

# Marius Victorinus' influence on Augustine's Trinitarian theology

Colten Cheuk-Yin YAM

(Assistant Professor, The Chinese University of Hong Kong)

**Author:** Colten Cheuk-Yin Yam is an Assistant Professor at the Divinity School of Chung Chi College, the Chinese University of Hong Kong. He received his Doctor of Theology from the University of Tübingen in 2018. He has published *Trinity and Grace in Augustine: An Analysis of De trinitate 8-10 in Light of De spiritu et littera* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh / Brill, 2019) and several articles on Augustine and Basil of Caesarea. Postal Address: The Divinity School of Chung Chi College, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong. Telephone number: 852- 39435979. Email: coltenyam@cuhk.edu.hk

**Abstract:** In spite of Augustine's indebtedness to Marius Victorinus as a role model for his own conversion (conf. 8, 3), it has been widely held in scholarship, since Pierre Hadot, that Victorinus did not influence Augustine's theological thinking. Although there are more recent attempts to demonstrate the traces of Victorinian influence on Augustine, their focus is primarily on the exegetical works. This article argues that Victorinian influence can indeed also be found in Augustine's Trinitarian theology. It will first critically evaluate the scholarly views (in particular Pierre Hadot and Nello Cipriani) on this topic, and then demonstrate the Victorinian influence by examining the resemblances between these two thinkers in the Trinitarian triads that they use in their Trinitarian theology, namely Victorinus' *esse, uiuere, intellegere* in *Aduersus Arium* and Augustine's Trinitarian triads in *Confessiones* and *De trinitate* 9-10.

**Key Words:** Marius Victorinus; Augustine; Trinity; Pierre Hadot; De trinitate

## 1. Marius Victorinus in the Augustinian scholarship

This article examines Marius Victorinus' influence on Augustine's Trinitarian theology (especially his theological expressions in *De trinitate*).<sup>[1]</sup> I do not intend, however, to argue for an exclusive influence of

---

[1] The first draft of this article has been presented at the Augustinus-Kolloquium held by Volker Henning Drecoll and Johannes Brachtendorf on 21 January 2017 in Tübingen. I have also dealt with the relationship between Victorinus and Augustine in my dissertation Colten Cheuk-Yin Yam, *Trinity and Grace in Augustine: An Analysis of De trinitate 8-10 in Light of De spiritu et littera* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh/ Brill, 2019), especially p. 104-7, 173-86, 278-83, and 311-22. This article is an expansion of my previous arguments and it articulates the topic in a more thorough and systematic way. I am also thankful to David DeMarco who has read the final draft of this article.

For the critical editions of the primary texts used here: Marius Victorinus' *Aduersus Arium* follows *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 83. 1 (CSEL 83. 1, ed. Henry/Hadot); Augustine's *Confessiones* follows *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* 27 (CCSL 27, ed. Verheijen); Augustine's *De trinitate* follows *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* 50 (CCSL 50, ed. Mountain). Hereafter, I will provide book and chapter number of the text and then the page and line number of the critical edition in bracket. For instance, conf. 8, 2 (CCSL 27, 114/3-6 Verheijen) means: *Confessiones* book 8 chapter 2 in the critical edition of Verheijen (CCSL 27) page 114, lines 3-6.

Victorinus on Augustine. Concerning the sources of Augustine's thought, I support the convergence-theory which recognizes Augustine as an original thinker,<sup>[3]</sup> whose thought is characterized by the convergence of various traditions, such as Manichaeism,<sup>[4]</sup> Neoplatonism,<sup>[5]</sup> Stoicism<sup>[6]</sup> and Pelagianism.<sup>[7]</sup> That being said, an investigation of the Victorinian influence on Augustine is a scholarly desideratum because of the unique role that Victorinus plays, not only in transferring the Greek literature to the Latin context,<sup>[8]</sup> but also in Augustine's own conversion. According to Jerome's *De uiris illustribus* 101<sup>[9]</sup> and Augustine's *Confessions* 8, 2-5,<sup>[10]</sup> the two main records we have for the life of Victorinus, he was a renowned rhetorician in Rome (*uir clarissimus and rhetor urbis Romae*)<sup>[11]</sup> and was honoured by a statue dedicated to him in the Forum of Trajan in his lifetime.<sup>[12]</sup> Augustine also tells us in *Confessions* that Victorinus' dedication to Christianity (which leads him to resignation of the official post) deeply influenced him and was a model for his own conversion.<sup>[13]</sup>

[3] This view is proposed by such scholars as Goulven Madec, Erich Feldmann and Volker Henning Drecoll. See Goulven Madec, "Christus," *Augustinus-Lexikon* 1, ed. Cornelius Mayer, 845-908 (Basel; Schwabe, 1986-), especially 859; Erich Feldmann, "Konvergenz von Strukturen? Ciceros Hortensius und Plotins Enneaden im Denken Augustins" in *Congresso Internazionale su S. Agostino nel XVI centenario della conversione Roma*, 15-20 Settembre 1986, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 24, vol. 1 (Roma 1987), 315-33; Volker Henning Drecoll, "Review of Augustine and the Trinity, by Lewis Ayres," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 66 (2013): 88-98.

[4] The classic for this is Eric Feldmann, *Der Einfluß des Hortensius und des Manichäismus auf das Denken des jungen Augustinus von 373*, 2 Bände (S. I.; Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität, 1975). For more recent study on this topic see Volker Henning Drecoll and Mirjam Kudella, *Augustin und der Manichäismus* (Tübingen; Mohr Siebeck, 2011), especially 207-21.

[5] Representing studies include: Olivier Du Roy, *L'intelligence de la foi en la Trinité selon saint Augustin. Genèse de sa théologie trinitaire jusqu'en 391* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1966); Johannes Brachtendorf, *Die Struktur des menschlichen Geistes nach Augustinus: Selbstreflexion und Erkenntnis Gottes in "De Trinitate"* (Hamburg; Meiner, 2000); Laela Zwollo, *St. Augustine and Plotinus: The Human Mind as Image of the Divine* (Leiden; Brill, 2018).

[6] Representing studies include: Gérard Verbeke, "Augustine et le stoïcisme," *Recherches augustiniennes et patristiques des études augustiniennes* 23 (1977), 245-64; Marcia L. Colish, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages. Volume 1, Stoicism in Classical Latin Literature* (Leiden; Brill, 1985).

[7] This is a central theme of my dissertation in which I demonstrate the influence of early Pelagian controversy on Augustine's Trinitarian theology. See Yam, *Trinity and Grace* (see note 1), especially 596-658.

[8] See Augustine, *conf.* 8, 2 (CCSL 27, 114/3-6 Verheijen); *ubi autem commemorauit legisse me quosdam libros Platonicorum, quos Victorinus quondam, rhetor urbis Romae, quem christianum defunctum esse audieram, in latinam linguam transtulisset.*

[9] The whole text of *De uiris illustribus* 101 is: "Victorinus, an African by birth, taught rhetoric at Rome under the emperor Constantius and in extreme old age, yielding himself to faith in Christ wrote books against Arius, written in dialectic style and very obscure language, books which can only be understood by the learned. He also wrote Commentaries on the Epistles." (NPNF 3, translation by Ernest Cushing Richardson).

[10] Stephen Andrew Cooper points out that besides Jerome and Augustine, our sources for the *uita et opera* of Victorinus also include Boethius and Cassiodorus, although he does not indicate which works he means. Stephen Andrew Cooper, "Marius Victorinus," in *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, vol. 1, ed. Lloyd Gerson, 538-551 (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2010), 538.

[11] See Jerome, *De uiris illustribus* 101 (ed. Ceresa-Gastaldo, 206) and Augustine, *conf.* 8, 2 (CCSL 27, 114/5 Verheijen). See also Volker Henning Drecoll, "Marius Victorinus" in: *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*<sup>4</sup>, band 9, ed. Hans Dieter Betz, 122-147 (Tübingen; Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 123.

[12] See Augustine, *conf.* 8, 3 (CCSL 27, 115/13-19 Verheijen); *habet enim magnam laudem gratiae tuae confitentem tibi, quemadmodum ille doctissimus senex et omnium liberalium doctrinarum peritissimus quique philosophorum tam multa legerat et diudicauerat, doctor tot nobilium senatorum, qui etiam ob insigne praeclari magisterii, quod ciues huius mundi eximium putant, statuam Romano foro meruerat et acceperat.* See also Robert Markus, "Marius Victorinus and Augustine" in: *The Cambridge History of Later Greeks and Medieval Philosophy*, ed. in A. H. Armstrong, 327-419 (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1967), 331; Cooper, "Marius Victorinus (see note 9)," 538.

