Grapho : Concordia Seminary Student Journal

Volume 6
Issue 1 *Grapho 2024*

Article 2

5-2-2024

The Holy Spirit as the Undiminished Giver in the Early Church

Kyle Weeks
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, weeksk@csl.edu

Kyle serves as Associate Pastor at Light of the Hills Lutheran Church in Cameron Park, CA. He is pursuing a PhD through Concordia Seminary's reduced residency program, and is focusing on the intersection of political idolatry and two realms in the Old Testament. Kyle lives with his wife (Krista) and their son (Tobias) in Placerville, CA.

The Holy Spirit as the Undiminished Giver in the Early Church[1]

Kyle Weeks

At one time or another, virtually every churchgoing Christian is bound to hear the moniker of "Sanctifier" applied to the Holy Spirit. In this role, the Spirit is often described as dwelling within believers to make them holy, so that they might produce the "fruit of the spirit" as they lead good and godly lives.[2] To that end, the Spirit is said to effect a complete "regeneration and renewal" of the individual, empowering them with the strength, grace, virtues, and other "spiritual gifts" requisite for Christian life.[3] In denominations such as Lutheranism, faith itself is proclaimed to be impossible without the Spirit, and it is not uncommon to hear the pastor tell those about to be baptized to "receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."[4]

But while the Spirit's sanctifying work is widely acknowledged, the church tends to be much less clear on what it means for believers to be indwelt by the Holy Spirit. How is it possible, after all, for the infinite, indivisible Deity to indwell finite human beings without being divided or diminished in His person or essence? Moreover, precisely how does the Spirit go about the work of making a Christian holy? Do believers draw on the Spirit as some sort of force or reservoir of power for holy living, or is something else being imparted? For that matter, what are the virtues and holiness the Spirit is instilling? Some suggest they represent a change in nature, others a skill taught, and still others a spiritual substance of some sort. The lack of clarity has caused many Christians to wonder what is actually received in the gift of the Holy Spirit. Where, in other words, does the Giver end and the gift begin? Considering the scope of the Spirit's activity in the life of the believer, this is no inconsequential query. Fortunately, it is far from a new question for historic Christianity. For although studies of the early church often focus on Christological controversies, the Holy Spirit's role in the life of the church also generated significant discussion.[5] In part, this was because many of the same objections to Jesus' divinity were eventually raised against the Spirit. This is not to say the earliest Christians did not proclaim the divinity of the Spirit, however, as the "divinity of the Spirit [is] implicit in their benedictions, baptisms, hymnody, and prayers."[6] But

just as the Incarnation of the Logos had challenged early theologians to "maintain the unity of God while insisting on the deity of one who was distinct from God the Father,"[7] so also did the church find itself compelled to defend the deity of the Spirit while confessing the indivisibility of the Godhead.

These theological conflicts prompted the church not only to articulate the Spirit's place within the Trinity more clearly, but also to devote considerable attention to the Spirit's indwelling among Christians. Yet most contemporary assessments of early pneumatology omit one of the most important and widespread arguments adduced for the divinity of the Holy Spirit in the early church, namely, the doctrine of the Undiminished Giver, wherein the Spirit is posited to be both the Giver and the Gift in His indwelling of believers. A rediscovery of the doctrine of the Undiminished Giver offers ample opportunities to grow in our appreciation of our Christian identity and its fruits.

Obstacles to the Spirit's Divinity in Jewish and Greek Thought

First, it must be noted that, given Israel's monotheistic understanding of God, the Trinitarian disputes were perhaps inevitable. As it is expressed in the *Shema*, the people of God were encouraged to, "Hear O Israel: the LORD our God, the LORD is one."[8] From this and other Old Testament texts, the Jewish people had derived a strict monotheism that understood Yahweh as utterly singular in His Being.[9] As a result, the Jewish people observed "a binary distinction between God and all other reality" that precluded any gradient view of divinity such as existed in the polytheistic pagan world.[10] In other words, God displays a "transcendent uniqueness" that necessitates "sharp ontological distinctions" between God and all other created reality.[11] In this way, Israel grasped implicitly that to include Yahweh among a pantheon of other gods—even if He were the greatest—would be to place Him within a category of beings. Inadvertently, to even entertain the existence of other deities would be to "subject [God] to the categories of finitude," in which case even "superlatives would become diminutives" when applied to God.[12] To assent to the belief that Yahweh is the most preeminent deity among many is to deny Him the status of being the *only* deity.

