

5 The human person as image and likeness of God

NONNA VERNA HARRISON

Who am I? What does it mean that I am human? Everybody asks these searching questions, but what is the Orthodox Church's answer? Orthodox reflection on what it is to be human begins with Genesis 1:26, "Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness". Theological anthropology, that is the study of humanity in the presence of God, begins by asking what it is about each human person that manifests the divine image and likeness. First of all, the Fathers usually distinguish between the image and likeness. The image names those Godlike characteristics with which we began, such as rationality, free choice, perception and the capacity to develop an excellent character. These characteristics form the foundation of our human existence. By choosing to use them wisely, we can then acquire the divine likeness, namely perception of and communion with God, actualisation of all the virtues, and eternal life. Though the two concepts are inseparable, the image is static and the likeness is dynamic: we can become more and more like God over time.

Theological anthropology begins from the first three chapters of Genesis. People today wonder what the historical value of these stories is, given that science tells us another narrative about human origins. Yet when Orthodox theologians have read Genesis 1–3 they have looked for answers to questions about humanity here and now, not about our ancient ancestors. These biblical stories tell us who we are in relationship to God and the natural world around us. By depicting Paradise they tell us what our life is supposed to have been like and what we can hope to become; by depicting the Fall they tell us where we went wrong and what our life has in fact become. Adam represents every human person. St Gregory of Nazianzus or 'Theologian' (fourth century), St Symeon the New Theologian (eleventh century) and St Silouan the Athonite (twentieth century) all identified themselves with Adam and repented before God. In the end we have a choice whether to join ourselves to Adam or Christ, Eve or the Mother of God.

In Genesis 1:26, God says, 'Let us make'. To St Basil the Great, among others, this mysterious plural speaks of the Trinity deliberating over the creation of the human person. The Father consults with the Son and the Holy Spirit.¹ The image of the Trinity is thus imprinted upon humans in their creation itself. This connection provides a patristic foundation for twentieth-century reflections about humankind as image of the Trinity.² Moreover, St Basil points to the contrast between the language of Genesis 1:26 and the 'Let there be' that echoes throughout the earlier parts of Genesis 1. The Trinity pauses to deliberate about the creative masterpiece.³ Then, instead of simply calling the human person into being, like the sun and the stars, 'God fashioned the human being with his own hands and breathed in something of his own breath' (Gen 2:7), as Clement of Alexandria says. He adds that God loves the human being as his own image, and that, because God is good, his image is good. Indeed, he says, 'the love-charm is within the human being – that which indeed is called a breath of God'.⁴ That is, God has shared his own breath with us, which forms a concrete connection between the divine and the human. This shared breath then attracts his love to us as well. Basil, Clement and the other Fathers find an affirmation of immense human dignity in Genesis.

The New Testament includes Christ in the theology of the divine image and likeness, thus encouraging reflection on relationships among God, Christ and humankind. In 2 Corinthians 4:4, St Paul speaks of 'Christ, who is the likeness of God'. Colossians 1:15 says of Christ, 'He is the image of the invisible God', and Hebrews 1:5 adds, 'He reflects the glory of God, and bears the very stamp of his hypostasis'.⁵ It follows that the Son's person is the image of the Father's person. Indeed, this is a perfect image, since Father and Son are consubstantial, equal and thus alike, except in the distinctive features each bears such as begetting and being begotten. So Christ is the image of God *par excellence*. Other human beings, by contrast, are obviously less than the Father and unlike him in various ways, so the image of God in humanity must be imperfect. The Fathers coined the term *to kat'eikona* ('that which is according to the image'), to name those aspects of humanity that manifest the divine image and are thus the core and definition of what it is to be human. Here we will follow the modern shorthand and speak of 'the image of God' in the human person, but would ask the reader to bear in mind the differences between Christ and all other humans. Christ *is* the image, while we are made *according to* the image; the difference between Christ and all other humans is thus qualitative, not merely quantitative.

