Trinitarian Relationship

Tim Hankins
Box 273
CHS662JZ

Introduction

The theological term Trinity is not found within scripture, yet it carries the weight of nearly two thousand years of tradition. With this word Trinity, Christians endeavor to describe the very nature of the relationship between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This relationship is a core belief to evangelical Christians and to deny it is to indeed reject the very root tenets of what Christianity is.

Yet Christianity did not come by the doctrine of the Trinity easily. It was struggled over, argued about, and slowly built over several centuries. Some of the earliest proponents of the doctrine of the Trinity were those Christian forefathers known as the Cappadocian Fathers. While many theologians were known for their contributions to the doctrine of the Trinity, these men, especially Gregory of Nazianzus, were champions of this doctrine at a time when it was still being formulated.

This was a time of many questions and many wrong answers. Arius split the empire with his teaching that there was a time when the Son was not. Sabellius taught that the Son and Spirit were simply facets or modes of one God. Semi-Arians tried to reconcile those who held to the full deity of Jesus Christ with Arius' teaching ending up with a somewhat hybrid doctrine. It was into this doctrinal upheaval that Gregory of Nazianzus wrote of the Trinity by building upon the unquestioned deity of the Father and using relationship between the Father, the Son, and the Spirit to demonstrate the personhood and deity of the latter two.

The Father

It is appropriate for any discussion on the Trinity to begin with the Father; however, given the nature of the Trinity, it is difficult to discuss the Father in absolute isolation from the Son and Spirit. Gregory's writing style and theological views further complicate this. As a result, some concepts and terms will be introduced with the Father, but not fully explained or developed until discussing the Son and the Holy Spirit.

To even speak of the Father is using a Trinitarian theological framework. The very word Father describes a relationship to another and requires the existence of another, the Son. Gregory says of the Father, "for whose Father would He be, if the Son were separated and estranged from Him?"[1] [2] Humanly speaking, a man is not a father until he sires a child. It is this same linguistic logic that Gregory attributes to the Father. The very fact that God is referred to in scripture provides evidence that there must be a Son.

Now Gregory does not argue that the Father derives His existence from the Son or from the Spirit, but the name Father illuminates us to some of His nature because of His relationship to the Son. Towards that end he says,

> "Father is not a name either of an essence or of an action, most clever sirs. But it is the name of the Relation in which the Father stands to the Son, and the Son to the Father. For as with us these names make known

---

[1] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (212). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 2, §38.*

[2] Within the context Gregory says that ranking the Son as a creation would rob the Father of His Fatherhood. However, this still carries the argument that the existence of a Son is necessary for the appellation "Father".

a genuine and intimate relation, so, in the case before us too, they denote an identity of nature between Him That is begotten and Him That begets."[3]

This provides a twofold argument for the Trinity then. First, that the appellation "Father" indicates a unique person within the Godhead. Secondly, the very nature of the appellation also then indicates the existence and presence of a second person within the Godhead, that of "Son" by providing a description of the relationship between the two.

Gregory further explains the Father as an absolute father. Unlike mankind who are at one time a son, and later in life fathers, but never truly lose their status as sons to their fathers, the Father has never been Son. He has never experienced the submission that a human son has to his father, nor is He diminished by this "lack of experience". Neither did He become a Father. That would mean that there was a time when the Son was not, something that Gregory explicitly and categorically denies elsewhere. He *is* Father.

Gregory also viewed the Father as the Source of, and greater than, the Son and Holy Spirit.

> I should like to call the Father the greater, because from him flows both the Equality and the Being of the Equals (this will be granted on all hands), but I am afraid to use the word Origin, lest I should make Him the Origin of Inferiors, and thus insult Him by precedencies of honour. For the lowering of those Who are from Him is no glory to the Source. Moreover, I look with suspicion at your insatiate desire, for fear you should take hold of this word Greater, and divide the Nature, using the word Greater in *all* senses, whereas it does not apply to the Nature, but only to Origination. For in the

---

[3] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (307). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 29, §16.*

Consubstantial Persons there is nothing greater or less in point of Substance.[4]

As before the terms Gregory uses cannot stand in solitude. A source requires an outflow, and a greater requires a lesser. Yet he is quite careful to define how he is using these terms. As the Source of the Son and Spirit, the Father provides equality to both. He considers the Father greater than the Son or Spirit in that he views the Father as the Source of the Son and Spirit, but absolutely not of greater substance.

