

**THE KENOTIC THEOLOGY
OF ANTHONY BLOOM
METROPOLITAN OF SOUROZH (1914-2003),
IN ANTHROPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE**

Roman Rytsar

Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the Ph.D. (Th) / D.Th. degree in
Eastern Christian Studies
Faculty of Theology
Saint Paul University

© Roman Rytsar, Ottawa, Canada, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

ABSTRACT	 5
ALA-LC TRANSLITERATION SCHEME FOR THE RUSSIAN SCRIPT	 9
INTRODUCTION	 10
Statement of the Problem	 10
Brief Historical Overview of Kenotic Theology	 13
Anthony Bloom's Kenotic Theology	 18
State of the Question	 22
Previous Research	 24
International Conferences and Seminars on Anthony Bloom	 27
Research Hypothesis	 29
Methodology	 31
Structure of the Thesis	 37
I.1. KENOTIC THEOLOGY	 40
I.2. Brief History of Kenotic Theology of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries	 41
I.3. Kenotic Theology in Russian Thought of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries	 49
I.3.1. Vladimir Soloviev (1853-1900)	 51
I.3.2. Mikhail Tareev (1866-1934)	 54
I.3.3. Metropolitan Anthony Khrapovitsky (1863-1936)	 57
I.3.4. Fr. Sergius Bulgakov (1871-1944)	 67
I.3.5. Vladimir Lossky (1903-1958)	 83
I.3.6. Archimandrite Sophrony (Sergei Sakharov) (1896-1993)	 90
II.1. ANTHONY BLOOM'S KENOTIC THEOLOGY	 101

II.1.1. God's Kenosis in the Creation of the World	 102
II.1.2. God's Kenosis in the Incarnation	 105
II.1.3. God's Kenosis in the Baptism of Christ	 113
II.1.4. Temptations, Prayer to the Father and Miracles	 116
II.1.5. Transfiguration – the Greatness and the Tragedy of the Event	 119
II.1.6. The Lord's Entry into Jerusalem – the Entrance to Holy Week	 122
II.1.7. God-forsakenness in the Kenotic Theology of Anthony Bloom	 127
II.1.8. The Descent into Hades	 135
II.1.9. Christ's Resurrection	 140
II.1.10. Ascension	 145
II.2. Persons of the New Testament in the Context of God-forsakenness	 148
II.2.1. Kenotic Life of the Theotokos	 148
II.2.2. John the Baptist	 168
II.2.3. Apostles: Both Forsaken and Forsaking the Lord	 173
III.1. ANTHONY BLOOM'S ANTHROPOLOGY	 179
III.2. Dual Solidarity of Christ	 180
III.3. God's Faith in the Human Person	 185
III.4. Creation of the World and the Human Being	 188
III.4.1. Adam – a "Total Human"	 193
III.4.2. The Fall	 200
III.4.2.1. Disharmony between Adam and the World	 202
III.4.2.2. Disharmony within Adam	 205
III.4.2.3. Disharmony between Adam and God	 211
III.5. Salvation in Jesus Christ – the Godman	 214
III.5.1. An "Atheistic" Christ	 220
III.5.2. Anthony Bloom's Response to the Atheism in Russia and in the West	 228
III.5.3. Encounter Between Christianity and Atheism	 238
IV.1. ANTHONY BLOOM'S KENOTIC THEOLOGY IN CHURCH PRACTICE	 247
IV.1.1. Kenosis in the Encounter with God	 247
IV.1.2. Anthony Bloom's Personal Encounter with Christ as the Foundation for His Future Kenotic Theology	 249
IV.2. Church and Kenosis	 256
IV.2.1. God-forsakenness and the Church	 263

IV.2.2. Sacraments as an Encounter	 268
IV.2.3. Sacraments and Matter	 270
IV.2.4. The Sacrament of Baptism and Kenosis	 274
IV.2.5. The Sacrament of Chrismation	 277
IV.2.6. The Sacrament of the Eucharist	 282
IV.2.7. Sacrament of Repentance and Confession	 290
IV.2.8. Sacrament of Unction	 298
IV.2.9. Kenosis in the Sacrament of Marriage and in Monasticism	 300
IV.2.10. Kenosis in the Life of a Priest's Wife	 312
IV.2.11. Kenosis in the Priesthood	 319
 V.1. ANTHONY BLOOM'S KENOTIC THEOLOGY IN PERSONAL PRACTICE	 330
V.2. Kenosis in the Encounter with God in Prayer	 331
V.2.1. Absence of God in Prayer	 333
V.2.2. Sin as an Obstacle to Encountering God	 334
V.2.3. An Opportunity for Spiritual Growth	 338
V.2.4. A False Vision of Oneself	 340
V.3. Practical Advice Regarding the Experience of God's Absence	 343
V.4. Experience of God in an Encounter Leads to Faith	 349
V.5. Kenosis in a Relation with the Other Person	 357
V.5.1. Love of Oneself as a Way to Love God and Others	 358
V.5.2. Faith in Oneself as Kenosis	 362
V.5.3. Faith in the Human Being and Kenosis in Encounter with the Other	 369
V.5.4. Vocation of Christians to the Kenotic Way of Life	 374
V.5.5. Kenosis in Death as the Final Encounter with God	 384
V.6. Kenotic Theology of Anthony Bloom and Fr. Sophrony Sakharov	 390
 CONCLUSION	 399
Anthony Bloom and Kenotic Theology	 399
Anthony Bloom and God-forsakenness	 404
Contribution of Anthony Bloom	 415
 APPENDIX	 423
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 429

ABSTRACT

Statement of the Problem

Metropolitan Anthony (Bloom) of Sourozh (1914-2003; henceforth: AB) was one of the leading Russian Orthodox voices of the 20th century and was widely known for his vast output of talks and sermons on the scriptures, spiritual life and contemporary issues. Some of this material was published during his lifetime but the majority has only become available after his death. Much of it remains to be translated from Russian. The inheritance of AB has not yet been properly studied and this doctoral dissertation is an initial attempt to sort through this huge body of material and begin to examine key themes. This thesis addresses the kenotic theology of Metropolitan Anthony. His unique insights in this one area are used as a lens through which to present his larger corpus of writings and their implications for Eastern Christian anthropology in our time.

Kenotic theology was a particular focus of 19th and 20th century Russian theology. The consistent focus of AB's kenotic theology is Christ's God-forsakenness on the cross: "My God, my God why have you forsaken me?" (Mk 15:34). These words became a motto for Metropolitan Anthony's life and preaching. In my research, I demonstrate that he developed a unique understanding of Christ's God-forsakenness that was fundamental to his understanding of 1) kenotic theology and 2) what it means to be a human being.

Because death, according to AB, is a “Godless” place, God entered precisely there, where He is not, in order to show true and deep solidarity with human beings and thus to bring salvation. Christ’s experience of God-forsakenness is, therefore, the deepest expression of God’s love and the key revelation of God’s faith in the human person. This is the central, creative, and original contribution that I believe AB makes to Eastern Christian theology today.

Methodology

There are a number of recurring topics in AB’s many talks: faith and atheism; spiritual life; marriage and family; priesthood and pastoral aspects; and sacraments and the Church. In this dissertation AB’s two central ideas are used as the keys to reading and analyzing this diverse material, namely the God-forsakenness of Christ (kenotic theology) and God’s faith in the human person (anthropology). As this appears to be the first doctoral research on the legacy of AB, the dissertation concentrates on a clear and full presentation of his kenotic thought, and leaves to others (or to later study) a more comparative, discursive analysis and evaluation of his theology. Here, the multiple threads of AB’s thought are gathered into a coherent tapestry (a project which has not yet, to my knowledge, been undertaken) using a synchronic, thematic mode of analysis. By employing AB’s characteristic notion of kenoticism as a hermeneutic lens, I present the underlying unity of his thought as seen throughout the discourses, which are currently available.

Having first established what kenoticism denotes, both within the Orthodox

tradition and in the wider Christian theological tradition, the distinctive features of AB's kenotic theology as they emerge throughout his work are examined to answer the following two questions: what did AB say in his kenotic theology and how did he apply kenotic theology in practice?

The dissertation is divided into two broad sections: theoretical and practical. In the first three chapters (theoretical) I compile and describe the background and possible roots of AB's kenotic approach. Here AB's kenotic theology is classed into two major themes: the God-forsakenness of Christ (kenosis) and God's faith in the human person (anthropology). In the last two chapters (practical), using AB's argumentation, I present the application of his kenotic theology and show how it is linked to the theoretical part of the thesis. In this practical section I first search AB's work for "places" where a human being might experience abandonment by God and how AB applies God's faith in the human person to address these circumstances. Second, I examine how the kenotic way of life, in AB's understanding, brings a person to genuine encounter with another human being, with oneself and with God.

Main Points and General Conclusions

As noted above, Bloom's original contribution is his conviction that Christ's experience of God-forsakenness is the deepest expression of God's love and the key revelation of God's faith in the human person. But this dissertation also shows that AB's kenotic theology has something practical and pastoral to offer contemporary people. First, AB underlines the need of every human being to rediscover authentic self-love.

Here he made a clear distinction between selfish egoism and the true understanding of love for oneself that is the foundation for love of God and others. Secondly, AB's kenotic theology offers Christians a practical tool for life with God and other people that is based on faith in the other person. As AB puts it: "If God believes in me, then I can believe in the other person. And if I believe in the other person, then the other person can believe in himself and in God." AB was not naïve and realized that being fully trustful in all circumstances is impossible. But he was convinced that despite the sins of a human being there remains within him the indestructible image of God. And only by experiencing that full conviction from someone else could they learn about God's faith and begin to love themselves and others.

According to AB, relationships with God and with other people have some elements in common, such as moments of dryness, absence, abandonment and, as a result, loneliness. What does a human being have to do in these moments when he personally experiences or sees these moments being experienced by other people? In both cases AB teaches that he or she has to follow the example of Christ. In the first case, in his own despair, he has to remain faithful to the promises made to Christ in the past. In the second case, one must be ready to descend together with Christ into Hades with the other person who is suffering these difficult moments. Christians are called to be present in solidarity with others in their most difficult moments because Christ gave the ultimate example of being in solidarity with God and with people.

ALA – LC
The American Library Association and the Library of Congress
Romanization Table
Transliteration Scheme for the Russian Script

Vernacular	Romanization	Vernacular	Romanization
Upper case letters		Lower case letters	
А	A	а	a
Б	B	б	b
В	V	в	v
Г	G	г	g
Д	D	д	d
Е	E	е	e
Ё	Ё	ё	ë
Ж	Zh	ж	zh
З	Z	з	z
И	I	и	i
Й	Ĭ	й	ĭ
К	K	к	k
Л	L	л	l
М	M	м	m
Н	N	н	n
О	O	о	o
П	P	п	p
Р	R	р	r
С	S	с	s
Т	T	т	t
У	U	у	u
Ф	F	ф	f
Х	Kh	х	kh
Ц	Ts	ц	ts
Ч	Ch	ч	ch
Ш	Sh	ш	sh
Щ	Shch	щ	shch
Ъ	” (hard sign)	ъ	” (hard sign)
Ы	Y	ы	y
Ь	’ (soft sign)	ь	’ (soft sign)
Э	E	э	e
Ю	Iu	ю	iu
Я	Ia	я	ia

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Metropolitan Anthony (Bloom) of Sourozh (henceforth: AB) was one of the most prominent Orthodox personalities of the twentieth century who influenced not only Eastern Christians, but also many others, especially Anglicans and Roman Catholics in Britain, Russia, North America, and beyond. His influence was enormous and yet his theological work has not been widely studied, especially in a systematic way (for reasons that will be addressed later). To my knowledge, this is the first doctoral dissertation on AB.¹ His influence and prominence alone make him worthy of serious scholarly attention, but certain aspects of his theology are especially noteworthy and need sustained scrutiny, in part because they seem so singular and even startling in their argumentation and implications. There are also other reasons for studying Bloom's contribution at this moment: his recent death in 2003, the publication of a first biography, and the enormous interest in his work among Slavic Christians today.

The proposed thesis will address AB's kenotic theology, using his unique insights as a lens through which to present his larger corpus of writings and their implications for Christian anthropology in our time. Kenotic theology has been discussed by Western theologians, but was also a particular focus of 19th and 20th

¹ John Palmer is currently a doctoral candidate at Aristotle University in Thessaloniki, writing on the work of Metropolitan Anthony Bloom.

century Russian theology. This early kenotic theology formed the background to Anthony Bloom's contribution.

Although, as mentioned above, AB is widely known at a *popular* level, his life and work are not as widely known among scholars. We begin, therefore, with a brief biographical sketch in order to situate his life and writings in their proper context.²

Metropolitan Anthony was born Andrei Borisovich Bloom on 19 June 1914 in Lausanne, Switzerland, into the family of an official of the Russian Imperial diplomatic service. He spent his early childhood in Persia, where his father served as an ambassador. After the Revolution in 1917, Bloom's family decided to emigrate to England but eventually settled in Paris. There they tasted all the bitterness and harshness of émigré life. His parents did not give much attention to his religious life, but as a Russian he identified himself with the Orthodox Church. His personal life was severely marred by his parents' divorce, a lack of acceptance from others, bouts of depression, and loneliness. All this caused him at one point to contemplate committing suicide.³

Until 1929, he did not believe in God. But once, during a youth camp, at the age of 15, he heard Fr. Sergei Bulgakov speak on Christianity. André did not like this speech and decided to make sure for himself that Christianity was worthless. He embarked upon reading the Bible to see what it was about. He chose the shortest gospel, Mark, and when

² Much of what follows in this biographical sketch is borrowed from: Roman Rytsar, review of *This Holy Man: Impressions of Metropolitan Anthony*, by Gillian Crow (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2005) in *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 47 (2006), Nos. 3-4, 134-138. For the extended biography of AB, see: Gillian Crow, *This Holy Man*. In the Appendix to this dissertation I will attach a short biography written by Andrew Walker on the occasion of AB's death. It has the advantage of both presenting the salient facts while also retaining a personal approach.

³ Gillian Crow, *This Holy Man*, 25; Bishop Hilarion Alfeyev, *Православное богословие на рубеже столетий* (Moscow: Krutitskoe podvor'e, 1999), online, available: <http://www.lib.eparhia-saratov.ru/books/09i/ilarion/bogoslovie/67.html#s1>

he began to read, he says “I realized Christ is standing here, without doubt.... If Christ is standing here alive, that means he is the risen Christ... and everything that is said about him in the Gospel is true.”⁴ This was neither a sensory hallucination nor a trance-like state, nor even the product of emotions. It was an encounter experienced with complete sobriety and equilibrium. He used to say about this event that “God for me became a fact.” Another impression that struck him from the first reading of the gospels was Christ’s God-forsakenness on the cross.⁵ “My God, my God why have you forsaken me?” (Mk 15:34)⁶: these words became a motto of Metropolitan Anthony’s preaching.

AB used different phrases to describe the same idea: experience of Godlessness (обезбоженность, испытал безбожие); the deprivation of God (боголишенность); God-forsakenness (бogoоставленность). Godlessness in English means atheism and AB used it in the sense of being abandoned by God. I will be using the term ‘God-forsakenness’ (in Russian - Богооставленность), except in cases where AB talked about the atheism (Godlessness) of Christ on the cross and AB’s understanding of the Original sin when he also used the term ‘Godlessness’. AB believed that Christ had suffered not only all the consequences of sin including death, but had also experienced separation from the divine presence of His Father. This experience is common for all fallen humanity. André gradually realized that God had not only created everything, but also loves everyone by sharing their emptiness. Since that time he found a purpose for his

⁴ Gillian Crow, *This Holy Man*, 41.

⁵ See for example: Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Encounter* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2005), 24, 109.

⁶ NRSV will be used throughout unless otherwise noted.

life: to share his discovery with others. His insight into kenotic theology will be the main focus of this dissertation.

Brief Historical Overview of Kenotic Theology

As we saw above, a crucially moment in AB's epiphany was his sudden awareness of the self-emptying and abandonment of Christ on the cross. This became the key to his message. To better understand his thought on this matter, it is necessary to situate it in the context of kenotic theology throughout the centuries.

According to Eastern Christian tradition, in thinking of Christ we can speak of an "identification of crucifixion from the first moment of birth."⁷ Early Christian communities read the evangelical descriptions of the passion and death of Christ in the light of His Resurrection and exaltation by the Father. Following Saint Paul (Phil. 2:5-11)⁸ and many Fathers,⁹ liturgical texts for Christmas portray Christ's birth as the beginning of His kenosis. According to Maximus the Confessor, Christ's Incarnation was the pre-temporal goal of creation, independent of original sin. The cross became

⁷ Waław Hryniewicz, *Chrystus nasza Pascha. Zarys chrześcijańskiej teologii paschalnej*, 3 vols. (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1982), 1:233-237. The following section depends extensively on Hryniewicz's analysis.

⁸ Many Western authors focus on this text. See: Ernst Käsemann, "Kritische Analyse von Phil 2, 5-11", *Die Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche* 47 (1950), 313-360; Karl Barth, *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, Bd. 4. Tl. 1. Zollikon 1953, 196-199; Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Mysterium paschale*, *Mysterium Salutis* III/2 (1967), 143-154; R. Schnackenburg, *Christologie des Neuen Testament*, *Mysterium Salutis* III/1, 309-322 in Waław Hryniewicz, *Chrystus nasza Pascha*, 283.

⁹ Athanasius of Alexandria, *Oratio De Incarnatione Verbi* 27 (Patrologia Graeca (=PG) 25, 141); Cf. Tertulian, *De Carne Christi* (Patrologia Latina (=PL) 2, 764); Cf. Leo the Great, *Sermo* 48 (PL 54, 298) in Waław Hryniewicz, *Chrystus nasza Pascha*, 236.

necessary only because of sin.¹⁰ The voluntary acceptance of human mortality by the Son of God was treated as an act of “descending” (from Greek “καταβάσις” – κατὰ, “down” βαίνω “go”); by the power of this descent He united and deified the whole of humanity in Himself.

According to most Eastern Christian theologians, Original sin resulted in the inheritance of death.¹¹ The resurrection of Christ destroyed death’s control over human existence. Human beings were freed from the tyranny of death. Death still exists as a physical phenomenon, but it does not ultimately prevail over humans any more. According to the Greek Fathers, Christ descends into the abode of the dead and saves those whom death held in slavery.¹² The idea of descending into Hades (cf. 1 Pet 3:19) also appeared in the teachings of certain Latin Fathers, but did not play as important a role in their thinking as it did for certain Eastern Fathers.¹³

¹⁰ Georges Florovsky, *Creation and Redemption* (Belmont: Nordland, 1976), 163-170.

¹¹ John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology. Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1974), 143-146.

¹² Gregory of Nyssa, *In Christi Resurrectionem* (PG 46, 605. 613-617); John Chrysostom, *Homilia in Sanctum Pascha* (PG 52, 765-772) in Waclaw Hryniewicz, *Chrystus nasza Pascha*, 249.

¹³ Augustine (Pseudo-Augustine?), *Sermo 377* (PL 39, 1672). Western thought according to Hryniewicz emphasized more the liberation of human beings from the slavery of sin and guilt. Eastern thought underlined salvation as the gift of God’s life and of human participation in God. Christ’s death was necessary so that the dead might receive participation in salvation, whose complement is the Resurrection. Some Western theologians criticized this Patristic interpretation of Christ’s descent into Hades for being too triumphal. It did not pay enough attention to such existential moments as Christ’s complete abandonment by His disciples, his experience of loneliness and the power of evil, his solidarity with the human person in death up to the end. It seems that Eastern interpretation, using the language of symbol and myth, especially as seen in the traditional icon of the “Descent into Hades,” moves too quickly from the humiliated death on the cross to the glory of the Resurrection. For Waclaw Hryniewicz, the Orthodox interpretation of the descent into Hades is neither an exclusive state of kenosis nor an exclusive state of exaltation (H. U. von Balthasar, *Mysterium paschale*, 229; Joseph Ratzinger, *Einführung in das Christentum* (München: Kösel, 1968); Frederic Huidekoper, *The Belief of the First Three Centuries Concerning Christ’s Mission in the Underworld* (Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co., 1954); Hans Küng, *Christ sein* (München: Piper, 1974), 356-359 in Waclaw Hryniewicz, *Chrystus nasza Pascha*, 252.

Another consistent element of kenotic theology is the abandonment of Christ on the cross. The Christian theological tradition did not give unambiguous answers to this essential moment of the act of Redemption: a large divergence of opinion exists on this subject. Differences already existed in the interpretation of the mystery of the cross among Fathers of the Church. Since Origen, there have been two approaches of interpreting this mystery. Some Fathers understood abandonment on the cross as a spiritual sadness because of sinners, without mentioning Jesus being forsaken by the Father. Others talked about Christ's suffering as the Head of believers, who are His body as the Church.¹⁴

The theme of the kenotic Christ is also well known in Russian theological and philosophical thought, but Russian thinkers have had a different approach to this doctrine, and underlined the renouncing by the Son of God of the external glory of divine existence.¹⁵ Kenotic theology was not only developed in the twentieth century by Russian theologians such as Vladimir Soloviev, Sergius Bulgakov, Vladimir Lossky, Mikhail Tareev, Metropolitan Anthony Khrapovitsky and Fr. Sophrony Sakharov but also by Western – and particularly German – theologians such as Eberhard Jüngel, Jürgen Moltmann, and especially by Swiss theologian Cardinal Hans Urs von Balthasar. They lived and worked in the same era as the Russian émigrés (including AB) and in their works we can see similar ideas. In Chapter I, a brief survey of these Western

¹⁴ G. Jouassard, "L'abandon de Jésus en Croix dans la tradition," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 25 (1924), 310; 26 (1925), 609; Cf. G. Jouassard, "L'abandon du Christ en Croix dans la tradition grecque," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 14 (1925), 633 in Waclaw Hryniewicz, *Chrystus nasza Pascha*, 292.

¹⁵ Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought* (London: Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, 1938), 127.

approaches will be presented in order to put AB's work in a wider context. But I will focus on *Russian* thinkers¹⁶ because Bloom was himself a hierarch of the Russian Church and, therefore, naturally in closest contact with Russian traditions and thinkers. We will focus on the particular Russian thinkers mentioned above because they are the most prominent of their age and also because, as Nadejda Gorodetzky demonstrates, they all share in common similar formative influences and they all develop the theme of Christ's humiliation. I will present a more detailed presentation of the kenotic theology of the Russian kenoticists in Chapter I. Below is a summary of the main points of the Russian thinkers on this topic:

Vladimir Soloviev (1853-1900) In his theology the whole cosmic and historic process of the penetration of all by the divine element reveals itself as self-denial. Kenosis becomes complete only in the Person of the Divine-human. The main spiritual victory of Christ was gained on the cross, where we see the most perfect expression of the obedience of the Son of God.

Mikhail Tareev (1866-1934) was the first one to build his entire system around the humiliation of Christ. Christ considered His humiliation as the expression of His Father's love for the world. Tareev saw the temptation of Jesus as what he termed "religious" or "theanthropic" temptation that has a salvific meaning.

Metropolitan Anthony Khrapovitsky (1863-1936) believed that a culminative moment of salvation took place in the garden of Gethsemane, rather than on the Cross.

