

## Destroying the Ship-Wrecking Rocks of Scylla: Augustine's Anti-Arian Corpus

### 擊碎那造成海難的錫拉海岸岩石： 奧思定的反亞略異端著作

Julia Cheung  
張紫蘭

摘要：奧思定（354-430）在神學舞台冒起時，異端者亞略（256-336）已逝世，而且亞略異端已分別在381年於東方舉行的君士坦丁堡大公會議和西方舉行的阿奎萊亞會議被壓止。儘管有不少針對奧思定的學術研究，聚焦於他對亞略異端進行抨擊之研究卻很少，當中亦大多只是研究其三部直接駁斥亞略異端的著作。為了填補這一空白，本作者構建了一個奧思定反亞略異端的文庫，並用以了解奧思定對這異端的看法。研究發現，奧思定對亞略異端所作出的抨擊，完全滲透了他皈依後所有時期及不同種類的著作。正因奧思定的皈依是建基於他真正地認識了基督，他願意不遺餘力地反駁這個困擾著早期教會的基督論異端。對他而言，亞略異端好比希臘神話中的海妖錫拉，值得他窮一生之力去與它搏鬥。

關鍵詞：奧思定、亞略異端、異端

**Abstract:** Augustine (354-430) rose to the theological scene after Arius (256-336) had died, and after Arianism had been seriously defeated in the East as well as in the West at the Councils of Constantinople and Aquileia (381) respectively. Given the plethora of studies of Augustine, relatively little has been focussed on his anti-Arian polemic, and few have looked beyond his three directly anti-Arian works. To fill this gap, I have constructed a more comprehensive “anti-Arian corpus” of Augustine and utilised it to examine Augustine’s attitude to Arianism. It is found that Augustine’s anti-Arian effort in fact permeates all genres of his works and all periods of his Catholic life. It comes as no surprise that for him whose very conversion centred upon the discovery of who Christ really is, this Christological heresy which plagued the Church in her incipient centuries is nothing less than Scylla the mythical monster, which is worth spending his entire life to fight against.

**Keywords:** Augustine, Arianism, heresy

Augustine is arguably the most influential Latin father. Over the millennia, scholars have shown intense interest in this Bishop of Hippo, who has perhaps determinately shaped the thought of Western Christianity. Arianism was without doubt the quintessential heresy of the first few centuries. From the rise of Arius in the 310s, the doctrine of Arius and those named after him has been the trigger of series after series of councils in the fourth century. Yet, not much has been said on the interaction between the two theological catchwords of the early centuries—Augustine and Arianism. This is perhaps because Augustine (354-430) and Arius (256-336) never crossed paths in their lives. After the Councils of Constantinople and Aquileia in 381, Arianism had more or less subsided in the East and it lingered on in the West only mainly among the barbarians. Arianism was not an imminent threat to Augustine when he came on the theological scene. However, the Arians came into his life at two pivotal moments. He encountered them during the Milan basilica siege by reviving Homoian Arians in 386, the year of his baptism, and he died during the siege of Hippo by Vandal Arians in 430.

Posterity knows Augustine much better as the defender of Catholic faith against Manichaeism, Donatism and Pelagianism. Arianism has always been a forgotten foe of Augustine, though many of his anti-Arian compositions were written during the last part of his life and thus comprise his most mature works. Augustine has written three directly anti-Arian works. *Contra sermonem Arrianorum* is his response to *Sermo Arrianorum*, an anonymous Arian treatise given to him in 419. *Conlatio cum Maximino Arrianorum episcopo* records the debate between the Arian bishop Maximinus with Augustine at Hippo

in 427, and *Contra Maximinum Arrianum* is Augustine's follow-up response. Yet, Augustine's anti-Arian polemic beyond his three directly anti-Arian works has not been adequately examined.<sup>1</sup> This essay therefore attempts to study and evaluate a wider set of Augustine's anti-Arian writings in order to better understand his assessment of the Arian doctrine.

In this essay, an inductive approach is utilised to construct a more comprehensive "anti-Arian corpus" of Augustine. First, Augustine's anti-Arian polemic in his treatises, debates, sermons and letters is collated by examining certain Arianism-related keywords in *Opera*

- 
- 1 Augustine's three directly anti-Arian works have been carefully studied in two monographs: Richard C. Gamble, *Augustinus Contra Maximinum: An Analysis of Augustine's Anti-Arian Writings* (Ann Arbor, MI: McNaughton & Gunn, 1985); William A. Sumruld, *Augustine and the Arians: The Bishop of Hippo's Encounter with Ulfilan Arianism* (Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press), 1994. The former situates Augustine's anti-Arian polemic within a philosophical context while the latter's approach is mainly historical. Sumruld seems to be completely unaware of Gamble's study. Michel René Barnes has written prolifically on Augustine's anti-Arian works, yet concentrating on examining specific aspects of those texts. His rereadings of Augustine's *De trinitate* with an anti-Arian lens situates the Bishop of Hippo's anti-Arian polemic within the context of his Trinitarian theology. Other works useful for understanding Augustine's encounter with Arianism include: Manilo Simonetti, "S. Agostino e gli Ariani," *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 13 (1967): 55-84; Basil Studer, "Augustin et la foi de Nicée," *Recherches Augustiniennes* 19 (1984): 133-154; Brian E. Daley, "The Giant's Twin Substances: Ambrose and the Christology of Augustine's *Contra sermonem Arianorum*," in Joseph T. Lienhard, Earl C. Muller and Roland J. Teske, ed., *Augustine: Presbyter Factus Sum*, *Collectanea Augustiniana* (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), pp. 477-495; Lewis Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge, 2010). Simonetti's article only targets to examine Augustine's three-directly anti-Arian works, while that of Daley focusses only on one of them. The works of Studer and Ayres shed light on Augustine's attitude towards Arianism, but offer no direct evaluation of his anti-Arian polemic.

*Omnia di sant'Agostino: Indice analitico generale.*<sup>2</sup> The list of works in the corpus is then supplemented with a computer search for the same keywords in the Augustine texts at the “augustinus.it” website. Finally, a few more are appended after finessing with an examination of the literature on Augustine's anti-Arian writings. This results in an “anti-Arian corpus” of 105 works.<sup>3</sup> This approach, which begins with the acceptance of these texts as the corpus, has the advantage that these writings would not be used as mere proof-texts. It thus offers a more panoramic perspective of Augustine's anti-Arian polemic. Surveying his response to the Arians in this corpus, this essay proposes that his anti-Arian polemic extends over a much broader range of works than has been commonly recognised. It actually permeates all types of his works and spans his entire theological career.

---

2 Franco Monteverde, ed., *Opera omnia di sant'Agostino: Indice analitico generale*, Opere di sant'Agostino, XLIV/1-5 (Rome: Città Nuova Editrice, 2007-2011).

3 The corpus consists of: *agon.*, *bapt.* 3.15.20, *c. adu. leg.* 1.23.48-49, *c. Iul. imp.* 1.75, 4.7, 5.25, 5.30, 5.44, *c. Max.*, *c. s. Arrian.*, *cath. fr.* 3.6, *ciu.* 5.26, 18.52, *conf.*, *conl. Max.*, *Cresc.* 2.1.2, 3.34.38, 4.44.52, 4.61.75, *diu. qu.* 16, 23, 37, 50, 60, 69, *en. Ps.* 32 (3), 35, 52, 54, 67, 80, 120, 124, 130, 149, *ench.* 1.1-2.8, 8.23-14.55, *ep.* 11, 22\*, 23A\*, 44, 93, 118, 120, 137, 147, 148, 170, 171A, 185 (*correct.*), 187, 213, 220, 228, 238, 239, 241, 242, *ep. Io. tr.* 6, *f. et symb.*, *Gn. litt.* 8.27.49-50, *Gn. litt. inp.* 1.2, *haer.* 44, 49, 51, 52, 54, *Io. eu. tr.* 1, 3, 17, 18, 20, 21, 26, 36, 37, 40, 43, 45, 47, 48, 53, 59, 71, 78, 79, 96, 97, 100, *nupt. et conc.* 2.23.38, *retr.* 2.52, *s.* 5, 7, 46, 71, 73A, 117, 126, 135, 139, 140, 162A, 182, 183, 212, 213, 214, 215, 229G (*s. Guelf.* 11), 229O (*s. Guelf.* 17), 244, 245, 252, 265A, 341 *augm.* (*s. Dolbeau* 22), 364, 375B, 380, 384, 398 (*symb. cat.*), 400 (*util. ieiun.*), *trin.* and *uera rel.* 5.8-6.11. Individual *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, *Epistulae*, *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus*, *Sermones* are counted as separate works.

## 1. Augustine's Encounter with Arianism

Augustine's grand public debut on the theological stage was the speech he delivered at the Council of Hippo in 393. After the Nicene Creed was read aloud, Augustine made an explanation of the Creed to the bishops gathered at the plenary council. Given the anti-Arian nature of the Christological statements of the Creed, one may argue that Augustine has in fact inaugurated his appearance on the theological stage with an address against Arianism.

During his Catholic career, Augustine spoke against Arianism through his correspondences. He wrote *Epistula* 171A to encourage Maximus, an ex-Arian. Sometime after 395, he wrote *Epistula* 242 to Elpidius, an African Arian who had sent him a work by an Arian bishop in an attempt to convert him. Sometime between 405 and 410, he debated with Pascentius, an Arian count, and followed the issue up with *Epistulae* 238, 239 and 241, on Pascentius' complaint against the Catholic use of the unscriptural word ὁμοούσιον. In 417, Augustine wrote *Epistula* 185 to Boniface, a military tribune, explaining to him the doctrinal differences between Arianism and Donatism. Boniface later allowed his daughter to be baptised by the Arians, and this caused Augustine to write *Epistula* 220, dated 427, to admonish him. In 419, his friend Dionysius sent him an anonymous *Sermo Arrianorum*. In response, he wrote his first main anti-Arian work, *Contra sermonem Arrianorum*, refuting the 34 Arian-themed paragraphs in *Sermo Arrianorum* point-by-point. Between 399 and 426, Augustine wrote his masterpiece — *De trinitate*. Contemporary studies, especially those by

Michel René Barnes,<sup>4</sup> clearly point to the existence of the many anti-Arian elements in this work. Given that the writing of this work spanned much of Augustine's theological career, his consistent and continual effort to curb Arianism speaks loudly for itself. In 427, Maximinus, an Illyricum Arian bishop, came to Africa and debated with Augustine at Hippo. The debate has come down to us as Augustine's second main anti-Arian work, *Conlatio cum Maximino Arrianorum episcopo*. Given that he was not able to answer Maximinus to his own personal satisfaction during the debate itself, Augustine wrote his third main anti-Arian work, *Contra Maximinum Arrianum*, as a post-debate response.

