
Antonov, N. K. 2022. “The Ἀρχή of the Priest in the ‘Apology for his Flight’ (or. 2) of Gregory of Nazianzus” [in English]. *Filosofiya. Zhurnal Vysshey shkoly ekonomiki [Philosophy. Journal of the Higher School of Economics]* 6 (4), 13–35.

NIKOLAY ANTONOV*

THE APXH OF THE PRIEST IN THE “APOLOGY FOR HIS FLIGHT” (OR. 2) OF GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS**

Submitted: Sept. 10, 2022. Reviewed: Nov. 20, 2022. Accepted: Nov. 28, 2022.

Abstract: This article reconstructs the categorical apparatus used by Gregory of Nazianzus to form notions of the ἀρχή of the priest. It has been shown that logic of religious leadership, developed by Gregory, is deeply rooted in paradigms of Late Antiquity. He connects the idea of the divine origin of the institution of the clergy with the notion of a world hierarchy (ἀρχή καὶ τάξις). In this context, oppositions between ministry/absolute authority (λειτουργία/ἡγεμονία) and force/persuasion (βία/πειθοῖ) are analyzed, showing that the priest is defined by his position between God and the laity, which is often described using the pastoral metaphor: Chief Shepherd Christ—shepherd—flock. At the same time, the category of “mediation” itself (μεσιτεία Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων) refers in his text exclusively to the cultic function of the priest, i. e. bringing people to God through the sacraments. Another way of achieving this goal is to help people through “spiritual guidance,” i. e. different practices of communication (conversation, sermon, instruction, etc.). This path is described by Gregory in Neoplatonic categories and implies that only someone who is close to God can lead others to Him. These two methods of influencing lay people have a different theological-ontological basis, however both of them constitute the ἀρχή of the priest. The performance of the sacraments is considered as that which places a priest closer to God, that is to say what includes him in ἀρχή καὶ τάξις on a level distinct from ordinary people. Moreover, the priest is thought of as a person who occupies in the New Israel—the Church—the place of the rulers of ancient Israel, and for this reason his position is described as authoritative, although this authority has to do with the government of souls (ἡγεμονία ψυχῶν), accomplished in this case exclusively through persuasion.

Keywords: Priesthood, Religious Leadership, Gregory of Nazianzus, Power/Authority, Mediation, Spiritual Guidance.

DOI: 10.17323/2587-8719-2022-4-13-35.

*Nikolay Antonov, MA, Visiting Fellow of the Ecclesiastical Institutions Research Laboratory St. Tikhon’s Orthodox University for the Humanities (Moscow, Russia), nickforgo@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-6588-1633.

**© Nikolay Antonov. © Philosophy. Journal of the Higher School of Economics.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the Russian Science Foundation under grant № 19-78-10143 (<https://rscf.ru/en/project/19-78-10143/>). The project was organized by St. Tikhon’s Orthodox University.

The word describing the action and position of the priest¹ which occurs most frequently in the *Apology for his Flight* (further — *Apology*) of Gregory of Nazianzus (St. Gregory the Theologian) is ἄρχω, with various derivations, which leads us inevitably to the conclusion that Gregory thinks of the priest as an instance of authority. Nonetheless, because the text speaks a great deal about the *duties* of the priest and the *demands* placed on him, and almost nothing is said about the *possibilities* which his position gives him, the question of the source, boundaries, and character of this ἄρχή require clarification.

Gregory's *Apology* is the first text in the Christian tradition dedicated to the image of the priest. As it has not been sufficiently studied itself (Antonov, 2021a), references to it in major monographs concerning church discourse on authority are rather superficial (Sterk, 2004: 122–125; Rapp, 2005: 42–44; Demacopoulos, 2006: 51–82; Hornung, 2020: 38–46). An exception to this rule is a monograph by Elm, where the author proposes a thoroughly detailed, though often controversial analysis of the image of the priest in the context of the Platonic image of the philosopher (Elm, 2012: 147–268).² In the *Apology* we encounter all the fundamental categories and oppositions which characterize the conceptions of authority in Late An-

¹Attention to word choice in the context of this research paper leads me immediately to make the qualification that I use the word “priest” exclusively to refer to the object of description of this text. Gregory makes a clear distinction between the presbyterial and episcopal ranks, of course. Nevertheless, this text, as testified to by the phrase “Nor [...] was I ashamed of the rank of this grade from my desire for a higher” (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 5), describes his acceptance of the rank of presbyter, while in some of his other texts the episcopacy is described using the same lexicon as in the *Apology*; the connotations of the word ἱερεὺς in Gregory's writings will be considered below. The Greek text of Gregory's orations is taken from the digital library of Greek literature TLG, the English translation from NPNF 2 (with minor alterations), unless otherwise stated. Greek quotations from other texts are also taken from TLG, unless otherwise stated.

²This approach is important to us, because it is in this context that the authoritative position of the priest is most clearly described for the first time. Nevertheless, ignoring the question of how the theological basis of the nature of this authority — in the first instance sacramental — leads to the authority of the priest (for some reason interpreted almost as a directly political activity, compare: “priestly office as leadership of the *oikoumene*” (Elm, 2012: 156)) being perceived as no more than the result of personal deification. This allows a Platonic scheme of the interpretation of authority to be discerned in Gregory's work, which is indeed adopted by him, but prevents us from seeing its development and transformation through the prism of Christian kerygma.

tiquity and the Middle Ages.³ What is more, Gregory’s particular authority as “the Theologian” in the Christian tradition has guaranteed the reception of this text in the Byzantine⁴ and Latin traditions,⁵ and in European thought in general. Characteristically, we regularly meet with references to this text in the formation of Modern discourse about the priesthood: for example, in the XIX century in most Russian textbooks on pastoral theology, as well as in the German language space⁶, etc. It is of great interest what role play the elements of Fathers of Church’ thought in the construction of Modern logic (or rather different logics) of religious leadership. The answer to this question must be preceded by a structural study of the position of the priest in the worldview of Late Antiquity.

It is no accident that the Greek word in the title of this article is left untranslated. When defining the nature of the ἀρχή of the priest, it would be entirely inadequate to assert that in this case is meant, let us say, not “power,” but “authority,” or “office,” or “leadership.” The opposition μὴ βίβη κατάρξειν, ἀλλὰ πειθοῖ προσάξεισθαι “not by the rule of force, but by means of persuasion”⁷ (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 15), which defines the principle of priestly action in the text, allows a parallel to be drawn, for example, with the classical (and later) division of power into *auctoritas* and *potestas*, and on this basis to choose one or another English equivalent. It is evident, however, that ἀρχή in Gregory’s thought is incorporated into quite a voluminous categorical network denoting by no means one single opposition, and as a result there is no single word in the modern vocabulary of any language which communicates the whole spectrum of meaning touched on by Gregory.

³A practical/contemplative life, the role of ascetic practices and education, worthiness/unworthiness, performance of the sacraments/guardianship of souls, power by force/persuasion, the power of office/personal holiness etc.

