

Ambrosiaster's Revisions of His *Commentary on Romans* and Roman Synodal Statements about the Holy Spirit

Theodore S. de Bruyn, University of Ottawa¹

Post peer-reviewed version, published as Theodore S. de Bruyn, "Ambrosiaster's Revisions of His *Commentary on Romans* and Roman Synodal Statements about the Holy Spirit," *Revue d'études Augustiniennes et Patristiques* 56 (2010): 45–68.

Introduction

One of the intriguing features of Ambrosiaster's work is its development over time, as Sophie Lunn-Rockcliffe notes in her introduction to this volume.² Both the *Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles* and the *Questions on the Old and New Testament* exist in several manuscript traditions, and the differing versions conveyed by these manuscript traditions appear to have originated with the author. The evidence suggests that Ambrosiaster refined, modified, and augmented his writings as the occasion presented itself. His writings thus afford us a rare opportunity to observe and investigate the evolution of a writer in his context.

Ambrosiaster's *Commentary on Romans* is the most extensively revised of the commentaries. It exists in three versions or recensions.³ The Vienna edition of the commentary refers to these recensions as *alpha*, *beta*, and *gamma*, and presents them on facing pages, *alpha* and *beta* on the left and *gamma* on the right. Many of the variants are

¹ A draft of this paper was presented in a seminar on Ambrosiaster at the Fifteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, 6–11 August, 2007. I am grateful to the anonymous reader for correcting several errors and for alerting me to bibliography published after the manuscript had been submitted for consideration.

² S. LUNN-ROCKLIFFE, "Ambrosiaster Revising Ambrosiaster: Introduction," p. x.

³ H.J. VOGELS, ed., *Ambrosiastri qui dicitur commentarius in epistulas Paulinas*, CSEL 81/1, Vienna, 1966, p. xxi–xlii.

stylistic in nature: changes in word order, substitutions of vocabulary, changes in the case of a noun or the mood or tense of a verb. But quite a few variants are substantive, consisting of additions to, modifications of, or deletions from the comment under consideration. While these changes do not often alter the overall interpretation of the text, they nevertheless introduce telling nuances, nuances that seem to have been occasioned by contemporary events.

A determination of the sequence of the recensions is fundamental, obviously, to any discussion of change or development in the comments. This question was broached by H. Brewer, who began the work of preparing a new edition of the *Commentaries*,⁴ and addressed by Heinrich Vogels, who all but completed the edition.⁵ Vogels concluded that Ambrosiaster first composed the version we have in *alpha*, which he then revised to create the version we have in *beta*, which in turn he revised to create the version we have in *gamma*.⁶ Since this hypothesis was recently called into question,⁷ I undertook a detailed

⁴ See A. SOUTER, *The Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul*, Oxford, 1927, p. 49–52.

⁵ See R. HANSLIK, “Ad lectorem,” *CSEL* 81/1, p. 3.

⁶ On the relationship between Ambrosiaster’s work on his *Commentary on Romans* and his work on the other Pauline commentaries, see also the paper by S.A. Cooper and D.G. Hunter in this volume, “Ambrosiaster *redactor sui*: The Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles (Excluding Romans),” p. x.

⁷ J. FAIRWEATHER, “Ambrosiaster: A Fourth–Century Commentator on Paul,” unpublished paper, 1998. I am grateful to Dr. Fairweather for making this paper available, though my own research has led to a different conclusion. Fairweather analyzed the versions in light of the characteristics of medieval scholia, which have been known to both drop portions and add portions to the text being summarized. She suggested that in the *Commentary on First Corinthians gamma* presents the version written by Ambrosiaster, while *alpha*, which eliminates portions of the comments, presents the epitome of a medieval scholia. In the *Commentary on Romans*, however, she found that *alpha* and *beta* had readings that were preferable to those in *gamma*. There she suggested that the interpolations and changes in *beta* and *gamma* could be the work of a revisor or critic; while some revisions that now appear as additions in *beta* or *gamma* could conceivably have been introduced by Ambrosiaster as marginal notes or corrections to his copy of the commentary, others seem to have been introduced by a later author, since they disrupt the flow of the comment. In his recent English translation of Ambrosiaster’s *Commentary on Romans*, Gerald Bray, like Fairweather, sees the work of later hands in material that digresses from or contradicts Ambrosiaster’s line of interpretation. He prefers the shorter version of the comments on the assumption that it is the oldest version. His translation includes later material that rounds out the meaning of the earlier material, but omits material that bears no relation to the text or that contradicts it. See G.L. BRAY, trans. and ed., *Ambrosiaster: Commentaries on Romans and 1–2 Corinthians*,

analysis of all the variants among the three recensions in the comments on the first five chapters on Romans. I have concluded, as did Vogels, that *alpha* presents the earliest version of the commentary, which was then revised twice by its author, first from *alpha* to *beta*, then from *beta* to *gamma*.⁸

Because the revisions to the *Commentary on Romans* are so extensive, it is not possible to discuss all the substantive changes in one paper. I have chosen to deal only with revisions that bear on language used in Rome to affirm the divinity of the Holy Spirit and refute the error of Apollinaris in the years immediately before and after the council of Constantinople in 381. This focus was suggested to me by a paper published recently by my colleague Marie–Pierre Bussièrès.⁹ Bussièrès investigated the *Questions* (which exist in two collections—one containing 150 questions, the other, 127 questions) for evidence of influence of christological and pneumatological formulae adopted at the council of Constantinople in 381 and the synods of Constantinople and Rome in 382. On the one hand, the results are inconclusive. They do not establish the chronological priority of one collection over the other; in *both* collections one finds vocabulary or arguments that suggest an awareness of christological and pneumatological concerns prior to and immediately after the council of Constantinople. But the results are significant nevertheless. They demonstrate that Ambrosiaster was aware of contemporary developments in trinitarian

Downers Grove, 2009, p. xvi–xvii.

⁸ I presented some of the data at the Fifteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies. I hope to publish a more complete discussion of my findings in future.

⁹ M.–P. BUSSIÈRES, “L’influence du synode tenu à Rome en 382 sur l’exégèse de l’Ambrosiaster,” *SEJG*, 45, 2006, p. 107–124.

theology, to the point of introducing new terminology to express the coeternal and consubstantial divinity of the Holy Spirit.¹⁰

Is it possible to detect a similar awareness in the recensions of Ambrosiaster's *Commentary on Romans*? I believe it is. I will first review developments in trinitarian theology in Rome during the episcopate of Damasus, paying particular attention to the language and sequence (a thorny question) of Roman synodal letters of the 370s. I will then discuss the relevant revisions to Ambrosiaster's *Commentary on Romans* in light of the language of the Roman synodal letters and other contemporary witnesses. Finally, I will conclude with some observations about the date of the *Commentary on Romans* in relation to Ambrosiaster's other writings.

Pneumatology in Rome in the 370s and 380s

As is well known, the theological disputes of the first half of the fourth century were not particularly concerned with the person and role of the Holy Spirit.¹¹ The bishops at the Council of Nicaea confessed simply that they believed “in the Holy Spirit” (καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα; *et in spiritum sanctum*),¹² and subsequent councils offered similarly brief statements. Dedicated consideration of the person and role of the Holy Spirit commenced

¹⁰ BUSSIÈRES, “L’influence,” p. 122–123. Bussières extends her investigation into the originality of Ambrosiaster's pneumatology, including his language to express the Holy Spirit's consubstantiality, in her paper in this volume, “L'esprit de Dieu et l'Esprit Saint dans les *Questions sur l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testaments* de l'Ambrosiaster.”

¹¹ For the summary that follows in this paragraph I rely mainly on R.P.C. HANSON, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381*, Edinburgh, 1988, rpt. 1993, p. 738–823, and M.A.G. HAYKIN, *The Spirit of God: The Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century*, Leiden, 1994, p. 9–49. For further bibliography, see esp. Haykin.

¹² G.L. DOSSETTI, *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli: Edizione critica*, Rome, 1967, p. 236–237.

in the 360s. Around the beginning of that decade Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, wrote a series of letters in response to a request from Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, for help in dealing with a group of Christians who accepted the divinity of the Son but denied that of the Holy Spirit. The synod that Athanasius convened in Alexandria in 362 subsequently issued a circular letter, the *Tomos ad Antiochenos*, that condemned, among others, those who say that the Holy Spirit is a creature.¹³ Athanasius called the proponents of this view πνευματομαχοῦντες, “assailants of the Holy Spirit”;¹⁴ later fifth-century writers referred to them as Macedonians, ascribing their origins, unjustly, to Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople. The so-called Pneumatomachians were unwilling to declare that the Holy Spirit is God or shares in the divine substance. Their presence in Asia Minor in the 370s is well attested, where their activity, as well as that of their opponents, forced Basil of Caesarea to articulate more clearly his own view of the Holy Spirit.¹⁵

The controversy concerning the Holy Spirit was not as acutely felt in the West at this time. Nevertheless, a number of synods convened by Damasus in Rome in the 370s issued statements that discussed, among other matters, orthodox teaching concerning the Holy Spirit. The relevant documents include the letters and excerpts of letters *Confidimus quidem*, *Ea gratia*, *Illud sane*, and *Non nobis*, preserved in the *Codex Veronensis LX* under the title *Exemplum synodi habitae Romae episcoporum XCIII ex rescripto imperiali*, and the so-called Tome of Damasus. Since these documents originated in Rome, they provide a valuable point of comparison for changes or developments in Ambrosiaster’s remarks

¹³ ATHANASIUS, *Tom. Antioch.* 3.1 (H.C. BRENNECKE, U. HEIL, and A. VON STOCKHAUSEN, eds., *Athanasius Werke*, vol. 2, fasc. 8, Berlin and New York, 2006, p. 343).