Christ is the foundation of Augustine's faith. It is unthinkable that the Arian heresy — the heresy which renounces the full divinity of Christ and so dominated the theological discussions of the fourth century — was something that Augustine could be indifferent about. Naturally, Augustine's knowledge of Arianism deepened as his encounter with this heresy became more personal. But Arianism was to him a much greater doctrinal threat than has been commonly believed. While Augustine's polemic against Arianism culminated in his debate with Maximinus, he was concerned about this heresy throughout his life.

---

4 Cf. Michel René Barnes, "Exegesis and Polemic in Augustine's *De Trinitate* I," *Augustinian Studies* 30, no. 1 (1999): 43-59; "The Arians of Book V, and the Genre of *De Trinitate*," *The Journal of Theological Studies* New Series 44, no. 1 (1993): 185-195; "*De Trinitate* VI and VII: Augustine and the Limits of Nicene Orthodoxy," *Augustinian Studies* 38, no. 1 (2007): 189-202.

## 2. The Arian Foe

In *De haeresibus*, Augustine identifies four types of Arians — the Arians, Semi-Arians, Macedonians and Eunomians.<sup>5</sup> These four are more traditionally labelled by Catholics as Homoians, Homoiousians, Pneumatomachians and Anomoians respectively — they being thus distinguished from classic Arians.

Augustine identifies Arians as those who deny that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are of the same nature, substance or essence, believe that the Son is a creature, and the Holy Spirit a creature of a creature, and that Christ has no soul.<sup>6</sup> Augustine knows of the Semi-Arians indirectly through Epiphanius, who labels them as those who believe the Son's essence is like that of the Father.<sup>7</sup> Aetians are better known as Eunomians, named after Aetius' disciple Eunomius, who believe the Son is unlike the Father in all aspects, and the Holy Spirit is unlike the Son.<sup>8</sup> They also maintain that Christ is the Son of God's will rather than of his substance.<sup>9</sup> Macedonians are right about the oneness in substance of the Father and the Son but believe that the Holy Spirit is not God but a creature.<sup>10</sup> Macedonians, Arians and Eunomians are alike in their claim that the Holy Spirit is a creature.<sup>11</sup>

---

5 In *De haeresibus*, the longest description goes to Manichaeism, followed by Pelagianism and then Donatism. The four categories of Arianism together rank fourth in length. The relatively sizeable amount of space Arianism occupies in Augustine's treatise against the different heresies reflects his knowledge and concern about this major Christological controversy of the first centuries of Christianity.

6 *haer.* 49.

7 *haer.* 51.

8 *haer.* 54.

9 *trin.* 15.20.38.

10 *haer.* 52.

11 *correct.* 11.48, s. 71.5.

Whenever Augustine mentions the Eunomians or the Macedonians, he never mentions them without mentioning the Arians in the same work. He sees them as one of the same broader group of Arians. When he speaks against the Eunomians, he seems to do so more for the rhetorical purpose of adding one more group of Arians rather to help his audience distinguish between the doctrines of the Arians versus those of the Eunomians. When he speaks against the Macedonians, his concern is more on the role of the Holy Spirit in Trinitarian doctrine rather than their originating from the Semi-Arians. In fact, *De haeresibus* is the only work of Augustine in which Semi-Arians are mentioned. Relative to other Arian groups, the Semi-Arians seem to be of little personal concern to Augustine, he never speaks against it elsewhere, nor does their catchword *homoiousios* occur in any of his works.

In contrast with his silence about the Semi-Arians, Augustine often speaks against the other three Arian groups — Arians, Eunomians and Macedonians — together in the same work.<sup>12</sup> He also frequently refers to the two groups, Arians and Eunomians, together.<sup>13</sup> But he refers to the Arians and Macedonians together in the same work only in *Contra*

---

12 These three Arian groups are referenced along with other heresies or dissenting groups in *cath. fr.*, *en. Ps.* 67, *ep.* 118, 185 (*correct.*), *ep. Io. tr.* 6, *haer.* and *s.* 71.

13 The Arians and Eunomians are referenced against other dissenting groups in *bapt. c. Iul. imp.*, *c. s. Arrian.*, *en. Ps.* 52, *s.* 46, 73A, 182, 183 and *trin.*. In *en. Ps.* 52, they are actually mentioned together only against pagans and Jews but not against other heretical groups. It is also worth noting that the Arians and Eunomians are mentioned by themselves without being pitted against other dissenting groups in *ep.* 238, *Io. eu. tr.* 78 and *s.* 229O. These are works that have specifically anti-Arian rather than generally anti-heretical content—*ep.* 238 is addressed to the Arian count Pascentius, *Io. eu. tr.* 78 is an anti-Arian exposition of Jn 14:27-28 on the Father being greater, and *s.* 229O announces the conversion of an Arian.

*Maximinum Arrianum*. In this case, they are pitted against only the Sabellians, who do not share their judgement about the inferiority of the Holy Spirit, but go to the other extreme and see him as identical with the Father.

The importance of the Arians for Augustine can be reflected in two of his possibly most important works. In his autobiographical *Confessiones*, besides the Manichaeism which he personally needed to shake off before his conversion, Arians, Apollinarians and Photinians are the only other enemies of Catholics mentioned. Apollinarians share with Arians their error about the lack of a human soul in Christ; Photinians share with Arians their denial of the Son's equality with the Father. In Augustine's most important dogmatic treatise *De trinitate*, the only adversaries of Catholics cited are Arians, Eunomians, Sabellians and the philosophers.<sup>14</sup> While Arians and Eunomians belong to the wider category of Arianism, Sabellianism serves to contrast Arianism in its opposite insistence on the Father's identity with the Son, and philosophers serve to contrast believers of the Catholic faith in general. Among other heresies, Arianism is thus indeed placed in a position of limelight in Augustine's works.

Among the 105 works in the constructed "anti-Arian corpus," 75 mention Arius or the Arians explicitly, while 30 do not. In the 30 works

---

<sup>14</sup> Rather than mentioning the heretics as a group as he would usually do, Augustine in *De trinitate* also cites the name of the heresiarchs — Arius, Eunomius and Sabellius — each of them once in *trin.* 6.1.1, 15.20.38, 7.4.9 respectively.

in which the Arians are not explicitly mentioned,<sup>15</sup> Augustine either calls them “heretic(s),”<sup>16</sup> refers to them in the third-person plural form, or simply as “men,” “someone,” “someone else,” or even “some foolish fellow.”<sup>17</sup> There appears to be no particular reason why Augustine refrains from naming the Arian heretics. It could be for a rhetorical purpose, as many of these occasions when the Arians are only implied occur in his homiletical discourses like *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus* and *Sermones*. Often, cliché Arian doctrines are called up to engage the audience to think. For instance, Arians are referenced by their doctrine of the Son being a creature in *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 32(3).5, 80.13, their denial of the true Son of God in *Epistula* 220.4, and as those believing the Father as invisible and the Son as visible in *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus* 3.18 and 53.12.

---

15 They are *diu. qu., en. Ps.* 32(3), 80, 130, *ench., ep.* 11, 22\*, 120, 137, 171A, 187, 213, 220, 239, 241, *Gn. litt., Gn. litt. inp., Io. eu. tr.* 3, 20, 21, 53, 79, s. 7, 140, 212, 213, 214, 215, 245 and 380. As the Arians are only implicitly suggested in these works, incorporating them into the “anti-Arian corpus” is more a theological art than a scientific categorisation. For instance, *Epistula* 137, a positive Christological treatise frequently cited by scholars, is included even though neither the name nor the doctrine of the Arians is explicitly cited. Its speaking against heresies that go against the name of Christ using Christ’s name (*ep.* 137.4.16), its mention of the Son’s coeternity (*ep.* 137.3.12) and its use of Jn 1:1 so pertinent to the anti-Arian literature make it likely that Augustine does have Arianism in his mind.

16 “haeretici” in *diu. qu.* 69.1 (CCL 44A: 185), *en. Ps.* 130.11 (CCL 40: 1907), *ep.* 120.3.13 (CCL 31B: 153), *ep.* 187.1.4 (CSEL 57: 83), *Gn. litt.* 8.27.50 (CSEL 28/1: 267) and s. 7.4 (CCL 41: 72); “haeticis” in *ep.* 220.4 (CSEL 57: 434); “haeticus” in *Io. eu. tr.* 20.5 (CCL 36: 206).

17 Third-person plural form in *en. Ps.* 32(3).5 (CCL 38: 259), *Io. eu. tr.* 53.12 (CCL 36: 457); “homines” in *Io. eu. tr.* 3.18 (CCL 36: 28); “aliquis” in *Io. eu. tr.* 21.17 (CCL 36: 222); “alius” in *en. Ps.* 80.13 (CCL 39: 1127); “an forte aliquis insipiens” in s. 245.2 (PL38: 1152).

As for providing a doctrinal base for the anti-Arian polemic, 63 of the 105 works include either a negative evaluation of the Arian doctrine or a positive inculcation of Catholic Christology, 18 consist of only a brief description or allusion to the heresy while 24 contain no discussion of the doctrine. Of the 18 works in which the Arian doctrine is only very briefly mentioned,<sup>18</sup> disproportionately many are from the *Enarrationes in Psalmos* — five out of 10 in the “anti-Arian corpus,” and all of them related to the theme of persecution and eventual triumph. Under the doctrinal disease of the Arians and other dissenters, Catholic steadfastness is called for. Note also that disproportionately few are from the *Sermones* which tend to be more apologetic, exploratory and argumentative in nature.

