Gregory of Nyssa and the Concept of Divine Persons

LUCIAN TURCESCU

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Gregory of Nyssa and the Concept of Divine Persons

Recent titles in
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF RELIGION
ACADEMY SERIES

SERIES EDITOR
Carole Myscofski, Illinois Wesleyan University

A Publication Series of
The American Academy of Religion
and Oxford University Press

GOD BLESS THE CHILD THAT'S GOT ITS OWN
The Economic Rights Debate
Darryl M. Trimiew

ENERGIES OF THE SPIRIT
Trinitarian Models in Eastern Orthodox and Western Theology
Duncan Reid

THE GODDESS LAKSMI
The Divine Consort in South Indian Vaisnava Tradition
P. Pratap Kumar

CREATIVE DWELLING
Empathy and Clarity in God and Self
Lucinda A. Stark Huffaker

HOSPITALITY TO STRANGERS
Empathy and the Physician-Patient Relationship
Dorothy M. Owens

THE BONDS OF FREEDOM
Feminist Theology and Christian Realism
Rebekah L. Miles

THE SPECTER OF SPECIESISM
Buddhist and Christian Views of Animals
Paul Waldau

INCARNATION AND PHYSICS
Natural Science in the Theology of Thomas F. Torrance
Tapio Luoma

OF BORDERS AND MARGINS
Hispanic Disciples in Texas, 1888–1945
Daisy L. Machado

HSIEH LIANG-TSO AND THE *ANALECTS* OF CONFUCIUS
Humane Learning as a Religious Quest
Thomas W. Selover

YVES CONGAR'S THEOLOGY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
Elizabeth Teresa Groppe

GREGORY OF NYSSA AND THE CONCEPT OF DIVINE PERSONS
Lucian Turcescu

AAR
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF RELIGION

Gregory of Nyssa and the Concept of Divine Persons

LUCIAN TURCESCU

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS
2005

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford New York
Auckland Bangkok Buenos Aires Cape Town Chennai
Dar es Salaam Delhi Hong Kong Istanbul Karachi Kolkata
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Mumbai Nairobi
São Paulo Shanghai Taipei Tokyo Toronto

Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.
198 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016

www.oup.com

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Turcescu, Lucian.
Gregory of Nyssa and the concept of divine persons / Lucian Turcescu.
p. cm.—(American Academy of Religion academy series)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN-13 978-0-19-517425-0
ISBN 0-19-517425-9
1. Trinity—History of doctrines—Early church, ca. 30–600. 2. Gregory, of Nyssa, Saint, ca. 335–ca. 394. I. Title. II. Series.
BT109.T87 2004
231'.044'092—dc22 2004005194

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

To Luc and Lavinia

This page intentionally left blank

Acknowledgments

This book owes a great deal to Paul Fedwick and John Rist of the University of Toronto, who codirected the doctoral dissertation that was the basis of this book. After my memorable, almost weekly, meetings with Paul over coffee and donuts at the Tim Hortons coffee shop at Bay and Bloor in Toronto, I always left with new ideas for the book. The numerous and very detailed letters John sent me from Cambridge or Tuscany have been a major help, especially with the philosophical sections of this book. I wish to thank both of them for their support and friendship.

Many scholars who heard various parts of this book at conferences of the Canadian Society of Patristic Studies and the North American Patristic Society provided helpful input. There are too many names to mention, but in particular I would like to thank Peter Widdicombe (McMaster University) and my colleague Margaret MacDonald (St. Francis Xavier University). Sarah Coakley (Harvard University) has taken a keen interest in my work on Gregory of Nyssa and has encouraged me to pursue it in every possible way.

The encouragement I received from the American Academy of Religion series editor Kimberley Rae Connor (University of San Francisco) and Oxford University Press editor Cynthia Read has been very important to me, as were the comments I received from two anonymous reviewers. I would also like to thank my good friends Vivian Olender, Naomi Gold, and Daniel Rakus, who all proofread various drafts of chapters, as well as the editors from

Oxford University Press who helped me to improve the quality of my writing. I also want to thank my research assistant, Sarah Gallant, for her help with the index.

This book would not have been possible without the constant support, kindness, and love offered by my wife, Lavinia Stan (St. Francis Xavier University), who not only read the many drafts of each chapter and provided valuable input, but also listened patiently to my incessant perorations on the subject and put up with my procrastination. Her mother, Sabina, was also instrumental in inspiring and supporting me during my doctoral years.

The completion of this book in a timely fashion was possible through the financial support of my university through a University Council of Research grant in 2001–2002 for which I wish to express my gratitude here.

Foreword

Basil of Caesarea (ca. 330–379) was never kind to his younger brother Gregory of Nyssa (ca. 335–395). During Basil's negotiations with Western churches in the 370s, Gregory's name was suggested to head the mission, and Basil strongly opposed it on the grounds that his younger brother lacked diplomatic skills. All the conflict seems to have started or at least got aggravated beyond repair when, in order to reconcile Basil to their feuding uncle, Gregory forged a letter from the latter extending an olive branch to Basil. When Basil excitedly accepted the gesture from his uncle he was more than displeased when the uncle denied having taken any steps toward reconciliation. During Basil's heavy involvement with the reform of the Eustathian type of asceticism, Gregory, who was married, was somewhat paradoxically engaged in writing a book in praise of virginity. Despite Gregory's polite and very highly encomiastic references to Basil, there was one incident for which Gregory, along with Gregory of Nazianzus, had reasons to resent Basil's overbearing character: the forced ordination of both Gregorys as bishops to two nonexisting sees (Nyssa and Sasima), in order to secure for Basil more influence after the province of Cappadocia was divided into two provinces.

Soon after Basil's death on 1 January 379, however, Gregory of Nyssa burst onto the scene, both as an active champion of orthodoxy and as an original thinker and very gifted writer. Without admitting it, he rewrote Basil's work *Against Eunomius* of Cyzicus and the

homilies on the days of creation. Posterity (like Basil) was unkind for a long time to Gregory; several of his works were even attributed to his older brother. It was not until the twentieth century that the world started to take notice of him as an original thinker and author, highly sophisticated in handling intricate questions, as an authority on the elucidation of dogmatic issues, and in particular as an authority on mysticism, an area rather neglected by Basil. For Gregory, one could say, the world was a bright place. Unlike Basil, he rejected the notion that evil is a power causing eternal damnation. For Gregory, even Satan will at the end be subdued to the compassionate and loving authority of God and his Christ. This idea, which came to be known as "apokatastasis," is something that today inspires many to be followers of Gregory. In addition, his very unique concept of "perpetual progress" (ἐπέκτασις)—rather than upholding a static vision of God in eternity, Gregory believes in an unending journey of discovery of the infinite—ranks him even above the great Plato who interpreted change in only the negative sense of deterioration from better to worse. For Gregory, change can also connote progress from the inferior to the superior.

In this volume, Lucian Turcescu masterfully extrapolates another of Gregory's major themes: the more plausible interpretation of personhood, a concept utterly unknown to Gregory's predecessors. In classical Greek thought, the idea of personal existence connoting the power of self-determination (αὐτοεξούσιον) was foreign and even incompatible with the premises of the Greek-Hellenistic way of thinking. In order to make acceptable the notion of One-God-in-Three-Persons, officially promulgated by the church during the fourth century, Athanasius of Alexandria and especially Basil resorted to the concept of person as implying an ontological relationship (σχέσις). Classical Greek lacked a term for person except in the etymological sense of πρόσωπον (Latin "persona" = per-sona: someone "sounding through") as just that: a mask worn by someone, particularly actors on the stage, through which they "sounded out" the roles of other people. Because of that, Basil with others advocated the use of ὑπόστασις, a term until then considered synonymous with οὐσία. Such a neologism did not win acceptance readily. A long debate followed in which Gregory not only continued the work of his brother and predecessors, but also significantly elucidated a whole spectrum of ideas closely associated with this novel notion.

The reader will be more than rewarded in following the historical and philosophical disquisition that the author presents in the following pages. Hardly any modern work dealing with the subject has been overlooked and, in many instances, modern thinkers have been challenged in this insightful study in which attention to detail goes hand in hand with an always present pano-

ramic perspective, making this a fascinating study of past debates and one very relevant to modern sensibilities.

—Paul J. Fedwick
Professor Emeritus
St. Michael's College, University of Toronto

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

This page intentionally left blank

Gregory of Nyssa and the Concept of Divine Persons

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

We, the people living in the Western world of the twenty-first century, take it for granted that we know eminently what a person is. Moreover, we can get very passionate about it, especially when it comes to beginnings or ends of human life. Whether or not we believe that every embryo or fetus should have the right to life, we do so by invoking not only God but also the rights of the person—the fetus's or the mother's. Whether or not we agree with modern techniques for treating infertility, we argue our point by claiming that such methods either boost or infringe on the rights of the person. Whether or not we agree with the cloning of humans—a possibility that seems to be just around the corner at this time—we invoke the rights of the person to freedom or uniqueness. Whether or not we agree with the death penalty, we do so because we think that our society's criteria for personhood continue or have stopped being met. Whether we agree or not that a "human vegetable" should be taken off life support because that human has lost his or her memories, consciousness, and judgment, we justify our decision either by continuing or not continuing to recognize the characteristics of personhood in that being.

In claiming to know what a person is, can we moderns be sure we are not deceiving ourselves? We in the West consider ourselves to be tolerant and open to understanding other contemporary cultures, but contemporary Western society should also open itself more toward concepts formulated in earlier eras and cultures. One

such concept is the concept of person; "the person" is not a modern discovery, as we often tend to believe. A person is not only a concept and a reality connected with our discovery of human rights, consciousness, and individuality, as we proudly tend to believe, but also one connected with God and relationality.

In this book, I consider a late antique concept of person that has a lot of potential to enrich our understanding of personhood and even to bring some answers to the moral dilemmas we are faced with today. The concept under investigation appears in the works of Gregory of Nyssa (ca. 335–395), a great theologian, philosopher, and mystic who introduced it in the context of the more general attempts to clarify the paradox of the Christian God being one and yet known in three persons. While I draw on studies dealing with other issues connected with personhood, I intend to point out the most important locus where this concept first appeared—in the Christian discourse about the divine.

During the past century, there has been an increasing interest in personhood, especially because of French personalism, the philosophy of mind, and more recently ethical-medical concerns. Yet some authors have voiced concerns against modern concepts of person of the Cartesian-Lockean type, according to which a person is understood as a center of consciousness. Scholars, ethicists, philosophers, and theologians have been arguing for the formulation of a new concept of person that would avoid the moral dilemmas posed by the understanding of person as a center of consciousness. A number of these thinkers—such as Boff, Wilson-Kastner, Gunton, Zizioulas, Yannaras, and LaCugna—have contended that such a concept of person would have to be based on the early Christian concept of divine persons understood as relational entities.[1]

Starting from such modern suggestions and given my earlier interest in patristic theology, I asked myself whether such a patristic concept did exist and what it was. The bulk of the literature pointed to the fourth-century Cappadocian theologians—Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa—as the first ones to propose a rather elaborate version of such a concept during the Trinitarian debates of that century. When I undertook to study the fourth-century Trinitarian theology and anthropology more systematically, I discovered that a concept of divine persons as relational entities did indeed exist in the Cappadocian writings but that the picture was clearly understudied and much more complex than previous studies had suggested. At the same time, I also noticed the lack of a booklong systematic study of the above concept in the three Cappadocians or in any single one of them. Accordingly, I decided

to undertake such a study myself, focusing on Gregory of Nyssa's works. The present volume is the result of that decision.

In their efforts to respond to critics of the divine Trinity, to defend the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and to uphold the biblical and traditional faith that the one God should be worshiped as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, fourth-century Eastern and Western church fathers had to clarify such key terms as substance (οὐσία, *substantia*) and person (πρόσωπον, ὑπόστασις, *persona*). Although not the only Cappadocian theologian to engage in the debates revolving around the concept of divine persons, Gregory of Nyssa is widely regarded as the most substantial thinker and theologian among the Cappadocians and is often used as the representative of Greek Trinitarian theology. This is partly due to the fact that among the Cappadocians he was inclined to value philosophical arguments more than his older siblings Basil of Caesarea and Macrina, and their common friend Gregory of Nazianzus. It is Gregory of Nyssa's skillful blend of biblical and philosophical arguments that makes his concept of divine persons the most interesting and theoretically rewarding to study.

In order to describe a divine person, Gregory proposes a two-step argument: First, he distinguishes a person from his or her nature; second, he establishes the person's identity. For the first step, Gregory uses the analogy of an individual as opposed to its species. He also contends that, unlike their common nature, which cannot be counted, persons can be counted. For the second step, he conceives of a person as a unique collection of properties that in themselves are not unique. Each such collection has causal relationships and finds itself in communion (κοινωνία) with other similar collections. These relationships are what make the collections persons. In introducing the notion of communion among divine persons, Gregory goes beyond the Neoplatonic understanding of the individual as a mere collection of properties. Yet Gregory remains in the Neoplatonic (more exactly Plotinian) tradition in holding that a divine person, although a willing subject, is not conceived of in the modern psychological sense of a center of consciousness, but in the sense of always choosing the good and wishing to be what he is.

In its search to uncover Gregory's concept of divine persons, the present study makes several important contributions. First, an in-depth investigation of the notion of person as developed by one Cappadocian father is a welcome addition to patristic studies in general and to Greek patristics in particular. As my bibliographical references indicate, in the past century there has been a great deal of discussion among theologians and patristic scholars about the meaning of person in early Christianity. However, none of those studies dealt

so specifically and comprehensively with the works of one of the most illustrious defenders of the Holy Trinity. Except for a handful of short articles, the studies published to date have considered the Cappadocian notion of person in a larger context, alongside other church fathers, and thus only cursorily. The present analysis breaks new ground by carefully analyzing Gregory of Nyssa's works in order to extract those elements that make up his concept of divine person. Moreover, a whole chapter is devoted to tracing rudimentary concepts of the individual prior to Gregory, which he seemed to have used.

Second, the study also contributes to a better knowledge of the history of Trinitarian theology at a time when theologians have increasingly turned their attention to the Trinity in search for more meaning in human lives.[2]

Third, the present investigation will be useful for those scholars who are interested in the role of scriptural and philosophical resources in Christian theology, both because it considers Gregory's usage of the Bible and because it has a whole chapter devoted to his philosophical sources.

Last, the present study has implications for non-patristic scholars and theologians who endeavor to use the Cappadocian concept of person in their dealings with contemporary ethics and church-related matters.

I

The Notion of Person in Antiquity

Before analyzing Gregory's own concept of person, it is necessary to examine the issue of person in antiquity. Did such a concept exist or not? If it existed, how developed was it? If such a concept (or perhaps concepts) existed, did Gregory use them? These are questions I shall answer in this chapter.

The Two Sides of the Debate in Modern Scholarship

Whether or not the ancients had a notion of person is a matter of modern debate. In order to understand this debate and why I think that the ancients did *not* have a notion of person before the Cappadocians, I need to indicate what I mean by "a person." Such a definition is no easy task, as proven by today's numerous, and many times contradictory, definitions.[1] In attempting to do so, I want to put forth as basic a definition as possible, so that it can be accepted as axiomatic for possible theories of person by both sides of the debate over concepts of person in antiquity. A working definition that would probably satisfy all these criteria is the following: A person is "an indivisible, unique and therefore non-replicable unity in human existence."[2]

The issue of the person in classical antiquity is especially important for my argument. If the ancients were aware of, or interested in, the notion of person or individual, then the Cappadocians could

have drawn on a previous development. But did such a notion exist? There are some scholars of antiquity who believe that the ancients did have such a notion.[3] They contend that ancient writers' interest in the various traits of human personality—such as courage, rationality, love, even consciousness—is proof that the ancients were aware of a notion of person. In my view, these scholars either confuse "person" with "personality," or "person" with "soul." As my definition of person makes clear, a person is a unique human existence, while personality is perhaps best understood as "the relatively stable organization of a person's motivational dispositions, arising from the interaction between biological[4] drives and the social and physical environment."[5] A child, a mentally deranged human, or a human vegetable can be considered persons; they should be acknowledged as existential units, even if they do not have a personality or are not "ego-conscious." I do acknowledge that the ancients were preoccupied with the soul and its traits. But they did not connect soul with the individual, because before the Cappadocians they only had rudiments of a theory of the individual.

Another nuance some of these scholars are willing to concede is that "there is probably *not* a (post-Cartesian) concept of 'person' in Greek philosophy. But there *is* a concept of rational animal, at least in Aristotle and the Stoics."[6] What the author of this statement means is that the ancients did not have the modern, post-Cartesian concept of person, but that they did have a certain concept of person, even if underdeveloped. I think that the arguments these scholars use to contend that there was a notion of person in Greek philosophy (even if different from the modern notion, they concede!) prove only that the ancients were interested in distinguishing between the human species and various animal species. The ancients, I should re-emphasize, were hardly interested in distinguishing two human individuals from one another, or a human individual from an individual animal.

Another series of studies has argued that for various reasons the ancients did not identify, nor were they interested in elaborating on, the human individual.[7] Although Plotinus came closest to recognizing a distinctive human individuality, he actually did not achieve this. Another step forward was made by Plotinus's best-known disciple, Porphyry, who gave a definition of an individual as a unique collection of properties.

In a first article on "Forms of Individuals in Plotinus," John Rist remarks that one of the major contributions Plotinus made to thought was his recognition of the role of individuality. For Aristotle, the individual could not be defined.[8] Philosophy should therefore be concerned with the individual only inasmuch as he is a member of a class. As for a Platonic philosopher's view on the issue of individuality, Rist quotes a good summary of it by Grube:

> We must remember that from first to last the aim of the Platonic philosopher is to live on the universal plane, to lose himself more and more in the contemplation of truth, so that the perfect psyche would, it seems, lose itself completely in the universal mind, the world-psyche. Hence it remains individual only in so far as it is imperfect, and personal immortality is not something to aim at, but something to outgrow.[9]

Plato and Aristotle spoke of forms (or ideas) as corresponding to one set of things that have a common name,[10] that is, forms are of universals. Moreover, both of them agreed that there is a form of human,[11] but they did not accept that there could also be a form of the individual known as Socrates. Although not rejecting forms of universals, Plotinus raised the question of the possibility of the existence of forms of individual humans and believed in the existence of such forms. In his view, one can speak of a form of Socrates.[12] This strange view of Plotinus's led Rist to state: "I believe it may now be assumed . . . that Plotinus was one of those Platonists who subscribed to a heretical version of Platonism according to which there are not only forms of species but also forms of individuals, at least in the case of individual men."[13]

Plotinus discusses forms of individuals in the following treatises: *Enn.* V.9 [5] 12; *Enn.* V.7 [18]; *Enn.* VI.5 [23] 8.21–42; *Enn.* IV.3 [27] 5.8–11 and IV.3.6.15–17; *Enn.* VI.7 [38] 3.10; VI.7.8.1–5; VI.7.9.20–46; VI.7.11.14–15; *Enn.* VI.2 [43] 22.11–17; *Enn.* VI.3 [44] 9.27ff.[14] The sections that offer much on the subject are the first three. As Rist has rightly noted,[15] in *Enn.* V.9 [5] 12, Plotinus is somewhat hesitant about forms of individuals, but here for the first time he raises the question of the possibility of their existence: "But if the Form of man is there . . . then one must say that the Forms of universals (καθόλου τὰ εἴδη) are there, not of Socrates but of man. But we must enquire about man whether the form of the individual (ὃ καθέκαστα) is there; there is individuality, because the same [individual feature] is different in different people."[16]

The treatise where Plotinus most clearly affirms the existence of forms of individuals and his belief in them is *Enn.* V.7 [18]. The question opening this treatise is the following: "Is there an idea of each particular thing?" The answer to it is "Yes." Plotinus bases his argument on the immortality of the soul, saying, "If Socrates, that is the soul of Socrates, always exists, there will be an absolute Socrates in the sense that, in so far as they are souls, individuals are also said to exist in this way in the intelligible world."[17] Yet Plotinus does believe in reincarnation, as demonstrated in *Enn.* III.4 [15], a treatise contemporaneous with *Enn.* V.7 [18]. Therefore, when realizing that such a doctrine could give a deathblow to the theory of forms of individuals if the latter is based on the

immortality of the soul, he immediately tries to address this issue and accommodate it to his new theory. He does seem to accommodate the two theories by considering in *Enn.* V.7.3.7–10 that even a craftsman who makes two identical things is aware of their "logical difference." By "logical difference" he means "numerical difference." In Rist's words, "although X is reincarnated as Y, he can never blot out that former X-ness that did in fact exist. Once existence has occurred, so to speak, it cannot be eliminated."[18] Therefore, the form of X will continue to exist in the intelligible world, even if X is reincarnated as Y.

The reason why Plotinus found it necessary to postulate a form for each human, as well as a form of human in general, is thus stated:

> No, there cannot be the same forming principle [λόγος] for different individuals, and one man will not serve as a model for several men differing from each other not only by reason of their matter but with a vast number of special differences of form. Men are not related to their form as portraits of Socrates are to their original, but their different structures must result from different forming principles.[19]

Compared with *Enn.* V.9 [5] 12, *Enn.* V.7 [18] represents a progress in the sense that the use of such an argument as the existence of the soul to account for the differences between the forms of various individuals shows that Plotinus has realized the importance "of differences of character, as against those of bodily features."[20]

Elsewhere, Plotinus inquires about the possibility of the existence of the forms of individual animals[21] or individual fires.[22] Nevertheless, he finds the hypothesis of forms of animals less attractive than that of forms of human individuals and completely rejects the forms of individual fires because in his view fire is a continuum. Having turned his attention twice to the relevant passages where Plotinus discusses the forms of individuals, Rist concludes that "from the time he wrote 5.7, Plotinus accepted certain Ideas of individuals, and . . . his conviction was strongest in the case of individual men. It is possible that he positively reaffirms his position in 4.3.5, but at least we must maintain that he nowhere withdraws or rejects it, explicitly or implicitly."[23]

Who could have possibly influenced Plotinus's theory of forms of individuals? Rist suggests that it might have been Aristotle, who alludes to this in *Metaph.* 990b14, and the Stoics through their distinction between κοινῶς ποιόν and ἰδίως ποιόν.[24] In the passage mentioned above, Aristotle writes:

> For according to the arguments from the existence of the sciences there will be Forms of all things of which there are sciences, and according to the argument that there is one attribute common to

> many things there will be Forms even of negations, and according to the argument that there is an object for thought even when the thing has perished, there will be Forms of perishable things; for we can have an image of these.[25]

In his book on Plotinus, Gerson has paid close attention to Aristotle's influence. Yet, besides alluding to *Metaph.* 990b14, Gerson adduces the testimony of the Peripatetic Alexander of Aphrodisias (fl. ca. AD 200), who attempts to explicate the passage in Aristotle:

> The argument that tries to establish that there are Ideas from thought [τοῦ νοεῖν] is as follows. If whenever we think of man or footed or animal, we are thinking of something that is both among the things that exist yet is not one of the particulars [τῶν καθ'ἕκαστον] (for when the latter have perished the same thought remains), clearly there is something besides particulars and perceptibles, which we think of whether the latter exist or not; for we are certainly not then thinking of something non-existent. And this is the Form and an Idea. Now he [Aristotle] says that this argument also establishes Ideas of things that are perishing and have perished, and in general of things that are both particulars and perishable—e.g., of Socrates, of Plato; for we think of these men and preserve some image of them even when they no longer exist. And indeed we also think of things that do not exist at all, like a hippocentaur, a chimaera; consequently neither does this argument show that there are Ideas.[26]

Alexander explains that in Aristotle's critique of the Platonic forms Aristotle says that the "argument from thought" would lead the Platonists to conclude that there are forms of particulars, a conclusion they may want to avoid. Gerson contends that "Plotinus certainly knew the argument as it appears in the *Metaphysics* and quite possibly knew of the longer version" as it appears in Alexander's commentary.[27] What is surprising, however, is that Plotinus accepted the conclusion envisaged by Aristotle, thus becoming the representative of a heretical version of Platonism.

I shall now consider a second influence on Plotinus's theory of forms of individuals, namely, the Stoic distinction between κοινῶς ποιόν and ἰδίως ποιόν, the two components of the second Stoic category, the qualified (τὸ ποιόν).[28] A search through the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* reveals that the phrase κοινῶς ποιόν never occurs in *Enneads*, and neither do its two components within four lines of each other, while ἰδίως ποιά occurs once, at *Enn.* VI.1 [42] 30.6, though

its two components (ἰδίως and ποι-) never occur elsewhere in the *Enneads* within four lines of each other. Yet *Enn.* VI.1.30 is a later treatise, number 42 in Porphyry's chronology of the *Enneads*, and the passage concerned is nothing but Plotinus's famous critique of the Stoic categories. So one would expect to find a reference to the "individually qualified" in *Enn.* VI.1.30. One should therefore conclude that it is not in this treatise that one should look for Stoic influences on Plotinus's forms of individuals. Neither its date nor its content make it relevant for our purposes. Rather, one should look for a treatise that precedes or at most is contemporaneous with *Enn.* V.7 [18], and this can be counted as a second method of detecting an influence of the second Stoic category on Plotinus. Rist points out that *Enn.* II.4 [12] 4 can be such a reference.[29] Chronologically, *Enn.* II.4 [12] 4 was written after *Enn.* V.9 [5], where Plotinus is still hesitant about forms of individuals, but before *Enn.* V.7 [18], where he affirms his belief in such forms. Thus, in *Enn.* II.4.4.2–4 he writes, "If, then, the Forms are many, there must be something in them common to them all; and also something individual, by which one differs from another." This idea, Rist suggests, may be of Stoic origin. The suggestion should be taken seriously, especially since a later Neoplatonist such as Simplicius certifies that the Plotinian notion of forms of individuals was associated with the Stoic "individually qualified."[30]

By specifically inquiring into the possibility of the existence of forms of individuals, Plotinus went further than any other ancient thinker before him in elaborating a formal theory of the human individual and he is to be praised for it. Nevertheless, compared to the theory of personhood the Cappadocians developed only a century later, Plotinus's theory is still rudimentary.

The Cappadocian Theology of Personhood in Previous Scholarship

Next I shall discuss several studies dealing with the history of the concept of person in antiquity and late antiquity and the history of two major technical terms (πρόσωπον, ὑπόστασις) used by the Cappadocians to indicate the divine persons.

I shall first consider an article by the Dutch scholar Cornelia J. de Vogel, "The Concept of Personality in Greek and Christian Thought." De Vogel wants to show that a word for either "person" or "personality" is by no means lacking, either in Greek or in Latin, and that "the first metaphysics of man as a moral person is found in Greek philosophy, and of man in his individuality as well" (p. 22). Initially, the author defines "person" and "personality" as distinct: "*Per-*

son is *man as a rational and moral subject*, free and self-determining in his actions, responsible for his deeds," whereas "*personality* is *man's individual character*, his *uniqueness*" (p. 23). In the notion of "person," then, she emphasizes rationality and morality. These two elements make humans superior to both inanimate things and animals, since self-determination and responsibility depend on the faculty of reason. De Vogel contends that in this general sense "there is a great deal of reflection on the 'person' in Greek philosophy" (p. 23).

To support her claim, de Vogel resorts to some seventeenth- and eighteenth-century philosophers such as John Locke and Christian Wolff, or Neo-Kantians such as Wilhelm Windelband, who define the person in terms of self-reflection and self-consciousness.[31] Having set this theoretical framework, de Vogel then goes back to Homer and the lyric poets, trying to show that their world appears to us "as a very personal world: the Homeric heroes appear to us as personalities" (p. 57). Other Greek poets also are eager to portray strong characters, or what we would call today "strong personalities." One of the characteristics of the Homeric heroes is their self-determination, which is respected even by the gods. In referring to these characteristics of the Homeric heroes, de Vogel concludes, "That is what we called *person*" (p. 26). Next, she moves from poetry to philosophy, considering both Greek and Latin philosophers: Heraclitus, Pythagoras, Anaximenes, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Marcus Aurelius, and Plotinus, to mention but the most important. All of them are to various degrees preoccupied with issues related to the human being and his soul. Again, she concludes that their preoccupation with these aspects of the human life betrays their interest in persons.

Only Plotinus leads her to conclusions specifically relevant to this study. De Vogel considers *Enn*. V.7 and VI.5.8.21–42, which are important for his theory of forms of individuals, as I pointed out earlier. After introducing the arguments of *Enn*. V.7.1, de Vogel concludes, "I do not hesitate to say: here we have a full-grown metaphysics of the personality" (p. 54). Indeed, it might have been better if she had hesitated, because the passages in question only point to Plotinus's attempts to grasp a notion of individual, not personality, and these attempts constitute only a beginning, not a full-grown theory.

De Vogel's article is only partially faithful to its title. Although dealing rather satisfactorily with the concept of personality in Greek thought, the article allots no more than three pages, mainly in the conclusions, to the concept of personality in Christian thought. Nor does she give a proper treatment to the concept of person, which is constantly confounded with the concept of personality, despite their being recognized at the beginning of the article as formally distinct. Moreover, de Vogel uses a psychological definition of the person, inspired by modern philosophy, especially John Locke. Yet as A. Michel showed

in an article about the history of the word *hypostasis,* the psychological view of the person is wrong, since it confuses the self with the perception of the self or, put in a more general way, the object known with the knowledge itself.[32] By asserting the self-knowledge of the self, modern philosophers such as those mentioned above and many others in their tradition prove only that the self can know itself, not what the self is or that the self exists.

As I argue in this book, prior to the Cappadocians there scarcely was a concept of person in ancient philosophy. Moreover, the Cappadocians provided a rather complex concept of person. Therefore, what de Vogel does in her study is to judge an epoch by the categories of a later epoch; this anachronistic approach usually leads to misinterpretation. De Vogel depicts here not the notion of person that we find in the church fathers and that was vaguely suggested, for example, by Plato in *Theaetetus* and further elaborated by Plotinus and Porphyry, but rather a notion of person in agreement with a modern, psychological definition.

Yet an even more interesting and, for me, a far more challenging case of psychological understanding of the person is found in Daniel F. Stramara Jr.'s doctoral dissertation, which I shall present next. Stramara has written and defended a dissertation on the concept of divine persons in Gregory of Nyssa entitled "Unmasking the Meaning of Πρόσωπον: Prosōpon as Person in the Works of Gregory of Nyssa." Stramara proposes to demonstrate that the term πρόσωπον in Gregory of Nyssa's works does not mean "mask" but is used as a psychological term referring to "person," and this as a self-aware psychological agent (p. 1). To be more accurate about the second point, Stramara proposes that Gregory understood a person in the modern sense of a center of consciousness.

To substantiate the meaning of πρόσωπον in Gregory's works, Stramara analyzes 313 instances. Stramara considers only those works that are unanimously accepted as written by Gregory of Nyssa. Gregory applies the term to denote the divine persons 28 percent of the time, exegetical personage 16.7 percent of the time, the human face 15.6 percent of the time, and the human person 12.3 percent of the time; πρόσωπον only means "mask" 0.7 percent of the time. Including prepositional phrases and the connotation of πρόσωπον as person, the term refers to a person (whether divine or human) 71.4 percent of the time.

In chapters 3 through 6, Stramara studies the psychological meaning by way of (a) a philological analysis of psychological terms used in connection with person, and (b) contextualizing Gregory's thought with Stoic and Neoplatonic psychology. Stramara concludes that Gregory of Nyssa understood πρό-

σωπον as a psychological being, operating out of a center of self-awareness, being both subject and object to itself.

I agree with Stramara's first point, namely, that most of the time the term πρόσωπον in Gregory of Nyssa's works does not mean "mask." Stramara's comprehensive analysis of the 313 instances of the term πρόσωπον in Gregory's works is most welcome and brings an important contribution to patristic scholarship. Πρόσωπον is shown to have a wide spectrum of meanings in Gregory's works, ranging from anatomical face, surface, face to face, gaze, and mask to person, subject, face of God, exegetical personage, and incarnate Logos. To express the idea of mask, most of the time Gregory prefers the more technical term προσωπεῖον to πρόσωπον. He was well acquainted with the theater, as one of his brothers, Naucratius, was an actor.[33] In *Ep.* 9.1, Gregory provides a detailed account of stage props and dramatic paraphernalia.

My only difficulty with Stramara's first point is that none of the authors he cites, whom he claims have said that Gregory means "mask" by πρόσωπον, refer to Gregory. Barth, for example, writes, "But did not persona, πρόσωπον, also mean 'mask'? Might not the term give new support to the Sabellian idea of three mere manifestations behind which stood a hidden fourth?"[34] I am sure that when writing this Barth was thinking of Basil of Caesarea and his attempts to banish the term πρόσωπον from Trinitarian vocabulary because of its modalist overtones.[35] Although simplifying the issues, Barth disapproves of the use of "person" both in the modern sense (the concept of person as a center of consciousness that Stramara tries to promote) and in the patristic and medieval sense.[36] Instead, he proposes that we use "mode of existence," because this phrase avoids all the dangers of the overused word "person."[37] Neither does Karl Rahner, the second defendant on Stramara's list, envisage Gregory of Nyssa when saying that πρόσωπον meant "mask." Like Barth, Rahner probably has in mind Basil's letters in which πρόσωπον is said to be modalist. Even less does Walter Kasper, the third defendant on Stramara's list, "simply equate the term πρόσωπον with mask."[38] For conformity, I quote Kasper's text:

> Tertullian's distinction between *natura* and *persona* was difficult for the East, because *persona* was translated as *prosōpon*; *prosōpon*, however, meant a mask, that is a mere appearance, and thus suggested modalism. For this reason Basil[39] issued a warning that, as understood in the confession of faith, the persons (*prosōpa*) of God exist as hypostases.[40]

If one reads Kasper's text with more care than Stramara, one discovers that Kasper is aware that πρόσωπον sounded modalistic and could have meant

"mask" to Basil but that even Basil accepted it if it was understood in the sense of "hypostasis."

To conclude my comments on the first part of Stramara's dissertation, the problem does not reside in the fact that Barth or Rahner or Kasper say in a qualified way that πρόσωπον means "mask" at one point in the history of Christianity. The problem is that although Basil of Caesarea believed the same thing, Stramara ignores Basil's contention.

I shall now consider the second point of Stramara's dissertation, namely, that πρόσωπον as "person" in Gregory means "a self-aware psychological agent." It is worth noting from the outset that throughout his dissertation Stramara has an unwarranted tendency to sprinkle words such as "psychological," "personality," and "consciousness." When he considers the 313 instances of πρόσωπον, Stramara has to acknowledge that in at least several cases Gregory uses πρόσωπον with the sense of mask. But he contends that " 'mask' does not denote a false reality, a façade. It is a psychological disposition" (p. 54). I would argue that a "mask" is not limited to psychological disposition and can be used to denote a reality other than the true, that is, natural, reality. For example, at the beginning of the twentieth century, white actors who played Othello had to paint their faces black; this is an example of a mask that is neither a psychological disposition nor a true reality. I agree with Stramara that a mask can be a psychological disposition as well, but I disagree with him that such a disposition cannot signify a false reality. If it is a disposition against nature, it sometimes has an aura of false reality.[41]

When discussing the meaning of προσωπεῖον, Stramara quotes a text from Lucian of Samosata:

> Noticing that the dancer had five masks [πρόσωπα] ready—the drama had that number of acts—since he [a barbarian] saw but one dancer, he enquired who were to dance and act the other rôles [προσωπεῖα], and when he learned that the dancer himself was to act and dance them all, he said: I did not realize, my friend, that though you have only this one body, you have many souls [ψυχὰς].[42]

Stramara's comment immediately following this text is, "The προσωπεῖον is connected with personality" (p. 58). I believe that the text clearly connects προσωπεῖον with soul, not with personality. Stramara fails to see these nuances.

In another context where he discusses the meaning of πρόσωπον as "personality or psychological person" (pp. 67–69), Stramara gives two examples from Gregory of Nyssa's works. In both cases, the reference is actually to πρόσωπον as the image of God in humans. It is we in the modern era who

consider the soul or the image of God in humans to be part of the personality. Stramara again tries to foist a psychological meaning on Gregory terminology.

Ever since I discovered this dissertation I have asked myself, What could have influenced Stramara to take this psychological turn? I believe one answer can be found in the following statement he makes in a note at the beginning of chapter 3: "With regard to the whole question of the origin of the idea of self-consciousness, the Plotinian and Stoic scholar suggests that Descartes is indebted to Augustine who is in turn indebted to Plotinus; see Andreas Graeser, *Plotinus and the Stoics* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), 126."[43] Stramara thus has inferred that if Descartes is indebted to Plotinus (via Augustine), then so should Gregory of Nyssa be as well. Moreover, if Descartes had a psychological notion of person (after all, scholarly agreement favors Descartes' influence on Locke), then so does Gregory of Nyssa, and that is why Stramara attempted to demonstrate the latter point. Stramara's intentions become even more evident on pages 193–194, where he quotes Wallis:

> The result of Plotinus' approach to religious experience was the transposition of Greek philosophy into a new key. . . . The decisive step was Plotinus' identification of metaphysical realities with states of consciousness. From a psychological point of view, his account of consciousness forms a remarkable contrast both with Classical Greek philosophy, which, except for a few passages in Aristotle . . . , had barely recognised the concept, and with the Cartesian identification of "consciousness" with "thought" or "mental activity."[44]

Both before and after this quotation, Stramara wants to make Gregory identify "consciousness" with "thought" or "mental activity," thus making him a precursor of Cartesianism.

Before proceeding to analyze Stramara's presentations of the "person as a center of consciousness" in Plotinus and Gregory, I would like to draw attention to two methodological problems in Stramara's approach. First, not once does he ask himself the question whether Gregory was really influenced by Plotinus or other authors; still less does he attempt to prove any such influences. He assumes that "Gregory of Nyssa's psychological anthropology is deeply influenced by the Stoic, Galean, and Plotinian psychological perspectives" (p. 227). Having made such a statement, it is not surprising that Stramara deliberately overlooks an important work dealing with the possibility of such an influence on the Cappadocians, Rist's "Basil's 'Neoplatonism.' "[45] This essay demonstrates that Plotinus's influence on both Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa is extremely limited. If Stramara had used this article in his

dissertation, he could not have assumed Plotinus's influence on Gregory of Nyssa. Second, even if Plotinus made such an important contribution to the notion of self-consciousness, he did not connect it with the notion of person for the simple reason that he did not have a notion of person beyond the very primitive one represented by the theory of forms of individuals. The definition of a person as a center of consciousness implies at least two terms: person and consciousness. If the ancients spoke of consciousness, it does not follow that they necessarily connected it with person, as we moderns do. From the examples already presented, it appears that the ancients connected consciousness with soul. To avoid condemning theories before presenting them, I shall now turn my attention to Stramara's presentation of the center of consciousness in Plotinus.

Stramara says that the notion and imagery of a center of consciousness can be traced back to the Stoics (p. 219). He uses an example provided in Rist's *Stoic Philosophy*: Chrysippus depicts the *hegemonikon* as a spider in the center of a web it has spun, causing the filaments to vibrate. Hence, Rist argues that for Chrysippus the governing principle functions as "the centre of consciousness" within the human being.[46] Toward the end of his book, however, Rist warns that

> although the tendency of the Old Stoa can thus be seen as explaining human activity as psychosomatic activity, it did not bring them much nearer to an explanation of the nature of the human person itself, as distinct from its activities. . . . The fact is that Chrysippus did not go far enough for his own purposes in exorcizing the talk of soul and body which he had inherited from earlier philosophers.[47]

On the same page of his dissertation, Stramara quotes Blumenthal as finding remarkable Plotinus's "concept of the 'we' as a mobile centre of consciousness."[48] Yet Stramara fails to notice that Blumenthal, a few pages previously, confirms Rist's fears about the Stoics in the case of Plotinus: Concerning the doctrine of the soul, "Plotinus followed in the direction of Plato. The soul was a separate substance, and at least in intention, independent of the body with which it was merely associated. On this basis Plotinus constructed his psychology."[49]

The examples Stramara gives from Plotinus (pp. 220–223) all refer to the soul as possessing consciousness, not to a person as a center of consciousness. Stramara himself avers that "Plotinus nowhere explicitly refers to a 'center of consciousness' " (p. 222). Nevertheless, he is ready to forgive Plotinus for this ("I, however, do not fault him for this," p. 222) and ready to paraphrase Plotinus in order to make him speak in favor of a center of consciousness.

Then, as if he had demonstrated the idea of a center of consciousness in Plotinus, Stramara proceeds to demonstrate it in Gregory of Nyssa, of course, taking for granted that Gregory knew Plotinus very well. Stramara goes so far as to coin the Greek phrase τὸ κέντρον τῆς διανοίας (center of consciousness), which, as expected, is not evident in any of the ancient authors he studies. I quote one example Stramara cites from Gregory and then Stramara's interpretation. Other examples and commentaries (pp. 223–227) are similar and can be easily checked for conformity:

> Let what has been said be demonstrated by what happens in your soul when you think about God. Look up to the sky and consider with your imagination (λογισμῷ) the depths beneath, reach out with your mind (διάνοιαν = conscious understanding) to the sides and corners of the subsisting universe, and consider what is the power which holds these things together like a sort of bond of everything, and you will see how involuntarily the shape of the cross is engraved upon your mind (διάνοιᾳ) by the thought of the divine power, a shape which goes from the heights to the depths and stretches across transversely to the furthest corners.[50]

I have reproduced here exactly Stramara's translation and parenthetic variants. He not only insists that διάνοια means "consciousness" in Gregory,[51] he interprets Gregory's text by paraphrasing it to read "stretch your consciousness to the horizontal poles and farthest vertical points of the subsisting universe. . . . [Thus] the geometrical figure of the cross is automatically engraved upon your consciousness" (p. 223). After several additional examples, Stramara is forced to recognize that "the mental imagery of Gregory of Nyssa is not graphically explicit" (p. 226). But this does not prevent him from immediately asserting that "while the terms κέντρον and διάνοια are not juxtaposed, the concept τό κέντρον τῆς διάνοιας is hardly outside the ambit of Gregory's thought" (p. 227).

To these arguments that do not support a view of person as a center of consciousness in Gregory of Nyssa, one can add the following. In one instance, when translating from Greek into English, Stramara adds words in order to make the text speak in favor of a self-aware agent. Speaking of the Holy Spirit, Basil of Caesarea says that it has αὐθεντικὴν καὶ δεσποτικὴν ἐξουσίαν (*Against Eunomius* 3.4; SC 305:160). In Stramara's translation, the text becomes: "an authentically [independent] and [self-]governing authority" (p. 377). The bracketed words have been added by Stramara.

After this analysis, I conclude that Stramara's case for a view of the person as a center of consciousness in Gregory of Nyssa is unconvincing. I now turn

my attention to four studies of the Greek terms used by the Cappadocians to designate divine persons.

An important investigation into the history and meaning of the word ὑπόστασις was published by the German scholar Heinrich Dörrie in 1955.[52] Two thirds of it deal excellently with the philosophical use of the term.[53] Yet as he enters the final third of his effort with consideration of the Christian use of ὑπόστασις, Dörrie exaggerates the influence of Athanasius of Alexandria, basing his view on some pseudo-Athanasian fragments.

Dörrie says that ὑπόστασις (=*substantia*) was one of the strongest technical terms of late antique philosophy (p. 13). Nevertheless, as church historian Socrates Scholasticus relates in his *Ecclesiastical History*, the term was not used by earlier Greek philosophers. Dörrie cites the passage:

> It appears to us that the Greek philosophers have given us various definitions of *ousia*, but have not taken the slightest notice of *hypostasis*. Irenaeus the Grammarian indeed, in his Alphabetical [Lexicon entitled] *Atticistes*, even declares it to be a barbarous term; for it is not to be found in any of the ancients, except occasionally in a sense quite different from that which is attached to it in the present day. Thus Sophocles, in his tragedy entitled *Phoenix*, uses it to signify "treachery": in Menander it implies "sauces"; as if one should call the "sediment" at the bottom of a hogshead of wine *hypostasis*. But although the ancient philosophical writers scarcely noticed this word, the more modern ones have frequently used it instead of *ousia*.[54]

Dörrie himself notes that Plato, for example, did not use the term ὑπόστασις at all.[55] Nevertheless, he adds that Plato used the verb ὑφίσταμαι (of which ὑπόστασις is the verbal substantive) twice, in *Philebus* 19A and the *Laws* 6.751E, in the sense of "to assert that one can do something."[56]

Dörrie starts the analysis of the Christian use of ὑπόστασις by affirming that, prior to Athanasius, its use did not differ at all from its use by non-Christian authors (p. 52). Thus, in the New Testament, ὑπόστασις occurs only five times: In 2 Cor 9:4 and 11:17 it means "state, condition" (pp. 17, 52); in Heb 1:3 and 3:14, "reality" or even "being" (p. 52); in Heb 11:1, something between "realization" (*Realisierung*) and "reality" (*Realität*) (p. 62). The *Epistle to Diognetus* 2:1 discusses the "reality" (ὑπόστασις) of pagan gods, and Tatian (*Ad Graecos* 5) calls God the "basis" or "foundation" (ὑπόστασις) of everything (p. 52). According to Dörrie, ὑπόστασις was not a central concept for Clement, whereas for Origen it was almost indistinguishable from οὐσία (p. 53). Nevertheless, Dörrie mentions Origen's *Contra Celsum* 8.12 where the great Alex-

andrian says: "We worship the Father of the Truth and the Son who is the Truth: they are two realities in hypostasis [ὄντα δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα], but one in unanimity, concord and identity of the will."[57] Here, Origen envisages the Father and the Son as two distinct realities; Dörrie believes that this text was important for Athanasius when he formulated a distinction between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις (p. 54).

In my opinion, *Cels.* 8. 2 is not necessarily the most important text in which Origen suggests the distinction between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις. Other texts make this distinction even more clear.[58] *Comm. Jo.* 2.10.75–76 even applies the term ὑπόστασις to the Holy Spirit. Yet, despite Origen's endeavor to distinguish between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, his opinion was not influential. This lack of influence is attested by fourth-century difficulties in formulating the Trinitarian doctrine.

Dörrie then observes that the Council of Nicaea (AD 325) explicitly condemned those who distinguished between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις with respect to the Father and the Son (p. 55). The anathema following the confession of faith of this council reads, "If anyone says that the Son is of another substance or hypostasis [ἐξ ἑτέρας οὐσίας ἢ ὑποστάσεως], the catholic and apostolic Church anathematizes him."[59] Dörrie also notes (p. 57) that, despite his support for the Nicene Creed, Athanasius of Alexandria acknowledges in his *Tomus ad Antiochenos* 5 (written in 362) the necessity of distinguishing between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις and of accepting "three hypostases" in regard to the Holy Trinity.[60]

Dörrie asserts that in *C. Ar.* 4, Athanasius "defended with strong words the unity of being and hypostasis," thus bringing "to an end the history of the meaning of ὑπόστασις, by establishing its use" (pp. 57, 59). In other words, Athanasius established that ὑπόστασις meant "individual or person," and as such it was to be distinguished from "substance." Yet scholars today agree that both the *C. Ar.* 4 and other works Dörrie invokes to buttress his arguments are unlikely to be by Athanasius.[61] As previously stated, it is clear that Dörrie exaggerates the influence of Athanasius in the shaping of ὑπόστασις as a theological concept. Moreover, if Athanasius had played such an important role in this matter, the difficulties encountered by the Cappadocians in their fight against the Neo-Arians would not have existed. However, that was not the case.

