studien 47. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.

Justin. *Dialogue with Trypho*. Edited by Thomas P. Halton and Michael Slusser. Translated by Thomas B. Falls. Selections from the Fathers of the Church 3. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003.

Justinian

Amelotti, Mario, and Livia Migliardi Zingale, eds. *Scritti teologici ed ecclesiastici di Giustiniano*. Legum Iustiniani imperatoris vocabularium 3. Milano: A. Giuffrè, 1977.

Novatian

Novatianus. *Opera, quae supersunt nunc primum in unum collecta ad fidem codicum, qui adhuc extant*. Edited by G.F. Diercks. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 4. Turnhout: Brepols, 1972.

Novatian. *The Trinity, The Spectacles, Jewish Foods, In Praise of Purity, Letters*. Translated by Russell J. DeSimone. The Fathers of the Church 67. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1974.

Numenius

Numenius. *Fragments*. Edited by Édouard des Places. Collection des universités de France. Paris: Les Belles lettres, 1973.

Numenius. *The Neoplatonic Writings of Numenius*. Translated by Kenneth Guthrie. Lawrence, KS: Selene Books, 1987.

Pamphilus

Pamphilus. *Apology for Origen with the Letter of Rufinus on the Falsification of the Books of Origen*. Translated by Thomas Scheck. The Fathers of the Church 120. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010.

Philo

Philo. *Volume I: On the Creation. Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis 2 and 3*. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library 226. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Philo. *Volume II: On the Cherubim. The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain. The Worse Attacks the Better. On the Posterity and Exile of Cain. On the Giants*. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library 227. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Philo. *Volume III: On the Unchangeableness of God. On Husbandry. Concerning Noah's Work as a Planter. On Drunkenness. On Sobriety*. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library 247. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Philo. *Volume IV: On the Confusion of Tongues. On the Migration of Abraham. Who Is the Heir of Divine Things? On Mating with the Preliminary Studies*. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library 261. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Philo. *Volume V: On Flight and Finding. On the Change of Names. On Dreams.* Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library 275. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934.

Philo. *Volume VI: On Abraham. On Joseph. On Moses.* Translated by F.H. Colson. Loeb Classical Library 289. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.

Philo. *Volume VII: On the Decalogue. On the Special Laws, Books 1-3.* Translated by F.H. Colson. Loeb Classical Library 320. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Philo. *Supplement I: Questions and Answers on Genesis.* Loeb Classical Library 380. Translated by Ralph Marcus. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Siebert, Folker. "The Philonian Fragment *De Deo*. First English Translation." *The Studia Philonica Annual* 10 (1998): 1-33.

Plato

Cooper, John, ed. *Plato: Complete Works*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997.

Burnet, John, ed. *Platonis opera*. Oxford, 1900-1907.

Refutatio

Hippolytus. *The Refutation of All Heresies*. Translated by J.H. Macmahon. Ante-Nicene Fathers 5, 9-162. 1886. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995.

Rufinus

Rufinus. *The Apology of Rufinus*. Translated by William Henry Fremantle. NPNF Second Series 3, 434-482. 1892. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995.

Stoic Fragments

Arnim, H.F.A., ed. *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. 4 vols. Leipzig: B.J. Teubner, 1903-1924.

Tertullian

Tertullian. *Tertulliani Opera: Pars II*. Edited by A. Kroymann and Ernest Evans. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 2. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954.

Tertullian. *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas*. Edited and translated by Ernest Evans. London: S.P.C.K., 1948.