Of the 24 works in the constructed “anti-Arian corpus” in which Arian doctrines are not brought up,<sup>19</sup> none are from *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus*, which is more doctrinal in nature. Instead, the themes of these works lean towards more practical or disciplinary matters — welcoming a converted Arian in *Sermo 229O*, recounting the writing of *Contra sermonem Arrianorum* in *Epistula 23A\**, suggesting an Arian-Donatist alliance at the Council of Sardica in *Epistula 44* and *Ad Cresconium*, blaming Valens as an iniquitous Arian emperor in *De ciuitate dei*, referencing a Nicene canon on the transfer of bishop in *Epistula 22\**, and perhaps most importantly, using the Arians as a foil

---

18 They include *c. adu. leg., c. Iul. imp., en. Ps.* 35, 52, 54, 67, 120, *ep.* 120, 171A, 187, 220, *ep. Io. tr.* 6, *Io. eu. tr.* 26, 45, 96, 100, s. 182 and 245.

19 They include *bapt., cath. fr., ciu. Cresc., en. Ps.* 124, 149, *ep.* 22\*, 23A\*, 44, 93, 118, 213, 228, *nupt. et conc., retr., s.* 5, 46, 73A, 162A, 229O (*s. Guelf.* 17), 252, 364, 400 (*util. ieiun.*) and *uera rel.*

against other heretics, as in *De baptismo*, *Ad catholicos fratres* and *Ad Cresconium* against the Donatists.

Among the 75 works in which the Arians are explicitly mentioned, 22 only mention the Arian name with no evaluation of the Arian doctrine.<sup>20</sup> This is a subset of the aforesaid 24 works in which the Arian doctrine is not discussed. In the remaining two, *Epistulae* 22\* and 213, the Council of Nicaea is mentioned, but not the Arian name or doctrine.

### 3. Arians with Other Adversaries

Many times Augustine does not present Arianism as a heresy by itself. It is revealing to see that in the “anti-Arian corpus” of Augustine, in 62 out of 105 works, Arius or the Arians — whether explicitly named or merely implied — are pitted against or mentioned along with other heretics or heresies cited or implied. Augustine’s attitude is that heretics, regardless of their specific sect, are enemies of the Catholic Church. Only the Catholic Church is the *via media* that holds the truth. Within the “anti-Arian corpus,” Augustine often puts different heresies together for comparison in his sermons — in nine of the 10 *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, in 17 of the 22 *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus* and in 13 of the 30 *Sermones* — which are more polemical by nature. But such opposition only occurs in seven of the 21 *Epistulae* which are addressed to specific parties.

---

<sup>20</sup> They are *bapt.*, *cath. fr.*, *ciu.*, *Cresc.*, *en. Ps.* 124, 149, *ep.* 23A\*, 44, 93, 118, 228, *nupt. et conc.*, *retr.*, *s.* 5, 46, 73A, 162A, 229O (*s. Guelf.* 17), 252, 364, 400 (*util. ieiun.*) and *uera rel.*

It is possible to identify 26 groups that Augustine has presented as enemies of the Catholic Church in the “anti-Arian corpus.” Nevertheless, the names of these groups are imposed upon them as such by those on the side of orthodoxy, often notwithstanding their objections to these labels. In fact, three of these groups — pagans, philosophers<sup>21</sup> and Jews or Pharisees<sup>22</sup> — cannot be considered as heretics in a strict sense. The remaining are<sup>23</sup> groups whom Augustine categorised as heretics — Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians, Apollinarians, Sabellians or Patripassians, Photinians, Manichees, Pelagians, Donatists or Parmenianists, its subgroups Montenses and Circumcellions, its split-off groups Maximianists and Rogatists,<sup>23</sup> Novatians, Cataphrygians or Montanists, Jovinianists, Marcionites, Apellites,<sup>24</sup> Valentinians, Ophites or Serpentine,<sup>25</sup> Anthropians,<sup>26</sup> Luciferians, and Priscillianists. In Augustine’s *De haeresibus*, 20 of these 23 heretical groups except the Serpentine, Anthropians and Rogatists are named. More often than not, Augustine speaks against the heretics rather than the heresies—

---

21 Though pagans and philosophers are not mutually exclusive groups, Augustine usually denotes them as two separate groups.

22 When Augustine speaks about the Jews, he may actually mean Jews in general or Pharisees in particular. Due to the obscure distinction Augustine makes between them, Jews and Pharisees are put together as the same group here.

23 Montenses are Donatists in Rome. Circumcellions are violent Donatists. Maximianists, named after Maximianus of Carthage, are schismatic Donatists. Rogatists are also schismatic Donatists.

24 According to *haer.* 23, the Apellites believe that there are two gods, one good and the other evil, but only one principle—the good God, and the evil one made by him.

25 Ophites worship the serpent, which they believe is Christ. Serpentine are Latin Ophites.

26 *Cresc.* 4.61.75 is the only occurrence of this group in the entire corpus of work by Augustine.

for instance, his hermeneutic is more anti-Arian than anti-Arianism — possibly because it is more persuasive to preach against heretics as concrete people rather than against heresies as abstract doctrines.

Of the 26 groups of enemies of the Catholics, Augustine would sometimes put the Arians against as many as nine other groups in one anti-Arian polemical work,<sup>27</sup> but most commonly against one, two or four other such groups.<sup>28</sup> It is in *Epistula* 118.12 that Augustine in one paragraph alone situates the Arians amidst nine other enemies of the Catholics, including eight heretical groups plus the Greek philosophers.<sup>29</sup> In response to Dioscorus' question about Cicero,

---

27 Arians are set against nine other groups in *Cresc.* (2.1.2, 3.34.38, 4.44.52, 4.61.75), *ep.* 118; eight other groups in *en. Ps.* 67, s.71; seven other groups in *agon.*; six other groups in *c. lul. imp.* (1.75, 4.7, 5.25, 5.30, 5.44), *cath. fr.* (3.6), *en. Ps.* 54, *ep.* 185 (*correct.*), s. 183; five other groups in *ep.* 120, *Io. eu. tr.* 47, 96, s.73A, 252, *uera rel.* (5.8-6.11); four other groups in *bapt.* (3.15.20), *en. Ps.* 32(3), 124, *ep.* 93, *ep. Io. tr.* 6, *Io. eu. tr.* 45, *nupt. et conc.* (2.23.38), s. 46, 182, 400 (*util. ieiu.*); three other groups in *c. adu. leg.* (1.23.48-49), *c. Max., conf.*, *en. Ps.* 52, *Io. eu. tr.* 100, s. 5, *trin.*; two other groups in *c. s. Arrian.*, *en. Ps.* 35, 80, *Io. eu. tr.* 18, 36, 37, 43, s.162A, 364; and one other group in *en. Ps.* 120, 149, *ep.* 44, 137, 187, *f. et symb.*, *Io. eu. tr.* 3, 17, 20, 21, 26, 40, 48, 53, 71, s. 229G, 244, 245, 375B. In *haer.*, due to the nature of the work, the Arians are mentioned along with 20 other groups.

28 In the “anti-Arian corpus,” there are 19 works in which Arians are positioned against one other group of enemies of the Catholics, nine works in which they are positioned against two such groups, and 10 works in which they are positioned against four such groups.

29 *ep.* 118.12 (CCL 31B: 120-121): “sed circuli atque conuenticula partim fugacia partim etiam audaciter prompta uel Donatistarum uel Maximianensium uel Manichaeorum uel etiam, ad quorum greges turbamque uenturus es, Arrianorum, Eunomianorum, Macedonianorum, Cataphrygarum ceterarumque pestium innumerabiliter perstrepat. [...] cum quorundam etiam haeticorum, qui nomine christiano gloriari uoluerunt, ut Marcionitarum et Sabellianorum, multorumque praeterea [...], de haeticis potius, qui se christianos uocant, quam de Anaxagora et Democrito nobis cogitandum fuit.”

Augustine declares that heretics are much more impending threats than Greek philosophers. The fact that Augustine places all three Arian groups — Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians — immediately after the Donatist groups and the Manichees, whom he has much more personal concern about, shows the place of importance of the Arians for him.

Possibly for rhetorical purposes, the dissenting groups are sometimes not named directly but are referred by their doctrine. This is particularly true in *De agone christiano* where from chapter 14 to 32, that is, in 19 out of 33 chapters of the book, Augustine presents a list of heresies according to their doctrines without naming them. Indeed, the battle of the Christians is the fight against heresies. Sabellians are those who confuse the persons in the Godhead in *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 32(3).5. Donatists are not explicitly named but alluded to as schismatics in *De baptismo* 3.15.20, those who want to rebaptise Catholics in *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 32(3).29, and those who consider the Church as surviving in one region in *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 120.12. Pagans are not named but hinted at as those who worship idols in *Sermo* 46.28.

Note that when Augustine cites other heretics, he hardly mentions Marcion, Valentinus or Praxeas,<sup>30</sup> against whom Tertullian has written vehemently. This suggests that Augustine draws up his own list of heretics and does not borrow from his African predecessor in apologetics.

---

30 In *haer.* 41, Augustine quotes Philaster of Brescia for also naming the Sabellians Praxeans after Praxeas. While Augustine in his anti-Arian polemic also refers to the Sabellians as Patripassians, he has not referred to them as Praxeans.

In Augustine's "anti-Arian corpus," Donatists rank first as the most mentioned dissenting group—they are referenced together with the Arians in 28 out of the 105 works.<sup>31</sup> This comes as no surprise, as Augustine worries most about Donatism. Just like Arianism in the Orient, Donatism in Africa greatly threatens to break the unity of the Church and to undermine its catholicity. Augustine blames the Donatists as those who think that the Church "exists in one region only"<sup>32</sup> and accuses Catholics as Macarians.<sup>33</sup> Often, many Donatist groups are mentioned together<sup>34</sup>—perhaps to show their self-divisiveness—though Donatist branches like Circumcellions and Montenses, and split-off groups like Maximianists and Rogatists are never mentioned by themselves without the main Donatist group. When more than one Donatist group is mentioned along with the Arians, the main theme of the work is either anti-Donatist, or on serious subjects like persecution and God's protection of the faithful in *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 35, 54, 124, or sin against the Holy Spirit in *Sermo* 71. Note that these are also works with the largest count of dissenting groups in the entire

---

31 They include *agon.*, *bapt.*, *c. Iul. imp.*, *cath. fr.*, *Cresc.*, *en. Ps.* 32 (3), 35, 54, 67, 120, 124, 149, *ep.* 44, 93, 118, 185 (*correct.*), *haer.*, *Io. eu. tr.* 47, *s.* 5, 46, 71, 73A, 162A, 182, 183, 252, 364 and 400 (*util. ieiun.*). Note that *haer.* and *agon.* included in the heresy counts are to some extent not very meaningful, for these works are by themselves catalogues of various heresies.