¹⁶ French existential philosophers (eg. Gabriel Marcel) influenced the Metropolitan too. Metropolitan Anthony quoted many times Gabriel Marcel, who wrote that to say to a person "I love you" is to say "You will never die." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Жизнь. Болезнь. Смерть* (Moscow: Zachatevskii monastery, 1995), 95; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Таинство любви: Беседа о христианском браке* (Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994), 16-17.

His understanding of salvation was a reaction against Anselmian theory (as he understood it). He understood salvation as the restoration of the relationship of love between God and humankind. He attributed the special soteriological meaning of Christ in Gethsemane (fear before death) to moral sufferings and His sympathizing love for all people. It was the culminating moment of salvation.

Sergei Bulgakov (1871-1944) undertook the most speculative attempt at interpreting the Incarnation in light of the idea of kenosis. Bulgakov was convinced that kenotic theory may be taken as a development and explanation of the Chalcedonian definition.¹⁷ Creation is a kenosis for the whole Trinity, because the Father consents to wait until His creation will respond to His love. Christ, the second Person of the Trinity, seems to abandon His own will, emptying Himself and bringing His life into complete subjection to the Father. Christ, retaining His divinity and not being affected by kenosis as the second hypostasis, nevertheless voluntarily separates Himself from the divine life. The death of Christ, consummated bodily on the cross, is at the same time the spiritual agony of an immortal life. The whole God-man in His unity and complexity dies on the cross.

For **Vladimir Lossky (1903-1958)**, self-abandonment or self-abasement was the key to understanding the very essence of the Son of God. Kenosis is the way of being of the divine person sent into the world to fulfill the common will of the Trinity, whose source is in the Father. The whole earthly life of Christ was a continual humiliation. Besides the prayer in Gethsemane, Christ's last cry of mortal agony on the cross

¹⁷ Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ*, 159.

manifested His true humanity which voluntarily submitted to death as a final emptying, the culmination of the divine kenosis.

Archimandrite Sophrony (Sergei Sakharov) (1896-1993) experienced in his life the presence of the crucified Christ several times and this shaped his own understanding of following Christ in His kenosis. Christ not only manifested kenosis in His earthly divine-human life, but also in the eternal intra-Trinitarian love. Fr. Sophrony used God-forsakenness as the main thread in his kenotic theology, and he also understood the unanswered prayer in Gethsemane as a component of Christ's further abandonment by the Father on the cross. In Gethsemane, Christ internally accomplished His sacrifice. Thus, His death on the cross was an external completion of kenotic God-forsakenness.

Anthony Bloom's Kenotic Theology

Besides his own experience of God-forsakenness and his encounter with God, AB's anthropology owes much to the Russian emigration in Paris and members of the so-called "Paris school."¹⁸ He personally knew Georges Florovsky, who recommended that he read the works of the saints and Fathers. From Nikolai Berdiaev AB borrowed the ideas of androgyny, freedom and creativeness. He was also very close to Vladimir Lossky, whose anthropology AB absorbed as his own (with some modifications). AB

¹⁸ For more on the Paris School, see: Antoine Arjakovsky, *Журнал Путь (1925—1940): Поколение русских религиозных мыслителей в эмиграции* (Kiev: Feniks, 2000). English translation: Antoine Arjakovsky, *The Way: Religious Thinkers of the Russian Emigration in Paris and their Journal*, trans. Jerry Ryan, Michael Plekon and John Jillions, eds. (UND Press, forthcoming, 2012).

was struck by the writings of Theophan the Recluse, a Russian saint of the nineteenth century. And like a thread throughout his sermons and talks is the idea of the personal relationship between God and man that seems to be influenced by Martin Buber's "I and Thou," which AB enhanced with his own concept of the encounter. He was also influenced by nineteenth-century Russian lay writers, especially Fyodor Dostoevsky. We will see a great number of references by AB to Fr. Sophrony Sakharov and some similarities in their understanding of the God-forsakenness of Christ. In the last chapter I will contrast the theology of these two theologians.

While AB was aware of these thinkers, he developed his own approach to kenotic theology. For AB, Christ's humiliation began with His Incarnation. He was born in the fallen world, with its limitation and horror, where He accepted in Himself all the consequences of sin: hunger, thirst, weariness, depression, pain, etc. With the Incarnation, Christ agreed to be in complete solidarity with us, not only with our human life but also with the whole tragedy of sin and death. For AB, Christ's God-forsakenness is an event between God and man in which Christ as God entered the place where He does not exist. He united Christ's God-forsakenness with the descent into Hades. "Christ descended where everyone who has died in separation from God descends, into Hades – a place of eternal and radical absence of God."¹⁹ AB criticized as folkloric and naïve the interpretation of Hades as a place of terrible torments. "The most terrible aspect of hell in the Old Testament, in Hades [...] is not torture, but that this is a place where God is not present and will never be, this is a place of the last, hopeless absence of God,

¹⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 88.

Godlessness for ever.”²⁰ For AB to die means to lose God. “It is possible to die and to become in one’s nature Godless or atheistic in the etymological sense of the word. It means that Christ died sharing our state of Godlessness, our loss of God.”²¹ In another place he compared the experience of atheism with the experience of Christ:

Christ has plumbed the depth beyond all atheists. Even the most devastating experience of atheism is not outside the experience of Christ. So we must look at the Godless world with new eyes. We can look at it with a depth it does not have itself – stranded, wounded, blinded but as full of virtual holiness as any member of the Church.²²

Christ’s cry on the cross: “My God, My God! Why have you forsaken Me?” (Mk 15:34) is not just a citation from Ps 22²³ put in Christ’s mouth by the evangelists Mark and Matthew but a real experience of God-forsakenness. It seems that in AB’s interpretation Christ’s experience on the cross is the key to understanding the human person. Humankind has lost God by sin, and God who wanted to be “all in all” (1 Cor. 15:28), “has appeared as a participant in the unique ontological and fundamental tragedy of the human person who has lost God.”²⁴ He descended to the place of the absence of God where:

²⁰ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Пастырство* (Minsk: Izdatelstvo Belorusskogo Ekzarkhata, 2005), 20.

²¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 88.

²² “Christ has experienced Godlessness (I speak not about ideological Godlessness, but about its reality), Godlessness as any atheist on earth has not experienced, and in this sense there is no person – either the atheist, or the believer, – who has remained outside of the experience of Christ.” Gillian Crow, *This Holy Man*, 158.

²³ “One does not rehearse a psalm when one is dying a violent death. The psalm is directed towards the event and not the other way round. And the descent into hell is the ultimate point of Christ’s solidarity with us.” *Ibid.*, 169.

²⁴ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 544.

He filled Hades with Himself, with His Divinity, with His eternal life, with His Light. And death is forever abolished. Now we call death 'falling asleep', a time when we die not in a chasm of despair and Godlessness, but a time when we depart for God who has loved us so much that He gave us His only-begotten Son, Unique. The Beloved has been given so that we might believe in His love!²⁵

AB absolutely insisted that God-forsakenness is an event between God and the person and not a Trinitarian event as Moltmann stated. AB was not afraid to leave some room for paradox, as a result, perhaps, of both his own experience of hell and meeting there with Christ, as well as the fact that paradox is so common in Eastern Christian theology. God is the one who initiates the encounter with human beings. Christ's experience of God-forsakenness is itself the deepest expression of God's love. Because death according to Metropolitan Anthony is a "Godless" place, God entered precisely there, where He is not, to show true and deep solidarity with human beings and thus to bring salvation. Christ's God-forsakenness is the link to God's faith in the human being. My hypothesis (to be discussed later) is that AB's kenotic theology is also the key to his understanding of personhood.

The theme of God's faith in the human person is one of the most important in AB's thought.²⁶ Interpreting the parable about the Last Judgment, the Metropolitan says:

²⁵ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа: Проповеди* (Moscow: Sviato-Danilov monastyr', 1993), online, available: http://www.metroplit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_10.htm

²⁶ A prominent aspect of his sermons is his desire to give people more confidence and assurance, to defend God's desire that they believe in themselves. He constantly repeated that the "whole Gospel is penetrated by belief in the person" and that "the person is that reality which is the theme of each person's life." The person becomes the "unique point of contact between the believer and the non-believer." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 10. He emphasized the immense depth of each person and the infinite value of the human soul for God. AB stressed the real opportunity for dialogue between the person and God at any moment in life. Thus the relationship between them is built on love and friendship, instead of on domination and slavery. For AB, God's faith in the person takes place in the encounter between God, who is the initiator, and the human person, who has to reply to God's invitation. This face-to-face encounter takes place in the heart of the person, where the Lord says: "I believe in you so much that I became a

Not mentioned in this parable are such questions as: In what did you believe? Did you believe in God? Did you believe in Christ? Did you believe in this or that? Did you follow the practices and rites of the Church? There are no questions at this level... The essence of the parable is this: Have you been human? If you were inhuman you do not have a place in the Kingdom of heaven. If you were human then you have a path to a further relationship with God.²⁷

State of the Question

Most of Metropolitan Anthony's vast literary output was not actually written down by him but rather consists of transcripts done by parishioners and others using tape-recordings and their notes on his numerous talks. He spoke without notes and he very rarely prepared his talks in advance. Gillian Crow writes: "What mattered to him was the essence of what he said, not peripheral details. A born storyteller, he always preferred the spontaneous approach, in which checking his sources could not feature."²⁸ AB never considered himself a theologian, but he was one of the most authoritative witnesses of Orthodox theology in the twentieth century.²⁹ Metropolitan Hilarion Alfeyev in *The Theology of Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh in Light of Patristic Tradition* compared Bloom's inheritance and influence to the Fathers of the Church and

person similar to you that you could believe in My belief in the person, in My love." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая: Проповеди произнесённые в России* (Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994), 77. God's faith in the person should be an example for human beings of how they need to love each other. Bloom understood faith in the human being, and in particular in oneself, not as faith in human powers, or abilities. It is not a self-confidence which is based on self-knowledge, but it begins with God's faith in the person. His faith in them is what transforms people.

²⁷ Roman Mikhailovich Iuzhakov, "Русское Православие в Англии: Николай Зернов и Антоний Сурожский," *Russkii Mir* 2 (2000), online, available: <http://www.russkymir.ru/out.php?cat=23&did=495>.

²⁸ Gillian Crow, *This Holy Man*, 139.

²⁹ Cf. A. Kyrlezhev, "Митрополит Антоний Сурожский – "заезжий православный миссионер" в России," *Kontinent* 4, 236.

put him in a list of the other Fathers.³⁰ AB always emphasized that he was not a “professional theologian” and that his only formal training was medical, not theological:

I cannot now improve my theological education and can speak only about what has grown in my soul. If this would seem unacceptable to many in its form, it might not be unacceptable in its essence. I believe I am not departing from the spirit of the Church, from the spirit of the Holy Fathers in the essentials, but I am using a different language to speak to a different people. I think the same was said about many Fathers, too.³¹

AB, in his sermons, often cited the Church Fathers, sometimes named them but sometimes just simply and vaguely referred to what “some of the Fathers”³² had said. AB had no speculative bent, nor any interest in the abstract. The list of his purely academic studies of a theological problem amounts to one lecture “On Contemplation and *Podvig*” delivered at the very dawn of his ecclesiastical “career” in 1948 before the Fifth International Conference on Religious Psychology. He also gave speeches to various diocesan assemblies,³³ conferences of the World Council of Churches,³⁴ and in similar venues. However, this lack of inclination for systematic presentation does not exclude a deep understanding of difficult theological questions. Numerous

³⁰ Bishop Hilarion Alfeyev, “Богословие митрополита Суразского Антония в свете святоотеческого Предания,” in Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 12-15.

³¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Church in the third Millennium*, from an interview with Alena Maidonovich (= Elena Maidanovich), published in *Russkaya Mysl'* on 8 June 2000; See also at: http://www.exarchate-uk.org/MA/Interview_AM.html

³² Bishop Hilarion Alfeyev asserts that this kind of citation can also be found in Symeon the New Theologian, who almost never cited the Fathers, but includes many allusions to Gregory the Theologian. Bishop Hilarion Alfeyev, “Богословие митрополита Суразского Антония в свете святоотеческого Предания,” in Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 16.

³³ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Christ, True and Perfect Man: The Address Printed below Was Delivered at the Diocesan Conference at Effingham, Surrey, in May, 1983*, online, available: http://www.mitras.ru/eng/eng_13.htm.

³⁴ Such as, for instance, a number of his talks in Geneva in 1968.

ecclesiological, anthropological, Christological, and ethical themes are constantly raised and examined from a pastoral perspective in more than 10,000 lectures, sermons, parish talks, and similar discourses.³⁵ If AB's "publications" are not those of a typical academic theologian, neither are his degrees, which are all purely honorary doctoral degrees awarded *honoris causa* by both Orthodox and non-Orthodox theological institutions, such as Aberdeen University (1973), Moscow Theological Academy (1983), Cambridge University (1996), and the Kyiv Theological Academy (1999). These led him to declare that "I have only one true doctorate in medicine; all others are false."³⁶

The inheritance of Anthony Bloom has not yet been properly studied. Except for a few B.A. theses on the spirituality and pastoral works of AB, there have been no critical studies of his perception and understanding of the Christological question. I would like to briefly present what little has been done so far.

Previous Research

Dimitrii Erin, in his thesis "Spiritual and moral ideals of Christian life according to Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh (Bloom),"³⁷ stated that Orthodox moral theology

³⁵ According to Metropolitan Anthony's own estimation, by the mid-1980s he had given more than 10,000 lectures, sermons, etc. to the non-Orthodox communities alone – see his *Любовь всепобеждающая*, 174. While this number might seem unrealistic or boastful, various witnesses attest to the frequency of his public speaking.

³⁶ Bishop Hilarion Alfeyev, *Православное богословие на рубеже столетий*, online, available: <http://www.lib.eparhia-saratov.ru/books/09i/ilarion/bogoslovie/67.html>

³⁷ Unpublished thesis "Духовно-нравственные идеалы христианской жизни по трудам митрополита Антония Сурожского (Блюма (Блума))" at Saint-Petersburg Orthodox Spiritual Academy in 2004 by Fr. Dimitrii Erin.

lost its identity under scholastic influences. The personal example of Metropolitan Anthony as a follower of the gospel with special emphasis on “inner truth” opens up an alternative path. Erin began with AB’s anthropology (individualism and personhood) and the first vocation of the human person – to be akin to God. Original sin made a division between God and man and among humankind. God did not leave people alone but became a man to save the human race. Christ came to reconcile the human person with God. Erin interpreted AB’s explanation of the Incarnation and God-forsakenness as a moral category. Now the goal for people is to accept life as an immediate presence of God. The “places” through which a person may contact God include the Church, Eucharist, confession, fear of God, prayer, thanksgiving, self-knowledge, love toward others, and similar evangelical ideals.

Another thesis was done by Ilya Makarov, “Pastoral Service according to the works of Metropolitan Anthony (Bloom).”³⁸ The author of this work has tried to look at the life and works of AB from the point of view of his pastoral activities. The roles of the laity as well as clergy – who serve but are not to rule – are leading themes in Makarov’s work. AB’s anthropology was presented with a focus on God’s faith in the human person as a leading and contradicting theme against Feuerbach’s atheistic humanism.

Ioann Kovalev, in his thesis “Homiletical Works of Metropolitan Anthony (Bloom),”³⁹ asserted that most of AB’s sermons and talks were devoted to questions of

³⁸ Unpublished thesis “Пастырское служение по трудам митрополита Антония (Блума)” at Saint-Petersburg Orthodox Spiritual Academy in 2004 by Ilya Makarov.

³⁹ Unpublished thesis “Проповеднические труды Митрополита Антония (Блума)” at Saint-Petersburg Orthodox Spiritual Academy in 2004 by Ioann Kovalev.

spiritual-moral perfection and formation of the Christian person. The author gave a very general overview of AB's life and works without any specific theme or emphasis on the interpretation of his legacy.

Iuliya Shubina, in "The Missionary Significance of the Works of Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh for Formation of Motivation: Lessons on the Foundations of Orthodox culture,"⁴⁰ stated that for AB faith should not be opposed to culture and the world because they are places where God can be discovered. Shubina gave practical suggestions for teaching "The Foundation of Orthodox Culture."

Iryna Stashkiv, in "The Soteriology of Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh,"⁴¹ presented the Christology of AB and his understanding of the mystery of salvation. According to Stashkiv AB did not emphasize original sin as the reason for the Incarnation, but rather focused on God's love as willing to be revealed to humanity. Stashkiv's presentation of AB's anthropology did not include the theme of God's faith in the human person, but focused on the Sacraments and the eschatological dimension of salvation as taught by AB.

Maxim O. Krioukov in "The Nature and Purpose of Marriage in Metropolitan Anthony (Bloom) of Sourozh,"⁴² presented AB's interpretation of the creation of the first humans as androgyny (*l'homme totale*). Before the fall, they were one undivided

⁴⁰ Unpublished thesis "Миссионерское значение трудов Митрополита Антония Сурожского для формирования мотивации на уроках Основ православной культуры" at St. Tikhon's Orthodox University in Moscow in 2003 by Iuliya Shubina.

⁴¹ Unpublished thesis "Сотеріологія Антонія, Митрополита Сурозького" at Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv in 2004 by Iryna Stashkiv.

⁴² Unpublished thesis at Saint Tikhon's Orthodox Theological Seminary in South Canaan, Pennsylvania in 2001 by Maxim O. Krioukov.

being in two persons – marriage is the event which brings two beings into oneness. The self-sacrificial love in the Holy Trinity is the paradigm of a personal relationship. The central theme in AB's ideas on marriage is the encounter. AB distinguished between several such encounters: the encounter with God, the encounter with man, and the encounter with oneself. Krioukov compared the anthropology of AB with Buber's famous "I and Thou."

International Conferences and Seminars on Anthony Bloom

Since the death of AB in 2003, three International Conferences have taken place in Moscow ("Конференция, посвященная осмыслению наследия митрополита Сурожского Антония" [A conference devoted to the understanding of the inheritance of Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh] on 28–30 September 2007; "Человек в богословии митрополита Антония Сурожского" [The human being in the theology of Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh,] on 11–13 September 2009; and "Церковь – Богочеловеческое общество" [The Church – A Theanthropic Community] on 23-25 September 2011). There were three conferences in London (Conference in Memory of Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh on 21 June 2008 dedicated to Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh commemorating the 94th anniversary of his birth on 19 June 1914; "Encounter with God" on 14 November 2009; and "The Search for Peace With God, Our Neighbour and Ourselves" on 27 November 2010). There were also twelve cycles of seminars in Moscow (1, 10-12: "Человек в общении" [The human being in communion] on 5 December 2009, 11 December 2009, 8 February 2010 and 19 April

2010; 2-3: “Цельность человека: дух, душа, тело [The wholeness of the human being: spirit, soul, body]” on 7 April 2008 and 12 May 2008; 4 – there is no information concerning this seminar; 5-9: “Цельность человека: путь ученичества” [The Wholeness of a Human Being: The Path of Discipleship] on 14 October 2008, 8 November 2008, 9 February 2009, 30 March 2009 and 1 June 2009).

Unfortunately the proceedings from the Conferences and cycles of seminars are not available, except for the First International Conferences which took place in Moscow on 28-30 September 2007. I reviewed that conference in *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*. Here is the summary of that conference from the review:

Apart from the few papers that analyze AB's methodology and the applications of some of his ideas in various professional fields (psychology, literature, linguistics, education), the rest are mainly recollections about AB. The papers lack a direct and substantial theological analysis of AB's teachings, and they overlook many of AB's writings – e.g., none of the speakers referred to the content of AB's article ‘What is Spiritual Life?’ in which he clearly outlines what is essential for the spiritual life of Christians. In general, in the future it would be useful to have a thorough presentation of the main outlines of AB's theology. I would agree with Lev Bolshakov, who said at the very end of the 2007 conference: there is a long road of work ahead of us. To systematize and formulate Vladyka's experience is hardly possible, but someone was right who said at the beginning that we have a scholarly task here. It is not enough to feel or to know something just for ourselves, but we must find a way to transmit it to others. We are not Vladyka Anthonys; we cannot talk in the way he did but we are obliged to bring his experience into our church life.⁴³

Besides the biographical recollection during the conference I would like to point out the paper of P. B. Mikhailov who presented on the “Theological Method of Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh.” Mikhailov acknowledged that he was not very

⁴³ Roman Rytsar, “The First International Conference on The Spiritual Legacy of Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh,” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*, Vol. 51 (2010) Nos. 1-2, 107-111, online, available: <http://www.kiev-orthodox.org/site/english/2294/>

familiar with the inheritance of AB. According to Mikhailov, AB was a theologian because he talked about God based on his experience.⁴⁴ In his understanding of “experience” Mikhailov included not only personal experience, but also common and inherited experience gained in the Church. I agree with Mikhailov that experience is one of the crucial topics in AB’s theology, but I would not use the category of experience as a method to present the vast theological inheritance of AB. Experience belongs to the practical dimension of the life of a human being and it can be analyzed in the categories of psychology. If we use “experience” as a method in AB’s theology then we will limit his outreach to only certain topics, such as the practical and spiritual level.

All these works touched on separate themes of AB’s life and work, but two themes seem to be a thread, namely God’s faith in the human person and kenosis. In my dissertation I would like to present the most important themes of Metropolitan Anthony that were not widely – if at all – covered in the few writings and talks that have paid critical attention to his thought.

Research Hypothesis

My research hypothesis is that AB developed a unique understanding of the God-forsakenness of Christ on the cross that was fundamental to his understanding of what it means to be a human being. This thesis will demonstrate that AB’s kenotic theology shaped his understanding of personhood.

⁴⁴ Petr Mikhailov, *Богословский метод митрополита Антония Сурожского*, online, available: <http://www.bogoslov.ru/text/1246631.html>

These two themes – kenosis and anthropology – while distinct to some degree, cannot be separated for several reasons. Most fundamentally, the link between these two themes is, of course, Christ: He is both God and man. Christ is the “royal road” of unity between man and God. As a man He entered into the depths of the human condition, experiencing even its doubts and despair over the existence of God. This experience of His allows Him to unite in His person both His own exalted divinity and also the depths of human “atheism” in His descent even into the depths of hell, which AB termed Godlessness. The experience of God-forsakenness by Christ is the key revelation of God’s faith in the human person: this is the central, creative, and original contribution that I believe Bloom can make to Eastern Christian theology today.

The links between kenosis and personhood – or, more broadly, “anthropology” and “Christology” – cannot be severed without doing violence to Bloom’s own holistic vision. To recall a key thought of his, which was noted earlier, Bloom wrote that:

We should believe in the human person with the same faith as we believe in God – just as absolutely, resolutely, passionately – and should learn to begin to see clearly in the human person the image of God, a sanctuary which we are called to lead back to life and to glory just as an icon restorer is called to return a spoiled icon to its former glory...⁴⁵

⁴⁵ “Мы должны поверить в человека верой такой же, какой мы верим в Бога, такой же абсолютной, решительной, страстной, и должны научиться прозревать в человеке образ Божий, святыню, которую мы призваны привести обратно к жизни и к славе, так же как реставратор призван вернуть к славе икону испорченную...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть православным в Англии. О Сурожской Епархии*, online, available: <http://www.foma.ru/article/index.php?news=2405>

In addition, the impulse to understand Christology and anthropology together is a classical hallmark of Eastern theology, which always seeks to resist the urge to over-systematization and specialization.⁴⁶

Methodology

There are a number of recurring topics in AB's speeches: faith and atheism; spiritual life; marriage and family; priesthood and pastoral aspects; Sacraments and the Church. AB's central ideas will be the keys to reading and analyzing this diverse material, namely the God-forsakenness of Christ (kenotic theology) and God's faith in the human person (anthropology).