¹⁴ ATHANASIUS, *Ep. Serap.* 1, 32 (*PG* 26, col. 605B; M. TETZ and D. WYRWA, eds., *Athanasius Werke*, vol. 1, fasc. 4, Berlin and New York, is forthcoming).

¹⁵ HAYKIN, *Spirit of God*, p. 24–49.

about the Holy Spirit in his *Commentaries*. However, the transmission of the texts is complex, and the dating of their redaction is disputed. Moreover, the difficulties they present are complicated by the intricacies of relations between Damasus and the eastern bishops during the Antiochene (or Meletian) schism within the Nicene party before and after the council of Constantinople.¹⁶ Although the sources, their redaction and transmission, and the events with which they are associated have recently been re-examined in detail by Lester Field and Ursula Reutter,¹⁷ these two scholars do not agree on the redaction and dating of the documents.¹⁸ I must leave it to specialists to weigh the merits of their arguments. For my purposes it will suffice to summarize their conclusions, noting salient differences between their positions and indicating my estimate of the evidence.

Sometime between 368 and 374¹⁹—probably 371²⁰—a Roman synod issued the letter *Confidimus quidem*, reaffirming the faith of Nicaea in response to the homoian theology of bishops in Illyria.²¹ Later in the decade another Roman synod issued the letter

¹⁶ In the two decades prior to the Council of Constantinople there were two Nicene claimants to the see of Antioch: Meletius, who had been translated to the see in 360 as a protégé of the Homoian party, and Paulinus, the leader of a small Nicene community in Antioch who was consecrated bishop of Antioch by Lucifer of Cagliari in 362. In 363 Meletius presided at a council in Antioch which accepted the Nicene formula of *homousios*. But when Athanasius visited Antioch later that year he failed to be reconciled with Meletius and recognized Paulinus as bishop in Meletius's place. In the following decades, the Nicene party in Egypt and the West supported Paulinus, whereas the anti-Arians in the East recognized only Meletius. The schism continued after Meletius died while presiding at the Council of Constantinople and his presbyter Flavian was consecrated bishop in his stead. Cf. HANSON, *Search*, p. 382–384, 651–653; M. SIMONETTI, *La crisi ariani nel IV secolo*, Rome, 1975, p. 592–593.

¹⁷ L.L. FIELD, *On the Communion of Damasus and Meletius: Fourth-Century Synodal Formulae in the Codex Veronensis LX*, Toronto, 2004; U. REUTTER, *Damasus, Bischof von Rom (366–384): Leben und Werk*, Tübingen, 2009. I am grateful to Marie-Pierre Bussières for bringing the former to my attention, and to the anonymous reviewer for apprising me of the latter.

¹⁸ Unfortunately, Reutter's study does not take Field's into account.

¹⁹ FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 117, nn. 1 and 2, p. 121.

²⁰ FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 117; REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 307–308.

²¹ On the transmission of the letter, which exists in Latin and Greek versions, see FIELD, *On the Communion*,

Ea gratia, a more extensive statement of trinitarian orthodoxy addressed to bishops in the East.²² According to Reutter, it originally formed a single document with the excerpt *Non nobis*.²³ (The excerpt *Illud sane*, Reutter holds, had a different audience and error in view.²⁴ It refers indirectly to the community of Paulinus in Antioch, with whom Damasus was in communion, and was composed when Damasus first became aware of the error of Apollinaris, a result of a visit to Rome of the Antiochene presbyter Vitalis around 375.²⁵) By 379, or earlier, *Ea gratia/Non nobis*, or all the documents included in the *Exemplum synodi*, had been received and accepted by bishops attending a synod convened by Meletius in Antioch.²⁶

About the same time the anathemas contained in the Tome of Damasus were issued, in several phases. The Tome comprises two sets of anathemas: the first eight anathemas (1–8) and the last fifteen anathemas (10–24).²⁷ On this much scholars agree.²⁸ They disagree on the chronological sequence of the two sets of anathemas.²⁹ To my mind,

p. 22–55, and REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 248–308. Both agree that the letter was originally composed in Latin.

²² FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 122–124.

²³ REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 317–318.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 362–374. See p. xx below.

²⁶ FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 132–137, holds that the Antiochene synod of 379 subscribed to all four texts preserved in the *Exemplum synodi*, which was then conveyed back to Rome in an imperial rescript in 379 or 380, in any event before 381. REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 344–349, argues that that the list of subscribing bishops in the *Exemplum synodi* pertains only to *Ea gratia/Non nobis*, and that if bishops convened in Antioch subscribed to it, they did so at a synod prior to 378.

²⁷ For the enumeration, see REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 381–397.

²⁸ Cf. C. MARKSCHIES, *Ambrosius von Mailand und die Trinitätstheologie: Kirchen- und theologischesgeschichtliche Studien zu Antiarrianismus und Neunizänismus bei Ambrosius und im lateinischen Westen (364–381 n. Chr.)*, Tübingen, 1995, p. 144–146; FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 139; REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 404–405.

²⁹ Cf. FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 139 n. 10.

Reutter's arguments tip the balance in favour of the priority of the last fifteen anathemas.³⁰ As she observes, they comment on clauses of the Nicene creed, the text with which the earliest version of the Tome began.³¹ Reutter assigns the first version of the Tome, comprising the Nicene creed, the first anathema against the Pneumatomachians, and the last fifteen anathemas, to a Roman synod in 375, contemporary with *Illud sane* and slightly before *Ea gratia/Non nobis*.³² The first eight anathemas of the Tome, Reutter argues, respond to a letter Basil of Caesarea sent to the West in 377, asking the Western bishops to condemn the errors of Eusthathius and Apollinaris, and calling the ordination of Paulinus into question.³³ She therefore assigns the second version of the Tome, comprising all twenty-four anathemas, including an additional ninth anathema against the translation of bishops, to the Roman synod in 377 or 378.³⁴ Field, on the other hand, holds that the first eight anathemas antedate the last fifteen anathemas.³⁵ He maintains that the two sets of anathemas were combined by 379, when the Tome was received in Antioch, but argues that the inclusion of the ninth anathema at this time is problematic, since it would indirectly condemn the translation of Meletius to the see of Antioch.³⁶ This would be difficult to reconcile with Meletius' willingness to subscribe to a Roman statement of orthodoxy.³⁷ According to Field, the Tome in its final form, including the ninth anathema,

³⁰ Pace FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 139–155, 185.

³¹ REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 406–408; FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 140, 168.

³² REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 408–411.

³³ REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 412–418.

³⁴ REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 418–419; cf. FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 168.

³⁵ FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 149, 185.

³⁶ FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 139–141, 169–173, 185.

³⁷ But cf. the comment at THEODORET, *Hist. eccl.* 5, 9, 13 (SC 530, p. 341 n. 5).

was the work of the Roman synod of 382,³⁸ which received the report of the synod held in Antioch in 379 and the report of the council of Constantinople in 381 from a delegation of Eastern bishops.³⁹

Despite lingering disagreements about the date and redaction of *Ea gratia/Non nobis* and the Tome of Damasus, it is clear that, when compared with *Confidimus quidem*, they present a noticeable increment in trinitarian precision. *Confidimus quidem* summarizes Nicene orthodoxy in the brief statement “that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are of one divinity, one strength, one form, one substance.”⁴⁰ *Ea gratia* explicates this Nicene orthodoxy in language that begins to approximate “neo–Nicene” usage.⁴¹ In order to distinguish the distinct reality of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit while nevertheless maintaining their common and coeternal divine substance, Latin Nicene writers were beginning to use the formula of one substance and three persons to express what their Greek counterparts meant when they spoke of one οὐσία and three ὑποστάσεις.⁴² It was still controversial in the West to profess one οὐσία and three ὑποστάσεις,⁴³ since Nicaea in its concluding anathemas used ὑπόστασις and οὐσία to refer to the common divine substance

³⁸ FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 176–177, 185.

³⁹ See p. 10 below.

⁴⁰ *Exemplum synodi* ll. 21–23 (FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 12): *ut patrem filium spiritumque sanctum unius deitatis, unius uirtutis, unius figurae, unius credere oporteret substantiae*. The translation here and in what follows is by Field, published opposite his text of *Exemplum synodi*; I modify Field’s translation at points and note emendations proposed by previous editors. REUTTER, *Damasus*, follows the edition of Schwartz throughout.

⁴¹ C. MARKSCHIES, “Was is lateinischer ‘Neunizänismuz’? Ein Vorschlag für eine Antwort,” in C. MARKSCHIES, *Alta Trinità Beata: Gesammelte Studien zur altkirchlichen Trinitätstheologie*, Tübingen, 2000, p. 238–264; REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 334–335.

⁴² MARKSCHIES, “Was is lateinischer ‘Neunizänismuz’?” p. 261–62, 264; cf. MARKSCHIES, *Ambrosius von Mailand*, p. 12–31.

