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Introduction

Several scholars have already analyzed the dogmatic facet of Cappadocian Christology\(^1\). Their perspective, shaped primarily through their interest either in the evolution of dogmatic formulations and dogmatic controversies, or the contemporary systematic debates, has envisaged Cappadocian Christology mainly through the lenses of conciliar problems, terminologies, and doctrinal formulations. The importance of Cappadocian Christology has in this way been weighted on the balance of the doctrinal problems and formulations that followed it. Viewed especially from this angle, it seemed to be a useful teaching on the way from Nicea to Chalcedon, although still imperfect from the perspective of the Chalcedonian formulation. The Cappadocians rejected Apollinarist\(^2\) idea that Jesus Christ did not have a human mind, they talked about the two natures of Christ, they elaborated on the mixture and unity of the two natures, but failed to define the relationships between unity and distinction, or substance and hypostasis\(^2\).

---


\(^2\) See this type of analysis for example in Grillmeier, Christ (see note 1), 280. Regarding the concept of ὀμοιότης, although the affirmation is generally true, there are exceptions: in Ga. Naz., ep. 101,19-21, Nazianzen affirms that Christological doctrine should be vice versa than the Trinitarian one (three ὀμοιότητες of one nature [ϖσώστες]).
However, Brian Daley’s studies on Nyssa’s Jesus Christ as the man in whom and through whom the saving reality of God touches us bring to light a fresh, distinct and inspiring vision.

Without denying the tremendous importance of the doctrinal Christological formulations and controversies, I would suggest that a reading of the Cappadocian Christological texts merely from this angle still deprives them of their theological complexity and entirety. For this reason I would propose a complementary perspective, perhaps equally complex and fascinating, namely from the angle of early Christian terminologies. As a comprehensive portrayal of the Cappadocian Christological doctrine needs a greater effort and more extensive treatment than space allows, I will start my investigation from a point which involves a sort of preeminence within Cappadocian Christology. It is the Paschal theology of the Cappadocians. Beyond the Greek philosophical terminology which construes the dogmatic elaboration of Cappadocian Christology, there is a festal, liturgical, and apocalyptic dimension of which roots can be traced back to the old traditions of the Second Temple in Jerusalem. Many of those images were sometimes taken over as such, sometimes re-semanticized, sometimes reworked through Greek categories, but all of them were set to play a role in the rhetorical construction of Paschal Christology.

I would also advance the hypothesis that the key Cappadocian change from their Asiatic predecessors, especially Melito and Pseudo-Hippolytus, is that although Christology preserves its central place, it is differently conceived in its main framework. While Melito and Pseudo-Hippolytus focused their Christological discourses mainly on the distinction between the old and new Pascha, between the old mysterious types and the newly revealed truth, between the salvation from Egypt and the salvation from death followed by the ascension to the Father, the Cappadocians conceive of the whole history of salvation on a larger scale, namely the time between the ab initio creation of the world and the eschatological re-creation of the human being. There is a change therefore in the general framework of the

Furthermore, with Nazianzen we have, perhaps for the first time, a change in the object of the universal worship of the Paschal celebration. The whole creation is no longer primarily worshiping the victorious Saviour who defeated death, but the entire Trinity. Trinitarian theology was also present in the previous authors, as long as the Son usually leads the whole redeemed creation to the kingdom of his Father, but the universal celebration and liturgy was primarily Christological. Trinitarian theology, through one of its most important representatives—Nazianzen—makes its way into the Paschal feast:

“The Lord’s Passover, the Passover, and again I say the Passover to the honour of the Trinity [τὴν τριάδος]. This is to us a feast of feasts and a Solemnity of solemnities as far exalted above all others (not only those which are merely human and creep on the ground, but even those which are of Christ Himself, and are celebrated in His honour) as the Sun is above the stars”. See Gr. Naz., or. 45,2 (Gregorio di Nazianzo, Tutte le orazioni, a cura di C. Moreschini, Milano, 2000, 1134); for the English translation see C.G. Browne/J.E. Swallow (eds.), Selected Orations of Saint Gregory Nazianzen, NPNE Second Series 7, Grand Rapids (Michigan) 1974, 432.
Paschal story of salvation. Furthermore, Christ is not only the heavenly Saviour who took human form, but he is also the Demiurge, the almighty Creator of every existing entity.

The discourse becomes even more complex since Christ is, at the same time, the Image of God and the Creator of the human being according to his Image. As this Image was lost in Paradise, the whole process of salvation actually consists in the re-creation of the human being according to the divine Archetype. Generally, the eschaton is viewed as this particular process of re-creation. However, according to the Cappadocian line of thought, the eschatological process of re-creation already started with the event of Incarnation; Christian life, in its essence, should be deemed as part of this eschatological process⁴. Hence, human salvation becomes intrinsically connected with and a central part of creation. Anticipating the conclusion of my investigation, the Cappadocian Paschal Christology may be viewed from the perspective of the Second Temple traditions as a synthesis and development of the glory (ὡς/δόξα) and Demiurge theologies applied to Christology, or as a synthesis of Glory- and Demiurge-Christologies, in which they also inserted their version of the Platonic-Philonian double-creation theory.

This general vision is primarily articulated through the following Christological terminological categories and traditions present in the works of Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa: Glory-Christology, Image-Christology, Anthropos- and Polymorphic-Christology, Pneuma-Sarx-Christology, Christology of Mélange, Demiurge-/Creator-Christology and Eikonic-Soteriology. The object of my analysis will primarily consist in the way the two authors re-semantized these traditions in order to create the general vision I mentioned above.

I. Glory-Christology

Perhaps one of the most appropriate starting points of this analysis is noting the presence in Cappadocian Paschal texts of the early Christian identification of Christ with the divine Glory (ὡς or δόξα). According to this ancient Christian tradition, Christ has a luminous nature, he is the divine glory Moses saw on Sinai, he guided the Israelites in the wilderness, abided in the Temple in Jerusalem, and appeared to the prophets and apocalyptic visionaries. He is the τὸς of the Holy of Holies, conceived either in its terrestrial or heavenly version. This identification is as early as the time of Paul and the Gospels: Paul, for example, calls Christ the “Lord of Glory” (κύριος τῆς δόξης: 1Cor 2,8), the “Father of glory” (πατὴρ

⁴ The entire elaboration has its roots in the Pauline 2Cor 5,17: “For anyone united to Christ, there is a new creation: the old order has gone; a new order has already begun”. Throughout this article, I will make use of the Oxford Study Bible.
τῆς δόξης; Eph 1,17), and informs us that he possesses a “body of glory” (σῶμα τῆς δόξης; Phil 3,21); the Gospel of John 1,14 also affirms that the apostles saw his glory. Like Melito, Pseudo-Hippolytus and Origen, Gregory Nazianzen employs in his Paschal oration such Christological titles as the “Great Light”, the “Glory that is on high”, the “Splendour of God”, the “Light of Light”, the “Light that shines in darkness”; all of them denoting Christ’s eschatological appearance already present in small measures during the Paschal night:

But today’s feast is more beautiful and more illustrious; inasmuch as yesterday’s light was a forerunner of the rising of the Great Light (τὸ υγάλον φωτός), and as it were a kind of rejoicing in preparation for the Festival; but today we are celebrating the Resurrection itself, no longer as an object of expectation, but as having already come to pass, and gathering the whole world unto itself. Let then different persons bring forth different fruits and offer different offerings at this season, smaller or greater [...] such spiritual offerings as are dear to God [...] as each may have power. For scarcely Angels themselves could offer gifts worthy of its rank, those first and intellectual and pure beings, who are also eye-witnesses of the Glory That is on high (τῆς δόξης τῶν ουρανῶν); if even these can attain the full strain of praise.

Nazianzen also employs several Christological titles of the Paschal tradition which have their roots in the Johannine prologue:

The Word of God Himself, Who is before all worlds, the Invisible, the Incomprehensible, the Bodiless, the Beginning of beginning, the Light of Light (ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, ὁ πρωτόκολον, ὁ δόρατος, ὁ αἰείωνος, ὁ δημιουργός, ἡ ἐκ τῆς θρονίας ἀρχή, ἡ ἐκ τοῦ φωτός φως). [...] For he that persecuted the Light that shines in darkness (ὁ φανίων ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φῶς) could not overtake Him.*

---


* Cf. Gr. Naz., or. 45,2 (1134-1136 M.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 423). See also Mel., Peri Pascha 103 (OECL, 58,774 Hall), Ps.-Hippolytus, In sanctum Pascha 1 (SPMed 15, 230,1-12 Visinoa) and Or., De Pascha II 5; III 14.16 (CAnt 2, 194,3f.; 244,23f.; 248,14 Guérard/Nautin).

