



Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal.
Philosophical Sciences. Vol. 2(88)

Вісник Житомирського державного
університету імені Івана Франка.
Філософські науки. Вип. 2(88)

ISSN: 2663-7650

UDC 1: 27-31

DOI 10.35433/Philosophical Sciences.2(88).2020.20-29

RELIGIOUS DIMENSION OF GLOBALIZATION CHALLENGES AND THEIR INTERPRETATION IN THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONCEPTS OF THEOLOGISTS

O. L. Sokolovskyi* , K. A. Kvasha**

The study aims to reveal the transformation of religious anthropology as a component of theology, which involves the study of the doctrines of Christian churches to analyze the processes of formation of the Christian worldview. The article emphasizes the need to determine the anthropological content of paradigmatic transformations of modern theology, and also establishing the possibilities of the influence of Christian doctrine of man on overcoming the anthropological crisis of modernity.

The authors proceed from the laws of transformation of Christian anthropology due to the rethinking of the basic dogmatic provisions of Christian doctrine and socio-cultural breakdown of the modern world. Dominant in Western theology was neo-patristic, whose followers attempted to update traditional teaching by using modern terminology in accordance with today's demands. As the opposite evolutionary direction, the authors cite the postulates of modern theology related to the liturgical teachings of Greek theologians, which are based on the idea of "Eucharistic ecclesiology", which became widespread in Eastern religious and philosophical thought.

Based on the analysis of anthropological concepts of modern Christianity, it is established that their main issue in theological teaching concerned the concept of the person of God and man. This approach has led to some contradictions in anthropology, interpreting the concept of personality in four meanings: as an embodiment; as a connection; as unity and divine consciousness. Christian theologians had an excellent view of the concept of personality in anthropological issues, which led to the formation of different approaches in modern theology. At the same time, theologians have established the ontological supremacy of the incarnation and the person over nature and essence, which allows man to realize human existence in the image of Christ. Therefore, the inferiority of human nature, on the one hand, does not allow man to become God, and on the other – He is manifested in his personality.

*Doctor of Sciences (Philosophy), Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Political Science
(Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University, Zhytomyr, Ukraine)

osokol_83@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0003-2228-3040

**Postgraduate Student at the Department of Philosophy and Political
(Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University, Zhytomyr, Ukraine)

kricinka15@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0003-2921-3221

Key words: anthropology, Christology, soteriology, man, theology, spirituality, being.

РЕЛІГІЙНИЙ ВИМІР ГЛОБАЛІЗАЦІЙНИХ ВИКЛИКІВ ТА ЇХ ІНТЕРПРЕТАЦІЯ В АНТРОПОЛОГІЧНИХ КОНЦЕПЦІЯХ БОГОСЛОВІВ

О. А. Соколовський, К. О. Кваша

Дослідження спрямоване на розкриття трансформації релігійної антропології як складової богослов'я, що передбачає вивчення доктрин християнських церков для аналізу процесів формування християнського світогляду. Підкреслена необхідність визначення антропологічного змісту парадигмальних перетворень сучасної теології, а також встановлення можливостей впливу християнського вчення про людину на подолання антропологічної кризи сучасності.

Автори виходять із закономірностей трансформації християнської антропології зумовленою переосмисленням основних догматичних положень християнського віровчення та соціокультурного зламу сучасного світу. Домінуючою в західній теології була неопатристика, послідовники якої здійснили спробу оновити традиційне вчення шляхом використання сучасної терміносистеми відповідно до запитів сьогодення. Як протилежний еволюційний напрямок автори наводять постулати сучасної теології, пов'язаної з літургійним вченням грецьких теологів, в основі яких закладена ідея "євхаристичної еклезіології", що набула поширення в східній релігійно-філософській думці.

На основі аналізу антропологічних концепцій сучасного християнства встановлено, що основна їх проблематика в богословському вченні торкалася поняття особи Бога і людини. Такий підхід призвів до певних протиріч в антропології, інтерпретуючи поняття особи в чотирьох значеннях: як втілення, як з'єднання, як єдність і божественна свідомість. Християнські богослови мали відмінний погляд на поняття особи в антропологічній проблематиці, що зумовило формування різних підходів у сучасній теології. При цьому теологами було встановлено онтологічну вищість іпостасі й особи над природою та сутністю, що дозволяє людині реалізувати людське буття за образом Христа. Тому неповноцінність людської природи, з одного боку, не дозволяє людині стати Богом, а з другого, – Він виявляється в її особистості.