⁴³ See A. DE HALLEUX, “‘Hypostase’ et ‘personne’ dans la formation du dogme trinitaire,” *RHE*, 79, 1984, p. 311–369, 623–670, reprinted in A. DE HALLEUX, *Patrologie et oecuménisme: recueil d’études*, Leuven, 1990, p. 113–214. In subsequent references I cite the pagination of the original publication, which is also provided in the republication.

of the Father and the Son.⁴⁴ Westerner Nicene writers preferred the language of one substance and three persons. To Greek proponents of one οὐσία and three ὑποστάσεις, however, the Latin formula of three persons of one substance did not adequately convey the real as opposed to nominal individuality of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; the Latin usage smacked of the modalism attributed to Sabellius and Marcellus of Ancyra. This disagreement was complicated by the ambiguity of the Latin term *substantia*, which was used to render both οὐσία and ὑπόστασις. The synodal letter *Ea gratia* attempts to circumvent this problem by employing the Latin transliteration *usia* of the Greek οὐσία in its statement of the one essence of the Trinity: “We all say with one voice that the Trinity is of one strength, one majesty, one divinity, one substance (*unius usiae*) so as to be an inseparable power.”⁴⁵ The letter continues immediately with an assertion of the three co-eternal divine persons in language that cautiously averts to the notion of three subsistent ὑποστάσεις:⁴⁶ “We assert, however, that there are three persons, that they do not turn back into themselves or are not diminished, as many blaspheme, but that they always remain, that they are not certain stages of power and disparate occasions of origin...”⁴⁷ *Ea gratia* later uses the term *usia* a second time to articulate the divinity of the Holy Spirit: “Let us

⁴⁴ DOSSETTI, *Il simbolo*, p. 238.

⁴⁵ *Exemplum synodi* ll. 48–50 (FIELD, *On the Communion*, 14): *quia omnes uno ore unius uirtutis, unius maiestatis, unius diuinitatis, unius usiae dicimus trinitatem ita ut inseparabilem potestatem.*

⁴⁶ In contrast to DE HALLEUX, “‘Hypostase’ et ‘personne’,” p. 630–631, MARKSCHIES, “Was is lateinischer ‘Neunizänismuz’?” p. 256–257, sees evidence neo-Nicene nuances in *Ea gratia*. The christological section includes the statement that the Son is not dissimilar from the Father in operation or power or in anything whatsoever, and, more significantly, “does not subsist from another source” (*Exemplum synodi* ll. 54–56 [FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 14]: *nec dissimilem opere filium nec dissimilem potestatem aut per uniuersa dissimilem nec subsistere aliunde*).

⁴⁷ *Exemplum synodi* ll. 50–53 (FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 14): *Tres tamen adseramus esse personas, nec redire in se aut minui, ut plerique blasphemant, sed semper manere nec potentiae gradus quosdam ortusque tempora disparata...* I accept the emendation of *minui* in place of *minus* (FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 16, apparatus to l. 51); cf. *Exemplum synodi* ll. 57–58 (FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 14): *ne minutum aut diuersum putetur*; REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 320.

also confess that the Holy Spirit is uncreated but of one majesty, one substance (*unius usiae*), one strength with God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.”⁴⁸ In the excerpt *Non nobis* the more traditional term *essentia* does similar duty: “For as we retain the council of Nicaea’s inviolable faith—in all respects, without words’ faking or corrupt sense—as we believe in the Trinity of coeternal and one essence, we in no way separate off the Holy Spirit, but worship the Holy Spirit together with the Father and the Son, perfect in all things, in strength, in honour, in majesty, in deity.”⁴⁹

The first version (following Reutter) of the Tome of Damasus similarly aims to affirm and explicate the one divine substance of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Explaining that after Nicaea some dared to assert that the Holy Spirit was made by the Son,⁵⁰ the first anathema condemns “those who do not declare with complete freedom that the Holy Spirit is of one power and substance with the Father and the Son.”⁵¹ Specific erroneous understandings of the Holy Spirit and of the Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are further addressed in anathemas 16 to 24. Anathema 16 condemns those who do not profess that “the Holy Spirit is truly and properly from the Father, as is the Son, of the divine

⁴⁸ *Exemplum synodi* ll. 63–65 (FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 16): *Spiritum quoque sanctum increatum autem unius maiestatis, unius usiae, unius uirtutis cum deo patre et domino nostro Iesu Christo fateamur.*

⁴⁹ *Exemplum synodi* ll. 106–110 (FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 18): *Vt enim Nicaeae concilii fidem inuiolabilem per omnia retinentes sine simulatione uerborum aut sensu corrupto coaeternae et unius essentiae trinitatem credentes in nullo spiritum sanctum separamus sed perfectum in omnibus, uirtute honore maiestate deitate, cum patre conueneramur et filio.* I accept the emendations of *in nullo* instead of *in ullum* and *separamus* instead of *separemus* (cf. FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 18, apparatus to ll. 108–109); cf. *Exemplum synodi* ll. 68–69 (FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 14): *non enim separandus est diuinitate qui in operatione ac peccatorum remissione connectitur*; REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 328.

⁵⁰ *Tomus Damasi* ll. 32–34 (C.H. TURNER, ed., *Ecclesiae occidentalis monumenta juris antiquissima*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1899–1939, 1, 2, 1, p. 284 [hereafter abbreviated as *EOM*): *Et quia postea hic error inoleuit, ut quidem ore sacrilego audent dicere Spiritum sanctum factum esse per Filium.* REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 384 n. 513, regards this as the beginning of the first anathema.

⁵¹ *Tomus Damasi* ll. 35–37 (*EOM* 1, 2, 1, p. 285): *Anathematizamus eos qui non tota libertate proclamant eum cum Patre et Filio unius potestatis esse adque substantiae.*

substance, and true God.”⁵² Anathema 18 condemns those who say that “the Holy Spirit is an artifact or is made through the Son.”⁵³ Anathema 20 condemns those who do not profess that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit hold their divine attributes in common.⁵⁴ Anathema 21 condemns those who do not profess that the three persons of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are equal in every respect.⁵⁵ Anathema 24 condemns those who speak of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as gods and not as God, as one should on account of their one divinity and sovereignty and on account of one’s baptism into the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.⁵⁶ It concludes with a declaration: “This, then, is the salvation of Christians: that we who believe the Trinity—that is, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit—and are baptized in the Trinity, believe without doubt that the one true only divinity and power, majesty and substance, is the same.”⁵⁷

⁵² *Tomus Damasi* ll. 97–100 (*EOM* 1, 2, 1, p. 289–290): *Si quis non dixerit Spiritum sanctum de Patre esse uere ac proprie, sicut Filium, de diuina substantia et Deum uerum: hereticus est.*

⁵³ *Tomus Damasi* ll. 105–107 (*EOM* 1, 2, 1, p. 290): *Si quis dixerit Spiritum sanctum facturam aut per Filium factum: hereticus est.*

⁵⁴ *Tomus Damasi* ll. 111–116 (*EOM* 1, 2, 1, p. 290–291): *Si quis non dixerit Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti unam diuinitatem potestatem maiestatem potentiam, unam gloriam dominationem, unum regnum adque unam uoluntatem ac ueritatem: hereticus est.*

⁵⁵ *Tomus Damasi* ll. 117–123 (*EOM* 1, 2, 1, p. 291): *Si quis tres personas non dixerit ueras Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, aequales, semper uiuentes, omnia continentes uisibilia et inuisibilia, omnia potentes, omnia iudicantes, omnia uiuificantes, omnia facientes, omnia saluantes: hereticus est.*

⁵⁶ *Tomus Damasi* ll. 133–154 (*EOM* 1, 2, 1, p. 292–293): *Quod si quis putat, [Christi] Patrem Deum dicens et Deum Filium eius et Deum sanctum Spiritum, deos dicere et non, propter unam diuinitatem et potentiam quam credimus et scimus Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, ita dicit Deum; subtrahens autem Filium aut Spiritum sanctum ita solum aestimet Deum Patrem dici, aut ita credit unum Deum: hereticus est in omnibus, immo Iudaeus, quod nomen deorum in angelis et sanctis omnibus a Deo est positum et donatum, de Patre autem et Filio et Spiritu sancto propter unam et aequalem diuinitatem non nomen deorum sed Dei nobis ostenditur adque indicitur ut credamus: quia in Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto solum baptizamur et non in archangelorum nominibus aut angelorum, quomodo heretici aut iudaei aut etiam pagani dementes.*

⁵⁷ *Tomus Damasi* ll. 154–159 (*EOM* 1, 2, 1, p. 294): *Haec est ergo salus christianorum, ut credentes Trinitati, id est Patri et Filio et Spiritui sancto, [et] baptizati in ea, ueram solam unam diuinitatem et potentiam, maiestatem et substantiam, eiusdem esse sine dubio credamus.*

For all its redundancy, this articulation of the divinity of the Holy Spirit is more daring than the compromise reached at the council of Constantinople in 381. Although the report of the council has not been preserved and the text of the creed attributed to the council is first attested seventy years later at the council of Chalcedon in 451,⁵⁸ most scholars agree that the bishops at Constantinople adopted an expansion of the article on the Holy Spirit in the Nicene Creed.⁵⁹ The language the council used was intended to reconcile the majority of the bishops with the Macedonian or Pneumatomachian party.⁶⁰ The bishops refrained from calling the Holy Spirit “God” (unlike the Tome of Damasus) and from stating that the Holy Spirit is “consubstantial” with the Father (as the Tome implies by speaking of one substance). Instead, the council confessed that the Holy Spirit is worshiped and glorified together with the Father and the Son, a statement that implied but did not assert the divinity of the Holy Spirit (let alone the consubstantiality of the three persons of the Trinity).⁶¹

The impetus for this compromise came, apparently, from the emperor Theodosius, whose decree ratifying the decisions of the council, issued on 30 July 381, likewise avoids an explicit assertion of consubstantiality:

⁵⁸ E. Schwartz, ed., *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, Berlin, 1914–1984, II, I, 2, p. 79–80

⁵⁹ See now R. STAATS, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis von Nizäa-Konstantinopel: Historische und theologische Grundlagen*, Darmstadt, 1996, p. 34–120; cf. J.N.D. KELLY, *Early Christian Creeds*, 3 ed., London, 1972, p. 296–331; A.M. RITTER, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol*, Göttingen, 1965, p. 132–208.