When Colossians and Hebrews speak of Christ as the divine image, they also speak of him as Creator. Thus, from the beginning he is the link between the Father and humankind and the source from whom the image of God in humans is derived. St Irenaeus speaks of God the Father, who is above time, looking to Christ incarnate as the model when first creating humankind.⁶ St Athanasius says that Christ is like an artist painting God's image in the human person, yet is also the model sitting for the portrait.⁷ For humans, the divine image is first of all a direct link at the very core of their being with Christ, and through him with God the Father. So, through prayer we can find Christ in our own hearts. So also we can receive from him, whom we can reach from within our own selves, moral excellence and eternal life, and thus come to bear the divine likeness.

Genesis 1:27 adds, 'So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.' Despite the androcentrism of the late antique Mediterranean world in which they lived, nearly all the Fathers conclude that men and women alike bear the divine image.⁸ They add that Eve's creation from Adam's side (Gen 2:21–2)⁹ shows her to be *consubstantial* with him. John Chrysostom quotes Genesis 2:18, 'Let us make him [i.e. Adam] a helper like himself', and comments that this means 'like him, of the same essence (*ousia*) as he, worthy of him, lacking nothing that is his'.¹⁰ Thus, the unity of humankind and the likeness between human persons are affirmed with the same strong word used to affirm that in the Trinity the Son is fully God and is one in essence with the Father. St John Chrysostom draws the conclusion that in paradise Eve shares in all of Adam's cosmic kingship.¹¹ Thus human unity and diversity both have their origins in our creation. However, today Orthodox theologians debate each other about the status of gender in humankind, as we shall see below.

Orthodox theologians speak of nature, persons and energies in God.¹² It is useful also to think of *human* nature, persons and energies. Our *nature* is the foundation of what we are and is what everybody shares, what makes all people alike. Being according to the divine image is intrinsic to our nature. It gives us the capacity to become like God or not, to choose between good and evil, to live a life of virtue, to love God and neighbours, to be rewarded by God in the age to come or not, and to enjoy communion with God in heaven. Their nature thus makes people capable of likeness to God, communion with him, and eternal life in the age to come – that is, salvation. Yet as human beings we are also *persons*. Our personhood makes each of us unique and invites us into loving relationship with God and with each other. As persons we are free and unique, we each become

different, we have distinctive characteristics we can share with each other. As persons we can choose to receive the grace God constantly offers us and thereby acquire more and more of God's likeness. As persons we can be saved and enter into eternal life. Yet as human we also have *energies* or activities. We are called increasingly to acquire and exercise the virtues as energies, to share them with God, thus to share in God's energies and collaborate in his activities. These shared energies are thus the very content of the divine likeness and the very life of those who are saved.

The Fathers identify a variety of human characteristics as the divine image and likeness. We can conclude that the divine image is multidimensional; it has many aspects. These include freedom and responsibility; spiritual perception and relationship with God and neighbour; excellence of character and holiness; royal dignity; priesthood of the created world; and creativity, rationality, the arts and sciences, and culture.

FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

Gregory of Nyssa emphasises the centrality of *freedom*. He notes that humans are free because they are images of God, who is free.¹³ They are able to choose between good and evil. This is why they were able to misuse their freedom and to fall. The divine image is like a mirror at the core of our being that we can choose to turn in different directions. When we turn it towards God, we too are filled with light, but when we turned away from God we became filled with darkness.¹⁴ To put it another way, we are like actors in ancient plays who wore masks that showed what characters they played. When we fall, we take off the mask that depicts God's image and instead put on a mask bearing the image of a savage beast, or even a demon.

Thus, we can misuse the powers given us in the divine image with devastating results. Adam and Eve were tempted to make themselves gods apart from God (Gen 3:5), and so they used their Godlike freedom for unwise purposes. As a result, all human beings, like their first parents, live in a fallen condition. Having turned away from God, the source of life, we are subject to moral and physical disintegration and to death.¹⁵ Yet we still remain free, though it is more difficult to choose good. In Paradise God's collaboration was readily available to Adam and Eve. Now our task is to turn back towards God. With God's help, we must pray and struggle as we seek to find the way back to what we were originally created to be.