Another important study of Greek words used to designate divine persons is the comprehensive encyclopedia entry "Hypostase" written by the French scholar A. Michel.[62] The article in question contains an analysis of the term ὑπόστασις beginning with early Christian writers from both East and West, to modernist Roman Catholics such as Alfred Loisy. Unlike Dörrie, when discussing the Cappadocians, Michel recognizes their paramount role in estab-

lishing the meaning of ὑπόστασις for Trinitarian theology. Unfortunately, in an article of such a large scope it is not possible to allot more than two to four columns to each historical figure. Hence, although accurate, Michel's treatment of the Cappadocians (cols. 381–385) is quite brief. In addition, his article is occasionally influenced by the views of the nineteenth-century French Jesuit Théodore de Régnon, whose insights have been seriously challenged in recent years.[63]

In his exposition of the history of ὑπόστασις, A. Michel mentions Letter 38, an important piece treating the differences between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις that used to be attributed to Basil of Caesarea. Yet scholarly studies[64] have shown that this letter belongs to Gregory of Nyssa, a conclusion which most contemporary students of Basil accept.[65] Regrettably, Michel does not quote Letter 38 directly, but Tixeront's summary of it:

> Οὐσία is that which is common in the individuals of the same species (τὸ κοινόν) and which they possess equally. . . . But this οὐσία could not really exist unless it is completed by individual characteristics which determine it. These characteristics receive various names: ἰδιότητες, ἰδιώματα, ἰδιαζόντα σημεῖα, ἴδια γνωρίσματα, χαρακτήρες, μορφαί . . . If one adds these individual characteristics to the οὐσία, one has the ὑπόστασις. The hypostasis is the individual determined, existing apart, which contains and possesses the οὐσία, but is opposed to it as the proper to the common and the particular to the general.[66]

Michel also adds that Basil did not use ὑπόστασις as a synonym of πρόσωπον, since he thought that the latter had modalist connotations. Unlike Basil, however, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa did use the terms as synonyms. While Michel's findings are correct, there are many more nuances that he was unable to discuss in his short treatment. Moreover, he did not have the necessary space to show whether there was an evolution of the Cappadocian view of the person. These and similar issues will be examined later.

A more recent study of ὑπόστασις is Jürgen Hammerstaedt's encyclopedia entry "Hypostasis (ὑπόστασις)."[67] Hammerstaedt analyzes the term beginning with non-Christian ancient philosophers to the sixth-century Monophysite author John Philoponus. Although incorporating the results of more recent scholarship, Hammerstaedt's treatment of the Cappadocians is, like Michel's, understandably brief and thus not too helpful.

The last study I shall consider is André de Halleux's " 'Hypostase' et 'personne' dans la formation du dogme trinitaire (ca. 375–381)."[68] This is an in-

valuable piece of research on the two terms that caused so much turmoil at that time, especially in the church of Antioch. De Halleux approaches the Antiochian debate on the Trinitarian formulae of the three hypostases and three persons by questioning two of their witnesses—Basil of Caesarea and Jerome—both of whom presented the points of view of those whom de Halleux calls "Neo-Nicenes" and "Old-Nicenes" respectively. According to de Halleux, the "Old-Nicenes" understood ὑπόστασις as a synonym of οὐσία, whereas the "Neo-Nicenes" distinguished between them (pp. 317–318).[69] He analyzes some representatives of the "Old-Nicene" group, namely, Paulinus of Antioch and his allies from Palestine, the Egyptian confessing bishops exiled at Diocesarea. He thus attempts to trace the origin of the "Old-Nicene" formula of the three *prosōpa*, which the "Neo-Nicenes" contested. He completes his long article with a study of the conclusion of the controversy around the two formulae that turned favorable to the "Neo-Nicenes," who were supported by Emperor Theodosius I. De Halleux also considers Gregory of Nazianzus's failed attempt at reconciliation in Constantinople. His main conclusion is that

> in assimilating the person to the hypostasis, the council of Constantinople canonized in triadology the Greek metaphysics at the expense of the Latin phenomenology, in the same way as fifty years later the council of Chalcedon would assimilate in christology the *persona* of Pope Leo to the ὑπόστασις of Cyril of Alexandria. (pp. 667–668)

De Halleux's is by far one of the most comprehensive studies to date of the theme of Trinitarian persons in the Cappadocians. It is also unique in starting from the pair πρόσωπον-ὑπόστασις. Nevertheless, the study does not consider Gregory of Nyssa but Basil. Nor does it mention the development in Basil's theology with regard to the use of ὑπόστασις, which I have already suggested.

This concludes my brief overview of the Cappadocian contribution to the concept of person in previous scholarship. As I attempted to demonstrate, the ancients did not have such a concept because of the strong Platonic interest in universals and the Aristotelian interest in an individual only inasmuch as he is a member of a class. Therefore, it is indeed necessary to study the Cappadocian concept of person, since no one before the Cappadocian fathers proceeded as far as they did in elaborating on this concept. The only significant contribution to this concept between Plotinus and the Cappadocians is Porphyry's. I shall consider it in detail in chapter 2 when dealing with philosophical influences on Gregory of Nyssa. Moreover, to date a satisfactory study of the concept and terminology of the person in Gregory of Nyssa does not exist.

Methodology

In this book I combine three methodological approaches: (1) the integral or synchronic model, (2) textual analysis, and, where possible, (3) the analysis of Greek Trinitarian terms such as πρόσωπον, ὑπόστασις, οὐσία.

The "integral model attempts a synchronous understanding of the development of the central ideas of Christianity."[70] Developed primarily by historians of doctrine (e.g., Adolf Harnack and Reinhold Seeberg), it proves a useful tool for both systematic theologians and historians. In comparison with other methods, such as "the special history model" or "the great thinker method," the "integral model" provides a broader and more complex view of the development of doctrine. With the support of historical criticism, this method shows that a certain doctrine appears because of interactions between theological topics and other issues, such as social concerns, politics, and ecclesiastical confrontations.

Textual analysis, the most used method in the present study, provides an opportunity to follow one thinker's development of ideas in a specific text. This approach enables me to examine Gregory's treatment of the concept of person in select texts. I will also pay attention to how his views on person in a particular text fit into his overall vision. Nonetheless, an attempt to identify a growth of Gregory of Nyssa's doctrine of divine persons should be regarded with reservations, since there is little agreement among scholars concerning the chronology of his works.

Concerning the analysis of terms used to refer to Trinitarian persons (πρόσωπον, ὑπόστασις), I collected data on the occurrence of these terms in the three Cappadocians, using the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. The result was almost one thousand entries. I then separated the authentic works from the spurious and considered the occurrences in the authentic works alone. My next step was to examine the places where these terms occur and to see if they were relevant for the concept of person. At this point, I looked not only at the terms themselves but also at the context. Sometimes it is necessary to consider the larger context or even an entire writing.

The advantage of this method is that it directs me to most of the texts where a discussion of person takes place. Nonetheless, if the context is not considered thoroughly, this method will yield a merely philological understanding of the terms involved, without noticing their theological or philosophical meanings. Besides πρόσωπον and ὑπόστασις, Gregory of Nyssa used other terms to express the notion of person: "individual or indivisible" (ἄτομον), "partial substance" (μερική οὐσία), and "particular substance" (ἰδική οὐσία). All of these will therefore be considered, as well.

2

Philosophical Concepts That Shaped Gregory of Nyssa's View of the Individual

In this chapter, I shall consider several philosophical concepts that contribute to a prehistory of the concept of the individual. These concepts are important for the scope of my study, as Gregory and the other two Cappadocians used them at various times to promote their own concept of the individual. As Dörrie noted, it is not possible for the modern researcher to measure the width and depth of Gregory of Nyssa's knowledge of philosophy from citations—a method used comfortably with Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius of Caesarea—since Gregory is a master of "thought-citation," whereby an idea is taken over from somewhere else but then completely remodeled and reworded so that all direct verbal parallelism with the original disappears.[1] Nonetheless, more recent studies have shown that the church fathers, Gregory of Nyssa in particular, used a certain method of reception of ancient culture into Christianity, which they call χρῆσις (use), whereby any philosophical speculation is relevant for a Christian only if it agrees with revelation.[2] Meissner goes on to argue in her analysis of Gregory's *De anima et resurrectione* that χρῆσις belongs to Gregory's fundamental principles.[3] Moreover, in using the so-called ἀκολουθία (a logically necessary sequence of thought) in his analyses, Gregory seems to betray some knowledge of Aristotle, Plotinus, Porphyry, Stoicism, Poseidonius, and Galen.[4] I suggest that Gregory seems to have used the concepts discussed below. In some cases this borrowing is obvious; in others it is not. Suggestions that Gregory was a convinced Platonist, al-

though disguised as a Christian to avoid accusations of heresy,[5] have been either generally regarded with reservation or simply discarded.[6] This chapter will deal with the following philosophical concepts: individuals and relations in Aristotle, individuals in Stoicism, the individual as a collection of properties in Platonism, and the Plotinian will of the One.

Individuals in Aristotle

Aristotle's notion of an individual is neither consistent nor clear-cut throughout his writings. In an early work such as the *Categories,* he tries to establish some rules to be used in logical and linguistic analysis as well as in describing being (τὸ εἶναι). To describe things, Aristotle first distinguishes between objects and properties; then he distinguishes between the general and the particular, or between universals and individuals. He attaches the categories of general and individual to both objects and properties. Thus, in *Cat.* 2 one can read of individual objects, individual properties, general objects, and general properties. Objects and properties are said to be combinations of "things said without any combination" (2a25); such things came to be known as "categories" (hence the later title of the work). In this work, Aristotle conceives of ten such categories: substance (οὐσία), quantity, qualification, relation, where, when, being-in-a-position, having, doing, or being-affected (*Cat.* 1b25–27). In later works, Aristotle calls the latter nine categories "accidents."

In dealing with the category of "substance," Aristotle says that there are primary and secondary substances; the former he calls "individuals," the latter "species" and "genera."

> A substance [Οὐσία]—that which is called a substance most strictly, primarily [πρώτως] and most of all—is that which is neither said of a subject nor in a subject, e.g. the individual man [ὁ τίς ἄνθρωπος] or individual horse [ὁ τίς ἵππος]. The species in which the things primarily called substances are, are called "secondary substances" [δεύτεραι οὐσίαι], as also are the genera of these species. For example, the individual man belongs in a species, man, and animal [ζῷον] is a genus of the species; so these—both man and animal—are called secondary substances. (*Cat.* 2a11–18)[7]

Nevertheless, from *Cat.* 2 we learn that Aristotle not only conceives of individual substances but also of nonsubstantial individuals (e.g., individual qualities ["this white"]).

What then is an individual? Aristotle says that individuals are indivisible

(ἄτομον or ἄτομος). In *Cat.* 1b6–7 an individual is that which is "one in number" (ἓν ἀριθμῷ, cf. also 3b12). Nevertheless, as the Aristotelian scholar Frede has noted, "Being one is not a *proprium* of individuals: species and genera, i.e., the kinds into which objects fall, also have a kind of unity. One can, for example, count the species of a given genus. The kind of indivisibility characteristic of individuals must, then, be a special kind of unity."[8]

Frede concludes that Aristotle uses the expression "one in number" more frequently by way of contrast with "one in kind or species" and "one in genus," and thus in the *Categories*, "genera and species, in a certain respect *are* one and, hence, indivisible, but in another respect, *are not* one and, hence, divisible."[9] According to this schema, individuals are completely indivisible. Yet what kind of division does Aristotle have in mind?

In *Cat.* 1b3–9 Aristotle says that individuals are "not said of any subject" (κατ' οὐδενὸς ὑποκειμένου λέγεται). This statement is not easy to understand without examples. Aristotle mentions both individual substances and individual properties: individual human, individual horse, and individual knowledge-of-grammar are not said of any subject. In other words, they have no further subjects (ὑποκείμενα) underneath them of which they can be predicated. To this can be added Aristotle's statement that in the case of secondary substance "the subject is not, as the primary substance is, one, but man and animal are said of many things,"[10] and a clearer picture emerges of what he means by an individual. The species "human" and the genus "animal" are not individuals, because they are said of many things, that is, they have a plurality of subjects. Frede notes that this strongly suggests that "an individual does not have any actual parts and is indivisible, because it has no subjects."[11]

It is not clear what exactly Aristotle means by nonsubstantial individuals, and modern commentators are at variance. Some maintain that individual properties (e.g., Socrates' health), at least in the *Categories*, are individuated by their bearers, while others claim that they are individuated independently of their bearers.[12] Gregory of Nyssa, however, does not seem to have been concerned with this issue when using Aristotle, and thus I shall not pursue it. Nevertheless, Frede is correct that Aristotle's notion of an individual is weak in the *Categories*, precisely because of the presence of nonsubstantial individuals; we tend to ground our notion of an individual in objects rather than properties.[13]

As we can see in his account of primary and secondary substances, Aristotle in the *Categories* moves back and forth between ontology and logic. The ontological example ("primary substance" versus "secondary substance") is easily transposed into logic to illustrate the difference between "individual" and "species." Aristotle returns to this theme in later works such as *De inter-*

pretatione 17a39–40, where he regards "species" as "universals." By *Metaphysics* 7.13, however, he has changed his mind dramatically and raises doubts as to whether kinds or universals really exist:

> It seems impossible that any universal term should be the name of a substance. For primary substance is that kind of substance which is peculiar to an individual, which does not belong to anything else; but the universal is common, since that is called universal which naturally belongs to more than one thing. . . . Further, substance means that which is not predicable of a subject, but the universal is predicable of some subject always. (*Metaph.* 1038b10–12)[14]

After the *Categories*, the phrase "secondary substance" disappears.[15] Aristotle's dramatic change of mind also represents a major change in his notion of individual: "If there are no genera and species, individuals no longer can be taken to be the ultimate, indivisible parts of genera."[16] Moreover, Aristotle contends that the individual cannot be defined:

> But when we come to the concrete thing, e.g. *this* circle, i.e. one of the individual circles, whether sensible or intelligible (I mean by intelligible circles the mathematical, and by sensible circles those of bronze and of wood), of these there is no definition, but they are known by the aid of thought or perception.[17]

He thus shows that philosophy can only be concerned with individuals inasmuch as they are members of a class.

That said, our immediate question is whether the Cappadocians were familiar with Aristotle. Recently, Stead corrected his earlier estimate, placing Christian knowledge of Aristotle's *Categories* and its distinctive treatment of substance in the late 350s, "when it perhaps began to be noticed by Arian logicians."[18] He contends that if Christians used the language of primary and secondary substance before 350, they did so in a nontechnical sense. The Cappadocians, who flourished after the 360s in their fight with Arian logicians, used the language of "individual" and "universal" to distinguish between individuals and their common substance, as the next chapters will show. Nevertheless, it is hard to affirm with certainty whether the Cappadocians took these notions directly from Aristotle or from handbooks of logic or philosophy that were in circulation.[19] The following examples are instances in which Gregory of Nyssa seems to hint at an acquaintance with Aristotle's ideas. In one example he even mentions the *Categories* by name. Even in this case, however, it is not possible to claim beyond doubt that he had firsthand knowledge of the *Categories*. Here are the examples:

1. In *Against Eunomius* (*CE* hereafter) 2.237, Gregory writes that "our nature was created capable of science" (δεκτικὴν πάσης ἐπιστήμης τὴν φύσιν ἡμῶν δημιουργήσαντα). This is reminiscent of Aristotle's *Topics* 130b8: "Man is a rational animal, capable of intellect and science."

2. In *CE* 1.172–176, Gregory does not admit to degrees of substance (οὐσία), either in the case of God or in the case of humans.[20] In *CE* 1.180–183, Gregory returns to the issue of the degrees of substance and adds that the subject itself (αὐτὸ τὸ ὑποκείμενον) is the one to which οὐσία is properly applied (*CE* 1.182). From this point of view, there is no difference of substance between the Father and the Son.

Gregory takes this opportunity to censure Eunomius for not knowing "the philosophers outside the faith" who never made "this mad statement" that there would be degrees of substance within the same substance (*CE* 1.186). "Nor does such a thing agree with either the divinely inspired texts or common sense," he adds in the same passage. Is the phrase "philosophers outside the faith" an allusion to Aristotle and the Peripatetics? I believe so, since Aristotle himself says, "Of species . . . no one is more truly substance than another" (*Cat.* 2b23–24). He then adds that the same holds true for individuals: "One individual man is not more truly substance than an individual ox" (*Cat.* 2b27). In *Cat.* 3b33, he states quite clearly that "substance does not admit of variation of degree" (ὅτι οὐσία ουσίας οὐκ ἐπι δέξεται τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ ἧττον).[21]

3. In *CE* 3.10.50, Gregory mentions by name Aristotle's *Categories* and their language as used by Eunomius. He writes in reference to Eunomius: "He who laboriously reiterates against our argument the Aristotelian division of reality (τῶν ὄντων), has elaborated 'genera,' and 'species,' and 'differentiae,' and 'individuals,' and advanced all the systematic treatment [τεχνολογία] of the *Categories* for the injury of our doctrines."[22] As Moreschini notes in commenting on this passage, "In reality, it is Gregory who, in his refutation of Eunomius, employs correctly the Aristotelian *Categories*. He distinguishes—as in *CE* 3.10.49–50—between substance and accidents, and then in God between substance and goodness; the former is inaccessible, the latter are shared also by the human nature."[23]

Other scholars today are even inclined to think that Gregory of Nyssa knew the *Categories* from Porphyry's *Isagoge*.[24] I myself think that Gregory was familiar with the *Isagoge*, as I endeavor to demonstrate later in this chapter.

The Cappadocians compared the three divine persons with three individuals having the same nature or species, all equally divine. Therefore, their solution to the issue of divine unity is considered to be rather weak.[25] This weakness will become evident in Gregory's *Ad Ablabium*. Yet it is acknowledged that the Cappadocians managed to provide some counterbalancing fea-

tures to express a stronger divine unity. Gregory of Nyssa, for instance, argued that the divine nature is simple, without degrees, that one single activity or energy is exercised by the three together, that the persons do not differ in rank but only in their mode of existence.

Relation in Aristotle

As chapter 5 will demonstrate extensively, both Gregory and his Christian predecessors drew heavily on Aristotle's category of relation. One of the arguments used in the third and fourth centuries CE to establish that the Son was God was the so-called argument from relations: If the Father is divine, the Son, who is a correlative of the Father, is also divine. To speak about relation Gregory of Nyssa used the following Greek expressions: τὰ πρός τι, πρός τί πως ἔχειν, and σχέσις. The first term is the Aristotelian technical phrase for relation, the second is the Stoic technical term (although it is used occasionally by Aristotle, too), and the third term is the noun used by many Greek speakers of antiquity (with the exception of Aristotle himself)[26] to mean "relation." Although all of the above expressions are currently rendered in English as "relation," τὰ πρός τι literally means "things [said] in relation to [something else]," and πρός τί πως ἔχειν means "relative disposition." An examination of the Aristotelian notion of relation is therefore in order here. Since not all of the issues connected with relation in Aristotle are of importance for this book, I shall touch mostly upon those that retained the attention of patristic writers.

Unlike substance, the category of relation did not undergo dramatic changes in Aristotle's thought. However, it did have a certain development from an earlier work such as *Cat.* 7 to a later work such as *Metaph.* 5.15, as will become evident shortly.[27] Let me begin with the definition of relation Aristotle gives in *Cat.* 7:

> (D1) We call *relatives* [τὰ πρός τι] all such things as are said to be just what they are, *of* or *than* other things, or in some other way *in relation to* something else. For example, what is larger is called what it is *than* something else (it is called larger than something); and what is double is called what it is *of* something else (it is called double of something); similarly with all other such cases.[28]

"Of" and "than" represent in this translation the Greek genitive that is meant to modify the correlatives of a relation. Yet Aristotle also gives examples of correlatives followed by some other cases (accusative and dative) or by the preposition πρός (6b8–10). Thus, (1) the master is called "master of a slave"

(6b29; δούλου, in the genitive), (2) the mountain is called high "in relation to something else," such as another mountain (6b8; πρός ἕτερον, in the accusative), and (3) that which is similar is called "similar to something else" (6b9; τινί, in the dative).[29] This should not make one believe that by simply using certain grammatical cases one speaks of relatives, because that is not how Aristotle conceives of relation. Aristotle then continues to examine the category of relation as follows:

> All relatives are spoken of in relation to correlatives that reciprocate. For example, the slave is called slave of a master and the master is called master of a slave; the double double of a half, and the half half of a double; the larger larger than a smaller, and the smaller smaller than a larger. Sometimes, however, there will be a verbal difference, of ending. Thus knowledge is called knowledge *of* what is knowable, and what is knowable knowable *by* knowledge; perception perception *of* the perceptible, and the perceptible perceptible *by* perception.[30]

Christian writers picked up the property of reciprocation. They even used some of Aristotle's examples, such as master-slave and father-son.[31] Aristotle, however, adds a necessary qualification, namely, that "all relatives . . . are spoken of in relation to correlatives that reciprocate, *provided* they are properly given" (*Cat.* 7a22–23). An example of correlatives that are improperly given and thus do not reciprocate is "wing of a bird" and "bird of a wing," for it is not as being a bird that a wing is said to be of it, but as being a winged creature (*Cat.* 6b38–7a5). Relatives are also generally simultaneous by nature:

> Relatives seem to be simultaneous by nature [ἅμα τῇ φύσει]; and in most cases this is true. For there is at the same time a double and a half, and when there is a half there is a double, and when there is a slave there is a master; and similarly with the others. Also, one carries the other to destruction [συναναιρεῖ]; for if there is not a double there is not a half, and if there is not a half there is not a double. So too with other such cases. (*Cat.* 7b15–21)

To prove that God the Father and God the Son are both divine and coeternal, Christian writers also used this property of simultaneity by nature. At times they even appropriated Aristotle's own words: ἅμα, συναναιρεῖ.[32] Nonetheless, Aristotle draws attention to some exceptions from this rule of simultaneity: knowable would seem to be prior by nature to knowledge, for there are first the things to be known and then comes the knowledge of them. Also, the destruction of knowledge does not entail the destruction of the things know-

able. "The perceptible" and "the measurable" also qualify as exceptions from the rule of simultaneity of the correlatives (*Cat.* 7b22–8a12).

Aristotle then raises the question of whether substances can be spoken of as relatives. He says that primary substances surely cannot be spoken of as relative, because "an individual man is not called someone's individual man" (the case for wholes), nor is an individual hand called someone's individual hand but someone's hand (the case for parts). Ackrill thinks that Aristotle probably means to suggest that it is linguistically improper to attach possessive genitives to designations of primary substances: One cannot say, for example, that something is "Callias's this ox," though one can, of course, say that this ox is Callias's (ox).[33] But in the case of secondary substances, Aristotle admits that there is room for dispute: Thus, a head is called someone's head and a hand someone's hand, and these seem to be relatives. To avoid the necessity of classifying parts of secondary substance (such as heads or hands) as relatives—that is, the necessity of calling a substance an accident—Aristotle provides a second definition of relation:

> (D2) Now if the definition of relatives which was given above was adequate, it is either exceedingly difficult or impossible to reach the solution that no substance is spoken of as relative. But if it was not adequate, and if those things are relative for which being is the same as being somehow related to something [οἷς τὸ εἶναι ταὐτόν ἐστι τῷ πρός τί πως ἔχειν] then perhaps some answer may be found. The previous definition does, indeed, apply to all relatives, yet this—their being called what they are, of other things—is not what their being relatives is. It is clear from this that if someone knows any relative definitely he will also know definitely that in relation to which it is spoken of. (*Cat.* 8a28–35)

At the end of *Cat.* 7, Aristotle clarifies that a head or a hand or any such substance can be known definitely without necessarily knowing definitely that in relation to which it is spoken of. Therefore, heads and hands and any parts of secondary substances would not be relatives, and consequently, no substances can be relatives (*Cat.* 8b15–20).

Since antiquity, the interpretation of the second definition of relation (D2) and the difference between it and the first definition (D1) have engendered much discussion. I shall mention only briefly the two different interpretations Ackrill and Morales provide. First, however, I would like to note that while Aristotle is opposed to the idea of calling any kind of substances relatives, Gregory of Nyssa is not of the same mind. Gregory says that by attaching possessive adjectives to "God," one obtains a relational name such as "our

God."[34] Morales too argues that Aristotle is correct: The phrase "John's cow" does not transform cow into a correlative.[35] Ackrill and Morales both use later works by Aristotle to interpret the relation between D1 and D2. Ackrill, on the one hand, maintains that the new criterion is also found elsewhere (e.g., *Topics* 6.142a29 and 146b3).[36] He finds the second criterion (D2) "too strong" if it is meant to imply that one could know that A (a given subject) is R (a relational predicate) only if one knew what it was R of. He says that the criterion is not satisfied by relational terms such as "half" or "slave"; one can know that 97 is half some other number without knowing definitely what that number is, and that Callias is a slave without knowing definitely who his master is.[37] Morales, on the other hand, argues that Aristotle's second criterion for recognizing relational attributes (D2) is based on their peculiar indefiniteness. This indefiniteness may be eliminated by a definite knowledge of the correlate. The indefiniteness is quite evident in relational predicates such as "to be the double of" and "to be greater than," but it may pass unnoticed in terms such as "father" and "slave."[38] Relatives such as "father" and "slave" are endowed with a comparatively complete sense, and they satisfy the first definition (D1) of relatives, too. To explain why Aristotle contends that parts of substance do not satisfy the second criterion (D2), Morales appeals to *Metaph.* 7, where Aristotle says that parts cannot exist if they are severed from a whole, "for it is not a finger in *any* state that is the finger of a living thing, but the dead finger is a finger only homonymously" (*Metaph.* 1035b23–25). To this Morales adds a theoretical explanation from Aristotle's *Politics* 1 in which a new discussion of wholes and parts (severed feet and hands) is introduced: "Things are defined by their function and power; and we ought not to say that they are the same when they no longer have their proper quality, but only that they are homonymous" (*Politics* 1253a20–25). Morales suggests that this latter criterion explains why parts of substances can satisfy the definition D1 of relatives but not definition D2: "For since one must appeal to the whole in order to define them, this reference is *contained* within the definition (and the meaning!) of the respective terms. They have to be considered, at least in this respect, definite enough."[39]

A later work such as *Metaph.* 5.15 brings additional clarification to Aristotle's view of relation. Here he distinguishes three main groups of relatives: (1) those which are said to be "according to the number" (κατ' ἀριθμόν), (2) those which are said to be "according to a capacity" (κατὰ δύναμιν), and (3) those which are said to be "as the measurable to the measure" (ὡς τὸ μετρητὸν πρὸς τὸ μέτρον). He then considers each group separately.

1. Relatives said to be "according to the number" (κατ' ἀριθμόν). Aristotle exemplifies with: the double to the half, the treble to the third, "that which

exceeds" to "that which is exceeded." Relatives such as the double and the half are in a definite numerical relation to 1, but others such as "that which exceeds" and "that which is exceeded" are in an indefinite numerical relation. "These relations are numerically expressed and are determinations of number, and so," adds Aristotle, "in another way are the equal and the like and the same, for all refer to unity" (*Metaph.* 1021a9). Thus, something is called "equal" to something because both things have a common *quantity*; something is called "similar" to something because both things have a common *quality*; and something is called "the same" as something because both things have a common *substance* (*Metaph.* 1021a10–13). In this regard, Morales notes that a particular quantity, quality, or substance has to be taken as the measure of comparison.[40]

2. Relatives said to be "according to a capacity" (κατὰ δύναμιν). The examples provided for this group of relatives are: "that which can heat" to "that which can be heated," "that which can cut" to "that which can be cut," and in general the active to the passive. In this context, "that which has made (or will make)" is relative to "that which has been made (or will be made)." Aristotle includes the relatives father-son in this second group. Morales's observation is correct that this kind of relatives includes a cause-effect relation; he also includes here the relatives master-slave (from *Cat.* 6b30, 7a34–7b7) "as a specification of the relatives 'the owner and the property'[41]—since for the latter relation to exist some event justifying the property (acquisition, war, inheritance, etc) must have taken place, an event which implies a cause-effect relation."[42] The church fathers of the first centuries were most interested in the relatives father-son because of the biblical resonances of this example. Gregory of Nyssa is certainly among those who considered the father-son relation as the relation between "cause and that which is caused."[43]

3. Relatives said to be "as the measurable to the measure" (ὡς τὸ μετρητὸν πρὸς τὸ μέτρον). The examples provided for this group are the measurable to the measure, the knowable to knowledge, and the perceptible to perception. Unlike the relatives in the previous two groups whose "very substance includes in its nature a reference to something else," relatives in the third group are called relatives because something else is related to them (*Metaph.* 1021a26–30). "For the thinkable implies that there is thought of it, but the thought is not relative to that of which it is the thought; for we should then have said the same thing twice" (*Metaph.* 1021a31–32); similarly for the other examples. Now let us remember that the examples of relatives in this third group are those relatives that (unlike all other relatives) in *Cat.* 7 have been said not to be "simultaneous by nature" and the destruction of one relative from the pair does not carry the other to destruction (e.g., the destruction of knowledge does not produce the destruction of the knowable).

Starting from this third group of relatives, Morales believes he can provide an additional argument for why Aristotle did not consider parts of substance as truly belonging to the category of relation. He states that in this third group, the two terms of a relation have an asymmetrical way of referring to each other: "The part is defined by reference to the whole (as fulfilling a particular function in it), but the whole is not defined by reference to the part. Since relatives of the third group may cease to be such once their determination has taken place, the parts of substances (like hand, head, etc.) do not really belong to the category of the relative."[44] He also considers, for similar reasons, that "wing" and "rudder" are not relatives, and their inappropriate inclusion in the *Categories* as examples of relatives has been a constant source of confusion in commentaries.[45] Morales also draws attention to the fact that for Aristotle the predication of any relational attribute always presupposes an underlying nature: Aristotle "thus repudiates the idea that relations be postulated as principles of Being (*Metaph.* 1088a20ff)."[46]

Individuals in Stoicism

Like Aristotle, the Stoics used categories (or perhaps "genera," γένη) for logical, linguistic, and metaphysical analysis. Unlike Aristotle, who originally taught ten categories, the Stoics conceived of only four, and these are significantly different from the Aristotelian ones. The various testimonies we have about the Stoic categories (chiefly Plotinus and Simplicius) suggest that the fourfold Stoic division originates with Chrysippus.[47] These four categories are substance or substratum (ὑποκείμενον), quality (ποιόν), disposition (πῶς ἔχον), and relative disposition (πρὸς τί πως ἔχον).[48] A presentation of the first two Stoic categories is in order here, since Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa seem to have been aware of them when distinguishing between substance and individuals.[49]

According to the Stoics, "substratum" corresponds to "matter," being an existing thing (οὐσία). Zeno himself is credited with having said that "substance is the prime matter of all existing things."[50] This substance the Stoics thought to be eternal; moreover, in its totality it could neither grow nor diminish. It was viewed as "qualityless," that is, as the "substratum" of everything that exists. The Stoics also conceived of particulars as bits of substance. The particulars can undergo qualitative changes, which the Stoics viewed as reconfigurations, but not changes, of the very substance. The qualitative changes are caused by the second constitutive element of the Stoic reality, the πνεύμα ("current of air" or "breath"). This *pneuma* is what Chrysippus called "qualities"

and, like substance, it is a corporeal entity (the Stoic universe, of course, is material). *Qua* corporeal, these currents of air are capable of running through a body and informing it. They can mix with one another and with the "substance" (*SVF* 1.85). Therefore, in any particular entity there is both "substance" and "quality."

The second Stoic category is not strictly speaking "quality" (ποιότης) but the "qualified entity" (ποιόν), that is, usually a substance having certain qualities.[51] Justice is a quality, but the corresponding qualified entity is a just individual. On the one hand, this situation is due to the Stoic metaphysical concern with particulars and its use of many human examples; on the other hand, it is due to the impossibility of separating in reality the first two Stoic categories. Sometimes, however, the Stoics themselves neglected this distinction.[52] The Stoics further divided their second category into the "commonly qualified" (κοινῶς ποιόν) and the "peculiarly qualified" (ἰδίως ποιόν). It is not really easy to understand what they meant by the "commonly qualified," since they greatly emphasized the "peculiarly (or individually) qualified." However, some help can be found in Diogenes Laertius, who claims that the Stoic Diogenes of Babylon (the head of the Stoic school in early to mid-second century BC) said that "an appellative is a part of language which signifies a common quality [κοινὴν ποιότητα], e.g. 'man,' 'horse'; a name is a part of language which indicates a peculiar quality [ἰδίαν ποιότητα], e.g. 'Diogenes.' 'Socrates.' "[53] Thus, the Stoics used the "commonly qualified" and the "individually qualified" to distinguish between what the Aristotelians and we today call species and individuals respectively. In other words, the Stoics used their second category, the "qualified," to make a distinction for which Aristotle used his first category, "substance."[54]

The testimonies we have about the Stoics shed more light on what they meant by "individually qualified." Most texts make it clear that an "individually qualified" entity is actually an individual. We thus learn of "a peculiarly qualified thing like Plato,"[55] or of "peculiarly qualified entities such as Dion and Theon."[56] It is also worth mentioning a reference to the Stoics made by the sixth-century Neoplatonist Simplicius, because he connects the Stoic "peculiarly qualified" with the Plotinian forms of individuals: "In the case of compound entities there exists individual form [τὸ ἀτομωθὲν εἶδος]—with reference to which the Stoics speak of something peculiarly qualified [ἰδίως ποιόν]."[57] This passage from Simplicius helps us to comprehend that Neoplatonists did indeed associate the Plotinian forms of individuals with the Stoic "peculiarly qualified." As Rist noted, Plotinus might have been influenced in his view of the forms of individuals by the Stoic notion of "peculiarly qualified."

To further explicate the relationship between the first two Stoic categories,

I would like to quote a text that will shed additional light on the topic and will help me to demonstrate that Basil and Gregory used Stoic categories. The text comes from two different sources, Dexippus and Simplicius, but is almost identical in both accounts. According to Simplicius, Porphyry says:

> The substratum has two senses, both with the Stoics and with the older[58]: the first meaning of substratum is the qualityless matter, which Aristotle calls "potential"[59]; in its second meaning, substratum is the qualified entity, subsisting either commonly or peculiarly; for both bronze and Socrates are substrata in those things that come to be in them or are predicated of them.[60]

In other words, the Stoics actually believed that their first category, substratum, means both "qualityless matter" and "qualified entity" (either commonly or peculiarly). This information accords with my earlier presentation of the first two Stoic categories.

Hübner has shown that Basil of Caesarea's concept of substance is predominantly Stoic.[61] Basil describes the substance of the created world as the material substratum (ὑλικός ὑποκείμενος).[62] Gregory of Nyssa rejects his brother's Stoic definition of the substance ("by *ousia* I do *not* mean the material substratum"[63]), while embracing more decidedly the Aristotelian definition.[64] Moreover, unlike Basil and the Stoics, Gregory thinks that there are various created *ousiai*, not only one: "One is the *ousia* of the fire, and another that of the water, and their meanings are different."[65]

Despite these examples, however, I think that Gregory found the second definition of the Stoic substance from Simplicius's account—substance is a peculiarly or commonly qualified entity—in agreement with Aristotle's own notion of substance; a qualified entity is a substance after all. In *Ad Graecos*, Gregory writes, "If somebody says that we call Peter and Paul and Barnabas three partial substances [οὐσίας μερικάς] (it is clear that this means particular [ἰδικάς] [substances])—for this is more accurate to say—he should recognize that [by that] we do not mean anything else but the individual, which is the person [ἄτομον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πρόσωπον]."[66]

As these examples show, Gregory seems to have deliberately amalgamated Stoic and Aristotelian categories here: expressions such as "partial substance" (μερική οὐσία) and "particular substance" (ἰδική οὐσία) seem to be a mix of the Aristotelian οὐσία with the Stoic ἰδίως ποιὸν,[67] although they may as well betray a Porphyrian influence on Gregory.[68] Of course, this amalgamation is not unprecedented by the time of Gregory. As shown above, Diogenes of Babylon, a noted Stoic himself, uses "man" and "horse" to exemplify what a commonly qualified entity is, whereas Aristotle uses the same examples for his secondary

ousia. At the same time, my argument is also supported by what Porphyry tells us in Simplicius's account quoted above. Therefore, I conclude that Gregory did use the Stoic category of quality to shape his view of the individual. To be more specific, I should say that both brothers use both Stoic and Aristotelian categories in their treatment of the individual. Yet whereas Basil's view is more Stoic, Gregory's is more Aristotelian.

The Individual as a Collection of Properties in Platonism

The definition of a sensible particular as a collection of properties (ἄθροισμα)—some scholars even translate it as "bundle of properties"—can be traced as far back as Plato's *Theaetetus* 157b–c where he suggests this idea in passing. After Plato a similar use of ἄθροισμα is encountered in Antiochus of Ascalon (2nd–1st c. BC) and Alcinous.[69] Lloyd claims to have identified the passage from Antiochus in a quotation by Sextus Empiricus:

> For just as hand by itself is not a man, nor is a head, nor a foot, nor any other such part, but the compound made up of them is conceived as a whole, so also 'Man' is not barely animal, nor solely rational, not mortal alone, but the aggregate of all these [τὸ ἐξ ἁπάντων ἄθροισμα]—that is to say, at once animal and mortal and rational.[70]

A Platonist himself, Alcinous also applies the term ἄθροισμα to a sensible substance, as in the following example:

> [S]ince of sense-objects some are primary, such as qualities, e.g. color, or whiteness, and others accidental, such as "white" or "colored," and following on these the composite entity [ἄθροισμα], such as fire or honey, even so there will be one sort of sense-perception concerned with the primary objects, called "primary," and another concerned with secondary, called "secondary" . . . The primary and secondary sensibles are judged by sense-perception not without the aid of opinion-based reason, while the composite [ἄθροισμα] is judged by opinion-based reason, not without the aid of sense-perception.[71]

Yet it was Plotinus who took his predecessors' suggestion a little further and Porphyry who presented it in a more accessible form. It is these latter two views that I wish to present next.[72] It should be kept in mind from the outset that, as a Platonist himself, Plotinus elaborates the theory of an individual as

a collection of properties in regard to a sensible substance. He does not say anything in this sense about intelligibles or the divinity. Moreover, he excludes the souls of those sensible substances from the discussion:

> but since here below [in the sensible world] also in the mixture and composition one element is body and the other soul . . . and the nature of soul is in that intelligible All and will not fit the classification of what is called substance here below, we must, even if it is difficult to do so, all the same leave soul out of the investigation in which we are at present occupied.[73]

The soul is a resident alien in the sensible world. Mulrooney warns that Plotinus does not investigate a human being *qua* human, but only *qua* sensible substance: "His investigation is thus a deliberately partial exploration of the full reality; and an exploration of the lowest part of that reality."[74] Plotinus then proceeds to describe a sensible substance as "a conglomeration of qualities and matter" (συμφόρησις τις ποιότητων καὶ ὕλης, *Enn*. VI.3.8.20) and "this compound of many [which] is not a 'something' but a 'such' " (τοῦτο τὸ ἐκ πολλῶν, οὐ τὶ ἀλλὰ ποιὸν, *Enn*. VI.3.15.27)[75] and "whose apparent existence [is] a congress of perceptibles" (τὴν δοκοῦσαν ὑπόστασιν αὐτῆς σύνοδος τῶν πρὸς αἴσθησιν, *Enn*. VI.3.10.16). It should be noted here that, in using such phrases to refer to the "apparent existence" of sensible substances, Plotinus is consistent with his previous intention of not examining the soul of these substances. Therefore, the question to be asked is "What keeps these collections of properties together, making them human individuals for example?" As Mulrooney notices, no principle of unity is apparent, since an individual sensible substance is grasped as such by the senses and not by reason.[76] Nevertheless, Mulrooney insists, against Lloyd, that there is a principle of unity for an individual sensible substance, namely, the soul, but that this principle is just not a sensible one.[77] Of course, *Enn*. VI.3 allows for this conclusion, but unfortunately Plotinus is not interested in elaborating further on an individual as a collection of properties. Consequently, we should turn to his disciple Porphyry for further elucidation.

Porphyry wrote the *Isagoge* (or "Introduction") at the request of Chrysaorius, a Roman senator who had studied Aristotle's *Categories* with little success. In this work, Porphyry expands on Plotinus's suggestion, describing an individual as a unique collection of properties which in themselves are not unique. Thus,

> Socrates, this white, and this approaching son of Sophroniscus, if Socrates be his only son, are called individual. Such things are

> called individuals because each thing is composed of a collection of properties which can never be the same for another; for the properties of Socrates could not be the same for any other particular man. The properties of man, however, I mean the man in common, will be the same for a great many, more strongly, for all particular men as men. (*Isag.* 7.20–26)[78]

In this example, Porphyry allows for individual qualities ("this white"), individual relations ("this approaching son of Sophroniscus"), and individual substances ("Socrates"). If one were to use Aristotelian language, one should say that Porphyry allows for individual categories, both substances and accidents. However, the best example for Porphyry's purposes seems to be the individual substance known as Socrates. It is Socrates who *qua* animal differs from a horse because of a specific difference such as rationality (*Isag.* 8.16–17); *qua* individual human, Socrates differs from other individual humans because of another specific difference, such as the hooked quality of his nose (*Isag.* 8.15). The differences Porphyry mentions as distinguishing humans from other animals and from one another are both substantial and accidental. Thus, he says, "Rational, mortal, and being capable of knowledge belong to man *per se*, but hook-nosed or snub-nosed belong accidentally and not *per se*" (*Isag.* 9.11–14). Regarded in themselves, these and other differences are not unique, since they can be ascertained in many individuals, but their coming together uniquely describes an individual in Porphyry's view.

This Porphyrian definition of an individual was perhaps the most elaborate one to be found in the fourth century. It is quite likely that the Cappadocians were familiar with it, since in Basil's *Against Eunomius* (*AE* hereafter) 2.4 and Gregory of Nyssa's *Ad Petrum* 2 we see the example of Socrates being replaced with that of the Apostles Peter or Paul, who are described as unique collections of properties. Thus, the Apostle Peter is described as the son of Jonah, born in Bethsaida and the brother of Andrew. Even if, as Rist has convincingly shown,[79] Basil knew very little Plotinus, we have to accept that he read Porphyry's *Isagoge* or a handbook that reproduced Porphyry's arguments; so, quite likely, did Gregory of Nyssa.[80] The *Isagoge* can be used as a beginner's guide to Aristotle's *Categories* and, given its introductory purpose, *Isagoge*'s arguments are less sophisticated than the arguments Porphyry provides in his other Aristotelian commentaries. What is perhaps most important is that the particular doctrine of an individual as a collection of properties does not occur in such a clear formulation in any pagan author (still less in Christian authors) prior to Porphyry. Therefore, the Cappadocians and later Neoplatonists might have been fascinated by it and adopted its use in their writings.

The Plotinian Will of the One

In searching for a concept of person in classical antiquity, scholars often also look for something that is essential in the constitution of human persons, namely, the will, or rather free willing, as a factor or aspect distinct from, and irreducible to, intellect and desire or reason and emotion. One example is Dihle's *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity*.[81] Dihle claims that there was no theory of will throughout the Greek philosophical tradition, because reason and intellectual knowledge played an extremely important role. He finds in Greek thought a tendency to evaluate human action "in terms of . . . knowledge and error or vision and blindness" (pp. 233–234); this "intellectualism" leads in the extreme case to a view of virtue as "cognition of the objectives of action" (p. 51). In his view, the concept of will was implicit from the beginning in the biblical notion of obedience to the commands of God, and it was Augustine who formulated the first classical theory of the will. While other scholars today agree that Augustine formulated the first theory of will, they regard Dihle's book as flawed primarily because he simplistically labels the Greek tradition "intellectualist" and ignores historical evidence that speaks against his theses.[82] The concept of person, however, should not be reduced to a discussion of free will, since it includes other major components as well, as this book will show.

From the point of view of my investigation into the patristic concept of divine persons, it would be tautological to speak of free will in God. It was evident to the church fathers that God was free. In their view, to deliberate is to take time to think of the distinction between right and wrong—that is, not to know this distinction immediately. This entails imperfection, which cannot be attributed to God. In his *Orations against the Arians* (1.35, 1.52, 3.62, 3.66) Athanasius also suggests that "willing" or "deliberating" can "tilt" either way, toward either the good or the bad.[83] A later Greek church father such as John of Damascus, in summing up the faith of the fathers before him, also considers that *prohairesis* is not properly predicated of God:

> But in the case of God, it is to be remembered, we speak of wish, but it is not correct to speak of choice. For God does not deliberate, since that is a mark of ignorance, and no one deliberates about what he knows. But if counsel is a mark of ignorance, surely choice must also be so. God, then, since He has absolute knowledge of everything, does not deliberate.[84]

Therefore, when dealing with divine persons, I propose to consider a different kind of will, such as was first expressed by Plotinus in *Enn.* VI.8.9.45–

46 in regard to the One and repeated almost word for word in regard to the Christian God by Gregory of Nyssa as "God continually wills to be what he is and is adequately what he wills to be" (*CE* 3.1.125).[85] *Ennead* VI.8 is of major importance for the intellectual history of Western civilization, because it introduces a radically new notion of the divine will as will of the self. As commentators of Plotinus have noticed,[86] this notion is totally unprecedented and amazing by the standards of ancient philosophy. It cannot be traced back to the doctrines of divine providence, that is, the divine will oriented toward the outside, toward the production of being and the regulation of the course of things.[87] The novel notion Gregory of Nyssa and some Christian predecessors added to this understanding of the divine will is that it can be both transcendent and immanent. Gregory's insight is the logical consequence of biblical reflection on the incarnation. At this point I shall focus on Plotinus.

Ennead VI.8 [39], entitled "On Free Will and the Will of the One," is a fairly late treatise and can therefore be regarded as a product of Plotinus's mature thinking. Both Rist[88] and Armstrong[89] think that this treatise may have been provoked by the reading of a treatise on the nature of God, possibly Christian or para-Christian, now lost to us; but this opinion has not been generally accepted, according to Armstrong.[90] *Ennead* VI.8 [39] and its immediate predecessor in both chronological and thematic order, *Enn.* VI.7 [38], contain the profoundest and most powerful expression of the thought of Plotinus about the One, or the Good. The positive language of will, love, and thought is used about the One here, but at the same time Plotinus makes it clear that he has no desire to abandon the negative (apophatic) way of approach to the One.

Ennead VI.8 starts quite reluctantly, since a better starting point does not exist, with an analysis of the concept of human freedom in order to ascend to the consideration of the freedom of the One. Plotinus's entire reaction seems to have been prompted by "a rash statement starting from a different way of thinking," which says that since the Good "happens to be as it is [τυχοῦσα οὕτως ἔχειν], and does not have the mastery of what it is, and is what it is not from itself, it would not have freedom, and its doing or not doing what it is necessitated to do or not to do is not in its power" (*Enn.* VI.8.7.11–16). It is not clear whether Plotinus considers this as a positive statement of doctrine other than his own or an attack on his doctrine. He takes it seriously, however, and tries to establish his own view of the One against this statement. What is interesting is that both his positive and negative ways of speaking about the One have been availed of and adapted by later Christian Platonists such as Gregory of Nyssa, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, and Maximus the Con-

fessor. For the purpose of showing how Gregory of Nyssa used *Enn.* VI.8, it is *not* worth presenting all the arguments that Plotinus produces against his opponent. I shall therefore be selective in my presentation.

Plotinus considers the "rash statement" contrary and absurd, because it would completely do away with the nature of free will and self-determination and our idea of what is in our power, and would imply that nothing is in anyone's power (*Enn.* VI.8.7.16–20). He endeavors to demonstrate that neither Intellect nor the One "happened to be" but that they "had to be" exactly what they are. In other words, there is no contingency but only necessity in the divine nature. I shall arrive shortly at the issue of exactly what necessity Plotinus is concerned with. In *Enn.* VI.8.9, Plotinus's argument takes the form of a *reductio ad absurdum*: "If someone takes the 'happened to be' [συνέβη] as applying to the One, then it should be applicable to the Intellect also which is after the One. But I can show that the 'happened to be' does not apply to the Intellect; therefore, still less can it be applied to the One."[91]

He shows that the "happened to be" does not apply to Intellect by using a second *reductio ad absurdum*: If the "happened to be" does not even apply to real being, how could it apply to Intellect which is "beyond being [ἐπέκεινα ὄντος]"?[92] "For, if anything is going to happen, it happens to being, but being itself does not happen, nor is it a casual occurrence that being is like this, nor does it derive being like this from something else, being as it is, but this is really its nature, to be real being."[93] The First Principle, or the One, therefore, has to be in the way it is.

