



The doctrines of the fall and salvation in Eastern Orthodox theology

Much attention has been given in recent years to the increasing number of conservative Protestants who are converting to Roman Catholicism. What is less well documented is that during this time a significant number of conservative Protestants – including some from Reformed backgrounds – have instead converted to Eastern Orthodoxy. The best known is perhaps Frank Schaeffer, son of the late Protestant apologist Francis Schaeffer. Reformed Christians confronting Eastern Orthodoxy for the first time, seeing the kissing of icons, the elaborate priestly garb, and the constant swinging of the incense sensor, will likely be struck by its strangeness and foreignness. Yet it is imperative for Reformed people to become acquainted with this ancient form of Christianity because it promises to be a player on the American religious scene in the years to come.

This paper seeks to familiarize readers with the doctrines of Eastern Orthodoxy in two important areas: the fall of man and salvation in Christ. Though these are by no means the only two points of Orthodox teaching which ought to be examined, the importance of these doctrines in Reformed theology make them an interesting starting point for us. For readers wishing to explore beyond these two issues in the history and theology of Orthodoxy, I suggest consulting Orthodox theologian Timothy Ware's *The Orthodox Church* (New York: Penguin Books, 1993).

A brief history of Eastern Orthodoxy

Before we begin our examination of the Orthodox views of fall and salvation, it may be helpful to briefly sketch the historical background of the Eastern church. During the early centuries of church history, most churches regarded as "Eastern" were found in Greece, Asia Minor, the Middle East and Egypt. They were predominantly Greek-speaking, while the churches in the "West" were predominantly Latin-speaking. At this time, Christians in the East and the West, politically united in the Roman Empire, interacted with each other and mutually participated in the Ecumenical Councils which worked out the critical trinitarian and Christological doctrines. As time wore on, however, the cultural differences between the groups took their toll and variations in theological emphasis became more pronounced. Politically, the two groups were fractured: The eastern part of the old Roman Empire, centered in Byzantium/Constantinople (modern-day Istanbul), remained largely intact while the western part, which had been centered in Rome, crumbled. Socially, the Muslim conquests took a much deeper toll on the churches of the East than of the West, and thus more significantly shaped the Eastern experience. Theologically, two major rifts between the Eastern and Western churches gradually developed which came to a head in the 11th century.

The Nicene Creed

One major theological rift concerned the doctrine of the Trinity as expressed in the *Nicene Creed*. The original *Creed* had not included the words "*and the Son*" after the statement "*I believe in the Holy Spirit ... who proceeds from the Father.*" During the early Middle Ages, however, Christians in the West adopted the addition of these words as a more complete and accurate expression of the relationship of the persons of the Godhead. The Eastern churches never approved of this addition, and in fact developed their trinitarian theology in such a way as to make these new words quite unacceptable. This disagreement is often called the *filioque* (Latin for "and the Son") controversy, and this remains a noteworthy division between Eastern Orthodoxy and Western Christendom (both Protestant and Roman Catholic).

The Papacy

The other major theological rift concerned the Papacy. The Eastern churches had developed a hierarchical structure of church authority, including, in ascending order of importance, priests, bishops,

metropolitans and patriarchs. They were also willing to afford the church in Rome a great deal of respect and to acknowledge the bishop of Rome as one of the great patriarchs. They would not, however, accept the supremacy of the Roman bishop (the Pope) over the other patriarchs who were found in Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria.

Schism

These differences finally produced schism in 1054. In that year the Pope excommunicated Cerularius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who in turn excommunicated the Roman messenger who delivered the bull of excommunication. Though some attempts at reconciliation were made over the next century and a half, the hostilities were sealed in 1204 when western Crusaders captured and sacked Constantinople, a deed of indescribable insult to the Eastern churches. In the many centuries since, East and West have communicated only sporadically and without much fruit to show for it. However, in recent years both the Pope and the Patriarch of Constantinople have displayed serious interest in resolving the differences between their respective bodies, and Orthodox theologians have entered into dialogues with some Protestant groups.