Moral and physical disintegration was never God's original purpose in giving us freedom. God loves us and would like us to love him in return, so

he would not have been satisfied in creating puppets or robots. Our freedom is what enables us to love authentically, to enter into genuine relationships with God and our neighbours. Freedom also makes our virtues real and worthy of reward and our crimes worthy of accountability. It enables us to collaborate with God in his own creative activities. Indeed, as Basil says, 'In giving us the power to become like God, [the Creator] let us be artisans of the likeness of God.'¹⁶

For Orthodox Christians, divine freedom supports human freedom, and human freedom is called to cooperate with divine freedom. The divine will and the human will are not incompatible; we were created to unite our wills with God's will, so that together with God we can do good and creative things. So we do not have to choose either divine freedom or human freedom, either divine sovereignty or human independence; Orthodox Christians affirm both. Human freedom need not be compromised in order to confess the glory of God; rather, it is an expression of God's glory. Yet this does not mean that an abundance of choices is good per se, or that all choices are equally valid. For example, a choice among cocaine, heroin and God is not better than a choice between heroin and God because it offers more options. Human freedom is a good gift because it makes it possible for us to love God in return, to assist in God's work, to grow into the divine likeness.

SPIRITUAL PSYCHOLOGY AND THE DIVINE IMAGE¹⁷

In the ancient world, the soul was understood as engaging in a broader range of activities than are sometimes ascribed to it today. It gives life to the body, so that without a soul a body becomes a cadaver. It also is the locus of human mental and emotional faculties including reason, free choice and conscience, fear and desire, sorrow and joy. Plato formulated a tripartite model of the soul that became standard in popular philosophy during Late Antiquity. The Cappadocians and many of the other Fathers use it, modifying Plato's model to say that the soul and all its faculties are in harmony when a person obeys God, rather than simply one's own reason. This model remains the basis of the Eastern Christian tradition of spiritual psychology.¹⁸

What follows is a simplified overview of this psychology. It is important to note that it names distinct activities of the human person that interact in various ways, not separate, self-enclosed, static entities that form components of the self. The first or highest of the three parts is *nous*, which means reason, mind or intellect, though this is understood as something greater, deeper and broader than the 'reasoning brain'

emphasised today. Its activities include cognition and reasoning but also moral insight and deliberation, and freedom of choice. The intellect perceives the material world through the senses and organises and evaluates these perceptions. Yet its highest and most important function is to perceive spiritual realities, including other people in their spiritual aspect, angels and ultimately God.¹⁹ St Basil explains succinctly how the mind can be used for good, evil or morally neutral purposes, depending where it focuses its attention.²⁰ According to the Fathers, the *nous* is the focal point of the divine image in the human person. Gregory of Nyssa says that we were created able to see and give thanks for all the beauties of the earth around us; and by the majesty of what we see, to sense 'the power of the Maker which is beyond speech and language'.²¹ In our fallen condition, we have lost awareness of these powers of spiritual perception. The Orthodox spiritual traditions gathered in the *Philokalia* guide people in the lifelong process of cleansing their faculties of spiritual perception so they can know and love God and neighbour.

Those who receive the divine light in the mirror at the core of their being can shine, for they pass along the same light to others around them. The saints can see God manifest in their own pure hearts, though for most of us the inner mirror is covered with the mud of our sins.²² It can be cleansed over time through a life of ongoing transformation for the better. We can come to see the divine light in the faces of the saints, and even of people around us who manifest Christ's character in diverse ways. Besides seeing icons of angels and saints on the walls of the church, we come to see fellow members of the congregation, or strangers we encounter on the street, as living icons.

In a mature, well-balanced human life, our *nous* is supposed to discern, receive and obey the will of God, and to guide and bring order to the other two faculties of the soul, which are understood as including the instinctive and emotional impulses and drives. Like the mind, both of these non-rational faculties can be used for good or evil purposes, depending in which directions they turn and move. One of these is desire, which seeks to move a person towards various things or persons, or draw them towards the self. Desire is easily misdirected when obsessively focused on the flesh or material possessions, but it also serves as the necessary driving force in love for God and love for neighbour.

