

## CHAPTER 5

# The Notion of Rhetoric in the Eastern Orthodox Patristic Tradition

*Bishop Auxentios*

RHETORIC IS NOT SOMETHING disassociated from the Greek Fathers. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the vast majority of patristic scholars, East and West, look to these Fathers as a paradigm of theological discourse set forth in image, language, and form reminiscent of the most beautiful in classical rhetoric. Saint Gregory the Theologian (d. 390), for example, has been universally hailed in the Church as a master of classical rhetoric. But if style and form and impression and expression are integral to the transmission and communication of truth in Western theological and spiritual thought; indeed, if they form that two-part construct of spirit and message so vital to the traditional Reformed notion of preaching as the very revelation and actualization of the Word of God—a notion which has reached far beyond the Reformed tradition in present-day homiletics; such, to be sure, is still not an apt statement about rhetoric as it is understood in traditional Eastern Christian thought. This point must be made. From an Eastern Orthodox perspective, from that perspective formed in and by the Greek patristic ethos, rhetoric is an adornment, as it were, to the truth, albeit one intimately and immediately linked to the truth. Just as truth, for the Greek Fathers, is expressed in their rhetoric, so, too, they reserved for such rhetoric, for this special medium of expression, the message of truth. If rhetoric and the truth form a single thing, it is not so much that one is contained in the other, but that rhetoric most appropriately complements the truth.

If we are to understand the subtly unique nature of rhetoric as it is received in Greek patristic thought, then we must understand this

uniqueness, in turn, within the context of the singularly unique truth to which it is suited. If rhetoric is an adornment, as we have said, its particular character and beauty can be understood only by clearly understanding the truth which it adorns and which, in turn, gives to it a distinct flavor and effectiveness. To the extent that rhetoric has a power of its own, that power constantly and inevitably returns to the truth from which it derives by adornment. Let us, then, look at the statement of theological truth put forth by the Greek Fathers and the crucial role which that statement plays in analyzing and understanding rhetoric in that tradition and in distinguishing it from rhetoric as it might be understood in other theological and intellectual systems.

How is it that the search for truth is set forth in the corpus of traditional Orthodox theological writings and discourses? In his now classic study, *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View*, the late Protospyter Georges Florovsky proffers a trenchant treatment of the problematic relationship between Scripture and Tradition in the early Church. In it lies a classical statement about theological truth from the Eastern patristic view. He observes that the essential hermeneutic concern of the early Fathers was not the search for an image or principle of authority—in the sense of an institution or a dogma—but rather the establishment of a *criterion* upon which to determine Christian truth: an operational principle to guide one in the science of authentic and authoritative interpretation that we today call hermeneutics. Indeed, in the early Church both the orthodox and heretical parties were in accord in affirming that what is true is authoritative. One might say that, for the early Fathers, these two terms were virtually synonymous. Orthodox and heretics in the early Church were, for the most part, also in agreement with regard to the necessity of putting forth any appeal to truth in a strictly scriptural context. Thus, Scripture constituted for the primitive Christian community the most perfect expression of the truth. The disagreements which separated the orthodox and heretical parties centered on how this appeal was to be made: How does one rightly determine the meaning of the words contained in Scripture? And here, in contradistinction to the heretics—for whom there reigned multifarious determinants—the Orthodox were in full agreement. “Tradition,” in the words of Father Florovsky, “was the only means to ascertain and to disclose the true meaning of Scripture.”<sup>1</sup> He expands on this pithy formula as follows:

1. Florovsky, *Collected Works*, 1:74–75.

[T]radition was in the Early Church, first of all, an hermeneutical principle and method. Scripture could be rightly and fully assessed and understood only in the light and in the context of the living Apostolic Tradition, which was an integral factor of Christian existence. It was so, of course, not because Tradition could add anything to what has been manifested in the Scripture, but because it provided that living context, the comprehensive perspective, in which only the true “intention” and the total “design” of the Holy Writ, of Divine Revelation itself, could be detected and grasped.<sup>2</sup>