The First Principle is also "all power, really master of itself, being what it wills to be."[94] This statement is perhaps one of the most important in the whole treatise because it expresses the will as will of self and connects it with being. As I mentioned, the definition of divine will as will of self is unprecedented before Plotinus, because divine will was thought of only as providence. The connection of will with being shifts the emphasis from will as power to deliberate[95] to the will as power to be, yet another dramatic shift, this time from the theory of knowledge to ontology. It is the necessity of being what it wills to be that Plotinus has in mind for the First Principle, and not a necessity imposed on it by someone else who is superior to it. Otherwise, we would have to postulate another First Principle on which no one else can impose anything. In his commentary on *Enn.* VI.8.9, Leroux notices the difficulty in putting together propositions that contradict so explicitly the doctrines of the classical philosophy to which Neoplatonism is heir: "for example, how to integrate a proposition affirming that there is necessity only in the inferior beings (*Enn.* VI.8.9.11–12), when this very necessity—when opposed to these beings' con-

tingency—seems to be reserved to the superior hypostases alone?" The explanation Leroux provides is that here Aristotle's heritage is transformed slightly for the sake of refutation.[96]

Leroux regards as strategic the introduction as late as *Enn.* VI.8.9.44 of the new concept of will for two reasons: (1) this concept is the only one that seems to resist the ordeal of the negative theology that in chapters 8 and 9 removed the majority of the predicates of the One; (2) the predicate of power (δύναμις), retrieving the classical relation between hegemony and will, makes the concept of will become the only one capable of refuting the "rash statement" and giving content to the metaphysics of the One.[97]

The First Principle is not only beyond being, but it also generates being.[98] Leroux distinguishes at this point between how the One and the Intellect generate being. The latter generates being like a demiurge. The former generates being in the same way in which the Good of Plato's *Republic* does: The One is before all beings, as their principle or source,[99] it overflows.[100] There is no voluntary or deliberative process involved in this case.[101] This overflow is involuntary and necessary.[102] As Rist notices when discussing the issue of the generation of new beings by the One,[103] Plotinus is less worried by the Parmenidean dictum that "nothing can come from nothing" than are most of his predecessors. As Plotinus clearly outlines in *Enn* VI.8.19.18 and V.5.12.57, although new beings arise "from the One," they are not part of the One or transformations of the One. In this Plotinus differs significantly both from Milesians and early Pythagoreans, for whom this notion of new beings arising from a First Principle was unknown, and from Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics, who were still under the spell of Parmenides.[104]

In *Enn.* VI.8.10.6–11 Plotinus explicitly connects "happened to be" with coming to be "by chance" (ἐκ τύχης). But how, he asks, could one attribute chance to the principle of all reason and order and limit—that is, to Intellect? "Chance is certainly mistress of many things," continues Plotinus, "but is not mistress of intellect and reason and order so as to generate them." Thus, he has answered the first part of the objection, namely, that the One happens to be what it is. Plotinus now addresses the second part of the objection, namely, that the One does not have the mastery of what it is.

Although he mentioned that Intellect is master of itself at *Enn.* VI.8.9.46, Plotinus returns to this issue and is more specific: Intellect is master of his own substance.[105] He wrote this perhaps to refute those who believed that even the gods were subject to fate. For example, Alexander of Aphrodisias wrote that it is not in the power of the gods to be what they are, "for such an element is in their nature, and nothing of things which exist in this sense is in someone's power [ἐπ' αὐτῷ]."[106] Intellect is before chance and master of his own substance,

emphasizes Plotinus. "He is what he is of necessity, and could not be otherwise. Now he is not as he is because he cannot be otherwise, but because being what he is is the best."[107] The idea that the divine is what it is because this is the best is a Platonic idea that makes freedom basically reside in the freedom of the good. With the appropriate adaptation, this idea was also rather widespread in patristic theology. Origen, Athanasius, Basil of Caesarea, and Gregory of Nyssa all believed that it was good for God to be the Father of such a Son.[108]

Leroux's comment on the latter Platonic idea is important. He says that in the case of the Plotinian First Principle the freedom is absolute because it cannot orient itself toward what is inferior, whereas in other beings the movement toward the inferior results precisely from a lack of freedom. A similar idea is encountered in Gregory of Nyssa when he speaks of the divine Son who can orient only toward the good, and human sons who can orient toward either the good or the bad, according to their own will.[109] Unlike Leroux, however, Gregory does not say that created beings are not free; on the contrary, they are free to choose the good and become adopted children of God, in this way following the example of the natural Son of God. The idea that humans have been created in God's image has perhaps played an important part in Christianity's strong affirmation of human freedom against the advocates of fate. Moreover, one has to keep in mind that Gregory speaks from within an incarnational system in which God "emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, being born in human likeness" (Phil 2:7).

I should also note, *pace* Leroux, that in referring to the will of the First Principle, Plotinus uses two Greek words interchangeably: βούλησις and θέλησις. Leroux advocates a point of view which alleges that Plotinus uses predominantly θέλησις in regard to the divine, a usage allegedly confirmed by the Christian tradition.[110] The same does not hold true for Gregory of Nyssa, who uses βούλησις in reference to God in the passage where he draws his inspiration from *Enn.* VI.8.

Yet let us not forget that Plotinus prefers the negative way of approach to the divine. The final step in the negative way is the necessity of negating one's negations.[111] Plotinus takes this step and says that we should "rather throw 'what it wills to be' away to the beings, [because Intellect] itself is greater than all willing, setting willing after itself."[112]

Conclusions

In summary then, Gregory of Nyssa shows signs of familiarity and in some cases explicit use of the philosophical concepts presented above. He borrows

them without acknowledgment either directly from their authors or from the works of his Christian or pagan predecessors. These concepts inform his thinking about the individual. Nevertheless, none of these concepts singularly represents a sufficiently sophisticated view of the individual, and still less of the person. It was the Cappadocian fathers who provided the first fully developed view of the person. The Christian debate about the Trinity forced the development of the concept of person in the direction in which it matured.

3

The Lesser Trinitarian Treatises I

To His Brother Peter: On the Difference between Ousia *and* Hypostasis

The authorship of the treatise entitled *To His Brother Peter: On the Difference between* Ousia *and* Hypostasis (*Ad Petrum* hereafter)[1] is still debated, with some scholars attributing it to Basil of Caesarea and others to Gregory of Nyssa. In thirty-four manuscripts the treatise is attributed to Basil of Caesarea, and in ten others to Gregory of Nyssa. Therefore, until quite recently it was believed to be the thirty-eighth letter of Basil of Caesarea. Yet studies such as those undertaken by Hübner[2] and by distinguished specialists in Basil—Cavallin,[3] Fedwick, and Pouchet[4]—have argued in favor of Gregory of Nyssa's authorship, a conclusion that is now widely accepted. Nonetheless, other specialists in Basil, such as Hausschild, Hammerstaedt, and Drecoll, do not accept the Gregorian authorship.[5] Another scholar, this time a specialist in Gregory of Nyssa, Johannes Zachhuber, is not totally willing to discard the Gregorian authorship, but he claims that "no unambiguous evidence has been adduced in [Gregory's] favour so far," and he does not think a decision on the question is vital for the purpose of his own book.[6] I find unconvincing the arguments against Gregory's authorship, especially since Drecoll himself, although attributing the treatise to Basil, confesses that "stylistically Gregory's authorship seems to be somewhat closer."[7] Therefore, in this book I assume Gregorian authorship. The addressee of the treatise in that case is Peter of Anessi, the brother of Gregory of Nyssa and the bishop of Sebaste. Concerning its date, scholars agree that *Ad Petrum* was written sometime after Basil's

death on January 1, 379. Daniélou dated it to 381, while May to 379 or a little later.[8]

As the title declares, the letter proposes to explain the difference between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, two Greek words the Cappadocians used to refer to "substance" and "person" respectively. The work is very similar to Basil's *Ep.* 236, of which the entire sixth section is devoted to the same topic. Pouchet noted that, after the death of his brother Basil and inspired by *Ep.* 236.6, Gregory of Nyssa composed a more substantial dissertation on the same topic, the famous *Ep.* 38 in the Basilian corpus.[9]

In this chapter, I present and analyze Gregory's view of the divine persons as it emerges from *Ad Petrum*. This evaluation helps me to understand more clearly the Cappadocian contribution to the notion of person and the formulation of Trinitarian dogma. I shall begin the presentation as the author of the treatise does, by considering the difference between substance and person as an analogy of the difference between common and particular (or species and individual). Further differences between the two will follow. Having distinguished between nature and person, I shall consider some of Gregory's definitions of the person and then see how they apply to divine persons.

The Common and the Particular

To explain the distinction between God's substance (οὐσία) and the divine persons (ὑποστάσεις), the Cappadocians used the analogy of the common and the particular, as detailed in Aristotle and the Stoics (see chapter 2, where I also discussed how Basil and Gregory might have adopted this distinction). Yet additional examples from the two Cappadocian brothers will further illuminate the discussion. Basil expresses his position on the issue in *Ep.* 236.6, and that passage most likely influenced his younger brother's views. Basil's text reads:

> Ὑπόστασις and οὐσία have the distinction that the common has with reference to the particular [τὸ κοινὸν πρὸς τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον]; for example, just as "animal" [ζῷον][10] has with reference to "a particular human" [δεῖνα ἄνθρωπον]. For this reason we confess one substance (οὐσία) for the Godhead, so as not to hand down variously the notion of being; but we confess that the ὑπόστασις is particular, in order that our conception of Father and Son and Holy Spirit may be unconfused and plain. For unless we think of the characteristics that are sharply defined in the case of each, as for example fatherhood and sonship and holiness [πατρότητα, υἱότητα καὶ ἁγιασμόν], but

> from the general notion of being confess God, it is impossible to hand down a sound definition of faith. Therefore, we must add what is particular to what is common and thus confess the faith; the Godhead is something common, the paternity something particular, and combining these we should say: "I believe in God the Father." And again in the confession of the Son we should do likewise—combine the particular with the common and say: "I believe in God the Son." Similarly too in the case of the Holy Spirit, we should frame on the same principle our utterance of the reference to him and say: "I believe also in the divine Holy Spirit," so that throughout the whole, both unity is preserved in the confession of the one Godhead, and that which is peculiar to the persons [τὸ τῶν προσώπων ἰδιάζον] is confessed in the distinction made in the characteristics attributed to each.[11]

Basil uses the example of "animal" (ζῷον) versus "a particular human" (δεῖνα ἄνθρωπον) to show the difference between the common and the particular. It is clear that what he has in mind is the distinction between species and individual.

To explain the difference between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, Gregory uses a similar example, speaking of the "human" (ἄνθρωπος) versus "a certain human" (τίς ἄνθρωπος). The context of Gregory's explanations is a reference to some of his contemporaries who do not distinguish between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις. When referring to God, they speak either of one ὑπόστασις or of three οὐσίαι.[12] Ziegler is right in claiming that those who speak of one ὑπόστασις are probably strict pro-Nicenes for whom ὑπόστασις and οὐσία are synonymous and mean "substance," whereas those who speak of three οὐσίαι are probably Homoiousians, Homoians and Anomoians.[13] Gregory writes:

> From among all names some, used for subjects plural and numerically diverse, have a more universal meaning, as for example "human" [ἄνθρωπος]. For when you say "human," you thereby signify the common nature [τὴν κοινὴν φύσιν], and do not specify any human who is particularly known by that name [τινὰ ἄνθρωπον, τὸν ἰδίως ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος γνωριζόμενον]. For Peter is no more human [Οὐ . . . μᾶλλον ἄνθρωπος] than Andrew, John, or James.[14] Therefore, the community of the thing signified, since it refers to all alike who are included under the same name, demands a further subdivision if we are to understand not merely human in general [τὸν καθόλον ἄνθρωπον], but "Peter" or "John."[15]

The influence of Basil's *Ep.* 236.6 on Gregory's *Ad Petrum* 2.1–11 is obvious, but a common philosophical source of inspiration for both Cappadocians is not to be excluded. The most likely influences on them are either the Aristotelian distinction between individual and species, or the Stoic distinction between individually qualified and commonly qualified, or both. To illustrate their point, both brothers use the example of "human" versus "this human." They only differ in their choice of the modifying pronoun: Basil uses δεῖνος, while Gregory τὶς.

Although I alluded to it in chapter 2 when discussing possible Stoic influences on Gregory, I shall summarize Hübner's argument about Basil's more Stoicizing view of substance here.[16] In considering the two components of the Stoic category of quality, Hübner proves that while Basil's distinction is influenced by the Stoics, Gregory's is Aristotelian. The Stoics held that οὐσία= ἄποιος ὕλη=πρῶτον ὑποκείμενον,[17] and "being" means "being material"; thus, in their view, the same οὐσία lies at the foundation of both God and the cosmos. By οὐσία Basil often means the "material substratum" (τὸ ὑλικὸν ὑποκείμενον—e.g., *AE* 2.4.11.577C for the human οὐσία). He exhibits a rather materialistic understanding of οὐσία, influenced by Stoicism, which is rejected by his brother Gregory.[18] Yet, unlike the Stoics, Basil distinguishes between God's οὐσία and the created οὐσία.[19] Basil's concept of substance is thus influenced by the Stoic notion of "commonly qualified" (κοινῶς ποιόν).[20] More recently, Zachhuber has argued against a Stoic understanding of οὐσία in Basil, based on the fact that in *AE* 1.19 and elsewhere Basil makes it quite clear that that sense of οὐσία cannot be an analogy for the Trinitarian Godhead. According to Zachhuber, the above-mentioned passages where Basil sounds Stoic should be taken as *ad hominem* arguments rather than positive statements of his views.[21]

According to Hübner, Gregory of Nyssa's description of οὐσία is Aristotelian.[22] The difference of perception between the two brothers enforces Hübner's conviction that *Ep.* 38 should be attributed to Gregory, since it displays an Aristotelian understanding of the οὐσία. Nevertheless, Hübner allows that Basil is not systematic but that he also uses both Aristotelian and Plotinian concepts to deal with other issues.[23] The concept of the "individual" is perhaps among these "other issues." Another German scholar, Grillmeier, also suggests that the understanding of the distinctions between substance and persons in both Basil and Gregory of Nyssa may be influenced by Stoicism.[24] Unfortunately, Grillmeier does not fully elaborate.

In his fine analysis of *Ad Petrum*, Zachhuber supports the idea that its author's understanding of human nature is influenced by Aristotle.[25] Gregory's understanding of human nature is also present in other later Aristotelian commentators, and this makes Zachhuber believe that it was probably a rather

common view at the time. Among the commentators, Zachhuber includes Porphyry, Ammonius Hermiae, and Boethius. Zachhuber demonstrates that the *phusis* that the universal term "human" was said to indicate would be the totality of human individuals; its relation to individual *pragma* is, then, probably that of a whole to its parts. Humankind as the totality of its individuals is universal *phusis* as employed by the treatise's author. Moreover, in *Ad Petrum* Gregory uses a proper name to include a reference to an object, more exactly to one *pragma*, for what Aristotle called πρώτη ουσία. In *Ad Petrum*, as in other places, Gregory uses a semantic theory to explain an ontological or logical distinction. According to this semantic theory used by grammarians,[26] a comprehensive name means a collective noun (e.g., "people," "crowd," or "human"); a proper name (e.g., Paul) is thought to separate or cut off (χωρίζειν) the notion of an individual from that of a whole, which the universal name conveys. This theory helped Gregory distinguish between substance/nature and individuals.

Further Differences between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις

In the last sections of *Ad Petrum* (6–8) Gregory returns to differences between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις. For a more systematic presentation, I shall now examine this issue. He tells his addressee that even the Apostle Paul envisioned the distinction between the two terms when writing "He [the Son] is the reflection of God's glory and the imprint of his ὑπόστασις (χαρακτήρ ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ)" (Heb 1:3).[27]

Currently, it is generally acknowledged that ὑπόστασις was synonymous with οὐσία in the time of Paul and even later. Modern biblical and patristic scholars consider that Heb 1:3 refers to the Son as the "imprint of God's substance (or being)," and modern translations of the Bible also reflect this consensus.[28] Gregory, however, does not accept this synonymy but alleges that by using ὑπόστασις the Apostle wanted to indicate the person and "the continuity and intimacy of the relationship between the Son and the Father."[29] To support his thesis, Gregory plays on the meanings of the word "imprint" (χαρακτήρ). On a first level, he equates "imprint" (χαρακτήρ) with "figure" or "exterior form" (σχῆμα) and states that a body consists altogether in form.[30] Nevertheless, even if the definition of the form (σχῆμα) is different from the definition of the body (σῶμα), and by reason one can separate form from body, "nature does not admit of the separation, but one is always thought of in connection with the other."[31] Accordingly, if one sees the form of a body, one is likely to think of the body itself, and if one sees the imprint of the ὑπόστασις of the Father, one

is bound to think of the ὑπόστασις of the Father. On a second level, Gregory uses the same argument in regard to "imprint" now equated with "image" (εἰκών) and draws heavily on the fact that the Son is the image of the Father.[32]

Basil of Caesarea himself not only insists on the distinction between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις in Heb 1:3, but he also alleges that the Nicene fathers distinguished between the two terms. It is in this way that he interprets the anathema accompanying the Nicene Creed: "If anyone says that the Son is of another substance or ὑπόστασις [ἐξ ἑτέρας οὐσίας ἢ ὑποστάσεως], the catholic and apostolic Church anathematizes him."[33] In an article on ὕπαρξις and ὑπόστασις in the Cappadocians, Jean Pépin suggests that the Cappadocians were actually anti-Nicene in their understanding of the meanings of οὐσία and ὑπόστασις.[34] In my view, even if the Cappadocians were anti-Nicene, they did not want to admit this, but tried to force the interpretation of the Nicene anathema in order to accommodate it to their understanding, which distinguished between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις. Yet whatever Gregory's and Basil's arguments in favor of a distinction between the two terms, even before their time, historical and exegetical testimony stands against their thesis.

First of all, the Cappadocians overlook the fact that ὑπόστασις was considered by many as synonymous with οὐσία at least until the synod held in 362 at Alexandria, and this synonymy caused endless trouble. For example, even Alexander himself, bishop of Alexandria at the time of the synod of Nicaea (325), preferred ὑπόστασις or φύσις often in contexts where οὐσία would have been possible.[35] The synonymy was due to the meaning of ὑφεστάναι (to lie under), which made ὑπόστασις an equivalent of "substratum" and consequently of οὐσία. While Origen attempted to distinguish these terms,[36] his opinion carried little influence. Hammerstaedt argues that the meaning of ὑπόστασις as used by Origen is different from the meaning imposed by the Cappadocians.[37] I am inclined to disagree with Hammerstaedt. I do acknowledge that in numerous Origenian texts ὑπόστασις is the exact equivalent of οὐσία. But this does not exclude the existence of the passages just indicated in which Origen uses the two terms with different meanings.

Second, in *AE* 1.20.11, Basil himself makes use of the synonymy of the two words in order to affirm the consubstantiality of God the Father with his Son.

Third, in *Ep.* 125.1, Basil writes that οὐσία refers to the Son's common substance with the Father, whereas ὑπόστασις expresses the doctrine of salvation. In other words, the former refers to the *theologia*, whereas the latter to the *oikonomia*. Yet the context in which the Nicene fathers anathematize whoever discriminates between the Son's and Father's οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, thus making the two words synonyms, is not "economic" as Basil insinuates. The

Nicaenum deals here with the Son's generation from the Father and his immutability, as well as with the formula "There was a time when he was not"; no mention of the Son's incarnation is made in this particular passage.

Fourth, there was a tradition that could have allowed for the interpretation embraced by the Cappadocians. It goes back to Eusebius of Caesarea who, in writing to his diocese to justify his endorsement of the *Nicaenum*, explained that the Son "is not from some other ὑπόστασις or substance, but from the Father."[38] This interpretation indeed allows for the conclusion that the Son is another person (or hypostasis), distinct from the Father, "so that there are two, and indeed three, divine hypostases."[39]

Fifth, the two Cappadocian brothers might also have read the famous letter of Athanasius of Alexandria known as the *Tomus ad Antiochenos* (the synodal letter of the council held in 362 in Alexandria),[40] where a distinction is made between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις.

Definitions of ὑπόστασις

Having distinguished between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις in *Ad Petrum* 1–2, Gregory proceeds to give definitions of ὑπόστασις in sections 3–6: "That which is specifically referred to is indicated by the term ὑπόστασις."[41] In Gregory's view, "human" (ἄνθρωπος) is a rather indefinite term that leaves the listener with an almost vague, unqualified idea of what it is referring to. As he employs the term in the other Trinitarian treatises, which we will examine in chapters 4 and 5, "human" indicates human nature, thus being the name of a species. That explains why it is rather unqualified. Of course, "human" is qualified in the sense that it is distinguished from other species (e.g., from "horse"), but as the name of a species it conveys little information. Gregory summarizes this by saying that "although the nature is indicated by the name 'human,' the thing that subsists [τὸ ὑφεστός] in that nature and is specifically [ἰδίως] indicated by the name is not made evident to us."[42] On the contrary, "Paul" is the name of a ὑπόστασις, because it indicates "the nature subsisting in the thing indicated by this name."[43] A ὑπόστασις, however, "is *not* the indefinite notion of substance, which by reason of the commonality of the term employed discloses no stability."[44] It now becomes evident that for Gregory ὑπόστασις means "individual" and is opposed to species. In the human and divine cases, ὑπόστασις can also be rendered as "person."

To clarify the issue even further, Gregory adds that a ὑπόστασις is "the concept which, by means of the specific notes which it indicates, restricts and circumscribes in a particular thing what is common and uncircumscribed."[45]

If Gregory speaks of "circumscription" (περιγραφή) in the case of a ὑπόστασις, he only speaks of "description" (ὑπογραφή) in the case of οὐσία.[46] In doing so, Gregory characterizes a hypostasis as "something that circumscribes" (περιγραφούσα) or the "circumscription of a particular object" (πραγματός τινος περιγραφή).[47]

Gregory then gives a concrete example borrowed from Scripture of what he has said thus far on a rather theoretical level: the case of Job.[48] The story of Job starts in general terms by describing what Job has in common with other humans; more precisely, the biblical author writes "human" (ἄνθρωπος). But then he immediately clarifies that he is indicating a particular human by adding the word "this" (τίς).[49] The Septuagint text that Gregory has in mind reads:

> There was once this human [Ἄνθρωπός τις] in the land of Uz, whose name was Job, and that human [ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος] was truthful, blameless, righteous, fearing God, and avoiding evil. There were born to him seven sons and three daughters. He had seven thousand sheep, three thousand camels, five hundred yokes of oxen, five hundred donkeys, and very many servants. (Job 1:1–2; my translation)

The account becomes more specific—"this human"—in order to characterize Job by means of his peculiar notes (γνωρίσματα), designating the place (the land of Uz), the marks which reveal his character (truthful, blameless, righteous, fearing God, and avoiding evil), and all such external adjuncts that differentiate him and set him apart from the common notion of human (with ten children, seven thousand sheep, etc.). This description gives the reader a rather clear account of just who Job was. Gregory thinks that if the biblical author were to give an account of the substance (that is, the human nature) of Job, he would not have referred to the characteristics just mentioned, because the substance is the same for both Job and his friends Eliphaz the Temanite, Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite.[50] Here Gregory makes a distinction between the species "human" and some of its individuals (Job, Eliphaz, Bildad, Zophar). Also the description of the person (ὑπόστασις) named Job suggests that this person is individualized by putting together some of his characteristic marks. Gregory confirms this supposition later in the treatise when he says that "a ὑπόστασις is also the concourse of the peculiar characteristics."[51] The latter definition of ὑπόστασις is highly reminiscent of the Neoplatonic definition of an individual as a collection of properties.[52] After giving the example of Job, Gregory states that one can apply the same reasoning to divine teachings in order to understand the three divine persons.[53] Gregory seems to be aware that Plotinus and Porphyry had applied only to sensible

substances the definition of an individual as a collection of properties. Therefore, when he passes from a sensible to an intelligible substance such as God, he warns that "it is of no avail to press upon a spiritual thing a definitely prescribed conception, because we are sure that it [i.e., the divine] is beyond all conception."[54] Gregory seems to be aware that he extends to an intelligible substance the Neoplatonic definition of an individual, a conclusion Neoplatonists would have probably found unacceptable. Nevertheless, he does not pretend to provide an explanation of how one should understand the divine nature and the three persons in perfect agreement with a philosophical view. He claims to provide his readers with "an illustration merely and adumbration of the truth, not the very truth of the matter."[55]

Divine Persons

The actual discussion of divine persons in *Ad Petrum* starts at 3.34. The long and beautiful passage (3.34–4.93) that follows will be the focus of this section. Gregory writes that the divine nature common to the three persons is uncreated, incomprehensible, infinite, uncircumscribed by space, and life giving.[56] No divine person can be said to be more uncreated or less uncreated than the other two, because "uncreated" describes the substance, and there are no degrees within the same substance. The idea that there are no degrees of substance betrays an Aristotelian influence.[57] Here Gregory applies, by way of analogy, to the divine persons the argument he developed in regard to human persons at *Ad Petrum* 2.6–7: "Peter is no more human than Andrew, John, or James." He repeats the argument in *CE* 1.172; 1.180, emphasizing that there are no degrees of substance in God: If one believes that the three persons are divine, then one has to accept that none of them is more divine, or less divine, than the other two.

Gregory then proposes in *Ad Petrum* to investigate only those properties (ἰδιάζοντα or γνώρισματα ὑποστάσεως) by which the notion (ἔννοια) of each person of the Trinity is conspicuously and sharply marked off from what is common. The investigation begins in the realm of divine economy, that is, God's relation to the world, or, to be more specific, God's relation to humans. He quotes 1 Cor 12:11: "All these [gifts] are activated by one and the same Spirit, who allots to each one individually just as the Spirit chooses." Gregory paraphrases this verse: "Every good thing that comes to us from the power divine we say is the working of the grace which works all things in all."[58] Gregory's selection of 1 Cor 12:11 is highly appropriate for the argument he is about to make, because the whole of chapter 12 in 1 Corinthians deals with the spiritual

gifts humans receive from the Holy Spirit and the way in which each human has to make use of these gifts for the common good of the Church which is the body of Christ. This very chapter presents not only the relations established among humans in the Church (the image of members of the same body is used) but also the relations between humans and God (the spiritual gifts all come from God). The spiritual gifts Paul refers to in this chapter are the following: utterance of wisdom, utterance of knowledge, faith, healing, working of miracles, discernment of spirits, various kinds of tongues, interpretation of tongues. All of these come from the Spirit alone—or do they? Gregory notices an apparent contradiction in Scripture:

> If we ask whether *from* [ἐκ] the Holy Spirit alone this supply of goods takes its origin and comes to those who are worthy, we are again guided by the Scriptures to the belief that the Only-begotten God is the source and cause of the supply of goods which are worked in us *through* [διὰ] the Spirit. For we have been taught by the Holy Scripture that all things came into being *through* [διά] him (cf. Jn 1:3) and in him hold together. (cf. Col 1:17)[59]

Of course, this is no contradiction, but the Scripture's way of teaching us in stages, lifting up our minds from what is simple to comprehend that which is more complex. This is one of Gregory's methods of interpreting difficult or apparently contradictory scriptural passages. A proof for this divine pedagogy is the fact that, as soon as we are lifted up to the conception that all things come into being through the Logos, "we are again led on by the divinely-inspired guidance and taught that *through* [διά] this power [i.e., the Only-begotten] all things are brought into being from not-being; not, however, even *from* [ἐξ] this power without a beginning; nay, there is a power which exists without generation or beginning, and this is the cause of the cause of all things that exist."[60]

The ultimate cause of everything that exists is God the Father. All that exists, including the Holy Spirit, comes into being from the Father through the Son. The cause of the Spirit's being (τὸ εἶναι) is the Father, Gregory assures us. Indeed, the characteristic notes of the Spirit's person are the following: to be known after the Son and with the Son, and to proceed (ἐκπορεύειν) from the Father, that is, to have his subsistence (ὑφεστάναι) from the Father.[61] From the Spirit the entire supply of goods gushes forth to creation, although the other two divine persons are the supply of goods as well.

Gregory then shifts his focus to the Son and the Father. He already said something about the Son earlier, namely, that all things come into being through him and in him are held together. He now speaks about the Son's

own way of being. Thus, in accord with the Bible and the *Nicaenum*, the Son shines forth as "the only uniquely generated"[62] from the ungenerated light. This is the Son's own characteristic mark that distinguishes him from both the Father and the Holy Spirit: The Son is the only begotten of the three. Unlike the Son and the Spirit, the Father is the "ungenerated light"[63] and "has the subsistence from no other cause."[64] Each of the three marks (ungenerated, begotten, and proceeding forth) best characterizes one divine person and only one.

Karl Holl notes that, unlike Basil, Gregory of Nyssa tends very rarely to use terms such as "fatherhood" (πατρότης) and "sonship" (υἱότης) to express the peculiarities (ἰδιότητες) of the first two divine persons.[65] Instead, Gregory prefers ἀγεννησία, γέννησις, and ἐκπόρευσις for the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit respectively.[66] Gregory also uses the biblical term μονογενὴς for the Son in order to emphasize against the Macedonians that the Son is the only begotten. The latter ridiculed the orthodox by saying that the Son and the Spirit were brothers or that the Spirit was the grandson of the Father. Consequently, in respect to the peculiarities (ἰδιότητες) of the divine persons, Gregory abandons philosophical speculation and adheres to biblical revelation.

If one adds to each divine person (ὑπόστασις) other properties besides the ones that uniquely characterize each of them, one describes each divine person as a unique collection of properties. For example, the Father can be described as, and is, a unique collection of the following: proceeding from no other cause, that is, being ungenerated, and being Father.[67] The Son is a collection of the following: "through himself and with himself makes known the Spirit who proceeds from the Father," and he shines forth as the unique only begotten of the Father; all things (including the Holy Spirit) come into existence from the Father through the Son. The Spirit in turn can be described as a unique collection of the following properties: has his being from the Father, that is, proceeds from the Father, and he is known after the Son and with the Son. Gregory seems to imply here that the unique collection of properties is both that by which the person is known or identified and that by which the person is constituted as distinct. Moreover, the relation of these persons to the common nature is similar to the relation between the individual and the universal (or the particular and the common). Thus, biblical data, as well as philosophical concepts of individuals analyzed in chapter 2, are present in Gregory's description of the divine persons.

The question arising now is "What causes the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to be divine persons and not mere 'collections of properties'?" The answer to this question is difficult, especially since one cannot speak of the soul in the case of the divine persons, as I did in chapter 2 when dealing with this issue

in the human case. Yet I think Gregory was aware of this complex issue and tried to address it.

Having said that the divine nature is common and that the three divine persons have individual characteristics, Gregory gives the impression of returning to consider the divine nature in more detail, but he abruptly changes the subject and speaks of the persons:

> Regarding attributes denoted by the terms infinite, incomprehensible, uncreated, uncircumscribed by space, and all others of the same order, there is no variation in the life-giving nature—I speak of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit—but a certain continuous and uninterrupted communion is observed in them [τινα συνεχῆ καὶ ἀδιάσπαστον κοινωνίαν ἐν αὐτοῖς].[68]

In my view, this passage holds the answer to the above question. Gregory makes communion among the three persons the important factor that transforms them from mere collections of properties into persons. Here are some of the reasons for why I believe this. First, that Gregory intends to speak of a "communion" of persons here and not of a "community" of substance is first indicated by the reference to the three persons and not to the common nature. Second, after he has said that there is no difference in regard to the common attributes describing the nature, it does not follow that he could add in the same sentence that there is "*a certain* communion" (emphasis added), because it would mean that actually there is a difference in the common nature. Third, if Gregory intended to refer to the common nature, then there should have been a numerical accord between "nature" (a noun in the singular) and its object. In this case, the text should have read: "There is no variation in the life-giving *nature*, but a certain continuous and uninterrupted communion is observed in *it*." But our text actually reads: ". . . communion is observed in them." Consequently, the second part of the sentence should refer to the persons and their communion rather than to the nature.

Another argument in favor of Gregory's discussing the communion of divine persons is to be found in the use of the term κοινωνία itself. In this particular work, Gregory uses two terms to express the idea of something that is common: κοινότης and κοινωνία. Yet whereas the former term is used in reference to substance or nature (see 2.7, 13; 3.9; 4.39, 86; 5.48, 62), the latter is used in reference to the divine persons (see 2.15; 4.33, 49, 84). Therefore, I propose to render κοινότης by "community" and κοινωνία by "communion." The passage just quoted above envisages the "communion of persons."

Gregory then describes the strong relations and what would be called later

the *perichoresis* existing among the divine persons. He says that by contemplating the majesty of any one of the Trinitarian persons, one arrives invariably at the other two persons, since "there is no interval [οὐδενὶ διαλείμματι] between Father and Son and Holy Spirit in which the thought will walk in a void."[69] Although distinct, the divine persons are not separated from each other. Moreover, they imply one another; if one believes in any one of them, one has to accept and confess the other two as well. He uses the image of a chain: One who grasps one end of a chain pulls along with it the other end also to oneself. Gregory wants to make his arguments sound as biblical as possible; therefore, he even quotes Rom 8:9 and Ps 119:131:

> Since the Spirit is *of* Christ and *from* God [the Father][70] (Rom 8:9) . . . he who draws the Spirit, as the prophet says,[71] through the Spirit draws both the Son and the Father along with it. And if you truly lay hold of the Son, you will hold him on two sides, on the one where he draws his Father to himself, and on the other where he draws his own Spirit. . . . In like manner he who accepts the Father virtually accepts along with him the Son and the Spirit also. (*Ad Petrum* 4.69–80)

Yet perhaps the most important expression of Gregory's teaching about the divine relations and communion in *Ad Petrum* is to be found in the following:

> There is apprehended among these three a certain ineffable and inconceivable communion [κοινωνία] and at the same time distinction [διάκρισις], with neither the difference between their persons [ὑποστάσεων] disintegrating the continuity of their nature, nor this community of substance [κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν κοινότητος] confounding the individual character of their distinguishing notes. . . . We devise a strange and paradoxical sort of united separation and separated union. (*Ad Petrum* 4.83–91)

In this passage, κοινωνία is clearly distinguished from κοινότης. It is exactly by this "communion" among the divine persons that Gregory manages to show that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are not mere individual "collections of properties" but divine persons. In other words, in addition to the other properties already mentioned, it is the communion among these persons that makes them persons. The dynamics of communion are expressed not only in relations of origin among the divine persons but also in their love for each other, perfect knowledge of each other, perfect accord of will, and all other

perichoretic activities. Since in *Ad Petrum* there is no comprehensive treatment of divine relationality, I shall pursue this topic in chapter 5. The whole dynamics of interpersonal communion will become evident at that point.

Conclusions

Gregory of Nyssa's *Ad Petrum* points to some factors that are essential for the understanding of the concept of divine persons: (1) The relation of the divine persons to the divine *ousia* is similar to the relation between the individual and the universal; (2) a divine person is understood as a unique collection of properties; (3) the divine persons are relational entities; (4) the main differences among the divine persons are that the Father is ungenerated, the Son is the only begotten of the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds forth from the Father; and (5) the divine persons are in a permanent and perfect communion with one another. This last factor makes them be living persons and not merely unique collections of properties. I should also add that, in contrast to a widespread, misinformed opinion of the twentieth century, the Cappadocians did not state a priority of the persons over the substance, but kept the two together in worshiping God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as in Basil's *Ep.* 236.6.

4

The Lesser Trinitarian Treatises II

To Eustathius: On the Holy Trinity, To Ablabius: On Not Three Gods, and *To the Greeks: Based on the Common Notions*

In this chapter I continue the search for a concept of divine persons in Gregory's lesser Trinitarian treatises. I shall consider together these three treatises because of some similar arguments present in them. For example, one such argument is Gregory's contention that the divine nature is one because each divine activity is one, being common to all three divine persons. Another prevalent argument is the alleged etymological derivation of "God" (θεός) and "Godhead" (θεότης) from the verb "to behold" (θεάομαι) in the sense of providential oversight; accordingly, "God" and "Godhead" would express the divine activity of oversight, not the divine nature. Modern scholars have found such arguments unconvincing, but Gregory was confident that by their use he could prove rationally that the divine nature is one.

I commence the analysis of each treatise by considering its *Sitz-im-Leben*, mentioning the date and what possibly prompted Gregory to write it. Then I look for various elements relevant for the concept of divine persons. In the case of the last treatise, I also attempt to trace some of Gregory's philosophical explanations.

To Eustathius: On the Holy Trinity

The treatise *To Eustathius: On the Holy Trinity* (*Ad Eustat.* hereafter)[1] attributed to Basil of Caesarea by some manuscripts, has been justly restored to Gregory of Nyssa by F. Müller in the GNO 3.1. Gerhard May dated this treatise to shortly before the Council of Constantinople of 381.[2] Daniélou initially dated it to 389, because he surmised that a passage on Balaam (9.18–19) was inspired by Gregory's *Life of Moses*, a late work usually dated to 388–389 or later.[3] But several years later he changed his mind and proposed the year 375 for the composition of this small treatise.[4] In the latter case, Daniélou thought that the adversaries Gregory mentioned in *Ad Eustat.* were partisans of Eustathius of Sebaste who attacked Basil, Gregory, and Meletius in 375 and against whom Basil wrote *De Spiritu Sancto*. May concluded that the adversaries were indeed supporters of Eustathius of Sebaste but that they attacked Gregory during his stay in Sebaste in 380. Eustathius was himself dead by 380, and Gregory's brother Peter was the bishop of Sebaste at that time.[5] Based on internal evidence—Gregory strives to defend the divinity of the Holy Spirit—one can easily infer that this treatise was most likely written before the Council of Constantinople of 381, at which the status of the Holy Spirit was clarified.

Addressed to a physician Eustathius, this treatise deals with two charges brought against Gregory of Nyssa: (1) He distinguishes the hypostases (τὸ διαιρεῖν τὰς ὑποστάσεις) when talking about God, yet (2) he does not employ any of the names that are worthy of God in the plural number but speaks "of the goodness as one, and of the power, and of the godhead, and all such names in the singular."[6] Gregory dismisses quite readily the first accusation, since those who formulate it "hold the doctrine of the diversity of substances [ἑτερότητα τῶν οὐσιῶν] in the divine nature."[7] "For it is not to be supposed that those who say that there are three substances do not also say that there are three hypostases [τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις]."[8] I have transliterated the word ὑπόστασις because in this case Gregory's accusers seem to use it as a synonym of οὐσία. One can conclude that Gregory's accusers are on the one hand Neo-Arians, who deny that the Son is of the same divine substance (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father, and on the other hand Macedonians, who deny that the Holy Spirit is of the same substance with the Father.

Gregory defends himself against the second accusation by showing that it is not biblical to use in the plural names referring to God's unique substance. The name "God" indicates the substance; therefore, it cannot be properly used in the plural. Those who do use such names in the plural are polytheists. To refute the second accusation, Gregory uses an argument that is present in all

three treatises analyzed in this chapter: The divine nature is one because each divine activity *ad extra* is common to all the persons. I shall deal with the logic of this argument later when analyzing *Ad Ablabium*. At this point, I confine myself to understanding a divine person by examining the meanings of the Greek words used to denote it.

In *Ad Eustat*. Gregory uses the term ὑπόστασις six times. It occurs four times in the plural (ὑπόστασεις), with reference to the three divine persons (*Ad Eustat*. 5.18; 6.8; 6.12; 6.15); it can be translated as "person" in two of the cases, but it should be transliterated as "hypostasis" (and understood as a synonym of οὐσία) in the two other cases for the reasons I have indicated above. Then ὑπόστασις occurs twice in reference to God the Father alone (13.13, 15). The context for the latter two occurrences is important for my analysis:

> For since it is said "the angels see the face [τὸ πρόσωπον] of my Father in heaven" (Mt 18:10), and it is not possible to see the person [τὸ πρόσωπον] of the Father otherwise than by fixing the sight upon it through his imprint [χαρακτὴρ]; and the imprint of the person of the Father [ὁ δὲ χαρακτὴρ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ὑποστάσεως] is the only-begotten (Heb 1:3), and to him no one can draw near whose mind has not been illumined by the Holy Spirit, what else is shown from this but that the Holy Spirit is not separated from any activity [ἐνέργεια] which is wrought by the Father?[9] Thus, the identity of activity in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit shows plainly the undistinguishable character of their nature.[10]

Gregory uses ὑπόστασις here interchangeably with πρόσωπον to refer to the same reality: the "person" of God the Father. To do so, he plays on the meanings of πρόσωπον as both "face" and "person," combining them to support his argument. At the same time, he speculates on the famous text Heb 1:3, interpreting ὑπόστασις in this text in the sense of "person."[11] A similar strategy used to advance his argument can be found in *Ad Petrum* 8, as shown in chapter 3. In his works written after 365, Basil of Caesarea no longer allowed for the use of πρόσωπον and ὑπόστασις as synonymous, because in his view πρόσωπον was compromised by Sabellius when the latter used it with the meaning of "mask." As seen here, Gregory of Nyssa does not share in his brother's *parti pris*, but continues to use the two terms interchangeably.

To Ablabium: On Not Three Gods

Regarding the composition dates of *To Ablabium: On Not Three Gods* (*Ad Ablabium* hereafter)[12] and *To the Greeks: Based on the Common Notions* (*Ad Graecos*

hereafter), May agrees with Daniélou in placing them toward the end of Gregory of Nyssa's life. May rejects the proposal for the year 381 voiced by some scholars. He argues that these treatises make no mention of the important disputes that took place that very year. These treatises remind May of Gregory of Nazianzus's *Ep.* 202, written in 387.[13] Daniélou dates *Ad Ablabium* and *Ad Graecos* to about 388. In his opinion, "they correspond to a period when Gregory is interested less in dogmatic controversies and more in spirituality and when he surely approaches them [i.e., these dogmatic controversies] by request from his friends and in a rapid manner."[14] Both May and Daniélou may be right in dating *Ad Ablabium* to around 387–388, especially since in *Ad Ablabium* 37.8 there is a reference to Gregory's old age. Their opinion has recently been confirmed by Stead.[15]

In this treatise Ablabius, a friend who does not know how to understand the formula "one substance, three hypostases," confronts Gregory with two equally extreme alternatives: Either say "three gods" or speak of one God, excluding the Son and the Spirit from the divinity. The former alternative is tritheism, whereas the latter is extreme Arianism and Macedonianism. Ablabius asks: If we can speak of Peter, James, and John as *three humans* although they are one in nature, why not speak of three gods also? In other words, if it is logical to refer to humans, who are more than one, by the plural number of the name derived from their nature, why then is this absurd in the divine case?

To begin with, Gregory replies that to speak of "many humans" (πολλοὶ ἄνθρωποι) is a customary abuse of language, since we do not call somebody by the name of his nature but by that which signifies the particular subject (ὑποκείμενον). In doing so, we try to avoid the confusion that may result from the community (κοινότης) of the name, "as it would happen if every one of those who hear it were to think that he himself was the person addressed."[16] "Human nature" (ἀνθρώπινη φύσις) is common to all human individuals, and the word "human" (ἄνθρωπος) signifies this nature. Consequently, to say "many humans" is roughly tantamount to speaking of "many human natures," which is erroneous.[17] Therefore, Gregory proposes that we correct our habit of calling "many" what is actually one. This correction would help us to avoid misunderstanding the divine nature, which is one and should be referred to as such. He means that from a logical point of view we cannot refer to an individual by the name of its species or to a species by the name of its genus. We have to qualify them somehow, in order to be able to provide more specific information. When referring to a human individual, Aristotle himself says "this human" or "a certain human" (τίς ἄνθρωπος, *Cat.* 2a15), not simply "human," and Gregory says "such and such human" (τοιόσδε ἄνθρωπος, *Ad Graecos* 29–30).

Nevertheless, Gregory has to recognize that common language employs

the phrase "many humans," as does Scripture. Hence, he is constrained to say that we can actually tolerate this bad habit in the case of the "lower nature" (κάτω φύσις), "since no harm results from the mistaken use of the name."[18] Yet the same variation in the use of the term is not acceptable in the case of the divine nature.[19] First of all, the habit of calling "many" that which is one is dangerous in referring to the divine, because it contravenes Scripture: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God is one Lord" (Deut 6:4).[20] Gregory insists that God is one, although "the name of Godhead extends through the Holy Trinity."[21]

Second, he proposes to analyze more closely the meaning of the word "Godhead" in order to obtain additional help in proving his point. A long argument beginning at 42.13 attempts to affirm that not even the word "Godhead" (or divine nature, θεότης) is able to fully describe what the divine nature is, because θεότης is the name of an activity (or energy, ἐνέργεια).[22] Gregory draws upon the alleged derivation of θεότης from the verb θεάομαι, which means "to behold" in the sense of providential oversight. Θεότης thus refers to the activity of oversight, as does θεός itself.[23] Yet any activity oriented from God to the creation is common to all three divine persons: "Every activity which extends from God to the creation, and is named according to our variable conceptions of it, has its origin from the Father, and proceeds through the Son, and is perfected in the Holy Spirit."[24] One example of activity common to the three divine persons is "seeing." God the Father is said to see: "Behold our shield, O God" (Ps 83:10 LXX; 84:9). The Son also sees the hidden thoughts of those who condemn him (Matt 9:4). The Spirit also is said to see when Peter says to Ananias, "Why had Satan filled your heart, to lie to the Holy Spirit?" (Acts 5:3), showing that the Spirit saw Ananias's hidden thoughts and revealed them to Peter.[25]

Unlike divine nature, human nature does not have the same oneness. The reason, according to Gregory, is that no single human activity is common to all humans. Even if several humans are engaged in the same activity, they work separately, each by himself at the task he has undertaken. "For instance, supposing the case of several orators, their pursuit, being one, has the same name in the numerous cases: but each of those who follow it works by himself, this one pleading on his own account, and that on his own account."[26] Therefore, unlike God, humans are properly called "many."

The fact that every divine activity manifested *ad extra* is common to the three divine persons is a sufficient reason in Gregory's view to demonstrate that the divine nature is one in a way that is different from the way in which the human nature is one. Therefore, in the divine case one should not use the phrase "three gods" to refer to the divine persons. One is allowed, however, to refer to humans as "many humans."

I believe I have presented quite extensively Gregory's argument regarding the unity of nature and the "proper" use of names derived from nature. I shall return to some of these arguments later in this chapter when dealing with *Ad Graecos*, as Gregory adds additional explanations there. At this point, however, I should say, along with Stead, that Gregory's essay "On Not Three Gods" "resembles an accomplished conjuring trick more nearly than a valid theological demonstration."[27] The message Gregory wants to convey by the whole argument, despite this flawed and ultimately unconvincing demonstration, is that unlike individuals, substance is not an enumerative entity. He then moves on to show why individuals can be enumerated.

The Concept of Enumeration of Individuals

The problem Gregory proposes to solve in *Ad Ablabium* is actually the same Trinitarian problem confronting all the Cappadocians: how to conceive of God as three according to persons and one according to substance. A concept he uses in *Ad Ablabium* to enhance this distinction is that of "enumeration of individuals": Unlike their common substance, individuals can be enumerated. After speaking of "Luke" and "Stephen," Gregory writes that "the notion of persons admits of that separation which is made by the peculiar attributes observed in each severally, and when they are combined is presented to us by means of number."[28] He returns to this argument later, as he finds it very useful to support his case:

> Neither diminution nor increase attaches to any nature, when it is contemplated in a larger or smaller number. For it is only those things which are contemplated in their individual circumscription [κατ' ἰδίαν περιγραφὴν] which are enumerated by way of addition [κατὰ σύνθεσιν ἀριθμεῖται]. Now this circumscription is noted by bodily appearance, and size, and place, and difference in figure and colour; and that which is contemplated apart from these conditions is free from the circumscription which is formed by such [properties]. That which is not thus circumscribed is not enumerated, and that which is not enumerated cannot be contemplated in multitude [ὃ δὲ μὴ περιγράφεται οὐκ ἀριθμεῖται, τὸ δὲ μὴ ἀριθμούμενον ἐν πλήθει θεωρηθῆν οὐ δύναται].[29]

In this text, Gregory states that no nature can be circumscribed; this holds true for the divine nature as well, which he previously described as infinite and incomprehensible.[30] Unlike nature, individuals are circumscribed and enumerable. Nevertheless, the examples of individuals he provides in the passage

are very material and therefore hardly relevant for divine persons. The divine persons are not material, although they are circumscribed.[31] As such, they are also enumerable. Gregory does not explain it here, but elsewhere he distinguishes divine persons from one another by their relations of origin. I shall deal with this issue later when discussing causal language in *Ad Ablabium*.