The other non-rational faculty is called *thumos* in Greek, a word that is difficult to translate. This faculty complements desire in that it pushes things away from the self and sets limits on other impulses, one's own or those of other people. Plato and Christian Fathers influenced by Platonism see well-ordered *thumos* as a useful ally to reason in curbing one's

inordinate desires. Basil compares it to a loyal soldier who has left his weapons with his wise general – that is, reason – and is ready to serve at his commander’s bidding.²³ *Thumos* is also the necessary driving force in virtues such as perseverance, courage, self-restraint, rejection of evil, and struggling for justice. Yet *thumos* is most closely associated with anger, and in some contexts this is what it means, though clearly it has a broader range of meanings.

When a person’s life is rightly ordered, all these impulses and drives work together harmoniously in serving excellence of character, guided by reason and obedient to God’s will. However, this harmony, which existed in the original human state in Paradise, has become disrupted in human-kind’s fallen condition. Our soul’s faculties pull us in different directions and are often in conflict with each other. It is the whole person, body and soul, who either turns towards God, turns away from him in sin, or turns back towards him in repentance. The centre of the human being, body and soul, in which all the mature person’s faculties and drives become concentrated, is called ‘the heart’. When the heart and all the human faculties are again directed towards God, their original harmony is restored.

When the non-rational faculties of the soul, desire and *thumos*, are allowed to run away with a human person, they become passions. ‘Passion’ is a slippery word in patristic writings. Sometimes it simply means instincts and emotions; sometimes it is intrinsically sinful, which is how I mean it here. As we have seen, instincts and emotions are not necessarily sinful at all. When allied with God and human reason, they become virtues – love for God and neighbour, perseverance, courage and self-restraint. ‘Virtues’ are excellence of character, as found in Jesus Christ and the saints. When we imitate Christ and the saints and are united with them, we acquire God’s likeness, since virtues are originally divine attributes such as wisdom, justice, humility, forbearance, compassion and love; by grace God shares them with us. The divine likeness is the aim of human existence. So virtues have a central place in Orthodox anthropology. Throughout history, countless sermons and spiritual writings have been devoted to teaching people how to overcome passions and grow in virtues, and the lives of the saints have provided many diverse examples. Monks and nuns love to reflect on this subject as they strive to put the teachings into practice.

ROYAL DIGNITY

As bearers of God’s image, all men and women are endowed with royal dignity. To be sure, St Basil is careful to keep a balance. He warns the

proud to reflect on the earth from which they were made and the poor to reflect that dignitaries who intimidate them are also made from the earth. Yet he also encourages the poor not to envy the rich, since they too are endowed with all the gifts of the divine image.²⁴ Early Christians such as St Gregory of Nazianzus and St John Chrysostom challenged Roman ideas of social hierarchy by stressing the royal dignity of the poor, slaves, the homeless, the ill, the disabled and all people.²⁵ Yet Gregory of Nyssa argues from the divine image to social justice most clearly. He asks slave owners how they can enslave others who are like themselves:

You condemn to slavery the human being, whose nature is free and self-ruling, and you legislate in opposition to God, overturning what is according to the law of nature. For upon the one who was created to be lord of the earth and appointed to rule the creation, upon this one you impose the yoke of slavery, as if he were resisting and fighting the divine precept. You have forgotten the limits of your authority, a rule limited to dominion over the non-rational animals. For scripture says, 'Let them rule birds and fish and quadrupeds and reptiles' [Gen 1:26]. How can you bypass the slavery within your power and rise up against the one who is free by nature, numbering one of the same nature as yourself among the four-legged and legless beasts?²⁶

Similarly, he argues for the dignity of one who is homeless, disabled and disfigured by disease:

He is a human being, created according to the image of God, appointed to rule the earth, having within his power the service of the non-rational animals. In this misfortune he has indeed been changed to such an extent that from his appearance it is doubtful whether his visible form with the identifying marks it bears is clearly that of a human being or of some other animal.²⁷

Of course, the most authentic dignity resides in virtues and the divine likeness. Those who have become like God will be manifest in the age to come, when the social hierarchies that preoccupy us in this life will have melted away.