In further speaking of truth as a product of proper scriptural interpretation drawn from authentic Tradition, Father Florovsky undertakes a careful examination of the various terms employed by the Orthodox in their appeals to Tradition: Saint Vincent of Lérins’s “ecclesiastical understanding,” Tertullian’s “rule of faith,” Saint Athanasios the Great’s “scope of faith,” Saint Basil the Great’s “unwritten mysteries of the Church” and “intention of the Scripture,” and Saint Augustine of Hippo’s “catholic preaching.”<sup>3</sup> His conclusion is that, in the early Church, an appeal to Tradition, or, as it is later more commonly called, an appeal to the witness of the Fathers, was neither a selective appeal—an appeal to a particular Father whose words confirmed what one wanted to say—nor an appeal to antiquity—grounded, as such an appeal usually is, on the erroneous premise that what is older is always more genuine (for, indeed, there are heresies older than the formulations by which they were subsequently refuted). Rather, the appeal to the Fathers was to a certain commonality of mind and thought, the patristic *φρόνημα*, the *consensus Patrum*. And the unique characteristic of this consensus was its spiritual—its ecclesiastical—dimension. The consensus of the Fathers was not contained in majority opinion, though the majority might hold to it; rather, it was rooted in, belonged to, and proceeded from the spiritual authority of the Church, the Pillar and Foundation of Truth.<sup>4</sup> “This consensus was much more than just an empirical agreement of individuals. The true and authentic consensus was that which reflected the mind of the Catholic and Universal Church—τὸ ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φρόνημα [‘the ecclesiastical mind’ or ‘the mind of the Church’].”<sup>5</sup>

2. Ibid., 79.

3. Ibid., 73–79.

4. Compare 1 Tim 3:15.

5. Florovsky, *Collected Works*, 1:105.

The *consensus Patrum* (the mind [φρόνημα] of the Fathers), the mind of the Church, and, indeed, the mind of Christ—all of these are synonymous for Father Florovsky. To some extent, they refer to yet another and essential criterion of truth recognized by the early Church and championed by the Greek Fathers: one which rests in the transformation and renewal of the human mind. This renewal is one to which all Christians are called. The response of the *novus homo*, a man or woman restored in Christ, to the imperative call of this vocation lies at the very core of Eastern Orthodox spirituality: “And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.”<sup>6</sup> This vocation is, as much as anything else, the vehicle for an epistemological and hermeneutic principle: the beginning of a spiritual ascent and renewal of the mind in which we come to know and understand the criterion of Truth.<sup>7</sup>

But in another and more universal sense, the renewal of human consciousness, the single believer’s participation in the mind of the Fathers, itself focuses on the Christian community, on Christ, and, as such, stands on the Pillar and Foundation, even the Source, of Truth. The logic here is somewhat tautological in nature, though in no way compromised by the pejorative connotations attached to the tautological; rather, it is the logic appropriate to that which in singularity is one with what single elements in consort form together. For He Who quickens His Body, the Church, is the source of Truth and the Supreme Authority. To the extent that we have the mind of Christ, that we attain, through spiritual transformation, to a oneness with Him, we apprehend and understand the Truth, according to the Greek Fathers. In the transformed individual resides that mind which makes all individuals one and which gives to the one that universal knowledge dwelling in all and derived from the One. Thus, we know the truth by possessing it and possess it by our knowledge. To help unravel this circularity, let us look a little closer at the Orthodox conception of dogmatic truth and its relation to the renewal of the human mind.

Father John Romanides, a contemporary Greek theologian and a student of Father Florovsky, is one of the more prominent figures in the so-called “patristic renewal” of the Orthodox Church, an intellectual movement that began some decades ago both in Eastern European and the Western Orthodox theological circles. He has been an active voice

6. Rom 12:2.

7. Compare 1 Cor 2:15–16.

in efforts, at least in the theological arena, to return Orthodox thought to its traditional roots and to remove from it many of the Western ideas and theological conceptualizations that have compromised and distorted its witness. In several of his works, he has maintained that the dogmatic contentions of the early Church arose from a confrontation between an empirical (what he considers the properly Orthodox) and a speculative (potentially or manifestly heretical) view of the science of theology. The former view (theological method, if you will), he argues, is founded and formulated on a therapeutic asceticism (a curative restoration of the human being through spiritual and bodily ascesis; *viz.*, among other things, intense love for God, the cultivation of selfless love, mental prayer, fasting, and warfare with the fallen world). It uses the nomenclature of its day, both Hebraic and Hellenic, to formulate its observations and to guide others to a verification of its formulae by replication.

