

Role of *Energeia* in the Knowledge of God: A Philosophical Discourse

Toimoi ZODINSANGA*

Federated Faculty for Research in Religion and Culture, Kerala, India

Abstract:

There has been a debate over the valid source of knowledge. Rationalists claim that innate idea or reason provides knowledge while empiricists argue for sense-experience as the valid means of knowledge. Idealists (Plato, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, George Berkeley, Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Immanuel Kant) affirm that reality of a thing lies in its essential nature. Plato, the idealist, declares that reality of a thing resides in its forms [1] (Panthanmackel 1999, 3-6; See also, Gracia 2003, 23). Immanuel Kant, another idealist philosopher holds different view that the essence or noumenon (“thing-in-itself”) of a thing cannot be known, what can be known is phenomenon (thing-it-appears). The realist philosophers on the other hand observe that the ultimate reality of a thing lies at the world of physical object which is existed independently from mental processes. Aristotle, in response to the absolute claim of Plato in the knowledge of reality (forms/ideas/essence) asserts that the essential nature of a thing is expressed in its movement (Ferrarin 2001, 380). In the knowledge of God, many theologians have agreed that the energeia of God is the only and the best element to know God as the ousia of God is beyond comprehension. The Cappadocian Fathers (Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus) are one group of theologians who advocate the revelation of God’s attributes through his activities. In this paper,

* bruzodin@gmail.com

attempt is made to discuss the role of energeia in the knowledge of God with special reference to the Cappadocian Fathers, which will be considered in the light of Neoplatonic philosophy. In this paper, attempt is made to discuss the role of energeia in the knowledge of God with special reference to the Cappadocian Fathers, which will be considered in the light of Neoplatonic philosophy.

Keywords:

energeia, knowledge, God, philosophy, Cappadocian Fathers

1. The Concept of Divine *Energeia*: An Aristotelian View

In his book, *Aristotle East and West: Metaphysics and the Division of Christendom*, David Bradshaw states that Aristotle is the one who coined the term, *energeia* (Bradshaw 2004, 1). *Energeia* for Aristotle is ‘actuality’. However, he does not separate between actuality and potentiality rather he correlates the two. For him, actuality refers to actuality of potentiality (*dunamis*) (Ferrarin 2001, 20). Bradshaw observes that Aristotle has distinguished *energeia* from *kinēsis* (change or motion) for the fact that motion directs towards certain extrinsic end whereas energies has its own intrinsic end (Bradshaw 2018). Seeing, thinking, living well and flourishing are some characteristics of *energeia* which are activities fully actual as they contain ends in themselves. In this manner, not only ‘potentiality’ and ‘actuality’ but also ‘activity’ and ‘actuality’ are interconnected in Aristotelian philosophy.

1.1. Divine *Energeia* as Divine Activity: from *Ousia* to *Energeia*

Bradshaw states that *ousia* (substance) of Prime Mover is *energeia* according to Aristotle. Though the Prime Mover is considered as self-thinking thought or ‘thought (that) is a thinking of thinking’, it does not refer to selfish thinking of God himself rather it refers to encompassing all possible intelligible content (Horton 2018). Moreover, the Prime Mover is not considered which embraces all possible intelligible content alone, more significantly he himself is the all possible intelligible content. Simply

speaking, thinking leads to action. In the case of the thinking of Prime Mover, he makes his thinking readable for all sentient being. In other words, it is in the activity of the Prime Mover that his substance has been made known to all generations. The essence or substance (*ousia*) of divine is revealed in the form of divine activity and therefore *energeia* is part of *ousia* in actual sense. In this case, divine thinking or essence plays an active role to acknowledge his essence in the form of *energeia*.

1.2. Divine *Energeia* as Divine Actuality: From *Energeia* to *Ousia*

Aristotle primarily refers *energeia* to 'actuality'. By referring *energeia* to actuality, he means to acknowledge divine substance which is contained in divine activity. The movement of divine such as creation clearly expresses the actual essence of himself. The divine *energeia* is fully actual on the ground that the divine activity has its own end that does not require time and space to reach the end (Bradshaw 2018). As Hans Küng has stated in his book, *On Being a Christian* about the interrelatedness between God and the world that there can be no God without a world and no world without God, both divine *ousia* and divine *energeia* are interconnected (Küng 1976, 306). Exclusion of any one of the two would mean demeaning of both. For instance, divine incarnation in the form of human being itself is not only an activity but is also the actual attributes in which divine love is incorporated. In this regard, one can discern divine substance incorporated in divine movement. That is to say, divine *energeia* is none other than divine substance in Aristotelian metaphysics.

