

Toward a Model of the Church

A few years back I had jotted down some notes related to St. Gregory of Nyssa's reflection on the Church but never got around to fleshing them out until now. Hence this essay deals with three Greek terms he employs to describe Christ's relationship with the Church: *phurama* (dough), *aparche* (first-fruits) and *hupotage* (subjection), all having biblical origins. Originally I was going to incorporate them into the title but later decided against it. For some time I wanted to examine the word *phurama* as representing the hidden, seminal presence of Christ within his Church. It seemed like an ideal starting point from which I could branch off into other related concepts. Then in December 2008 the Jesuit theologian, Avery Dulles, passed away, noted for his book entitled **Models of the Church**. Some familiarity with that book got me a-thinking as to the nature of the Church, so I decided to use a similar title though obviously on a much more modest and unprofessional scale. Furthermore, the notion of church as an assembly of living persons was in my mind within the context of a treatise on First Corinthians 15.28 by Gregory of Nyssa which deals primarily with *hupotage* though he incorporates the first two words, *phurama* and *aparche*. *Hupotage* or subjection pertains to Jesus Christ or his relationship with the Father which, in turn, applies to the subjection of the Church to both divine persons. A specific order exists for this as will be spelled out. *Hupotage* does not connote that the Son is secondary or inferior to the Father but pertains to his proper role within the Trinity. Even though we recognize this intellectually, nevertheless it remains a difficult notion to grasp, for unconsciously it is natural for us to think in terms of ideas related to numerical and temporal sequence. Among scholarly circles Gregory's text is known by its Latin title, **In Illud: Tunc et Ipse Filius**, which is incorporated on this Home Page, minus the Introduction, as well as the Gregory of Nyssa Home Page linked with this one (includes the Introduction).

Prior to getting down to details, please allow for a short digression. The more immediate impetus, if you will, which got me to set down these thoughts was a phone conversation on Christmas Day 2008 with a priest friend of mine in New Hampshire. I simply wanted to wish him well for the holiday. To my surprise, I got him directly, having finished one Mass and before he was off to another in one of three parishes he serves in a semi-rural area of the state. Obviously this was one of the busiest times of the year for someone in his profession, so my friend could spare just a few minutes which was perfectly fine. The first words out of his mouth other than Christmas greetings? How exhausted he was after three Masses the day before, two earlier on Christmas Day itself and another two ahead of him...that totals seven Masses in two days, homilies included. My friend remarked that despite the busyness of active ministry, we don't know a thing about what lies at its core. By that he meant we know nothing or next to nothing about divine reality. Sure, God revealed himself in Jesus Christ from whom a rich tradition had sprung, and we are quite familiar with that as manifested within the Church. But when we get right down to contacting God directly as through prayer and the sacraments, we haven't a clue whatsoever about God . . . nada, absolutely nada. We both agreed that such a simple, obvious fact gets lost easily, especially among professional religious people. At the same time and in a strange way it enlivens our faith. As with my friend, readily he acknowledged this ignorance was not at all a hindrance; it was essential to his ministry, and he got a clear appreciation of it on Christmas day. He was very grateful for my phone call because rarely can faith be phrased like this, even to his congregation, for it would be open to misunderstanding. He could be accused of proclaiming that which he knew nothing about...true in one sense yet not in another. In the next few days I bounced this idea off to others engaged in active ministry; all agreed that it was true and were pleased to hear they weren't alone in their quandary. One expressed a caveat from his engagement in ecumenical work: while many would concur, those of a more Pentecostal or fundamentalist view never would admit to such ignorance out of fear of undermining their faith. In the next breath he added that in part this is due to a lack...even a fear...of exposure to prayer of a contemplative dimension

nourished by *lectio divina*.

And so we can abstract two points from the second paragraph. First comes awareness of personal ignorance about God, and this healthy condition can be distorted by the experience of humiliations. Not that ignorance *per se* humiliates us, but when we do run across the invariable humiliation, immediately this ignorance is translated into a dreadful silence or absence which we find difficult to escape. Second come knowledge and experience pertinent to matters of faith which are laid out in a tradition extending 2,000 back in time. These interact with our ignorance (as in the example of my priest friend) and frequently disguise it. Such a disguise can assume the form of familiarity with facts about the faith and their presentation which, in the long run, are secondary to being aware of our ignorance concerning things divine. Knowledge of the faith can be more comforting than launching out into divine ignorance. The most basic fact of the Christian tradition, right up to its functioning within the present, uses the word “God” and other relative terms. All one has to do is open a Bible, prayer book or the like to see this word throughout. The same may be applied equally to all major religions, for we’re dealing with the universal phenomenon of divinity. While this is perfectly fine, “God” is bantered about in many circles without having the slightest idea of what the word means.

The fundamental question about God is even more pertinent during the Christmas season, namely, the Incarnation of Jesus Christ whom Christians proclaim as God...more precisely, the second person of the Trinity or one among three persons, all having equal share in the same divinity. We could refine this a bit by saying that the second person (Jesus Christ) assumed human nature whereas the other two persons did not. This really complicates the situation as anyone knows from the history of theology. Unlike Jews or Muslims with their strict monotheism, Christianity has a completely unknowable entity (God) becoming man. How the two mesh together is anyone’s guess, really. Sure, theology distinguishes the role of each divine person and the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, but in the long run does nothing more. It can go only so far when it comes to sizing up divinity, leaving its “what-ness” completely outside the realm of intelligibility. Nevertheless, we’re left hanging around with this “what-ness” and don’t know what to do with it. After performing its role of examining matters of faith, theology gives way to either moving to another (theological) issue or standing in silent awe before this unknowable entity. Thus it’s a question whether we are comfortable with unknowability or not.

What, after all, is this thing called God? Often we hear such attributes as almighty, infinite, along with other adjectives, all good which, in the final analysis, are all-inclusive. Really, they aren’t inspiring by reason of their generality and blandness despite being tossed about by professional religious people and lay persons alike. And so they make us fall back upon our ignorance which is quite different from how we commonly experience it in other aspects of life. The ignorance at issue here applies to the bottom line gleaned from contemplative prayer, of being left without a clue as to what had transpired within it. Simultaneously this ignorance is accompanied by a joy and satisfaction unlike nothing else. The only thing we can say with certainty from our ignorance is that the attributes we hear about God are wholly other than our ordinary experience, including that of scientific inquiry. As an agnostic friend once remarked during a discussion about spirituality, “How can anyone get excited about nothing?” That question, despite being understandable, misses the point...misses why God is both puzzling and fascinating. And so it comes down to when we hear about God—and let’s get specific by bringing in Jesus Christ or the Holy Spirit—we can attribute complete ignorance with respect to them all. It’s especially true when we hear about the Father; the other two persons have some scriptural documentation (historical, that is, the New Testament), but the Father is really way out there.

One way of getting a better grip on this issue...keeping in mind that never can we access the identity of God...is to look at the matter from the opposite point of view, if we could put it that way.

Historically, the greatest challenge to divinity of the monotheistic variety is, of course, polytheism or a multitude of gods. Polytheism perceives divinity as present in either animate or inanimate objects (or both). The common denominator for attributing divinity to these things is that any phenomena associated with them is not known and cannot be explained. However, the advantage of polytheism is that a particular god or a number of gods can be concretized and thus manipulated. Also, if one god turns a deaf ear to your request, there's always another and so forth. There come to mind obvious examples as found in the Old Testament where Israel is engaged in a more or less continuous struggle with gods or better, idols. In other words, once a numinous power is recognized, this power is localized in an object. Despite this localization, the numinous remains outside normal perception while simultaneously making its presence felt. The automatic response is that of worship, a desire to show allegiance to a power beyond ourselves and to entreat that power to protect and sustain us. It's a legitimate need and is more subtle than those popular images that naturally come to mind, for example, bowing before a golden calf. Such an image evokes a whole array of how idols are viewed: childish, on the gross level, and dismissed out of hand as proper to primitive cultures.

There is more to the worship of gods and idols than that. If anyone looks within himself, quickly he will discover an innate need to worship someone or something even if this is disguised by sophisticated, modern terminology. A crucial fact can be overlooked, the experience of unification we get when giving allegiance to a god or idol. In daily life our minds, hearts and thoughts are scattered, giving a bland color to existence, especially in a culture pervaded by all sorts of media and devices to access it. But when something captivates us to a high degree, our hearts and minds are lifted high above mundane life and are brought together in a marvelous way. It's sudden and mysterious, often bypassed without closer reflection. A recent example of this was the inauguration of Barak Obama when so many people experienced a unity of all their senses and faculties. A desire to be like him is purely secondary; instead, people were content to continue along with their regular lives only now they were endowed with a sense of purpose, of unity both inner and outer, which they had achieved through the inaugural event. The word "adore" is used a lot and can be applied to such a situation even though primarily it belongs to the sphere of religion. Clearly religious unity is the most satisfying experience of them all, even more than sex, simply because it endures longer than most experiences and can be shared with like-minded people. At all times the object of our veneration is present. Even though we may not be physically in its presence, we have the option of cultivating memory of it. The veneration remains constant even should the object become tyrannical and make demands that go against our grain. Performing these acts (even if they border upon the immoral or outrageous) fosters inner unity which is more valuable than the moral implications, so we go ahead with them anyway. Again, the goal is unification of senses, mind and spirit, to which everything is automatically subordinate. The same experience can be had through worship of God...singular...and plenty of examples are out there to behold as in religious extremism. A similar unity takes place when confronted with that ignorance we've been discussing. Yes, it effects unity but one which does not become fixated upon a person, object or ideal because it is imageless. As we move along in this essay exploring a key scriptural passage and Gregory of Nyssa's remarks on it, we'll get a better picture of the dynamic behind this unity and how it differs from the one just noted.

