



Eastern Christian Approaches to Philosophy

Edited by
James Siemens · Joshua Matthan Brown

palgrave
macmillan

Eastern Christian Approaches to Philosophy

James Siemens • Joshua Matthan Brown
Editors

Eastern Christian Approaches to Philosophy

palgrave
macmillan

Editors

James Siemens
School of History, Archaeology, and
Religion
Cardiff University
Cardiff, UK

Joshua Matthan Brown
Department of Philosophy
Messiah University
Mechanicsburg, PA, USA

ISBN 978-3-031-10761-0 ISBN 978-3-031-10762-7 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10762-7>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2022

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration: funkyfood London - Paul Williams / Alamy Stock Photo

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG.

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to Amy Invernizzi at Palgrave Macmillan for believing in this project, and for showing great patience with us as we worked to overcome significant obstacles and setbacks. Additionally, we deeply appreciate the helpful recommendations and advice we received from our esteemed colleagues Yujin Nagasawa, Augustine Cassidy, Elizabeth Theokritoff, and Brandon Gallaher, as well as the insightful input we received from several anonymous reviewers. Furthermore, we would like to express our gratitude to the exceptional philosophers who laboured day and night to produce the contents of this book. We are truly honoured to have partnered with such fantastic and talented people. Sadly, due to the complications of a worldwide pandemic (and, in one case, an intense battle with cancer) several of our original contributors were unable to meet the submission deadline. It would be remiss of us, therefore, if we did not offer a special thanks to Clemena Antonova, Nathan Placencia, Tyler Dalton McNabb, and Michael DeVito for swooping in at the last minute and producing superb contributions in a very short amount of time. Last but not least, we would like to thank our longsuffering and very large families (seriously, we have like fourteen children between us!) for supporting us as we worked on this project. We love you guys with all of our hearts.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| Joshua Matthan Brown and James Siemens | |
| Part I Metaphilosophy | 13 |
| 2 St Ephrem and the Pursuit of Wisdom | 15 |
| Andrew Hayes | |
| 3 The Emergence of the Scholastic Attitude Towards Philosophy in Greek Patristic Thought | 39 |
| Anna Zhyrkova | |
| Part II Philosophical Theology and Metaphysics | 65 |
| 4 What We Can and Cannot Say: An Apophatic Response to Atheism | 67 |
| Joshua Matthan Brown | |
| 5 Divine Impassibility in Eastern Patristic Thought: Origen of Alexandria and Gregory Thaumaturgus | 95 |
| James Loxley Compton | |

| | | |
|-----------------|---|------------|
| 6 | Gregory of Nyssa on the Individuation of Actions and Events | 123 |
| | Beau Branson | |
| Part III | Epistemology and Philosophy of Language | 149 |
| 7 | Warranted Eastern Christian Belief: Extending Plantinga's Extended AC Model | 151 |
| | Tyler Dalton McNabb and Michael DeVito | |
| 8 | The Mystery of Words: Orthodox Theology and Philosophy of Language | 171 |
| | Christoph Schneider | |
| Part IV | Ecological Philosophy and Bioethics | 197 |
| 9 | Agency and Responsibility: Ecologically Inflected Insights from the Syriac Tradition | 199 |
| | Christina M. Gschwandtner | |
| 10 | Eastern Roman Theology and Its Philosophical Insights for Transhumanist and Transgender Understandings of the Body | 227 |
| | E. Brown Dewhurst | |
| Part V | Social and Political Philosophy | 257 |
| 11 | Christian Philosophy as a Philosophy of Crisis: Re-reading Florensky in the Twenty-First Century | 259 |
| | Clemena Antonova | |

| | | |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 12 | Race in the Afterlife: An Eastern Christian Approach | 281 |
| | Nathan Placencia | |
| 13 | <i>Theosis</i> and Human Rights: Two Orthodox Approaches | 303 |
| | Nathaniel Wood | |
| | Index | 327 |

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Clemina Antonova read art history at the universities of Edinburgh and Oxford. She works on topics relating to the art of the icon, Russian critiques of the image with a focus on Pavel Florensky (1882-1937), and the role of religion in modernity. She has published two books—*Space, Time, and Presence in the Icon: Seeing the World with the Eyes of God* (Ashgate, 2010) and *Visual Thought in Russian Religious Philosophy: Pavel Florensky's Theory of the Icon* (Routledge, 2020). Her articles have come out in *Sobornost*, *Cithara*, *Leonardo*, etc. Recently, Clemina guest-curated the exhibition 'Icons for Our Time: Orthodox Art from around the World' at the Museum of Russian Icons, USA (14 October 2021-3 April 2022). At present, she is the Research Director of the Eurasia in Global Dialogue Programme at the Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna, Austria.

Beau Branson is currently Associate Professor of Philosophy at Brescia University in Owensboro, Kentucky. He completed his PhD at the University of Notre Dame under Richard Cross with a dissertation focusing on the logic and metaphysics involved in St Gregory of Nyssa's defence of the doctrine of the Trinity. His research continues to be centred on the philosophy of the early Church Fathers, lying at the intersection of ancient philosophy, patristic theology, and contemporary metaphysics. By bringing the rigor of contemporary logic and analytic metaphysics to bear on philosophical issues in patristics scholarship, he hopes to show how both analytic philosophy of religion and historical theology can benefit from a deeper engagement with one another. For more information on his

research, including links to papers and videos, visit his website at beau-branson.com.

