THE DIVINE MIND

The development of Platonism is marked chiefly by the beginning of a metaphysic of mind, or *Geistmetaphysik*. This development provides the background for early Christian thought, especially the logos theology, through the establishment of thought as a metaphysical entity. The concepts of *arche* and *noos* are brought together.

There has been considerable discussion over the question of the divine mind. When did Platonic ideas first find their home in God? Antiochus and others have been named, but there is clear evidence for the concept much earlier. Both numbers and ideas are placed in the divine mind by Xenocrates. In the same writer we find the principles of the *stoicheion* theory by which all things are derived from an ultimate simplicity. The Monad is at the peak of reality, and is *noos* or mind. Xenocrates makes here a substantial modification to Plato for whom the one is beyond being and truth. God is number and mind, says Xenocrates, he is one, prior to all things, in all things and after all things, since all things derive from the one, are covered by the one and cease in the one. Thought is a metaphysical entity which contains the basis of reality.

The ideas of mind and Monad are found again, unambiguously, in Numenius where the first God is a pure unity while the second God is twofold, being both idea and creator of the cosmos. The first God is concerned solely with mental entities and the second covers both mental and sensible objects. The first God or *noos* of Numenius contains ideas and substances as the objects of its thought and yet maintains a perfect congruence of subject and object. Thought passes through the objects of mind which it contains. The views of Xenocrates and Numenius are remarkably similar: The first God, mind or Monad contains ideas and numbers.

A still clearer statement is found in Albinus where the first God explicitly contains the basis of reality.

1. See H. J. Krämer, *Der Ursprung der Geistmetaphysik*, (Amsterdam 1964). The general argument of this impressive work is sound; but there is insufficient regard for the difference in genre, within the *Geistmetaphysik*, between ancient platonists, gnostic theosophists, evangelists, and modern idealists.

2. Krämer, *Ursprung*, 18


contains the ideas within his mind and also represents the ultimate simplicity of the *stoicheion* metaphysic. Middle Platonism presents a clear picture. The concept of the ideas in the mind of God concentrates transcendence in one single entity, the nous-Monad. The negative theology of the Middle Platonists does not derive from contemporary Pythagorean influence, but it is a clear development from the *stoicheion* metaphysic within the platonic tradition. The tension in Middle Platonism between the simplicity of God and his comprehension of the world of ideas is no new thing, but goes back to Xenocrates. The theology of Xenocrates demands attention because of the way in which the ideas are taken up in the mind by an identity of subject and object. The contents of the mind are not merely the *objects* of thought, but they share in the character of *nous*. At the same time the thought which is directed towards the content is always simultaneous and identical. It thinks itself. The divine mind remains the one first principle, the ultimate element of simplicity. This concentration of transcendence means that for Xenocrates and Middle Platonists, the one or the first principle is no longer beyond being, but is being itself. All this indicates that Xenocrates was an original thinker who for the first time in the history of philosophy set out thought as a metaphysical entity and followed the consequences of this principle in a systematic way. He is therefore the founder of the pure philosophy of mind which later developed in Christianity and also in modern idealism. The same metaphysic is to be found in Aristotle.

In the academic tradition, metaphysics must uncover the elements and ultimate simplicity of what is real; this doctrine is found clearly within Aristotle in direct succession to Plato. Aristotle's first principle, the divine mind, is linked to the first God of Xenocrates, the mind which is the Monad.

The structure of divine thought is explicit in Aristotle for whom the mind must think itself and be simple and indivisible. The act of divine thought is the same in Aristotle as it is in Xenocrates; God thinks his own thought and is therefore a thinking of thinking. Transcendence is brought together under one principle in a monistic way and is divided into pluralism so that thought fulfils itself through its individual moments. Aristotle and Xenocrates line up together against Plato and Speusippus. The first principle is not purely negative and beyond being, but is itself the content of transcendent being and brings its many elements or moments together in its thought or mind. The divine mind is, for both Aristotle and Xenocrates in contrast to the followers of Plato, the good itself.

9. Ibid., 124
10. Aristotle's account however depends on Plato and may not be traced back to Anaxagoras. Krämer, *Ursprung*, 189.
Plotinus distinguishes the One from the divine mind, but maintains like Xenocrates, that the divine mind contains ideas and numbers. Plotinus has been anticipated by earlier writers in his separation of the divine mind from the highest principle. Earlier examples may be found in the Gnosis of Valentinus and in the theology of Philo.

