



THE ROMANIAN INSTITUTE OF
ORTHODOX THEOLOGY AND
SPIRITUALITY

Symposium

**Humanity in the Third Millennium
and the Mystery of the Divine**

*The Eighth Ecumenical Theological
Symposium*

Vol. VIII, Nr. 1, 2001



THE ROMANIAN INSTITUTE OF
ORTHODOX THEOLOGY AND
SPIRITUALITY

The Chapel "St. Apostles Peter and Paul"

INCORPORATED IN AUGUST 1993

**Humanity in the Third Millennium
and the Mystery of the Divine**

*The Eighth Ecumenical Theological
Symposium*

December 3, 2000

Published by The Romanian Institute of
Orthodox Theology and Spirituality

New York, 2001

Editors:

Fr. Theodor Damian, Ph.D., George Alexe

Assistant to the editor and designer:

Claudia Damian

Text revisions: Suzana and Fr. Paul Theophilus

© 2001, The Romanian Institute of Orthodox Theology
and Spirituality

All rights reserved

Printed in the USA

ISBN 1-888067- 12-8

ISSN 1084-0591

Contents

The Eighth Ecumenical Theological Symposium **Humanity in the Third Millennium and the Mystery of the Divine**

GEORGE ALEXE Introductory address.	5
FR. DR. VASILE VASILACHI Who is God and who is Man?	11
GEORGE ALEXE Humanity in the Third Millennium and the Mystery of the Divine.	13
RICHARD GRALLO, PHD The General Problem of the One and the Many: A Psychological Viewpoint.	23
FR. DR. EUGEN PENTIUC The Tetragrammaton. From Revelation to Mystery.	33
REV. DR. BERT F. BREINER Incarnation, Deification and Interfaith Dialogue	41
FR. DR. THEODOR DAMIAN The Relation between the Incomprehensibility of God and the Naming of God in the Theology of Pseudo-Dionysius.	53
List of participants.	67

Introductory address

Before presenting my general overview of the 8th Annual Ecumenical Theological Symposium, let me briefly share with you some good news for our Romanian Institute of Orthodox Theology and Spirituality.

First of all, under the diligent leadership and hard work of our President Rev. Prof. Dr. Theodor Damian, the Romanian Institute of Orthodox Theology and Spirituality has been academically recognized and affiliated with the Medieval Institute of Western Michigan University at Kalamazoo, Michigan. In this new position, our Institute is entitled to participate in the largest international congresses on Medieval Studies in the world, which is annually attended by an approximate number of 3500-4000 medievalists and delegates.

Beginning in May 2001, our Institute will organize and sponsor, for the first time, two Romanian sessions under the general topic *The Roman Byzantine cultural, artistic and spiritual inheritance of Eastern Europe and Asia Minor*.

All of you are kindly invited to attend, if possible, this international debut of our Institute. Already, the Director of the Medieval Institute of Western Michigan University, Prof. Dr. Paul E. Szarmack has invited us to participate in the 36th International Congress on Medieval Studies in 2001.

For this most appreciated academic performance, our President Fr. Dr. Theodor Damian deserves sincere congratulations and all the best wishes in his noble task to represent the Romanian Institute of Orthodox Theology and Spirituality at the highest university levels in the USA and Canada. Thank you, Fr. Damian.

Another good news is concerning our public relations via the internet. From now on, we hope, all the activities of our Institute may be presented on the Internet Orthodox Directory, precisely on YOMEE.COM ORTHODOX DIRECTORY, under the care of Rev. Fr. Archpriest Constantin Alecese of Los Angeles, California, who certainly deserves our gratitude.

In the light of these good news that are marking the growing cultural prestige of our Institute, let us now direct your attention to this year's event, the 8th Ecumenical Theological Symposium. We are deeply

moved by the presence and blessings of our distinguished guests of honor, His Eminence Archbishop Victorin of the Romanian Orthodox Archdiocese in America and Canada, and the Rt. Rev. Fr. Dr. Vasile Vicelike, the Archdiocesan Vicar.

As it was announced in our call for papers, the main topic of the 8th Ecumenical Theological Symposium is one of the most ardent problem of our times: *Humanity in the Third Millennium and the Mystery of the Divine*.

It is no secret that we are living in a world full of mysteries. We are all surrounded by many kinds of mysteries. And sometimes we are feeling from outside of us the terror of these unknown or unexplained mysteries.

Also, the mystery is a constitutive part of the human being. In fact, each human person is a mystery. Not theologically or philosophically, but scientifically, Dr. Alexis Carrel (1873-1944) the famous French surgeon and physiologist, who was also active in the United States, has explicitly confessed the mystery of the human being in his most celebrated book: *Man, This Unknown Being*.

We hope that among the conclusions drawn by our Symposium, one of them, the most essential one, will be the one asserting the mystery of the human person as deriving from the mystery of the Divine.

Jaroslav Pelikan, the great American Theologian converted to the Orthodox Christian Faith, who in *The Melody of Theology* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, London, England, 1958), asserted that “Mystery is usually thought of as the quantity of the unknown” (p. 168). Accepting this definition of mystery, as theology has throughout much of its history, Jaroslav Pelikan remarked that, “it has tended to lay claim to the territory of the unknown as the realm of mystery, and hence as the appropriate content of a divine revelation.” (p. 168)

Citing Paul Tillich, Markus N. A. Bockmuehl in his thoughtful book *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, Cambridge, UK, 1990), has rightly asserted that “Modern society seems to use the word *mystery* for any sublime and nebulous truth which is marveled at but not fully understood. Similarly, the word *revelation* today is often commandeered to describe any experience of cognitive realization” (p. 2).

Since most of the papers presented by our distinguished speakers this afternoon are dealing with these two key words, *mystery*

and *revelation* in their relationship with humanity and the mystery of the Divine, I consider the following *working definitions* proposed by Markus Bockmuehl as being also very useful for our purposes. According to him: “*Revelation* designates a) any divine disclosure communicated by visionary or prophetic means, or b) the manifestation of heavenly realities in a historical context. By *Mystery* is meant any reality of divine or heavenly origin specifically characterized as hidden, secret, or otherwise inaccessible to human knowledge” (*Ibidem*).

Certainly, searching for its spiritual equilibrium, the humanity of the third millennium could find valuable if not definitive answers in the religious anthropology and cosmology of Mircea Eliade, particularly in his interpretation of the “Sacred”, the *Sacrum*, which is the “Holy”, and its *hierophanies* that culminate in the supreme hierophany that is the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In fact, the *Sacrum* is the revelation of the mystery of the Divine in the life of humanity, configuring the comportment of the *homo religiosus*, as has been demonstrated by Mircea Eliade. Indeed, the entire life and work of Mircea Eliade was principally dedicated to the dialogue between the humanity of all times and the mystery of the Divine.

However, from our Orthodox Christian perspective, the greatest mystery of Christianity is Jesus Christ, the Son of God. All the Sacraments are based upon the mystery of the Son of God incarnated as man for our salvation. We regard, and confess in the same time, the mystery of Incarnation as being the mystery of all mysteries. The second main mystery in the Orthodox Christian teaching is the Church itself, in which the Divine Liturgy and all the Sacraments are performed. In this sense we could say that all mysteries celebrated by our tradition are comprised in the ritual of the Church where they are not just routinely remembered, but reactualized and lived as such.

Thus, sacraments being communicated to the faithful, the believers receive, through them, the spiritual energies of the Divine grace. All the Sacraments and all the dogmas are revealing the mystery of the Divine.

According to the Orthodox Christian teaching, all mysteries could be interpreted in the light of the mystery of the Divine, as they derive from it.

As one would expect, the papers that are going to be presented to your attention, will certainly underscore some of the very interesting aspects of our general topic.

We regret that Dr. Bruce Buglione, Vice President of Audrey Cohen College, New York, and Fr. Dr. Calin Samarghitan of Sibiu, Romania, were not able to be with us today.

In conformity with our program, the following papers will be offered here:

Who is God and who is Man? by Fr. Dr. Vasile Vicelike.

Existentialism and Personalism in Byzantine Humanism and Hesychasm, by Prof. Constantin N. Tsirpanlis, Ph.D..

Humanity in the Third Millennium and the Mystery of the Divine, by George Alexe.

The General Problem of the One and the Many: A Psychological Viewpoint, by Prof. Richard Grallo, Ph.D.

The Tetragrammaton: From Revelation to Mystery, by Fr. Dr. Eugen Pentiuc, Ph.D.

Incarnation, Deification and Interfaith Dialogue, by Rev. Bert F. Breiner, Ph.D.

The Relation Between the Incomprehensibility of God and the Naming of God in the Theology of Pseudo-Dionysius, by Fr. Theodor Damian, Ph.D.

Following the presentations we will have a break after which Prof. Elena Bront de Avila, Ph.D., Rev. Pavel Niculescu, and Julia Corduneanu will engage the audience in comments and discussion.

The entire event will be moderated by Fr. Paul Theophilus, who proves himself to be an excellent organizer. He has the rare talent to agreeably hold the attention of the audience, by creating not only an enjoyable atmosphere, but also restoring the spiritual strength and energy much needed for academic work.

Finally, it is our privilege to acknowledge some important messages of good will for the success of our Symposium, that we have received from Romania and the United States, especially from His Grace Petroniu Salajanul of the Romanian Orthodox Diocese of Oradea, Rev. Prof. Dr. Ioan Vasile Leb, the Dean of the Theological Faculty of Cluj-Napoca University, and from Jane Ann Groom, Interim Regional Conference Minister of the United Church of Christ, New York Conference, Southeastern Region. Also the messages received from Prof. Dr. Mircea Itu of Brasov and George Cabas of Sibiu, are to be kindly appreciated.

And now is the proper time for Fr. Paul Theophilus to exercise

his noble art of moderating the Eighth Ecumenical Annual Theological Symposium, organized by our Romanian Institute of Orthodox Theology and Spirituality. Thank you!

Who Is God and Who Is Man?

On the threshold of the Third Millennium, all mankind is coming now into sight as being intellectually, culturally, philosophically, socially, economically and even religiously divided into many creeds of life. All of these intellectual systems are disputing among themselves, especially when they are not together fighting against the materialistic, atheistic or hedonistic doctrines.

But at the same time, above all of these various human opinions, there is a new quest for God, a new interest in man's spiritual journey into eternity, in one's spiritual betterment, echoing the biblical and patristic teachings on that subject. The Son of God Himself has called the whole of mankind to be perfect, "You therefore must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. 5:48).

Saint Gregory of Nyssa saw the human person as an icon of God, so that true knowledge of oneself brings the knowledge of God, essential for such betterment.

How does one translate such an intention into practice? One of the Church Fathers, Dorotheos of Gaza, has insisted on the comportment we need to have with one another in our life: "When you see your brother, you see the Lord our God. Therefore you have to consider one another as a friend." This is a divine rule of living the Christian life.

Later, at the end of the first millennium, another spiritual father, St. Symeon The New Theologian, insisted on the mystery of man's relation to God. He wrote: "When you contemplate the grandeur of the created things with which the world is filled, do not think that they are more precious than you are; you have to keep in your mind the grace that has been given to you, deifying your soul. So as God has honored you above all visible things, also you have to honor God in everything you are doing, and God, in return, will glorify you above all visible creation and call you a true friend. But God gave to man something more. God gave to man His will with a treasure of wisdom. [...] For that I beg you to follow the path of Christ's commandments so that your face will be not ashamed" (Psalm 34:5). So here, in the present life and in the life to come you will fully enjoy them in company with all saints of all the times, in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be the glory throughout the ages!"

Speaking of the mystery of man's connection to God one must not separate the deification of the soul from the glorification of our bodies by God. In reference to this St. Paul advised: "Your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which is of God, and not yours. Therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's" (I Cor. 6:19-20). And again: "We are the temple of the living God, as God said, 'I will live in them and walk among them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people'" (II Cor. 6:16).

The mystery of the Divine makes us think of the mystery of man. Who is man? That is the question. A good starting point for reflection would be the words of the prophet: "What is man that you are mindful of him? And the Son of Man that you care for him? For You made him a little lower than the angels, and crowned him with glory and honor. You made him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; You put all things under his feet..." (Psalm 8:4-6).

Who is God and who is man? Two questions we need to never cease to struggle with.

Humanity in the Third Millennium and the Mystery of the Divine

From the very beginning I have to concede the very fact that we cannot pretend to understand humanity and the mystery of the Divine, without making a serious effort to know the tense relationship that has always existed between humanity and divinity. In other words, we need to comprehend the true ontological relation between the mystery of man and the mystery of the Divine, and also why the mystery of man is tempted to deny or even to replace the mystery of the Divine.

The issue is especially significant now, at this cyclical crossroads of our times, when at the end of this month of December 2000, the entire humankind will be festively parading through the gate of no return to the 21st century and the 3rd millennium.

This spectacular event of worldly proportions is supposed to be solemn. But it is not. In this very moment, we may have the last chance to spiritually reevaluate the present worldwide religious crises, and then to critically scrutinize the past where they originate, because they are still determining our already fragile future. To anticipate a theological answer, one may consider, as a common ground for these religious crises, the lack of the correct understanding of the mystery of the Divine in relation with the mystery of the man, throughout the millennia.