Joshua Matthan Brown recently obtained his doctorate in philosophy from the University of Birmingham (UK). His research interests include the eutaxiological argument for God's existence, the coherence of apophatic theism, the epistemology of brute facts, and bringing Eastern Christian thinkers into conversation with contemporary philosophy. Currently, he is an adjunct lecturer in philosophy at Messiah University. Prior to this, he was an academic fellow at the Centre for Applied Theology and a research assistant for the Pantheism & Panentheism Project. He has published in such journals as the *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, *Religious Studies*, and the *International Journal of Philosophy and Theology*.

E. Brown Dewhurst is a post-doctoral researcher at Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München, where they are working on a project entitled 'The Absence of Sex and Gender in Early Byzantine Theology'. The project sets out to revisit the theology of agenderlessness and consider its impact on expressions of gender in early Christian monasticism. It also considers the importance of these findings as a contribution toward the study of LGBTQA+ history. She completed her doctorate at Durham University (UK) with the thesis *Revolution in the Microcosm: Love and Virtue in the Cosmological Ethics of St Maximus the Confessor*. Their primary area of interest is Greek Patristics and its relevance for contemporary ethics. She specialises in Maximus the Confessor and Gregory of Nyssa, with ethical topics of interest being anarchism, environmentalism, and bioethics.

James Loxley Compton is a lecturer in the department of philosophy at Auburn University. He is a graduate of St Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary and received his PhD from the University of Birmingham (UK). He works in philosophy of religion and specialises in concepts of God in late antiquity and the Middle Ages. He has a particular interest in mediaeval Muslim arguments for the existence of God. He co-chairs the Auburn Philosophy and Religion Workshop and is an advisor for the philosophy and religion minor at Auburn University.

Michael DeVito is a PhD candidate at the University of Birmingham (UK) working under the supervision of professors Jussi Suikkanen and Nikk Effingham. His dissertation focuses on the longstanding problem of divine foreknowledge and human free will, exploring appeals to paradox

and the utilisation of subclassical logic in an attempt to provide novel solutions to the problem. He is also the author of several academic journal articles.

Christina M. Gschwandtner is Professor of Philosophy and Brian and Kathleen MacLean fellow at Fordham University. She obtained a doctorate in theology from Durham University (UK) and received her doctorate in philosophy from DePaul University. While she specialises in continental philosophy of religion, she also has interests in the history of philosophy, environmental ethics, phenomenology, and liturgical theology. She has authored numerous books and journal articles, including *Welcoming Finitude: Toward a Phenomenology of Orthodox Liturgy* (Fordham, 2019), *Postmodern Apologetics? Arguments for God in Contemporary Philosophy* (Fordham, 2012), and *Reading Religious Ritual with Ricoeur: Between Fragility and Hope* (Lexington Press, 2021).

Andrew Hayes is Division Dean for Liberal Studies and Associate Professor of Theology at the University of St Thomas in Houston. He specialises particularly in asceticism, spirituality, and theological poetics in the thought of St Ephrem the Syrian (fourth century), with a focus on the intersection between Ephrem's literary forms and his approach to the knowledge of God. His recent publications include an annotated translation of Ephrem's Metrical Discourses on Faith (Peeters, 2020).

Tyler Dalton McNabb is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at St Francis University. He obtained his doctorate in philosophy from the University of Glasgow, specialising in philosophy of religion, epistemology, comparative philosophy, and analytic theology. He is the author of numerous books and articles, including *Classical Theism and Buddhism: Connecting Metaphysical and Ethical Systems* (2022), *Religious Epistemology* (2018), and *Plantingian Religious Epistemology and World Religions: Prospects and Problems* (2018).

Nathan Placencia is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Los Angeles Valley College. He works on topics in moral psychology, the philosophy of race, and the philosophy of religion. He recently published *Will There Be Races in Heaven?* (2021) and is working on a book investigating the moral psychology and social ontology of persons in the afterlife and a paper entitled 'Race Without Racism'. In addition to these projects, he has significant interests in Eastern Orthodox thought and practice, which he plans

to explore in his contribution to the second instalment of *Turning East: Contemporary Philosophers and the Ancient Christian Faith* (forthcoming).

Christoph Schneider is academic director and lecturer in philosophical theology at the Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies in Cambridge, England. He received his doctorate in philosophy from the University of Zürich and an MA from King's College London. His various research interests include Russian religious philosophy, philosophy of religion, epistemology, and philosophy of language. He is the author of numerous articles and is the editor of the superb book *Theology and Philosophy in Eastern Orthodoxy* (2019).

James Siemens is an honorary research fellow in the School of History, Archaeology, and Religion at Cardiff University in Wales. Additionally, he is one of the founding directors of the Centre for Applied Theology, an international school of theology and philosophy based in the UK. He undertook his initial undergraduate work at the University of Manitoba in Religious Studies and History. He later undertook a second undergraduate degree in theology, followed by a Master of Divinity at McGill University in Montréal. He is the author of a monograph entitled *The Christology of Theodore of Tarsus* (Brepols), and numerous peer-reviewed articles in such journals as the *Heythrop Journal*, *The Scottish Journal of Theology*, *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*, and the *Journal for Late Antique Culture and Religion*. He is also a priest of the Archdiocese of Russian Orthodox Churches in Western Europe.