‘God is either mind or something beyond mind’: these words of Aristotle indicate the central problem and also the point at which the two streams of this philosophy divide. For Aristotle and Xenocrates God is mind, while for Plotinus God is beyond mind. The One is described in negative terms and yet possesses mental qualities; Plotinus speaks of the One as transcendent thought, *hypernoesis*, which is above the divine mind. He failed to separate completely the One from mind; there is an overlap of functions between the two entities. The problem which Plotinus and Plato wish to solve is the contradiction between the content of mind and its ultimate simplicity. Following Plato, Plotinus makes the One transcendent over the mind, describing the One as pure potentiality, or the *dunamis* of all things. The conceptual abstraction and isolation of the One overcomes the inner tension within the theology of *nous*.

While a theology of *nous* presents the first principle as God, good, being or mind, and also as the totality of the ideas, numbers and substances, the abstract One proceeds beyond all plurality, being, thought, to the negation of goodness or godhead. *Nous* and the One present transcendence in different ways, either by complexity on the one hand or by differentiation on the other, either by homogeneity or by articulation, either latently or expressly, either implicitly or explicitly, either by immanence or by over-transcendence. The first principle is accessible either by addition or by subtraction, by affirmation or by negation. The two systems are distinguished by whether the first principle is regarded as inclusive of thought and being or as the pure potentiality of the things which are derived from it. The metaphysic of the One separates the ground of being from its derivatives in a way that the theology of *nous* does not.

The philosophical idea of the transcendent divine intellect or of an absolute spirit is not an obvious idea, but suggests anthropomorphism or a rudimentary theology. Seen against its historical background, however, this idea may be readily understood. The thinking of oneself, the integration of act and thought, and the reality of being belong together in the classical metaphysic of mind.

---

13. Ibid., 384ff.
14. Ibid., 403
Justin gives us a Christian metaphysic of mind with his account of *logos*.

I. *Word of God*. Justin begins from the anthropomorphic language of the OT: when we read that God shut Noah into the ark or came down to see the tower which the sons of men had built, we must not think that the unbegotten God himself came down or went up anywhere. He never walks or sleeps or gets up, but 'stays in his own place, wherever that is, being quick to see and quick to hear, having neither eyes nor ears but being of indescribable might; he sees all things, and knows all things and none of us escapes his observation; and he is not moved or confined to a spot in the whole world, for he existed before the world was made' (D. 127.). On the contrary, it was Christ, as lord, God, son of God, who appeared in power as man, angel, burning bush. He was not an impersonal force, emanating like light from the father and sinking when the father wills; rather he is numerically distinct like a fire kindled from another fire, distinct but not depriving the original fire in any way. (D. 128.)

Scripture tells that God begat before he began creatings things; his only begotten was a 'certain rational power', whom the holy spirit calls with many names, such as glory of the lord, son, wisdom, angel, God, lord and logos. God's begetting was like our thinking and speaking, 'for when we produce some *logos* we beget the *logos*, not by cutting it off so that there is less *logos* left in us, when we produce it, just as we see also happening in the case of fire, which is not made less when it has kindled another fire but stays the same, and what has been kindled by it is seen to exist by itself, not taking away from that which kindled it.' (D. 61.) If we turn to Solomon (Prov. 8.21ff) we hear how this happened, for here 'the word of wisdom, who is himself this God begotten of the father of all things, and word and wisdom, and power, and glory of the begetter, gives testimony.' (D. 61)

This word declares that those who prefer opinion to truth cannot find success, and whatever he forbids, no sensible man will choose. (1A 12) Truth belongs to Jesus Christ because he is God's proper son, his word and first-begotten and power. (1A 23) No one knows the father but the son and no one knows the son but the father and those to whom it is revealed. The word of God is his son; as angel he tells us what we should know, as apostle he is sent to declare whatever is revealed. The Word appeared sometimes in the form of fire, sometimes in that of an angel; finally in the form of man he suffered all that the foolish (anoetoi) Jews inflicted on him. (1A 63).