One way out of the tension between monotheism and polytheism that has been tried for generations is to combine worship of one God with any number of gods although such practice evoked condemnation and swift action from established monotheistic religions. On paper it sounds good and did work, albeit temporarily. Just consider how many times Israel took this route to the dismay of her prophets, always there to call her back to worship of the One God. With this shadow background to Western heritage, there has sunken into our collective unconscious a choice between one God and an indefinite number of gods, usually expressed in violent struggles. In other words, the victory of

monotheism mirrors to some extent the overwhelming desire for inner unity discussed in the last paragraph. On the other hand, polytheism reflects an abhorrence for an imposed unity and a desire to incorporate discordant elements without necessarily subjecting them to violence. Monotheism, should it devolve into a dogma imposed from without, can present a colorless view of reality. At the same time, we don't hear much about polytheism imposing its multi-faceted world view with such zeal. Its powers are too scattered for this single-minded effort. So in view of monotheism's zeal it's no small wonder that some people opted to lean towards polytheism with its multiplicity of choices. Always there remains within us a split between the two that never has been resolved even if it may not be expressed in religious rites or forms. Perhaps the advantage of Christianity with three divine persons offers a helping hand here; the "multiplicity" found in the Trinity softens the stark nature of monotheism while retaining all the dimensions proper to it. Catholicism has softened this tension even further by popular devotion to Mary and the saints, legitimate practices, though some adherents to forms of Protestantism with strong monotheistic proclivities, think otherwise. Thus in practice Catholicism offers a worshiper the ability to shift without recrimination between silent, image-less prayer and a whole range of devotions. Putting this in another way, the former effects inner unity in a manner quite different from the one described above though on the surface both appear the same. As for the latter, it too effects the same unity but through a more vigorous use of words and images.

With these few observations in mind, I hope to put into clearer focus the notion of God as that which is completely unknowable despite all the talk we're exposed about it. Everything else falls into that which we know whether this knowledge is scientific, practical or theological reflection itself. Sounds rather stark, but that's the bottom line. Precisely for this reason I chose the three Greek words of *phurama*, *aparche* and *hupotage* which serve as a basis not so much to elucidate this distinction but to soften it. Caution is required because we've come to see the distinction of what's unknown and what's known more as a division or better, a gulf, while it doesn't have to be so. For that reason I prefer to use the noun "perception" or in Greek, *aisthesis*, hence the reason for several quotations from Gregory of Nyssa given below. Chiefly it relates to the senses yet is broader than that. *Aisthesis* is more global in its reach than knowledge or even its Greek equivalent of *gnosis* which is more specific to intellectual knowledge. That term gave rise to "gnosticism." It seems there is no counterpart to gnosticism in the form, for example, of "aisthesis-im" although the counterpart is found in the patristic approach to Scripture.

Instead of inclining towards intellectual knowledge and a slide into gnosticism, we can opt for our aisthet-ic faculty when considering the three Greek words, the first being *phurama*, that which is mixed and kneaded or dough, and the second being *aparche*, first-fruits. Both have an earthy feel about them, something we cultivate in order to consume and not allow to remain outside ourselves. The third is a bit more abstract, *hupotage* or subjection, which St. Paul uses with respect to the role of Christ relative to his Father. In sum, all three work together: *phurama* represents a hidden element...yeast...which makes the loaf of bread rise. *Aparche* represents the result of this rising and *hupotage*, the correct ordering of the process. The short, essentially nameless treatise by Gregory of Nyssa brings all three words together which, in patristic circles, goes by the Latin title, **In Ilud: Tunc et Ipse Filius**, and centers upon 15.28 of First Corinthians. The term *phurama* isn't mentioned here but plays a part in Gregory's treatise and is found in the same letter (5.7): "Cleanse out the old leaven that you may be a new lump (*phurama*), as you really are unleavened." In order to situate this verse as well as within the context of **In Ilud**, I present it in the larger context of vss. 20-28. Not only that, but I take into consideration 1 Cor 15.42-9, a discussion of which follows shortly. But first here is 1 Cor 15.20-28:

"But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep. For

as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive. But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits, then at his coming those who belong to Christ. Then comes the end, when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power. For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. 'For God has put all things in subjection under his feet' [Ps 8.6]. But when it says, 'All things are put in subjection under him,' then the Son himself will also be subjected to him who put all things under him, that God may be everything to everyone."

This following verse by verse explanation of the passage just cited is intended to show the relationship between *phurama* (lump or dough which contains the small, hidden growth element of yeast), *aparche* (first fruits or visible result of this yeast) and *hupotage* (subjection or the result of the previous two made available for the one who inserted the *phurama* to begin with):

Vs. 20. *Aparche* or first fruits is identified with Christ and with those persons who have "fallen asleep," another way of saying those who have died. The verb *egeiro* as used in the passive mode ('has been raised') signifies that Christ did not rise on his own but through a power external to himself.

Vs. 21. Instead of speaking about Christ, we have man (*anthropos*), actually two men. The first is not given a personal name but obviously is Adam, the first man. The preposition *dia* (through) is used twice; although it can mean "by," it connotes mediation. With respect to death, *dia* situates the origin of this reality with one man and being passed on to future generations. This first *dia* makes the second use of the preposition that more significant, the resurrection of the dead. Note that the verse does not mention Christ's resurrection directly; it is more in the background, intimated. Vs. 21 lacks a verb whereas the English has "came."

Vs. 22. This verse contains two adverbs: *husper* (as) and *houtos* (so) as well as two prepositions, *en* (in), and is reflective of the previous verse. There is a correlation between the two uses of "in:" first with respect to Adam and second, with respect to Christ. However, first attention is to be paid to Adam's death or more precisely, what effected his death. Actual mention of his death is found in Gen 5.5: "Thus all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and then he died." However, originally Adam (along with his wife) were destined for immortality in the Garden of Eden. The actual turning point, if you will, is Gen 3.17-19, where death is introduced. Thus the preposition *en*, coupled with *husper* (as), indicates the original pattern into which "all" are situated. This pattern requires close attention to see how it spells out with respect to death, for it leads to the pattern signified by the second adverb, *houtos* (so). Without attention to this pattern, *houtos* would not result. As for being "made alive" with respect to Christ (the second *en* or in), the verb is *zoopoieo*, implying future action from a source other than the human one...*made* alive. It stands in contrast to the pattern laid out by Adam, namely, action which was not from without but from within or from Adam's free will.

Vs. 23. Order or *tagma* can also mean ordinance and has military connotations. The first *tagma* is Christ as *aparche* and the second consists of those who belong to him (literally, 'of him'). A future is suggested here, at his coming or *parousia* which literally means a being-present, *para* signifying that which is around or in close proximity. This takes place in the future, and no indication as to when it will happen is given. In the meanwhile, the location of his presence, if you will, remains unknown; the same applies to our modes of detecting it. Thus an indefinite interval of time exists between when Christ became first fruits and his *parousia*. Both he and those who have fallen asleep shall be made alive, *zoopoieo*. Despite his divinity, Christ too will be subject from an action other than himself.

Vs. 24. As soon as we have the *parousia* of Christ, his presence, there is the end or *telos* which, in turn, intimates a beginning, and that beginning is Christ as first fruits or the interval between when Christ obtained that (resurrection) and the indefinite future of *parousia*. Recognition of this *telos* comes about by being made alive (*zoopoieo*) or more specifically, becoming aware of the source which effects this. Also, the *telos* is known by Christ delivering God's kingdom to the Father, the verb being *paradidomai* which connotes a transmitting or handing over to another. The Greek text applies it to both God and the Father. To get a feel of this kingdom, refer to the parables, many of which describe it in terms of growth such as the mustard seed. This progressive growth fits in with the Corinthians passage under consideration. Note that the preposition *para* is prefixed to this verb as well as *parousia*: "a handing over" and a "being with or about." Prior to the action of *paradidomai* comes a three-fold destruction or *katargeo* which implies abolishment or making ineffective: rule, authority and power. If they were allowed to continue, Christ as *aparche* could not be present.

Vs. 25. This verse says that Christ must reign (*basileuo*., that is, reign like a king) prior to the three-fold destruction just mentioned which here is put in terms of putting his enemies under his feet. Note *dei* or "must" which means fulfilling an obligation.

Vs. 26. Death is presented as an enemy but the last (*ekastos*) enemy, presuming that other enemies existed before this one. Regardless of what those enemies might be, they are secondary to the absolute finality of death. The verb *katargeo* is used in vs. 24 as well with respect to the destruction of rule, authority and power. This harkens back to Adam of vs. 22 and his death which was the first. Historically, Cain is the first recorded human death, well before his father, Adam's. However, Adam's death is primary in that it permeated the entire human race starting with his son, Cain.

Vs. 27. This verse is a partial quote from Ps 8.6 which reads in full, "You have given him dominion over the works of your hands; you have put all things under his feet." The verb in the Corinthians citation is *hupotasso*, to subject in the sense of putting under authority, and from it is derived *hupotage* noted above. What is subjected is "all," the same all as in vs. 22 ('all die...shall all be made alive'). There is, however, an exception (*ektos*, also as 'outside') with regard to Christ who does not submit to *hupotage* of this order.

Vs. 28. This verse continues the theme of *hupotasso*: and employs it three times and demonstrates a three-fold order: 1) conditioned by "when" (*hotan*) which signifies duration in that "all things" have not been subjected to Christ, 2) the Son will be subjected (to the Father) but on condition that #1 has occurred, and 3) mention of "the one" or Father who imparted the power of *hupotage* to the Son. The small word "that" (*hina*, 'in order that') is important in that it reveals the purpose of *hupotage*, namely, that "God may be all in all." When reading this "all," keep in mind the one of vs. 22: "all die (i.e., in Adam)...shall all be made alive (i.e., in Christ)."