Father Romanides remarks that, “in the Orthodox Patristic tradition, genuine spiritual experience is the foundation of dogmatic formulations which, in turn, are necessary guides for leading [one] to glorification . . . . The experience of glorification of the prophets, apostles, and saints are [*sic*] expressed in linguistic forms, whose purpose is to act as a guide to the same experience of glorification by their successors.”<sup>8</sup> In contrast to this, the purveyors of the speculative tradition were not convinced of the necessity of grounding theological formulae in empirical fact. Rather, this school was generally optimistic about the intrinsic ability of the mind, independent of empirical experience, to reason and formulate on the loftiest of matters pertaining to the divine. The highly refined philosophical vocabulary of the Greek language and, more importantly, the basic presuppositions of the philosophies that shaped that language were the tools of this speculative school. Father Romanides contends that this approach, divorced as it was from any notion of empirical verification and trusting in the mind’s innate reasoning abilities, was destined to repeat the “errors of the ancients.” The “dogmas” of these speculative heretics, while perhaps pleasing in their logic and consistency, were essentially counterfeits, he argues, that misled the Faithful and gave them “stones instead of bread.”<sup>9</sup>

Father Romanides characterizes the foregoing distinction between the empirical and speculative theological methods with a remarkable analogy, likening those who were Orthodox in their understanding to contemporary

8. Romanides, *Franks*, 39.

9. Compare Matt 7:9; Luke 11:11.

practitioners of the hard sciences. His analogy also clarifies the patristic understanding of human language (thus, we should emphasize, touching tangentially on matters rhetorical), vis-à-vis the spiritual, and the importance of the traditional hermeneutic that accompanies that language.

The Fathers did not understand theology as a theoretical or speculative science, but as a positive [*i.e.*, positivistic] science in all respects . . . .

Scientific manuals are inspired by the observations of specialists. For example, the astronomer records what he observes by means of the instruments at his disposal. Because of his training in the use of . . . [these] . . . instruments, he is inspired by the heavenly bodies, and sees things invisible to the naked eye . . . . Books about science can never replace scientific observations. These writings are not the observations themselves, but [are] about these observations . . . .

[Moreover] . . . , the writings of scientists are accompanied by a tradition of interpretation, heeded by successor scientists, who, by training and experience, know what their colleagues mean by the language used, and how to repeat the observations described.<sup>10</sup>

And here follows the completion of the analogy:

The same is true of the Orthodox understanding of the Bible and the writings of the Fathers. Neither the Bible nor the writings of the Fathers are revelation or the word of God. They are *about* revelation and *about* the Word of God [*emphasis mine*].

. . . Only those who have the same experience of glorification as their prophetic, apostolic, and patristic predecessors can understand what the Biblical and Patristic writings are saying about glorification and the spiritual stages leading to it. Those who have reached glorification know how they were guided there, as well as how to guide others, and they are the guarantors of the transmission of this same tradition.<sup>11</sup>

The general points that Father Romanides is making are simple enough. Firstly, he contends that Holy Scripture and the writings of the Fathers are essentially testimony *about* God's revelation to man. This revelation, itself, is primarily comprised of the vision of the Uncreated Glory of God, whether it be in the Old Testament Prophetic visions of the Logos

10. Romanides, *Franks*, 40–41.

11. *Ibid.*

appearing as the Angel of God, the Angel of Great Counsel, the Lord of Glory, or the Lord God of Sabaoth; or, after the Incarnation and Pentecost, through the Human Nature of God the Word incarnate. Secondly, he claims that the *utterances* made by those who have received this vision *are not to be mistaken* for the revelations themselves. From the standpoint of these visions (revelations) themselves, such words are necessarily imperfect—though from our standpoint they may carry the force of infallible dogma or correct doctrine.

Finally, the revelation of God—the vision of God—is not a unique historical event, not something confined to scriptural revelation or even the Incarnation or *Parousia*; it is, rather, something assigned to each person, to be experienced by every human being, first in this life and then in the other. Therefore, the recorded testimonies of those who, throughout the course of history, have had this vision—the Prophets, Apostles, and Fathers and Mothers of the Church—are meant as guidebooks. And these books are most properly and correctly employed by those who, in each succeeding generation, have passed through (or at least are undergoing) the stages of purification and illumination that lead to glorification, or the vision of God. Such men and women, in turn, can wield these books, by their own discretion and with their counsel, to guide others through the same processes and to the same experiences. This mastership of spirituality was the original criterion for election to ordination and license to preach.