2. *Word of Men*. Logos, in Socrates, condemned the demons and was in turn condemned. (1A 5) Long before Christ came there was hostility from

---

those who lived without reason towards those who lived with reason (1A 46). The Stoics, who were to be admired for their moral teaching, which was due to the *logos spermatikos* in every man, were hated and put to death. (2A 8) Lawgivers and philosophers did good things when they saw some part of the *logos*; but they contradicted one another because they saw different parts and did not know Christ the whole *logos*, who is a power of the ineffable father and not just an instrument of human reason. (2A 8) The difference between the reality of the *logos* and the dim perception of human minds is explained by the Platonic theme of participation. The *logos* himself is the reality in which direct participation is possible. Other ways to the truth are indirect through seeds and imitations. (2A 13) The idea is plainly of Stoic origin but it has become part of a Platonic metaphysic which allows for degrees of truth and reality.

3. Words of Jesus. The highest truth is that of the Word himself; he spoke with terseness and brevity, unlike the sophists, for ‘his word was the power of God.’ (1A 14) Justin’s conversion leads him to the prophets and the writings of the friends of Christ. Here he finds the only safe and useful philosophy. The source is the words of the saviour, for these have a terrible power of their own, and bring dread to those who stray from the right path, but rest to those who faithfully practise them. (D 8).

4. Prophetic Spirit. More ancient than the philosophers and more extensive than the words of Jesus are the words of the prophets. They alone saw and announced the truth to men, being filled with the Holy Spirit. They did not argue and prove because they had a direct apprehension of the truth. Spirit and word are identical ways to the divine truth which is above all opinion. (D 7) The prophetic spirit published in advance all that was going to happen in the life of the son of God. These things were predicted by successive generations of prophets, from 5000 years before Christ to 800 years before him. (1A 31) More than a third of the *Apology* is taken up with prophecies which have been fulfilled or which are yet to be fulfilled. These are seen as the unique source of truth. Even Plato learnt from the prophets, who are ‘our teachers’ (1A 59). Philosophers and poets are able to talk about the immortality of the soul and other doctrines because they have received hints from the prophets which have enabled them to interpret the truth on these matters. That is why we may see ‘seeds of truth’ scattered among all men. Of course they do not have the whole truth, so they contradict one another and themselves. The prophetic spirit is seen to fulfil exactly the same function as the *logos* except that the seeds are traced to scripture rather than to the human mind. (1A 44).

The entire argument of Justin’s *Dialogue* depends on the acceptance of scripture as ‘the mind and will of God.’ (D 68) It is, therefore, important to
look at all the obscurities, parables and symbols which are interpreted by later prophets. The Holy Spirit often announces events by parallels and similitudes. (D 77) The attitude to scripture is one of acceptance of a complex world of divine truth; historical exegesis would be unthinkable within this world of word and spirit, a world which has the same regularity as the sun and moon and stars, for its repeats itself in the same way. (D 85).

Both word and spirit are multiple. The prophets had one or two powers of the spirit: Solomon had wisdom, Daniel had understanding and counsel, Isaiah had knowledge. Isaiah speaks of all the powers resting on the one who is to come. This means that all the powers came together on him and ceased to be found elsewhere. Just as he is the whole logos so the fullness of the spirit is in him and not elsewhere. (D 88).

Justin, in one place (2A 10) speaks of man as body, logos, and soul, and in another place (D 6) speaks of man as body, life-giving spirit, and soul. In the first case he is speaking of the incarnation, and in the second case he is speaking of death as the separation of the soul from the body and the life-giving spirit from the soul. Spirit has lost the strong materialist force of its Stoic use.16

CLEMENT

(i) Word and spirit make God known, comprise reality, and work man's salvation. Spirit works through word. For Clement, the cohesion of word and spirit is clear on every hand. Spirit is the strength of the word as blood is of flesh. (P.2.2.19.) The Lord is spirit and word (P.1.6.43) The word of God is spirit incarnate. (P.1.6.43.) As with Justin all the powers of the spirit terminate in the son. (S.4.25.) As the divine word, by his providence, rules and presides, the holy spirit, like a magnet, attracts the virtuous in their different degrees and grades. (S.7.2.9.)

(ii) The word is universal, diffused like the sun over all things (S.7.3.21.) Truth is a universal presence; since God is everywhere, an oath is always inappropriate. (S.7.8.51.) The spirit is one and the same everywhere (P.1.6.42); his is no static identity, but he works through all things. (S.5.6.38.) The word is all eye, seeing all, hearing all and knowing all. (S.7.2.5.) God is all ear and all eye if we may be permitted to use these expressions. (S.7.7.37.) By the holy spirit, the word orders the cosmos. (Ex.1.5.) Sleepless light now spreads over all as the word gives faith in the gospel. (Ex.11.116.) The Pythagoreans have rightly spoken of God as within the world, one mind and vital power holding all together. (Ex.6.72.)