Today there are some remnants of Eastern Orthodoxy in Turkey, Palestine and Egypt. But Orthodox people are a distinct minority in these places and most live under Muslim domination. Orthodoxy does remain the primary religious force in a number of countries including Greece, Serbia, Romania, Bulgaria, the Ukraine and Russia. Immigrants from these places have established churches in America which can be seen all over this country. Most retain a very close link with their ethnic heritage, though some Orthodox people are seriously attempting to develop a distinctly American-style Orthodoxy stripped of its unnecessary old-world baggage. In short, Eastern Orthodoxy retains a significant place in the worldwide religious scene, and has established a presence in America as well. And for restless Protestants weary of informal worship and a lack of connection with a theological past, the reverence and seeming timelessness of Eastern Orthodoxy will likely continue to be a tempting alternative to both Protestantism and Roman Catholicism.

The Eastern Orthodox doctrine of the fall of man

We turn now to an examination of the Eastern Orthodox view of the fall of the human race into sin. At the outset, we should stress that this topic really is an important one. Not only is it one of the very first things which is recorded in the Bible, but it has serious consequences for one's views on the doctrine of salvation itself. After all, people cannot really understand what salvation is all about unless they understand what they must be saved from. As we will see in Eastern theology, as in most other theologies, the doctrine of the fall shapes the expression of the doctrine of salvation, and thus it deserves a careful study.

Much of the Orthodox doctrine on the creation of Adam is consistent with the beliefs of Reformed theology. The Orthodox do affirm the historicity of Adam and his creation as a sinless bearer of the image of God. Some of the early Eastern theologians (whom we will call the "Greek Fathers") spoke in terms similar to those used by many Reformed theologians: Adam was placed in a provisionary, probationary state in which his obedience to God was tested, and incorruptibility and union with God would have been the reward of obedience.¹ Some Orthodox writers do emphasize that the task set before Adam was a process of progressing in godliness, of ascending to the Divine. This is something usually lacking in Reformed thinking. But like Reformed theology, Eastern Orthodoxy affirms that Adam did not pass the test.

The serious differences between Orthodoxy and Reformed theology can be quickly seen, however, when one begins to examine the Orthodox view of the *consequences* of Adam's disobedience. To summarize, it seems fair to say that Eastern Orthodoxy does not believe that the results of the fall were as disastrous as Reformed theology believes them to be. Two major differences emerge: First, though Orthodoxy believes that each person bears some guilt for his own sin, it does not think that anyone bears the guilt of Adam's first sin except Adam himself; and second, while Orthodoxy does hold that human ability to do good was seriously damaged when Adam fell, it does not believe that man is totally depraved. We will now address these two issues in order.

The guilt of Adam's sin

In regard to the guilt of Adam's sin, contemporary American Orthodox theologian John Meyendorff has written:

From these basic ideas about the personal character of sin, it is evident that the rebellion of Adam and Eve against God could be conceived only as their personal sin; there would be no place, then, in such an anthropology for the concept of inherited guilt, or for a "sin of nature," although it admits that human nature incurs the consequences of Adam's sin.²

This statement summarizes some of the concerns which Orthodox theologians feel as they observe the way many Westerners, Protestants and Roman Catholics alike, handle "original sin" and the "imputation" of Adam's guilt. Though different Western theologians deal with these concepts in substantially different ways, one important similarity is that most Western theological traditions affirm that all people today, in one way or another, bear the *guilt* that Adam incurred by eating of the forbidden fruit. Some Westerners have proposed that we bear Adam's guilt because somehow we were all physically in Adam when he fell, and thus that we all participated in it. Other Westerners believe that we are all born corrupt, and that it is for this reason that God holds us guilty for Adam's first sin. This second view is sometimes called the "mediate imputation" of Adam's guilt because his guilt is "mediated" (or perhaps "passed down") through the prior generations to the present generation. A third Western view is that of "immediate imputation," which holds that Adam's sin is directly and "immediately" charged against each of his individual descendants, rather than being passed down from generation to generation. It is this last view which in large part won the day in Reformed theology.³

Eastern Orthodoxy would disagree with all three of these formulations (though it may be doubted whether it has seriously considered the third). As the quote from Meyendorff suggests, Orthodoxy does not believe God will hold anyone guilty for any sin which he does not personally commit. Thus, the focus of Eastern thinking on the consequences of Adam's sin is only on the *corruption and mortality* which he brought into the world. Adam's sin weakened human nature and issued hardship and destruction into the natural world. Adam's sin placed his posterity under the dominion of death and the tyranny of Satan. But, Orthodoxy says, Adam's sin did not make anyone else *guilty* before God. Only one's own sin can do that.