We must touch on a few final elements in our treatment of the unique notion of truth found in Eastern Orthodox theology and spiritual practice. First, the Greek Fathers everywhere insist on the ultimate unknowability of God. This is a touchstone, one might say, of the consensual theology. “Eastern theology,” Father Florovsky notes, has “been always committed to the belief that God [is] absolutely ‘incomprehensible’—*ἀκατάληπτος*—and unknowable in His nature or essence . . . ‘One insults God who seeks to apprehend his essential being,’ says Chrysostom . . . The ‘essence of God’ is absolutely inaccessible to man, says St. Basil (*Adv. Eunomium* 1.14).”<sup>12</sup>

As well, there is, in Eastern patristic thinking, a fundamental division between the Uncreated and the created realms, the Uncreated pertaining to the Holy Trinity and the created to all else—from Angelic beings to lifeless matter. Now, human language is among those things included in the category of the created and is wholly incapable of describing or conveying the Uncreated. This observation has obvious importance for the subject of

12. Florovsky, *Collected Works*, 1:115–16.

rhetoric, since it speaks to the notion of communication, though in a fundamentally theological way. It behooves us, here, to quote Father Romanides's reference to the thought of Saint Gregory of Nyssa on this matter, since the latter's observations have become authoritative for the Orthodox patristic Tradition. As such, they will reinforce our subsequent specific commentary on rhetoric in the Eastern patristic Tradition.

St. Gregory . . . insists that all words and languages are products of human accommodations to the necessities of communication on the human level, and all concepts either conveyed by words or simply contemplated can never extricate themselves from their creaturely qualities. Knowledge of God, therefore, cannot be conceptual. God cannot be reached by contemplation. God is not like anything man experiences either intellectually or by sensation. Knowledge of God can be had only from those who have been the objects of this revelation, which is above all rational and sentient categories. It is a knowledge which can be indicated but not conveyed by human language or concepts.<sup>13</sup>

Lastly, as we have observed, through the process of purification, illumination, and ultimately glorification, it is possible for us to become "partakers of the divine Nature."<sup>14</sup> This participation, according to Orthodox theology, does not compromise the unknowability of God, since the Greek Fathers make a clear and firm distinction between the Divine Essence and Divine Energies of God. The Divine Essence of God is totally unknowable. The transcendent God, as Essence, is forever transcendent and beyond human knowledge. The Divine Energies, however, correspond to God's creative, vivifying, and ruling powers, and, being communicable, account for man's glorification. But even these communicable aspects of God, because they are Uncreated, are also inconceivable; they can be communicated, or passed on, but they are beyond human conceptualization. Let us recall the words of Saint Gregory the Theologian:

What is this that has happened to me? . . . I was running to lay hold on God, and thus I went up into the Mount, and drew aside the curtain of the Cloud, and entered away from matter and material things, and as far as I could I withdrew within myself. And then when I looked up, I scarce saw the back parts of God; although I was sheltered by the Rock, the Word that was made flesh for

13. Romanides, "Highlights," 177.

14. 2 Pet 1:4.



us. And when I looked a little closer, I saw, not the First and unmingled Nature, known to Itself—to the Trinity, I mean; not That which abideth within the first veil, and is hidden by the Cherubim; but only that Nature, which at last even reaches to us. And that is, as far as I can learn, the Majesty, or as holy David calls it, the Glory which is manifested among the creatures, which It has produced and governs . . . .

Therefore we must begin again thus. It is difficult to conceive God but to define Him in words is an impossibility, as one of the Greek teachers of Divinity taught, not unskillfully, as it appears to me . . . . But in my opinion it is impossible to express Him, and yet more impossible to conceive Him.<sup>15</sup>

It was his mystical experience that first prompted Saint Gregory to theologize. In fact, in his “First Theological Oration” he maintains that to theologize “is permitted only to those who have passed examinations and have reached *theoria* [“mystical vision”—often badly translated as “contemplation” or “meditation”], and who have been previously purified in soul and body, or at least are being purified.”<sup>16</sup> Yet he immediately qualifies his observation by noting that such experience is not within the domain of human language and concepts: “It is impossible to express Him, and yet more impossible to conceive Him.” “In this way”—that is, on the foundation of personal spiritual experience and mindful of the limitations of human thought—Saint Gregory says, “shalt thou discourse of God.”<sup>17</sup>

Let us now weigh some of the implications of the unique theological schema of the Eastern Fathers for an Orthodox rhetoric. In the first place, the spiritual stature of a minister or church teacher; advancement through the stages of purification, illumination, and glorification; empirical, rather than merely conceptual or theoretical knowledge of the goal of Christian life, the vision of God; or progress along these paths—these constitute the fundamental criteria for Orthodox Christian preaching. In the words of Saint John Chrysostomos: “. . . I pass over all those qualities and . . . superfluous embellishments of pagan writers. I take no account of diction or style. Let a man’s diction be beggarly and his verbal composition simple and artless, but do not let him be inexpert in the knowledge and