1.3. Divine *Energeia* as Divine Potentiality/Power

In his book, *Metaphysics*, Aristotle correlates *energeia* and *dunamis* (potentiality) by stating that where there is *energeia* there is potentiality and no *energeia* no potentiality (Aristotle 1891, 230). For instance, a person who does not build a house practically does not have capacity to build though he/she has knowledge of building whereas actual building of a house reveals his/her potentiality of building a house (Aristotle 1891, 230). One may argue this statement that potentiality or power is not determined by action, or even without really build a house one may have

capacity to build. However, in the case of divine *energeia* the activity of divine itself is driven by divine potentiality. In other words, divine *energeia* acknowledges divine power on one hand and divine possession of power and potentiality on the other hand. The divine activity also acknowledges that divine power engineers divine movement and again the divine activity reveals the potentiality in the activity that energizes (activates) the essence of the divine.

2. *Energeia* and Cappadocian Fathers

The Cappadocian Fathers have contributed a lot in theological enterprise. One of their major contributions in the field of theology is formulation of the Doctrine of Trinity. They are pro-Athanasian as well as pro-Nicean but anti-Eunomius (Arianism) in philosophico-theological orientation. Regarding divine *energeia* in the Cappadocian Fathers, one can trace from their exegesis of Scripture particularly Moses' encounters with God in the Old Testament; and their Trinitarian controversy with Eunomius.

2.1. Divine *Energeia* in Moses' Experiences

The Cappadocian Fathers are considered as the exponent of *via negativa* method in doing theology. Nyssa refers to Moses' encounter with God to illustrate the incomprehensibility of divine nature and the vague operation of God. The biblical accounts include – Moses' vision of God on Mount Horeb at the burning bush (Exodus 3: 2); Moses' vision of God on the clouded mountain top of Sinai (Exodus 19: 18); and, Moses' encounter with God in the thick darkness (Exodus 20: 21 & 33: 20-33) (Kariatlis 2012, 103). The first vision symbolizes entering into the presence of God from darkness, but still cannot comprehend the Being of God. The cloud refers to the curtain between human being and God. Darkness refers to the veil that makes unable to comprehend the nature of God by human intellectual. It also refers to the presence of God. Like Nyssa, Nazianzus also refers to the two Exodus accounts of Moses' vision of God (Exodus 20: 21 & 33: 22) in order to argue for the incomprehensibility of God (Nazianzus 1955a). In the first account Moses stands near to the thick

darkness where God is resided. Nazianzus describes darkness as the veil which separates between created being and the creator (George 1994, 6). The second reference narrates Moses' vision of God in the cleft of the rock. When the divine glory passes by, Moses sees only the back parts of God (George 1994, 6). Nazianzus internalizes the obstacle that "the darkness of this world and the thick covering of the flesh is an obstacle to the full understanding of the truth" (Nazianzus 1955b, 290). He further opines that divine *ousia* can be discovered when a person becomes godlike and divine but this state of life can never be achieved in earthly life (Nazianzus 1955b, 294).

Moses' encounters with God strengthen the Cappadocian Fathers' arguments for the incomprehensibility of divine *ousia* by any form of human intellectual faculty. They also admit the incompatibility of human mind and reason to comprehend the essential nature of God. They hold the view that human can know God in part through the activity of God himself. The divine *ousia* cannot be fully understood and apprehended unless the earthly body is transformed into divine, which is not possible on earth. In this case, the Cappadocian Fathers keep distance between transcendence and immanence in the study of God. The incarnation of Jesus Christ, the Son who is regarded as the first fruit of the Father, who shares the divine *ousia* of the Father is not considered the complete *energeia* of the divine *ousia*.