* Cf. Gr. Naz., or. 45,9 (1144 M.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Ora- tions [see note 3], 425) and or. 45,13 (1150 M.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 428), respectively. Cf. Mel., Peri Pascha 103 (58,774f. H.) and Ps.-Hippolytus, In sanctum Pascha 1 (230-232 V.). One may also notice that most likely due to his strong Triadological emphasis and the combusubstantiality of the three divine Persons, Gregory sometimes associates the heavenly glory with God — term by which he usually understands the Trinity — or the Trinity. See note 11 and Gr. Naz., or. 45,2 (1134 M.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 423): “For scarcely Angels themselves could offer gifts worthy of its rank, those first and
At the same time, Christ receives the title of the “Sun of Righteousness” – an echo of Mal 4,2: “He is the Sun of Righteousness (ἡλιον δικαιοσύνης) setting out from heaven, and circumscribed by His visible Nature, and returning unto Himself”. Likewise, he is the King of heavens who, in all his glory (ὁ τῶν πόλων πάγκλωτος ἡσυχῶς ἀνέδειξεν) destroyed the dragon and the abodes of Hades through his light (φῶς). As we will further see, intellectual and pure beings, who are also eye-witnesses of the Glory That is on high; if even these can attain the full strain of praise⁵. Cf. Gr. Naz., or. 45,3 (1138 M; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 424): “And so the Second-ary Splendours came into being, as the ministers of the Primary Splendour (whether we are to conceive of them as intelligent Spirits, or as Fire of an immortal and incorporeal kind, or as some other nature approaching this as near as may be). I should like to say that they are incapable of movement in the direction of evil, and susceptible only of the motion of our Love and Wisdom, about God and illuminated with the ray of the Light (for earthly beings have but the second illumination).” See also that Basil characterizes the Son as the Demiurge-Logos (ὁ δειμαρχόγος λόγος), the Only-begotten God, and the true Light (φῶς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ) because he enlightens (Bas., spir. VIII 19 [SC 17bis, 312,9ff. Pruche]). Cf. Ath., decr. 17,8f. (Athanasius Werke 2/1, 14,34-15,8 Opitz), for the luminous destiny of the human being. Similarly, Athanasius affirms in Ath., gent. 38,44 (SC 18bis, 180,3-8; 198,9ff. Cameron) that the λόγος, who is the Ruler and King of creation, illuminates and gives movement to all by his own light (τὸν ἀρχηγόν καὶ βασιλέα τῆς πάσης κτίσεως, τὸν τὸ ἡσυχοῦς φωτιζά τὰ πάντα καταλαμπτάντα καί κυστίζαντα). Furthermore, Athanasius maintains in gent. 40 (180,6-8 C) that the light of the sun and moon comes from the light of the λόγος, and in Ath., inc. 41,4 (SC 195, 412,15 Kammenjasser) that all receive light, life and being (light and movement in 41,7 [414,31 K] and 42,1 [414,2 K]) through his Providence (cf. Iren., haer. IV 19,2 [SC 100, 621,42-46 Rousseau]). Eusebius also affirms in many places that the λόγος is light (e.g., Eus., p.e. II 5,2 [GCS Eusebius 8/1, 88,22-89,6 Mraš]; V 1,2 [219,11-13 M]); VII 10,12 [381,24f. M]; VII 15,5 [392,1 M]; Eus., d.e. IV 6,2 [GCS Eusebius 6, 138,28 Heikel]; IV 10,16 [167,32 H]; VI 18,6 [275,15 H]; VII 2,41f. [335,26-30 H]; Eus., theoph. I 4,25,30,38 [GCS Eusebius 3/2, 42,1; 48,11f.; 51,21f.; 56,17-19 Greßmann/Laminski]; III 39 [144,28 G./L.]; IV 7 [174,33 G./L.] and the source of light for the sun, moon, stars and angels (Eus., d.e. IV 5f. [260-268 M]). However, Basil sometimes ascribes the title “light” to the Spirit, especially when he explains that the Image of the Son cannot be seen but in the light of the Holy Spirit. He explains that it is impossible to “divorce light (τὸ φῶς) from visible objects (τὸν ἀρχηγόν). For it is impossible to behold the Image of the visible God except by the enlightenment of the Spirit (ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀρχηγοῦ, μὴ ἐν τῷ φωτισμῷ τοῦ πνεύματος), and impracticable for him to fix his gaze on the Image to dissemble the light (τὸ φῶς) from the Image, because the cause of vision (τὸν ἰδων αἰτία) is of necessity seen at the same time as the visible objects (συγκαθόθηκα τοῦ ἀρχηγοῦ)” (see Bas., spir. XXXV 64 [476,15-20 P]; for the English translation see P. Schaff/H. Wace [eds.], Basil, Letters and Select Works, translation by B. Jackson, NPNE. Second Series 8, Grand Rapids [Michigan] 1974, 40; cf. Bas., spir. IX 22 [324,27 P]). For the common light of the Trinity, see also note 11.

⁵ Gr. Naz., or. 45,13 (1130 M; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 427); Cf. Eus., p.e. VII 15,5,15; 16,1 [391,1; 394,5; 395,12 M]; Eus., d.e. IV 10,16 [167,31f. H]; VII 29,1 [248,5 H]; IX 18,7 [443,19 H].

⁶ See, if an authentic Gregorian work, Gr. Naz., Chr. pat. 1643-1650.1730f. (SC 149, 260.266 Tullier) and Tullier’s arguments for the authenticity of this tragedy (A. Tullier, Introduction, in: Grégoire de Nazianze, La passion du Christ. Tragédie, introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et index de A. Tullier, SC 149, Paris 1969, 11-74). See also Chr. pat. 1535,2044,2100.2542 (252.294.298.334 T.), where he receives the title “Eternal King or Prince”; although the title recalls the βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν of 1 Tim 1,17 and echoes Isa 9,6, Gregory once again employs the ancient language of tragedians, namely
Gregory of Nyssa in his turn associates Christ with the divine glory and the image or form of God. Glory-, light- and image-terminologies generally represent an important feature of the Cappadocian Christology. These terminologies are essential in many other writings of all the three Cappadocians\(^{30}\). It is cardinal for Basil of Caesarea’s arguments for the identity of the nature of the Father with that of the Son, since the two divine persons share the same glory\(^{31}\). Basil also compares the relationship between the Son and the Father with the relationship between brightness and its source, the glory (τὸ ἀπαύγασμα μετὰ τῆς δόξης), or that between image and its archetype (τὸ εἰκόνα μετὰ τοῦ ἀρχετύπου)\(^{32}\).

\(^{30}\) For Light- and Glory-terminology, see for instance, Gr. Naz., or. 38, 2 (SC 338, 104,1-4 Mesechinai/Gallay); 39.1, 6f. 136,20 (150,5-12; 160,6; 162,12; 176,10; 180,1; 196,12-15 M./G.); 40,1, 6 (198,13; 206,1-208,28 M./G.) and Gr. Nyss., Eun. I 334f. 338,378 (GNO 1, 126,12,23; 133,1-4; 138,13-15 Jaeger); III 64 (GNO 2, 26,14,22 Jaeger). See also note 11. It is worth noticing that Nazianzen – in his orations on the great feats of the year – generally portrays Christ as the heavenly Light. In addition to Pascha (Gr. Naz., or. 1 and or. 45), see also Theophany (or. 38), Holy Lights (or. 39), Holy Baptism (or. 40) and Pentecost (or. 41).

\(^{31}\) For Basil, the identity of glory seems to be an important anti-Arian argument for the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, as such expressions as τὸ πρῶτον τοῦτο ἄνω τῆς δόξης (Bas., spir. VI 15 [292,30 P.]); αὐτὸ τοῦ Κυρίου [...] ὁμοτύπων ἡμῶν τῆς δόξας τοῦ πατρός (spir. VI 15 [292,31f. P.]); ἡ δόξα κοινὴ πατρός καὶ ἡλίον (spir. VII 16 [300,30 P.]); ὁ ἁγιότατος θεὸς καὶ ἡλίον, μετα-πατρός καὶ σύν πατρός τῆς δόξας ἡλίον (spir. VIII 17 [306,50f. P.]); τὴν τοῦ πανωμοσύνου πρὸς ἡλίον καὶ πατρός κοινωνίαν τῆς δόξης (spir. XVIII 70 [496,10f. P.] can prove; cf. spir. VI 13 (286,13-17 P.) and spir. XVIII 45 (406,15-17 P.). Basil took over the idea either from Athanasius or from Eusebius. In a similar way, glory- and light-language is cardinal for Athanasius’ doctrine about the relationship between the Father and the Son, as one can see, e.g., in Ath., exp. lfd. 4 (PC 25, 208A Migne); Ath., decr. 12,2 (10,31-11,2 O.); 20,1; 24,5 (16,27-20 O.); Ath., gent. 3,46 (208,6-11 C.); Ath., Dion. 15,2-5 (57,4-19 O.). Athanasius also speaks about a unity of nature and an identity of light (τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς φύσεως καὶ τὴν τοιοτήτα τοῦ φωτός) between the Father and the Son, e.g., Ath., decr. 24,1 (20,4f. O.). Glory- and Light-terminologies are also essential for Eusebius’ Trinitarian doctrine (e.g., Eus., p.e. VII 15,7f. [392,7-23 M.]; Eus., d.e. IV 3,4f. [152,20-153,25 H.]; IV 6,1f. [158,13-159,10 H.]; V 1,18 [212,34, 214,22 H.]; Eus., theoph. I 25 [48,10-13 G.-L.]), though the argument of consubstantiality from the identity of glory or light is not obvious. See also Or., princ. I 1,6-8 (SC 252, 120-128 Crouzel/Simontelli) and IV 4,1 (SC 268, 402 Crouzel/Simontelli) and B. Scebois’ observation that Basil took over from Origen his light-imagery in connection with Trinitarian theology and used the image of light “comme expression de la propriété essentielle de Dieu” (SC 299, 69 Seboué) in Bas., Eun. I 25,1-29,36 (SC 305, 104-124 Seboué). Light-terminology is also cardinal for the Trinitarian theologies of Gregory Nazianzen (e.g., Gr. Naz., or. 28,31 [SC 250, 172-174 Gallay]; 31,3 [SC 250 281,11-22 Gallay]; 39,20 [SC 338, 196 M./G.]; 40,5 [SC 258 204,6 M./G.]; Gregory of Nyssa (e.g., Gr. Nyss., Eun. I 338 350f.6f. [GNO 1, 132,28-133,7; 179,19-181,11; 224,2 J.]; III [VII] 46f.; III [VII] 56f.; III [XI] 18f. [GNO 2, 202,5-205,7; 234,23-237,18; 296,4-311,6 J.], ref. Eun. 94.104.114f. [GNO}
In addition, Glory-Christology is part of the ancient liturgical tradition of the church, and Paschal celebrations are primarily suffused with glory-terminologies and glory-titles ascribed to Christ. While the use of torches or candles was an ancient Paschal tradition, Basil quotes in his De Spiritu sancto XXIX 73 the vesperal Christological hymn sung in the Eastern Church at the lighting of the lamps, and specifies that the hymn he calls the “words of thanksgiving at the lighting of the lamps” (τῶν ἐνδότων τῆς ἐπιλυχνίας εὐχαριστιῶν) is ancient and the author unknown. The imagery of light, however, is central, as one can see in the above passage of Gregory who envisions the whole Paschal liturgy as the celebration occasioned by the rising of the Great Light and the Resurrection. It is the feast of feasts (Gregory, Oratio 45,2) when the earthly and heavenly liturgies become one, since angels’ song joins human praises as in Bethlehem when Christ was born. Gregory himself regards his rhetorical effort as part of the universal symphony:

Thus he speaks; and the rest sing out, as they did before when Christ was manifested to us by His birth on earth, their glory to God in the highest, on earth, peace, goodwill among men. And with them I also utter the same words among you. And would that I might receive a voice that should rank with the Angel’s, and should sound through all the ends of the earth.