Given that there are dozens of ways in which one might proceed to analyze as rich a body of texts as that of AB's, the reader may wonder how my own analysis will be conducted. One possible method would be diachronic, i.e., tracking given concepts in AB's corpus as they occur chronologically: comparing how he understood the ideas of God-forsakenness and God's faith in the human person, for example, in his earlier discourses with how they are presented later on. At the present time, I do not think it would be possible to undertake a diachronic approach to the study of AB's work, even with the materials currently accessible at the main websites: <http://mitras.ru> and <http://masarchive.org>. There are many editorial mistakes (grammatical, spelling and

⁴⁶ For more on this see the important essay of John Meyendorff, "Theology in the Thirteenth Century: Methodological Contrasts," in *The 17th International Byzantine Congress: Major Papers*, ed. A.D. Caratzas, (New Rochelle, NY, 1986).

stylistic) and also a lack of consistency in translation. Besides that, editors are still discovering new materials from AB's listeners which have to be verified. Almost every week a new homily, sermon or speech, hitherto unavailable, is published. Only when the full compilation of extant materials is completed will it be possible to look at the chronological development of AB's main theological ideas.

Then again, one could consider the broader question of metaphorical language in theology as this pertains to AB's expressions, such as the following: solidarity with others; God's faith in a person; loneliness; the feeling of being abandoned by God; God-forsakenness; Godlessness, etc. How does one go about defining, not to say, proving, the truth value, or even semantic range, of these terms?

If we take for analysis, for example, AB's usage of the last two terms, "God-forsakenness" and "Godlessness." Sometimes AB used these terms in a metaphorical sense, but at other times he was emphasizing their "reality." Then we have to ask: how did he understand these terms: literally or metaphorically? And then it would be important to establish the criteria by which they may be analyzed. It would also be necessary to take into consideration the original sources, because AB gave his talks in several languages; the researcher cannot rely on English translations alone. Finally, one would have to consider all the contexts in which AB used these terms to undertake this kind of analysis. Thus far I have identified over 120 instances in which AB referred directly or indirectly to the theme of God-forsakenness. It is important to remember that in the seventies when AB's first books were published they used the term "Godlessness" to describe the experience of Christ on the cross; in contemporary English usage, however, this term has received a different connotation and now "God-forsakenness" is

more common. In my thesis I establish the criteria of the usage of these terms in his works, but the new materials available on the official Web-site (<http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/>) and AB's archive (<http://masarchive.org/>) might lead to the establishment of different criteria and conclusions. This is just one example, based on the usage of the terms "God-forsakenness" and "Godlessness," but there are also other terms that would need the same attention.

Alternatively, one might wish to explore the roots of AB's thought in terms of the influences on him, whether literary, cultural, theological or other: can one discern the filiation of his concept of kenoticism back through the preceding generation of Russian Orthodox theologians? I believe future research can try to undertake the effort to establish the influences on AB's kenotic theology more substantially, but such an effort would be conjectural, although perhaps of some value, because in many cases AB's referred to other authors quite freely.

This dissertation, while aware of such trajectories of inquiry, has a more modest intention, namely, to gather the multiple threads of AB's thought into a coherent tapestry – a project which has not yet, to my knowledge, been undertaken. As this appears to be the first doctoral research on the legacy of AB, I believe the dissertation should concentrate on a clear and full presentation of his kenotic thought, and leave to others (or to later study) a more comparative, discursive analysis and evaluation of his theology.

It should be noted up front that AB never made kenoticism the *explicit* object of his attention – he did not, after all, consider himself a theologian, much less a *systematic* theologian. My aim is not to create a theological system out of the inheritance of

someone who never considered himself a systematic theologian. Nevertheless, my conviction is that kenotic theology is the hidden font, so to speak, from which flow the manifold currents of his theology. Originality (the first dissertation), viability (sources now available for public consultation) and contribution to knowledge (any project of this proportion – taking account of a legacy that numbers around 8,000 pages) requires *some* organizing matrix. I believe that I have chosen not only one that “works” methodologically, but one that is reflective of AB’s own, original point of view. In my dissertation I will not only combine and compose main theological themes of AB, but also reorganize and sort out the disembodied material into essential themes. My research shows that what makes AB’s kenoticism distinct is its dual focus on the God-forsakenness and God’s faith in the human person.⁴⁷

To best achieve my aim, I believe a synchronic, thematic mode of analysis to be apropos: by using AB’s characteristic notion of kenoticism as a hermeneutic lens, I will be able to present the underlying unity of his thought, manifest throughout the diversity of discourses in which it has been made available to us.⁴⁸ Having first established what kenoticism denotes, both within the Orthodox tradition in particular, and the wider Christian theological tradition, I will then identify the distinctive features of AB’s kenotic theology as displayed throughout the breadth of his work, trying to give an answer to the following two questions: what did AB say in his kenotic theology and how

⁴⁷ The reader will realize that any organization of AB’s disparate material into an ordered whole requires a creative theological labor of interpretation – in my case, the elaboration of a “kenotic” hermeneutic. I believe that this labor in part validates the criterion of originality to which the dissertation is summoned.

⁴⁸ It may come as a surprise to the reader to discover that AB appears to speak the same way in every context: his “academic” lectures in conference settings have the same flavor, the same use of the first-person and recourse to anecdotes, as do his homilies and informal talks to parishioners.

did he apply kenotic theology in practice?

It has already been stated several times that AB never presented his ideas in a systematic fashion, because he never thought of himself as a theologian and never wrote a book as such. Every one of his publications is a speech, sermon, talk or dialogue recorded and later critically edited, and these are the available sources for my research. Although he did not use notes, every speech is very clearly organized and this fact will make for an easier scholarly presentation and analysis of his works.

In my research I used extensively the electronic library of Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh which is available at <http://mitras.ru> (= <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru> and <http://mitras.ru/eng> (= <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng>). I based my research on materials published up to 2008. Among the 334 items of bibliography collected by Elena Maidanovich in “Works” there are books and articles published between 1949 and 2001, organized in chronological order with reprints and translations.

In the beginning of August 2010 the Archive of AB became available to the public. This contains an enormous amount of material – over 2,000 text files (each file has a different number of pages: from one to eighty pages), 800 photographs, 1,600 audio files, and 200 videos in Russian, English, French, and eight other languages. The archive became available too late to be included in this thesis. As a result, in my thesis I only used some materials from the Archive (<http://masarchive.org>), although I reviewed most of the text, video and audio files.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ There are a few reasons why I am not going to use the recently published materials more substantially in my research. First of all, in surveying this new material, I was not able to find any ideas that would question or contradict the kenotic approach of AB, but rather the opposite, I found more statements from AB that support my hypothesis. Secondly, there are some minor problems that make it difficult to use the

If we compare the Archive to the Electronic library with most of his books in Russian freely available to download and even English versions of the same web site with weekly updates of AB's talks, homilies and sermons, we will see a substantial difference. At <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/> (Eng- <http://mitras.ru/eng/>) all materials went through strict editorial work with most of the books having been published in Russian – some in their second and even third editions. Interestingly enough, there is no referral link in <http://mitras.ru/eng/> to the Archive.

Recently published books in English based either on materials never published, but recorded, transcribed and edited before or translated from Russian are: Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Encounter*, Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd, 2005; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Living Body of Christ*, Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd, 2007; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Coming Closer to Christ: on Confession*, SPCK Publishing, 2009; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Essential Writings: Selected and Introduced by Gillian Crow*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010.⁵⁰

above mentioned archive for scholarly work. There is no search engine on the website so it is impossible to search with key words or phrases. Some of the texts still require editorial work (e.g., language mistakes and phraseology such as expressions used in speaking, but inappropriate for a written idiom). Remembering that AB did not write his own books, and that most of his published works are based on oral presentations, I personally doubt that he even reviewed the published materials, entrusting rather his faithful listeners with this work.

⁵⁰ The last book, *Essential Writings: Selected and Introduced by Gillian Crow*, I reviewed in *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*, Vol. 52 (2011) Nos. 1-2, 173-174.

Structure of the Thesis

I will divide my dissertation into theoretical and practical parts. In the first three chapters (theoretical) I will compile and describe the background and possible roots of AB's kenotic approach. I will divide AB's kenotic theology into two major themes: the God-forsakenness of Christ (kenosis) and God's faith in the human person (anthropology). In the last two chapters, using AB's argumentation, I will present the practical application of his kenotic theology and show the links with the theoretical part of the thesis. Here, first of all, I search for "places" where a human being might experience abandonment by God and the practical application of God's faith in the human person. Second, how the kenotic way of life, as AB understood it, brings a person to the encounter with another person, with oneself and with God.

To better understand AB's kenotic theology I will present in Chapter I the history of kenotic theology and the main Western and Russian kenoticists of the nineteenth-twentieth century. My goal is not to give an exhaustive presentation of their theology, but rather to give a general overview of the main ideas that might have influenced AB's own approach. It is difficult to prove that AB was familiar with representatives of the Western kenotic thought. But as a follower of the Russian Orthodox Church, he knew well the works of Russian kenoticists. It was for this reason that I will devote more space to the Russian theologians than to the Western ones.

In Chapter II, I will present in detail the life of Christ using AB's kenotic interpretation with a special focus on God-forsakenness. All major events from Christ's life are linked to the event on the cross. I will point out AB's specific approach in

kenotic theology concerning the interpretation of Phil. 2:7 and his emphasis on the God-forsakenness of Christ. In addition, again using AB's kenotic interpretation, I present the lives of Mary- the Mother of God, John the Baptist, and the Apostles linked to the kenotic life of Christ. They all experienced kenosis and the absence of God in their lives.

Chapter III will present the main anthropological ideas in AB's kenotic theology. Starting with fundamental concepts – encounter with God, dual solidarity of Christ and God's faith in the human person, I will proceed to the vocation of the first couple, the idea of a "total human," Original sin, salvation in the Godman, and atheism. Here I deploy the originality of AB's kenotic theology – understanding of Original sin and its consequence – death as Godlessness. Christ on the cross became an atheist in the etymological sense of the word because He entered into death. AB understood matter as God-bearing and used this as an argument in discussion with atheists and with followers of "death of God" theology. He looked at three aspects: (1) the understanding of the human person, (2) "You are what you eat," and (3) matter could be the place of the encounter between Christians and atheists.

Chapter IV will explore the possible roots for AB's kenotic approach in theology: the harsh life of Russian émigrés, his personal experience of the absence of God and the final encounter with Christ that redirected his life. AB was familiar with the works of Russian kenoticists and he even knew some of them personally. AB extended his understanding of kenosis onto the Church and the Sacraments as the places for the application of kenotic theology in practice. For the Eucharist, Chrismation and Unction he focused more on the role of matter and its practical application in the life of Christians. For Baptism and Confession he emphasized sin as a state of Godlessness and

the kenotic life of Christ as the ultimate example for Christians. For Marriage, he looked at the kenotic relationship between a husband and wife with particular exposition on the life of the married priest. Also, I will combine AB's understanding of Marriage with Monasticism because he understood them in the same way. For Ordination, the emphasis was on the priest as a follower of the kenotic life of Christ. And he gave the priest's wife as a separate example of the kenotic life put into practice.

In Chapter V, I will look at the practical application of AB's kenotic theology: kenosis in the relationship between God and a human person; encounter of God and a human person in prayer and death; difficulties in prayer and the absence of God; two types of God-forsakenness and practical advice from AB on what to do in moments of the absence of God; kenosis in relationship with other people; God's faith in the other person; human's faith in the other person; and, faith in oneself. In the final section of the last chapter I will contrast AB's kenotic theology with Fr. Sophrony's since AB's approach was the closest to the one by Fr. Sophrony Sakharov. Although it is not my goal to compare AB with other kenoticists, I want the reader to see the general differences between their two approaches in order to expose the originality of AB's teachings.

CHAPTER I

I.1. Kenotic Theology

In this chapter I hope to present an overview of Russian and Western kenotic theology. For a broader presentation of the Russian kenoticists, I have chosen the most famous theologians, who might have influenced, even if not directly, AB. As we will see the authors presented here treat specific aspects of kenotic theology, except Sergius Bulgakov. Bulgakov integrated kenosis throughout his whole theology including: relationships in the Trinity, the creation of the world, the Incarnation, the life of Christ, His sufferings, God-forsakenness, death and Resurrection, the Ascension, and the Church. AB followed the kenotic approach, even if he did not develop such a theological system as Bulgakov did. AB constantly returned to the theme of God-forsakenness in his sermons and talks, which is evidence that we can acknowledge him as a kenoticist, but one who also gave a practical application of kenotic theology. Also AB did not fully follow Fr. Sophrony Sakharov's approach who based his kenotic theology exclusively on God-forsakenness.

The goal in presenting Western kenoticists of the nineteenth century is to show the wider context of the Russian kenotic school and that the theme of kenosis became a main thread in the thought of the Russian theologians of the twentieth century presented below. As we will see, in the nineteenth century, German and British kenoticists were mostly developing a kenotic Christology. The theme of God-forsakenness was part of the twentieth century inheritance. As was mentioned in the Introduction, kenosis was

known in the Scriptures, in the writings of the Fathers, in liturgical texts, and spirituality, but its theological dimension was explored in a unique way in the nineteenth and the twentieth century.

I.2. Brief History of Kenotic Theology of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

The inspiration for the nineteenth century kenotic theology was the encounter with modern biblical criticism. In the nineteenth century, a number of Evangelical theologians in Germany, such as Gottfried Thomasius (1802-75),¹ J. H. August Ebrard (1818-88),² Bishop H. Matensen of Denmark (1808-84),³ Wolfgang Friedrich Gess

¹ Thomasius was the first to develop a full kenotic Christology. He proceeded from a distinction between various attributes of God. Omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence were traits he considered relational, while, truth, holiness and love he considered as immanent. The relational attributes express how God relates to the world, and are not compatible with a true human nature, because they can harm the limited psychical functioning of the person. The immanent attributes express the essence of the divine life and can be expressed in and through the human person. So the Incarnation was possible, because the Logos in His kenosis laid aside the relational attributes. Christ received back His glory and the relational attributes at the exaltation. Gottfried Thomasius, *Christi Person und Werk*, 3rd ed., (Andreas Deichert, Erlangen, 1886), two volumes cited in Donald G. Dawe, "A Fresh Look at the Kenotic Christologies," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 15 (1962): 343-344; See also: Ronald J. Feenstra, *Trinity, Incarnation, and Atonement: Philosophical and Theological Essays*, (eds.) Ronald J. Feenstra, Cornelius Jr. Plantinga, Library of Religious Philosophy 1, (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 129-133.

² Christ, according to Ebrard, in His kenosis exchanged a pre-existent eternal form for a temporal one. The Logos retains all His attributes only in proportion to a human existence. Thomas R. Thompson, "Nineteenth-Century Kenotic Christology: The Waxing, Waning, and Weighing of a Quest for a Coherent Orthodoxy," in *Exploring Kenotic Christology: The Self-Emptying of God*, ed., C. Stephen Evans (Oxford: University Press, 2006), 86.

³ The kenosis of the Son of God in the man Jesus as the Christ, this revelation consists in limited human form and weakness. The Logos lived a two-fold consciousness. Thomas Thompson, *Nineteenth-Century Kenotic Christology*, 86-87.

(1819-91),⁴ and later in the United Kingdom C. Hugh Ross Mackintosh (1870-1936),⁵ Peter Taylor Forsyth (1842-1921),⁶ and Alexander Balmain Bruce (1831-1899) attempted to interpret the Incarnation in the light of Philippians 2:5-11. This passage says that Christ, who “was in the form of God, did not regard equality with God as something to be exploited, but emptied himself (σε αὐτὸν ἐκένωσεν), taking the form of a slave” (NRSV), or as the NIV translation says, “made himself nothing.” The Greek verb “κενόω” (“to empty,” “pour out”) inspired theologians to develop the theory that the Son of God, in becoming a human being, temporarily emptied Himself of some Divine prerogatives or attributes, such as glory, omniscience, omnipresence, and omnipotence.

The main question of the nineteenth century was whether “ἐκένωσεν,” was to be understood literally or metaphorically. Did Christ literally “empty himself of *something*” when he took the form of a slave? Or did he metaphorically “make himself nothing” by assuming the form of a slave, in becoming human?⁷ Another problem could arise in

⁴ According to Gess, the Logos emptied Himself of any divine attributes; otherwise they would vitiate the reality of Jesus’ human personality. The Logos was transformed into a human soul, and gradually grew in his divine identity and mission. In his spiritual life, Christ was completely dependent on the Father in the power of the Holy Spirit. Wolfgang Friedrich Gess, *Das Dogma von Christi Person und Werk* (C. Detloff, Basel, 1887), three volumes cited in Donald G. Dawe, “A Fresh Look at the Kenotic Christologies,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 15 (1962): 344; Thomas Thompson, *Nineteenth-Century Kenotic Christology*, 87.

⁵ Mackintosh did not accept Thomasius’s distinction between relational and immanent attributes. He considered the omni-attributes as essential to divinity. Mackintosh considered love to be the essence of God, which is immutable. Love is what makes kenosis possible. *Ibid.*, 93.

⁶ Forsyth understood kenotic theology as “a moral and religious principle in the face of its insuperable speculative difficulties.” Peter Taylor Forsyth, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* (London: Independent Press, 1955), 294 in Donald G. Dawe, “A Fresh Look at the Kenotic Christologies,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 15 (1962), 346.

⁷ Gordon D. Fee, “The New Testament and Kenosis Christology,” in *Exploring Kenotic Christology: The Self-Emptying of God*, ed., C. Stephen Evans, (Oxford: University Press, 2006), 33.

understanding kenosis as the Son of God having in some way limited or temporarily divested himself of some divine prerogatives, such as omnipotence, omnipresence and omniscience during his earthly life. Can God limit himself in some attributes without ceasing to be God? What is the transition from a divine mode of being to a human mode of being? How could the Logos, the Second Person of the Trinity become a human? The answer, according to the summary of Donald Dawe, was the following: “God in some way limited Himself so that the presence of the divine in Jesus did not vitiate the distinctively human aspects of His personality.”⁸ The concept of kenosis states that God is capable of some sort of change and even becoming passible. “The divine impassibility does not consist in the absence of change, rather it means the ability to change in a manner that does not destroy the absoluteness of God. [...] The absoluteness of God is His freedom to accept even limitation in fulfilling His will of love to the salvation of man.”⁹ Kenosis was interpreted as God’s self-emptying of some aspects of the divine being, so that the presence of the divine in Jesus did not destroy the human dimension of his personhood.

As a scholar of kenotic theology, Oscar Bensow classified three types of kenoticists of the nineteenth century: those who viewed kenosis as (1) the relinquishing of certain divine attributes (Thomasius); (2) the relinquishing of all divine attributes (Gess); and (3) the exchange of the divine mode of existence, all attributes intact, for a

⁸ Donald Dawe, “A Fresh Look,” 343.

⁹ Ibid., 347.

human mode of being (Ebrard and Martensen).¹⁰ The approach of kenoticists was criticized for an insufficient account of the deity of the Incarnate Christ.¹¹ Most nineteenth century kenoticists emphasized the concept of the reality of Jesus' temptations and sufferings (at that time it was an innovation, but today this concept is considered commonplace). Kenoticists using this approach tried to give their own interpretation to the formulation of the Council in Chalcedon (451):

Christ, Son, Lord, Only Begotten, acknowledged to be unconfusedly, unalterably, undividedly, inseparably in two natures, since the difference of the natures is not destroyed because of the union, but on the contrary, the character of each nature is preserved and comes together in one person and one hypostasis, not divided or torn into two persons but one and the same Son and only-begotten God, Logos, Lord Jesus Christ.¹²

Chalcedon did not provide the Church with a comprehensive explanation of the Logos; rather it laid down some boundaries for the orthodox Christian understanding of

¹⁰ Oscar Bensow, *Die Lehre von der Kenose* (Leipzig: A. Deichert Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1903), 123 in Thomas Thompson, *Nineteenth-Century Kenotic Christology*, 87.

¹¹ Francis J. Hall, as an opponent of kenoticism, did not distinguish between the attributes of Christ. He said: "Was He God or not? If he possessed the fullness of the Godhead – i.e., all Divine attributes – He was God. But if He was lacking in any of these attributes, He certainly was not God. It is possible to fail in perceiving the fact, but the logic of kenoticism is utterly inconsistent with a real acceptance of the Christian dogma that Jesus Christ was very God." Francis J. Hall, *The Kenotic Theory* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1898), 221-222. Karl Barth understood kenosis not as a loss of divinity, but as the affirmation that God is the Lord even in his humiliation: "God is always God even in His humiliation. The divine being does not suffer any change, any diminution, any transformation into something else, any admixture with something else, let alone any cessation. The deity of Christ is the one unaltered because unalterable deity of God. [...] If in Christ – even in the humiliated Christ born in a manger at Bethlehem and crucified on the cross of Golgotha – God is not unchanged and wholly God, then everything that we may say about the reconciliation of the world made by God in this humiliated One is left hanging in the air." Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, vol. IV/1: *The Doctrine of Reconciliation*, eds. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Edinburg: T & T Clark, 1956), 179-180; 183. in Thomas Thompson, *Nineteenth-Century Kenotic Christology*, 96. Donald Baillie described the kenotic theory as follows: "He who formerly was God changed Himself temporarily into man, or exchanged his divinity for humanity." Donald Baillie, *God Was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement* (New York: Scribner's, 1948), 96.

¹² 'The Council of Chalcedon's "Definition of the Faith",' in *The Christological Controversy*, trans. and ed. Richard A. Norris, Jr. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 159.

Jesus' status. Chalcedon did not define 'person' and 'nature' and their relation to one another. Also there is no explanation of how two 'non-confused' but 'non-separated' natures relate to one another. C. Stephen Evans stated that Chalcedon left many questions open: Does having both a divine and human nature imply that Christ has both a human and a divine mind? Does the duality of natures really allow for the unity of the person?¹³ The implication of kenosis for Christology was not appreciated until the nineteenth century, when the rise of a new philosophical and religious approach provided new categories for interpretation of the orthodox conception of Christ as one person in two natures.¹⁴ The patristic concept of the person of Christ was built on ontological characteristics of classical Greek philosophy and did not provide answers to the psychological questions. In the West since René Descartes' *Cogito ergo sum*, attention was focused upon states of consciousness and a person was defined in terms of the consciousness of self.¹⁵ Also the "turn to the subject" begun by Descartes and then fully developed by Kant, that along with biblical criticism, gave rise to kenotic theology. The same question was posed concerning Christ's consciousness: How many

¹³ C. Stephen Evans, "Introduction: Understanding Jesus the Christ as Human and Divine" in *Exploring Kenotic Christology: The Self-Emptying of God*, ed., C. Stephen Evans (Oxford: University Press, 2006), 1-2; Sarah Coakley, "What Does Chalcedon Solve and What Does It Not," in Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall S.J., and Gerald O'Collins S.J. (eds.), *The Incarnation: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Incarnation of the Son of God* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 161.