[13] See Augustine, *conf.* 8, 3 (CCSL 27 114/1-115/27 Verheijen). See also Drecoll's exposition of this text in Volker Henning Drecoll, "Die Bedeutung der Gnadenehre Augustins für die Gegenwart" in: *Augustinus-Ethik und Politik, Zwei Würzburger Augustinus-Studententage: "Aspekte der Ethik bei Augustinus"* (11. Juni 2005) and "Augustinus und die Politik" (24. Juni 2006), ed. Cornelius Mayer, 129-147 (Würzburg; Augustinus-Verlag, 2009), 113.

In spite of the common consensus of Augustine's affiliation to Marius Victorinus,<sup>[14]</sup> it is difficult to give a definite account of the extent to which Victorinus influenced him. The case is, I think, similar to the famous one-century-debate on the contents of the libri Platoniorum Augustine refers to in Confessions 7,<sup>[15]</sup> a study which we can never have a definite answer.<sup>[16]</sup> As regards the investigation of the Victorinian influence, there are three limitations that have to be recognized: 1) Many of Victorinus' works, in particular his translations, have been lost;<sup>[17]</sup> 2) No substantial textual parallels between Victorinus and Augustine can be found; 3) Augustine never quotes Victorinus explicitly in his works. All this leads many to doubt whether Augustine read Victorinus at all.

The view that Augustine was not influenced by Victorinus is best represented by Pierre Hadot, an eminent French scholar whose legacy has been influential in both the Victorinian and Augustinian scholarship.<sup>[18]</sup> Hadot's view is that due to 1) the lack of textual parallels and 2) the obvious differences discerned between Victorinus and Augustine, we cannot explain the similarities between them as a direct influence of Victorinus on Augustine.<sup>[19]</sup> Rather, according to Hadot, their resemblances should be explained as an existence of a common source between them.<sup>[20]</sup> He claims this source is the Anonymous Commentary on Parmenides, which he attributes to Porphyry.<sup>[21]</sup> Hadot's position has long been a dominant view on the relationship between Victorinus and Augustine and has thus blocked attempts of understanding a direct Victorinian influence on Augustine.

Recently, however, Hadot's view has been challenged and deconstructed in various ways. The Anonymous Commentary on Parmenides which Hadot attributed to Porphyry has now been regarded

[14] For instance, Adolf von Harnack has highly recognized Victorinus' influence on Augustine, naming him as "Augustinus ante Augustinum." See Adolf von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, vol. III (Tübingen, 1932), 34.

[15] See Augustine, *conf.* 7, 13 (CCSL 27, 101/4-6 Verheijen); *procurasti mihi per quendam hominem immanissimo typho turgidum quosdam Platoniorum libros ex graeca lingua in latinam uersos.*

[16] Scholars can be classified into three groups as regards the contents of these Platonic books (libri Platoniorum): 1) wholly Plotinian; Grandgeorge, Alfarić, Nørregaard, Henry, O'Connell, etc.; 2) wholly Porphyrian; Theiler, O'Meara, etc. and 3) a mixture of both; Courcelle, Solignac, Du Roy, Matthews, etc. I am inclined to the third position. For a good review on this topic see Pier Franco Beatrice, "Quosdam Platoniorum libros. The Platonic Readings of Augustine in Milan," *Vigiliae Christianae* 43 (1989): 248-81 and Robert Crouse, "Paucis mutatis verbis; St Augustine's Platonism" in: *Augustine and His Critics; Essays in honor of Gerald Bonner*, ed. Robert Dodaro and George Lawless (London/New York 2000), 37-50. I have also offered a succinct account of the scholarly positions on this topic in *Yam, Trinity and Grace* (see note 1), 28 note 74.

[17] See Cooper, "Marius Victorinus (see note 9)," 539; Drecoll, "Marius Victorinus (see note 10)," 123.

[18] In the studies of Victorinus, the groundbreaking work is Pierre Hadot's *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 2 vols (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1968). Hadot's further research, namely Pierre Hadot, *Marius Victorinus; Recherches sur sa vie et ses oeuvres* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1971) and Pierre Hadot, *Commentaire; Marius Victorinus, Traité théologique sur la Trinité*, Sources Chrétiennes 69 (Paris: Cerf, 1960) are also scholarly classics.

[19] For a detailed analysis of the thesis, see Hadot's influential work *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 2 vols (see note 17). For a condensed form of his thesis, see Pierre Hadot, "L'image de la Trinité dans l'âme chez Victorinus et chez saint Augustin," *Studia Patristica* 6 (1962): 409-42 (especially 433-42).

[20] See Hadot, "L'Image de la trinité (see note 18)," 433; "Mais, pour la doctrine trinitaire, je penserais plus volontiers à une commune influence du néoplatonisme sur Victorinus et sur Augustin, qu'à une influence directe du premier sur le second."

[21] *Ibid.*, 437. Hadot draws upon Theiler's thesis in arguing that Augustine's Trinitarian triad *mens, notitia, amor* is Porphyrian (*Sententiae* 40).

as more likely pre-Plotinian instead of post-Plotinian,<sup>[22]</sup> meaning that the common elements between Victorinus and Anonymous Commentary on Parmenides can only indicate that he has referenced some materials in middle Platonists such as Cronius and Numenius.<sup>[23]</sup> Moreover, concerning Victorinus, it has now been shown that Porphyry is not likely the one dominant source for him since a) parallel passages between Victorinus' writings (in particular *Aduersus Arium* 1,49-50) and the Nag Hammadi treatise *Zostrianos* (NHC VIII,1) have been found that indicate that the previous so-called Porphyrian elements in Victorinus indeed likely comes from Gnostic materials,<sup>[24]</sup> and b) the philosophical fragments found in Victorinus can hardly belong to one source.<sup>[25]</sup> All this shows that we cannot simply use Porphyry to explain the common elements found in Victorinus and Augustine; the commonality may well be a direct Victorinian influence.

Indeed, there have been more attempts to claim a Victorinian influence on Augustine in recent decades. The representatives on this are Nello Cipriani,<sup>[26]</sup> Eric Plumer<sup>[27]</sup> and Stephen Andrew Cooper.<sup>[28]</sup> Their point is that, despite the lack of literal parallel, a direct Victorinian influence on

---

[22] A pre-Plotinian view is held by Bechtle, Corrigan, and Turner. See Gerald Bechtle, *The Anonymous Commentary on Plato's 'Parmenides'* (Bern/Stuttgart/Wien: Verlag P. Haupt, 1999), 77-91; Kevin Corrigan, "Platonism and Gnosticism. The Anonymous Commentary on the Parmenides: Middle or Neoplatonic?" in: *Gnosticism and Later Platonism: Themes, Figures, and Texts*, ed. John D. Turner and Ruth Majercik (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 141-77; John Turner, *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition*, BCNH 6 (Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval and Louvain-Paris: Éditions Peeters, 2001), 724-36. For a succinct review of the discussions see Tuomas Rasimus, "Porphyry and the Gnostics: Reassessing Pierre Hadot's Thesis in Light of the Second and Third-Century Sethian Treatises" in: *Plato's Parmenides and Its Heritage. Volume 2, Reception in Patristic, Gnostic, and Christian Neoplatonic Texts*, ed. John D. Turner and Kevin Corrigan, 81-110 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 85-6.

[23] See Kevin Corrigan, "Platonism and Gnosticism (see note 21)," 141-77.

[24] The parallels were first detected by Michel Tardieu in *Rescherches sur la formation de l'Apocalypse de Zostrien et les sources de Marius Victorinus*, *Res Orientales IX* (Bures-sur Yvette, 1996), 12-113. Further explorations see Catherine Barry and others, *Zostrien* (nH VIII,1), *Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi [section «Textes»]* 24 (Leuven/Quebec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 2000), 483-662.

[25] See Volker Henning Drecoll, "Is Porphyry the Source Used by Marius Victorinus?" in: *Plato's Parmenides and Its Heritage. Volume 2, Reception in Patristic, Gnostic, and Christian Neoplatonic Texts*, ed. John D. Turner and Kevin Corrigan, 65-80 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 71-75. Delineating Victorinus' argument with substantial textual support (especially *Aduersus Arium* 1B,49-62), Drecoll convincingly shows that the so-called philosophical fragments found in Victorinus' work can hardly belong to one source or author.