Ключові слова: антропологія, христологія, сотеріологія, людина, теологія, духовність, буття.

Introduction of the issue. Catholic and Orthodox theologians have a number of common positions on the issues of Christological doctrine, which are revealed in the doctrine of Christ as the Son of God and the Son of Man. Thus, Christological doctrine in Orthodox theology is represented by a holistic doctrine, combining several key issues: the dogma of the Incarnation, the problems of divine and human nature, the doctrine of the two actions and will of Christ, his ministry, suffering, death on the cross, ascension and deification.

Instead, the vector of modern Christological issues, which is associated with the anthropological

turn of the twentieth century, is reflected in the philosophical and religious anthropology of Orthodoxy. Knowledge of the essence of man in accordance with the dogmas of today's inquiries necessitates theological discourse, rethinking, and often a new interpretation of the basic Christological questions. Anthropological provisions of Orthodox doctrine, which reveal the nature of man, his purpose in life and ways of salvation, are formed on the basis of Christian dogmas of triadology and Christology, where it is understood as the image and likeness of God. Theologians of the twentieth century make an important conclusion for the

understanding of the individual about the ontological primacy of the incarnation and the person in relation to nature and essence. The Christological nature of anthropology helps a person to overcome the theoretical limits of teaching, directing him to the knowledge of his true nature. Such an approach in theology determines the view of the doctrine of man not only as theoretically significant, but also as a practical implementation of the idea of godlikeness.

The works of leading philosophers, theologians and theologians (Ishuk, 2018; Kirilo (Govorun), 2017) are devoted to the philosophical and religious understanding of the evolutionary processes of anthropology in Orthodox theology. A thorough analysis of the anthropological dimensions of Orthodoxy in the context of the relationship with Christology was performed (Buchma, 2019; Gavrilyuk, 2019; Chutchenko, 2019; Sokolovskiy, 2018; Zenko, 2019).

The aim of the article is not only to study Christological concepts in the field of Orthodox anthropology, but also to understand the evolution of this problem and its explanation in modern times by individual theologians. Influence at the beginning of the twentieth century led to the separation of two directions in Orthodox theology, determining the specifics of the interpretation of Christological issues in accordance with the transformation of social consciousness to change human nature and its essence in the modern world. To understand these processes, we will identify general factors that influenced the formation of anthropological views and contributed to the development of Christological concepts by Orthodox theologians.

Results and discussion.

Understanding the problem of personality in the dimension of Orthodox theology by returning to the

patriarchal tradition was carried out by G. Florovsky. Only the revival of the Greek type of thinking, according to the theologian, will free the Orthodox faith from the influence of Latin and liberal theology. The notionalist considers Christology in the context of personalism, where the Scriptures play an important role. In it, a man perceives revelation on a personal level, the reality of which is revealed in the Person of Jesus Christ.

In the Christological doctrine of G. Florovsky, Jesus presented humanity as a historical person capable of caring for human destiny. In the hypostatic union, Christ voluntarily accepts human nature, thus establishing a special connection with humanity, but the difference between the divine and human nature in Christ remains.

Thus, G. Florovsky concludes that if human nature is embodied in the guise of God-Word and united by His Person, then the body of Christ is not subject to decay [1: 124]. The dogma of the incarnation is interpreted by the theologian as the desire of God to identify Himself with man in one incarnation while preserving the divine essence. It should be noted that G. Florovsky, with the help of Christology, expressed philosophical ideas about the natural desire of man for the supernatural, the knowledge of which is peculiar only to the whole man, who is a person. The Christological ideas of the theologian are important for the development of modern Orthodox theology, as they create the possibility of discourse in a plane that was considered inviolable.

An important contribution to the understanding of Christological issues in Orthodox theology was made by V. Lossky – the founder of the neo-patristic synthesis, which is based on Christian personalism and existentialism. Unlike G. Florovsky, who called for the return of the

objective-idealistic ontology of Greek Christianity, V. Lossky was a supporter of the personal-mystical tradition in Orthodoxy: "Christian mysticism cannot exist without theology and vice versa" [2: 98]. In mystical theology, the thinker saw the existence of those principles that allow a person to comprehend the needs of the spiritual life.