---

2, 351,6; 355,16-24; 360,5-364,27 [J.]). It appears, therefore, that light-terminology is essential for the Alexandrian and Cappadocian Trinitarian doctrines, and most likely the Cappadocians took it over from the intellectual context of their formation, namely Origen, Athanasius and Eusebius.

32 See Bas., spir. VII 16 (300,35-37 P.); cf. spir. VI 15 (292,23-27 P). He makes use of the New Testament terminology from Heb 1,3 and 2Cor 4,4. Glory or splendor (λαμπρότης) is also the essential attribute of both the defined and eschatological human beings; cf. spir. XV 36 (370,1-7 P.); XXIV 55 (448,1-3 P.); Bas., hex. II 8 (GCS N.F. 2, 37,11 Mendieta/Baerberg). See also notes 54f. With no doubt, the term glory covers sometimes, in Basil, a larger semantic area than the noetic light; see, for instance, Bas., spir. XXIII 54 (446 P.) for such an expression as “to give glory”.

33 See, for instance, B.G. Bucur, Exegesis of Biblical Theophanies in Byzantine Hymnography. Rewritten Bible?, TS 68, 2007, 92-112. Cf. the Triodion, the Canons of Pascha and Antipascha and the liturgy ascribed to Basil used in the Eastern Church. One of the manuscript traditions of the liturgy ascribed to Basil depicts Christ as θεόμορφος υἱὸς θεοῦ (PG 55, 1644D Migne).

34 See, for example, Ps.-Hippolytus, In sanctum Pascha 62 (316,27-29 V.), Gr. Naz., or. 45,2 (1134-1136 M.) and Gr. Nyss., De tridui spatio (vulgo Gr. Nyss., res. 1) (GNO 9/1, 273 Gebhardt).

35 Also mentioned in the Const. App. VIII 35,2 (SC 336, 246 Metzger) as the “psalm at the lighting up the lights” (ὁ ἐπιλυχνόν ψαλμός), the hymn assigns the title “light” to the Son: “O Gladsome Light of the holy glory of the Immortal Father, heavenly, holy, blessed Jesus Christ”.

36 Gr. Naz., or. 45,1 (1134 M.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 423). See also or. 1,6 (SC 247, 78,6-9 Bernardi; English translation: Browne/ Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 204): “And he [the Father] adds to the inanimate temple a living one; to that exceedingly beautiful and heavenly shrine, this poor and small one, yet to him of great value, and built too with much sweat and many labours”. See also notes 63f.
In fact, Pascha is essentially a Christological celebration and the Paschal night festivity represents a liturgical expectation of the divine light of Christ, an expectation present already in Melito, Pseudo-Hippolytus, Origen and also in the Cappadocian fathers, as one can see in the following fragment of Gregory Nazianzen:

And to complete the mystery [of the human being], deified by its inclination to God [...] for to this, I think, tends that light of Truth (φῶς τῆς ὑλῆθειας) which here we possess but in measure: that we should both see and experience the Splendour (λαμπρότητα) of God, which is worthy of Him Who made us, and will dissolve us, and remake us after a loftier fashion\(^7\).

Pascha, in addition, is the celebration of the sacrifice of the luminous Saviour. Christ, in his first nature an unsacrificeable Victim (ἀθυτόν ἱερέων [...] ἐπὶ τῷ πρώτῳ φότῳ), became a perfect Victim (Gregory, Oratio 45,13). He was at once God, High Priest and Sacrifice (τὸν θεόν, καὶ ἄρχων, καὶ θυματίον; Oratio 45,22). Through his sacrifice, he dissolved the primordial darkness and granted the human being an unprecedented mystery of purification and salvation\(^8\). This is the reason why Gregory urges his audience to participate into this mystery, to consume the Victim and, thus, eat the solid food of the λόγος (Oratio 45,14-19) in order to be purified, restored and led to the heavenly City. Nazianzen also advises his audience that resurrection, sanctification and the heavenly City can be reached only through appropriating Christ’s self-sacrifice, humility and death:

Let us make our Head, not the earthly Jerusalem, but the heavenly City; not that which is now trodden under foot by armies, but that which is glorified by Angels. Let us sacrifice not young calves, nor lambs that put forth horns and hoofs, in which many parts are destitute of life and feeling; but let us sacrifice to God the sacrifice of praise upon the heavenly Altar, with the heavenly dances; let us hold aside the first veil; let us approach the second, and look into the Holy of Holies\(^9\).

As we will further see, this theology of transformation into Christ is strongly connected with Image-Christology and Eikonc-soteriology, since Christ

---


\(^8\) See also Or., De Pascha II 10-16 (204-216 G./N.) for the identification of Christ with the perfect Victim and the λόγος and the interpretation of the consummation of the Lamb as eating the divine λόγος.

\(^9\) Gr. Naz., or 45,23 (1162 M.); English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 431). See also notes 63f.
is the Image or the Eikon of God in itself and the Cappadocian Fathers see the ultimate goal of the human existence as being transformed into the Image of Christ.

II. A Hellenized Version of Image-Christology

As scholars have also observed, Kabod-theology is ordinarily associated with the theology of the heavenly Image, since the divine glory the prophets and visionaries saw was usually perceived in the form of a man sitting on the divine throne\(^{20}\). Gregory in his turn calls Christ the “Image” (εἰκών), the “Seal” (σφραγίς), or the “Archetype” (ἁρχηγός) according to which human beings were created and he associates them with the idea of divine glory:

And that was that the Word of God Himself, Who is before all worlds, the Invisible, the Incomprehensible, the Bodiless, the Beginning of beginning, the Light of Light, the Source of Life and Immortality, the Image of the Archetype (τὸ διάμεταλλακτικὸν τοῦ ἁρχηγοῦ), the Immovable Seal (ἡ μὴ κινουμένη σφραγίς), the Unchangeable Image (ἡ ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκών), the Father’s Definition and Word (ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ὁρὸς καὶ λόγος), came to His own Image (εἰκών), and took on Him Flesh for the sake of our flesh [...]. He that is full (ὁ πλήρης) empties Himself; for He empties Himself of His Glory (καθορίσεις γὰρ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δόξης ἐπὶ μικρόν) for a short while, that I may have a share in His Fullness. What is the riches of His Goodness? What is this mystery that is around me? I had a share in the Image (τὴν εἰκόνα) and I did not keep it; He partakes of my flesh that He may both save the Image (τὴν εἰκόνα) and make the flesh immortal (τὴν σώρα σώματος)\(^{21}\).

Without a doubt, there are many other form/image titles ascribed to Christ: the “Image of the Archetype”, the “Immovable Seal”, the “Unchangeable Image”. However, Gregory’s most important contribution is his insertion of Greek philosophical concepts and his treatment of the ancient biblical Image-terminologies through philosophical concepts. Though Christ is a Seal, he is also “Immovable” (μὴ κινουμένη) as Aristotle’s unmoved moving principle. At the same time, while Christ receives the title of Image, this title is characterized through the attribute “unchangeable” (ἀπαράλλακτος), similar to the way Plato characterizes the noetic Ideas and Aristotle the first

---

20 See note 6 and J. Fossum, Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism, VigChr 37, 1983, 260-287.
21 Gr. Naz., or. 45,9 (1144 M.); English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 425f.; Cf. Gr. Naz., or. 1,4 (SC 247, 76,8-78,10 B.); English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 203: “Let us offer ourselves, the possession most precious to God, and most fitting, let us give back to the Image what is made after the Image (ἀμπτάομας τὴν εἰκόνα τὸ κατ’ εἰκόνα). Let us recognize our Dignity, let us honour our Archetype (τιμήσωμεν τὸ ἁρχηγόν).”
principle. Moreover, Gregory characterizes Christ through other Greek philosophical titles such as the "Invisible" (ὁ ἄρατος), the "Incomprehensible" (ὁ ἄπραλπήττος), the "Bodiless" (ὁ ἄσωμος), the "Beginning of beginning" (ὁ τεύχος τῶν πατρών οἶκος) and "Word" (λόγος) in order to emphasize the ontological status of the Son as completely distinct from visible things. Besides, he does not have a body, as being the principle of principles. His epistemological status is also underscored, since nobody can comprehend the divine λόγος.

Gregory of Nyssa in his turn describes Christ as existing in the Form of God in the glory of the Father. While interpreting John 20,17 — the passage narrating the post-resurrection episode where Mary Magdalen finds Christ in the garden of his burial and he says “Do not touch me!” — Gregory explains:

That means, “Do not imagine any more in your faith the bodily and servile form (τὴν υἱοποιήσαν καὶ δουλικὴν μορφήν), but the one that is in the glory of the Father (τὸν ἐν τῷ δόξα τῶν πατρῶν άντικείμενον) and exists in the form of God (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχοντα) is God’s Word (θεοῦ άντικείμενον λόγῳ); him you must worship, not the form of the servant (τὴν τῶν δοξῆς μορφήν)”

The text does not represent a quotation or speech in another person’s name, but Gregory’s own words and opinions. Christ is no longer identified with the glory itself, but lives in the glory of the Father and exists in the Form of God. However, Gregory commonly conceives of God and Christ’s divine nature as beyond any image, form or shape. Although he usually avoids to speak of the Form or Image of God when he employs this terminology, especially the term “Image”, he understands it in a Hellenistic philosophical way, namely as goodness.

---

22 See Pl., Tim. 27d-29d. The Christological title the Unchangeable Image (ὁ ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκὼν) occurs as well in Ath., gent. 41 (188,9 C.: τοῦ δόξας πατρῶν εἰκὼν ἐν τῇ ἁπαράλλαξι) and 46 (208,11 C.: εἰκὼν ἀπαράλλακτος τοῦ πατρός). In the same passage, Athanasius ascribes to the λόγος such titles as Wisdom, Light, Truth, Image, Brightness (ἅπαξλεγόμενον καὶ ἑρμηνευτικόν). Cf. Ath., gent. 47 (208-210 C.). Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that Nazianzen conceives of the divine nature of Christ as formless (ἡ ἁπαξλεγόμενη φύσις) in his or. 37.2 (SC 318, 274.26 Gallay/Moreschini).

23 Gr. Nyss., De tridui ipstitio (304 G.); for the English translation see A. Spira/C. Klock (eds.), The Easter Sermons of Gregory of Nyssa. Translation and Commentary, translation by S.G. Hall, Cambridge (Massachusetts) 1979, (31-50) 49.