⁶⁰ STAATS, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis*, p. 115; RITTER, *Das Konzil*, p. 190–191; DE HALLEUX, “‘Hypostase’ et ‘personne’,” p. 657–659.

⁶¹ The council thus fell short of the precision sought by Gregory of Nazianzus. For his position during and after the council, see now F. GAUTHIER, *La retraite et le sacerdoce chez Grégoire de Nazianze*, Turnhout, 2002, p. 389–395, with F. GAUTHIER, “À propos du témoignage de Grégoire de Nazianze sur le concile de Constantinople (mai–juillet 381) aux vers 1750–1755 du *De uita sua*,” *REAug*, 51, 2005, p. 67–76. The *De uita sua*, delivered prior to Gregory’s departure from Constantinople, expresses Gregory’s adherence to the divinity of the Holy Spirit in indirect terms, while *Oration 42*, prepared after his departure, articulates the terms of this divinity more explicitly, criticizing the ambiguity of the council’s confession; cf. J. MCGUCKIN, *Saint Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography*, Crestwood, NY, 2001, p. 361–364.

We command that all churches shall immediately be surrendered to bishops who confess that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are of one majesty and strength, of the same glory, of one splendor; to those who produce no discord by unholy disunity, but acknowledge the order of the Trinity by the affirmation of the persons and the unity of the divinity.⁶²

However, a letter composed by Eastern bishops assembled again in Constantinople in the following year is less conciliatory and more explicit. The Eastern bishops had received an invitation from Western bishops to attend a synod in Rome—the synod of 382.⁶³ When writing to decline the invitation, the Eastern bishops elaborated on the faith of Nicaea to which they subscribed,⁶⁴ referring the Western bishops to the report of the synod of Antioch in 379 and the report of the council of Constantinople in 381 for more detail.⁶⁵

“[the faith of Nicaea] which teaches us to believe in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, such that one believes clearly in one godhead and power and substance of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, equal in dignity and co-eternal in dominion, in three very

⁶² *Cod. Th.* 16, 1, 3 (TH. MOMMSEN, ed., Berlin, 1954; SC 497, p. 116): *Episcopis tradi omnes ecclesias mox iubemus, qui unius maiestatis adque virtutis patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum confitentur eiusdem gloriae, claritatis unius, nihil dissonum profana divisione facientes, sed trinitatis ordinem personarum adsertione et divinitatis unitate.* The translation is by C. PHARR, *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions*, Princeton, 1952, p. 440, slightly modified.

⁶³ THEODORET, *Hist. eccl.* 5, 8, 11 (SC 530, p. 362–364).

⁶⁴ THEODORET, *Hist. eccl.* 5, 9, 10–12 (SC 530, p. 370–372).

⁶⁵ THEODORET, *Hist. eccl.* 5, 9, 13 (SC 530, p. 372).

perfect hypostases, that is to say, three perfect persons, so that there may be no place for the disease of Sabellius, which confuses the hypostases and thus does away with the properties, and so that the blasphemy of the Eunomians and the Arians and the Pneumatomachi may not prevail, which divides the substance or the nature or the godhead and introduces into the uncreated and consubstantial and co-eternal trinity some sort of nature that is posterior or created or of a different substance. And we preserve without distortion the doctrine of the incarnation of the Lord, rejecting a dispensation of the flesh without a soul or without a mind or incomplete, knowing that the Word is God wholly complete before the ages, and that he became a complete human being in the last days for our salvation.”⁶⁶

This summary, as Abramowski has elucidated,⁶⁷ associates the common divinity (godhead, power, and substance) of the persons of the Trinity with their shared predicates (dignity, dominion), thereby asserting indirectly the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit. It uses the newer Nicene terminology of three *ὑποστάσεις* to protect the individuality of the persons, but immediately explicates this innovation with the Western terminology of three

⁶⁶ THEODORET, *Hist. eccl.* 5, 9, 11–12 (SC 530, p. 370–372): ... και διδάσκουσιν ἡμᾶς πιστεῦν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, δηλαδὴ θεότητος καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ οὐσίας μιᾶς τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος πιστευομένης ὁμοτίμου τε τῆς ἀξίας καὶ συναϊδίου τῆς βασιλείας, ἐν τρισὶ τελειόταταις ὑποστάσεσιν ἦγουν τρισὶ τελείοις προσώποις, ὡς μήτε τὴν Σαβελλίου νόσον χώραν λαβεῖν συγχεομένων τῶν ὑποστάσεων εἴτ’ οὖν τῶν ιδιοτήτων ἀναιρουμένων, μήτε μὴν τὴν Εὐνομιανῶν καὶ Ἀρειανῶν καὶ Πνευματομάχων βλασφημίαν ἰσχύειν, τῆς οὐσίας ἢ τῆς φύσεως ἢ τῆς θεότητος τεμνομένης καὶ τῆ ἀκρίστῳ καὶ ὁμοουσίῳ καὶ συναϊδίῳ τριάδι μεταγενεστέρας τινὸς ἢ κτιστῆς ἢ ἑτεροουσίῳ φύσεως ἐπαγομένης. Καὶ τὸν τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως δὲ τοῦ κυρίου λόγον ἀδιάστροφον σώζομεν οὔτε ἄψυχον οὔτε ἄνουν ἢ ἀτελεῖ τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς οἰκονομίαν παραδεχόμενοι, ὅλον δὲ εἰδότες τέλειον μὲν πρὸ αἰῶνων ὄντα θεὸν λόγον, τέλειον δὲ ἄνθρωπον ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν γενόμενον.

⁶⁷ L. ABRAMOWSKI, “Was hat das Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum (C) mit dem Konzil von Konstantinopel 381 zu tun?” *ThPh*, 67, 1992, p. 482–484.

persons. It extends the Nicene assertion of consubstantiality (*homoousios*) of Father and Son to the entire Trinity, a step that the bishops were not prepared to take in their expansion of the Nicene Creed at Constantinople in 381. And it concludes with a condemnation of the error of Apollinaris, who had conceived of the Word as displacing the soul or the mind when assuming humanity.

One can see, then, an increasingly more precise articulation of the nature and role of the Holy Spirit in statements by Roman synods in the second half of the 370s and in the report that the Roman synod in 382 received from the East about the council of Constantinople. Given that Ambrosiaster worked on his *Commentary on Romans* during this period, is there evidence of this emerging precision in his revisions to the work?

Revisions to Ambrosiaster's *Commentary on Romans*

Happily, there are some indications. Ambrosiaster's *Commentary on Romans* contains several variants that appear to reflect the articulation of the divinity of the Holy Spirit in the second half of the 370s. While the variants are not numerous, they are telling. I will present the variants as they appear in the *Commentary* and discuss their relationship to the Roman synodal letters and other contemporary statements.

Romans 1:3

Ambrosiaster twice revised his comment on Romans 1:3, where Paul declares that he was called to be an apostle for the gospel “concerning his Son, who was made for him

from the seed of David according to the flesh.” On each occasion Ambrosiaster introduced pneumatological and christological precisions. In order to assess these in their context, I present the entire comment in each recension, highlighting in bold the changes introduced into *beta* and *gamma*, successively.

alpha: Qui factus est ei ex semine David secundum carnem. 2. eum qui erat dei filius secundum sanctum spiritum, factum dicit iuxta carnem dei filium ex semine David iuxta illud: et verbum caro factum est, ut iam unus sit dei filius et hominis filius dei filius.⁶⁸ qui enim ex aeterno dei filius erat, ignorabatur autem a creatura, dum vult manifestari pro humana salute, visibilis debuit et corporeus fieri, quia et cognosci se voluit per virtutem et hominem peccatis abluere in carne morte devicta. 3. et ideo ex semine David fit, ut sicut de deo rex ante saecula natus est, ita et secundum carnem ex rege ortum caperet, de virgine natus, ut reverentia ei reservata ex hoc ultra hominem cognosceretur, qui ab humanae legis nativitate distaret, sicut praedictum fuerat ab Esaia profeta: ecce virgo in utero concipiet et cetera, ut cum novum factum videretur et laude dignum, providentia quaedam dei circa visitationem humani generis futura dinosceretur.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ The second reference to *dei filius* in *alpha* is puzzling. It is replaced by *Christus Iesus* in *beta*, which makes better sense.