Additionally, the early church had to contend with the influence of Greek philosophical thought regarding the nature of the Deity. In the 6th century B.C., the Greek philosopher Pythagoras (ca. 580-500 B.C.) began using the term Monad (derived from μόνος, which means "only," "alone," or something standing "as the only entity in a class") in reference to the "One," or the Supreme Being.[13] Just as all numbers are built on the number one, so was the Monad held to be the immutable, irreducible source and principle of all things[14] In the same way that one is the simplest, foundational number and is neither complex nor divisible, so also is the Monad utterly simple and devoid of any composite parts. If the Monad *were* to have

constituent components, it would be contingent upon some characteristic or attribute outside of itself, and thus being mutable, would show itself as something other than the Monad.[15] Consequently, the Monad must be static or immutable, as any addition or subtraction would imply a composite nature. Naturally then, the singular nature of the Monad as a unity implied a basic duality between the Monad and the rest of creation, the latter of which was said to emanate from the unity of the Monad.[16] In order to maintain the immutability of the Monad, it was always held in sharp distinction from the rest of reality.

Given that Christianity was itself grounded upon the monotheism expressed in the Old Testament, many Christian thinkers found themselves sympathetic to the Greek concept of the Divine as utterly simple, static, and unchanging. As such, the divinity of Christ and the Holy Spirit initially appeared inconsistent with this emphasis on the oneness of God. For if multiple persons were present within the Godhead, this would seemingly imply divisibility and a composite nature, thereby diminishing God and destroying monotheism.[17]

While the church's response cannot be fully enumerated here, its basic reply was to confess in accord with Scripture that "the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit [were] of one and the same substance," such that there is one God in three persons, all of whom are *homoousios* with one another.[18] For instance, Augustine and others were able to affirm that each of the three persons possesses the divine essence substantially and in full (as opposed to accidentally), so that the divine essence of the three together is not greater than the essence of any one of the three.[19] Whereas the Greek concept of the Monad mandated oneness in both personhood and essence, the church realized Scripture's attestation of God's singularity applied to His essence, but not to His personhood.[20] In this way, Christians were able to maintain the eternal, ontological oneness of the Godhead, while also confessing that economically God is not static but dynamic in time as He graciously conveys His gifts to creation.[21]

Yet the Spirit's divinity presented particular challenges not posed by the Son. For one thing, unlike the Logos, the Spirit did not have the advantage of a familial appellation such as "Son" analogous to everyday life to suggest a shared essence. As a result, many found it easier to follow Arianism and "regard the Spirit as some kind of an elevated creature with its own unique dignity and power, or as some kind of intermediate being who was neither God nor creature."[22] Perhaps even more problematic, however, was the matter of the Holy Spirit's presence within believers. For while it was at least conceivable that there could be multiple persons within the Godhead in light of the Incarnation, for those steeped in Greek thought the dispensation of the Spirit to countless individuals seemed to be an inexcusable parceling out of the Monad. As such, the indwelling of Christians demanded an explicit response, lest the Spirit be blasphemed and the impression given that believ-

ers were sanctified by and baptized in the name of a mere creature.[23]

The Development of the Doctrine of the Undiminished Giver

To address the concerns elicited by the Spirit's lodging within believers, the doctrine of the Undiminished Giver was frequently employed to explain the work of the Holy Spirit. In doing so, Christian thinkers sought to protect the divinity and immutability of the Spirit, as well as to foster appreciation for the Spirit's particular role in the economy of salvation. By referring to the Holy Spirit as the Undiminished Giver, these writers intended to say that what the Spirit gives is inherent to His nature, so that the Spirit actually *is* what He gives, and that He furthermore gives without being reduced or lessened in any way. It is important to note that this is *not* to say that God is a mere exemplification of our virtues, but rather that He graciously gives immeasurably more of Himself than we might otherwise have thought.[24]

As for the origin of the doctrine of the Undiminished Giver, its first undisputed appearance was in the writings of Philo, a first century Alexandrian Hellenistic Jewish philosopher (ca. 20 B.C.- A.D. 45).[25] Philo writes that "God decided that it was fitting to [gift] with unlimited and abundant favors a nature which, without the divine gift, was unable of itself to obtain any good thing; but he [gifts] it, not [with the fullness] of his own graces, for they are illimitable and eternal, but according to the power of that which…[receives] his graces."[26] In other words, Philo asserts that because "good things" are not intrinsic to man's being, mankind can only receive them from the One to whom they are innate. Also implied is the inference that because these attributes exist within God in an infinite capacity, they cannot be diminished. Rather, God's distribution of the gifts demonstrates His own simplicity by way of juxtaposition with finite creatures.