⁴This theme has rarely been explored at all: not even an exhaustive comparison with the *De sacerdotio* of John Chrysostom has been made (the best examples are Lochbrunner, 1993; Hofer, 2011). However, the toolkit of the TLG database shows that quotations from the *Apology* are given in Isidore of Pelusium’s letters (ep. 1641, 3. 127), in the *Novellae* of Justinian (Novellae. 696), in the section on episcopacy of the Florilegium *Sacra Paralella*, compiled most probably by John Damascene (PG 95. 1541. 30), and also in Theodore the Studite’s *Magna Cataphesis* (1. 1–2; 10. 63).

⁵Aside from the fact that the *Apology* was read by St. Gregory the Great, reflected in its being quoted in the *Liber Regulae Pastoralis* (Holder, 2009: 77), separate research is required into the reception of the Latin translation of the *Apology* made by Ruthenus of Aquila around 400 CE together with eight other *works* by the Theologian (CSEL 46).

⁶Beginning with the first major monograph about Gregory, we see an appeal to the topic of priesthood in a clearly practical way (Ullmann, 1825: 509–527).

⁷Here the translation is taken from a dissertation (Sparacio, 1997).

Accordingly, the aim of this article is the rough definition of the categorical apparatus which Gregory uses to think about the figure of the priest in the complex Late Antique, but at the same time Christian, cosmos.

THE POSITION OF THE PRIEST

As stated, of primary importance for Nazianzus is the emphasis on the special position, juxtaposed with or set apart from that of a “subordinate,” occupied by the priest, and not based on his authority to perform any particular sort of action. This is evidenced, for example, by the regular parallel use of verbs in the active and passive voices to present this opposition,⁸ and also by the prevalence of pastoral imagery, necessarily implying the different statuses of pastor and flock. Characteristically, the text does not even mention “the power to bind and to loose”—a thought which had currency in Gregory’s time⁹—most likely due to the rhetorical situation of the text.¹⁰

Although the word “hierarchy” itself would not be used in Christian literature until later, the notion of a hierarchy of entities is clearly present in Gregory’s thought, whose order reflects closeness to God (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 3–4):

καθάπερ ἐν σώματι τὸ μὲν τι ἄρχον ἐστὶ καὶ οἷον προκαθεζόμενον, τὸ δὲ ἀρχόμενον καὶ ἄγόμενον· οὕτω κἀν ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις διέταξεν ὁ Θεὸς [...] τοὺς μὲν ποιμαίνεσθαι τε καὶ ἄρχεσθαι [...] τὴν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν οἰκειώσιν τοὺς δὲ εἶναι ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους, λόγον ψυχῆς πρὸς σῶμα, ἢ νοῦ πρὸς ψυχὴν ἐπέχοντας [...].

Οὔτε οὖν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀναρχίαν καὶ ἀταξίαν λυσιτελεστέραν οἶδα τάξεως καὶ ἀρχῆς, οὔτε ἀνθρώποις[...].

as in the body there is one member which rules and, so to say, presides, while another is ruled over and subject; so too in the churches, God has ordained, that those [...] should be subject to pastoral care and rule, while others *should be pastors and teachers*, those who surpass the majority in [...] nearness to God, performing the functions of the soul in the body, and of the intellect in the soul. [...]

I am aware then that anarchy and disorder cannot be more advantageous than order and rule, either to other creatures or to men [...]. (emphasis added).

⁸See, for example: Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 3: τοὺς μὲν ποιμαίνεσθαι τε καὶ ἄρχεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ εἶναι ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους.

⁹See, for example: Gregorius Nyssenus. *Adversus eos qui castigationes aegre ferunt* (PG 46. 312).

¹⁰First of all, Gregory of Nyssa’s topic is the authority of the bishop, but in the *Apology* the subject includes that of the rank of presbyter. Secondly, Gregory of Nazianzus mentions the authority of the pastor in order to point out the difficulty of this ministry, and for this reason, perhaps, he somewhat exaggerates the absence of any “leverage” over lay people; see, for example, Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 19–20.

This quote from the Epistle to the Ephesians (4:11), while retaining its central intuitions—the existence of particular ministries in the Church as the Body of Christ—becomes the basis for a wider thought in Gregory’s work: it is not simply the New Testament priesthood which has been established by God (not for nothing does the author conserve only the last two of the types of ministries: apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers), but above all the division into pastors and flock; moreover the existence of ἀρχὴ καὶ τάξις is of critical structural importance for the Church, as for all levels of the cosmos.¹¹

The fact that in Gregory’s thought the clergy does not replace Christ in the Church may also be considered of primary importance. God has not simply ordained priests to direct lay people towards “that which is needful and right,” but in order that both become “worthy of Christ Himself, *our Head*” (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 4) (emphasis added). That is, Christ retains his position of the Head, while in the Church there are relations between two levels, just as “the soul” is “in relation to the body, or the mind in relation to the soul” (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 4). In another place in the *Apology*, we see Gregory praying to God that He as “Chief Shepherd” be Shepherd to the shepherds and “Himself present to Himself His flock radiant” (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 117), i. e., that God should directly conduct the life of the Church.¹²

The assertion of the divine origin of the authority of the clergy in the Church is confirmed by Gregory’s historico-theological intuition that the priest is the heir of all those whose office (προστασία) was the governance (οἰκονομία) of Israel (see Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 52, 57–68). This allows abundant use of Old Testament lexis and examples to describe different aspects of the authority of the priest, both on the mystical (through the image of the Levitical priesthood (see “ἱερεῖς καὶ ἄρχοντες” in Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 57, 67) and the topic of the temple) and the socio-political levels, as the local

¹¹For an analysis of the hierarchical structure of the cosmos in Gregory in comparison to Plotinus and Origen, see (Richard, 2003: 313–440). For a more detailed description of the synthesis of quotes from Eph. 4 with ideas from Antiquity, see (Antonov, 2021b).

¹²It is interesting to compare this intuition, which for a Christian worldview is obvious, with Plato’s *Politicus*. This dialogue develops the description of the politician as the shepherd of a rational flock. It cannot be claimed that Gregory is writing in direct response to exactly this text (in contrast to the *Republic*, on which see below), however an important thought for our question may be seen here: in the Myth of Er it is said that people were ruled by “divine shepherds”, that is ruling gods, while a supreme god ruled over the whole cosmos (271d). In the current age, a politician, replacing the gods, leads a flock of people, and not tyrannically but through persuasion. Gregory’s priest finds himself in a more complex system of relationships, adopting a series of isomorphic traits.

Church is described in terms of a people (the metaphor of Israel), led by a pastor (see the vocabulary for the description of rulers and people in Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 56–68).

Hence, the main characteristics of the position of the pastor are his mutual relations with the Archpastor-Christ and his flock. Let us describe some of the categories which define this position.

TRANSFORMATIONS OF CATEGORIES

In the previous section we have seen how the intuition of the divine origin of particular ministries in the Church was placed in the context of general classical *topoi* describing the hierarchical structure of the world.¹³ In the text of the *Apology* there is much material from both biblical and classical sources,¹⁴ which of course leads to their interpenetration and consequently to the transformation of the categories which inform them. Let us examine from this point of view an important categorical opposition which, to a significant degree, defines the position of the priest.