This theological debate might appear to be minor or hair-splitting. It is, in fact, of great importance to one's Christian faith. This is perhaps best illustrated by a glance at Romans 5:12-21. There the apostle Paul, in the midst of the Bible's most lengthy and detailed exposition of our salvation in Christ, explains the doctrine of justification by comparing it to our fall in Adam. In verse after verse Paul analogizes salvation in Christ with fall in Adam, and stresses that we stand in a relationship with Christ which is similar to our prior relationship with Adam. The upshot of this is that *the accuracy with which we define the effect of Adam's fall on us will greatly impact our ability to accurately define the effect of Christ's saving work on us*. Romans 5:18 is particularly relevant here: "*Consequently, just as the result of one trespass was condemnation for all men, so also the result of one act of righteousness was justification that brings life for all men*" (NIV). Note that Paul here speaks about *condemnation* (which involves a judicial decree of guilt), and he speaks of it coming upon *all*, not just upon Adam, the one who actually sinned. How did condemnation fall upon everyone? Not by the individual sins of each person, but by *one trespass*, the first sin of Adam. And note also the comparison of Adam with Christ: the result of Christ's act of redemption occurred "*just as*" the result of Adam's sin did. Therefore, if we assert that Adam's sin only got people going down the wrong road, but that they *bring condemnation upon themselves*, then the logical corollary is that Christ's act of redemption only got people going down the right road, but that *they earn justification for themselves*. When we see how erroneous and dangerous a conclusion logically results from a misunderstanding of the consequences of Adam's sin, we ought to be encouraged to take this issue very seriously.

Has Eastern Orthodox theology, then, wholly gone astray in its doctrine of the sin of Adam? The answer, I think, is no. This is not because the issue is not important, but because there have been some revered voices in the history of Eastern theology who have actually affirmed the "Western" view that Adam's sin did bring guilt upon the whole human race. Eastern Orthodox people have an enormous respect for the Greek Fathers and a great desire to be faithful to the theological ground which they broke. Their opinions are afforded weighty status. Therefore, if we can show that some important Greek Fathers believed in an imputation of Adam's guilt, then a case can be made that such a doctrine has a legitimate place in Orthodox theology, even if it was never emphasized by most of the Greek Fathers and is rejected by modern-day Orthodox theologians.

Two examples will be offered here. The first quote comes from the great 4th century Alexandrian theologian, Athanasius:

*But since the debt owed by all men had still to be paid, for all, as I said above, had to die, therefore after the proof of his (Christ's) divinity given by his works, he now on behalf of all men offered the sacrifice and surrendered his own temple to death on behalf of all, in order to make them **all guiltless and free from the first transgression**, and to reveal himself superior to death, showing his own incorruptible body as firstfruits of the universal redemption (emphasis mine).⁴*

Note that here Athanasius states that Christ's death makes people guiltless of the first transgression. The implication one must draw from this statement is that apart from Christ's work, people were *guilty* of the first transgression, the very thing which modern Orthodox theologians deny.

A second quote comes from the highly-regarded preacher and biblical commentator of 4th and 5th century Constantinople, John Chrysostom, commenting on Romans 5:

For that one man should be punished on account of another does not seem to be much in accordance with reason. But for one to be saved on account of another is at once more suitable and more reasonable. If then the former took place, much more may the latter. Hence he has shown from these grounds the likelihood and reasonableness of it. For when the former had been made good, this would be readily admitted.⁵

Here John admits that the idea that one person would be condemned for another's sin is hard to accept. Yet he appeals to the fact that this has happened in the case of Adam and his posterity in order to demonstrate that people are also saved on account of another's work, namely, Christ's. For, he says, if the thing which is difficult to accept took place (one person bringing condemnation on another), then it is that much easier to accept that which is less offensive (that one person could earn salvation for another). Later John states even more explicitly: "(T)he world was condemned from Adam, but from Christ was saved and freed from condemnation"⁶ Certainly it seems that the beloved John Chrysostom also rejected the now-prevailing Eastern position. Examples such as these ought to be pointed out to Eastern Orthodox people in the hope that they may come to rediscover the important biblical truths here which are lying dormant in their tradition.