Without dramatizing, these religious crises are far from being extinguished. There seems to be a chain of sources that make them prolifically multiply in our world. History is showing us that causal explanations for crises are not enough. We should try to detect the real causes that are distorting the religious truth and are generating errors in thinking and approaching the sacred mysteries of humanity and Divinity. For this reason, all misinterpretations or misunderstandings should be recognized and rejected as such. It is very hard to believe in what is not true. There must be something else, ontologically more effective, transcending the inertia of these secularized modern and postmodern religious tribulations. One conclusion should be agreed upon, by common consent, in all its meanings. The mystery of existence cannot be rationalized or converted into philosophical concepts. And, much less, the mystery of the Divine cannot be metaphysically conceptualized as the ultimate reality.

What we really need this time is to look for a common denominator, a standard criterion for all of these specifically religious

crises that humanity has been enduring for such a long time. However, a cautionary attitude is advisable. We have to leave aside, once and for all, the confessional cortege of so many different paradigms that are strongly struggling for legitimacy based on old or renewed patterns, outside the real mystery of the Divine. Doing so, they only increase the religious disunity among themselves, by delaying to bring into existence the most desired religious unity of the entire humanity.

As we mentioned above, at this epochal crossroads of centuries and millennia, the tense relationship between humanity and God must be approached in a new way. There is a factor that is constitutive not only to all the religions of the world, but also to the entire mankind. This universal and ecumenical factor, which is recognized as such by the whole world, is the mystery of the Divine. That is to say the mystery of the Holy from which the mystery of the world and, strictly speaking, the mystery of the human beings come.

Apparently, the mystery of God and the mystery of man seem to be two distinct mysteries that are opposing each other. But this is not true. In fact there is only one and the same sacred mystery of the hypostatic union of the two natures, human and divine, hypostatically and theandrically united not only in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ but, certainly, in all Christian persons who have received the Sacrament of the Holy Baptism in the name of the Holy Trinity.

In fact, this hypostatization, ascribing a distinct existence to the human person, is the theandric mystery of man's existence which is, at the same time, the real theandric denominator for the whole world created by God. Without it the humanity of the third millennium might become meaningless.

By now, there is no secret that "humanity is a great mystery," as Pierre Teilhard de Chardin has clearly demonstrated. There is no wonder why the true glorious hymn of Christianity is dedicated to the mystery of the Divine, as we learn from St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy. Without any controversy, this very old Christian hymn is rightly revealing us, that "Truly great is the mystery of Christianity: God was manifested in the body, vindicated in the Spirit, seen by angels, proclaimed among the nations, believed in throughout the world and ascended into the glory" (I Timothy, 3:16).

Unfortunately, against the truth of these divine mysteries, solemnly emphasized by St. Paul, a large part of Western humanity has more and more emphatically expressed the mystery of the human, independent from the mystery of the Divine. But the effect of disregarding the sacredness of hypostatic union of the theandric mystery,

has almost diminished, if not totally broken, the spiritual equilibrium between the two natures, human and divine, particularly in the last three centuries of the second millennium. In this respect, Western humanity is still enduring the consequences of its modern anthropocentric desecration and profanation of the Divine mystery.

In the name of this anthropocentric humanism and rationalism, the holiness of life has been gradually minimized by an intensive process of desecration and secularization. The spiritual equilibrium between the mystery of the Divine and that of man has been almost destroyed. The gates of the anthropocentric humanism have been triumphantly opened to a new era. The Western anthropocentrism has claimed the victory of the modern and postmodern era everywhere in the world. Pantheism did also. But, by the grace of God, the theocentric humanism has not passed away. As yet it is still alive.

The fact that the mystery cannot be rationalized was overlooked. As Berdyaev demonstrated in one of his books, “the mystery has already been over-rationalized,” asserting that “the mystery can only be approached through myth and not through logical ideas.” More than that, Berdyaev was convinced that “...the mysteries of being are revealed only in and through man, in spiritual life and spiritual experience.” His conclusion was that “Man is the key to the mystery of knowledge and of existence.”¹

We cannot ignore the fact that for more than three centuries, Western humanity faced a strange competition between anthropocentric and theocentric humanism. This anachronistic competition has created all these modern and postmodern religious crises, by neglecting or, even worse, by detesting the mystery of the Divine.

The competition proved to have been a Western illusion, a luciferic temptation, not consistent with reality, in that it believed that the sacred mystery of life could simply be controlled, if not conquered, by the modern or postmodern man.

Of course, mystery cannot be eliminated from life because it is a constitutive part of it. More than that, the mystery of man cannot be approached only by rationalistic ideas, and certainly it cannot possibly have a sense of orientation outside of the Divine mystery.

It was by accepting reason as the supreme authority, that modern man and then postmodern man, have produced an existential paradox pretending to define humanity as being free from any kind of human or Divine mystery. Yet there is no freedom from the mystery of the human or from the mystery of the Divine. Life itself demonstrates it. The

antagonistic opposition between the mystery of man and the mystery of the Divine, invented by anthropocentric modernism was not enough to consider the human life as lacking its inner mystery.

Probably, in this opposition between the mystery of man and mystery of the Divine, something was enough or something was missing at the same time. The total absence of mystery, either Divine or human, from human life, has proved to be at the end of this second millennium something of an abnormal situation, whose dangerous anthropological consequences have been already attained a paroxysmal level.

Even Emil Cioran, the astute critic of Western culture, has recognized that “The mystery is the sign of human being. There where it exists, it indicates a hidden plenitude. As long as we have the sentiment of mystery, we implicitly have a religious dimension. Because to be religious means to feel the mystery even outside of any form of religious form.”²

To reverse this abnormal situation which has rationalistically created so many religious crises, by deteriorating the ontological relationship between humanity and the mystery of the Divine, humanity must prove to itself that it is ready for another spiritual renewal in the third millennium.

First of all, it has to prove that it is again capable of the Divine mystery, by daringly restoring the hypostatic union of its inner theandric mystery. Especially Western humanity must finally recognize that the mystery of man’s existence does not lie in the anthropocentric humanism alone, nor exclusively in the theocentric one, but in both of them.

A creative symbiosis between the mystery of the Divine and the mystery of the humans, so to say between anthropocentrism and theocentrism, will restore the theandric unity of man’s existence and personality. Otherwise this new modern and postmodern monophysitism (emphasizing only the Divine nature) and Nestorianism (emphasizing only the human nature), by unilaterally separating the Divine from the human, seems to be unavoidable.

Nevertheless, in order to be saved, our humanity, emptied of any Divine and human mystery, has to be restored in the image and likeness of God. However, many are doubting that anything positive will happen soon. Devoid of its existential mystery, humanity’s future is in question and no one knows for sure what spiritual changes will take place.

This is what André Malraux had in mind when he was asked about the future of humanity and when he gave his famous answer: “The 21st century will be religious or it will never be.” On another

occasion, Malraux significantly underlined the very fact that the West lost the “communion with the world” and that is telling a lot because “the Christian used to be linked to the season, the trees, the animals, because he was linked to all God’s creation. Man in urban civilizations is isolated, and it is perhaps for that reason that the question ‘What are you doing on earth?’ can take on such a meaning.”³

In the same way, Jacques Maritain predicted that at the end of this secular evolution, we will find ourselves face to face with two absolute positions: “Pure atheism or pure Christianity.”⁴

Following the three centuries of rationalism, science, secularism, humanism and anthropocentrism, not to forget the totalitarian ideologies, a tired humanity is finding itself to be more confused than ever, ironically entering the Third Millennium in the confusing company of the New Age Movement.

Pat Robertson in his inciting book *The New Millennium* predicted that “The 1990s will not be a decade dominated by rationalism or science, but a decade of religious faith. We are entering the age of the supernatural.”⁵ But what kind of religious faith? Pat Robertson sincerely said that he doesn’t know. His answer at this point is hesitant. “Will the world embrace the claims of Jesus Christ and the truths of the Bible, or are we to expect the world to turn to an ‘Age of Aquarius’ dominated by the Hindu religions and led by mystic holy men in touch with demonic spirits known as ‘ascended masters’?”⁶

Obviously, these are crucial questions and humanity of the 3rd millennium has to answer them in order to restore its spiritual equilibrium and its filial relationship with God in the shining light of the mystery of the Divine. Because humanity does not exist as true reality if it does not participate in the divine reality that transcends it.

Along with André Malraux, Jacques Maritain and Pat Robertson, as well as many others who made similar predictions about the religious problem of the future, we have to take into serious consideration one of the most authorized opinions on this matter, which was masterly expressed by our compatriot Mircea Eliade.

Asked by Claude-Henry Roquet if his position concerning the religious problem in the future is close or not to that of André Malraux, Mircea Eliade promptly replied that nothing could be predicted. The freedom of spirit is so unlimited that nothing could be anticipated or predicted. Though, Mircea Eliade believes that some of the primordial revelation might disappear, he admits that man cannot be changed and cannot be taken out from the current cosmic rhythm in which he is integrated.⁷

According to Mircea Eliade the fundamental man is religious in nature, “Homo Religiosus.” For this reason, Mircea Eliade is firmly convinced that future forms of religious experience will be totally different from those we know now, which are fossilized, obsolete or devoid of sense in Christianity, Judaism and Islam. He is also convinced that other religious expressions will come into existence. But which ones? He sincerely said, he could not tell. Because the great surprise will always reside in the freedom of the human spirit and its creativity, as Mircea Eliade has acknowledged many times.

Since all the crises of the modern man are of a religious nature, and due to an obvious absence of the spiritual dimension of our life, as the above mentioned scholar asserted, only religion is the answer to the fundamental question humanity has always had: what is the sense of existence?

This is what Berdyaev thought, too, when he said that “the whole meaning, importance and value of life are determined by the mystery behind it, by an infinity which cannot be rationalized but can only be expressed in myth and symbols. God is the infinite mystery that underlies existence – and this alone makes the pain and evil endurable... We come to God not because rational thought demands His existence but because the world is bounded by a mystery in which rational thought ends.”⁸

Anyway, when humanity was aware of the mystery of the Divine, it was consciously and deeply affected by this sacred and transcending presence. Since that time, humanity was permanently preoccupied to partake in the meaning and being of the unknown mystery of the Divine, in order to discover, to justify or to legitimate its inner sense of existence. To realize this existential task, to be in communion with the mystery of the Divine, the humanity of all the centuries and millennia has exhaustively explored many ways to accede the mystery of the Divine. Finally, only two ways have proved their efficacy. The first way was that of initiation, used in the primitive religions and the religion of mysteries. The second way is the Christian revelation which is supernatural in essence and the true coronation and fulfillment of the religious initiations and revelations before or after Jesus Christ.

In this respect again, Mircea Eliade’s religious anthropology and cosmology becomes very relevant in that it brings a highly appreciated contribution to the correct understanding of what is called “Sacrum,” or “the Sacred” or “the Holy,” which is, in fact, the mystery of the Divine. In other words, *sacrum* means the revelation of the mystery of the

Divine, of the Holy, through the “hierophanies,” in the religious life of the entire world. According to the religious beliefs of the primitives “nature is a hierophany, and the ‘laws of nature’ are the revelation of the mode of existence of the divinity.”⁹

For Mircea Eliade, “the Sacred” transcends this world and reveals its inner sacral dimension. The Sacred makes the world become real and appears not to be the only object of humanity’s worship, but also the sacred source of Divine power, spiritual significance and religious value. All hierophanies are nothing else than a multitude of revelations of the Sacred which are spiritually configuring the compartment of the “homo religiosus,” since the stone age and certainly till the end of all the centuries and millennia.

However, interpreted not only as “patterns” in the history of religions but also as primitive manifestations of the mystery of the Divine, in the light of Christian theology, all these sacred hierophanies seen in their intimate structure and religious function in the spiritual life of humanity, are culminating in what Mircea Eliade convincingly believed to be the supreme hierophany of the great mystery of Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is to say the “total hierophany,” the total revelation of the mystery of the Divine in the life of humanity.

Speaking of hierophanies, one might take into consideration Pierre Teilhard de Chardin’s concept of “diaphaneity” or “diaphany” or “transparency” on which he elaborates when interpreting the mystery of Christianity. In other words, he considered that the great mystery of Christianity consists not so much in the hierophany of God but in “the transparency of God in the Universe.”¹⁰

Theologically speaking we may conveniently say that the total hierophany of the great mystery of Incarnation, and the diaphany of God in the Universe, are complementary to each other, both of them revealing the same mystery of the Divine in the world.

Indeed, Mircea Eliade’s pertinent analysis and scholarly synthesis have clearly established the correct rapport between the humanity and the Holy, by identifying the presence of the transcendent in the human experience and, above all, by determining the existential modality of man’s being in the world at a time when he has lost the true dimensions of the human existence.

We have to mention here that the opposition between the Holy and profane was attentively studied in all its consequences, particularly by the theology of the so called death of God. As stated by Mircea Eliade, the death of God is the only religious creation of the Western

world and represents the last stage of the desecration of the world. In other words, this theology illustrates in a significant way the camouflage of the Holy and its perfect identification with the profane. But the camouflage or even the occultation of the Holy and of all the spiritual dimensions in general, are considered by Mircea Eliade as characterizing the crepuscular epochs in the history of humanity. Under this heavy camouflage the larval survival of the original sense of the Holy is becoming almost unrecognizable.