32 *en. Ps.* 120.12 (CCL 40: 1797, trans. Maria Boulding, WSA, *Expositions of the Psalms*, III/19: 522): "Quisquis rursus putauerit ecclesiam in una parte esse."

33 *c. Iul. imp.* 1.75. Macarius was sent to Carthage by Emperor Constans to curb Donatism. Macarians therefore signify Christians who persecute Christians. Pamela Bright, "Church, North African," in *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Alan D. Fitzgerald (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans, 1999), p. 187.

34 More than one Donatist group are mentioned with the Arians in *cath. fr.*, *Cresc.*, *en. Ps.* 35, 54, 124, *ep.* 93, 118, *haer.* and *s.* 71.

“anti-Arian corpus”—*Ad Cresconium* and *Epistula* 118 with nine other groups, and *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 67 and *Sermo* 71 with eight other groups besides the Arians. This shows that whenever Augustine wants to criticize the various heresies and especially the most upsetting Donatists, which divide the church in Africa, he would not miss the arch-heretical Arians, who divide the universal Church.

Surprisingly, it is neither the Pelagians nor Manichees who most preoccupy Augustine but Jews, who rank second in being most mentioned along with the Arians. Though they are not even Christians, they are referenced together with the Arians in 24 out of the 105 works.<sup>35</sup> To Augustine, Jews are “eager to justify their impious crime”<sup>36</sup> of killing Christ. They “have not believed in Christ”<sup>37</sup> nor believed in him as the Son of God<sup>38</sup> or the Mediator.<sup>39</sup> They see only the flesh of Christ the man but do not know or believe him as God.<sup>40</sup> They honour the Father but despise the Son in his form of servant, not understanding

---

35 Jews are mentioned with the Arians in *c. adu. leg., c. Max., en. Ps.* 32 (3), 52, 54, 67, 124, *ep.* 93, 120, *Io. eu. tr.* 3, 17, 18, 20, 21, 36, 45, 48, 53, 96, s. 5, 71, 245, 252 and *uera rel.*

36 *agon.* 12.13 (CSEL 41: 117, trans. Robert P. Russell, FC, *Christian Instruction, Admonition and Grace, The Christian Combat, Faith, Hope and Charity*, II: 331): “peccatum impietatis suae defendere cupientes.”

37 *en. Ps.* 32(3).29 (CCL 38: 272, trans. Maria Boulding, WSA, *Expositions of the Psalms*, III / 15: 423): “in Christum non crediderunt.” In *Io. eu. tr.* 45.4 (CCL 36: 390), Augustine also says the Pharisees “negabant Christum.”

38 *Io. eu. tr.* 96.3.

39 *Io. eu. tr.* 53.10.

40 *Io. eu. tr.* 18.2 (CCL 36: 180): “in homine non intellegebant Deum. Carnem uidebant, Deum nesciebant;” *Io. eu. tr.* 36.3 (CCL 36: 324): “Isti ergo Iudaei uidebant hominem, nec intellegebant nec credebant Deum.”

that he is equal to the Father.<sup>41</sup> As enemies of the resurrected Christ, they are dispersed among all nations<sup>42</sup>—“dispersed everywhere as a sign of their shame.”<sup>43</sup> It is noticeable that Augustine frequently mentions Arians and Jews together in *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus*. In the Gospel of John, Jews are represented as those not understanding Jesus as the Son of God. Given that Arians consider Christ as a creature, they and the Jews are both guilty of failing to do justice to Christ's divinity.

In third rank are the Photinians. They are referenced together with the Arians in 23 out of the 105 works.<sup>44</sup> Augustine does not say much about them. Most frequently, he refers to them simply by their belief that Christ is merely a man.<sup>45</sup> They do not understand the equality between Father and Son,<sup>46</sup> consider that “Christ has not yet ascended to the Father”<sup>47</sup> and only the Father is God.<sup>48</sup> Augustine cites Ambrose

---

41 *Io. eu. tr.* 21.16 (CCL 36: 222): “Iudaeis honorificatur Pater, contemnitur Filius. Filius enim uidebatur ut servus, Pater honorificabatur ut Deus;” *Io. eu. tr.* 17.16 (CCL 36: 179): “Hanc formam serui contemnentes Iudaei, Dominum Christum aequalem Patri intellegere non poterant.”

42 *en. Ps.* 67.2.

43 *en. Ps.* 52.4 (CCL 39: 640, trans. Maria Boulding, WSA, *Expositions of the Psalms*, III/17: 34): “Iudaei, qui ad testimonium confusionis suae ubique diffusi sunt.”

44 Photinians are mentioned with the Arians in *agon.*, *conf.*, *en. Ps.* 67, 124, *ep.* 120, 185 (*correct.*), *haer.*, *Io. eu. tr.* 26, 37, 40, 45, 47, 96, 100, s. 71, 73A, 162A, 182, 183, 244, 252, 400 (*util. ieiun.*) and *uera rel.*

45 *agon.* 17.19, *ep.* 120.3.15, *Io. eu. tr.* 26.5, 45.5, 47.9, 96.3, 100.3, s. 71.5 and 183.8.

46 *ep.* 120.3.15.

47 s. 244.4 (PL 38: 1150, trans. Edmund Hill, WSA, *Sermons*, III/7: 98): “nondum [...] Christus ascendit ad Patrem.”

48 *correct.* 11.48, s. 71.5.

for their attributing the Son's beginning to the womb of Mary.<sup>49</sup> Besides, they deny the existence of the Holy Spirit.<sup>50</sup> Perhaps Augustine often put the Photinians and the Arians together because both groups challenge the divinity of Christ as true God.

Together in fourth rank are the Manichees and Sabellians. They both reject the true humanity of Christ and are referenced together with the Arians in 21 out of 105 works.<sup>51</sup> Augustine calls the Manichees "old heretics,"<sup>52</sup> who accuse Catholics as Pharisees.<sup>53</sup> Though they agree with the Catholics that the Trinity is one in essence,<sup>54</sup> their despising matter as evil lead them to deny that Christ has come in flesh<sup>55</sup> and his resulting role as the Mediator between God and man, but instead claim him as "God only without any true humanity."<sup>56</sup> Worse, Mani "fashioned for himself a god at war with the race of darkness, a god always fearful of being invaded."<sup>57</sup>

---

49 *uid. deo* 7.19.

50 *correct.* 11.48, s. 71.5.

51 Manichees are mentioned with the Arians in *agon.*, *c. adu. leg.*, *c. Iul. imp.*, *conf.*, *en. Ps.* 67, 80, *ep.* 118, *haer.*, *Io. eu. tr.* 43, 47, 96, 100, *nupt. et conc.*, s. 5, 46, 73A, 182, 183, 252, 364 and *uera rel.*. Sabellians are mentioned with the Arians in *agon.*, *c. Iul. imp.*, *c. Max.*, *c. s. Arrian.*, *Cresc.*, *en. Ps.* 32 (3), 67, *ep.* 118, *f. et symb.*, *haer.*, *Io. eu. tr.* 36, 37, 45, 47, 71, 96, *nupt. et conc.*, s. 71, 183, 229G (*s. Guelf.* 11) and *trin.*.

52 *c. Iul. imp.* 5.30 (CSEL 85/2: 229, trans. Roland J. Teske, WSA, *Answer to the Pelagians III*, 1/25: 556): "haereticos veteres."

53 *c. Iul. imp.* 1.75.

54 *c. Iul. imp.* 5.30.

55 *Io. eu. tr.* 96.3, 100.3, s. 182.2 and 183.13.

56 *Io. eu. tr.* 47.9 (CCL 36: 409, trans. John Gibb and James Innes, NPNF I/7: 263): "solum sine homine Deum."

57 *en. Ps.* 80.13 (CCL 39: 1127, trans. Maria Boulding, WSA, *Expositions of the Psalms*, III/18: 161): "Fecit sibi alius deum pugnantem contra gentem tenebrarum, timentem ne inuadatur, satagentem ne corrumpatur."

The Sabellians, who find Christ the Son identical to the Father, is at the other extreme of the Arians, who deny their equality. Positioning Sabellianism against Arianism — albeit Sabellianism was a practically non-existent heresy in Augustine's time — served as a perfect platform for Augustine to position the Catholic way as the orthodox *via media*. Note that Sabellians and Arians are mentioned together in only one *Epistula* but frequently in *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus*. This makes sense because letters tends to be less dogmatic and the Gospel of John tends to stress the divinity of Christ. In giving a balanced exegesis of Jn 10:30, which is Augustine's ultimate anti-Arian verse, the Bishop of Hippo would often position the Arians against the Sabellians to show that, while the Son is equal to the Father, they are not the same. Augustine most commonly calls the Sabellians those who consider the Father and the Son as the same. It is fascinating to see how Augustine plays with the language to express their doctrinal summary in many different ways<sup>58</sup> — could this be his parody on the Sabellian idea of sameness? Augustine also notices that the Sabellians deny that God is Triune.<sup>59</sup> The Father is at times called the Son or the Holy Spirit<sup>60</sup> — “the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one and the same person.”<sup>61</sup> That is to say, they opine that only the Father exists, but not

---

58 s. 183.7 (PL 38: 990): “Ipse est Filius, qui est et Pater;” *Io. eu. tr.* 45.5 (CCL 36: 390): “Qui Filius est, ipse est Pater;” *Io. eu. tr.* 71.2 (CCL 36: 505): “Pater est ipse et Filius;” *Io. eu. tr.* 47.9 (CCL 36: 409): “Ipse est Pater qui Filius;” *f. et symb.* 4.5 (CSEL 41: 8): “filium esse qui pater est;” s. 229G.3 (MA 1: 476): “ipsum esse Patrem, qui est Filius;” *Io. eu. tr.* 36.9 (CCL 36: 329) and *Io. eu. tr.* 37.6 (CCL 36: 334): “ipsum esse Patrem qui est Filius.”