¹⁴ According to J. A. T. Robinson "the development of kenotic Christologies in the latter half of the nineteenth century, first in Germany and later in England and Russia, was a response to the felt inadequacies of the static doctrine of the two natures with its presupposition of divine immutability and impassibility. Under the impact of historical studies and evolutionary theories, kenoticism performed a valuable function as a bridge from the past to the present." *The Human Face of God* (Philadelphia, 1973), 207.

¹⁵ Donald Dawe, "A Fresh Look," 342.

consciousnesses did Christ have? How could human consciousness coexist with the divine consciousness in one person?

Exponents of kenotic Christology in the nineteenth century, as we saw earlier, found the kenotic approach a new way “of integrating the new understanding of personality into the traditional understanding that the center of Jesus’ personhood was the eternal Logos. For these theologians God in some way had to limit Himself so that the presence of the divine in Jesus did not destroy the human dimension of his personhood.”¹⁶

In twentieth-century Western theology Dietrich Bonhoeffer initiated a new direction in kenoticism with an emphasis on the weakness and humiliation of Jesus. He did not negate or minimize the divinity, but instead saw Christ as fully God in his humiliation.¹⁷ In the 1960’s some radical interpretations of kenosis were given by the “Death of God” movement. Thomas Altizer understood the self-emptying of God in Jesus Christ’s Incarnation as a real death. Altizer followed Hegel and Nietzsche and stated the necessity for a “Christian atheism.”¹⁸ As Lucien Ricard noted, “This form of kenosis is a radical solution to the Christological question of how God can become one with man through the act of self-emptying, since it sacrifices the person of God.”¹⁹

¹⁶ Lucien Joseph Richard, *Christ: The Self-Emptying of God* (New York: Paulist Press, 1997), 84.

¹⁷ Vocation of Christians to follow Christ in His kenotic life, See: Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship*, revised and unabridged edition containing material not previously translated., (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1958), 48-69; Christ as the ultimate example for Christians to follow, see: Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, ed. by Eberhard Bethge, trans. by Neville Horton Smith, (London: Collins, 1964), 57-80.

¹⁸ I will return later in the thesis to the statements of this movement.

¹⁹ Lucien Joseph Richard, *A Kenotic Christology. In The Humanity of Jesus Christ, The Compassion of Our God* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982), 166.

Under the weight of such criticism the idea of kenosis was for a few decades forgotten. Also contributing to this eclipse, as Dawe suggested, was the persistent influence of a Greek understanding of God's immutability and impassibility.²⁰

The kenotic approach of the nineteenth century and later the theology of the "Death of God" in general lacked a Trinitarian dimension. Jürgen Moltmann later in the twentieth century brought this back to kenotic theology. He interprets the death of Christ not as an event between God and the human being, but primarily as an event within the Trinity between Jesus and his Father, an event from which the mission of the Spirit proceeds. He states:

Any attempt to interpret the event of Jesus' crucifixion according to the doctrine of the two natures would result in a paradox, because of the concept of the one God and the one nature of God. On the cross, God calls to God and dies to God. Only in this place is God 'dead' and yet not dead. If all we have is the concept of one God, we are inevitably inclined to apply it to the Father and to relate the death exclusively to the human person of Jesus, so that the cross is 'emptied' of its divinity. If, on the other hand, this concept of God is left aside, we have at once to speak of persons in the special relationship of this particular event, the Father as the one who abandons and 'gives up' the Son, and the Son who is abandoned by the Father and who gives himself up. What proceeds from this event is the Spirit of abandonment and self-giving love who raises up abandoned men.²¹

The initial source of his theology was the experience of the reality of God when Moltmann was a prisoner of war in the period 1945-1948. It was an experience of God's presence in suffering and of God as the power of hope. On the cross Jesus identified with the negative reality of the world: suffering, subjection to sin, death or what Moltmann calls

²⁰ Donald Dawe, *The Form of a Servant: A Historical Analysis of the Kenotic Motif* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), 53.

²¹ Jürgen Moltmann, "The 'Crucified God': God and the Trinity Today," in *New Questions on God*, ed. J. B. Metz, (New York: Herder & Herder, 1972), 31-35.

godlessness, God-forsakenness, and transitoriness.²² The Cross is God's act of loving solidarity with all who suffer, apparently abandoned by God.

Just as Moltmann's personal experience in prison influenced his theology of God-forsakenness, the most important influence on Hans Urs von Balthasar was the physician and mystic Andrienne von Speyr, whom he received into the Catholic Church. Together they conceived the idea of a new form of religious order whose members would continue to exercise their normal professions and occupations in the world. (In addition an encounter with Henri de Lubac and Jean Daniélou gave him his enduring love of the Fathers, especially Maximus and Gregory of Nyssa.) Speyr's mystical experience of Hell is similar to the event on the cross.

The Son descends into Hell, into the absolute God-forsakenness of the dead. He takes upon himself the fate (not only the substance but the condition) of sinful humanity, drinks its cup to the lees, and so embraces that which is wholly opposed to God - and yet remains God. [...] The passing into the realm of the dead is a passing into the place which is cut off from God, which is beyond hope, where the dead are confronted with the reality of that which is wholly opposed to God. [...] Such presence of the divine in the God-forsakenness of Hell is possible only on the basis of the trinitarian distinction between the Father and the Son.²³

Balthasar, like Moltmann, brought the Trinitarian context to the event on the cross. The "incomprehensible and unique 'separation' of God from himself" is a supra-event that "*includes* and grounds every other separation – be it ever so dark and bitter."²⁴

²² Richard Bauckham, "Jürgen Moltmann," in *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, 3rd ed., edited by David F. Ford and Rachel Muers, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 147-163.

²³ Ben Quash, "Hans Urs von Balthasar," in *The Modern Theologians*, 115.

²⁴ Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, vol. III, trans. Graham Harrison, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press 1988- ; first published 1973-83), 325.

As we can see above, kenotic theology developed during the past two centuries. Of course this concept was well known during the patristic period and later in spirituality, as was mentioned in the Introduction. But its rational and more sophisticated dimension was developed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. According to Balthasar, the kenoticists of the nineteenth century “wrote under the influence of Hegel for whom the absolute Subject, to become concrete and ‘for-himself,’ renders himself finite in nature and world history. These theologians take up, therefore, the opposite position: the subject of the Kenosis is not he who became man, but he who becomes man.”²⁵ These kenoticists attempted to offer a new commentary on the Chalcedonian formula and were mainly interested in the mystery of the Incarnation and in the question of the immutability of God. In the twentieth century, kenotic theology was extended into a Trinitarian dimension, and in kenotic Christology the focus was moved to the question of the impassibility of God, and specifically the issue of God-forsakenness.

I.3. Kenotic Theology in Russian Thought of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

The modern Western development of kenotic theology outlined above serves as an important background when one investigates eastern theology and specifically Russian theology for its understanding of kenosis. According to Nadejda Gorodetzky, Russian theologians have been well aware of western thinking because they “used

²⁵ Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Mysterium Paschale. The Mystery of Easter*, trans. Aidan Nichols, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1994), 31.

Western sources and, in particular, they considered the doctrine of kenosis as a contribution of the Protestant world even though they themselves had a different approach to this doctrine.”²⁶

Some key Russian thinkers have made kenosis the key theme of their theological work. We focus on *Russian* thinkers because AB was himself a hierarch of the Russian Church and naturally in closest contact with Russian traditions and thinkers. We focus on a particular set of Russian thinkers because they are the most prominent of their age and also because, as Nadejda Gorodetzky demonstrates, they all share in common similar formative influences and they all developed the theme of Christ’s humiliation.

In what follows, I will present the kenotic elements and systems in the works of the most important Russian thinkers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including Vladimir Soloviev,²⁷ Mikhail Tareev, Metropolitan Anthony Khrapovitsky, Sergius Bulgakov, Vladimir Lossky, George Florovsky and Sophrony Sakharov which serve as the background of AB’s kenotic theology. I will not analyze in detail all the ideas of the authors, but only the elements which are connected to the subject of Russian kenotic theology and are important as background for further research on AB. I will present the background of kenotic theology as presented in the book by Nadejda Gorodetzky, who, according to Elisabeth Behr-Sigel, “discovered the theme of *kenosis* as an essential

²⁶ Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1938), 127.

²⁷ =Solovyov.

thread”²⁸ in Russian literature and theology of the nineteenth and first part of the twentieth century. Kenotic theology also found its philosophical and later theological interpretation in various literary works of the nineteenth century.²⁹ In the present research I present the background of kenotic theology of AB through the most important authors, mentioned above, who were influenced by the kenotic approach in their theological thought. For this reason I will base further background on the primary sources and on the works of authors who researched the above-mentioned writers.

I.3.1. Vladimir Soloviev (1853-1900)

Vladimir Soloviev (1853-1900) is one of the most significant Russian thinkers in the nineteenth century. He was an academically trained philosopher, a poet, and original theologian. In his early years he was an atheist, but through the study of the philosophy of Spinoza and Kant he came back to faith in God and became a Christian. He studied the Fathers of the Church and read recent mystics. Soloviev was influenced by

²⁸ Elizabeth Behr-Sigel, *Discerning the Signs of the Times: The Vision of Elizabeth Behr-Sigel*, ed. Michael Plekon and Sarah E. Hinlicky, transl. Lyn Breck ... [et al.] (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), 29.

²⁹ Among the literary authors that deserve to be mentioned are Ivan Turgenev, Nikolai Gogol, Leo Tolstoy, and Fyodor Dostoevsky as the main authors who had kenotic elements in their works. For more details about kenotic elements in the mentioned authors, see Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ*, 27-74.

Augustine's doctrine of the freedom of the will.³⁰ He developed a unique notion of Sophia.³¹

Even if Soloviev was not a systematic theologian, it is possible to distinguish in his works three stages of Christ's kenosis – the preexistence of the Logos, Christ in history, and the presence of Christ in the Church after His ascension.³² For him, the whole cosmic and historical process of the penetration of all by the divine element reveals itself as self-denial. Soloviev sees the kenosis of the historical Logos in the preexistence of the world. The Logos “renounces any manifestation of His divine dignity (glory of God), leaves the peace of eternity, [...] and subjects Himself to all of the anxieties of the cosmic process, appearing in the chains of external being, within the limits of space and time.”³³ The fullness of kenosis became complete only in the Person of the Logos. For Soloviev the Incarnation revealed God as a Triune Person and the Trinitarian relationship in terms of the human experience understood as love and freedom. Love, according to Soloviev, “was a desire for perfect unity between two or more independent beings. He described the purpose of creation as the will of its author

³⁰ Vladimir Solovyov, *Lectures on Divine Humanity*, revised and edited by Boris Jakim, (Hudson, N.Y.: Lindisfarne Press, 1995), 94-95.

³¹ More about Soloviev's conception on sophiology see: S. Frank, *V. Solovyev Anthology* (London 1950), 9-13; Paul Valliere, *Modern Russian Theology: Bukharev, Soloviev, Bulgakov: Orthodox Theology in a New Key* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing 2000), 155-165.

³² Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ*, 134.

³³ Vladimir Solovyov, *Lectures on Divine Humanity*, 160.

to enlarge the Divine Realm by including in it creatures endowed with intelligence, freedom of will, and a capacity for further growth towards perfection.”³⁴

Secondly, kenosis appears within the Person of Christ, because as Godman He possesses dual consciousness: the consciousness of divine essence and power, and the consciousness of the limits of natural existence. “And so, experiencing the limitations of natural being, the Godman may be subjected to the temptation of making His divine power a means for the ends that follow from these limitations.”³⁵ The temptation of Christ is illustrated in the gospel, when the devil tempted Christ in the desert. Soloviev perceives two kenotic moments in this gospel account: the temptation of Christ and His obedience. Satan tempted Christ to use His divine power to achieve something beyond the state of human limitation. Christ gained victory over the devil through subduing and coordinating His human will with the divine will, “[thereby] deifying His humanity after the humanization of His Divinity.”³⁶ Thus Christ restored the order of will broken by the first Adam. But the main victory of Christ was gained bodily through His death on the cross, where it was the most perfect expression of the obedience of the Son of God. “Christ did no more call God, as He usually did, ‘Father’ but He cried together with all the groaning creation, ‘My God, My God’.”³⁷ Soloviev showed the reality of the full human nature of Christ. “Christ being the centre of the cosmic, historical and redeeming

³⁴ Nikolai (=Nicolas) Zernov, *The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1963), 291.

³⁵ Vladimir Solovyov, *Lectures on Divine Humanity*, 161.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 163.

³⁷ Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ*, 134.

process, His kenosis becomes thus the basic act of this ‘theanthropic process’. His humility, obedience and meekness are proposed as examples for individual morality.”³⁸

Thirdly, Soloviev applied kenotic theology also to the Church, in which he was more interested in the social and collective aspects of life than in the role of the individual. The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ follows her teacher in her earthly life and received the task of divine-human unity. As in Christ who took upon Himself the infirmities and the sufferings of human nature, “all that is infirm and earthly was swallowed up in the resurrection of the spiritual body, and so must it be in the Church, His universal body, when it attains its fullness.”³⁹

I.3.2. Mikhail Tareev (1866-1934)

Mikhail Tareev (1866-1934) was born the son of a village priest. He studied at the Moscow Theological Academy and graduated with the degree of candidate in 1891 and in 1904 received a doctorate. In 1893 he became a professor of moral theology at the Moscow Theological Academy.⁴⁰ His kenotic theology was influenced by Dostoevsky’s *The Brothers Karamazov*, by works of nineteenth century “kenotic” theologians, especially A. B. Bruce,⁴¹ and by the idea of “Godmanhood” which he appropriated from

³⁸ Vladimir Soloviev, *Works*, 10 vols. (Saint-Petersburg, 1896), III: 167-171 in Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ*, 138.

³⁹ Vladimir Solovyov, *Lectures on Divine Humanity*, 165.

⁴⁰ According to Nadejda Gorodetzky “There is no full biography of Tareev and no information about him after 1917, the date of his last publication.” See: Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ*, 139.

⁴¹ Alexander B. Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ*, 2nd ed., (Edinburgh, 1905).

V. Soloviev. Tareev is the first who built his moral system of “glory in humiliation” around the humiliated Christ.⁴² Tareev distinguished the self-limitation of God in creation from the personal kenotic act of Christ in His Incarnation. The revelation of divine life was manifested in Christ in a self-emptying mode.⁴³ According to him “God’s glory united not with humanity’s glory but with human humiliation.”⁴⁴ Tareev asserts that the central idea of humiliation is emphasized by the fact that Christ calls Himself mostly “Son of man,” while the disciples exalt Him as Christ.⁴⁵ He Himself considered His humiliation as the expression of His Father’s love for the world.

Tareev considered kenotic theology to be the only possible approach to fully understand the Gospel. The originality that Tareev brought to kenotic theology is his interpretation of the role of Christ’s victory over Satan’s temptations in the desert. This event played a redemptive role in the whole work of Christ. Thus, he detached it from the drama of the Incarnation, Passion and Resurrection.⁴⁶ Tareev sees the temptation of Jesus not as something external, but as essentially religious, as a theanthropic temptation.

⁴² In my research I will present Tareev’s kenotic theory, which is the background for his moral system. For more about “glory in humiliation” see: Paul Richard Valliere, “M. M. Tareev: A Study in Russian Ethics and Mysticism,” (Th. D. diss., Columbia University, 1974).

⁴³ Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ*, 145.

⁴⁴ Mikhail Tareev, *Основы христианства*, vol. I: 161 in Zenkovsky, *История Русской философии*, vol. II (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1950), 119.

⁴⁵ Mikhail Tareev, *Основы христианства*, vol. IV (Moscow, 1910), 164 in Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ*, 147-148.

⁴⁶ Tareev’s thesis on the interpretation of Christ’s temptations in the desert was published in 1892. See: “Искушения Богочеловека, как единый искупительный подвиг всей земной жизни Христа, в связи с историею дохристианских религий и христианской Церкви,” (Th. D. diss., Moscow: Izdanie Obshchestva liubitelei dukhovnogo prosveshcheniia, 1892).

Temptation, as described by the evangelists, was rejected by Christ's (a) humble obedience to natural laws of human life with its human limitations, (b) by His refusal to seek an evident and special divine protection, and (c) by refusal to serve the malignant spirit of national pride in the sense of false Messiahship.⁴⁷

Christ chose the divine will instead of bread. The divine and the natural world were thus reconciled in Christ's consciousness. Hence Christ's temptation was deeper than it seems because it was mainly an attack against the consciousness of His sonship or Godmanhood.

Jesus was tempted as the Incarnate only-begotten Son, clearly conscious of His sonship, as the witness of divine love sent by God on earth... having taken our weaknesses, He was tempted like us, in infirmity of our nature... The Son of God might be tempted by desiring to show His particular relation to God and to the world; the Son of man – the very same Son of God deprived of His glory – might have been in doubts [sic] about His sonship.⁴⁸

For Tareev, Christ's temptation is viewed as humanity's moral struggle. Tareev accepted the general concept of Godmanhood that allowed him to see a parallel between "the Son" and "the sons" (human race) as a fundamental anthropological principle in theology.⁴⁹ The goal of life for humans is to become the "Son." Tareev interprets the cross on which Jesus surrendered His spirit as the sum of a few kenotic events: "The extreme humiliation of the Son of God and His complete outward abandonment by God; disbelief of men waiting for miracles opposed by salutary belief in the humiliated Son of God and spiritually of His eternal life."⁵⁰ Tareev saw the roots for his moral system in

⁴⁷ Mikhail Tareev, *Основы христианства*, vol. III, 256 in Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ*, 149.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 149.

⁴⁹ See: Valliere, "M. M. Tareev: A Study in Russian Ethics and Mysticism," 107, 113.

⁵⁰ Mikhail Tareev, *Основы христианства*, t. I, 336 in Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ*, 151.

the Sermon on the Mount. “Righteousness and justice of the Old Covenant seem to him to be superseded by love which becomes non-resistance. This love presented such apparent contradictions as a positive meaning of suffering, foolishness for Christ’s sake, or a perfect spiritual love compatible with hatred of one’s kindred.”⁵¹ The kenotic theology of Tareev has some practical consequences in the vocation of “the sons” to become “the Son,” where human beings experience “religious temptation” as a result of this potentiality.⁵²

I.3.3. Metropolitan Anthony Khrapovitsky (1863-1936)

Alexei Khrapovitsky was born in 1863 in the district of Novgorod. In 1885 he graduated from the Saint Petersburg Theological Academy, was tonsured a monk and ordained. Beginning in 1889, he served as the Moscow Academy’s Inspector. In 1890 he was appointed rector of the Petersburg Academy and in 1895 of Kazan. In 1897 he was ordained bishop of Cheboksary and in 1902 archbishop of Volyn. After the Revolution in 1917, Khrapovitsky was deprived of his diocese and was confined to the Valamo Monastery, where he wrote his main work *The Dogma of Redemption*.⁵³ During the All-Russian Council (1917-1918) he was nominated as one of three candidates for patriarch, but finally Metropolitan Tikhon was elected patriarch by lot. In 1918, Khrapovitsky was

⁵¹ Ibid., 151.

⁵² Valliere, “M. M. Tareev: A Study in Russian Ethics and Mysticism,” 107. For Tareev religious temptation is a temptation to rely too quickly on the Divine rather than to struggle within one’s human nature.

⁵³ Anthony Khrapovitsky, *Догмат искупления* (Sremski Karlovtsy, 1926).

appointed metropolitan of Kyiv. Soon after his arrival in Kyiv, he was arrested by the short-lived Ukrainian Government of Petliura and banished to Galicia, where he was kept as a prisoner in a Greek-Catholic monastery. Shortly afterwards he was evacuated because of the arrival of Soviet forces. In 1920 he moved to Constantinople. In 1921 he organized the Supreme Administration of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad that finally was transferred to Sremski Karlovtsy in Yugoslavia.

Rather than a systematized presentation on Khrapovitsky's thought, I will point out the main topics in his thoughts on redemption that relate to kenotic theology. Thus, I will treat original sin; his understanding and rejection of the "Anselmian" (=juridical, =satisfactory) theory, Khrapovitsky's so-called "moral monism" and how Anselmian theory was understood and taught in universities and seminaries; his insistence on love rather than on justification; and the turning of attention not only to the cross, but also to Gethsemane. However, Khrapovitsky did not refer to the concept of kenosis as such, nor to the words of Christ on the cross: "My God, my God why have you forsaken me?" (Mk 15:34). Even if some of Khrapovitsky's apologists saw some similarities with the theology of John Damascene on this particular topic of God-forsakenness, we cannot find a reference to it in Khrapovitsky's main work *The Dogma of Redemption*.⁵⁴ However, for the present research it is important to include his theory because it gives us a wider picture of kenotic theology.

Khrapovitsky's understanding of salvation was a reaction against Anselmian theory (as he understood it), which had come with other Latin influences to the Kyivan

⁵⁴ Cf. *Vestnik Germanskoi Eparkhii Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi za granitsei*, no. 5, 1996, online, available: http://www.orthodoxcanada.org/russian/texts_ru/antony_DogmatIskupleniya.pdf

Academy under Peter Mohyla (1596-1647). Both Russian and Greek theologians had promoted this idea, but Khrapovitsky denied the notion of the satisfaction of divine justice. Khrapovitsky objected to the doctrine of original sin in Augustine (again, as he understood it), which was accepted in the Catechism of Peter Mohyla and repeated in the Catechism of Metropolitan Philaret Drozdov of Moscow (1782-1867),⁵⁵ with particular stress on humanity's inherited guilt. This juridical theory became an official teaching in the Russian Church.⁵⁶

According to Khrapovitsky, our salvation was not accomplished by a restoration of justice between God and man, but by an outpouring of Christ's compassionate love for man onto the whole of mankind. The central point in his theory was that the redemption of mankind was located in the garden of Gethsemane, rather than on the Cross. Khrapovitsky understood salvation as the restoration of the relationship of love between God and humankind. He attributed the special soteriological meaning of Christ in Gethsemane (fear before death) to His moral sufferings and His sympathizing love for all people. This was the culminating moment of salvation. The sufferings of the body and physical death on the Cross are, according to him, the visible manifestations of an incomparably deeper spiritual suffering which completed the *mysterium* of the Incarnation. Christ is the gift and power of moral revival, and not the expiatory victim.

⁵⁵ Metropolitan Philaret's Catechism published in 1823 was a very influential manual of the faith for almost two hundred years. See the English version of the Catechism, online, available: http://www.pravoslavieto.com/docs/eng/Orthodox_Catechism_of_Philaret.htm#ii.xv.iii.i.p41. The main defender of Metropolitan Philaret's orthodox teaching is Vladimir Moss. See: *The Mystery of Redemption* (St. Michael's Press, 2007). Moss defended the traditional Orthodox doctrine of redemption in Christ against the attacks made on it by Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky) of Kyiv.