Philo also applies the doctrine of the Undiminished Giver in his *De gigantibus* when treating the 70 elders in Numbers 11:17, illustrating that its usage was a mainstay in his thinking and not merely an anomaly. Philo's application of the doctrine in this passage is quite well-developed, and so deserves to be quoted at length:

> For it is said, 'I will take of my spirit which is upon thee, and I will pour it upon the seventy Elders'. But do not think that this taking away could be by means of cutting off or separation; but it is here, as is the case in an operation effected by fire, which can light ten thousand torches, without itself being diminished the least atom, or ceasing to remain as it was before. Something like this is also the nature of knowledge…it is in no degree diminished [for its being shared]…the spirit which…is everywhere diffused, so as to fill the universe, which, while it benefits others, is not injured by having a share in it given to another."[27]

Philo's analysis of the passage is remarkable in at least two respects. First, it is worth recalling that Philo is writing as a Hellenistic Jew, but as a Jew nonetheless. As such, his application of the doctrine to the Pentateuch demonstrates a belief that it was compatible with Old Testament monotheism, even not having recognized the Trinity. Second, Philo provides the analogies of knowledge and a torch's flame as everyday examples of things which can be shared without being diminished. The implication of this is that as the infinite, immutable God who shares Himself, the deity or essence of the Spirit of God likewise is not somehow changed or reduced by way of said sharing.

In addition to these observations, Lewis Ayres adduces three corollaries of the Undiminished Giver from the above excerpts which are present in the writings of subsequent Christian thinkers. First, Ayres states, "there can only be one undiminished giver," as the attributes of the first principle must remain a singularity.[28] Second, the possession of any quality gifted by the Undiminished Giver is in in some sense a participation in the Undiminished Giver.[29] This point is necessitated by the fact that the attribute being shared is inherent in the Giver, and so interaction with that gift cannot occur apart from a simultaneous participation in the Giver. And finally, to be undiminished, the Giver cannot be spatially or temporally limited, and so must be omnipresent.[30] Any entity which fits these criteria must by necessity be God, as only He is noncontingent and transcendentally unique; only He is utterly simple; and only God is omnipresent.

After Philo, the doctrine is frequently utilized by Platonists such as Plotinus, Numenius, and Proclus till at least late antiquity.[31] Thus, there can be little doubt that Christian theologians of the period familiar with Greek philosophy were aware of the concept of the Undiminished Giver. Indeed, Christian thinkers began explicitly appropriating the doctrine as early as the second century to better defend and explicate the Trinitarian relationship.

While both Justin Martyr and Irenaeus occasionally hint at the doctrine, the first of the church fathers to apply it to the Trinity seems to have been Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150-215 A.D.), who uses it in reference to the Son. In his *Stromateis*, Clement writes that the Son, in accord with the Father's will, "holds the helm of the universe…with unwearied and tireless power, working all things in which it operates…not being divided, not severed, not passing from place to place; being always everywhere, and being contained nowhere; complete mind, the complete paternal light."[32] While this passage lacks the precise trinitarian language of later formulations, it is noteworthy in that Clement clearly recognizes the inexhaustibility, indivisibility, and omnipresence of the Son. In doing so, Clement is arguing that multiple persons within the Godhead are capable of functioning as the Undiminished Giver, thereby making a decidedly Christian contribution to the doctrine.

Following Clement, Origen (ca. 185-254 A.D.) leverages the doctrine over

and against Celsus' criticisms of the *imago dei*.[33] In the process, Origen establishes an important clarification which Philo hinted at but which will be especially helpful to later thinkers. Namely, Origen states that God, "is participated in rather than participates; and he is participated in by those who possess the Spirit of God. Our Savior also does not participate in righteousness, but being righteous, he is participated in by the righteous."[34] In other words, while created beings can participate in the righteousness of God and other such attributes, God can never participate in some external attribute. Indeed, this must be so, because if the gifts of God—such as goodness or holiness—were external to Him, God would no longer be simple and immutable. Instead, God would be contingent upon an external force or standard, and necessarily diminished in the giving of gifts He Himself did not inherently possess. Likewise, God is not simply the greatest exemplar of said virtues, as this again implies that God is subject to measurement by an independent standard, and that His virtue only differs from ours as a matter of degree. Rather, the gifts of God can *only* be conveyed through direct communion with Him. Notably, Origen also looks to be thinking in terms of "one fount of deity, the Father, and one unified operation by which the Father works through Son and Spirit."[35] Thus, his tendency toward subordinationism notwithstanding, Origen laid the groundwork for the Undiminished Giver's application to the Spirit by seemingly conceiving of participation in the Spirit as participation in the Father.