God is a god who draws near, remote in essence but near in the power which holds all things in its embrace. (S.2.2.5.) Within this universal word all are called to take their place in the harmony of the divine will. (Ex.9.88.)

(iii) The way into this reality is by faith and knowledge. The gates of the word are intellectual (logikai) and are opened by the key of faith, for no one knows the father but the son and he to whom the son shall reveal him. (Ex.1.10.) The word of God is intellectual and the image of mind is seen in man alone, in the true gnostic who is free from passion. (S.6.9.72.) He prays with his mind, in his thought. (S.6.14.126.) He can rationally distinguish genuine from counterfeit gold, philosophy from sophistry, gymnastics from decoration, medicine from cookery, dialectic from rhetoric, truth itself from the schools of philosophy; he knows that it is necessary to do philosophy. (S.1.9.43.) The lord has sent down his word like rain on men of every time; they can know the difference between guessing and truth, likeness and reality, for the former comes from learning and practice while the latter comes from power and faith. (S.1.7.38.) Philosophers have torn apart the limbs of truth, but whoever brings them together will know the theology of the everliving word. (S.1.13.)

(iv) In all this the spirit is intelligently active. Those who possess the holy spirit search the deep things of God, that is, they grasp the secret that is in the prophecies. (S.2.2.7.) The gnostic is united to the spirit by unending love. (S.7.7.44.) The prophetic and teaching spirit works through mind or nous. (S.1.9.45.) The spirit is above all the spirit of prophecy, who speaks in both the OT and NT. (passim). The truth of the scriptures comes from the divine word, for Plato insisted that truth could only be learnt from God or from the offspring of God. (S.6.15.123.) Yet there is concealment of the truly sacred word. (S.5.4.19.) Scriptures become pregnant to Gnostics; but while all have the same judgement some follow the word and others twist scripture in accordance with their lusts. (S.7.16.94.) In scripture numbers have a mystical meaning. (S.6.11.)

(v) Spirit joins intelligence to holiness. It is the spirit who wings the believer upwards to the Jerusalem above. (S.4.26.172.) In the face of death, the spirit of the father testifies in us. (S.4.9.73.) Worship in the spirit is secret prayer. (S.1.6.34.) Spirit is the light of truth, indivisibly distributed to all who are sanctified by faith. (S.6.16.138) In spite of the strong bias against materialism, the NT and Stoic insistence on the importance of the body comes through. The body is dignified by the holy spirit through the sanctification of soul and body. (S.4.26.)

(vi) Word is the power of God to salvation. The activity of the word is directed to the salvation of men, bringing them to healing truth and immortality. (S.1.8.40.) He is the voice of the Lord, powerful, unseen, bringing
light and truth from heaven. (S6.3.34) He who brings truth from heaven is
the athlete of the universe. (Ex.1.2.) The word is all things to the child,
acting as father, mother, tutor and nurse. (P.1.6.42.) He brings newness,
youth and springtime to those who receive him. (P.1.5.20.) For the word
has acted out the drama of man's salvation, as the champion of creation,
and his power is spread over all the earth, so that the universe is an ocean
of blessings. (Ex.10.110.)

The word is the highest reason, proceeding from God, consummated by
the Son, who is nearest to the first cause. (S6.17.161.) He is called by Peter
in his preaching, 'lord', 'nomos' and 'logos'. (S.2.15.68.) He brings all
truth so that to believe him is to know the truth, while to disbelieve him is to
disbelieve God. (S2.4.12.) The word of the father is not a spoken word, but
is the wisdom, kindness, power, will of God. (S5.1.6.) He is the face of God
by whom God is manifested and known. (P.1.7.) He was from the first and
is the source of all things. (Ex.1.)