Secondary Literature

- Argárate, Pablo. "The Holy Spirit in *Prin* I, 3." In *Origeniana Nona: Origen and the Religious Practice of His Time*, edited by G. Heidl and R. Somos, 25-48. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Ayres, Lewis. "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver': Didymus the Blind's *De spiritu sancto* and the development of Nicene Pneumatology." In *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church: The Proceedings of the Seventh International Patristic Conference*, Maynooth, 2008, edited by D. Vincent Twomey and Janet Rutherford, 57-72. Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2010.
- Ayres, Lewis. "Innovation and *Ressourcement* in Pro-Nicene Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39.2 (2008): 187-205.
- Ayres, Lewis. *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Bagby, Stephen. "The 'Two Ways' Tradition in Origen's *Commentary on Romans*." *Studia Patristica* 56 (2013): 135-141.
- Balas, David. "The Idea of Participation in the Structure of Origen's Thought. Christian Transposition of a Theme of the Platonic Tradition." In *Origeniana: Premier colloque international des études origéniennes*, edited by Henri Crouzel, Gennaro Lomiento, and Josep Rius-Camps, 257-275. Bari: Istituto di Letteratura Cristiana Antica, 1975.
- Baldry, H.C. "Plato's 'Technical Terms'." *The Classical Quarterly* 31 (1937): 141-150.
- Barbel, Joseph. *Christos Angelos: Die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des christlichen Altertums*. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1941.
- Bardy, Gustave. *Recherches sur l'histoire du texte et des versions latines du De Principiis d'Origène*. Paris: É. Champion, 1923.
- Barnes, Michel R. "The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39.2 (2008): 169-186.
- Barnes, Michel R. *The Power of God: Δύναμις in Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Theology*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2001.
- Beeley, Christopher. *The Unity of Christ: Continuity and Conflict in Patristic Tradition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- Berthold, George. "Origen and the Holy Spirit." In *Origeniana Quinta*, edited by Robert Daly, 444-448. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Biriukov, Dmitry. "Paradigms of Participation in Origen." *Scrinium* 13 (2017): 277-290.

- Briggman, Anthony. *God and Christ in Irenaeus*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Briggman, Anthony. *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Bruns, Christoph. *Trinität und Kosmos: Zur Gotteslehre des Origenes*. Adamantina 3. Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 2013.
- Buchheit, Vinzenz. "Rufinus von Aquileja als Fälscher des Adamantiosdialogs." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 51 (1958): 314-328.
- Bucur, Bogdan. *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Butterworth, G.W. Introduction to *On First Principles*, by Origen, xxiii-lxi. Translated and edited by G.W. Butterworth. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Cadiou, René. *Origen: His Life at Alexandria*. Translated by John Southwell. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1944.
- Carrell, Peter. *Jesus and the Angels: Angelology and the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Chadwick, Henry. "Rufinus and the Tura Papyrus of Origen's Commentary on Romans." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 10 (1959): 19-37.
- Clark, Elizabeth. *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Crawford, Matthew. "The Triumph of Pro-Nicene Theology over Anti-Monarchian Exegesis: Cyril of Alexandria and Theodore of Heraclea on John 14:10-11." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 21 (2013): 537-68.
- Crouzel, Henri. "L'image de Dieu dans la théologie d'Origène." *Studia Patristica* 2 (1957): 194-201.
- Crouzel, Henri. *Origen*. Translated by A.S. Worrall. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989.
- Daniélou, Jean. *The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea. Volume I: The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. Translated by John Baker. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Daniélou, Jean. *Origen*. Translated by Walter Mitchell. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955.

- DelCogliano, Mark. "The Interpretation of John 10:30 in the Third Century: Antimonarchian Polemics and the Rise of Grammatical Reading Techniques." *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 6 (2012): 117-138.
- Dillon, John. *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Dix, Gregory. "The Seven Archangels and the Seven Spirits." *Journal of Theological Studies* 28 (1926): 233-50.
- Drecoll, Volker. "Der Begriff Hypostasis bei Origenes bemerkungen zum *Johanneskommentar* II,10." In *Origeniana Octava*, edited by Lorenzo Perrone, 479-487. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.
- Dünzl, Franz. *Pneuma: Funktionen des theologischen Begriffs in frühchristlicher Literatur*. Münster: Aschendorffsche, 2000.
- Dupuis, Jacques. *L'Esprit de l'Homme: etude sur l'anthropologie religieuse d'Origène*. Desclée de Brouwer, 1967.
- Fatehi, Mehrdad. *The Spirit's Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul: An Examination of Its Christological Implications*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 128. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2000.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 94. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1997.
- Fossum, Jarl. "Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism." *Vigiliae Christianae* 37 (1983): 260-287.
- Frangoulis, Johannes. *Der Begriff des Geistes Πνεῦμα bei Clemens Alexandrinus*. Leipzig: Robert Noske, 1936.
- Fürst, Alfons. "Jerome Keeping Silent: Origen and His Exegesis of Isaiah." In *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*, edited by Andrew Cain and Josef Lössl, 141-152. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2009.
- Garijo Guembe, Miguel María. "Vocabulario origeniano sobre el Espirito Divino." *Scriptorium Victoriense* 11.3 (1964): 320-358.
- Garijo Guembe, Miguel María. "Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana." *Scriptorium Victoriense* 13.1 (1966): 65-86.
- Garijo Guembe, Miguel María. "Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana." *Scriptorium Victoriense* 13.2 (1966): 173-216.