In order to heal his own spiritual crises and anxieties, modern man entering the new millennium has to rediscover the richness of the religious symbolism as it appears in the light of the history of religions¹¹, to understand not only the sources of his modern crises and anxieties, but also the great perspective of a new initiation into the mystery of the Divine.

To conclude this paper, if the humanity of the third millennium wants to survive and become realistic again about its condition, as we think it would, it must restore the theandric relationship between God and the whole world in the light of the mystery of the Divine. It has to rediscover the mystery of the Divine as the theandric denominator for the entire humanity.

However, in order to succeed, our world needs, in the first place, to free the Sacred, the Holy, the mystery of the Divine, from its profanatory camouflage. In this perspective, the new humanity has the noble task of trying to sanctify again what is commonly labeled as profane or mundane. Then and only then, we can say with Gandhi, that we can look for God in the heart of humanity.¹²

NOTES:

¹ See: Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, First Harper Torchbooks, 1960, New York and Evanston, pp. 24, 30, 5, 11.

² Emil Cioran, *Caiet III (1967-1972)*, Translated from French in Romanian by Emanoil Marcu and Vlad Russo, Bucharest, Humanitas, 2000, p. 267.

³ André Malraux, *Anti-Mémoires*. Translated by Terence Kilmartin, Bantam Books, 1970, New York, p. 290.

⁴ Jacques Maritain, *True Humanism*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1938, p.126.

⁵ Pat Robertson, *The New Millennium: 10 Trends That Will Impact You and Your Family by the Year 2000*, Word Publishing, Dallas-London-Vancouver-Melbourne, 1990, p. 73.

⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁷ See especially his book *L'Épreuve du labyrinthe. Entretiens avec Claude-Henry Roquet* (Belfont, Paris, 1978), translated from French into Romanian by Doina Cornea, Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1990, p. 103.

⁸ Nicolas Berdyaev, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

⁹ Mircea Eliade, *The Myth of the Eternal Return or Cosmos and History*, Translated from French by Willard R. Trask, Bollingen Series XLVI, Princeton University Press, 1974, p. 59.

¹⁰ Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *Le Milieu Divin. Essai de vie intérieure*. Editions du Seuil, Paris, 1957, p. 149.

¹¹ Mircea Eliade, *Myths, Dreams and Mysteries. The Encounter between Contemporary Faiths and Archaic Realities*, Translated from French by Philip Mairet, Harper Torchbooks, New York and Evanston, 1967.

¹² André Malraux, *op. cit.*, p. 286.

Human Strivings and Their Ultimate Goals: A Psychological Viewpoint

Introduction: Seven Areas of Striving for Transcendence and the Problem of Their Unification

To transcend is to exceed a familiar boundary of experience or existence. Some formerly limiting horizon is surpassed, either through personal effort, or by enablement from an 'other.' The word transcendence points to the immeasurable human capacity for opening to relationship and experience.

Prokes, 1992, p. 80

My topic is the remarkable capacity of human transcendence. This has traditionally been a topic of concern for philosophers and theologians because of its connection to ultimate questions about human identity and destiny. However, it is also a topic of particular interest to psychologists because of its apparent relation to human growth and to the distinct phenomena of refusals to grow and of human decline. Of course, in the much more recent Western psychological literature, aspects of transcendence are not usually discussed under that name; but what research psychologists have discovered regarding “human growth”, “development”, “actualization” and their opposites may prove fruitful in future dialogues among representatives of various disciplines and traditions.

As we enter a new millennium, human nature remains a mystery. Part of that mystery is the human effort to transcend itself and its ongoing failure to do so. How are we to understand transcendence? What is the nature and limit of human striving to transcend? Towards what ends are humans striving? Of course, these questions lead to still further questions, including the religious question of humanity’s relation to divinity. This paper will not address that last issue.

Instead, this paper has three broad aims:

- to discuss the nature, interconnection and importance for

human living of seven large areas of human striving, named here the “Seven Transcendentals”

- to identify points on the intellectual landscape for collaboration and dialogue, organized by the 7 Transcendentals (particularly dialogue among philosophers, theologians, psychologists (e.g. cognitive, developmental, clinical, etc.) and economists, poets, composers, playwrights, other citizens)

- to invite, formally, future dialogue and collaboration through local workshops, associations, societies and institutes (e.g. New York Academy of Sciences, Institute for Philosophic Research, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, Lonergan Workshop, Roumanian Institute of Orthodox Theology and Spirituality, and Quest Research Institute).

Why bother examining human striving at all? To abandon such an examination, we relegate ourselves to ongoing self-ignorance and are likely to suffer the consequences that such a refusal entails. We lose an opportunity to achieve greater self-knowledge, however, limited, with the attendant responsible freedom that it might bring. There are important lessons to be learned by familiarizing ourselves with the nature and limitations of human ability, aptitude and achievement, with their inevitable connections to human growth.

The Seven Transcendentals & the Possibility of Interdisciplinary Dialogue:

Lists of the Transcendentals: A variety of lists of transcendentals have been proposed in the history of Western philosophy. One such list includes *being, truth, goodness* and *beauty*. The transcendentals on this list correspond to branches of philosophy: being–metaphysics, truth–epistemology, goodness–ethics, and beauty–aesthetics. Other lists have been proposed. For example Lonergan, in his major philosophic work *Insight* (1958), offered another list of four, substituting *unity* for *beauty*. A subsequent dictionary of philosophy proposes a list of six (Runes, 1960).

Here we propose a list of seven areas of “transcendental striving” or “transcendentals”: *being, truth, goodness, beauty, love, peace, and happiness*. I hypothesize that striving in each of these areas will account for well over 90% of specifically human activity. I also

hypothesize that a fundamental problem of life is how to put them all together. If the seven are regarded as pieces of perfection, how can we fit the pieces together? This problem may be characterized as the “general problem of the one and the many”. Does a “solution” to this problem exist? Is it in our unaided grasp? Or, is the “solution” something that transcends us absolutely? Is there a role for another person or force in its solution?

These seven areas are well named “transcendentals” not only because they point beyond us in our current situation, but because they seem to be constantly eluding our grasp.

What are Transcendentals? There seems to be a fundamental confusion in various literatures regarding the transcendentals on our list. They seem to be referred to in three different ways: (1) As *end-states*, often considered ideal, the terminus of some human striving. (2) As *ideas* or *concepts*, often presented as definitions (e.g. Tarski’s definition of truth) or as part of a larger system of thought, (e.g. Hegel’s concept of being). (3) Less often, as *constitutive dynamism* or *immanent process* associated with human striving, (e.g. Lonergan’s notions of being or truth). Consider an example involving *love*. Suppose that person X is in love with someone else. This state of being-in-love may be regarded as an end-state: it suggests a kind of accomplishment, of having arrived, of completion. Even if this state does not last, at least for a time it has these elements to it. However, being-in-love does not entail that X knows what is happening, or that X has a theory of love, including a definition, predictions, identification of causes of love. That understanding, that knowledge is part of the transcendental idea of love. It is ongoing, historically conditioned and developing. Finally, in living life X may have a tendency toward and an attraction for love: this tendency and attraction is an immanent dynamism. It is not required that X know about it, but it can exist. So, with regard to *love* we can distinguish the *experience of love* from a *idea of love* from a *tendency towards love*.

(1) *Transcendentals as end-states:* As end-states, the transcendentals are understood as an ideal limit for striving in a particular area. Since they are presently anticipated and intended ends states, they may be referred to as *transcendent*. The word “transcendent” suggests arrival, achievement and completion, at least for a while. If described, they can provide clues about the reality of what is currently

beyond our reach. Some of these end states, themselves imperfect, are currently beyond our reach but can be reached by human effort in time. These end states may be described as *relatively transcendent*. Other end states, themselves perfect, are not only currently beyond our reach practically, but are beyond the reach of any human effort. They may be understood as *absolutely transcendent*. The description of relatively transcendent end states can inform the next steps in human progress and possible criteria for judging them. In contrast, the description of absolutely transcendent end states need not describe a fantasy, but like the limit in the calculus they can make explicit the broad outlines of a limit which itself is perfect. The outlines of such limits may have significance for a more adequate philosophic anthropology, advances in theological understanding and interfaith dialogue.

Contemporary Western psychology may provide numerous clues for an increased understanding of human efforts to reach relatively transcendent end-states (or goals). For example, over the last fifteen years there has been a flurry of empirical research the area of *happiness* (or what psychologists call “subjective well-being”). Social psychologists have begun to examine the various dimensions of *love* relationships. They have also begun work in the area of *beauty* in their studies of “attractiveness”. Developmental psychologists have implicitly taken up a concern with *truth* and *goodness* in their studies of intellectual and moral development. Community psychologists have studied the role that *peace* plays in the development of communities and have examined methods for conflict resolution. Clinical psychologists often provide important clarification by contrast in their examinations of the myriad forms of human pathology and distortions in growth. All of these studies provide further clarification of the range of possibilities that are associated with *being* human and with *being* in the world.

With regard to what seem to be absolutely transcendent end-states, many religious and other traditions point to or describe an end state for the perfectability of the human being,(e.g. paradise, nirvana, utopia). Such descriptions frequently involve the unification of the seven transcendentals. While there may be debate about the attainability of these transcendent end states,(i.e. Are they absolutely or only relatively transcendent?), the very descriptions of them can inform the nature and variety of imperfection in human achievement and in the world we experience.

(2) *Transcendentals as ideas*: As ideas, the transcendentals are historically conditioned understandings of ideal limits, proposed by various thinkers. Since such understanding is part of an ongoing historical dialogue and development, these ideas may be referred to as *transcendental ideas*. As ideas, they are objects of consciousness that can play a role in all cognitive functions: for example, questioning, formulation of insights, criteria for weighing of evidence in judgments of fact, criteria for assessing pros and cons in judgments of value and decision making.

Since these ideas are historically conditioned, to fully understand them is to understand their history. That history may illuminate different aspects or limitations of the phenomenon under consideration. As imperfect descriptions, transcendental ideas can inform the next steps in human progress and possible criteria for judging them. In contrast, although they are imperfect descriptions, transcendental ideas need not be describing a fantasy in the attempt to describe absolutely transcendent end-states, but they may provide clues about the reality of what is currently beyond our reach. Even imperfect clues in this arena may also have significance for a more adequate philosophic anthropology, advances in theological understanding and interfaith dialogue.

Nor is the consideration of ideas unimportant in human living, but ideas are themselves constitutive of human life, as evidence from contemporary Western psychology shows. From developmental psychology we learn about the construction of overall problem solving capability through the increasing accumulation of specific cognitive processes and more versatility with ideas. This area of research traces, in broad outline, the increasing problem solving skills that are acquired as children master one content area after the next, as they learn to mentally manipulate ever more sophisticated and abstract ideas. Studies on mental retardation provide a stunning contrast, in outlining the nature and quality of life when such problem solving capability is slowed, delayed or practically non-existent. Studies on learning a second language, particularly in adults, attest not only to the difficulty of acquiring a new code, but acquiring a new conceptual scheme as well. In addition, these studies also attest to the increasing social freedom and ability to function in another culture that comes with greater levels of linguistic expertise. From cognitive-behavioral studies in psychotherapy, we learn about the importance of ideas in generating and

moderating emotions and in influencing behavior. Clients who operate in accordance with rigid, irrational and otherwise distorted ideas are far more likely to suffer unnecessarily increased levels of emotional disturbance and self-imposed practical difficulties than those who do not have such ideas.

Consequently, as persons assume the role of philosopher (see Adler, 1981) and join the ongoing historical dialogue regarding the transcendental ideas they not only can possibly make real contributions to that dialogue, but they are preparing themselves to meet the challenge of the future from a particular standpoint, living in the world.

(3) *Transcendentals as dynamic processes*: A few contemporary philosophers and theologians have alluded to dynamic processes, immanent in humans, that stand in special relation to the *Seven Transcendentals*. Notable among these is Bernard Lonergan (1958, 1972) who speaks of *transcendental notions*. Such dynamic processes are inherently *transcendental* in that they anticipate and intend end states of knowing or action that are currently beyond the subject's present state of knowing or doing. For example, when a person asks the question for intelligence "What is this?" she is expressing an immanent (cognitional) tendency towards an answer, and that answer is part of a much larger total "what is" (or *being*). When another asks the question for reflection "Is this true?", once again they express an intention and a tendency towards an answer. That answer, if correct, will be a particular *truth*, and it will also be part of a more complete and total truth. Also, when someone asks the question for deliberation "Is this worthwhile?", she is expressing an intention towards an answer as well as a tendency for seeking out what is *good*. While that good may be merely a particular good, it is nevertheless part of the totality of what is good.

In similar ways, Aristotle alluded to immanent tendencies in humans towards *truth*, and *goodness* and *happiness*. Plato before him, gave priority to the *good*, but included *beauty* in this. Augustine referred to our natural tendency to *love* (even though such loves may be misguided), and he also pointed to a restlessness that seeks some sort of hitherto unknown *peace* or rest – perhaps a rest in the abundance and unification of the seven transcendent ends in a perfect life.

