1

INTRODUCTION—GENDER, TRINITARIAN ANALOGIES, AND THE PEDAGOGY OF *THE SONG*

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

SARAH COAKLEY

Introduction: Nyssa Studies in Transition

No one who works in systematic theology, let alone in patristic studies, can have failed to notice the recent upsurge of interest in the work and thought of Gregory of Nyssa (c. 330–c. 395), the youngest of the so-called "Cappadocian Fathers", and in many ways the most subtle and intriguing. The reasons for this renewed interest are arguably three-fold. First, it corresponds to the notable resurgence of trinitarianism in post-modern theology in general, and hence to a re-examination of the place of Nyssa in the supposed founding of a distinctively "Eastern" trinitarian tradition.[1] Second—and for the most part so far in disjunction from this first focus—there is the interest spawned by Nyssa's fascinating views on asceticism and desire (matters which now often fall under the rubric of "gender theory").[2] And finally—and again in somewhat problematic connection to the other two foci—there is a new appreciation of Nyssa's distinctive apophaticism, another theme re-invigorated by the interests of post-modernity.[3] By and large, however, these three interests have tended not to find integration in any one author: they are "fragments" that the post-modern theologian has gathered into her basket *ad libitum*, whether in search of the doctrinal renewal of "orthodoxy" (at one end of the spectrum), or of the destruction of repressive "gender binaries" (at the other).

It is in this rather confused context that this collection of essays on Gregory has been brought together to mark a new moment in the interpretation of his

Sarah Coakley
Harvard Divinity School, 14 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

oeuvre, one that the contributors believe holds creative promise both for the patristic exegete and for the systematician. But there is both death and life here: death, because a significant portion of our work is involved in the tolling of the final funeral bell on a *misreading* of Gregory's trinitarianism that has been peculiarly long-standing and pernicious for ecumenical understanding; and life, because the re-reading that we jointly propose suggests not only opportunities for renewed ecumenical understanding, but an integrated approach to Gregory's work in which the false disjunctions of modernity ("theology"/"spirituality", "doctrine"/"ascetical theology", "philosophy"/"exegesis", even "sex"/"gender") may be laid aside in aid of a deeper appreciation of his significance and creativity.

A brief, synthetic overview of the main themes of this collection—and their interconnection—is in order first (Section I). Here I shall merely provide a template into which the various essays may be slotted, although their distinctive emphases should not be lost sight of in the detailed reading. To undertake this task I shall need to allude to some features of the *Redaktionsgeschicte* which has led to the misreadings of Gregory we have inherited. From here (Section II) I shall turn to an explication of some proposed new exegetical principles of my own for the future study of Gregory's doctrinal *Nachlass* in general, and especially of his trinitarianism, and so indicate at the outset of this collection (Section III) how questions of eroticism and "gender" (a modern appellation, to be sure) fall squarely within the reach of what the trinitarian exegete of Gregory must attend to. Whilst not all the contributors need necessarily concur with my reading here, it is certain that the cumulative effect of the essays will stir new thoughts about the appropriate way of *teaching* Gregory's views on doctrinal matters. If his own pedagogy is a purified "pedagogy of desire", we may well enquire what are the implications for an equivalent contemporary exposition, what—that is—are the *ascetical* requirements for a mature appreciation of dogmatic questions. That is a question that this volume leaves for the reader's consideration.

I: The End of the "de Régnon" Paradigm, and What Lies Beyond

The first purpose of this collection of essays, however, is to call radically into question the adequacy of a long-established, and oft-repeated, account of the significance of Gregory of Nyssa's contribution to the trinitarian debates of the late-fourth century. That text-book account is familiar to those in the English-speaking (and especially Anglican) world from the pages of such indispensable introductory guides as Prestige, Kelly, Hardy and Richardson, and Wiles.[4] For all that these authors differ in emphasis and detail in their analyses, they share the presumption that Gregory's text *Ad Ablabium: On Why there are Not Three Gods* (written c. 375) is a crucial one—if not the crucial one—for understanding Gregory's specific advance on previous trinitarian thinking. They point to his supposed clarification of the meaning of *hypostasis*,