In order to affirm the dignity of slaves and the homeless disabled, Gregory of Nyssa contrasts the human person who is made in God's image with other animals who are not. The concept of animals as slaves is shocking today, but slavery was taken for granted in the ancient world, and Gregory was writing in a rural economy. Farmers work with animals every day, respect them, and have to take care of them to maintain

their livelihood. Gregory's point is like that made by my uncle, a dairy farmer, who visited farms in South Africa during the Apartheid era. He told me afterward that he was shocked at the contrast between the sleek, healthy cows and the black farm hands in ragged clothes.

The authority given to humans in Genesis 1:26 means a responsibility to care for animals and for the natural world. In order to understand how this responsibility manifests the image of God, we must consider the role of the human body, which links human beings with the natural world. The Fathers affirm the body's great dignity. It is, after all, designed to house the mind made in the divine image, and equips the soul with tools that it needs to perform acts of virtue. Gregory of Nyssa says that, just as the soul is the image of God, the body is the image of the soul, that is, an image of the image of God.²⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus says the soul is called to educate the body, so that instead of remaining a slave it comes to labour alongside the soul in serving God, and then God will unite both with himself in the age to come.²⁹ Thus, provided we use our bodies to work with God, they too come to share in his likeness. All the Fathers affirm that God will raise the body from the dead to enjoy eternal life. There can be no greater affirmation of its eternal value.

The human body in fact has an important function in uniting the created world within itself, and joining it to God. The human person is a *microcosm*, a small world: that is, one who shares in every level of reality in the cosmos. Our bodies are composed of the same elements as earth and sky, while our souls share in the spiritual world with the angels. Gregory of Nazianzus says that God created the heavens and the earth, then created the human being as a participant in both who can unite them together.³⁰ St Maximus the Confessor says that humans had the task of uniting Paradise and the inhabited earth, heaven and earth, the material and immaterial worlds, and finally the created and the uncreated. When we fell we failed in this task, but Christ has accomplished it and invites us to join again in his work.³¹

Being a microcosm also enables the human person to become a *mediator*, which is an essential function of the image of God. As human beings we are called with Christ to a cosmic priesthood³² whose task is to offer the world to God and bestow God's blessing on the world. Metropolitans John Zizioulas and Kallistos Ware, mindful of the ecological crisis, have said that the 'dominion' God gave humankind over the earth (Gen 1:28) is best understood as a priesthood.³³ Yet it is also a royal task. Just as Adam's work was to care for the garden of Paradise, our work is to care for the earth and all its creatures, on behalf of God.

THE DIVINE IMAGE AND HUMAN CULTURE

The divine image also includes the practical reason that has enabled humankind to develop creativity, the arts and sciences, economics and politics, and cultures. Because we are endowed with inventiveness, humans have created prodigious variety. Here, perhaps above all, it is clear that human free will governs the powers given with the divine image, so they can be used for good or evil. Human culture can glorify God and assist in his work, or it can threaten to undo God's handiwork by destroying humankind and with it the earth on which we live.

In icons, the Church has made ordinary matter into images that shine forth with divine beauty.³⁴ Icons are a unique expression of Christian life, and they are not to be equated with art in general. Yet they do point to the true purpose of all the arts: to disclose beauty that is ultimately from God, not to hide or distort that beauty, producing idols or serving secular ideologies. Practical creativity has also invented skills that enable the world's economy, such as the crafts, agriculture, manufacturing and technology. Economic exchange enables humans to share with one another, yet it also produces many material things that can draw our attention away from God. Why do many find it easier to perceive God in the beauty of the natural world, which he has made, than in cities, which we humans have made?