⁶⁹ AMBROSIASTER, *In Rom.* 1, 3(2) (CSEL 81/1, p. 14).

beta: *Qui factus est ei ex semine David secundum carnem. 2. eum qui erat dei filius secundum sanctum spiritum, **id est secundum deum, quia deus spiritus est et sine dubio sanctus est, factum dicit iuxta carnem dei filium ex semine David iuxta illud: et verbum caro factum est, ut iam unus sit et dei et hominis filius **Christus Iesus.** qui enim ex aeterno dei filius erat, ignorabatur autem a creatura, dum vult **autem** manifestari pro humana salute, visibilis debuit et corporeus fieri, quia et cognosci se voluit per virtutem et hominem peccatis abluere in carne morte devicta. 3. et ideo ex semine David fit, ut sicut de deo rex ante saecula natus est, ita et secundum carnem ex rege ortum caperet, **factus opere spiritus sancti ex virgine, hoc est natus, ut reverentia ei reservata ex hoc ultra hominem cognosceretur, qui ab humanae legis nativitate distaret, sicut praedictum fuerat ab Esaia profeta: ecce virgo in utero concipiet et cetera, ut cum novum factum videretur et laude dignum, providentia quaedam dei circa visitationem humani generis futura dinosceretur.*****⁷⁰

gamma: *Qui factus est ei ex semine David secundum carnem. 2. eum qui erat dei filius secundum sanctum spiritum, id est secundum deum, quia deus spiritus est et sine dubio sanctus est, factum dicit iuxta carnem dei filium ex **Maria,** iuxta illud: et verbum caro factum est, ut iam unus sit et dei et hominis filius **Christus Iesus, ut sicut verus deus est, verus esset et homo. verus autem non erit, nisi sit ex carne et anima, ut sit perfectus.***

⁷⁰ Idem.

qui enim ex aeterno dei filius erat, ignorabatur autem a creatura, dum vult illum manifestari pro humana salute, visibilem eum et corporeum fecit, quia et cognosci eum voluit per virtutem ut homines passione eius a peccatis ablueret in carne morte devicta. 3. et ideo ex semine David fit, ut sicut de deo rex ante saecula natus est, ita et secundum carnem ex rege ortum regium caperet, factus opere spiritus sancti ex virgine, hoc est natus, ut reverentia ei reservata ex hoc ultra hominem cognosceretur, qui ab humanae legis nativitate distaret, sicut praedictum fuerat ab Esaia profeta: ecce virgo in utero concipiet et cetera, ut cum novum factum videretur et laude dignum, providentia quaedam dei circa visitationem humani generis futura dinosceretur.⁷¹

Ambrosiaster elaborates on the nature and role of the Holy Spirit at two points in *beta*; both of these additions are retained in *gamma*. First, Ambrosiaster explains that “he who was Son of God according to the Holy Spirit—**that is, according to God, because God is spirit and is undoubtedly holy**—was made Son of God according to the flesh from

⁷¹ AMBROSIASTER, *In Rom.* 1, 3(2) (CSEL 81/1, p. 15). English translation: *Who was made for him from the seed of David according to the flesh.* 2. He says that he who was Son of God according to the Holy Spirit—that is, according to God, because God is spirit and is undoubtedly holy—was made Son of God according to the flesh from Mary, as in the verse: *And the Word was made flesh* (John 1:14). As a result, there is now one Son of both God and a human being, Christ Jesus, so that just as he is true God, he was also a true human being. He will not, however, be a true human being unless he is made of flesh and soul, so as to be complete. When God wanted him who was Son of God from eternity but was not known by creation to be revealed for the salvation of humankind, he made him visible and corporeal, because he also wanted him to be recognized in power, so that by his passion he might wash people from sins, death having been vanquished in the flesh. 3. And he was made from the seed of David in order that, just he was born of God as king before the ages, so too he would assume the beginning of his reign according to the flesh from a king. He was made by the work of the Holy Spirit of a virgin—in other words, born—so that, by virtue of the veneration reserved for him on account of this, he might be acknowledged to be more than a human being. For he departed from the human law of birth, as had been foretold by the prophet Isaiah—*Behold a virgin will conceive in the womb* and so on (Isa 7:14)—so that when this novel event was also perceived to be worthy of honour, a certain providence of God regarding the visitation of the human race might be discerned to be coming about.

the seed of David.”⁷² Although the language of the addition is not technical, it specifies that the Holy Spirit is God, a step that the Pneumatomachians were unwilling to take. One can see a parallel in the final words of Anathema 16 of the Tome of Damasus, where the Holy Spirit is said to be “true God.”⁷³

Secondly, Ambrosiaster explains in *beta* that Jesus Christ “**was made by the work of the Holy Spirit** of a virgin—**in other words**, born—so that, by virtue of the veneration reserved for him on account of this, he might be acknowledged to be more than a human being.” The statement that Christ was born from the Holy Spirit and (or of) the virgin Mary had long been an element of baptismal questions and declaratory formulae in Rome, and was probably incorporated into the earliest Roman form of the creed in the third century.⁷⁴ The exact phrasing of the statement varied, with witnesses in Rome and elsewhere in the West attesting *et Maria virgine* and *ex Maria virgine*.⁷⁵ The element was subsequently introduced into the creed of Constantinople,⁷⁶ possibly as a result of the influence of the Roman version of the Nicene creed at the synod of Antioch in 379.⁷⁷ The coincidence of the incorporation of the statement that Jesus Christ was born from the Holy Spirit and the virgin Mary into the Nicene creed at or just prior to Constantinople and the addition of the words “was made by the work of the Holy Spirit” to Ambrosiaster’s comment in *beta* is tantalizing, particularly in light of evidence from the *Questions* that Ambrosiaster was alert

⁷² In *gamma* Ambrosiaster changes “from the seed of David” to “from Mary.” On this revision, see below.

⁷³ Cf. n. 52 above.

⁷⁴ See L.H. WESTRA, *The Apostles’ Creed: Origin, History, and Some Early Commentaries*, Brepols, 2002, p. 21–72.

⁷⁵ WESTRA, p. 230–233.

⁷⁶ DOSSETTI, *Il simbolo*, p. 246–247.

⁷⁷ Cf. STAATS, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis*, p. 165–169 and 175–179.

to the effort at Constantinople to exclude heretical formulations of the generation and incarnation of the Son.⁷⁸ (The creedal statement could also account for the revision in *gamma*, noted above,⁷⁹ that Jesus Christ was made Son of God according to the flesh “from Mary” instead of “from the seed of David.”⁸⁰) However, the statement would have been familiar to Ambrosiaster from Roman usage; he in fact echoes it elsewhere in the *Commentary on Romans* already in *alpha*.⁸¹ Nor does Ambrosiaster in *alpha* or *beta* of the commentary manifest a concern to clarify that Christ was not made (*non factus*), as appears to be the case from his revision of *Question 54*.

It may be that Ambrosiaster had the error of Photinus of Sirmium in view when he revisited his comment at Romans 1:3. Photinus, a disciple of Marcellus of Ancyra, was widely reported to have denied the divinity of Christ; he apparently taught that Jesus was a man to whom God the Word adhered after his birth from Mary.⁸² On several occasions in the *Commentaries* Ambrosiaster charges Photinus with denying that Christ is God.⁸³ He also devotes *Question 91* to refuting the finer points of Photinus’ christology.⁸⁴ There he makes a brief reference to the incarnation of the Word “through the work of the Holy Spirit

⁷⁸ See BUSSIÈRES, “L’influence,” p. 113–114 with 118–119 on *Quaest.* 54.

⁷⁹ See n. 72 above.

⁸⁰ Cf. n. 85 below for a similar statement in *Quaest.* 91.

⁸¹ At *In Rom.* 9, 33(3) (CSEL 81/1, p. 342) Ambrosiaster in *alpha* explains that the “stumbling–stone undoubtedly refers to the body of the Saviour. It was cut out without the use of human hands, because he was made of a virgin by the Holy Spirit without the use of a man (*quia sine viro de sancto spiritu facta de virgine est*).” When Ambrosiaster in *beta* expands his comment a few lines earlier at *In Rom.* 9, 33(2) (CSEL 81/1, p. 340), he adds that Christ “was born by the Holy Spirit from a woman (*natus de spiritu sancto ex muliere*).”

⁸² L.A. SPELLER, “New Light on the Photinians: The Evidence of Ambrosiaster,” *JThS*, n.s. 34, 1983, p. 99–113; HANSON, *Search*, p. 235–238.

⁸³ AMBROSIASTER, *In Rom.* 1, 1(3) (CSEL 81/1, p. 10–11), *In 1 Cor.* 4, 10 (CSEL 81/2, p. 47), *Gal.* 1, 1(2) (CSEL 81/3, p. 5–6), *Phil.* 1, 1(1) (CSEL 81/3, p. 130).

⁸⁴ AMBROSIASTER, *Quaest.* 91 (CSEL 50, p. 151–160): *Quaerendum quo modo contradicendum sine argumentis Fotino sit Christum ante Mariam esse*; cf. Speller, “New Light,” p. 105–113.

from Mary,” citing John 1:14 (a verse which Ambrosiaster also cites in the comment on Romans 1:3) as evidence that what was incarnate was the pre-existent Word and Son of God.⁸⁵ It is noteworthy, in this connection, that Anathema 5 of the Tome of Damasus condemns Photinus for renewing the heresy of the Ebionites and confessing that Jesus Christ is “only from Mary.”⁸⁶ (The Photinians are also included among the heresies condemned in canon 1 of the council of Constantinople, but without the explanation found in Anathema 5 of the Tome of Damasus.) For Ambrosiaster, then, as for others in Rome, the creedal statement that Jesus Christ was born from the Holy Spirit and the virgin Mary could have been understood to protect against the error of Photinus (among others).⁸⁷

Finally, Ambrosiaster adds a remark to his comment at Romans 1:3 which, though it does not refer to the Holy Spirit, is relevant for the dating of the revisions we have already discussed. The remark occurs only in *gamma* and is directed against the christology of Apollinaris, who is not named. After quoting John 1:14, Ambrosiaster continues: “As a result, there is now one Son of both God and a human being, Christ Jesus, **so that just as he is true God, he was also a true human being. He will not, however, be a true human being unless he is made of flesh and soul, so as to be complete.**” What might have impelled Ambrosiaster to add this remark in *gamma*? We know that sometime after 375—

⁸⁵ AMBROSIASTER, *Quaest.* 91, 9 (CSEL 50: 157–158): *Legimus namque quia uerbum caro factum est, hoc est ministro sancto spiritu incarnatum esse ex Maria, hoc uerbum in principio apud deum fuisse et deum esse, hoc quoque filium dei appellari.*

⁸⁶ *Tomus Damasi* ll. 48–50 (EOM 1, 2, 1, p. 285–286): *Anathematizamus Fotinum, qui Ebionis heresim instaurans Dominum Iesum Christum tantum ex Maria confitetur.*

⁸⁷ At the time of the council of Chalcedon, Diogenes of Cyzicus and others claimed that the Roman statement of the operation of the Holy Spirit in the incarnation of Christ was introduced into the creed of Constantinople to counter the error of Apollinaris. This explanation strikes me as unlikely; for reasons to discount it, see KELLY, *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 332–337. However, STAATS, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis*, p. 176, maintains that the Roman addition would have been attractive to the opponents of Apollinaris at the synod of Antioch in 379.