The first is *λειτουργία/ἡγεμονία* (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 4), which is developed a little further on in the text as *λειτουργία ὑπεύθυνος/ἀρχὴ ἀνεξέταστος* (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 8): a ministry for which we must give account/an absolute authority. At first glance, we see here four common classical terms describing the realities of politics and retaining their original meaning. Such a juxtaposition is entirely typical of political thought in Antiquity, as shown by the articles on each of these works in LSJ. In Demosthenes (*Adversus Leptinem*, 18) and other authors, for example, *λειτουργία* means a public service performed at one's own expense and not that of the city; *ὑπεύθυνος* means accountability to the city; and, beginning with Herodotus, *ὑπεύθυνος ἀρχή* (*Histories*. 3. 80) is juxtaposed to monarchy. In Aeschines, we encounter the following phrase: “*Ἄνυπεύθυνον δὲ καὶ ἀζήτητον καὶ ἀνεξέταστον οὐδὲν ἔστι τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει*” (*In Ctesiphontem*, 22: “There is nothing in all the state that is exempt from audit, investigation, and examination” (Aeschines, Adams, 1919)).

¹³The priest may be discussed in the context of an Antique “style of thought” using the terminology of L. Fleck, see: Vorontsov, 2020.

¹⁴As Matz writes, the *Apology* contains 508 citations from Scripture in 117 paragraphs (Matz, 2016: 54). Apart from this, it is worth mentioning the paraphrase of a fragment from the *Republic* (See Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 9 c Plato. *Republic*. 343b–c, 345d–e. (Antonov, 2021b: 196–200)), and also the fairly obvious Platonic intuitions in Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 3–5 (see: Portmann, 1954: 28–36), in order to appreciate the scope of the synthesis achieved by Gregory in his construction of the image of a pastor.

Nonetheless, having posed the question to whom the priest should be accountable, we see that the suggestion that the priest should be subordinate to the “citizens” of the Church would contradict the rest of the text. The biblical contexts corresponding to this question in other parts of the *Apology* will inevitably reconstitute the *polis* “ruler — city” scheme of relations by introducing God into them.

It should be noted that in the opposition in question, in the examples from biblical history, and in the autobiographical fragments, a number of words indicating specific offices are employed when discussing the assumption of this office. The relationship of these situations, regardless of the difference in the offices of a church priest, or of the Prophet Jonah and the High Priest Aaron, is conditioned precisely by the identical structure of their position, namely that of service to human beings with accountability before God.

Let us analyze these contexts, beginning with another fragment where the phrase ζυγόν τῆς λειτουργίας occurs. It indicates the priestly ministry, in parallel with the position of prophet, (προφητεία) of Jonah, whose story of the acceptance of his ministry is seen as being relevant to the case of Gregory.¹⁵ Jonah’s ministry (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 106), and the ministry of other offices (προστασία, see: Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 52) in the Old Testament is called διακονία (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 114) in the *Apology*, among other things.

Characteristically, this word does not occur in the Old Testament, but it frequently does in the epistles of the Apostle Paul and the book of Acts, where it refers to the ministry of the apostles (e. g., Acts 1:17, 25). In these texts it appears in several meanings, a comparison of which easily permits the identification of the following general scheme: it is a ministry appointed by and received from God (e. g., Acts 20:24), consisting in ministry to people (e. g., 1 Cor. 16:15), which at the same time constitutes service to God. Here it should be emphasized that such an understanding implies that the person who performs διακονία is not subordinate in status to the people whom he is serving, but on the contrary is their “ruler”, although his authority is of a particular nature.

In Gregory, we see the exact same usage of this word. From his reflections on the principle of the reception of διακονία (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 114), based on the examples of Aaron and Isaiah (as those who accepted it straight away), and Jonah, Moses, and Jeremiah (as those who initially refused

¹⁵Or. 2. 110: “although he [Jonah] might possibly meet with some indulgence, if reluctant to prophesy [...] what defense could be made, if I longer [...] rejected the yoke of ministry”.

it), we see that the ministry of a particular leader proceeds from God, is directed towards people, and is performed for God.

The following method of describing a church leader, borrowed from the Apostle Paul, testifies to the same logic: πιστευθῆναι ἰατρεῦειν, φωτίζειν, παιδεύειν, ἐπανορθοῦν, διευθύνειν, ποιμνῆς ἐπιστατεῖν.¹⁶ It seems unlikely that the passive voice of the verb indicates that all of these ministries have been “entrusted” to the priest by the community and not by God (especially that the guidance of the pastorate could be entrusted to the shepherd by the self-same pastorate).

Aside from this, it should be mentioned that the category of obedience/disobedience pervades the whole text of the *Apology*, correlating, one might suppose, with the idea of “accountability” from the opposition in question (ὑπεύθυνος). It appears both in personal fragments where Gregory describes his return to his ministry as εὐπειθεία (ready obedience, Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 113) and in descriptions of the priestly position in general (for example in the quote from Is. 1, 23: ἄρχοντες ἀπειθοῦντες (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 56)). Here it is clear that what is being discussed is the relationship of the bearer of ἀρχή to God.

In conclusion, the following maxim may be mentioned, taken from the description of the ministry of the Apostle Paul (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 54), where the same intuition is formulated using classical language:

Ὁὗτος ὁρος πάσης πνευματικῆς προστασίας, πανταχοῦ τὸ καθ’ ἑαυτὸν παρορᾶν πρὸς τὸ τῶν ἄλλων συμφέρον.

This is the aim of all spiritual authority, in everything it serves the interests of others.

To the idea in the *Republic*, for example (for the significance of this text to Gregory in the *Apology*, see footnote 13), in which power is described as benefiting not the ruler, but their subjects (*Republic*, 346–347), is added the necessity of a conscious sacrifice of the ruler’s own interest.

Finally, for an accurate understanding of the opposition in question, let us analyze how lay people are presented in the *Apology*. Almost always they are described as a group of people. The most frequently used term is λαός (15). However, this group is almost always the object, not subject,

¹⁶In the Apostle Paul — οικονομίαν πεπίστευμαι (1 Cor. 9. 17), τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (Gal. 2. 7). Interestingly, in the context of the previous paragraph is the verse Col. 1. 25: ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οικονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ (emphasis added).

of the action. Another name which occurs often in the text testifies to this: “flock”—ποιμνη (3), ποιμνιος (7), πρόβατα (9)—and the frequent use in passive constructions or as an object: ἀρχόμενοι, ἀγόμενοι, οἱ ὑπὸ χεῖρα, οἰκονομία τοῦ λαοῦ, ποιμαίνοντας τὸν λαόν etc. The most striking example here is the image from Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 44:

If anyone were to undertake to tame and train an animal of many forms and shapes, compounded of many animals of various sizes and degrees of tameness and wildness. [...] And what must the master (ἐπιστάτην) of such an animal do [...] so as successfully to lead and preserve the beast? And since the common body of the church is composed of many different characters and minds [...] it is absolutely necessary that its ruler (προστάτην)...

The totality of the passages examined here enables the opposition λειτουργία ὑπεύθυνος/ἀρχή ἀνεξέταστος to be interpreted as follows: bearing in mind that ἀρχή in and of itself regularly signifies the position of priest, this opposition points not to the absence of any authority (ἀρχή) possessed by the priest, but to the source of this authority and the fact that the priest must “give an account” for the way it is used is not to himself (in Gregory’s opinion, it is precisely this mistaken understanding on the part of many clerics which has led to the crisis in the Church (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 8)), but to God.