24 See, for instance, Gr. Nyss., hom. opif. 5,1; 11,4 (PG 44, 137AB.1568 Migne).

25 While Clement identified the image with the intellect (νοῦς; Clem., str. V 14,94,3-6 [GCS Clemens Alexandrinus 2, 388,9-16 Stahlin/Prichtel], perhaps from Philo, De opificio mundi XXII 69 [LCl. Philo 1, 54,10 Colson/Whitaker]), Origen with the inner-man of 2Cor 4,16 (Or., hom. in Gen. 1 13 [SC 7bis, 56,12 Doureleau]), Athanasius with rationality (Ath., inc. 3,3 [272,1-3 K.]), Eusebius of Caesarea with the intellect (Eus., p.e. VII 10,12 [381,26.M.] and XI 23,5 [Eusebius 8/2, 56,20 M.], from Clem., str. V 14,94,3-6 [388,9-16 S./E.]) or the noetic and rational essence of the soul (Eus., p.e. VII 10,9; 18,3 [381,10-12; 399,13 M.]) and Basil of Caesarea also with rationality (Bas., De creatione hominis sermo primus I 7 [SC 160, 182,1-15 Smets/Van Esbroek]), Gregory of Nyssa considered it to be participation in all good (Gr. Nyss., hom. opif. 16,10 [184A-B M.]).
III. Christ the Hellenized ἄνθρωπос and Polymorphic Christology

As several scholars have shown, polymorphic Christology originates in the Pauline theology of the form of God and the form of the servant present in Phil 2,6f., and in the Gospel writings. Such episodes as the Transfiguration, the disappearance in Emmaus, or the apparition in closed rooms illustrate it.26 The central theological feature is that Christ pre-existed in the form of God and took the form of a servant, a human being. The idea of a divine being taking a human or animal form was a common element in various ancient religions from Babylon to Egypt and Greece, and one may remember only the gods of the Greek Pantheon to have a hint of the whole paradigm. The paradigm occurs in the Book of Tobit where the angel Raphael takes the form of a young man and it is re-worked afterwards in the Christian context of the Pauline letters (Phil 2,7).

In Gregory Nazianzen’s homily, the paradigm is present in the old Melition Paschal formula for Incarnation – which recalls a Johannine idea – the λόγος came down from heaven and clothed himself in a body:

And that was that the Word of God Himself (ὁ Λόγος του Θεοῦ λόγος) [...] the Image of the Archetype, the Immutable Seal, the Unchangeable Image, the Father’s Definition and Word, came to His own Image, and took on (φυγετῶν) Him Flesh for the sake of our flesh, and mingled Himself with an intelligent soul for my soul’s sake, purifying like by like; and in all points except sin was made Man [...] the Self-existent (ὁ ὄν) comes into Being (γίνεσθαι), the Uncreated is created, That which cannot be contained is contained by the intervention of an intellectual soul mediating between the Deity and the corporeity of the flesh. And He who gives riches becomes poor; for He assumes the poverty of my flesh, that I may assume the riches of His Godhead. He that is full empties Himself (ὁ πλήρης καινόται; for He empties Himself of His Glory (καινόται γὰρ τῆς ἐκείνου δόξης ἐπὶ μικρόν) for a short while, that I may have a share in His Fullness.27


27 Gr. Naz., or. 45,9 (1144 M.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 425f.). Cf. John 1,14: “The Word became flesh”. See also Mel., Peri Pascha 66 (34,451-454 H.) for the idea that Christ came from heaven and clothed himself (ἐνθυμώμενος) with the suffering one (τοῦ πάγκοντα), and Mel., Peri Pascha 100 (56,748 H.) where he clearly affirms that Christ clothed himself with man (ἐνθυμώμενος τοῦ ἄνθρωπον). Likewise, Ps.-Hippolytus thanks that Christ came into his body (τοῦ σώματος ἐνθύμωμεθα, Ps.-Hippolytus, In sanctum Pascha 47 [296,10 V.]), clothed himself with a body (ἐνθυμώμενος σώματος, Ps.-Hippolytus, In sanctum Pascha 48 [296,18 V.]) and re-clothed his old image after the resurrection (Ps.-Hippolytus, In sanctum Pascha 61 [314,1-3 V.]). In a similar way, Gregory Nazianzen affirms in Gr. Naz., Chr. pat. 1731-1740 (266 C.)
As in the traditional Jewish and Christian theologies, the vocabulary commonly linked to the Form of God is always connected with glory-terminology. Christ leaves the divine form and his glory for a while and takes the poverty of the human form or image. The process is essentially one of kénosis, a humble acceptance of emptying oneself. Gregory is here still resonating with the Pauline vision, the verb καθήμονται being at the same time present in both Paul’s Phil 2,7 and Gregory’s text.

However, once again Gregory’s new input consists in the philosophical concepts he associates with this glory-terminology, an insertion which brings to light a philosophical flavor to the whole construction. In fact, polymorphic Christology is translated into a phenomenological Christology: the Self-existent One (ὁ ὄν), incorporeal and invisible comes into Being out of a divine salvic intentionality manifesting itself in the corporeal and visible form of a human creature. In fact, the origin of the theology of kénosis, as one may see in this fragment, has its origins in this ancient biblical terminology: God empties himself of the divine glory and puts on the poor garments of flesh. The goal of the whole history of salvation, seen through this terminological prism, consists in re-clothing the human being in the fullness of glory which God possesses. In Oratio 45,13, Gregory also describes the λόγος in a phenomenological process through the title-metaphor of the “Sun of Righteousness”. In a very similar way with the visible sun, the Sun of Righteousness sets out from heaven, appears to every creature bringing light to all, and sets up at the end of his revolution. In Gregory’s philosophical words, the λόγος becomes manifest from his invisible realm and, at the end of his economy, he withdraws himself into the hidden, mysterious, invisible realm of his origin. The author also clarifies to his audience that the λόγος withdraws unto himself.

Likewise, Nazianzen expresses the process of the manifestation of the λόγος through the ancient parallel between the invisible, uncircumscribed (ἐπερίγραπτον) and not manifested, on the one hand, and the visible manifestation in circumscribed boundaries (τὸ ὄρομένῳ περίγραπτον) on the other. In Oratio 45,9 Gregory uses the verb χωρεῖ (give way to, make way for, retire before, go forward, contain) for expressing the Son’s manifestation in a circumscribed, confined structure, his own Image: ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἄρσι καὶ λόγος, ἐπὶ τὴν ἱπιάν εἰκόνα χωρεῖ. Hence, his ontological condition becomes twofold: he is simultaneously the uncircumscribed λόγος of the Father and a limited human being. His assumption of a lower ontological status is phrased through this antinomic and paradoxical expression: “the one who cannot be contained is contained” (ὁ ἄχωρότος χωρεῖται). As a kenoetic act, the entire manifestation of the λόγος is an

---

that Christ took a beggarly garment (πτωχεύων σταυλής Χρ. pat. 1734 [266 C.]): in order to descend to Hades and save humanity. However, in or. 39,17 (SC 358, 186,2 M.) he expressly affirms that Christ took a new form for our sake (ἐν ᾧ ἡμᾶς μορφοθείη).
assumed condescension which confers on the Son a second ontological condition: visible, corporeal and limited\textsuperscript{28}. Moreover, since the luminous appearance of the λόγος destroys the darkness of death, it is essentially salvific. Nazianzen’s soteriology is deeply connected with polymorphic Christology, a connection which entails a morphologic dynamic of salvation within his discourse. First of all, one should observe that, besides the polymorphism of Christ, he also conceives of a polymorphism of the human being. This is an expression of the doctrine of deification in one of its most ancient vocabularies: the human being has lost its divine form and should recover it\textsuperscript{29}. Nazianzen therefore adopts a polymorphic anthropology which has its roots in Second Temple theology, where human visionaries were clothed in glory and changed into angelic or deified forms\textsuperscript{30}. Second of all, Gregory’s polymorphic anthropology and polymorphic Christology synthesize into a dynamic polymorphic soteriology. Christ changed his form and took the form of the servant in order to produce a change in the human being, in broad lines to re-fashion humankind – which had lost its theoform status – save humankind and bring it to the Father:

Let us become like Christ (γνωστόν ὡς Χριστός), since Christ became like us. Let us become God’s for His sake (literally “let us become gods”; γενομένον θεόν), since He for ours became Man (ἀνθρωπος). He assumed the worse that He might give us the better; He became poor that we through His poverty might be rich (2Cor 8,9); he took upon Him the form of a servant (δούλου μορφήν δεσπόζων) that we might receive back our liberty; He came down that we might be exalted; He was tempted that we might conquer; He was dishonoured that He might glorify us; He died that He might save us; He ascended that He might draw to Himself us, who were lying low in the Fall of sin. Let us give all (πάντα διδόσοι), offer all, to Him Who gave Himself a Ransom and a Reconciliation for us. But one can give nothing like oneself, understanding the Mystery, and becoming for His sake all that He became for ours\textsuperscript{31}.

\textsuperscript{28} See also Gr. Naz., or. 38,2 (SC 358, 106,16-18 M.; translation by the author): “the One Who is not carnal becomes incarnate, the Word assumes consistency, the invisible becomes visible, the untouchable One becomes touchable, the One beyond time assumes a beginning, the Son of God becomes the Son of man [Ὁ ἄνωθεν παροικίας, ὁ λόγος παροίκεται, ὁ ἄρσεν δρᾶται, ὁ ἀναμήστη, ὁ τυρσοῦσας δρᾶται, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸς αὐθρόπου γίνεται]”.

\textsuperscript{29} See the images of clothing and form in Melito and Ps.-Hippolytus in the previous note.

\textsuperscript{30} See for instance Moses’ shining face while descending the Sinai (Exod 34,29) or the paradigmatic transformation of Enoch into an angel as he stays with the angels in front of the divine throne (1En 71,11-17 or 2En 22,8f.), and 1En 62,15 which affirms that the righteous will have in the kingdom a garment of glory. Cf. C.R.A. Murray-Jones, Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition, JJS 43, 1992, 1-31. Likewise, Paul characterizes the spiritual transformation as a metamorphosis of glory (2Cor 3,18; Eph 3,16; Phil 4,19; Col 1,11) and the eschatological goal of salvation as obtaining the glory of Christ (Rom 8,30 and 2Thess 2,14); cf. Newman, Paul’s Glory-Christology (see note 5) 3-7,213-247.