Two things are worth noting in the above-quoted passage. First, the definition of the individual as a "circumscription" (περιγραφή) formed by some properties reminds us of the Platonic definition of an individual as a collection of properties. Origen too used the term περιγραφή to indicate the separate reality of the many δυνάμεις of God,[32] in particular, the real and separate existence of God's Word, which—unlike the human word inherent in our minds—possesses substance (ὑπόστασις).[33] Περιγραφή in this case can perhaps be rendered by "individuality," as Heine does when translating Origen.

Second, individuals are characterized by means of the concept of enumeration. To make this theoretical explanation more accessible to Ablabius, Gregory provides some concrete examples. He says that we do not speak of "many golds" but of "much gold." Yet we do speak of many "gold pieces" or "gold coins" or "staters" without finding any multiplication of the nature of gold by the number of staters,[34] but after making this statement, he emends it by saying that "properly, we should not call them 'gold [coins]' but 'golden [coins].' "[35] Similarly, continues Gregory, one can think of Peter, James, and John as many, "yet the human [ἄνθρωπος] in them is one."[36] Elsewhere, Gregory writes, "Numerical order does not bring about diversity of the natures, but the numbered items, whatever their nature is, remain what they are, whether they are numbered or not. The number is a sign to make it known how many things are."[37] Basil of Caesarea also uses the concept of enumeration of hypostases (by *hypostasis* he means "person" at this time),[38] but he insists that the divine hypostases have to be "enumerated piously" (εὐσεβῶς ἀριθμεῖν), not materially, and adds that divinity is above number.[39]

Gregory's goal is to prove that there are not three gods. The concept of enumeration of individuals can and should be added to the notion of persons; more exactly, persons are enumerable entities. Troiano reaches a similar conclusion for Basil, namely, that the concept of enumeration of hypostases is closely connected to the distinction of hypostases.[40]

Causal Differences among the Divine Persons

Some of his opponents accused Gregory of not recognizing the difference of nature in the Godhead. His argument, therefore, would allegedly lead to a confusion of persons. To these calumniators (συκοφάνται) Gregory answers

that he does not confuse the persons, because he admits of their difference in respect of cause and that which is caused (τὴν κατὰ τὸ αἴτιον καὶ αἰτιατὸν διαφορὰν).[41] He distinguishes the person who is "the cause" (τὸ αἴτιον; i.e., the Father) from the person who is "from the cause" (ἐκ τοῦ αἰτίου) or "directly from the first" (προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου; i.e., the Son), and from that who is "by that which is directly from the first" (διὰ τοῦ προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου; i.e., the Holy Spirit).[42] "The mediation of the Son preserves his being the only-begotten and does not sever the Spirit's relation by way of nature to the Father."[43] These causal relations in which one person is the source of the other two persons are relations of origin. They help Gregory to distinguish the persons from each other.

This conception, however, must not be identified with *filioque*, since the Father and the Son do not form one principle like in that Western doctrine; the proper cause of the Spirit is the Father (τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ ἀμφιβάλλειν).[44] Phrases found in Gregory's writings which would allegedly imply that he favors the *filioque* have proven to be interpolations.[45] In stating that the Spirit comes from the Father through the Son, Gregory and his brother Basil actually manifest themselves as followers of Origen. It was Origen who interpreted John 1:3 ("All things came into being through him [i.e., the Word], and without him not one thing came into being") as meaning that all things come into existence through the Word, including the Holy Spirit.

Gregory then proceeds with his causal argument and says that in using this language, we do not actually state *what* the persons are, but *how* they are. Causal language indicates only "the difference in manner of existence" (τὴν κατὰ τὸ πῶς εἶναι διαφορὰν)[46] among the persons; the divine persons are distinct from each other by the way in which they obtain their existence.[47] It is worth noting that, like the divine names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, causal language is relational language expressing relations of origin.

To sum up, differences among the divine persons are also indicated by causal language. Consequently, the description of the divine persons by means of this language should be added to the concept of divine persons.

To the Greeks: Based on the Common Notions

As mentioned earlier, May and Daniélou considered *Ad Graecos* to be a late work by Gregory, probably from the late 380s. Stramara, the English translator of *Ad Graecos*, argued that this tract was written shortly after the Council of Constantinople, which ended in July 381.[48] The lack of any reference to this great council in the tract was due to the Eunomians' renunciation of the coun-

cil, which had explicitly condemned them in its first canon. "Gregory's argument would have to be linguistic and metaphysical, rather than ecclesiological and doctrinaire, if it were to convince such philosophically hellenized Christians."[49]

The complete title of this work in Müller's critical edition is the following: "By stating 'three persons' in the Godhead, we do not say 'three gods.' To the Greeks, based on common notions."[50] In *Ad Graecos*, Gregory wants to prove that even if one bases one's understanding of God on the "common notions" and not on revelation, one cannot infer that there are three gods from the fact that Christians speak of three persons in the Godhead. By "common notions" (κοιναὶ ἐννοίαι) Gregory means "general principles" or "universally accepted opinions." Basil of Caesarea, too, in a polemical text against Eunomius says that the κοιναὶ ἐννοίαι tell us that God exists, not *what* he is.[51] The doctrine of the "common notions" (κοιναὶ ἐννοίαι) was widespread in ancient philosophy and was used to establish a ground of common agreement as a support for a given theory.[52] In being a mixture of logic and ontology, *Ad Graecos* reminds us very much of Aristotle's *Categories* or *Metaphysics*. Nevertheless, it is an Aristotle probably learned from an intermediary. Given the fact that Gregory addresses this treatise to "the Greeks"—that is, perhaps contemporaries who were trained in Greek philosophy and could not accept that God is triune—one should not be discouraged from reading it by the language of genus and species or substance and accidents used or hinted at throughout this work.

The style of this treatise is circumlocutory and rather difficult to follow. Gregory starts by assuming that the name "God" is not indicative of the persons (πρόσωπα) but of the substance (οὐσία) of divinity; otherwise, when speaking of three persons, we should necessarily affirm three gods.[53] Then he says that when speaking of God, we say "Father *and* Son *and* Holy Spirit" or "God the Father *and* God the Son *and* God the Holy Spirit." We do not say "God *and* God *and* God," because, according to the "[commonly accepted] notion" (κατ' ἔννοιαν), the conjunction "and" (καὶ) binds different realities, not one and the same reality.

Most of the time Gregory uses πρόσωπον and ὑπόστασις synonymously in this treatise when referring to divine or human persons, but whereas the former term occurs sixty times, the latter occurs only thirty-six times. To express the notion of the person, however, he also uses other terms: "individual or indivisible" (ἄτομον), "partial substance" (μερικὴ οὐσία), and "particular substance" (ἰδικὴ οὐσία). Gregory tries to be careful in his use of the latter terms, since one could infer that God's οὐσία is divided among the divine persons. The division of the substance into three because of the persons would imply the division of God into three gods (*Ad Graecos* 22.22). In my view, Gregory

seems to be somewhat inconsistent, because almost immediately after stating that the substance should not be divided among the persons, he speaks of "partial" or "particular substances." His only excuse possibly is that he does so in reference to human persons and swiftly qualifies his statements. The text reads:

> If somebody says that we call Peter and Paul and Barnabas three partial substances (οὐσίας μερικάς) (it is clear that this means particular [ἰδικάς] [substances])—for this is more accurate to say—he should recognize that [by that] we do not mean anything else but the individual, which is the person [ἄτομον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πρόσωπον].[54]

The question that immediately arises about "partial" and "particular substances" is whether or not, when using these phrases, Gregory has in mind Aristotle's "primary substance." Christopher Stead answers this question in the negative.[55] Another scholar, Hermann Vogt, the translator of *Ad Graecos* into German, is inclined to see Aristotle lurking behind Gregory's expressions.[56] Yet Vogt goes even further and regards the entire treatise as a "Christian use of Porphyry's introduction to the Aristotelian teaching on the categories."[57] I shall return to Vogt's statement later. In chapter 2 I argued that Gregory's view of substance, especially in the case of such phrases as "partial substance" or "particular substance," is likely to be an amalgam of the Aristotelian "primary substance" and the Stoic "peculiarly qualified entity," or to betray an influence of Porphyry's commentaries on Aristotle's *Categories*.

Gregory then invokes the same argument mentioned in *Ad Ablabium,* that we cannot speak of "many humans," since the noun "human" signifies human nature. Consequently, to say "many humans" is tantamount to speaking of "many human natures," which is erroneous.[58] As I argued when analyzing *Ad Ablabium,* Gregory means that we cannot refer to an individual by the name of its species or to a species by the name of its genus alone. It is necessary to qualify them in some manner. Yet he recognizes that people and even Scripture do speak of "many humans." Nonetheless, in the case of Scripture, Gregory distinguishes between a manner of speaking "habitually" (διὰ συνήθειαν),[59] which Scripture uses by condescension (συγκατάβασιν),[60] and another, more accurate manner corresponding to the nature of things.[61] Concerning our use of the phrase "many humans" Gregory says that actually, because of some "constraining causes" (ἐξ ἀναγκαίων αἰτιῶν; *Ad Graecos* 23.22–23), we have to speak in this way about human beings. The same causes are not present in the Holy Trinity. The two constraining causes Gregory mentions in *Ad Graecos* are: (1) The total number of humans is not constant, owing to deaths and births (24.1–14), while this cannot be the case with the Holy Trinity, for which one can never speak of a duality or quaternity (24.15–25); (2) humans have different

origins—that is, parents—whereas the Trinity has only one origin, namely, the person of God the Father (24.26–25.4). In *Ad Ablabium*, Gregory adds one more cause: (3) We speak of "many orators" because each of them works independently (47.11–17). In his "Why Not Three Gods?"[62] Stead claims that Gregory mentions one more such cause: (4) More generally, only spatial and material things are numbered.[63] Nevertheless, as I showed earlier when treating this issue in *Ad Ablabium*, Gregory's text does not support the latter inference at the exclusion of the divine persons who clearly are aspatial and immaterial. Stead, however, dismisses as "quite unconvincing" all of these causes Gregory presents to explain our differences of language usage in reference to the divine and human natures.[64] I agree with Stead in this case and acknowledge that Gregory has become confused because of too much trust in speculative thinking and false etymologies.

In leaving aside the "constraining causes" because they are unconvincing and do not add much to the discussion of the persons, I shall now return to the logical explanation of the difference between substance and persons that constitutes Gregory's next argument. The explanation "based on common notions" that Gregory adduces in order to exonerate himself from the accusation of tritheism sheds more light on the differences between substance and persons. In what follows, I shall simply transliterate ὑπόστασις as "hypostasis" for reasons that will become clear. Gregory writes that "a substance differs from a substance not insofar as it is substance, but as 'such and such' [τοιάδε] a substance, and a hypostasis from a hypostasis as 'such and such' a hypostasis."[65] To this Gregory adds another rather theoretical explanation a little later on the next page:

> Therefore, "such and such" [τοιόσδε] is said when someone wishes to distinguish a particular from the general proper to that designation, to which "such and such" is applied [προστίθεται]. Thus we say that a human is "such and such" an animal, having in mind to distinguish him from a horse, for example—a horse which has in common with him the name of animal, but which is differentiated from him with regard to rationality-irrationality. Something is distinguished from something else either by substance or by hypostasis or by both substance and hypostasis. Human is distinguished from horse by substance, Paul is distinguished from Peter by hypostasis, whereas this hypostasis of the human is distinguished from this hypostasis of the horse by both substance and hypostasis.[66]

He then explicates each of these distinctions. One can distinguish among various substances by indicating "such and such" (τοιόσδε) a characteristic—

what we would call a *differentia specifica*—of each substance. In Gregory's examples "human" (ἄνθρωπος), "horse" and "dog" are nouns indicative of human, equine, and canine nature, respectively. Thus, "human" is rational (λογικός) in contradistinction to "horse," which is irrational (ἄλογος); "horse" in turn is characterized by neighing (χρεμετιστικός) in contradistinction to "dog," which is characterized by barking (ὑλατικός), and so forth.[67] Gregory insists that these characteristics just mentioned belong to the substances per se. The same cannot be said of persons; their characteristics do not belong to them per se but accidentally.

When making distinctions "by hypostasis," Gregory again says that differentiae should be added to the common term "hypostasis" in order to obtain "such and such a hypostasis"—for example, Peter or Paul. Such differentiae in his view are baldness, height, fatherhood, sonship, and the like,[68] and they "constitute the hypostasis not the substance" (ὑπόστασιν καὶ οὐκ οὐσίαν συνιστᾶν)[69] of Peter or Paul. In this sense, I think the differentiae can be said to be accidental. Gregory uses the term "accidents" (συμβεβηκότες, *Ad Graecos* 31.20) in reference to πρόσωπον, not to ὑπόστασις. From these explanations it becomes evident that "hypostasis" no longer designates an individual understood as something indivisible; rather, it is a new species to which "such and such" can be attached in order to obtain Peter or Paul. This observation, however, will be contradicted by what Gregory himself says next, although Gregory will reconfirm it only a few lines below in a passage (*Ad Graecos* 31.16–20) I shall discuss at the end of this section. Let us first see how Gregory contradicts what he has just said: "It is clear that species [εἶδος] and individual [ἄτομον] are not the same thing, that is, substance [is not the same] as hypostasis."[70] This statement apparently contradicts the previous assertion that "hypostasis" is a sort of new species to which "such and such" can be added to obtain "Peter" or "Paul" or "this horse." "Individual," continues Gregory (that is, "hypostasis"), makes one think of someone with curly hair, grey eyes, a father, a son, and the like, whereas the term "species" (that is, "substance") makes one think of "a rational animal, mortal, capable of understanding and knowledge," or of "an irrational animal, mortal, capable of neighing and the like."[71]

He then applies the same reasoning by analogy to God. We can now connect these arguments with the introductory part of *Ad Graecos* where Gregory says that the name "God" refers to the divine nature, distinguishing it from the mortal nature. At the same time, the reader of Gregory's explanations should not refer to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit as merely "such and such God" or "God and God and God," since he or she is supposed to have understood by now that the three divine persons have the same common substance and that the relation between the substance and the persons is the

same as that between a species and its individuals.[72] His triumphal conclusion in regard to the Trinity is that if one discriminates among the divine persons, one should not divide the substance of God according to these persons.

Nevertheless, before the triumphal end there is *Ad Graecos* 31.16–20, a passage hard to interpret.[73] Here Gregory asserts beyond any reasonable doubt that ὑπόστασις is a species for πρόσωπον, thus confirming what he says in *Ad Graecos* 30.20–21. The statement is astounding, because it causes one to think that ὑπόστασις is actually synonymous with οὐσία, after Gregory himself has assured the reader that ὑπόστασις is in fact the individual. It can also mean that ὑπόστασις is a subspecies of οὐσία, something between οὐσία and πρόσωπον. If this is the case, then Gregory can be credited with making a distinction between individuals and persons, thus being a personalist *avant la lettre*, which is perhaps unlikely. The text reads: "We attach the phrase 'such and such' to hypostasis in order to differentiate the persons [πρόσωπα] from one another, even though they have in common this name, that of hypostasis, and thus differ from one another not in peculiarities proper to substance, but rather according to so-called accidents."[74]

In commenting on *Ad Graecos* 31.16–20, Vogt asks himself whether a rupture of logic is not unavoidable when Gregory tries to speak of the Trinity in the same way in which he speaks of humans and other created beings. According to Vogt, *Ad Graecos* 31.16–20 might suggest the idea that the concept of "hypostasis," just as "person" but *unlike* "individual" (ἄτομον), can be used in regard to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.[75] In other words, Vogt intimates that the concept of "individual" cannot be applied to God. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit cannot be individuals under any circumstances whatsoever. The difficulty with Vogt's explanation is that Gregory's text does not support such a clear conclusion.

Another German scholar, Jürgen Hammerstaedt, author of an article on "Hypostasis,"[76] in a letter to me suggested that he did not believe that Gregory wanted to qualify ὑπόστασις as a species for πρόσωπον. Hammerstaedt is rather inclined to see a "capital error" occurring in Gregory's whole argumentation starting at *Ad Graecos* 29 that then becomes evident only at 30.16 and that leads him to the statement contained in the passage under investigation (31.14). In Hammerstaedt's view, the error consists in an indiscriminate use of the demonstrative adjective "such and such" (τοιόσδε) with both *concrete* qualifying terms such as "animal" and *abstract* qualifying terms such as "genus," "ousia," or "hypostasis." Accordingly, if you say "such animal," you point to "human" or "horse," but if you say "such οὐσία," you point to other οὐσίαι, not to species subsumed under the same οὐσία (ὑπ᾽ αὐτὴν κατ᾽ οὐσίαν; 31.15), as Gregory suggests.

In considering the passages in question, Stead himself notices that the discussion in *Ad Graecos* "takes a surprising form."[77] Gregory says that we attach the phrase "such and such" to a word denoting a genus, thereby picking out a particular species. He argues that at this point one would expect Gregory to continue on the same principle and say, "We attach the word 'such-and-such' to a word denoting a species, so as to pick out a particular individual; saying for instance, 'Paul is a grey-eyed man.' " Then Stead justly remarks:

> But this is not what Gregory says; he argues that since the particularizing characteristics belong to the individual, the particularizing description must be attached to the word ὑπόστασις, "individual," and not to the class-name "man." We can thus describe Paul as a grey-eyed individual, but not as a grey-eyed man. On this ground he claims that his critics' case collapses.[78]

I conclude this analysis by noting that the main contention of *Ad Graecos* is that each of the three divine persons can be referred to as God, because the name "God" indicates their common nature, but nobody should speak of "three gods," since this would contradict the commonly accepted principles. The first part of his demonstration is correct. The difficult part, as just mentioned, is that Gregory makes ὑπόστασις a species for πρόσωπα and we have to acknowledge it as a mistake in judgment.

Eustathius of Antioch, Gregory of Nyssa, and Their Possible Philosophical Sources

I shall now consider another Trinitarian writing, Eustathius of Antioch's *Against Photinus*, as it can shed more light on Gregory of Nyssa's *Ad Graecos*. Given the striking similarities between these two works, Rudolf Lorenz argued that *Ad Graecos* was heavily influenced by *Against Photinus*.[79] Eustathius was a bishop of Antioch and played a prominent part at the Council of Nicaea (325).[80] His authorship of *Against Photinus* was considered spurious until recently, and at one time this work was even attributed to Gregory of Nyssa. Yet new fragments from the treatise of Peter of Callinicus against Damian of Alexandria preserved in the Codex Vaticanus Syriacus 108 have caused Lorenz to believe that Eustathius is the author of *Against Photinus,* which can thus be dated to around AD 340. Eustathius's writing is important since it displays familiarity with textbooks of logic used in the fourth century, sheds some light on the early history of the Trinitarian dispute, and is used by Gregory of Nyssa in his *Ad Graecos*.

The treatise entitled *Against Damian* is the principal literary achievement of Peter of Callinicus, Monophysite patriarch of Antioch from 581 to 591. He wrote it in Syriac against his co-religionist Pope Damian of Alexandria (ca. 557–606), who seemed to have embraced some Trinitarian errors. To date, books 2 and 3 have been published of the critical edition of Peter's *Against Damian*, but other volumes are being prepared.[81] Unfortunately, none of the three volumes published thus far reproduces pages 267–268 of the Vatican manuscript Syr. 108, which contains the above-mentioned quotation from Eustathius of Antioch. Lionel R. Wickham, however, kindly provided me with the English translation of the passage in question before it went to press, and I also rely on R. Lorenz's German translation in his article mentioned above. I shall show immediately how Eustathius's *Against Photinus* influenced Gregory of Nyssa's *Ad Graecos*, if *Against Photinus* was indeed written by Eustathius. The following is Eustathius of Antioch's text as quoted by Peter of Callinicus:

> Murinus or Photinus, with his associates, will criticize us, then, as calling Father, Son and Holy Ghost "three Gods," and he and they will be very foolish. For if we were simply saying "God and God and God," they would have been justified in censuring us for saying "three Gods"; but seeing that it is true and apposite that we should call the Father "God," the Son "God" and the Holy Ghost "God," nevertheless it is not because we call God three by division (even though each hypostatic *prosōpon* is professed as God, because they belong to one and the same divine nature) but because we recognize the Father's, Son's and Holy Ghost's kinship, property and natural mutual unity. If the name "God," then, were significant of *prosōpon*, by saying "three *prosōpa"* we should certainly have been saying "three Gods"; but because it is significant of nature, being apprehended from some property which is in the nature (as laughter in man, and barking in dog) whereas the properties said to belong to natures indicate natures, we do not say "three Gods" because we do not say "three natures." But if we call each of the *prosōpa* of the divine nature "God," because it belongs to the nature, it will be recognized as having the name "God" in the full sense, not because "God" is significant of *prosōpon*, but because it is significant of the one nature. The *prosōpon* too is capable of being called by this title, because it belongs also to that nature. For *prosōpon* is one thing but nature another. If, then, "God" belonged to *prosōpon*, by saying "three *prosōpa*" we should certainly be saying "three Gods," but because we say that the *prosōpa* have one nature, of necessity we say

> that there is only one God. But if there is one nature and "God" belongs to that nature, it follows that if we say "one nature" we also say there is only one God.[82]

A comparison between this text and Gregory's *Ad Graecos* makes one recognize the astounding similarities between the two texts. The argument about "God and God and God," the fact that in both authors the noun "God" refers to God's nature, and the distinction between *prosōpon* and nature are just three telling examples.

Moreover, when reading the two texts, one has the feeling that both authors are familiar with Porphyry's *Isagoge* or *On Aristotle's Categories (Exp. Cat.)*. Both Porphyry and Gregory state that rationality, neighing, and barking characterize the species human, horse, and dog, respectively (*Isag.* 7.5; *Exp. Cat.* 82.18–19; *Ad Graecos* 30.10–11); that rationality is also a specific difference distinguishing human from horse (*Isag.* 8.17; 11.20; *Ad Graecos* 30.7–10); that rational and mortal belong to human per se, while snub-nosedness (in Porphyry) or baldness (in Gregory) belong to humans accidentally (*Isag.* 9.9–13; 11.11–13; *Ad Graecos* 31.20). Eustathius also speaks of properties that are in the nature of a species, such as laughter in man and barking in dog.

It is important to note that Gregory uses more explanations than Eustathius in the remaining fragment from *Against Photinus*. For example, rationality as a property of the human substance appears in Porphyry and Gregory but not in Eustathius; rationality is not only a property but can be counted also as a specific difference distinguishing human from horse, and this does not occur in Eustathius. However, we do not know what the rest of *Against Photinus* might have contained. At the same time, it should be kept in mind that Gregory's brother, Basil of Caesarea, provides similar explanations about various natures in his *Homilies on the Hexaemeron* 4.4.1–5, but like Gregory's editors, Basil's editors indicate no source for these explanations.[83]

Consequently, I tried to discover the first occurrences of the explanations we know mainly from Porphyry. I used the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. I ran a search for the pair "rational-neighing," that is, λογικ near χρεμετιστικ within four lines of each other throughout the whole corpus contained on the CD-ROM. Surprisingly, the two words do not occur within four lines of each other in Aristotle himself but in later authors. What does occur in Aristotle is the pair "human-horse" (ἄνθρωπ-ἵππ; sometimes along with "dog" or "god") within four lines of each other (e.g., *Metaph.* 1016a25, 1018b5, 1020a30, 1023b30, 1058a1–1058b15; *Eth. nic.* 1176a5 to mention only a few relevant passages), but never accompanied by the pair "rational-neighing." As a matter of fact, χρεμετιστικ never occurs in Aristotle. In the passages I have just mentioned, Aristotle

usually speaks of "human" and "horse" (and "dog" and "god") as having one genus, namely, animal or living thing. The post-Aristotle but pre-Porphyry authors whom I found to have used the pair "rational-neighing" are the following: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Sextus Empiricus, Clement of Alexandria, and Pseudo-Plutarch. The first three were contemporaneous (2nd–3rd centuries AD), whereas the last one, if he is to be identified with the Greek doxographer Aetius, lived somewhat earlier (around AD 100).

Alexander of Aphrodisias, a renowned commentator on Aristotle and a Peripatetic philosopher himself, in dealing with combinations and figures in his mentor's *Prior Analytics*, writes:

> The middle term may be predicated of both the terms in the problem, as in the following combination. Suppose we are investigating whether men are neighers or not. We take a third term, rational, and predicate it of both the others—both of man and of neigher (affirmatively of man and negatively of neigher). This makes the following combination: Every man is rational. No neigher is rational.[84]

Clement of Alexandria, in addressing the restraint we should impose on our laughter (human is the only animal capable of laughter, according to Aristotle, *De anim. membr.* III.673a8), writes, "Because human is an animal capable of laughter, he should not laugh at everything and because horse is capable of neighing, he should not neigh on every occasion; as rational animals we should govern ourselves with measure, harmoniously relaxing the austerity and over-tension of our serious pursuits."[85]

The third work in which the pair in question occurs is Pseudo-Plutarch's *Placita philosophorum*, a collection of opinions of the philosophers and a work usually attributed to Aetius today. Thus, in a context presenting what various philosophers think of principles one can read:

> If one considers the multitude of humans taken one by one, they cannot be perceived, their infinite number cannot be apprehended, and we cannot conceive but a unique human with whom no one else is identical; likewise the horse we conceive cannot be but unique, but there is an infinite number of horses considered one by one. Indeed, all these species and genera are envisaged from the point of view of the monad; that is why we apply to each of them a definition speaking of rational animal or neighing animal.[86]

I have left to the end the text from Sextus Empiricus, because in my view it is the most interesting and closest explanation to what we encounter in

Porphyry and the Cappadocians. In a context dealing with the usefulness of definitions, Sextus writes:

> For example—if we may indulge in a little ridicule—suppose someone wanted to ask you if you had met a human on horseback leading a dog, and were to pose the question like this: "O mortal rational animal receptive of thought and knowledge, have you met a broad-nailed animal capable of laughter and receptive of political knowledge, resting his buttocks on a neighing mortal animal, leading a barking quadruped animal?"—wouldn't he be mocked for casting such a familiar subject into obscurity because of his definitions? As far as these considerations go, then, we should say that definitions are useless.[87]

However, in a footnote to this passage from Sextus's *Outlines of Scepticism,* the English translators mention that the example which Sextus has in mind is from an anonymous commentary on Plato's *Theaetetus* that reads, "Epicurus says that names are clearer than definitions, and that indeed it would be absurd if instead of saying 'Hello, Socrates' one were to say 'Hello, rational mortal animal.' "[88] But the reference to Epicurus (341–271 BC) takes us almost as far back as Aristotle who, as we saw, does not speak of horse as a "neighing animal."

Therefore, at this time we can trace with certainty the pair "rational-neighing" only as far back as Aetius, Alexander of Aphrodisias, and Sextus Empiricus, that is, to the second or third century CE. It is very likely that the Cappadocians knew some of these authors' writings or knew of their ideas from textbooks of philosophy. Aetius's *Placita philosophorum* is an excellent example of such a collection of philosophical opinions grouped under various headings. It is also possible that Clement of Alexandria or Eustathius of Antioch was an intermediary for these ideas. At the same time, I would not exclude the hypothesis that the Cappadocians—Gregory of Nyssa in particular—might have read at least Porphyry's *Isagoge*. This is a small, introductory work to Aristotle's famous *Categories* and, like today, some people back then might have wanted to be introduced to a major work by a commentator who could make the subject matter more accessible.

5

Against Eunomius and the *Refutation of the Confession of Faith of Eunomius*

In this chapter, I propose to analyze additional aspects of the concept of divine persons in two major dogmatic writings by Gregory of Nyssa, *Against Eunomius* and the *Refutation of the Confession of Faith of Eunomius*. Specifically, the bulk of the chapter deals with the issue of divine relationality. As corollaries to this, I shall also study what I call Gregory's theology of exile and homecoming, with special attention to Gregory's view of divine freedom and the issue of gender language in reference to the Holy Trinity.

In the late 370s, the Arian bishop Eunomius of Cyzicus[1] published the *Apology for an Apology* (or *Second Apology*). In this work, he attempted to defend himself against accusations raised by Basil of Caesarea's *Against Eunomius* (*AE*), which in turn was a response to Eunomius's *First Apology*. Unfortunately, Basil himself was too ill to answer this second writing by Eunomius. After Basil's death on January 1, 379, this challenge was left to his brother, Gregory of Nyssa. Gregory composed his own *Against Eunomius* (*CE* hereafter), in this way preventing Eunomius from having the final say. Later, Eunomius wrote a *Confession of Faith,* which was preserved by Gregory. This was written expressly for the gathering of various parties in the Church called by Emperor Theodosius in 383 as a last effort to achieve unity.[2] Gregory responded to the latter as well by writing the *Refutation of the Confession of Faith of Eunomius* (*Ref.* hereafter).

There is a greater degree of agreement among scholars over the composition dates of Gregory of Nyssa's *CE* and *Ref.* than in the

case of other Gregorian works. May places the writing of *CE* 1–2 between the summer of 380 and the spring of 381, and, following Diekamp,[3] dates *CE* 3 between 381 and 383.[4] As for the *Ref.*, Jan van Parys thinks that it occupies a special place in the ensemble of Gregory's anti-Eunomian polemics.[5] Not only is it chronologically the last in the series of writings against Eunomius (written perhaps shortly after May 383), but unlike *CE,* which does not deal with pneumatology, *Ref.* refutes the totality of Eunomius's Trinitarian and christological heresies. Van Parys thinks that the convocation at Constantinople of an "interconfessional colloquium" in May 383 was an additional occasion for Gregory of Nyssa to refute Eunomius. The homily Gregory also delivered at that colloquium, *De deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti*, mainly refutes Eunomius's theological opinions and reveals a number of points in common with the *Ref.* Hanson agrees with the dating of the *Ref.* to 383 and believes that it is possible *De deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti* was written for the council of 383.[6]

Patristic Antecedents of Divine Relationality

The argument from correlativity was used long before the Cappadocians to prove that the Son is to be distinguished from the Father, that the Son is eternally generated by the Father, and even that he is of the same divine nature as the Father. Basically this argument sets forth the idea that correlative terms imply one another: A father implies the existence of a son, a lord implies the existence of a slave, and vice versa.

In *Against Praxeas* 9–10, Tertullian argues against the Monarchian Praxeas, who confuses the three divine persons. Tertullian says that the very names "father" and "son" prove the personal distinction of the two, since "a father makes a son and a son makes a father and they become what they are by relationship with one another (*ex alterutro*)." Each one of them needs the other one in order to be what he is. One can never be a son to oneself, nor can one ever be one's own father. Another example of relation in the same chapter (10) is that of husband and wife. As for the Holy Spirit, Tertullian writes, "It suits my case also that when our Lord used this word [*alius*] regarding the person of the Paraclete, he signified not division but disposition (*dispositionem*): for he says, I will pray the Father and he will send you another (*alium*) advocate, the Spirit of truth (Jn 14:16). Thus [he calls] the Paraclete other than himself, as we say the Son is other than the Father."[7] It is worth noting that to express the idea of correlativity Tertullian does not use the word *relatio* but *dispositio* and the phrase *qui ex alterutro fiunt* (those whose existence depends on each other).

In a recent book, Widdicombe gives a comprehensive treatment of divine

relationality from Origen to Athanasius of Alexandria, considering also Dionysius of Alexandria, Methodius of Olympus, Alexander of Alexandria, and Arius.[8] More than half a century before Widdicombe, Chevalier made a similar attempt to present divine relations when he tried to compare the Greek and Augustinian views. Chevalier's treatment is less comprehensive and less compelling than Widdicombe's, but, in addition to Arius and Athanasius, it covers a number of authors not examined by Widdicombe, such as Basil of Ancyra, Epiphanius of Salamis, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Didymus the Blind.[9] Since it is very likely that Gregory of Nyssa was familiar at least with some works of his Christian predecessors,[10] a summary of these predecessors' views on divine relationality is certainly in order.

In *De principiis* (*Princ.*) 1.2.2 and 3, Origen makes clear the disastrous consequence entailed in the denial of the Son's eternal existence: God would not always be a Father.[11] In *Princ.* 1.2.10, he also says that "one cannot be a father apart from having a son." Widdicombe suggests that Origen's assumption of the correlative argument may reflect the influence of Aristotle's category of relation, πρός τι,[12] but he also draws attention to the parallel between the father-son and lord-slave relationship in *Princ.* 1.2.10 and Mal 1:6, a text Origen quotes in the context of his discussion of the movement from the knowledge of God as Lord to that of God as Father.[13] Origen connects the idea of the correlativity of the Father and the Son with that of God's goodness.[14] Widdicombe thinks that the Father-Son relationship is paramount in Origen's thought. It is characterized by continuous activity. Here are some of the images Origen uses to express it: unceasing generation of the Son by the Father (*Hom. Jer.* 9.4); the Son unceasingly turns toward the Father (*Comm. Jo.* 2.2.18); the Father's life is an eternal rejoicing in the presence of the Son who is Wisdom (*Princ.* 1.4.4 and 4.4.1; *Comm. Jo.* 1.9.55); knowledge and love of the Father are the characteristics of sonship (*Comm. Jo.* 20.34.305–309); the Logos is Son, glorifying and being glorified by the Father (*Comm. Jo.* 20.11.28 and 29).[15] These images are derived from Scripture.

Dionysius of Alexandria's writings also provide evidence for the argument from correlativity, but his language, as reported by Athanasius, seems to be more inclusive than that used by theologians both before and after him: "When there is a parent, there is also a child."[16] Ever since the beginning of the Arian controversy, the argument from correlativity was used by the non-Arian party against their enemies. Bishop Alexander of Alexandria used it, but Arius rejected it.[17] In a credal letter to his bishop (written ca. 320),[18] Arius wrote, "For [the Son] is not eternal, or coeternal or equally ingenerate with the Father, nor does he have his being simultaneously [ἅμα] with the Father, [in virtue] some say [of] his relation with him [τὰ πρός τι], thus postulating two ingenerate first

principles. But as monad and first principle of all things, God thus is before all things."[19]

To Arius's letter, Alexander of Alexandria replied with a letter known as ἡ φίλαρχος (ca. 321/2). Both were preserved by Athanasius in his *De synodis*. In his letter, Alexander uses the argument from correlativity: "[The Father] is Father because of the eternal presence of the Son, on account of whom he is called Father. . . . To say that the brightness of the Father's glory did not exist destroys [συναναιρεῖ] the original light of which it is the brightness. And if also the image of God was not eternal, it is clear that neither is that of which it is the image [εἰκὼν] eternal."[20]

In a letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia written shortly after receiving Alexander's letter, Arius summarized Alexander's teaching about the correlativity of Father and Son thus: "God eternal, Son eternal, Father and Son always together" (ἀεὶ θεὸς ἀεὶ υἱός, ἅμα πατὴρ ἅμα υἱός).[21] Both Arnou[22] and Widdicombe[23] notice that some terms (ἅμα, συναναιρεῖ) used by both Arius and Alexander are reminiscent of Aristotle's discussion of the category of relation in *Cat.* 7b15[24]: "Relatives seem to be simultaneous [ἅμα] by nature and in most cases this is true. . . . Also, one carries the other to destruction [συναναιρεῖ]." Widdicombe, however, adds that Alexander also uses Origen's argument that the denial of the eternal generation of the Son imperils the eternity of God's fatherhood.[25] Like Origen, Alexander employs various biblical images to express the Father-Son relationship: Prov 8:30 ("I was daily his delight") confirms in his view the eternal presence of Wisdom (identified with the Son) with the Father[26]; the Son is the brightness and image of the Father.[27]

Both Arius and Eusebius of Caesarea reject the argument from correlativity. As Williams has noticed, "Arius treats the words Father and Son as names identifying distinct and unique subsistences who do not share substantial attributes."[28] Eusebius says that the coeternity of Father and Son would eliminate their individual identities as father and son.[29] Eunomius repeats some of the earlier Arian arguments against correlativity, as illustrated later.

For Athanasius of Alexandria the fact that the Father and the Son are correlatives means that to defend the divinity of the Son is to defend the fatherhood of God.[30] However, he caricatures Arius's position in order to discredit him: For example, he implies a change in God when quoting Arius, which actually presents a position intolerable to the latter.[31] Athanasius's fundamental belief in the eternal correlativity of Father and Son is perhaps best expressed by the formula οὐκ ἀεὶ πατήρ, οὐκ ἀεὶ υἱός ([if] no eternal Father, [then] no eternal Son).[32] Widdicombe notices that Athanasius recasts Origen's presentation of the argument from relations in the language of a post-Methodian conception of God and the world.[33] Athanasius does this by positing

two sets of correlatives against Arius: Father and Son, on the one hand; unoriginate and originate, on the other hand. In *C. Ar.* 1.33, Athanasius writes, "And just as 'unoriginate' is indicated with reference to originated things, so also 'Father' is indicative of the Son. The one who names God 'maker,' 'fashioner,' and 'unoriginate' sees and discovers the creatures and originated things, while the one who calls God 'Father' immediately knows and contemplates the Son."[34] Nevertheless, Athanasius distinguishes between the correlativity of maker and thing made on the one hand, and the correlativity of father and son on the other: The former belongs to the realm of will, the latter to the realm of substance.[35]

Like Origen, Athanasius links the eternity of God's fatherhood with the attributes of immutability and perfection. He then contrasts divine and human generation, stating that in man, fatherhood and sonship do not "properly" (κυρίως) exist since they do not reside in their respective "characters,"[36] whereas in the Godhead alone "the Father is properly [κυρίως] father and the Son properly [κυρίως] son, and in them and them only, is it the case that the Father is always Father and the Son always Son."[37] God is "eternally Father, and the character of Father is not adventitious [οὐκ ἐπιγέγονε] to him, lest he be thought mutable."[38] Again like Origen, Athanasius connects the eternity of God's fatherhood with the attribute of God's goodness.[39] Athanasius is probably unaware of the Platonic origin of the idea that for God to be the way he is, is good. Some of the images Athanasius uses to illustrate the Father-Son relationship are the following: The characteristic and determinate quality of this relation is that of love;[40] the Father takes "pleasure" (εὐδοκία) in the Son whom he has generated "by nature"[41]; the Father and the Son delight in one another (based on Prov 8:30: "I was by him, daily his delight, rejoicing always before him").[42]

Yet perhaps the one who influenced Gregory of Nyssa the most in his view of the divine relationality was his own brother, Basil, whom he sometimes called "teacher and father."[43] In his polemics against Eunomius, Basil cautioned against the use of the name "ungenerated" (ἀγέννητος) because Eunomius alleged that it referred to divine substance. According to Eunomius's logic, if God is ungenerated, his substance is ungenerated; the Son, who is referred to as generated, should have a generated substance, and accordingly should differ from God. Briefly, the Son is not God according to the young generation of Arians represented by Eunomius. Even if Basil considers "ungenerated" quite appropriate to refer to God the Father, he says that, unlike the word "Father," the word "ungenerated" is not biblical; therefore, the latter should rather not be spoken of (σιωπᾶσθαι). The name "Father" has the same power as "ungenerated," contends Basil, "for the one who is truly Father and only

[Father] is from no other." Moreover, "father" introduces the notion of the son because of the relation (διὰ τῆς σχέσεως).[44] Eunomius will notice this synonymy and try to turn it on its head in his *Apologia Apologiae*, as my analysis of Gregory's handling of relationality later in this chapter will demonstrate.

Basil's statement that the name "Father has the same power as ungenerated" (τῆς Πατρὸς φωνῆς ἴσον δυναμένης τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ)[45] is not easy to understand. Basil is careful not to say that the two words have the same meaning just because they refer to the same reality; instead, he says that they have the "same power." To this he adds another qualification: The statement holds true for God alone, because unlike human fathers, God is the absolute Father, coming from no other. To say that "father" and "ungenerated" are synonymous in all cases (including the human case) is wrong, for two reasons: On the one hand, all human fathers are generated; on the other hand, it is as if "unemployed" and "man" are synonymous just because they refer to, for example, George. Eunomius clearly does not grasp Basil's fine explanation, as one can see from his *Apologia Apologiae* where he refers to the two terms with no qualifications whatsoever and pushes Basil's statement in a direction the latter would have found unacceptable: "Names with the same power also mean the same thing."[46] Gregory of Nyssa will be very cautious, too, saying that "Father" and "ungenerated" can be said to be synonymous "in one sense."[47] Gregory provides additional explanations, which I shall deal with later.

Turning again to relationship, "Father" is not only more suitable than "ungenerated," but it also introduces the notion of "son" because of the relation. One can also add that because of its correlative power, by the time of Basil, the word "father" had quite a history of use in defeating Arians such as Eunomius, as we have seen. Basil elaborates on relation in *AE* 2.9 (588c–589a) where he presents his theory of absolute and relative names.[48] Some names are said absolutely and refer to themselves, indicating the realities that are their substrate; others are said relatively, indicating the relation to the realities in regard to which they are said. "Human" (ἄνθρωπος), "horse," and "ox" are examples of absolute names, and "son," "slave," and "friend" are examples of relative names. The influence of Aristotle's *Categories* is obvious here.[49] Basil attempts to show that "offspring (or product of generation)" (γέννημα) does not refer to the Son's substance but to his relation to the Father. "Offspring" is a relative, not an absolute, name. Therefore, it does not refer to the substance but indicates the attachment of the reality designated as "offspring" to another reality. Then Basil hurries to add that actually neither do absolute names refer to the substance but at the most to the substratum (ὑποκείμενον), that is, the properties considered in the substance. A little later, however, Basil refers to relation

in terms of πρὸς τι πῶς ἔχειν and understands it as the equivalent of σχέσις.[50] This may betray the influence of the Stoic category of relation.

From other texts, one learns that for Basil, "father" and "son" express only the relation of one to the other (πρὸς ἄλληλα σχέσιν): "Father is the one who provides to the other the principle of his being in a similar nature; son is the one who has received from the other through generation the principle of his being."[51] Divine generation, however, is an eternal mystery inaccessible to human comprehension.[52] If divinity is common, fatherhood and sonship are properties (ἰδιώματα), and the role of properties is to show alterity within the identity of substance. The combination of common and particular distinguishes the persons of the Father and the Son from one another.[53]

In a later work, *De Spiritu Sancto*, written ca. 375, Basil uses a relational argument reminiscent of Origen's *Princ.* to establish the coeternity of Father and Son: "It certainly is not the human concept [of son] that compels [Eunomius] to say that the Son is posterior to the Father: [first because Father and Son] are perceived simultaneously due to the relationality, and [second because the term] 'posterior' is applied to something which is temporally closer to the present and, conversely, [the term] 'prior' to what is more remote from the present."[54]

Gregory of Nyssa's View of Divine Relationality

Gregory's view of divine relations is quite similar to his predecessors' views, as I shall demonstrate next.[55] Starting in *CE* 1.155, Gregory deals with an issue against which the Arians fought bitterly, namely, calling God "Father." The Arians knew that their acceptance of the argument from relations would result in their defeat because it would imply that God the Father had a divine Son. Gregory summarizes Eunomius's doctrine of the Trinity by stating that Eunomius replaces the revealed biblical names Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (Matt 28:19) with other titles and, instead of "the Father," he speaks of "the highest and most authentic being," instead of "the Son," of "the one which exists because of that [highest] being," and instead of "the Holy Spirit," of "a third which is in no way aligned with them but subject [to the other two]."[56] Like Athanasius and Basil before him, Gregory believes that the reason why Eunomius invents new titles is that "father" and "son" are correlatives which imply each other; their use would compel Eunomius to recognize that father and son have the same nature. It is exactly this implication that Eunomius wants to avoid at any cost. "All humans," says Gregory, "when they hear the

titles 'father' and 'son,' immediately recognize from the very names their intimate and natural relation to each other [φυσικὴν πρὸς ἄλληλα σχέσιν]. Community of nature [φύσεως συγγενὲς] is inevitably suggested by these titles."[57] The natural relation that the names "father" and "son" indicate is a proof for the divinity of the Son, which Eunomius endeavors to deny.

Eunomius and other Arians and Anomoeans before him also preferred to use "ungenerated-generated" instead of "Father-Son." They argued that "ungenerated" and "generated" referred to the nature of the Father and the Son respectively. Thus, they believed they could prove that the Father's and the Son's natures were "unlike" (ἀνόμοιος) one another: The Father was surely God and his nature was ungenerated; since the Son's nature was generated, this implied that the Son was not God. I mentioned above Basil's reaction to this attitude when he wrote that "ungenerated" is unbiblical and advised his brother Gregory and their supporters to preserve the pious meaning[58] of "ungenerated" in their soul but not to favor the actual word, as the word "Father" would sufficiently express the sense of "ungenerated" in God and would introduce the notion of Son because of the relation (διὰ τῆς σχέσεως).[59]

Eunomius devised another counterargument by trying to turn on its head the Cappadocian case that "Father" and "ungenerated" were used in reference to the first divine person. According to Gregory, Eunomius wrote, "If 'Father' and 'ungenerated' are the same in power, and if names with the same power also mean the same thing, and 'ungenerated' on their own showing[60] means to be God from no other, it necessarily follows that 'Father' also means to be God from no other, and not that he has generated the Son."[61] Eunomius either caricatures or does not fully comprehend Basil's argument here. Basil did not say that names with the same power would mean the same thing. Gregory counters Eunomius's assertion with an extensive argument of the meaning of the name "Father." Among other things, he interweaves in this argument a theory of absolute and relative names similar to, but less sophisticated than, the one Basil proposed in *AE* 2.9.11–27 (588c–589a). Gregory begins his argument by saying that "ungenerated" and "father" refer to the same reality, the person of God the Father; therefore, "in one sense" (κατά τινα διάνοιαν) the two words can be said to be synonymous.[62] However, he continues, both words have other connotations as well; their being synonymous in one sense does not imply their being synonymous in all:

> We call the Emperor both Sovereign and Absolute, and also Chief of his subjects, and it is not false to say of him that the word "Emperor" also means "Absolute"; nor do we say that it is logically necessary, if sovereignty and absence of a superior are indicated by this

> word, that his authority over his subjects is no longer signified by his being Emperor.[63]

Similarly, since God the Father is not the son of any other father before him, he is also ungenerated.[64] One can say that God the Father is an absolute father, "the Father." This, however, does not imply that we must "wrench the meaning of 'Father' away from his relation to the Son [πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν σχέσεως]."[65] Gregory turns his attention to this relation next.

In another example used to refute Eunomius, Gregory says that Eunomius's own father was both a "father" and a "human."[66] But neither title excludes the other; being a father does not exclude being a human or vice versa. One should note that in the above examples Gregory utilizes both absolute names (sovereign, human) and relative names (chief, father). He therefore explains his theory of names: "Who does not know that some nouns are absolute and unrelated [ἀπόλυτά τε καὶ ἄσχετα], others are used to express a relation (πρός τινα σχέσιν)?"[67] He exemplifies directly with names attributed to God in Scripture. Absolute names, or names said absolutely, are those which "describe by themselves some complete idea about God," such as " 'imperishable,' 'eternal,' 'immortal,' and the like."[68] Relative names "refer only to some beneficial relationship, like 'help,' 'shield,' 'succour' . . . If you remove the need for help, the significant force of the name is lost."[69] In this context, mention has to be made of another text (*Ref.* 124–125) where Gregory deals with relative names attributed to God, such as "almighty," "lord," "physician," "shepherd." Here Gregory speaks of relation in Stoic terms (τὸ πρός τί πως ἔχειν):

> Those then who enquire precisely into the meaning of the term "almighty" find that it declares nothing else concerning the divine power than that that activity (or energy) which controls created things and is indicated by the word "almighty" stands in a certain relation to something [τὸ πρός τί πως ἔχειν]. For as he would not be called a physician, save on account of the sick . . . so neither would he be styled almighty, did not all creation stand in need of one to regulate it and keep it in being.[70]

Nevertheless, Gregory does not seem to favor the Stoic category of relation. The phrase πρός τί πως ἔχειν occurs only two more times in all of his works, at *CE* 2.116 (NPNF 2.5:262) and *CE* 2.392 (NPNF 2.5:289). In both places, the Stoic category of relation is used to express the relation of a body to other objects and the relation between created things, respectively. Gregory does not attach any special significance to this phrase.