and his drawing of the distinction (in terms of the analogy of individualizing *versus* generic characteristics applied to the visible world) between the three *hypostaseis* and the more encompassing divine *ousia*. No one would deny—least of all I—that this argument represents a significant technical advance in attempting to ward off Arianism and Sabellianism simultaneously, although the precise force, success, and significance of the argument has been debated,[5] and is given new adjudication by Ayres, Barnes and Turcescu in this volume. What is more puzzling, however (granted the amount of writing that Gregory devoted to the matter of the Trinity in his lifetime), is the stranglehold that the *Ad Ablabium*, with its opening analogy of three men proffered initially by Ablabius, has come to hold in this textbook account. Granted that the *Letter 38* (previously ascribed to Basil, and covering much of the same philosophical ground) also utilizes the analogy, this too has been marked out for (suitably excerpted) anthologizing (as in Wiles and Santer).[6] The dominance of the three men analogy, one may note, is a matter not without interest to those concerned with questions of *gender* in theological utterance, although perhaps unsurprisingly it occurs to none of the textbook writers I have mentioned to comment on that implication. (Gregory of course uses *anthropoi* rather than *andres* in the three men analogy, but his examples of proper names are all male ones.) I shall return to the matter of gender and the Trinity in the last section of this introductory essay.

On closer inspection of the text of the *Ad Ablabium*, however, it turns out that this supposedly crucial analogy of three men is one that Gregory himself sees as limited in its significance, and indeed distinctly misleading if construed without the necessarily *apophatic* effacement required of any analogical move from the human to the divine realms. "We", writes Gregory, "following the suggestions of Holy Scripture, have learned that [God's] nature cannot be named and is ineffable". Thus, although we can distinguish between "right" and "wrong" conceptions of the deity, we cannot "*explain*" the divine nature.[7] "Our feeble powers of reason", Gregory has already said, are almost certainly not adequate to the problem in hand; we may have to fall back on the authority of "tradition".[8] Immediately, then, the question of the status of Gregory's negative theology impinges on the assessment of his trinitarianism. A further consideration is that Gregory offers many other, mutually corrective, analogies for the Trinity alongside the three men one, both in the two texts already mentioned, and elsewhere, even in his apologetic and catechetical writings: there is a spring as source of water (repeatedly in the anti-Eunomian writings and again in the *Ad Ablabium*); the grape and the wine, again in the anti-Eunomian corpus; gold and coins in the *Ad Ablabium*; the rainbow and the chain in *Ep*. 38; and an interesting psychological analogy of breath and mind in ch. 2 of the *Catechetical Oration* which we might more readily expect from Augustine.[9] Even this list does not exhaust Gregory's repertoire, as Hart's essay in this volume—drawing on a number of untranslated writings—amply testifies. So this diversity in itself should already

cause us to question a simplistic account of Gregory's trinitarian achievement based only on one visual model, and only one (supposedly key) text.

But *why*, then, the continuing, regnant emphasis on the "three men" in the literature I have cited? Could it be, as an important earlier article by Michel René Barnes[10] has documented fully (and André de Halleux had already earlier suggested[11]) that the lurking influence of de Régnon's classic work on the Trinity[12] has fixated both Easterners and Westerners, and for over a century now, on a reading of Gregory as "starting from the three and proceeding to the one"; and so—according to a further elaboration, most famously associated with John Zizioulas[13]—normatively instantiating the so-called "social Trinity of the East", a "communitarian" understanding in which "personhood" is somehow *prior* to "substance"? This is a view that has certainly both fuelled and bedevilled ecumencial exchange in recent decades; and it is ironic to find Lossky at points directly dependent on de Régnon on this issue, and Zizioulas on Prestige![14] To have the "West" attacked by the "East" on a reading of the Cappadocians that was ultimately spawned by a French Jesuit is a strange irony. But this reading has both drawn on, and further cemented, the dominance (visually and imaginatively speaking) of the personalistic "three men" analogy for this purportedly "Eastern" view. It is precisely this reading, and this dominance, that Ayres's and Barnes' essays, taken together, crucially question here. Whilst Ayres gives a detailed new reading of the *Ad Ablabium* which attempts finally to lay to rest the "de Régnon" reading, Barnes provides a detailed account of the developing relationship between Gregory's vision of the individual "self" and of trinitarian "persons" (*hypostaseis*), arguing strongly against the smuggling of modern "personalism" into the reading of the latter. The trinitarian persons are neither prototypes of Enlightenment "individualism", *nor* exemplars of a "personalism" that somehow precedes and transcends "substance" (a false disjunction). Rather, the most important point of contact between Gregory's human psychology and his trinitarianism (even allowing for apophatic difference) lies in the notion of the unity of *will*: in the Trinity of divine "persons" *one* will pervades the ordered flow of divine activity, just as in Gregory's doctrine of the human, "psychology takes its fundamental shape from a concern for the integrity of the will in its action".