Nathaniel Wood is Associate Director of the Orthodox Christian Studies Centre of Fordham University. He completed his PhD in systematic theology at Fordham University and a Master of Theological Studies at Emory University. He specialises in modern Orthodox theology, political theology, and Russian religious philosophy and has published primarily on Christian theological engagement with liberal democracy and human rights theory. He is managing editor of *The Journal of Orthodox Christian Studies* and the online editorial forum Public Orthodoxy and is a Senior Fellow in the 'Orthodoxy and Human Rights' research project at Fordham.

Anna Zhyrkova is professor of philosophy at the Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow. She received her PhD in Patristic Theology and habilitation degree in Ancient Philosophy. She specialises in the field of Neoplatonism and in Greek Patristic philosophical thought. She was awarded grants from Poland's National Science Centre for studying the

philosophical outcomes of the Christological debates of the fifth and sixth centuries and is a member of a team working on a new Polish edition of Plotinus' *Enneads* within the National Program of Development of Humanities established by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of Poland.



Introduction

Joshua Matthan Brown and James Siemens

The volume in your hands presents a number of essays on different facets of philosophy in the context of Eastern Christianity. That this is so, however, gives rise to a number of questions. What, for example, is meant by the term ‘Eastern Christianity’? How is philosophy in relation to Eastern Christianity different to philosophy in the West? And why should we dedicate our intellectual energies to understanding it? It is not as if the Christian world would be unaware of a certain diversity of approaches to philosophy; those familiar with theological history, meanwhile, will surely know that the earliest developments in doctrine come about as a result of apologists making sense of Christian claims using the language and methods of Greek philosophy. For all that, however, there is a heavy bias—at least among anglophone philosophers—to assuming that the philosophical enterprise is an inherently Western one, and that whatever conclusions might be drawn as part of that enterprise must inherently correspond with customary Western Christian conclusions. So, this volume is an attempt to

J. M. Brown (✉)

Department of Philosophy, Messiah University, Mechanicsburg, PA, USA

J. Siemens

School of History, Archaeology, and Religion, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK
e-mail: siemensj@cardiff.ac.uk

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature
Switzerland AG 2022

J. Siemens, J. M. Brown (eds.), *Eastern Christian Approaches to
Philosophy*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10762-7_1

redress the matter, and bring to the English-speaking world's attention a sample of the sort of thinking going on in the Christian East; and, importantly, to bring this thinking into conversation with contemporary philosophy.

But first, we need to define what we mean by 'Eastern Christianity'.

THE CONCEPT OF 'EASTERN CHRISTIANITY'

There are, in fact, numerous Churches across the Eastern Christian world, including the primarily Byzantine Eastern Orthodox Churches; the Oriental Orthodox Churches representing various ancient rites, separated from their Eastern Orthodox counterparts as a consequence of theological and linguistic differences at the third and fourth ecumenical councils of the fifth century; and the Eastern Catholic Churches which, aside from one or two exceptions, were once either Eastern Orthodox or Oriental Orthodox, but which took the decision to enter into communion with the Catholic Church represented by the See of Rome at different points from the fifteenth century on. As different as each of these Churches might be, however, what they hold in common is an intellectual, theological heritage characterised by proximity to their Semitic birthplace, formation in a predominately Hellenic milieu, and their use of Greek philosophy in the elucidation of Christian ideas. But one of these features stands out as requiring further explanation, as what it represents for Eastern Christianity also bears on its relation to philosophy. We speak of the Semitic dimension.

That Christianity first emerges in Jewish soil is obvious, if often overlooked. That it did, however, means that it would be forever shaped in its approach to philosophy by its own Jewishness, and particularly a late Second Temple form forced to 'overcome' Greek influence. Indeed, the zeal of Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes in imposing Greek cultic practice on Judea in the second century B.C. seems to have had the effect of galvanising later Jewish determination to maintain intellectual and ritual purity at least through to the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70. Yet for all this, we should not assume an unconditional dichotomy between Judaism, its Christian offspring, and philosophy. It does signify the potential for tension, though, especially for Christians and Jews in diaspora forced to confront more acutely the challenges of a cosmopolitan empire and the emergence of Gnostic sects. We can conclude that what historical theologians call 'Jewish-Christianity'—that is, its first- and early

second-century form still closely connected with the wider Jewish tradition—was not an ideal locus for philosophical development. That would come later.

Nevertheless, by asking what Athens has to do with Jerusalem, second-century Church Father, Tertullian of Carthage, was expressing a critical question for Christians. Christianity, after all, as an heir to Jewish temple and synagogue, was a religion of revelation; it was not a religion of speculation. Indeed, the suggestion that philosophy might be part of the hermeneutical lens through which the experience of Jesus Christ could be read and understood was at least an incongruity, or worse. Or so it was perceived by some. The fact that G.L. Prestige, in the second part of the introduction to his book *God in Patristic Thought*, felt it needful to declare, ‘I must make clear my fundamental outlook. I do not believe that the importation of Hellenic rationalism, to expound and explain the facts of Christian history, was illegitimate. Finite minds can never adequately theorise the infinite’ (Prestige, 1964 p. xiii) suggests that the Christian tradition has never come to a unanimous attitude toward the marriage of philosophy and the terms of revealed faith. Against Prestige, meanwhile, is the fourth-century example of the great hymnographer, St Ephrem the Syrian, who denounced Greek philosophical method in relation to theology—preferring, rather, to cast his own, inherently Semitic, theological imagination in poetic form.¹ Yet, despite the apparent dichotomy between the two, there can be little doubt that the Apostle Paul, as a man of the Greco-Roman world of his time, was influenced by Platonic ideas and that, within two generations, Christian thinkers beginning with the likes of Justin Martyr were explicitly drawing on their Hellenic philosophical heritage to explain and further elucidate Christian ideas.