In the Christology of personalism, V. Lossky pays special attention to the subject of knowledge of God. According to the theologian, in the absence of an appropriate terminology, it is impossible to comprehend the ontological essence of nature and the person, which leads to the distortion of the act of redemption and deification. In the embodiment, according to V. Lossky, the principle of hypostatic freedom is realized through the union of two natures in one incarnation for the salvation of mankind. To explain this process of Christology, the theologian uses the concept of "manifest nature", justifying the unity of Christ with human nature, not the person.

Thus, the Christology of V. Lossky establishes the difference between the individual and the personality, which is expressed in the presence for the first subject of "separate nature" and "superhuman essence" for the second [2: 129]. This approach in Christology contradicted the patriarchal tradition, which understood the individual as a separate being, but treated the individual as an individual endowed with an intelligent nature. Thus, V. Lossky's personality is identified with self-consciousness, while in theology it was identified with independent being.

It should be noted that critics of Lossky's Christological conception were somewhat biased in their use of the term "In-hypostasis" to denote the connection between the person and nature, substantiating the expediency of use in the relationship between the individual and the species. Instead,

S. Zinkovsky, having analyzed in detail the Christological concept of V. Lossky, argues that the thinker uses the concept of "in-hypostasis" exclusively in the patriarchal tradition, arguing that he belongs to the "personnel of Christ" [3: 94]. This allowed the theologian to state the ability of man to approach the divine state. However, only the personality is the image of God, while man creates his own nature by his existence, revealing the essence: "All our nature is subject to deification, and is connected with God, creates a personality with two natures – human and divine" [3: 95].

V. Lossky's Christological teaching directs soteriology to pneumatology. According to the theologian, the union of human and divine nature in the individual is made possible by the action of the Holy Spirit and personal freedom: It is difficult for man to understand the meaning of Christological dogma, which relates the will to the function of nature... The concept of personality allows freedom to nature, but the individual is free from his nature. The human incarnation is asserted in renunciation of one's own will. Self-affirmation, which leads to the loss of individual freedom, must be overcome... Only in this case does a person receive the freedom of the individual, and hence the image of God [2: 93].

However, the image of God in man can become His likeness; depending on the state of choice that human nature is endowed with.

A meaningful analysis of the economy of the Son with the Holy Spirit in the personalist Christology of V. Lossky was conducted by J. Zizioulas. According to the theologian, the content of pneumatology, in contrast to Christology, should be defined in ecclesiological terms. In this context, J. Zizioulas distinguishes between "subjective" and "objective" aspects of the Church. The first belongs to the

prerogative of pneumatology, as it concerns the "personalization" of the mystery of Christ, understood by believers, and the second – to Christology. In contrast to nature and personality, V. Lossky developed an approach that allowed us to consider Christology and pneumatology as components of ecclesiology. In the structure of the Church, the "objective" Christological aspect is complemented by the "subjective", which correlates with the freedom and integrity of each person and his spiritual life. Thus, V. Lossky in Orthodox theology tried to combine Christological, pneumatological and ecclesiological teachings, which, according to J. Zizioulas, makes this synthesis complex and impossible.

The deification of man as an integral aspect of soteriology, according to V. Lossky, is carried out in the sacraments through the action of the Holy Spirit. However, only the inner experience of the sacraments based on one's own experience and love can guarantee one's salvation. Thus, V. Lossky's Christology tends to "personalism" and is an attempt to modernize Orthodox theology.

A significant contribution to the development of Orthodox theology was made by the archpriest of the Orthodox Church in America, John Meindorf. In his Orthodox theology, the thinker theologian, like his mentor G. Florovsky, pays special attention to the study of personalist Christology. The influence of the latter in the formation of the Christological approach in theology is evidenced by Meindorf's use of the term "asymmetric Christology" to describe the teachings of Cyril of Alexandria. This term indicated the embodiment of the Divine Logos and the absence of a separate incarnation in human nature. Therefore, the subject of all the actions of Christ was the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. Meindorf finds

confirmation of his reasoning in the "theopaschism" of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, which corresponded to the Orthodox teaching that He died in human rather than divine nature.