Field argues for a date between 375 and 378, Reutter for a date of 375 or 376⁸⁸—Damasus sent the letter *Per filium meum* to Paulinus in Antioch to require an anti–Apollinarian profession of faith from Vitalis, an Antiochene presbyter whose orthodoxy Damasus had previously affirmed in a letter of recommendation to Paulinus but who had subsequently been ordained bishop by Apollinaris. In refuting the christology of Apollinaris (without, however, naming him), *Per filium meum* specifies that Word assumed a complete human being, comprising body, soul, and mind, but without sin.⁸⁹ As Reutter observes, this more precise refutation of Apollinaris’ christology suggests that *Per filium meum* was composed after *Illud sane*,⁹⁰ which reacted in a more preliminary way to news of the teaching of Apollinaris.⁹¹ A similar precision is found in Anathema 7 of the Tome of Damasus, which, like *Per filium meum*, specifies that the Word assumed a rational and intelligible soul, but without sin.⁹² If it took some time for Damasus to become better informed about the christology of Apollinaris and to sharpen his refutation of it, the relative lateness of Ambrosiaster’s response is less surprising than at first sight. There is, in fact, a parallel in Ambrose, who first mentions Apollinaris after he was condemned by the council of Constantinople.⁹³ There may therefore, be grounds for supposing that Ambrosiaster was

⁸⁸ FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 143–149, 152–155; REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 373.

⁸⁹ Damasus, *Ep. 3* (PL 13, col. 356B) *id est confitendus ipse sapientia, sermo filius Dei humanum suscepisse corpus, animam, sensum, id est integrum Adam, et, ut expressius dicam, totum veterem nostrum sine peccato hominem.*

⁹⁰ REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 371–373.

⁹¹ *Exemplum synodi* ll. 79–101 (FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 16–18).

⁹² *Tomus Damasi* ll. 54–61 (EOM 1, 2, 1, p. 286): *Anathematizamus eos qui pro hominis anima rationabili et intellegibili dicunt Dei Verbum in humana carne uersatum, cum ipse Filius et Verbum Dei non pro anima rationabili et intellegibili in suo corpore fuerit, sed nostram (id est rationabilem et intellegibilem) sine peccato animam suscepit adque saluauerit.*

⁹³ AMBROSE, *Extra collectionem ep. 8, 4* (CSEL 82/3, p. 199); cf. FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 177–178 and N.B. MCLYNN, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*, Berkeley, 1994, p. 143–144.

more alert to the error of Apollinaris toward the end of the 370s or the beginning of the 380s. In any event, it seems that the error of Apollinaris caught the attention of Ambrosiaster later than the error of the Pneumatomachians, since he addresses the latter already in *beta* but the former only in *gamma*.

Romans 8:26–27

At Romans 8:26–27—“But the Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs that are beyond word, and he who searches hearts knows what the Spirit desires, because it intercedes for the saints according to God”—Ambrosiaster adds several comments in *beta* to explain the nature of communication among the persons of the Trinity on the basis of their common substance and divinity. These additions are retained unchanged in *gamma*. First, Ambrosiaster expands his initial comment on the last clause of verse 26 with the following addition: “The apostle says that the Spirit of the Lord intercedes for us not with human eloquence, but in keeping with his nature. When that which is of God speaks with God, it necessarily speaks in the same way that the one from whom he is speaks. No one speaks with his fellow citizen in a foreign tongue.”⁹⁴ Ambrosiaster then modifies his comment on verse 27 to the same end. Whereas in *alpha* Ambrosiaster commented, “It is obvious that to God, for whom nothing is unspoken or unseen, the prayer of the Holy Spirit is known,”⁹⁵ in *beta* he explains why this is so by referring to the unity of divine substance:

⁹⁴ AMBROSIASTER, *In Rom.* 8, 26(3a) (CSEL 81/1, p. 288): *non humanis eloquiis postulare pro nobis dicit spiritum domini, sed more naturae suae. cum enim quod de deo est, deo loquitur, eo more loquatur necesse est, quo ille loquitur, de quo est. nemo enim cum cive suo alia lingua loquitur.*

⁹⁵ AMBROSIASTER, *In Rom.* 8, 27(1) (CSEL 81/1, p. 288): *manifestum est, quia deo, cui nihil tacitum est et occultum, nota est precatio spiritus sancti.*

“It is obvious that to God, for whom nothing is unspoken or unseen, **the prayer of every spirit is known, and even more so the prayer of the Holy Spirit, who is without doubt of the same substance, and who speaks not by the movement of air nor as the angels or like any other creatures, but as befits his divinity.**”⁹⁶

What is significant about these additions in *beta* is the extension to the Holy Spirit of the argument from divine consubstantiality. The phrases *unius substantiae* and *eiusdem substantiae* were commonly used in the West to refer to the common divine substance of the Father and the Son.⁹⁷ This language echoes, of course, the Latin version of the Nicene creed, which confessed that the Son is “of one substance with the Father, what the Greeks call *homoousion*.”⁹⁸ On several occasions in the *Commentaries* Ambrosiaster argues for or from the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son by using the language of “the same substance,” “one substance,” and “a common substance.”⁹⁹ By extending this language to the Holy Spirit—particularly by using the phrase *eiusdem substantiae*, which comes closer to the meaning of ὁμοούσιος than the phrase *unius substantiae*¹⁰⁰—Ambrosiaster is

⁹⁶ AMBROSIASTER, *In Rom.* 8, 27(1–1a) (CSEL 81/1, p. 288): *manifestum est, quia deo, cui nihil tacitum est et occultum, nota est precatio omnium spirituum, quanto magis spiritus sancti qui eiusdem utique substantiae est, et loquitur non impulso aeris neque ut angeli aut sicut cetera ex creaturis, sed sicut competit eius divinitati.* In *gamma* the clause *et loquitur...divinitati* is attested only by the manuscripts Amiens 87 and Monte Cassino 150.

⁹⁷ For Ambrose’s usage, which included *unius substantiae*, *eiusdem substantiae*, and *unitas substantiae*, see MARKSCHIES, *Ambrosius von Mailand*, p. 188, n. 566.

⁹⁸ DOSSETTI, *Il simbolo*, p. 231: *unius substantiae cum patre quod Graeci dicunt homoousion*. The phrase is attested, among others, by Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer of Cagliari, Gregory of Elvira, and the Tome of Damasus.

⁹⁹ AMBROSIASTER, *In Rom.* 11, 36(1) (CSEL 81/1, p. 390–391): *per filium eius, qui eiusdem utique substantiae est; In 2 Cor.* 5, 18–21(1–2) (CSEL 81/2, p. 237): *pater enim per id intellegitur esse in filio, quod una eorum sit substantia; In Eph.* 2, 3(2) (CSEL 81/3, p. 79): *ut in virtute et substantia et nomine nihil distet filius a patre; In Phil.* 2, 11(9) (CSEL 81/3, p. 145): *ut una gloria sit patris et filii per communem substantiam et virtutem; In 2 Thess.* 2, 16 (CSEL 81/3, p. 243): *quoniam pater et filius una virtus unaque divinitas et substantia est.*

¹⁰⁰ MARIUS VICTORINUS, *Adv. Arium* 4, 14 (CSEL 83, p. 245), explains with reference to the Father and the Son that *homoousios* in Greek can be rendered *consubstantialis* or *eiusdem substantiae* in Latin: ὁμοούσιος

declaring the Holy Spirit to be *homoousios* with the Father and the Son. This move is consistent with the articulation of the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit in *Ea gratia/Non nobis* and the first version of the Tome of Damasus. If anything, it is more explicit. It is, moreover, illustrative of a trend. In the first half of the 380s the Luciferian Roman presbyter Faustinus likewise uses the phrase *eiusdem substantiae* to state categorically that the Holy Spirit is of the same substance as the Father and the Son.¹⁰¹

The point which Ambrosiaster makes in his addition in *beta* at Romans 8:27 is developed at greater length in *Question 125*. Ambrosiaster composed this short treatise to refute the idea, which he recalls having read in a work of a certain Eusebius,¹⁰² that the Holy Spirit was ignorant of the mystery of the incarnation of Jesus Christ.¹⁰³ Ambrosiaster argues that the Holy Spirit cannot be ignorant of anything that the Father or the Son knows, because the Holy Spirit is of the same substance as the Father and the Son.¹⁰⁴ Among the biblical passages Ambrosiaster adduces in support of his argument is Romans 8:26–27.¹⁰⁵ It is difficult from this excerpt alone to determine whether Ambrosiaster’s additions to his

ergo Christus cum deo, id est consubstantialis, quod est eiusdem substantiae.