Hence, in my opinion it would be possible to sum up Gregory’s ideas on the position of the priest using the expression ἀρχή ὑπεύθυνος — “accountable authority” — where ὑπεύθυνος would denote the relationship between the priest and God, and ἀρχή that between the priest and his flock. It should be emphasized that ἀρχή is thought of here precisely as a certain type of authority (if not power), as evidenced by a whole series of images and associations: the master of an animal composed of different animals; the concealed comparison with the ruler from Plato’s *Republic*; a set of figures of authority from Scripture perceived as role models (παράδειγμα) for the priest (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 52), and the lexis taken from the Old Testament: ποιμένες, ἱερεῖς καὶ ἄρχοντες, πράκτορες, κυριεύοντες, προστάται, ἡγούμενοι, κατορθοῦντες, πρεσβυτέραι, κριταὶ (from Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 56–68). The definition of the office (προστασία) of the priesthood as the “guiding of man” (ἄνθρωπον ἄγειν — Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 16).

The principle of the realization of this ἀρχή is given by another opposition:

μη βία κατάρξεν, ἀλλὰ πειθοῖ προσάξεσθα

not by the rule of force, but by means of persuasion (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 15).

This common maxim in classical literature acquires a universal character in Gregory (and in the Christian tradition generally) as a result of the fact that it is affirmed as the principle of God's action in relation to mankind—*Ikonomia* (or. 31.25).¹⁷ As the priest is called the collaborator *συνεργός* of this *Ikonomia* (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 26), it is not surprising that this principle is also used to describe the action of a pastor towards his flock.

In summary, on the basis of an examination of several key categories describing the position of the priest, the position may be characterized as a mediatory one between God and the priest's flock, which has its source in God and is directed in terms of the bearer's action towards people. This aspect is manifested in the service of the priest to God and his authority over people.¹⁸ This interaction must be performed on all levels by all the subjects voluntarily and by means of persuasion,¹⁹ but is nonetheless without any doubt thought of by Gregory as a relationship of authority over subordinates.

Before moving on to examine the ways the ἀρχή of the priest is achieved in practice, it is essential to look at the category of “mediation”, which has already appeared several times in our paper.

MEDIATION

Gregory directly defines the position of the priest as μεσιτεία Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 91). This expression is an allusion to 1 Tim. 2: 5 (“one God, one mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ”), whereas in other places in Scripture, and also in most of the monuments of early Christian literature,²⁰ the idea of mediation pertains to Christ. The same usage can be seen in Gregory's own texts.²¹ This fragment, on the other hand, must be considered in a wider context.

Gregory writes that he considers it not without danger “to be entrusted with the rule over souls, or the office of mediator (for such, I take it, a priest is) between God and man” ἢ ψυχῶν προστασίαν δέξασθαι, ἢ μεσιτείαν Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων (τοῦτο γὰρ ἴσως ὁ ἱερεὺς) (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 91). The double

¹⁷Also as a principle of theological polemic, including for the emperor (Gregor von Nazianz, 1919: 1280–1305).

¹⁸Compare the definition of the priesthood from *carm.* 1. 2. 34. 227–228: ἱερωσύνη δὲ ἀγνισμὸς φρενῶν, Θεῷ φέρων ἀνθρώπων, ἀνθρώπων Θεόν.

¹⁹ἐκ προαιρέσεως. Or. 2. 15.

²⁰See, for example: Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*. 3. 26; Origenes, *Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistolam ad Ephesios* (in *catenis*). 29. 21; Eusebius, *Contra Marcellum*. 1. 1. 29.

²¹Including in the *Apology*, where His adoption of human nature through the mediation of the soul is referred to (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 23). For typical Christological usage, see or. 30. 14, among others.

conjunction (ἢ ... ἢ) here may be regarded as not being accidental: with these two expressions, Gregory points to two different principles of the “influence” of the priest on his flock: through the word and through the sacraments. Let us consider the second expression, given as a definition of the position of the “ἱερεὺς” (priest).

The word ἱερεὺς in the Christian literature in the 4th century was not a technical term denoting a church leader but contained cultic connotations with the Old Testament. The logic described by Stewart on the basis of 3rd century texts can also be seen plainly in texts of the 4th century (Stewart, 2015). He showed that this word began to be employed to denote a church leader in the 3rd century as part of a rationale of describing church realia using Old Testament language, made possible by the perception of the Church as the New Israel. This allowed the Church to be described as a new culture/polity/people. Consequently, it is unsurprising that we discover the majority of occurrences of the word ἱερεὺς in the corpus of Greek texts of the 3rd–4th centuries in exegetical contexts, or in quotations from the Old Testament.²² It is fairly obvious that a competing image with pagan priests (ἱερεὺς) was constructed in this way, with maximum emphasis placed on the distinct nature of the Church’s priesthood, but claiming to occupy the same place for it within the empire. The exact stages of this polemic, notwithstanding, require separate study.

These intuitions can also be seen in the *Apology*. Of the 23 occurrences of this word, 15 pertain to the fragment Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 56–68, comprised of quotations from the books of prophecy, which clearly represent an example of the description of the church clergy with the help of quotations and paraphrases from the Old Testament. Of the remaining eight, three instances from Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 81–82 acquire Old Testament connotations as a result of the fact that one of them forms part of a quote from Hos. 4:9; another two refer to the children of Aaron (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 92) and to the priest Eli from 1 Sam. 4 (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 93); and one to the description of laws from Lev. (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 94). With this typological subtext, the other occurrences become much clearer, that is, besides the above, the following phrase which Gregory uses to help describe his entry into the clergy: “clothe myself with the garb and name of priest” ἱερέως σχῆμα καὶ ὄνομα ὑποδέσθαι (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 95).

The same is true in relation to the expression μεστρεῖα Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων. Two instances which I have discovered prior to Gregory of the attribution

²²Which becomes obvious when exploring the history of the word in the corpus of the TLG.

of a mediatory position to a religious leader speak explicitly of mediation in the priesthood: according to Athanasius the Great, Aaron “ἐμεσίτευσεν τῇ ὀπτασίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων θυσίαις” (*Orationes tres contra Arianos*, II. 7. 5–6). In the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* fragments (*circa* 380, Antioch), taken from the earlier monument *Didascalia Apostolorum* (3rd century), we find the following definition of a bishop: “You [bishops] are to the laity prophets, rulers, governors, and kings; the mediators between God and His faithful people” (II. 4. 25), and below this: the bishop is “the mediator between God and you in the several parts of your divine worship” (μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖς πρὸς αὐτὸν λατρείαις) (II. 4. 26; Schaff, 1885: 409–410).

A contextualization of the passage in question enables us to argue that the category of “mediation,” through the metaphorical transfer of the connotations of an Old Testament priest to a cleric of the Church, relates exclusively to his sacramental ministry. Nevertheless, as stated, even in this passage we see that the ministry of a pastor is not limited to the performance of the sacraments, as another of his tasks is the προστάσια ψυχῶν, which is illustrated in a variety of different ways throughout the text: through medical metaphor (ἰατρεία/θεραπεία ψυχῶν), pedagogical lexis (παιδεύειν πρὸς ἀρετὴν, διδασκαλία), and the affirmation of the authority of the priest over souls and his duty of care for them (ψυχῶν προστάσια/ἡγεμονία/ἐπιμέλεια); all of this, as is clear from the contexts, concerns precisely the influence of the word and sphere of communication.²³ We now identify how these two modes of influencing the flock — the care of souls and the performance of the sacraments — are combined in Gregory’s thought.

SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE AND PRIESTHOOD

While large fragments in the text of the *Apology* are devoted to descriptions of principles of healing and instruction of souls, we encounter only a handful of mentions of the sacramental ministry of the clergy. These are crucial for an understanding of the ontology of the priestly position.

The first fragment was to some degree examined at the beginning of this article (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 4). It affirms that order and authority (in this case the presence of the clergy) are more important for people “than for

²³Compare: “its [the common body of the church] ruler (τὸν προστάτην [τῆς Ἐκκλησίας σώματος]) should be [...] as far as possible manifold and varied in his treatment of individuals (τὴν πρὸς ἕκαστον οἰκείωσιν), and in dealing with all (τῆς ὁμιλίας πρὸς πάντας) in an appropriate and suitable manner” (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 44).

all the others" (τοῖς ἄλλοις),²⁴ because people need "the ability to pick themselves up after sin"—that is they need the sacraments.²⁵ Later in the same paragraph, Gregory says that without priests, "the fair fulness of the Church would be halting in the highest degree, and in fact cease to be fair," because the "mysteries which lead us heavenward" would not be performed. It is typical that preceding this passage, the subject of the text is the establishment in the Church by God and the influence of "pastors and teachers" over those who are "subject to pastoral care and rule" (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 3) and following the general principles of authority with obvious Platonic implications (or. 2. 5), as discussed at the beginning of the article. However, the connection between sacred ritual and a position of authority is not spelled out here.

The second passage which is of interest to us contains criticism of unworthy priests.

I was ashamed of all those others, who, without being better than ordinary people, nay, it is a great thing if they be not worse, with unwashed hands, as the saying runs, and uninitiated (ἄμύητος) souls, intrude into the most sacred offices; and, before becoming worthy to approach the temples, they lay claim to the sanctuary, and they push and thrust around the holy table (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 8).

The use of cultic vocabulary here is of significant interest; ἄμύητος means a person who has not yet undergone initiation. Gregory denotes with this word "souls" which cannot truly be called uninitiated in a literal sense, since not only have they been baptized but also ordained as priests; thus, his criticism is of an ethical nature. In this way, personal morality is postulated as an essential element of a priestly position (although, of course, what is being talked about is not the non-recognition of the validity of the holy orders of those being criticized or of the sacraments performed by them).²⁶ Later on, this is stated directly: "they thought this office (τὴν τάξιν ταύτην) to be a means of livelihood, instead of a pattern of virtue" (ἀρετῆς τύπον)

²⁴By which, presumably, are meant other earthly beings and angels.

²⁵Judging from the context, what is meant here is Baptism, though one might also suppose it could be Repentance, as for Gregory these sacraments are intrinsically linked to one another; see or. 39. 17, where Gregory talks about five baptisms: 1. Transformative in the Old Testament; 2. The Baptism of John; 3. The Perfect Baptism of Christ, through the participation the Holy Spirit; 4. Martyrdom as a baptism of blood; 5. Baptism through tears, i. e. Repentance.

²⁶See or. 40. 26: "Do not say, 'a Bishop shall baptize me, and he a Metropolitan ... and he of noble birth...' Do not say, 'I do not mind a mere Priest, if he is a celibate, and religious, and of angelic life...' Do not ask for the credentials of the preacher or the baptizer... But to thee let each be trustworthy for purification, as long as he is one of those who have been approved, not of those who are openly condemned, and not a stranger to the Church."

(Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 8), after which the topic changes to that of authority (λειτουργία υπεύθυνος vs ἀρχὴ ἀνεξέταστος).

In another place Gregory says that when serving the Liturgy, the priest “is to take his stand with Angels and give glory with Archangels [...] and share the priesthood of Christ” (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 73). One should remember that in Gregory’s theology, angels are represented as being as close to God as it is possible for created beings to be.²⁷ This passage continues with words which, in all probability, should be seen as a reference to Baptism: the priest should “renew the creature, and set forth the image”;²⁸ and to the Eucharist: “cause the sacrifice to ascend to the altar on high”; and it concludes “be God, and make others to be God” (Θεὸν ἐσόμενον, καὶ θεοποιήσοντα) (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 73). Without discussing the content of the latter words from the point of view of the question of a combination of mystical and contemplative ascension to God,²⁹ we may point out that the position of a performer of sacraments becomes the basis for what is, in essence, the *de facto* deification of the priest.³⁰

We see that in Gregory’s thought, the reception of holy orders brings a person nearer to God,³¹ and the ability to perform the sacraments places the priest in a position which distinguishes him from “ordinary people”, as evidenced by the very idea of mediation between God and man. The subject of authority and the care of souls appears constantly alongside the discussion of the sacraments, though we never see an explicit link between them, and the ability to exercise the care of souls does not follow directly from the ability to perform sacred rituals. The basis of this influence on lay people should not to be called objective — mystical — the nearness of the priest to God, but

²⁷Or. 40. 5: “God is Light: the highest, the unapproachable, the ineffable... That Light, I mean, which is contemplated in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost... A second Light is the Angel, a kind of outflow or communication of that first Light... A third Light is man”.

²⁸τὸν ἀναπλάσσοντα τὸ πλάσμα καὶ παραστήσοντα τὴν εἰκόνα. Saint Gregory follows the biblical description of man as “πλάσμα καὶ εἰκὼν Θεοῦ” (car. 2. 1. 34. 20).

²⁹Which, I might remark, also leads to “roaming about with the angels” συμπεριπολεῖν ἀγγέλοις (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 7).

³⁰The fragment continues: “And who, that is as yet still surrounded by the darkness here below and by the dullness of the flesh, shall be able to clearly contemplate or gaze upon the Whole Mind with his whole mind?” (Sparacio, 1997; Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 74).

³¹Gregory says that he is not ashamed to accept the office of presbyter, and not that of bishop, as he “was not so ignorant of the greatness of God nor unacquainted with the low estate of man as to consider it no great thing for any created nature, in whatever manner, to approach God (πλησιάζειν Θεῶ)” (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 5).

subjective, that is, individual holiness, which is described by Gregory in entirely Platonic (perhaps Neoplatonic (Pinault, 1925: 196–197)) terms, and which on the whole can be characterized as philosophical contemplation.³² Of key importance here are the purification of the mind and the subjection of the soul and body to it through a series of practices.³³ It is precisely the arrival at the end of this path, or at least significant progress along it which, in Gregory’s opinion,³⁴ endows a person with the capability of “arbitrating fairly between soul and body” (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 18)³⁵ where others are concerned, that is to say, what we have termed here the care of souls.

In the first instance, it is these practices which are described in the text using the vocabulary and imagery of authority. On the other hand, they are only tangentially connected with the idea of mediation, that is to say, although they do have God as their foundation, this is different from through the sacraments. Descriptions of the priest as pastor or physician of souls are to be found in the text alongside descriptions of God as physician and shepherd of people (e. g., Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 25–26, 34). Notwithstanding, in the case in question an analogy is made between the position of the priest vis-à-vis the community, and God vis-à-vis all people.³⁶ Convincing, instructing, and exhorting people are the actions of the priest on his own,³⁷ while

³²See: “to live superior to visible things, ever preserving in myself the divine impressions pure and unmixed with the erring tokens of this lower world, and both being, and constantly growing more and more to be, a real unspotted mirror of God and divine things” (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 7).