Later in First Corinthians (15.42-9) is a passage closely related to the one above which is outlined in a briefer form in order to show the difference yet interdependence of two realities, that which is physical and that which is spiritual, with respect to the resurrection of the dead. First here is the passage as a whole:

"So it is with the resurrection of the dead. What is sown is perishable, what is raised is imperishable. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a physical body, there is also a spiritual body. Thus it is written, 'The first man Adam became a living being' [Gen 2.7]; the last Adam became a life-

giving spirit. But it is not the spiritual which is first but the physical, and then the spiritual. The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven. As was the man of dust, so are those who are of the dust; and as is the man of heaven, so are those who are of heaven. Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the man of heaven.”

Now the same passage verse by verse, each of which contains a pair of opposites which will be outlined just below. The first three verses use the verb “sown” suggesting a putting in the ground or in a place hidden from sight where it will mature and later come to light. Keep in mind those parables of Jesus which speak of the same theme. Prior to this (vss. 35-41), however, Paul speaks of various types of glory (*doxa*) with respect to bodies (*soma*), whether human, celestial or otherwise, hence the reason for this verse opening with “so” (*houtos*) with respect to the resurrection of the dead. The last two verses (48 and 49) have *hoios* and *kathos*, translated here as “as:”

- Vs. 42. What is sown as (*en* or in) perishable - what is raised is (*en* or in) imperishable.
- Vs. 43. What is sown in dishonor - what is raised in glory.
- Vs. 44. What is sown a physical body - what is raised a physical body.
- Vs. 45. First man Adam is a living being - last Adam is a life-giving spirit.
- Vs. 46. Spiritual not first - physical first.
- Vs. 47. First man from earth (dust) - second man from heaven.
- Vs. 48. As was the man of dust so those are of dust - as is the man of heaven so those of heaven.
- Vs. 49. As we bore the image of the man of dust - so we shall bear the image of the man of heaven.

Each of the eight verses gives priority of order to what is composed of the earth and thus is subject to the familiar cycle of birth and death after which comes the spiritual dimension. Yet instead of being opposed to each other, a mysterious correlation exists between the two. Given the just mentioned priority, one needs to intuit the process of the first part (i.e., the ‘perishable’ and related terms) and become attuned to its order...or in light of what was said earlier, have an *aisthesis* of the process, a feel for it. Then and only then is revealed the second, the “imperishable,” etc. Such is the importance of the “as-ness” which for all intensive purposes reveals the degree of awareness we have of the first. Once this is plumbed to the fullest of our capacity we can plumb the second, no exceptions. We are confronted with a proposal which works against our impulse to escape the perishable which assumes the form of paying close attention to what we’d prefer to avoid. If we assent, the former (perishable) becomes a bridge to the latter (imperishable). The other way around goes against our grain and simply doesn’t work. Realizing what this means is done within the context of contemplative prayer coupled with the practice of *lectio divina*. It looks different from usual modes of prayer and talk about it, and so may be the case when applied to real life situations. Yet the two small words “as” and “so” are underlined precisely because they show the relationship between two extremes, this-worldly existence and that of life in Jesus Christ. One could say they act as a kind of formula:

- Vs. 48. As was the man of dust so those are of dust - as is the man of heaven so those of heaven.
- Vs. 49. As we bore the image (*eikon*) of the man of dust - so we shall bear the image (*eikon*) of the man of heaven.

Note the distinction between “man of dust” / “man of heaven” on one hand and “image of the man of dust” / “image of the man of heaven” on the other. It should be noted that First Corinthians is built around the second account of man’s creation compared with the first account which is recorded in Gen 1.26: “Then God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.’” This second account of 2.7 reads: “Then the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being.” Gregory of Nyssa devotes a lot of exegesis on this

distinction as can be seen in his **On the Making of Man**; chapter sixteen being the essence of his argument. As for vs. 48, the account is more ontological with regard to the human and divine natures, whereas the second (which includes the word image or *eikon*, incorporating an important element from the first account of man's creation) is more descriptive. Through the verb "bore" (*phero*, in the sense of carrying) we get a feel for what a burden means, something imposed upon us as a weight upon our shoulders. Biblically speaking, we get a poignant feel for this weight from Gen 3.24: "He drove out the man"...drove out in the sense of expelling him from the garden of Eden. Despite this, Adam retained memory of the garden; although being made in the divine *eikon* can never be erased, often it is smeared over by forgetfulness. That is to say, the indestructibility of *eikon* is closely allied to our recollective capacity (in the fuller meaning of the word *anamnesis*), while focused upon the past but past-as-origin (in God), it is orientated towards the future: "so we shall bear." This is interesting in light of Jesus' words, "For my yoke is easy, and my burden (*photion*: derived from *phero*) light" [Mt 11.30].

Despite the wonderful correlation between the two images or *eikon* ('man of dust' and 'man of heaven'), the former is situated in the past and the latter in the future. It should be noted, however, that vs. 49 lacks mention of the present tense. Furthermore, there is a distinction between the *eikon* proper to "man of dust" and "man of heaven" by those who bore...and will bear...each respectively. That bearer, if you will, exists within the present; it looks both backwards and forwards as indicated by the two small words "so" and "as," *hoios* (to the past) and *kathos* (to the future). These words are used in conjunction with *eikon* which, through the mediation of the bearer, are quite dissimilar. In other words, we shed the *eikon* of the man of dust in favor for the *eikon* of the man of heaven. Still, each *eikon* mirrors each other; their task is to reflect the environment of their respective locations. The bearer ('we') exists in the present and had plenty of experience bearing the man of dust. This valuable experience can be stored up as information for a later time using our recollective faculty (in the sense of *anamnesis*) and put to service when we are called upon to bear the man of heaven. Note that vs. 49 speaks of bearing the image of the man of dust and image of the man of heaven as opposed to saying simply bearing the man of dust and the man of heaven. This *eikon* is easier to bear (*phero*) than the actual elements of dust/heaven and is put this way deliberately. The "we" as existing in the present is a tacit acknowledgment of the likeness (*homoiosis*) in which the image is made which is in accord with the first account of man's creation in Genesis. Likeness is more fluid than *eikon*, able to incorporate that which is past and that which will come to be. Also, the verb *phero* (to bear) is not in the present, signifying that the present, when properly understood as mediator between the two *eikons*, is free from it. All this may be summed up by the following outline:

Past (*phero* with respect to the *eikon* of the man of dust)

Present (absence of *phereo*)

Future (*phero*: with respect to the *eikon* of the man of heaven)

One of the problems dealing with the Church...and by that I mean the whole assembly of real persons with real lives...is a tendency to talk about it in abstract terms. The same can apply to any institution which has direct impact on people. On occasion I've found it helpful to read magazines and articles about ecclesiastical goings-on. Although helpful information can be garnered from them, still I come away with a sense of incompleteness. They deal in a peculiar type of religious-speak which forms an endless feed-back loop...not all, of course, but the sameness of expression appears to be a general trend. Behind it all I get the impression that primary sources are not consulted as much as would be desired, perhaps due to the authors themselves having little time or energy which is unfortunate. Awareness of this provided motivation to look at how someone like Gregory of Nyssa viewed the Church, that is, someone imbued with appreciation of what we call now the classics...which for his

time was part and parcel of the culture. For example, as the *phurama* passages indicate, this term is very concrete and shows how Christ is present within the Church, a term with which everyone could identify, that is, when making bread. The beauty of *phurama* is that it stands in contrast to the much more familiar word “idea” which represents a concept, very necessary but nonetheless abstract. One could equate “idea” with Plato or better, mis-interpretations of it which have sunk deeply into common Western consciousness and have obscured the original meaning.

Phurama does mean dough but more than that, something which is kneaded or mixed within a mixture in order to bind it together. You don’t have an “idea” about *phurama* but perceive its presence while at the same time never being able to wrap your mind around it simply because it is so diffuse. Nevertheless, it pervades the mixture with a definite smell and taste making it easily recognizable. These two faculties are ideal for detecting the presence of *phurama*, for it escapes any attempt at visualization...except by your nose or tongue. Here is where the word *aisthesis* comes into play as briefly outlined below in some passages from Gregory of Nyssa. *Aisthesis* connotes a feel of something which starts with sense perception and moves toward an intuitive grasp of the object as a whole. This isn’t done primarily by visualization but by a global insight which sums up every feature of that which is under our consideration. Should *phurama* as a model for the Church be used, that means we’d have to rely more on the senses of scent and taste, generally considered inferior to those of sight and hearing. This is unfamiliar territory for most people and subject to mis-interpretation. Yet the type of *aisthesis* proposed here is accessible if one views the Church and indeed the entire Christian tradition from a contemplative point of view. For example, you don’t walk around “smelling” or “tasting” the Church nor Christ’s presence within it. On other hand, putting it somewhat crudely like this counters the more familiar way (again, inadequately put but deliberately) of going around “seeing” and “listening” to the Church with Christ’s presence within it. Some years back I composed a lengthy document (elsewhere on this home page) dealing with the commentaries on the Song of Songs by Origen, Gregory of Nyssa and Bernard of Clairvaux. That is to say, the document contains all the scriptural references each author employed to construct his own commentary. While engaged in the lengthy and tedious process of jotting down these innumerable verses, immediately I was struck by each author’s reliance upon the sense of smell, taste and feel compared with sight and hearing. If this were true...and each author holds a commanding place within the Church...why not try to incorporate these lesser appreciated senses into how we’d perceive Jesus Christ? Surely Eucharistic implications are there. At the same time these implications are not limited to this sacrament but expandable (like *phurama*) throughout the Church as a whole.