The appropriation of the Undiminished Giver by Christians makes its next developmental leap thanks to Athanasius, who recognizes the inextricable link between the Spirit's creative and sanctifying work. Specifically, Athanasius notes that the New Testament consistently attributes holiness, sanctification, and renewal to the Holy Spirit, who is the gift partaken of according to Hebrews 6:4.[36] In addi-

tion, Athanasius observes that in Psalm 103:30 and elsewhere Scripture attests to the Spirit Himself as being responsible for creation.[37] Taking this into account, Athanasius asks:

> So [the Spirit] who is not sanctified by another, nor participates in sanctification, but is himself the one who is participated in, the one in whom all creatures are sanctified: how can he be one of the *all things* [Jn 1.3]…? For those who claim this would also have to say that the Son, through whom *all things* came to be, is one of the *all things*… But [the Spirit] who does not participate in life, but is himself participated in and gives life to creatures: what sort of affinity does he have with things which have come into existence? In sum, how is the Spirit one of the creatures to whom the Word gives life through him?[38]

Following Athanasius' logic, only created realities require sanctification, life, and renewal be granted to them from without, because God is immutable and such qualities inhere in His very being. This is illustrated by the mutability of humanity and the fallen angels, who in their fallenness demonstrate that they do not possess holiness, righteousness, and the like as unchangeable aspects of their natures.[39] Conversely, Athanasius concludes that because holiness and life are granted to creatures via participation in the Spirit, He must possess them eternally as God. As a result, Athanasius concludes that all creatures—angels included—have always been intended to be indwelt by the sanctifying Spirit from creation, and are utterly dependent on the Spirit in this way.[40] Significantly then, Athanasius has for the first time employed the doctrine of the Undiminished Giver in relation to the Holy Spirit, thereby establishing the precedent of its pro–Nicene usage.[41] Notably, Athanasius does not assert multiple sources of gifts given to creatures but rather one unified source located in the divine nature which is common to all three persons of the Trinity. Finally, the doctrine of the Undiminished Giver is perhaps given its clearest and most sophisticated exposition by Didymus the Blind (ca. A.D. 313-398), in his *De spiritu*.[42] As Ayres says regarding Didymus' treatise, his whole argument is unified by the premise that "the Spirit is the boundless source of all sanctification, and thus *a priori* cannot be a created reality that participates in goodness."[43] Thus Didymus identifies the Spirit's very essence with the act of sanctification, asserting that, "this substance we are now discussing produces wisdom and sanctification," and that conversely "everything which is capable of participating in the good of another is separated by this substance….[and] are creatures."[44] Accordingly, if the Holy Spirit does not possess holiness inherently but is "actually holy through participation in another's sanctity, then he should be classified with the rest of creatures."[45] However, when it comes to the Holy Spirit it is not possible to find in Him

> any strength which he receives from some external act of sanctification and virtue, for a nature such as this would have to be mutable. Rather, the Holy Spirit…is the immutable sanctifier, the bestower of divine knowledge and goods…it is apparent that the Holy Spirit is the fullness of the gifts of God and the goods bestowed by God are nothing other than the subsistent Holy Spirit.[46]

It is evident, Didymus concludes, that the Spirit's person is the gift, precisely because He is Goodness, Sanctification, and Holiness, and accordingly, He must exist in a state of ontological co-equality with the Father and the Son.