2.2. Divine *Energeia* in Trinity

Philosophically speaking, Eunomius [2] separates between *noumenon* (*ousia*) and *phenomenon* (*energeia*) stating that the two are distinct entities (Gregorios 1980a, 114). To him, *ousia* of the Father alone is unbegotten and can never be shared to anyone. He also holds the view that the divine *energeia* having been generated by the *ousia* can never be considered as unbegotten, that is to say, the *energeia* is something subordinate to God, the Father (Gregorios 1980a, 114). Eunomius employs three terms – *ousia*, *energeia* and *erga* – in order to distinguish the first two entities (Gregorios 1980a, 110). He states that *ousia* can be known through its works or *erga*, and *erga* is conditioned

by *energeia* (activity or operation) of the being (*ousia*) (Gregorios 1980b, 58). Differences in operations result differences in works and further differences in operations are grounded in differences in beings (Gregorios 1980b, 58). Thus, for Eunomius, understanding *erga* is the preconditioning factor to understand both *energeia* and *ousia*.

2.2.1. Basil of Caesarea and Divine Energeia: Operation of Attributes

Eunomius equates divine *ousia* and divine attributes. He holds that knowing the attributes of God means knowing the essence of God (Philip 2015, 15). However, Basil keeps distance between essence and attribute stating that divine *ousia* is unknowable or incomprehensible. To Basil, God can only be known through his activity. In his *Letters Vol II*, Basil expresses the incomprehensibility of divine essence that "...we know the greatness of God, and His power, and wisdom, and goodness, and the providence with which He cares for us, and the justice of His judgment, not His substance itself" (Basil 1955: 159). He adds that "...from His operations we know our God; we do not undertake to approach His substance itself. His operations come down to us, but His substance remains inaccessible" (Basil 1955: 160). Though the Son and Holy Spirit are proceeded from the Father and share the same substance with the Father, they can only derive the attributes of God but not the essence of God (Basil 1951, 85, 86; cf. Philip 2015, 20).

2.2.2. Gregory of Nyssa and Divine Energeia: Partial Knowledge of God

Eunomius holds the view that the Son and the Holy Spirit are not the work of one and the same (Nyssa n.d., 65). To him, the study of *erga* (work) helps to understand what type of *energeiai* that produces a particular *erga*, and from the knowledge of difference in *energeia* one can classify different *ousiai* to which *energeiai* are attached (Gregorios 1980a, 111). Nyssa refutes the epistemological principle of Eunomius with regard to *ousia* and *energeia* for the fact that *erga* criterion is inadequate to understand the first two (Gregorios 1980b, 58). For Nyssa, there is only one source who is God, the Father. Since the divine *ousia* is beyond

conceivable, it is only through the *energeia* which has been derived in the created orders that one can have partial perceptual knowledge about God (Gregorios 1980b, 59). Nyssa is of the opinion that in order to know the *energeia* of God in both the universe and in the form of image of God within a person, one must live a life of evil-free or to stay away from evil (Gregorios 1980b, 58).

2.2.3. Gregory of Nazianzus and Divine *Energeia*: Jesus, the First *Energeia* of God

Nazianzus maintains the absolute unity in the three persons of Godhead or in other words a *trinity* of Persons and a *unity* of nature (Nazianzen 1955, 282). He also argues that there is no difference in essence between the Father and the Son. The point of difference lies only in attributes – the Father is *unbegotten* and source of the Son and Holy Spirit, the Son is *begotten* and becomes the source of all created orders, the Holy Spirit is *proceeded* from the Father and sent to the world (Nazianzen 1955, 282). The Son is the First creation of the divine energy and through him God created the world. In this sense, the Son is the *energeia* that makes divine attributes conceivable to human being in part. Nazianzus affirms that human reason cannot fully comprehend the essence of God (Nazianzen 1955, 282).

3. *Energeia* and the Knowledge of God: A Neoplatonism Assessment

Considering the above discussion from the philosophical point of view, *energeia* can be dealt with *phenomenon* of Kantian philosophy. *Energeia* is empirical in the sense that sense perception or sense experience plays significant role in encountering the activity of God. However, it cannot be treated with pure empiricism as empiricism strongly believes that knowledge is derived from sense experience, and denies the idea that reasoning (mind) can conceive the abstract reality (Mayer 1976, 184). It is also phenomenal because *energeia* is the ‘thing-as-it-appears’ which can only be known and perceived by human being. The divine *ousia* which is the ‘thing-in-itself’ cannot be comprehended. In such case, *energeia* in the Cappadocian Fathers can be best fitted to

Neoplatonism [3] (Knowles 1962, 7). This is due to the fact that Cappadocian Fathers in their theologizing keep distance between divine *ousia* and divine *energeia* and between God and humanity, which could be an integration of Platonic and Aristotelian in philosophical sense. Therefore, under this section attempt is made to study critically on *energeia* or in philosophical term, Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy from the Neoplatonic philosophy accompanied by Cappadocian Fathers.