⁵⁶ More examples of Latin influences on the Russian school, online, available: <http://ukrstor.com/ukrstor/florowskij-liyania.html>

He can sanctify every person through grace because of His ontological solidarity with the whole human race, for whom Christ is the perfect example.⁵⁷

Khrapovitsky built his main argument concerning original sin on his critique of a faulty translation of Romans 5:12: “By one man sin entered into the world, and so death entered all men by sin... for in him all have sinned.” In the opinion of Metropolitan Anthony, these words from the Apostle Paul are translated incorrectly in the Slavonic translation.⁵⁸ Khrapovitsky asserted that the correct translation of Romans 5:12 is “death passed upon all men, *because* all have sinned” rather than “death passed upon all men, for *in him* [i.e. in Adam] all have sinned.” He continued his understanding of Adam’s sin:

Adam was not so much the cause of our sinfulness as he was the first to sin, and even if we were not his sons, we still would sin just the same. Thus one should think that we are all sinners, even though our will be well directed, not because we are descendants of Adam, but because the All-knowing God gives us life in the human condition (and not as angels, for example), and He foresaw that the will of each of us would be like that of Adam and Eve. This will is not evil by nature, but disobedient and prideful, and consequently it needs a school to correct it, and this is what our earthly life in the body is, for it constantly humbles our stubbornness. In this matter this school attains success in almost all its pupils who are permitted to complete their whole course, that is, live a long life; but some of God’s chosen ones attain this wisdom at an early age, namely those whom Providence leads to the Heavenly Teacher or to His ‘co-workers’.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Anthony Khrapovitsky, *Догмат искупления* (Sremski Karlovtsy, 1926), 7-10; Cf. John Meyendorff, *Новая жизнь во Христе: спасение в православном богословии*, online, available: <http://pravbeseda.ru/library/index.php?page=book&id=908>

⁵⁸ Anthony Khrapovitsky, *The Dogma of Redemption*, 47. We can see the same explanation in John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1974), 144.

⁵⁹ Anthony Khrapovitsky, *The Dogma of Redemption*, 47-48. For this understanding of Rom 5.12, Archbishop Theophan of Poltava criticized Khrapovitsky: “His Eminence Metropolitan Anthony in his Catechism gives a new interpretation of the cited words of the Apostle Paul, and, in accordance with this interpretation, puts forward a new teaching on original sin, which essentially almost completely overthrows the Orthodox teaching on original sin.” Archbishop Theophan, *The Patristic Teaching on Original Sin*, in *Russkoe Pravoslavie* 3:20, (2000), 20. Interestingly, Orthodox literature in English almost

Khrapovitsky's main critique was addressed to a perverted element of the juridical conception, i.e., that in order to pardon Adam's original sin, God needed to be satisfied with His Son's torturous sufferings.

In 1926, the second edition of Khrapovitsky's *Dogma of Redemption* was published in Sremski Karlovtsy in Serbia. He attempted to conceptualize the mystery of Christ's redemption of mankind by means of a sharp contrast between redemption understood as an act of supremely compassionate love and redemption understood as the satisfaction of God's justice, the so-called "juridical theory." The juridical theory was rejected by Metropolitan Anthony as "scholastic," and he sharply criticized the Catechism of Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow, which Khrapovitsky's supporters proposed to replace with his own Catechism containing his theory of redemption.

According to Khrapovitsky, the juridical theory does not have roots in Holy Scripture but in Roman law. In the Middle Ages, scholastic theology explained salvation in terms of a duel, i.e., "to satisfy with blood for a slap in the face." This is how Khrapovitsky summarized the teaching that he rejected:

The Supreme Being, God, was offended by Adam's disobedience and man's disbelief in the Divine injunction regarding the tree of knowledge. This was an extreme offense, and was punished by the curse not merely laid upon the transgressors, but also upon their entire posterity. Nevertheless, Adam's sufferings and the agonizing death which befell Adam's descendants were not sufficient to expunge that dreadful affront. The shedding of a servant's blood could not effect this; only the Blood of a Being equal in rank with the outraged Divinity, that is, the Son of God, Who of His own good will took the penalty upon Himself in man's stead. By this means the Son of God obtained mankind's forgiveness from the wrathful Creator Who received satisfaction in the shedding

always follows Khrapovitsky's line of thought and presents a deep chasm between Orthodox and Roman Catholic teaching on the sin of Adam.

of the Blood and the death of His Son. Thus, the Lord has manifested both His mercy and His equity!⁶⁰

Thus, Khrapovitsky on the one hand disagreed with this concept of satisfaction, but on the other he never rejected an opinion “from the viewpoint of criminal, military, or commercial law,” unless it claimed to be an exclusive treatment of salvation. Khrapovitsky considered that juridical explanation when understood in such a wide sense “[has] very little in common with the explanations of Anselm, Aquinas, and the later Scholastic dogmatic theology, which introduces the idea of a duel here.”⁶¹ Khrapovitsky understands the “idea of a duel” on the basis of the scholastic concept of satisfaction. Within this teaching, according to Khrapovitsky, is hidden the medieval feudal concept of honor. The knightly code of honor demanded a duel for the restoration of honor. This concept was transferred to God the Father, who as an immeasurable being was immeasurably hurt in His honor by humans as His creatures. Neither a human being, nor the whole of mankind could satisfy God for this insult because they are limited. Satisfaction could only be given to God by someone equal to Him – His Son. Christ replaced by Himself the whole mankind and accepted the just punishment and all the anger of the Father, and in this way restored the hurt honor of God.

Contemporaries of Khrapovitsky expressed their critical voices against the widely accepted theory of satisfaction. For example, Fr. P. Svetlov insisted that Christ’s incarnation and not His sufferings had the greatest significance for mankind’s salvation. Nesmyelov was also trying to fight against the juridical theory but could not avoid its

⁶⁰ Anthony Khrapovitsky, *The Dogma of Redemption*, 5-6.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 42.

grasp. “The notion that God the Father received satisfaction through Christ’s sacrifice is refuted, this same sacrifice is understood as a satisfaction of the conscience of redeemed mankind which allegedly cannot accept the idea of reconciliation with God without a definite act of vengeance.”⁶²

Khrapovitsky’s main goal was to prove that the juridical conception of salvation accepted from scholastic theology (again as he understood it) does not have any connection with the Fathers; also, that “redemption is the gift of grace which enables us to work out our salvation, and that salvation is spiritual perfection by means of moral conflict and communion with God.”⁶³ It means that all acts of salvation, such as the Incarnation, Christ’s suffering, and His death on the cross are subordinated to the main goal – to “our longing [for] perfection and the struggle between good and evil within us.”⁶⁴

Khrapovitsky did not doubt the saving character of Christ’s sufferings and resurrection, but his aim was to show the bond between His suffering and our salvation.⁶⁵ Khrapovitsky posed a question concerning Christ’s sufferings in Gethsemane: “Where was the value of the exploit: in physical suffering or in spiritual torment? [...] In His spiritual torment, of course! We understand it as compassionate

⁶² Anthony Khrapovitsky, *The Dogma of Redemption*, online, available: <http://www.kds.eparhia.ru/bibliot/nasledie/hrapovickiy/dogmiskyp/>. Khrapovitsky mentioned only the last names of authors.

⁶³ Anthony Khrapovitsky, *The Dogma of Redemption*, 17.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 14.

⁶⁵ Cf. Ibid., 6.

love for sinful humanity.”⁶⁶ Where is the link between Christ’s sufferings and the redemption itself? What was the need for Christ’s death? Khrapovitsky’s answer is: “Christ’s bodily suffering and death were primarily necessary so that believers would value His spiritual suffering as incomparably greater than His bodily tortures.”⁶⁷ Here we can see how Khrapovitsky moved the focus from Golgotha to Gethsemane and subordinated physical sufferings to spiritual sufferings.

And again Khrapovitsky believed the main goal of Christ’s compassionate love is to draw believers into union with Christ in order for them to obtain moral power. Even Christ’s doubts are not caused by a fear of further sufferings and fear before death, but were the result of His contemplation of the sinful lives of all human generations.

During that night in Gethsemane, the thought and feeling of the Godman embraced fallen humanity numbering many, many millions, and He wept with loving sorrow over each individual separately, as only the omniscient heart of God could do. In this did our redemption consist. This is why God, the Godman, and only He, could be our Redeemer. Not an angel, nor a man. And not at all because the satisfaction of Divine wrath demanded the most costly sacrifice.⁶⁸

It seems that for Khrapovitsky the most important issue is sanctity; and Christ is its only perfect example. Khrapovitsky did not actually give an answer as to what Christian perfection is for. Khrapovitsky distinguished in Christ’s passion physical suffering and torment of the soul, and thus he stressed the latter as the more important, because only torments in Christ’s soul revealed His compassionate love for sinful

⁶⁶ Ibid., 49-50.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 51.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 28.

humanity.⁶⁹ Christ's sufferings, His cross and death inspire Christians to love Him and because of this His passion becomes salutary.

The merit of Khrapovitsky is in his attempt to transfer Orthodox thought from scholastic-rational categories into a spiritual and moral way. He did not pretend to have the last word in the understanding of salvation, but gave his own theory, which later was called "a moral monism" (нравственный монизм). This theory recognizes the danger of reducing the whole mystery of our redemption to what Khrapovitsky calls "the law of psychological interaction,"⁷⁰ the submission of the will of the believer to Christ's compassionate love as "an active, revolutionary and often irresistible power."⁷¹

Khrapovitsky was mainly criticized for having a non-orthodox understanding of original sin and for transferring the focus from Golgotha to Gethsemane. According to his critics (mentioned above), this shift of focus of salvation from Golgotha to Gethsemane is foreign to the mind of the Church as expressed in her liturgical services. Moreover Metropolitan Anthony states that it is in the Lord's suffering in Gethsemane that "in this did our redemption consist," which would appear to some to imply that it did not consist in the suffering and death of Christ on Golgotha. The main critics of Khrapovitsky's moral monism were Archbishop Theophan (Bystrov) of Poltava,⁷² the

⁶⁹ Cf. Ibid., 61.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 20.

⁷¹ Ibid., 19.

⁷² Archbishop Theophan writes: "[Khrapovitsky] gives a metaphorical, purely moral meaning to the Sacrifice on Golgotha, interpreting it in the sense of his own world-view, which he calls the world-view of moral monism. But he decisively rejects the usual understanding of the Sacrifice on Golgotha, as a sacrifice in the proper meaning of the word, offered out of love for us by our Savior to the justice of God, for the sin of the whole human race. He recognizes it to be the invention of the juridical mind of the Catholic and Protestant theologians. It goes without saying that with this understanding of the redemptive

former rector of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy; Metropolitan Eleftherios of Lithuania; and the Serbian priest M. Parenta,⁷³ former rector of the Karlovtsy Seminary.⁷⁴

One of the most important achievements of Khrapovitsky was to underline the place of Christ's prayer in Gethsemane in the whole act of salvation. Why was Christ, according to Khrapovitsky, grieving not for Himself, but for the whole world? I consider the main reason for this was the context and circumstances of the revolution in 1917. *The Dogma of Redemption* was published for the first time in 1917. Khrapovitsky saw deep similarities between the suffering of people and the suffering of Christ, and here the Son of God became an example of compassionate love. Thus, during Christ's extreme internal anxiety he was united with other people, with the whole world rather than merely expressing His own sufferings. And only later, He accepted physical death

feat of the Saviour the author had to establish a point of view with regard to the Old Testament sacrifices, the teaching on which has up to now been a major foundation for the teaching on the Saviour's Sacrifice on Golgotha." Online, available:

http://www.orthodoxchristianbooks.com/downloads/1_THE_MYSTERY_OF_REDEMPTION.pdf

⁷³ Parenta, immediately after the publication of *The Dogma of Redemption* in 1926, wrote in the Serbian Church's official publication: "The tragedy of Metropolitan Anthony is amazing! A pillar of the faith in soul, a great Orthodox in his heart, a strict fulfiller and preserver of Church discipline to the smallest details. But when he approaches a scientific-theological examination and explanation of the dogmas, then he either insufficiently comprehends them, or he cannot avoid the temptation of, and enthusiasm for, modernism. The explanation of the dogma of redemption offered by the author in this work openly destroys the teaching on this truth faithfully preserved by the Orthodox Church, and with it the Christian Religion itself, because the truth of the redemption together with the truth of Christ's incarnation is its base and essence. However, it is necessary to recognize that it is very difficult to analyze this work of the author, because in it there are often no definite and clear concepts, although there are many extended speeches which hide the concepts or say nothing, and because in part there are no logical connections in it, nor any strictly scientific exposition, nor systematic unity." Online, available: <http://www.romanitas.ru/eng/ON%20THE%20DOGMA%20OF%20REDEMPTION.htm>; Parenta, *Herald of the Serbian Orthodox Patriarchate*, 1926, N II (1/14 June), 168-174 (10-34) (Original in Serbian).

⁷⁴ More about critiques of "moral monism," online, available: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/36636704/7/THE-THEORY-OF-MORAL-MONISM>

on the cross. As a pastor of his flock, Khrapovitsky saw analogies of co-suffering love and that the co-suffering of the lover can facilitate the moral restoration of the loved one.

Thus, unfortunately, Khrapovitsky could not avoid the temptation to overemphasize the role of Gethsemane before Golgotha. If our redemption consists in Christ's compassionate suffering for the whole world in Gethsemane as Khrapovitsky explicitly asserts, it was not necessary for Him to die, but only to suffer. Khrapovitsky repeated that the whole life of Christ had salvific meaning, but still he pointed to Gethsemane as a key of redemption. He personally saw equality between Gethsemane and Golgotha and distinguished between Christ's suffering and death, but he did not explain dogmatically or ontologically or soteriologically the meaning of the physical death of Christ, His God-forsakenness, or His Resurrection. According to the Orthodox teaching, the sufferings of Christ alone nor the overflowing force of His co-suffering love in the Garden of Gethsemane into the hearts of believers without His death could not save us, because death could only be destroyed by the death of Christ. In the following chapter we will see how AB understood a balance between Gethsemane and Golgotha.

I.3.4. Fr. Sergius Bulgakov (1871-1944)

Fr. Sergius Bulgakov (1871-1944) is one of the most prominent thinkers in twentieth-century theology. He was a professor at Kyiv and Moscow Universities, but in 1923 was exiled from the Soviet Union along with other members of the Russian intelligentsia. He emigrated and finally settled in Paris. In 1925, with the support of

Metropolitan Evlogy, the Institute Saint-Serge was founded.⁷⁵ Bulgakov became founding dean and professor of dogmatic theology. He held the chair of dogmatics until his death.

Bulgakov was born into a priest's family, but personally came to the faith after wandering through Marxism and idealism.⁷⁶ Among others, the work of Vladimir Soloviev and Fyodor Dostoevsky had a great influence on him. From Soloviev he borrowed the idea of Sophia and developed his own system which was condemned as heresy by Metropolitan Sergius of Moscow (September 1935) and by the Karlovtsy Synod (October 1935). Generally the Bulgakov name is associated with his sophiology, but only a few authors have paid attention to his kenotic theology, which, according to Paul Gavrilyuk, is "central to Bulgakov's Trinitarian theology, his doctrine of creation, and Christology."⁷⁷ Bulgakov based his kenotic approach on Philippians 2: 6-8, and, according to Gavrilyuk, was influenced by German Protestant kenotic theologians.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ More on the history of Saint Serge Institute: A. Kniazeff, "L'Institute Saint-Serge. De l'Académie d'autrefois au rayonnement d'aujourd'hui," *Le Point Théologique* 14, (1974).

⁷⁶ Winston F. Crum, "Sergius N. Bulgakov: From Marxism to Sophiology," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 27 (1983): 3.

⁷⁷ Paul L. Gavrilyuk "The Kenotic Theology of Sergius Bulgakov," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 58(3) (2005): 251-269, online, available: http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FSJT%2FSJT58_03%2FS0036930605001390a.pdf&code=ebb1ad992ae380d17005a5003ed21b36 Cf. Rowan Williams: "[Bulgakov] is the only theologian of the century to use kenosis as a pivotal and normative concept for *all* language about God, in creation as in redemption..." Rowan Williams, "Eastern Orthodox Theology," in *The Modern Theologians*, 577.

⁷⁸ Gottfried Thomasius, *Christ's Person and Work*, 31-101; Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1955), 144-152. Bulgakov was also familiar with the works of J. H. A. Ebrard, F. Godet, J. Bovon, H. R. Mackintosh, W. W. Sanday, P. T. Forsyth, H. Rashdall and others. See: Sergius Bulgakov, *Агнец Божий: О Богочеловечестве*, vol. 1, (Moscow: Obshchedostupnyi pravoslavnyi universitet, 2000), 246. In Bulgakov's kenotic theology it is difficult to determine the precise influence of the aforementioned authors, since he rarely cited them.

I will devote more space to Bulgakov's kenotic theology and God-forsakenness than to the other authors mentioned in this section because his understanding of kenosis as the foundation for his theological system can be likened to AB's understanding of God-forsakenness as the foundation for his theology. I will base my understanding of Bulgakov's kenotic theology on his *The Lamb of God*,⁷⁹ which is the primary source of Bulgakov's thought on kenosis. I will also use commentaries on this work by Gavriilyuk, Gorodetsky, and others.

Bulgakov developed a unique approach for understanding the person of Christ. If the amount of space he devoted to kenosis in this book is compared with the Resurrection, the result is impressive: only fifteen pages for the Resurrection and over 200 pages for kenosis. It can be shown that he understood the Resurrection as a part of kenosis. It is very unusual for a modern Orthodox thinker to base his/her theory almost exclusively on Holy Scripture. Bulgakov referred to the Holy Fathers, but only occasionally, and criticized them.⁸⁰ He stressed the role of Christ's kenosis before His Resurrection, and asserted that the theology of Byzantium had become moribund on this particular point. He further said that his own purpose was to bring an Orthodox answer to the kenotic problem. Bulgakov was convinced that kenotic theory may be taken as a

⁷⁹ This was originally published in 1933 in Russian under the title *Агнец Божий* by YMCA Press. According to Lev Zander, the book "The Lamb of God" is the "synthesis, in which all finds its place, all is gathered in harmony. This work is the apex of the whole of Fr. Sergei's inheritance". L. A. Zander, *Бог и мир: Созерцание Отца Сергия Булгакова*, vol. 1, (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1948), 71-72.

⁸⁰ See his criticism on the anthropology of Cyril of Alexandria. Cf. Sergius Bulgakov, *Агнец Божий*, 22-32.

development and explanation of the Chalcedonian definition.⁸¹ Bulgakov was a great representative of the “Russian school” that Alexander Schmemmann described as follows:

Orthodox theology must keep its patristic foundation, but it must also go ‘beyond’ the Fathers if it is to respond to a new situation created by centuries of philosophical development. And in this new synthesis or reconstruction, the Western philosophical tradition (source and mother of the Russian ‘religious philosophy’ of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries) rather than the Hellenic, must supply theology with its conceptual framework. An attempt is thus made to ‘transpose’ theology into a new ‘key,’ and this transposition is considered as the specific task and vocation of Russian theology.⁸²

He was opposed to the Neopatristic school,⁸³ which, according to Paul Valliere, “focuses on the concept of theosis (deification) and subordinates the whole gamut of anthropological values to it. In the Russian school the humanity of God is connected first of all with kenosis, the self-emptying of God in the Incarnation, a connection that was still clear as late as the 1930s in Bulgakov’s dogmatic theology.”⁸⁴

For Bulgakov, as for Soloviev, the kenosis of God begins within the interior life of the Trinity. Bulgakov distinguished Trinity *in se* and Trinity *ad se*. The Trinity exists in tri-hypostatic relationship and lives in one nature that is ontological and cannot be changed, but the way of the fullness of life could be limited. This is not external, but by the inner decision of God. “God in His being *for Himself*, in the mode of the living out

⁸¹ Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ*, 159.

⁸² “Russian Theology: 1920-1972, An Introductory Survey,” *St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 16 (1972), 178 in Paul Valliere, *Modern Russian Theology*, 1.

⁸³ The main representatives of the Neopatristic school are Georges Florovsky and Vladimir Lossky. The Neopatristic trend historically became dominant in Russian theological thought of the twentieth century.

⁸⁴ Paul Valliere, *Modern Russian Theology*, 14.

of His life and its fullness, is free to limit Himself.”⁸⁵ The Trinitarian relationships also have kenotic elements: “The sacrifice of the Father’s love consists in self-renunciation and in self-emptying in the begetting of the Son. The sacrifice of the Son’s love consists in self-depletion in the begottenness from the Father, in the acceptance of birth as begottenness... The Sonhood is already *eternal kenosis*.”⁸⁶ The love of the Son is sacrificial and self-denying. Bulgakov understood the kenosis of the Holy Spirit as mutual love between the Father and the Son that consists in His passive procession from the Father onto the Son. “The eternal kenosis of the third person of the Trinity consists in divesting himself of his hypostatic self (*samost*) and serving as a ‘bond’ (*sviazka*) or a ‘bridge of love’ between the Father and the Son.”⁸⁷

Secondly, kenosis is continued in the creation of the world. The act of creation is understood by Bulgakov not as due to necessity but to the impossibility that God would not share His love. Descending towards the object outside Himself – to the creation, the result and aim of His divine love – the Absolute becomes a personal God for His creation. Creation is a kenotic event for the whole Trinity, because the Father consents to wait until His creation will respond to His love. “God, who transcends space and time,

⁸⁵ Sergius Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God*, trans. Boris Jakim (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008), 223. This important statement of Bulgakov was ignored in Gavrilyuk’s article, but this is crucial for further analysis of Bulgakov’s kenoticism. If the Trinity can “изживать” (overcome) its inner life in the way of self-limitedness, so the Logos could refuse to live His Divine life in His kenosis in the Incarnation. Gavrilyuk jumped to the next step, i.e., to the relationships in the Trinity, through the sacrificial love *in se* of the Trinity and that this sacrificial love became foundational for the Incarnation. For Bulgakov ontological freedom in self-limitedness precedes the sacrificial self-limitedness in love both for relationships within the Trinity and for the salvation of the world.

⁸⁶ Sergius Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God*, 99.

⁸⁷ Sergius Bulgakov, *Утешитель* (Paris: YMCA, 1936), 51, 213. According to Bulgakov, Christ becomes temporarily subordinated to the Holy Spirit.

freely enters the world of temporality and becoming and limits his manifestation by the conditions of time and space.”⁸⁸ In creation the Father becomes God for the world and enters into relationship with it. In creation God is absolutely free in His self-limitedness, thus the creation is the revelation of God’s love to the world. “The Father’s kenosis in creation consists of this going out of Himself [...] *Transensus* toward the world is the sacrifice of the Father’s love; analogous to it is the birth of the Son in the intra-Trinitarian life, when the Father, depleting Himself, begets the Son.”⁸⁹ The Son is sent by the Father to create the world and His obedience to the Father is the beginning of the Son’s kenosis. Also in creation is the kenosis of the Holy Spirit: “Wholly reposing upon the Son in eternity, as the hypostatic love of the Father and the Son, here the Holy Spirit proceeds outward, as the Father’s love for the Son in creation.”⁹⁰

In creating the world, God abandoned His transcendence to be personally engaged in creation. God endowed human beings with free will and He manifests respect for this free will. This is the ultimate expression of God’s kenosis – to be willing to be rejected by humans in their freedom. He interacts with human beings in

such a way as to protect this endowment. God freely chose to limit his omnipotence by giving human beings a degree of independence from himself [...] The synergism of the divine and human wills entails a restraint of God’s power. [...] In addition, Bulgakov maintains that God also limits his knowledge of the future in order to enable genuinely free human choices [...]