The freedom of the will and total depravity

We turn now to the second key difference between Eastern Orthodoxy and Reformed theology in regard to the consequences of the sin of Adam. This involves the Orthodox belief in the freedom of the human will after the fall and its corresponding rejection of the doctrine of total depravity. Contemporary English Orthodox theologian Timothy Ware writes:

*Orthodox do not say, as Calvin said, that humans after the fall were utterly depraved and incapable of good desires. They cannot agree with Augustine, when he writes that humans are under "a harsh necessity" of committing sin, and that "human nature was overcome by the fault into which it fell **and so came to lack freedom**" (emphasis his).⁷*

Orthodox theologians place great stress upon the retention of the image of God in fallen humanity, and on God's continuing love for the human race. They believe that one essential component of the image of God is free will: the absence of free will would make a being less than fully human. Thus Ware writes: "*And because we still retain the image of God, we still retain free will, although sin restricts its scope.*"⁸ As one might expect, such views also lead to the conclusion that people must exercise their free will in cooperation with God if they are to be saved. Again, Ware's comments are instructive on this point:

The Orthodox Church rejects any doctrine of grace which might seem to infringe upon human freedom. To describe the relation between the grace of God and human freedom, Orthodoxy uses the term cooperation or synergy... If we are to achieve full fellowship with God, we cannot do so without God's help, yet we must also play our own part: we humans as well as God must make our contribution to the common work, although what God does is of immeasurably greater importance than what we do.⁹

From quotations such as these it should be readily evident to those familiar with Reformed theology how different such views are from those espoused by Augustine, Calvin and later Calvinist theologians. It is true that there is much attractive in the Orthodox position. Even at their worst, people are still image-bearers of God who retain the liberty to do good or evil. There is still much to admire even in the most fallen of human beings. Who would not like to believe this, and reject the Augustinian-Calvinist

belief in total depravity, which Ware terms "sombre"? Yet the biblical record compels us to hold otherwise, however unattractive. Though Ware, in defense of free will, states, "*God wanted sons and daughters, not slaves,*" Scripture asserts that all who sin are "*slaves*" to sin (John 8:34). Though Ware speaks of sinful humans making a contribution to a common work with God, Scripture assigns us no such ability, instead describing us as "*dead in our transgressions and sins*" until God, of His own initiative and grace, makes us "*alive with Christ*" (Ephesians 2:1, 5). Though most Reformed theologians believe that some spark of the divine image remains in fallen humanity, and that unbelievers can do "civil" good, they cannot ignore the graphic imagery of slavery and death which Scripture employs to describe the state of our race as we stand in Adam apart from Christ.

So, as we conclude this section, where does fallen man stand before God in Eastern Orthodox theology? He stands in a bad position, but not in too bad of a position. His human liberty and ability to do good works has been damaged, but not destroyed. Death and Satan prevent him from making the ascent to God that Adam could have made before the fall, but they do not prevent him from making a small step to God in cooperation with Him. He bears guilt for his own personal sins, but he is not condemned for the sin of Adam.

All these things must be kept in mind as we move to the next section, for they intimately shape the Orthodox doctrine of salvation.

Now we will examine the Orthodox soteriology, or doctrine of salvation. As we do so, we will find that Eastern theologians employ much rich, biblical imagery which Reformed Christians will find useful and edifying. At the same time, we will also find important themes missing or neglected in their soteriology. We will try to give due attention to both and formulate a Reformed analysis of Orthodox thinking in this area. To accomplish this, we will focus *first* upon the Orthodox view of Christ and what His work accomplished, and, *second*, upon how people come to possess this salvation and of what this salvation consists.

The person and work of Christ

We turn, then, to the Eastern theology of Christ and His work. In regard to the doctrine of *the person of Christ*, East and West share all the same foundational beliefs. Orthodoxy believes, as we do, that Jesus Christ is the eternally begotten Son of God, of the same divine nature as the Father. It confesses that He became incarnate by the virgin Mary, and that the incarnate Christ was truly God and truly man, one person in two natures. In fact, to say that the East *shares* these beliefs with us may be giving it less than its due. For in the early church, it was predominantly theologians in the East who pushed forward advancements in Christological doctrine, and most of the main players in the Ecumenical Councils were from the Greek-speaking churches. Though the West did participate in these councils and did at times make important contributions, the West owes the East a large debt for its theological creativity in this area.