3.1. 'Tode ti' and the 'One': Reality of Ousia

In his book, *Aristotle: Fundamentals of the History of his Development*, W. Jaeger holds the view that Aristotle accepts almost all the doctrines of Plato except the doctrine of Forms (Jaeger 1934, 15). Aristotle, being a realist asserts that there is reality existed independently from the contact of mind. He abandons Plato's theory of Forms stating that it is unconceivable in reality (Knowles 1962, 9). Aristotle questions about if the Form individual or universal. He further argues that if the Form is universal, the Form cannot be present in the individual (Knowles 1962, 9). In his *Metaphysics*, Aristotle attacks Plato's theory of Forms arguing that Forms cannot be essences if there is separation among the Forms as essence is the fundamental feature of things. He further argues against the doctrine of Forms that since *ousia* signifies a *tode ti* (substance as separate and some this), *ousia* cannot be treated as universal. Furthermore, Aristotle treats the theory of Forms wholly irrelevant and bids good bye to the doctrine as they are 'jibber-jabber' which cannot be clearly understood. For Aristotle, Forms are irrelevant to human conduct as it denies theoretical economy (operation/activity), and does not contribute to the understanding of perceptible things.

Despite Neoplatonism separates God and the world, it considers the material object/world as the real entity (Hirschberger 1976, 47). Neoplatonism regards God as transcendent and super being which cannot be covered by any category. Plotinus called God 'the One' and 'the Good' (Hirschberger 1976, 47). For Plotinus, the 'One' is infinite, who is beyond all attributes such as goodness, freedom, love and beauty. The One is absolutely transcendent, absolutely good, and absolutely free (Souza

2010, 968). The One is unknowable by human intellectual or any sense perception therefore he is beyond human comprehension. The concept of the One for Plotinus implies to absolute unity devoid of multiplicity and division (Souza 2010, 968). Souza states that Plotinus names the One in various categorical terms, “in the hierarchical order the One is the First; in a logical and numerical manner the One is religiously God, morally the Good, structurally the Simple, metaphysically the Transcendent, philosophically the Supreme, temporally the Infinite, and functionally the Absolute” (Souza 2010, 968). The Cappadocian Fathers complement Neoplatonist doctrine of the ‘One’ by affirming that the divine *ousia* is beyond understanding and beyond human’s reach. In this case, they observe absolute transcendence of divine *ousia* which cannot be revealed even by divine operations (*energeiai*). Nyssa holds the view that the nature of God cannot be revealed by any means. For him, what is known to us about God is his attributes. Divine essence unites the three Persons of Godhead. It is shared among the three Persons of God but cannot be revealed, it is absolutely unknown.

3.2. The Sensible World: A Genuine Revelation

Platonism holds the view that the things which are sensible are temporal and not real; reality exists in unseen (Fox 1957, 24). According to Plato, senses deal only with particulars but cannot know the essence of a particular thing. For him, mere awareness of the external object is not the real knowledge (Gustafson & Ongyango-Okello 2007, 184). In fact, for Plato, essence is real which is associated to universal. On the other hand, appearance is associated to particular and inferior to forms in degree of reality and value. The forms can only be apprehended by reason, not by sense. The forms, on the other hand, are not a property of sensible material, rather they are in the realm of abstract entities – a world of ideas (Cornford 1960, 6). In this regard, the world of ideas/forms is beyond time and space. Plato further holds that sensible world keeps on changing and cannot provide valid knowledge; the world of forms remains constant, which is invisible and real (Cornford 1960, 246). He believes that the universal ideas or forms derived by pure reasoning are more authentic

than that of the knowledge derived by sense organs from particular objects (Gustafson & Ongyango-Okello 2007, 185).