Contemporary Western psychology has paid a great deal of attention to the existence and functioning of immanent dynamic processes. The psychodynamic tradition has focused mainly on "unconscious" processes and their role in channeling desire and

constructively addressing the problems of human living. Such immanent processes were largely ignored in the behaviorist tradition, but they later re-emerged in humanist, existential, cognitive-behavioral and more recently cognitive schools of thought. For the most part, the processes studied in these last four schools are immanent but conscious. A great deal of work needs to be done, to connect what philosophers and theologians have identified as transcendental notions with ongoing psychological research in allied areas.

An Ongoing Invitation to Exploration, Collaboration and Transcendence?

I have attempted to indicate here in very general terms some points of correspondence between lines of contemporary Western psychological research and more traditional thought in philosophy. To the extent that the areas of human striving, named here as the *Seven Transcendentals*, are important in human living, then any light that can be shed upon them will prove useful. That increased understanding can be used to guide us in our personal, social and institutional development. It can also identify errors, distortions and the ultimately growth-defeating practices that emerge from these, and suggest remedies for them.

Of course, we can refuse such understanding. We can refuse to collaborate on an uncertain quest for greater self-knowledge, and ultimately for greater freedom. For some, all such searches are doomed to failure, and are at best a diversion in a very dangerous world.

I reject that point of view as ultimately a *conclusion* about the general structure of being. I am not discussing *conclusions* here, but rather am issuing an invitation to re-state the *questions*, and to do so collaboratively. This is what we are attempting to do at the Quest Research Institute: an informal collection of thinkers who choose to explore the *Seven Transcendentals* in their nature, implications, applications and in relation to other central ideas for human thought and action. Of course there are precedents for this throughout all of human history.

In this enterprise we may move to create a somewhat better world, but certainly we will have changed ourselves. In the limit, through such efforts we may take up the invitation of Heidegger to “prepare a preparedness” for facing the remarkable uncertainty of this

life. I interpret this as going through an extended experience in an imperfect world, so as to develop a *set of criteria for recognizing perfection should we encounter it*. Could it be that such perfection will be a unification of all Seven Transcendentals at one time?

But Heidegger's call is also to "prepare a preparedness" for facing the profound mystery of death, after which we encounter nothing or the transcendent perfection of divinity. Could it be that such perfection will be a unification of all Seven Transcendentals once and for all? In the words of T.S. Eliot,

“We shall not cease from exploration
And the end of all our exploring
Will be to arrive where we started
And know the place for the first time.
Through the unknown, remembered gate
When the last of earth left to discover
Is that which was the beginning;
At the source of the longest river
The voice of the hidden waterfall
And the children in the apple-tree
Not known, because not looked for
But heard, half heard, in the stillness
Between the two waves of the sea.
Quick now, here, now, always--
A condition of complete simplicity
(Costing not less than everything)
And all shall be well and
All manner of things shall be well
When the tongues of flames are in-folded
Into the crowned knot of fire
And the fire and the rose are one.”

Little Gidding V, Four Quartets

REFERENCES:

- M. Adler, *Six great ideas*, Macmillan, New York, 1981.
M. Adler, *The great ideas: A syntopicon I-II*, Encyclopedia Britannica, Chicago, 1984.

B. Lonergan, *Insight: A study of human understanding*, Longmans, London, 1958.
B. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, Herder & Herder, New York, 1972.
M.T. Prokes, "Theresa of Avila's 'earthy mysticism'" in *Lonergan review*, 1(1), 1992,
pp. 80-91.

The Tetragrammaton. From Revelation to Mystery

*Truly, you are God who hides himself (mistatte^{-r}),
O God of Israel, the Savior*

Is 45:15

The Bible often asserts that God of Israel is hidden, ambiguous, and unpredictable. He is irresistible, alluring, fascinating, even “abusive” in W. Brueggemann’s view (*Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 359 f.). Here is Jeremiah’s passionate confession: “O Lord, you have enticed me (*pittîtanî*), and I was enticed; you have overpowered me, and you have prevailed” (Jer 20:7). The verb *pâtâh* “to entice, seduce” is used elsewhere with sexual overtones. It refers to violent sexual exploitation or rape (Exod 22:16; Judg 14:15; Job 31:9). Hosea, a 8th century prophet from Samaria, uses the same verb in a more positive way: “Therefore, I will now allure her (*m[∞]pattêhâ*), and bring her into the wilderness, and speak sweet nothings to her” (Hos 2:16/14). In the Hoseanic passage, Yahweh, the affronted husband, “woos” Israel, the estranged wife. Out of a unspeakable generosity, God forgives Israel entirely, turning this second marital union into a brand new, hope-giving, quite passionate engagement.

In this context, any revelation of God in the Bible instead of being a dispel of mystery is often an open door leading to a more profound mystery. The first revelation of God in the Bible is as Creator. The One who brings a whole, sophisticated, and colorful world out of nothingness into existence. But from the very beginning we are confronted with two mysterious entities, “darkness” (*o⁻Δek*) and “abyss” (*t[∞]hôm*). Genesis 1:2 is quite silent regarding the source or origin of these entities. The biblical author does not say that God created them nor does he declare that they are hostile to the Creator. “Darkness” is neither good nor bad. It is an ambiguous reality. God controls this reality by naming it “night.” As for the “abyss,” we are told that the Spirit of God was “hovering” over it (Gen 1:2) like a bird hanging in the air over its young in the nest (Deut 32:11). “Darkness” and “abyss” are not part of the creation. Yet, mysteriously, they are traveling along with the entire creation towards the purpose set up by God.

“Darkness” is the ninth plague (Exod 10:21: “And the Lord said

to Moses, ‘Stretch out your hand toward heaven so that there may be darkness over the land of Egypt for three days’”) and a precursor of the final sign, the sign of the Son of Man heralding the end of time (Matt 24:29-30: “The sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light ... Then the sign of the Son of Man will appear in heaven”).

Due to this unusual situation the power of death is still on the loose. There is a certain dualism in creation which contributes to the mystery of God. But as Fredrik Lindström (*Suffering and Sin: Interpretations of Illness in the Individual Complaint Psalms*, Stockholm, 1994) remarks, this notion of dualism is not an intellectual exercise but a serious pastoral resource. It is not a belittlement of God but a strong testimony of how important is God’s presence in this menacing world in which we live. The undoing of creation is always a possibility. The Flood in the days of Noah is just a reminder of this truth.

But this dualism life-death, light-darkness, revelation-mystery is also found in the revelation of God’s Name. Here the divine revelation leads to a higher degree of mystery. Instead of bringing more light, the discovery of God’s proper Name casts one into a deeper mystery, the mystery of God.

God of Israel is “Sublime,” to use Immanuel Kant’s proposed name, or the *Tremendum*, the notion coined by Rudolph Otto. The Old Testament expresses the same paradoxical idea of remoteness-nearness of God resorting to the mysterious name of YHWH (*yahweh*) “He Is.” But what Is He or rather who Is He? This is the question!

The Context

The text (Exod 3:13-15) under investigation is found in the narrative “The Call of Moses” (Exod 3). While shepherding the flock of his father-in-law Jethro of Midian, Moses, one of the Hebrews, came to Horeb the mountain of God where he witnessed an odd theophany: a burning bush yet not consumed. Speaking to Moses from within the burning bush, God commissioned him to lead Israel out of the Egyptian slavery.

The Texts

Exod 3:13-15: “Moses said to God: ‘When I come to the Israelites and say to them: ‘The God of your fathers has sent me to you,’

and they ask me: ‘What is His name?’ what shall I say to them?’ And God said to Moses: *I Am Who I Am* ($\leq ehyeh \leq a\check{\Delta}er \leq ehyeh$). He continued: ‘Thus shall you say to the Israelites: ‘*I Am* ($\leq ehyeh$) sent me to you.’ And God said further to Moses: ‘Thus shall you speak to the Israelites: YHWH (*yahweh*), the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you: This shall be My name forever, this is My appellation for all eternity”’ (Elohistic Source).

Exod 6:2-3: “I am YHWH. I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, as $\leq e\text{-}l\Delta adday$, but by my name YHWH I did not make myself known to them” (Priestly Source).

But note Gen 4:26: “To Seth also a son was born, and he named him Enosh. At that time people began to invoke the name of YHWH” (Yahwist Source); contradiction between Exod 6 and Gen 4? interpretations: (1) different sources (Y vs. P); (2) YHWH was revealed in the time of Enosh but explained later on to Moses.

The evidence suggests that it was first in the time of Moses that the Hebrew tribes employed YHWH as the name of their God. The Elohistic (Exod 3) and the Priestly (Exod 6) traditions agree on this point. The occurrence of personal names containing a YHWH element (e.g., Joshua “Yahweh is salvation”-Moses’ time) also points in this direction.

Some scholars went beyond the text and came up with different interpretations. For instance, the proponents (so Karl Budde at the turn of last century) of the so-called “Kenite-Midianite theory” maintain that the Name had a pre-Israelite and pre-Mosaic history among some Semitic tribes in eastern Sinai. This theory gets support in a few poetic texts which suggest that YHWH “came out” of a particular area south of Palestine: “YHWH came from Sinai, and dawned from Seir upon them. He shone forth from Mount Paran and came from Meribath Kadesh” (Deut 33:2). Or: “God came from Teman, the Holy One from Mount Paran” (Hab 3:3). We also know of a “YHWH of Teman” on basis of inscriptions found at Kuntilled Ayrud (south of Kadesh, in northeastern Sinai) dated to around 800 B.C. One of these inscriptions reads “YHWH and his Asherah,” where the goddess Ashera is introduced as YHWH’s spouse.

Extrabiblical evidence shows that the Name YHWH was known outside the Bible. A text comes from Pharaoh Amenophis III (ca. 1400 B.C.) and reads: “Yhw in the land of the Shasu bedouins”; apparently,

“Yhw” is a tribal or geographical name related to Seir in Sinai. Note that Moses received the revelation of the Name in Midian (located in Sinai). Thus, “Yhw” in the Egyptian text may refer to a territory (“Ashur” indicates both a god and a territory [Assyria!]), the home of YHWH, from where he came out to reveal himself to Moses. The fact that a Midianite priest, Jethro, Moses’s father-in-law, brings a sacrifice together with the Hebrew leaders (Exod 18:12) suggests communality in their beliefs. In a nutshell, the biblical and extrabiblical data support the conclusion that the awesome Name revered by the Israelites existed prior to the time of Moses among bedouin tribes in eastern Sinai. The biblical account (Exod 3:1) regarding the revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses in the land of Midian fits well in this larger context.

Exegesis of Exod 3:13-15

Let us take a closer look at Exodus 3. There are three stages in the revelation of the Name.

- (1) MT: $\leq ehyeh \leq a \check{\Delta} er \leq ehyeh = I Am Who I Am$
LXX: $\epsilon j g w v \epsilon i j m i \omicron J [W n = I Am The One Who Is [I Am The Being]$
- (2) MT: $\leq ehyeh = I Am$
LXX: $\omicron J] W n = The One Who Is [The Being]$
- (3) MT: YHWH (*yahweh*) = *He Is*
LXX: Kuvrio” = *The Lord*

(1) At the first level lies God’s answer to Moses’s demand concerning the divine name: $\leq ehyeh \leq a \check{\Delta} er \leq ehyeh$ - in other words, you are eager to know my name. Look, my name is mysterious because “I Am Who I Am,” the unconditioned One, unrestrained by time or space; I am God beyond any name and appellation. “My name is different” (*pel $\leq i$*), declares the angel to Manoah, Samson’s father (Judg 13:1718), in the sense that the divine name evokes surprise and wonder (LXX: *qaumastovn* = “wonderful”), hence God’s reluctance to reveal it. But we should not consider this a direct refusal on the part of God to reveal his name. Nevertheless a certain reluctance or unease may be detected but not a categorical refusal. At this level there is a tilt towards mystery which becomes even more obvious at the next level. The Hebrew $\leq ehyeh \leq a \check{\Delta} er \leq ehyeh$ may also be translated “I Am The One

Who Is.” This is the Septuagint understanding, *eigwv eijmi oJ* [Wn “ I Am The One Who Is” or “I Am The Being.”

(2) The name *ēhyeh* “I Am” was revealed by God Himself as a response to Moses’s request. “I” points to God’s liberty. It is God who decides when, where and how to intervene in the course of human history. “I Am” is the Name of God coming out from the mouth of God, whereas *Yahweh* is the divine Name uttered by the mortal man.

(3) YHWH-the Tetragrammaton appears 6,828 times in the Old Testament. The Septuagint’s (3rd century B.C.) rendition “The Lord” was determined by pious reasons (see the second commandment of the Decalogue). Later, between 500-1000 A.D., the Masoretes will proceed in a similar way, vocalizing the tetragrammaton resorting to the vowels of the word *śaḏônây* “The Lord.” Thus, any Jewish reader was forced while encountering the Name to substitute it with *śaḏônây* “The Lord.” That is why in most of the modern translations “Lord” stands for YHWH. “Jehowah” is a grammatical aberration since it represents an odd combination between the consonants of a word (YHWH) and the vowels of a different word (*śaḏônây*).