In analyzing Byzantine Christology, Meindorf also uses the terminology of G. Florovsky. Yes, the expression "unity of the subject in Christ" was first used by G. Florowski, but Meindorf gave it a new interpretation in the doctrine of incarnation. If the former believed that the human nature of Christ was the incorruptible nature of Adam before the Fall, then I. Meindorf emphasized its perishability, so deification begins only with the death of Christ. To substantiate his position, the theologian uses the concept of "Easter mystery", which is reduced to the concept that through the death and resurrection of Christ, his human nature is transformed from decay to immortality, from death to life.

In this context, I. Meindorf constructs the problem of the natural and gnomical will of Christ. Here the theologian imitated Maximus the Confessor, who determined the subordination of the natural will to the divine with the subsequent transition to the will of God after hypostatic union. Instead, the gnomical will depends on the characteristics of man and the availability of freedom of choice allows him to be determined between good and evil. The imperfection of the gnomical will leads to sin. Therefore, Maximus the Confessor denied the existence of such a will in Christ. A similar position was taken by I. Meindorf, who stated: "The presence of a gnomical will in Christ leads to the opposition of the will of the Father and the Spirit" [4: 165-166].

However, S. Zenkovsky does not agree with this interpretation of the theologian. The researcher notes that the analysis of Christological texts of John of Damascus gives grounds to speak about the erroneous views of

I. Meierdorf in this issue: "Christ united two natures and two natural wills, but since the incarnation (of Christ) is one, the gnomical will is also one" [5: 154]. But this fact, according to S. Zenkovsky, does not diminish the contribution of I. Meierdorf in the development of modern Orthodox theology and Christology, because "he adhered to the conceptual apparatus of Maxim, considering "gnomic will" a synonym and symbol of creative personal dynamics" [5: 155].

Another aspect of Meierdorf's Christological teaching concerned the concept of "free will." Using this concept, G. Florovsky correlated it with the divine nature of Christ and His trial by death on the Cross was a voluntary act of God's will, despite the incorruptibility of human nature. Instead, I. Meierdorf believed that the divine will was expressed in the incarnation, when Christ consciously united with sinful and, therefore, mortal human nature. At the same time, the theologian emphasized the complete ignorance of Christ of the consequences of the laws of human nature, which affected His divine essence. The answer to this question, according to I. Meierdorf, will remain a mystery, because it goes beyond human understanding.

The main concept in the Christological concept of I. Meierdorf was "Hypostasis". Reference to this concept, according to the theologian, is a necessary condition for understanding the connection of different and incompatible human and divine nature in Christ. This allowed the theologian to interpret the term "voipostasny" as the absence of human incarnation in Christ and the belonging of consciousness to His divine nature. Thus, I. Meierdorf formulates the basic postulate of his Christological concept: the Divine Hypostasis of the Logos loses its transcendence and the perception of human nature determines His

immanence... He becomes fully compatible with human nature and makes it His own [6: 30].

Defining the way of uniting the divine and human nature in Christ, I. Meierdorf substantiates the openness of the Hypostasis of God to his creation, which in the incarnation defined His personal existence. The theologian is convinced that after the union of the two natures, it was the divine person who underwent change, and this made it possible to realize the salvation of mankind in full.

Thus, the Christological views of I. Meierdorf had a decisive influence on most modern Orthodox theologians. The proposed Christological concept allowed us to rethink the concepts of "personality", "hypostasis", "person", which were interpreted by the Orthodox tradition.

A significant contribution to the development of Orthodox theology is made by J. Zizioulas, who made an attempt to comprehend the basic Christian principles to the demands of today. In his works, the theologian raises a number of Christological questions, offering a kind of "Christological ecclesiology". Note that the Christological views of J. Zizioulas are revealed in the Trinitarian understanding of the nature of the Church. The theologian himself considers his ecclesiological system in two aspects – Christological and pneumatological. These aspects, according to J. Zizioulas, are inseparable in Christian doctrine.