In 'two world vision' theory, Neoplatonism distinguishes between 'intellectual world' and 'sensible world' (Souza 2010, 968). The intellectual consists of three realities such as the 'One', the *Nous*, and the World-Soul. The sensible world refers to the material world. *Nous* and the World-Soul (the individual soul) are emanated from the One. Even the material world proceeds from the One. Plotinus holds the view that although various realities are emanated from the One but cannot be equal to the source. In other words, the emanated realities are the reflection of some part of the source (though not in full form), which are real. The sensible world or material world cannot qualify the intellectual world, but the latter world is the qualifying elements of the One's attribute. William J. Wolf in his book, *Man's Knowledge of God* also states that it is through the Christ's event – his life, death, resurrection, exaltation and return of Christ – that Christians are trying to draw the knowledge of God (Wolf 1955, 54). He further states that though empirical knowledge cannot be claimed as the absolute means of knowing the reality, it provides some knowledge about reality. Likewise, the operation of God reflects certain knowledge about God, which is the real image of God (Wolf 1955, 55). In this regard, Wolf stands in the affirmation that revelation or the operation of God through any form of sensible material provides the knowledge of God. In his article, *The Synthesis of History, Experience, and Reason in the 'Knowledge of God'*, A. E. Garvie states that "the only knowledge of God which avails and satisfies is the vision of God in the face of Jesus" (Garvie 1931, 107). Alister E. McGrath also opines that the revelation of God in the cross of Christ is still *Posteriora Dei* which means revelation in the form of disguise or mask (McGrath 1990, 149). Though the cross reveals the knowledge of God it is still indirect revelation, yet a genuine revelation. For Luther, God reveals in the form of mask which can only be understood only by faith [4] (Kadai 1999, 179, 186). In the same manner, the Cappadocian Fathers also hold the view that what we see and know about God is only the back part of him, but still genuine knowledge.

3.3. Moral Discipline: Prerequisite to read *Energeia*

Plato advocates human endeavor and activity towards the higher knowledge. He proposes preparation and purification of the soul and mind by means of moral and intellectual discipline in order to attain the knowledge of Forms (Knowles 1962, 22). He further holds that the knowledge of Forms which is realized in this life remain in part not in full. For Plato, even to get partial knowledge of Forms, one has to prepare the soul and mind by disciplining moral and intellectual life. That is to say, in Plato's idealism, there is a significant meeting point between morality and reason (Patrick 1935, 214). Aristotle on the other hand holds the view that a good moral conduct (beatitude) enables to comprehend both metaphysical and physical reality even in this earthly life (Knowles 1962, 23). In this regard, both Plato and Aristotle recommend maintenance of a good moral discipline of life as a prerequisite factor in pursuit of the knowledge of metaphysical and physical reality.

Plotinus is extremely concerned with moral life of human being. This is area where Plotinus puts the common ideas of both Plato and Aristotle together, of course in mystical manner in his Neoplatonism (Knowles 1962, 27). He is of the opinion that the activity of soul in its union with the knowledge and love with the One can be realized in partial manner in this life. Apart from the good life in this world, Plotinus also concerns with the improvement of the soul from lower level to the higher status. Owing to Plato's physical, moral and intellectual discipline, Plotinus calls for a well discipline and purification of life in order to attain certain perfection in life (Knowles 1962, 27). This perfection in life, according to Plotinus will further lead to the attainment of the knowledge of reality. Plotinus by taking Aristotle's impulse holds that the good life opens the way to the knowledge of reality on earth. He brings the two ideologies (Plato and Aristotle) together by affirming that the moral disciplined life is the key to the knowledge of the reality. However, he declares that the knowledge of reality realizes in this world is partial; in the 'yonder' or hereafter, the reality will be realized in totality (Knowles 1962, 27). Like Plotinus, the Cappadocian Fathers also recommend a good moral conduct in the search of metaphysical as well as physical reality. Particularly, Nyssa holds the

view that a person's morality is the preconditioning factor in order to know the *energeia* of God. Morality for him is a life free from evil (Gregorios 1980b, 58). Obtaining a life free from evil further ensures union with God, which in turn leads to the knowledge of the *energeia* of God. The Cappadocian Fathers affirm that even to understand the activity of God, a person needs to maintain moral discipline with godly life.