59 *Io. eu. tr.* 96.3, s. 71.5.

60 *agon.* 14.16, s. 71.5.

61 *nupt. et conc.* 2.23.38 (CSEL 42: 292, trans. Roland J. Teske, WSA, *Answer to the Pelagians II*, I/24: 77): “unum eundemque esse patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum.”

the Son or the Holy Spirit, so they are “sometimes called Patripassians, because they hold that the Father suffered.”<sup>62</sup> For them, “the Father assumed flesh and came to men, [...] the Father suffered, rose again, and somehow ascended to Himself.”<sup>63</sup>

In referencing the dissenting groups together and against each other, Augustine is able to delineate the boundaries of doctrinal orthodoxy and paint better portraits of the various heresies. Given that the Arian stance is much closer to that of the Photinians and Jews, it is sensible that Arians are mentioned along with Photinians and Jews more often than with Manichees and Sabellians. Note that both Photinians and Jews regard Christ as a mere man and give him an even lower status than the Arians. In referencing them together with the Arians, who at least consider Christ as sharing some aspect of divinity, Augustine can more precisely define the Arian error. At the other end of the scale, the position of the Manichees and Sabellians is closer to that of the Catholics than that of the Arians. Indeed, though ironically, those who fail to understand Christ’s true humanity help anchor the Catholic faith, which confesses that Christ is fully God and fully man, as the true *via media*.

There are also several categories of dissenting groups which Augustine frequently pairs together and references along with the

---

62 *s. 71.5* (IPM 45: 184, trans. Edmund Hill, WSA, *Sermons*, III/3: 249): “quos quidam ‘patripassianos’ uocant, ideo quia Patrem perhibent passum.” In *Io. eu. tr.* 36.8 (CCL 36: 328), Augustine identifies Patripassians as those who consider “ipsum Patrem passum fuisse.”

63 *Io. eu. tr.* 37.7 (CCL 36: 335, trans. John Gibb and James Innes, NPNF I/7: 215): “ipsum Patrem indutum carne uenisse ad homines, ipsum esse passum, ipsum resurrexisse, et quodammodo ad se ascendisse.”

Arians. For example, he tends to put the Sabellians and Photinians as a pair alongside the Arians.<sup>64</sup> There are several instances of such occurrence from *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus*, probably due to the importance of a correct interpretation of Jn 10:30 in this context. For Augustine, Catholics are at the *via media* of right faith, Sabellians see Christ as too equal to the Father to the extent that they are the same, Arians see Christ as unequal to the Father, and Photinians go even farther to say that he is but a man. Note that while some may consider that Sabellianism survived in the fourth century only through Marcellus of Ancyra and his disciple Photinus of Sirmium, Augustine instead sets the Sabellians and Photinians at two opposite ends of the spectrum in their respective one-sided conviction about Christ's divinity and humanity.

Donatists and Manichees are also mentioned with the Arians in quite a few works.<sup>65</sup> The pairing together of Donatists and Manichees is not unexpected, as Manichees and Donatists have been Augustine's two personal and long-time threats before Pelagianism. Note that the works listed in this category are mostly homiletic in nature, with the theme of heresy in general being a threat to Catholicism. Donatists and Manichees may not be most doctrinally related to Arianism, but they are all significant enemies of the Catholics, either in Augustine's immediate world, or in the universal Catholic Church.

---

64 Sabellians and Photinians are mentioned with the Arians in *agon., en. Ps. 67, haer., Io. eu. tr. 37, 45, 47, 96, s. 71 and 183*. Note that there is no *Epistula* on this list.

65 Donatists and Manichees are mentioned with the Arians in *agon., c. Iul. imp., en. Ps. 67, ep. 118, haer., Io. eu. tr. 47, s. 5, 46, 73A, 182, 183, 252 and 364*.

Augustine also likes to contrast the pagans and the Jews with Christian heretics. These two groups represents Augustine's world of non-Christian adversaries. Pagans are referenced with the Arians in 13 out of the 105 works. <sup>66</sup> Augustine rejects them as those "who do not yet believe in Christ" <sup>67</sup> and think that Christ is a magician. <sup>68</sup> They deny "that the world was made by Him who was crucified," <sup>69</sup> worship various false gods and hold among themselves only a feigned unity, <sup>70</sup> and are "fearful of losing their empty joy in ever curious satisfactions." <sup>71</sup> They are mentioned together with the Jews along with the Arians in *en. Ps.* 32 (3), 52, 54, *Io. eu. tr.* 18, 45, 96 and s. 71. Note that none of these occurs in *Epistulae*, since "pagans and Jews" together for Augustine seems to represent one "singular" group of anti-Christian adversaries in the abstract rather than concrete or personal opponents. Pagans and Jews

---

66 Pagans are referenced with the Arians in *en. Ps.* 32 (3), 52, 54, 80, *ep.* 137, 185 (*correct.*), *Io. eu. tr.* 18, 45, 96, 100 and s. 46, 71, 400 (*util. ieium.*). Though technically pagans are Gentiles too, Augustine views them from two very different perspectives. He sees pagans (*pagani*) as enemies of the Catholics for their false worship, but he sees the people of the Gentiles (*populus Gentium*) as the uncircumcised, whom Christ and the apostles strove to reach. These *populus Gentium* mentioned by Augustine with no sense of animosity as in s. 252.3 are not included in the counts of the enemies of Catholics here. Jews mentioned simply as a people but not as enemies of Catholics as in s. *Dolbeau* 22.23, or mentioned not by Augustine but by his debate opponent Maximinus in *conl. Max.* 15.16, 15.18, 15.23, are not counted either.

67 *en. Ps.* 32(3) 29 (CCL 38: 272, trans. Maria Boulding, WSA, *Expositions of the Psalms*, III/15: 423): "nondum credentes in Christum."

68 *Io. eu. tr.* 100.3.

69 *Io. eu. tr.* 96.3 (CCL 36: 570, trans. John Gibb and James Innes, NPNF I/7: 372): "quod per eum qui crucifixus est, factus est mundus."

70 *util. ieium.* 9.

71 *agon.* 12.13 (CSEL 41: 117, trans. Robert P. Russell, FC, *Christian Instruction, Admonition and Grace, The Christian Combat, Faith, Hope and Charity*, II: 331): "curiositatem uanae licentiae perdere timentes."

serve well to set the stage for Augustine against the Arians. Arians, not unlike pagans and Jews, fail to comprehend that Christ is God — they are thus not Christians in the truest sense of the word.

Though Augustine also considers the classical philosophers as adversaries of Catholics, he references them with the Arians in only four out of 105 works.<sup>72</sup> Augustine denounces them as those “who were following not the true way but one like the truth, and who were misleading themselves and others by it.”<sup>73</sup> They differ from Catholics in their considering philosophical wisdom as one thing and religion another.<sup>74</sup>

Combating the Pelagians occupied much of Augustine's energy in the latter part of his episcopacy, and this coincides with the period in which the threat of Arianism became more imminent in Africa. But there are only four out of the 105 works in which the Pelagians and the Arians backdrop each other.<sup>75</sup> Augustine calls the Pelagians “new heretics.”<sup>76</sup> They deny that sin is natural<sup>77</sup> and assert that Christ came in the flesh like all others, that is, in the flesh of sin.<sup>78</sup> Pelagians are culpable for accusing Catholics of being

---

72 They are *ep.* 118, 120, *trin.*, *uera rel.*

73 *ep.* 120.1.6 (CCL 31B: 147, trans. Roland J. Teske, WSA, *Letters*, II/2: 133): “uerisimilem sectantibus, et in ea se ipsos aliosque fallentibus.”

74 *uera rel.* 5.8.

75 They are *c. Iul. imp.*, *haer.*, *nupt. et conc.* and *s.* 183.

76 *c. Iul. imp.* 5.30 (CSEL 85.2: 229, trans. Roland J. Teske, WSA, *Answer to the Pelagians III*, 1/25: 556): “haeretici novi.”

77 *c. Iul. imp.* 5.30.

78 *s.* 183.12.

Manichees<sup>79</sup> or traducianists.<sup>80</sup> In particular, Julian of Eclanum accuses Augustine and Mani of attributing evil to eternal darkness (nothing), Augustine responds to him that evil is the lack of good<sup>81</sup> and not a nature or substance.<sup>82</sup> In *Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum* 5.25 and *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* 2.23.38, Augustine maintains that the Pelagians end up holding more destructive opinions in their striving to flee from Manichaeism, just as the Arians end up making a worse mistake in their striving to flee from Sabellianism. In *Sermo* 183.12, he charges Pelagians with considering that Christ has come in the flesh of sin. Pelagianism and Arianism are similar not only in their *de facto* denial of the Son's incarnation, they also both contest the divine nature and hence the mediatory power of Christ. It remains curious why Augustine, who is unarguably the greatest apologist against Pelagianism, has not dealt more extensively with the connections between these two heresies in his works.

#### 4. Augustine's Anti-Arian Polemic

Arianism is a pastoral threat to Augustine. Arians read Scripture in a carnal manner, with a sense of pride, and tend to rush to a wrong

---

79 *c. Iul. imp.* 5.25, *nupt. et conc.* 2.23.38.

80 *c. Iul. imp.* 1.75, 5.25. The Pelagian Julian of Eclanum, who rejects the concept of original sin yet does not spare Christ from concupiscence as part of his human nature, also accuses Augustine, who confesses a concupiscence-free Christ, of being an Apollinarist. Serge Lancel, *Saint Augustine*, trans. Antonia Nevill (London: SCM Press, 2002), p. 420.

81 *c. Iul. imp.* 5.44.

82 *c. Iul. imp.* 5.25.

conclusion.<sup>83</sup> Yet, Augustine seems to show no obvious personal hostility towards the Arians, as they seem relatively distant and less violent compared to the African Donatists. He has asked his audience to pray for the conversion of the Arians and he desires their return.<sup>84</sup> From Augustine's perspective, Arianism is neither the worst nor the mildest of all heresies. He maintains that Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians, and Photinians, who have spoken against the divinity of Holy Spirit can be forgiven, yet Donatists, who refuse forgiveness in the body of Christ, to which the Holy Spirit gives life, cannot be forgiven.<sup>85</sup> In his home of Africa, there is little doubt that Donatism was what posed the greatest threat to both the peace and the unity of the Church.