\textsuperscript{31} Gr. Naz., or. 1,5 (SC 247, 78,1-12 B.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 203).
As we have previously seen, Gregory of Nyssa in his turn portrays Christ as the Form of God and employs the terminology of polymorphic Christology. The divine λόγος who eternally exists in the form of God took the form of the servant. Gregory expresses this change of forms as the change of the λόγος into a human creature. Christ as both the new ἄνθρωπος and the Son of God brings his ἄνθρωπος, the human nature, to his Father in order to inherit the Father’s kingdom. As Christ becomes a brother of human beings through the event of the Incarnation, the entire humankind is adopted and human beings become sons of God able to receive in their turn the inheritance of the Father:

He who for us became one of us, so that by becoming our kin he might make us his own brothers, he brings his own Man to the true Father (προσάγει τὸν ἁπάντων ἄνθρωπον τῷ ἀληθινῷ πατρὶ), in order through him to attract all that is akin (ὅπως τῷ ἁμαρτάνει), so that there is no more reproach against those who have been slaves to the truly unreal gods [i.e., the fallen angels].

Gregory changes πάσης κτίσεως with ἁγιασθεὶς κτίσεως in the Pauline expression “first-born of the whole creation” (see also Col 1:15 for πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως), and changes in this way Paul’s focus from the creation ab origine to the eschatological re-creation. This process of the restored humanity begins with the event of Incarnation and refers to the humanity recreated in the image of Christ and inheritor of the Kingdom of Heavens. The doctrine of the new eschatological creation starting with Christ’s Incarnation is based on the Pauline thought found in Rom 8:29; Col 1:15 or 2Cor 5:17. Gregory’s new interpretation possibly followed the Arian controversy and tried to be the exegetical solution of Col 1:15 in that context, namely a solution which avoids the Arian position of a Son and λόγος of God born as a creature of the universe before all the other creatures.

32 Gr. Nyss., De tridui spatio (291 G.). Christ is also called the “new man” because he was “created in a divine way and not by normal human means” (English translation: Spira/Klock [eds.], Easter Sermons, translation by Hall [see note 23], 41). Cf. 1Cor 15:45.

33 Gr. Nyss., De tridui spatio (305 G.; English translation: Spira/Klock [eds.], Easter Sermons, translation by Hall [see note 23], 49). He also continues in De tridui spatio (305 G.; English translation: Spira/Klock [eds.], Easter Sermons, translation by Hall [see note 23], 49f.): “Because those who through adoption have followed the Son have been brought near again to the living and true God and have not become rejects and exiles from the paternal inheritance, he who through the flesh made himself (ἐποίησεν διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς ποιήσας) first-born (πρωτότοκος) of the good creation (τῆς ἁγιασθείσης κτίσεως) among many brothers has drawn upon him the whole nature (τὸν οἶκον τῆς φύσεως) in which he shared (διὰ τῆς ἀνθρωπισμοῦ συμμετέχων) through the flesh commingled with him (διὰ τῆς ἀνθρωποւικοῦ συμμετεχον) σαρκός)."
Scholars have traditionally defined the specific Cappadocian Christology as the Christology of the mixture (μίξις καὶ κράσις) between Christ’s flesh and his divine nature. This doctrine is a revised form of the traditional Pneuma-Sarx- and Logos-Sarx-Christologies. As Quasten noticed, Nazianzen rebuffed the Logos-Sarx-Christology in his Epistles 101 and 102—a position most likely associated with Apollinaris—and proposed a Logos-Man-Christology. However, the old Logos-Sarx- and Pneuma-Sarx-terminologies are still in use, I would say, though reworked in the Paschal homilies of the two Gregorys in the following manner:

And that was that the Word of God Himself, Who is before all worlds, the Invisible, the Incomprehensible, the Bodiless, the Beginning of beginning, the Light of Light, the Source of Life and Immortality, the Image of the Archetype, the Immovable Seal, the Unchangeable Image, the Father’s Definition and Word (ὁ όρος καὶ λόγος), came to His own Image (ἐπὶ τὴν ἴδιαν εἰκόνα χωρεῖ), and took on Him Flesh (σάρκις φορεῖ) for the sake of our flesh, and mingled Himself with an intelligent soul (ψυχὴν φορεῖ διὰ τὴν ἱνήν ψυχὴν μίγνυται) for my soul’s sake, purifying like by like; and in all points except sin was made Man (τάνων γίνεται, ὅλην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, δυσφαίροντα) conceived by the Virgin, who first in body and soul was purified by the Holy Ghost, for it was needful both that Child-bearing should be honoured and that Virginity should receive a higher honour. He came forth then, as God, with That which He had assumed; one Person in two natures (literally “one out of two contraries”: ἐν ἕκαστῷ τῶν ἑναντίων), flesh and Spirit (σάρκις καὶ πνεῦμα), of which the latter deified the former. O new commingling! (Ὄ τῆς καταπληκτικῆς μιξεώς!); O strange conjunction! (Ὄ τῆς παραδόξους κράσιος!) the Self-existent comes into Being, the Uncreated is created, That which cannot be contained is contained (ὅ δεχόμενος χωρεῖται) by the intervention of an intellectual soul (ὅθεν ἡμῖν ψυχής νοείται) mediating between the Deity (μεσοποτόμος θεότης) and the corporeity of the flesh (σάρκις ποικιλώτης).

Gregory enjoys making use of ancient terminologies in this passage. As in the ancient Christian theologians, the πνεῦμα refers to the divine dimension.

34 For the Cappadocian Christology of melange, see also Grillmeier, Christ (see note 1), 367-377; Seeberg, Lehrbuch (see note 1), vol. 2, 198-206; J.-R. Bouchet, Le vocabulaire de l’union et du rapport des natures chez Grégoire de Nyssé, RThom 68, 1968, 533-582; Daley, Divine Transcendence (see note 1), 501f.
35 For Pneuma-Sarx- and Logos-Sarx-Christologies, originated in the Johannine Gospel and also present in Ignatius, Melito, 2Clement, Theophilus and many others, see Grillmeier, Christ (see note 1), 56.
36 Quasten, Patrology (see note 1), vol. 3, 252: “He explicitly rejects the Logos-Sarx Christology and makes that of the Logos-Man his own (Ep. 102, MG 37, 200B). ‘There are two natures [in Christ], God and Man, since there is a soul as well as a body in him’ (Ep. 101, MG 37, 180A; cf. Ep. 102, MG 37, 201B).”
37 Gr. Naz., or. 45,9 (1144 M.); English translation: Browne/Flawell, Selected Orations [see note 3], 423f.)
of Christ and the flesh denotes the human dimension. However, Gregory’s concept of “flesh” has a larger semantic extension than the biological soul, as Apollinaris supposed while conceiving of Christ without human mind. For Gregory, the “flesh” refers to the human being in general and comprehends an intellectual soul as well, therefore a soul capable of mind or intellectual processes. This soul has its own human mind (νοῦς). In addition, Greek terminologies are added to the ancient vocabulary: Christ, in his divine nature, is the Uncreated, the Deity, the Invisible, the Incomprehensible, the Bodiless, or the Beginning of beginning.

Expounding on Christ’s human dimension, Gregory of Nyssa portrays him as the “new man” (καινὸν ἀνθρώπου) which is the “not man-made receptacle of God” (θεὸς δοχεῖον ἔχειρποιτήτου). A similar Christology of melange, in a more elaborated version may be encountered in this passage:

When Wisdom was building her house (ὅθεν τῆς σοφίας) and by the overshadowing of her power (τῆς δυνάμεως) the shape had been moulded (καταμορφωθέντος τοῦ πλάσματος) within as if with the impress of a seal (τύπῳ σφραγίδος), then the divine power was mingled (ὁ θεὸς κατακαρτίσθηται δύναμις) with both elements of which human nature (ὁ ἀνθρωπότις ψυχος) is constituted, I mean soul and body, having mixed (καταμιμήθη) itself correspondingly with each.

For Gregory of Nyssa, the divine power – also identified in the next quotation with the Godhead (θεότητα) – is mixed and manifested through the elements which constitute the human nature of Christ, namely the body and the soul endowed with will and the intellectual capacity to make a deliberate choice. Yet noteworthy is the phenomenology of the Godhead in Christ’s human nature. The Godhead in Christ does not remain a hidden, mysterious divine presence, but it is manifested through Christ’s created dimension, through his soul and body, and performs marvelous things through their operations in the outside, visible world:

So with the godhead (θεότητα) mixed (καταμορφωθέντος τοῦ πλάσματος) correspondingly into each of the human sections (τῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τμημάτων) the evidences of supernatural power (τῆς ὑπερφύσεως φύσεως) were apparent (τὰ γνωρίσματα ἐν) through both. The body indicated (ἐπεσήμανον) the godhead in it by performing (ἐργαζόμενον) the healings through touch, while the soul exhibited the divine power (τὴν θείαν ἐνεργείαν δύναμιν) through that powerful will (τὸ δύναμεν ἔχειν θελήματι); for just as the sense of touch is a property of the body, so deliberate choice (ὁ κατὰ προαιρεσιν κύριος) is a property of the soul. [...] You see how through both of them is publicized the godhead (θεότης

---

38 See Grillmeier, Christ (see note 1), 56. Modern scholarship has entitled this type of vocabulary Spirit-Christology; see, for instance, M. Simonetti, Note di cristologia pneumatica, Aug. 12, 1972, 201-232 or G.W.H. Lampe, God as Spirit, Oxford 1977, 210-227.

39 G. Nyss., De tridui spatio (291 G.), English translation: Spira/Klock [eds.], Easter Sermons, translation by Hall [see note 23], 411.

40 G. Nyss., De tridui spatio (291f. G.), English translation: Spira/Klock [eds.], Easter Sermons, translation by Hall [see note 23], 411f.
The concept of Godhead is therefore fascinating. For the two Gregories, the divinity of Christ is not conceived of in an Aristotelian perspective as a principle isolated in its simplicity without a productive or efficient power, but as a Platonic and Neoplatonic principle with productive activity. The Cappadocian Christology of mélange involves therefore a concept of Godhead as a productive divine power. Especially for Gregory of Nyssa, the “Godhead” or the “divine power” – the latter a divine title not much present in Gregory Nazianzen – is active in the universe as the efficient cause of creation, both ab initio and ad finem mundi. It is likewise the divine power always present and manifested in Christ’s earthly existence. It is also the power which operates Christ’s miracles and helps his will at the time of passion. Its presence in the universe does not impede, for Gregory of Nyssa, its unity and simplicity. More than that, it restores the unity of the soul and body Adam lost in Paradise:

Since, then, the human conjoining is twofold, while the nature of godhead is simple and uniform (συγκρότησις τῆς ἁγίατος φύσεως, at the time of the disjunction of body from soul [i.e., death] the indivisible does not share the severance of the composite, but the opposite happens: by the unity (τῆς ἁγίατος φύσεως) of the divine nature (τῆς θείας φύσεως) which is equally present in both, the separated elements are again united with each other (πάντα ψεύδηξε τα ἑαυτών συμφύτησιν).  