³³See, for example: ἡσυχία καὶ ἀναχώρησις (or. 2. 6). Compare: or. 12. 4: τὸν νοῦν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναχωρῆσαι. On this term, see: Festugière, 1954: 53–59. Below Gregory continues: μύσαντα τὰς αἰσθησεις, ἕξω σαρκὸς καὶ κόσμου γενόμενον, εἰς ἑαυτὸν συστραφέντα... (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 7).

³⁴Or. 2. 72: “A man must himself be cleansed, before cleansing others: himself become wise, that he may make others wise; become light, and then give light: draw near to God, and so bring others near; be hallowed, then hallow them; be possessed of hands to lead others by the hand, of wisdom to give advice (συμβουλευσαι μετὰ συνέσεως).”

³⁵Also more than just a metaphor is the assertion that, for lay people, the priest should be “performing the functions of the soul in the body, and of the intellect in the soul” (Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 3).

³⁶See: Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 34: τοσοῦτον ἐνταῦθα τὸ ἔργον τῷ ἀγαθῷ ποιμένι, τῷ γνωστῶς γνωσομένῳ ψυχᾷ ποιμνίου, καὶ ἀφηγησομένῳ κατὰ λόγον ποιμαντικῆς, τῆς γε ὀρθῆς καὶ δικαίας, καὶ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ ποιμένου ἡμῶν ἀξίας. The English translations are not very accurate in this instance. The expression “ποιμαντικῆς ἀξίας” refers to God: He is the true Shepherd. In the meantime, the expression “κατὰ λόγον” indicates that the position of pastor is analogous to Him (see the article on “λόγος” in LSJ: §II. 1), and precisely because of the necessity of corresponding to this ἀξία it is so difficult for the good shepherd (in this case the priest) to guide his flock (Antonov, 2021b: 202–205).

³⁷See several examples of the description of the care of souls: Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 18: more difficult than the healing of bodies is “the diagnosis and cure of our habits, passions, lives,

in the sacraments God Himself acts through the mediation of the priest. Meanwhile, as stated above, the direct action of God in the world is highlighted several times in the text. Hence, the care of souls and the performance of the sacraments are found to be two priestly functions of a fairly distinct nature, as it is possible here to speak of two paths approaching God: through contemplative practices and through the sacraments, where the role of the priest is different in each.³⁸ In this, and other texts by Gregory, we do not find an explicit description of their combination in the ministry of the priest. In spite of this, Gregory clearly thinks of the pastor as someone who has himself progressed and leads his flock along both paths.

CONCLUSION: THE APXH OF THE PRIEST

To conclude, I describe Gregory's ideas on the ἀρχή of the priest, summing up the analysis conducted here of the key categories and placing them in a broader context. The categorial network described by Gregory, it would seem, allows someone to be thought of as both a cleric whose activity is confined exclusively to the performance of the sacraments — a pure “ἱερεὺς” — and someone who is a spiritual guide carrying out θεραπεία and ἡγεμονία ψυχῶν as a result of their closeness to God, even if they do not actually have a priestly ordination. The prior Neoplatonic contexts, in part adopted by Gregory,³⁹ at the very beginning form an ontology within the framework of which deification is thought of as ascension of the soul to God;⁴⁰ the figure of the *philosopher-spiritual guide* is formed in the same place. The notion

wills, and whatever else is within us, by banishing from our compound nature everything brutal and fierce, and introducing and establishing in their stead what is gentle and dear to God, and arbitrating fairly between soul and body”. 30: “Some are led by doctrine, others trained by example; some need the spur, others the curb”. 31: “Some are benefited by praise, others by blame, both being applied in season; while if out of season, or unreasonable, they are injurious; some are set right by encouragement, others by rebuke; some, when taken to task in public, others, when privately corrected”.

³⁸It is typical that in research into deification in the theology of St. Gregory, the role of the priest is either not mentioned at all, or is only outlined in general terms. For example, Russel (Russel, 2004: 213–224) limits himself to just a short mention of the mediatory position of the priest in the sacraments, while (Maslov, 2012) analyzes this theme exclusively through the prism of a comparison with antique philosophy, ignoring the sacraments.

³⁹On hierarchical ontology, see Richard, 2003. On the use of mystical lexis when describing the sacraments using the example of Baptism, see McGuckin, 2001: 65–71.

⁴⁰What is being referred to is the ontology and anthropology of Plotinus, for example *The Enneads*. v. 9.

of theurgy is also developed in this tradition,⁴¹ which then coexists with philosophy, seemingly without any particular reflection on their connection.⁴²

In the Christian tradition after St. Gregory, we meet the same parting of the ways, as within it there is the notion that confession, by which was understood not just the sacrament of the absolution of sins but also instruction in spiritual life, that is to say authority over the soul itself,⁴³ should be given by people of pure life, i. e., above all monks, even those not in priestly orders.⁴⁴

For Gregory, nonetheless, the figure of a pastor leading the church by his word and in the sacraments, and who is the bearer of a certain ἀρχή, is axiomatic. In order to describe him, Gregory introduces an opposition of two sorts of ἀρχή. The first is self-contained: it is its own source and is directed towards its own benefit (ἡγεμονία; ἀρχή ἀνεξέταστος, see also

⁴¹For its definition, see: Iamblichus. *De Mysteries*. 1. 11. In his work we see the difference between these two paths. See *De Mysteries*. 2. 11: "it is not pure thought (ἐννοία) that unites theurgists (θεουργούς) to the gods. Indeed what, then, would hinder those who are theoretical philosophers (θεωρητικῶς φιλοσοφούντας) from enjoying a theurgic union with the gods? But the situation is not so: it is the accomplishment of acts not to be divulged and beyond all conception, and the power of the unutterable symbols, understood solely by the gods, which establishes theurgic union" (Iamblichus, Clarke et al., 2003: 114).

⁴²Or this link requires separate research. In the oeuvre of the Emperor Julian we encounter descriptions of theurgic and philosophical ascensions almost ubiquitously in different works (the theurgical theme in hymns (or. 4–5) and partially in the "Fragment of a letter to a priest," the philosophical in texts against the Cynics (or. 6–7)). In Proclus we see how they are built into one whole system but are also apparently described as different paths, the link between which is not obvious. See: Proclus. *Theologia platonica*. 1. 113: συνάπτεται ταῖς πρωτουργοῖς αἰτίαις, τὰ μὲν διὰ τῆς ἐρωτικῆς μανίας, τὰ δὲ διὰ τῆς θείας φιλοσοφίας, τὰ δὲ διὰ τῆς θεουργικῆς δυνάμεως.

⁴³It is characteristic that the notion of mediation is already in the first instance connected with purity of life and not with ordination. A historico-theological basis for such a vision was put forward several centuries later by Saint Symeon (IX v.). See: Symeon the New Theologian. Ep. 1: "search for a mediator, physician, and good counsellor, so that he may as a good counsellor suggest to you, conformably with good counsel, ways of repentance; that as physician he may give you appropriate medicine for each wound; and that as mediator, by means of prayer and petitioning God, as he stands face to face in his very presence, he may propitiate the Deity on your behalf" (Turner, 2009: 41).