⁸⁸ Sergius Bulgakov, *Вечная Жизнь* (Paris: YMCA, 1945), 123, 251.

⁸⁹ Sergius Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God*, 129.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 129-30.

For example, God foreknew the possibility of the fall, but God did not know that the fall was bound to happen, for this would entail that God caused the fall.⁹¹

Another kenotic element in the creation of the world is time. God limited Himself in “becoming,” not for Himself but for the world. “The idea of God’s becoming God not for Himself but for the world together with the becoming of the world – this idea necessarily follows if one fully accepts the Christian revelation.”⁹² Bulgakov asserts that here exists a paradox. On the one hand, God lives in the world and with the world, and on the other, God is timeless and eternal in Himself.⁹³

Thirdly, the Father not only condescends towards the creation but also sends His Son, thereby making the Incarnation the greatest act of kenosis because in it God descended into the world not as the Creator but as a creature. Bulgakov follows Maximus the Confessor’s understanding of the goal of Incarnation and asserts that “in view of the Fall, the Incarnation, as it in fact took place, was obviously primarily an atonement. But its purpose extends beyond this to the complete divinization of creation, and the union of things in heaven and things on earth under the headship of Christ.”⁹⁴

Bulgakov unites Philippians 2:6-7 with the Incarnation text in John 1:14. Christ, the second Person of the Trinity, seems to abandon His own will, emptying Himself and bringing His life into complete subjection to the Father. Christ, retaining His divinity and not being affected by kenosis as the second hypostasis, nevertheless voluntarily

⁹¹ Paul L. Gavrilyuk “The Kenotic Theology of Sergius Bulgakov,” online, available: http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FSJT%2FSJT58_03%2FS0036930605001390a.pdf&code=ebb1ad992ae380d17005a5003ed21b36

⁹² Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God*, 134.

⁹³ Ibid., 134.

⁹⁴ Sergius Bulgakov, *The Wisdom of God* (New York: Paisley Press, 1937), 125.

separates Himself from the divine life. His divine life gradually returns to Him only in the process of His human life, death, and victory over death. “In the Incarnation, the Son removes from Himself His divine glory, empties Himself of His Divinity, extinguishes it in Himself, as it were... By His will the Father takes the place in the Son of the Son’s own Divinity, so to speak, which the Son, as it were, has abandoned.”⁹⁵

For Bulgakov, only the kenotic approach can answer the question of the unity of the two natures in one hypostasis. Earlier writers, he argued, had left gaps. The Chalcedonian definition did not offer a theological synthesis, but only dogmatic assertion. The “enhypostasis”⁹⁶ theory of Leontius of Byzantium was only a scholastic construction, which does not satisfy the need for contemporary answers. St. John of Damascus only summarized his predecessors and did not bring new theological ideas to Christology. St. Maximus the Confessor did not bring enough clarity.⁹⁷ Bulgakov accepted the concept that “Christ takes from humanity *only* the nature (i.e., soul and body, animated corporeality), which has a hypostatic spirit in the Logos,” and in the Chalcedonian definition, Christ’s humanity was defined as consisting of “‘a reasonable [λογικῆς] soul and body,’ which presupposes a tripartite structure of man where the third and supreme principle of the spirit is the Logos.” Christ’s kenosis refers not to God’s nature (ousia), but to God’s glory. The Logos refused to live God’s life, but remained God. Bulgakov criticized some Protestant theories, according to which the Logos left

⁹⁵ Sergius Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God*, 305-306.

⁹⁶ The unity of the Divine and human natures in the person (hypostasis) of Jesus Christ.

⁹⁷ Sergius Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God*, 1-2.

His Divinity, and explained instead that Christ left the fullness of God's life and His glory.⁹⁸ He explained that the divine-human hypostasis of the Logos has its proper divine nature and is inseparable from it.⁹⁹

Bulgakov criticized the Antiochene approach of the separation in the understanding of the two natures of Christ. Using the example of the miracles, which some understood Christ to have performed as God, not as a human being, Bulgakov asserts: "Christ did not do anything 'as God' or 'as man'. He did all things as *the Godman*, in the inseparability and inconfusability of the two natures."¹⁰⁰ The whole divinity of the Logos was revealed only through His humanity and even miracles were "manifestations of God's power acting in and through man and were thus essentially *divine-human* works, which therefore could not be taken away or separated from His humanity."¹⁰¹ In other words, Bulgakov did not separate natures in Christ, and considered Him as the Godman, and therefore the divine glory, power, and life were limited in Christ by the free decision of the Logos. Christ really lived a human life. He grew in self-consciousness as the Godman.¹⁰² He did not know about the time of the end

⁹⁸ According to Thomasius, in the Incarnation the second person of the Trinity retained the immanent attributes (truth, holiness and love) and divested Himself of the relative attributes (omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence), without violating the integrity of His divine nature. Here Bulgakov meant that Thomasius's theory of the existence of a distinction between the immanent attributes of the divine nature and relative attributes was artificial and affirms that the kenosis must affect all divine attributes. Thomasius, *Christ's Person and Work*, 68-74.

⁹⁹ Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God*, 235.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 237.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 240.

¹⁰² "If one believes in the authenticity of the Incarnation, one must also believe in the self-diminution of Divinity, in the real kenosis of God, signifying His real entry into the domain of relative and becoming being, in which all things realize themselves only in development." Ibid., 302.

of the world.¹⁰³ He really was praying to His Father as to God.¹⁰⁴ In His kenosis, Christ completely denied Himself and gave Himself to his Father. “One can say that the personality of the Son is entirely this obedience. It is as if this personality itself – with its will, its action, and its divinity – does not exist; it is exhausted by the will of the Father.”¹⁰⁵ Christ did not call Himself the Son of God, but rather the Son of Man.¹⁰⁶ Bulgakov considers Christ’s divinity in kenosis to be self-limited within the extent of human nature.

Fourthly, the temptation of Christ in the desert is another element of His kenosis.¹⁰⁷ Bulgakov is concerned with the reality of Christ’s temptations. Compared with Tareev’s moral understanding of this event,¹⁰⁸ Bulgakov chose a kenotic explanation. All temptations were real: “the Godman receives the temptation directly as such..., but He receives it only in the measure of His humanity”; He needed to be tempted, even more because “the New Adam too had to undergo the temptation of the

¹⁰³ Bulgakov stated that Christ emptied Himself of the knowledge of the time of His Second coming. Ibid., 303.

¹⁰⁴ “The divinity in Jesus was concealed behind humiliation, and calling His Father His God and praying to Him as God on an equal footing with men and together with men, He Himself never taught men to pray to Him or to worship Him as God.” Ibid., 263. “He did not pray to Himself, to His proper Divinity, which was naturally inherent to Him but kenotically weakened. He prayed to the Father, who for Him was, above all and before all, God.” Ibid., 280.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 264.

¹⁰⁶ “The Lord teaches about His Divine Sonhood; He preaches it and confesses it. But He does not give Himself the name *Son of God* as His proper and unique name.” Ibid., 267. But two pages later, Bulgakov contradicted himself, “... it becomes clear that ‘Son of Man’ and ‘Son of God’ are names that are identically applied by Christ to Himself, and that this is His own teaching about Himself.” Ibid., 270. I think Bulgakov intended to prove the unity within Christ and single Godman self-conscience. Ibid., 271-303.

¹⁰⁷ This kenotic element is omitted in Gavriilyuk’s article on Bulgakov’s kenotic theology.

¹⁰⁸ According to Tareev the role of Christ’s victory over Satan’s temptations in the desert played a redemptive role in the whole work of Christ.

old Adam.”¹⁰⁹ Bulgakov used St. Gregory the Theologian’s maxim “that which is not assumed, is not redeemed,” and considered this event as “the first real victory of deification over human nature.”¹¹⁰ Bulgakov refused to accept the view that His Divinity protected the Godman in the face of temptation. He said: “On the contrary, His Divinity permitted the temptation and did not interfere in the outcome of the struggle, leaving it for human freedom and diminishing itself to the measure of the human essence, as if hiding in it.”¹¹¹ The First Adam disobeyed God, but the New Adam revealed His complete obedience with the victory over the temptation in the desert. “Although the human will in Christ, which was what was tempted in Him, also belongs to the human nature, nevertheless it was realized from the Divine hypostatic center, the Divine Person, although in a kenotically diminished state.”¹¹²

Fifthly, Bulgakov did not overemphasize the meaning of the prayer in Gethsemane, but placed it on equal footing with the event on Golgotha. In Gethsemane, Christ’s kenosis is extended to His intellect and will. The divine side is so extinguished in Christ at the moment of the prayer in Gethsemane that it leaves His humanity alone to experience, while abandoned by God, all the power, the darkness and the sorrow of the sin of the world. “In the night of Gethsemane, Christ suffered and fully lived out all the sins of all humanity and of every human being committed in the present, in the

¹⁰⁹ Sergius Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God*, 293-294.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 298.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 300.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 301.

past, and in the future.”¹¹³ In Gethsemane, Christ experienced spiritual death, followed by his physical death on the cross. In the prayer of the cup (Mt 26:42), Christ first experienced that His prayer was not heard by His Father, but He completely gave Himself into the Father’s hands.¹¹⁴

The culmination of Christ’s kenosis is the event on the cross, which should be understood in close connection with the Incarnation. The whole Trinity is involved in the event of the cross, because “the cross is not only the symbol of human salvation, but also symbolizes the power of mutual self-denial of the three persons of the Trinity.”¹¹⁵ Bulgakov goes even further in involving the Father and the Holy Spirit in spiritual suffering with Christ even though they did not become incarnate. He cited the words from the Good Friday sermon of Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow: The love of the Father is crucifying, the love of the Son is crucified, and the love of the Holy Spirit triumphs by the power of the cross.¹¹⁶ Bulgakov distanced himself from the heresy of patripassianism¹¹⁷ and claimed a distinction in his understanding.

The entire Holy Trinity, because of its inseparability, suffers with the Son of God from this sin: the Father suffers as the Just Judge who judges His Son and, in His Son, Himself as the Creator of the world; the Son suffers as the One who is judged and bears the condemnation; and the Holy Spirit suffers as God’s love,

¹¹³ Ibid., 357.

¹¹⁴ “In Jesus, the omniscience of the Logos is diminished, because of the kenosis, solely into obedience to the Father’s will: ‘not what I will, but what thou wilt.’ (Mk 14:36).” Ibid., 355.

¹¹⁵ Sergius Bulgakov, *Glavi o Troichnosti in Trudi o Troichnosti*, ed. M. A. Kolerov, (Moscow: OGI, 2001), 97 in Paul L. Gavriluk “The Kenotic Theology of Sergius Bulgakov,” online, available: http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FSJT%2FSJT58_03%2FS0036930605001390a.pdf&code=ebb1ad992ae380d17005a5003ed21b36

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 353.

¹¹⁷ This was a belief that God the Father was Incarnate and suffered on the cross.

offering sacrifice and suffering, as the sacrifice of love for the sake of love – of God’s love for the world.¹¹⁸

Who died on the cross? Bulgakov again interpreted this event independently and criticized those who claimed that Christ suffered and died only in His humanity. According to Bulgakov, it was the whole Godman in His unity and complexity that died on the cross.

One must accept the full force of the fact that the Godman suffered and tasted death not only in His humanity but also in His Divine-Humanity. One cannot separate, in opposition to Chalcedon, His humanity from His Divinity here, saying that He suffered not as God but only as man, since the death on the cross, just as His entire life, would then be only an appearance, in which His Divinity would not participate at all. [...] He dies differently in His two natures: His humanity dies, and as a result, His human hypostasis passes together with His humanity through the gates of death [...] – this human hypostasis of His, which is the divine hypostasis of the Logos.¹¹⁹

On the cross, Christ experienced death as the full weight of God-forsakenness. His cry, “My God, My God, why have you forsaken me?” (Mk 15:34) is the full extent of God’s kenosis that is equal to the depth of His love: “He addresses here not the Father but God, for He is surrounded by the darkness of death, and the consciousness of His Divine Sonhood abandons Him. In the name of creation, the Godman cries out to God – to God with whom He is one, to God who never forsakes Him – that He has forsaken Him. Like all men, He too remains alone in death. This cry of the dying Godman bares the entire bottomless depth of the kenosis, the divine self-humiliation that is equaled only by the depths of God’s love.”¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 363-364.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 312-313.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 313.

In the act of God-forsakenness, the Father manifested the acceptance of the death of the Son. The Son committed His spirit to the Father's hands; in this act Bulgakov saw the deepest "kenotic concealment of Divinity: It is a divine mystery, unfathomable by the human understanding, that the Father receives the Son in the devastation of death and watches over Him until the Resurrection."¹²¹ In the experience of God-forsakenness the Holy Spirit also left Christ. Thus this became a kenosis also for the Third Person of the Trinity, co-suffering with the Son.

Kenosis continues in the descent into Hades, which Bulgakov identified with the state of death. The three days in the tomb signify the authenticity of death: Christ's soul was separated from the body, and His divine spirit was accepted by the Father. "As for Christ's body, it remains separated from His soul, but it is not entirely separated from the Divine Spirit, no longer being bound by spatiality."¹²²

Even the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, according to Bulgakov, also belong to the final stages of kenosis, because Christ is raised and ascended not by His own divine-human power, but by the Father in the power of the Holy Spirit. Christ's kenosis was completed only after the sending of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. But for Bulgakov, the kenosis of Christ is still going on. "Christ is still humbling Himself and waiting for the decision of man's freedom."¹²³ Bulgakov elaborates:

Christ suffers and is crucified in the world, for, in Him, the Golgotha sacrifice is being offered [in the Eucharist], 'till he come' (1 Cor. 11:26). In His glorified humanity, the Lord sits at the right hand of the Father; but in His

¹²¹ Ibid., 314.

¹²² Ibid., 316.

¹²³ Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ*, 171.

earthly humanity, for which He is the New Adam, in His body (that is, the Church which finds itself in a militant state), Christ abides not only in a glorified state but also in a state of kenosis.¹²⁴

For any further analysis of AB it is important to mention Bulgakov's personal experience of kenosis. This event was omitted in Gavrilyuk's and Gorodetzky's presentations, but I consider these events to be some of the most important for a genuine understanding of kenosis, because, as we will see later in AB's kenotic theology, a personal experience of the lost and rediscovered God is crucial.

The first time that Bulgakov experienced a deep understanding of kenosis in his own life was recorded by him in *Autobiographical Notes*. It was the moment in 1909 when his three-year-old son Ivan died. "In the light of a new, hitherto completely unknown experience heavenly joy together with the pain of crucifixion descended into my heart, and in the darkness of God-forsakenness, God reigned in my soul."¹²⁵ Another important event that gives us a better understanding of the existential roots of Bulgakov's kenotic theology can be gleaned from notes after the operation on his vocal chords. After this operation, he lost his voice, and could only whisper; even then he continued teaching and serving the morning liturgy. Bulgakov compared his experience of suffering with the experience of Christ's God-forsakenness on the cross:

My sufferings began in the Holy Week when the larynx had been removed. In the first place, it was agonizingly difficult to breathe, [...] so that I could neither move nor sleep. A disgusting tube was stuck into my nose, through which some nasty liquid was poured in. 'I thirst.' And they gave him vinegar to drink' (John

¹²⁴ Sergius Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God*, 408.

¹²⁵ Sergius Bulgakov, *Автобиографические заметки* (Paris, 1946), 68 in Sergius Bulgakov, *A Bulgakov Anthology*, ed., James Pain and Nicolas Zernov, (London: SPCK, 1976), xii.

19: 28). The most agonizing part of it all was not pain but breathlessness, absence of air, together with mortal, unendurable weakness. [...] I was plunged into a kind of darkness and lost the sense of space and time; I only vaguely remembered that it was Holy Week and that Good Friday and Lady Day [Annunciation] were at hand. [...] What, then, remained in me that was still human – if it remained at all? Yes, something did remain, and that was as it were the last miracle in my tortured soul – it was love. I loved my fellow-men; I loved everyone. I do not know whether it was love in God. I believe it was; it probably was, or else how could I love? [...] And yet, at the same time, there was something else that I had not known before and that was a true spiritual event for me. It will forever remain a revelation to me – not about death, but about dying with God and in God. **That was my dying with Christ and in Christ. I was dying in Christ, and Christ was dying with me and in me.** [*My emphasis*] That was the terrible, the shattering revelation which perhaps I could not have expressed in words and concepts at the time but only recognized later. **Only one incalculable single moment passed between ‘Why hast Thou forsaken Me’ and ‘yielded up the ghost’, between Christ’s dying in his God-forsakenness and his death. But it contained timeless duration and completeness of dying for every man, in so far as he dies in and through it. A man cannot die except in a state of God-forsakenness, just as the universal man, the new Adam, could not die in his Godmanhood.** I knew Christ in my dying, I felt his nearness to me, an almost bodily nearness, but as of ‘a bruised and mutilated corpse’ dying beside me. **He could only help me in my suffering and dying by suffering and dying with me.** [...] Through my human dying there was revealed to me his human dying in his Godmanhood; his divinity was, as it were, fading out in God-forsakenness, and his humanity was dying. The dying which took place in the Godman could only have taken place humanly, i.e. in man’s God-forsakenness. It identified itself with all human dying and in that sense was universal, including within itself every aspect of death, every mortal illness, and was the synthesis of them all. And the general content of all these multifarious forms of dying was death. The Godman in his God-forsakenness laid himself open and made himself accessible to dying. Death approached him in his humanity. And his dying was the agony of all human agonies. In its humanity it was natural, i.e. it was not lightened by being merged with the divine power.¹²⁶

Bulgakov did not go beyond a strictly Christological application of kenosis and particularly of God-forsakenness, while AB extended its application to the sphere of ascetic theology. Bulgakov’s kenotic theology was written by him much earlier, before his experience of the operation, but the experience of suffering and especially God-

¹²⁶ Ibid., 22-27.

forsakenness gave him a deeper understanding of what he had taught for years. AB's experience was the opposite, he first experienced the absence of God and later developed his own understanding of the implications of kenosis in life.¹²⁷

I.3.5. Vladimir Lossky (1903-1958)

Vladimir Nikolaevich Lossky (1903-1958), son of the famous philosopher Nikolai Lossky, was born in Petersburg in 1903. He studied medieval philosophy and patrology at Petersburg's university. In 1920 his family was exiled from Russia and they moved to Prague and later to Paris, where he remained until his death in 1958. He served as the first dean of the St. Denis Institute in Paris, where he also taught dogmatic theology. In Paris he continued to study philosophy at the Sorbonne under Étienne Gilson. Lossky is one of the best known and most influential scholars of modern Orthodox theology. He also influenced a number of great Western theologians such as Louis Bouyer, Yves Congar and Hans Urs von Balthasar.

Lossky built his dogmatic theology on the foundation of the writings of the Holy Fathers and strived to be faithful to their inheritance. He attempted to give an Orthodox answer to the tensions within Western theology and to offer a contrast with them. He was also opposed to using certain philosophical approaches in Orthodox theology, such

¹²⁷ As for "personal kenosis" there is also his "ecclesiological kenosis" immediately after the Revolution where he asserts that Russia's greatest mistake was not accepting the Union of Florence. Cf. Sergius Bulgakov, *Sous les remparts de Chersonèse* (Geneva, 1999). Although Bulgakov later repudiated this statement as "Catholic infection and the 'temptation' to set his [Bulgakov's] hopes on the apparent stability of the Roman papacy." Sergius Bulgakov, *Автобиографические заметки*, 48-50 (cited in Lev Zander's introduction to *The Vatican Dogma* (South Canaan PA., 1959), 4 in Anastassy Galaher, "Bulgakov's Ecumenical Thought" *Sobornost* vol. 24:1 (2002), 39.

as idealism. This could be a reason for his dislike of Dostoevsky and especially of Bulgakov. In 1936 Lossky wrote a ninety-page pamphlet against Bulgakov's sophiology,¹²⁸ in which he criticized him for confusion of person, will, and nature. "Kenosis cannot be 'natural', cannot *be* the nature of God, since it is always a free act, in God and in us. If love is nature, it is not innovative or creative, it does not belong to the realm of the personal."¹²⁹

According to Lossky, kenosis does not relate to the Father, but only to the Son; even if Lossky mentioned the presence of the Trinity in the Incarnation, in the life of Christ, and His death on the cross, the role of the Father is not significantly clear. It seems that the Father, who is the source of the Trinity, only accepts the work done by the Son and the Holy Spirit.¹³⁰

The Son is the one who experienced kenosis and became the best example of the way to theosis. Christ's kenosis began in renunciation of "His own will in order to accomplish the will of the Father by being obedient to Him unto death and unto the cross."¹³¹ The resignation of the Son from existence as an end in itself and doing one's own will are inherent aspects of the being of the Persons of the Trinity because they

¹²⁸ See: *Cnop o Coφuu* (Paris: Bratstvo sv. Fotiia, 1936).

¹²⁹ Rowan Williams, "Eastern Orthodox Theology," 2:160.

¹³⁰ It was in the creation, according to Lossky, that we find "the 'economical' manifestation of the Trinity: the Father operating by the Son in the Holy Spirit. This is why St. Irenaeus calls the Son and the Spirit 'the two hands of God'." Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Cambridge & London, 1973), 100. "It is renunciation of His own will is not a choice, or an act, but is so to speak the very being of the Persons of the Trinity who have only one will proper to their common nature. [...] The Kenosis [and] the work accomplished on the earth by the incarnate Son is the work of the Holy Trinity from whom Christ cannot be separated." Ibid., 144.

¹³¹ Ibid., 144.

possess only one will, which is common to the divine nature. Christ's divine will is the will common to all three persons; kenosis is therefore the way of being of the divine person sent into the world to fulfill the common will of the Trinity, whose source is in the Father. The kenosis "was not an impoverishment of the divinity, but an ineffable descent of the Son who is reduced to the 'form of a slave' without ceasing to be fully God."¹³²

The continuity of kenosis is in the unity of two natures of Christ in the Incarnation, especially in the unity of two wills. Even if Lossky used the word "permeation" (perichoresis) of two natures and two wills, according to Lossky we cannot find any influence of human nature or will on God's nature or will. The reason for this lies in the way that Lossky presented this topic, namely he followed the Antiochene approach to understanding the unity of the two natures and wills. "Each nature acts according to its own properties: the human hand raises the young girl, the divine restores her to life; the human feet walk on the surface of the water, because the divinity has made it firm."¹³³ There can be a certain danger in presenting the two natures as acting consecutively because of the potential distortion of the unity. This Christ could switch from one nature to another. In addition, it might seem that human nature and will are completely subordinated to the divine without bringing anything new to the divine nature. Although Lossky stressed the deep unity and unconflicted relationship between

¹³² Ibid., 148.