(vii) Word and spirit continue to interlock in the work of salvation.
Spirit blows on man as on a pipe. (Ex.1.5.) The holy spirit anoints and
brings a sweet fragrance. (P.2.8.61.) The work of the spirit is continuous in
old and new convenants. (Ex. Theod. 24.) The spirit leads to immortality.
(P.2.2.20.) and pours down on men from heaven. (P.1.6.28.) Mouth and
body may like a lyre be plucked by the spirit, (P.2.4.41), who is the mouth
of the lord. (Ex.9.82.) Father, son and holy spirit are all in one, in whom is
all. (P.3.12.101.) The spirit is the third, (S.5.14.103), and Plato spoke of
him, pointing to the holy trinity. (S.5.14.103.)

All these points - active, saving power, universality, intellect and truth
are found in the decisive passage for the existence of the Geistmetaphysik in
Clement (Strom.4.25.) Here nous is called the place of the ideas, following
Plato, and nous is God. Now God cannot be the object of proof and
demonstration; but the son is wisdom and knowledge and truth. 'All the
powers of the spirit become collectively one thing, and come together in the
same point - the son.' According to Posidonius and Philo the cosmos was
governed by a system of powers, which took the place of the forms of Plato,
and the immanent logos of the earlier Stoics. A still stronger influence on
Clement was the concept of the manifold powers of the spirit in the OT and
especially in Paul, whose understanding of spirit was strongly influenced by
Stoicism. The son is one thing as all things, the circle of the powers rolled
into one, a metaphor which Plotinus was later to use. To believe is to
become one in this unity of the son, while to disbelieve is to be separated,
estranged, divided. To be one in Christ is to be pure, free from the sin which
separates from God, to be born again to a life of righteousness, to serve
God with our whole being in the world which he has made, and to exchange an earthly for a heavenly life.

This account of the son is given in different terms in *Strom.* 7.2. Here the son is most perfect, holy, powerful, princely, kingly, beneficent and near to the almighty. He steers the universe, never leaves his watch tower but is present everywhere. He is, in the terms of Xenophanes, perfect mind, seeing, hearing, knowing all things. The relation of the father to the son is one of perfect unity. As in the Fourth Gospel, the son is in the father and the father in the son. (P 1.5.24.) This unity is credible because, despite the contrast between the simple unity of the father and the complex unity of the son, they are seen as identical; the same functions are given to them and when the father is described as *nous* and the place of the ideas, the son is described as containing all the powers. God the father is *nous* and God the son is the unique *logos,* son of the father who is *nous.* The difference from Philo where the *logos* is seen as a distinct entity is most important. 

**ONE GOD.**

The reason for the unity and simplicity of the Father of all things is that he is totally mind, totally spirit, totally thought, says Irenaeus, totally conception, reason, hearing, eye, light, fount of good 'totus cum sit sensus (nous), et totus ratio, et totus auditus, et totus oculus, et totus lumen, et totus fons omnium bonorum' (A.H. 2.15.3. Mass.2.13.3.) Each of the attributes mentioned has the quality of simplicity together with the capacity to include multiplicity. Human thought, says Irenaeus, does not reach this ultimate purity and comprehension, because God is not as men and his thoughts are not like men's thoughts (Isaiah.55.8). The heretics have made their mistakes because they have reduced God to the peculiar limitations of human thought.

It has been argued by Hager at length that the concepts of *nous* and the One compete, cooperate and interact in the definition of the first principle by Plato, Aristotle and Plotinus. In Plato the divine *nous* orders and causes the world, yet the One is seen as the good and the highest principle. In Aristotle the divine *nous* is made the highest principle and the One is displaced. In Plotinus the One is made the highest principle and the divine *nous* is demoted. Hager's discussion is extensive and detailed; all that we may note here is the centrality of the concepts which have been the subject of our investigation.

Middle Platonism is our concern and here there is no doubt concerning the place of *nous* as the first principle. Albinus writes *(Did.10)*

17. See the discussion of divine unity, Christopher Stead, *Divine Substance,* (Oxford 1977), 186f.
Since Mind is better than Soul, and Mind in activity intelligising all things simultaneously and eternally, is better than mind in potentiality, and nobler than this is the cause of this and whatever might exist superior to these, this would be the Primal God, which is the cause of the eternal activity of the mind of the whole heaven (i.e. of the cosmos). The former, being motionless itself, directs its activity towards this latter, even as the sun towards vision, when someone looks at it, and as an object of desire sets desire in motion, while remaining itself motionless; even thus will this Mind move the mind of the whole heaven.