The effects of this re-reading, and its extension of consideration to a much wider collection of Nyssa's texts (even within the apologetic/catechetical *genre*) than the "de Régnon paradigm" tended to encourage, is to open up possibilities of East/West *rapprochement* that have seemingly long been despaired of. It was thus a conscious editorial policy to invite into this exchange the perspectives of Orthodox (Turcescu, Hart), Roman Catholic (Barnes, Laird, Daley) and Anglican (Ayres, Coakley) scholars, who—remarkably, one might think—have converged on a re-assessment of Gregory's significance as one refusing to be "boxed" into the stereotype of an "Easterner" rudely confronting the supposed trinitarian "mentalism" of "the West". Whilst Congar,

in his great trilogy *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*,[15] had already drawn attention to the misleading nature of this disjunctive myth, it has taken a long time effectively to dislodge it. Especially important in this collection, then, are the contributions of the two Orthodox scholars: Turcescu challenging Zizioulas's polemical reading of the Cappadocians as supposedly routing "Western" essentialism, and Hart drawing attention to the profound commonalities between Gregory's and Augustine's trinitarian instincts. We can only hope that this collection will lead to further mutual enrichment and understanding, both East and West, of the formative patristic periods of trinitarian thinking.

So far I have focused on the primary constellating theme of this volume, its careful re-reading of Gregory's trinitarianism through the axis of (1) an extended range of apologetic and catechetical texts (beyond the *Ad Ablabium* and *Ep. 38*); (2) diverse controlling "analogies" (beyond the "three men"); and (3) chastened "modernistic" assumptions about *either* Cartesian "individualism" *or* relational "personhood". The crucial significance (4) of taking Gregory's apophatic sensibilities into account in this re-reading has also been noted, as has the possible implications for East/West ecumencial re-engagement (5). But this is not quite all that this collection undertakes in its suggestions about "re-thinking" Gregory of Nyssa. For to this list of distinctive themes we now should add: (6) the importance of bringing Gregory's (unduly neglected) christology into relation with his trinitarianism, especially in connection with the supposed "clarification" he brought to bear—trinitarianly—on the meaning of "person"; (7) the significance of Gregory's wider *exegetical* corpus for the assessment and understanding of his doctrinal contribution; concomitantly, (8) the importance of Gregory's *ascetical* programme as a matrix for the understanding of his doctrinal contribution; and finally, and also relatedly, (9) the intrinsic significance of Gregory's views about the transformation of human "desire" (a matter that contemporaneously shelters under the—perhaps misleading—rubrics of "eroticism" and "gender") in his perception of our capacity for transformation into the trinitarian God. Here we glimpse the possibility of the integration of the varying points of interest recently aroused in Nyssa scholarship that I mentioned at the outset.

On point (6) in this list, Brian Daley's programmatic article in this collection is especially important, raising as it does the issue of the undue neglect of Gregory's christology on account of its failure to conform to what may be called the "false-starts or approximations" model of Grillmeier's reading of pre-Chalcedonian christology. Gregory's christology is indeed peculiarly hard to classify from the perspective of the fifth-century Antiochene/Alexandrian dialectic; ingeniously, he seems to incorporate aspects of both extremes. Yet much work remains to be done on the relation of his unusual reading of *kenotic* christology as it coheres with his subtle trinitarian perception of the nature of "person".[16] This collection can only raise the possibility of that

future work, and of a more detailed assessment of the coherence of Gregory's christological contribution.