Despite the great measure of agreement between East and West on this topic, we are not yet ready to move on to a discussion of the work of Christ. We must emphasize at this point the tremendous theological importance which Orthodoxy places on the incarnation. Though the West also recognizes its importance, we tend to view the incarnation as something of a means to an end. More specifically, we often look at the reality of God becoming man as little more than a necessary prerequisite for the accomplishment of redemption in the crucifixion and resurrection. In the East, however, the incarnation is viewed much more as an end in itself. Orthodoxy does not skip quickly from the incarnation to a discussion of Christ's saving work. Rather, it pauses over the incarnation, meditates on it and marvels at it. Orthodox theologians, while at their best never ignoring the necessity of Christ's work, at times almost speak as if the incarnation itself accomplished our salvation. They often speak of human nature as itself some sort of independent entity, and of the incarnation as God's embracing of this human nature. Therefore, the Word becoming flesh has *cosmic implications*. When Jesus became man, human nature as a whole — perhaps even all of creation — was brought into some sort of union with God. In the incarnation, the human and the divine were brought back to their pre-fall communion, and human nature was restored to its true position as the image-bearer of God. These words from John Meyendorff indicate the way Orthodox theologians speak of the incarnation:

Moreover, the fact of the Incarnation implies that the bond between God and man, which has been expressed in the Biblical concept of the "image and likeness," is unbreakable. The restoration of creation is a "new creation," but it does not establish a new pattern, so far as man is

*concerned; it reinstates man in his original divine glory among creatures and in his original responsibility for the world. It reaffirms that man is truly man when he participates in the life of God; that he is not autonomous, either in relation to God, or in relation to the world; that true human life can never be "secular." In Jesus Christ, God and man are one; in Him, therefore, God becomes accessible not by superseding or eliminating the **humanum**, but by realizing and manifesting humanity in its purest and most authentic form (emphasis his).¹⁰*

Notice here how Meyendorff speaks of "man" and "humanity" as concrete entities which themselves are radically affected by the incarnation itself, and note just how much the incarnation itself accomplishes in his theology. This is not at all atypical among Eastern thinkers.

What place is there then, for the saving work of Christ? In Orthodoxy theology, there is generally quite little said about the atonement, which is often the focus of Western reflection on Christ's work. Instead, the great emphasis falls upon Christ's work of conquering Death and Satan and emerging victorious over them in His resurrection. *His dying and rising again are not ignored, but they are not seen primarily as a substitutionary atonement for sins resulting in a judicial pardon of sin and declaration of righteousness, as they generally are in Reformed thought.* Whereas Reformed theology often uses imagery of a courtroom to describe the work of Christ, Orthodox theology would rather use imagery of a battlefield, of a fight to the death. Athanasius, for instance, spoke of death reigning through Satan, of Christ struggling and warring against Satan, and of His triumphing over death by His own death on the cross. Christ bound Satan (who is called a "tyrant") hand and foot, and Christ's resurrected body was His *"trophy of victory."*¹¹ The imagery used by Athanasius is graphic and moving. The important 8th century Orthodox theologian, John of Damascus, also used such imagery. In regard to Christ, he writes:

He was put to the test and He conquered that He, might gain for us the victory and give to our nature the power to conquer the Adversary, so that through the very assaults by which the nature had been conquered of old it might conquer its former victor.¹²

(Notice here again how human "nature" is spoken of as some sort of concrete entity.) Later in this same work John changes his imagery slightly, but the ideas are similar:

Wherefore, then, death approaches, gulps down the bait of (Christ's) body, and is pierced by the hook of the divinity. Then, having tasted of the sinless and life-giving body, it is destroyed and gives up all those whom it had swallowed down of old.¹³