[26] See Nello Cipriani's series of articles: Nello Cipriani, "Le fonti cristiane della dottrina trinitaria nei primi dialoghi di S. Agostino," *Augustinianum* 34 (1994): 253-312; Nello Cipriani, "La retractatio agostiniana sulla processione-generazione dello Spirito Santo (Trin. 5, 12, 13)," *Augustinianum* 37 (1997): 431-39; Nello Cipriani, "Agostino lettore dei commentari paolini di Mario Vittorino," *Augustinianum* 38 (1998): 413-28; Nello Cipriani, "La presenza di Mario Vittorino nella riflessione trinitaria di S. Agostino," *Augustinianum* 42 (2002): 261-313. A summary of his arguments can be found in his shorter lexicon-article: Nello Cipriani, "Marius Victorinus" in: *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan D. Fitzgerald and others (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 533-5.

[27] See Eric Plumer, *Augustine's Commentary on Galatians: Introduction, Text, Translations and Notes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 5-33.

[28] See Stephen Andrew Cooper, *Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 182-246.

Augustine can still be proved through conceptual parallels.<sup>[29]</sup> However, the focus has been more on comparison between the commentaries of Victorinus and Augustine, in particular their commentaries on Galatians.<sup>[30]</sup> As for the Trinitarian theology, Cipriani is the only one who has attempted to demonstrate a Victorinian influence on Augustine's Trinitarian theology, though the influence is articulated in a rather indirect and peripheral way.<sup>[31]</sup>

Indeed Victorinian influence on Augustine's Trinitarian theology can be detected not only in some peripheral places, but also at the core of the Trinitarian discourses of these two theologians.<sup>[32]</sup> This article aims to shed light on this by, first, reviewing the theses of Hadot and Cipriani, and, second, investigating the resemblances demonstrated in the Trinitarian triads, namely Victorinus' *esse, uiuere, intellegere* in *Aduersus Arium* and Augustine's Trinitarian triads in *Confessiones* and *De trinitate* 9-10.

## 2. The theses of Hadot and Cipriani and their limitations

I shall begin the discussion by engaging with the French scholar Pierre Hadot and the Italian scholar Nello Cipriani, two most prominent scholars on this topic whose views have frequently been cited but not critically discussed. In critically reviewing their theses, I seek to summarize what have been discussed and, more importantly, show what needs to be further discussed in order to advance scholarship in both Victorinian and Augustinian studies.

In 1962, Hadot published an impressive article "L'Image de la trinité dans l'âme chez Victorinus et chez Saint Augustin,"<sup>[33]</sup> which argues against a direct Victorinian influence on Augustine. Hadot's view in this article has widely been adopted and his analysis there remains the best in the

---

[29] Stimulating is Plumer's use of the so-called Newman's "antecedent probability" in doing the comparison between Victorinus and Augustine on their commentaries on Galatians. By "antecedent probability" Plumer argues that apart from direct evidence, the question also hangs on the likelihood that Augustine would have consulted Victorinus' commentary. Plumer, *Augustine's Commentary on Galatians* (see note 26), 8: "As applied in this case, the method involves beginning with the question: Apart from any direct evidence that might be gleaned from a comparison of their commentaries on Galatians, what is the likelihood that Augustine would have consulted Victorinus' commentary? To estimate this likelihood we need to draw upon all we know about Augustine and Victorinus, and especially upon what Augustine himself tells us about Victorinus in the Confessions. If this likelihood can be estimated, even roughly, then it will provide an interpretative framework in which to view whatever direct evidence can subsequently be adduced from the commentaries themselves."

[30] For Plumer and Cooper see notes 26 and 27; for Cipriani, see his "Agostino lettore dei commentari paolini (see note 25)," 413-28.

[31] Namely (see note 25): Cipriani, "Le fonti cristiane," 253-312; Cipriani, "La retractatio agostiniana," 431-39; Cipriani, "La presenza di Mario Vittorino," 261-313.

[32] The Trinitarian writings of Victorinus consist of nine treatises (composed between 357 and 363) and three hymns. The first four treatises are framed as an epistolary exchange between Victorinus and an Arian named Candidus. After the modern edition, the treatises now appear to us as *The First Letter of Candidus*, *The Letter to Candidus*, *The Second Letter of Candidus*, *Against Arius IA*, *IB*, *II*, *III* and *IV*. For a succinct account on this see Drecoll, "Marius Victorinus (see note 10)," 130-32.

[33] Pierre Hadot, "L'Image de la Trinité dans l'âme chez Victorinus et chez saint Augustin," *Studia Patristica* 6 (1962): 409-42.

literature.<sup>[34]</sup> Although this article has frequently been cited, its content has not received due attention.<sup>[35]</sup> In short, Hadot argues that Victorinus and Augustine can be compared because both propose a Trinitarian structure of the soul<sup>[36]</sup>—the *esse, uiuere, intellegere* (Victorinus) and *mens, notitia, amor* (Augustine). From this central point he explores to what extent we can see the similarities and differences between the two systems. Hadot's arguments can be summarized into the following four points:

1) *Imago dei*. Hadot points out that Victorinus and Augustine understand this concept in different ways. While Victorinus regards the Son as the *imago dei* (image of God) and the human person as only *imago imaginis* (image of the image) because he is the image of the Son, Augustine regards the human person directly as the *imago dei*. The difference between Victorinus and Augustine on the doctrine of image has recently received further attention by Gerald Boersma, who argues that Augustine's doctrine of image is an advancement upon that of Victorinus.<sup>[37]</sup> According to him, Augustine is able to conceive of human person as the image of the whole Trinity while Victorinus cannot.<sup>[38]</sup> Indeed, Hadot has interpreted this point differently and I think Hadot is right. Victorinus' *imago imaginis* also refers, so claims Hadot, to the image of the Trinity at the same time because the *Logos* (i. e., the *imaginis* in *imago imaginis*) and the Father are of the same substance in Victorinus.<sup>[39]</sup> As such, the difference between Victorinus and Augustine on *imago* is not that

---

[34] After Hadot, Mary T. Clark has also written an article on this topic. See Mary T. Clark, "Victorinus and Augustine: Some Differences," *Augustinian Studies* 17 (1986): 147-60. If we read the two articles together, it is not difficult to see that many points mentioned by Clark have already been dealt with (some even in more detail) by Hadot, although the point of Augustine's critique of Victorinus on the feminine aspect of the Holy Spirit is unique in Clark's article. Moreover, the style of presentation is also similar in both articles. Kany even criticizes Clark on her way of handling the secondary literature. Roland Kany, *Augustins Trinitätsdenken; Bilanz, Kritik und Weiterführung der modernen Forschung zu „De trinitate“* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 106 note 531.

[35] Here I will give the examples of Kany, Cooper and Cipriani. 1) Kany summarizes this article only in one sentence: "In einem sehr dichten Aufsatz zeigte Hadot, daß Augustinus zwar ebenso wie Marius Victorinus ein Bild der Trinität in der Seele gesucht habe, daß bei beiden Autoren die Triade »Sein - Leben - Denken« eine Rolle spiele und auch sonst mit einer Reihe gleicher Begriffe operiert werde, daß aber dennoch völlig unterschiedliche Konzeptionen vorlägen." Kany, *Augustins Trinitätsdenken* (see note 33), 105. Kany only describes Hadot's article as a "thick essay" but has not paid attention to his arguments. I am also not able to agree with Kany's judgement in *Augustins Trinitätsdenken* (see note 33), 106 that Clark's discussion is less speculative, and is thus better, than Hadot's. 2) In his detailed account of Victorinus' influence on Augustine concerning their commentary on Galatians, Cooper also mentions Hadot's article superficially, without really entering into the central discussion of Hadot. See Cooper, *Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians* (see note 27), 183: "Hadot pointed out another coincidental conceptual parallel; prior to Augustine, Victorinus taught that the soul had a Trinitarian structure; he has maintained that Victorinus' influence upon Augustine was more likely to have been through the Paul commentaries than the Trinitarian treatises, and to pertain to the subject of grace rather than the Trinity." 3) Cipriani takes Hadot's article as point of departure in doing his analysis on the Victorinus' influence on Augustine's commentary on Galatians, yet without going into any detail of Hadot's argument. See Cipriani, "Agostino lettore dei commentari paolini di Mario Vittorino (see note 25)," 413: "Sembra comunque prevalente il parere di un autorevole studioso come P. Hadot, il quale in uno studio comparativo sulla dottrina trinitaria dei due autori, dopo aver espresso l'opinione che dalla lettura del *De trinitate* è praticamente impossibile affermare se Agostino ha conosciuto o no l'opera di Vittorino, continuava: "Je serais moins réservé pour les ... Augustin."