The synthesis of Christology and pneumatology is objective in nature and is not an artificial product of theological constructions. Confirmation of this position for J. Zizioulas is the New Testament texts, in particular the Gospel of John: "For there was not yet a Spirit in them, for Jesus was not yet glorified" (John 7:39), and the statement that: "There is no Christ until the Spirit appears, who is not only

a forerunner of His coming, but also one who asserts His very identity as Christ" [7: 129-130]. In the liturgy, according to the theologian, these two approaches are clearly expressed in the relationship between baptism and anointing. Given the church's practice of anointing after baptism, there is every reason to believe that pneumatology is primary in relation to Christology. However, these sacraments of the Christian church are combined in the liturgical synthesis in a theological way, which removes the question of superiority.

The main problem for the Church, according to J. Ziziulas, is the rupture of the synthesis between Christology and pneumatology in liturgical practice and theology. The consequence of such a separation for the Catholic Church was not only the liturgical separation of baptism and anointing, but also the dominance of Christology over pneumatology. Instead, the Orthodox Church preserved the unity of the sacraments at the liturgical level, but this did not solve the problem of relations between the churches. The dominance of Christology over pneumatology in the Western tradition and pneumatology over Christology in the Eastern tradition leads to the definition of different accents and priorities in the theological and cultic approaches of the churches. This problem is closely related to ecclesiology, as it directly depends on the solution of previous aspects of theology.

In trying to solve this problem, the Christological views of J. Ziziulas are revealed, which are closely connected with triadology: Where the Son is, there is also the Father and the Holy Spirit, and where the Spirit is, there is also the Father and the Son. Yet the contribution of each of these Persons of God to the economy is characterized by notable features of direct significance to

the ecclesiology in which they are to be reflected [7: 131-132]).

Since God knows His creation as the fulfillment of His will, it is not being, but the will of God's love that unites all beings and points to the meaning of being. It is in this aspect that the Christological problems of the incarnation are revealed. The incarnate Christ, according to J. Ziziulas, is so similar to the highest will of God's love that the incarnate Christ is the meaning of all created being and the goal of history. The creation of all things was done with Christ in the heart, so despite the fall of man, the incarnation had to take place. From this J. Ziziulas concludes: "The incarnate Christ is the truth, because He is the highest, unquenchable will of the ecstatic love of God, who intends to bring everything created into communion with His own life to know Him and himself in this event of communion" [7: 98].

An important achievement of J. Ziziulas in theology is the Christological substantiation of the synthesis of truth, which appears at the same time as being and history. The theologian states: "The truth of history lies simultaneously in the substrate of created existence, in the completion or future of history and in the incarnate Christ" [7: 98-99]. Therefore, Christ becomes the "principle" and "end" of all things, those who not only move history in its own unfolding, but also directs existence even from the multiplicity of all created things to true being, which is true life and true communication.

Thus J. Ziziulas concludes that, despite the presence of the Father and the Spirit in history, only the Son becomes history. When comparing the concept of time and history to the Father and the Spirit, according to the theologian, their participation in economy is denied: "Economy, insofar as it contains history and itself has history, is only one, and is the event of

Christ" [7: 132]. Therefore, all the events of the New Testament that are at first sight of a pneumatological nature, in particular Pentecost, should be connected with the event of Christ, so as not to be leveled by soteriology.

The unity of Christology and pneumatology, according to J. Zizioulas, is manifested in the Son's liberation from the Spirit and economy from the dependence of history: If the Son died on the cross, thus humbled by historical existence, it was the Spirit who raised him from the dead. For the Spirit exists outside of history, and when He acts in history, He does so in order to bring the last days, the Eschaton, into the course of history. [7: 132].

Thus, the Spirit makes Christ an eschatological being, who in theology is referred to as the "New Adam".

J. Zizioulas points to another important aspect of the action of the Holy Spirit in the events of Christ. The participation of the Holy Spirit in economy, according to the theologian, makes Christ not just an individual, not "one" but "many." Therefore, the "collective personality" of Christ cannot be imagined without pneumatology, which introduces the dimension of communication into Christology. This is what allows J. Zizioulas to single out the Christological aspect in ecclesiology in the doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ. In this regard, M. Bukin rightly notes: "The Metropolitan of Pergamum considers the Church as a corporate Person of Christ, consisting of" many "" [5: 131]. This circumstance was due to the fact that in the minds of the faithful formed a belief in the essence of the Eucharist to unite "many" in the bosom of the Church as the Body of Christ.