However, he envisions a third category of names, "which are used both

independently and with their relatedness, such as 'God' and 'good' and others like them."[71] One transforms such names from absolute into relative by attaching possessive adjectives to them, such as "my God" or "your good." In the example of absolute names that can be turned into relative names by merely attaching to them possessive adjectives, Gregory shows that he is either unaware of, or does not care about, Aristotle's argument that no substances can be called relatives (expressed clearly at *Cat.* 8b15–20):[72]

> The universal God often becomes personal to the one who calls upon him, in the way we may hear the holy ones making the supreme nature personal to them. "Holy is the Lord God" (Rev 4:8) is as far as it goes unrelated [ἄσχετον]. But if someone adds "our" (Rev 4:11), he no longer allows the name to be understood by itself; he has made the meaning personal in relating it to himself. Again, the Spirit cries, "Abba, Father!" (Rom 8:15); here the word is independent of the particular relationship. But we are also commanded to call the Father in heaven "our Father" (Mt 6:9); this again is the relational meaning [ἡ σχετικὴ σημασία]. So just as the person who makes the universal God his own in no way obscures his position as supreme over all, so there is no reason why the Father, having appointed the one originating from himself as the Firstborn of all creation, should not simultaneously indicate by the title "Father" that he has generated the Son, and by the same word explain that he exists from no superior cause.[73]

There is in this passage the beginning of a theology of adoption: The Son of God, who is son by nature, calls on us, who are different in nature from God, to become sons of God by adoption. God the Father becomes our Father. One is reminded of Origen's theology of adoption.[74] But was Gregory's view of adoption really influenced by Origen? I shall deal with this issue later in this chapter.

In the *Refutation of the Confession of Faith of Eunomius* (*Ref.*) Gregory again takes issue with Eunomius's unwillingness to call the three divine persons Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. He tells us that Eunomius calls the Father "creator" and "demiurge" of the Son, the Son "work, creature and product," and the Spirit "creature of the creature, work of the work" (*Ref.* 4). Gregory is of the opinion that we have to pay greater attention to the titles Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, since they were revealed by the Lord himself. This is another way of saying that although Scripture uses other titles in regard to God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit describe the triune God more appropriately. For, "if understood in its natural sense [δία τῆς προσφυοῦς σημασίας], each of these titles

is for Christians a canon of truth and a law of piety" (*Ref.* 5) Gregory then elaborates: "The name 'Father' is not understood with reference to itself alone, but also by its proper signification indicates the relation to the Son [πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν σχέσιν]."[75] The name "Father" tells us that God is not only one person but at least two, indeed three, because of the relationality these names express. The faith in the triune God forms the canon of truth for most Christians. At this point, Gregory uses in reference to God a paradoxical phrase that he seems to like and that we have also encountered in *Ad Petrum* 4.87–88, namely, that God, because of the one nature and three persons, can be described as "divided without separation and united without confusion."[76]

Yet what does this relationality of the divine persons mean for Gregory? First of all, it means (as it meant from Origen onward) that since God the Father is immutable and eternally identical to himself, he has always had a Son. Conversely, the Son has always had an eternal and divine Father. The Son too is immutable and divine precisely because of the relationality with the Father (*Ref.* 7). Otherwise, change from the better to the worse or from the worse to the better would have been implied; but change and alteration in God are unacceptable (*Ref.* 8).

Second, relationality means that the Son, "who *is* in the bosom of the Father" (John 1:18), is from all eternity to be contemplated in the Father (*Ref.* 8). The present tense of the verb "to be" used by the evangelist suggests, in Gregory's view, that the Son has always been in the bosom of the Father, not that he came to be there at one point in time after not having been there before that moment. The Son being contemplated in the bosom of the Father means that he is contemplated as "power and wisdom of God" (1 Cor 1:24), "truth, light, and sanctification" (1 Cor 1:30), "peace" (Eph 2:14), "life," and other similar names (*Ref.* 9). Accordingly, denial of the Son's existence implies denial of all these goods in the bosom of the Father, which is to say that God did not always possess them. (*Ref.* 9).

The Spirit is also a correlative term of both the Father and the Son. In using biblical phrases, Gregory refers to the Spirit as good and holy, princely, principal, quickening, governing, and sanctifying of all creation (*Ref.* 11). He conceives "no gap between Christ and his anointing, between the king and his kingdom, between wisdom and the Spirit of wisdom, between truth and the Spirit of truth, between power and the Spirit of power" (*Ref.* 11). Therefore, he concludes that since the Son is eternally contemplated in the Father and the Spirit is the Son's Spirit, the Spirit too is eternally contemplated in the Father (*Ref.* 12). All these reflections about relationality enable us to understand that the three divine persons are strongly united with each other, but at the same time they are to be distinguished from each other (*Ref.* 13).

Then Gregory interprets Matt 28:19: "baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit."[77] He thinks that Christ stops short of telling us what the name is, because it refers to the divine substance, which for us is ineffable and incomprehensible. (*Ref.* 14ff.). These reflections persuade Gregory to return to the issue of relationality. He thus says that "it is plain that the title of Father does not present to us the substance, but only indicates the relation to the Son."[78] Let us also remember what Gregory stated just previously: "The name 'Father' is not understood with reference to itself alone, but also by its proper signification indicates the relation to the Son [πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν σχέσιν]."[79] His conclusion is twofold: On the one hand, the name "Father" refers to the first divine person; on the other hand, it points to another person, the Son. This is a reason to conclude that, when using correlatives such as "Father," "Son," and "Spirit," Gregory does not have in mind nonsubsistent relations.

This whole discussion is placed in the context (*Ref.* 14–17) of what is sufficient for us to come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved (1 Tim 2:4). In view of this objective, God has not considered it necessary for us to know the divine substance. It is sufficient for us to know that God is "the absolutely existent [τὸ ὄντως ὄν], together with whom, by the notion of relation [διὰ τῆς σχετικῆς ἐννοίας], the majesty of the Son is also manifested, whereas the Son, as said previously, shows himself inseparably united with the Spirit of life and truth, inasmuch as he is himself life and truth."[80] In Gregory's view this is the most perfect teaching of piety, and beyond it nothing else is necessary for our salvation (*Ref.* 17).

Like Basil and Origen before him, Gregory connects the idea of correlativity between the Father and the Son with that of God's goodness. He says that for God to be the Father of such a Son is good.[81] If Eunomius and his supporters deny that God is a Father, they imply that God's goodness did not always exist in its fullness but was only acquired after he begot the Son. An even more dramatic implication would be that before begetting the Son, God would have had "neither wisdom nor power nor truth nor life nor any of those things by which in his various aspects the Only-begotten Son has both his being and his titles."[82] As Widdicombe noticed in his comments on Origen, "It is fundamental to [Origen's] thought that since the attribute of goodness is central to God's nature, God acts eternally to realize that which is good."[83] The same holds true for the Cappadocian view of God.

It is possible that when writing *CE* 1.584, Gregory recalled Origen's argument from the *Commentary on Genesis,* of which only a fragment has come down to us in Eusebius's *Contra Marcellum*. The *Comm. Gen.* fragment is the only text known to us in which Origen makes an explicit comparison between

the fatherhood of God and the fatherhood of men.[84] Origen says that unlike men who become fathers but are at one time unable to be fathers, God has always been Father. Gregory argues in a more comprehensive manner, speaking of the fact that for humans "it is impracticable for anyone to acquire the habit of a number of functions at the same time, but [they] must take up each of the interests in order and one at a time."[85] Unlike humans, God does not have at one time ungeneratedness, then acquires power, then imperishability, then wisdom, then fatherhood, then eternity, but has all of these and many other attributes always and at the same time.[86] Therefore, the Father is always Father and with him the Son is also always implied because of the correlativity of the two terms.[87]

Another place where Gregory compares divine and human fatherhood is *CE* 3.2.161–164. This time he explicitly mentions that the view originates with his brother Basil. The latter spoke of two meanings of the word "son": (1) the being formed by passion (ἡ τε διὰ πάθους) and (2) the true relationship to the begetter (ἡ πρὸς τὸν γεγεννηκότα γνησιότης). In discourses upon things divine, Basil did not admit the former sense because it was "unseemly and carnal," but he did admit the latter sense as it bore witness to the glory of the only begotten.[88] Eunomius, contends Gregory, dishonors the Son by the novelties he tries to introduce in theology. At this point, Gregory calls Basil admiringly "a follower of Apostle Paul" and Eunomius derogatorily "the new Stoic and Epicurean," borrowing an image from Acts 17:21 that describes Paul's visit to Athens. In the Athenian Areopagus, Paul met "Stoics and Epicureans" who, like all the Athenians of this account, "spent their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing." From this point of view, Eunomius is "the new Stoic and Epicurean" because, asks Gregory rhetorically, "what could be found newer than this—a Son of an energy, and a Father of a creature, and a new god springing up from nothing, and good at variance with good?"[89] These are the consequences of Eunomius's teaching about God, and they are indeed disastrous not only for the Son, whom Eunomius disparages, but also for the Father and the entire Godhead.

Biblical Views of Divine Relationality in Gregory's Works

Chapters 14–15 and 20 of the Gospel according to John contain important statements about the relationship among the three divine persons, as well as between God and humans. Gregory refers to them in a number of passages in *CE* and *Ref.* when explaining the divine relationality. I will consider these places next. John 14:9–10 reads: "Jesus said to him [i.e., to Philip], 'Have I been

with you so long, and yet you do not know me, Philip? He who has seen me has seen the Father; how can you say, "Show us the Father?" Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father is in me?' "

In refuting Eunomius's view that all the names given to God except "ungenerated" are mere human conceptions (ἐπίνοιαι),[90] Gregory has recourse to John 14:10:

> No one, I imagine, can be so densely stupid as to be ignorant that God the Only-begotten, who is in the Father (Jn 14:10), and who sees the Father in himself, is in no need of any name or title to make him known, nor is the mystery of the Holy Spirit, who searches the deep things of God (1 Cor 2:10), brought to our knowledge by a nominal appellation, nor can the incorporeal nature of supramundane powers name God by voice and tongue.[91]

This is indeed apophatic theology at its peak. The two biblical verses (John 14:10 and 1 Cor 2:10) Gregory quotes together both in this context and elsewhere[92] are important for his view of divine relations. As we have seen, the former refers to the relationship between the Father and the Son, while the latter refers to the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the other two persons ("the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God"). Both verses express the deep intimacy existing among the divine persons. Each person dwells in the other two and knows them perfectly. This is the supreme degree of relationality and communion, and Gregory contends that because they are spiritual, the divine persons need not express their knowledge or feelings about each other, that is, they do not communicate with each other in the way we humans do. Nor do the "supramundane powers" need to name God "by voice and tongue."

The two verses also occur together in *CE* 2.216–218, and this passage is also very telling. Gregory deals here with the way in which the divine persons communicate with each other. His argument can be summarized as follows. We humans communicate with one another in the following manner: One utters one's thoughts by means of voice or writing or other gestures (such as an expression of the eye or a movement of the hand), and the other one hears or reads them. A medium (μέσον) is necessary, "for voice to be produced," continues Gregory, "unless it takes consistence in the air."[93] Air is the medium in this case. Yet what is the medium between the Father and the Son? If there is such a medium between them at all, then it should be either created or uncreated. It cannot be created, since the Father and the Son communicated with one another even before the creation of the world. If it is uncreated, then it should perhaps be either generated or ungenerated, but we know that the

only begotten alone is generated and the Father alone is ungenerated. Therefore, Gregory concludes that such a medium does not exist in the divine case. Hence, "where separation is not conceived of, the closest connection (τὸ συνημμένον) is confessed. And what is so connected needs no medium for voice or speech."[94] By "connection" Gregory means "what is in all respects inseparable (ἐν πᾶσιν ἀχώριστον)," and in the case of a spiritual nature "connection" does not mean corporeal connection but "the union and blending of spiritual with spiritual through identity of wills."[95]

Accordingly, there is no divergence of will between the Father and the Son. "If the Father wills anything, the Son who is in the Father (John 14:10) knows the Father's will."[96] Because of this coinherence (περιχωρήσις, as it was called later), the Son has everything that belongs to the Father and, most importantly, has the Father himself and the whole of the Father's will.[97] Therefore, "the Son is himself the Father's will"[98] and needs no words to learn what the Father's will is. He himself is also the Word of the Father.

An equally strong relation exists between the Holy Spirit and the other two divine persons. Basing himself on 1 Cor 2:10, Gregory says that the Holy Spirit requires no instruction to know what God wills, as he is the one who searches the deep things of God. Gregory does not elaborate on what exactly he means, but he probably refers to the fact that the Spirit knows everything, including the Father's will, as perfectly as the Son does.

Sometimes Gregory associates John 14:10 with John 14:9 ("Who has seen me has seen the Father"). These two verses complement each other in expressing the strong relationship between the Father and the Son, and Gregory uses this complementarity against Eunomius. In *CE* 3.2.136–150 he argues against Eunomius that there is no variance in the substance of the Father and the Son, "for what mutual relation is so closely and concordantly engrafted and fitted together as that meaning of relation to the Father expressed by the word 'Son'?"[99] He then repeats the idea that the two terms are correlatives and brings in some biblical quotes to clarify what this correlativity means.

Thus, Phil 2:6 tells us that the Son is "in the form of God." Gregory explains this phrase using the analogy of a piece of wax stamped by a signet: When the figure engraved is fitted again to the signet, it accords with that which surrounds it. The one who is "in the form of God" has been formed by the impression of the Father on it and accordingly is "the imprint of the Father's substance" (Heb 1:3). Gregory also argues that the "form (μορφή) of God" means the substance (οὐσία) of God, because when it is said that Christ "took the form of a servant" (Phil 2:7), the substance of a servant was also involved, not only the form.[100] He concludes that "in the form of God" (Phil 2:6), and "in the Father" (John 14:10), and he "on [whom] the Father set his seal" (John

6:26), as well as "the image of goodness" (2 Cor 4:4), and "the brightness of glory" (Heb 1:3), and all other similar titles given to the Son testify that the Son's substance is not out of harmony with the Father's substance.[101] I would add that these phrases allow us to gaze into the relationship between the two divine persons.

Later in *CE* 3, Gregory gives additional details about relationality. The Son has all the attributes of the Father (cf. John 16:15) except for being ungenerated. The Son is God, eternal, existent at all times, incorruptible, has no beginning and no end, is in the Father altogether and so is the Father in him.[102] Gregory then mentions again John 14:10, a verse he cherishes, in order to explain it. In his view, this verse expresses "the complete absence of divergence in the image, as compared with him whose image he is."[103] Moreover, John 14:9 should best be understood, according to Gregory, in the sense of Heb 1:3.[104] The application that Gregory suggests yields a new image of biblical inspiration of the relationship I have been analyzing: The Son glorifies the Father and is being glorified by the Father: "The majesty of the Father is expressly imaged in the greatness of the power of the Son, that one may be believed to be as great as the other is known to be. . . . All that glory which the Father is sheds its brilliancy from its whole extent by means of the brightness that comes from it, that is, by the true light."[105]

Gregory mentions John 14:9–10 in yet another context. He says that a large number of expressions found in Scripture in reference to the Son are not used for the created world: "For the creation was not in the beginning, and was not with God, and was not God, nor life, nor light, nor resurrection, nor the rest of the divine names, as truth, righteousness, sanctification, etc."[106] Neither are "the more exalted words" contained in John 14:9–10 used in reference to the creation. The use of these expressions in reference to the Son alone testifies, according to Gregory, that the Son is not created. Therefore, it follows that the relationship between the Father and the Son is clearly distinct from the relationship between God the Father and creation. Widdicombe notices something similar in Origen, namely, that "[Origen] does not use the idea of the eternal existence of the rational creation to prove the eternity of God's fatherhood,"[107] although he does use the idea of the Son's eternal existence to the same end.

"I am in the Father and the Father is in me" (John 14:10), according to Gregory, is also equivalent to saying that the Son is in the bosom of the Father.[108] This gives Gregory the opportunity to produce another syllogism against Eunomius. When the Son, as Eunomius says, "was not," what did the bosom contain? One should assume that the bosom was either full or empty. If it was full, it should have been filled by the Son; therefore, the Son existed. If it was empty when the Son was not (ὅτε οὐκ ἦν) and then became full when

the Son began to exist, then God the Father underwent a change, in the sense that "he passed from the state of void and deficiency to the state of fullness and perfection."[109] But this conclusion is unacceptable; therefore, Eunomius and the whole Arian tradition is mistaken in claiming that there was a point in time when the Son did not exist.

The *Refutation of the Confession of Faith of Eunomius* brings additional clarifications to the interpretation of John 14:10 and other relational texts. One learns that John 14:10 also means that "the one is in his entirety in the other in his entirety [ὅλος ἐν ὅλῳ], the Father not superabounding in the Son, the Son not being deficient in the Father."[110] There are other similar verses that Gregory quotes at this point: "The Son should be honored as the Father is honored" (cf. John 5:23), "He who has seen me has seen the Father" (John 14:9), "No one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son" (Matt 11:27). He insists that those who accept these verses as genuine should accept that there is no hint in them of any variation of glory, or of substance, or anything else, between the Father and the Son.[111] The relationship between the Father and the Son is thus expressed in equal glory, sameness of substance, and perfect knowledge of each by the other. A little later, Gregory adds that the Son does not divide the glory with the Father, but each has the whole glory of divinity.[112] The fact that the whole passage presently under scrutiny refers to relationship is proven by Gregory's earlier statement in the same writing: "For without the Son the Father has neither existence nor name, any more than the powerful without power, or the wise without wisdom."[113] It is also worth noting that for Gregory, identity of glory indicates community of nature.[114] The latter statement is not difficult to understand, given the date of *Ref.*'s composition after the Council of Constantinople (AD 381), which proclaimed that the Holy Spirit, "along with the Father and the Son, is worshiped and glorified," thus avoiding the use of an unbiblical word such as *homoousios* to state the community of nature between the divine persons.

Thus far I have dealt rather strictly with intra-Trinitarian relations. Nevertheless, both the Gospels and Gregory of Nyssa also consider the relationship between God and humans. I shall now turn my attention to this relationship, because it will provide a clearer understanding of Gregory's concepts of divine persons. The next two sections are corollaries to the issue of divine relationality.

Homecoming versus Adoption and the Will of God

Scriptural texts bearing witness to the second type of relationship, between God and humans, are both pre- and postresurrection, and they occur in John

14–15 and 20 (and parallels).[115] The *Biblia patristica* sees an allusion to John 14:6 ("I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father except through me") in *CE* 1.335.[116] Here Gregory combines John 14:6 with John 1:3 ("all things came to be through him") and writes that, on the one hand, the cause of our life is "the true life which descended to our nature"; on the other hand, in the ascending direction, it is Christ, "the true light, by whom we were made foreigners to darkness."[117] The latter shows that Gregory has in mind John 14:6, where Jesus tells his disciples that it is only through him that anyone can come to the Father. This verse contains a whole theology of humanity's return to God, from whom it had strayed through sin. Next I would like to analyze Gregory's understanding of what I prefer to call "a theology of humanity's exile and homecoming to God." This theology is important inasmuch as it sheds light on divine relationality.

Between bondage and our adoption as children, an intermediary station on humanity's way back to God is friendship with God. Christ addresses his disciples in this way: "I do not call you servants any longer, because the servant does not know what the master is doing; but I have called you friends, because I have made known to you everything that I have heard from my Father" (John 15:15). In interpreting this verse, Gregory endeavors to show against Eunomius that the Son of God who redeemed us from bondage is not under the dominion of the Father, nor in a state of slavery. Otherwise, not the Son alone but also the Father, who is in the Son and is one with him, must be a servant.[118] Through the incarnation he took all that was ours in order to give us in return what is his: "As he took disease, death, curse, and sin, so he took our slavery also, not in such a way as himself to have what he took, but so as to purge our nature of such evils, our [defects] being swallowed up and done away with in his stainless nature."[119] Gregory then returns to the Son's knowledge of the Father, yet another characteristic of relationship, expressed clearly in John 15:15. He reemphasizes that the Son's knowledge of the Father is perfect, as the Son has everything that pertains to the Father and, even more, has the Father himself in himself.

It is worth noting here that, on the one hand, Gregory uses the pair of correlative terms "father-son" to prove that the Father and the Son have the same nature; on the other hand, he uses another pair of correlatives, "lord-slave," to prove that a lord and a slave have different natures (like God and creation). Eunomius thought that the two pairs may work against each other, and thus he tried to use the latter against the former to prove his point that the Son is not divine. I shall turn to this issue shortly.

Another biblical pericope dealing with the relationship between God and

humans is John 20:17: "Do not hold on to me, because I have not yet ascended to the Father. But go to my brothers and say to them, 'I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.' "[120] The text figured prominently in the Arian controversy, because the Arians interpreted it as proclaiming the transcendence of the ungenerated over the only begotten.[121] These words were addressed by the resurrected Christ to Mary Magdalene, the woman who was the first human being to see him. According to this verse, after the Lord's resurrection, humans are brought into the closest relationship possible with God. They become the Son's brothers and sisters and the Father's children. Humans are thus taken beyond slavery, beyond even friendship, and are adopted as children by God. But Eunomius, too, had noticed John 20:17 and tried to turn the new argument from relationship on its head:

> Either by the relative meaning [διὰ τῆς σχετικῆς σημασίας] employed there is expressed what is common to the substance also between the disciples and the Father, or else we must not by this phrase bring even the Lord into communion in the Father's nature, and, even as the fact that God over all is named as their God implies that the disciples are his servants, so by parity of reasoning, it is acknowledged, by the words in question, that the Son also is the servant of God.[122]

The conclusion Eunomius wants to impose is that, according to John 20:17, the Son is a servant by nature. Therefore, the Son is not God. Gregory's first reaction to Eunomius is to say that, first of all, the words addressed to Mary ("I have not yet ascended to my Father") do not refer to the divinity of the Only-begotten but to his humanity. Then, "following the guidance of the fathers," he proceeds to explain the meaning of John 20:17. The authentic interpretation of this verse can only be retrieved if the verse is placed within the scope of the history of salvation.[123] He first quotes 1 Cor 8:6: "There is one God, the Father, from whom are all things."[124] As such, God the Father is by nature (τῇ φύσει) Father of existent things, in the sense that it is he who has given them existence: "Human nature [ἀνθρωπίνη φύσις] . . . had for the author [ποιήτης] of its own constitution none other than the Father of all."[125] This is to say that in one sense "Father" means "author." But then Gregory speculates that there is yet another sense, a relational one, in which God can be regarded as Father of humanity: He says that "the name of Godhead [θεότης] itself, whether it indicates the authority of oversight or of foresight [ἐποπτικὴν ἢ προνοητικὴν ἐξουσίαν], imports a certain relation to humanity."[126] This is another allusion to the supposed etymological derivation of θεός from θεάομαι (to gaze at, to see);

consequently, θεός would also be related to other verbs expressing the idea of sight or seeing, such as "foresight" and "oversight." Thus, God and the human race are in a relation of overseer to the object overseen.

Yet humans moved from being in this divine Father's image to being in the image of the "father of sin."[127] It is "in virtue of the similarity of will [διὰ τῆς κατὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν ὁμοιότητος]" that humans become sons of the father of sin,[128] and honor those who "by nature were no gods" (Gal 4:8).[129] Gregory regards this whole departure of humanity from the good Father as an exile (τὸ ἐξοικειωθῆναι, *CE* 3.10, 11). It is an exile of cosmic proportions, to which God reacted accordingly: "The Good Shepherd of the whole rational creation left in the heights of heaven his unsinning and supramundane flock and, moved by love, went after the sheep which had gone astray, even our human nature."[130] In comparing what God left behind, the ninety-nine other sheep, to come after the lost one, Gregory believes that humanity is an insignificant and infinitesimal part of the whole rational creation. Yet it seemed important to God to do this, because it was impossible for estranged humanity to return by itself to the heavenly place. The good tidings Christ proclaimed to the human race is precisely that he came down to earth to take it back to heaven. At this point Gregory has recourse to an image of adoption suggested by Isa 8:18: "For behold, I and the children whom God has given me . . ."[131]

But Gregory recalls that his discussion started from John 20:17. He, therefore, turns to the paramount role women played in the history of salvation, as Mary Magdalene was the first human being to witness to the resurrected Christ. In agreement with the author of 1 Timothy, Gregory says "the woman, being deceived, was in transgression." God chose a woman to be the first witness of the resurrection,

> that she might retrieve by her faith in the resurrection the overthrow caused by her disobedience, and that as, by making herself at the beginning a minister [διάκονος] and advocate to her husband of the counsels of the serpent, she brought into human life the beginning of evil, and its train of consequences, so, by conveying[132] to his disciples the words of him who slew the dragon, she might become to humans the guide to faith, whereby with good reason the first proclamation of death is annulled.[133]

Given the fact that gender language in Gregory of Nyssa will be discussed later, it is worth noting that he underscores the role of Mary Magdalene as a minister to the rest of humanity of the good news about Christ's resurrection. This, too, is an important part of humanity's homecoming.

In sum, the image of humanity's exile and homecoming to God is one of

Gregory's favorite images in salvation history. He develops a whole theology around this image, and one cannot but notice his enthusiasm when he unfolds it before his readers. As will become apparent below, this image is more elaborate than another image expressive of salvation history—our adoption as children of God—which Origen developed so powerfully.

The important issue of the will of God appears in a context in which Gregory compares human and divine sonship, thus speaking of our adoption as children of God. The noun "adoption" (υἱοθεσία) and its cognates are very infrequent in *CE*. An important passage where Gregory deals with our adoption as children of God starts at *CE* 3.1.111. The context is yet another refutation of Eunomius's view that the correlative term "son" does not imply a common nature between the Father and the Son. Gregory uses an *argumentum ad hominem*, first strengthening the adversary's point so that he can then crush it more forcefully. Gregory himself says, on behalf of Eunomius and the Eunomians, that in Scripture the phrase "child of wrath" (Eph 2:3) is used as well as "son of perdition" (John 17:12; Matt 3:7), "product of a viper" (Matt 3:7), "sons of light" (John 12:36), and "sons of the day" (1 Thess. 5:5). But in such phrases no community of nature is apparent.[134]

Now comes the explanation. Gregory says that he is aware that divine Scripture uses "son" in two senses: (1) In one sense this appellation is derived "from nature" (ἐκ φύσεως); (2) in other senses, it is "adventitious and artificial" (ἐπισκευαστὴν καὶ ἐπίκτητον), or the "result of choice" (ἐκ προαιρέσεως).[135] For the first sense of the word, he exemplifies with the phrases "sons of humans" and "sons of rams," and for the second with "sons of power" and "children of God." Gregory says, "For when they are called 'sons of Eli,' they are declared to have a natural relationship [κατὰ τὴν φὺσιν συγγενές], but in being called 'sons of Belial,' they are reproved for the wickedness of their choice [τῆς προαιρέσεως] as no longer emulating their father in their life, by addicting their own purpose to sin."[136] Gregory clarifies at this point that whichever way we choose to be, we do so freely, but our human nature remains within its natural confines: "It is in our power [ἐφ' ἡμῖν] to become sons either of night or of day, while our nature yet remains, so far as the chief part of it is concerned, within its proper limits."[137]

Gregory warns that the explanation he has just produced holds true for the "lower nature" (κάτω φύσις),[138] but adds that our nature (or perhaps "substance") remains what it is. Therefore, in the case of human beings, the word "son" is applied metaphorically (ἐκ μεταφορᾶς) when we are referred to as sons of anything other than humans,[139] because our nature is a borderland (μεθόριος; *CE* 3.1.121) between virtue and vice.[140] We can become children of either light or darkness by affinity to the good or to its opposite. We can choose to change

from children of darkness to children of light by "casting off the works of darkness [and] by decent life."[141] In other words, it is through moral effort that we can attain a superior state. However, since the status of "sons of God" is the supreme state that we can reach, it is not only through our own efforts that we achieve this. It is the Son of God proper who helps us in this by joining us to him by spiritual generation.[142] Thus, Christ bestows upon us adoption (υἱοθεσία) as children of God.[143] Elsewhere, Gregory calls humans "disinherited sons" and shows what Christ has done for us: "This is what the 'mediator' between the Father and the disinherited sons means, he who has reconciled through himself the enemies with God, through his true and unique divinity."[144]

Unlike humans, the Only-begotten does not change from an inferior to a superior state. Nor does he need another Son to bestow adoption upon him. Accordingly, Gregory maintains that the Only-begotten is properly called the Son of God, as he is the Son of God by nature.[145] The distinction between "by nature" and "by choice" is very important in Gregory's view, and he emphasizes it several times. Yet the case of the Son of God is very different from the case of human sons:

> God, being one good, in a simple and uncompounded nature, looks ever the same way, and is never changed by the impulses of choice [ταῖς τῆς προαιρέσεως ὁρμαῖς], but always wishes what he is, and is, assuredly, what he wishes [ἀεὶ καὶ βούλεται ὅπερ ἐστὶν καὶ ἐστι πάντως ὅ καὶ βούλεται]. So that he is in both respects properly and truly called Son of God, since his nature contains the good, and his choice [προαίρεσις] also is never severed from that which is more excellent, so that this word is employed without inexactness, as his name.[146]

These statements are both powerful and in the Plotinian tradition. They are powerful because in the divine case, sonship-by-nature and sonship-by-will converge in the same direction of the good. There is no contradiction between the goodness of the divine nature and the good (or rather supremely good) choice the Son makes. The affirmation is also Plotinian because Plotinus, in referring to the One about a hundred years before Gregory, made an almost identical statement: The One is "all power, really master of itself, being what it wills to be."[147] The Son is thus presented as a willing subject. But his will appears as both the will to choose (προαίρεσις), which is always directed toward choosing the good, and the will to be what he wishes (βούλεσις) to be, which is an ontological will.

Gregory also deals with adoption in *CE* 3.5.3. Here he explains Rom 8:16: "It is the Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God." Gregory says that the meaning of this verse is that the Holy Spirit comes to be "in the mind of the faithful" (τῇ διανοίᾳ τῶν πιστῶν), because in many other passages the Apostle Paul uses "spirit" (πνεῦμα) for "mind" (νοῦς). Nonetheless, an important statement follows that sheds greater light on the meaning of adoption: "When [the mind] receives the communion of the [Holy] Spirit the recipients attain the dignity of adoption."[148] The latter statement is not only beautiful but also gives a more complete picture of what Gregory means by adoption: The Holy Spirit too (not only the Son) contributes to our adoption as children of God. Unfortunately, Gregory does not elaborate further.

Yet we find a brief indication elsewhere. In *Ref.* 55, Gregory writes that our adoption as children of God is a grace of God. We become children "by grace not by nature" (χάριτι καὶ οὐ φύσει).[149] This means that God offers adoption freely, but also that humans remain created beings unlike the Only-begotten, who is uncreated and Son by nature. In reflecting on the seventh Beatitude, Gregory also says that the peacemakers will be crowned with the grace of adoption (τῆς υἱοθεσίας χάριτι στεφανῶθηση).[150] Becoming "children of God" in his view is to be treasured above any good fortune (εὐκληρία).[151] The children of God imitate the authentic Son of God, the son by nature, chasing evil out of human nature to introduce in its stead the communion of the good.[152] They show in their lives God's love for humans, that is, the proper character of divine action.[153]

To summarize Gregory's theology of adoption, I should say that it contains two elements. In order for humans to become adopted children of God (1) they should be joined to Christ by spiritual generation[154] and (2) their mind should receive the communion of the Holy Spirit.[155] The issue of our adoption as children of God, as I hinted at the beginning of this section, is not one of Gregory's favorite images of humanity's return to God. To be more accurate, I should say that Gregory does not have as elaborate a theology of adoption as Origen. He does not, for example, expand the idea of the three stages in salvation history: bondage, friendship with God, adoption as children of God. Rather, he prefers to conceive of the return of the human race to God more in terms of what I call a "theology of exile and homecoming." Gregory's favorite image seems to be that of the Good Shepherd who goes after the lost sheep to bring her back to the fold where she belongs. Of course, the theology of adoption should not be completely overlooked, since, as I have shown, it exists but is underdeveloped.

Interwoven with the theology of adoption, a few brief thoughts can be

found on Gregory's notion of the will of God. He conceives of God as a willing subject who always chooses the good and wishes to be what he is. The latter view is not present in Basil's thought but betrays a Plotinian influence.

Gregory of Nyssa's Use of Gender Language in Reference to God

Like the previous section, this section is a corollary to the issue of divine relationality. It allows for an even deeper glimpse at Gregory's concept of divine persons. In an earlier work such as *CE*, Gregory hints at the fact that some might be tempted to introduce gender in God because of such language as "father" and "son." The Gospel according to John reads "In the beginning was the Word" (John 1:1) rather than "In the Father was the Son," because some "more carnally minded," learning of the Father, may be led by its understanding to imagine also by consequence a mother.[156] The allusion to Eunomius's "carnal mind" is quite transparent here, especially since Gregory adds that, upon hearing the word "son" applied to God, someone like Eunomius cannot conceive of impassible generation. In the second book of *CE*, Gregory himself uses feminine imagery to refer to God, and he does not find this inappropriate. Thus, he compares the all-powerful God condescending to commune with humans to a tender mother who joins in the inarticulate utterances of her baby.[157]

As Verna Harrison has accurately noticed, Gregory used more explicit feminine language in reference to God in later works.[158] Thus, in the seventh homily of the *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, he explains that the bridegroom's mother in the Song of Songs allegorically indicates God the Father. According to Gregory, both "mother" and "father" mean the same thing here, because there is neither male nor female in God (Gal 3:28).[159] Elsewhere in the same *Comm. Song,* Gregory refers to God as the mother of all creation, that is, the cause of its existence.[160] Because God's activities *ad extra* are regarded as common to all three persons, the term "mother" in these two contexts may refer to God in general.[161] Yet in *De perfectione,* Gregory speaks clearly of God the Father as the "lifegiving mother" of humanity, to whom Christ as mediator reconciles us following the fall.[162] To this one should add the feminine references to the Son and the Holy Spirit in the *Comm. Song*. The Son is identified with Sophia, the female personification of Wisdom found in the Old Testament book of Proverbs.[163] The Holy Spirit who descends as a dove upon Christ from heaven at the baptism in the Jordan River is referred to as a

"mother," whereas Christ himself is presented here as the daughter dove "born of the Spirit."[164]

Feminine language can be used to refer to each member of the Holy Trinity, as long as one keeps in mind that God is neither male nor female. In Gregory's view, so were humans in the original state, and so will they be in the eschaton.[165] In *Ref.* 5, Gregory contends that the names Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are better than other scriptural names referring to God because they were revealed by the Lord himself: These names are "better able to lead us to the faith about the existent [and Christ declares] that *it is enough* for us to hold to the title 'Father, Son, and Holy Spirit' in order to apprehend the absolutely existent, who is one and yet not one" (emphasis mine).[166] This statement does not support the categorical conclusion Harrison reaches that "the names Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in their obvious meanings constitute *the indispensable foundation* of Christian faith and further theological reflection" (emphasis mine).[167] "It is enough" (ἀρκεῖν) in Gregory's statement means "sufficient," whereas "indispensable" in Harrison's statement means "necessary." The context should also be considered: From *Ref.* 5 one learns that Eunomius refused to call God the Father "Father," because he wanted to avoid the implications from relationality. Gregory combats him by saying that *it would be better* for us to stick to those names that lead us to the right faith, but he does not exclude the possibility that other names could serve the same purpose if understood correctly. The Cappadocian fathers even used a nonbiblical name, ἀγέννητος, for the Father, but because Eunomius tried to misinterpret it, they recommended the use of "Father" instead as being less open to misinterpretation. It is in this context that one can also use feminine language in regard to God.

A Note on τρόπος τῆς ὑπαρξεως in the Cappadocian Fathers

In modern languages, τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως has been rendered as "mode of existence" or "mode of subsistence." As we saw, the Cappadocians thought that it is through their modes of existence that the divine persons differ from each other. Louth thinks that the τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως was used by the Cappadocians and the whole Greek theological tradition after them to refer to a person (especially a divine person).[168] The purpose of this excursus is to demonstrate that the Cappadocians never use the phrase under consideration to indicate a person; the phrase itself only as a rhetorical device—a *pars pro toto*—can be used to designate a person. Τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως occurs three times in Gregory of

Nyssa's writings (all in *CE*). Therefore, I think it is important to discuss it at this point. The Cappadocians believe that the Father's mode of existence is to be ungenerated and generator, the Son's to be generated (or begotten), and the Spirit's to proceed forth from the Father.

As Prestige noted, the phrase τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως "seems to have been rescued by Basil [of Caesarea] from the schools of logic, and subsequently adopted generally into the theological tradition."[169] Unfortunately, Prestige was not more specific about which "schools of logic" he had in mind. The *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* could bring some help in this direction, although only in the case of extant texts. Before the Cappadocians, the phrase τροπ- υπαρξεως (with or without the article τῆς) occurs in Alexander of Aphrodisias[170] and Themistius.[171] It does not occur at all in the extant works of Plato, Aristotle, Sextus Empiricus, Plutarch, Pseudo-Plutarch, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Plotinus, Porphyry, Dexippus, Athanasius of Alexandria, and Gregory of Nazianzus. It occurs five times in Basil of Caesarea's works (twice in the spurious work *Adversus Eunomium* 5, PG 29:680A and 681C) and three times in Gregory of Nyssa's. The occurrences of the phrase in the Cappadocians will be presented below. The fact that Alexander of Aphrodisias used the above-mentioned phrase before the Cappadocians does not necessarily mean that the latter had access to Alexander's commentaries. It is more plausible that the commentaries made their way into handbooks of logic and philosophy used in various schools at that time. Basil might have come across such a handbook during his student years.[172] Themistius (ca. 317–388) was a famous rhetorician and statesman residing in Constantinople. As we saw, he too uses the phrase τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως in his paraphrases of Aristotle. Basil, like other Christians, may have studied under him, especially since Themistius seems to have had the respect of Christians.[173]

Prestige understood correctly that the "mode of existence" was part of the definition of a person, not the person itself.[174] As we saw in chapter 2, the Cappadocians understood a person in the Neoplatonic sense as a collection of properties. In their view, a person is substance *and* mode of existence *and* power *and* so on and so forth. Each of these properties makes the person known to us in part, but no property can be called a person apart from the other properties.

In *Ep.* 235, addressed to his spiritual son Amphilochius of Iconium, Basil writes, "A thing [τί] is knowable with respect to number, and size, and power, and *mode of existence*, and time of generation, and substance"[175] (emphasis added). In *Contra Sabellianos, et Arium, et Anomoeos*, Basil speaks of the "mode of existence" of the Holy Spirit, which should not be mistaken for that of the creatures,[176] and in *De Spiritu Sancto* the "mode of existence" of the Holy Spirit

is said to be ineffable.[177] In an earlier writing such as *AE* 1.15, Basil uses the term ὑπόστασις as a synonym of ὕπαρξις in the phrase τρόπος τῆς ὑποστάσεως. He says that the latter phrase shows *how* God is, not *what* he is; therefore, the τρόπος τῆς ὑποστάσεως does not indicate God's nature or substance.[178] The context of the discussion in *AE* 1.15 is roughly Aristotelian, and Basil pretends to be embarrassed because he is "constrained" to use such language. The τρόπος τῆς ὑποστάσεως refers here to God the Father's ungeneratedness, because the ungeneratedness shows *how God is* (ὅπως ἐστι), not *what he is* (τί ἐστι).[179]

On the "mode of existence," Gregory of Nyssa, too, has something to say. In *CE* 1.216, he writes:

> It is in order to demonstrate the diminished and in natural rank inferior status of the Son and the Spirit that [Eunomius] says that one originates from the other; and, so that those who learn from the way things originate from each other may never reach the thought of their intimate connection as a result *of such a mode of existence* [ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου τρόπου τῆς ὑπάρξεως], he resists the principle of nature, both by saying that one originates from another and asserting that the one generated is illegitimate as far as concerns the nature of the one who generated him. (Emphasis added)

The second occurrence of the τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως in Gregory of Nyssa's *CE* is even more illuminating. It refers to the different "modes of existence" of Adam and Abel as an analogy of what happens in the Godhead, thus showing three things: (1) No alteration of the definition of humanity is produced because of Adam's and Abel's different modes of existence; (2) similarly, no alteration is produced in the divine nature either because of the existence of three different modes of existence there; and (3) except for this example, humans cannot be said to have different modes of existence, because biologically they come into existence in the same way, namely, by conception and birth. Humans, therefore, cannot be distinguished from each other by their modes of existence. Gregory's text reads:

> The first man and the one sprung from him, though they get their being in a different way from each other, the one by the coupling of parents, the other by shaping from the dust, are both believed to be two and in terms of substance are not split from each other. . . . Both former and latter are human, and the word for their being is the same for them both: each is mortal, and rational too, and similarly capable of thought and knowledge. If then the word for hu-

> manity is not altered in the case of Adam and Abel by the change in the way they are generated, since neither the order nor the *mode of* their *existence* [τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως] imports any change in nature, but by the common consent of sober men their state is the same, and no one would deny this unless he is badly in need of hellebore, what necessity is there to argue this unreasonable conclusion in the case of the divine nature? (Emphasis added)[180]

The third and last occurrence of τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως in Gregory of Nyssa is in a context where Eunomius's assertion that the Son obtained his existence from the mere will of the generator and not from his substance is refuted. Gregory contends that the "mode of existence" of the Son definitely differs from the mode of existence of the created world.[181]

To sum up, the scarcity of the phrase τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως in the Cappadocian writings demonstrates that, although having a certain importance, this phrase is far from being a prominent or preferred expression of the Cappadocians.[182]

Conclusions

In this chapter I have presented Gregory of Nyssa's view of divine relations as it emerges mainly from *CE* and *Ref.*, although I have also referred to other works dealing with relations. The patristic antecedents of the divine relations have been dealt with, as was the connection between the patristic concept of relations and the Aristotelian category of relation.

In his concept of divine relations, Gregory of Nyssa does not differ significantly from such patristic predecessors as the Alexandrian theologians (Origen, Dionysius, Alexander, Athanasius) or his brother, Basil of Caesarea. Moreover, all of them seem to be influenced by Aristotle's category of relation, which they apply to God. Thus, a father is both the name of a person and also points to a son—a reality that is different from the father but has the same nature. Patristic authors developed this view of relation in opposition to those who denied the eternity or the divinity of the second divine person. Similarly, the Holy Spirit is in relation with the other two persons.

The relation between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit is not manifested only by the Father's eternal generation of the Son and gushing forth of the Spirit, or the last two persons' receiving their existence from the Father. It has numerous other dynamic aspects of biblical inspiration, such as love, eternal rejoicing of each person in the presence of the other two, glorification of

each by the other two, perfect knowledge of one another, and perfect communion.

Gregory also has a very elaborate theology of the humanity's exile and homecoming as an image of the relationship between God and humans. Compared to Origen's, Gregory's theology of humans' adoption as children of God is underdeveloped although still quite beautiful. As part of the discussion on adoption, I have presented a possible Plotinian influence on Gregory's view of God's will. God as person thus appears as a willing subject.

This page intentionally left blank

6

On the Holy Spirit: Against the Macedonians

This chapter continues my analysis of the concept of divine persons in Gregory's thought, this time taking a closer look at the person of the Holy Spirit. For this purpose I shall turn my attention to Gregory's writing entitled *On the Holy Spirit: Against the Macedonians, the Spirit Fighters* (*Adv. Macedonianos* hereafter).[1] May dates *Adv. Macedonianos* to some time after the Council of Constantinople of 381, while Daniélou to the spring of 380.[2] Macedonius had been bishop of Constantinople in 340, and, as Meredith notices, it is not entirely clear how his name came to be associated with a movement that sprang to prominence so much later.[3] It may also be the case that this treatise envisages the followers of Eusthatius of Sebaste who were located in Armenia. It appears that Basil of Caesarea himself was a friend of Eusthatius at one point, and something of their position may be inferred from the treatise Basil himself wrote ca. 375, *De Spiritu Sancto*. The opponents, whoever they may have been, seem to have attacked Gregory, as we can gather from the introductory section of the treatise.

Gregory writes that he is accused of "profanity for entertaining lofty conceptions about the Holy Spirit." He teaches that the Holy Spirit is of the same rank as the Father and the Son, that there is no difference between them in anything, except in regard of person. Moreover, the Holy Spirit is indeed *from* God the Father and *of* the Christ, and is contemplated in his peculiar attributes in regard of person (τοῦ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἰδιαζόντως θεωρεῖσθαι).[4] In characteris-

tics other than his individuality, the Spirit has an exact identity (συνημμένον καὶ ἀπαράλλακτον)[5] with the Father and the Son. We shall see immediately what these characteristics pertaining to the Spirit's individuality are.

Gregory's opponents asserted that the Spirit was a stranger to any natural communion (φυσικῆς κοινωνίας)[6] with the Father and the Son, that he was thus inferior to them in every point, including in power, in glory, in dignity, or everything else that is usually ascribed to the divinity. The main accusation Gregory tries to rebut, as one gathers from reading the treatise, is that the Holy Spirit occupied a median position between creature and creator.

Gregory begins his defense of the divinity of the Holy Spirit, by appealing to Scripture which, according to him, does not recognize any distinctions in the divine nature. He does not mention any scriptural texts to support his point yet, but he would do so later on in this treatise. Gregory may have assumed that his readers were familiar with the scriptural texts he had in mind, and that is why he does not mention them. Then, he adds that not only arguments based on Scripture, but also those based on the common notions,[7] will lead one to recognize no distinctions in the divine nature in which the Spirit partakes (90.27–30). By these distinctions he means degrees of substance in the divine nature, as we shall see shortly. The argument based on the lack of degrees of substance is one of Gregory's favorite arguments when trying to prove the divinity of the Son or the Spirit and it seems to be inspired by Aristotle.[8] The divine nature is perfect because it is simple, uniform, and incomposite, and thus it does not have any variations or degrees of substance. The lack of variation in a substance can be noted, Gregory assures us, not only in the divine substance but even in bodily instances (διὰ τῶν σωματικῶν ὑποδειγμάτων, 91.13), such as fire, water, and air, that is, every element that underlies the universe for the ancients. Gregory believes that one cannot say that fire can be said to have the heat more intense or less intense and water more wet or less wet, while air cannot be called less dense or more dense, because in that case those elements would no longer fit the bill for their initial definition (91 passim). To a modern mind these are obviously weak examples, all three above elements being capable of being more dense or less dense. Gregory may not have been aware of variations in the density of the air in the fourth century (after all, we know that by measuring the barometric pressure), but he should have had knowledge about variations in the intensity of fire and he probably experienced differences in the viscosity and behavior of fresh water and salt water. By using those examples he only does a disservice to himself and to the whole argument he proposes.

The Spirit is divine, absolutely good, omnipotent, wise, glorious, eternal, as well as everything of that kind that is worthy of the divine nature (92.10–

16). These are properties the Spirit has in common with the other two divine persons, and which he possesses fully not just partially or by participation only (οὐκ ἐκ μετουσίας, 92.16). Therefore, Gregory rushes to declare that the Spirit himself *not only has* those properties, but he *is* goodness, wisdom, power, sanctification, righteousness, everlastingness, imperishability, and every name that is lofty and elevating above other names (92.22–27). Such a being should clearly be glorified, because it is glorious by nature (τῇ φύσει ἔνδοξον, 92.29), unlike us humans who have them by participation.

The fact that the Holy Spirit is listed in the third place, after the Father and the Son, should not make us think of any diminution or variation (οὐδεμίαν ἐλάττωσιν ἢ παραλλαγὴν ἔχει, 92.34–93.1) in the Spirit's nature; that is only an indication of the numerical order (ἀριθμὸν τάξιν, 93.2) in which the three persons are listed. To explain his argument, Gregory uses the analogy of three lit torches placed next to one another: the flame of the third is caused by that of the first being transmitted to the middle, and then kindling the third torch.[9] The heat of the first flame does not exceed that of the following flames; similarly, the nature of the three divine persons does not suffer any variation and diminution by being transmitted from one person, the Father, to the other two, Son and Holy Spirit. Another image he uses a little later is that of the Father as the fountain of power, the Son as the power, and the Holy Spirit as the spirit of power (100.1–3); again the idea of numerical order is present. But Gregory speaks of another type of order here, namely order of transmission (τάξις παραδόσεως, 100.22). In regard to differences, as Gregory said a little earlier, there is difference in regard to person, and now he tells us that there is a difference of order as well between the three.[10] By difference in regard to person he probably means the peculiar characteristic which makes the Spirit a unique person. The Spirit is distinguished from the other two persons by the manner in which he receives his substance, namely by procession from the Father and through the Son. The Spirit as person, we are told, is also distinguished from the other two by numerical order and the order of transmission.