Scientific reason is also a facet of the divine image. People can use the methods of science to discern the patterns of the natural world, thus to 'think God's thoughts after him', to discover with awe the vast inventiveness of the Creator. Yet, as Evagrius Ponticus³⁵ and his successors in monastic life have understood, there is a way of contemplating nature that goes beyond scientific method. It is possible through prayer to perceive God within everything he has made, and at the same time to see God's ultimate purposes and plans at the heart of each created thing. Science can measure the outward surfaces of objects, but prayer can plumb their depths. In the end, we can come to see the whole creation as a vast burning bush, alight with God's glory.

Humans are also called to use reason to organise and govern society by implementing wise and loving plans. Political, economic and organisational leaders can thus share in the work of divine providence. Yet such power is often misused in ways that frustrate God's purposes. More generally, we must guard against the danger of becoming self-enclosed in our own imagination, of creating a 'virtual reality' that becomes an alternative to God's reality. We have been given creativity so we can share directly in God's creative activity, not so as to invent our own reality in a way that

excludes God and tries to put humans in his place. That, after all, was the sin in the garden.

THE HUMAN BEING IN MODERN ORTHODOX THOUGHT³⁶

Panayiotis Nellas, one of the principal twentieth-century writers on Orthodox anthropology, expresses the point made above in terms of the 'garments of skin' of Genesis 3:21.³⁷ According to St Gregory of Nyssa's interpretation, these 'garments' stand for mortality and all that goes with it; and that includes law, family life, political and economic life. All these things belong to the world of the Fall; but they are given within that world as blessings and means of salvation, provided that God is the ultimate goal of our endeavours within these areas. If, however, these 'garments' are treated as autonomous, they work to our harm. This provides Nellas with a clear framework for both affirming human engagement in 'the world' and keeping such activity in perspective.

Growing into the divine likeness through use and understanding of the world, through science and economic activity, is a theme very prominent in the thought of Dumitru Stăniloae. Whereas Nellas uses the image of 'garments of skin', Stăniloae starts from the cosmology of St Maximus. For him, using the world is a matter of developing our reason (*logos*) by perceiving God's Word and rationality (*logos*) in all creation. That Word calls for response and responsibility towards both God and the human community.³⁸

Modern Orthodox anthropology is extensively concerned with interpreting the Church Fathers, but this should not obscure the fact that much of it is responding directly to the challenges of modern humanisms. 'False, atheistic humanism is a question put to the Church', writes Sergius Bulgakov, 'and Christian humanism would be an answer'.³⁹ A part of that answer is the notion of personhood,⁴⁰ seen as a corrective to both the impersonal collective of Communism and the individualism of capitalism. In addition to the well-known 'personalist' theologians discussed later in this volume, we should note the significance of Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov). In this Russian Athonite, the personalist emphasis of Russian religious philosophy meets the ascetic tradition with its profound experiential knowledge of human nature, and of the potentials of that nature revealed in the saint. Fr Sophrony shows how Christian asceticism and obedience open the person up to his or her full personal potential; their goal is prayer for the whole Adam-humanity, in which the oneness of human nature is realised.⁴¹

A similarly bold vision of human potential is expressed by Nellas, who advances what he calls a 'theocentric humanism'. Drawing on Maximus, Cabasilas and Nikodimos of the Holy Mountain, he sees humanity as created for the sake of the Incarnation. In the Virgin Mary, human nature itself is revealed as 'Theotokos' ('Mother of God') – the creature through whom the Word of God comes into the world so that the human being can be deified.⁴²

An aspect of this 'high' anthropology is the value it ascribes to the human body. Much more emphatically than most of the early Fathers, modern writers underline that the totality of the human being is created in the divine image. Important here is the influence of St Gregory Palamas; his emphasis on the Transfiguration and the actual vision of divine light inspires continuing exploration of the heights to which our bodily nature is called.