15. St. Gregory Nazianzen, “The Second Theological Oration,” in *Select Orations*, 289–90.

16. Quoted in Romanides, *Franks*, 49.

17. St. Gregory Nazianzen, “Second Theological Oration,” 289.

careful statement of doctrine.”<sup>18</sup> Indeed, as we earlier noted in a remarkable quote from Father John Romanides, “[I]n the Orthodox patristic tradition, genuine spiritual experience is the foundation of dogmatic formulations which, in turn, are necessary guides for leading to glorification.”<sup>19</sup> By the same token, the proclamation of the Word of God, the virtual explication of dogma and doctrine, rests squarely, in the Orthodox spiritual Tradition, on the same “genuine spiritual experience.” As one Orthodox writer has noted, true preachers of the word are found “where there is theory pregnant with true experience,” warning us, in the words of the Desert Fathers, that those who employ beautiful words to describe things which they have not themselves experienced are like “a tree which has beautiful leaves but does not bear fruit.”<sup>20</sup>

In terms of classical rhetorical categories, it is *ethos*, the formation of the preacher, to which Orthodox homiletics is primarily subject. And this formation is founded upon an asceticism therapeutically applied to the preacher’s whole being; an ascesis that in turn affords him or her an empirical knowledge of the subject matter, the *logos* (and, indeed, the *Logos*). Orthodox rhetoric can best be likened, therefore, to the third of the three ancient rhetorical traditions: the technical, sophistic, and philosophical. Plato (or Socrates) placed great emphasis on a rhetor’s need for intimate knowledge of the truth of things, as opposed to knowledge based on deductions from logical probabilities. It is this image of true rhetorical art that best fits that of the Eastern Orthodox Church. As Plato writes, “Until someone knows the truth of each thing about which he speaks or writes . . . , not until then will it be possible for speech to exist in an artistic form . . . .”<sup>21</sup> This quotation might easily be attributed to an Eastern Orthodox commentator on homiletics or the rhetoric attendant to it.

For the Eastern patristic Tradition, then, Plato was right on the mark in his statement about the fundamentals of effective rhetoric or preaching. The Greek Fathers, however, placed much less trust in the perceptual apparatus of the human being than Plato. Whereas the classical Greek ideal of the rhetorician entails lofty demands on human capabilities, the Greek patristic Tradition rests its ideal on the transformed individual—on a person

18. St. John Chrysostom, *On the Priesthood*, 121–22.

19. Romanides, *Franks*, 39.

20. Chrysostomos and Auxentios, “Saint Gregory Palamas on the Hesychasts,” in *Contemporary Traditionalist Orthodox Thought*, 62.

21. Quoted in Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 59.

purified of the foibles that render this philosophical ideal, however lofty and elevated, unattainable. Moreover, the transmission of the very method by which human nature is lifted up to the traits of the ideal rhetorician is part and parcel of what Orthodox rhetoric is. This transmission, this tradition or handing-down (*παράδοσις*) of the rhetorical ideal, is for the Orthodox Fathers a living process, giving birth and form to human words and images; the philosophical rhetorical ideal, in this sense, is no tradition at all, but is at best stillborn.

In the second place, we can make some remarks in regard to “invention,” the process by which the rhetorician decides upon the subject of his discourse. Many rhetorical theories confidently commend Holy Scripture as a multi-faceted source of wisdom or inspiration for the preacher’s art—an indispensable aid in homiletic invention. Saint Augustine, though he elsewhere expresses some reservations in this regard, succinctly expresses the same idea in the fourth book of his *On Christian Doctrine*: “For a man speaks more or less wisely to the extent that he has become more or less proficient in the Holy Scriptures.”<sup>22</sup> For an Orthodox theory of invention, the order is backwards. Saint Augustine’s words *should read*: “One speaks more or less scripturally to the extent that one is more or less proficient in wisdom.”