Concluding Remarks

Energeia or 'activity' plays significant role in the knowledge of every reality. To know the knowledge provided by *energeia*, sense experience becomes essential factor rather than the perception of the mind. However, in the case of divinity, the activity or operation of God does not reveal the essential nature of God. That is to say, the *energeia* of God cannot be regarded as the complete form of the knowledge of God; rather it serves partial knowledge about God but genuine knowledge. Neoplatonism, though rooted into an idealist form still affirms the reality of the *energeia* (the realist view). In other words, both *ousia* (Plato) and *energeia* (Aristotle) are put together in a fashionable manner, which is again engineered by mystical elements. More specifically, in the concept of the 'One', Plotinus blends the universality of Plato and the particularity of Aristotle in the sense that the essence of the One which is universal to *Nous* and World-Soul is presented beyond comprehension; and the operations of the One reveal in particular matters can be known by sense organs. The Cappadocian Fathers, being Neoplatonists stand for idealist view and affirm the incomprehensibility of the *ousia* of God. Nevertheless, they still believe the revelation of God's attributes through the activity of God provides the knowledge of God. In order to understand the operation of God, the Neoplatonists, Cappadocian Fathers prescribe the need of obtaining a good moral discipline or keeping one's life distance from evil. Succinctly speaking, the divine *energeia* is not limited to philosophic realism as the doctrine of divine *energeia* holds that the activity of God does not reveal the *ousia* of God, and not limited to philosophic idealism for the fact that the doctrine recognizes the genuineness of the knowledge of God derived from the activity of God.

Notes

- [1] Plato reconciled the argument between Heraclitus' view of impermanence of everything which momentarily change into its opposite, and the permanency of the homogenous traits such as being and non-being developed by Parmenides. Plato held the view that the forms or ideas of a thing remain permanent whereas the appearance of a thing goes on changing. In his *Theory of Forms*, Plato authenticated Heraclitus' *becoming* theory and Parmenides' theory of *being* by employing both theories in developing the knowledge of 'particularity' and 'universality' respectively. For he declared, particularity kept on changing but universality remained constant.
- [2] Eunomius is one of the fourth century's heretics. He was a student of Amanuesis of Aetius who has deeply rooted in Arianism. Later on, the Anomean Arians were called Eunomians instead of Aetians. Though Arius advocates the incomprehensibility of God, the neo-Arian Eunomians advocate the complete comprehensibility of the Divine nature. Eunomius, one of the prominent followers of Aetius develops *idealism* that mind could comprehend the full knowledge of God. Eunomius describes God as 'unbegotten' (*agennētos*) which is the very essence of God himself. He further holds the view that the unbegottenness of God (*ousia*) cannot be shared to others. To him, if Jesus Christ is claimed to be the begotten, he cannot be God as the *ousia* of God cannot be shared. Being deeply rooted into Arianism, Eunomius asserts the absolute unlikeness of the Being of the Father and of the Son. For him, the Father is superior and the Son is inferior. The Son's essence is not like that of the Father. The Father's essence is unbegotten or self-existent but the Son's essence is begotten or proceeded from the Father. Eunomius teaches that God is Absolute Being and is Unbegotten. The Son is begotten from God and therefore has beginning. God is beginningless. Eunomius teaches the Son is begotten from the Father and the Holy Ghost is proceeded from the only begotten Son. Eunomius keeps God the Father inconceivable and

out of reach by any means. He also keeps the Son and the Holy Spirit lower to the Father.

- [3] Neoplatonism is a reinterpreted form of Platonic philosophy founded by Plotinus (204–269 AD) in the third century AD. It is a synthesis of different philosophical tradition such as Platonism, Aristotelian philosophy, Stoics and religious mysticism. In many ways Plotinus reproduces the thought of Plato in different fashion. There are lot of Aristotelian insights in Neoplatonism. The Aristotelian doctrines of matter and form, potency and act are applied by Plotinus. Moreover, the Aristotelian epistemology is employed in cognition of the mind in connection to the material world. In this regard, Neoplatonism can be regarded as both philosophy and a religious belief system. Other Neoplatonist philosophers are Porphyry and Proclus. Categorically, Neoplatonism stands for an idealist type of philosophy.
- [4] Luther takes Exodus 33: 20-23 as biblical basis for incomprehensibility of the glory of God by human intellectual faculty – wherein God told Moses, “You cannot see my face; for no one shall see me and live... See, there is a place by me where you shall stand on the rock; and while the glory passes by I will put you in a cleft of the rock, I will cover you with the hand until I have passed by; then I will take away my hand, and you shall see my back; but my face shall not be seen.