Phurama as a agent of growth which permeates a given body naturally leads to the second term brought up in this article, *aparche* or first fruits. Originally it was an agricultural term signifying the offering made to God as at a harvest, the idea being that what had been offered to God now sanctifies the rest of the harvest. The sanctification not only pertains to the harvest but to those who have consumed the offering. That means one has to ingest the offering and allow it to ferment, as it were, and expand from within. Only a few uses are found in St. Paul’s Epistles; the Gospels have none. Also, *aparche* is allied closely with “first born,” a term St. Paul applies to Jesus Christ which is representative of his supremacy or head of the human race as the Second Adam. *Aparche* is joined with *phurama* in Rom 11.16 and incorporated in two excerpts below: “If the dough offered as first fruits is holy, so is the whole lump; and if the root is holy, so are the branches.” From Scripture, as well as the Gregory excerpts, one gets the idea that *aparche* is the first manifestation of *phurama* once this dough has permeated the mass into which it had been inserted. Therefore *aparche* is barely perceptible and requires close attention to perceive its presence at this early stage, for easily it can be overlooked. One could almost say that *phurama* represents the act of conception and *aparche* the child once it is born. During her pregnancy, the mother neither sees nor hears the fetus but feels it, a

manner of perception pretty much in line with the other senses of smell and taste as important for realizing Jesus Christ as the “first born” of all creation.

Aparche relates to the humanity of Jesus Christ as a whole, not just to his birth, for “through this (divinized) man all mankind is joined to the divinity” (cf. below, **In Illud**). To this *aparche*, as well as *phurama*, the senses of feeling, scent and tasting apply though at first glance they are subordinate to the “higher” senses of sight and hearing. We get a good indication of reliance upon the senses from 1Jn 1.1: “That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and touched with our hands, concerning the word of life.” Note two uses of seeing: the first is *horao* or plain, outright looking whereas the second (*theaomai*) involves continuous contemplation...*theoria*...of what’s before our eyes. But the key word here, one related to what’s being discussed, is *pselaphao* which means to grope about like a blind person. This isn’t necessarily a defect but an asset as anyone knows who is familiar with a person in this condition. To compensate for a lack of sight, a blind person’s other senses are developed to a sharper degree, not just hearing. When doing *pselaphao*, you feel the object or person very carefully during which a composite mental picture of the whole emerges. *Pselaphao* wouldn’t apply to *phurama*, for that requires smelling or better, tasting, a faculty not unlike touch. Thus this verb applies better to Christ as *aparche* which is in according with the context of John’s letter.

Finally, we have *hupotage* or subjection, the fundamental theme of Gregory’s **In Illud** treatise. The English translation is unfortunate, implying that Jesus Christ has assumed a secondary an inferior position. The Greek isn’t immune from this either, hence Gregory’s motivation for composing **In Illud**. He did this in light of various heresies of his day, most of which viewed Jesus Christ as inferior to God the Father (Arianism). With hindsight, this mis-interpretation is understandable, especially in light of the Eastern view of transcendence which sees it in an absolute fashion. Nowadays heresies sound a bit out of date yet are fascinating because they reveal the dominant mind set of transcendence as wholly other which admits no comprise. Each heresy attempts to sneak in a water-down version of this transcendence, all the more complicated when dealing with a monotheistic religion which maintains the equality of three divine persons. Thus by examining each heresy we get an appreciation of the human mind as it understands divinity and its relationship with ourselves. So when we come to the term *hupotage*, we take a quantum leap, as it were, from the seminal content of *phurama* and *aparche*. They aren’t left behind but taken up and inserted into a realm beyond ours, namely, the relationship between Father, Son and Holy Spirit. In sum, there’s a little bit of the heretic in each one of us, even those persons who are strict monotheists, so an understanding of how Gregory of Nyssa employs *hupotage* is certainly educative.

The real value of both *phurama* and *aparche* is their rootedness in this-worldly existence as virtually all excerpted passages below demonstrate. Thus we have a firm basis for shifting attention to a completely other-worldly realm without leaving the former behind; instead, it is incorporated into the divine reality. Hence the two words form a proper basis to appreciate orthodox Christian (patristic) teaching about divinity. As the First Corinthians outline above reveals, *hupotage* applies to “all things.” Thus *hupotage* works backwards and forwards: the former applies to temporal duration and the latter to the trans-temporal domain, if you will. Though not the place to speak of it here, Gregory of Nyssa develops in a sophisticated manner the theme of temporal duration by the word *diastema*, interval. It connotes existence here and now though intimates that it is an unfulfilled temporary state awaiting fulfillment or *apokatastasis*. *Diastema* shouldn’t be conceived as endless space and time but in the ancient Greek context of a cosmos which abhors the concept of infinity. And so *diastema* mirrors this cosmos which, in turn, is a mirror of divinity. By reason of Christ’s divine nature, the latter (or “forward”) *hupotage* exists before us though it is mentioned second by reason of our *diastem*-ic

existence.

The relationship of the divine Persons amongst each other has been a source of endless theological debate which can prevent us from understanding them properly. First Corinthians 15.23 is key: "But each in his own order (*tagma*)." The tiny word *de* (but) is not an after-thought by Paul but represents an extremely important cautionary role that can be overlooked or dismissed outrightly. Although what Paul describes here sounds wonderful, it requires considerable discipline in order to understand properly and even more so to put into practice. One gets the feeling from the history of theology that the humble word "but" is overlooked, sometimes conveniently. It serves to introduce an even more uncomfortable word, *tagma* (1Cor 15.23 contains the only New Testament use) which is related to temporal succession and arrangement (also it has military connotations) and may be taken as a refinement of *hupotage*. Thus a *tagma* exists for both Christ and us ("but each"...) and smacks of some kind of hierarchical order, not especially palatable nowadays though part and parcel of the message.

As noted in the first paragraph, I made passing reference to Avery Dulles' book, **Models of the Church**, and used a similar title for this modest essay. I took care to insert "toward" in order to signify that what is offered here is tentative only. By elaborating upon the three Greek terms of *phurama*, *aparche* and *hupotage*, I hoped to employ them as a kind of model of perceiving how we could use them to appreciate the Church and Christ's relationship to it. All three come together nicely especially in light of the three commentaries on the Song of Songs by Origen, Gregory of Nyssa and Bernard of Clairvaux. Earlier I noted how each author relied more upon the three senses of smell, touch and taste to compose their respective commentaries as opposed to the more dominant ones of sight and hearing. To take this further, it would be helpful to read through their abundant scriptural citations, sifting out those related to the three more physical senses. Doing this in the spirit of *lectio divina*, we could see how they flesh out a picture of the Song's bridegroom in his relationship with his bride. Christian tradition has viewed the bridegroom as Jesus Christ and the bride as the Church. That project would be a backward commentary: reading the scriptural verses while having in view the context in which they are found, namely, each verse of the Song. Perhaps without referring to their actual commentaries we could get a snapshot of how their hearts and minds worked vis-a-vis the Song of Songs. Such would be a fine "model" not only of the Church but of her bridegroom, Jesus Christ.

+

Phurama References

Song of Songs 380-1

Since Christ is uncreated and before all the ages, eternally incomprehensible and totally ineffable, that which appeared to us through flesh allowed something of him to be known. Our teacher the Church looks at this aspect of Christ and explains it as best she can to her listeners. I am speaking now of the great mystery of our religion [1Tim 3.16] through which God was manifested in the flesh; he was in the form of God and lived with men in the disguise of a slave. Once he took on by way of first fruits flesh's mortal nature through the incorruptible virgin, Christ continually sanctified the common mass of mankind by uniting it to himself in a mysterious fellowship. He nourishes his own body the Church and harmoniously arranges limbs begotten through faith to form the eye, mouth, hands and other limbs. Paul says "the body is one while the members are many" [1Cor 12.14].

Song of Songs 390-1

Now let us consider the bridegroom's beauty which is praised in each of his bodily limbs: "His head is

fine gold (kephaz)" [5.11]. If the Hebrew is translated into our [Greek] language, kephaz signifies pure, uncontaminated gold which is free from any impurity. It seems to me that those translating Hebrew into Greek have left the term kephaz unexplained; they could not find any word to convey the Hebrew meaning. We have learned however, that kephaz represents uncorrupted purity because it is free from anything base. We have come to understand that this term pertains to Christ as head of his body the Church [Col 1.18]. We maintain that this word does not refer to Christ's eternal divinity but to that man who received the divinity. He was seen upon earth and conversed among men; He was an offshoot of virginity in which dwelt bodily the fullness of his divinity; He was the first fruit of the common mass of dough by which the Word assumed our nature; He restored it to purity and cleansed it from every inherent defect. The prophet says of him, "He did not commit sin, nor was any deceit found in his mouth" [Is 53.9]. "He was tempted in everything according to our nature and was without sin" [Heb 4.15]. Thus he is the head of his body the Church, the first fruit of our nature, is free from evil and composed of pure gold.

Song of Songs 427-8

Our Lord also spoke of the passing by of the Law which was of no avail; neither priest nor Levite tended the wounds of the man who fell in among robbers, for the blood of goats and bulls are unable to take away sin [Heb 9.13]. However, Christ put on our full human nature as the first fruits of the dough [Rom 11.16] which included a part of each race: Jew, Samaritan, Greek and all mankind. With his body, that is, the ass, he hastened to the place where evil had befallen man, healed his wounds, put him upon his own beast and made for his loving providence a resting place in which all those who labor and are burdened can rest [Mt 11.28]. Whoever enters him receives him, as the Word said, "Whoever remains in me, I will remain in him" [Jn 6.56].