Arianism is primarily a doctrinal threat to Augustine. He takes delight in putting together “In the beginning was the Word” (Jn 1:1), “I and the Father are one” (Jn 10:30) and “He did not think it robbery to be equal to God” (Phil 2:6) as his “anti-Arian triad” against his Arian foes, doing so in 11 out of the 105 anti-Arian works, of which 6 times he uses them in conjunction with the Arian proof-text “the Father is greater than I” (Jn 14:28) to render them an anti-Arian interpretation.<sup>86</sup> Augustine most frequently uses Jn 1:1 to demonstrate the Son's coeternity with the Father, citing it

---

83 In *Io. eu. tr.* 20.5, the three aspects are epitomised in the way Augustine ridicules, that upon hearing Jn 5:19, the vanity of the heretics coupled with their carnal understanding of Scripture causes them to rise too quickly to say that the Son is less.

84 *s.* 162A.12, *en. Ps.* 32(3).5, *Io. eu. tr.* 40.7, *ep.* 220.4-9.

85 *correct.* 11.48-49.

86 The “anti-Arian triad” is used without Jn 14:28 in *concl. Max.* 14, *Io. eu. tr.* 36.1-9, *s.* 126.12-13, *s.* 212.1 and *trin.* 6.2.3-5. It is used in conjunction with Jn 14:28 in *diu. qu.* 69.1, *ench.* 10.35, *f. et symb.* 9.18, *Io. eu. tr.* 78.2, *s.* 229G.3-6 and *s. Dolbeau* 22.13-14.

most frequently in *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus* and *Sermones* and less often in the non-directly anti-Arian works.<sup>87</sup> Coeternity is what guarantees that he is a true Son,<sup>88</sup> it also implies equality.<sup>89</sup> “*Ego et Pater unum sumus*” (Jn 10:30) is Augustine’s frequently used verse to demonstrate the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father.<sup>90</sup> While according to the Arian bishop Maximinus Jn 10:30 implies the Father and the Son are “one in harmony (*unum*), not one in number (*unus*),”<sup>91</sup> Augustine considers the neuter form *unum* to mean oneness in substance, while the masculine form *unus* can refer to different substances as used in 1 Cor 6:17 to talk about the oneness

---

87 Within the “anti-Arian corpus,” Augustine has used Jn 1:1 in *agon.* 17.19, *c. Max.* 1.19, 2.23.7, 2.17.4, 2.18.2, *c. s. Arrian.* 1.2, 1.19, *conf.* 7.9.13, 10.43.68, 11.7.9, *concl. Max.* 14, *correct.* 1.3, *dūc. qu.* 69.1, *en. Ps.* 35.1, 54.3, 80.13, 120.6, 124.4, 130.9, 149.1, *ench.* 10.35, *ep.* 137.3.14, 170.4, *ep. Io. tr.* 13, *f. et symb.* 9.18, *Gn. lit.* 8.27.49, *Io. eu. tr.* 1.12, 3.4, 17.15, 18.2, 18.4, 20.3, 21.9, 26.8, 36.1, 37.4, 37.8, 40.4, 43.9, 43.18, 45.8, 47.6, 47.10, 48.6, 78.2, 96.2, *s.* 117.3, 117.5, 117.15, 126.5, 126.6, 126.13, 135.4, 135.8, 183.4, 212.1, 214.5, 215.3, 229G.5, 244.3, 245.4, 375B.4, 375B.6, 380.2, 380.3, 380.4, *s. Dolbeau* 22.3, 22.5, 22.10, 22.11, 22.13, 22.14, *trin.* 1.6.9, 2.5.9, 2.16.27, 4.1.3, 6.2.3, 7.3.4, 13.1.2, 15.10.19 and 15.11.20.

88 *c. Max.* 2.14.9 (CCL 87A: 587): “Filius autem numquam non fuit.”

89 *Io. eu. tr.* 40.6 (CCL 36: 354): “Ipsa est aequalitas *semper*; non ex quodam initio et deinceps, sed sine initio, sine fine.”

90 Within the “anti-Arian corpus,” Augustine has used Jn 10:30 in *c. Max.* 1.10, 2.14.3, 2.20.1, 2.22.2, *c. s. Arrian.* 8.6, 9.7, *concl. Max.* 14, *ep.* 170.8, 238.2.10, 238.2.12, 238.5.28, 241.2, *f. et symb.* 9.18, *Io. eu. tr.* 20.3, 36.9, 37.7, 40.3, 45.5, 48.8, 48.10, 53.3, 53.12, 59.2, 71.2, 78.1, 78.2, 97.4, *s.* 126.12, 139.1, 140.4, 212.1, 229G.4, 265A.6, 265A.7, *s. Dolbeau* 22.13, *trin.* 1.8.17, 1.11.22, 1.12.25, 2.1.3, 4.9.12, 5.3.4, 5.9.10, 6.2.3 and 7.6.12.

91 *concl. Max.* 15.22 (CCL 87A: 458, trans. Roland J. Teske, WSA, *Arianism and Other Heresies*, 1/18: 216): “‘Vnum’ ad concordiam pertinet, ‘unus’ ad numerum singularitatis.”

in spirit between holy men and God.<sup>92</sup> Against Maximinus' use of Phil 2:9-11 to stress that it is the Father who bestows upon Christ the name at which every knee shall bow,<sup>93</sup> Augustine often resorts to Phil 2:6—"non rapinam arbitratus est esse aequalis Deo,"<sup>94</sup> which he considers as the crux of Phil 2:5-11, for this pre-primordial identity of Christ is the basis of his incarnation and the ground for his immutability. He is the Son coeternal and coequal with the Father,<sup>95</sup> the Son of God "endowed by nature, and not by robbery."<sup>96</sup>

---

92 *c. Max.* 2.22.2 (CCL 87A: 635-636): "Sed numquid apostolus diceret: 'Qui autem adhaeret Domino, unum sunt'? Quid enim aliud diceret, si hoc diceret, nisi: 'homo sanctus, et Deus, unum sunt'? Sed absit ab illa sapientia ista sententia. Et tamen dixit: *Qui autem adhaeret Domino, unus Spiritus est*; ut noueris de his dici *unum sunt*, quae unius sunt eiusdemque substantiae [...]. Cum autem 'unus' dicitur, et quid 'unus' dicitur, et de diuersis substantiis dici potest [...]." Augustine uses "*Ut sint unum, sicut et nos unum sumus*" (Jn 17:11) to support his interpretation of *unum* as unity in substance in Jn 10:30 in *concl. Max.* 14 (CCL 87A: 415-416): "legimus, ipso Christo dicente: *Vt sint unum, sicut et nos unum sumus*. Non dixit: 'Vt ipsi et nos unum', sed: *Vt ipsi sint unum*, in natura sua et in substantia sua, concordia aequalitate quodam modo uniti atque conflati, Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus unum, propter indiuiduam eandemque naturam. Aliud est enim, unum sunt; aliud, unus est."

93 *concl. Max.* 15.2 (CCL 87A: 421-422): "Nihil est in caelo quod non genu flectat Christo; nihil remansit in terra quod non genu flectat Christo; nihil in inferis quod non genu flectat Christo. Et hoc Pater *ei donauit*."

94 Within the "anti-Arian corpus," Augustine has used Phil 2:6 in *conf.* 7.9.14, 10.43.69, 13.2.3, *c. Max.* 1.5, 2.15.1, *c. s. Arrian.* 8.6, *concl. Max.* 14, *diu. qu.* 69.1, *en. Ps.* 130.9, *ench.* 10.35, *ep.* 170.8, 238.2.17, 242.3, *f. et symb.* 4.5, 4.6, 9.18, *Io. eu. tr.* 17.16, 21.14, 36.2, 47.13, 78.1, 78.2, 79.2, *s.* 46.11, 117.13, 126.13, 183.5, 212.1, 213.4, 214.5, 229G.3, 244.3, 265A.7, 380.3, 380.4, 380.6, *s. Dolbeau* 22.11, 22.14, 22.20, *trin.* 1.6.12, 1.7.14, 1.13.31, 2.1.3, 2.11.20, 2.17.28, 5.3.4, 6.3.5, 7.3.5 and *uid. deo* 11.28.

95 *Io. eu. tr.* 36.2 (CCL 36: 324): "Patri aequale atque coaeternum de illo audieritis in euangelio poni, uel legeritis, scitote uos hoc legere quod ad formam Dei pertinet, non quod ad formam serui."

96 *Io. eu. tr.* 79.2 (CCL 36: 527, trans. John Gibb and James Innes, NPNF I/7: 343): "Filio Dei natura contulerat, non rapina."

Augustine also shows that the Son is coeternal with the Father using the analogy of fire and brightness,<sup>97</sup> and that of the bush and its mirror image over water.<sup>98</sup> He shows that the Son is consubstantial with the Father using the analogy of human being generating human being,<sup>99</sup> or even dog generating dog—God must therefore generate God.<sup>100</sup> The Son is coequal with the Father. Arians claim that the Son, who is begotten, must be less than the Father, who is unbegotten. Augustine critiques that the Arians have confused what belongs to relationship with what is substance. Generation is a relationship; unbegotten and begotten are not the respective natures of the Father and the Son. What makes the Son equals to the Father is not his relation to the Father but what he is himself substance-wise.<sup>101</sup> The names of the Father and the

---

97 Fire is the father of brightness, for brightness exists from fire and not vice versa (s. 117.11). Fire is never without its brightness, so fire and brightness are coeval—and if fire were eternal, so would brightness (s. 265A.5). The Father and the Son are thus coeternal (*trin.* 6.1.1). As the flame and brightness are simultaneous, the begetter does not precede the begotten (c. s. *Arrian.* 34.32). As a fire does not precede its brightness, the Father is never without the Son, for the Son as wisdom is the radiance of eternal light by Wis 7:26 (*ep.* 170.4).