The next argument Gregory uses to demonstrate the divinity of the Holy Spirit is connected with the distinction between the common and particular and is somewhat reminiscent of the discussion in Basil's in *Ep.* 236, 6 and Gregory's *Ad Petrum*, presented above in chapter 3. The analogy he uses in *Adv. Macedonianos* 101.29 ff. can be summarized as follows: the common human (κοινός ἄνθρωπος), that is, human species, is defined by some characteristics; if one were to term one individual a human being, that is, belonging to the human species, then one has to provide evidence of that individual's signs indicative of the human nature. If the evidence cannot be provided, then that individual cannot be said to belong to the human species. A little earlier,

Gregory said that, for example, an unformed embryo cannot be considered a human being, but only a potential one, assuming that it is completed so as to come forth to human birth (101.11–13). But what are these characteristics of human beings, the ones that define the human species in its completeness? Gregory considers that they are "reason, capacity for thought and knowledge, a share of life, an upright bearing, risibility, and broadness of nail" (101.32–102.2).[11] Then, using the analogy of the human species and an individual human being, Gregory applies it to Christian belief. He says that one of the characteristics of the "common Christian" is to confess belief in the divinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. If an individual claims to be a Christian but does not confess this belief, that individual in fact is not a Christian. Therefore, the Holy Spirit is divine, and not a go-between god, belonging both to created and uncreated natures, as some of Gregory's opponents would confess. Jews and Manichees—continues Gregory—cannot be called Christians, because they are not characterized by Christian doctrinal orthodoxy. As in many other instances, Gregory tries to make his argument sound as biblical as possible. Thus, by associating the earlier example of the embryo with Ecclesiastes 11.5—a text speaking of the spirit or breath of life shaping the human frame in the mother's womb—Gregory concludes that the heretic who does not believe in the divinity of the Spirit is lifeless and only bones in the womb of his mother (102.11–13). Thus, the heretic who denies the divinity of the Spirit is not a Christian. It is interesting how, using logic, Gregory makes belonging to a species (Christianity) dependent on doctrinal orthodoxy.

When dealing with relationality in the previous chapter, I presented the relationships the Spirit has with the other two divine persons. In *Adv. Macedonianos* 102.14–103.13 the issue of relationality comes up again. This time Gregory uses the analogy of the ancient practice of consecrating kings by unction with oil. The relationship between the Son and the Spirit is described as that between the anointed one (χρισθέντος) to the unction (χρίσμα). The unction is a symbol of the kingship. This is a strong, inseparable union, with no interval (ἀδιάστατός, 103.5) intervening between the two, because there is no interval between the body of the person being anointed and the oil being used for that purpose. Here Gregory uses a pair of correlative terms (unction-anointed) that imply one another: unction implies a person who is anointed, and the anointed implies unction. But he goes on to say that "unction" is also a symbol of kingship, because in ancient times kings were anointed when starting their reign. Moreover, the Only-begotten Son of God who became incarnate is referred to as Christ and, thus, he is a king by nature. If he is a king and is so closely connected with the unction, then the unction is not a thing alien to kingship. Similarly to how there is no difference between the anointed

and the unction, one can say that there is no interval separating the Son from the Holy Spirit.

But this union (συνάφεια, 103.5) between the Son and the Spirit tells about another fact: "whosoever is to touch the Son by faith must first encounter the oil in the very act of touching; there is not a part of [the Son] that is devoid of the Spirit" (103.5–7). This part of the argument is reminiscent of Gregory's discussion in *Ref.* 11–13 and, of course, of the Pauline argument that "no one can say 'Jesus is Lord,' except in the Holy Spirit."[12] The Spirit is the one who leads believers to confess the lordship of Jesus. In my view, this whole argument is yet another proof of how important relationality is in the definition of a person. In terms of support for the divinity of the Spirit, Gregory means to say that one cannot claim that one confesses the Son to be divine, without having to confess also that the Spirit is divine as well.

Having argued that the Son represents the king and the Spirit represents the kingship, Gregory tries to preempt the argument that the Spirit is a creature or something in between created and uncreated (103.11 f). He uses another pair of correlative terms, "king-subject" this time: "kingship is most assuredly shown in the rule over subjects" (103.12). But the world of subjects is different from the world of rulers, and in temporal terms, the latter existed forever, because it created the former; simply put, God created the world. But God has always been a king, because, as agreed earlier, he is king by nature. Since that is the case, then kingship should have always existed with God; yet kingship is unction and unction is a symbol for the Holy Spirit. So, the Spirit always existed with God. But the world of subjects came into existence at t=0, when God created it along with time. Therefore, the Spirit cannot belong in the world of subjects, that is, in the created world. The Spirit, like the Son and the Father, is a ruler, not a subject. Nor can the Spirit be a combination of created and uncreated, because "no new invention of any natural attribute on the borderland (ἐν μεθορίῳ)[13] between the created and the uncreated can be thought of, such as would participate in both, yet be neither entirely" (104.8–12). This is absurd, argues Gregory, because if that were the case, among other things, "creation will be found at variance with itself, divided into ruler and ruled, so that part of it is the benefactor, part the benefited, part the sanctifier, part the sanctified" (105.1–5).

The Spirit himself is referred to as a person (πρόσωπον, 106.28) who facilitates the transmission of the life-giving grace in baptism. If one rejects baptism, one rejects the life-giving grace, and thus the Holy Spirit. Their blasphemy, however, continues Gregory, does not stop there, but extends to the entire Holy Trinity. This happens because there is a sort of chain which keeps the divine persons connected to one another: "as grace flows down from the

Father, through the Son and the Spirit to those who are worthy, so too blasphemy flows back in the opposite direction from the Spirit, through the Son to the God of all" (106.30–107.2). Although he does not use the word "chain" here, the image is similar with that used in *Ad Petrum* 4, 69–80: one who grasps one end of a chain pulls along with it the other end also to oneself.[14] Therefore, by blaspheming the Spirit, one implicitly ends up blaspheming the other two divine persons.

The issue of relationality comes up once again in this treatise in connection with glorification. This time the image used is no longer coming close to that of a chain but to a circle (108.33–109.16). The Spirit gives glory to both Father and Son. Gregory bases this on texts such as: "I will glorify those who glorify me" (1 Kgs 2:30), Jesus' address to the Father—"I have glorified you" and "Glorify me with the glory I had with you from the beginning before the world was" (John 17:4–5)—and the voice from heaven, (i.e., the Father's answer) which says, "I have glorified and will glorify again" (John 12:28). He thus speaks of a circular course taken by the glory, always going through things that are like:

> The Son is glorified by the Spirit; again the Son has glory from the Father and the Only Begotten becomes the glory of the Spirit. For by what else will the Father be glorified save by the true glory of the Only Begotten? Again, in what else shall the Son be glorified, save in the greatness of the Spirit? And so again the argument goes round in a circle, glorifying the Son through the Spirit and the Father through the Son. (109.9–109.15)

This in my view points to the close relationships among the three divine persons. The same circularity and relationality is visible in another section of the treatise, *Adv. Macedonianos* 110.24–111.1, where Gregory only repeats an argument mentioned earlier, namely, that one cannot really think of the Son without automatically thinking of the Holy Spirit (cf. 1 Cor 12:3). But he extends this argument to the Father, whose worship also entails the worship of the Son and the Spirit. These words are clearly reminiscent of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, which canonized the phrase that the Holy Spirit "together with the Father and the Son is both worshipped and glorified."[15]

Conclusions

I began this study by asking whether it is necessary to study the concept of divine persons in Gregory of Nyssa's works. My affirmative answer to this question and the undertaking of the present study has been determined by both the numerous—many times contradictory—concepts of person existing today and the lack of an adequate study dealing specifically with Gregory of Nyssa. Gregory's contribution to the shaping of a concept of person during the Trinitarian debates of the fourth century is remarkable. The fact that in modern times there have been several partial or unsuccessful attempts to recover a fourth-century concept of person also speaks for the importance of the concept and the necessity of a systematic study. Although some rudimentary concepts of the individual existed in antiquity that Gregory likely used, a more developed notion of person did not exist prior to the Cappadocian fathers.

An increasing number of studies of Gregory's relationship with the philosophy of his time are only now starting to reveal his complex knowledge of Platonism, Neoplatonism, Aristotelianism, and Stoicism. This conclusion can be extended to his concept of divine persons. Gregory depended on some philosophical luminaries before him. Besides philosophical sources, however, Gregory used extensively the Bible and the writings of his Christian predecessors. Therefore, it cannot be claimed that he was a convinced Platonist or Aristotelian disguised as a Christian to avoid accusations of heresy. He was a Christian who considered it necessary to use the language

and philosophical concepts of his time to speak to his educated contemporaries, most of whom were recent converts to Christianity.

In this book, I have analyzed the most relevant works in which Gregory of Nyssa dealt with divine persons. The concept of divine persons emerging from these writings is complex, but I will try to summarize it. First, to refer to a person in general, Gregory uses Greek terms such as ὑπόστασις, πρόσωπον, περιγραφούσα (or περιγραφή, circumscription), μερική οὐσία (partial substance), ἰδική οὐσια (particular substance), and even ἄτομον (indivisible or individual). Second, to distinguish a divine person from the nature that person has in common with the other two persons, Gregory uses the analogy of the individual and the universal. This betrays an influence from Aristotle, the Stoics, or Porphyry. In addition, to distinguish between nature and persons, Gregory uses the explanation that, unlike nature, persons are enumerable entities. The concept of individuals admits of a separation due to the particularizing properties observed in each. When individuals are taken together, we can count them.

Third, having distinguished between persons and nature, Gregory moves on to establish the identity of each divine person and why each is unique. To do this, he adapts for Christian usage the Platonic view of an individual as a unique collection of properties. According to this adapted view, each divine person can be described as a unique collection of characteristics in the following way: The Father proceeds from no other cause, that is, he is ungenerated and is generator; the Son is generated from the Father as the only-begotten, and through himself and with himself makes known the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father; moreover, all things (including the Holy Spirit) come into existence from the Father through the Son; the Holy Spirit in turn has his being from the Father and is known after the Son and with the Son. To express the particularizing notes of each divine person, Gregory also speaks of relations of origin or causal relations: The Father is the cause, the Son is from the cause or directly from the first, and the Spirit is from the cause (i.e., from the Father) through that which is directly from the first (i.e., through the Son). These causal relations are briefly expressed by the now classical formula (which Gregory uses) according to which the Father is ungenerated, the Son is generated (or only begotten), and the Spirit proceeds forth from the Father. Under the influence of Aristotle's category of relation, Gregory, like his Christian predecessors from Origen onward, paid a lot of attention to the relations among the divine persons. He emphasized that the term "father" indicates the relation to a "son" because the two terms are correlatives implying one another. At the same time, Gregory added that "father" is the name of a person. The Spirit is also a correlative term of both the Father and the Son, although the Spirit's correlativity

to the other two persons is not as obvious as that between the Father and the Son. Indeed, the fact that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son expresses the relationality among the three.

Yet relations in Gregory's theology are more than simple ontological causality. They are manifested in the perfect communion among the three divine persons. Communion (κοινωνία) is the solution Gregory proposes to the question, "What causes the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to be persons and not mere collections of properties?" Relationality as communion means that the Son, "who is in the bosom of the Father" (John 1: 18), is from all eternity to be contemplated in the Father. The Son being contemplated in the bosom of the Father means that he is contemplated as "power and wisdom of God" (1 Cor 1: 24), "truth, light, and sanctification" (1 Cor 1: 30), "peace" (Eph 2: 14), "life," and the like. As for the Spirit, Gregory refers to him in biblical terms as good and holy, princely, principal, quickening, governing, and sanctifying of all creation. This allows him to present the Spirit as a correlative of both the first and the second person; there is no gap between Christ and his anointing, between the king and his kingdom, between wisdom and the Spirit of wisdom, between truth and the Spirit of truth, between power and the Spirit of power. Since the Son is eternally contemplated in the Father, and the Spirit is the Son's Spirit, the Spirit too is eternally contemplated in the Father. All three persons rejoice eternally in the presence of each other and know each other perfectly. This is communion, and it allows for both the distinction of each person and the perfect unity among them. The Spirit as person is also distinguished from the other two divine persons by numerical order, that is, by being listed in the third place, and by the order of transmission, that is, the fact that he receives his substance from the Father in the second place, after the Son, if one can speak of an "after" in the case of the eternal. Last, the Spirit is said to be in very close relationships with the other two persons, this pointing once again to the paramount importance relationality plays in Gregory's concept of person.

To conclude, I should say that Gregory's concept of divine persons, although drawing on some rudimentary concepts of the individual existing before his time, is much more complex, biblical, and highly relevant for today than those concepts. Like his brother Basil, Gregory did not write treatises on the concept under scrutiny, but endeavored to produce a fine analysis of what a person is by defending the Christian Holy Trinity.

This page intentionally left blank

Abbreviations

CAG	Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller
GNO	Gregorii Nysseni Opera
Loeb	Loeb Classical Library
LXX	Septuagint
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
PG	Patrologia Graeca
SC	Sources chrétiennes
SVF	Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta

Ancient Sources

Aetius	*Placita philosophorum*
Alexander of Aprodisias	*De fato*
Aristotle	*Cat.*
	Eth. nic.
	De interpretatione
	Metaph.
	Politics
	Topics
Athanasius	*C. Ar.*
	Contra gentes
	De decretis
	Expositio fidei

	De incarnatione
	Oratio catechetica
	De sententia Dionysii
	De synodis
	Tomus ad Antiochenos
Basil of Caesarea	*AE*
	Contra Sabellianos, et Arium, et Anomoeos
	Ep.
	Homilies on the Hexaemeron
	De Spiritu Sancto
Cicero	*De officiis*
Dionysius Thrax	*Ars gramm.*
Eunomius	*Apol.*
	Confession of Faith
Eustathius of Antioch	*Against Photinus*
Gregory of Nazianzus	*Ep.*
	Or.
Gregory of Nyssa	*Ad Ablabium*
	Ad Eustat.
	Ad Graecos
	Ad Petrum
	Adv. Apolinarium
	Adv. Macedonianos
	De anima et resurrectione
	Beatit.
	CE
	Comm. Song
	Ep.
	In Res.
	Life of Moses
	De perfectione
	Ref.
	De tridui spatio
John of Damascus	*De fide orthodoxa*
Lucian of Samosata	*De salutatione*
Origen	*Cels.*
	Comm. Gen.
	Comm. Jo.
	Dialogue with Heraclides

	On Prayer
	Princ.
Peter of Callinicus	*Against Damian*
Plato	*Laws*
	Philebus
	Republic
	Theaetetus
	Timaeus
Plotinus	*Enn.*
Porphyry	*Isag.*
	Exp. Cat.
Pseudo-Plutarch	*Placita philosophorum*
Sextus Empiricus	*Math.*
	Outlines of Scepticism
Simplicius	*In Phys.*
Stobaeus	*Eclogae*
Tatian	*Ad Graecos*
Tertullian	*Adv. Prax.*

This page intentionally left blank

Notes

INTRODUCTION

1. Leonardo Boff, *Trinity and Society* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1988); Patricia Wilson-Kastner, *Faith, Feminism, and the Christ* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983); Colin E. Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997); John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985); Christos Yannaras, *The Freedom of Morality* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984); Catherine Mowry LaCugna, *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991).

2. See, for example, S. Coakley and D. A. Pailin, eds., *The Making and Remaking of Christian Doctrine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Stanley Rudman, *Concepts of Person and Christian Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O'Collins, eds., *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

CHAPTER 1

1. For a brief overview, see H. J. Eysenck, W. Arnold, and R. Meili, eds., *Encyclopedia of Psychology* (New York: Herder, 1972), 777–778.

2. W. Arnold, "Person," in *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, ed. H. J. Eysenck, W. Arnold, and R. Meili (New York: Herder, 1972), 778.

3. Cornelia J. de Vogel, "The Concept of Personality in Greek and Christian Thought," in *Studies in Philosophy and the History of Philosophy*, ed. John K. Ryan (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1963), 20–60; Daniel F. Stramara, Jr., "Unmasking the Meaning of Πρό-

σωπον: *Prosōpon* as Person in the Works of Gregory of Nyssa" (Ph.D. diss., St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., 1996).

4. I would replace the word "biological" with "natural" so as not to exclude the soul.

5. T. Takuma, "Personality," in *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, ed. H. J. Eysenck, W. Arnold, and R. Meili (New York: Herder, 1972), 779.

6. Christopher Gill, "Is There a Concept of Person in Greek Philosophy?" in *Psychology*, ed. Steven Everson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 193.

7. John M. Rist, *Human Value: A Study in Ancient Philosophical Ethics* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 145–152; Rist, "Forms of Individuals in Plotinus," *Classical Quarterly,* n.s., 13 (1963): 223–231; Rist, "Ideas of Individuals in Plotinus: A Reply to Dr. Blumenthal," *Revue internationale de philosophie* 24 (1970): 298–303; Rist, "*Prohairesis*: Proclus, Plotinus *et alii,*" in *De Jamblique à Proclus*, ed. B. D. Larsen (Vandoeuvres-Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1975), 103–117. Cf. also H. J. Blumenthal, "Did Plotinus Believe in Ideas of Individuals?" *Phronesis* 11 (1966): 61–80; A. H. Armstrong, "Form, Individual, and Person in Plotinus," *Dionysius* 1 (1977): 49–68; Charles H. Kahn, "Discovering the Will: From Aristotle to Augustine," in *The Question of 'Eclecticism' in Later Greek Philosophy*, ed. John M. Dillon and A. A. Long (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 234–259.

8. Aristotle, *Metaph.* 1036a5–6.

9. George M. A. Grube, *Plato's Thought* (London: Methuen, 1935), 148.

10. Plato, *Republic* 596a5–7.

11. See, for example, Plato, *Philebus* 15a; Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1096b1.

12. *Enn.* V.7 [18].

13. John M. Rist, *Human Value: A Study in Ancient Philosophical Ethics* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 101.

14. For the Greek text and English translation, see Plotinus, *Enneads*, 7 vols., trans. A. H. Armstrong, Loeb (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966–1988). In square brackets, I mark the chronological order in which the *Enneads* were written, as indicated by Porphyry in his edition of the *Enneads.*

15. Rist, "Forms of Individuals in Plotinus," 224. He re-emphasizes the same position in an essay published seven years later, "Ideas of Individuals in Plotinus: A Reply to Dr. Blumenthal," *Revue internationale de philosophie* 24 (1970): 298–303, against a rejoinder to his first article published by H. J. Blumenthal, "Did Plotinus Believe in Ideas of Individuals?" *Phronesis* 11 (1966): 61–80. Blumenthal (p. 76) argued that in both *Enn.* V.9 [5] 12 and VI.5 [23], Plotinus denied the existence of forms of individuals. After Rist's critique, Blumenthal recognized that in the earlier article "I probably adduced VI.5.8 as negative evidence [for the existence of forms of individuals] too confidently" (Blumenthal, *Plotinus' Psychology: His Doctrine of the Embodied Soul* [The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1971], 122–123 n. 24). Later, two other Plotinian scholars agreed with Rist: A. H. Armstrong, "Form, Individual, and Person in Plotinus," *Dionysius* 1 (1977): 49–68; and Lloyd P. Gerson, *Plotinus* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 77–78.

16. *Enn.* V.9 [5] 12.1–6.

17. *Enn.* V. 7 [18] 3–6.

18. Rist, "Forms of Individuals in Plotinus," 228.

19. *Enn.* V.7 [18] 1.19–23.

20. Rist, "Forms of Individuals in Plotinus," 227.

21. *Enn.* V.7 [18] 3.2–3.

22. *Enn.* VI.5 [23] 8.21–42.

23. Rist, "Ideas of Individuals," 303. Cf. also John M. Rist, *Plotinus: The Road to Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 111.

24. Rist, "Forms of Individuals in Plotinus," 229–230.

25. *Metaph.* 990b10–14.

26. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica commentaria* 81.25–82.7, ed. M. Hayduck, CAG 1 (Berlin: Reimer, 1891). ET by Lloyd P. Gerson, *Plotinus* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 73.

27. Gerson, *Plotinus*, 74.

28. It is probably worth mentioning that Gerson (*Plotinus*, 72–78) is uninterested in this influence on Plotinus, although Rist mentions it explicitly in his "Forms of Individuals," 226–227.

29. Rist, "Forms of Individuals in Plotinus," 226.

30. Simplicius, *On Aristotle's On Soul* 217.36.

31. John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Peter Nidditch (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975), II. xxvii, § 9; Christian Wolff, *Psychologia rationalis* (n.p., 1734), 660; Wilhelm Windelband, *An Introduction to Philosophy*, trans. Joseph McCabe (London: Unwin, 1921), 281; Cited in Vogel, "Concept of Personality in Greek and Christian Thought," 24 n. 11.

32. A. Michel, "Hypostase" in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, ed. E. Amann et al., vol. 7, part 1 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1927), col. 433–434.

33. See Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita s. Macrinae* 8, GNO 8.1.378, 9–15.

34. Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* I.1 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975), 355. This is the text Stramara summarizes on p. 4 of his dissertation.

35. See Lucian Turcescu, "*Prosōpon* and *Hypostasis* in Basil of Caesarea's *Against Eunomius* and the Epistles," *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, no. 4 (1997): 374–395.

36. "What is called 'personality' in the conceptual vocabulary of the 19th century is distinguished from the patristic and medieval *persona* by the addition of the attribute of self-consciousness" (Barth, *Church Dogmatics* I.1, 357).

37. Barth, *Church Dogmatics* I.1, 359.

38. Stramara, "Unmasking the Meaning of Πρόσωπον," 5.

39. Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 210.5; *Ep.* 214.4; *Ep.* 236.6. Based on an extensive analysis of these epistles in my "*Prosōpon* and *Hypostasis* in Basil," 387–394, I can confirm Kasper's statement.

40. Walter Kasper, *The God of Jesus Christ*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 259. I also consulted the German original for conformity.

41. See Cicero, *De officiis* 1.32.115: "The role (*persona*) we choose in life, however, depends entirely on our own wishes. Thus some apply themselves to philosophy, others to jurisprudence, others to oratory" ("Ipsi autem gerere quam personam velimus, a nostra voluntate proficiscitur. Itaque se alii ad philosophiam, alii ad ius civile, alii ad eloquentiam applicant," in Marcus Tullius Cicero, *De officiis*, ed. M. Winterbottom

[New York: Oxford University Press, 1994]; ET in Cicero, *On Moral Obligation*, trans. John Higginbotham [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967], 80). For more on role playing, see Cicero, *De officiis* 1.31–33.

42. Lucian of Samosata, *De salutatione* 66, Loeb 5:268. Quoted in Stramara, "Unmasking the Meaning of Πρόσωπον," 57.

43. Stramara, "Unmasking the Meaning of Πρόσωπον," 270 n. 6.

44. R. T. Wallis, *Neo-Platonism* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972), 4–5.

45. John M. Rist, "Basil's 'Neoplatonism': Its Background and Nature," in *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium*, ed. Paul J. Fedwick (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981), 1:137–220. One cannot maintain that Stramara did not know the two volumes edited by Fedwick, because in the bibliography he mentions another article contained in one of the volumes.

46. John M. Rist, *Stoic Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 87.

47. Ibid., 256.

48. Blumenthal, *Plotinus' Psychology*, 140.

49. Ibid., 135.

50. Gregory of Nyssa, *De tridui spatio*, GNO 9.301.1–10.

51. Cf. Stramara, "Unmasking the Meaning of Πρόσωπον," 191–195, where he argues unconvincingly in favor of διάνοια = consciousness. On pages 187–201, Stramara also argues that Gregory used two other words to designate consciousness: συνείδησις and διανοήτικον. If συνείδησις is indeed a Greek word for consciousness (used even in the Latin New Testament, *conscientia*), the case for the other two is hardly convincing. The difference between Plotinus's συναίσθησις and Gregory's συνείδης, in Stramara's view, is probably due to the former's connection with sense perception. Otherwise, he has no problem in stating with certainty that Plotinus influenced Gregory of Nyssa.

52. Heinrich Dörrie, "Ὑπόστασις: Wort- und Bedeutungsgeschichte," in *Platonica Minora* (Munich: W. Fink, 1976), 12–69. Cf. Christopher Stead, *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 173–186.

53. Dörrie's interpretation of the Stoic use of ὕπαρξις as a form of existence subordinate to ὑπόστασις has been challenged. See A. A. Long, "Language and Thought in Stoicism," in *Problems in Stoicism*, ed. A. A. Long (London: Athleton, 1971), 89–90; Victor Goldschmidt, "Ὑπάρχειν et ὑφιστάναι dans la philosophie stoïcienne," *Revue des études grecques* 85 (1972): 336–340; John Glucker, "The Origin of ὑπάρχω and ὕπαρξις as Philosophical Terms," in *Hyparxis e Hypostasis nel Neoplatonismo: Atti del I Colloquio Internazionale del Centro di Ricerca sul Neoplatonismo (Università degli Studi di Catania, 1–3 ottobre 1992)*, ed. F. Romano and D. P. Taormina (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1994), 21.

54. Socrates Scholasticus, *The Ecclesiastical History* 3.7.17–20, trans. A. C. Zenos, NPNF 2.2 (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1890), 81.

55. I checked this with the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* CD-ROM (Irvine: University of California, 1995).

56. Dörrie, "Ὑπόστασις," 14 n. 7.

57. Origen, *Contre Celse*, vol. 4 (books 7–8), ed. Marcel Borret (Paris: Cerf, 1969), SC 150:200. Dörrie, "Ὑπόστασις," 54, quotes Koetschau's edition of Origen.

58. *Comm. Jo.* I.24.151–152; II.10.75–76; see Origen, *Commentaire sur Saint Jean*, vol. 1 (books 1–5), ed. Cécile Blanc (Paris: Cerf, 1966), SC 120:136–137 and 254–257.

59. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman P. Tanner (London: Sheed & Ward, 1990), 1:5.

60. Athanasius, *Tomus ad Antiochenos* 5 (PG 26:801A–D). For the text of the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, see J. Stevenson, ed., *Creeds, Councils, and Controversies: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church A.D. 337–461*, rev. W. H. C. Frend (London: SPCK, 1989), 80–83.

61. For the authenticity of *Oratio contra Arianos* 4 (PG 26:468–525), see Timothy D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 254 n. 26. For *Expositio fidei*, see R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 862 n. 170.

62. Michel, "Hypostase."

63. See André de Halleux, "Personnalisme ou essentialisme trinitaire chez les Pères cappadociens? Une mauvaise controverse," *Revue théologique de Louvain* 17 (1986): 129–155 and 265–292. Michel R. Barnes, "De Régnon Reconsidered," *Augustinian Studies* 26, no. 2 (1995): 51–79. Théodore de Régnon, *Études de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité*, 4 vols. in 3 (Paris: Victor Retaux, 1892, 1898), was very influential throughout the twentieth century.

64. In chronological order, they are the following: Anders Cavallin, *Studien zu den Briefen des Hl. Basilius* (Lund: Gleerupska Universitetsbokhandeln, 1944), 71ff. R. Hübner, "Gregor von Nyssa als Verfasser der sog. *Ep.* 38 des Basilius: Zum unterschiedlichen Verständnis der *ousia* bei den kappadozischen Brüdern," in *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, ed. J. Fontaine and Ch. Kannengiesser (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972), 463–490. P. J. Fedwick, "A Commentary of Gregory of Nyssa or the 38th Letter of Basil of Caesarea," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 44 (1978): 31–51.

65. Nonetheless, there is a group of German scholars who do not accept the Gregorian authorship: Wolfgang-Dieter Hauschild in his German translation of Basil's letters (Basil of Caesarea, *Briefe* [Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1990], 1:182ff n. 181); Jürgen Hammerstaedt, "Zur Echtheit von Basiliusbrief 38," *Tesserae: Festschrift für Josef Engemann*, ed. Ernst Dassmann and Klaus Thraede (Münster: Aschendorff, 1991), 416–419; and Volker H. Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea: Sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 297–331.

66. Quoted in Michel, "Hypostase," col. 382.

67. Jürgen Hammerstaedt, "Hypostasis (ὑπόστασις)," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1994), 16:986–1035.

68. André de Halleux, " 'Hypostase' et 'personne' dans la formation du dogme trinitaire (ca. 375–381)," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 79 (1984): 313–369, 625–670.

69. The titles "Neo-Nicene" and "Old-Nicene" were originally coined by Th.

Zahn and "vulgarized" by A. von Harnack. According to Zahn's theory of *Jungnizänismus*, the fathers of Nicaea allegedly defined the *homoousion* by the numerical unity and identity of the divine *ousia* (*Weseneinheit*). The Cappadocian fathers allegedly departed from this definition: They understood the *homoousion* in the sense of the *homoiousion*, that is, as the mere equality (*Wesengleichheit*) of the first *ousiai* in the generic unity of the second *ousia* (see Theodor Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra* [Gotha: n.p., 1867], 87; Adolf von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 4th ed. [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1909], 2:262–264). In the meanwhile, patristic scholars have discarded the theory of *Jungnizänismus* as it appears in the Zahn-Harnack formulation.

70. For what follows, see James E. Bradley and Richard Muller, *Church History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works, and Methods* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 31–32.

CHAPTER 2

1. Heinrich Dörrie, "Gregor III (Gregor von Nyssa)," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 12 (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1983), col. 885.

2. Christian Gnilka, ΧΡΗΣΙΣ. *Die Methode der Kirchenväter im Umgang mit der antiken Kultur. I: Der Begriff des "rechten Gebrauchs"* (Basel:Verlag Schwabe, 1984); Henriette M. Meissner, *Rhetorik und Theologie: Der Dialog Gregors von Nyssa "De anima et resurrectione"* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1991); Hubertus R. Drobner, "Gregory of Nyssa as Philosopher: *De anima et resurrectione* and *De hominis opificio*," *Dionysius*, 18 (December 2000): 69–102.

3. Meissner, *Rhetorik und Theologie*, 373.

4. Drobner, "Gregory of Nyssa as Philosopher."

5. Harold F. Cherniss, *The Platonism of Gregory of Nyssa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1930); and more recently Charalambos Apostolopoulos, *Phaedo Christianus: Studien zur Verbindung und Abwägung des Verhältnisses zwischen dem platonischen Phaidon und dem Dialog Gregors von Nyssa "Über die Seele und die Auferstehung"* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1986).

6. See, for example, J. C. M. van Winden, review of Apostolopoulos's *Phaedo Christianus*, *Vigiliae Christianae* 41 (1987): 191–197; Meissner, *Rhetorik und Theologie*; Enrico Peroli, "Gregory of Nyssa and the Neoplatonic Doctrine of the Soul," *Vigiliae Christianae* 51 (1997): 117–139.

7. For the Greek text, I use Aristoteles, *Categoriae et Liber de Interpretatione*, ed. L. Minio-Paluello (Oxford: Clarendon, 1959). For English translations of Aristotle's works, I use *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, trans. and ed. Jonathan Barnes, 2 vols. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984).

8. Michael Frede, *Essays in Ancient Philosophy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 51.

9. Ibid., 51–52. Cf. John M. Rist, *The Mind of Aristotle: A Study in Philosophical Growth* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989), 258.

10. *Cat.* 3b16–18: οὐ γὰρ ἔν ἐστι τὸ ὑποκείμενον ὥσπερ ἡ πρώτη οὐσία, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πολλῶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος λέγεται καὶ τὸ ζῷον.

11. Frede, *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, 52. I disagree with Frede when he then tries to "avail himself" of the Scholastic terms "integral" and "subjective" to explicate Aristotle's notion of "part." Devised later, these Scholastic terms, however exactly they overlap with Aristotle's notions, can obfuscate our understanding of Aristotle.

12. G. E. L. Owen, "Inherence," *Phronesis* 10 (1965): 97–105, and Frede, *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, 55–63, advocate the former position, whereas G. B. Matthews and S. M. Cohen, "The One and the Many," *Review of Metaphysics* 21 (1967–1968): 630–655, and R. Heinaman, "Non-Substantial Individuals in Aristotle," *Phronesis* 26 (1981): 295–307, the latter. Rist thinks that "Owen has not established his case, and perhaps both he and his critics are right. There is also the possibility that Aristotle did not see the problem at this time. If that were true, Heinaman's good evidence from later works does not necessarily help" (*Mind of Aristotle*, 327 n. 6).

13. Frede, *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, 63

14. Greek text in Aristotle (Aristoteles), *Metaphysica*, ed. W. Jaeger (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957).

15. Rist, *Mind of Aristotle*, 255–256, 261. Cf. the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* CD-ROM, version D (Irvine: University of California, 1995).

16. Frede, *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, 63.

17. *Metaph.* 1036a1–6.

18. Christopher Stead, *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 159. In *Divine Substance*, Stead thought that until the end of the fourth century Christian authors, with the exception of Hippolytus (*Refutation of All Heresies* VII.16–18), did not know the doctrine of primary and secondary substances (Stead, *Divine Substance* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1977], 114–118).

19. The conclusion about an Aristotelian influence on the Cappadocians will probably baffle some Eastern Orthodox theologians. Yet even Georges Florovsky has noted that in eschatology too "it was Aristotle and not Plato who could help Christian philosophers." Aristotle's understanding of "the unity of human existence" was of great importance, according to this Russian Orthodox émigré theologian (Florovsky, *Aspects of Church History*, ed. Richard S. Haugh [Vaduz: Büchervertriebanstalt, 1987], 75).

20. See also Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Petrum* 2.

21. The last reference (*Cat.* 3b33) is also indicated by W. Jaeger, the editor of the critical edition of Gregory's *CE* (GNO 1.80 note).

22. ET, slightly modified by me, in NPNF 2.5: 247.

23. Gregory of Nyssa, *Teologia trinitaria. Contro Eunomio. Confutazione della Professione di fede di Eunomio*, trans. Claudio Moreschini (Milano: Rusconi, 1994), 587 n. 56. ET is mine.

24. See G. Christopher Stead, "Individual Personality in Origen and the Cappadocian Fathers," in *Arché e telos: l'antropologia di Origene e di Gregorio di Nissa. Analisi storico-religiosa*, ed. U. Bianchi and H. Crouzel (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1981), 182; Stead, *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity*, 82ff.; see also "Die Schrift *Ex communibus notionibus* des Gregor von Nyssa," trans. and with commentary by Herman J. Vogt, in *Theologische Quartalschrift* 171 (1991): 204 n. 1. Cf. David L. Balás, "*Plenitudo humani-*

tatis: The Unity of Human Nature in the Theology of Gregory of Nyssa" in *Disciplina nostra: Essays in Memory of Robert F. Evans*, ed. Donald F. Winslow (Cambridge, Mass.: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979), 129.

25. Stead, *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity*, 162.

26. *Aristotle's "Categories" and "De Interpretatione"*, trans. J. L. Ackrill (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), 98.

27. In my presentation of Aristotle's category of relation I rely on the comments J. L. Ackrill makes in *Aristotle's "Categories" and "De Interpretatione"*, 98–103 (referred to as Ackrill hereafter), as well as an article that tries to bring further clarifications to this issue, Fabio Morales, "Relational Attributes in Aristotle," *Phronesis* 39, no. 3 (1994): 55–274 (Morales hereafter).

28. *Cat.* 6a36–40.

29. Morales, 257. Charles Kahn also wrote: "Aristotle never regards predication as a grammatical or linguistic relation of word to word, nor does he ever speak of subject and predicate as concepts united in judgement." (Kahn, "Questions and Categories: Aristotle's Doctrine of Categories in the Light of Modern Research," in *Questions*, ed. Henry Hiz [Dordrecht: Reidel, 1978], 248).

30. *Cat.* 6b28–35.

31. See chapter 5 for examples.

32. See chapter 5 for examples.

33. Ackrill, 101.

34. *CE* 1.572–573.

35. Morales, 258 n. 10.

36. According to the chronological chart of Aristotle's works provided by Rist in *Mind of Aristotle*, *Cat.* 7 was written ca. 353 (p. 283), whereas *Topics* 6 ca. 343 (p. 285), *Metaph.* 7 ca. 327, and *Politics* 1 ca. 324 (p. 287).

37. Ackrill, 101–102.

38. Morales, 261. For his whole argument, see pp. 259–266.

39. Morales, 264. There is a misprint in the reference to Aristotle's *Politics* on this page: The quote is from *Politics* 1253a20–25, not 1253b20–25. The examples from *Metaph.* 1035b23–25 and *Politics* 1253a20–25 are actually suggested in Ackrill, 103.

40. Morales, 267.

41. In *Cat.* 8a24, "property" (κτῆμα) is treated as a relational attribute.

42. Morales, 268.

43. Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Ablabium* 55.24–56.17.

44. Morales, 270.

45. Morales, 270 n. 30.

46. Morales, 271.

47. A. A. Long, *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*, 2nd ed. (London: Duckworth, 1986), 160; see also A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 1: 166. Where possible for Greek original and English translations of Stoic texts, I use Long and Sedley.

48. John M. Rist, *Stoic Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 154. Other scholars render them as substrate, qualified, disposed, and relatively disposed (Long and Sedley, *Hellenistic Philosophers*, 1: 167).

49. In what follows, I rely in part on explanations provided by Rist, *Stoic Philosophy*, 152–172; A. A. Long, *Hellenistic Philosophy*, 160–163; Long and Sedley, *Hellenistic Philosophers*, 1: 162–166, 172–177.

50. According to Stobaeus, *Eclogae* I 11.5a2–3. οὐσίαν δὲ εἶναι τὴν τῶν ὄντων πάντων πρώτην ὕλην (*SVF* 1.87).

51. Simplicius of Cilicia, *In Aristotelis Categoras commentarium* 214.24–37 (=*SVF* 2.391), ed. Carol Kalbfleisch, CAG 8 (Berlin: Reimer, 1907).

52. Long and Sedley, *Hellenistic Philosophers*, 1: 172.

53. Diogenes Laertius 7.58 (*SVF* 3, Diogenes 22; ET in Long and Sedley, *Hellenistic Philosophers*, 1: 198).

54. Stead seems to confirm my observation: "Stoic theory could accommodate the obvious distinction between the species and the individual (see p. 49)—but in terms of 'quality' (*poion*), not *ousia*" (*Philosophy in Christian Antiquity*, 182).

55. *An Anonymous Academic Treatise*: ἰδίως ποιὸν οἷον Πλάτων (Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 3008, in Long and Sedley, *Hellenistic Philosophers*, 1: 167).

56. Stobaeus, *Eclogae* 1.177.21: ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίως ποιῶν οἷον Δίωνος καὶ Θέωνος (Long and Sedley, *Hellenistic Philosophers*, 1: 168).

57. Simplicius, *On Aristotle's On Soul* 217.36 (*SVF* 2.395; ET in Long and Sedley, *Hellenistic Philosophers*, 1: 169).

58. Dexippus's account reads "older philosophers," and the English translator explains in a footnote that he means the Peripatetics and the old Academy (Dexippus, *In Aristotelis Categorias commentarium* 23.25–30 [ßVF 2.374], ed. Adolf Busse, CAG 4.2 [Berlin: Reimer, 1888]; ET by John Dillon in Dexippus, *On Aristotle Categories* [London: Duckworth, 1990], 50 n. 73).

59. Again, Dexippus's account reads "potential body," and Dillon comments that "Aristotle does not actually say this, though he implies it (e.g. *Metaph.* 9.8, 1050a15; 14.1, 1088b1, 14.4, 1092a3) but he was generally held in later times to have done so, as was Plato (Albinus *Did.* 163, 6ff.; Apuleius *de Plat.* 192; Diels, *Dox. Gr.* 567, 16)" (Dexippus, *On Aristotle's Categories*, 51 n. 74).

60. Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Categorias* 48.11–16: διττόν, φησίν ὁ Πορφύριος, ἐστὶν τὸ ὑποκείμενον, οὐ μόνον κατὰ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους · ἥ τε γὰρ ἄποιος ὕλη, ἣν δυνάμει καλεῖ ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης, πρῶτόν ἐστιν τοῦ ὑποκειμένου σημαινόμενον, καὶ δεύτερον, ὃ κοινῶς ποιὸν ἢ ἰδίως ὑφίσταται · ὑποκείμενον γὰρ καὶ ὁ χαλκός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ Σωκράτης τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις ἢ κατηγορουμένοις κατ' αὐτῶν (ET mine). See also the parallel in Dexippus, *In Aristotelis Categorias commentarium* 23.25–30.

61. I present his argument in chapter 3. Reinhard Hübner, "Gregor von Nyssa als Verfasser der sog. *Ep.* 38 des Basilius: Zum unterschiedlichen Verständnis der *ousia* bei den kappadozischen Brüdern," in *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, ed. J. Fontaine and Ch. Kannengiesser (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972), 463–490.

62. See, for example, Basil, *Against Eunomius* (*AE* hereafter) 2.4.11.577C.

63. *CE* 3.5 (GNO 2.168.2–3): οὐσίαν δὲ λέγω νῦν οὐ τὸ ὑλικὸν ὑποκείμενον.

64. See the examples I provide at the end of the section dealing with the individual in Aristotle.

65. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adv. Apolinarium* (GNO 3.1: 165, 9–12): ἄλλη πυρὸς οὐσία καὶ ὕδατος ἄλλη καὶ αἱ προσηγορίαι τῶν δύο διάφοροι.

66. *Ad Graecos* 23.4–8.

67. Immediately after discussing Basil's Stoic notion of the substance, Stead says that Gregory of Nyssa's notion of substance is harder to interpret and warns that "phrases like *merikē* or *idikēousia*—'partitive' or 'individual substance'—used to designate the individual are misleading; Aristotle's 'primary substance' is I think ignored" (*Philosophy in Christian Antiquity*, 182–183).

68. Porphyry uses μερική οὐσία several times in his *In Aristotelis Categorias* (71.33–35; 72.8; 72.15–16; 73.16–17; 74.19–21). For a good discussion of the Neoplatonic interpretation of Aristotle, see Steven K. Strange, "Plotinus, Porphyry, and the Neoplatonic Interpretation of the 'Categories,' " in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, ed. Wolfgang Haase (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987), 955–974.

69. A. C. Lloyd, "Neoplatonic Logic and Aristotelian Logic II," *Phronesis* 1 (1956): 158–159.

70. Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus mathematicos* 7.276–277. Greek text and ET in Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Logicians*, trans. R. G. Bury (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935), 146–147.

71. Alcinous, *The Handbook of Platonism*, trans. and with commentary by J. Dillon (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 156.2–10: 7–8. For the Greek text see Alcinous (Alcinoos), *Enseignement des doctrines de Platon*, ed. and with commentary by John Whittaker; and trans. Pierre Louis (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1990).

72. For what follows about Plotinus I rely in part on Sean Mulrooney, "Boethius on 'Person' " (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1994), esp. 47–51.

73. Plotinus, *Enn.* VI.3.1.22–26.

74. Mulrooney, "Boethius on 'Person,' " 48–49.

75. Cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 49d–50b.

76. Mulrooney, "Boethius on 'Person,' " 50.

77. "In *The Anatomy of Neoplatonism* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), A. C. Lloyd acknowledges that for Plotinus and the Neoplatonists 'a sensible individual is a bundle of qualities without genuine substance. It excludes a core self of form and matter for Socrates or Dion which would have been a substrate for their accidents' (p. 46). But Lloyd fails to acknowledge that Socrates or Dion does have a core self; it is just not a sensible one" (Mulrooney, "Boethius on 'Person,' " 50 n. 73).

78. Porphyry the Phoenician, *Isagoge*, trans. Edward W. Warren (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1975), 41. Greek text in Porphyry, *Isagoge et In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium* 7.20–26, ed. Adolf Busse, CAG 4.1 (Berlin: Reimer, 1887): ἄτομον δὲ λέγεται ὁ Σωκράτης καὶ τουτὶ τὸ λευκὸν δαὶ οὑτοσὶ ὁ προσιὼν Σοφρονίσκου υἱός, εἰ μόνος αὐτῷ εἴη Σωκράτης υἱός. ἄτομα οὖν λέγεται τὰ τοιαῦτα, ὅτι ἐξ ἰδιοτήτων συνέστηκεν ἕκαστον, ὧν τὸ ἄθροισμα οὐκ ἂν ἐπ᾽ ἄλλου ποτὲ τὸ αὐτὸ γένοιτο · αἱ γὰρ Σωκράτους ἰδιότητες οὐκ ἂν ἐπ᾽ ἄλλου τινὸς τῶν κατὰ μέρος γένοιτο ἂν αἱ αὐταί, αἱ μέντοι τοῦ ἀθρώπου, λέγω δὴ τοῦ κοινοῦ, ἰδιότητες γένοιτ᾽ ἂν αἱ αὐταὶ ἐπὶ πλειόνων, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀνθρώπον, καθὸ ἄνθρωποι.

79. John M. Rist, "Basil's 'Neoplatonism': Its Background and Nature," in *Basil of*

Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium, ed. Paul J. Fedwick (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981), 1: 137–220.

80. In speaking of Gregory of Nyssa's Platonism in a recent article, Rist allows that "further investigation of the indirect effects of Porphyry might alter this picture in some details" (John M. Rist, "Plotinus and Christian Philosophy," in *The Cambridge Companion to Plotinus*, ed. Lloyd P. Gerson [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996], 401).

81. Albrecht Dihle, *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).

82. See, for example, John M. Rist, review of *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity*, by Albrecht Dihle, *Phoenix* 37 (1983): 275–277. See also Charles H. Kahn, "Discovering the Will: From Aristotle to Augustine," in *The Question of 'Eclecticism' in Later Greek Philosophy*, ed. John M. Dillon and A. A. Long (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 258. Cf. John D. Madden, "The Authenticity of Early Definitions of Will (*Thelêsis*)," in *Maximus Confessor: Actes du symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur. Fribourg, 2–5 septembre 1980*, ed. Felix Heinzer and Christoph Schönborn (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1982), 79: "[D]espite Aristotle's insistence on the rational nature of the *prohairesis*, it remained perenially resistant to identification with the intellect or subordination to it."

83. For a good discussion of the issue of the Christian view of the freedom of will before the Cappadocians, see Christopher Stead, "The Freedom of the Will and the Arian Controversy," in *Platonismus und Christentum: Festschrift für Heinrich Dörrie*, Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum 10 (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagbuchhandlung, 1983), 245–257. See also E. P. Meijering, "Die Diskussion über den Willen und das Wesen Gotter, theologiegeschichtlich beleuchtet," in *L'Église et l'empire au IVe siècle*, ed. Albrecht Dihle (Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1989), 35–65.

84. John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa* 2.22. ET by S. D. F. Salmond in John of Damascus, *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, NPNF 2:9 (1898; reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 38. Greek text in John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei* 36 (=PG 94: 945C), ed. Bonifatius Kotter (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973): Χρὴ δὲ γινώσκειν, ὅτι ἐπὶ θεοῦ βούλησιν μὲν λέγομεν, προαίρεσιν δὲ κυρίως οὐ λέγομεν· οὐ γάρ βουλεύεται ὁ θεός. Ἀγνοίας γάρ ἐστι τὸ βουλεύεσται · περὶ γὰρ τοῦ γινωσκομένου οὐδεις βουλεύεται. Εἰ δὲ ἡ βουλὴ ἀγνοίας, πάντως καὶ ἡ προαίρεσις. Ὁ δὲ θεὸς πάντα εἰδὼς ἁπλῶς οὐ βουλεύεται. For other meanings of προαίρεσις in the Fathers, see *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961), 1133–1134.

85. See also Jérome Gaïth, *La conception de la liberté chez Grégoire de Nysse* (Paris: Vrin, 1953), 17–39.

86. Georges Leroux, introduction to *Traité sur la liberté et la volonté de l'Un [Ennéade VI.8 (39)]*, by Plotinus, trans. and with commentary by Georges Leroux (Paris: Vrin, 1990), 31; Rist, review of *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity*, 277.