The Greek theologian develops the doctrine, referring to the historical foundations of unity in the Eucharist, which has its roots in Old Testament times and is equivalent to the

consciousness of the Jewish people. In the New Testament testimonies, Jesus was represented in the context of the Eucharist as a servant of God under the titles "Lord" and "Son of Man". Hence the dialectic of "one" and "many", which in the Christian sacrament unites "many" with "one", while "one" contains "many" - that is, the people of God. Due to this unity, J. Zizioulas considers it appropriate to use the term "corporate person" [5: 131].

In the ecclesiological Christology of J. Zizioulas, Jesus is represented in the person of the incarnate Christ ("One") and Christ of the Church ("many"). Only in the sacrament of the Eucharist, according to the theologian, does this distinction disappear. That is why the Eucharist occupies a central place in the ecclesiological Christology of J. Zizioulas. However, man is not able to build his own future, because in the Eucharist he perceives the present as existence in the Kingdom of God. This aspect, according to T. Gavriilyuk, created a fundamentally new for Orthodox existentialism concept of mystical knowledge of God, which can be called the theory of passive expectation [8: 144]. In the context of the analysis of the "catholic" character of the Eucharistic community, J. Zizioulas relies on the Christological aspect. In the very meaning of the concept of "catholicity", according to the theologian, laid down Christological issues: "We cannot understand catholicity as an ecclesiological concept until we comprehend it as Christological reality" [7: 161]. The theologian is convinced that the Christological nature of catholicity lies in the impossibility of interpreting the Church as a catholic community that strives for openness, but is a community that experiences and represents the unity of all creation. It is this unity, according to J. Zizioulas, that is reflected in the person of Christ. In its catholicity, the Church is precisely

the unity of Christ and His catholicity: "It is a presence that unites in one existential reality both what is given and what is required by the presence of the One who unites in Himself the community and the whole creation through His existential inclusion in them both" [7: 162]. Thus, the catholicity of the Church is determined by the inseparable unity with Christ and the recognition of His presence in history.

Note that Christological catholicity, which opposes division, cannot be static, it must express dynamic catholicity. This, as noted by J. Zizioulas, becomes possible under the condition of realizing the pneumatological dimension of the Catholicism of the Church: "In concluding the Eucharist, the Church realized early on that in order for the Eucharistic community to become or discover in itself the integrity of the Body of Christ, the descent of the Holy Spirit on this creation is necessary" [7: 162].

However, some theologians express their disagreement with certain provisions of the ecclesiological Christology of J. Zizioulas. The Greek theologian, in their view, goes beyond Christology when he transfers the principle of "one" and "many" to bishops and the Ecumenical Church. In this aspect, they argue, the position of J. Zizioulas is not consistent with the teachings of the Church and needs a theological justification. The canonical aspect determines the unity of the Church around the bishop, despite the division of dioceses into parishes under the presbytery. The Church becomes one in Christ with the help of the Eucharist, through which her unity in the bishop is expressed.

Conclusions and research perspectives. The question of anthropology contains a deep meaning not only of liberation from sin and death of the Divine and human origins,

where they came together, but also gives humanity the opportunity to begin a new life. Christological ideas in the concept of redemption are clearly traced in the doctrine of the hypostatic union of two natures in the person of Jesus Christ, who became the Mediator between God and man. A reborn person who has come to know Christ is obliged to follow Christian guidelines and to be a role model in his new way of life.

Orthodox anthropology is formed on the basis of the reference to the position of the two natures of Christ and their hypostatic connection. In Orthodox theology, a person is represented as a dynamic reality, which in the process of ascent and communication determines its attitude to God. Man, created in the image, is called to attain the likeness of God, so his formation is reduced to the spiritual experience he acquires in coexistence with God. Therefore, Orthodox Christology forms the image of a perfect man who ceases to be a natural being and rises to the reality of his existence. Christ restores the lost unity of God and man. The human and divine natures of Christ define the dual essence of man, which allows us to know God and communicate with Him. The changes that a person experiences in life through the creation of his own world as a creative being occur under the influence of Christological teaching.

