${\bf 0213\text{-}0270-Gregorius\ Thau maturgus-On\ the\ Trinity}$

On the Trinity

this file has been downloaded from http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf06.html

(The minister...to the Gentiles, p. 43.)

IF St. Peter had been at Rome, St. Paul would not have come there (2 Cor. x. 16). The two apostles had each his jurisdiction, and they kept to their own "line of things" respectively. How, then, came St. Peter to visit Rome? The answer is clear: unless he came involuntarily, as a prisoner, he came to look after the Church of the *Circumcision*,³⁷² which was "in his measure;" and doubtless St. Paul urged him to this, the Hebrew Christians there being so large a proportion of the Church. St. Peter came "at the close of his life," doubtless attended by an apostolic companion, as St. Paul was, and Barnabas also (Acts xv. 39, 40). Linus probably laboured for St. Paul (in prison) among the Gentile Romans,³⁷³ and Cletus for St. Peter among Jewish Christians. St. Peter *survived all his martyred associates*, and left Clement in charge of the whole Church. This most probable theory squares with all known facts, and reconciles all difficulties. Clement, then, was first bishop of Rome (A.D. 65); and so says Tertullian, vol. iii. p. 258, note 9.

That compendious but superficial little work, Smith's *History of the First Ten Centuries*,³⁷⁴ justly censures as "misleading" the usage, which it yet keeps up, of calling the early bishops of Rome "Popes."³⁷⁵ The same author utterly misunderstands Cyprian's references to Rome as "a principal *cathedra*," "*a* root and *matrix*," etc.; importing into the indefinite Latin *a definite article*. Cyprian applies a similar principle, after his master Tertullian (vol. iii. p. 260, this series), to all the Apostolic Sees, the *matrices* of Christian churches.



On the Trinity.

Fragment from the Discourse.376

Origin says so, expressly. See Cave, *Lives*, i. p. 230.

^{373 2} Tim. iv. 21.

³⁷⁴ The Student's Eccl. Hist., London, 1878.

It accepts the statement that the earliest application of this term, by way of eminence, to the Bishop of Rome, is found in Evnodius of Pavia, *circa* A.D. 500. Robertson, vol. i. p. 560.

Mai, Spicil. Rom., vol. iii. p. 696, from the Arabic Codex, 101.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bishop of Neo-Cæsareia in Pontus,³⁷⁷ near successor of the apostles, in his discourse on the Trinity, speaks thus:—

I see in all three essentials—substance, genus, name. We speak of man, servant, curator (curatorem),—man, by reason of substance; servant, by reason of genus or condition; curator, by reason of denomination. We speak also of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: these, however, are not names which have only supervened at some after period, but they are subsistences. Again, the denomination of man is not in actual fact a denomination, but a substance common to men, and is the denomination proper to all men. Moreover, names are such as these,—Adam, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob: these, I say, are names. But the Divine Persons are names indeed: and the names are still the persons; and the persons then signify that which is and subsists,—which is the essence of God. The name also of the nature signifies subsistence;³⁷⁸ as if we should speak of the man. All (the persons) are one nature, one essence, one will, and are called the Holy Trinity; and these also are names subsistent, one nature in three persons, and one genus. But the person of the Son is composite in its oneness (unita est), being one made up of two, that is, of divinity and humanity together, which two constitute one. Yet the divinity does not consequently receive any increment, but the Trinity remains as it was. Nor does anything new befall the persons even or the names, but these are eternal and without time. No one, however, was sufficient to know these until the Son being made flesh manifested them, saying: "Father, I have manifested Thy name to men; glorify Thou me also, that they may know me as Thy Son."³⁷⁹ And on the mount the Father spake, and said, "This is my beloved Son."380 And the same sent His Holy Spirit at the Jordan. And thus it was declared to us that there is an Eternal Trinity in equal honour. Besides, the generation of the Son by the Father is incomprehensible and ineffable; and because it is spiritual, its investigation becomes impracticable: for a spiritual object can neither be understood nor traced by a corporeal object, for that is far removed from human nature. We men know indeed the generation proper to us, as also that of other objects; but a spiritual matter is above human condition, neither can it in any manner be understood by the minds of men. Spiritual substance can neither perish nor be dissolved; ours, however, as is easy to understand, perishes and is dissolved. How, indeed, could it be possible for man, who is limited on six sides—by east, west, south, north, deep, and sky—understand a matter which is above the skies, which is beneath the deeps, which stretches beyond the north and south, and which is present in every place, and fills all vacuity? But if, indeed, we are able to scrutinize spiritual substance, its excellence truly would be undone. Let us consider what is done in our body; and, furthermore, let us see whether it is in our power to ascertain in what manner thoughts are born of the heart, and words of the tongue, and the like. Now, if we can by no means apprehend

The Arabic Codex reads falsely, Cæsareæ Cappadociæ.