[36] Hadot, "L'image de la Trinité (see note 18)," 409: "un type de structure ternaire et de multiplicité consubstantielle."

[37] Gerald Boersma, *Augustine's Early Theology of Image* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 72-86.

[38] *Ibid.*, 51-86. For a summary of Boersma's thesis and arguments as well as some critical notes on this work in general, see my review on this book: Colten Cheuk-Yin Yam, "Review of Augustine's Early Theology of Image, by Gerard Boersma," *Augustiniana* 66 (2016), 253-7.

[39] Hadot, "L'image de la Trinité (see note 18)," 413: "L'âme est donc l'image propre du Logos, c'est-à-dire du Fils, et elle n'est image de la Trinité que parce que le Logos, grâce à l'unité de la substance, a en lui-même la Trinité; comme chacun des Trois, il est les Trois."

Augustine can refer to the Trinity but Victorinus cannot. The crucial difference lies on their different understanding of the nature of imago; for Victorinus imago means substance but for Augustine it means relation. <sup>[40]</sup>

2) *Esse, uiuere, intellegere*. Hadot notes that Augustine has used *esse, uiuere, intellegere* but has not considered it as representing the Persons of the Trinity as in Victorinus' use. The reason is, Hadot suggests, because Augustine's Trinitarian doctrine emphasizes the dimension of relation while Victorinus draws on the principle of predominance ("le principe de prédominance"). <sup>[41]</sup> In other words, Augustine does not use *esse, uiuere, intellegere* because this triad does not sufficiently display the distinction between each element in respect of relation. Hadot also points out that the fact that *esse, uiuere* and *intellegere* are intransitive verbs makes it difficult for them to convey a sense of a mutual relationship. <sup>[42]</sup>

3) *Mens*. Hadot notes the subtle difference between Victorinus and Augustine in regards to where the imago is situated. For Victorinus, the imago is the soul. The essence of the imago is its being and its activities (movement), and hence the triad *esse, uiuere, intellegere*. For Augustine, however, the imago is not equal to the soul but only to a part of the soul, namely the *mens*, which Hadot considers to be synonymous to "l'esprit." According to Hadot, the difference revealed here is that the three powers of the imago in Victorinus are the existence, the life, and the thinking, while in Augustine these three powers are restricted to the thinking since *mens* is  $\nu\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\zeta$ , i. e., the intellectual power. <sup>[43]</sup>

4) The notion of generation. According to Hadot, the notion of generation differs between the two theologians in that Marius Victorinus takes it as "une autoposition, une autodéfinition," whereas Augustine regards it as "une pure relation." <sup>[44]</sup>

Let us now turn to Cipriani, the representing voice in supporting a direct Victorinian influence on Augustine concerning the Trinitarian theology. Apart from arguing that Augustine's use of certain Trinitarian terms (i. e., *tripotens* and *principium sine principio*) reveals traces of his reading of theological treatises from Marius Victorinus, <sup>[45]</sup> Cipriani's main arguments revolve around two themes: a) *imago dei* and b) the generation of the Holy Spirit, both of which, according to Cipriani, demonstrate a kind of reaction to Victorinian theology. I generally agree with Cipriani's observation, yet I think his evidence is not as strong as he claims.

For the account of *imago dei*, Augustine discusses the distinction between *imago dei* and *ad*

[40] Ibid., 427.

[41] Ibid., 427, especially: "A ce principe de distinction hypostatique, Augustin substitue un autre principe de distinction; non plus le prédominance, mais la relation."

[42] Ibid., 427: "C'est surtout, je crois, l'intransitivité des verbes être et vivre qui a dû conduire Augustin à éviter d'utiliser la triade être, vivre, penser, pour rendre compte des relations trinitaires."

[43] Ibid., 425 and 428. "Chez Victorinus, le lieu propre de l'image, c'est l'âme, en son être, en sa substance la plus profonde, et le lieu propre de la ressemblance, c'est l'activité de l'âme, son mouvement ou son Logos. Chez Augustin, le lieu propre de l'image, c'est cette partie de l'âme qu'il appelle *mens*, qu'il serait commode de pouvoir appeler  $\nu\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\zeta$ , qu'il est en tout cas indispensable de nommer l'esprit ou la puissance intellectuelle. Il en résulte que l'image se trouve dans une partie de l'âme, que l'âme elle-même n'est pas véritablement image." (p. 425)

[44] Ibid., 429.

[45] See Cipriani, "Le Fonti Cristiane (see note 25)," 264-5.

imaginem dei in trin. 7, a view that he says is held by previous church fathers.<sup>[46]</sup> Here Cipriani reasonably suggests that Augustine has Victorinus in mind since the latter is an obvious example of one who held a difference between *imago dei* and *ad imaginem dei* before time of Augustine. For Victorinus, *imago* signifies the same substance rather than something inferior. The human being, therefore, cannot be *imago dei*, a term Victorinus regards as sharing the same substance with God. Rather, drawing on the phrase *secundum imaginem* of Gen. 1:26, Victorinus claims that the human person is created not as image of God but according to the image—which is the Son, the only image of God. In other words, the human person is not *imago dei* but *imago imaginis* (image of the image) because he is created *ad imaginem*.<sup>[47]</sup> Augustine explicitly refutes the distinction between *imago dei* and *ad imaginem dei* in trin. 7,<sup>[48]</sup> and I agree with Cipriani that here Augustine probably has Victorinus in mind. Yet Cipriani goes too far to treat this point as a determinate Victorinian influence. We have to note that 1) Augustine refers to “several authors” (*nonnulli*) instead of one,<sup>[49]</sup> and 2) Victorinus uses *secundum imaginem*<sup>[50]</sup> while Augustine uses *ad imaginem*<sup>[51]</sup> in expressing “according to the image of God,” which shows that at least here cannot be a direct quotation of Marius Victorinus.<sup>[52]</sup>

For the account of the generation of the Holy Spirit, Cipriani has also rightly observed that Augustine makes an explicit distinction between “beget” (*generare*) and “proceed” (*procedere*) in comparison with the blurry distinction in Victorinus, which is another piece of evidence demonstrating Augustine's reaction to Victorinus' Trinitarian theology.<sup>[53]</sup> I am again sympathetic to

[46] See Augustine, trin. 7, 12 (CCSL 50, 266/152-267/154 Mountain): *sunt enim qui ita distinguunt ut imaginem uelint esse filium, hominem uero non imaginem sed ad imaginem.*

[47] Victorinus, adu. Ar. I 20 (CSEL 83. 1, 85/5-6 Henry/Hadot): *Solus enim Iesus imago dei, homo autem secundum imaginem, hoc est imago imaginis.*

[48] See Augustine, trin. 7, 12 (CCSL 50, 267/154-159 Mountain): *refellit autem eos apostolus dicens: uir quidem non debet uelare caput cum sit imago et gloria dei, non dixit ad imaginem sed imago, quae tamen imago cum alibi dicitur ad imaginem non quasi ad filium dicitur quae imago aequalis est patri; alioquin non diceret ad imaginem nostram.* That is to say, Augustine refutes this view with Apostle Paul's statement in 1 Cor. 11:7 (*refellit autem eos apostolus*). For a fuller discussion of Augustine's arguments on this point see Yam, *Trinity and Grace* (see note 1), 104-6.

[49] See Augustine, trin. 12, 7 (CCSL 50, 361/16-19 Mountain): *sunt enim tales usitatae in illis litteris locutiones quas nonnulli, etiamsi catholicam fidem asserunt, non tamen diligenter aduertunt ut putent ita dictum, fecit deus ad imaginem dei, quasi diceretur, fecit pater ad imaginem filii.* Concerning this *nonnulli*, I am aware that sometimes Augustine uses the plural even when referring to a single author, as has been pointed out by Berthold Altaner, “Augustinus Methode der Quellenbenützung; Sein Studium der Väterliteratur,” in: *id., Kleine patristische Schriften* (ed. Günter Glockmann; Texte und Untersuchungen 83; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967), (164-73) 165-67. However, this case here is fairly certain since apart from Marius Victorinus we can find the distinction between *imago dei* and *ad imaginem dei* in Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose, both of whose thought Augustine was familiar.