- Garijo Guembe, Miguel María. "Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana III: Carácter ontológico del Espíritu Santo." *Scriptorium Victoriense* 13.3 (1966): 297-324.
- Garijo Guembe, Miguel María. "Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana IV: Relación del Espíritu Santo con ambos testamentos." *Scriptorium Victoriense* 17.1 (1970): 65-93.
- Garijo Guembe, Miguel María. "Aspectos de la pneumatología origeniana IV: Relación del Espíritu Santo con ambos testamentos [B]." *Scriptorium Victoriense* 17.3 (1970): 283-319.
- Gieschen, Charles. *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 42. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Grant, Robert. "The Prefix *Auto-* in Early Christian Theology." In *The Impact of the Church upon Its Culture: Reappraisals of the History of Christianity*, edited by Jerald Brauer, 5-16. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Gruber, Gerhard. *ZQH: Wesen, Stufen und Mitteilung des wahren Lebens bei Origenes*. München: Max Hueber Verlag, 1962.
- Gundry, Robert. "Angelomorphic Christology in the Book of Revelation." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 33 (1994): 662-678.
- Hammond, C.P. "The Last Ten Years of Rufinus' Life and the Date of his Move South from Aquileia." *Journal of Theological Studies* 28 (1977): 372-429.
- Hannah, Darrell. "Isaiah's Vision in the Ascension of Isaiah and the Early Church." *Journal of Theological Studies* 50 (1999): 80-101.
- Hannah, Darrell. *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 109. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999.
- Hanson, R.P.C. *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *History of Dogma*. Translated by Neil Buchanan. New York: Dover Publications, 1961.
- Hauschild, Wolf-Dieter. *Gottes Geist und der Mensch: Studien zur frühchristlichen Pneumatologie*. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 63. München: C. Kaiser Verlag, 1972.
- Haykin, Michael. *The Spirit of God: The Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 27. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

- Haykin, Michael. "‘The Spirit of God’: The Exegesis of 1 Cor. 2:10-12 by Origen and Athanasius." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 35 (1982): 513-528.
- Heine, Ronald. "The Christology of Callistus." *Journal of Theological Studies* 49.1 (1998): 56-91.
- Heine, Ronald. "Hippolytus, Ps.-Hippolytus and the Early Canons." In *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, edited by Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth, 142-151. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Heine, Ronald. Introduction to *Commentary on the Gospel according to John, Books 1-10*, by Origen, 3-28. Translated by Ronald Heine. Fathers of the Church 80. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989.
- Heine, Ronald. Introduction to *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*, by Origen, 1-43. Translated by Ronald Heine. Fathers of the Church 71. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1982.
- Heine, Ronald. *Origen: Scholarship in the Service of the Church*. Christian Theology in Context. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Heron, Alasdair. "The Holy Spirit in Origen and Didymus the Blind: A Shift in Perspective from the Third Century to the Fourth Century." *Kerygma und Logos: Beiträge zu den geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen Antike und Christentum*. Edited by Adolf Martin Ritter. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1979, 298-310.
- Heron, Alasdair. *The Holy Spirit: The Holy Spirit in the Bible, the History of Christian thought, and recent theology*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.
- van den Hoek, Annewies. "Philo and Origen: A Descriptive Catalogue of Their Relationship." *Studia Philonica Annual* 12 (2000): 44-121.
- Kannengiesser, Charles. "Divine Trinity and Structure of Peri Archon." In *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy*, edited by Charles Kannengiesser and William Petersen, 231-249. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Creeds*. 3rd ed. 1972. Reprint, London and New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Knight, Jonathan. *Disciples of the Beloved One: The Christology, Social Setting and Theological Context of the Ascension of Isaiah*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 18. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Koch, Hal. *Pronoia und Paideusis: Studien über Origenes und sein verhältnis zum Platonismus*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1932.
- Kretschmar, Georg. *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 21. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1956.