Although this imagery we have been surveying above is undoubtedly the favorite imagery employed by Orthodox theologians to describe the work of Christ, they do not completely ignore terms which are more commonly used in Reformed theology. Athanasius also referred to Christ as our "substitute" and "propitiation," and he spoke of Christ as fulfilling our "debt." John of Damascus called Christ's death a "sacrifice" made to win our "redemption." Yet none of these terms take on any real importance in Eastern theology. Why is this? Surely much of it has to do with the Orthodox view of the consequences of Adam's sin, which we discussed above. Since Orthodox thinkers focus their attention on the corruption and mortality that comes from Adam, Christ's work is portrayed as doing away with this corruption and mortality. Death, the ever present enemy, must be destroyed, and Christ accomplishes this task. *But because guilt is not seen as a significant problem in Orthodox theology, there is also little attention focused upon Christ's work as a sacrifice, substitution, or propitiation, since these ideas are primarily connected with Christ's bearing guilt on our behalf.* The converse is true of Reformed theology. Since the imputation of Adam's guilt plays a critical role in its understanding of the consequences of sin, it also places great importance on Christ's vicarious, substitutionary atonement, by which the punishment due to our guilt is laid upon the Lord.

What ought Reformed Christians to make of the Eastern Orthodox presentation of the person and work of Christ? There is undoubtedly much material to appreciate. In regard to their reflections on the incarnation, that is, on *the person* of Christ, we could probably learn a great deal from Orthodox theologians. Perhaps we ought to pause a moment longer contemplating the awesome reality of the eternal God taking on human flesh. Perhaps we too quickly move on to other doctrines rather than fully think through the implications of the incarnation. We may well not wish to go as far as they do in speaking of "humanity" as a whole being united with God in the incarnation, but it would certainly be worth our time to seriously consider Orthodox thinking on this matter.

There is also much to appreciate in the Orthodox portrayal of the *work* of Christ. The imagery of Christ as the victorious hero conquering the tyrannous Death and Satan is not only exciting, it is also quite biblical. To offer but one New Testament example, Hebrews 2:14-15 says:

"Since the children have flesh and blood, he too shared in their humanity so that by his death he might destroy him who holds the power of death — that is, the devil — and free those who all their lives were held in slavery by their fear of death" (NIV).

We might also think of all the Old Testament stories in which salvation in Christ is typologically portrayed by the salvation of the people of Israel through destruction of the enemy (e.g. the drowning of the Egyptians in the Red Sea and the conquest of Canaan). The first Question and Answer of the *Heidelberg Catechism* itself speaks of Christ freeing us from the tyranny of the Devil. Certainly there is much to work with here, and Reformed preachers and teachers would do well to explore these themes further.

And yet, we cannot overlook the fact that in giving relatively short shrift to the biblical teaching that Christ's death was an atoning sacrifice, Eastern Orthodoxy has downplayed a crucial aspect of the doctrine of salvation. *It is imperative that Christians recognize that we bear guilt that must be atoned for, and that Christ's sacrifice on the cross accomplished just this:*

"But he was pierced for our transgressions, he was crushed for our iniquities; the punishment that brought us peace was upon him, and by his wounds we are healed."
(Isaiah 53:5) (NIV)

It is imperative that Christians acknowledge that they have not matched the standard of obedience demanded by God, and that Christ's obedience met the standard on our behalf:

"For just as through the disobedience of the one man the many were made sinners, so also through the obedience of the one man the many will be made righteous."
(Romans 5:19) (NIV)

These are not matters that Eastern Orthodoxy can ignore if it wishes to be faithful to the biblical record.

D Van Drunen

© 2013

www.christianstudylibrary.org

¹ For some examples, see Athanasius, *Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione*, trans. and ed. Robert W. Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 141; John of Damascus, "An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith," in *Writings*, trans. Frederic H. Chase, Jr. (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1958), 265-6. For a modern statement, see Sergius Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, trans. Lydia Kesich (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988), 105.

² *Byzantine Theology* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1974), 143.

³ For a detailed defense of immediate imputation, see John Murray, *The Imputation of Adam's Sin* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1959).

⁴ Athanasius, *De Incarnatoine*, 183.

⁵ *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans* (Oxford, 1848), 151-52.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 155. See also 154.

⁷ *The Orthodox Church* (New York: Penguin Books, 1993), 223.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 224.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 221.

¹⁰ *Byzantine Theology*, 151-52.

¹¹ *De Incarnation*, 189, 195, 199-207, 251.

¹² "Exposition of the Orthodox Faith," 324.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 332