Bibliography

- Aristotle. 1891. *Metaphysics*. Translated by John H. M’Mahon. London: George Bell and Sons.
- Basil. 1951. *Letters Volume I*. Translated by Sister Agnes Clare Way. New York: Fathers of the Church.
- Basil. 1955. *Letters Volume II*. Translated by Sister Agnes Clare Way. New York: Fathers of the Church.
- Bradshaw, David. 2004. *Aristotle East and West: Metaphysics and Division of Christendom*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bradshaw, David. 2018. “The Concept of Divine Energies,” <http://www.uky.edu/~dbradsh/> (17 Jan 2018).

- Cornford, F. M. 1960. *Plato's Theory of Knowledge*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ferrarin, Alfredo. 2001. *Hegel and Aristotle*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, Adam. 1957. *Plato and the Christians*. London: SCM Press.
- Garvie, A. E. 1931. "The Synthesis of History, Experience, and Reason in the 'Knowledge of God'". In: *The Expository Times* xliii/8, December: 107.
- George, K.M. 1994. *The Silent Roots: Orthodox Perspectives on Christian Spirituality*. Geneva: WCC Publications.
- Gracia, Jorge J. E. eds. 2003. *The Classics of Western Philosophy: A Reader's Guide*. USA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gregorios, Paulos Mar. 1980a. *Cosmic Man: The Divine Presence*. Kottayam: Sophia Publications.
- Gregorios, Paulos Mar. 1980b. *The Human Presence: An Orthodox View of Nature*. Madras: The Christian Literature Service.
- Gustafson, James Walter & Joseph B. Ongyango-Okello. 2007. *The Quest for Truth: An Introduction to Philosophy*. Sixth edition. Massachusetts: Proclaim Publications.
- Hirschberger, Johannes. 1976. *A Short History of Western Philosophy*. Translated by Jeremy Moiser. Guildford and London: Lutterworth Press.
- Horton, Michael. 2018. "The Doctrine of the Divine Energies," <https://wspapers.wordpress.com/2010/02/25/the-patristic-doctrine-of-the-divine-energies/> (17 Jan 2018).
- Jaeger, W. 1934. *Aristotle: Fundamentals of the History of his Development*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Kadai, Heino O. 1999. "Luther's Theology of the Cross". In: *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 63/3, July: 179, 186.
- Kariatlis, Philip. 2012. "Dazzling Darkness: The Mystical or Theophanic Theology of St. Gregory of Nyssa". In: *Phronema* 27/2: 103.
- Knowles, David. 1962. *The Evolution of Medieval Thought*. New York: Vintage Books.

-
- Küng, Hans. 1976. *On Being a Christian*. Translated by Edward Quinn. London: Sons & Company and Doubleday & Company.
 - Mayer, Frederick. 1976. *A History of Modern Philosophy*. New Delhi: Eurasia.
 - McGrath, Alister E. 1990. *Luther's Theology of the Cross*. UK 7 USA: Blackwell Publishers.
 - Nazianzen. 1955. "Theological Oration". In: *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol 7*. Translated and edited by Philip Schaff & Henry Wace. Grand Rapid, Michigan: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
 - Nazianzus. 1955a. "Oration 23.3". In: *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol 7*. Translated and edited by Philip Schaff & Henry Wace. Grand Rapid, Michigan: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
 - Nazianzus. 1955b. "Theological Oration XXVIII". In: *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol 7*. Translated and edited by Philip Schaff & Henry Wace. Grand Rapid, Michigan: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
 - Nyssa. n.d. "Against Eunomius Book 1". In: *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol 5*. Edited by Philip Schaff & Henry Wace. Grand Rapid, Michigan: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
 - Panthanmackel. 1999. *George Coming and Going, Vol 1*. Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporation.
 - Patrick, G. T. W. 1935. *Introduction to Philosophy*. Revised edition. USA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
 - Philip, Bijesh. 2015. *St. Basil the Great and the Globalized India*. Delhi: ISPK.
 - Souza, Denis D'. 2010. "Neoplatonism". In: *ACPI Encyclopedia Philosophy, Vol II*. Edited by Johnson J. Puthenpurackal. Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporation.
 - Wolf, William J. 1955. *Man's Knowledge of God*. New York: Doubleday & Company.