Didymus then begins to parse out what this means for the Spirit's indwelling of believers. As Didymus reasons, "because He is good, God is the source and principle of all goods. Therefore, He makes good those to whom He imparts Himself; He is not made good by another, but is good."[47]And indeed, making creatures good is *precisely* what the Spirit does when He empowers new obedience or holy living. The Spirit does not have to impart any foreign substance or serve as a conduit to some external power, because He Himself sanctifies and renews. Neither is the Holy Spirit merely "an activity and not the substance of God."[48] In this way the Spirit does not suffer loss in His dispensation of gifts, because He simply gives of Himself; this of course poses no problem because the Spirit who searches even the depths of God "does not have a circumscribed substance."[49]

Again, the inescapable conclusion of Didymus' logic is made clear just a little later when he emphatically declares "[the Holy Spirit] *is goodness itself* because his nature sanctifies and fills the universe with good things."[50] For if the Spirit differed in His essence from these two, and yet still imparted the good gifts of the Father and the Son, then the goodness of the Spirit would necessarily differ from theirs. In turn, this would mean either the Father and the Son were not inherently good, or that their goodness was somehow incomplete, both of which would imply mutability and inferiority to the Spirit. Yet the Father and the Son are not inferior, so the Spirit must be God.

Lastly, Didymus proceeds to demonstrate how this fundamental tri-unity can be seen in any number of gifts given by the Spirit. For instance, Didymus notes that God is the Only-Wise, Christ the Power and Wisdom of God, and the Holy Spirit the Spirit of Wisdom; necessarily then, the Spirit gives the Son, who is Himself the Father's Wisdom.[51] This is also seen in the believer's reception of grace, for "it is not the case that the Father gives one grace and the Savior another," but that there is a single grace bestowed by "the Spirit of Grace."[52] Hence, for Didymus the doctrine of the Undiminished Giver "seems to signify the existence of each Person with the same essence and the existence of the Persons in each other." Indeed,

every virtue imparted by the Holy Spirit belongs to the essence of all three persons, so that the indwelling of the Spirit is in fact "a single reception of the Trinity," even as each subsists as their own distinct person.[53] Thus the Christian's reception of grace, forgiveness, life, holiness—and indeed every good thing—is inextricably bound up in our participation in the Spirit, who unites us with Christ so that we may be reconciled to the Father and conformed to the image of His Son.

Christian Identity and the Undiminished Giver Today

After Didymus, the doctrine of the Undiminished Giver continued to enjoy widespread usage not only among Alexandrian theologians, but also by the Cappadocian Fathers and the church at large.[54] Thus, Christian thinkers found a means of affirming the divinity of the Spirit while maintaining the oneness of the Trinity, all while proclaiming a lively and vibrant depiction of God's gracious economy of salvation.

While there have been many theological books written, it is a sad reality that in many ways the Holy Spirit remains "the last unexplored theological frontier" of Christianity.[55] Yet in an age when the problems confronting the church seem to multiply annually, a rehabilitation of the doctrine of the Undiminished Giver could greatly benefit the faith, life, and witness of God's people, especially within the LCMS. Accordingly, while a comprehensive exploration of the ways the doctrine might be applied within the church today must surely be an ongoing and collaborative project, a few brief suggestions can be offered here.

First and foremost, the doctrine of the Undiminished Giver provides significant clarity as to what exactly is received in the gift of the Holy Spirit: the Gift of the Divine Giver Himself. Rather than speculating wildly concerning the Spirit's

role or focusing on showier gifts such as speaking in tongues, the teaching of the Undiminished Giver sets Scriptural boundaries for the Spirit's work by grounding His activity in God's economy of salvation. Moreover, by centering the work of the Spirit in the act of putting us back into a relationship with Christ so that we can be reconciled to the Father and receive the fruits of Christ's victory for us, this tenet may help to reinvigorate and reenchant the church's proclamation of the Gospel as it basks in the wonder of the Triune God's good gifts.

Expanding upon this theme, the doctrine facilitates dialogue about the Spirit in a way that encompasses the deeply relational nature of His work. Too often the church instrumentalizes the Spirit as an impersonal force whose functions overshadow His personhood. The Spirit is not *only* a guarantor of scriptural infallibility. The Spirit's role in disseminating God's gifts is highly intimate, and it can be a profound source of encouragement for disciples of Jesus. In a time when Christians struggle not to feel as though God is distant and aloof, the Undiminished Giver teaches that God's transcendent uniqueness, coupled with His determination to be God with us, is the very source of our salvation and hope. Indeed, all of creation was fashioned to enjoy the presence of the Spirit. In this way, we see that the trajectory of the Christian life is not movement from dependence to independence, but rather that we were created for dependent life in the Spirit from the beginning. In fact, because God is Good, rebellion from God is nothing less than rebellion against all that is Good.[56] In other words, if we are Godless, then we are also "goodless."[57] As Paul asks, "What do you have that you did not receive?"[58] Thus, all that you have —righteousness before God, faith, sanctification, and any other good—is not your own, just as you are not your own.[59]