- Kydd, Ronald. "Origen and the Gifts of the Spirit." *Église et Théologie* 13 (1982): 111-116.
- Lebreton, Jules. "ΑΓΕΝΝΗΤΟΣ dans la tradition philosophique et dans la littérature chrétienne du II Siècle." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 16 (1926): 431-443.
- Levison, John. "The Angelic Spirit in Early Judaism." In *Society for Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers*, edited by Eugene Lovering, Jr., 464-493. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Levison, John R. "Inspiration and the Divine Spirit in the Writings of Philo Judaeus." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 26.3 (1995): 271-323.
- Levison, John R. "Two Types of Ecstatic Prophecy according to Philo." *The Studia Philonica Annual* 6 (1994): 83-89.
- Logan, A. H. B. "Origen and Alexandrian Wisdom Christology." In *Origeniana Tertia: The Third International Colloquium for Origen Studies, University of Manchester, September 7th-11th, 1981*, edited by Richard Hanson and Henri Crouzel, 123-29. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1985.
- Logan, A.H.B. "Origen and the Development of Trinitarian Theology." In *Origeniana Quarta: Die Referate des 4. Internationalen Origeneskongresses*, edited by Lothar Lies, 424-429. Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1987.
- Longenecker, Richard. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. Naperville, IL: A.R. Allenson, 1970.
- de Lubac, Henri. *History and Spirit: The Understanding of Scripture according to Origen*. Translated by A.E. Nash and J. Merriell. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2007.
- Lyman, J. Rebecca. *Christology and Cosmology: Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Macaulay, Williamina. "The Nature of Christ in Origen's *Commentary on John*." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 19 (1966): 176-187.
- Markschies, Christoph. "Der Heilige Geist im *Johanneskommentar* des Origenes." In *Origenes und sein Erbe: Gesammelte Studien*, 107-126. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.
- Martens, Peter. *Origen and Scripture: Contours of the Exegetical Life*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Martens, Peter. "Why Does Origen Refer to the Trinitarian Authorship of Scripture in Book 4 of *Peri Archon*?" *Vigiliae Christianae* 60 (2006): 1-8.
- McDonnell, Kilian. "Does Origen Have a Trinitarian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit?" *Gregorianum* 75.1 (1994): 5-35.

- McGuckin, John, ed. *The Westminster Handbook to Origen*. The Westminster Handbooks to Christian Theology. Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.
- Miller, Harold. "Dynamis and Physis in *On Ancient Medicine*." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 83 (1952): 184-197.
- Miller, Micah. "What's in a Name?: Titles of Christ in Justin Martyr." *Studia Patristica* 93 (2017): 155-164.
- Morgan-Wynne, J.E. "The 'delicacy' of the Spirit in the Shepherd of Hermas and in Tertullian." *Studia Patristica* 21 (1989): 154-157.
- Moser, Maureen Beyer. *Teacher of Holiness: The Holy Spirit in Origen's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2005.
- Nardoni, Enrique. "Origen's Concept of Biblical Interpretation." *The Second Century* 4 (1984): 9-23.
- Nautin, Pierre. *Origène: Sa vie et son oeuvre*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1977.
- Nemeshegyi, Peter. *La Paternité de Dieu chez Origène*. Tournai, Belgium: Desclée, 1960.
- Oeyen, Christian. "Die Lehre der göttlichen Kräfte bei Justin." *Studia Patristica* 11 (1972): 215-221.
- Oeyen, Christian. "Eine frühchristliche Engelpneumatologie bei Klemens von Alexandrien." *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 55 (1965): 102-120; 56 (1966): 27-47.
- Orbe, Antonio. *La Epinoia: Algunos preliminares históricos de la distinción κατ' ἐπίνοιαν*. Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1955.
- Orbe, Antonio. "Orígenes y los monarquianos." *Gregorianum* (1991): 39-72.
- Pásztori-Kupán, István. "The Holy Spirit as the Mother of the Son?: Origen's Interpretation of a Surviving Fragment from *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*." In *Origeniana Nona*, edited by G. Heidl and R. Somos, 285-291. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2009.
- Plaxco, Kellen. "Didymus the Blind, Origen, and the Trinity." PhD diss., Marquette University, 2016.
- Pollard, T.E. "Logos and Son in Origen, Arius and Athanasius." *Studia Patristica* 2 (1957): 282-287.
- Prestige, George. *God in Patristic Thought*. London: SPCK, 1952.
- Price, Richard, ed. *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553 with related texts on the Three Chapters Controversy*. 2 vols. Translated Texts for Historians 51. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009.