[50] See Victorinus, adu. Ar. I, 20: *Dicit Moyses dictum dei: faciamus hominem secundum imaginem nostram et secundum similitudinem. Deus dicit ista. Faciamus cooperatori dicit, necessario Christo. Et secundum imaginem dicit, Ergo homo non imago dei, sed secundum imaginem. Solus enim Iesus imago dei, homo autem secundum imaginem, hoc est imago imaginis. Sed dicit: secundum imaginem nostram. Ergo et pater et filius imago una. Si imago patris filius est et ipsa imago pater, imagine ergo ὁ μὴ ὁμοῦ ὁμοῦ. Ipsa enim imago substantia est*

[51] Augustine uses *ad imaginem* consistently. For example, Augustine, trin. 12, 7 (CCSL 50, 361/16-19 Mountain): *sunt enim tales usitatae in illis litteris locutiones quas nonnulli, etiamsi catholicam fidem asserunt, non tamen diligenter aduertunt ut putent ita dictum, Fecit deus ad imaginem dei, quasi diceretur, 'Fecit pater ad imaginem filii,'*; Augustine, trin. 7, 12 (CCSL 50, 267/156-158 Mountain): *Non dixit ad imaginem sed imago. Quae tamen imago cum alibi dicitur ad imaginem non quasi ad filium dicitur quae imago aequalis est patri; alioquin non diceret ad imaginem nostram.*

[52] For a fuller discussion see Yam, *Trinity and Grace* (see note 1), 182-3.

[53] See Cipriani, “La presenza di Mario Vittorino (see note 25),” 274.



Cipriani's argument, but I have to point out that Augustine's concern in distinguishing between the Son and the Holy Spirit is not necessarily anti-Victorinian since 1) he is, in fact, following tradition in using *procedere*,<sup>[54]</sup> and 2) he mentions, again, *multos* (instead of one) are involved in this issue,<sup>[55]</sup> showing that even if Victorinus is probably in Augustine's mind in treating this issue, he is not the exclusive triggering factor. In short, I would say that Cipriani's thesis opens up a wider horizon for exploring the Victorinian influence on Augustine's Trinitarian theology. Yet his arguments are indirect since he can only argue for the existence of Augustine's counter-reaction against Victorinus but not explicit similarities between these two theologians.

### 3. A more direct Victorinian influence on Augustine

Indeed, the comparison between the Trinitarian theology of Victorinus and Augustine can go beyond the frameworks set up by Hadot and Cipriani. I will show that the differences proposed by Hadot are not insurmountable and that we can, in fact, see similarities beneath the surface. This also means that I will go beyond Cipriani to argue for more explicit similarities between these two thinkers. In the following, I will elaborate my arguments in three respects, namely: a) Augustine's *notitia* and Victorinus' conception of the Son, b) the oneness dimension in their Trinitarian theology, and c) the relation of Victorinus' *esse, uiuere, intellegere* to Augustine's own Trinitarian triads.

#### 3.1 Augustine's *notitia* and Marius Victorinus' conception of the Son

In comparing the Trinitarian triads of Marius Victorinus and Augustine, an obvious point of contact is the element of knowledge—the *intellegere* of Victorinus' triad *esse, uiuere, intellegere*<sup>[56]</sup> and the *notitia* of Augustine's triad *mens, notitia, amor*. Note the different position of knowledge in the triads. Victorinus regards *intellegere* as representing the Holy Spirit, which is an inward movement of the existent towards itself, whereas he regards *uiuere* as representing Christ, which is an outward movement of the existent. Different from Victorinus, Augustine regards *notitia* as Christ, which is the Son and the eternal light of truth. Indeed, the difference between them is not as big as it seems to be. However, the parallel to the *notitia* in Augustine is not simply *intellegere* in Marius Victorinus, but rather his conception of the Son as a movement, which covers both Christ and the Holy Spirit. Their resemblance is especially manifest in Augustine's *trin.* 6, 11; 9, 4; 9, 12-15 and 9, 18. Let us look at them in detail.

1) In *trin.* 6, 11, Augustine quotes Hilary of Poitiers' words: "aeternitas in patre, species in imagine, usus in munere" and then makes a further elaboration. His elaboration is quite Victorinian. He first says that a perfect image is equal to the original (*ipsa coaequatur ei non illud imagini*

[54] The language of *procedere* is also present, for instance, in Hilary of Poitiers, *De trinitate* 2, 29, Ambrose, *De spiritu sancto* 1, 11 and in the Nicene Creed.

[55] See Augustine, *trin.* 15, 5 (CCSL 50, 222/7 Mountain): *quod solet multos mouere*. As mentioned above, the *multos* may well include Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose.

[56] Two texts are particularly illuminating to Victorinus' *esse, uiuere, intellegere*, namely: *adu. Ar.* IV 16 (CSEL 83, 1, 248/12-15 Henry/Hadot) and *adu. Ar.* IV 25-26 (CSEL 83, 1, 265/44-47 Henry/Hadot). For a detailed analysis of these two texts see Yam, *Trinity and Grace* (see note 1), 278-80.

suae),<sup>[57]</sup> then says that this image possesses the primal and supreme life (*est prima et summa uita*).<sup>[58]</sup> This description of image is similar to Marius Victorinus who also says that *imago* is equal to the original and that this *imago* is a life.<sup>[59]</sup>

2) *Intrin.* 9,4, Augustine describes knowledge as a kind of life in the reason of the knower (*illa enim uita quaedam est in ratione cognoscentis*).<sup>[60]</sup> This is similar to Marius Victorinus' statement that *uiuere* is the movement of *esse*. In both cases, the life is of equal substance to the subject, the knower and the being. Moreover, Augustine also uses the language of perfection to describe the life of *notitia*,<sup>[61]</sup> which again is similar to Marius Victorinus.

3) *Intrin.* 9,12-15, Augustine brings forth the concept of *uerbum* in elaborating *notitia*. There he consistently describes *uerbum* on two levels, the conception of a word (*conceptus*) and the birth of a word (*natus/partus*). The former refers to the state in which the word is not yet formed or cannot yet be expressed, whereas the latter refers to the state in which the word can be perceived. Augustine also points out that these two states are different in corporeal things<sup>[62]</sup> but the same in spiritual things<sup>[63]</sup>. These two levels of *uerbum* are very similar to Victorinus' paradigm of act and potency in speaking about God.<sup>[64]</sup> In Victorinus' Trinitarian theology, he describes the relationship between the Persons of the Trinity with two aspects. On the one hand, the Father is *esse*, the Son *uiuere*, and the Holy Spirit *intellegere*. In this aspect, the Father is depicted as the being in repose (*esse*), while Christ and the Holy Spirit are the movement of the *esse* (the same movement, different only in direction). On the other hand, however, Marius Victorinus also emphasizes that the triad *esse*, *uiuere*, *intellegere* exists in each Person of the Trinity. The difference between the Father and the Son (Christ and the Holy Spirit) is not revealed in the differing characteristics of the individual *esse*, *uiuere*, *intellegere*, but in the form of potency (*esse*) and act (*agere*). In other words, the Father is God in potency and the Son is God in act or manifestation. The Father is the *actus*; the *esse*, *uiuere*, *intellegere*, while the Son (Christ and the Holy Spirit) is the *forma*; the *existentia*, *uita*, *intellegentia*.<sup>[65]</sup>

[57] Augustine, *trin.* 6,11 (CCSL 50,241/10-12 Mountain).

[58] Augustine, *trin.* 6,11 (CCSL 50,241/16-17 Mountain).

[59] Victorinus, *adu. Ar.* I 20 (CSEL 83,1 85/7-86/9 Henry/Hadot): *Ergo et pater et filius imago una. Si imago patris filius est et ipsa imago pater, imagine εἰκόμοῦ ἑστίαι.*

[60] Augustine, *trin.* 9,4 (CCSL 50,297/17-18 Mountain).

[61] See Augustine, *trin.* 9,4 (CCSL 50,297/13-17 Mountain): *item notitia si minor est quam est illud quod noscitur et plene nosci potest, perfecta non est, si autem maior est, iam superior est natura quae nouit quam illa quae nota est, sicut maior est notitia corporis quam ipsum corpus quod ea notitia notum est.*

[62] See Augustine, *trin.* 9,14 (CCSL 50,305/5-7 Mountain): *In amore autem carnalium temporaliumque rerum sicut in ipsis animalium fetibus alius est conceptus uerbi, alius partus.*

[63] See Augustine, *trin.* 9,14 (CCSL 50,305/1-3 Mountain): *conceptum autem uerbum et natum idipsum est cum uoluntas in ipsa notitia conquiescit, quod fit in amore spiritualium.*

[64] On Victorinus' use of act and potency see Boersma, *Augustine's Early Theology of Image* (see note 36), 58-60.