In their article "A Defense of the Doctrine of the Eternal Subordination", Kovach and Schemm refer to the previous quote saying the following:

Gregory has formed the foundational notion behind the modern terminology "ontological equality but economic subordination." He wants to call the Father "greater" but not greater "in *all* senses." If he allows for greater "in *all* senses" then he loses consubstantiality. But, there must be some sort of relational order or ranking or else why call the Father "greater?"[5]

They recognize Gregory's aforementioned statement to indicate the deity of the Son and Spirit as well as a demonstration of a relational order between the Father and the other two. They too note the care which Gregory has taken in choosing his words, so that he can describe this relationship of equals in nature but of different rank or role. This identification of a relational order indicates a multiplicity of persons within the Godhead, which is also inferred by what Kovach and Schemm describe as ontological equality.

---

[4] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (375–376). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 40, §44.*

[5] Kovach, Steven; Schemm, Peter Jr. "A Defense of the Doctrine of the Eternal Subordination" *Vol. 42*: *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society Volume 42*. 1999 (3) (467–468). Lynchburg, VA: The Evangelical Theological Society.

Aside from Father and Source, Gregory refers to the Father as the Unoriginate, saying, "but the Proper Name of the Unoriginate is Father",[6] and Unbegotten. Unoriginate simply means that the Father has no beginning. The term Unbegotten is used to indicate the fact that there is no Source for the Father. Of themselves these appellations do not necessarily imply a relationship in and of themselves, yet in conjunction with other terms Gregory uses they take on that function. The Father is Unbegotten, but there is One who is referred to as the Begotten. Together these then highlight the different persons within the Godhead having distinctions that apply to one and not the others.

The use of negatives terms (i.e. *Un*begotten, *Un*originate, etc.), however, Gregory considers insufficient for describing God.

> "But this term Incorporeal, though granted, does not yet set before us—or contain within itself His Essence, any more than Unbegotten, or Unoriginate, or Unchanging, or Incorruptible, or any other predicate which is used concerning God or in reference to Him . . . just so he who is eagerly pursuing the nature of the Self-existent will not stop at saying what He is *not*, but must go on beyond what He is not, and say what He *is*; inasmuch as it is easier to take in some single point than to go on disowning point after point in endless detail, in order, both by the elimination of negatives and the assertion of positives to arrive at a comprehension of this subject".[7]

So better then, for understanding the Father, and the relationship within the Trinity, are the affirmative terms which Gregory uses to express the distinction of persons within the Trinity. Three such terms are Begetter, Emitter, and

---

[6] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (316). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 30, §19*

[7] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (291). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 28, §9*

Generator. These terms have a specific aspect of the Father that they describe. "The Father is the Begetter and the Emitter; without passion of course, and without reference to time, and not in a corporeal manner."[8] The term Begetter is indicative of Gregory's understanding of the relationship between Father and Son. Likewise the term Emitter is indicative of Gregory's understanding of the relationship between the Father and the Holy Spirit. The term Generator then applies to the Father in respect to both Son and Spirit. These terms continue with Gregory's understanding that the Father is the Source of the Son and Spirit, and thus demonstrate the deity of the Son and Spirit since they are sourced in the Father. Gregory's use of separate terms for the Father's relationship to the Son and Spirit are once again indicative of distinct persons and distinctions between Son and Spirit.