87. Plotinus's later treatises *On Providence* (*Enn.* III.2–3 [47–48]) confirm this observation, since they present the classical view about the divine will.

88. John M. Rist, *Human Value: A Study in Ancient Philosophical Ethics* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 99.

89. A. H. Armstrong, "Two Views of Freedom," *Studia Patristica* 18 (1982): 397–406.

90. A. H. Armstrong, "Introductory Note," in Plotinus, *Enn.* VI.6–9, trans. A. H. Armstrong (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), 224.

91. If A, then B. But if not B, then not A.

92. *Enn.* VI.8.9.24–29; see also *Enn.* VI.8.16.34 and 19.13. This is an allusion to Plato, *Republic* VI.509B9: The Good is beyond intellect and being (ἐπέκεινα νοῦ καὶ οὐσίας). For the historical aspects of this phrase, see John Whittaker, "Ἐπέκεινα νοῦ καὶ οὐσίας," *Vigiliae Christianae* 23 (1969): 91–104.

93. *Enn.* VI.8.9.24–29.

94. *Enn.* VI.8.9.45–46.

95. At the beginning of *Enn.* VI.8, Plotinus comments on Aristotle's discussion of the freedom of the will in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. The Stagyrite discusses the freedom of the will in terms of choice there. For Aristotle's limited influence on Plotinus's *Enn.* VI.8, see Rist, *Human Value*, 106–108.

96. Georges Leroux, "Commentaire," in Plotinus, *Traité sur la liberté et la volonté de l'Un*, 304.

97. Ibid., 308–309.

98. *Enn.* VI.8.9.29.

99. *Enn.* III.8.9.41.

100. *Enn.* V.2.1.8; V.1.6.7.

101. *Enn.* V.4.1.29; V.1.6.26.

102. Leroux, "Commentaire," 306–307, quoting *Enn.* I.8.7.21 and *Enn.* V.5.12.40–49 against Rist's view that the process of generation of beings by the One is voluntary. See Rist, *Eros and Psyche: Studies in Plato, Plotinus, and Origen* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1964), 76–77; and Rist, *Plotinus: The Road to Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 66–83.

103. Rist, *Human Value*, 104.

104. Rist, *Human Value*, 104. The generation of beings is important for Gregory of Nyssa, who has similar remarks about how God the Father is father (or rather author) of created beings, albeit his nature is different from theirs (*CE* 3.10.10).

105. *Enn.* VI.8.10.22: τῆς αὑτοῦ οὐσίας κύριος.

106. Alexander of Aprodisias, *De fato*, 32.204.10–14. ET, slightly modified by me, and Greek text in Alexander of Aphrodisias, *On Destiny: Addressed to the Emperors*, trans. A. Fitzgerald (London: Scholartis Press, 1931), 136–137 (Greek also in CAG suppl. 2.2, ed. Bruns).

107. *Enn.* VI.8.10.24–26.

108. Origen, *Princ.* 1.2.9; and *Comm. Gen.* (in Eusebius, *Contra Marcellum* I.4, GCS 14, p. 22, 11–18); Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos* 1.28 and 3.59–67; Basil of Caesarea, *AE* II, p. 593 A–B; Gregory of Nyssa, *CE* 1.584.

109. *CE* 3.1.18; NPNF 2.5:148.

110. Leroux, "Commentaire," 310; following Theodor Gollwitzer, *Plotins Lehre von der Willensfreiheit*, vol. 1 (Kempten, 1900); and Carolina W. Zeeman, *De Plaats van de Wil in de Philosophie van Plotinus* (Arnhem: Van Loghum Slaterus, 1946).

111. Armstrong reminds the reader at this point how strong the apophatic way of

knowing is stressed by the Athenian Neoplatonists Proclus and Damascius and the Christian Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite.

112. *Enn.* VI.8.9.46–48.

CHAPTER 3

1. References to the Greek text will be to Saint Basil, *Lettres*, ed. and trans. Yves Courtonne (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1957), 1:81–92. Other quotes from Basil's letters are based on the other two volumes produced by Courtonne (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1961 and 1966). Citations from all three volumes will hereafter appear as, e.g., Courtonne 3:53. I also consulted the English translation of this letter, St. Basil, *The Letters*, trans. Roy J. Deferrari, vol. 1 (London: W. Heinemann, 1926); however, since Deferrari's translation is not too reliable, I have had to alter it.

2. Reinhard Hübner, "Gregor von Nyssa als Verfasser der sog. *Ep.* 38 des Basilius: Zum unterschiedlichen Verständnis der *ousia* bei den kappadozischen Brüdern," in *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, ed. J. Fontaine and Ch. Kannengiesser (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972), 463–490.

3. Anders Cavallin, *Studien zu den Briefen des Hl. Basilius* (Lund: Gleerupska Universitetsbokhandeln, 1944), 71ff.

4. Paul J. Fedwick, "A Commentary of Gregory of Nyssa or the 38th Letter of Basil of Caesarea," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 44 (1978): 31–51; Fedwick, *Bibliotheca Basiliana vniversalis: A Study of the Manuscript Tradition of the Works of Basil of Caesarea*, vol. 1, *The Letters* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1993), 620–623. Robert Pouchet also accepts the Gregorian authorship in his comprehensive study of the Basilian correspondence, *Basile le Grand et son univers d'amis d'après sa correspondance: Une stratégie de communion* (Rome: Augustinianum, 1992), 29.

5. Wolfgang-Dieter Hauschild, in his German translation of Basil's letters, Basil of Caesarea, *Briefe*, (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1990), 1:182–184 n. 181); Jürgen Hammerstaedt, "Zur Echtheit von Basiliusbrief 38," *Tesserae: Festschrift für Josef Engemann*, ed. Ernst Dassman and Klaus Thraede (Münster: Aschendorff, 1991), 416–419; and Volker H. Drecoll, *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea: Sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 297–331.

6. Johannes Zachhuber, *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical Background and Theological Significance* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 61.

7. Drecoll, *Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre*, 309. Cf. the criticism of Drecoll in David G. Robertson, "Stoic and Aristotelian Notions of Substance in Basil of Caesarea," *Vigiliae Christianae* 52 (1998): 410 n. 61.

8. Jean Daniélou, "La chronologie des oeuvres de Grégoire de Nysse," *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966): 163 n. 2; Gerhard May, "Die Chronologie des Lebens und der Werke des Gregor von Nyssa," in *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse: Actes du Colloque de Chevetogne (22–26 septembre 1969)*, ed. Marguerite Harl (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 57.

9. Pouchet, *Basile le Grand*, 60.

10. "Animal" in English and other modern languages comes from the Latin

word *animus* (soul). Thus, "animal" means an "ensouled or living creature" and is probably the best rendering of the Greek ζῶον.

11. Basil, *Ep.* 236.6.1–22 (Courtonne 3:53–54); my translation.

12. *Ad Petrum* 1.

13. Thierry Ziegler, "Les petits traités trinitaires de Grégoire de Nysse: Temoins d'un itineraire théologique (379–383)" (Ph.D. diss., University of Human Sciences of Strasbourg, 1987), 1:127.

14. Cf. Aristotle, *Cat.* 2b25–27: "[O]f the primary substances one is no more a substance than another: the individual man is no more a substance than the individual ox."

15. *Ad Petrum* 2.1–11.

16. Cf. D. L. Balás, "The Unity of Human Nature in Basil's and Gregory of Nyssa's Polemics against Eunomius" in *Studia Patristica* 14 (1976): 279.

17. Hübner, "Gregor von Nyssa als Verfasser," 480.

18. Gregory of Nyssa, *CE* 3.5: "By *ousia* I do *not* mean the material substratum" (GNO 2:168.2–3: οὐσίαν δὲ λέγω νῦν οὐ τὸ ὑλικὸν ὑποκείμενον).

19. Hübner, "Gregor von Nyssa als Verfasser," 480.

20. Ibid., 470, 480. Bernard Pottier fully agrees with Hübner in his book *Dieu et le Christ selon Grégoire de Nysse: Etude systématique du "Contre Eunome" avec traduction inédite des extraits d'Eunome* (Namur, Belgium: Culture et Vérité, 1994), 85–87.

21. Zachhuber, *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa*, 61.

22. Hübner, "Gregor von Nyssa als Verfasser," 469–470.

23. Hübner, "Gregor von Nyssa als Verfasser," 482.

24. Aloys Grillmeier, "Das Scandalum oecumenicum des Nestorius in kirchlich-dogmatischer und theologiegeschichtlicher Sicht," *Scholastik* 36 (1961): 340–341.

25. Zachhuber, *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa*, 63–70.

26. Dionysius Thrax, *Ars grammatica*, ed. G. Ulhig (Leipzig: Teubner, 1883), 12, 15 (lines 40.4–41.1).

27. In the fourth century, the Epistle to the Hebrews was attributed to Paul.

28. Cf. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books*, the New Revised Standard Version, ed. Bruce Metzger and Roland Murphy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 317 (NT).

29. *Ad Petrum* 7.8–10.

30. *Ad Petrum* 7.27.

31. *Ad Petrum* 7.31–33.

32. *Ad Petrum* 8.

33. See *Ep.* 125.1.32–49. See also Norman P. Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, (London: Sheed & Ward, 1990), 1:5.

34. Jean Pépin, "Ὑπαρξις ετ ὑπόστασις en Cappadoce," in *Hyparxis e Hypostasis nel Neoplatonismo: Atti del I Colloquio Internazionale del Centro di Ricerca sul Neoplatonismo (Università degli Studi di Catania, 1–3 ottobre 1992)*, ed. F. Romano and D. P. Taormina (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1994), 76.

35. Christopher Stead, *Divine Substance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 225.

36. See Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 1.24.151–152; 2.10.75–76; and *Cels.* 8.12.

37. Jürgen Hammerstaedt, "Der trinitarische Gebrauch des Hypostasisbegriffs bei Origenes," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 34 (1991): 12–20.

38. Greek text in Hans-Georg Opitz, ed., *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites, 318–328* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1941) 22: μὴ ἐξ ἑτέρας τινὸς ὑποστάσεως τε καὶ οὐσίας, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ τοῦ πατρός (quoted in Stead, *Divine Substance*, 239).

39. Stead, *Divine Substance*, 240.

40. For the text of the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, see J. Stevenson, ed., *Creeds, Councils, and Controversies: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church A.D. 337–461*, rev. W. H. C. Frend (London: SPCK, 1989), 80–83.

41. *Ad Petrum* 3.1–2: τὸ ἰδίως λεγόμενον τῷ τῆς ὑποστάσεως δηλοῦσθαι ῥήματι.

42. *Ad Petrum* 3.4–6.

43. *Ad Petrum* 3.7–8.

44. *Ad Petrum* 3.8. "Stability" renders the Greek στάσις. Gregory etymologizes here using *stasis*, the second part of the word *hypostasis*.

45. *Ad Petrum* 3.10–12.

46. *Ad Petrum* 3.17.

47. *Ad Petrum* 2.14. The issue of circumscribability played a major role in the fight over images in the iconoclastic period. See Christoph von Schönborn, "La 'lettre 38 de saint Basile' et le problème christologique de l'iconoclasme," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 60 (1976): 446–450.

48. *Ad Petrum* 3.13–29.

49. *Ad Petrum* 3.13–17.

50. *Ad Petrum* 3.26–30; cf. Job 2:11.

51. *Ad Petrum* 6.4–6: τὴν συνδρομὴν τῶν ἰδιωμάτων. Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 33.16: μία φύσις ἐν τρισὶν ἰδιότησιν. Cf. Drecoll, *Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre*, 317.

52. See Plotinus, *Enn.* VI.3.8.20, VI.3.15.27; and Porphyry, *Isag.* 7.21. See my discussion of this issue in chapter 2.

53. *Ad Petrum* 3.30–33.

54. *Ad Petrum* 3.35–36: αὐτὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν εἶναι νόημᾶ.

55. *Ad Petrum* 5.1–2.

56. *Ad Petrum* 3.38–40 and 4.45–46.

57. See chapter 2 for a discussion of this Aristotelian influence on Gregory of Nyssa.

58. *Ad Petrum* 4.2–4.

59. *Ad Petrum* 4.6–11; emphasis mine.

60. *Ad Petrum* 4.11–19; emphasis mine. Gregory plays on the two prepositions, "from" (ἐκ) and "through" (δια).

61. *Ad Petrum* 4.25–29.

62. *Ad Petrum* 4.31: μόνος μονογενῶς.

63. *Ad Petrum* 4.31: ἀγέννητος φώς.

64. *Ad Petrum* 4.36–37: ἐκ μηδεμιᾶς αἰτίας ὑποστῆναι μόνος ἔχειˆ.

65. Karl Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den großen Kappadoziern* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904), 211. A search through Gregory's texts avail-

able on the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (Irvine: University of California, 1995), confirms Hall's view.

66. Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Graecos (ex communibus notionibus)*, in GNO, vol. 3, part 1, ed. Friedrich Müller (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 25, 5–6.

67. These examples are taken from *Ad Petrum* 4.19–37. See also Drecoll, *Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre*, 313.

68. *Ad Petrum* 4.45–50.

69. *Ad Petrum* 4.52–55.

70. Greek: τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστὶ το Πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Note the clearly non-filioquist nuance.

71. Ps 118:131 (LXX): τὸ στόμα μου ἤνοιξα καὶ εἵλκυσα πνεῦμα, ὅτι τὰς ἐντολάς σου ἐπεπόθουν (Ps 119:131). Deferrari says that Gregory perhaps intentionally misinterprets "I drew breath" from Ps. 119 (*Letters*, 211).

CHAPTER 4

1. References to the Greek text will be to *Ad Eustathium de sancta Trinitate* in GNO, vol. 3, part 1, ed. Friedrich Müller (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 1–16. I consulted Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Holy Trinity, and of the Godhead of the Holy Spirit: To Eustathius*, trans. H. A. Wilson in NPNF 2.5 (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1893), 326–330; however, since the latter predates the critical edition prepared by Müller, I have not relied entirely on it.

2. Gerhard May, "Die Chronologie des Lebens und der Werke des Gregor von Nyssa," in *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse: Actes du Colloque de Chevetogne (22–26 septembre 1969)*, ed. Marguerite Harl (Leiden: Brill, 1971)," 57–58. The same position is held by R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy* 318–381 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 717.

3. Jean Daniélou, review of *Gregorii Nysseni Opera dogmatica minora* I, ed. F. Müller, *Gnomon* 31 (1959): 615.

4. Jean Daniélou, "La chronologie des oeuvres de Grégoire de Nysse," *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966): 162.

5. Hanson, *Search for the Christian Doctrine*, 716–717.

6. *Ad Eustat.* 6.11; cf. 5.18.

7. *Ad Eustat.* 6.11–13.

8. *Ad Eustat.* 6.14–15: οὐ γὰρ εἰκός ἐστι τοὺς τρεῖς λέγοντας οὐσίας μὴ καὶ τρεῖς πάντως ὑποστάσεις λέγειν.

9. Five out of nine manuscripts used to establish the critical text read "wrought by the Father and the Son" (*Ad Eustat.* 13.18–19). The editor, F. Müller, regards this as an interpolation due to dogmatic reasons. He may be wrong at this point.

10. *Ad Eustat.* 13.11–21. Cf. NPNF 2.5:329.

11. See also Basil, *AE* 2.3.5 (661a), and Turcescu, "*Prosōpon* and *Hypostasis* in Basil of Caesarea's *Against Eunomius* and the Epistles," *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, no. 4 (1997): 384–385 for an explanation of the reasons for the deliberate Cappadocian misinterpretation of the meaning of ὑπόστασις in Heb 1:3.

12. References to the Greek text will be to *Ad Ablabium Quod non sint tres dei* in GNO, vol. 3, part 1, ed. Friedrich Müller (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 35–58. I consulted Gregory of Nyssa, *On "Not Three Gods": To Ablabium*, trans. H. A. Wilson in NPNF, 2nd series, vol. 5 (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1893), 331–336; yet, since the latter predates the critical edition prepared by Müller, I did not rely entirely on it.

13. May, "Chronologie des Lebens," 58–59.

14. Jean Daniélou, review of *GNO* 3/1 in *Gnomon* 31 (1959): 615–616.

15. G. Christopher Stead, "Why Not Three Gods? The Logic of Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Doctrine," in *Studien zu Gregor von Nyssa und der christlichen Spätantike*, ed. Hubertus R. Drobner and Christoph Klock (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 150.

16. *Ad Ablabium* 40.10–14.

17. *Ad Ablabium* 40.5–9.

18. *Ad Ablabium* 41.18–20.

19. *Ad Ablabium* 42.1–3.

20. This Septuagint text differs quite dramatically from the Hebrew text, which reads: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord is our Lord, the Lord alone."

21. *Ad Ablabium* 42.5–6.

22. Like the other two Cappadocians, Gregory refers to a divine activity as "that which surrounds [the substance]" (τὰ περὶ αὐτὴν; *Ad Ablabium* 43.14) but which is different from the substance itself.

23. Cf. *Ad Eustat.* 14.6.

24. *Ad Ablabium* 47.24–48.2; NPNF 2.5:334.

25. *Ad Ablabium* 44.17–46.2.

26. *Ad Ablabium* 47.14–16.

27. Stead, "Why Not Three Gods?" 149.

28. *Ad Ablabium* 40.24–41.2. ὁ μὲν τῶν ὑποστάσεων λόγος διὰ τὰς ἐνθεωρουμένας ἰδιότητας ἑκάστῳ τὸν δια μερισμὸν ἐπιδέχεται καὶ κατὰ σύνθεσιν ἐν ἀριθμῷ θεωρεῖται·.

29. *Ad Ablabium* 53.7–15; NPNF 2.5:335.

30. *Ad Ablabium* 52.15–53.13.

31. See Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Petrum* 3.10–12: ὑπόστασις is "the concept which, by means of the specific notes which it indicates, restricts and circumscribes in a particular thing what is common and uncircumscribed."

32. Michel R. Barnes, "The Background and Use of Eunomius' Causal Language" in *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, ed. Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 220 n. 10. Cf. Barnes, "Δύναμις and the Anti-Monistic Ontology of Nyssen's *Contra Eunomium*" in *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments*, ed. Robert C. Gregg (Cambridge, Mass.: Philadephia Patristic Foundation, 1985), 330.

33. See Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 1.292. Ronald Heine translates this passage as follows: "As, therefore, there are many powers of God, each of which has its own individuality [περιγραφή] . . . so also the Christ . . . will be understood to be the 'Word'—although the reason which is in us has no individuality [περιγραφή] apart from us—possessing substance [ὑπόστασις]" (*Origen: Commentary on the Gospel according to John Books 1–10* [Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1989], 94).

34. *Ad Ablabium* 53.16–19.

35. *Ad Ablabium* 53.25–54.1.

36. *Ad Ablabium* 54.2–3.

37. Gregory of Nyssa, *CE* 1.201–202.

38. See his *Ep.* 210, 5.31–36 (Courtonne 2:195–196), *Ep.* 214, 4.16–22 (Courtonne 2:205–206). For the meaning of ὑπόστασις in these letters, see Turcescu, "*Prosōpon* and *Hypostasis,* 389–394.

39. *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.44.1–23 (ed. Pruche, 402–404, SC 17 bis). Cf. Andrea Milano, *Persona in teologia: Alle origini del significato di persona nel cristianesimo antico* (Naples: Dehoniane, 1984), 149–151. Troiano traces the concept of enumeration of hypostases back to Aristotle's *Metaph.* 1074a31–38 (Marina Silvia Troiano, "Il concetto di numerazione delle ipostasi in Basilio di Cesarea," *Vetera Christianorum* 24 [1987]: 350–351).

40. Troiano, "Numerazione delle ipostasi," 347 n. 30.

41. *Ad Ablabium* 55.23–56.2.

42. *Ad Ablabium* 56.3–6. Note that the English translation in NPNF 2.5 is mistaken in rendering ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου by "from the first Cause"; consequently, the Spirit is mistakenly said to be "by that which is from the first Cause" (p. 336). Gregory did not speak here of the "first" and "second cause," but of the Father as merely "the first" in the Trinity, because he is the cause of the other two persons.

43. *Ad Ablabium* 56.8–9: τῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ μεσιτείας καὶ αὐτῷ τὸ μονογενὲς φυλαττούσης καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς φυσικῆς πρὸς τὸν πατέρα σχέσεως μὴ ἀπειργούσης.

44. *Ad Ablabium* 56.7–8.

45. See Karl Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den großen Kappadoziern* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904), 215 n. 1. Simonetti agrees with Holl that neither Gregory nor the other two Cappadocians spoke of the *filioque* (see Manlio Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo* [Rome: Augustinianum, 1975], 449–451).

46. *Ad Ablabium* 56.13–14.

47. See also Brian E. Daley, " 'A Richer Union': Leontius of Byzantium and the Relationship of Human and Divine in Christ," *Studia Patristica 24* (1993): 264. For a discussion of the phrase "mode of existence" in the Cappadocians, see chapter 5 below.

48. Daniel F. Stramara, Jr., "Introduction to Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Graecos*: How It Is That We Say There Are Three Persons in the Divinity but Do Not Say That There Are Three Gods (To the Greeks: Concerning the Commonality of Concepts)," trans. Daniel F. Stramara, Jr., *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 41, no. 4 (1996): 377.

49. Ibid., 378.

50. References to the Greek text will be to *Ad Graecos (ex communibus notionibus)* in GNO, vol. 3, part 1, ed. Friedrich Müller (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 17–34. ET of the passages quoted is mine. A long overdue English translation of this text was eventually published as "*Ad Graecos*: How Is It That We Say . . . ," 381–391. I find this translation highly problematic though, especially when it renders into English important theological terms such as ἄνθρωπος, ὑπόστασις, ὕπαρξις, and οὐσία. Here are some examples: (1) The Greek ἄνθρωπος is an inclusive word which I usually translate as "human"; Stramara prefers to render it as the noninclusive "man," which he then twists to "mans" (as in the next example). (2) Gregory says that one cannot properly

say πόλλοι ἄνθρωποι (I render it as "many humans") because ἄνθρωπος stands for human nature; Stramara renders the phrase as "many Mans" *(sic)*, a highly misleading phrase in my view. (3) Stramara translates ὑπόστασις, ὕπαρξις, and οὐσία as "subsistence," "substance," and "essence" respectively, when there is a certain scholarly consensus that they should actually be rendered as "person" (or "hypostasis"), "existence," and "substance" (or "essence") respectively.

51. *AE* 1.12.8 (SC 299:212). Cf. Hanson, *Search for the Christian Doctrine*, 689–690.

52. See Robert B. Todd, "The Stoic Common Notions: A Re-Examination and Reinterpretation," *Symbolae Osloenses* 48 (1973): 47–75. By rendering the title of Gregory's treatise "To the Greeks: Concerning the Commonality of Concepts," Stramara seems unaware of the existence of the rhetorical device of "common notions" in antiquity. His choice of title also betrays his failure to understand Gregory's logic.

53. *Ad Graecos* 19.1–7.

54. *Ad Graecos* 23.4–8.

55. Stead, *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)*, 182–183.

56. "Die Schrift *Ex communibus notionibus* des Gregor von Nyssa," trans. and with commentary by Herman J. Vogt, in *Theologische Quartalschrift* 171 (1991): 209 n. 16.

57. "Die Schrift *Ex communibus notionibus*," 204 n. 1.

58. *Ad Ablabium* 40.5–9.

59. *Ad Graecos* 28.1.

60. *Ad Graecos* 28.5.

61. Cf. also *Ad Eustat.* 5.20–26.6; Basil *AE* 2.585BC, 616A; Mariette Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique: Étude des rapports entre le langage et la connaissance de Dieu* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1983), 71 n. 21.

62. Stead, "Why Not Three Gods?" 153.

63. Cf. *Ad Ablabium* 47.11–18.

64. Stead, "Why Not Three Gods?" 153.

65. *Ad Graecos* 28.24–25.

66. *Ad Graecos* 29.16–20: διακρίνεται δέ τί τινος ἢ οὐσίᾳ ἢ ὑποστάσει ἢ οὐσίᾳ καὶ ὑποστάσει · καὶ οὐσίᾳ μὲν διακέκριται ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ἵππου, ὑποστάσει δὲ Παῦλος Πέτρου, οὐσίᾳ δὲ καὶ ὑποστάσει ἥδε ἡ ὑπόστασις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῆσδε τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ ἵππου.

67. *Ad Graecos* 30.10–11.

68. *Ad Graecos* 30.20–23.

69. *Ad Graecos* 30.23.

70. *Ad Graecos* 31.1–2.

71. *Ad Graecos* 31.2–7.

72. *Ad Graecos* 32.21–26.

73. Two scholars who deal with the concept of person in Gregory of Nyssa fail to notice this troubling passage: John M. Lynch, "*Prosōpon* in Gregory of Nyssa: A Theological Word in Transition," *Theological Studies* 40 (1979): 728–738; and Stramara, in his translation of *Ad Graecos*.

74. *Ad Graecos* 31.16–20: τῇ δὲ ὑποστάσει . . . τὸ τοιὰδε συζεύγνυμεν πρὸς διαίρεσιν προσώπων τῶν ἀλλήλοις κοινωνούντων τούτου τοῦ ὀνόματος, τουτέστι τῆς ὑποστάσεως, καὶ διαφερόντων ἀλλήλων οὐ τοὶς οὐσίαν [another manuscript reads οὐσίας χαρακτηρίζουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς λεγομένοις συμβεβηκόσιν] Cf. *Ad Graecos*, trans. Stramara, 390.

75. Vogt, "Die Schrift *Ex communibus notionibus*," esp. 215, 218.

76. Jürgen Hammerstaedt, "Hypostasis (ὑπόστασις)," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 16 (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1994): cols. 986–1035.

77. Stead, "Why Not Three Gods?" 155.

78. Ibid.

79. Rudolf Lorenz, "Die Eustathius von Antiochien zugeschriebene Schrift gegen Photin," *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 71 (1980): 109–128.

80. For more on Eustathius of Antioch, see the entries in Angelo di Berardino, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, trans. A. Waldorf (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 1:303; and F. L. Cross, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed. by Elizabeth Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 576.

81. *Petri Callinicensis Patriarchae Antiocheni Tractatvs contra Damianvm*, books 2 and 3, ed. Rifaat Y. Ebied, Albert van Roey, and Lionel R. Wickham, Corpvs Christianorvm Series Graeca, vols. 29, 32, and 35 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1994, 1996, and 1998). Cf. the same editors' Peter of Callinicum, *Anti-Tritheist Dossier* (Louvain: Department Orientalistiek, 1981).

82. Peter of Callinicus, *Against Damian*, book 40. I wish to express my gratitude to Lionel R. Wickham for providing me with the English translation of this passage.

83. See Basil of Caesarea, *Homélies sur l'Hexaéméron*, ed. Stanislas Giet, 2nd ed., SC 26 bis (Paris: Cerf, 1968), 264–267; and the long overdue Basil of Caesarea, *Homilien zum Hexaemeron*, ed. E. Amand de Mendieta and Stig Y. Rudberg (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997), 64–65.

84. Greek text in *Alexandri in Aristotelis analyticorum priorum librum i commentarium*, ed. M. Wallies, CAG 2.1 (Berlin: Reimer, 1883), 46.32–47.2. ET in Alexander of Aphrodisias, *On Aristotle's Prior Analytics 1.1–7*, trans. Jonathan Barnes et al. (London: Duckworth, 1991), 107.

85. Greek text in Clement of Alexandria, *Le Pédagogue*, 2.5.46.2, ed. C. Mondésert and H.-I. Marrou, 2nd ed., SC 108 (Paris: Cerf, 1991), 100; ET mine.

86. Greek text in *Plutarchi Moralia*, ed. Jürgen Mau (Leipzig: Teubner, 1971), 5.2.1.877b1–8; ET mine.

87. Greek text in Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhoniae hypotyposes* 2.211, vol. 1 of *Sexti Empirici opera*, ed. H. Mutschmann (Leipzig: Teubner, 1912). ET in Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Scepticism*, trans. J. Annas and J. Barnes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 125.

88. Greek text in *Anonymer Kommentar zu Platons Theaetet*, ed. H. Diels and W. Schubart, Berliner Klassikertexte 2 (Berlin: Weidman, 1905). ET and reprint of the Greek text in A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 1:99 and 2:102.

CHAPTER 5

1. For an account of Eunomius's career, see R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 611–617.

2. Ibid., 618.

3. F. Diekamp, "Literargeschichtliches zur Eunomianischen Kontroverse," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 18 (1909): 1–13 and 190–194.

4. Gerhard May, "Die Chronologie des Lebens und der Werke des Gregor von Nyssa," in *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse: Actes du Colloque de Chevetogne (22–26 septembre 1969)*, ed. Marguerite Harl (Leiden: Brill, 1971)," 57, 60. Hanson agrees to these dates (*Search for the Christian Doctrine*, 717–718).

5. Jan van Parys, *Grégoire de Nysse, Refutation de la profession de foi d'Eunome* (Ph.D. diss., University of Paris-Sorbonne, 1968), 1:170.

6. Hanson, *Search for the Christian Doctrine*, 718.

7. *Adv. Prax.* 9. ET in Tertullian, *Treatise against Praxeas*, ed., trans. and with commentary by Ernest Evans (London: SPCK, 1948), 140–141.

8. Peter Widdicombe, *The Fatherhood of God from Origen to Athanasius* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).

9. Irénée Chevalier, *S. Augustin et la pensée grecque. Les relations trinitaires* (Fribourg: Librarie de l'Université, 1940), esp. 106–163. See also R. Arnou, "Arius et la doctrine des relations trinitaires," *Gregorianum* 14 (1933): 269–272; and A. Michel, "Relations divines," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (Paris: printed for Letouzey et Ané, 1937) cols. 2135–2156.

10. For arguments in favor of Gregory's use of Origen's *De principiis* and Athanasius's *Contra gentes* and *De incarnatione* in his *Oratio catechetica*, see Reinhard Jakob Kees, *Die Lehre von der Oikonomia Gottes in der "Oratio catechetica" Gregors von Nyssa* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 69–90. Cf. David L. Balás, ΜΕΤΟΥΣΙΑ ΘΕΟΥ*: Man's Participation in God's Perfections according to St. Gregory of Nyssa* (Rome: "IBC" Libreria Herder, 1966), 11ff.; Hubert Merki, Ὁμοίωσις θεῷ. *Von den platonischen Angleichung an Gott zur Gottähnlichkeit bei Gregor von Nyssa* (Fribourg: Paulsdruck, 1952), 156–157; Reinhard M. Hübner, *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa: Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der 'physischen' Erlösunglehre* (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 144ff.

11. Cf. Origen, *Dialogue with Heraclides* 4.

12. *Cat.* 7b15, *Metaph.* 5.15.

13. Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 69 n. 21. Cf. the influence of John 15:15 on Origen (*ibid.*, 95).

14. See, for example, *Princ.* 1.2.9 and *Comm. Gen.* (in Eusebius, *Contra Marcellum* I.4, GCS 14, p. 22, 11–18): καλὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα τοιούτου υἱοῦ.

15. Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 90ff., and Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1987), 139ff.

16. Athanasius, *De sententia Dionysii* 15, in Hans-Georg Opitz, ed., *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites, 318–328* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1941) 57.14–16.

17. For a detailed discussion of these issues, see Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*,

128–144; Williams, *Arius*, 155ff. Cf. Arnou, "Arius et la doctrine de relations trinitaires."

18. For the chronology, see Williams, *Arius*, 58–59.

19. Opitz, *Urkunden* 6.13.10–13; ET in Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 143.

20. Opitz, *Urkunden* 14.24.3–6; ET in Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 132ff.

21. Opitz, *Urkunden* 1.2.1–2; ET in Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 133.

22. Arnou, "Arius et la doctrine de relations trinitaires," 270.

23. Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 131ff.

24. This was presented in chapter 2.

25. Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 132.

26. Opitz, *Urkunden* 14.23.32–42.1.

27. Opitz, *Urkunden* 14.24.3–6; Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 133; Williams, *Arius*, 155.

28. Rowan Williams, "The Logic of Arianism," *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., 34 (1983): 61.

29. Opitz, *Urkunden* 3.4.4–6.

30. See Opitz, *Urkunden* 4.7.19–20; *C. Ar.* 1.5–6 (PG 26:21A) and 1.9 (PG 26: 29A–B); *De decretis* (Opitz, *Urkunden* 5.23–26), *Ad Episcopos Aegypti* 12 (PG 25:564B). Quoted in Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 160.

31. Williams, *Arius*, 104.

32. *De decretis* 6; Opitz, *Urkunden* 5.23–24. See Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 163–164.

33. Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 167.

34. PG 26:80B. ET in Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 167.

35. See *C. Ar.* 1.29; PG 26:72B.

36. *C. Ar.* 1.21; PG 26:56C.

37. *C. Ar.* 1.21: PG 26:57A.

38. *C. Ar.* 1.28; PG 26:72A.

39. *C. Ar.* 1.28 and 3.59–67. Cf. Origen, *Princ.* 2.9 and *Comm. Gen.* (the fragment preserved by Eusebius of Caesarea mentioned above).

40. In *C. Ar.* 3.59–67, Athanasius elaborates on this. Cf. John 5:20 quoted in PG 26:461C. Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 184, 186, 206–207.

41. Cf. Mark 1:11: "This is the Son in whom I am pleased" (PG 26:461B).

42. *C. Ar.* 1.20; 1.38; 2.56; 2.82.

43. Although Chevalier's thesis that Augustine knew the Greek fathers very well is less compelling, his analysis of Basil of Caesarea's theory of relations is still useful to map out one's route through the Basilian texts (see Chevalier, *S. Augustin et la pensée grecque*, 129–140). Nevertheless, some of Chevalier's quotations from Basil are unreliable.

44. Basil, *AE* 1.5: 516d–517a; ET mine, following the critical text established in Basil of Caesarea, *Contre Eunome suivi de Eunome, "Apologie,"* trans. and with commentary by Bernard Sesboüé, Georges-Matthieu de Durand, and Louis Doutreleau, 2 vols., SC 299, 305 (Paris: Cerf, 1982, 1983). *AE* was completed in 364, at the beginning of Basil's theological activity (see Lucian Turcescu, "*Prosōpon* and *Hypostasis* in

Basil of Caesarea's *Against Eunomius* and the Epistles," *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, no. 4 (1997): 374–375).

45. Wrongly translated by Sesboüé as "Le vocable Père a le même *sens* que celui d'inengendré" (SC 299:177) and by Stuart George Hall as "Father and unbegotten have the same *meaning*" (*CE* 1.553); emphases mine.

46. Eunomius, *Apologia Apologiae,* quoted by Gregory of Nyssa, *CE* 1.552: τὰ δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχοντα δύναμιν τῶν ὀνομάτων ταὐτὸν πάντως καὶ σημαίνειν πέφυκε.

47. *CE* 1.553.

48. Stead notices that Plato's unwritten doctrines seem to have contained a primitive categorical theory: Realities are divided into Absolutes, Opposites, and Relatives (Simplicius, *In Phys.* 247.30–248.1; Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 10.263–265). Stead suggests that even if Aristotle's theory of categories is quite different from Plato's, the latter may shed some light on the origin of Aristotle's own theory (Christopher Stead, *Divine Substance* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1977], 53).

49. See chapter 2 above and Bernard Sesboüé, introduction to *AE* (SC 299: 81ff.).

50. *AE* 2.10:589c.

51. *AE* 2.22:621b.

52. *AE* 1.12:540.

53. *AE* 2.28:637b–c.

54. *Spir.* 6.14:88b. Basil of Caesarea, *Sur le Saint-Esprit,* rev. ed., ed. Benoît Pruche, SC 17 (Paris: Cerf, 1968), 288–289; ET mine.

55. ET of *CE* 1 (GNO 1, pp. 1–225) by Stuart George Hall, in *El "Contra Eunomium I" en la produccion literaria de Gregorio de Nisa,* Sixth International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa, ed. Lucas F. Mateo-Seco and Juan L. Bastero (Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 1988), 19–135. For the rest of *CE* and *Ref.,* I use the ET provided in NPNF 2.5, trans. William Moore and Henry A. Wilson (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1893), 101–314. I have altered both translations when they do not reflect the critical edition of Jaeger. Perhaps the handiest referencing format will be the following: In *CE* 2.145, for example, "2" indicates the second book of *Contra Eunomium* and "145" the passage number in that particular book, according to the Jaeger edition. In the case of the third book of *CE,* the reference will have the format *CE* 3.2.57, where "2" indicates the second tome of the third book, and "57" the passage number in that particular tome, according to the Jaeger edition. As for the *Refutation*: In *Ref.* 55, for example, "55" represents the passage number in the Jaeger edition.

56. *CE* 1.156.

57. *CE* 1.159.

58. Εὐσέβεια is a polysemantic word in Gregory's writings, meaning "piety," "right faith" (hence "orthodoxy"), "faithfulness to the tradition," and even "truth." See J. Ibañez and F. Mendoza, "Naturaleza de la 'eusebeia' en Gregorio de Nisa," in *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie: Zweites Internationales Kolloquium über Gregor von Nyssa (Freckenhorst bei Münster, 18–23 September 1972),* ed. Heinrich Dörrie et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 261–277).

59. Basil, *AE* 1.5.63–75 (516d–517a), quoted by Gregory in *CE* 1.548; cf. *CE* 1.558.

60. The allusion is to the passage quoted earlier from Basil, *AE* 1.5 (516d–517a).

61. Quoted in Gregory of Nyssa, *CE* 1.552.

62. *CE* 1.553.

63. *CE* 1.554.

64. *CE* 1.555.

65. *CE* 1.556.

66. *CE* 1.563–565.

67. *CE* 1.568. At *CE* 2.130, 145–148, 283, Gregory exposes his understanding of religious language and the hermeneutical principles undergirding his exegesis. He believes that the "names" revealed in Scripture about God complement the dim and imperfect comprehension of the divine nature that reason supplies us with (*CE* 2.130). For a recent discussion of Gregory's understanding of religious language, see Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 140–143. Nevertheless, I disagree with her statement that "the terms used 'relatively' are invariably those that relate to the *oikonomia*, to God's relationship with the world" (p. 143). As one can see here, Gregory endeavors to convince Eunomius that names such as "Father" and "Son," which refer to the *theologia*, that is, God's intra-Trinitarian life, are relative names also.

68. *CE* 1.570.

69. *CE* 1.571.

70. *CE* 1.571; NPNF 2.5:119–120.

71. *CE* 1.571.

72. See my discussion of the issue in chapter 2.

73. *CE* 1.572–573.

74. See esp. Origen, *Comm. Jo.* 32, *Cels.* 3.28.56, *On Prayer* 20, etc., and their thorough analysis in Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 93–118.

75. *Ref.* 6; NPNF 2.5:102.

76. *Ref.* 6; NPNF 2.5:102.

77. For a detailed analysis of Gregory's interpretation of Matt 28:19 and its patristic antecedents, see Michel J. van Parys, "Exégèse et théologie dans les livres *Contre Eunome* de Grégoire de Nysse: textes scripturaires controversés et élaboration théologique," in *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse: Actes du colloque de Chevetogne (22–26 septembre 1969)*, ed. Marguerite Harl (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 186–192.

78. *Ref.* 16, NPNF 2.5:103: φανερὸν γὰρ ὅτι ἡ τοῦ πατρὸς κλῆσις οὐκ οὐσίας ἐστὶ παραστατική, ἀλλὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν σχέσιν ἀποσημαίνει. This should not make us label the Cappadocian notion of relation as either nonsubsistent or subsistent relation, because this was not the case. Stead thinks that questions related to distinctions between God's substance and his properties were not clearly formulated by the Christian writers of the fourth century (cf. Stead, *Divine Substance*, 164–166). On the one hand, although arguing that God is completely simple, has no "accidents," and needs nothing to complete his substance, which is incomprehensible (*De decretis* 22), Athanasius still suggests a variety of terms that enable us to "signify" his substance, such as "God and Father and Lord." On the other hand, the Anomoeans contend that "ungeneratedness" is completely adequate to express the divine nature. Another Arian ar-

gument was that, since God has no accidents, everything that can be said about him belongs to his substance, and "Son" is excluded from it. The Cappadocians reply that "ungeneratedness" and "generatedness" are not internal to the substance of God but are distinguishing properties (ἰδιώματα). In Aristotelian terms, they are not properties but *differentiae,* marking off individuals within a genus (Stead, *Divine Substance*, 165 n. 14).

79. *Ref.* 6, NPNF 2.5:102.

80. *Ref.* 17, NPNF 2.5:103.

81. *CE* 1.584: καλόν ἐστι νῦν καὶ τῇ μεγαλειότητι τοῦ θεοῦ πρέπον τὸ τοιούτου γενέσθαι πατέρα. Gregory's language is highly similar to Basil's (*AE* 2, p. 593 a–b, quoted by Gregory at *CE* 3.6.56: καλὸν δε τὸ τοιούτου παιδὸς εἶναι πατέρα) and Origen's (*Princ.*, 1.2.9 and *Comm. Gen.*: καλὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα τοιούτου υἱος).

82. *CE* 1.584.

83. Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 71.

84. Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 70.

85. *CE* 1.585.

86. *CE* 1.586.

87. *CE* 1.593.

88. *CE* 3.2.161; NPNF 2.5:171.

89. *CE* 3.2.164; NPNF 2.5: 171.

90. Eunomius, *Apol.* 8.1–6. Cf. Basil's refutation of the same argument in *AE* 1.5.133–137 and my discussion in "*Prosōpon* and *Hypostasis,*" 378.

91. *CE* 2.390; NPNF 2.5:289.

92. *CE* 2.216–218; NPNF 2.5:272.

93. *CE* 2.209.

94. *CE* 2.214; NPNF 2.5:271.

95. *CE* 2.214; NPNF 2.5:272: τὴν τοῦ νοητοῦ πρὸς τὸ νοητὸν διὰ τῆς ταὐτότητος τῶν θελημάτωτ ἕνωσίν τε κ αὶ ἀνάκρασιν.

96. *CE* 2.216; NPNF 2.5:272.

97. *CE* 2.216; NPNF 2.5:272: τοῦ πατρὸς ὅλον τὸ θέλημα ἐν ἑαυτῷς.

98. *CE* 2.216; NPNF 2.5:272.

99. *CE* 3.2.143; NPNF 2.5:168–169.

100. *CE* 3.2.147; NPNF 2.5:169.

101. *CE* 3.2.149–150; NPNF 2.5:169.

102. *CE* 3.6.9–11; NPNF 2.5:201.

103. *CE* 3.6.11; NPNF 2.5:201.

104. *CE* 3.6.12; NPNF 2.5:201.

105. *CE* 3.6.13–14; NPNF 2.5:202.

106. *CE* 3.6.64; NPNF 2.5:208.

107. Widdicombe, *Fatherhood of God*, 76.

108. *CE* 3.8.41; NPNF 2.5:225–226.

109. *CE* 3.8.42; NPNF 2.5:226.

110. *Ref.* 28; NPNF 2.5:105.

111. *Ref.* 28; NPNF 2.5:105.

112. *Ref.* 41; NPNF 2.5:107.

113. *Ref.* 26; NPNF 2.5:105.

114. *Ref.* 42; NPNF 2.5:107: ἔδειξε διὰ τῆς κατὰ τὴν δόξαν ταὐτότητος τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς φύσεως.

115. An earlier version of this section was published as " 'Blessed Are the Peacemakers, for They Will Be Called Sons of God': Does Gregory of Nyssa Have a Theology of Adoption?" in *Gregory of Nyssa, Homilies on the Beatitudes: An English Translation with Supporting Commentaries and Studies*, ed. Hubertus R. Drobner and Albert Viciano (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 397–406. It is reprinted here with permission from Brill Academic Publishers.

116. There are numerous places where Gregory quotes John 14:6, but in *CE* almost all of them refer to the first part of it. I am interested in the second part.

117. *CE* 1.335.

118. *CE* 3.8.52–53; NPNF 2.5:227.

119. *CE* 3.8.54; NPNF 2.5:227.

120. For a strictly christological interpretation of this verse in Gregory, see Mariette Canévet, *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique: Étude des rapports entre le langage et la connaissance de Dieu* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1983), 243.

121. See Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 29.18, and *Or.* 30.7–8.

122. Quoted in *CE* 3.10.8; NPNF 2.5:241.

123. When presenting Gregory's interpretation of John 20:17 in *CE*, van Parys fails to notice the main point of the whole argument, namely, the meaning of the name "father" (Parys, "Exégèse et théologie," 173–175). But he endeavors to trace the history of the interpretation of this verse in "the fathers" from Origen to Gregory of Nazianzus (see pp. 171–179).

124. In *Ref.* 82–83, Gregory associates John 20:17 with Rom 8:29 (Christ is the "firstborn among many brothers").

125. *CE* 3.10.10; NPNF 2.5:241.

126. *CE* 3.10.10; NPNF 2.5:241.

127. *CE* 3.10.10; NPNF 2.5:241: πατὴρ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

128. *CE* 3.10.10; NPNF 2.5:241.

129. The argument about the similarity of will with the father of sin is based on the explanations Gregory provides in *CE* 3.1.114–115, which I present in the section dealing with adoption in *CE*.

130. *CE* 3.10.11; NPNF 2.5:241.

131. *CE* 3.10.14; NPNF 2.5:241.

132. Jaeger gives διακομίσασα (conveying) and no variants in the *apparatus criticus*. The English translator in the NPNF 2.5:242 prefers to read διακονήσασα (ministering). His argument that διακομίσασα is a misprint of διακονήσασα is quite persuasive, given that Gregory uses "minister" in reference to Mary on the same page.

133. *CE* 3.10.16; NPNF 2.5:242.

134. *CE* 3.1.114–115; NPNF 2.5:148.

135. *CE* 3.1.116; NPNF 2.5:148.

136. *CE* 3.1.117; NPNF 2.5:148.

137. *CE* 3.1.118; NPNF 2.5:148.

138. He produces a similar argument about lower and higher natures in *Ad Ablabium* 41.18–42.3.

139. *CE* 3.1.122; NPNF 2.5:149.

140. See Jean Daniélou, "La notion de confins (*methorios*) chez Grégoire de Nysse," *Recherches de science religieuse* 49 (1961): 161–187. See also Maria C. Pacheco, *S. Gregório de Nissa: Criação e tempo* (Braga: Faculdade de Filosofia, 1983), 193–215. For discussions of human freedom in Gregory of Nyssa, see Jérome Gaïth, *La conception de la liberté chez Grégoire de Nysse* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1953); David Amand, *Fatalisme et liberté dans l'antiquité grecque* (Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'université, 1945), 418–435; Verna Harrison, *Grace and Human Freedom according to St. Gregory of Nyssa* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992); Albrecht Dihle, *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 119–122.

141. *CE* 3.1.122; NPNF 2.5:149.

142. *CE* 3.1.123: διὰ τῆς πνευματικῆς γεννήσεως.

143. *CE* 3.1.123; NPNF 2.5:149.

144. *De perfectione*, GNO 8.1:205, 14–21.

145. *CE* 3.1.123–124; NPNF 2.5:149.

146. *CE* 3.1.125; NPNF 2.5:149.

147. Plotinus, *Enn.* VI.8.9.45–46. I deal with the Plotinian will of the One and its influence on Gregory of Nyssa in chapter 2.

148. *CE* 3.5.3; NPNF 2.5:191.

149. *Ref.* 55; NPNF 2.5:109.

150. *Beatit.* 7, GNO 7.2:151, 28. (ed. John F. Callahan [Leiden: Brill, 1992]).

151. *Beatit.* 7; GNO 7.2:149, 15–16.

152. *Beatit.* 7; GNO 7.2:159, 12–15.

153. *Beatit.* 7; GNO 7.2:149, 16–19.

154. *CE* 3.1.123.

155. *CE* 3.5.3.

156. *CE* 3.2.19; NPNF 2.5:154.

157. *CE* 2.419; NPNF 2.5:292.

158. Verna E. F. Harrison, "Gender, Generation, and Virginity in Cappadocian Theology," *Journal of Theological Studies,* n.s., 47 (1996): 39–41; and Harrison, "Male and Female in the Cappadocian Theology," *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., 41 (1990): 441–471.

159. GNO 6:212–213; ET in Gregory of Nyssa, *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, trans. Casimir McCambley (Brookline, Mass.: Hellenic College Press, 1987), 145–146.