As for the remaining three themes ((7)–(9), above), while other contributors allude to them, it is largely Laird and I who are concerned to explore them, and—in my case—especially to underscore their intrinsic connection to the other themes of the volume. Laird's essay looks at the language of "desire" in Gregory (admittedly confusing in its lack of semantic consistency), charts its relation to his apophaticism, and explores his programme for the ascetical transformation of passion, especially as illuminated by his late work, the commentary on *The Song*. My own addition to this, in what remains of this introductory essay, is to attempt to show the significance of that material for our understanding of the full impact of Gregory's trinitarian vision. If I am right, then no one should be teaching or expounding Gregory's views on the Trinity without also explaining his theory of "desire" for God, and his unique charting of the shifts in (what we would now call) "gender" perception—both in oneself and in God—that seemingly inexorably attend the ascetical transformation of that desire. If this is granted, then here is a rich dimension to Gregory's trinitarian thinking which, as far as I know, is completely ignored in expository textbook accounts, but which, once we are released from the false dominance of the "three men" model, may rightly find its due.

But this is to jump ahead to the material from the commentary on *The Song* to be explored in my final section. In preparation for that exposition, I need to prepare the ground (especially in relation to points (7) and (8), above), by enunciating some general principles for an integrated reading of Nyssa that might transcend some of the classic hermeneutical disjunctions of "modernity".

II: Exegesis and Doctrine in Gregory's Corpus

Before turning to the salient trinitarian passages in the commentary, then, let me mention some overarching principles that, as I see it, should rightly guide our use of Gregory's *exegetical* writings in the explication of his full doctrinal position on the Trinity. Here are seven such principles for reflection, which cut across all of the distinctive themes in this volume that I have just outlined.

(i) First, surely only a false disjunction between exegesis and philosophical thinking, or between (so-called) "spirituality" and "theology", would prevent us from utilizing the commentaries as a source of insight for Gregory's doctrinal position *in toto*. In ignoring the exegetical material the textbooks already provide but a partial understanding of Gregory's full trinitarian contribution. In this light, it is odd to say, as Daniélou does of Gregory's late exegetical writings: "Once freed from administrative burdens and the heat of *theological* controversy, Gregory now turned himself wholly towards the life of the *spirit*."[17] As Ronald Heine too has noted in his dissertation on the *Life of Moses*, this is a questionable diremption.[18] These late writings contain no

less "theological" content than their predecessors, despite their (often very great) differences of *genre* and intended audience.

(ii) Secondly, we must however take account of the complexification that the exposition of doctrine does not unfold for Gregory on a *flat plane*, so to speak. He is regularly wont to remind us that different audiences, and different occasions, will require different sorts of skill on the part of the theologian. In the famous opening passage of the *Catechetical Oration*, for instance, Gregory underscores that one would rightly shift one's Christian pedagogical tactics depending on whether one's interlocutors were Jews, "Hellenists", Manicheans, or certain sorts of Christian "heretic".[19] He also regularly uses the metaphor of the doctor's varying prescriptions to indicate the diversity of "cures" needed in doctrinal disputes.[20] By implication, we should expect the same principle of diversification of purpose to attach to the explication of trinitarian doctrine —as indeed the opening sections of the *Catechetical Oration* on the Trinity go on to testify.

(iii) However, by implication also, Gregory's understanding of "spiritual ascent" (as adumbrated rather differently in the *Inscriptions on the Psalms*, *The Life of Moses*, and *The Song*) suggests a doctrinal progression and deepening in the life of each individual Christian over time. Stages of spiritual growth are thus no less levels of doctrinal apprehension; we should not expect the careful apologetic rejoinder to a possible charge of tritheism (as in the *Ad Ablabium*) to be the last word in the trinitarian "case", but rather the movement "from Dove to Dove" which marks the mature apprehension of incorporation into the divine life itself.[21] Exegesis of *The Song* constitutes the apex of spiritual and doctrinal apprehension, as Gregory, following Origen (following the rabbis), expounds at length in the first *Homily*.[22]