¹³³ Ibid., 146.

the two natures in Christ,¹³⁴ this too might give an impression that the human nature of Christ could only bring with it some sort of negative experience. In this line of thought it seems that kenosis takes place only in the human nature of Christ, not in His divine nature. “The earthly life of Christ was a continual humiliation. His human will unceasingly renounced what naturally belonged to it, and accepted what was contrary to incorruptible and deified humanity: hunger, thirst, weariness, grief, sufferings, and finally, death on the cross.”¹³⁵ On this particular point, Lossky based his analysis on St. Cyril of Alexandria, that God “could not divest His nature in incarnating Himself, else He would no longer be God and one could no longer talk of the Incarnation. This means that the subject of kenosis is not divine nature, but the person of the Son.”¹³⁶

Lossky focused his kenotic theology not only on the abandoning of glory by Christ, on His humiliation, but also on the importance of the fact that Christ remained God. He gave two examples of theophanies produced through His humanity: at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration. “Every time Christ manifested Himself not in His ‘form of slave’ but in his ‘form of God,’ He let his divine nature, that is, His unity with the Father and the Spirit, shine through His deified humanity.”¹³⁷

¹³⁴ “The two natural wills in the person of the Godman could not enter into conflict. [...] the person of Christ, before the end of His redemptive work, before the Resurrection, possessed in His humanity as it were two different poles – the incorruptibility and impassibility proper to a perfect and deified nature, as well as the corruptibility and possibility voluntarily assumed, under which conditions His kenotic person submitted and continued to submit His sin-free humanity.” Ibid., 147, 148.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 148.

¹³⁶ Vladimir Lossky, *Orthodox Theology: An Introduction* (SVS Press: Crestwood, NY, 1978), 100-101.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 102.

Lossky was opposed to kenotic statements concerning a progress in Christ's consciousness.

Contrary to the ascending scheme of the "kenotic" doctrines, if there is a progress in Christ's consciousness, it is in a descent, not a climb. Indeed, for the kenoticist, Christ grows ceaselessly in consciousness of His divinity. Thus it is at baptism that He becomes aware of being the Son of God, by a sort of "reminiscence." But in reading the Gospel, we see, to the contrary, the consciousness of the Son descending ever lower, and opening more and more to human degradation.¹³⁸

Christ's incorruptible and immortal human nature was completely deified by the hypostatic union, but submitted voluntarily to all consequences of sin. The whole earthly life of Christ was a continual humiliation. "His human will unceasingly renounced what naturally belonged to it, and accepted what was contrary to incorruptible and deified humanity: hunger, thirst, weariness, grief, sufferings, and finally, death on the cross."¹³⁹ The prayer in Gethsemane was an expression of horror in the face of death; it was a reaction proper to all human nature, but especially to an incorrupt nature that should not have submitted to death.

The last cry of Christ on the cross was a manifestation of His accepted deified human nature "voluntarily submitted to death as a final stripping, emptying, the culmination of the divine *kenosis*."¹⁴⁰ For salvation it was necessary for Christ to experience the entire abyss of humanity's perdition. "For accepting all sin, allowing it to

¹³⁸ Ibid., 108. Interesting that Lossky did not mention names.

¹³⁹ Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Cambridge & London, 1973), 148.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 148.

enter Him, Who is without sin, He annuls it. The shadows of the cross reach into a purity they cannot tarnish, and the rending of the cross, into a unity it simply cannot rend.”¹⁴¹

According to Lossky the final stage of kenosis is the repose in the tomb, wherein lies the link with the work of creation. The repose in the tomb “brings us suddenly into the mysterious repose of Creator: the work of redemption is identified with the work of creation.”¹⁴² He followed St. Maximus the Confessor in the understanding of the goal of the Incarnation. “[I]f original sin had not taken place, Christ would have become incarnate anyhow, in order to unite created being and the divine nature in Himself.”¹⁴³ Lossky did not talk about kenosis in creation, but only in the Incarnation and salvation, so this link with creation does not seem clear. This means that for Lossky kenosis is not the main approach in the understanding of salvation. He put the main emphasis on theosis, which makes everything else less important. Perhaps it is more accurate to say that kenosis fits into an antinomic relationship with theosis, with one unable to consider the former without considering the latter.

Christ’s deified human nature through the hypostatic union is the example for human beings of what should be deified in us: “[It] is our entire nature, belonging to our person which must enter into union with God, and become a person created in two natures: a human nature which is deified, and a nature or, rather, divine energy, that deifies.”¹⁴⁴

¹⁴¹ Vladimir Lossky, *Orthodox Theology*, 109.

¹⁴² Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 151.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 136.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 155.

Another example of following Christ is His kenosis in obedience to the Father.

Christ almost never manifested His divinity and

He accomplishes on earth the Trinity's work of love. And by the infinite respect that He witnesses towards human liberty, to the point of showing men not only the sorrowful brotherly face of the slave and sorrowful brotherly flesh of the cross, He awakens faith in man as a response to love: for only the eyes of faith recognize the form of God beneath the form of the slave and, deciphering beneath the human face the presence of a divine person, learn to unveil in each face the mystery of the person created in the image of God.¹⁴⁵

According to Lossky, the Holy Spirit manifests the common nature of the Trinity, but His kenosis is contained in leaving His own Person along with the divinity. "His [the Holy Spirit's] Person is hidden from us by the very profusion of the Divinity which He manifests. It is this 'personal kenosis' of the Holy Spirit on the plane of manifestation and economy which makes it hard to grasp His hypostatic existence."¹⁴⁶ According to Lossky, the Holy Spirit is revealed as a gift, given to humans in grace, but the Person of the Giver is hidden.

As we have seen above, for Lossky kenosis is not the main approach to the whole of theology, rather he used it to support another idea – theosis. Lossky followed Phil. 2:5-11 and interpreted this passage as did Cyril of Alexandria and Maximus the Confessor: Only in the light of Christ's Incarnation. The subject of kenosis is not divine nature, but the person of the Logos, whose very being is the reality of the expression of the Trinitarian will. Lossky did not explain kenosis within the inner life of the Trinity, nor did he develop an explanation of kenosis of the Holy Spirit. For Lossky the most

¹⁴⁵ Vladimir Lossky, *Orthodox Theology*, 101-102.

¹⁴⁶ Vladimir Lossky, "The Procession of the Holy Spirit in Orthodox Trinitarian Doctrine," Chapter 4 of *In the Image and Likeness of God* (SVS Press: Crestwood, NY, 1976), 92.

important thing was the teaching of Leontius of Byzantium, “enhypostasis” which means that Christ’s divine nature fully accepted human nature as its own and deified it from the moment of the Incarnation. The same can be said about Christ’s acceptance of the human will. It seems that here kenosis is related to the human nature and to the will, which were accepted by God. It is not Jesus discovering the divinity within Himself – in other words it is not the ascending approach – but this is the consciousness of the Son descending and opening up more and more to humanity’s degradation, up to its boundaries and right up to death. The main goal of the Incarnation was to “discover in His own flesh how far the man whom He created in His supremely beautiful image was made ugly by corruption.”¹⁴⁷

I.3.6. Archimandrite Sophrony (Sergei Sakharov) (1896-1993)

The last author whose kenotic theology I would like to present is Archimandrite Sophrony Sakharov (1896-1993). His theology is tremendously similar to AB’s which perhaps is not surprising since they lived during the same time and knew each other well (though not without contention).¹⁴⁸ Both included in their personal stories their own search for God, including the confession of dealing with modern atheism, and made God-forsakenness the main thread in their anthropology. But for a consistent

¹⁴⁷ Vladimir Lossky, *Orthodox Theology*, 101.

¹⁴⁸ Also they corresponded with each other, but unfortunately I did not receive access to these letters.

presentation, I will present in this chapter the kenotic theology of Sakharov¹⁴⁹ and in the last chapter I will contrast these two great theologians.

Sergei Sakharov was born in 1896 in Moscow into a bourgeois family. He studied at the Moscow School of Painting and during the 1920s exhibited in Paris. His future spiritual silhouette was shaped by painting and oriental mysticism. As a result of the political situation in Russia, Sakharov emigrated to Western Europe. He studied at the St. Sergius Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris, where Sergius Bulgakov profoundly influenced the dogmatic theology of Sakharov, especially his Trinitarian and kenotic theology and anthropology. Other influences on Sakharov's teachings were the Gospel, the Fathers of the Church and his personal experiences. In his spiritual life, Sakharov experienced several times the presence of the crucified Christ that shaped his own understanding of following Christ in His humility.¹⁵⁰ Indeed, Sakharov was disillusioned with what he regarded as an excessively intellectual approach to Christian life at St. Sergius Institute.

In 1925-1947 he set out for Mount Athos and became a monk and later a priest at the Russian monastery of St. Panteleimon under the spiritual direction of Fr. (now St.) Silouan.¹⁵¹ St Silouan did not have a theological system, but he did offer some concepts that influenced Sakharov: prayer for the whole world, love for our enemies, Christ-like

¹⁴⁹ More about the teaching of Fr. Sophrony, see: Archimandrite Zacharias, *Christ Our Way and Our Life: A Presentation of the Theology of Archimandrite Sophrony* (St. Tikhon's Seminary Press: 2003); Nicholas V. Sakharov, *I Love, Therefore I Am: The Theological Legacy of Archimandrite Sophrony* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002).

¹⁵⁰ Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *On Prayer*, trans. Rosemary Edmonds, (Essex: 1996), 67-68.

¹⁵¹ Fr. Sophrony, in 1952, published a first edition of the life of Elder Silouan, based partially on the manuscripts that St Silouan gave to Fr. Sophrony.

humility.¹⁵² St Silouan's ascetic formula: "Keep your mind in hell, and despair not," was matched by Sakharov's own motto: "Stay on the brink of despair, but when you feel you are falling over, step back."¹⁵³ After the Second World War he returned to Paris where a group of spiritual children gathered around him. This group used the Jesus Prayer as a form of liturgical, that is corporate prayer, which became a unique feature of their worship. They moved to England, where Sakharov founded a double monastery of monks and nuns under the jurisdiction of Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh. As Gillian Crow stated in her biography of AB, "the two men were both individualists and the relationship was not always easy, despite their mutual respect for one another."¹⁵⁴ Later Sakharov took his monastery out of the Moscow Patriarchate to become a stavropegic monastery under the Ecumenical Patriarchate.¹⁵⁵

Sakharov made kenosis a mainstay of his entire teaching, including the ascetic life and human perfection. Christ, in His Incarnation, gave up some divine attributes and always acted in the name and power of the Father or by the Holy Spirit.¹⁵⁶ That is why, according to Fr. Sophrony, Christ preferred to use the title "Son of Man" rather than the title "Son of God." According to Nikolai Sakharov,¹⁵⁷ Fr. Sophrony stressed that "the

¹⁵² Kallistos of Diokleia, "Kenosis and Christ-like humility according to Saint Silouan," *Sobornost* vol. 21:2 (1999), 23. According to Kallistos of Diokleia, the kenoticism of St Silouan is derived directly from the Gospel and his own spiritual experience of life, rather than from the writings of kenoticists of the nineteenth and twentieth century. *Ibid.*, 24.

¹⁵³ Nicholas Sakharov, *I Love, Therefore I Am*, 22.

¹⁵⁴ Gillian Crow, *This Holy Man: Impressions of Metropolitan Anthony* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2005), 120.

¹⁵⁵ St. John the Baptist Monastery in Essex, England.

¹⁵⁶ Here we can see some similarities with Bulgakov's understanding on the miracles performed by Christ.

¹⁵⁷ Fr. Sophrony's nephew and a monk of St. John the Baptist Monastery.

kenosis of the Logos consists in his ‘incarnational ontological descent’ and voluntary dynamic ‘conformation’ to the mode of human existence.”¹⁵⁸

Sakharov distinguished between two levels of God’s kenotic love: love within the Trinity and the love of God for the world. Christ not only manifested kenosis in His earthly divine-human life, but also in the eternal intra-Trinitarian love. According to Sakharov, the Father gave Himself totally to the Son, and the Son “in like fullness of Self-emptying love gives Himself to the Father both in His Divinity and humanity.”¹⁵⁹ A similar relationship exists between the Father and the Holy Spirit: “The Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father, lives the same love as in the Father. Thus the Father and the Spirit eternally participate in ‘the work’ [John 17:4], which was given to Jesus to do.”¹⁶⁰

Sakharov was not original in presenting the relationships within the Trinity in a kenotic way. The influence from Bulgakov is obvious, but it is interesting that Sakharov did not reflect on kenotic elements in the creation of the world, but proceeded to the theme of the Incarnation. Unlike Bulgakov, who considered the Incarnation and the cross as the manifestation of the internal life of the Trinity, Sakharov understood the above-mentioned events as purely soteriological and determined only by the fall of Adam.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁸ Nicholas Sakharov, *I Love, Therefore I Am*, 94-95.

¹⁵⁹ Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *We Shall See Him as He Is*, trans. Rosemary Edmonds (Essex, 2004), 139.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 139.

¹⁶¹ Nicholas Sakharov, *I Love, Therefore I Am*, 103.

The continuity of God's kenosis was in the Incarnation, where the Father and the Son revealed their kenosis. "The Father empties Himself of all things in the birth of the Son. And the Son appropriates nothing to Himself but gives all things to the Father."¹⁶² Sakharov extended the sacrificial love within the Trinity up to the point of self-hatred. "The 'hate' of which the Lord of love speaks in its essence is the plenitude of God's kenotic love."¹⁶³ Love to the point of self-hatred manifests Christ-like humility – the Son gave Himself to the Father both in His divinity and humanity.¹⁶⁴ Sakharov even went further, saying that the Father is the sole basis of Christ's being. "Christ's own I was absolutely emptied in his 'taking in' of the Father's persona so much so that he is an express image of the Father's person (Heb 1:3), identical with him (cf. Jn 10:30)."¹⁶⁵

Unlike his predecessors in kenotic theology, Sakharov worked out a theological connection between the experience of Tabor and Gethsemane – merging these experiences into one ascetic theme. The whole life of Christ was a manifestation of the self-giving of God, but in particular Gethsemane and Golgotha. Christ in Gethsemane, according to Sakharov, emptied Himself of his strength to implore the Father for the sins of the world.¹⁶⁶ In this prayer, Christ sacrificed His will and all His love. Although Sakharov considered God-forsakenness as the main thread in his kenotic theology, he also understood the unanswered prayer in Gethsemane as a component of Christ's

¹⁶² Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *On Prayer*, trans. Rosemary Edmonds, (Essex: 1996), 25.

¹⁶³ Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *We Shall See Him as He Is*, 200.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 139.

¹⁶⁵ Nicholas Sakharov, *I Love, Therefore I Am*, 84.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 107.

further abandonment by the Father on the cross. In Gethsemane Christ internally accomplished His sacrifice, thus His death on the cross was an external completion of kenotic God-forsakenness.

Christ's God-forsakenness on the cross was "transfigured into equally perfect divinization of our nature which He assumed in the act of incarnation."¹⁶⁷ At the crucifixion Christ manifested his full abandonment of "self" for the sake of the Father. Concerning Christ's own abandonment by the Father, Sakharov only stated "that on the Divine plane ontologically this could not happen – that is, the Father could have withdrawn from His co-eternal Son, of one substance with Himself, in Whom He had poured the plenitude of His eternal Being,"¹⁶⁸ and did not give a further explanation for it. The final stage of Christ's kenosis was His descent into hell, where in its darkness humans were separated from God's love. Christ 'filled' all the space of created being with His deifying Energy and set free Adam and the spirits of the just from the bonds of darkness.

Sakharov made his own contribution to the understanding of God-forsakenness and used kenotic theology for practical implications. The experience of the "dark night" of John of the Cross¹⁶⁹ and most of all St Silouan's God-forsakenness shaped Sakharov's own spiritual life and his theology.

¹⁶⁷ Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *We Shall See Him as He Is*, 128.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 135.

¹⁶⁹ There is a debate going on about the influence of John of the Cross on Fr. Sophrony. For similarities between the theology of the "dark night" of John of the Cross and Fr. Sophrony's God-forsakenness, see: Nicholas Sakharov, *I Love, Therefore I Am*, 181-186.

The abandonment by God St. Silouan was given to experience before the Lord appeared to him as, in spiritual fact, the Saint's own *kenosis*. In this abandonment by God which he expressed in the words, '*God cannot be moved by entreaty*', we see the Divine Providence that allowed Silouan to plunge into black despair – to be reduced to nought by God's withdrawal from him. But it was this very descent into hell that prepared his soul to meet with Christ, Who appeared to him with great force. [...] Despair and emptiness were transformed into 'Christ-like humility which is indescribable. [St Silouan wrote:] 'The Lord taught me to keep my mind in hell, and not despair, and thus my soul is humbled. But this is not yet true – that is, Divine – humility, which is *indescribable*.'¹⁷⁰

Sakharov discerned two types of God-forsakenness. The first one, is when a human deserts God: "To the extent that we live in this world, to that same extent we are dead in God." The second one, is when humans experience a horrific state of being abandoned by God. When a person has no more life in this world, i.e., when he cannot live by the terms of this world, the memory of the divine world draws him 'there', yet despite all this, darkness encompasses his soul.¹⁷¹ He explains: "These fluctuations of the presence and absence of grace are our destiny until the end of our earthly life."¹⁷² Sakharov explained the experience of abandonment by God as diminishing the active power of grace: "Objectively it is not a complete withdrawal of grace but rather

¹⁷⁰ Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *We Shall See Him as He Is*, 132.

¹⁷¹ Nicholas Sakharov, *Outline of Fr. Sophrony's Theological Formation Outline of Fr. Sophrony's Theological Formation*, online, available: <http://sophrony.narod.ru/texts/chapt1.htm>

¹⁷² Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *We Shall See Him as He Is*, 128. "Only after long practice at self-emptying does Divine love come. The revelation is given in brief moments of visitation from on High, to be followed inevitably by days – years – of being forsaken by God. The soul deserted by God is seized with dread. We may not know why this has happened. We are faced with danger – the love, which appeared to us in Light, departs, hiding itself like the setting sun. Dark night approaches. In this fashion we learn to follow Christ descending into hell – follow Him 'whithersoever he goeth' (Rev 14:4)." Ibid., 129.

subjectively the soul experiences even the smallest reduction of grace as abandonment by God.”¹⁷³

Christ’s experience on the cross is the supreme example of self-emptying and an inevitable stage in development for believers on their path to perfection. “Utter self-emptying precedes the fullness of perfection.”¹⁷⁴ Christians, who with a maximum effort observe God’s commandments, will reach the state of desertion by God. “When the grace is withdrawn (or hidden), the persona [sic] is expected to act in the same way as if grace were present.”¹⁷⁵ Another feature of God-forsakenness is suffering, when God hides from a person, which is “a necessary stage in ascetic development: ‘Divine grace comes only in the soul that has undergone suffering.’”¹⁷⁶ The experience of God-forsakenness becomes “an immeasurably great Divine gift. Otherwise, it is difficult to understand the promised divinization of fallen man.”¹⁷⁷ In another place: “Our perfection must begin with a descent into the abyss of hell.”¹⁷⁸

Sakharov stated that only “those who have already experienced God’s goodness and try their utmost to abide in and with Him know this grief. The more a man has tasted of the joy of unity with God, the more profoundly he suffers on being parted from Him.”

Or: “Strange and quite extraordinary is the life of Christians: desertion by God and the

¹⁷³ Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *St Silouan the Anthonite*, trans. Rosemary Edmonds, (New York, 1998), 200-201 in Nicholas Sakharov, *I Love, Therefore I Am*, 179.

¹⁷⁴ Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *We Shall See Him as He Is*, 53.

¹⁷⁵ Nicholas Sakharov, *I Love, Therefore I Am*, 166.

¹⁷⁶ Letters to David Balfour, in the Archive of the Gennadeios Library (Athens), unpublished, C I (August 10, 1934) in Nicholas Sakharov, *I Love, Therefore I Am*, 25.

¹⁷⁷ Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *We Shall See Him as He Is*, 135.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 66.

darkness of eternal perdition are interwoven with the appearance of God in Uncreated Light.”¹⁷⁹ This state is only possible for those who know God, because “unbelievers have no idea of what it means to be bereft of God.”¹⁸⁰ Abandonment by God means to Sakharov to be following Christ on the path of humility and his descent into hell. The whole life of humans is to “know the [kenotic] love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that we may be filled with *all the fullness of God*.’ Here we hang on our cross, be it still an invisible one; but only thus are the greatness of man and the searchless depths of Divine Being made manifest.”¹⁸¹

Sakharov brought the categories of kenotic theology down to a practical level. He saw the role of hegumen (abbot) in the monastic community in terms of intra-Trinitarian kenotic relationships, where the Father is the kenotic source of Divinity. Consubstantiality in the Trinity is realized in the unity of the will and the endeavor of the Three Persons towards one goal. In a community, consubstantiality can be realized in everyday life – liturgical service, meals, work, and meetings.¹⁸² Kenotic theology was present in his understanding of liturgical prayer, especially at the Eucharist. Prayer for Sakharov was more a “Gethsemane” type of prayer than a merely triumphant celebration and the spiritual essence of the liturgy is the “sacrifice for the sins of the world.”¹⁸³ The

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 135.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 128.

¹⁸¹ Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *On Prayer*, 38. Original emphasis.

¹⁸² Nicholas Sakharov, *Понятие образа и подобия у архимандрита Софрония*, online, available: <http://sophrony.narod.ru/texts/obraz1.htm>

¹⁸³ “Liturgical Prayer,” in *We Shall See Him as He Is*, Russian ed., 228 (Essex, 1985) in Nicholas Sakharov, *I Love, Therefore I Am*, 115.

goal of the liturgy is therefore to represent the earthly sacrificial work of Christ. Here we can see some similarities with Bulgakov, who also considered the Eucharist as a remembrance of the last supper dynamically related to the sacrifice of Golgotha.¹⁸⁴

For Sakharov, Christ's cry on the cross (Mt 27:46) is the supreme moment of God-forsakenness and kenosis. This event he interpreted as an example for Christians of the faithfulness of Christ to the Father "even unto death" (Phil 2:6) by committing Himself to God – "Father, into your hands I commend my spirit" (Lk 23:46). Sakharov stressed in his teaching the importance of suffering and pain and understood it as a constructive component for divinization.

In this chapter we saw a brief history of kenotic theology with key Western theologians, and rediscovered the kenotic approach in the writings of Russian theologians, which was presented in more detail. My goal was not to present exhaustively these topics, but rather to provide a general background for AB's thought. It is very difficult to show the links between AB's approach to kenotic theology and the approach of Western kenoticists. He might have been familiar with the theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Jürgen Moltmann, Hans Urs von Balthasar, but, as discussed below, one does not find any references to their theologies in AB's work. AB was familiar instead with the "Death of God" movement. This topic will be addressed in the third chapter.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 115.

The theme of the kenotic God was present in the Slavic literature before the nineteenth century, as we saw in the Introduction to the present research. However, the systematic approach used by the Russian kenoticists came from Western sources. AB's thought was grounded in the thought of Russian theologians, some of whom he knew personally. I chose a few Russian theologians: Vladimir Soloviev, Mikhail Tareev, Metropolitan Antony Khrapovitsky, Fr. Sergius Bulgakov, Vladimir Lossky, and Fr. Sophrony Sakharov – to provide the reader with some background of the kenotic approach in Russian theology. However, it should also be noted that there are no direct references to Tareev, Soloviev or Khrapovitsky in AB's work. On the other hand, it was not my goal to compare AB's theology to that of these great theologians. This will be a task for the further research of AB's legacy. I turn now to AB's own approach to kenosis.