With respect to the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton the earliest evidence is found in the writings of Clement of Alexandria (the Greek transcriptions *Iaoue* and *Iaouai*) and those of Theodoret of Cyrrhus (*Iabe* and *Iabai*). These transcriptions suggest that the Patristic authors were familiar with the pronunciation “Yahweh” accepted today by most scholars. Regarding the meaning of “Yahweh,” there are several opinions:

(a) a cultic shout consisting of two elements: the emphatic word *ya*, like in Arabic, and the Old Semitic pronoun *huwa* “he,” hence the proposed translation of “Yahweh” = “O, he!” (among texts adduced to support this view, Is. 43:10, 13);

(b) a connection with the Arabic *h-w-y* “to love,” and the interpretation of the Name as “He [who] loves devotedly”;

(c) a form from the Hebrew root *h-y-h* “to be”; this view seems the most likely being supported by the v. 14 which appears as a commentary on the tetragrammaton. Note that YHWH (*yahweh*) presupposes a medial *w* and not *y* as the root *h-y-h* shows. The root with medial *w* indicates an earlier stage in the Hebrew lexicon. The initial syllable *ya-* in *yahweh* is the sign of the “imperfective aspect” (which may translate our present and future); so *yahweh* means: “He is/will be” - incomplete action.

What stem (conjugation) does this form belong to? Hebrew language has seven conjugations. Formally, *yahweh* may be treated as belonging to either Qal (simple conjugation) or Hiphil (causative conjugation). If it is a Qal imperfective, *yahweh* should be translated “He is”; if it is Hiphil, the Name should be rendered “He causes something to be” or “He brings into existence [creates]” (the latter interpretation is embraced by Cross and Freedman). Thus the divine Name might be an early expression of the worship of God as Creator. Some scholars consider “Yahweh” an abbreviation of the phrase “*YHWH β∞bā≤ōt*” meaning “He [who] creates heavenly hosts” (in liturgical rendition: “Lord of Sabaoth”). But this interpretation is unlikely first of all for the reason that the Old Testament uses other verbs for “to create” (e.g., *bārā≤*, *qānāh*, etc.). Thus, the Name *Yahweh* means simply “He Is.”

Much support for this interpretation comes from Syria. In 1975, around 16,000 clay tablets inscribed in cuneiform and written in “Eblaite,” a dialect of Akkadian, were discovered at Ebla. These tablets date back to 2000 B.C. In 1981, H.-P. Müller, a biblical scholar, demonstrated that the verb “to be” serves as a divine designation in some of the Eblaite personal names. For instance, a name like *sumi yi(h)ya* may be translated “Offspring of ‘He Is’” where *yi(h)ya* “He Is” is a substitute for a “real” divine name. Apparently, names containing the divine element *yi(h)ya* were given in sign of “thanksgiving” (hence “names of thanksgiving”) to a certain deity for being present and helpful in the birth of a child. According to Exod 6:2-3, the Name “Yahweh” is to replace an earlier divine name like “El Shadday.” Müller’s observation does not lead to the conclusion that the name YHWH appears in the Ebla texts. The comparison with Ebla onomasticon shows how old is the conceptual motif underlying Exod 3:14 - “existence” is the main attribute of a unnamed deity. Müller’s finding helps one understanding a biblical verse (Exod 3:14: the explanation of the divine name *≤ehyeh/yahweh*) which has often been classified as a late addition to the text.

Theological Reflection

The use of a verb form as a name for the Hebrew God is almost unique in the history of religions. Let us examine closer the meaning of the Hebrew verb *hāyāh* “to be.” Seen in parallel with the Ebla evidence,

the biblical divine Name *Yahweh* expresses the conviction of God's active and helpful presence; not a cold statement about past, but a passionate creed about present and future: "He Is [here and now helping]." But who is He remains a mystery for us. What really matters for us humans is that He Is helping us in time of need, in time of trials and temptations. He Is always here with us. The divine Name Yahweh corresponds to "Immanuel" "God is with us" in Is. 7:14. In the New Testament the absolute "I Am" expressions of Jesus point to the divine Name of Exod 3:14. "The Jews then said: 'You are not fifty yet, and you have seen Abraham!' Jesus replied: 'In all truth I tell you, before Abraham was I Am' (ejgw; eijmiv)" (Jn. 8:57-58).

Yhaweh is a blank check offered to humans for all unknown future; a name for all seasons and circumstances. Yves Congar (*Jesus Christ*) has a beautiful interpretation of the Tetragrammaton. He writes: "I am who I am, you are going to see it in my deeds. I will always be with you. I will personally be your Passover, I will be your Crossing of the Red Sea, I will be your Manna, the very Bread of life, the very serpent raised in the desert, the very Liberator, the very ransom of your sins; I will be the covenant of my people. I WILL BE JESUS CHRIST."

Incarnation, Deification, and Interfaith Dialogue

St. Irenaeus, in the second century, wrote boldly of Christ's Incarnation that "out of His immense love, He became what we are, that we might become what He is."¹ Two centuries later, St. Athanasius reiterates the point in even bolder terms: "For He became human, that we might be made divine."² The doctrine has been central to the Church's understanding of the person and work of Christ our Savior. It is based squarely on the New Testament, in particular a passage in the Second Epistle of Peter. There he writes of God's promises "that through these you may ... become partakers of the divine nature" (ὡς διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως (2 Peter 1:4). It has for centuries been reflected in the Offertory of the Roman Mass in a text preserved in the Post-Vatican II liturgy. At the mixture of the water and wine, the priest is directed to say quietly "By the mystery of this water and this wine may we come to share in the divinity of Christ, who humbled himself to share in our humanity."³ It is the central theme of the Anglican collect for the Second Sunday after Christmas:

O God, who wonderfully created, and yet more wonderfully restored, the dignity of human nature: Grant that we may share the divine life of him who humbled himself to share our humanity, your Son Jesus Christ; who lives and reigns with you, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever. Amen.⁴

The doctrines of the Incarnation and Deification are opposite sides of the same coin, the Mystery of our Salvation. Although much neglected in Western theological thought, it is almost impossible to read even an introductory text on Orthodox theology without realizing the intimate connection between these two doctrines. I do not intend to revisit the doctrine in detail here.⁵ It will be sufficient to highlight certain aspects of it which will be important to the points I wish to make about the relationship between these doctrines and the practice of interfaith dialogue in the third millennium.

There can be little doubt that religion is an important dimension of the political and social fabric of human interaction as we enter the third millennium. Hans Küng has been quoted as saying, "There will be

no peace between nations without peace between religions.” We need only look at the many areas of the world where religion is at least a volatile element of potentially violent situations: Northern Ireland, the former Yugoslavia, Cyprus, the Middle East, India, Indonesia, the Sudan (to name only a few). Clearly, the future of humanity in the third millennium is going to depend not only on religious conviction and spiritual struggle and growth; it is going to depend on the ability of men and women of different faiths (and none) to relate to each other and to cooperate in building a sustainable social, political, and moral order for our common life together. Although the “global village” has become a cliché, it is an unavoidable one. It is no longer an option for any ethnic, or religious group, indeed even for whole nations, to completely cut themselves off from the social and economic influences of an increasingly global culture. How we relate across ethnic, cultural, religious, and ideological boundaries will become increasingly central to any understanding of humanity in the third millennium.

There can also be little doubt that interfaith dialogue and interfaith relations are becoming an increasingly urgent concern of Christian theologians. In all parts of the Church, Catholic, Protestant, Anglican, Orthodox, theologians are struggling to elucidate an appropriate Christian response to the faith of others. In some ways, it is not unlike the struggle of the early church to elucidate the appropriate theological basis for its relationship with the religions and philosophies of the Mediterranean world of the first several centuries of the first millennium. The theological debate ran the gamut from the views of Tertullian to those of Justin the Martyr or Clement of Alexandria. Tertullian bitterly opposed any accommodation with non-Christian religion or philosophy. In his book *On the Prescription of Heretics*, he wrote:

What indeed has Athens to do with Jerusalem? What concord is there between the Academy and the Church? what between heretics and Christians? Our instruction comes from “the porch of Solomon,” who had himself taught that “the Lord should be sought in simplicity of heart.” Away with all attempts to produce a mottled Christianity of Stoic, Platonic, and dialectic composition! We want no curious disputation after possessing Christ Jesus, no inquisition after enjoying the gospel! With our faith, we desire no further belief. For this is our primary faith, that there is nothing which we ought to

believe besides.⁶

Clement on the other hand could say following about the relationship between Christianity and pagan thought. In this passage he is speaking about philosophy, but both he and Justin Martyr apply the same argument to traditional Greek religion as well.

Accordingly, before the advent of the Lord, philosophy was necessary to the Greeks for righteousness. And now it becomes conducive to piety; being a kind of preparatory training to those who attain to faith through demonstration. "For thy foot," it is said, "will not stumble, if thou refer what is good, whether belonging to the Greeks or to us, to Providence." For God is the cause of all good things; but of some primarily, as of the Old and the New Testament; and of others by consequence, as philosophy. Perchance, too, philosophy was given to the Greeks directly and primarily, till the Lord should call the Greeks. For this was a schoolmaster to bring "the Hellenic mind," as the law, the Hebrews, "to Christ." Philosophy, therefore, was a preparation, paving the way for him who is perfected in Christ.⁷

It is not surprising that many modern theologians are turning once again to the early Fathers of the Church for creative insights into the question of how we of the household of faith ought to relate to men and women of other faiths and none.

In the end, however, any understanding of how faithful Christians ought to relate to men and women of other faiths will be fundamentally unsatisfying unless it is firmly grounded in the central doctrines of Christian faith. Incarnation and the deification of humanity are two of the central doctrines which, I believe, have a great deal to say about the crucial question of interfaith relations as we enter the third millennium.

"God became human that humans might be made divine." That simple affirmation with which we started has given rise to a rich theological literature. There can be little doubt those doctrines have achieved their richest development in the hands of the Greek Fathers and in the ongoing theological tradition of the Orthodox Church. That development has touched on the doctrine of the human and divine nature of Christ, on the theology of the "person" and its anthropological implications for an understanding of the human person, on the difference

between the divine essence and the divine energies. The understanding of the “person” is one area that needs to be explored in this particular context and a good place to begin would be the thoughtful analysis of the subject in works like Lossky’s *In the Image and Likeness of God*.⁸ In particular, his insistence on the distinction between a human person and a human individual provides a particularly Christian approach to how we are related to the rest of humanity and invites exploration of its implications for relations to those who are outside the community of faith. Unfortunately, his book does not really take the discussion in that direction and to develop the point here would be a too lengthy digression from the main points I am trying to make.

In this brief presentation, I wish to concentrate on another aspect of the doctrine as it has been developed in the tradition of the Orthodox Church. One dimension of the doctrine’s development has been the importance of the distinction made by the Greek Fathers between the “image” and the “likeness” of God related in the book of Genesis. According to the traditional interpretation, the image of God inheres in all human persons. Even after the fall, humanity preserves the image of God. It pervades the whole of the human person and may be found reflected in our physical, mental and spiritual natures. It is, however, most particularly identified with our intellectual and spiritual natures. In this way, it focuses on the fact that we are rational (λογικός) and, most especially, in the reality of free-will (αὐτεξούσιος). The “likeness” of God, however, is restored to the human person by grace. It is a gift. This understanding it might be argued, is grounded in the Fathers’ understanding of the deification of humanity. The second dimension is the distinction made between the essence and the energies of God. It is not possible for humanity to participate in the divine essence, for that would effectively nullify the ontological reality of the distinction between the Creator and the creature. Humanity, however, may participate in the divine energies, the activity of God’s existence. Indeed, Georgios Mantzaridis in a study of the doctrine of deification in the thought of Gregory Palamas, writes:

Obviously, not all men who have deifying grace conferred on them participate in it to an equal extent. The degree of participation depends on the degree of purity and receptiveness. But seeing that God, as inseparable and indivisible, is present in His entirety within each of His energies, the man who partakes of this deifying gift even to

a small degree is united through it to God in his entirety.⁹

The tradition has largely explored the meaning of deification from the perspective of the incredible and loving *gift* which it undoubtedly is. But if deification means being united to the divine energies and this, in turn, renews the “likeness” of God in those who previously bore only the “image,” so that they become “like God,” then there is implied another way to look at the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Deification of humanity.

It is possible to look at the doctrine in terms of the new life that deification will bestow upon us. We can concentrate on the new “energies” which will properly belong to this new humanity. Those “energies” will be the “energies” of God. And although the Fathers teach the “energies” of God toward the created universe are multiple, yet there is, I believe, a fundamental unity of them all. The Apostle John tells us that “He who does not love does not know God; for God is love” (1 John 4:8). God is, in all His actions, loving. The Liturgy and the prayers of the Church refer often to God’s love of humanity (his *φιλανθρωπία*, *a Sa iubire de oameni*). This means that to participate in the divine energies, to be conformed in this way to the likeness of God, is to become a lover of humanity. In speaking of the deified person, one would be compelled to speak of his or her love of humanity (*a Sa iubire de oameni*).