(iv) Certain sorts of polemical context demand philosophical precision; but ultimately philosophy is *subordinate* to Scripture. (Gregory makes this point, for instance, in vivid terms in *The Life of Moses*, likening the "daughter of Pharaoh" to vain philosophy—always in labour but never giving birth.[23]) Thus we should, by the same token, expect to find *deeper* insight, ultimately, into trinitarian doctrine in the exegetical writings than in the polemical or philosophical—even though we must beware here of re-forcing a disjunction that we are attempting to overcome: Gregory's exegetical writings can and do contain polemical modes, and *vice versa*. Nonetheless, I am suggesting here that we consider coming to Gregory's polemical tracts on the Trinity with our eyes already on *The Song*. To read Gregory as a somewhat failed Oxford Greats man, someone whose philosophical acumen deserted him under stress (as seems, one sometimes feels, to be Christopher Stead's mode of critique in relation to the *Ad Ablabium*[24]), is to miss this major complexification. For as Gregory underscores (also in Origen's train), Scripture does not easily or quickly deliver her "mystical" insights. A philosophical manoeuvre may be readily accessible to the pagan interlocutor; an exegetical manoeuvre less obviously so. The insights of "faith" (*pistis*) in the technical, epistemological

sense that Gregory uses for this term,[25] are not ones arrived at without inner transformation precisely in relation to Scriptural norms.

(v) The central hold of apophaticism in Gregory's trinitarian exposition in polemical contexts has already been underscored. A careful reading of the *Ad Ablabium*, as we have already intimated (and Ayres demonstrates in detail), must take this line of Gregory's argument more seriously than many modern commentators have. From here we need to relate that line of thinking to its deeper, and more "affective", enunciation in the exegetical writings. In *The Song*, that feature of noetic darkness as regards God's "essence" is all the more marked: here it is only the "hand of the bridegroom" that reaches out from the darkness to draw us to him: "'My beloved has put his hand through the door'", writes Gregory, "[for] Human nature is not able to contain the infinite unbounded divine nature" (*Cant.* 11).[26]

(vi) The effect of the established hold of the apophatic dimension at the level of *The Song* seems to be a certain loosening up of imagery where trinitarian "analogies" are concerned—a willingness to rehearse a veritable chaos of different visual symbolisms for the *hypostaseis*, which, if falsely pressed, would certainly result in absurdities (and we shall come to some examples of this from *The Song* shortly). The difference here from the carefully chosen (but mutually corrective) analogies of the more polemical and catechetical writings is instructive, and—I presume—advised.

(vii) Matters of "sex" and "gender" (in modern appellation)[27] are to the fore in *The Song* where questions of incorporation into the life of the Trinity are at stake. This is of course to be expected granted the pervasive dominance of the erotic metaphor in *The Song*. Even so, as Verna Harrison's work has so illuminatingly exposed,[28] Gregory takes more surprising risks in this area than we might expect.

If we may grant the acceptance, or at least entertainment, of these exegetical principles, let us now look at how these risks specifically relate to *trinitarian* exposition in *The Song*.

III: Trinitarian Images in the Commentary on The Song

When we read Gregory's commentary with trinitarian questions in mind, the first thing that one notes is his happy disregard for what we may call "orthodox" precision. It is a striking feature of this work that individual divine "persons" can be spoken of as "acting in quite different roles",[29] with the Father's origination of those roles being merely left implicit. Thus, for instance, Gregory will speak of Christ as the "nuptial torch of the Holy Spirit's splendor" (*Cant.* 13);[30] or about how we may smell the "scent of the divine perfumes" by "drawing in the good odor of Christ by an inhalation of the Spirit" (*Cant.* 1).[31] Despite this freedom, even apparent carelessness, the implicit underlying pattern remains that which was set out in the *Ad Ablabium* about the ordered causality of the divine

operations *ad extra*—originating in the Father, and extending via the Son to the Spirit.

When we look for more lengthy or developed expositions of the Trinity's operations in Gregory's *Song*, four are to be found in the Commentary, each characterized by unusually visual and imaginative complexity, and each concerned with the pressure towards incorporative union with the divine. Of these, two I shall mention only briefly here (for reasons of conciseness): in *Homily* 12, the Spirit is the wind sent by the Father in the sails of the vessel (the Church) that moves to contemplate the Word, and in which the "Song's text" acts as "pilot"[32]—an elaborated nautical image which it is interesting to compare with the *internalized* "wind" and "word" of the psychological analogy at the beginning of the *Catechetical Oration*. In *Homily* 15, in contrast, in the course of a reflection on the Johannine farewell discourse on the union of Father and Son (John 17:21), the Spirit, interestingly, becomes the bond (*sundetikon*) of union between Father and Son, characterized as "glory" (*doxa*) and overflowing to the Church: "[Christ] received this glory which he already had before the world's beginning when he clothed himself with human nature. Because his human nature was glorified by the Spirit, such a relationship in the glory of the Spirit is distributed to everyone united with Christ, beginning with the disciples."[33] With this idea of the Holy Spirit as bond between Father and Son and as then overflowing to the church, we could hardly hope, perhaps, for a more "Western", Augustinian, trinitarian reflection—something that presents yet another challenge to the textbook stereotypes of so-called "Eastern" and "Western" Trinities.