An obvious corollary of this truth is that the Undiminished Giver helps us lay out a Scriptural anthropology. In contrast to decision theology and other such distorted anthropologies today, we are reminded that if the Holy Spirit is truly a gift, then we cannot wrest that gift from God by our own reason or strength. As Luther says, it is up to "the Holy Spirit to call us through the Gospel and enlighten us with his gifts so that we may be made holy and kept in the truth faith."[60] One application of this would be to emphasize more regularly the points in the Divine Service such as the salutation and the epiclesis at communions where the church asks for the Spirit to be present so that the church people may receive God's gift. Indeed, the church *depends* on the Spirit to come and indwell us, to bring us back into communion with the Triune God so that we can be holy once more. Likewise, Christians can be encouraged to lead lives of repentance and to heed the Spirit via new obedience, as the gifts of God depend on the gift of the Spirit's ongoing presence.

All in all, the Gift of the Giver presents the church with inestimable riches for its life, proclamation, and witness. There is simply no reception of God's gifts absent the Giver Himself. Yet, God is indeed Good, and He showers His goodness

upon us in innumerable ways, including by stooping down to make a temple of the Holy Spirit out of every baptized child of God and claiming us as His own. This should move us to humility, awe, and praise, as we realize that every day of discipleship is an ongoing participation in the Spirit, who also indwells countless others and yet is undiminished in His person or gifts. Indeed, although the gifts we have received are not our own, we are infinitely and eternally better off for them. Thus, may we and all believers pray continually with repentant joy: "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from your presence, and take not your Holy Spirit from me. Restore to me the joy of your salvation, and uphold me with a willing spirit."[61]