Honesty requires that an exalted view of the nature of the human creature must go hand in hand with a profound sense that our world is touched by a Fall: most of what we regard as 'natural' does not correspond to the Creator's original intent. This applies even to the apparently basic division of humanity into male and female. Certainly, men and women are both created according to the divine image; but does this mean that sexual differentiation is a necessary consequence of being in the divine image? Theologians influenced by Russian religious philosophy are more inclined to see masculinity and femininity as ontological components of the human being; Paul Evdokimov is one such who has explored anthropology in some detail, for instance in his *Woman and the Salvation of the World: Christian Anthropology on the Charisms of Woman*.⁴³ But other Orthodox theologians, particularly patristic scholars, are sceptical of the claim that sexual differentiation in humans is part of God's original intention and will persist in the resurrection. As Valerie Karras points out, this raises some perhaps unexpected points of contact between Orthodox and feminist anthropology. Within Orthodoxy, this aspect of theological anthropology and its implications are still a subject of lively debate.⁴⁴

CONCLUSION

In the Orthodox understanding, the mystery of human identity is an image of divine mystery. Gregory of Nyssa observes that the incomprehensibility of the human mind is an image of God's incomprehensibility.⁴⁵ So although we have identified many features of the divine image in human-kind in this chapter, this can only be a starting point. The image of God is multi-faceted and open-ended. There is always more to God, and

thus more to God's self-manifestation within the human being, to be discovered; more than words can describe. This means that, as humans, we are invited to share increasingly in God for eternity, as our capacity stretches towards the infinite. The gifts God gives us at once fill us and increase our capacity so we can hope to receive more of his life.⁴⁶ This eternal growth includes an ever closer sharing in the divine likeness.

Further reading

- Harrison, V. E. F., 'Gregory of Nyssa on human unity and diversity', *Studia Patristica* 41 (2006), 333–44.
- 'Male and female in Cappadocian theology', *JTS*, n.s., 41 (1990), 441–71.
- 'Women, human identity and the image of God: Antiochene interpretations', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9 (2001), 205–49.
- *Nellas, P., *Deification in Christ: Orthodox Perspectives on the Nature of the Human Person*, Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1987.
- *Sakharov, N. V., *I Love Therefore I Am: The Theological Legacy of Archimandrite Sophrony*, Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 2002.
- Ware, K. T. (Bishop of Diokleia), *Through the Creation to the Creator*, London: Friends of the Centre, 1997.
- *'The unity of the human person according to the Greek Fathers' in A. Peacocke and G. Gillett (eds.), *Persons and Personality: A Contemporary Enquiry* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987), pp. 197–206.
- Zizioulas, J. D., Metropolitan of Pergamon, 'Preserving God's creation: three lectures on theology and ecology', *King's Theological Review* 12 (1989), 1–5, 41–5; 13 (1990), 1–5.

Notes

1. Basil of Caesarea, *On the Origin of Humanity, Discourse* 1, 4.
2. See B. Bobrinskoy, 'God in Trinity', above, and A. Papanikolaou, 'Personhood and its exponents in twentieth-century Orthodox theology', below.
3. Basil of Caesarea, *On the Origin of Humanity, Discourse* 1, 3.
4. Clement of Alexandria, *The Instructor* 1. 3.7.1–3.
5. Here I have modified the RSV according to the Greek text.
6. Irenaeus of Lyons, *Against Heresies* III.22.3.
7. Athanasius of Alexandria, *On the Incarnation* 14.1–2.
8. See V. E. F. Harrison, 'Male and female in Cappadocian theology', *JTS*, n.s., 41 (1990), 441–71; and 'Women, human identity and the image of God: Antiochene interpretations', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9 (2001), 205–49.
9. In Hebrew and Greek, the word customarily translated 'rib' can as easily be translated 'side', which shows that when Eve was made from Adam, they emerged as two 'sides' of the same human being.
10. John Chrysostom, *Homily 15 on Genesis* 1.