According to the clear teaching of the Bible, this characteristic marks in a special way the quality of God’s dealing with humanity. Indeed, love is the most basic structure of all of God’s movement toward the other, even as it marks the hidden inner life of the Triune God. If this is true, then there is a sense in which it must also be the defining characteristic of God’s energies. There is a sense in which it directs and focuses all of God’s energy. One might say that all of the energy God, in whom there is no shadow of turning, *is* love, for whatever God does, He does it lovingly. He knows each human person lovingly; He calls them lovingly; He governs them lovingly; He leads them lovingly; He judges them lovingly; He saves them lovingly; He redeems them lovingly. He lovingly calls them into communion with Himself. If one were to ask, therefore, what was the most telling characteristic of a person who lived the divine life, of divinized humanity, it would be “love” – a love as generous and as gracious as God’s own, a love sending its blessings on all, just as God send the rain on good and evil alike.

Jesus taught this radical love. “You have heard it said love your neighbor and hate your enemy. But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven, for he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust” (Matthew 5: 43-45). This, then, is one aspect of the doctrine of deification – that we be transformed into the likeness of God who is always and everywhere known in His divine energies for his constant love of humanity, His *φιλανθρωπία*, a *Sa iubire de oameni*.

Another aspect is to be found in the doctrine of the Incarnation itself, for the Fathers have always insisted that it was the whole of human nature, our nature, even fallen human nature, which was assumed by God the Word in His marvelous condescension. He became what we are, in all its fullness, in all reality – indeed, in all ways, sin only excepted. If this is true, then there is no aspect of the human condition, except sin, which cannot become for us a revelation of the humanity of God. He became incarnate and died for all, not only so that all might become divine, but also so that all might become for us a revelation of the humanity of God.

To refuse to find Christ present in the religious quest of humanity is no longer an option. Such a refusal would be possible only if one could say that the human quest for God was itself sinful. And whatever one might wish to say about the specific teachings or doctrines of the great religions, one would be treading on dangerous and very unpatristic ground to claim that humanity’s quest for God is itself a sin. If it is not, we can expect to learn, even there, something of the reality of God’s humanity, even if the glorious divinity which is His gift to the faithful members of Christ’s body remains there in unfulfilled obscurity.

I would like to illustrate the practical implications of these doctrines with a particular story. It is the story of an Eastern Rite Catholic priest. Louis Massignon¹⁰ was born in France. His mother was a devout Roman Catholic and his father was an atheist. As he grew up, he followed his father’s religious convictions (or rather lack thereof) and he entered the family business. This involved commerce with North Africa. Once on a trip to North Africa, his caravan was attacked because he had been betrayed by his interpreter. As a result he swore that he would learn Arabic. He did learn Arabic and became a member of the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale. To make a long story short, his studies eventually introduced him, by a roundabout route, to the

story of a Muslim mystic named Al-Hallaj. Al-Hallaj had been crucified for teaching a mystical doctrine which bears some similarity to the doctrine of deification. While he hung on the cross, mutilated and dying, he prayed for his torturers. He prayed that God would forgive them, because they actually believed that they were doing God's will. He also prayed that God would accept his death as a sacrifice for his persecutors.

Some years later, Massignon became ill with fever in the Middle East and almost died. He was cared for by a Muslim family that had befriended him. In his delirium, he saw three people praying for him before God's throne. One was his mother. He later discovered that she actually had been praying for him with a particular intensity during that time, because she had an uneasy feeling that something was wrong. Upon his recovery, Massignon found his faith deepened and he was eventually ordained a priest in the Greek Catholic Church.

As he reflected on the life of Al-Hallaj, he became increasingly convinced that it reflected the activity of the Holy Spirit. Fallen human nature, he reasoned, may have preserved the image of God, but the life and martyrdom of Al-Hallaj were so conformed to the pattern of Christ's own that they reflected not only the image but also the likeness of God. To Massignon this meant that the Holy Spirit was at work outside the Church. (This is a theme which has also been developed by the Greek Orthodox theologian, Bishop Georges Khodr, in a famous article on the economy of the Holy Spirit and it is a doctrine which can ultimately claim its roots in the patristic theology.) For Massignon, this implied a relationship between those in the Church, where the Holy Spirit operates by a particular dispensation since the sending of the Spirit at the Feast of Pentecost, and those outside the Church who allow themselves to be open to the working of the Spirit of God, the same Spirit who hovered over the unformed waters at the Creation.

Based on this spiritual affinity, Massignon formed a new understanding of how Christians might relate to those outside the Church. He started a movement called the *badaliyya*. *Badaliyya* is an Arabic word meaning "substitution." In the Badaliyya Movement, priests obligated themselves to say Mass with a particular intention. This intention included praying that all Muslims might come to the full joy and comfort of faith in Christ, but it went beyond that. The intention was to offer their Christian faith on behalf of Muslims, to pray that God would accept their faith as an offering to help make up what is lacking

in the faith of Muslims. Members of this remarkable movement included among its prominent members both Jean Daniélou (a prominent French theologian) as well as the man who was destined to become Pope Paul VI.

What is at issue is not only Massignon's theology, but his attitude toward non-Christians. His concern that God except his faith and the faith of other Christians for the ultimate salvation of those outside the Church. Surely, this is an example of a truly generous love which prefers the welfare of the other. This is an example of φιλανθρωπία, човеколюбие, *iubire de oameni*.

This makes me think of one of the key moments in the Liturgy of John Chrysostom. After the Words of Institution and the Anamnesis, at the Elevation of the Precious Gifts, the priest says:

Ale Tale dintru ale Tale, Pie-ți aducem de toate ți pentru toate.

“We offer you your own of your own, in behalf of all and for all.”¹¹ At the last symposium of the Romanian Institute of Orthodox Theology and Spirituality, Fr. Prof. Dr. Theodore Damian delivered a scholarly presentation on the doctrine of the Recapitulation in St. Irenaeus. I believe that it is impossible to fully understand this incredible moment in the Liturgy except in the context of this doctrine. The full import of this “all” cannot be understood apart from the remarkable reality of this Recapitulation, this ἀνακεφαλαίωσις. Here the Church fulfills the priesthood of creation to which humanity is called. Here the Church celebrates the Sacrifice of Christ which He so freely and lovingly gave “in behalf of all and for all.” And this wonderful mystery finds its potential fulfillment and realization in the liturgy after the Liturgy, in the possibility that Christian believers will go from the Sacred Mysteries into the world bearing forth the love of God. I say it is a *potential* fulfillment. All too often the community of faith does not bear the love of Christ, God's φιλανθρωπία into the world God loves so much. And yet the potential is there. In a sense, it is like the great hesychast controversy. The Church understood that it was possible for humanity to shine with the uncreated light of Mount Tabor, to participate in the divine energies. Of course, it is not the case that all members of the Church will achieve that in this life, but it is possible. And so it is possible for the members of the Church to truly live nothing less than God's own love for humanity.

An example of the kind of attitude towards others which will mark those who cultivate the love of God may be seen in the following

quotation from a Rumanian Orthodox theologian, Fr. Dr. Ion Sauca, who is himself relying on the work of Dumitru Stăniloae:

The actual members of the Church advance towards eschaton consciously, participating actively in the transfiguration of history and creation. Through the Church, in the discovered communion with God, they wholly understand the senses of life in history and their final goal. Towards the realization of this goal is directed their whole life and activity.

But unconsciously, the others, the potential members of the Church, non-Christians or even unbelievers, who are outside the Church but not outside God, advance towards this point too. God is He who works through them, as well. The same eternal Logos is the source of the *logo* according to which they were created, too. They are also concerned with the achievement of certain moral and social values, with the discovery, control and transformation of nature for the better because they act through the natural 'movement' that God granted to creation to tend towards Him. God is the source of good (Jac. 1, 17) and every good realized by man is a sign of God's presence and work in the world. Every man who is engaged in such a process, participates, somehow, in God and is in dialogue with Him even if he is not aware of it.¹²

Interfaith dialogue in the next millennium will undoubtedly be a crucial challenge for the Church. But it is also a wonderful opportunity to exercise our participation in the divine energies – filling all such encounters with God's love for humanity. This hope, this possibility, is, of course, grounded in the doctrine of the deification. At no point do we more fully participate in the divine energies, than when we participate in this divine love. The possibility of our deification is an incredible gift. It is, as it were, grace run wild. And yet this wonderful gift of the love of God is also a challenge. It is the challenge of love, the challenge to love all others with a love which is no less than divine.

NOTES:

¹. "Qui propter immensam suam dilectionem factus est quod sumus nos, uti nos perficeret esse quod est ipse" MG 7, 1120.

- ². Αὐτός γὰρ ἐνηνθρόπησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν, MG 25, 192.
- ³. *The Roman Missal*, C. Goodliffe Neale, Alcester, England, 1974. p. 400.
- ⁴. The Episcopal Church, *The Book of Common Prayer*, The Church Hymnal Corporation, New York.
- ⁵. Reference may be made to any number of Orthodox sources on this matter. In particular one might note the article by Fr. Prof. Dr. Theodor Damian, “The Concept of Recapitulation in St. Irenaeus’ Theology” (in *Symposium*, Vol. VII, No. 1, 2000, pp. 43-63). Reference may also be made to Vladimir Lossky’s *Orthodox Theology: An Introduction* (St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, Crestwood, NY, 1978) or Constantine N. Tsirpanlis’ *Introduction to Eastern Patristic Thought and Orthodox Theology*, Theology and Life Series 30, The American Institute for Patristic and Byzantine Studies, n.d. One might also note Georgios I. Mantzaridis’ *The Deification of Man*, St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, Crestwood, NY, 1984.
- ⁶. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3, Scribners, New York, 1905, p. 246.
- ⁷. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 4, Scribners, New York, 1905, p. 305.
- ⁸. St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, Crestwood, NY, 1974.
- ⁹. Georgios I. Mantzaridis’ *The Deification of Man*, St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, Crestwood, NY, 1984, pp. 108-109.
- ¹⁰. The story of Massignon’s life and work is detailed in the excellent biography by Fr. P. Giulio Basetti Sani, *Louis Massignon (1883-1962)*, Series: Italia, Oriente, Mediterraneo, Alinea Editrice, Florence, 1985.
- ¹¹. The Romanian Orthodox Episcopate of America, *The Divine Liturgy according to Saint John Chrysostom in Romanian and Modern English*, The Romanian Orthodox Episcopate of America, Detroit, 1975.
- ¹². Ioan Sauca, *The Missionary Implications of Eastern Orthodox Ecclesiology*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Birmingham (England), 1987.

The Relation Between the Incomprehensibility of God and the Naming of God in the Theology of Pseudo-Dionysius

Preliminaries

The Personality of Pseudo-Dionysius

Pseudo-Dionysius is a controversial personality both in respect to his biography and to his thought. He lived during the end of the fifth century and the beginning of the sixth. L. Montet wrote about Pseudo-Dionysius in the following terms: he was “un de ces chrétiens platonisants, un élève, peut-être un ami de Proclus, aussi fervent dans sa croyance religieuse que fidèle dans ses doctrines philosophiques, excité par le désir de pacifier son âme en mettant en accord sa foi et sa raison.”¹

It was the medieval humanist Lorenzo Valla who first raised the problem of the authenticity of Dionysius' name. Valla was followed in his affirmations by Erasmus of Rotterdam and other scholars, especially from the Protestant Tradition. An important point that leads to the denial of his identity is the fact that Dionysius and his works were not mentioned by the Early Church Fathers, theologians or historians.

There were many attempts to identify Dionysius with several authors of the first Christian centuries. Perhaps, the most recent one is that of Gh. Drăgulin and Augustin Gh. Drăgulin who, on the basis of an extensive comparative theological and historical study, think that Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagite was, in fact, Dionysius Exiguus.²

As the quotation of L. Montet indicates, Pseudo-Dionysius was a neoplatonic thinker, but he was also influenced by the Early Church Fathers, and at this point, D. Rutledge mentions especially St. Gregory of Nyssa.³

As for those who succeeded him, the Areopagite had the chance to be believed in his assumed identity and to enjoy great credit and authority in the Church. An important, rather decisive contribution in his accreditation as a theological authority was that of Maximus the Confessor who, as Olivier Clément says, “a su l'équilibrer par un tradition plus ancienne, proprement existentielle et par un sens aigu de la liberté personnelle et de sa tragédie.”⁴

In order just to mention the great, at times overwhelming

influence Dionysius had on the Theology of the Church, I just reiterate here J. Pelikan's information who said that St. Thomas Aquinas, alone, in his works quoted Pseudo-Dionysius 1700 times!⁵

Method

Following the order of ideas indicated by the title, in this work I will first present Pseudo-Dionysius' doctrine on the incomprehensibility of God, and then, that of the naming of God, after which I will examine the relation between these two doctrines. The conclusion will consist of a few general considerations on the subject as a whole.