But it is the two remaining (developed) trinitarian passages in *The Song* that I wish to focus upon in closing, for they both relate fascinatingly to questions of "gender" and the Trinity, and thus take us back to the undermining of the purported hegemony of the "three men" analogy. Both these passages are to be found in *Homily* 4. The first is a direct, but interestingly gender-modified, reflection on the incorporative theme of Romans 8, where Gregory is speaking of the bride's transformation into a "lily":

> Having thus become a flower, the soul is not injured by thorny temptations in her transformation into lily; she forgets the people and the house of her [sc. false] father and looks to her true Father. Therefore, she is named *sister* of the Son, having been introduced by the Spirit of adoption into this relationship and released from fellowship with the daughters of the false father. And so she becomes still more sublime and gazes at the mystery through dove's eyes. I mean she does this by the Spirit of prophecy.[34]

Because Gregory is here charting the highest (and third) stage in the ascent to God, it is crucial for him that the soul/bride is figured as "feminine", as receptive to the bridegroom's advances. The necessary gender fluidities and reversals of this ascent are already vividly spelled out in *Homily* 1, as Verna

Harrison's work has so well elucidated.[35] What is striking in this *Homily*, then, is the exegetical freedom with which Gregory superimposes the *female* "sister" on the Pauline narrative of adoptive sonship through the Spirit.

In the same *Homily* 4, we find our last, and most alluring and complex trinitarian allegory (a purple passage also commented on by Laird, *intra*, and finding an interesting short counterpart in Gregory's commentary on Psalm 3 in his *Commentary on the Inscriptions on the Psalms*[36]). Here the ("feminine") soul/bride is wounded by the arrow of divine love and then in turn becomes another arrow ready to be shot by the divine bowman.[37] Superimposed on this (already shifting) imagery is the *Song*'s theme (*Song* 2. 5–6) of the lover's left hand under the head of the bride and his right hand receiving her body. When we untangle these different, even chaotically-related, images, we have the Father as the archer, the Son as the arrow, and the Spirit as that in which the arrow is dipped. The arrow penetrates the soul with the wound of love, just as the Son as the bridegroom also penetrates, takes possession, of the bride. But the bride then herself *becomes* an extension or replication of the Son's arrow, since she has been allowed to "participate" in his "eternal incorruptibility".[38]

Of this remarkable passage, von Balthasar comments, in *Presence and Thought*: "The mystical level achieved by the soul [here] has definitely gone *beyond* the 'philosophy of desire'."[39] Yet oddly von Balthasar does not spell out the implications for Gregory's *trinitarian* contribution. Let us however now draw those implications together in closing.

We started this introductory essay with some comments on the way in which a particular reading of the "three men" analogy of the *Ad Ablabium* had achieved a false dominance, both in certain English patristic textbooks, and in important ecumencial debates. Much of this volume is devoted to overturning, and replacing, that paradigm with a richer and fuller picture of Gregory's doctrine of God. I, in my turn, have been concerned to widen the scope of our understanding of the final *telos* of Gregory's more precise and philosophical trinitarian reflections. If I am right, they find their completion in his exegetical account of *The Song*, and supremely in the rich if chaotic images of incorporation into the life of the divine *energeia*. In this account, it is the *human* soul that must, by progression, undergo various gender shifts and transformations *en route* to this incorporation. Gender, being strictly not applicable to God, leaves God unaffected by these human transformations; but equally, we are freed up, at the level of *The Song*, to speak of God as "mother" provided literal-mindedness is strictly ruled out of court. As Gregory puts it in a famous passage in the seventh *Homily*, "Both terms [i.e., mother and father] mean the same, because the divine is neither male nor female".[40] If we return to the "three men" analogy with these deeper thoughts in mind, it will be abundantly clear, on grounds other than the strictly philosophical ones that Gregory is rehearsing in the *Ad Ablabium*, that we need a broader base from which to assess the full significance of Gregory's trinitarianism,