Against Eunomius col b (references to all three terms)

For we recognize a twofold creation of our nature, the first that whereby we were made, the second that whereby we were made anew. But there would have been no need of the second creation had we not made the first unavailing by our disobedience. Accordingly, when the first creation had waxed old and vanished away, it was needful that there should be a new creation in Christ, (as the Apostle says, who asserts that we should no longer see in the second creation any trace of that which has waxed old, saying, "Having put off the old man with his deeds and his lusts, put on the new man which is created according to God," and "If any man be in Christ," he says, "he is a new creature: the old things are passed away, behold all things are become new") — for the maker of human nature at the first and afterwards is one and the same. Then He took dust from the earth and formed man: again, He took dust from the Virgin, and did not merely form man, but formed man about Himself: then, He created; afterwards, He was created: then, the Word made flesh; afterwards, the Word became flesh, that He might change our flesh to spirit, by being made partaker with us in flesh and blood. Of this new creation therefore in Christ, which He Himself began, He was called the first-born, being the first-fruits of all, both of those begotten into life, and of those quickened by resurrection of the dead, "that He might be Lord both of the dead and of the living Romans 14:9," and might sanctify the whole lump by means of its first-fruits in Himself. Now that the character of "first-born" does not apply to the Son in respect of His pre-temporal existence the appellation of "Only-begotten" testifies. For he who is truly only-begotten has no brethren, for how could any one be only-begotten if numbered among brethren? but as He is called God and man, Son of God and Son of man,— for He has the form of God and the form of a servant, being some things according to His supreme nature, becoming other things in His dispensation of love to man,— so too, being the Only-begotten God, He becomes the first-born of all creation,— the Only-begotten, He that is in the bosom of the Father, yet, among those who are saved by the new creation, both becoming and being called the first born of the creation. But if, as heresy will have it, He is called first-born because He was made before the rest of the creation,

the name does not agree with what they maintain concerning the Only-begotten God. For they do not say this,— that the Son and the universe were from the Father in like manner,— but they say, that the Only-begotten God was made by the Father, and that all else was made by the Only-begotten. Therefore on the same ground on which, while they hold that the Son was created, they call God the Father of the created Being, on the same ground, while they say that all things were made by the Only-begotten God, they give Him the name not of the "first-born" of the things that were made by Him, but more properly of their "Father," as the same relation existing in both cases towards the things created, logically gives rise to the same appellation. For if God, Who is over all, is not properly called the "First-born," but the Father of the Being He Himself created, the Only-begotten God will surely also be called, by the same reasoning, the "father," and not properly the "first-born" of His own creatures, so that the appellation of "first-born" will be altogether improper and superfluous, having no place in the heretical conception.

Aparche References

Against Eunomius: cf. 158 col b just above

Against Eunomius 181 col b

He Who, because He is the Lord of glory, despised that which is shame among men, having concealed, as it were, the flame of His life in His bodily Nature, by the dispensation of His death, kindled and inflamed it once more by the power of His own Godhead, fostering into life that which had been brought to death, having infused with the infinity of His Divine power that humble first-fruits of our nature, made it also to be that which He Himself was— making the servile form to be Lord, and the Man born of Mary to be Christ, and Him Who was crucified through weakness to be Life and power, and making all that is piously conceived to be in God the Word to be also in that which the Word assumed, so that these attributes no longer seem to be in either Nature by way of division, but that the perishable Nature being, by its commixture with the Divine, made anew in conformity with the Nature that overwhelms it, participates in the power of the Godhead, as if one were to say that mixture makes a drop of vinegar mingled in the deep to be sea, by reason that the natural quality of this liquid does not continue in the infinity of that which overwhelms it.

Against Eunomius 241 col b

Since then it was impossible that our life, which had been estranged from God, should of itself return to the high and heavenly place, for this cause, as says the Apostle, He Who knew no sin is made sin for us, and frees us from the curse by taking on Him our curse as His own, and having taken up, and, in the language of the Apostle, "slain" in Himself "the enmity" which by means of sin had come between us and God,— (in fact sin was "the enmity")— and having become what we were, He through Himself again united humanity to God. For having by purity brought into closest relationship with the Father of our nature that new man which is created after God, in Whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, He drew with Him into the same grace all the nature that partakes of His body and is akin to Him. And these glad tidings He proclaims through the woman, not to those disciples only, but also to all who up to the present day become disciples of the Word— the tidings, namely, that man is no longer outlawed, nor cast out of the kingdom of God, but is once more a son, once more in the station assigned to him by his God, inasmuch as along with the first-fruits of humanity the lump also is hallowed.

Song of Songs 40.8

Now, through what she has already achieved, she has passed to a more interior part of the mysteries with her mind, and she cries out that her passage has brought her only to the vestibule of goodness.

By the first fruits of the Spirit of which she was made worthy by the kiss of her spouse she says that she searches the depths of God within the innermost says that she searches the depths of God within the innermost unseen and hears words not to be spoken [2Cor 12.4].

Song of Songs 380-1

Since Christ is uncreated and before all the ages, eternally incomprehensible and totally ineffable, that which appeared to us through flesh allowed something of him to be known. Our teacher the Church looks at this aspect of Christ and explains it as best she can to her listeners. I am speaking now of the great mystery of our religion [1Tim 3.16] through which God was manifested in the flesh; he was in the form of God and lived with men in the disguise of a slave. Once he took on by way of first fruits flesh's mortal nature through the incorruptible virgin, Christ continually sanctified the common mass of mankind by uniting it to himself in a J.382 mysterious fellowship. He nourishes his own body the Church and harmoniously arranges limbs begotten through faith to form the eye, mouth, hands and other limbs. Paul says "the body is one while the members are many" [1Cor 12.14].

Song of Songs 390-1

Refer to passage above

Song of Songs 427-8

Our Lord also spoke of the passing by of the Law which was of no avail; neither priest nor Levite tended the wounds of the man who fell in among robbers, for the blood of goats and bulls are unable to take away sin [Heb 9.13]. However, Christ put on our full human nature as the first fruits of the dough [Rom 11.16] which included a part of each race: Jew, Samaritan, Greek and all mankind. With his body, that is, the ass, he hastened to the place where evil had befallen man, healed his wounds, put him upon his own beast and made for his loving providence a resting place in which all those who labor and are burdened can rest [Mt 11.28]. Whoever enters him receives him, as the Word said, "Whoever remains in me, I will remain in him" [Jn 6.56].

In Illud, M.13.13

Here, then, is the object of our treatise: I will first set forth my own understanding of the text and will add the Apostle Paul's words as applied to my understanding. What does Paul teaching consist of? Evil will come to nought and will be completely destroyed. The divine, pure goodness will contain in itself every nature endowed with reason; nothing made by God is excluded from his kingdom once everything mixed with some elements of base material has been consumed by refinement in fire. Such things had their origin in God; what was made in the beginning did not receive evil. Paul testifies to the truth of this. He said that the pure and undefiled divinity of the Only-Begotten [Son] assumed man's mortal and perishable nature. However, from the entirety of human nature to which the divinity is mixed, the man constituted according to Christ is a kind of first fruits of the common dough. It is through this [divinized] man that all mankind is joined to the divinity.

In Illud, M.13.16

Therefore every wicked authority and domination has been destroyed in us. No longer do our passions rule our [human] nature since it is necessary that none of them dominate--all are subjected to the one who rules over all. Subjection to God is complete alienation from evil. When we are removed from evil in imitation of the first fruits [Christ], our entire nature is mixed with this selfsame fruits. One body has been formed with the good as predominant; our body's entire nature is united to the divine, pure nature. This is what we mean by the Son's subjection-- when in his body Christ rightly has the subjection brought to him, and he effects in us the grace of subjection.

Hypotage References

In **Illud** references are omitted because they are so numerous.

Against Eunomius 53b & 54a

Let us first, then, ascertain the meaning of this word 'subjection' in Scripture. To whom is it applied? The Creator, honoring man in his having been made in His own image, 'has placed' the brute creation 'in subjection under his feet;' as great David relating this favor (of God) exclaimed in the Psalms : "He put all things," he says, "under his feet," and he mentions by name the creatures so subjected. There is still another meaning of 'subjection' in Scripture. Ascribing to God Himself the cause of his success in war, the Psalmist says , "He has put peoples and nations in subjection under our feet," and "He that puts peoples in subjection under me." This word is often found thus in Scripture, indicating a victory. As for the future subjection of all men to the Only-begotten, and through Him to the Father, in the passage where the Apostle with a profound wisdom speaks of the Mediator between God and man as subject to the Father, implying by that subjection of the Son who shares humanity the actual subjugation of mankind— we will not discuss it now, for it requires a full and thorough examination. But to take only the plain and unambiguous meaning of the word subjection, how can he declare the being of the Spirit to be subject to that of the Son and the Father? As the Son is subject to the Father, according to the thought of the Apostle? But in this view the Spirit is to be ranked with the Son, not below Him, seeing that both Persons are of this lower rank. This was not his meaning? How then? In the way the brute creation is subject to the rational, as in the Psalm? There is then as great a difference as is implied in the subjection of the brute creation, when compared to man. Perhaps he will reject this explanation as well. Then he will have to come to the only remaining one, that the Spirit, at first in the rebellious ranks, was afterwards forced by a superior Force to bend to a Conqueror.