---

41 Gr. Nyss., De tridui spatio (292 G.; English translation: Spira/Klock [eds.], Ester Sermons, translation by Hall [see note 23], 42). For the manifestation of the Logos through the operations of Christ’s body (διὰ τῶν τοῦ σώματος ἐργων), see also Ath., inc. 14, 8; 43, 6 (316–318; 422 K.) and Eus., d.e. III 7, 4, 40 (140, 24–141, 2); 147, 14–16 II; Eus., theoph. III 39 (141, 1–143, 28 G./L.).

42 As Aristotle explains in Metaph. XII, unlike all other species of movers, a final cause (also called unmoved mover or god) does not produce motion by being moved, but by being loved and desired (Metaph. XII 7 1072b4). A very similar perspective occurs in Nazianzen. Although Nazianzen does not identify Godhead with the divine power, the anti-Aristotelian position is clearly identifiable. Godhead (Gr. Naz., or. 45, 4) or Goodness (or. 45, 5) cannot be an unproductive principle, but active in the universe; e.g., Gr. Naz., or. 45, 5 (1138 M.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 424): “But since this movement of Self-contemplation (τὸ κύκτοςιν μόνου τῆς θεωρίας) alone could not satisfy Goodness (τῆς ἄγαθοτητάς), but Good (τὸ ἄγαθον) must be poured out (χύσεται) and go forth (δεδέσθαι) beyond itself, to multiply the objects of its beneficence (for this was essential to the highest Goodness), He first conceived the Angelic and Heavenly Powers. And this conception was a work fulfilled by His Word and perfected by His Spirit”. Cf. Eus., p.e. III 6, 6, 10, 7 (122, 1–12; 131, 17–23 M.).

43 See also Ath., inc. 18, 3 (330, 20 K.), where δόσωμι and λόγος seem to designate two titles of Jesus Christ, though δόσωμι may also refer to the Holy Spirit, in a similar theory with the Irenaean doctrine of the two hands of the Father.

44 Gr. Nyss., De tridui spatio (293f. G.; English translation: Spira/Klock [eds.], Ester Sermons, translation by Hall [see note 23], 43).
In addition, through the divine activity of the Godhead, Christ’s soul and body operate together and both of them take part in the processes of economy and salvation of humankind:

And the two operate (ινηργίαν) at once as the Godhead achieves good (τὸς θεότητος τὸ δύσεον καταρθόσθη) through both, through the non-corruption of the body the destruction of death, and through the soul which hastens to its own home the return of mankind to Paradise⁴⁵.

V. Demiurge-Christology

One of the most significant features of the Gregorian discourse is the insertion of the Platonic distinction between the invisible, noetic universe and the visible one. As Plato unravels in Timaeus 27d-29d, visible copies are created according to the model of invisible paradigms⁴⁶. A few centuries after Plato, Philo of Alexandria develops this ontological scheme in his commentary on the Genesis narrative. Once inserted within the Genesis story, the scheme gave birth to a special hermeneutical doctrine which modern scholars call the “double-creation theory”: God first created an invisible, noetic universe in his mind encompassing the models of all the future visible things, and in a second stage fashioned the visible universe as a sensible copy of the noetic kosmos⁴⁷. From now on a topos of the Hellenized Jewish and Christian theology, the Platonic scheme comes out surprisingly in the Paschal Cappadocian texts as well. However, the interesting fact is that the Cappadocians modify the paradigm in various ways. Nazianzen strongly rebuffs the doctrine of Platonic ideas and – together with his friend Basil – conceives of the noetic universe as populated with angelic beings, the secondary lights, rather than with noetic paradigms⁴⁸:

Thus then and for these reasons, He gave being to the world of thought (νοητός κόσμος), as far as I can reason on these matters, and estimate great things in my own poor language. Then, when His first Creation (τὸ πρῶτο) was in good order, He conceives a second world (Βείατερον ἰοστεῖον κόσμον); material and visible (Ωκλιον καὶ δρόμων); and this a system of earth and sky and all that is in the midst of them; an admirable creation indeed when we look at the fair form of every part, but yet more worthy of admiration when we consider the

⁴⁵ Gr. Nyss., De tridui spatio (293 G.; English translation: Spira/Klock [eds.], Easter Sermons, translation by Hall [see note 23], 43).
⁴⁶ For the usage of Plato’s Timaeus in the late Roman, Greek, Jewish, as well as Christian environment, see J. Pelikan, What Has Athens to Do with Jerusalem? Timaeus and Genesis in Counterpoint, Ann Arbor 1997.
⁴⁷ See, for instance, Philo’s commentaries on creation in De opificio mundi IV 15-VI 25 (14-20 C./W.).
⁴⁸ For Gregory’s criticism of the Platonic ideas, see Gr. Naz., or. 27,10 (SC 250, 94,3 Gallay).
harmony and unison of the whole, and how each part fits in with every other in fair order, and all with the whole, tending to the perfect completion of the world as a Unit (ἰὸν κόσμου)\textsuperscript{49}.

More than that, the Cappadocians bestow a distinct Christological flavour on the Platonic scheme, since now the Demiurge and λόγος is Christ, and Christ plays the role of co-worker of the Father, as in Basil's case. Basil is also interesting because he takes over the Philonian double-creation theory and explains – using Aristotelian vocabulary – that God created the matter and form of every thing in the universe and shaped the form on the material substratum through his divine power\textsuperscript{50}.

However, the first application of the Platonic scheme to anthropology, to a conception about the creation of man ab initio, also started with Philo. Developing a double-creation theory in connection with the human being,

---

\textsuperscript{49} Gr. Naz., or. 45,6 (1140 M.); English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations (see note 3, 424). See also, for his doctrine of the three types of lights or splendours – Trinity, angelic beings and humans – Gr. Naz., or. 28,31 (SC 250, 170-172 G.); 38,9 (SC 358, 120-122 M.); 45,5 (1138 M.). As one can see in Gr. Naz., Christos patiens 990-997 (206 T.), Nazianzen associates with Christ those functions the Old Testament commonly ascribed to Yahweh, e.g. by quoting Ps 136,6 (135,6 LXX), “he who spread out the earth on the waters”. It is interesting to see that, while in Theophilus of Antioch God the Father assigns the demiurgic function to the Word and created everything through him (Thpl. Ant., Autol. II 10), in Irenaeus the Father assigns the demiurgic function to his “hands”, the Son and the Holy Spirit and creates everything through them (e.g., Iren., haer. IV praefatio 4 [391,58-61 R.]; IV 7,4 [465,66-72 R.]; IV 20,1 [627,15-20 R.]). Cf. B. Sesboüé, Le Père et ses deux mains, le Fils et l’Esprit, in: Idem, Tout récapituler dans le Christ. Christologie et soteriologie d’Irenée de Lyon, CJ[C 80], Paris 2000, 183-199. For Basil’s view on the invisible world, see Bas., hex. I 5 (8,17-10,1 M./R.), where he quotes directly Col 1,16.

\textsuperscript{50} Cf. Bas., hex. II 2 (24,23-25,3 M./R.); for the English translation see A.C. Way, Saint Basil: Exegetical Homilies, FaCh 46, Washington D.C. 1963, 24: “God, however, before any of the objects now seen existed, having cast about in His mind (ὅτι νοοῦ) and resolved to bring into being things that did not exist, at one and the same time devised (ἐκδόθην) what sort of a world it should be and created the appropriate matter together with its form (τὸ ἐδείκτη). For the heavens He assigned a nature (φύσιν) suitable for the heavens; and for the plan of the earth He produced a substance (οὐσίαν) peculiar and destined for it. And fire and water and air He moulded (διαφημίσατο) variously as He wished, and He formed (ἐφηγαγό) them into substance (οὐσίαν) when the reason (λόγος) for the existence of each demanded.” Basil also adds in hex. II 3 (25,10-17 M./R.), in Way’s English translation, Saint Basil, 24f., that God created “the entire heavens and the whole earth, including the substance itself with the form (τὴν οὐσίαν τῷ ἐδείκτη συνελημμένην). He is not the Inventor of the shapes, but the Creator of the very nature of all that exists (τὴν φύσιν τῶν δυναμεων). Otherwise, let them answer us as to how the active power of God (ἡ ἡγεμονία) τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμεως and the passive nature of matter (τὴν ὑλὴν) came in contact with each other, the one providing substance (ὁ συμπληρώσων) without form (χωρὶς ἔφρονι), the other possessing an understanding of shapes but without matter (τὴν ὄλην), so that what was lacking to each might come from the other – to the Creator, the possession of an opportunity to display His art; to matter (τῇ ὑλῇ), the ability to lay aside its unsightliness (τὴν διαφορὰν) and absence of form (τοῦ ἐδούματος). It is also interesting to observe that Gregory thinks of God as first producing the matter of things and second shaping them in various forms; cf. Gr. Naz., or. 44,4 (1124 M.).
the Alexandrian distinguished between the first man, heavenly and made after the image of God, and a second one, earthly and made of clay. Nonetheless, the next chapter of this study will show that the two Gregories applied this Platonic scheme not only to the creation of man ab origine, but also to the eschatological re-creation of the human being. In addition to this, the eternal and intelligible paradigm or archetype is now a unique original heavenly model, namely the divine Image of Jesus Christ.

VI. Demiurge-Christology and Eikonic-Soteriology: Christ Re-Creates Human Beings according to his Divine Image

In one of his orations, Gregory Nazianzen identifies Christ with the Demiurge of the world and of the human being. The Demiurge has also the power to decompose human bodies at the time of their death and recreate them at the time of the eschaton:

Mind then and sense (νοῦς καὶ σαφήνης), thus distinguished from each other, had remained within their own boundaries, and bore in themselves the magnificence of the Creator-Word (τοῦ δημιουργοῦ λόγου), silent praisers and thrilling heralds of His mighty work (τῆς μεγαλουργίας). [...] Now the Creator-Word (ὁ τεκτὸν λόγος), determining to exhibit this, and to produce a single living being out of both (the invisible and the visible creation ἄρετον καὶ ἄρατον φύσεως), I mean fashions (δημιουργεῖ) Man; [...] so we should both see and experience the Splendour of God, which is worthy of Him Who made (τοῦ συνήθεον) us, and will dissolve (λύσεται) us, and remake us after a loftier fashion (συνήθοντος ωφλητέου)\(^{53}\).