With the benefit of hindsight, there was an inevitability to this turn of events. For even at the most primitive stage in their respective developments, doctrines like the Trinity and the Incarnation presented difficulties that the language of simpler concepts just could not accommodate. So, for example, how God in his unity could be revealed as a plurality of persons, or how the witness of a human Jesus could be reconciled with a simultaneous divine nature: these fundamental Christian ideas each pose obvious hurdles to easy comprehension and linguistic conciliation. Consequently, the distinct implementation of philosophy in addressing

¹Although, as we shall see in Chap. 2, St Ephrem’s critique of Greek philosophy was not a wholesale repudiation of the pursuit of wisdom and the life of the mind.

such challenges might at first be seen in apologists such as Justin Martyr, Theophilus of Antioch, and Clement of Alexandria, but it is arguably in Origen of Alexandria that it bears its most remarkable fruit. The legacy of these pioneers (however shared between East and West the figures themselves might be), deploying philosophy as it does in the service of theology, is that the Eastern Christian intellectual tradition becomes virtually indistinguishable from the philosophical enterprise for a long time to come.

Despite such an auspicious beginning, however, it would not be unreasonable for the contemporary Western reader to assume that the Eastern Christian world had forsaken philosophy at some point, as so much recent literature produced by the Orthodox has been primarily historical-theological in nature. Ironically, this is due—at least in part—to a movement in Russia that intentionally withdrew from things it perceived as having been drawn from the Western, Latin tradition, including—and especially—a rationalistic approach to questions of faith. So, in the first half of the nineteenth century, the Slavophiles, a group of intellectuals in Moscow, set out a view of Russia and its culture that they believed was irreconcilable with Western values and which, as far as it concerned Orthodoxy, eschewed what it cast as Western rationalism, individualism, and materialism. A corollary to this was the elevation of aesthetic practice and an emphasis on the thought of the ancient Church: the latter of which Georges Florovsky rendered a hundred years later as the ‘neo-patristic synthesis’.

A prominent, if slightly older, contemporary of Florovsky and other proponents of this neo-patristic synthesis was Sergius Bulgakov, who, although sometimes enumerated among their number, was also subject to their criticism. Florovsky was particularly provoked by Bulgakov, due in part to the latter’s sophiology—born, as it was, on an intellectual plain that entailed some openness to the Western philosophical tradition. But Florovsky also felt that Bulgakov’s openness to greater ecumenical cooperation with non-Orthodox Christians, as limited as it was, went too far. This was despite Florovsky’s own commitment to the ecumenical movement. So, in contending with their disagreements, Florovsky and Bulgakov can also be set against one another by the same people who group them together under the banner of the neo-patristic synthesis. And this can, in turn, leave the enquirer bereft of anyone to identify as a representative of Eastern Christian philosophy. Yet as curious as this paradox might seem, upon reflection it is not so confusing. For Bulgakov and Florovsky were both philosophers. They disagreed, but they also shared an interest in

being informed by patristic sources without being limited to the letter of a given source, and they believed in the reassertion of an authentically Eastern (read: Greco-Russian) theological mind and method. Both, it seems, may be looked to as representatives of Eastern Christian philosophy, even if the way in which they are categorised or eclipsed by controversy means that one or the other can end up neglected or obscured.

There is, undoubtedly, such a thing as Eastern Christian philosophy. It was the default means for thinking about the complexities of the Holy Trinity and the nature and work of Christ, almost from the dawn of the Christian religion. It impelled the Church's thought through the conciliar period: dominated, as most of the councils were, by questions specific to the Christian East, together with the language and method of philosophy to answer them. But a fog descended between East and West. Their respective development meant that they took on different shapes, and when, after centuries of little intellectual contact, the fog lifted, the West had affected a rationalism the East did not recognise (represented, of course, by Aquinas), while the East affected an asceticism in terms that did not figure in the West (Palamas being the herald). Then over the following centuries, even with the Palamite legacy to draw on, the East would fall under heavy Western influence, and much of what was characteristically Eastern was forgotten. The nineteenth century, however, saw the emergence of the Slavophiles in Russia, who sought to re-assert an authentic Orthodox identity over and against the Christian West, which included the rejection of what they saw as the Western intellectual presuppositions: individualism, rationalism, materialism, and authoritarianism. The Slavophile movement, in turn, prepared the ground for Florovsky and Bulgakov alike, the latter of whom especially represented a new Russian religious philosophy, even while the two shared similar concerns. The philosophical landscape in the Christian East ever since, though, has largely been dominated by them—either in terms of those who have followed and repeated, those who have sought to respond critically to what they represented, or those who are not yet satisfied that their deposit has been sufficiently understood. That is not to say that there has been no Eastern Christian philosophy outside of the Russian sphere; it is only to say that the Russian enterprise has loomed largest in terms of what we have received in the English-speaking world.