Let him choose which he likes of these alternatives: whichever it is I do not see how he can avoid the inevitable crime of blasphemy: whether he says the Spirit is subject in the manner of the brute creation, as fish and birds and sheep, to man, or were to fetch Him a captive to a superior power after the manner of a rebel. Or does he mean neither of these ways, but uses the word in a different signification altogether to the scripture meaning? What, then, is that signification? Does he lay down that we must rank Him as inferior and not as equal, because He was given by our Lord to His disciples third in order? By the same reasoning he should make the Father inferior to the Son, since the Scripture often places the name of our Lord first, and the Father Almighty second. "I and My Father," our Lord says. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God ," and other passages innumerable which the diligent student of Scripture testimonies might collect: for instance, "there are differences of gifts, but it is the same Spirit: and there are differences of administration, but it is the same Lord: and there are differences of operations, but it is the same God." According to this, then, let the Almighty Father, who is mentioned third, be made 'subject' to the Son and the Spirit. However we have never yet heard of a philosophy such as this, which relegates to the category of the inferior and the dependent that which is mentioned second or third only for some particular reason of sequence: yet that is what our author wants to do, in arguing to show that the order observed in the transmission of the Persons amounts to differences of more and less in dignity and nature. In fact he rules that sequence in point of order is indicative of unlikeness of nature: whence he got this fancy, what necessity compelled him to it, is not clear. Mere numerical rank does not create a different nature: that which we would count in a number remains the same in nature whether we count it or not. Number is a mark only of the mere quantity of things: it does not place second those things only which have an inferior natural value, but it makes the sequence of the numerical objects indicated in accordance with the intention of those who are counting. 'Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus' are three

persons mentioned according to a particular intention. Does the place of Silvanus, second and after Paul, indicate that he was other than a man? Or is Timothy, because he is third, considered by the writer who so ranks him a different kind of being? Not so. Each is human both before and after this arrangement. Speech, which cannot utter the names of all three at once, mentions each separately according to an order which commends itself, but unites them by the copula, in order that the juncture of the names may show the harmonious action of the three towards one end.

Aisthesis References

Song of Songs J.6-7

Yet Paul somewhere calls the shift from the corporeal to the spiritual "a turning to the Lord and the removal of a veil" [2 Cor 3.16]. In all these different expressions and names of contemplation Paul is teaching us an important lesson: we must pass to a spiritual and intelligent investigation of scripture so that considerations of the merely human element might be changed into something perceived by the mind once the more fleshly sense of the words has been shaken off like dust. For this reason Paul says, "the letter kills, but the spirit gives life" [2Cor 3.6].

Song of Songs J.89

There are many diverse perfumes and their fragrances differ from one another, but a careful mixture creates a special perfume. One fragrant herb called nard gives its name to the whole mixture. Many aromatic properties contribute to one, good odor of the bridegroom which the purified sense receives. We think that the Word teaches us here about his essence underlying the order and structure of creation: it is inaccessible, intangible and incomprehensible. Instead of the Word we have in us this compounded fragrance from the perfection of the virtues. It imitates by its own purity that which by nature is incorruptible; by its goodness it imitates his goodness; by its incorruptibility, his incorruptibility; by its immutability, his immutability; and by everything in us effected through virtue, his true virtue which contains all the heavens according to the prophet Habakkuk [Hab 3.3].

Song of Songs J.268

Animal sacrifices were many and frequent. If any lesson can be gained, it is enjoined upon you in mystery, that is, the necessity of sacrificing your own passions. "A sacrifice to God is a contrite heart. A contrite and humble heart God will not spurn" [Ps 50.19]. Hence, our sacrifice of praise glorifies such a One who smells the fragrance. The soul spiritually inhales a good fragrance like Paul, a "good odor of Christ" [2Cor 2.15], and transcends every symbolic fragrance of the Law. The soul becomes fragrant in her life, breathing the myrrh of priesthood and the incense of conscience composed from the different virtues; her life is a sweet smelling odor to the bridegroom. When Solomon speaks of the "divine sense" in comparison with the material spices of the Law, he adds that immaterial, pure, good scent compounded by the virtues: "And the scent of your ointments is better than all spices."

Song of Songs J.324-5

How can what is invisible be seen at night? The bridegroom bestows upon the soul a perception of his presence although a clear apprehension escapes it since his invisible nature lies hidden. What is the mystic initiation which the soul experiences during this night? It is the Word touching the door. We understand by this door the human mind searching for what is hidden; through it the object sought after enters. Therefore, truth stands outside our souls because, as the Apostle says [1Cor 13.12], we know in part. Truth knocks at the mind by means of allegory and mystery saying "Open," and with this summons the bridegroom suggests a way we can open the door. He gives us certain keys, that is, the beautiful words of the Song. Names such as sister, companion, dove and perfect one are clearly the keys which open what is hidden.

In Illud: Tunc et Ipse Filius

All the utterances of the Lord are holy and pure as the prophet says [cf. Ps 33.4-5]. When the mind (*nous*) has been purified as silver in fire and cleansed of every heretical notion, it has the capacity of noble utterances and a splendor which is in accord with truth. Before this, however, I think it is necessary to attest to the brilliance and purity of Saint Paul's teachings: in paradise he was initiated into the knowledge of unintelligible things. Having Christ speaking within himself, Paul uttered such things which anyone would utter who was taught by such a teacher, guide and master as the Word. Since evil frauds lay hands on the divine silver to make it base by mixing it with heretical and adulterated conceptions which obscure the Word's brightness and the Apostle's mystical perceptions, they either do not understand these perceptions or they resolve wickedly to choose selectively among them in order to defend their own wicked behavior, having appropriated them for their own wicked purposes. Such persons claim, in order to diminish the glory of the Only-Begotten [Son] of God, that the apostle's words agree with them when he says, "Then the Son will be subjected (*hupotagestetai*) to him who has subjected all things to himself" [1Cor 15.28]. Thus they would say such a style of speaking reveals a certain servile subjection of the Son to the Father]. For this reason it seemed necessary to diligently examine what is being said here that we may show that the apostolic silver is truly pure, separated and unmixed from every kind of sordid and heretical concept. We, for our part, know that such a saying or word [that is, *hupotasso*] has many meanings in Holy Scripture and is not always suited to the same purposes: now it signifies one thing, and at another time something else, for instance slaves are to be subjected to their masters.

Man's irrational nature is to be subjected to God of which the prophet says, "He put all things under his feet" [Ps 8.8]. As for those taken captive in battle it says, "He subjected peoples under us and nations under our feet" [Ps 46.4]. Yet again mentioning those who have been saved through knowledge, the prophet says in the person of God, "He subjected other peoples under me" [Ps 59.10]. Thus, it behooves us to see how what was examined in this psalm verse can be applied to Psalm 61: "Will not my soul be subjected to God?" [Ps 61.2]. That which is brought to our attention by our enemies from all these examples is taken from the Epistle to the Corinthians, namely, "then the Son himself will be subjected to the One who subjects all things to himself." Because this text can be understood in many ways, it would be helpful if each use of the word [subjection] is examined so that we may know the proper meaning the apostle had in mind by the term "subjection."

We say that those vanquished in battle unwillingly and forcefully submit themselves to their victors--this is a sign of subjection. If any opportunity arises which may offer hope of overcoming their masters, the captives who consider it bad and disgraceful to be in such a state once again rise up in rebellion. Irrational (*alogos*) beasts are subject to men endowed with reason (*logikos*); such is the order of things. How necessary it is for that which is inferior to be subjected to that which enjoys a superior lot by nature! Those under the yoke of servitude as some consequence of the law--even if they are equal in nature (to their masters) but are unable to resist the law--hear the state of subjection, having inevitably been brought to this state out of necessity.

On the other hand, the mark of submission to God is, as we have learned by the prophecy, "To God be subjected, my soul, for from him is my salvation" [Ps 61.2]. When the apostle's text is brought forward by our adversaries, that is, saying that the Son must be subjected to the Father, it follows that once its meaning has been clarified, we must ask those who are accustomed to attribute Paul's text to

the Only-Begotten [Son] of God what they mean by subjection. But it is clear that the Son's subjection should not be understood according to any mode of human speech. An enemy vanquished in battle does not rise up a second time against his victors out of hope and eagerness [for overcoming them]. Neither through a lack of the good does an irrational beast have a natural, necessary subjection as in the case of sheep and cattle which are subjected to man. Similarly, neither does a bought or home-born slave ever expect to become free of slavery's yoke by law either through kindness or clemency. With regard to salvation's goal it is said that the Only-Begotten [Son] of God is subjected to the Father in the same way salvation from God is procured for mankind.

As for mutable [human] nature's participation in the good, it is necessary for such a nature to be subjected to God by means of which we have fellowship in this good. Subjection has no place in God's immutable and unchanging power; in it is contemplated every good name, intelligence, incorruptibility and blessedness. This power always remains as it is; neither does it have the capacity to become better nor worse. Also, neither does God's power receive increase in the good nor a downward inclination to a worse condition. Rather, God's power makes salvation spring up for others while having no other function than bestowing salvation.

What can reasonably be said as to the meaning of subjection? Everything which has been examined is found quite remote from a proper understanding and discussion about the Only-Begotten [Son] of God. If it is necessary to attribute the kind of subjection spoken of in Luke's Gospel to Christ—"The Lord was obedient [subjected] to his parents until he reached twelve years of age" [2.51]—the meaning implied in this text does not apply to the God who existed before all ages; the same holds true when applied to his real Father. Christ was tempted in our human nature [literally, 'there'] in everything according to our likeness except sin [Heb 4.15] and advanced through the stages proper to our human existence. -Just as a little child, Christ received a newborn infant's nourishment, that is, butter and milk. While advancing into adolescence, Christ did not avoid anything related or pertaining to that particular stage of life, but was an example of good conduct for that particular age.

Since the understanding of some persons is imperfect regarding these matters, the function of Christ's youth is to lead to a better state by what is more perfect. Thus the twelve-year-old child [Jesus] was subject to his mother; Christ showed us that which is perfected through advancement, although he was perfect beforehand. Rightly did he take subjection as a means to the good. He who is perfect in every good and was incapable of assuming any kind of diminution—because his nature is self-sufficient and cannot be lessened—is subjected for a reason beyond the range of thoughtless persons.