Endnotes

1 This essay has been adapted from an earlier version prepared for Professor Joel Elowsky's HIS913: Pneumatology in the Early Church, taught at Concordia Seminary in fall 2019.
2 Galatians 5:22 ESV. Hereafter all Scriptural citations will be taken from the ESV unless otherwise stated.
3 Titus 3:5; 1 Corinthians 12:1-11.
4 Acts 2:38. Even if they do not conceive of faith itself as a gift, nearly every expression of Christianity recognizes the Spirit indwells believers from the beginning of their faith journey to aid them in their sanctification.
5 For a wide-reaching survey of some of the early church fathers who write about the Holy Spirit, see Joel, Elowsky ed., *We Believe in the Holy Spirit*, Ancient Christian Doctrine Series, Vol. 4 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2009).
6 Elowsky, *We Believe*, xxii.
7 Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils* (325-787): *Their History and Theology* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press: 1983), 33.
8 Deuteronomy 6:4. This is of course not to say that individual Israelites did not engage in polytheistic practices at times, merely that the language concerning God in the Old Testament and the traditional Jewish understanding of God is patently monotheistic. Stephen, Bullivant, *The Trinity: How Not to Be a Heretic* (New York: Paulist, 2015), 21.
9 For example, see Isaiah 44:6-8.
10 Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, 2008),109.
11 Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 109.
12 William C. Placher, *The Domestication of Transcendence: How Modern Thinking about God Went Wrong* (Louisville: John Nox Press, 1996), 10.
13 Thomas Rankin, "Pythagoras" Salem Press Biographical Encyclopedia, 2019. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ers&AN=88258864&ite=eds-live. William F. Arndt et al., A *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1979), 3441.
14 Christoph Riedweg. *Pythagoras: His Life, Teaching, and Influence* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), 23.
15 Riedweg, *Pythagoras*, 23.
16 Joel Elowsky, "Introduction to the Holy Spirit in the Early Church," Lecture in HIS913 Pneumatology in the Early Church, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, September 5, 2019.
17 The Incarnation was seen as particularly problematic, as it represented the crossing of the ontological divide between God and creation, which was thought to be impassable. In reaction, many concluded "that God's essence could in no way be shared by another," and so heterodox solutions such as Sabellianism, Docetism, and Arianism were proposed to preserve the oneness of the Godhead. Elowsky, We Believe in the Holy Spirit, xxiii.
18 Edmund Hill, trans. *Augustine: The Trinity*, The Works of Saint Augustine, Part 1. Vol. 5 (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 1991), 171. For an even earlier example, see Tertullian's writings on the Spirit in Burgess, The Holy Spirit, 63.
19 Hill, *Augustine: The Trinity*, 239.
20 By personhood, I mean the quality of being distinguishable from other individuals, not a disunity between will or essence.
21 This is not to say God is dynamic in a Monarchian sense, but rather that He crosses the ontological barrier to redeem and restore His creation, yet without diminishing Himself.
22 Elowsky, *We Believe*, xxiv.
23 A. Mingana, *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed*, Woodbrooke Studies, Vol. 5, (Cambridge: Heffer & Sons, 1933), 111.
24 Placher, *The Domestication of Transcendence*, 10.
25 Lewis Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver'" in *The Holy Spirit in the Fathers of the Church: The Proceedings of the Seventh International Patristic Conference, Maynooth 2008*, D. Vincent Twomey SVD and Janet E. Rutherford, ed., (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2010), 59; Daniel C. Scavone, "Philo of Alexandria," *Salem Press Biographical Encyclopedia*, 2019. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ers&AN=88258837&site=eds-live.
26 Philo of Alexandria, *De opificio mundi* 6.23, as cited in Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver,'" 59.
27 Philo of Alexandria, *De gigantibus* 24-8, as cited in Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver,'" 60.
28 Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver,'" 60.
29 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
31 Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver,'" 61. Proclus especially seems to rely on the doctrine in propositions 8, 25, and 26 of his *Elements of Theology*. E.R. Dodds, trans. *Proclus: The Elements of Theology, 2 nd ed.* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1963), 9-11; 29-31.
32 Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 7.2.5, as cited in Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver,' 62-63.
33 Glenn W. Olsen, "Origen." *Salem Press Biographical Encyclopedia*, 2019. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ers&AN=88258825&site=eds-live.
34 Origen, *Contra Celsum*, Henry Chadwick trans., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 379.
35 Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver,'" 62. For instance, see also *De principiis* 1.3.8.
36 Athanasius, "Letters to Serapion," 88. For instance, see Romans 1:4, 1 Corinthians 6:11, Titus 3:4-7, and 1 Peter 1:2.
37 Ibid.
38 Athanasius, "Letters to Serapion," 88-89.
39 Athanasius, "Letters to Serapion," 93-94.
40 Athanasius, "Letters to Serapion,"95.
41 Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver,'" 63.
42 DelCogliano, *Works on the Spirit*, 31.
43 Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver,'" 58.
44 *Didymus*, "On the Holy Spirit",146; 148.
45 *Didymus*, "On the Holy Spirit", 149.
46 *Didymus,* "On the Holy Spirit", 146-147.
47 *Didymus*, "On the Holy Spirit", 148.
48 *Didymus*, "On the Holy Spirit", 174.
49 *Didymus*, "On the Holy Spirit", 150. Cf. Psalm 139:7-12; Acts 1:8; 1 Corinthians 2:10-16.
50 *Didymus*, "On the Holy Spirit", 153. Emphasis added.
51 *Didymus*, "On the Holy Spirit", 172.
52 *Didymus*, "On the Holy Spirit", 172-173. Cf. 2 Corinthians 13:13; Romans 1:7; Hebrews 10:29.
53 *Didymus*, "On the Holy Spirit", 172.
54 For instance, see Stephen, Hildebrand, trans., *St Basil the Great: On the Holy Spirit*, Popular Patristics Series 42, (Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011), 52-53; Cyril, David R. Maxwell, and Joel C. Elowsky. *Commentary on John Volumes 1-2*, Ancient Christian Texts (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2013), 97-98 V.1; 259 V.2. Likewise, Ayres notes the doctrine's usage can be observed in Gregory of Nyssa's *Contra Eunomium* 1.274 & 291 and his *Adversus Macedonianos* 1.108, as well as Gregory of Nazianzus' Oration 41.9 & 41.11. Ayres, "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver,'" 68-69.
55 Nicholas Berdyaev, *Spirit and Reality* (London: G. Bles. 1946), 22, as quoted in Elowsky, *We Believe in the Holy Spirit*, xv.
56 Psalm 119:68.
57 Psalm 16:2.
58 1 Corinthians 4:7.
59 James 1:17.
60 SC "The Third Article: On Being Made Holy," Kolb, Robert, and Timothy J. Wengert *eds. The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000,) 355.
61 Psalm 51:10-12.