Perhaps it is indicative of the diverse, and often disparate, nature of the Eastern Christian world that we should be limited in what we recognise as Eastern Christian philosophy. There are simply too many languages and

traditions which, for much of history, have been forgotten in the West, due to a combination of historical, social, political, and geographic factors. Yet even these traditions—Oriental and other Eastern Orthodox alike—have felt the impact of the neo-patristic synthesis and the new Russian religious philosophy. It is clear, however, that there is more to be discovered. Among converts and ‘cradle’ Orthodox alike, there are many philosophers seeking to contend with the challenges of the contemporary world. It is the intention of this volume to foster some of those, to contribute to the proliferation of Eastern Christian voices in the English-speaking world especially, and to engender a conversation that is richer in the sources it might reference than would be the case were ‘Christian philosophy’ simply equated to ‘Western’.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

The volume is structured as follows. Part I primarily focuses on *metaphilosophy*; which is to say, it focuses on the nature, aims, and methods of philosophy from an Eastern Christian perspective. As we noted above, there is a heavy bias to assuming that the philosophical enterprise is an inherently Western one, and that whatever conclusions might be drawn as part of that enterprise must inherently correspond with customary Western Christian conclusions. One of the major goals of this section is to challenge this assumption by showing how philosophy was creatively appropriated by several significant ancient Eastern Christian thinkers. A careful examination of how ancient Syrian and Greek Christians engaged with late antique thought, to produce original ideas, both provides justification for the project of Eastern Christian philosophy and, importantly, invaluable insights into how the Eastern tradition might fruitfully engage with philosophy today.

In Chap. 2, Andrew Hayes explores the thought of St Ephrem the Syrian who is often, and quite mistakenly, believed to have been a proponent of anti-intellectualism or *fideism*. To the contrary, Hayes demonstrates that despite some of his criticisms of Greek thought, St Ephrem heavily engaged with, reacted to, and borrowed from many ideas and themes found in late antique philosophy. He does this by analysing St Ephrem’s understanding of the purpose of cognitive activity. Hayes shows that, for St Ephrem, the pursuit of wisdom is the very aim of our cognitive faculties. He also explores the role of sensation or perception in St Ephrem’s thought and explains how his ideas anticipate and even offer

fresh insights into Marshall McLuhan's theories about media ecology. In so doing, Hayes not only provides us with a striking overview of St Ephrem's approach to philosophy, but with an example to emulate, a roadmap for how Eastern Christian thought might fruitfully be brought into conversation with contemporary philosophy.

In Chap. 3, Anna Zhyrkova challenges the conventional narrative that often pits a rational Christian West against a mystical Christian East. She does so by showing that the Scholastic stance towards the relationship between philosophy and theology was already at work informing the Christological debates of the sixth century that took place in the Eastern part of Christendom. Specifically, she demonstrates that the distinctive features of Scholastic philosophy can be found in the writings of John the Grammarian, Leontius of Byzantium, and Leontius of Jerusalem. Through a careful examination of how they appropriated Neoplatonic and Stoic philosophical concepts to address Christology, she not only provides historical justification for the project of Eastern Christian philosophy but provides yet another insightful look at how ancient Eastern Christians creatively engaged with the intelligentsia of their day to develop original solutions to pressing problems.

In Part II we shift our attention to matters of metaphysics and philosophical theology. This section will be of particular interest to those working within the fields of philosophy of religion, analytic theology, and ontology. In Chap. 4, Joshua Matthan Brown contrasts the concept of God assumed by most analytic philosophers, what he refers to as *theistic personalism*, with that of the apophatic conception of God endorsed by Eastern Christian thinkers. He argues that the most powerful and economical response to contemporary arguments for atheism is to reject theistic personalism and adopt apophatic theism. Apophatic theists believe there is a lot we *cannot* say about God, taking the divine nature to be completely ineffable. Brown develops a coherent account of divine ineffability and provides reasons for adopting this oft misunderstood view. Importantly, he draws upon apophatic theology, and its commitment to divine ineffability, to proffer an undercutting defeater for virtually every contemporary argument for the nonexistence of God. He also anticipates and responds to several significant objections.

In Chap. 5, James Loxley Compton dives deeper into the Eastern Christian conception of God by exploring the doctrine of divine impassibility. Compton notes that there has been a '*passibilist* turn' in Western philosophy which has become hostile to the traditional notion that God is

impassible. With very few exceptions, the contemporary debate over divine impassibility has taken place in what he calls a ‘Western arena’ with very little input from the Eastern tradition. To fill this lacuna, Compton draws upon the resources of the Eastern Christian tradition to offer an original response to contemporary critiques of the doctrine of divine impassibility. He does this by exploring two key thinkers, Origen of Alexandria and Gregory Thaumaturgus, and bringing a nuanced discussion of their concept of impassibility into conversation with contemporary philosophy of religion.

Following this, in Chap. 6, Beau Branson rounds out the previous two chapters, by exploring the doctrine of *inseparable operations ad extra* in the writings of St Gregory of Nyssa. This doctrine says that all the activities of the three hypostases of the Trinity, at least insofar as they relate to things outside of (‘ad extra’) the Trinity, are not only qualitatively identical but numerically identical. Importantly, Branson focuses his attention on Gregory’s theory of action and the individuation of events that emerges from his theological defence of the doctrine of *inseparable operations ad extra*. Through a heavy engagement with contemporary metaphysics, Branson shows that Gregory’s philosophy of action is not only coherent, anticipating current trends in the ontology of actions and events, but may provide novel solutions to longstanding problems in this field.