[65] See Victorinus, *adu. Ar.* IV 25-26 (CSEL 83, 1,265/44-7 Henry/Hadot): *Etenim deus uiuit. Id autem est esse et intellegere, quae ista unum tria faciunt potentias tres, existentiam, uitam, intellegentiam, sed quia illa tria unum - quomodo sunt, docui: ut unum quodlibet tria sit, sic et ista tria unum sunt, sed in deo haec tria esse sunt, in filio uiuere, in spiritu sancto intellegere - ergo esse, uiuere, intellegere in deo esse sunt, existentia autem, uita, intellegentia forma sunt, actu enim interiore et occulto eius quod est esse, uiuere, intellegere. See also Hadot's illustration in his *Marius Victorinus, Traités Théologiques sur la Trinité II*; *Commentaire* (see note 17), 925-6 and 975-7.*

4) In trin. 9, 18, Augustine attempts to show that *notitia* is different from *amor* since the former can be perceived in the process of *conceptus - partus* while the latter cannot. He further makes use of this difference between *notitia* and *amor* to explain why only the Son (but not also the Holy Spirit) is described as “begotten (*genitus*).” Here we can see similarities and differences between Augustine and Marius Victorinus. In portraying how *notitia* and *amor* can be distinguished, Augustine introduces the role of will (*uoluntas/inquisitio*) in bringing forth knowledge. According to him, knowledge is the result of the movement of will in seeking, and knowledge is said to be born when the will rest in its goal.<sup>[66]</sup> In a similar fashion, will is also an important element for Marius Victorinus concerning the begetting of the Son. He says that the begetting of the Son from the Father is not by necessity of nature but by the will of the Father (*non a necessitate naturae, sed uoluntate magnitudinis patris*).<sup>[67]</sup> In other words, the concept of generation is always a willed generation. He even says that every will is a birth (*omnis enim uoluntas progenies est*)<sup>[68]</sup> and that the will of the Father is the Logos, the Son Himself (*Pater ergo, cuius est uoluntas; filius autem uoluntas est et uoluntas ipse est λ ὁ γ ο ς*).<sup>[69]</sup> Of course, there are differences between Victorinus and Augustine. Marius Victorinus regards will as the Son Himself. For Augustine, however, will is not the Son but an element closely related to love; will is therefore linked with the Holy Spirit. As the previous scholarship (Cipriani<sup>[70]</sup>, Clark<sup>[71]</sup>, etc.) has shown, Augustine is not satisfied with the Victorinian model since it mixes up the Son and the Holy Spirit. In light of this, it is understandable why Augustine draws on the will to elaborate the Son as a movement, on the one hand, while, on the other hand, distinguishing himself from Victorinus by identifying the will with the Holy Spirit instead of with the Son.

### 3.2 Oneness in their Trinitarian thought

In *adu. Ar.* 1B 48, Victorinus uses five terms to explain the Trinity, namely: *spiritus, λογος, νοῦς, sapientia, substantia*.<sup>[72]</sup> He continues the discussion of these five terms, though not systematically, up to *adu. Ar.* 1B 60.<sup>[73]</sup> At first sight, *adu. Ar.* 1B 48-53 is not concerned with these five terms at all, since Victorinus does not mention them in a clear manner. Yet we can still find them

[66] See Augustine, *trin.* 9, 14 (CCSL 50, 305/1-3 Mountain); *cum uoluntas in ipsa notitia conuiescit*; *trin.* 9, 18 (CCSL 50, 309/52-310/53, Mountain); *quod saepe praecedit inquisitio eo fine quietura*.

[67] Victorinus, *adu. Ar.* 1A 31 (CSEL 83. 1, 110/18-19 Henry/Hadot).

[68] Victorinus, *adu. Ar.* 1A 31 (CSEL 83. 1, 110/23-24 Henry/Hadot).

[69] Victorinus, *adu. Ar.* 1A 31 (CSEL 83. 1, 111/30-31 Henry/Hadot).

[70] Cipriani, “La retractatio agostiniana (see note 25),” 431-9.

[71] Clark, “Victorinus and Augustine (see note 33),” 147-60.

[72] Victorinus, *adu. Ar.* 1B 48 (CSEL 83. 1, 142/4-10 Henry/Hadot); *Spiritus, λ ὁ γ ο ς, νοῦς, sapientia, substantia, utrum idem omnia an altera a se inuicem? Et si idem, communique quadam an universitate? Si communique quadam, quid primum, quid ex alio et qua communique? Si universitate, et ista et quae differentia et quae communitio? Si a se inuicem altera, omnimodo altera, an alia ut subiectum, alia ut accidens, an iuxta alium alterum modum?*

[73] For example, Victorinus, *adu. Ar.* 1B 55 (CSEL 83. 1, 152/3-12 Henry/Hadot); *spiritus substantiae nomen est vel existentiae, quod quidem esse significat et in eo quod quid est et appellatur et intellegitur. Si uoles nosse quid est deus, spiritus eius quod sit esse significat. Ergo deus et spiritus quod est esse significat. Rursus quid est uita? Quod spiritus, Spiritus erto et uita quod est esse significat. Sic et spiritus sanctus quod est esse secundum istud ipsum nomen significat cum differentia duorum primorum uno nomine significat cum differentia duorum primorum uno nomine nominatorum. Quae differentia, substantialis cum sit, quod est esse significat. . . .*

scattered in the argument; adu. Ar. 1B 49 on λόγος<sup>[74]</sup>, adu. Ar. 1B 50 on spiritus<sup>[75]</sup>, adu. Ar. 1B 51 on λόγος, sapientia and spiritus,<sup>[76]</sup> adu. Ar. 1B 52 on λόγος and νοῦς.<sup>[77]</sup>

The central point of these passages is to investigate whether these five terms are identical to or different from one another.<sup>[78]</sup> The discussion is interesting because although Victorinus seems to claim that these five terms are different from each other, his argument leads him to consider them to be nearly synonyms.<sup>[79]</sup> Two features of Victorinus' Trinitarian doctrine are apparent in the discussion of these five terms. First, the Victorinian model tends to emphasize the oneness over the threeness of the Trinity. One may even argue that this model is unable to properly speak of the threeness of the Trinity. This can be seen in the fact that Victorinus does not distinguish between Christ and the Holy Spirit with a clear boundary. For him, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ and is, accordingly, Christ Himself. The second feature is that the Victorinian model is Christ-centred. Although he has mentioned here and elsewhere that sapientia and νοῦς should be identified with the Holy Spirit, he refers back to Christ in the conclusion. For instance, he says that the Son is “both word and voice, he is life, he is Logos, he is movement, he is Nous, he is wisdom, he is existence and first substance” (adu. Ar. IB 56).<sup>[80]</sup> He also makes it clear that the Logos himself and the Holy Spirit and Nous and Wisdom are all the same thing (adu. Ar. IB 59).<sup>[81]</sup>

There are certain similarities in Augustine as far as expressing the oneness of the Trinity is concerned. All these five terms of Victorinus also appear in *De trinitate* and they all tend to refer to the oneness of the Trinity. In *trin.* 9, 5-6, Augustine explains in detail how *notitia* and *amor* is *substantia* by itself,<sup>[82]</sup> thus designating *substantia* with the meaning of oneness in the Trinity. This is also the case for *mens* (= νοῦς) and *spiritus* in *trin.* 9, 6 in which he explains the difference

[74] Victorinus, adu. Ar. 1B 49 (CSEL 83. 1, 143/29-31 Henry/Hadot): De deo et λόγῳ, hoc est de patre et filio, dei permissu, sufficienter dictum, quoniam unum quae duo. Dictum et de λόγῳ, hoc est de filio et de sancto spiritu, quod in uno duo.

[75] Victorinus, adu. Ar. 1B 50 (CSEL 83. 1, 145/1-11 Henry/Hadot): perfectus super perfectos, tripotens in unalitate spiritus, perfectus et supra spiritum; non enim spirat, sed tantum spiritus est in eo quod est ei esse, spiritus spirans in semet ipsum ut sit spiritus, quoniam est spiritus inseparabilis a semet ipso, ipse sibi et locus et habitator, in semet ipso manens, solus in solo, ubique existens et nusquam, simplicitate unus qui sit, tres potentias conueniens, existentiam omnem, uitam omnem et beatitudinem ...