LITERATURE

1. Флоровский Г. Восточные отцы V–VIII веков [Репринт изд. УМСА-PRESS.]. Париж, 1933. М.: МП Паломник, 1992. 260 с.
2. Лосский В. Очерки мистического богословия Восточной Церкви // Мистическое богословие. [Пер. с фр. В. А. Решиковой; изд. христ. благотвор.-просветит. ассоц. "Путь к Истине"] Киев: Путь, 1991. С. 97–259.
3. Мефодий (Зинковский С. А.). Православное богословие личности: истоки, современность, перспективы развития / иеромонах Мефодий

(Зинковский). Москва – Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Олега Абышко, 2014. 721 с.

4. Мейендорф И. Иисус Христос в восточном православном богословии / Пер. с англ. свящ. Олега Давыденкова, при уч. Л. А. Успенской, примеч. А. И. Сидорова. М., 2000. 318 с.

5. Афанасий (Букин М. А.). Христологические основания экклезиологии митрополита Иоанна // Христианское чтение: научный журнал. Санкт-Петербургская духовная академия. СПб. № 6 [ноябрь-декабрь]: Теология. Философия. История. 2016. С. 128–138.

6. Мейендорф И. Империя и Церковь в эпоху Юстиниана // Свидетель истины. Памяти протопр. Иоанна Мейендорфа / Сост. А. В. Левитский. Екатеринбург: Изд. отдел Екатеринбургской епархии, 2003. С. 12–31.

7. Зізіулас Й. Буття як спілкування. Дослідження особистості і церкви [пер. з англ. В. Верлок, М. Козуб]. К.: Дух і літера, 2005. 276 с.

8. Havryliuk T. The western doctrine of justification and the eastern doctrine of deification within contemporary anthropological perspective // Софія. Гуманітарно-релігієзнавчий вісник. 2018. 3 (12). С. 8–11.

9. Соколовський О. Л. Христологія: еволюція доктрини: монографія. Житомир: Вид-во Євенок О. О., 2018. 472 с.

REFERENCES (TRANSLATED & TRANSLITERATED)

1. Florovskij, G. (1992). *Vostochnye otcy V–VIII vekov* [Eastern Fathers of the V–VIII centuries]. M.: MP Palomnik (in Russian).

2. Losskij, V. (1991). *Ocherki misticheskogo bogosloviya Vostochnoj*

Cerkvi. [Essays on the Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church]. *Misticheskoe bogoslovie*. Kiev: Put, 97–259 (in Russian).

3. Mefodij (Zinkovskij S.). (2014). *Pravoslavnoe bogoslovie lichnosti: istoki, sovremennost, perspektivy razvitiya* [Orthodox theology of personality: origins, modernity, development prospects]. Moskva–Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatelstvo Olega Abyshko (in Russian).

4. Mejendorf I. (2000). *Iisus Hristos v vostochnom pravoslavnom bogoslovii* [Jesus Christ in Eastern Orthodox Theology]. M. (in Russian).

5. Afanasij (Bukin M.). (2016). *Hristologicheskie osnovaniya ekkleziologii mitropolita Ioanna*. [Christological foundations of the ecclesiology of Metropolitan John]. *Hristianskoe chtenie: nauchnyj zhurnal. Teologiya. Filosofiya. Istorija*, 6, 128–138 (in Russian).

6. Mejendorf, I. (2003). *Imperiya i Cerkov v epohu Yustiniana*. [Empire and Church in the era of Justinian]. *Svidetel istiny. Pamyati protopr. Ioanna Mejendorfa*, 12–31 (in Russian).

7. Ziziulas J. (2005). *Buttya yak spilkuvannya. Doslidzhennya osobistosti i cerkvi* [Being as communication. The study of personality and the church]. K.: Duh i litera (in Ukrainian).

8. Havryliuk, T. (2018). *The western doctrine of justification and the eastern doctrine of deification within contemporary anthropological perspective*. *Sofiya. Gumanitarno-religiyeznavchij visnik*, 3 (12), 8–11 (in English).

9. Sokolovskij, O. (2018). *Hristologiya: evolyuciya doktrini: monografiya* [Christology: the evolution of doctrine: a monograph]. Zhitomir: Vid-vo Yevenok O. O (in Ukrainian).

Receive: October 09, 2020
Accepted: November 16, 2020