In Part III we focus our attention on epistemology and philosophy of language. This section will be of special interest to scholars and students working on religious epistemology and theories of meaning. In Chap. 7, Tyler Dalton McNabb and Michael DeVito develop a ‘thoroughly original and Orthodox model for how Christian belief, and, even specifically Eastern Christian belief, can be warranted’. They do this by creatively bringing recent work on religious experience, in the context of the Divine Liturgy, into conversation with Alvin Plantinga’s well-known explication of Reformed Epistemology. What emerges is a distinctly Eastern Christian approach to warranted Christian belief, that modifies and, arguably, improves upon Plantinga’s original model.

In Chap. 8, Christoph Schneider sets about the task of developing a compelling Eastern Christian philosophy of language. His point of departure is what he calls the *triadic* understanding of semiosis which is grounded in the doctrine of the Trinity. According to this distinctively Christian *schema*, a convincing theory of meaning must take into consideration the object in the world that a term or linguistic sign refers to (i.e., *reference*), the relationship between the sign and the sign-user (i.e., *use*),

and the sense or aspect under which the object is being interpreted (i.e., *sense*). According to Schneider, the twentieth-century's re-discovery of the pragmatic dimension of meaning, which heavily emphasises the relationship between a sign and a sign-user, may lead to an uncritical acceptance of a post-Kantian finitism that is unamenable, and even hostile to Orthodox religious language and metaphysics. Drawing heavily on the writings of Russian religious philosophers such as Soloviev, Florensky, and Bulgakov, Schneider sets out to show how Orthodox philosophers might respond to this challenge, paving the way for future work in this important area.

In Part IV we turn our attention to ecological philosophy and bioethics. Readers who are broadly interested in moral philosophy and applied ethics, as well as those more specifically concerned with ecological philosophy and Christian bioethics, will find this section illuminating. In Chap. 9, Christina M. Gschwandtner looks to the Syriac tradition for ecologically inflected insights into the problem of agency and responsibility. One significant issue vexing environmental ethicists and philosophers of ecology is that environmental problems, such as water pollution and climate change, seem to transcend the standard categories of individual agency and responsibility that traditional ethics is largely concerned with. Gschwandtner contends that the Eastern Christian tradition may provide the resources for a notion of agency that avoids the problems typically associated with standard treatments of agency in the West. To develop her thesis, she draws upon an oft neglected dimension of the Eastern tradition, namely, Syriac hymnography.

In Chap. 10, E. Brown Dewhurst considers what philosophical insights we can glean from Byzantine theology, regarding transhumanist and transgender conceptions of the body. She accomplishes this by, first, carefully exploring St Macrina the Younger, St Gregory of Nyssa, and St Maximus the Confessor's writings on pre-lapsarian and resurrected bodies. After thoroughly developing their concept of the human body, she draws upon their work to engage with two closely related issues. First, to engage with the notion that sex is an unchanging and essential phenomenon, and second, to interact with transhumanist desires to alter the body or give it access to 'beyond human' capabilities. Dewhurst shows that the desire to alter one's body is often met by a specific form of criticism, generated by normative belief in what should and shouldn't be considered an acceptable change introduced into one's body. According to Dewhurst, the grounds for such normativity are rejected in the theologies of SS Macrina, Gregory, and Maximus.

We conclude the volume, in Part V, by focusing on matters of social and political philosophy. Those with interests in modern social philosophy, the philosophy of race, and human rights will be particularly drawn to this section. In Chap. 11, Clemena Antonova brings the highly original thinking of the Russian polymath, Pavel Florensky, to bear on the looming sense of social and political crisis permeating the first decades of the twenty-first century. In her exploration of Florensky's thought, Clemena defends two contentious claims. First, she argues that, in contrast to what many scholars believe, Florensky was not a theologian but, rather, a religious philosopher. Second, she argues that much of Florensky's work can be thought of as translating theological language into the language of philosophy. She especially focuses on his work translating the theological dogma of *consubstantiality* into the Russian philosophical concept of *full unity*. After developing these ideas, Clemena draws upon them to address contemporary issues related to the sense of crisis pervading the twenty-first century; namely, theories of multiple modernity, secularisation, and communitarian philosophy.

In Chap. 12, Nathan Placencia addresses the problem of race in the afterlife. He begins by canvassing several major contemporary theories of race, namely, racialist accounts, skeptical accounts, socialrace theory, and minimalist accounts. After explicating these different conceptions of race, Placencia argues that only the minimalist account of race is compatible with Eastern Christianity. Building upon this argument, Placencia further demonstrates that the minimalist account of race is congruent with a strong current of Eastern Christian theology, as exemplified by St Theodore the Studite, which emphasises the embodied character of the afterlife. He concludes by carefully considering the implications of this view. Among other things, Placencia maintains that 'the existence of race in the afterlife avoids the racial homogeneity found in alternate accounts of heaven, it presents a moral challenge to those who seek racial reconciliation in this life or the next, and it gives us a perspective from which we can consider what minimalist races might offer humanity in a world without racism'.

In our final chapter, Chap. 13, Nathaniel Wood develops an Eastern Christian approach to human rights that is grounded in the crucial theological concept of *theosis*. Wood begins by acknowledging that Orthodox Christians have fallen behind their Catholic and Protestant counterparts when it comes to serious engagement with the challenges of political secularisation and liberalisation (issues that are closely related to the topic of

human rights). By and large, says Wood, the Orthodox reaction to liberalism, and especially to the concept of human rights, has been negative. This is especially true of the current patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church, Kirill of Moscow, who has expressed scepticism about the compatibility of human rights and Orthodox theology. In response to this, Wood turns to the religious philosophy of Vladimir Soloviev to develop a vision of human rights according to which rights are meant to assist human beings in the realisation of their deification, or union with God.