The Son

As with the Father, to speak of the Son assumes a Trinitarian (or at least a Dualitarian) framework. For Gregory, the term Son speaks eloquently to His fully divine nature. He poses this rhetorical question, "for whose son would He be, if His origin were not referred to the Father?"[9] Ultimately the Son's origin is the Father. That is what sonship is. Had the Son been the less than fully divine being that the Arians taught, then He would have been:

---

[8] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (301). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 29, §2*

[9] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (212). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 2, §38*

separated and estranged from Him, by being ranked with the creation, (for an alien being, or one which is combined and confounded with his father, and, for the sense is the same, throws him into confusion, is not a son)[10]

The gulf between creator and creation is too vast to be joined by the terms Father and Son. The Son has His origin, His source, in the Father. That very sourcing means that the Son must share in the divine nature which the Father has and imparts. Had the Son been created, He would have been alien to God, something wholly other and thus by definition not Son.

Gregory also notes that the Son cannot be combined or confused with His Father. This is one of a couple arguments which Gregory raises against Sabellian modalism. If the Son were merged with that of the Father ("combined and confounded") how could such be called Father or Son? Either name indicates a distinction in identity from the other. Such a merging would exclude the existence of any Son.

Part and parcel with the concept of sonship is that of begottenness. For Gregory, the Father is the Begetter, begetting is the generation of the Son, and the Son is the one whom the Father has begotten. This term is important to Gregory, and a thorough examination of how he uses it will give insight into the relationship that it represents.

The Son is the Only-Begotten because of the uniqueness of the manner of His sonship which Gregory sees as unique only to the Godhead.

> "And He is called Only-Begotten, not because He is the only Son and of the Father alone, and only a Son; but also because the manner of His Sonship is peculiar to Himself and not shared by bodies."[11]

---

10 *ibid.*

The begetting of the Son was unique, and not something which any creature can share in or duplicate. Gregory's wording here deliberately excludes any idea of human impregnation and birth. The begetting of the Son by the Father is something that only of the two of them will ever experience, thus creating a wholly unique relationship between the two which is not shared by any creature.

As seen above, he title "Only-Begotten" is only applicable to the Son. The Son is the only Son of the Father. In speaking of the divinity of the Spirit's Gregory asks, "What titles which belong to God are not applied to Him, except only Unbegotten and Begotten?"[12]. So the Begetter and the Only-Begotten are descriptions of a relationship that is unique in the Godhead between the Father and Son, not shared by the Spirit. This uniqueness of relationship distinguishes the individual persons, both of the Son who alone has the title Only-Begotten, and of the Spirit who cannot be addressed as such.

The idea that the title Only-Begotten indicated the deity of the Son was something Gregory found based in scripture.

> "For we have learnt to believe in and to teach the Deity of the Son from their great and lofty utterances. And what utterances are these? . . . The only "begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, it says, He hath declared Him."[13] [14]

---

[11] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (316). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 30, §20*

[12] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (327). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 31, §29*

[13] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (307). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 29, §27*

[14] John 1:18

Of course this is only one of the passages quoted by Gregory, yet it

demonstrates the biblical basis for Gregory's doctrine, in addition to the fact that

Gregory saw the title Only-Begotten as a proof of deity.

In continuing his argument against the Arians the theologian points out

that Begottenness does not detract from the glory of the Son, he shares in God's

glory and has a distinct additional glory of being generated from God.

> "Thus much we for our part will be bold to say, that if it is a great thing for
> the Father to be Unoriginate, it is no less a thing for the Son to have been
> Begotten of such a Father. For not only would He share the glory of the
> Unoriginate, since he is of the Unoriginate, but he has the added glory of
> His Generation, a thing so great and august in the eyes of all those who
> are not altogether groveling and material in mind."[15]

The nature of the Father's begetting of the Son both conveys the Father's glory

because the Son comes from the Father, but Gregory also sees the begetting as

bestowing its own glory completely apart from that of the Father because of the

unique, matchless generation. This again becomes an argument for the deity of

the Son since none but God could share in the Father's full glory, as well as one

for the distinctions of persons since the generation produces a unique glory in

itself.

Not only does the begetting of the Son convey the Father's glory upon the

Son, but it also by definition means that the Son shares in the Father's nature.