The Incomprehensibility of God

One of the most well-known characteristics of Dionysius' theology is its apophatism. It does not mean, however, that he is not cataphatic in his way of doing theology. Nevertheless, the *via negativa* remains the feature that imposed Dionysius as an authority in the history of Christian theology and mysticism. For Dionysius, no word can reach or express the inexpressible Good, the One, the unapproachable Light, the Cause and Source of all unity, the super-existent Being, the Mind beyond mind.⁶ He stresses everywhere in his works the idea of the word's inadequacy to present the reality of God. That is why the highest level of knowledge is the denial of any knowledge. In order to give a Scriptural foundation to his apophatic theology and to express it more plastically, the Areopagite, like St. Gregory of Nyssa before him, has resorted to the example of Moses on the Mount of Sinai: "But then he [Moses] breaks free of them, away from what sees and is seen, and he plunges into the truly mysterious darkness of unknowing. Here, renouncing all that the mind may conceive, wrapped entirely in the intangible and the invisible, he belongs completely to him who is beyond everything. Here, being neither oneself nor someone else, one is supremely united by a completely unknowing inactivity of all knowledge, and knows beyond the mind by knowing nothing."⁷

One can see better how and what Pseudo-Dionysius understands by his apophatic knowledge of God if one looks more closely at Dionysius' doctrine of God. For him, God is *hypertheos*, God beyond God or God more than God; as O. Clément writes, "un cercle de silence est tracé autour de l'abîme divin, le Dieu logique est refusé."⁸ The

constant use of the word ὑπερ in relation to God, is one of Dionysius' ways of stressing the divine transcendence.⁹ Thus, as Gregory Palamas explains Pseudo-Dionysius' apophatism, God is beyond antithesis between affirmation and negation, beyond unknowability, ὑπεραγνώστος,¹⁰ "superunknowable,"¹¹ God is hidden in the superabundance of his light and that is where he reveals himself¹² because God is "à la fois participable et inaccessible, d'autant plus inaccessible que participé, d'autant plus caché qu' Il est proche."¹³

Here we already have the concept of *coincidentia oppositorum* in Dionysius' teaching on God, the cohabitation of both Transcendence and Immanence in God at the same time, because "He is all things in all things and he is no thing among things."¹⁴ In other words, "all that we know is knowledge of God, all that we have and are is the being of God. Yet God remains infinitely beyond the creature.¹⁵ No one can reach the divine darkness, the unapproachable light¹⁶ where God is; even Moses saw, as M. de Gandillac says, only "le lieu où est Dieu,"¹⁷ or in the words of P. Scazzoso, "si può vedere solo il luogo dove Egli sta; il τόπος è l'anima in preghiera, la Chiesa."¹⁸ This "luminous darkness,"¹⁹ is the cloud of unknowing, a place where we arrive by knowledge beyond knowledge or beyond symbols and analogies. Dionysius writes: "I pray we could come to this darkness so far above light."²⁰ If he prays, he thinks that this is not impossible to realize but "if we plunge ourselves into that darkness which is beyond intellect...we shall find ourselves speechless and unknowing."²¹ This unknowing, for Dionysius, as Christos Yannaras wrote, defines the negation of God as being because God is nonbeing beyond any essence. Yet the negation of God as being does not mean that the essence of the nonbeing is God.²²

With such a teaching about God, such a theology, it is clear and almost natural to understand that the theory of knowledge of God is a negative and paradoxical one. In Dionysius' theological system, God is Cause of everything and beyond all things; consequently noetic knowledge is possible but insufficient. The metanoetic knowledge is more complete than the first one but it is not a total one because it does not exhaust the divine essence; nevertheless, it is the highest kind of knowledge that we have and ultimately, the most appropriate, in relation to God. As Fr. J. Meyendorff writes, because God is none of what is created, therefore, the knowledge of God can be conceived in the Dionysian system, only by method of exclusion.²³ This leads again to the idea of the "docte ignorance,"²⁴ of the incomprehensibility, incognoscibility of God, ἀγνοσία. This means that one can know only

the incognoscibility of God by means of the abstractive negation;²⁵ we know God through unknowing,²⁶ which is, as Pseudo-Dionysius teaches, to renounce all knowledge and to enter in the darkness of unknowing, for the final unity with God, ἔνωσις, through radical ecstasis.²⁷

Although this apophatic knowledge is paradoxical, it is, for Dionysius, as Ch. Yannaras puts it, “le résultat de la communion personnelle de l’homme et de Dieu, de la participation de l’homme à la divinité totale.”²⁸ This personal participation in the divine life, however, is possible through the divine energies which, thus, become a foundation for the apophatic knowledge.²⁹ Through these energies, God manifests the love for his creation, or his yearning; this yearning brings God into ecstasis³⁰ “so that the lover belongs not to self but to the beloved.”³¹ Here Ch. Yannaras remarks: “Il est clair que ce que nous avons appelé connaissance apophatique s’identifie finalement à la déification de la personne humaine.”³² It is worthy to specify here, with Vl. Lossky, that for Pseudo-Dionysius, unknowability does not mean agnosticism or refusal to know God,³³ rather it means the knowledge of one’s own limits before the impenetrable, infinite and inexhaustible essence of God. Also, the fact that the transcendence of God is so much stressed by Dionysius, as for instance, when the Areopagite speaks of the “inebriation” or the “drunkenness” of God,³⁴ or of God as the “beyond beingly be-ing,” ὦν ὑπερουσίως, Dionysius does not mean neither an empty God³⁵ or an empty darkness³⁶ nor a God whose person disappeared in an impersonal abyss;³⁷ rather, he speaks of a superabundance of the divine essence, of a divine superfulness, ὑπερπλήρης.³⁸

It is also worth mentioning here the fact, that, because of this personal inter-communion between God and man, in Pseudo-Dionysius’ understanding, knowledge of oneself leads to the knowledge of God,³⁹ as well as does prayer and piety. Even more, prayer and piety are already knowledge of God.⁴⁰ For this reason, Dionysius exhorts that we approach God with “a wise silence,” and only then “we do honor to the Inexpressible.”⁴¹

The Naming of God

For the ancient people, as A. von Heuer wrote, the name was not a simple designation of a person or a thing. The name was seen as a link between cause and effect and revealed the essence of things: “le nom est

une limite, le nom encercle la personne ou la chose, la contient, dit ce qu'elle est. Seul Dieu n'a pas de nom puisqu'Il transcende tout."⁴²

From the first lines of *The Divine Names* Pseudo-Dionysius already stresses the idea of the divine transcendence.⁴³ He does this in order to show the framework in which the doctrine of the naming of God is going to be developed. It is also a clear indication about the permanent tension which this doctrine implies, that tension between that which the name designates and the cause which generates that which is designated by the name.⁴⁴ However, the fact that God is unknowable is the most current assertion of the work *The Divine Names*,⁴⁵ although this may seem to be a work of the positive theology.

The Divine Names represents for Pseudo-Dionysius, as J. Vanneste mentions, a real *θεολογία*⁴⁶ since theology means *stricto sensu*, the science about God. In Pseudo-Dionysius' book on the divine names, God is spoken of under a multitude of appellations; he is Good, Cause, Source, Being, Beauty, Life, Light, Love, Unified, One, Differentiated, Ecstasy, Wisdom, Zeal, Mind, Word, Truth, Faith, Power, Righteousness, Salvation, Redemption, Inequality, Greatness, Smallness, Similarity, Dissimilarity, Rest, Motion, Equality, Omnipotent, "Ancient of Days," Peace, "Holy of Holies," "King of Kings," "Lord of Lords," "God of Gods," Perfect, etc. The first name, "le plus vénérable," is Good, *ἀγαθὸν*, then Being, in relation to the Cause and others.⁴⁷ For Dionysius, one can notice that each name implies the tension between Immanence and Transcendence because each name has something to say about God, but each name does not say enough and indicates a great silence beyond itself with respect to what it designates. Every name indicates not only something that God has, but also something that God is; for instance, God is Good, wise, omnipotent but he is, at the same time, Goodness, wisdom, omnipotence by excellence.⁴⁸ Or, in the words of the Areopagite, for instance, "in the super-essential being of God, the transcendent Goodness is transcendently there."⁴⁹

This is another concrete example of how the theology of naming God in Dionysian thought reflects the coincidence of opposites: already saying that God is Good, is a positive assertion; but the negative is implied here because this Good transcends everything, "its nature, unconfined by form, is the creator of all form; in it nonbeing is really an excess of being."⁵⁰ The Good, Dionysius writes, is the only true existence that gives being to everything.⁵¹ The Good, thus, is here even the Cause of being and, in this case, God is nonbeing, or beyond being. Up to a certain point, the Areopagite uses these names interchangeably.

For example, as he says that the Good is Cause and the Cause is the Source of all things, *τα πάντα*,⁵² he also says that the Cause is the Life of the living, the being of beings, Source of all things⁵³ or that Beauty is the Source of all things, “the great creating Cause,”⁵⁴ and that all things are derived from the Beautiful and the Good.⁵⁵

Because these names all refer to the super-essential transcendent divinity, in one point or aspect, they are the same in God. When they refer to the energies of God and God’s specific work in creation and especially in relation to the hypostatic Trinity, they designate different realities. The fact that he speaks separately in different chapters of different names does not indicate a multiplicity in God’s nature; rather, it indicates, as he specifies himself, the economy of the book he was writing. Speaking about the divine names and the divine deeds in creation, Fr. G. Florovsky wrote that for Dionysius, “the multitudinousness of the Divine names signifies the multitudinousness of his deeds, without violating the essential simplicity and the supra-multitudinousness of his Existence.”⁵⁶

All of the attributes of God – Good, Cause, Being, Love Measure, One, etc. – in Dionysius’ thought are related to creation. It is in relation to cosmogony that he develops his cataphatic theology of naming God. He does this faithfully to the Scriptural revelation and this is evident from the abundant use of biblical references.

The Relation Between Apophatic and Cataphatic Theology

There may seem to be contradictions or ambiguities in the thought of Pseudo-Dionysius as, for instance, when he says that God is Being and then that God is not being but the source of being. Through this kind of apparently confusing distinctions, in fact, Pseudo-Dionysius makes the distinction between the divine essence and the divine energies, between God’s attributes and what God really is in His hidden essence. This is the dynamics of his theology and the dialectics of his apophatic and cataphatic way of speaking about God.

As V. Lossky wrote, like the divine energies, in Pseudo-Dionysius’ thought, the divine names are innumerable; the nature that they reveal remains unknowable, “a darkness hidden by the abundance of light.”⁵⁷ However, as I mentioned before, Dionysius “makes a distinction between general divine names which he applies to the entire Holy Trinity, and hypostatic names.” Yet in so doing, he is careful to emphasize that the Trinity he speaks about, as well as the Oneness of

God, are not to be understood numerically; they are super-numerical because God is beyond any number and measure.⁵⁸ However, the Trinity, we find specified in *The Divine Names*, besides One, is “the most sublime” name for God.⁵⁹ Therefore, all names have in view a tri-personal God in One essence, as R. Roques puts it;⁶⁰ that is, they reflect a certain knowledge of God, but one which finishes in apophasis.

Modern theologians saw an identity between God’s attributes and God’s energies.⁶¹ VI. Lossky calls these energies powers, δυνάμεις, or rays of the divine darkness.⁶² The energies, being in relation to creation, creation becomes a source of revelation about the things of God,⁶³ and together with the divine energies, a foundation for the cataphatic knowledge of God.⁶⁴ But again, this does not violate the apophatism about God because, although all these names are taken from the providence of God towards his creation, they are only metaphorically fitting to him.⁶⁵ Here the creative tension between the two ways of knowledge of God remains evident.

From both theologies of the incomprehensibility of God and of the naming of God, there are basically, in Dionysius’ thought, two kinds of knowledge: the empirical, natural, noetical, cataphatic knowledge of God which refers to creation as divine theophany and the paradoxical, mystical kind of knowledge of God which is in continuity with the first one and the crown or accomplishment of the first one. What is specific to Pseudo-Dionysius, at this point, is the fact that although the cataphatic knowledge is a good and helpful kind of knowledge, however, when the soul wants to attain union with God, it must renounce that which helped it in its progress upwards. Cataphatic knowledge is one of the greatest goods⁶⁶ but it has to be left behind and this is a part of κάθαρσις, purification of the soul, after it was purified from what is impure.⁶⁷

Creation for Pseudo-Dionysius is not negative. Its theophanic character,⁶⁸ through the divine energies there implied, represent a basis for the ascent of the soul and its participation in God. Thus, knowledge of God becomes participation, and participation is work of divine energies.⁶⁹ Participation, a strong, concept in Dionysius’ theology, as an act of knowing, unites the knower and the object to be known⁷⁰ and operates the transformation of the one who knows.⁷¹

It has to be specified here, in relation to God’s incomprehensibility and to the naming of God, that in Pseudo-Dionysius’ understanding, there is a kind of hierarchy of all affirmations and negations with respect to God. This is because, as Paul Rorem remarks, “not all affirmations are equally inappropriate and not all

negations are equally appropriate.”⁷² There is, in Dionysius’ synthesis, an insufficiency, both of positive and negative knowledge of God, although the last is superior to the first one, but this shows the “interplay that exists between epistemology and metaphysics” in the theology of the Areopagite.⁷³ This interplay is also evident in the fact that Dionysius “carefully preserved the simultaneity of procession and return,”⁷⁴ and thus, of affirmation and negation because for Dionysius, affirmation is related to the idea of descent or procession and negation to that of ascent or return. In other words, theophany in creation is cataphatic and deification belongs to the apophatic theology,⁷⁵ but they both are in a relation of simultaneity with each other, although without being equal with each other. Thus, the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God, the apophatic theology of Dionysius, is nothing other than a due corrective to the doctrine of the naming of God, the cataphatic theology.⁷⁶ Yet, the double way is necessary for the eschatological goal of the soul and they are correlative to each other: the cataphatic way, in Dionysius’ terms, makes assertions, and asserts also that which is beyond assertions, and the apophatic way denies everything that can be denied and goes beyond denial into the total darkness of unknowing.⁷⁷

Conclusions

What is very important for the actualization in the spiritual life of Pseudo-Dionysius’ mystical theology is the fact that both cataphatic, in what it has mystical in it and, to another degree, in what it has natural, and apophatic ways of knowledge of God lead towards the participation of the soul in the divine life. This participation is total, not partial: “the entire wholeness is participated by each of those who participate in it; none participates in only a part.”⁷⁸ Participation, in its turn, leads to deification. Deification is also based on both cataphatic and apophatic knowledge because it starts in the concrete material life in the Church and goes upwards progressively through the work of Jesus Christ, of the sacraments and of hierarchies, until the highest degree of possible union with God,⁷⁹ “as far as each one is capable.”⁸⁰

The mystical union with God of the man who is “indeed divine,”⁸¹ realized through noetic knowledge⁸² and “learned ignorance” does not suppose a depersonalization of the human being, an annihilation of the soul in God, but only its transformation.⁸³ However, the union, as St. Gregory Palamas explains Dionysius’ theology, remains

indescribable and inconceivable even to those who are subject to such an experience.⁸⁴ Pseudo-Dionysius writes himself: “Union, we do not know how it will be; somehow, in a way we cannot know, we shall be united with him.”⁸⁵ What we know is that it is a work of God’s love⁸⁶ and grace, as well as of our awareness and effort to make from the positive knowledge and negative knowledge of God a ladder of ascent and reintegration of our souls in the initial and final divine communion.

Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite is a theologian of demythologization. He wants to awaken the human consciousness to the fact that in this world of ours and of God’s, everything is of help for salvation but one should not confuse the means with the goal but see this supreme goal beyond anything in creation. He is the theologian of the “beyond” or *ὕπερ*; in this, he demythologizes all the concepts of the Christian theology, names, symbols, analogies, drawing the attention to the fact that no matter how abstract, well-built, high or sophisticated a concept of God can be, God, in his essence, is beyond the concept. Otherwise, there would be idolatry. Any concept of God cannot explicate but only indicate the mystery. What is thought of and spoken is good and constructive but is little and inadequate. What is unspoken constitutes the real dimension of Reality, of God’s essence and it corresponds to the mystical consciousness of man. As E. Underhill wrote, “the importance of Dionysius lies in the fact that he was the first and, for a long time, the only Christian writer who attempted to describe frankly and accurately the workings of the mystical consciousness [of man] and the nature of its ecstatic attainment of God.”⁸⁷

NOTES:

¹. L. Montet, “Pseudo-Denys,” in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité ascétique et mystique*, III, Beauchesne, Paris, 1957, col. 246.

². Pr. Dr. Gheorghe Drăgulin and Prof. Augustin Gh. Drăgulin, “Cercetări asupra operei lui Dionisie Exiguul, și îndeosebi asupra celei necunoscute până acum” (“Research on the works of Dionysius Exiguus and especially on those unknown until now”), in *Mitropolia Olteniei*, Nr. 5, 1988, Craiova, pp. 24-68.

³. Dom Denys Rutledge, *Cosmic Theology; the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of Pseudo-Denys: an Introduction*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1964, p. 13.

⁴. Olivier Clément, “Situation de la Parole théologique selon la Tradition Orthodoxe,” as a preface to the book of Christos Yannaras, *De l’absence et de l’inconnaissance de Dieu*, Ed. du Cerf, Paris, 1971, p. 20.

- ⁵. See his introduction to *Pseudo-Dionysius, The Complete Works*, Translation by Colm Luibheid, Foreword, Notes and Translation collaboration by Paul Rorem, Preface by Rene Roques, Introductions by Jaroslav Pelikan, Jean Leclercq and Karlfried Froehlich, Paulist Press, 1987, p. 21. The references that I will make of Dionysius' works edited in this book will be under the following abbreviations: DN=*The Divine Names*; MT=*The Mystical Theology*; CH=*The Celestial Hierarchy*; EC=*The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*; Ep=*The Letters*.
- ⁶. DN, p. 50.
- ⁷. MT, p. 137.
- ⁸. O. Clément, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
- ⁹. P. Scazzoso, *Ricerche sulla struttura del linguaggio dello Pseudo-Dionigi Areopagita*, Società editrice "Vita e Pensiero," Milano, 1967, p. 112.
- ¹⁰. Gregory Palamas, *The Triads*, Edited with an Introduction by John Meyendorff, Translation by Nicholas Gendle, Preface by Jaroslav Pelikan, Paulist Press, New York, 1983, p. 121, note 9.
- ¹¹. DN, p. 53.
- ¹². O. Clément, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
- ¹³. *Ibidem*, p. 28.
- ¹⁴. DN, p. 109.
- ¹⁵. D.D. Rutledge, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
- ¹⁶. Ep. V, p. 265.
- ¹⁷. See "Introduction" in *Oeuvres Complètes du Pseudo-Denys L'Aréopagite*, traduction, préface et notes par Maurice de Gandillac, Ed. Montaigne, Paris, 1943, p. 36.
- ¹⁸. P. Scazzoso, *op. cit.*, p. 168.
- ¹⁹. D.D. Rutledge, *op. cit.*, p. 168.
- ²⁰. MT, p. 138.
- ²¹. *Ibidem*, p. 139.
- ²². Christos Yannaras, *op. cit.*, p. 95.
- ²³. See Gregory Palamas, *The Triads...*, p. 13.
- ²⁴. E.H. Weber, *Dialogue et Dissensions entre Saint Bonaventure et Saint Thomas d'Aquin de Paris (1252-1273)*, Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, Paris, 1974, p. 113.
- ²⁵. J. Vanneste, *Le Mystère de Dieu*, Desclée de Brouwer, Paris, 1959, p. 205.
- ²⁶. *Ibidem*, p. 200.
- ²⁷. Pseudo Dionysius Areopagite, *The Divine Names and Mystical Theology*, Translated from the Greek with an Introductory Study by John D. Jones, Marquette Univ. Press, Milwaukee, WI., 1980, p. 93.
- ²⁸. Ch. Yannaras, *op. cit.*, p. 105.
- ²⁹. *Ibidem*, p. 103.
- ³⁰. *Ibid.*, p. 119.
- ³¹. DN, p. 82.

- ³². Ch. Yannaras, *op. cit.*, p. 120.
- ³³. Vl. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, James Clarke and Co. Ltd., London, 1957, p. 43.
- ³⁴. *Ep.*, IX, p. 287.
- ³⁵. Pseudo Dionysius Areopagite, *The Divine Names and Mystical Theology...*, p. 54.
- ³⁶. Gregory Palamas, *The Triad...*, p. 14.
- ³⁷. Ch. Yannaras, *op. cit.*, p. 103.
- ³⁸. Pseudo Dionysius Areopagite, *The Divine Names and Mystical Theology...*, p. 54.
- ³⁹. R. Rogues, *L'Univers Dionysien*, Ed. Montaigne, Aubier, 1954, p. 242.
- ⁴⁰. *Ibidem*.
- ⁴¹. *DN*, p. 50.
- ⁴². A. von Heuer, *Le huitième jour ou La dette d'Adam*, Labor et Fides, Genève, 1980, p. 8.
- ⁴³. J. Vanneste, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
- ⁴⁴. Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagite, *The Divine Names and Mystical Theology...*, pp. 49-50.
- ⁴⁵. J. Vanneste, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
- ⁴⁶. *Ibidem*, p. 21.
- ⁴⁷. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
- ⁴⁸. J. Durantel, *Saint Thomas et le Pseudo-Denis*, Librairie Félix Alcan, Paris, 1919, p. 136.
- ⁴⁹. *DN*, p. 54.
- ⁵⁰. *Ibidem*, p. 73.
- ⁵¹. *Ibid.*, p. 98.
- ⁵². *Ibid.*, pp. 56, 100.
- ⁵³. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
- ⁵⁴. *Ibid.*, p. 77.
- ⁵⁵. *Ibid.*, p. 79.
- ⁵⁶. G. Florovsky, *The Byzantine Ascetic and Spiritual Fathers*, vol. X *The Collected Works*, Büchervertriebsanstalt, Vaduz, 1987, p. 219.
- ⁵⁷. Vl. Lossky, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
- ⁵⁸. G. Florovsky, *op. cit.*, p. 220.
- ⁵⁹. Vl. Lossky, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
- ⁶⁰. R. Roques, *L'Univers...*, p. 125.
- ⁶¹. Jean Philippe Houdret, "Palamas et les Cappadociens" in *Istina*, Dix-neuvième année, Paris, 1974, p. 266, note 14.
- ⁶². Vl. Lossky, *The Vision of God*, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, Crestwood, New York, 1983, p. 158.

- ⁶³. Ronald F. Hathaway, *Hierarchy and the Definition of Order in the "Letters" of Pseudo-Dionysius*, Ed. Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, 1969, p. 110.
- ⁶⁴. Vl. Lossky, *op. cit.*, pp. 72, 80.
- ⁶⁵. G. Florovsky, *op. cit.*, p. 219.
- ⁶⁶. R. Roques, *L'Univers...*, p. 240.
- ⁶⁷. Vl. Lossky, *The Mystical...*, p. 27.
- ⁶⁸. E.H. Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 493.
- ⁶⁹. Ch. Yannaras, *op. cit.*, p. 105.
- ⁷⁰. *DN*, p. 109.
- ⁷¹. O. Clément, *op. cit.*, p. 12.
- ⁷². P. Rorem, *Biblical and Liturgical Symbols within the Pseudo-Dionysian Synthesis*, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Toronto, 1984, p. 88.
- ⁷³. *DN*, p. 53, note 17.
- ⁷⁴. P. Rorem, *op. cit.*, p. 90.
- ⁷⁵. P. Scazzoso, *op. cit.*, p. 111.
- ⁷⁶. *Ibidem*, p. 112.
- ⁷⁷. *MT*, p. 139.
- ⁷⁸. *DN*, p. 62.
- ⁷⁹. *EH*, p. 198.
- ⁸⁰. *DN*, p. 67.
- ⁸¹. *EH*, p. 216.
- ⁸². E.H. Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 129.
- ⁸³. E. Underhill, *op. cit.*, p. 171.
- ⁸⁴. Gregory Palamas, *The Triads...*, p. 64.
- ⁸⁵. *DN*, p. 52.
- ⁸⁶. *CH*, p. 168.
- ⁸⁷. E. Underhill, *op. cit.*, p. 457.

List of participants

GEORGE ALEXE

Senior theologian of the Romanian Orthodox Church, poet and writer, essayist, publisher; director and founder of *Romanian Communion*; chairman of the Romanian Institute of Orthodox Theology and Spirituality

FR. DR. THEODOR DAMIAN

Professor of Philosophy and Ethics at Audrey Cohen College, New York; president of the Romanian Institute of Orthodox Theology and Spirituality

FR. DR. EUGEN PENTIUC

Professor of Old Testament and Hebrew at Holy Cross Greek School of Theology, Boston, MA

RICHARD GRALLO, PHD

Professor of Human Services, Audrey Cohen College, New York; Quest Research Institute, New York

REV. DR. BERT F. BREINER

Episcopal Church USA, Professor of Human Services, Audrey Cohen College, New York

DR. CONSTANTIN N. TSIRPANLIS

Professor of Church History, Patristics and Orthodox Theology, President of the American Institute for Patristic and Byzantine Studies. Unfortunately his outstanding intervention was presented orally, and we did not have the text available for publication.

Guests of Honor

HIS EMINENCE VICTORIN URSACHI

Archbishop of the Romanian Orthodox Archdiocese of America and Canada

THE RIGHT REV. FR. DR. VASILE VASILACHI

Vicar of the Romanian Archdiocese of America and Canada

Discussion Panel

DR. ELENA BRONT DE AVILA
Professor of Sociology, Audrey Cohen College

REV. DRD. PAVEL NICULESCU
Romanian Baptist Church, Ridgewood, NY

IULIA CORDUNEANU
Holy Cross School of Theology, member of the executive committee of
the World Council of Churches

Mr. George Alexe

Fr. Dr. Vasile Vasilachi

His Eminence Archbishop Victorin

followed by Fr. Dr. Vasile Vasilachi and Fr. Paul Theophilus;
to the left: Fr. Dr. Eugen Pentiu, Fr. Marcel Miron, Dean;
to the right: Fr. Dr. Theodor Damian, Fr. Drd. George ^achiop.

Rev. Fr. Paul Theophilus

Prof. Dr. Richard Gallo

Prof. Dr. Constantin Tsirpanlis

Prof. Dr. Bert Breiner

Prof. Dr. Eugen Pentiu

Prof. Dr. Theodor Damian

Dr. Theodor Damian, Dr. Richard Gallo, Dr. Bert Breiner,
Ms Elizabeth Mellen