But since the first Mind is the noblest of things, the object of its thought must also be noblest, and nothing is nobler than it is itself; so therefore it would have to contemplate eternally itself and its own thoughts, and this activity it has is Idea.19

The God of Plutarch knows all (De Is.351D) and orders all things (De Is.382B). Among the Neopythagoreans the case is even clearer. Nicomachus of Gerasa does not distinguish between a supreme god and a demiurge. God is the principle of unity and knowledge and a creator. There is also emphasis on the technikos logos as the creative principle which causes the world.20 Dillon comments: 'It would certainly be convenient to establish a distinction between Demiurge and Supreme God in Nicomachus, as is to be found in both Moderatus and Numenius; the evidence presented in connection with the Monad, however, seems to be against it.'21 Numenius (Frag 12) speaks of the first God sending nous down to all those who are ready to participate in it and thereby find life. The use of nous is deliberately ambiguous to cover 'both the intellect of the Demiurge, emanating from him as a separate entity and the intellect in each one of us.'22

Christianity insists that there is one God and that he is known by those who believe that Jesus is God and Son of God. The Geistmetaphysik makes this possible: the logos theology shows that it is not only possible but necessary that the Logos should by revelation make God known and by a salvation which overcomes evil make God credible. Revelation and salvation go beyond a Geistmetaphysik which is static and not dynamic.22 Spirit is the power of the logos by which God is revealed in scripture or incarnation and men are saved. It is not clear that Christianity was best served by logos and nous. Would spirit have been a better choice? The concept of

21. Dillon, Platonists, 357.
22. Ibid., 371
spirit has provided the subject for a most original theological work, Geoffrey Lampe's *God as Spirit.*

Lampe begins with an account of the practical significance of the concept. The important thing is that, for Christians, Jesus is alive today, and it is with this present reality of Jesus that the spirit is concerned. Take this reality away and Christianity has little to commend it. The concept of spirit evolves through the writings of Old Testament and New Testament, and within the thought of the Early Fathers. Irenaeus gives a clear account of the total reality of the spirit working through creation and human development so that man grows towards God; this development goes on within the human person and depends upon the holy spirit. In the discussion of the Trinity, Lampe is incisive and disturbing. 'Here is Paul's plainest affirmation . . . that in the last resort the Spirit is not a third entity, a power or influence or even a personal being mediating between God and Christ, between God and the believer, or between Christ and the believer, but rather the Spirit is God: the inner personal being of God, self-conscious deity.'

This deity has been disclosed in Christ, in union with the Holy Spirit; as the mind of Christ, the same Spirit inspires men today with wisdom.

Christian theology, says Lampe, followed the Platonist way of *Logos* and Son because spirit had such strong Stoic associations. 'In Greek philosophical thought *pneuma* is immanent deity . . . it did not provide a bridge between a transcendent deity and the world, for *pneuma* was primarily a Stoic, pantheistic, concept, and the deity of 'spirit' was in fact understood to be the inherent deity of the universe itself.' The fatal error was to hypostasise and distinguish *logos*, wisdom, spirit, son, 'These artificial and unreal distinctions remind us that in all this speculation we are not really concerned, as the early Church supposed, with the distinct functions and attributes of actual divine hypostases or "persons", but with different ways, which in reality are interchangeable, of expressing man's awareness of the creativity and providence of the one God.'

For Lampe the classical doctrine of the Trinity is, in the end, less satisfactory than the unifying concept of God as spirit. It is too hierarchical and not sufficiently direct. Arius the heretic had given wrong questions as well as wrong answers and those who rejected his answers still accepted his questions. Going behind these questions Lampe insists that Jesus is divine because the one God revealed Himself and acted decisively for man in Jesus. The holy spirit is divine because the same God is here and now not far
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from everyone as creator and saviour spirit: 'for in Him we live and move, in him we have our being, in us, if we consent to know and trust him, he will create the Christlike harvest: love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, fidelity, gentleness and self-control.'

CONCLUSION

Middle Platonism and the earliest Christian Platonists found in *nous*, *logos*, *pneuma*, a set of concepts which enabled them to express the unity of the divine first principle. God the *nous*, God the *logos* and God the *pneuma* declared the divine simplicity without division into hypostases. Scripture, as a record of divine mind and word, spoken by the *pneuma* through prophet and apostle, provided a universe within which the true dialectic searched out the truth.

28. Ibid., 228