98 In s. 117.12, Augustine maintains that the image of the bush over water begins to exist simultaneously with the bush, yet the image of the bush comes from that of the bush and not vice versa.

99 In s. 117.14, Augustine asks rhetorically, if human gives birth to human, would not God give birth to God as well? In c. *Max.* 2.6, he argues that since corruptible human beings give birth to an offspring of the same nature, the omnipotent Father could certainly do the same.

100 Augustine questions the Arian Maximinus in *conl. Max.* 14 (CCL 87A: 412): “*homo hominem generat, canis canem, et Deus Deum non generat?*” He asserts that none among human, ox, sheep or dog would give birth to an offspring of a different nature in *ymb. cat.* 3 (CCL 46: 187): “*Non generat homo bouem, non generat ouis canem, nec canis ouem.*”

101 *trin.* 5.6.7 (CCL 50: 212): “*Quia uero filius non ad filium relatiue dicitur sed ad patrem, non secundum hoc quod ad patrem dicitur aequalis est filius patri. Restat ut secundum id aequalis sit quod ad se dicitur. Quidquid autem ad se dicitur secundum substantiam dicitur. Restat ergo ut secundum substantiam sit aequalis.*”

Son “signify their mutual relations, not the very substance by which they are one.”<sup>102</sup>

Against the Arians, who claim that only the Father is invisible, Augustine maintains that the divine substance of the Trinity is invisible.<sup>103</sup> Yet, the Father is “visible” to the Son by his true and eternal Sonship. To the Son, “to see,” “to hear” and “to know” are the same thing as “to be,” on the basis of his Sonship and consequent equality with the Father.<sup>104</sup> Besides, since God is absolutely simple, “to be” is the same as “to be wise.”<sup>105</sup> Other attributes could be added as well.<sup>106</sup>

---

102 *ep.* 238.2.14 (CSEL 57: 453, trans. Roland J. Teske, WSA, *Letters*, II/4: 149): “His enim appellationibus hoc significatur, quod ad se inuicem referuntur, non ipsa substantia, qua unum sunt.”

103 God's substance is invisible (*uid. deo* 19.47, *Io. eu. tr.* 3.18). The Arian Maximinus attributes Old Testament theophanies (Gen 3:9, Gen 18:1, Gen 32:24) to the Son (*conl. Max.* 15.26). Augustine retorts that these theophanies were the work of angels, and what was seen was neither the substance of the Father nor the Son nor the Holy Spirit (*c. Max.* 2.26.9-10). Instead, they were representations of God (*trin.* 2.15.25). The Son is visible only in the form of servant, but invisible in the form of God (*Io. eu. tr.* 53.12, *s.* 229G.3, *conl. Max.* 14). The nature of the Holy Spirit is invisible as well. He has appeared visibly in the form of dove and fire, also only through a creature subject to God (*c. Max.* 1.19). Hence, the substance of each person of the Trinity is invisible, as Augustine says in *conl. Max.* 14 (CCL 87A: 417): “quantum adinet ad ipsam diuinam substantiam, uel Patris uel Filii uel Spiritus sancti omnino est inuisibilis.”

104 To the Son, “to see” is the same as “to be” (*Io. eu. tr.* 21.4); “to see” and “to hear” are the same as “to be” (*Io. eu. tr.* 18.9-10); “to know” is the same as “to be” (*Io. eu. tr.* 40.5). By that Augustine means “to hear,” “to see” and “to know” are the same for the Son in his divine form as the Word of God. Certainly, these three are not the same for the Son in his human form of flesh and soul.

105 *trin.* 7.1.2 (CCL 50: 249): “uere ibi est summe simplex essentia; hoc ergo est ibi esse quod sapere.”

106 Augustine identifies twelve attributes of God in *trin.* 15.5.8 (CCL 50A: 470): “Aeternus, immortalis, incorruptibilis, immutabilis, uiuus, sapiens, potens, speciosus, iustus, bonus, beatus, spiritus.”

Against the Arian claim that the Father is the source of and wisdom of the Son, Augustine asserts that the Son himself is also wise, and so too is the Holy Spirit, for it is the Trinity who alone is wise.<sup>107</sup>

Augustine consistently uses Sabellianism as a contrast in his polemic against Arianism. The former “is too old, and has been gradually eviscerated,” but the latter “seems still to have some movement about it, like that of a putrefying carcase, or certainly, at the most, like a man at the last gasp; and from this some still require deliverance, just as from that others many were delivered.”<sup>108</sup> Augustine portrays Arianism as the ship-wrecking rocks of Scylla and Sabellianism as the ship-swallowing whirlpool of Charybdis in Homer’s *Odyssey*. In the Greek myth, to avoid his boat being drawn into the whirlpool of Charybdis, Odysseus steered closer to Scylla at a cost of six sailors being devoured by the sea monster. Scylla—the Arian monster—is what every spiritual Odysseus should seek to avoid. Those tempted towards Arianism by an excessive fear of Sabellianism are bound for disaster. Augustine bids the faithful to steer straight for the *via media* to avoid the danger of either side, lest in escaping the whirlpool of

---

107 *c. Max.* 1.16. Both Maximinus and Augustine use Rom 16:27 together with 1 Cor 1:24. In *conl. Max.* 15.13, Maximinus uses them in the sense that God the Father alone is wise, while the Son’s wisdom is derived from the Father. In *conl. Max.* 14 and *c. Max.* 1.16, Augustine uses them in the sense that the Trinity is wise, therefore God is wise and the Son is wise.

108 *Io. eu. tr.* 40.7 (CCL 36: 354, trans. John Gibb and James Innes, NPNF I/7: 227): “Non audeo suspicari esse sabellianos qui ipsum Patrem dicunt esse qui Filius est; haeresis quippe ista nimis antiqua est, et paulatim eviscerata. Arianorum autem adhuc uidetur habere aliquas motiones quasi cadaueris putrescentis; aut certe, ut multum, quasi hominis animam agentis; oportet inde reliquos liberari, sicut inde multi liberati sunt.”

Charybdis, one be wrecked on the rocks of Scylla.<sup>109</sup> To him, Catholic faith should thus be the *via media* between Charybdis and Scylla, or between Sabellianism and Arianism.<sup>110</sup> The Sabellians who maintain that the Father and the Son are one, as well as the Arians who say that the Son is created, have both excluded themselves from the Catholic faith.<sup>111</sup> This Catholic faith is Nicene faith, and Nicene faith is, by its very historical context, anti-Arian faith.<sup>112</sup>

While the Christ of the Arians is one without a soul, Augustine stresses repeatedly that Christ is Word, soul and flesh.<sup>113</sup> Christ is Word by nature and man of body and soul by grace,<sup>114</sup> and thus, “mediator

---

109 *Io. eu. tr.* 36.9 (CCL 36: 329): “Vorabat enim te gurgis impietatis sabellianorum, [...] a Charybdi quidem euasisti, sed in Scyllaeis scopulis naufragasti. In medio nauiga, utrumque periculosum latus euita.” For Augustine, the Arians—in avoiding the Sabellian error—fall into a greater error of claiming that there are different natures rather than persons in the Trinity (*nupt. et conc.* 2.23.38).

110 *s.* 229G.4 (MA 1: 476-477): “Ecce catholica fides, tamquam inter Scyllam et Charybdim navigans, sicut navigatur in illo freto inter Siciliam et Italiam: ex una parte saxa navifraga, ex alia parte vorago navivora. [...] Inter utrumque naviga, et rectum iter tene.”

111 *f. et symb.* 4.5 (CSEL 41: 8): “Hac igitur fide catholica et illi excluduntur, qui eundem dicunt filium esse, qui pater est [...]; excluduntur etiam illi, qui creaturam dicunt esse filium, quamuis non talem, quales sunt ceterae creaturae.”

112 In *c. Max.* 2.14.3 (CCL 87A: 572), Augustine underlines the authority of the Catholic fathers in adopting the anti-Arian word *homoousios* at the Council of Nicaea: “Pater ergo et Filius unius sunt eiusdemque substantiae. Hoc est illud ‘homousion’, quod in concilio nicaeno aduersus haereticos arrianos a catholicis patribus ueritatis auctoritate et auctoritatis ueritate firmatum est.”

113 *ench.* 10.35, *c. s. Arrian.* 9.7, *Io. eu. tr.* 47.9, 47.13 and *s.* 375B.6-7.

114 *c. s. Arrian.* 8.6 (CCL 87A: 196): “unus Christus et Dei Filius semper natura, et hominis Filius qui ex tempore adsumptus est gratia.”

between God and man” (1 Tim 2:5).<sup>115</sup> The unity of the human and divine natures in the one person of Christ is the basis of Augustine’s concept of what would be called *communicatio idiomatum*, a concept he uses in his polemic against his two main Arian targets. He interchanges the term “Son of God” for the “Son of Man.” Against Maximinus, he claims: “if you pay attention to the unity of the person, both the Son of Man came down from heaven and the Son of God was crucified.”<sup>116</sup> To the anonymous Arian in *Sermo Arrianorum*, he adds that the ultimate end of this interchange of properties is soteriological: “the Son of God is said to have been crucified and buried. [...] the Son of Man has come down from heaven. [...] Therefore, the divinity took the name of this humanity. [...] Hence, the humanity has received the name of that divinity. Thus we have the same Christ, a twin-substanced giant.”<sup>117</sup> The unity of his two natures is described as a twofold substance united in

---

115 Within the “anti-Arian corpus,” Augustine has used 1 Tim 2:5 in *agon.* 20.22, *conf.* 7.18.24, 10.43.67-68, *c. s. Arrian.* 7.6, 9.7, *ench.* 14.48, *ep.* 137.3.12, 147.22.51, *Io. eu. tr.* 17.7, 47.3, *s. Dolbeau* 22.13, *trin.* 1.7.14, 1.8.16, 1.8.17, 1.10.20, 3.11.26, 13.10.13, 13.18.23 and 15.25.44. Among Augustine’s anti-Arian works, this verse is most frequently quoted in his dogmatic treatise *De trinitate*, not at all in the more rhetorical *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, and not employed in Augustine’s three directly anti-Arian works except twice in *Contra sermonem Arrianorum*. This is perhaps because 1 Tim 2:5 is purely doctrinal in nature and is not as polemical in style.