Divine wisdom, indwelling the purified, illumined, and glorified human soul, is that which enables one properly to comprehend the message of Sacred Scripture and to employ it, or similar words, in guiding others to purification, illumination, and glorification—to divine wisdom, and, thereby, to an identical understanding of Scripture. In the East, centuries of struggle with heretics, most of them tremendously facile and “proficient” in the Scriptures, drove this point home. So did the preaching and Orthodox witness of a veritable choir of desert ascetics, many of whom, though actually unversed in literal or rhetorical knowledge of Holy Writ, rose to Prophetic stature and were thus able to transmit the genuine wisdom of the Christian Scriptures.

For the Christian East, the fruit of a spiritual life correctly cultivated and the copious wisdom proceeding from the transformed and God-bearing soul are the proper sources of and inspiration for the preacher’s words. To the extent that a preacher relies on logical, conceptual, or linguistic analyses of the Scriptures or any other spiritual writings, he or she is all the more open to the subjective faults of “personal interpretation” and to possible error. At best, the speculative spirit of the unenlightened is a matter

22. St. Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, 122.

of the “blind leading the blind.”<sup>23</sup> At worst, especially when it engenders philosophical speculation about God, this spirit gives birth to heresy, a fall “into the ditch.”<sup>24</sup> Thus it is that the Christian East carefully heeds such scriptural warnings as that of Saint Peter about the Epistles of Saint Paul, “in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.”<sup>25</sup>

In the third place, the Orthodox understanding of rhetoric also places tremendous responsibility on the listener. Just as the preacher can only rightly speak to the extent that he has been—or is being—purified, illumined, and glorified, so the listener can only rightly receive these words to the extent that he or she has undergone or is undergoing the same process of transformation. “Purify yourselves,” cries Saint John Chrysostomos over and over again in his introductory homily on Saint John’s Gospel, warning that otherwise hours of listening are in vain. The theme is ubiquitous in patristic homilies.

What we have said regarding the Orthodox understanding of true Christian knowledge, as well as the role and limitations of human language and concepts in attaining that knowledge, profoundly affects the Eastern Orthodox view of the various prescriptive rhetorical traditions bequeathed to the Christian world by the ancients. Because Eastern Christians are so keenly aware of the limitations of words and concepts, especially with regard to the Uncreated realities which they know so well as the cornerstone of Christian experience, the Orthodox Church has never canonized a particular technical or prescriptive rhetoric. Rather, comments about rhetorical methods seem to be limited to warnings against excess. Classical rhetorical traditions did remain the foundation of primary education in Byzantium, and various Greek Fathers enjoyed such training, as their writings demonstrate. But for these Fathers, as for the Christian East in general, rhetorical elements of style and technique are wholly a matter of accident, not essence. Moreover, however lofty even the accidental rhetoric of the Eastern Greek Fathers, it has from the very beginning enjoyed a dignity secondary always to that of spiritual wisdom itself. Let us illustrate this with a story from the Egyptian desert:

23. Compare Matt 15:14.

24. Ibid.

25. 2 Pet 3:16.

## THE NOTION OF RHETORIC

Once Abba Arsenios revealed his thoughts to an Egyptian Elder and asked him about them. But a certain other Abba saw him and said to him: “Abba Arsenios, you have had so much education in Greek and Latin, yet you ask this man, so unlettered in worldly knowledge, about your thoughts?” Abba Arsenios said to him: “Indeed, I know Roman and Greek letters well; but I have not yet learned even the alphabet of this simple man.”<sup>26</sup>

## Bibliography

- Augustine, St. *On Christian Doctrine*. Translated by D. W. Robertson Jr. New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- Chrysostomos, Archbishop. *Ancient Fathers of the Desert*. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1980.
- Chrysostomos of Etna, Archbishop, Bishop Auxentios of Photike, and Archimandrite Akakios. *Contemporary Traditionalist Orthodox Thought*. 2nd. ed. Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 1998.
- Florovsky, Georges. *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View*. The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky 1. Edited by Richard S. Haugh. Vaduz: Büchervertriebsanstalt, 1987.
- Gregory Nazianzen, St. *Select Orations of Saint Gregory Nazianzen*. Translated by Charles Gordon Browne and James Edward Swallow. A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd series 7. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- John Chrysostom, St. *Six Books on the Priesthood*. Translated by Graham Neville. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1977.
- Kennedy, George A. *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- Romanides, John S. *Franks, Romans, Feudalism, and Doctrine: An Interplay between Theology and Society*. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982.
- . “Highlights in the Debate Over Theodore of Mopsuestia's Christology and Some Suggestions for a Fresh Approach.” *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 5.2 (Winter 1959–60) 140–85.

26. Chrysostomos, *Ancient Fathers*, 19.