We shall conclude the introduction by addressing several potential concerns readers might have. The first concern regards how we have structured the volume. Ancient philosophers, historians, and those coming from a religious studies background may be worried that we have anachronistically used contemporary categories like ‘metaphilosophy’, ‘philosophy of religion’, ‘philosophy of language’, and so on and so forth to label the five parts of our book. We wish to assure the concerned reader that we, by no means, believe the Eastern Christian thinkers covered in this volume—especially the ancient Syriac and Greek patristic authors—would have divided up the various philosophical disciplines in the way that we have. It is important to remember, however, that this volume is not merely interested in historical critical analysis, exegesis, or hermeneutics. Its *primary* goal is to bring Eastern Christian thought into serious engagement with contemporary philosophy. It is to that end, and for the sake of attracting the attention of contemporary philosophers, that we decided to label each part of the book the way that we have. Indeed, we believe this is very much in keeping with the spirit of the Eastern Christian tradition, whose thinkers have always borrowed from and creatively engaged with the philosophy of their time to articulate an authentic Orthodox worldview.

The second concern has to do with several inconsistencies in language and style that the astute reader might notice throughout the volume. To cite but one example, some of our contributors (the present authors included) use the name ‘Soloviev’ whilst others prefer to use ‘Solovyov’ when referring to the great Russian religious philosopher. There are a number of minor inconsistencies similar to this throughout the book. These inconsistencies have occurred precisely because this book came about as a result of a rare collaboration of philosophers hailing from vastly different scholarly traditions. For example, Andrew Hayes and Anna Zhyrkova are scholars of late antique history and philosophy, Beau Branson and Tyler Dalton McNabb are analytic philosophers of religion, whereas contributors like Christina M. Gschwandtner and Clemena Antonova are

trained in continental philosophy. We believe these inconsistencies are inconsequential and have decided to retain them, rather than smooth everything out, precisely to highlight and, indeed, celebrate the monumental feat of bringing together such a diverse range of scholars to create this book.

REFERENCE

Prestige, G. L. (1964). *God in patristic thought*. S. P. C. K.

PART I

Metaphilosophy



St Ephrem and the Pursuit of Wisdom

Andrew Hayes

St Ephrem the Syrian (ca. 306–373), when encountered for the first time, strikes one as a unique figure in comparison to the Greek and Latin speaking fathers and to the classical philosophical tradition with which they critically engaged. For one thing, he wrote solely in his native Syriac, of whose poetic genres he was an undoubted master, with a skill that tinged even his prose with lyricism. The sophisticated biblical symbolism of his *madrāšē* and *mēmṛē* seems at first far removed in style and vocabulary from the treatises, handbooks, and dialogues of late antique philosophical discourse. He wrote nothing in Greek, as far as we know, and even left some remarks disparaging “Greek wisdom.” As a result, the recovery and publication of his authentic poetry (Griffith, 1989) was felt by many as a breath of fresh air: a glimpse into an alternative paradigm of patristic thought, one more biblical and semitic, quite different from the Hellenistic cultural matrix for which other fathers are known. Reactions to Ephrem’s unique qualities have varied from appreciative to critical, though the former have tended to predominate, particularly since Ephrem’s symbolic paradigm for theological thinking did not hinder him from defending the pro-Nicene view.

A. Hayes (✉)
University of St Thomas, Houston, TX, USA
e-mail: hayesaj@stthom.edu

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature
Switzerland AG 2022

J. Siemens, J. M. Brown (eds.), *Eastern Christian Approaches to
Philosophy*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10762-7_2

Viewed in the way just described, Ephrem's writings present a paradox. On the one hand, Ephrem excoriates in his poetry those whom he describes as "investigators" and "debaters." Much of his writing concerns the limits of human knowledge in the face of divine mystery. For this reason, some have regarded him as fideistic or anti-intellectual (Bruns, 1990). An even more widely accepted view has been that Ephrem was antagonistic to Greek learning and little Hellenised (Brock, 1982). On the other hand, scholars have subsequently established that he knew of, reacted to, and borrowed from late antique philosophical ideas, problems, and debates, particularly in his prose. Does he oppose Greek thought and culture or does he accept it? What, if anything, can this Aramaic poet theologian of the fourth century tell us about Eastern Christian approaches to philosophy?

Prior treatments of Ephrem's relationship to philosophy have focused mainly on his methods of thought or his conceptual sources. Yet, if we look instead at the *purpose* of cognitive activity as Ephrem understands it, we discover that Ephrem embraces the pursuit of wisdom as an ideal. Moreover, that embrace fits within the context of the debate over Christian wisdom occasioned by Julian the Apostate's revival of paganism, and, more importantly, within Hadot's paradigm of late ancient philosophy as a way of life.

Indeed, Ephrem reflects on the purpose of human existence in sapiential terms, he reads the book of nature to attain a totalizing perspective on God's relationship to the world (as an antidote for idolatry), and he integrates ascetic practice into this pursuit. Moreover, as we survey these themes, we notice a striking emphasis on and expansive understanding of sensation. The forming and shaping of perception becomes crucial, in Ephrem's view, to the pursuit of wisdom. For this reason, I argue, Ephrem's views on seeking wisdom echo and anticipate some of Marshall McLuhan's ideas about media ecology. The post-modern McLuhan thus offers new ways of reading the late ancient Ephrem and fresh insight into this perennial human quest.