It is important to observe that Demiurge-Christology is also present in previous Paschal texts, since Melito identifies Christ with the Demiurge of Genesis and with Yahweh in general\(^{54}\). But more than Melito, Gregory Nazianzen construes in this passage a soteriology in which salvation is conceived of as a process of re-creation of the human being where Christ plays the primary

\(^{53}\) E.g., Philo, *Legum allegoriarum liber* I 12,31f. (LCL Philo 1, 166-168 Cohn/Wendland).

\(^{54}\) Gr. Naz., or. 45,7 (1140-1142 M.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Oration [see note 3], 425): He also renews these positions in other passages by mentioning the function of all the three divine persons, e.g., or. 45,5 (1138 M.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Oration [see note 3], 424): “He first conceived the Angelic and Heavenly Powers. And this conception was a work fulfilled by His Word and perfected by His Spirit”. Cf. or. 45,30 (1168 M.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Oration [see note 3], 433): “O Word conceived and Man contemplated, Who bearest all things, binding them by the Word of Your power”. Likewise, in his or. 41,14 (SC 358, 344,11f. M.), the Son co-operates (συνηθεορουμεν) with the Spirit in Creation and Resurrection. For contemporary scholarship, see Bouthenf, St. Gregory Nazianzen (see note 1); P. Bouthenf, Soteriological Imagery in Gregory of Nyssa’s Antirheticus, StPatr 32, 1997, 81-86; Daley, Divine Transcendence (see note 1); J. McGuckin, The Vision of God in St. Gregory Nazianzen, StPatr 32, 1997, 145-152.

\(^{55}\) Cf. Mel., *Peri Pascha* 82-85,104 (44,46,58-60 H.).
role. Moreover, Christ is not only the Demiurge, but also the Image of God in itself and the archetype of the eschatological re-creation of the human being. I would call this theory of salvation “Eikonc-soteriology” and, as its presence is not obvious in Melito’s and Origen’s Paschal writings, I would trace its roots back to Irenaeus and Pseudo-Hippolytus at least (if not to Col 3,9 and generally to Paul’s Glory-Christology). But this kind of soteriology is deeply inserted in the Paschal tradition which conceives of salvation as human nature’s re-clothing with the divine image.

However, it is part of the general Cappadocian soteriology. The tractate De baptismo I 2,7, which many scholars ascribe to Basil, compares the human being with the broken statue of a king34. As the royal statue lost its glorious shape (πὴν ἀνδρὸν μερήθη), it needs to be re-fashioned in the hands of a wise artisan and a skilful creator able to restore the statue to its first glory. In the same way, as the human being lost its first glory according to God’s image and likeness, it was necessary for it to be restored to the original glory of the image of God. Likewise, in the same tractate, employing the imagery of “clothing”, Basil affirms that the blood of Christ took the old man off of the human being and re-clothed it in the new man in the Holy Spirit. Thus, the human being was renewed according to the image of its creator (κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν)35. Moreover, as Christ is the Basileus of heaven, the human being will be dressed in a royal image and the bishop of Caesarea identifies this process with divinization:

Only then after a man is purified from the shame whose stain he took through his wickedness, and has come back to his natural beauty (τὸ ἐκ φύσεως κόσμος ἐπαναθέτο), and as it were cleaning the Royal Image and restoring its ancient form (ἐκκλίνει βασιλική τὴν ἄρχαλαν μερὴν διὰ καθαρόττιτος ἐποδότο), only thus is it possible for him to draw near the Paraclete. […] Hence comes […] the being made like God, and, highest of all, the being made God (ἤ πρὸς θὸν ἐκκλισίας, τὸ ἀκροττῶν τῶν ὀρκτῶν, θὸν γενέθη)36.

---

34 Bas., I, 2,7 (SC 357, 124,21-126,43 Neri). For the discussion on the authenticity of this tractate, see J. Ducatillon’s, Introduction, Basile de Césarée, Sur le baptême, texte grec de l’édition U. Neri, introduction, traduction et annotation par J. Ducatillon, SC 357, Paris 1989, (7-74) 7-16 (SC 357, 7-12 N.). For a similar doctrine where the baptism should be followed by the refashion (ἀνέκτησις) of the lost luminous face (προσώπου) of Adam and become perfect light (φῶς γενεσίας τῆς πλήρους), see Gr. Ncr., or. 39,11. (SC 358, 150-152 M.).

35 Bas., I, 2,23 (176,21 N.). Cf. Col 3,9. Basil also quotes Paul’s Rom 8,29 which states that God made those he knew conformable to the image (συμμορφῶν τῆς εἰκόνος) of his Son. According to Basil, the ones re-clothed in the Son of God were considered worthy to participate in the perfect initiation (παντὸς τολέους βαπτισμοῦ, I, 2,24 (176,2 N.). Basil inserts the doctrine of re-clothing Christ in the liturgical context of the Baptism: the Baptism in the name of the Holy Spirit has the spiritual meaning of being born from above, that in the name of the Son of being re-clothed in Christ and that in the name of the Father of becoming children of God (I, 3,11 (190,14-19 N.). In this context, putting Christ on refers to eating the divine body of Christ and drinking his divine blood (I, 3,1-3 (192-198 N.).

36 See Bas., sp. IX 23 (326,3-328,9,24f. P.; English translation by Jackson, Basil: Letters [see note 7], 15f.). For the complex inter-connections between the Father, Son, and the
In a short history of salvation, Gregory Nazianzen employs the same terminology of “Royal Image”:

That He lit a candle, His own flesh, and swept the house, by cleansing away the sin of the world, and sought for the coin, the Royal Image (τὴν βασιλικὴν ἐκκόμιον) that was all covered up with passions, and calls together His friends, the Angelic Powers, at the finding of the coin, and makes them sharers of His joy, as He had before made them sharers of the secret of His Incarnation.37

In addition, Nazianzen combines this eikonc-soteriological conception with the Demiurge-Christology38. It is interesting to see that this synthesis between Eikonc-soteriology and Demiurge-Christology appears for the first time in Irenaeus of Lyon, though the bishop emphasizes mostly the Holy Spirit as the agent of the reconstruction of the divine image of Christ. Irenaeus produces, therefore, rather a synthesis between an Eikonc-soteriology and a Demiurge-Pneumatology39. However, without mentioning the double-creation theory, Athanasius of Alexandria is much closer to the Cappadocians regarding the synthesis between an Eikonc-soteriology and a Demiurge-Christology40. Likewise, Basil of Caesarea commonly ascribes to the Son the title of “Demiurge” – and most likely this doctrine was of great influence on the two Gregories – though Basil strongly underlines Trinitarian synergy in every creative event, according to the principle: the

Holy Spirit and how they confer glory, knowledge, vision, image and likeness, see, for instance, Bas., spiro. XVIII 46-XIX 49 (408-422 F); cf. spiro. XXI 52 (436,51-62 F) for the comparison with the glorified Moses. See also note 11. The same tripartite work for giving the divine grace is confessed in Bas., bpnt. I 2,9 (130,30-32 N). grace of God given through Jesus Christ our Lord in the Holy Spirit [τῷ σωτηρίῳ Χριστοῦ καὶ Πνεύματι]; cf. bpnt. I 2,21 (170,3-13 N), an echo of Eph 3,14-17; Gal 5,25 and Rom 12,6f.

37 Gr. Naz., or. 45,26 (1164 M); English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 432.

38 While Eikonc-soteriology does not occur in Melito and Origen, Demiurge-Christology is not obvious in Ps-Hippolytus and it is debatable in Origen’s Paschal homily. See Ps.-Hippolytus, In sanctum Pascha 61 (314,1f. V.) for the Eikonc-soteriology of Ps.-Hippolytus.

39 Cf. J. Fantino, La théologie d’Irenée. Lecture des Écritures en réponse a l’exégèse gnostique. Une approche trinitaire, Paris 1994, 216-218. It is also interesting to see that – due perhaps to his polemics against the Gnostics – Irenaeus rejects the idea that earthly, corruptible, composed and ephemeral things can be images of the spiritual ones, therefore the double-creation theory (Iren., haer. II 7,6 [SC 294, 76,13-29 Rousseau/Doutreleau]); cf. J. Fantino, L’homme image de Dieu chez Saint Irenée de Lyon, Paris 1986, 87-92. The Cappadocian doctrine of creation, in this case, is much closer to Irenaeus than to Clement, Origen and Eusebius.

40 Ath., inc. 13,7-9, 14,2; 20,1 (312-314; 336 K.). According to Ath., gent. 2 (54,8-10 C.), the Father made, through his λόγος, the human being according to his image; yet, according to gent. 34 (164,20-24 C.), the human soul has to recover the illuminated [φωτισμένον] image of God. It is worth noting that while Demiurge-Christology also occurs in Eusebius (e.g., Eus., theoph. 12-4:341,43 [460,10-42,2, 52,28-53,24; 60,4-61,3 G./L.]; II 3 [81,24 G./L.]; III 39 [141,16 G./L.]; V 14 [226,21 G./L.]), Eikonc-soteriology is not noticeable.
Lord commends, the Word creates and the Spirit strengthens. Accordingly, his Eikonic-soteriology does not describe the re-creation of the divine image as an exclusive work of one of the persons of the Trinity.