- Quispel, Gilles. "Genius and Spirit." In *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Pahor Lahib*, edited by Martin Krause, 155-169. Nag Hammadi Studies 6. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Radde-Gallwitz, Andrew. *Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Transformation of Divine Simplicity*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Radde-Gallwitz, Andrew. "The Holy Spirit as Agent, not Activity: Origen's Argument with Modalism and its Afterlife in Didymus, Eunomius, and Gregory of Nazianus." *Vigiliae Christianae* 65 (2011): 227-248.
- Ramelli, Ilaria. "Origen's Anti-Subordinationism and Its Heritage in the Nicene and Cappadocian Line." *Vigiliae Christianae* 65 (2011): 21-49.
- Rius-Camps, Josep. "Comunicabilidad de la naturaleza de Dios según Orígenes." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 34 (1968): 5-37; 36 (1970): 201-247.
- Rius-Camps, Josep. *El dinamismo trinitario en la divinización de los seres racionales según Orígenes*. Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1970.
- Rowe, Nigel. "Origen's Subordinationism as illustrated in his Commentary on St. John's Gospel." *Studia Patristica* 11.2 (1972): 222-228.
- Rowland, Christopher. "The Vision of the Risen Christ in Rev. i.13 ff.: The Debt of an Early Christology to an Aspect of Jewish Angelology." *Journal of Theological Studies* 31 (1980): 1-11.
- Runia, David. "Philo and Origen: A Preliminary Survey." In *Origeniana Quinta*, edited by Robert Daly, 333-339. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Runia, David. *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993.
- Russell, Norman. *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Rutherford, Janet. "The Alexandrian Spirit: Clement and Origen in Context." In *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church: The Proceedings of the Seventh International Patristic Conference, Maynooth, 2008*, edited by D. Vincent Twomey and Janet Rutherford, 32-56. Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2010.
- Savan, David. "Self-Predication in 'Protagoras' 330-331." *Phronesis* 9.2 (1964): 130-135.
- Scheck, Thomas. Introduction to *Apology for Origen with the Letter of Rufinus on the Falsification of the Books of Origen*, by Pamphilus, 3-31. Translated by Thomas Scheck. Fathers of the Church 120. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010.

- Schlütz, Karl. *Isaias 11,2 (Die Sieben Gaben des Hl. Geistes) in den ersten vier christlichen Jahrhunderten*. Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932.
- Simonetti, Manlio. "Spirito Santo." *Origene Dizionario: la cultura, il pensiero, le opere*, edited by Adele Monaci Castagno, 450-456. Rome: Città Nuova, 2000.
- Simonetti, Manlio. *Studi sulla cristologia del II e III secolo*. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1993.
- Sorabji, Richard. *Matter, Space and Motion: Theories in Antiquity and Their Sequel*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- Souilhé, Joseph. *Étude sur le Terme Δόνατος dans les Dialogues de Platon*. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1919.
- Stead, Christopher. *Divine Substance*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Strousma, Gedaliahu. "Le couple de l'ange et de l'esprit: traditions juives et chrétiennes." *Revue Biblique* 88 (1981): 42-61.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren. *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 70. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.
- Studer, Basile. "À propos des traductions d'Origène par Jérôme et Rufin." *Vetera Christianorum* 5 (1968): 137-154.
- Swete, Henry. *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers*. London: MacMillan, 1912.
- Tite, Philip. "The Holy Spirit's Role in Origen's Trinitarian System: A Comparison with Valentinian Pneumatology." *Theoforum* 32 (2001): 131-164.
- Torjesen, Karen Jo. *Hermeneutical Procedure and Theological Method in Origen's Exegesis*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.
- Trigg, Joseph. *Origen: The Bible and Philosophy in the Third-Century Church*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983.
- Vogt, Hermann Josef. "Die Lehre des Origenes von der Inspiration der Heiligen Schrift." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 170 (1990): 97-103.
- Waers, Stephen. "Monarchianism and Origen's Early Trinitarian Theology." PhD diss., Marquette University, 2016.
- Williams, Rowan. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2002.

- Williams, Rowan. "The Son's Knowledge of the Father in Origen." In *Origeniana Quarta: Die Referate 4. Internationalen Origeneskongresses*, edited by Lothar Lies, 146-153. Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1987.
- Wilson, John Christian. "Toward a Reassessment of the Milieu of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and Its Pneumatology." PhD diss., Duke University, 1977.
- Winkelmann, F. "Einige Bemerkungen zu den Aussagen des Rufinus von Aquileia und des Hieronymus über ihre Übersetzungstheorie und -methode." In *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, vol. 2, edited by P. Granfield and J. Jungmann, 532-547. Münster: Aschendorff, 1970.
- Ziebritzki, Henning. *Heiliger Geist und Weltseele: Das Problem der dritten Hypostase bei Origenes, Plotin und ihren Vorläufern*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 84. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.