¹⁰¹ FAUSTINUS, *Conf. fid.* (CCL 69, p. 357): *et Spiritus Sanctus, non creatura existens sed Spiritus Dei, non est alienus a substantia Patris et Filii, sed est et ipse eiusdem substantiae cum Patre et Filio, sicut eiusdem deitatis; Trin. 48* (CCL 69, p. 349): *sed sic est Spiritus Dei, ut sit eiusdem substantiae cum Patre et Filio.* The *Confession of the True Faith* was submitted to the emperor Theodosius in 384, while *On the Trinity* was commissioned by his wife, Flaccilla, before 386; cf. M. SIMONETTI, “Praefatio,” CCL 69, p. 287–288.

¹⁰² On his identity see the literature referenced by E. DI SANTO, *L’Apologetica dell’Ambrosiaster. Cristiani, pagani e giudei nella Roma tardoantica*, Rome, 2008, p. 28 n. 34, 203 n. 292.

¹⁰³ AMBROSIASTER, *Quaest. 125, 1* (CSEL 50, p. 384): *Memini me in quodam libello Eusebii, quondam egregii in reliquis uiri, legisse, quia nec spiritus sanctus sciat mysterium nativitatis domini Iesu Christi.*

¹⁰⁴ Cf., e.g., AMBROSIASTER, *Quaest. 125, 1* (CSEL 50, p. 385): *sin uero eiusdem substantiae est et diuinitatis, quo modo potest nescire quae sua sunt? Quaest. 125.2* (CSEL 50, p. 385): *Quam ob rem si sanctus spiritus eiusdem diuinitatis est, qua ratione segregatur, ne sit eiusdem scientiae, cum eiusdem non negetur esse substantiae? Quaest. 125, 4* (CSEL 50, p. 386): *Quo modo igitur dici potest de spiritu sancto quia nescit natiuitatem filii dei, si consubstantiuus est ei? Quaest. 125, 6* (CSEL 50, p. 386): *Quid ergo ambigitur de spiritu sancto, an eiusdem diuinitatis sit, cum sit eiusdem substantiae?*

¹⁰⁵ AMBROSIASTER, *Quaest. 125, 11–14* (CSEL 50, p. 388).

commentary at Romans 8:26–27 preceded or followed his composition of *Question* 125, since the former comprise a few remarks whereas the latter is a complete tract. However, the use of *consubstantiuus* as a synonym for *eiusdem substantiae* elsewhere in *Question* 125 would suggest that it is later in date.¹⁰⁶ Ambrosiaster never uses the term *consubstantiuus* in his remarks on the Trinity in the *Commentaries*.¹⁰⁷ The term appears only in the *Questions*. Marie–Pierre Bussièrès examines Ambrosiaster’s unusual and independent use of *consubstantiuus* in detail in her paper in this volume. Her discussion would lead one to conclude that *Question* 125 was written sometime after 382, since the only other instance where *consubstantiuus* is applied to the Holy Spirit occurs in *Question* 41,¹⁰⁸ and that question appears to have been written after 382 at the earliest.

Given the points of similarity between Ambrosiaster’s comments in *beta* on Romans 8:26–27 and his arguments in *Question* 125, it is noteworthy that nowhere in the *Commentary on Romans* does Ambrosiaster employ the distinction between the nature and the persons of the godhead to explain the substantial unity and distinct reality of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This reasoning first appears in a lengthy comment in the *Commentary on First Corinthians* at 12:6,¹⁰⁹ and continues in the later commentaries.¹¹⁰ It also appears in the *Questions*.¹¹¹ In their paper in this volume Stephen Cooper and David Hunter note

¹⁰⁶ AMBROSIASTER, *Quaest.* 125, 4 (CSEL 50, p. 386), cited at n. 115 above.

¹⁰⁷ The term *consubstantialitas* does appear in one manuscript in a comment at *In Col.* 1, 15(2) (CSEL 81/3, p. 171, apparatus at l. 14) on the unity of Father and Son. The term *consubstantiva* is attested in the manuscripts Monte Cassino 150 and Laurentian Library, Florence, Codex Ashb. 60 in a comment at *In Eph.* 5, 22–24 (CSEL 81/3, p. 118, apparatus at l. 4) on the unity of husband and wife; other manuscripts have *substantia*; one manuscript has *consubstantialis*.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. BUSSIÈRÈS, “L’esprit de Dieu,” p. xx.

¹⁰⁹ AMBROSIASTER, *In 1 Cor.* 12, 6(1–2) (CSEL 81/2, p. 133–134).

¹¹⁰ AMBROSIASTER, *In Eph.* 3, 17(3) (CSEL 81/3, p. 92), *In 1 Tim.* 2, 5(1) (CSEL 81/3, p. 261).

¹¹¹ AMBROSIASTER, *Quaest.* 45, 2 (CSEL 50, p. 82), *Quaest.* 93, 1 (CSEL 50, p. 163), *Quaest.* 97, 8 (CSEL 50, p. 177), *Quaest.* 97, 19 (CSEL 50, p. 184–185), *Quaest.* 102, 12 (CSEL 50, p. 209), *Quaest.* 125, 22

the parallel between the conclusion of *Question 125* and Ambrosiaster's comment on 1 Thessalonians 3:9–10,¹¹² where Ambrosiaster in *gamma* adds an observation about the nature and the persons of the godhead.¹¹³ In both instances Ambrosiaster explains that the Holy Spirit is third in rank but equal in substance to the other persons of the Trinity. What is striking about the additional comment at 1 Thessalonians 3:9–10 is its reference to the properties of Father and Son—"unbegottenness" and "begottenness"—to distinguish the persons of the Trinity:

It is one thing to receive the faith and another thing to receive an exposition of the faith. The one is a discussion about the nature of the Father and the Son, and the other is a discussion about the persons. The Father is unbegotten, whereas the Son is begotten. Insofar as the persons are concerned, there appears to be a difference, although the unity of nature is undivided. For the unity exists not in person, but in substance.¹¹⁴

It is tempting to see in this explanation the influence of neo-Nicene theology in the West, as Latin theologians such as Ambrose became more familiar with the language used by Greek theologians to discuss the individual properties of the Father, Son, and Holy

(CSEL 50, p. 391–392).

¹¹² Cf. AMBROSIASTER, *In 1 Thess.* 3, 9–10(2) (CSEL 81/3, p. 222), with AMBROSIASTER, *Quaest.* 125, 22 (CSEL 50, p. 391–392).

¹¹³ COOPER and HUNTER, "Ambrosiaster *redactor sui*," p. xx–xx.

¹¹⁴ AMBROSIASTER, *In 1 Thess.* 3, 9–10(2) (CSEL 81/3, p. 222): *aliud est enim fidem accipere et aliud expositionem fidei. altera enim disputatio est de natura patris et filii et alia de personis. pater ingenitus est, filius vero genitus. quantum ad personas pertinet, diversum videtur, cum sit individua unitas naturae. unitas enim non in persona est, sed in substantia.* The translation is by D. Hunter.

Spirit.¹¹⁵ Certainly Ambrosiaster's use of the terms *persona* and *natura* at 1 Thessalonians 3:9–10 is an advance upon the Tome of Damasus, which refers only once to the three persons,¹¹⁶ and the synodal letter *Ea gratia*, which uses the language, but in an imprecise way.¹¹⁷ At the same time one must acknowledge that Ambrosiaster appears to have used the terms *persona* and *natura* not so much to differentiate the distinct properties of the three persons of the Trinity as to affirm their common divinity and operation.¹¹⁸ Be that as it may, the difference between Ambrosiaster's additions in *beta* at Romans 8:26–27, on the one hand, and the addition in *gamma* at 1 Thessalonians 3:9–10 and the language in *Question 125*, on the other, suggest that the former was completed before the latter, that is, before 382.

Summary and conclusions

What can we conclude from this examination of revisions to Ambrosiaster's *Commentary on Romans* in comments bearing on the Holy Spirit? It is possible to discern three stages or points of intervention in the evolution of Ambrosiaster's comments. The earliest stage is found in Ambrosiaster's comment in *alpha* on Romans 1:3, where Ambrosiaster did not feel it necessary to explain, as he subsequently did in *beta*, that the Holy Spirit is God and was the agent of the Son's incarnation of a virgin. The next stage is

¹¹⁵ On Ambrose's trinitarian evolution, see MARKSCHIES, *Ambrosius von Mailand*, p. 197–212.

¹¹⁶ *Tomus Damasi* l. 117 (*EOM* 1, 2, 1, p. 291), cited at n. 55 above; cf. REUTTER, *Damasus*, p. 407; MARKSCHIES, *Ambrosius von Mailand*, p. 162–164.

¹¹⁷ *Exemplum synodi* ll. 50–62 (FIELD, *On the Communion*, p. 14).