> "But if you say that He That begat and That which is begotten are not the
> same, the statement is inaccurate. For it is in fact a necessary truth that

---

[15] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (305). Oak
Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 29, §11*

they are the same. For the nature of the relation of Father to Child is this, that the offspring is of the same nature with the parent. [16]

This then is the strongest statement of Begotten indicating deity. This sharing of natures means that the Son shares in all of what makes the Father God, and this nature comes from the Father through begetting to the Son.

Yet even with all of this emphasis on the generation of the Son through begetting, Gregory acknowledges that he has not clearly and specifically explained the details of this generation. His responses to petitions for specifics though are curtly dismissive.

> "Ask me again, and again I will answer you, When was the Son begotten? When the Father was not begotten. And when did the Holy Ghost proceed? When the Son was, not proceeding but, begotten—beyond the sphere of time, and above the grasp of reason; although we cannot set forth that which is above time, if we avoid as we desire any expression which conveys the idea of time. For such expressions as "when" and "before" and "after" and "from the beginning" are not timeless, however much we may force them; [17]

> How was He begotten?—I repeat the question in indignation. The Begetting of God must be honoured by silence. It is a great thing for you to learn that He was begotten. But the manner of His generation we will not admit that even Angels can conceive, much less you. Shall I tell you how it was? It was in a manner known to the Father Who begat, and to the Son Who was begotten. Anything more than this is hidden by a cloud, and escapes your dim sight.[18]

God is wholly other and Gregory recognized that there would be things about God that finite man simply is not equipped or intended to understand. The

---

[16] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (304). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 29, §10*

[17] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (301–302). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 29, §3*

[18] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (303). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 29, §8*

specifics of the generation of the Son is one of these mysteries. However, Gregory does hold that time is an aspect of creation; therefore it is in no way valid to speak of the generation or begetting in terms of time. Gregory does not clarify whether he is expressing timelessness with, or without duration[19].

Through this examination of Gregory's doctrine of the Only-Begotten it is clear that the title Only-Begotten describes the relationship between two persons in the Godhead, the Father and the Son, which is a result of the unique manner of His sonship, and which imparted both the divine nature of the Father and the glory of the Father to the Son. Thus Only-Begotten represents both a statement of the divinity and of unique personhood of the Son.

Although Wright in his article titled "The Formation Of The Doctrine Of The Trinity In The Early Church" views the words generation and begotten as analogy, he too recognizes that they are terms used by Gregory to describe the relationship between Father and Son, and introduces another term "procession" which is related to the Holy Spirit.

> But if words such as "generation" and "begotten" by analogy related the Son to the Father, how should the Spirit's relation be spoken of—and to Father and Son alike? It was Gregory of Nazianzus who developed the notion of "procession" from John 15:26,[20]

The Spirit

To help his audience understand the procession of the Holy Spirit, Gregory likened the Trinity to Adam, Eve, and Seth.

---

[19] Paul Helm addresses this concept in TB 45:2 in his article on Eternal Creation, p. 319.

[20] Wright, David F. "The Formation Of The Doctrine Of The Trinity In The Early Church". *Vol. 10*: *Reformation and Revival Volume 10*. 2001 (3) (86). Carol Stream, Illinois: Reformation and Revival Ministries.

"What was Adam? A creature of God. What then was Eve? A fragment of the creature. And what was Seth? The begotten of both. Does it then seem to you that Creature and Fragment and Begotten are the same thing? Of course it does not. But were not these persons consubstantial? Of course they were."[21]

Gregory very clearly explains that while he uses this as an analogy, he is not attributing to the Trinity any property of humanity or creation. However, this analogy serves its function to broaden the view of his audience, so they can grasp that God is not limited to begetting as the only way for the Father to be the Source of the Godhead.

As with the Son and begotten, Gregory uses several terms to describe the relationship of the Spirit to the Father but one stands out from the others: procession. The procession of the Holy Spirit has the same eternal timelessness and absence of passion as the begetting of the Son,[22] yet Gregory is quite particular how he uses relational terms. Despite the similarity of timelessness and passionless, the procession of the Spirit *must* be different from begetting the Son. These terms are not interchangeable. To use the term begotten with reference to the Spirit would mean that the Spirit and Son are brothers (invalidating only-begotten) or else it could be taken to mean that the Spirit is begotten of the Son making the Spirit the grandson of the Unoriginate, instigating a whole different set of heresies. Either way, Gregory adamantly opposes this misuse of terms.