EPHREM AND LATE ANTIQUE GREEK PHILOSOPHY: REORIENTING THE QUESTION

To establish that the pursuit of wisdom is an Ephremian ideal it will be helpful to contrast the orientation proposed here with three prior approaches. Each of these has tended to argue in terms of a hermeneutic of Ephrem's *methodology* or *sources*. Method and sources converge because

which sources Ephrem might use are felt to depend on his methodological commitments: can one, that is, use human reason logically to investigate divine mystery? If so, the philosophical texts and ideas of Hellenistic culture would likely be valid sources for theological discussion.

Previous Approaches: Ephrem's Way of Thinking

Ute Possekkel was the first to establish definitively that Ephrem used Greek philosophy in his writings, for the most part conceptually, though at least one instance of specific literary dependence on a now lost Platonist treatise against the Stoic doctrine of the incorporeals also emerged from her study (Possekkel, 1999, pp. 155–185). Agreeing with Griffith's assessment that many had attempted "to isolate Ephrem himself from direct contact with Greek thought, alleging that his theology is hellenophobic in principle" (Griffith, 1986, p. 26; quoted in Possekkel, 1999, p. 1), Possekkel aimed to correct this view. As she put it, "Ephrem's theology incorporates many concepts that originate from Greek philosophy" (Possekkel, 1999, p. 230). Moreover, these ideas derived from a number of different schools, regarding which he exercised critical judgment and selectivity. Possekkel also showed that many of these concepts belonged especially to the domains of philosophical cosmology and anthropology. Her conclusion was that though Ephrem's theology was unique, "his approach to theology was not. Like other patristic theologians, Ephrem availed himself of Greek philosophy" (Possekkel, 1999, p. 235).

Scott Johnson, writing after Possekkel, concurred and took a broader view. He began with Sebastian Brock's influential paradigm, according to which Syriac literature moved from antagonism against Greek culture, represented above all by Ephrem who identified it with paganism, toward assimilation of that culture, represented for instance by Philoxenus of Mabbugh's embrace of "philosophically oriented Greek theology" (Brock, 1982, pp. 17–34; on Philoxenus and Ephrem, in particular, see also Van Rompay, 2004, pp. 83–105). Yet, Johnson pointed out, the evidence we have for early Syriac literature does not precisely support Brock's influential paradigm. Rather, he notes, since the authors of the fourth century knew the Syriac literature of preceding generations, "It is difficult to imagine that, over the course of the later third and early fourth centuries, Syriac authors lost the innate acquaintance with Greek genres, ideas, and language that they displayed around 150–250 CE" (Introduction, 2015, p. 23). For this reason, he inclined to think that Ephrem's "poison of the

wisdom of the Greeks' quip ... may be a hostility aimed only at Greek pagan philosophy, which Ephrem seems to have known intimately" (Introduction, 2015, pp. 26–27). Johnson's conclusions suggest that Ephrem adopts not a blanket condemnation of Hellenic culture, but rather a targeted rejection of certain pagan philosophical tendencies. This becomes more plausible when one notices that, in the light of Ephrem's other references to the poison of false teaching, his objection to Greek wisdom refers specifically to the immoderate use of dialectic (*drāšā ... d-lā kaylā*). (See *SdF* 2.137–140; Beck, 1961b, p. 10; Comparable is Macrina as described by Gregory of Nyssa. see Pelikan, 1993, p. 19). Like other fathers, Ephrem seems willing to take some things from the Greek philosophical tradition, while rejecting others.

Kees den Biesen offered a different and more sweeping solution. Building on Tanios Bou Mansour and others, he explored Ephrem's similarities to "modern phenomenological method" (Den Biesen, 2006, pp. 35ff, 253–260). He argued that Ephrem developed his own specific way of thinking analogically and symbolically which, according to den Biesen, was more intelligent and sophisticated than the logical thinking of Greek philosophy. Thus he opposed Ephrem's inherently poetic analogical thinking to "logical thought" (Den Biesen, 2006, pp. 92–93).

Den Biesen sought to overcome the view that "symbolism and poetry were generally considered to be obstacles rather than the key to authentic theology" (Den Biesen, 2006, p. 16). Nevertheless, for den Biesen Ephrem's poetic "analogical way of thinking does not imply that he was unable or unwilling to use abstract concepts or logical argumentation" (emphasis mine; Den Biesen, 2006, p. 41). How then, are these two ways related? According to den Biesen,

Ephrem subordinates the use of clear terminology and logical reasoning to a more comprehensive and superior form of intelligence that is the driving force of his symbolism. He not only uses abstract philosophical concepts, but also develops a whole set of antithetical notions like "fear" and "love," "audacity" and "boldness", "simple-mindedness" and "simplicity," that ... represent genuine theological categories. (Den Biesen, 2006, p. 46)

These two modes constitute, in den Biesen's words, "two different but complementary modes of thought," logical and analogical (Den Biesen, 2006, p. 46). One philosophical concept in particular, namely discernment (*pūrṣānā*), plays a key role in this approach: it is that quality by which the mind navigates the inter-connected and nested analogical