⁴⁴"The possibility of making our confession to a monk who has not received the order of priesthood, ever since the vesture and clothing which is the mark of repentance was given by God to his inheritance and they were called 'monks,' this you will find to have been open to everybody, as is written in the divinely inspired writings of the fathers. If you study them you will find that what I am saying is true. Before there were monks, bishops alone used to receive the authority to bind and loose, by right of succession, as coming from the divine apostles. But with the passing of time and with the bishops becoming good for nothing... priests and bishops together becoming like the rest of the people [...] then this function was transferred, as I said, to the elect people of Christ, I mean the monks" (ibid.: 49).

the allusion to Plato's *Republic* in Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 9); the second consists in the position of a mediator between God and people. God is the source and "instance of accountability" for the priest (and it is precisely in relation to God that the priesthood constitutes λειτουργία ὑπεύθυνος), while his activity is directed towards the good of people. The latter are most frequently thought of as a single, though composite subject (a people, flock, "an animal compounded of many animals") which voluntarily submits itself to the priest. This relationship is described as one of authority towards subordinates. Thus, the collocation ἀρχή ὑπεύθυνος may be suggested as reflecting the bidirectional position of the priest. This ἀρχή is realized with regard to the flock in verbal instruction and in the sacraments.

The two modes of action of the priest in terms of his flock pose a problem when reconstructing Gregory's thought. As shown, the sacraments coexist with, but are not structurally connected to, the fact that the priest "governs souls" (ἡγεμονία ψυχῶν — Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 78). The vocabulary and imagery of authority, besides the description of the general position of the priest, relate in the main to practices of the care of souls and not to the sacraments. Notwithstanding, it is precisely the necessity of the sacraments for people which Gregory is talking about when he points to the presence of "ἀρχὴ καὶ τάξις" in the Church, as in the rest of the cosmos.⁴⁵ In this way, the performance of the sacraments and the care of souls provide a basis for the construction of the authoritative image of the priest, although on different levels.

Let us recall that the category of mediation (μεσσιτεία) is used by Gregory to refer precisely to performance of the sacraments. On receiving the possibility to perform the sacraments, according to Gregory, a person occupies a higher position than others in the hierarchy, which is not understood in the narrow sense of offices in the Church, but as a cosmic hierarchy defined by nearness to God. The priest, as we have seen, in the performance of the sacraments inevitably takes his place at very least among the ranks of the angels (as we have seen above "to take his stand with Angels, and give glory with Archangels [...] and share the priesthood of Christ"), thus becoming set

⁴⁵See Or. 2.4: I am aware then that anarchy and disorder cannot be more advantageous than order and rule (ἀρχὴ καὶ τάξις), either to other creatures or to men [...] if they fail of their highest purpose — to be free from sin — to attain at least to that which is second best, restoration from sin (τὸ ἀμαρτάνοντας ἐπανάγεισθαι) [...] if all men were to shirk this office [priesthood...] by whom would God be worshipped among us in those mystic and elevating rites (θηρησκεύοιτο ἡμῖν ὁ Θεὸς τὰ μυστικά καὶ ἄνω φέροντα).

apart from “ordinary people.” The enactment of the authority of the priest in the community is described in terms of practices of the care of souls.

It may be supposed that the union of these two lines in a single ἀρχή of the priest, implied by the author axiomatically, is also conditioned by the insistent demands for the “virtue” (ἀρετή) of the priest. Since this position presupposes “objective” closeness to God, ideally only people who have also “subjectively”—that is, by means of purification of the mind—come close to God (πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν οἰκειώσις, πλησιάζειν Θεῷ) should attain this office. It is this state which endows someone with the capacity for “arbitrating between soul and body” (βραβεῦσαι ψυχῇ τε καὶ σώματι, Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 18) in other people, and the figure of the priest is judged to be the most suitable for the combination of both functions.

Notwithstanding, Gregory views as inadequate the demands placed on the priest for ritual purity (which is supposedly adequate for the performance of the sacraments)⁴⁶—inadequate precisely for the guidance of others. Demands for his “subjective” closeness to God are thus postulated to be higher than those essential for “objective” nearness to Him:

Or. 2. 14: although a man has kept himself pure from sin, even in a very high degree; I do not know that even this is sufficient for one who is to instruct others in virtue (παιδεύειν πρὸς ἀρετήν). For he who has received this charge [...] must not only wipe out the traces of vice from his soul, but also inscribe better ones, so as to outstrip men further in virtue (κατ’ ἀρετήν προέχειν) than he is superior to them in dignity [of office] (ἀξιώματι).

The unity of these functions in the priestly ministry is ensured by the historico-theological conception adopted by Gregory, according to which priests are the heirs of the rulers of Israel in the Church in the latter’s quality as the new Israel (see, Greg. Naz. Or. 2. 52).⁴⁷ The analogous position of the Church leader to the leaders of Israel (judges, kings, generals etc.) is described by Gregory as ἀρχή over the local Church. This leadership has clear political connotations, though it is not thought of as something political in modern sense—it refers more to politics in the Aristotelian sense, i. e.,

⁴⁶In the subsequent history of priestly asceticism, it is these which play the most important role; see (Hornung, 2020: 109–111), where the author emphasizes the three most important coordinates in this history: mediation in the Eucharist, the consequent demands for purity, and the sacralization of the clergy which proceeds from this.

⁴⁷Without speaking about the development of church organization in the Constantinian era, let us point out that in early Christian literature, a church leader was never thought of simply as a sort of priest, i. e., a sacrificer, which is plainly demonstrated, for example, by an analysis of an early phase of the use of the word ἱερεύς/sacerdos (Stewart, 2015).

the organization of community (κοινωνία) for its supreme good (κυριωτάτη ἀγαθή) (Aristotel. *Politics*. 1.1). A priest is a leader of the sacral-social space of the local Church, who leads it to the Supreme Good. Therefore he is the one who leads this community in worship, preaching, and through the spiritual guidance of its members.

Because of the inevitable gap between what ought to be and what actually is, a problem in the ethics of becoming a priest arises: how, in the context of Christian ethics, can someone voluntarily accept this position, considering that he corresponds to the demands which have been made. It is to this question that the *Apology* seeks to find an answer.

ABBREVIATIONS

CSEL 46	Grégoire de Nazianze. 1910. <i>Tyrannii Rufini opera: Orationum Gregorii Nazianzeni novem interpretatio. Pars I</i> [in Latin]. Ed. by A. Engelbrecht. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 46. Vienna: F. Tempsky.
Greg. Naz. Or. 2	———. 1978. <i>Discours II</i> [in French]. Ed. by J. Bernardi. Sources chrétiennes 247. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, et al. 1996. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
NPNF 2, 7	Cyril of Jerusalem and Gregory Nazianzen. 1893. <i>Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen. Select Texts</i> . Vol. 7 of <i>Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers</i> , ed. by P. D. D. Schaff. 14 vols. Edinburgh and Grand Rapids, Michigan: T & T Clark / Eerdmans.
PG 46	Gregorius Nyssenus. 1863. <i>S. P. N. Gregorii episcopi Nyssensis opera omnia quae exstant</i> [in Greek]. Ed. by J.-P. Migne. Patrologia Graeca 46. Paris: Garnier Fratres.
TLG	“Thesaurus Linguae Graecae” [in Ancient Greek and English]. 1971–. Thesaurus Linguae Graeca Project, Irvine, California. Accessed Nov. 18, 2022. http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/index.php .