Another noteworthy aspect of the process of the re-creation of the human being concerns the conditions which make it possible. For Nazianzen, the entire process is double conditioned, human and divine. On the one hand, there is a divine ontological condition which makes possible the transformation of the human being and the process of salvation, namely the Incarnation of Christ which essentially consisted in κύσματι (the divine emptying of greatness and glory) and self-sacrifice. On the other hand, the human being has to become a mirror of this divine self-sacrifice and κύσματι as the only way which may bring the human being to the participation in Christ’s Godhead, Fullness and Image:

And He who gives riches becomes poor; for He assumes the poverty of my flesh, that I may assume the riches of His Godhead. He that is full empties Himself; for He empties Himself of His Glory for a short while, that I may have a share in His Fullness. What is the riches of His Goodness? What is this mystery that is around me? I had a share in the Image and I did not keep it; He partakes of my flesh that He may both save the Image and make the flesh immortal. He communicates a Second Communion, far more marvelous than the first, inasmuch as then He imparted the better nature, but now He Himself assumes the worse. This is more godlike than the former action; this is loftier in the eyes of all men of understanding. The process of self-sacrifice is in itself an image of the archetypal sacrifice and consists of imitating Christ in his passion and resurrection:

A Mystery anointed me (μυστήριον ἤχρισεν με) I withdrew (ὑπεραύρησα) a little while at a Mystery, as much as was needful to examine myself (διδος ἐκανατέν ἐπιστήμησαν); now I come in with a Mystery, bringing with me the Day as a good defender of my cowardice and weakness; that He Who today rose again from the dead may renew me also by His Spirit (καταποιησας τῷ πνεύματι); and, clothing me with the new Man (τὸν νέον ἀνθρώπον, ἀνθρωποδομαν), may give me to His New Creation (δώ τῇ καινῇ κτίσει), to those who are begotten after God (ἀπὸ τῶν γενεσμένων), as a good modeler and teacher for Christ, willingly both dying with Him (συναποκατομένου) and rising again with Him (συναναστάσεως).  

---

63 Cf. Bas., spir. XVI 38 (380,37f. P.). The Son is co-operator in the work of creation (τῶν κοσμών τῆς ἐπιστημονίας) in Bas., hex. IX 6 (159,8 M./R.) and the Father made the world through (διὰ) his Only-begotten Son (bas., bapt. I 1.15 [100,33 N.]; II 12,1 [292,2 N.]; 13,1 [298,2 N.] and Bas., hex. IX 6 [159,8 M./R.]).

62 Gr. Naz., or. 45,9 (1144 M.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 426). See also or. 1,4 (SC 247, 76,8-78,12 B.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 203): “Let us offer ourselves, the possession most precious to God, and most fitting, let us give back to the Image what is made after the Image. Let us recognize our Dignity, let us honour our Archetype; let us know the power of the Mystery, and for what Christ died.”

61 Gr. Naz., or. 1,2 (SC 247, 74 B.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 203). It is noteworthy that the Holy Spirit plays a demiurgic role in this passage in a similar way with the role of the Holy Spirit in Irenaeus.
Gregory here employs mystery terminology and describes himself as in a process of incubation. Similarly to Christ before death, Nazianzen is anointed, he withdraws into himself in a mystery and examines himself with the purpose of imitating Christ. The expectation which accompanies this mystery experience is to rise with Christ and get dressed in the new Man in a process of new creation. In a different passage, he describes the process of imitating Christ’s passion in this way:

Yesterday I was crucified with Him; today I am glorified with Him; yesterday I died with Him; today I am quickened with Him; yesterday I was buried with Him; today I rise with Him. But let us offer to Him Who suffered and rose again for us – you will think perhaps that I am going to say gold, or silver, or woven work or transparent and costly stones, the mere passing material of earth, that remains here below, and is for the most part always possessed by bad men, slaves of the world and of the Prince of the world. Let us recognize our Dignity; let us honour our Archetype; let us know the power of the Mystery, and for what Christ died. Let us become like Christ, since Christ became like us (γνώσματα ὡς Χριστός, ἐπεί καὶ Χριστός ὡς ἡμῖν). Let us become God’s for His sake, since He for ours became Man (γνώσμα θεοὶ δὲ αὐτῶν, ἐπείδη καὶ ἡμῖν ἀνθρώποι).

The imitation of Christ’s passions appears to start the process of deification. As Christ offered himself, human beings should sacrifice themselves in an effort of self-offering, which in its nature is giving honour to the archetype. Human beings cannot give to God something else more worthy than themselves. In the process of self-sacrificing, they imitate Christ’s drama and mystery of passion and death, and start becoming ontologically like him. As Nyssa explains in a similar manner, this is the “power of the Mystery and for what Christ dies”. Rephrasing the meaning of the mystery, one may affirm that imitating the passion of God makes human beings, in a mysterious way, theophorm.

For Gregory of Nyssa as well, Christ the Saviour is the eschatological Demiurge of the human being. Gregory uses the aforementioned Platonic scheme, but identifies the artisan with Christ and, instead of describing Christ’s creation from the beginning of time, he outlines the eschatological one:

I am absolutely astonished at the all-wise art of the master-artist God and Saviour (τοῦ ἀρχιστέρου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος), considering how the copies (αἱ μιμήσεις) of the archetypes (τῶν ἀρχηγίων) which are non-existent (μὴν ὄντων) and invisible

64 Gr. Naz., or. 1.4f. SC 247, 76-78 B.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 203). See also or. 45,28 (1168 M.; English translation: Browne/Swallow, Selected Orations [see note 3], 433): “We needed an Incarnate God, a God put to death, that we might live. We were put to death together with Him, that we might be cleansed; we rose again with Him because we were put to death with Him; we were glorified with Him, because we rose again with Him.”
(μὴ ταχυμένου) are created and fashioned (δημιουργοῦντοι καὶ ζωοπλάστησοντοι) by an inexpressible secret, resurrecting the deceased as different people through the activity of the replicas (διὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας τῶν τύπων). In a different passage, he conceives of the resurrection as a process of re-creation of the world as a copy of the first creation, namely of the visible world. The eschatological creation becomes in this way a copy of the copy without actually experiencing diminution in its ontological value:

You [the over-curious] may rightly be perplexed and irritated at the fact that you know the explanation of the creation (τῆς γενεσίας τῶν λόγων εἴδος) but do not know the reordering that comes with re-creation (τῆς τῶν παλαιωτέρων μετακόσμησης). But if those things are to you as a dream and fantasy, and their knowledge unobtainable, do not complain if, unable to account for the construction (τῶν λόγων τῆς κατασκευῆς δράσεων), you cannot conceive the restoration of what was destroyed (τῆς διάβρωσιν τοῦ φανεροῦ οὐ συνορίσκο). It is the same craftsman (ὁ αὐτὸς τεχνίτης) for the first creation (τῆς πρώτης κτίσματος) and for the second remolding (τῆς δευτέρως μετακόσμησης). He knows how he will fit together again in its ancient design (εἰς τὴν ἀρχαῖαν κατάστασιν) the work of his which has suffered dissolution.

In his turn, Nyssa deems that the momentum where the process of salvation starts is not the end of the world, but the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. With Christ, a new humanity, a new human genre (the new man) commence. In eschatological-paradisiacal tones, Gregory describes the new creation which begins with the event of the Incarnation and the human being re-created according to the image of God. Eschatology, in this way, is viewed as a new creation and starts with Christ’s Nativity:

“This is the day which the Lord made” (Ps 117:24), but different from the days made at the beginning of creation, by which time is measured, this is the beginning of another creation (Δίκαιης κτίσματος οἰκίων Αὐτοῦ). For on this day God makes a new heaven and a new earth, as the prophet says. What heaven? The firmament of faith in Christ. What earth? I mean the good heart, as the Lord said, the earth which drinks the rain which comes on it and ripens plentiful grain. In this creation pure living is the sun, the virtues are stars, transparent conduct is the air, the depth of the riches of wisdom and knowledge is the sea,

---

65 Ge. Nyss., In sanctum Pascha (269,13-18 G.; English translation: Spira/Klock [eds.], Easter Sermons, translation by Hall [see note 23], 22f.). The invisible models seem to refer, in this case, to the forms of the dead persons, rather than to the Platonic ideas.

66 Ge. Nyss., In sanctum Pascha (256 G.; English translation: Spira/Klock [eds.], Easter Sermons, translation by Hall [see note 23], 13). See also In sanctum Pascha (258f. G.; English translation: Spira/Klock [eds.], Easter Sermons, translation by Hall [see note 23], 15): “As then the seed, which in the early stages is shapeless, is formed into a pattern (εἰς σχῆμα τυπουότας) and ripens into bulky parts as it is built up by the ineffable skill of God (τῆς ἀποφράσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ κατασκευαζόμενον τέχνης), so it is not at all surprising, but follows naturally, that the matter in the toms that once had shape should again be restored to its original formation (εἰς τὴν παλαιὰν διάπλασιν), and that dust should again become man, just as he originally came into existence from it (τὸ πρῶτον εἰκόνον λέγετο τῆς γένεσις).”
good teaching and divine doctrines are herbage and plants, which the people of his pasture, that is God’s flock, grazes on, the performance of the commandments is trees bearing fruit. In this is created also the true man who is made in the image and likeness of God (ἐν τούτῳ κτίζεται καὶ ὁ ἀληθινὸς ζωτικός ἰσότητα καὶ κατ’ ἐκάστου γενόμενος θεοῦ καὶ ἐκοιμηθεὶς)\(^67\).

**Conclusion**

The Paschal orations of Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa conceive of Christ as the Lord of Glory praised by the universal choir of human and angelic beings, of visible and invisible worlds, He is the Divine Glory and Unchangeable Image, the salvific manifestation of the Godhead and the λόγος-σάρξ- or Spirit-flesh-mixture, the heavenly Archetype and the Demiurge-λόγος capable of recreating the decomposed human bodies and resurrecting them as new human beings according to his heavenly Archetype. The two Gregories confer new applications to the Platonic conception of creation present in *Timaeus*, and embrace the Philonian theory of double-creation. But while the theory was traditionally related to the event of creation, the Cappadocians applied it to the eschatological re-creation of the human being. Humans should try to imitate the divine Image and involve themselves in an ontological process of recreating their beings as images of Christ even from this earthly life. The ancient anthropomorphic tones are now faded into a theorization about a divine Image primarily conceived as divine light, reason, beauty and goodness, which human beings should imitate during their earthly existence in order to recover a genuine garment of light in the *eschaton*. Consequently, Cappadocian Paschal Christology can be envisioned as a synthesis of Eikon-soteriology and Demiurge-Christology inserted within Paschal theology. While Eikon-soteriology can be traced from Irenaeus and Pseudo-Hippolytus to Athanasius and Basil, Demiurge-Christology is present in Melito, Athanasius, Eusebius and Basil.

\(^67\) Ge. Nyss., *De tridui spatio* [279ff. G.; English translation: Spira/Klock [eds.], Easter Sermons, translation by Hall [see note 23], 34f.
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