11. John Chrysostom, *Homily 10 on Genesis* 4–5.
12. See B. Bobrinskoy, *The Mystery of the Trinity. Trinitarian Experience and Vision in the Biblical and Patristic Tradition*, trans. A. P. Gythiel (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1999), esp. pp. 55–63.
13. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Creation of Humanity* 16.11–12.
14. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Creation of Humanity* 12.9–11.
15. Athanasius, *On the Incarnation* 3.11–13.
16. Basil of Caesarea, *On the Origin of Humanity, Discourse 1*, 16.
17. Much of this section is taken, with modifications, from the Introduction to V. E. F. Harrison, *St Basil the Great: On the Human Condition* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 2005), pp. 22–4.
18. One of the best brief descriptions of these psychological terms can be found in the glossary at the end of each volume of the English translation of the *Philokalia*. The spiritual psychology described here is presupposed throughout this treasury of Orthodox monastic spirituality. See A. Louth, 'The theology of the *Philokalia*' in J. Behr, A. Louth and D. Conomos (eds.), *Abba. The Tradition of Orthodoxy in the West. Festschrift for Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 2003), pp. 351–61.
19. Basil of Caesarea, *On the Holy Spirit* 9.
20. Basil of Caesarea, *Letter 233*.
21. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Creation of Humanity* 2.
22. Gregory of Nyssa, *Homily on the Beatitudes* 6.4.
23. Basil of Caesarea, *Homily Against Anger* 5.
24. Basil of Caesarea, *On the Words, 'Be Attentive to Yourself'* 5–6, and *On the Origin of Humanity, Discourse 2*, 13.
25. See Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration 14, On the Love of the Poor*, which aimed to raise funds for the hostel that St Basil had founded. John Chrysostom advocated for the poor throughout his life. See, for example, his *Homilies on Wealth and Poverty* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1984).
26. Gregory of Nyssa, *Homilies on Ecclesiastes* 4.
27. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Love of the Poor* 2.
28. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Creation of Humanity* 12.9–11.
29. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration 2, In Defence of this Flight to Pontus* 17.
30. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration 38, On Theophany* 11.
31. Maximus the Confessor, *Ambigua*, trans. Louth, p. 41.
32. This refers to the 'royal priesthood' of all believers (1 Pet 2:9).
33. Kallistos of Diokleia, *Through the Creation to the Creator* (London: Friends of the Centre, 1997); J. Zizioulas, 'Preserving God's creation: three lectures on theology and ecology', *King's Theological Review* 12 (1989), 1–5; 41–5; 13 (1990), 1–5.
34. John of Damascus, *On the Divine Images* 1.16; cf. M. Fortounatto and M. B. Cunningham, 'Theology of the icon', below.
35. Evagrius Ponticus, *The Praktikos* 1–3.
36. This section, along with texts marked with an asterisk in 'Further reading', are contributed by Elizabeth Theokritoff.
37. P. Nellas, *Deification in Christ: Orthodox Perspectives on the Nature of the Human Person* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1987), pp. 93–104.

38. D. Stăniloae, *The Experience of God. Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, vol. II, trans. I. Ionita and R. Barringer (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2000), pp. 21–63.
39. S. Bulgakov, *Social Teaching in Modern Russian Orthodox Theology*, included with *The Orthodox Church* (Maitland, FL: Three Hierarchs Seminary Press, 1935), p. 16.
40. See A. Papanikolaou, 'Personhood and its exponents in twentieth-century Orthodox theology', below.
41. N. V. Sakharov, *I Love Therefore I Am: The Theological Legacy of Archimandrite Sophrony* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 2002) pp. 137, 204–21.
42. P. Nellas, 'The Mother of God and theocentric humanism' in *Synaxis*, vol. I (Montreal: Alexander Press, 2006), pp. 129–40.
43. P. Evdokimov, *Woman and the Salvation of the World: A Christian Anthropology on the Charisms of Woman*, trans. A. P. Gythiel (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1994).
44. See further V. A. Karras, 'Eschatology' in S. F. Parsons (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Feminist Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 243–60; Karras, 'Orthodox theologies of women and ordained ministry' in A. Papanikolaou and E. Prodromou (eds.), *Thinking Through Faith* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 2008).
45. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Creation of Humanity* 11.3.
46. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Soul and Resurrection*.