[76] Victorinus, adu. Ar. 1B 51 (CSEL 83. 1, 146/1-6 Henry/Hadot): Sed unum istud quod esse dicimus unum unum, uita est, quae sit motio infinita, effectrix aliorum, uel eorum quae uere sunt, existens λόγος ad id quod est esse quae sunt omnia, a se semet mouens, semper in motu, in semet ipsa habens motum, magis autem ipsa motus est. Victorinus, adu. Ar. 1B 51 (CSEL 83. 1, 147/22-24 Henry/Hadot): Sed quoniam, sicut demonstratum, ista motio, una cum sit, et uita est et sapientia, uita conuersa in sapientiam et magis in existentiam patricam. Victorinus, adu. Ar. 1B 51 (CSEL 83. 1, 147/27-28 Henry/Hadot): Descensio enim uita, ascensio sapientia. Spiritus autem et ista, spiritus igitur utraque, in uno duo.

[77] Victorinus, adu. Ar. 1B 52 (CSEL 83. 1, 148/14-15 Henry/Hadot): hoc autem per ministrantem λόγον, hoc est per uitam, quae omnibus praestat uiuere. Victorinus, adu. Ar. 1B 52 (CSEL 83. 1, 149/41-46 Henry/Hadot): ab eo qui νοῦς est, potentiam fontanam et uiuersalem accipiens, iuxta motionem et intus et foris est - motio enim νοῦς est - sic et uita, iuxta quod motio est, filius est factus, manifesta motio a motione patrica, quae in occulto est, quae secundum primam potentiam existentia est.

[78] Victorinus, adu. Ar. IB 48 (CSEL 83. 1, 142/4-10 Henry/Hadot). Text see above.

[79] See Victorinus, adu. Ar. 59-60.

[80] Victorinus, adu. Ar. IB 56 (CSEL 83. 1, 154/15-17 Henry/Hadot): Verbum igitur et uox filius est, ipse uita, ipse λόγος, ipse motus, ipse νοῦς, ipse sapientia, ipse existentia et substantia prima ...

[81] Victorinus, adu. Ar. IB 59 (CSEL 83. 1, 159/13-14 Henry/Hadot): Ex his apparet quod λόγος ipse et spiritus sanctus et νοῦς et sapientia id ipsum.

[82] See Augustine, *trin.* 9, 5 (CCSL 50, 298/37 Mountain); sed substantialiter etiam ista sunt sicut ipsa mens ... *trin.* 9, 6 (CCSL 50, 298/45-46 Mountain); substantia sit scientia, substantia sit amor ...

between absolute terms and relative terms in expressing the Trinity. Here, Augustine contrasts *mens* and *spiritus* with the relative terms of the lover - love and the knower - knowledge, saying explicitly that *mens* and *spiritus* are not relative terms.<sup>[83]</sup> In other words, he regards *mens* and *spiritus* as absolute terms which denote the oneness of the Trinity. As for the term *sapientia*, he uses this term in a highly Christological sense on the one hand,<sup>[84]</sup> and uses it to denote the oneness of the Trinity, on the other. This dimension of oneness is manifest in *trin.* 15, 6-9, where Augustine reduces the twelve terms<sup>[85]</sup> that he used to describe God the Trinity to three terms<sup>[86]</sup> and then finally to one term: *sapientia*. As such, Augustine's emphasis of the dimension of oneness in *sapientia* is obvious.<sup>[87]</sup> The case of *uerbum* (*trin.* 9, 15-18 and 15, 17-24) is also similar, although this term does not always refer to oneness of the Trinity.

### 3.3 The relation of *esse, uiuere, intellegere* to Augustine's own triad

The most crucial respect in determining the degree of Victorinian influence on Augustine's Trinitarian theology is the relationship between Victorinus' *esse, uiuere, intellegere* and Augustine's Trinitarian triads. Do they share the similar features? If so, can we say that Augustine has copied Victorinus? On the other hand, if there exists substantial difference, can we accordingly exclude Victorinian influence on Augustine's Trinitarian theology? This issue has been a decisive factor for scholars to argue for or against the presence of Victorinian influence, and we can find both positions in the scholarship. As mentioned above, Hadot argues against a direct influence due to the difference he discerns between Victorinus' *esse, uiuere, intellegere* and Augustine's *mens, notitia, amor*.<sup>[88]</sup> On the other hand, some scholars, for instance Cipriani, tend to simply claim a Victorinian influence, not on the basis of a comparison between Victorinus' *esse, uiuere, intellegere* and Augustine's *mens, notitia, amor* (or *memoria, intellegentia, uoluntas*), but on the fact that *esse, uiuere, intellegere* are present in both theologians.<sup>[89]</sup> Indeed, the Victorinian influence is present and a more sophisticated analysis than that of Hadot (and of Cipriani) is needed. First, Augustine has also used *esse, uiuere, intellegere* but never in a Trinitarian sense like Victorinus. Therefore, we cannot simply claim, as Cipriani does, the presence of Victorinian influence because the triad *esse, uiuere, intellegere* also appears in Augustine. It should be noted that Augustine's use of this triad is mainly to demonstrate the certainty of the mind's self-knowing (cf. *sol.* 2, 1, *lib. arb.* 2, 7, *trin.* 10, 6, *trin.* 10, 13, etc),<sup>[90]</sup>

[83] See Augustine, *trin.* 9, 6 (CCSL 50, 298/48-49 Mountain): *mens uero aut spiritus non sint relatiua sicut nec homines relatiua sunt*

[84] Augustine first uses *sapientia* to represent Christ's relation to God the Father by explaining 1 Cor 1:24 "Christ, the power and the wisdom of God" (*Christum dei uirtutem et dei sapientiam*). See *trin.* 6, 1-2 and *trin.* 7, 1-2, etc. He then regards *sapientia* as a linkage between man and God: The wisdom of man (*hominis sapientia*) is somehow related to the wisdom of God (*sapientia dei*) which makes us possible to participate in God. See *trin.* 14, 1-3; 14, 11-15, etc.

[85] The twelve terms in *trin.* 15, 8: *aeternus, immortalis, incorruptibilis, immutabilis, uiuus, sapiens, potens, speciosus, iustus, bonus, beatus, spiritus*

[86] I. e., *aeternus, sapiens, beatus*

[87] See Augustine, *trin.* 15, 8 (CCSL 50, 471/13-16 Mountain): *quis itaque disputandi modus, quoniam tandem uis intellegendi atque potentia, quae uiuacitas rationis, quae acies cogitationis ostendet, ut alia iam taceam, hoc unum quod sapientia dicitur deus quomodo sit trinitas?*

[88] Hadot, "L'image de la Trinité (see note 18)," 427. See note 40 above.

[89] See Cipriani, "La presenza di Mario Vittorino (see note 25)," 283-5.

[90] For a detailed discussion of Augustine's use of *esse, uiuere, intellegere* and the traditions before him, see Yam, *Trinity and Grace* (see note 1), 271-84.

which demonstrates a notable difference to Victorinus' Trinitarian interpretation of *esse, uiuere, intellegere*. Second, Hadot is also not completely correct in denying any parallel between the Trinitarian triads of Marius Victorinus and Augustine. Although he is right that Marius Victorinus' *esse, uiuere, intellegere* demonstrates substantial difference to Augustine's *mens, notitia, amor*, he has overlooked the possibility of the Victorinian influence on the intermediary stages of Augustine's Trinitarian triads. Indeed, I argue that there is striking similarity between Marius Victorinus' *esse, uiuere, intellegere* and Augustine's *esse, nosse, uelle* in *conf. 13,12* and *uita, mens, substantia* in *trin. 10,18*, which I will explain below.