and its fascinating—and we might say, necessary—connections to gender issues, than that provided by the often-misconstrued text of the *Ad Ablabium* alone. What, I have suggested, if a new pedagogy of Gregory's trinitarianism should *start* with the rich insights into incorporation into the life of the Trinity brought about by mature "faith" (*pistis*)? How then would we turn back to read the import of the earlier, more obviously polemical, discussions? The emphases and expectations, I suggest, would be significantly different from those of the old textbook account with which we started. Whilst we cannot deny the myriad differences of style and *genre* with which Gregory plays in his various works, and his often infuriatingly inconsistent modes of argument, it is the challenge laid down by these collected essays to consider a "re-thinking" of the relation of those works in the ways here described, and thereby to attempt an integration of what modernity has balefully dubbed Gregory's "spirituality", on the one hand, with his "theology" and "philosophy", on the other.

NOTES

1 See Gerald O'Collins, S.J., "The Holy Trinity: The State of the Questions", in S. T. Davis, D. Kendall, S.J., and G. O'Collins, S.J., eds, *The Trinity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 1–25, for a survey of the recent upsurge of interest in trinitarian theology.
2 See Martin Laird's essay, *intra*, especially nn. 1–5, for relevant literature. Also see my "The Eschatological Body: Gender, Transformation and God", in *Powers and Submissions: Spirituality, Power and Gender* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), pp. 153–167.
3 See especially David Bentley Hart, "Beauty, Violence, and Infinity: A Question Concerning Christian Rhetoric", Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1997, for an excellent new discussion of the differing assessments of Gregory's apophaticism in the work of Daniélou and Mühlenberg.
4 See G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (London: SPCK, 1952); J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (London: A & C Black, orig. 1958; 5th. ed. 1977); E. R. Hardy (ed), with C. C. Richardson, *Christology of the Later Fathers* (London: SCM Press, 1954); M. F. Wiles, *The Making of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).
5 On the question of the supposed "clarification" of the meaning of "hypostasis" by Gregory, see the important article by Joseph T. Lienhard, S.J., "*Ousia* and *Hypostasis*: The Cappadocian Settlement and the Theology of 'One *Hypostasis*'", in Davis, Kendall and O'Collins, eds (see n. 1), pp. 99–121, for an effective critique of that view. For an anticipation of some of the central themes of this collection, see also my "'Persons' in the 'Social' Doctrine of the Trinity: A Critique of Current Analytic Discussion", in ibid., pp. 123–144.
6 See the selection from *Ep*. 38 in M. F. Wiles and M. Santer (eds), *Documents in Early Christian Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), pp. 31–35.
7 As translated in Hardy and Richardson (eds), p. 259.
8 Ibid., p. 257.
9 These differing analogies and their precise contexts are discussed in some detail in my article "'Persons' in the 'Social' Doctrine of the Trinity" (see n. 5). Also see the essays by Ayres and Barnes, *intra*, for close discussion of these varying analogies.
10 M. R. Barnes, "De Régnon Reconsidered", *Augustinian Studies* 26 (1995), pp. 51–79.
11 See A. de Halleux, *Patrologie et Oeuménisme*: *Recueil D'Études* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), chs. 5, 6.
12 T. de Régnon, S.J., *Études de théologie positive sur la sainté Trinité*, vol. 1 (Paris: Victor Retaux et fils, 1892); one must be cautious, however, of attributing all the "blame" of this cumulative misreading to de Régnon himself: for a careful assessment, see again M. R. Barnes' article (n. 10).