The difference between begetting and procession is one of manifestation.

---

[21] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (321). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 31, §11*

[22] reference quote #17 on p. 11 and quote #8 on p. 7.

But the difference of manifestation, if I may so express myself, or rather of their mutual relations one to another, has caused the difference of their Names.[23]

This manifestation then is an integral aspect of their relationship to one another. Had the Holy Spirit been begotten, He would have been named Son rather than Spirit. He is not less than the Son for having a different relationship with the Father; He is simply distinct from the Son with a different relationship, one which cannot be understood through the term begotten.

Gregory again highlights that difference elsewhere indicating that both come from the Father as their Source yet the manner in which they are derived from the Father is different

The Holy Ghost is truly Spirit, coming forth from the Father indeed, but not after the manner of the Son, for it is not by Generation but by Procession (since I must coin a word for the sake of clearness); for neither did the Father cease to be Unbegotten because of His begetting something, nor the Son to be begotten because He is of the Unbegotten (how could that be?), nor is the Spirit changed into Father or Son because He proceeds, or because He is God[24]

The use of these separate terms continues to indicate distinction between the persons of God. The begetting of the Son did not cause Him to change into the Unbegotten, nor does the procession of the Spirit become either Father or Son as a result of His procession. These terms indicate relationship and source of deity because of consubstantiality, but they cannot indicate a unity of

[23] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (320). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 31, §9*

[24] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (356). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 39, §12*

personhood. Rather the opposite. The procession of the Spirit indicates that He

is a distinct person from the Unoriginate, or the Begotten.

Gregory also notes that the coming forth from the Father who is spirit[25]

(John 4:24) means that the Holy Spirit is genuinely spirit in the same way that the

Father is. This provides further demonstration that the procession of the Spirit

conveys the nature of the source of the procession, the Father, to the One who

proceeds. It is because the Father is spirit, and the nature of procession that the

Holy Spirit is spirit. In this Gregory expounds upon the relationship between

Father and Spirit.

The procession itself defies human explanation and yet the result of that

procession is One who is not creature but fully God.

> The Holy Ghost, which proceedeth from the Father; Who, inasmuch as He
> proceedeth from That Source, is no Creature; ... What then is Procession?
> Do you tell me what is the Unbegottenness of the Father, and I will explain
> to you the physiology of the Generation of the Son and the Procession of
> the Spirit, and we shall both of us be frenzy-stricken for prying into the
> mystery of God[26]

Man is not meant to know the mechanics of the procession any more than we are

to understand the mechanics of the divine begetting. It remains a divine mystery.

For Gregory this remains inviolable and sacrosanct. There is both the physical

"fleshly" limitation of our physical existence as well as the sovereign divine

prerogative to withhold details from creatures.

---

[25] John 4:24

[26] Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII* (320). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems. *Oration 31, §8*

15

With the term procession it is unsurprising then that Gregory also refers to the Spirit as the Proceeding One. His other appellation for the Holy Spirit is "Emission". This goes hand in hand with his appellation for the Father "Emitter". As with the other terms of relationship used by Gregory, Emission demonstrates the Father as the Source of the Spirit and hence proves deity by virtue of consubstantiality. Here too though is found the distinction between Father and Spirit: there is the one who emits, the Father, and then there is the one who is the emission, the Spirit.

Gregory's development of the relationship between the Father and the Holy Spirit is still (or perhaps better, again) discussed by theologians, primarily within the context of the discussion of the *filioque* debate and single procession versus double procession. Gerald Bray, in an article regarding the theological necessity of the double procession of the Spirit, states,

> "The relationship of the Holy Spirit to the Father has been expressed in terms of procession at least from the time of Gregory of Nazianzus."[27]

Professor Bray here recognizes Gregory's use of the term procession as indicating the relationship between the Father and Spirit.