Or, the name signifies the subsistence of the nature—Nomen quoque naturæ significat subsistentiam.

John xvii. 6.

³⁸⁰ Matt. iii. 17.

things that are done in ourselves, how could it ever be that we should understand the mystery of the uncreated Creator, which goes beyond every mind? Assuredly, if this mystery were one that could be penetrated by man, the inspired John would by no means have affirmed this: "No man hath seen God at any time." He then, whom no man hath seen at any time,—whom can we reckon Him to resemble, so that thereby we should understand His generation? And we, indeed, without ambiguity apprehend that our soul dwells in us in union with the body; but still, who has ever seen



his own soul? who has been able to discern its conjunction with his body? This one thing is all we know certainly, that there is a soul within us conjoined with the body. Thus, then, we reason and believe that the Word is begotten by the Father, albeit we neither possess nor know the clear rationale of the fact. The Word Himself is before every creature—eternal from the Eternal, like spring from spring, and light from light. The vocable Word, indeed, belongs to those three genera of words which are named in Scripture, and which are not substantial,—namely, the word conceived, 382 the word *uttered*, ³⁸³ and the word *articulated*. ³⁸⁴ The word *conceived*, certainly, is not substantial. The word *uttered*, again, is that voice which the prophets hear from God, or the prophetic speech itself; and even this is not substantial. And, lastly, the word articulated is the speech of man formed forth in air (aëre efformatus), composed of terms, which also is not substantial. 385 But the Word of God is substantial, endowed with an exalted and enduring nature, and is eternal with Himself, and is inseparable from Him, and can never fall away, but shall remain in an everlasting union. This Word created heaven and earth, and in Him were all things made. He is the arm and the power of God, never to be separated from the Father, in virtue of an indivisible nature, and, together with the Father, He is without beginning. This Word took our substance of the Virgin Mary; and in so far as He is spiritual indeed, He is indivisibly equal with the Father; but in so far as He is corporeal, He is in like manner inseparably equal with us. And, again, in so far as He is spiritual, He supplies in the same equality (*æquiparat*) the Holy Spirit, inseparably and without limit. Neither were there two natures, but only one nature of the Holy Trinity before the incarnation of the Word, the Son; and the nature of the Trinity remained one also after the incarnation of the Son. But if any one, moreover, believes that any increment has been given to the Trinity by reason of the assumption of humanity by the Word, he is an alien from us, and from the ministry of the Catholic and Apostolic Church. This is the perfect, holy, Apostolic faith of the holy God. Praise to the Holy Trinity for ever through the ages of the ages. Amen.

John i. 18. 381

τὸ κατ' ἔννοιαν. 382

³⁸³ προφορικόν.

άρθρικόν. 384

On these terms, consult the Greek Fathers in Petavius, de Trin., book vi. [See Elucidation below.] 385

Elucidation.

Petavius, to whom the translator refers his readers, may be trusted in points where he has no theory of his own to sustain, but must always be accepted with caution. The Greek Fathers in this very series, from Justin³⁸⁶ onward, enable us to put the later terminology to the test of earlier exposition (see examples in the notes to the *Praxeas* of Tertullian, and consult Dr. Holmes' valuable note embodied in my elucidations).³⁸⁷ We may go back to Theophilus for the distinction between the ἐνδιάθετος and the προφορικός , the immanent and the uttered Word.³⁸⁸ Compare Tertullian, also, against Marcion.³⁸⁹ Evidences, therefore, are abundant and *archaic*, indeed, to prove that the Ante-Nicene Fathers, with those of the Nicene and the Post-Nicene periods, were of one mind, and virtually of one voice.



Twelve Topics on the Faith.

Wherein is Given Also the Formula of Excommunication, and an Explication is Subjoined to Each.³⁹⁰

Topic I.

If any one says that the body of Christ is uncreated, and refuses to acknowledge that He, being the uncreated Word (God) of God, took the flesh of created humanity and appeared incarnate, even as it is written, let him be anathema.

Explication.

Vol. i. pp. 164, 166, 170, 178, 190–193, 263, 272; Irenæus, *Ibid.*, 468, 546, etc.

Vol. iii. p. 628. Compare (same volume) notes 15, p. 602, and 1, p. 604.

Vol. ii. p. 98, notes 1, 2; also p. 103, note 5.

³⁸⁹ Vol. iii. p. 299, note 19.

Works of Grester, vol. xv. p. 434, Ratisbon, 1741, in fol., from a manuscript codex.