Christ associated himself with our human nature and experienced the stage of childhood through which he effected the obedience [subjection] proper to this time of youth. It is clear that Christ progressed from that state to a perfect age when he no longer relied upon a mother's authority. His mother urged him to manifest his power in Canna of Galilee when there was a lack of wine at the wedding feast, and wine was needed for the celebration. He did not refuse those in need but rejected his mother's request as no longer being appropriate for his present age (*kairos*) of life. He said, "What do you have to do with me, woman?" [Jn 2.4]. "Do you wish to have power over me now at this stage of my life? Has not my hour come which shows that I have a mind and free will of my own?" If the just measure of our parents' subjection in this life according to the flesh is shaken off—for it has a place in our present existence—no one is able to command Christ whose lordship remains forever. The divine and blessed life is his own which always abides in him and never admits of transformation due to change.

Because the Word, the Only-Begotten [Son] of God from the beginning, is alien from every aberration

and change, how can what now is not a reality exist afterwards? The Apostle does not say that the Son is always subjected but that he will be subjected at the final consummation of all things. If subjection is said to be good and worthy of God, how can this good be apart from God? The good is equally in both persons--in the Son who is subjected and in the Father who receives his Son's subjection. Such a good is lacking to both Father and Son at the present. What the Father does not have before all ages neither does the Son have; at the fulfillment of time this good will be present to Father. On the other hand, there will be a certain addition and increase in God's own glory which at present he does not have. How does this relate to what is unchangeable? That which will exist afterwards but not now refers to our mutable human nature. If subjection is good, the good now consists of believing in God; if such a good is unworthy of God, neither can it exist now nor in the future. However, the Apostle claims that the Son is to be subjected; He is not so at the present.

Does the term "subjection" have another meaning which is far removed from any kind of heretical perversity? What, then, is it? Perhaps by connecting what has also been written in this part [of First Corinthians] to the text at large, we may obtain an idea of what Paul means. When Paul wrote against the Corinthians who had received their faith in the Lord, they held the teaching of the Resurrection as a myth saying, "How can the dead rise? And what kind of body will they have?" [1Cor 15.35]. By what diverse and varied ways do bodies return to existence after death and disintegration after having been destroyed either by carnivorous animals, reptiles or animals which swim, fly or are four-footed beasts? Paul sets before the Corinthians many arguments, entreating them not to compare God's power to their own human capacity nor to estimate anything as being impossible regarding man as well as God. However, one may consider God's greatness from examples well-known to us. Thus God placed in man the marvelous example of seeds in their bodies which are always renewed by his power [1Cor 15.37]. God's wisdom is not exhausted. It is found in myriad bodily forms of all descriptions-- those which are rational, irrational, air-borne and on the earth as well as those which we see in the heavens, such as the sun and other stars. Each one having been begotten by the divine power is a certain proof that God will resurrect our bodies.

All things come to manifestation not from any underlying matter but from the divine will acting as matter and substance for such created things; it is easier to mold that which already exists into its proper shape (schema) than to bring into being that which had no substance and essence right from the beginning. In the text [cf. 1Cor 15] Paul showed that the first man was dissolved into the earth through sin and was regarded as being of the earth. It followed that all who took their origin from this first man became earthly and mortal. Another consequence necessarily resulted by which man is renewed once again from mortality into immortality. Similarly, the good begotten in human nature was bestowed upon every person as one entity, just as evil was poured into a multitude of persons by one man through succeeding generations. These words can be used for confirming Paul's teaching. "The first man," he says, "was from the earth; the second man is from heaven. As it was with the man of dust, so it is with those of the dust; as it is with the man of heaven, so are those who are of heaven" [1 Cor 15.47-48]. These and similar reflections confirm the fact of the Resurrection.

By many other arguments Paul thwarted heretics with syllogisms. He showed that the person not believing in the resurrection of the dead does not admit of Christ's Resurrection. Through the web of mutual connections there comes the inevitable conclusion--"If there is no resurrection of the dead, neither has Christ risen. If Christ has not risen, our faith in him is vain" [1Cor 15.16]. If the proposition is true, namely that Christ is risen from the dead, it is necessarily true that this connection spoken of is true, that there is a resurrection of the dead. For by a particular demonstration the universal is presented at the same time. On the contrary, if anyone says the universal is false, that is, the resurrection of the dead, neither is the truth found in an individual example such as Christ's

Resurrection from the dead. Paul therefore compels the Corinthians by syllogisms to accept his teaching on the Resurrection. From it he claims that if the Resurrection does not exist, its universal confirmation is concluded. For with a specific proof the general principle is also revealed. And on the contrary, if anyone were to say that the general principle is false (that there is a resurrection of the dead), then neither would the specific be found true (that Christ was raised from the dead). Paul adds to this fact that as all have died in Adam all will be restored to life in Christ. Paul clearly reveals here the mystery of the Resurrection. Anyone who looks at what stems from the Resurrection readily sees its consequence, the goal for which all men hope and for which they direct their prayers.

Here, then, is the object of our treatise: I will first set forth my own understanding of the text and will add the Apostle Paul's words as applied to my understanding. What does Paul teaching consist of? Evil will come to nought and will be completely destroyed. The divine, pure goodness will contain in itself every nature endowed with reason; nothing made by God is excluded from his kingdom once everything mixed with some elements of base material has been consumed by refinement in fire. Such things had their origin in God; what was made in the beginning did not receive evil. Paul testifies to the truth of this. He said that the pure and undefiled divinity of the Only-Begotten [Son] assumed man's mortal and perishable nature. However, from the entirety of human nature to which the divinity is mixed, the man constituted according to Christ is a kind of first fruits of the common dough. It is through this [divinized] man that all mankind is joined to the divinity.

Since every evil was obliterated in Christ--for he did not make sin-- the prophet says, "No deceit was found in his mouth" [Is 53.9]. Evil was destroyed along with sin, as well as the death which resulted; death is simply the result of sin. Christ assumed from death both the beginning of evil's destruction and the dissolution of death; then, as it were, a certain order was added. Decrease of the good always results by straying from its principle, whereas the good is found closer to us insofar as it lies in each one's dignity and power; thus a result follows from the action preceding it: after the man in Christ who became the first fruits of our human nature received in himself the divinity, He became the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep and the first born from the dead once the pangs of death have been loosened. After this person has completely separated himself from sin and has utterly denied in himself the power of death and destroyed its lordship and authority and might--if anyone like Paul may be found who became a mighty imitator of Christ in his rejection of evil--such a person will fall in behind the first fruits at Christ's coming.

And, on the other hand--I say this as an example--there is Timothy who as much as he could was also imitating his teacher; there are other persons not quite like him who, one after another, gradually suffer a loss of goodness and follow behind certain people who are always ready to anticipate and lead until the followers, by continual imitations, resemble their leaders in whom there is little good because evil abounds. In the same way there is a conformity that comes from those who are less flawed and as a consequence, turn from those who excel in evil by following their own inclinations and who are driven back from better things until at the last gasp of evil growth in goodness achieves the destruction of evil. Similarly, by a growing resemblance to less evil persons, those who excelled in doing evil enter the way of persons being led into what is better until through progress in the good they put an end to their evil ways by the destruction of wickedness. The goal of our hope is that nothing contrary to the good is left but that the divine life permeates everything. It completely destroys death, having earlier removed sin which, as it is said, held dominion over all mankind. Therefore every wicked authority and domination has been destroyed in us. No longer do our passions rule our [human] nature since it is necessary that none of them dominate--all are subjected to the one who rules over all. Subjection to God is complete alienation from evil. When we are removed from evil in imitation of the first fruits [Christ], our entire nature is mixed with this selfsame fruits. One body

has been formed with the good as predominant; our body's entire nature is united to the divine, pure nature. This is what we mean by the Son's subjection-- when in his body Christ rightly has the subjection brought to him, and he effects in us the grace of subjection.

Such is our understanding of these teachings which we have received from the great Saint Paul. It is time now to quote the Apostle himself on these matters: "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive. But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits, then at his coming those who belong to Christ. Then comes the end when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power. For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. 'For God has put all things in subjection under his feet' [a reference to Ps 8.6]. But when it says, 'All things are put in subjection under him,' it is plain that he is accepted who put all things under him. When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to him who puts all things under him, that God may be everything to everyone" [1Cor 15.22-28].

Towards the end of his words Paul plainly speaks of the nonexistence of evil by stating that God is in all things and present to each one of them. It is clear that God will truly be in all things when no evil will be found. It is not proper for God to be present in evil; he will not be in everything as long as some evil remains. If it compels us to truly believe that God is in everything, then evil cannot be seen as existing along with faith; God cannot be present in evil. However, for God to be present in all things, Paul shows that he, the hope of our life, is simple and uniform. No longer can our new existence be compared to the many and varied examples of this present life. By the words quoted above, Paul shows that God becomes all things for us. He appears as the necessities of our present life or as examples for partaking in the divinity. For God to be our food, it is proper to understand him as being eaten; the same applies to drink, clothing, shelter, air, location, wealth, enjoyment, beauty, health, strength, prudence, glory, blessedness and anything else judged good which our human nature needs. Words such as these signify what is proper to God.