13 J. D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985).
14 For Lossky's use of de Régnon, see again M. R. Barnes's article (n. 10); for Zizioulas's occasional appeals to Prestige, see *Being as Communion* (n. 13), 38n., 41n., 85n.
15 See Y. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* (New York, NY: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997), vol. III, pp. xvi–xviii. I am grateful to my Harvard pupil Philip McCosker for drawing my attention to this passage.
16 I have attempted a first assessment of Nyssa's unusual reading of Phil. 2 in a forthcoming paper, "Does *Kenosis* Rest on A Mistake?: Three *Kenotic* Models in Patristic Exegesis", given at Calvin College, June, 2002.
17 In the "Introduction" to H. Musurillo, S.J., *From Glory to Glory: Texts from Gregory of Nyssa's Mystical Writings* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995), p. 9, my emphasis.
18 See R. Heine, *Perfection in the Virtuous Life: A Study in the Relationship between Edification and Polemical Theology in Gregory of Nyssa's* De Vita Moysis (Cambridge, MA: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1975).
19 See Hardy and Richardson (eds), pp. 268–286.
20 See, e.g., the repeated return to the metaphors of doctor, medicine and cure in Gregory's *Homilies on the Beatitudes*, trans. H. C. Graef, ACW (London: 1954), pp. 88–89, 91–92, 104, 117, 172.
21 See the section on this theme (illustrated from *The Song*) in H. Musurillo (n. 17), pp. 189–191.
22 See *Saint Gregory of Nyssa Commentary on the Song of Songs*, trans. Casimir McCambley OCSO (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1987), pp. 43–56.
23 *The Life of Moses*, trans. A. J. Malherbe and E. Ferguson (New York: Paulist Press, 1978), p. 57. For a sustained recent discussion of Gregory's evolving views on philosophy and the intellect, see Alden A. Mosshammer, "Gregory of Nyssa and Christian Hellenism", *Studia Patristica* 32 (1997), pp. 170–195.
24 See, for instance, G. C. Stead, "Ontologie und Terminologie bei Gregor von Nyssa", in eds H. Dörrie, M. Altenburger, U. Schramm, *Gregor von Nyssa und die Philosophie* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp. 107–127; also idem, "Why Not Three Gods?", in H. R. Drobner and C. Klock, eds, *Studien zu Gregor von Nyssa und der ChristlichenI Spätantike* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990), pp. 149–163.
25 For a sustained treatment of this theme of *pistis* in Gregory, see Martin Laird, "The Grasp of Faith: Union and Knowledge in Gregory of Nyssa", Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1999.
26 *Commentary* (n. 22), p. 208.
27 This distinction has itself become contentious in post-modern feminist theory, and is not of course utilized by Gregory himself. It is an intriguing question whether Gregory provides some of the necessary resources for overcoming this ("modern") disjunction, in a way that ironically anticipates some of the features of Judith Butler's current feminist theorizing. On this comparison, see my "The Eschatological Body" (n. 2, above).
28 See V. E. F. Harrison, "Male and Female in Cappadocian Theology", *Journal of Theological Studies* 41 (1990), pp. 441–471; and eadem, "Gender, Generation and Virginity in Cappadocian Theology", *Journal of Theological Studies* 47 (1996), pp. 38–68.
29 This phrase is from an unpublished paper by my Harvard pupil, Francis C.-W. Yip, "The Trinity and Christian Life in the Dogmatic and Spiritual Writings of Gregory of Nyssa". I am indebted to Yip for first having trawled the text of *The Song* for trinitarian passages at my suggestion. I acknowledge my gratitude to him for identifying the key passages which I also mention here.
30 *Commentary* (n. 22), p. 236.
31 Ibid., p. 52.
32 Ibid., p. 213.
33 Ibid., pp. 275–276.
34 Ibid., pp. 97–98.
35 See "Gender, Generation and Virginity" (n. 28).
36 Gregory of Nyssa, *Commentary on the Inscriptions of the Psalms*, trans. Casimir McCambley OCSO (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1994), pp. 102–103.
37 *Commentary on the Song of Songs* (n. 22), pp. 103–104.

38 Ibid., p. 103.
39 H. U. von Balthasar, *Presence and Thought: Essay on the Religious Philosophy of Gregory of Nyssa* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1995), p. 160, my emphasis.
40 *Commentary* (n. 22), p. 145.

This paper was first presented, in an earlier version, at the Oxford Patristics Conference, August 1999; I am grateful to those who commented on it on that occasion. I would also like to express my thanks to all the contributors to this volume, and especially to my Harvard colleague Nicholas Constas, for much assistance and stimulating exchange in the preparation of these essays. My thanks too to two Harvard students, Todd Billings and Philip McCosker, for their speedy and efficient collection of bibliographical materials.