Professor Bray also wrote an article for the Tyndale Bulletin regarding *filioque,* in which he says,

> Gregory of Nazianzus could not explain how the procession of the Spirit differed from the generation of the Son, but he regarded the distinction as essential in distinguishing the hypostases of the Godhead.[28]

---

[27] Bray, Gerald. "The Double Procession Of The Holy Spirit In Evangelical Theology Today: Do We Still Need It?". *Vol. 41*: *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society Volume 41*. 1998 (3) (417). Lynchburg, VA: The Evangelical Theological Society.

Between the two articles we can see Professor Bray identify procession as expressing a relationship which necessarily demonstrates separate persons within the Trinity.

Kovach and Schemm, in their previously mentioned article, also state,

"The next oration in which Gregory speaks of an order or ranking in the Godhead is *The Fifth Theological Oration: On the Holy Spirit*. Here the context is a discussion on the procession of the Spirit."[29]

In discussing order and rank within the Trinity, implicit in that discussion is the concept of relationship between the members of the Trinity.[30] The authors see the procession of the Spirit as a part of the basis for their argument for establishing rank within the Trinity.

In his aforementioned article on the formation of the doctrine of the Trinity while discussing the *filioque*, David Wright states,

"But if words such as "generation" and "begotten" by analogy related the Son to the Father, how should the Spirit's relation be spoken of—and to Father and Son alike? It was Gregory of Nazianzus who developed the notion of "procession" from John 15:26," [31]

---

[28] Bray, Gerald. "The *Filioque* Clause In History And Theology". *Vol. 34*: *Tyndale Bulletin Volume 34*. 1983 (1) (109). Cambridge: Tyndale House.

[29] Kovach, Steven; Schemm, Peter Jr. "A Defense of the Doctrine of the Eternal Subordination" *Vol. 42*: *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society Volume 42*. 1999 (3) (468). Lynchburg, VA: The Evangelical Theological Society.

[30] Subsequent to the quoted statement, Kovach and Schemm quote a passage from the fifth oration (*Oration 31, §9*) which includes a portion previously referenced in quote #23 on p. 14.

[31] Wright, David F. "The Formation Of The Doctrine Of The Trinity In The Early Church". *Vol. 10*: *Reformation and Revival Volume 10*. 2001 (3) (86). Carol Stream, Illinois: Reformation and Revival Ministries.

Once again a modern scholar identifies begotten and procession as terms which demonstrate relationship between members of the Trinity.

By starting with the Father as a basis for his theological arguments, Gregory of Nazianzus builds upon a solid foundation for establishing the deity and persons of the Trinity. He carefully uses specific terms to describe the different relationships between the Father and the Son and the Father and the Spirit, and through their use proves the deity of the two by demonstrating that the Father is the source of their natures. Gregory refuted both Arianism and modalism and helped provide for the early church a foundation for its understanding of the Trinity.

Bibliography

Schaff, P. (1997). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series Vol. VII*. Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems.

Bray, Gerald. "The Double Procession Of The Holy Spirit In Evangelical Theology Today: Do We Still Need It?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society Volume 41*. 1998. Lynchburg, VA: The Evangelical Theological Society.

Kovach, Steven; Schemm, Peter Jr. "A Defense of the Doctrine of the Eternal Subordination"*. Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society Volume 42*. 1999. Lynchburg, VA: The Evangelical Theological Society.

Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society Volume 47. 2004. Lynchburg, VA: The Evangelical Theological Society.

Wright, David F. "The Formation Of The Doctrine Of The Trinity In The Early Church". *Reformation and Revival Volume 10*. 2001. Carol Stream, Illinois: Reformation and Revival Ministries.

Bray, Gerald. "The *Filioque* Clause In History And Theology" *Tyndale Bulletin Volume 34*. 1983. Cambridge: Tyndale House.

Noble, T. A. "Gregory Nazianzen's Use Of Scripture In Defence Of The Deity Of The Spirit". *Tyndale Bulletin Volume 39*. 1988. Cambridge: Tyndale House

Helm, Paul. "Eternal Creation". *Tyndale Bulletin Volume 45*. 1994. Cambridge: Tyndale House.