The triad *esse, nosse, uelle* can be seen as an intermediate stage in Augustine's development of his Trinitarian triads. This triad has been used in *conf. 13,12* (written in 397-401)<sup>[91]</sup> but is no longer in use in *De trinitate* where Augustine expounds his two most famous Trinitarian triads: *mens, notitia, amor* and *memoria, intellegentia, uoluntas*.<sup>[92]</sup> While the elements of *esse, nosse, uelle* are similar to that of *mens, notitia, amor* and *memoria, intellegentia, uoluntas*, Augustine's arguments on their Trinitarian structures demonstrate substantial differences. In *esse, nosse, uelle*, he emphasizes the ability of "immersion" of the three elements/activities, focusing on how the other two activities are present in each of the three: "I am and I know and I will: knowing and willing I am, I know that I am and I will, I will to be and to know."<sup>[93]</sup> In *memoria, intellegentia, uoluntas*, however, Augustine emphasizes the ability of referencing in the elements. *Memoria, intellegentia* and *uoluntas* reflect the Trinity not only because these three activities can be one and three at the same time, but also because each of these activities can demonstrate a twofold referencing-*ad se ipsam dicitur* (referring to itself) and *ad aliquid dicitur* (referring to another)-which is an ability pertinent to be a subject. When one remembers (i. e., in the case of *memoria*), he can remember himself as well as remember that he is thinking and willing something. This twofold referencing also applies to *intellegentia* and *uoluntas*, but cannot be found in *esse, nosse, uelle*, at least not apparent in Augustine's own explanation (cf. *conf. 13,12*). In other words, it seems that Augustine has abandoned *esse, nosse, uelle* in his mature conception of the Trinity because, although *esse, nosse, uelle* can demonstrate how one is present in three, this triad cannot demonstrate how one relates to three.

Indeed, this intermediate stage of Augustine's Trinitarian thought is very similar to what Victorinus proposes through *esse, uiuere, intellegere*. Marius Victorinus says that the three (*esse, uiuere, intellegere*) are one because they are all contained in *esse*. In this *esse*, moreover, is this *uiuere*, this *intellegere*, all as to substance, subsisting as one (*omnia substantialiter ut unum*

---

[91] For the dating of Confessions see Frederick Van Fleteren, "Confessiones" in: *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan D. Fitzgerald and others, 227-232 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 227 and James O'Donnell, *Augustine. Confessions I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), xii.

[92] *Mens, notitia, amor* and *memoria, intellegentia, uoluntas* are discussed mainly in *trin. 9-15* which was likely not written before 413. For details see Yam, *Trinity and Grace* (see note 1), 22-5.

[93] See Augustine, *conf. 13,12* (CCSL 27, 247/7-8 Verheijen): *sum enim et scio et uolo; sum sciens et uolens et scio esse me et uelle et uolo esse et scire.*

subsistentia).<sup>[94]</sup> He also says that none of these three is not the three (nam nihil horum est quod non tria sit), and that these three elements are a mingling (mixta) and are simple with a simplicity which is triple (triplici simplicitate simplicia).<sup>[95]</sup> Note that Victorinus' explanation of esse, uiuere, intellegere is very similar to Augustine's esse, nosse, uelle. Both emphasizes the ability of how one activity can "immerse" into the other two so that all three activities can be present in one single moment. Similarly, both keep silent on how one can be related to the other two.

Another piece of evidence for the influence of Victorinus' esse, uiuere, intellegere is Augustine's use of uita, mens, substantia in his Trinitarian discussion. Strictly speaking, uita, mens, substantia is not a triad, but three terms that Augustine uses together to explain the unity/oneness of memoria, intellegentia, uoluntas in trin. 10, 18, where he says; memoria, intellegentia, uoluntas are not tres uitae but una uita, not tres mentes but una mens, and consequently (consequenter) not tres substantiae but una substantia.<sup>[96]</sup> Note that uita, mens, substantia is, in fact, the nominal representation of uiuere, intellegere, esse, and Augustine's emphasis on their oneness is similar to Victorinus' esse, uiuere, intellegere. For Victorinus, the Father can be best represented by esse, and the Son is the movement of the Father as denoted by uiuere and intellegere (one single movement of opposite direction). He also argues insistently that the Son, being imago dei, is of equal substance to the Father. In other words, the oneness is highlighted in Victorinus' system, not only the oneness between uiuere and intellegere, but also between the Father (esse) and the Son (uiuere and intellegere). More specifically, Victorinus also emphasizes that uiuere and intellegere refer to one substantia, hence in the same sequence as Augustine's uita, mens, substantia. We should also note that the sequence of first uita (uiuere) then mens (intellegere) in Augustine's uita, mens, substantia is Victorinus' usual practice. To name a few: "Life and knowledge are the Logos which is Christ ... The Logos is, therefore, both life (uita) and knowledge (intellegentia);"<sup>[97]</sup> "life and knowledge are movement (uita atque intellegentia motus sunt);"<sup>[98]</sup> from God and from one same substance come substance (substantia) and life (uita) and knowledge (intellegentia).<sup>[99]</sup>

## 4. Conclusion

In this article, I have argued that it is indeed possible to see a more direct influence of Marius Victorinus on Augustine's Trinitarian theology than previous scholars have suggested. The similarity

[94] See Victorinus, adu. Ar. III 4 (CSEL 83. 1, 197/6-11 Henry/Hadot): Etenim cum sint ista existentiae uiuentes intellegentesque, animaduertamus haec tria esse uiuere intellegere, ita tria esse, ut unum semper sint atque in eo quod est esse, sed in eo quod esse dico, quod ibi est esse. In hoc igitur esse, hoc est uiuere, hoc intellegere, omnia substantialiter ut unum subsistentia. Viuere enim ipsum id est quod esse.

[95] See Victorinus, adu. Ar. IV 5 (CSEL 83. 1, 231/41-45 Henry/Hadot): Nam nihil horum est quod non tria sit. Esse enim hoc est esse, si uiuat, hoc est in uita sit. Ipsum uero uiuere; non est uiuere, quod uiuat intellegentiam non habere. Quasi mixta igitur et, ut res est, triplici simplicitate simplicia.

[96] Augustine, trin. 10, 18 (CCSL 50, 330/29-32 Mountain).

[97] Victorinus, adu. Ar. III 2 (CSEL 83. 1, 193/49-51 Henry/Hadot): Quoniam autem haec uita et intellegentia λόγος est, qui Christus est, ... Est ergo λόγος et uita et intellegentia.

[98] Victorinus, adu. Ar. III 2 (CSEL 83. 1, 194/26-27 Henry/Hadot).

[99] Victorinus, adu. Ar. III 2 (CSEL 83. 1, 194/26-27 Henry/Hadot): unde de deo atque ex eadem substantia est et substantia et uita et intellegentia ...

between Victorinus' esse, uiuere, intellegere and Augustine's Trinitarian triads is more than the fact that both base their argument on the Trinitarian structure of the soul. In fact, we can see resemblances in their conception of knowledge as movement, their emphasis on oneness in the Trinitarian discussion, and their similar Trinitarian argument (as demonstrated in esse, uiuere, intellegere and esse, nosse, uelle). In view of all this, I am convinced that Augustine must have known Victorinus' Trinitarian theology before his own conception. He does not completely agree with Victorinus, as he never follows Victorinus in using esse, uiuere, intellegere in a Trinitarian sense, yet Augustine's intermediate way of discussing the Trinity in the development of his Trinitarian triads is strikingly similar to that of Victorinus. This intermediate stage strongly suggests that Augustine considered the Trinitarian argument proposed by Victorinus and then adapted it to his own situation.



中文题目:

## 维克托利努斯对奥古斯丁三一神学的影响

**任卓賢**, 香港中文大学崇基神学院助理教授, 于2018年取得德国杜平根大学神学博士学位, 著有 *Trinity and Grace in Augustine: An Analysis of De trinitate 8–10 in Light of De spiritu et littera* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh / Brill, 2019) 及数篇有关奥古斯丁及巴西流的论文。地址: 香港沙田中文大学崇基神学院, 电话: 852-39435979, 电邮: coltenyam@cuhk.edu.hk

**摘要:** 本文探讨马里乌·维多里努斯(Marius Victorinus)对奥古斯丁(Augustine)的三一神学的影响。虽然在《忏悔录》以来学者普遍认为维多里努

对奥古斯丁的思想影响不大。即使近来多了人主张探讨奥氏与维氏的关联, 研究重点主要集中在两位思想家的释经上, 对他们神学思想之间的关联, 着墨仍然不多。本文将提出理据, 证明维多里努斯对奥古斯丁三一神学的影响实比以往学者所认为的更明显。笔者先会检视及评论以往的主流观点(特别是法国学者 Pierre Hadot 及意大利学者 Nello Cipriani), 然后会透过详细分析两位思想家的三一类比, 即维多里努斯的「存有、活着、认知」(esse, uiuere, intellegere) 及奥古斯丁在《忏悔录》及《论三位一体》中的三一组合, 将维氏对奥氏的影响具体地呈现出来。

**关键词:** 马里乌·维多里努斯; 奥古斯丁; 三位一体; Pierre Hadot; 《论三位一体》