¹¹⁸ See, e.g., AMBROSIASTER, *In 1 Cor.* 12, 6(1) (*CSEL* 81/2, p. 133), *In Eph.* 3, 17(3) (*CSEL* 81/3, p. 92), *In 1 Tim.* 2, 5(1) (*CSEL* 81/3, p. 261), *Quaest.* 97, 8 (*CSEL* 50, p. 177), *Quaest.* 97, 19 (*CSEL* 50, p. 184–185).

found in the additions in *beta* at Romans 1:3 and Romans 8:26–27. These correspond roughly to interventions made in *Ea gratia/Non nobis* and the first version of the Tome of Damasus against the error of the Pneumatomachians, but do not yet employ terminology found in Ambrosiaster’s writings after 382, such as *Question 125*. (The discussion of the difference between person and nature at 1 Thessalonians 3:9–10 in *gamma* likewise seems to belong to a period after *Ea gratia/Non nobis* and the Tome of Damasus, insofar as it hints at a reception of Eastern trinitarian terminology not found in these documents.) Finally, a third stage of revision is suggested by the addition of anti–Apollinarian remarks at Romans 1:3 in *gamma*. While there is precedent for this addition in the criticism of Apollinaris’ christology in *Per filium meum* and the second version of the Tome of Damasus, the explicit condemnation of Apollinaris in imperial edicts in the early 380s would have provided a further impetus.¹¹⁹ In short, the comments on Romans in *alpha* appear to belong to a period before 375 and possibly before 371, the changes introduced in *beta* correspond to theological developments in Rome in the second half of the 370s, and the changes introduced in *gamma* appear to belong to the early 380s.

This chronology, imprecise though it is, fits with some of the evidence gathered by Stephen Cooper and David Hunter in their paper in this volume on the date of Ambrosiaster’s revisions to the *Commentaries*. They argue that the reference to Donatists at Romans 2:15–16 in *beta* suggests a *terminus a quo* of 378 for the *beta* version of the *Commentary on Romans*.¹²⁰ This would not conflict with a dating of *beta* on the basis of additional remarks about the Holy Spirit, since these could have been introduced by the

¹¹⁹ *Cod. Th.* 16, 5, 12 (Dec. 3, 383) and 16, 5, 13 (Jan. 21, 384) (*SC* 487, p. 248–253).

¹²⁰ COOPER and HUNTER, “Ambrosiaster *redactor sui*,” p. xx.

late 370s. Cooper and Hunter also argue that the *gamma* version of the *Commentary on Galatians* was completed no earlier than the beginning of the year 384, since Ambrosiaster's language in his comment on Galatians 1:19 echoes Jerome's language in *Against Helvidius*, which he composed in early 384.¹²¹ If we assume, as do Cooper and Hunter, that this comment was introduced in *gamma* and that the revisions made to the *Commentary on Galatians* in *gamma* antedated, if only briefly, the revisions made to the *Commentary on First Thessalonians* in *gamma*, we arrive at a date for the latter that fits with the theological language of the comment on 1 Thessalonians 3:9–10. That language, as we have seen, is harder to explain prior to 382 than after 382.

However, there are complications. As Cooper and Hunter note, the *terminus ad quem* for the *Commentary on First Timothy*—and by inference the *Commentaries* as a whole—is usually taken to be the end of the year 384. In a comment in *alpha* on 1 Timothy 3:15, which is retained in *gamma*, Ambrosiaster refers to Damasus as the current rector of the church in Rome.¹²² Since Damasus died on 11 December 384, the *Commentaries* are assumed to have been completed by that date. But, as Cooper and Hunter also observe, 384 is also the year in which Ambrosiaster is thought to have completed *beta* on Romans. The evidence for this date was assembled over fifty years ago by Vogels, who noted a connection between Jerome's *Letter 27* and several passages in Ambrosiaster's *Commentaries*.¹²³ Writing to Marcella, Jerome ridicules those who criticize his revision of the received Latin version of the New Testament based on Greek codices.¹²⁴ He scornfully

¹²¹ COOPER and HUNTER, "Ambrosiaster *redactor sui*," p. xx.

¹²² AMBROSIASTER, *In 1 Tim.* 3, 15 (CSEL 81/3, p. 270).

¹²³ H.J. VOGELS, "Ambrosiaster und Hieronymus," *RBén*, 66, 1954, p. 14–19.

¹²⁴ The scholarly consensus, following F. CAVALLERA, "Saint Jérôme et la Vulgate des Actes, des Épîtres, et de l'Apocalypse," *BLE*, 21, 1920, p. 269–292, is that Jerome completed the revision only of the gospels; see

refers to three received but inaccurate Latin readings,¹²⁵ all of which are found in Ambrosiaster's *Commentaries*.¹²⁶ In his comments on Romans 5:14 and 12:11 in *beta*, Ambrosiaster defends his use of the received Latin version against proponents of the Greek text.¹²⁷ If one assumes, as Vogels did, that Ambrosiaster introduced the additional remarks at Romans 5:14 and 12:11 in *beta* in response to Jerome's criticisms in *Letter 27*, and if one accepts that Jerome wrote the letter in the latter part of 384 after he had completed his revision of the gospels,¹²⁸ then these remarks and presumably all the revisions in *beta* in the *Commentary on Romans* would have been completed in latter part of 384.

But when, then, are we to place the revisions in *gamma* on Romans? They do not fit easily into the above timeline. If we accept that Ambrosiaster completed *beta* on Romans in the latter half of 384 (as suggested by the comments responding to Jerome's *Letter 27*), it is hard to believe that he would have followed immediately with another extensive revision of the *Commentary on Romans* by the end of that year.¹²⁹ It is more plausible that *gamma* on Romans was prepared later. But if we accept that Ambrosiaster completed

J.N.D. KELLY, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*, London, 1975, p. 88–89; D. BROWN, *Vir trilinguis: A Study in the Biblical Exegesis of Saint Jerome*, Kampen, 1992, p. 100–101; S. LETSCH–BRUNNER, *Marcella—Discipula et Magistra. Auf den Spuren einer römischen Christin des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin, 1998, p. 115, n. 168; A. CAIN, “In Ambrosiaster's Shadow: A Critical Re–Evaluation of the Last Surviving Letter Exchange between Pope Damasus and Jerome,” *REAug*, 51, 2005, p. 271, n. 70.

¹²⁵ JEROME, *Ep. 27*, 3 (CSEL 54², p. 225–226).

¹²⁶ AMBROSIASTER, *In Rom.* 12, 11 (CSEL 81/1, p. 404): *tempori servientes*; *In 1 Tim.* 5, 19 (CSEL 81/3, p. 284): the omission of *nisi sub duobus aut tribus testibus*; and *In 1 Tim.* 1, 15 (CSEL 81/3, p. 255): *humanus sermo*.

¹²⁷ AMBROSIASTER, *In Rom.* 5, 14(4e) (CSEL 81/1, p. 176), *In Rom.* 12, 11 (CSEL 81/1, p. 404).

¹²⁸ Scholars disagree on exactly when in 384 Jerome wrote the letter. F. CAVALLERA, *Saint Jérôme, sa vie et son œuvre*, 1^{er} partie, Louvain and Paris, 1922, t. 2, p. 24–25 places the letter in the spring of 384, whereas LETSCH–BRUNNER, *Marcella*, p. 115, argues, with others (at nn. 163 and 166), for a date late in the year.

¹²⁹ The revisions introduced in *gamma* on Romans are as numerous as the revisions introduced in *beta*. An analysis of the revisions to the first five chapters of Romans yielded the following preliminary results: 681 changes from *alpha* to *beta*; 719 changes from *alpha/beta* to *gamma*. The latter set of changes contain more stylistic changes (word order, vocabulary, grammatical changes) and fewer substantive changes (additions of a word, phrase, sentence, or paragraph) than the former set of changes.

gamma on the remaining letters by the end of 384 (as suggested by the comments which echo Jerome's *Against Helvidius* and by the reference to Damasus as rector of the church in Rome), we would have to conclude that *gamma* on Romans was completed after *gamma* on the remaining letters. However, many of the manuscripts that transmit *gamma* on Romans also transmit *gamma* on the remaining letters.¹³⁰ Although the eventual incorporation of the individual commentaries into a manuscript tradition does not require that they were in fact completed at the same time, we still would have to explain why the reference to Damasus in the comment on 1 Timothy 3:15 was left in the present tense if the final version of the *Commentaries*, including *gamma* on Romans, was completed sometime after 384.

The evidence before us does not enable us to resolve these difficulties. Two scenarios suggest themselves, each speculative. First, although the many small stylistic changes suggest that Ambrosiaster revised his commentaries in a systematic way, it is possible that, after having completed a revision, he introduced marginal notes or further changes as occasion arose. Jerome's criticism of his adherence to the received Latin text of Romans would have been one such occasion; theological pronouncements or ecclesiastical disputes could have presented other such occasions. Thus the comments in support of the received Latin text at Romans 5:14 and 12:11 may have been introduced into *beta* on Romans after it had been largely completed. This would place *beta* on Romans in the late 370s or early 380s and *gamma* on Romans, along with *gamma* on the remaining letters, in 384. Alternatively, Ambrosiaster could have completed *beta* on Romans and *gamma* on the remaining letters by 384, and then revised the *Commentary on Romans* a

¹³⁰ See the lists of codices in *CSEL* 81/1, 81/2, and 81/3; cf. *CSEL* 81/1, p. xxi–xxix, xlii–lvi.

third time at a later date, when he overlooked the inconsistency between the date of that revision and his reference to Damasus' tenure in Rome. Whichever scenario one accepts—and others may be possible—it remains unlikely, I would submit, that Ambrosiaster prepared both *beta* and *gamma* on Romans in the latter half, and perhaps the last months, of 384. Both the extent and the nature of the revisions in these two versions argue against the likelihood of such a scenario.¹³¹

¹³¹ Cf. n. 129 above; H.J. VOGELS, *Das Corpus Paulinum des Ambrosiaster*, Bonn, 1957, p. 14; and COOPER and HUNTER, “Ambrosiaster *redactor sui*,” p. xx.