116 *c. Max.* 2.20.3 (CCL 87A: 623, trans. Roland J. Teske, WSA, *Arianism and Other Heresies*, I/18: 302): “si unitatem personae, et Filius hominis descendit de caelo, et Filius Dei est crucifixus.” Cf. Jn 3:13, 1 Cor 2:8.

117 *c. s. Arrian.* 8.6 (CCL 87A: 196, 198, trans. Roland J. Teske, WSA, *Arianism and Other Heresies*, I/18: 146): “Filius Dei dicitur crucifixus et sepultus [...]. [...] Filium hominis descendisse de caelo [...]. [...] Ergo et illa diuinitas huius humanitatis nomen accepit. [...] Ergo et ista humanitas illius diuinitatis nomen accepit. Apparet tamen idem ipse Christus, geminae gigans substantiae.”

the one person of Christ,<sup>118</sup> without confusion<sup>119</sup> or division,<sup>120</sup> or bias towards humanity or divinity. This unity guarantees the full divinity of Christ against the Arian lessening of the divine nature of the incarnated Christ.

Even though Augustine is more Nicene than Constantinopolitan — he seems unaware of the Council of Constantinople — his anti-Arian polemic is more Trinitarian than Christological, and more important than most scholars have acknowledged. In the *Indice analitico generale* of Augustine, under the term “*Trinità*,” approximately one third of its content is on Augustine’s “*polemica con gli ariani*” in his three major anti-Arian works.<sup>121</sup> Augustine affirms that the Holy Spirit is God by interpreting 1 Cor 3:16 with 1 Cor 6:19.<sup>122</sup> He charges the Arian Maximinus for deceitfully citing only the former without the latter,<sup>123</sup>

---

118 *c. s. Arrian. 7.6* (CCL 87A: 195): “*gemina quidem substantia, sed una persona est;*” *c. Max. 2.10.2* (CCL 87A: 554): “*Christus una persona est geminae substantiae.*”

119 In *conl. Max. 44* and *s. 245.4*, Augustine asserts that despite Christ’s assuming flesh, his divinity was not contaminated as a result. He explains in *f. et symb. 4.10*, that this is just like how the rays of the sun stays uncontaminated whilst reaching even to the sewers with the most unpleasant odour.

120 In *ench. 10.35* (CCL 46: 69), Augustine teaches that Christ as Word is equal to God while Christ as man is less than God, yet there are not two sons but only one Son of God: “*aliud est propter uerbum, aliud propter hominem: propter uerbum aequalis, propter hominem minor; unus dei filius, idemque hominis filius; unus hominis filius, idemque dei filius, non duo filii dei, deus et homo, sed unus dei filius; deus sine initio, homo a certo initio, dominus noster Iesus Christus.*”

121 Cf. Monteverde, ed., *Indice analitico generale*, pp. 66-77.

122 *conl. Max. 14, c. Max. 1.11, 2.21.1* and *s. 214.10*.

123 *c. Max. 1.11* (CCL 87A: 518): “*quare tam fraudulenter egisti, ut unum horum commemorares, quod dictum est: Templum Dei estis, et alterum taceres, quod dictum est: Corpora uestra templum in uobis est Spiritus sancti?*”

making it seem as if the Holy Spirit cleanses the temple of God rather than his own,<sup>124</sup> thus rendering the Holy Spirit less than God. Instead, the Holy Spirit, who is “a kind of inexpressible communion or fellowship of Father and Son,”<sup>125</sup> is consubstantial and coeternal with them.<sup>126</sup> Thus, “the Trinity is one God, not three Gods; one substance, three persons,”<sup>127</sup> and the works of the Father and Son are done inseparably.<sup>128</sup> To Maximinus’ interrogation on why the Holy Spirit is not a son like the Son, Augustine responds that the Son is born while the Holy Spirit proceeds; the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son with the Father as the author,<sup>129</sup> hence the concept of the *filioque*.

---

124 *c. Max.* 1.11 (CCL 87A: 517): “Atque isto modo intellegi voluisti [...] purgat Spiritus sanctus templum Dei, non suum,” *c. Max.* 2.21.1 (CCL 87A: 625): “quasi templum Deo habitaturo, non sibi, sanctificet et purget Spiritus sanctus.”

125 *trin.* 5.11.12 (CCL 50: 219, trans. Edmund Hill, WSA, *The Trinity*, 1/5: 199): “Ergo spiritus sanctus ineffabilis quaedam patris filiique communio.”

126 *trin.* 6.5.7 (CCL 50: 235): “*Spiritus* ergo Sanctus commune aliquid est *patris et filii*, quidquid illud est, aut ipsa communio consubstantialis et coaeterna.”

127 *s.* 7.6 (CCL 41: 74, trans. Edmund Hill, WSA, *Sermons*, III/1: 236): “trinitas unus deus non tres dii; una substantia, tres personae.”

128 Creation is usually appropriated to the Father. Yet, Augustine emphasizes that the world is created by all three divine persons (*Io. eu. tr.* 20.9). The works of performing miracles, teaching and healing people are appropriated to the Son. Yet, in *s.* 126.10 (RB 69.188), Augustine uses the healing of the blind man as an example to argue that the work of the Son is in fact the work of the Trinity: “*Illuminavit filius caecum, numquid pater non illuminavit? Illuminavit pater per filium in spiritu sancto. Trinitas est, sed una operatio, una maiestas, una aeternitas, una coaeternitas, et opera eadem trinitatis.*”

129 *c. Max.* 2.14.1. In *trin.* 15.17.29 (CCL 50A: 503), Augustine presents this authorship of the Father by claiming that it is from the Father that the Holy Spirit “principally” (*principaliter*) proceeds: “*Et tamen non frustra in hac trinitate non dicitur uerbum dei nisi filius, nec donum dei nisi spiritus sanctus, nec de quo genitum est uerbum et de quo procedit principaliter spiritus sanctus nisi deus pater. Ideo autem addidi, principaliter, quia et de filio spiritus sanctus procedere reperitur.*”

Augustine has in his anti-Arian polemic gone far beyond the Nicene concept of *homoousios* between the Father and the Son, and stamped it with his own distinguishing Trinitarian mark. The work that he is most known for and spent most years on — *De trinitate* — while principally a positive Trinitarian treatise, is considered by Studer as an intentionally anti-Arian work.<sup>130</sup> Its anti-Arian background is evident in its exegesis of Jn 10:30 and its emphasis on the equality of the persons of the Trinity.<sup>131</sup> The anti-Arian arguments in *De trinitate* are even considered by Chadwick as the only polemical element in an otherwise serene work.<sup>132</sup>

## 5. Arianism as a Chronic Virus to Augustine

It is fascinating to discover how Augustine has incessantly worked to refute the most enduring and prototypical Christological heresy of Arianism all his life. Traditionally, scholars have divided Augustine's anti-heretical polemics into three phases. His polemic against the Manichees tends to concentrate at the beginning of his theological career (c. 388-399), his polemic against the Donatists in the middle period (c. 400-411), and his polemic against the Pelagians at the later stage (c. 411-430). There seems to be no particular "anti-Arian phase" in Augustine's active Catholic life. But this essay, utilising a constructed "anti-Arian corpus," demonstrates that Arianism is more

---

130 Basil Studer, "Augustin et la foi," *Recherches Augustiniennes* 19 (1984): 137.

131 Studer, "Augustin et la foi," p. 143.

132 Henry Chadwick, *Augustine of Hippo: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 118. Chadwick adds that Augustine has greater objection against the "ineffective and insufficient" anti-Arian polemic of orthodox theologians rather than the Arians themselves. *Ibid.*, p. 119.

than a marginal issue for Augustine. It aims to fill the gap of the relative inattention to Augustine's anti-Arian doctrine by highlighting how his polemic against the Arians uniquely permeates his various kinds of works, in the earliest as well as latest periods, unlike his other anti-heretical works which tend to be more period-defined.

Augustine was the orchestrator of a series of councils in Africa (393-427) together with Aurelius of Carthage, but none of these councils was directly related to Arianism. He never instituted any council against Arianism or consented to the use of coercion against Arians as he did against the Donatists. Yet, during this period packed with African councils unrelated to Arianism, the already busy Bishop of Hippo still spared his limited time to write against the Arians. It was around the time when Augustine was occupied with the 8<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> Councils of Carthage (403-410), which dealt heavily with Donatist issues, that Augustine debated with and wrote three letters to the Arian Pascentius. It was when Augustine was in the heat of dealing with Pope Innocent and Pope Zosimus regarding the excommunication of Pelagius and Caelestius in the Councils of Carthage 416 to 418 that he wrote *Epistula* 185 to Boniface. In 419, the year that the 17<sup>th</sup> Council of Carthage dealt with the Apiarius affair regarding appeals to Rome, Augustine wrote one of his major anti-Arian treatises — *Contra sermonem Arrianorum*. And it was in the year 427 when the general council of Africa had to be held again in Hippo due to Augustine's poor health that Augustine, already in semi-retirement, debated with Maximinus and wrote his climactic *Contra Maximinum Arrianum*.

Augustine had no personal animosity against the Arians, thus his anti-Arian polemic shows a tranquil character and a concentration on doctrinal exploration rather than angry rhetoric. Arianism was not a burning issue for Augustine during his active theological career; he had personally brushed past the Arians only a few times. The Arians seemed so far away from Augustine, yet at the same time they were always so close to his heart, especially since his very conversion was centred upon the realisation of who Christ is. Still, for this theological giant who spent his entire life combating those who were against Christ, he could not have simply have turned a blind eye to the resilient Christological Arian heresy, even if it seemed to be far away from his immediate horizon. Given the very Christocentric nature of his theology, Arianism was to him as threatening as Scylla — the mythical monster.

Augustine was committed to go against Arianism throughout his theological career, refuting this archetypal heresy that reduces Christ's divinity and crushes the very wonder of the incarnation — that God has truly become man in the form of flesh and blood. He shrewdly incorporated his anti-Arian polemic into his many works, both in passing and as the centre of his discourse, explicitly and implicitly, consciously as well as unconsciously. While other heresies were more like acute outbursts, the Arian heresy was — to Augustine — a chronic virus that must be dealt with ceaselessly and at all times.