We learn from the examples mentioned above that the person in God has everything which God himself has. To have God means nothing else than unity with him. Unity means to be one body with him as Paul states, for all who are joined to the one body of Christ by participation are one body with him. When the good pervades everything, then the entirety of Christ's body will be subjected to God's vivifying power. Thus the subjection of this body will be the subjection of the Church. Regarding this point Paul says to the Colossians, "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and in my flesh I complete what is lacking in Christ's afflictions for the sake of his body, that is, the Church of which I became a minister according to his dispensation" [Col 1.24]. To the Church at Corinth Paul says, "You are the body of Christ and his members" [1Cor 12.27]. To the Ephesians Paul more clearly puts this teaching when saying, "Rather, speaking the truth in love, we are to grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ, from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by every joint with which it is supplied, when each part is working properly, makes bodily growth and builds itself up in love" [Eph 4.15-16].

Christ eternally builds himself up by those who join themselves to him in faith. A person ceases to build himself up when the growth and completion of his body attains its proper measure. No longer does he lack anything added to his body by building since he is wholly constructed upon the foundation of prophets and apostles. When faith is added, the Apostle says, "Let us attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" [Eph 2.13].

If the head, in turn, builds up the body, it joins, connects and brings together everything else for which it was born according to the measure of its function such as the hand, foot, eye, ear or any other part completing the body in proportion to each person's faith. By so carrying out these functions, the body builds itself up as Paul says above. It is clear that when this is accomplished, Christ receives in himself all who are joined to him through the fellowship of his body. Christ makes everyone as limbs of his own body; even if there are many such limbs, the body is one. By uniting us to himself Christ is our unity; having become one body with us through all things, he looks after us all. Subjection to God is our chief good when all creation resounds as one voice, when everything in heaven, on earth and under the earth bends the knee to him and when every tongue will confess that has become one body and is joined in Christ through obedience to one another; at this point he will bring into subjection his own body to the Father.

Let not what is said here sound strange to anyone because we ascribe to the soul a certain means of expression taken from the body. That which is read as pertaining to the fruitfulness of the land may also be applied to one's own soul: "Eat, drink, and be merry" [Lk 11.19]. This sentence may refer to the fullness of the soul. Thus the subjection of the Church's body is brought to him who dwells in the soul. Since everything is explained through subjection as the book of Psalms suggests. As a result we learn that faith means not being apart from those who are saved, a fact we learn from the Apostle Paul.

By the Son's subjection Paul signifies the destruction of death. Two elements concur: the destruction of death and when everything will be completely changed into life. The Lord is life. According to the Apostle, Christ will have access to the Father with his entire body when he will hand over the kingdom to our God and Father. As it is often said, Christ's body consists of human nature in its entirety to which he has been united. Because of this Christ is named Lord by Paul as mediator between God and man [1Tim 2.5]. He who is in the Father and has lived with men accomplishes intercession. Christ unites all mankind to himself and to the Father through himself. As the Lord says in the Gospel, "As you, Father, are in me, and I am in you, that they may be one in us" [Jn 17.21]. This clearly shows that having united himself to us, he who is in the Father effects our union with this very same Father.

The Gospel then adds, "The glory which you have given to me I have given to them" [vs. 22]. I think that Christ's own glory is meant to be the Holy Spirit which he has given to his disciples by breathing upon them, for what is scattered cannot otherwise be united unless joined together by the Holy Spirit's unity. "Anyone who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him" [Rom 8.9]. The Spirit is glory as Christ says of the Father: "Glorify me with the glory which I had with you before the world was made" [Jn 17.5]. The Word is God who has the Father's glory and became flesh during these last days. It is necessary for the flesh to become what the Word is (that is, to become divine) by uniting itself to him; this is effected when the flesh receives that which the Word had before the world was made. This is none other than the Holy Spirit, that same Holy Spirit existing before the ages together with the Father and the Son. Hence the text says, "The glory which you have given me, I have given to them" in order that "the unity given through the Holy Spirit to me might be given to you through me."

Let us consider the words following those quoted above from the Gospel: "That they may be one as we are one. You in me and I in them, because I and you are one, in order that they may be perfectly one" [Jn 17 .21-23]. There is no need for exegesis of these words which agree with what we have already explained above because the text itself clearly sets forth the teaching on unity. "In order that they may be one as we are one." It cannot be otherwise--"that all may be one as we are one"--unless the disciples, being separated from everything dividing them from each other, are united together "as we

are one," that "they might be one, as we are one." How can it be that "I am in them?" For "I alone cannot be in them unless you also are in them, since both I and you are one. Thus they might be perfectly one, having been perfected in us, for we are one."

Such grace is more clearly shown by the following words: "I have loved them as you have loved me" [Jn 17.23]. If the Father loves the Son, all of us have become Christ's body through faith in him. Thus, the Father who loves his own Son loves the Son's body just as the Son himself. We are the Son's body. Paul's words are now clear: the Son's subjection to his Father signifies that he knows our entire human nature and has become its salvation. The text to which Paul is referring might become clearer to us from his other insights. I especially recall one of his many reverent testimonies without quoting it at length. Paul says of himself that "with Christ I am crucified. It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me" [Gal 2.20]. If Paul no longer lives but Christ lives in him, everything which Paul does and says is referred to Christ living in him. Paul's words are spoken by Christ when he says, "Do you desire proof that Christ is speaking in me?" [2Cor 13.3]. Paul claims that the good works of the Gospel are not his; he attributes them to the grace of Christ dwelling within him. If Christ living in Paul works and speaks those things as a result of this indwelling, Paul has relinquished everything which formerly dominated him when he was a blasphemer, persecutor and behaved arrogantly. Paul looked to the true good alone, and by it made himself submissive and obedient.

Once Paul has been subjected to God, he is brought to the One who lives, speaks and effects good things. The supreme good is subjection to God. This fact which occurred in one person [Paul] will be harmoniously applied to every human being "when," as the Lord says, "the Gospel will be preached throughout the world" [Mk 16.15]. All who have rejected the old man with its deeds and desires have received the Lord who, of course, effects the good done by them. The highest of all good things is salvation effected in us through estrangement from evil. We are separated from evil for no other reason than for being united to God through subjection. Subjection to God then refers to Christ dwelling in us. What is beautiful is his; what is good is from him which God expresses through the prophets. Because subjection is both beautiful and good—Christ himself demonstrated this to us—the good is entirely from him who is good by nature, as the prophet says.

No one who looks at the term "subjection" as generally used spurns it. The great Paul in his wisdom knew how to use the outward appearance of words. He knew how to adapt such appearances by joining them together in his own mind to see if the common usage of words may be employed for other meanings. One such occurrence of this reads as follows: "He emptied himself" [Phil 2.3], "No one will make void my boasting" [1Cor 9.15], "faith is made void" [Rom 4.14] and "In order that the cross of Christ may not be without effect." What use are these expressions to their author? Who can judge him saying, "I am desirous of you" [1Th 2.8]? Such words as these show a loving attitude.

From where does Paul's lack of arrogance, which is love, come? It is revealed through his statement that love does not boast [1Cor 13.4]. Strife is full of disputes and is vengeful as the term *eritheia* signifies [selfish or factious ambition]. It is clear that *erithos* [a worker in wool] is derived from the term *eritheia*, and we are accustomed to signifying diligent work with regards to wool (*eria*) by the term *eritheia*. Paul finds pleasure in such cold etymologies and by them he desires to show the sense intended by these words. Many other examples may be examined closely in which the Apostle's words are found. They do not serve the common use of speech, but Paul freely brings his own peculiar understanding to them while avoiding the common usage. Hence, another meaning of subjection is understood by Paul as opposite to the common one.

The exposition of the term "subjection" as used here does not mean the forceful, necessary subjection

of enemies as is commonly meant; on the other hand, salvation is clearly interpreted by subjection. Clear proof of the former meaning is definitely made when Paul makes a twofold distinction of the term "enemy." He says that enemies are to be subjected; indeed, they are to be destroyed. The enemy to be blotted out from human nature is death whose principle is sin along with its domination and power. In another sense the enemies of God which are to be subjected to him attach themselves to sin after deserting God's kingdom. Paul mentions this in his Epistle to the Romans: "For if we have been enemies, we have been reconciled to God" [Rom 5.10]. Here Paul calls subjection reconciliation, one term indicating salvation by another word. As salvation is brought near to us by subjection, Paul says in another place, "Being reconciled, we shall be saved in this life" [Rom 5.10]. Paul says that such enemies are to be subjected to God and the Father; death no longer is to have authority. This is shown by Paul saying, "Death will be destroyed," a clear statement that the power of evil will be utterly removed; persons are called enemies of God by disobedience, while those who have become the Lord's friends are persuaded by Paul saying, "We are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: 'Be reconciled to God [2Cor 6.20]."

According to the promise made in the Gospel, we are no longer slaves of the Lord, but once reconciled, we are numbered among his friends. However, "it is necessary for him to reign until he places his enemies under his feet." We reverently take this as Christ valiantly holding sway in his power; the strong man's ability in battle will cease when all opposition to the good will be destroyed. Once the entire kingdom is gathered to himself, Christ hands it over to God and the Father who unites everything to himself. The kingdom will be handed over to the Father; all persons will yield to God [Christ] through whom we have access to the Father.

When all enemies have become God's footstool, they will receive a trace of divinity in themselves. Once death has been destroyed--if there are no persons who will die, not even death would exist--we will be subjected to him; but we should take this as some sort of servile humility. Our subjection consists of a kingdom, incorruptibility and blessedness living in us; this is Paul's meaning of being subjected to God. Christ perfects his good in us by himself and effects in us what is pleasing to him. According to our limited understanding of Paul's great wisdom which we received, we have only understood part of it. The Apostle's intent was not to expose heretical teachings which is what you would gather from the text being treated. If what was said by our inquiry has been sufficient for you, it must be attributed to God's grace. Should our inquiry appear insufficient, we will eagerly offer its completion proved that you make it known to us by writing and if through our prayers what is hidden has been manifested by the Holy Spirit.