REFERENCES

- Aeschines. 1919. *The Speeches of Aeschines*. Ed. and trans. by Ch. D. Adams. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press / William Heinemann.
- Antonov, N. 2021a. “Obzor issledovatel’skoy literatury po teme svyashchenstva v tvoreniyakh svyatitelya Grigoriya Bogoslova [A Review of Research Literature on the Topic of the Priesthood in the Works of St. Gregory the Theologian]” [in Russian]. *Voprosy teologii [Issues of Theology]* 3 (2): 177–208.

- . 2021b. "Pastyrskaya obraznost' v 'Apologii' svt. Grigoriya Bogoslova [Pastoral Imagery in the *Apology* for His Flight by Gregory of Nazianzus]" [in Russian]. *Shagi [Steps]* 7 (2): 193–211.
- Demacopoulos, G. 2006. *Five Models of Spiritual Direction in the Early Church*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Elm, S. 2012. *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Festugière, A.-G. 1954. *Personal Religion Among the Greeks*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Gregor von Nazianz. 1919. *De vita sua* [in Latin and German]. Ed. by C. Jungck. Heidelberg.
- Hofer, A. 2011. "The Reordering of Relationships in John Chrysostom's 'De sacerdotio'." *Augustinianum* 51 (2): 451–471.
- Holder, A. L. 2009. "Gregory the Great: Book of Pastoral Rule." In *Christian Spirituality: The Classics*, ed. by A. L. Holder, 74–85. New York: Routledge.
- Hornung, C. 2020. *Monachus et sacerdos. Asketische Konzeptualisierungen des Klerus im antiken Christentum* [in German]. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Jamblichus. 2003. *De Mysteriis*. Trans. from the Ancient Greek by E. Clarke, J. Dillon, and J. Hershbell. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Lochbrunner, M. 1993. *Über das Priestertum: Historische und systematische Untersuchung zum Priesterbild des Johannes Chrysostomus* [in German]. Bonn: Borengasser Publ.
- Maslov, B. 2012. "The Limits of Platonism: Gregory of Nazianzus and the Invention of Theōsis." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 52:440–468.
- Matz, B. J. 2016. *Gregory of Nazianzus*. Michigan: Baker Books.
- McGuckin, J. 2001. *Saint Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography*. New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.
- Pinault, H. 1925. *Le platonisme de St. Grégoire de Nazianze* [in French]. La Roche-Sur-Yon: G. Romain Publ.
- Portmann, F. X. 1954. *Die gottliche Paidagogia bei Gregor von Nazianz: Eine dogmengeschichtliche Studie* [in German]. Ottilien: St. Ottilien Eos Verlag.
- Rapp, C. 2005. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 37. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Richard, A. 2003. *Cosmologie et théologie chez Grégoire de Nazianze* [in French]. Paris: Brepols.
- Russel, N. 2004. *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schaff, Ph. 1885. *Fathers of the Third and Fourth Centuries: Lactantius, Venantius, Asterius, Victorinus, Dionysius, Apostolic Teaching and Constitutions, Homily, and Liturgies*. Vol. 7. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

- Sparacio, P. F. 1997. "From Earth to Heaven: An Understanding of and Vision for Ordained Ministry as Guided by Gregory Nazianzus' Flight to Pontus and further grounded in the Fathers of the Church." PhD diss., Drew University.
- Sterk, A. 2004. *Renouncing the World, yet Leading the Church: The Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Stewart, B. A. 2015. *Priests of My People: Levitical Paradigms for Early Christian Ministers*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Turner, H. 2009. *The Epistles of St Symeon the New Theologian*. Oxford: Oxford Press University.
- Ullmann, C. 1825. *Gregor von Nazianz, der Theologe* [in German]. Darmstadt: Verlag Carl Wilhelm Leske.
- Vorontsov, S. A. 2020. "Svyashchennik v svete stiley myshleniya [The Priest in Light of Thought Style Theory]: Iyerarkhicheskaya i dolzhnostnaya spetsifikatsii [Hierarchical and Official Descriptions]" [in Russian]. *Vestnik PSTGU. Seriya 1: Bogosloviye. Filosofiya. Religiovedeniye* [STU Review. Theology. Philosophy. Religious Studies] 91:36–54.

Antonov N. K. [Антонов Н. К.] The Ἀρχή of the Priest in the "Apology for his Flight" (or. 2) of Gregory of Nazianzus [Ἀρχή священника в «Апологии» (ор. 2) Григория Богослова] // *Философия. Журнал Высшей школы экономики*. — 2022. — Т. 6, № 4. — С. 13–35.

НИКОЛАЙ АНТОНОВ

МАГИСТР ФИЛОЛОГИИ, ПРИГЛАШЕННЫЙ СОТРУДНИК
 ЛАБОРАТОРИЯ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ ЦЕРКОВНЫХ ИНСТИТУЦИЙ
 ПРАВОСЛАВНЫЙ СВЯТО-ТИХОНОВСКИЙ ГУМАНИТАРНЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ (МОСКВА);
 ORCID: 0000-0002-6588-1633

АРХН СВЯЩЕННИКА В «АПОЛОГИИ» (ОР. 2) ГРИГОРИЯ БОГОСЛОВА

Получено: 10.09.2022. Рецензировано: 20.11.2022. Принято: 28.11.2022.

Аннотация: В статье реконструируется категориальный аппарат Григория Назианзина, формирующий представления об ἀρχή (власть / авторитет) священника. Показано, что идею о богоустановленности клира в Церкви Григорий соединяет с представлением о мировой иерархии (ἀρχή καὶ τάξις). В этом контексте проанализированы оппозиции служение/правление (leitourgia/hyemonia) и сила/убеждение (βία/πειθοί), показывающие, что священник определяется его положением между Богом и мирянами, которое часто описывается через пастырскую образность: Архипастырь Христос — пастырь — паства. При этом сама категория «посредничества» (μεσότης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων) относится в этом тексте исключительно к литургической функции священника, т. е. к приведению людей к Богу через таинства. Также эта цель достигается через помощь людям посредством духовного руководства, т. е. разных коммуникативных практик (общение, проповедь, наставление и т. д.). Этот путь описывается в неоплатонических категориях и подразумевает, что лишь тот, кто близок к Богу, может вести к Нему других. Эти два образа

воздействия на мирян имеют разное богословско-онтологическое основание, однако оба формируют ἀρχή священника. Совершение таинств осмысливается как то, что ставит священника в объективно более близкое положение к Богу, т. е. включает его в ἀρχή καὶ τάξις на отличном от обычных людей уровне. Вместе с тем священник мыслится как тот, кто занимает в Новом Израиле — Церкви — место правителей древнего Израиля, и потому его положение описывается как властное, однако подразумевается именно власть над душами (ἡγεμονία ψυχῶν), причем реализуемая исключительно убеждением.

Ключевые слова: священство, Григорий Богослов, власть/авторитет, посредничество, духовное руководство.

DOI: 10.17323/2587-8719-2022-4-13-35.