160. GNO 6:56 and 183.

161. Harrison, "Gender, Generation, and Virginity," 40.

162. *De perfectione*, GNO 8.1:205.

163. GNO 6:20–23; McCambley, 46–47.

164. GNO 6:468–469; McCambley, 276.

165. For a discussion of the paradisial state of Adam and the division of sexes in Gregory of Nyssa, see Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual*

Renunciation in Early Christianity (New York: Columbia Universiy Press, 1988), 293–297.

166. *Ref.* 5; NPNF 2.5:102.

167. Harrison, "Gender, Generation, and Virginity," 41.

168. See, for example, Andrew Louth, "They Speak to Us across the Centuries. 4. St Maximos the Confessor," *Expository Times* 109, no. 4 (January 1998): 103.

169. G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought*, 2nd ed. (London: SPCK, 1952), 245.

170. Alexander of Aphrodisias, *In Aristotelis topicorum libros octo commentaria*, ed. M. Wallies, CAG 2.2 (Berlin: Reimer, 1891), 179.7 and 295.7; Alexander, *In Aristotelis analyticorum priorum librum i commentarium*, ed. M. Wallies, CAG 2.1 (Berlin: Reimer, 1883), 197.2. The fourth occurrence is in Alexander, *In Aristotelis Metaphysica commentaria*, ed. M. Hayduck, CAG 1 (Berlin: Reimer, 1891), 725.7.

171. Themistius Constantinopolitanus, *Quae fertur in Aristotelis Analyticorum priorum librum i paraphrasis*, ed. M. Wallies, CAG 23.3 (Berlin: Reimer, 1884), 29.30.

172. Risch enforces my suggestion by asserting that, at least terminologically, the phrase under consideration may come from Alexander of Aphrodisias (e.g., *In Aristotelis Topicorum* 295.6–7, ed. Wallies) and Dexippus, *In Aristotelis Categorias commentarium*, ed. Adolf Busse, CAG 4.2 (Berlin: Reimer, 1888), 40.28–41.3. (Franz Xaver Risch, "Kommentar," in Pseudo-Basil, *Adversus Eunomium IV–V*, trans. and with introduction and commentary by Franz Xaver Risch [Leiden: Brill, 1992], 129–130). The text from Dexippus does not contain the phrase under scrutiny.

173. On Themistius, see Everett Ferguson, "Themistius," in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, 2nd ed., ed. Everett Ferguson et al. (New York: Garland, 1997), 1113; Clifford Ando, "Pagan Apologetics and Christian Intolerance in the Ages of Themistius and Augustine," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4 (Summer 1996): 171–207.

174. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought*, 245–249.

175. *Ep.* 35.2 (Courtonne 3:45; ET in Deferrari, 3:379, slightly modified).

176. PG 31:613a–b.

177. *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.46.8 (SC 17:195).

178. *AE* 1.15.548a–b.

179. *AE* 1.15.545b. See also the discussion of *AE* 1.15 in Turcescu, "*Prosōpon* and *Hypostasis*," 378. A similar treatment of "ungeneratedness" as a "mode of existence" can be found in Pseudo-Basil, *AE* 5 (PG 29:681; cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th ed. [San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978], 266).

180. *CE* 1.496–497.

181. *CE* 3.2.42; NPNF 2.5:157.

182. For the meaning of the phrase in the Greek theology, see the entry on ὕπαρξις in *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961), which was obviously written by G. L. Prestige and reflects his treatment of the topic in *God in Patristic Thought*, 245–249.

CHAPTER 6

1. References to the Greek text are from *De Spiritu Sancto, Adversus Macedonianos Pneumatomachi* in GNO, vol. 3, part 1, ed. Friedrich Müller (Leiden: Brill, 1958),

89–115. I consulted Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Holy Spirit: Against the Followers of Macedonius*, trans. H. A. Wilson, NPNF 2.5 (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1893), 315–325; however, since the latter predates the critical edition prepared by Müller, I have not relied entirely on it. A more recent English translation of *Adv. Macedonianos* 19–26 (GNO 3.1.105.19–110.23) can be found in Anthony Meredith, *Gregory of Nyssa* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 39–46.

2. Gerhard May, "Die Chronologie des Lebens und der Werke des Gregor von Nyssa," in *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse: Actes du Colloque de Chevetogne (22–26 septembre 1969)*, ed. Marguerite Harl (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 59; Jean Daniélou, "La chronologie des oeuvres de Grégoire de Nysse," *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966): 163.

3. Meredith, *Gregory of Nyssa*, 38.

4. *Adv. Macedonianos* 89.24–25.

5. *Adv. Macedonianos* 90.4–5.

6. *Adv. Macedonianos* 90.7.

7. See Gregory's *Ad Graecos* for the meaning of these "common notions."

8. Cf. Aristotle: "Of species . . . no one is more truly substance than another" (*Cat.* 2b23–24).

9. See Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio 29 (De Filio)*, 2.22–23: τὸ ἀγέννητον εἰσάγομεν, καὶ τὸ γεννητόν, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον (ed. J. Barbel, Dusseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1963).

10. Cf. Gregory, *Adv. Macedonianos* 100.19–20: διαφορὰ κατὰ τάξιν καὶ ὑπόστασιν.

11. Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *CE* 1.1.421. In chapter 4 I tried to trace some of the philosophical sources for Gregory's definition of human nature.

12. 1 Cor 12.3 (cf. Mark 9.39 and 1 John 4.2–3).

13. In *CE* 3.1.121, Gregory speaks of human nature as a borderland between virtue and vice.

14. Basil too uses similar ideas, as seen in his *De Spiritu Sancto* 9.23 and 18.47. See also Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Eustat.* 13.11–21.

15. In n. 36 of his translation of *Adv. Macedonianos*, Meredith notices that the idea that "co-worship" implies the inseparability and equality of the three persons is also encountered in Athanasius of Alexandria, *Letter 1 to Serapion*, 18–20; and Basil of Caesarea, *De Spiritu Sancto* 26, 64.

This page intentionally left blank

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

GREGORY OF NYSSA

Ad Ablabium Quod non sint tres dei in GNO, vol. 3, part 1, ed. Friedrich Müller (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 35–58. An English translation prior to Müller's critical edition can be found in *On "Not Three Gods": To Eustathius,* trans. H. A. Wilson, NPNF 2.5 (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1893), 331–336.

Ad Eustathium de sancta Trinitate in GNO, vol. 3, part 1, ed. Friedrich Müller (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 1–16. An English translation prior to Müller's critical edition can be found in *On the Holy Trinity, and of the Godhead of the Holy Spirit: To Eustathius,* trans. H. A. Wilson, NPNF 2.5 (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1893), 326–330.

Ad Graecos (ex communibus notionibus) in GNO, vol. 3, part 1, ed. Friedrich Müller (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 17–34. English translation: "*Ad Graecos*: How It Is That We Say There Are Three Persons in the Divinity but Do Not Say That There Are Three Gods (To the Greeks: Concerning the Commonality of Concepts)," trans. Daniel F. Stramara, Jr., *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 41, no. 4 (1996): 381–391. German translation: "Die Schrift *Ex communibus notionibus* des Gregor von Nyssa," trans. and with commentary by Herman J. Vogt, in *Theologische Quartalschrift* 171 (1991): 204–218.

Ad Petrum fratrem de differentia usiae et hypostaseos in Saint Basile, *Lettres,* ed. and trans. Yves Courtonne, vol. 1 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1957), 81–92. An unreliable English translation can be found in Basil, *The Letters,* trans. Roy J. Deferrari (London: W. Heinemann, 1926), 1:196–226.

Contra Eunomium Libri in GNO, vols. 1–2, ed. Werner Jaeger (Leiden: Brill,

1960). An English translation of the whole work predating Jaeger's critical edition can be found in *Select Writings and Letters of Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa,* NPNF, 2nd series, vol. 5 (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1893), 33–315. A more recent English translation is *Contra Eunomium I,* trans. Stuart George Hall, in *El "Contra Eunomium I" en la produccion literaria de Gregorio de Nisa,* Sixth International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa, ed. Lucas F. Mateo-Seco and Juan L. Bastero (Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 1988), 21–135. Italian translation: *Teologia trinitaria. Contro Eunomio. Confutazione della Professione di fede di Eunomio,* trans. Claudio Moreschini (Milan: Rusconi, 1994).

De beatitudinibus in GNO, vol. 7, part 2, ed. John F. Callahan. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

De Spiritu Sancto, Adversus Macedonianos Pneumatomachi in GNO, vol. 3, part 1, ed. Friedrich Müller (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 89–115. An English translation is *On the Holy Spirit: Against the Followers of Macedonius,* trans. H. A. Wilson in NPNF, 2nd series, vol. 5 (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1893), 315–325. A more recent English translation of *Adversus Macedonianos* 19–26 (GNO 3.1.105.19–110.23) only can be found in Anthony Meredith, *Gregory of Nyssa* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 39–46.

OTHER WORKS BY GREGORY OF NYSSA ARE IN:

Jaeger, Werner, et al., eds. GNO. Leiden: Brill, 1958–.

Migne, J. P., ed. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca,* vols. 44–46. Paris, 1858.

BASIL OF CAESAREA

Briefe. Translated and with commentary by Wolf-Dieter Hauschild. 3 vols. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1973, 1990, 1993.

Contre Eunome suivi de Eunome, "Apologie." Translated and with commentary by Bernard Sesboüé, Georges-Matthieu de Durand, and Louis Doutreleau. 2 vols. SC 299, 305. Paris: Cerf, 1982.

Homélies sur l'Hexaéméron. Edited by Stanislas Giet. 2nd ed. SC 26 bis. Paris: Cerf, 1968.

Homilien zum Hexaemeron. Edited by E. Amand de Mendieta and Stig Y. Rudberg. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997.

The Letters. Translated by Roy J. Deferrari. 4 vols. London: W. Heinemann, 1926, 1928, 1930, 1934.

Lettres. Edited and translated by Yves Courtonne. 3 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1957, 1961, 1966.

Pseudo-Basil. *Adversus Eunomium IV–V.* Translated and with introduction and commentary by Franz Xaver Risch. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Sur le Saint-Esprit. Rev. ed. Edited by Benoît Pruche. SC 17 bis. Paris: Cerf, 1968.

GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS

Discours 27–31 (Discours théologiques). Edited and translated by Paul Gallay with the collaboration of Maurice Jourjon. SC 250. Paris: Cerf, 1978.

Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning: The Five Theological Orations of Gregory Nazianzen. Commentary by Frederick W. Norris. Translated by Lionel Wickham and Frederick Williams. Leiden: Brill, 1991.

ANCIENT AUTHORS

Alcinous (Alcinoos). *Enseignement des doctrines de Platon.* Edited and with commentary by John Whittaker. French translation by Pierre Louis. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1990.

———. *The Handbook of Platonism.* Translated and with commentary by John Dillon. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.

Alexander of Aphrodisias. *In Aristotelis Metaphysica Commentaria.* Edited by M. Hayduck. CAG 1. Berlin: Reimer, 1891.

———. *In Aristotelis Topicorum libros octo commentaria.* Edited by M. Wallies. CAG 2.2. Berlin: Reimer, 1891.

———. *De fato.* Greek text and ET in Alexander of Aphrodisias, *On Destiny: Addressed to the Emperors,* trans. A. Fitzgerald (London: Scholartis Press, 1931). Greek text also in CAG suppl. 2.2, ed. Bruns.

———. *In Aristotelis Analyticorum priorum librum i commentarium.* Edited by M. Wallies. CAG 2.1. Berlin: Reimer, 1883. Partial ET in Alexander of Aphrodisias, *On Aristotle's Prior Analytics 1.1–7,* trans. Jonathan Barnes et al. London: Duckworth, 1991.

Aristotle (Aristoteles). *Metaphysica.* Edited by W. Jaeger. Oxford: Clarendon, 1957.

———. *Categories et Liber de Interpretatione.* Edited by L. Minio-Paluello. Oxford: Clarendon, 1959.

———. *The Complete Works of Aristotle.* The revised Oxford translation. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. 2 vols. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Aristotle's "Categories" and "De Interpretatione." Translated by J. L. Ackrill. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.

Athanasius of Alexandria. *Tomus ad Antiochenos* 5 (PG 26:801 A–D). English translation in J. Stevenson, ed., *Creeds, Councils, and Controversies: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church AD 337–461,* rev. by W.H.C. Frend, 80–83. London: SPCK, 1989.

Boethius, Anicius Manlius Severinus. *Opera Omnia.* Edited by J. P. Migne. PL 63–64. Turnholt: Brepols, n.d.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De officiis.* Edited by M. Winterbottom. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. ET in Cicero, *On Moral Obligation,* trans. John Higginbotham. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Clement of Alexandria. *Le Pédagogue.* Edited by C. Mondésert and H.-I. Marrou. 2nd ed. SC 108. Paris: Cerf, 1991.

Dexippus. *In Aristotelis Categorias commentarium.* Edited by Adolf Busse. CAG 4.2. Berlin: Reimer, 1888. ET in Dexippus, *On Aristotle's Categories,* trans. John Dillon (London: Duckworth, 1990).

Eunomius. *The Extant Works.* Translated by Richard Paul Vaggione. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei.* Edited by Bonifatius Kotter. Berlin: Walter de Gruy-

ter, 1973. ET in John of Damascus, *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith,* trans. S. D. F. Salmond. NPNF 2.9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989. This translation was originally published in 1898.

Origen. *Contre Celse.* Vol. 4 (Books 7–8). Edited by Marcel Borret. SC 150. Paris: Cerf, 1969.

———. *Philocalie, 1–20, Sur les Écritures.* Edited and translated by Marguerite Harl. Published with *La Lettre à Africanus sur l'histoire de Suzanne.* Edited and translated by Nicholas de Lange. SC 302. Paris: Cerf, 1983.

———. *Commentaire sur Saint Jean.* Vol. 1 (Books 1–5). Edited by Cécile Blanc. SC 120. Paris: Cerf, 1966. ET in Origen, *Commentary on the Gospel according to John, Books 1–10,* trans. Ronald Heine. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1989.

Peter of Callinicum. *Anti-Tritheist Dossier.* Edited by Rifaat Y. Ebied, Albert van Roey, and Lionel R. Wickham. Louvain: Department Orientalistiek, 1981.

———. *Petri Callinicensis Patriarchae Antiocheni Tractatvs contra Damianvm.* Books 2 and 3. Edited by Rifaat Y. Ebied, Albert van Roey, and Lionel R. Wickham. Corpvs Christianorvm Series Graeca 29, 32, and 35. Turnhout: Brepols, 1994, 1996, and 1998.

Plotinus. *Enneads.* 7 vols. Translated by A. H. Armstrong. Loeb. 440–445, 448. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966–1988.

———. *Traité sur la liberté et la volonté de l'Un [Ennéade VI, 8 (39)].* Translated and with commentary by Georges Leroux. Paris: J. Vrin, 1990.

Porphyry. *Isagoge et In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium.* Edited by Adolf Busse. CAG 4.1. Berlin: Reimer, 1887. ET in Porphyry the Phoenician, *Isagoge,* trans. Edward W. Warren. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1975.

Pseudo-Plutarch. *Placita philosophorum.* In *Plutarchi Moralia,* edited by Jürgen Mau. Vol. 5.2.1. Leipzig: Teubner, 1971.

Sextus Empiricus. *Adversus mathematicos.* Greek text and ET in Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Logicians,* trans. R. G. Bury. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.

———. *Pyrrhoniae hypotyposes.* Vol. 1 of *Sexti Empirici opera.* Edited by H. Mutschmann. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. ET in Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Scepticism,* trans. J. Annas and J. Barnes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Simplicius of Cilicia. *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium.* Edited by Carol Kalbfleisch, CAG 8. Berlin: Reimer, 1907.

Socrates Scholasticus. *The Ecclesiastical History.* Translated by A. C. Zenos. NPNF 2.2. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1890.

Tertullian. *Treatise against Praxeas.* Edited, translated, and with commentary by Ernest Evans. London: SPCK, 1948.

Themistius Constantinopolitanus. *Quae fertur in Aristotelis Analyticorum priorum librum i paraphrasis.* Edited by M. Wallies. CAG 23.3. Berlin: Reimer, 1884.

MODERN AUTHORS

Abramowski, Luise. "Trinitarische und christologische Hypostasenformeln." *Theologie und Philosophie* 54 (1979): 38–49.

Amand, David. *Fatalisme et liberté dans l'antiquité grecque*. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'université, 1945.

"Ammonius Hermiae." In *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumwissenschaft* Vol. 1, part 2. Cols. 1863–1865. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche, 1894.

Anastos, Milton V. "Basil's Κατὰ Εὐνομίου." In *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium,* edited by Paul J. Fedwick, 1: 67–136. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981.

Ando, Clifford. "Pagan Apologetics and Christian Intolerance in the Ages of Themistius and Augustine." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4 (Summer 1996): 171–207.

Andresen, Carl. "Zur Entstehung und Geschichte der trinitarischen Personbegriffes." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 52 (1961): 1–39.

Apostolopoulos, Charalambos. *Phaedo Christianus: Studien zur Verbindung und Abwägung des Verhältnisses zwischen dem platonischen Phaidon und dem Dialog Gregors von Nyssa "Über die Seele und die Auferstehung."* Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1986.

Armstrong, A. H., ed. *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

———. "Form, Individual, and Person in Plotinus." *Dionysius* 1 (1977): 49–68.

———. "Two Views of Freedom." *Studia Patristica* 18 (1982): 397–406.

Arnou, R. "Arius et la doctrine des relations trinitaires." *Gregorianum* 14 (1933): 269–272.

Balás, David L. ΜΕΤΟΥΣΙΑ ΘΕΟΥ*: Man's Participation in God's Perfections according to St. Gregory of Nyssa*. Rome: "IBC" Libreria Herder, 1966.

———. "The Unity of Human Nature in Basil's and Gregory of Nyssa's Polemics against Eunomius." *Studia Patristica* 14 (1976): 275–281.

———. "*Plenitudo humanitatis*: The Unity of Human Nature in the Theology of Gregory of Nyssa." In *Disciplina nostra: Essays in Memory of Robert F. Evans,* edited by Donald F. Winslow, 115–131. Cambridge, Mass.: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979.

———. "Gregor von Nyssa (331/340–ca. 395)." In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 14:173–181. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985.

Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *Presence and Thought: Essay on the Religious Philosophy of Gregory of Nyssa*. Translated by Mark Sebanc. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1995.

Barnes, Michel René. "Δύναμις" and the Anti-Monistic Ontology of Nyssen's *Contra Eunomium*." In *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments,* edited by Robert C. Gregg, 327–334. Cambridge, Mass.: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1985.

———. "The Background and Use of Eunomius' Causal Language." In *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts,* edited by Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams, 217–236. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.

———. "De Régnon Reconsidered." *Augustinian Studies* 26, no. 2 (1995): 51–79.

———. "The Power of God: Δύναμις." In *Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Theology*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2001.

Barnes, Michel R., and Daniel H. Williams, eds. *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.

Barnes, Timothy D. *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics*. 4 vols. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1956–1975.

Bebis, George S. "Gregory of Nyssa's *De vita Moysis*: A Philosophical and Theological Analysis." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 12, no. 3 (1967): 369–393.

Berardino, Angelo di, ed. *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*. Translated by A. Waldorf. 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Bergjan, Silke-Petra. *Theodoret von Cyrus und der Neunizänismus: Aspekte der altkirchlichen Trinitätslehre*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994.

Berthold, George C. "The Cappadocian Roots of Maximus the Confessor." In *Maximus Confessor: Actes du symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur. Fribourg, 2–5 septembre 1980,* edited by Felix Heinzer and Christoph Schönborn, 51–59. Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1982.

Biblia patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique. Vol. 5, *Basile de Césarée, Grégoire de Nazianze, Grégoire de Nysse, Amphiloque d'Iconium*. Produced by the Centre d'analyse et de documentation patristiques. Paris: Centre Nationale de Recherche Scientifique, 1991.

Blumenthal, H. J. "Did Plotinus Believe in Ideas of Individuals?" *Phronesis* 11 (1966): 61–80.

———. *Plotinus' Psychology: His Doctrine of the Embodied Soul*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1971.

Boff, Leonardo. *Trinity and Society*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1988.

Böhm, Thomas. *Theoria, Undendlichkeit, Aufstieg: Philosophische Implikationen zu 'De Vita Moysis' von Gregor von Nyssa*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Borst, Arno, *Medieval Worlds: Barbarians, Heretics, and Artists in the Middle Ages*. Translated by E. Hansen. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Bradley, James E., and Richard Muller. *Church History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works, and Methods*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Brennecke, Hans Christof. "Erwägungen zu den Anfängen des Neunizänismus." In *Oecumenica et patristica: Festschrift für Wilhelm Schneemelcher zum 75. Geburtstag,* edited by. Damaskinos Papandreou, Wolfgang A. Bienert, and Knut Schaferdiek, 241–257. Chambesy: Metropolie der Schweiz, 1989.

Brown, Peter. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

Burrus, Virginia. *"Begotten, Not Made": Conceiving Manhood in Late Antiquity*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Canévet, Mariette. *Grégoire de Nysse et l'herméneutique biblique: Étude des rapports entre le langage et la connaissance de Dieu*. Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1983.

Cavallin, Anders. *Studien zu den Briefen des Hl. Basilius*. Lund: Gleerupska Universitetsbokhandeln, 1944.

Cavarnos, Constantine. *The Classical Theory of Relations: A Study in the Metaphysics of Plato, Aristotle, and Thomism*. Belmont, Mass.: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1975.

Cavarnos, John P. "Gregory of Nyssa on the Nature of the Soul." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 1, no. 2 (1955): 133–141.

Cherniss, Harold Frederick. *The Platonism of Gregory of Nyssa*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1930.

Chevalier, Irénée. *S. Augustin et la pensée grecque: Les relations trinitaires*. Fribourg: Librarie de l'Université, 1940.

Coakley, Sarah. "Why Three? Some Further Reflections on the Origins of the Doctrine of the Trinity." In *The Making and Remaking of Christian Doctrine,* edited by S. Coakley and D. A. Pailin, 35–36. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Collins, Paul M. *Trinitarian Theology: West and East: Karl Barth, the Cappadocian Fathers, and John Zizioulas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Cross, F. L., ed. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 3rd ed., edited by Elizabeth Livingstone. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Crouzel, Henri. *Origen: The Life and Thought of the First Great Theologian*. Translated by A. S. Worrall. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989.

Daley, Brian E. ' "A Richer Union': Leontius of Byzantium and the Relationship of Human and Divine in Christ." *Studia Patristica* 24 (1993): 239–265.

Daniélou, Jean. *Platonisme et théologie mystique: essai sur la doctrine spirituelle de saint Grégoire de Nysse*. Aubier, France: Montaigne, 1944.

———. Review of *Gregorii Nysseni Opera dogmatica minora I,* edited by F. Müller, *Gnomon* 31 (1959): 612–615.

———. "La notion de confins (*methorios*) chez Gregoire de Nysse." *Recherches de science religieuse* 49 (1961): 161–187.

———. "Le Symbole de la Caverne chez Grégoire de Nysse." In *Mullus: Festschrift T. Klauser,* edited by A. Stuiber and A. Herman. Münster: Aschendorff, 1964.

———. "La chronologie des oeuvres de Grégoire de Nysse." *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966): 159–169.

———. "L'Adversus Arium et Sabellium de Grégoire de Nysse et l'origènisme Cappadocien." *Recherches de Science Religieuses* 54, no. 1 (1966): 61–66.

Davis, Stephen T., Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O'Collins, eds. *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Desalvo, Claudia. *L' "oltre" nel presente: La filosofia dell'uomo in Gregorio di Nissa*. Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1996.

Dihle, Albrecht. *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

Dillon, John M. *The Middle Platonists, 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. 2nd ed. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Dörrie, Heinrich. "Ὑπόστασις: Wort- und Bedeutungsgeschichte." 1955. Reprinted in H. Dörrie, *Platonica Minora* (Munich: W. Fink, 1976).

———. "Gregor III (Gregor von Nyssa)." In *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum,* vol. 12, cols. 863–895. Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1983.

Dörrie, Heinrich, Margarete Altenburger, and Uta Schram, eds. *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie: Zweites Internationales Kolloquium über Gregor von Nyssa (Freckenhorst bei Münster, 18–23 September 1972)*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Dörries, Hermann. *De Spiritu Sancto: Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluß der trinitarischen Dogmas*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.

———. "Griechentum und Christentum bei Gregor von Nyssa." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 88 (August 1963): 569–582.

Drecoll, Volker Henning. *Die Entwicklung der Trinitätslehre des Basilius von Cäsarea: Sein Weg vom Homöusianer zum Neonizäner*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Drobner, Hubertus R. *Person-Exegese und Christologie bei Augustinus: Zur Herkunft der Formel "Una Persona."* Leiden: Brill, 1986.

———. "Gregory of Nyssa as Philosopher: *De anima et resurrectione* and *De hominis opificio*." *Dionysius* 18 (December 2000): 69–102.

Drobner, Hubertus R., and Christoph Klock, eds. *Studien zu Gregor von Nyssa und der christlichen Spätantike*. Leiden: Brill, 1990.

Einsenberger, Herbert, ed. *Hermeneumata: Festschrift für Hadwig Hörner*. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1990.

Eysenck, H. J., W. Arnold, and R. Meili, eds. *Encyclopedia of Psychology*. New York: Herder, 1972.

Fedwick, Paul J. "A Commentary of Gregory of Nyssa or the 38th Letter of Basil of Caesarea." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 44 (1978): 31–51.

———. *The Church and the Charisma of Leadership in Basil of Caesarea*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1979.

———. "Abbreviations: 1. The Works of Basil of Caesarea." In *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium,* edited by Paul J. Fedwick, 1:xix–xxxi. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981.

———. "A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea." In *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium,* edited by Paul J. Fedwick, 1:3–19. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981.

———. *Bibliotheca Basiliana Vniversalis: A Study of the Manuscript Tradition of the Works of Basil of Caesarea,* 1.2.1–2. Turnhout: Brepols, 1993.

Ferguson, Everett, et al., eds. *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. New York: Garland, 1997.

Florovsky, Georges. *Aspects of Church History*. Vol. 4 of *Collected Works,* edited by Richard S. Haugh. Vaduz: Büchervertriebanstalt, 1987.

Frede, Michael. *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Gain, Benoît. *Traductions latines de Pères grecs: La collection du manuscrit Laurentianus San Marco 584. Editions des lettres de Basile de Césarée*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1994.

Gaïth, Jérome. *La conception de la liberté chez Grégoire de Nysse*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1953.

Gerson, Lloyd P. *Plotinus*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Gill, Christopher, ed. *The Person and the Human Mind: Issues in Ancient and Modern Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

———. "Is There a Concept of Person in Greek Philosophy?" In *Psychology*, edited by Steven Everson, 166–193. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Glucker, John. "The Origin of ὑπάρχω and ὕπαρξις as Philosophical Terms." In *Hyparxis e Hypostasis nel Neoplatonismo: Atti del I Colloquio Internazionale del Centro di Ricerca sul Neoplatonismo (Università degli Studi di Catania, 1–3 ottobre 1992)*, edited by F. Romano and D. P. Taormina, 1–23. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1994.

Gnilka, Christian. ΧΡΗΣΙΣ. *Die Methode der Kirchenväter im Umgang mit der antiken Kultur. I: Der Begriff des "rechten Gebrauchs."* Basel: Verlag Schwabe, 1984.

Goldschmidt, Victor. "Ὑπάρχειν et ὑφιστάναι dans la philosophie stoïcienne." *Revue des études grecques* 85 (1972): 336–340.

González, Severino. *La formula* ΜΙΑ ΟΥΣΙΑ ΤΡΕΙΣ ΥΠΟΣΤΑΣΕΙΣ *en san Gregorio de Nisa*. Rome: Gregorianum, 1939.

Gribomont, Jean. "Intransigence and Irenicism in Saint Basil's 'De Spiritu Sancto,' " *Word and Spirit* 1 (1979): 109–136.

Grillmeier, Aloys. "Das Scandalum oecumenicum des Nestorius in kirchlich-dogmatischer und theologiegeschichtlicher Sicht." *Scholastik* 36 (1961): 321–356.

Grube, George M. A. *Plato's Thought*. London: Methuen, 1935.

Gunton, Colin E. *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.

Halleux, André de. " 'Hypostase' et 'personne' dans la formation du dogme trinitaire (ca. 375–381)." *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 79 (1984): 313–369, 625–670.

———. "Personnalisme ou essentialisme trinitaire chez les Pères cappadociens? Une mauvaise controverse." *Revue théologique de Louvain* 17 (1986): 129–155, 265–292.

Hammerstaedt, Jürgen. "Der trinitarische Gebrauch des Hypostasisbegriffs bei Origenes." *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 34 (1991): 12–20.

———. "Zur Echtheit von Basiliusbrief 38." *Tesserae: Festschrift für Josef Engemann*, edited by Ernst Dassmann and Klaus Thraede, 416–419. Münster: Aschendorff, 1991.

———. "Hypostasis ('Υπόστασις)." In *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 16, cols. 986–1035. Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1994.

Hanson, R. P. C. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.

Harl, Marguerite. "A propos d'un passage du *Contre Eunome* de Grégoire de Nysse: aporroia et les titres du Christ en théologie trinitaire." *Recherches de science religieuses* 55, no. 2 (1967): 217–226.

———, ed. *Ecriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse: Actes du colloque de Chevetogne (22–26 septembre 1969)*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

———. "Références philosophiques et références bibliques du langage de Grégoire de Nysse dans ses Orationes in Canticum canticorum." In *Hermeneumata: Festschrift für Hadwig Hörner*, edited by Herbert Eisenberger, 117–131. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1990.

Harnack, Adolf von. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*. Vol. 2. 4th ed. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1909.

Harrison, Verna E. F. "Male and Female in the Cappadocian Theology." *Journal of Theological Studies,* n.s., 41 (1990): 441–471.

———. *Grace and Human Freedom according to St. Gregory of Nyssa*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992.

———. "Gender, Generation, and Virginity in Cappadocian Theology." *Journal of Theological Studies,* n.s., 47 (1996): 38–68.

Holl, Karl. *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den großen Kappadoziern*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904.

Hübner, Reinhard. "Gregor von Nyssa als Verfasser der sog. *Ep.* 38 des Basilius: Zum unterschiedlichen Verständnis der *ousia* bei den kappadozischen Brüdern." In *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou,* edited by J. Fontaine and Ch. Kannengiesser, 463–490. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972.

———. *Die Einheit des Leibes Christi bei Gregor von Nyssa: Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der 'physischen' Erlösunglehre*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

———. "Basilius von Caesarea und das *homoousios*." In *Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy in Late Antiquity: Essays in Tribute to G. C. Stead,* edited by Lionel R. Wickham et al., 70–91. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

"Hypostasis." In *A Patristic Greek Lexicon,* edited by G. W. H. Lampe, cols. 1454–1461. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Ibañez, J., and F. Mendoza. "Naturaleza de la 'eusebeia' en Gregorio de Nisa." In *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie: Zweites Internationales Kolloquium über Gregor von Nyssa (Freckenhorst bei Münster, 18–23 September 1972),* edited by Heinrich Dörrie et al., 261–277. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

———. "El valor del termino 'hypostasis' en el libro I Contra Eunomium de Gregorio de Nisa." In *El "Contra Eunomium I" en la produccion literaria de Gregorio de Nisa. Sixth International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa,* edited by Lucas F. Mateo-Seco and Juan L. Bastero, 329–337. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 1988.

Jaeger, Werner W. *Gregor von Nyssa's Lehre vom Heiligen Geist*. Leiden: Brill, 1966.

Kahn, Charles H. "Questions and Categories: Aristotle's Doctrine of Categories in the Light of Modern Research." In *Questions,* edited by Henry Hiz, 227–278. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1978.

———. "Discovering the Will: From Aristotle to Augustine." In *The Question of 'Eclecticism' in Later Greek Philosophy,* edited by John M. Dillon and A. A. Long, 234–259. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Kasper, Walter. *The God of Jesus Christ*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. New York: Crossroad, 1989.

Kees, Reinhard Jakob. *Die Lehre von der Oikonomia Gottes in der "Oratio catechetica" Gregors von Nyssa*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Keith, Graham. "Our Knowledge of God: The Relevance of the Debate between Eunomius and the Cappadocians." *Tyndale Bulletin* 41 (May 1990): 60–88.

Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Creeds*. 3rd ed. New York: Longman, 1972.

———. *Early Christian Doctrines*. 5th ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978.

Kopecek, Thomas A. *A History of Neo-Arianism*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979.

LaCugna, Catherine Mowry. *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991.

Lampe, G. W. H., ed. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.

Leroux, Georges. Introduction to *Traité sur la liberté et la volonté de l'Un [Ennéade VI, 8 (39)]*, by Plotinus, trans. and with commentary by Georges Leroux, 23–123. Paris: J. Vrin, 1990.

Lienhard, Joseph T. "The 'Arian' Controversy: Some Categories Reconsidered," *Theological Studies*, n.s., 48 (1987): 415–437.

———. "Basil of Caesarea, Marcellus of Ancyra, and 'Sabelius.' " *Church History* 58 (1989): 157–167.

———. "Did Athanasius Reject Marcellus?" In *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth-Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, edited by Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams, 65–80. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.

Lilla, Salvatore. "Platonism and the Fathers." In *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, edited by Angelo di Berardino, translated by A. Walford, 2: 689–698. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Lloyd, A. C. "Neoplatonic Logic and Aristotelian Logic II." *Phronesis* 1 (1956): 146–159.

———. *The Anatomy of Neoplatonism*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited by Peter Nidditch. Oxford: Clarendon, 1975.

Long, A. A. "Language and Thought in Stoicism." In *Problems in Stoicism*, edited by A. A. Long, 75–113. London: Athleton, 1971.

———. *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*. 2nd ed. London: Duckworth, 1986.

Long, A. A., and D. N. Sedley. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Lorenz, Rudolf. "Die Eustathius von Antiochien zugeschriebene Schrift gegen Photin." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 71 (1980): 109–128.

Louth, Andrew. "They Speak to Us across the Centuries. 4. St Maximos the Confessor." *Expository Times* 109, no. 4 (January 1998): 100–103.

Lynch, John. "Prosōpon in Gregory of Nyssa: A Theological Word in Transition." *Theological Studies* 40 (1979): 728–738.

Madden, John D. "The Authenticity of Early Definitions of Will (*Thelêsis*)." In *Maximus Confessor: Actes du symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur. Fribourg, 2–5 septembre 1980*, edited by Felix Heinzer and Christoph Schönborn, 61–79. Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1982.

May, Gerhard. "Die Chronologie des Lebens und der Werke des Gregor von Nyssa." In *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse: Actes du Colloque de Chevetogne (22–26 septembre 1969)*, edited by Marguerite Harl, 51–67. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Meijering, E. P. "Die Diskussion über den Willen und das Wesen Gotter, theologie-

geschichtlich Beleuchtet." In *L'Église et l'empire au IVe siècle,* edited by Albrecht Dihle (Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1989), 35–65.

Meissner, Henriette M. *Rhetorik und Theologie: Der Dialog Gregors von Nyssa "De anima et resurrectione."* Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1991.

Meredith, Anthony. "Gregory of Nyssa and Plotinus." *Studia Patristica* vol. 17, part 3 (1982): 1120–1126.

———. "The Divine Simplicity: *Contra Eunomium* 1.223–241." In *El "Contra Eunomium I" en la produccion literaria de Gregorio de Nisa: Sixth International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa,* edited by Lucas F. Mateo-Seco and Juan L. Bastero, 339–351. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 1988.

———. *The Cappadocians.* Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995.

———. *Gregory of Nyssa.* New York: Routledge, 1999.

Méridier, Louis. *L'Influence de la seconde sophistique sur l'oeuvre de Grégoire de Nysse.* Paris: Hachette, 1906.

Merki, Hubert. *Ὁμοίωσις θεῷ: Von den platonischen Angleichung an Gott zur Gottähnlichkeit bei Gregor von Nyssa.* Fribourg: Paulsdruck, 1952.

Meyendorff, John. "St. Basil, Messalianism, and Byzantine Christianity." *Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 24, no. 4 (1980): 219–234.

Michel, A. "Hypostase." In *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* edited by E. Amann et al., vol. 7, part 1, col. 369–437. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1927.

———. "Relations divines." *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* edited by E. Amann et al., cols. 2135–2156. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1937.

Milano, Andrea. *Persona in teologia: Alle origini del significato di persona nel cristianesimo antico.* Naples: Dehoniane, 1984.

Morales, Fabio. "Relational Attributes in Aristotle." *Phronesis* 39, no. 3 (1994): 55–274.

Mühlenberg, Ekkehard. *Die Unendlichkeit Gottes bei Gregor von Nyssa: Gregors Kritik am Gottesbegriff der klassischen Metaphysik.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

———. "Synergism in Gregory of Nyssa." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 68 (1977): 93–122.

Mulrooney, Sean. "Boethius on 'Person.' " Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1994.

Nédoncelle, Maurice. "*Prosōpon* et *persona* dans l'antiquité classique." *Revue des sciences religieuses* 22 (1948): 277–299.

The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books (New Revised Standard Version), edited by Bruce Metzger and Roland Murphy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Opitz, Hans-Georg, ed. *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites, 318–328.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 1941.

Pacheco, Maria C. *S. Gregório de Nissa: Criação e tempo.* Braga: Faculdade de Filosofia, 1983.

Parfit, Derek. *Reasons and Persons.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.

Parys, Jan van. *Grégoire de Nysse, Refutation de la profession de foi d'Eunome.* 2 vols. Ph.D. diss., University of Paris-Sorbonne, 1968.

Parys, Michel J. van. "Exégèse et théologie dans les livres *Contre Eunome* de Grégoire

de Nysse: textes scripturaires controversés et élaboration théologique." In *Ecriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse: Actes du colloque de Chevetogne (22–26 septembre 1969)*, edited by Marguerite Harl, 169–193. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Patterson, L. G. *Methodius of Olympus: Divine Sovereignty, Human Freedom, and Life in Christ*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1997.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Christianity and Classical Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1993.

Pépin, Jean. "Ὑπαρξις et ὑπόστασις en Cappadoce." In *Hyparxis e Hypostasis nel Neoplatonismo: Atti del I Colloquio Internazionale del Centro di Ricerca sul Neoplatonismo (Università degli Studi di Catania, 1–3 ottobre 1992)*, edited by F. Romano and D. P. Taormina, 59–78. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1994.

Peroli, Enrico. *Il platonismo e l'antropologia filosofica di Gregorio di Nisa: con particolare riferimento agli influssi di Platone, Plotino e Porfirio*. Milan: Vita e pensiero, 1993.

———. "Gregory of Nyssa and the Neoplatonic Doctrine of the Soul." *Vigiliae Christianae* 51 (1997): 117–139.

Phillips, John F. "Stoic 'Common Notions' in Plotinus." *Dionysius* 11 (1987): 33–52.

Plantinga, Cornelius, Jr. "Gregory of Nyssa and the Social Analogy of the Trinity." *The Thomist* 50 (1986): 325–352.

Pottier, Bernard. *Dieu et le Christ selon Grégoire de Nysse: Etude systématique du "Contre Eunome" avec traduction inédite des extraits d'Eunome*. Namur, Belgium: Culture et Vérité, 1994.

Pouchet, Robert. *Basile le Grand et son univers d'amis d'après sa correspondance: Une stratégie de communion*. Rome: Augustinianum, 1992.

Prestige, G. L. *God in Patristic Thought*. 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1952.

Régnon, Théodore de. *Études de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité*. 4 vols. in 3. Paris: Victor Retaux, 1892, 1898.

Rist, John M. "Forms of Individuals in Plotinus." *Classical Quarterly*, n.s., 13 (1963): 223–231.

———. *Eros and Psyche: Studies in Plato, Plotinus, and Origen*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.

———. *Plotinus: The Road to Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

———. *Stoic Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

———. "Ideas of Individuals in Plotinus: A Reply to Dr. Blumenthal." *Revue internationale de philosophie* 24 (1970): 298–303.

———. "*Prohairesis*: Proclus, Plotinus *et alii*." In *De Jamblique à Proclus*, edited by B. D. Larsen, 103–117. Vandoeuvres-Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1975.

———. "Basil's 'Neoplatonism': Its Background and Nature." In *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium*, edited by Paul J. Fedwick, 1:137–220. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981.

———. *Human Value: A Study in Ancient Philosophical Ethics*. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

———. Review of *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity*, by Albrecht Dihle. *Phoenix* 37 (1983): 275–277.

———. *The Mind of Aristotle: A Study in Philosophical Growth*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

———. "Plotinus and Christian Philosophy." In *The Cambridge Companion to Plotinus*, edited by Lloyd P. Gerson, 386–413. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Ritter, Adolf Martin. "Gregor von Nyssa *In suam ordinationem* eine Quelle für die Geschichte des Konzils von Konstantinopel 381?" *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 79, no. 3 (1968): 308–328.

Robertson, David G. "Stoic and Aristotelian Notions of Substance in Basil of Caesarea." *Vigiliae Christianae* 52 (1998): 393–417.

Rousseau, Philip. *Basil of Caesarea*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Rudman, Stanley. *Concepts of Person and Christian Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Runia, David T. *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993.

Schönborn, Christoph von. "La 'lettre 38 de saint Basile' et le problème christologique de l'iconoclasme." *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 60 (1976): 446–450.

Seifert, Josef. *Das Leib-Seele-Problem und die gegenwärtige philosophische Diskussion: Ein systematisch-kritische Analyse*. 2nd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1989.

Simonetti, Manlio. *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*. Rome: Augustinianum, 1975.

Spoerl, Kelley McCarthy. "The Schism at Antioch since Cavallera." In *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, edited by Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams, 101–126. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.

Stead, Christopher. "Ontology and Terminology in Gregory of Nyssa." In *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie: Zweites internationales Kolloquium über Gregor von Nyssa (Freckenhorst bei Münster 18–23 September 1972)*, edited by Heinrich Dörrie et al., 107–119. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

———. *Divine Substance*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.

———. "Individual Personality in Origen and the Cappadocian Fathers." In *Arché e telos: l'antropologia di Origene e di Gregorio di Nissa. Analisi storico-religiosa*, edited by Ugo Bianchi and Henri Crouzel, 170–191. Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1981.

———. "The Freedom of the Will and the Arian Controversy." In *Platonismus und Christentum: Festschrift für Heinrich Dörrie*, edited by Horst-Dieter Blume and Friedhelm Mann, 245–257. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagbuchhandlung, 1983.

———. "Logic and the Application of Names to God." In *El "Contra Eunomium I" en la produccion literaria de Gregorio de Nisa: Sixth International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa*, edited by Lucas F. Mateo-Seco and Juan L. Bastero, 303–320. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 1988.

———. "Why Not Three Gods? The Logic of Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Doctrine." In *Studien zu Gregor von Nyssa und der christliche Spätantike*, edited by Hubertus Drobner and Christoph Klock, 149–163. Leiden: Brill, 1990.

———. *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Stevenson, J., ed. *Creeds, Councils, and Controversies: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church AD 337–461*. Revised by W. H. C. Frend. London: SPCK, 1989.

Stramara, Daniel F., Jr. "Unmasking the Meaning of Πρόσωπον: *Prosōpon* as Person in the Works of Gregory of Nyssa." Ph.D. diss., St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., 1996.

Strange, Steven K. "Plotinus, Porphyry, and the Neoplatonic Interpretation of the 'Categories.' " In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt,* edited by Wolfgang Haase (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987), 955–974.

Stritzky, Maria-Barbara von. *Zum Problem der Erkenntnis bei Gregor von Nyssa*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1973.

Studer, Basil. "Hypostase." In *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie,* edited by Joachim Ritter, vol. 3. Basel: Schwabe, 1974.

———. "Der Person-Begriff in der frühen kirchenamtlichen Trinitäts-Lehre." *Theologie und Philosophie* 57 (1982): 161–177.

———. *Trinity and Incarnation: The Faith of the Early Church*. Translated by M. Westerhoff. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1993.

Tanner, Norman P., ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*. Vol. 1. London: Sheed & Ward, 1990.

Tanner, R. G. "Stoic Influence on the Logic of St. Gregory of Nyssa," *Studia Patristica* 18, no. 3 (1989): 557–584.

Telepneff, Gregory. "The Concept of the Person in the Christian Hellenism of the Greek Church Fathers: A Study of Origen, St. Gregory the Theologian, and St. Maximos the Confessor." Ph.D. diss., Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, Calif., 1992.

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. CD-ROM, version D. Irvine: University of California Press, 1995.

Todd, Robert B. "The Stoic Common Notions: A Re-Examination and Reinterpretation." *Symbolae Osloenses* 48 (1973): 47–75.

Troiano, Marina Silvia. "La polemica sull'origine dei nomi nell' *Adversus Eunomium* di Basilio: l'*epinoia*." In *Basilio di Cesarea: la sua età, la sua opera e il basilianesimo in Sicilia*. Atti del Congresso Internazionale (Messina 3–6 XII 1979), 1:523–531. Messina: Centro di Studi Umanistici, 1983.

———. "Il concetto di numerazione delle ipostasi in Basilio di Cesarea." *Vetera Christianorum* 24 (1987): 337–352.

Turcescu, Lucian. "*Prosōpon* and *Hypostasis* in Basil of Caesarea's *Against Eunomius* and the Epistles." *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, no. 4 (1997): 374–395.

———. " 'Blessed Are the Peacemakers, for They Will Be Called Sons of God': Does Gregory of Nyssa Have a Theology of Adoption?" In *Gregory of Nyssa, Homilies on the Beatitudes: An English Translation with Supporting Commentaries and Studies,* edited by Hubertus R. Drobner and Albert Viciano, 397–406. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

———. " 'Person' versus 'Individual,' and Other Modern Misreadings of Gregory of Nyssa." In *Rethinking Gregory of Nyssa,* edited by Sarah Coakley, 97–110. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.

Ullmann, W. "Der logische und der theologische Sinn des Unendlichkeitsbegriffes in der Gotteslehre Gregors von Nyssa." *Bijdragen* 48 (1987): 150–171.

Vaggione, Richard Paul. "Of Monks and Lounge Lizards: 'Arians,' Polemics, and Asceticism in the Roman East." In *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts,* edited by Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams, 181–216. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.

———. *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Vogel, Cornelia J. de. "The Concept of Personality in Greek and Christian Thought." In *Studies in Philosophy and the History of Philosophy,* edited by John K. Ryan, 20–60. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1963.

Völker, Walther. "Zur Gotteslehre Gregors von Nyssa." *Vigiliae Christianae* 9 (1955): 103–128.

———. *Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1955.

Wallis, R. T. *Neo-Platonism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972.

Westra, Laura. *Plotinus and Freedom: A Meditation on Enneads 6.8*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.

Whittaker, John. "Ἐπέκεινα νοῦ καὶ οὐσίας." *Vigiliae Christianae* 23 (1969): 91–104.

Widdicombe, Peter. *The Fatherhood of God from Origen to Athanasius*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Williams, Rowan. "The Logic of Arianism." *Journal of Theological Studies,* n.s., 34 (1983): 56–81.

———. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1987.

Wilson-Kastner, Patricia. *Faith, Feminism, and the Christ*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Windelband, Wilhelm. *An Introduction to Philosophy*. Translated by Joseph McCabe. London: Unwin, 1921.

Winden, J. C. M. van. Review of Apostolopoulos's *Phaedo Christianus. Vigiliae Christianae* 41 (1987): 191–197.

Witt, R. E. "Hypostasis." In *Amicitiae Corolla: A Volume of Essays Presented to James Rendel Harris,* edited by H. G. Wood, 319–343. London: University of London Press, 1933.

Yannaras, Christos. *The Freedom of Morality*. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984.

Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Zachhuber, Johannes. *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical Background and Theological Significance*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Zahn, Theodor. *Marcellus von Ancyra*. Gotha: n.p., 1867.

Ziegler, Thierry. "Les petits traités trinitaires de Grégoire de Nysse: Temoins d'un itineraire théologique (379–383)." 2 vols. Ph.D. diss., University of Human Sciences of Strasbourg, 1987.

Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion*. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.

Index