CHAPTER II

II.1. Anthony Bloom's Kenotic Theology

My aim in this chapter is to present the theme of the God-forsakenness of Christ according to AB. This theme is the most essential and crucial in the whole kenotic theology of AB. In the following paragraphs, I will show how he understood the event on the cross in light of Christ's cry: "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" (Mk 15:34). All major events from Christ's life were directed towards the cross and are interpreted in a kenotic way. AB used this event so frequently in his talks, homilies, lectures and speeches that one can be assured of the significant value Metropolitan Anthony places on this sense of abandonment by God. In this chapter we will examine the links of God-forsakenness made by AB in the following examples:

- The creation of the world, Christ's Incarnation, His Baptism in the Jordan, the temptations in the desert, the Transfiguration, the Mystical Supper, Christ's prayer in Gethsemane, His suffering, presence on the cross on Golgotha, Descent into Hades, His Resurrection and Ascension.
- Other people of the New Testament in the context of the kenotic life of Christ: the Apostles, John the Baptist and Mary.

II.1.1. God's Kenosis in the Creation of the World

For AB the creation of the world and the whole life of Christ is understood as kenotic, the center of which is God-forsakenness. God did not create the world to rule over it or to possess it, but to give everything that He has, to give Himself and to bring the world into relationship with God and to make it a participant in His life.¹ AB, like Soloviev and Bulgakov, understood the will of the Trinity to create the world as an act of kenosis. God took a risk when He created the human being because He had to take responsibility² for the consequences of human will and freedom. This is one of the kenotic elements in the act of creation. AB saw the Trinity as taking responsibility for the readiness of the Second Person to be prepared to become a human and to die. God foreknew the tragedy of the world, and that salvation would be realized with the Incarnation of the Logos: “The Apostle Peter says that Christ is the Lamb sacrificed from the foundation of the world. The Lord in His wisdom, before the creation of the world, foreknew what was going to happen with the world.”³ AB used a citation from the *Life*

¹ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая* (Moscow: Praktika, 2007), 787.

² Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды* (Moscow: Praktika, 2002), 852.

³ “Апостол Петр говорит, что Христос – Агнец, закланный прежде создания мира... Еще до того, как Господь державным Своим словом создал мир, Он в Своей премудрости, в Своем извечном знании судеб знал, что случится с этим миром.” Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Пути христианской жизни: Беседы* (Kyiv: Dukh i litera, 2004), online, available: <http://mitras.ru/pouty/crestny.htm>

of Archpriest Avvakum⁴ as a template to present the pre-temporal conversation within the Trinity:

The Father turned to the Son and said, “My Son, let us create a world.” And the Son said, “Yes, Father.” And the Father said, “Yes, but this world will lose its way. It will betray its vocation and to save this world You, my Son, will have to enter into it and to die for it.” And the Son said, “Let it be so, Father.” And the world was created.⁵

Interestingly, in the *Life of Avvakum*, the focus of this decision is the creation of the human person, while AB used it to describe the creation of the world.⁶ The motivation for creation is the love of the Trinity for creation. God called creation to be His partner. AB calls this invitation an encounter, one of the key words in his theology. This encounter took place in absolute harmony and beauty and the whole creation was in the unity of love until the fall of angels and later humans. In other contexts, but on the same theme of creation, AB used the term “solidarity,”⁷ that is, God called human beings “not to a transitory ephemeral existence, not as an experiment, but called to be,

⁴ Original: “(Совет отецъ.) Рече отецъ сынови: сотворимъ человека по образу нашему и по подобію. И отвѣща другій: сотворимъ, отче, и преступитъ бо. И паки рече: о единокровный мой! о свете мой! о сыне и словѣ! о сіяніе славы моея! аще промышляеши созданиемъ своимъ, подобаетъ ти облещися в тлимаго человека, подобаетъ ти по земли ходити, плоть воспріяти, пострадати и вся совершити. И отвѣща другій: буди, отче, воля твоя. И посемъ создася Адамъ.” *Житіе протопопа Аввакума им самимъ написанное*, ed. V. Gusev, (Moscow, 1960). Gusev’s version is based on Avvakum’s autograph, with later additions added as footnotes.

⁵ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Who Is God?: A Sermon Preached at Great St. Mary’s, the University Church, Cambridge, 18th November, 1979*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_153.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Пути христіанской жизни*, online, available: <http://www.mitrass.ru/pouty/crestny.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 457.

⁶ But there is an exception. He cited the human, not the world, within the context of creation. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек?* (Klin: Khristianskaia zhizn, 1999), online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/molitva/modern.htm>

⁷ I will come back to these key words of AB’s vocabulary in subsequent chapters.

and to be forever, the companion of eternity of the living God.”⁸ It is not only the human being that is called to communion with God, but also the whole of creation.⁹ The cosmic understanding of salvation formed AB’s basis for the interpretation of 2 Pet 1:4 – that the whole creation is called to become a partaker of the Divine nature.¹⁰

We can find another link between the creation of the world and the cross in AB’s interpretation of the liturgical gesture a priest makes with incense. He mentioned the kenosis of all persons of the Trinity and unity with the cross:

The mystery of the cross is written as it were within the mystery of the Trinity. In the beginning of the vigil the priest, holding the censer in his hand, makes with it a sign of the cross, saying: *Glory to the Holy, Consubstantial, Lifecreating and Undivided Trinity*. Both these words and this movement of his hand inscribe the cross in the very mystery of the Holy Trinity. The Holy Trinity is the mystery of Divine love and this love is at once a celebration, an exultation, and crucified compassion with all creation. The centre of this mystery of the Holy Trinity is in relation to us – crucified love.¹¹

This is one of a few cases where AB referred to the whole Trinity in the context of the cross and mentioned their common kenosis, although he did not explain the role of each of the Persons in this event. Even assuming that the cross is written into the

⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man: A University Sermon Preached in the University Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, on October 22nd, 1967*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_03.htm

⁹ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 373; 391-393; 547; 554-555.

¹⁰ Ibid., 371, 392.

¹¹ “Тайна Креста как бы вписана в самую тайну Святой Троицы. Когда священник начинает всенощную, он, держа кадило в руке, начертывает им крест и произносит слова: *Слава Святей, Единосушней и Животворящей и Нераздельней Троице*; и эти слова, и это движение его руки вписывают крест в самую тайну Святой Троицы. Святая Троица – это тайна Божественной любви; и эта Божественная любовь является одновременно и торжеством, и ликованием, и крестным состраданием со всей тварью. Центр этой тайны Святой Троицы по отношению к нам – распятая любовь.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Пути христианской жизни*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/pouty/crestny.htm>; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы* (Moscow: Libris, 1991), online, available: http://www.mitras.ru/prop/prop_02.htm

whole life of the Trinity, AB did not mention explicitly either the abandonment by the Holy Spirit or the presence of the Trinity on the cross.

II.1.2. God's Kenosis in the Incarnation

AB unites God's responsibility in creation with Christ's Incarnation and the tragedy of the cross. God did not reject His creation after original sin,¹² but became faithful unto death on the cross. In the Incarnation, the Father sacrificed His Son and gave Him up to death.¹³ Without the Incarnation it is impossible to understand the mystery of Good Friday. The incarnate Christ was immortal in His humanity, but accepted to share human suffering, abandonment, and death. AB stressed that Christ, in becoming a human, revealed a genuine humanity. This true humanity is the vocation and goal for humans. For AB, the act of the Incarnation was essentially an act of solidarity with humans.

But how far does this solidarity go? Usually in our sermons we underline, or we hear people say, that he became partaker of all that was man's condition except sin. And if we ask what are these things he became a partaker of, we are told that it is the limitations of time and space and the conditions of human life, tiredness, and hunger and thirst and anguish and isolation and loneliness and hatred and persecution and in the end death upon the cross. But when we have said this we seem to overlook something which is subjacent to all this, something which seems to me more important than any of these things. Yes, Christ accepts finally not only human life but human death.¹⁴

¹² This theme will be presented in subsequent chapters.

¹³ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Christ, True and Perfect Man: The Address Printed below Was Delivered at the Diocesan Conference at Effingham, Surrey, in May, 1983*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_13.htm

¹⁴ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_03.htm

The reason for the Incarnation was to experience everything that humans experience in their life, especially the moment of death. Of course the main motivation for becoming a human is God's love,¹⁵ but as we have seen above, the experience of death and especially God-forsakenness is more important for AB.¹⁶ The reason why God became a human is not only because of sin, but also because of the Resurrection and Ascension and giving us the vocation to "become participants of the divine nature" (2 Peter 1:4).¹⁷ In other words, the Incarnation does much more than simply atone for sin. It offers humanity an even greater intimacy with God. It brings humanity into the life of God. God's love for humans leads to the tragedy of the cross.¹⁸ "Christ was born to die, because of His love He wanted to become one of us."¹⁹ In the Incarnation, "Christ responded to the human tragedy and horror of God-forsakenness and became a human

¹⁵ "In the Incarnation, in the Nativity of Christ in Bethlehem, God takes hold of a frailty of a child, and, as a parable, gives Him to us. Love is always given; love is always defenseless, love is always ultimately vulnerable, and the more perfect the love, the more fulfilled, the more defenseless, the more given and vulnerable it is." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Eve of Epiphany 18 January, 1985*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_152.htm

¹⁶ AB, after talking about the Incarnation and God's solidarity with sinful people, moved to the theme of God-forsakenness and descent into the Hades. AB clearly distinguished between physical death and death because of the loss of God (человек умирает, это потеря Бога). Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 233-234; 460; 541-542.

¹⁷ Ibid., 428.

¹⁸ After writing about the meaning of the Incarnation, AB usually returned to the theme of God-forsakenness. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_03.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Путь христианской жизни*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/pouty/crestny.htm>

¹⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви* (Moscow: SP Interbuk, 1991), online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy7.htm>

forever”²⁰ and “became an unseparated part of mankind.”²¹ Before the Incarnation, God observed human history, He was present from outside of it. “Since the Incarnation of the Son of God, human history and God are woven together, becoming united in all relations. From the moment of the Incarnation the incomprehensible God is immanent in history, He is within it, and He is in it.”²² AB distinguished between human birth and the birth of the Son of God:

The birth of the Son of God is unlike ours. He has not entered from non-being into time. His birth is not the beginning of a continually evolving life, but the limitation of the fulness that He had from the beginning of the world. He possesses the eternal glory of His Father before all ages and enters into our world, in the created world where man brought sin, suffering, death. The birth of Christ is not for Him the beginning of life, but the beginning of death. He accepted everything that creates the conditions of our life, and the first day of His life on the earth is the first day of His ascending the Cross.²³

The greatness of the Incarnation is that God revealed Himself through kenosis as a vulnerable and defenseless child. “Christ revealed to us the image of God in an absolutely new way that was previously unimaginable to humans. God revealed Himself

²⁰ “Христос отозвался на человеческое горе и ужас обезбоженности и стал Человеком *навсегда*.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа: Проповеди* (Moscow: Sviato-Danilov monastery, 1993), online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_7.htm

²¹ “стал как бы неотрывной частью человечества.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы...*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy7.htm>

²² “С Воплощением Сына Божия человеческая история и Бог сплетены, стали едины в каком-то отношении. Непостижимый Бог теперь, с момента Воплощения, имманентен истории, Он внутри ее, Он в ней.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 545.

²³ “Рождение Сына Божия непохоже на наше. Он не вступает из небытия во время. Его рождение - не начало все возрастающей жизни; оно есть ограничение той полноты, которую Он имеет прежде начала мира. Он обладает вечной славой Отчей прежде всех веков и вступает в наш мир, в тварный мир, куда человек внес грех, страдание, смерть. Рождение Христа не является для Него началом жизни, а началом смерти. Он принимает все, что составляет условия нашего бытия, и первый день Его жизни на земле есть первый день Его восхождения на Крест.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие: Размышления перед Великим Постом* (Moscow: Palomnik, 1997), online, available: http://www.mitras.ru/soul_put/put_7.htm

as the humiliated one, as the one who gave Himself in defenceless love and could not protect Himself.”²⁴ God also revealed the greatness of the human person and the true humanity to which humans are called to become. God revealed that the greatness of the human person, which “is so vast, so deep, so mysteriously deep, that he cannot only contain the divine presence as a temple, but unite himself with God.”²⁵ Through Christ’s body the whole creation is penetrated by divine presence.

It is a revelation of the fact that man was created by God in such a way that, not only in spirit, but also in soul and in body, he can be not only spirit-bearing, but God-bearing, He can not only see God face to face, be a friend to God, stand in the deepest possible relation of obedience and communion, but can also, in the daring and inspiring words of St. Peter, become a partaker of the divine nature, can become, even while remaining man, what God is in his nature, just as God, being God by nature, becomes man by participation.²⁶

AB stressed Christ’s will to share in the life not of righteous people, but of sinners. “Not because of love of the righteous – He said that it is not the healthy who need a doctor, but the sick. He came to share with the same sinner, with the same unbearable person, whom we reject and with whom we are in contention, to share not only our common human nature, but also our destiny, suffering and struggle.”²⁷

²⁴ “Христос явил нам образ Божий совершенно по-новому, так, как человек Его и помыслить не мог, так, как человек себе и пожелать Его не мог. Бога, явившегося в смирении, Бога униженного, Бога, беззащитно Себя отдающего по одной любви, Бога, как будто бессильного Себя Самого защитить.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая: Проповеди произнесенные в России* (Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994), online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_68.htm

²⁵ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *After Christmas: January 13, 1985*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_151.htm

²⁶ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Christ, True and Perfect Man*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_13.htm

²⁷ “И не по любви к праведным – Он ведь сказал, что не здоровые нуждаются во врачах, но больные; Он пришел, чтобы с тем самым грешником, с тем самым невыносимым человеком, которого мы отвергаем, с кем мы в раздоре, разделить не только нашу общую человеческую природу, но и

Another important element of the Incarnation, which brings us to God-forsakenness as an event between God and humans, is the unity of the two natures of Christ. For the explanation of the unity of the two natures in the one person of Christ, AB used the illustration from St. Maximus the Confessor. “Union between the humanity and divinity of Christ is like the union of fire and iron that takes place when you plunge a sword of iron into a furnace until it glows with fire. ‘Fire and iron,’ he says, ‘are united now in an indistinguishable way. You can no longer separate the one from the other.’ This is the dogma of Chalcedon.”²⁸ St. Maximus used this comparison to illustrate the co-existence of the two wills in Christ, but AB expanded this explanation to include the whole being of Christ.²⁹ Concerning the two wills in Christ, AB did not use the illustration from Maximus, but explained their co-existence in one hypostasis as the very condition for salvation.

If the will of God overpowers the will of man, harmony is not restored. If the will of man remains forever independent of the will of God and in a state of confrontation with it, there is again no harmony. It is only because there is in Christ all that is man, including the freedom of man, and all that is God, including the freedom of God, the greatness, the humility, the surrender and kenosis of God, that victory can be won. Two natures are united, and a new Adam is born.³⁰

судьбу, и муку, и борение.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_7.htm

²⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Christ, True and Perfect Man*, online, available: http://www.mitrar.ru/eng/eng_13.htm

²⁹ Sergius Bulgakov criticized this famous patristic example for “non integral theological doctrine, especially on the most important questions, in particular the question of how the simultaneous operation of the two wills in Christ is possible.” Sergius Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God*, trans. Boris Jakim, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008), 81.

³⁰ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Christ, True and Perfect Man*, online, available: http://www.mitrar.ru/eng/eng_13.htm

AB emphasized the perfection of the human nature in Christ. Christ became a perfect human because His humanity is in full unity with God. Also, His humanity, taken from the ground, makes Him closer to us because we also are taken from the dust. This connection to the material world expands God's Incarnation to the whole cosmos and it becomes deified and united with God.³¹ Christ's acceptance of the human body reveals the greatness of matter. It became possible for both the body and for matter itself not only to contain God, but also to be united with Him and to remain itself.³²

Also, Christ's Divinity did not experience any changes or diminishment in His Incarnation. The Incarnation, according to AB, is a one-sided act of God – the Father gave His Son, God was incarnated and in Christ gave Himself to His creation. This same Christ in His humanity freely accepted His mission on the banks of the Jordan.³³

It is important to stress that, in his kenotic theology, AB did not mention any changes in Christ's Divine nature as a result of the Incarnation.³⁴ Rather, he focused on the acceptance and fullness of Christ's humanity. "God, Whom we cannot grasp, truly became a human, accepted human flesh, lived among us in humility, simplicity, but also

³¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 373, 458.

³² Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 741. More about role of the matter in further chapters.

³³ "Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Пути христианской жизни*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/pouty/crestny.htm>

³⁴ "Сам Бог стал человеком, Сам Бог принял на Себя плоть; полнота Божества обитала во плоти, и Божество ничуть не умалилось, осталось Собой." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 392; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 272; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и Беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_11.htm

in glory.”³⁵ AB did not explain in which glory: human or Divine, Christ lived. The answer can be found in this quotation:

We discovered a God who, in an act of love, had chosen to be what we were, defeated, helpless, vulnerable, contemptible, hopeless, rejected, superfluous, a God who was not ashamed of being like us and indeed of whom we had no need to be ashamed. And we discovered that the glory of God, the resplendence of God, is made manifest in that. This God we can venerate, we can respect, we can learn from, we can follow, we can trust, we can worship.³⁶

The previously presented kenoticists, such as Thomasius, Gess, and Bulgakov, stressed the importance of diminishing the Divine attributes. AB, however, in his paradoxical and unique way, united the kenosis of God with the maintenance of His Divine glory. For AB, it was not important which attributes God had diminished, but rather how God revealed Himself on earth as a humiliated, vulnerable and defenseless human. This is the way God kenotically experienced all types of suffering, including death, but remained in His glory and remained God.

A similar approach we can find in the works of Fr. Georges Florovsky. He also considered that in order for God to become a human it was not necessary for Him to give up His glory. He said: “This was the ‘humiliation’ of the Word (Phil. 2:7). But this ‘kenosis’ was no reduction of His Divinity, which in the Incarnation continues unchanged. It was, on the contrary, a lifting-up of man, the ‘deification’ of human

³⁵ “Бог, Которого мы не можем постичь, — действительно стал человеком, принял человеческую плоть, жил среди нас в смирении, простоте, но также и во славе.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 568.

³⁶ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Who is God*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_153.htm

nature, ‘the theosis.’”³⁷ AB applied the same understanding of kenosis in his kenotic theology. He strongly believed that matter did not sin but was wounded and polluted by Adam’s decision to turn away from God. Matter was able to accept God and was God-bearing. We will see later how AB applied this understanding in his theology.

As we can see from Florovsky’s explanation, an understanding that God remained in His glory and did not diminish any of His Divine attributes in the Incarnation was also a part of Orthodox theological thought. But if we return to AB’s interpretation of the kenotic passage (Phil 2:6-9), we will see a contradiction:

Out of love for us, God wanted to become helpless, vulnerable, contemptible, defeated; His glory was exhausted, He appeared in the *form of a slave* (Phil 2:7), lived among people in the most shameful way, and died as a common criminal. No one who enters into the depth of the human hell of defeat, vulnerability, humility, wounds, humiliation, contempt, shows himself to be lower than God, because the Savior Christ descended more deeply into this hell before anyone else.³⁸

How to resolve the contradiction that Christ remained in His glory and yet, from the above quotation, we read that “His glory was exhausted?” This is an example of the inconsistencies in AB’s theology. In my opinion, he did not see the necessity to give a further or exact explanation to resolve this particular question, and he also did not link exhaustion of glory with God-forsakenness. This is also one of the few times where AB referred to the kenotic passage. As we have seen in the first chapter, for most kenoticists

³⁷ Georges Florovsky, *Creation and Redemption*, vol. 3., in *Collected Works*, (Belmont: Nordland Publishing Company, 1976), 97.

³⁸ “Бог по любви к нам захотел стать беспомощным, уязвимым, презренным, побежденным; истощена Его слава, Он явился в образе раба (Флп 2:7), пожил среди людей в самом позорном виде, умер, как простой преступник, – и ни один человек, который уходит в глубину этого человеческого ада пораженности, раненности, унижения, презренности, не оказывается ниже своего Бога: еще глубже, чем он, в этот ад сошел Спаситель Христос до него.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 541.

Phil 2:6-9 is at the core of their theology, but that is not the case for AB. In his kenotic theology, God-forsakenness is more important because it was the full exposition of God's humility and love for the human race.

II.1.3. God's Kenosis in the Baptism of Christ

Why did Jesus come to John to be baptized? From what did the sinless God, both as God and in His humanity, come to be cleansed? For AB the answer to these questions came from Sergius Bulgakov or from an unnamed Presbyterian pastor in France.³⁹

People came to John, confessed their sins and emerged from the waters having received cleansing and new life. These waters became, according to AB, "heavy with sin, heavy with mortality, heavy with evil, which these people washed away but which stayed in these waters."⁴⁰ For AB, Christ's baptism is one of the most dramatic moments of His life, because it was the beginning of accepting sin and death.

Christ – the only one who is without sin – he too comes to be baptized. He too plunges into these waters, heavy and turbid with human mortality, human sin, human atheism, with all the evil on earth, he immerses himself in this element of death, and emerges again, weighed down with the burden of this evil, this sin, this death. Baptism, which meant liberation for those who came in penitence to St. John, means for him the beginning of his Passion.⁴¹

³⁹ In the English version, AB cited a Presbyterian pastor, but in Russian he did not. The name is not mentioned in published books. Sometimes AB cited Bulgakov or "a certain old priest". Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Way of the Cross: Extracts from a talk at Essex University 14 March, 1996*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_162.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Eve of Epiphany 18 January, 1985*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_152.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 542, 561.

⁴⁰ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Way of the Cross*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_162.htm

⁴¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, "The Prayer of Intercession," *Sourozh* 1 (1980), 22-33, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_10.htm

AB identified in his theology the words “death,” “atheism,” “sin” and “mortality.” Original sin in AB’s understanding consisted of Adam’s decision to turn away from God and, as a consequence, his ending up in sin and death and becoming atheist in the etymological meaning. I will explore these ideas in further detail later in my research.

If the Incarnation was the moment when the body was penetrated by Divinity and renewed, then the baptism was the finalization of this preparation period. Christ grew up in His humanity from childhood to adolescence to adulthood freely united in perfect love and free obedience to His Father, ready to make a sacrifice in the gradual ascending of the cross.

In the Incarnation [...] it is a one-sided act of God, in a sense: in His humanity the Babe of Bethlehem cannot take upon Himself this divine act by which God delivers Himself into the power of man. [In the Baptism] at thirty years of age He is ready to make this decision, not as God but as man because in Christ the two natures coincide. His humanity is true and real as much as His divinity is true and real. And this is the moment when He starts by His own choice the Way of the Cross.⁴²

Christ, immortal in His Divinity and humanity, accepted all consequences of sin and from this moment He was ready to die. “This is the beginning of the way to Calvary. [...] The culminating point will come on Calvary when He will say, ‘My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?’ It will be a moment when God as He was in His humanity

⁴² Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Way of the Cross*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_162.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 561-563; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_24.htm

will have lost communion with the Father by partaking of the destiny of mankind. This is the ultimate act of divine love.”⁴³

AB also found it important to stress the fate of the cleansing waters full of sin. When Jesus came out of the waters, He took all sins upon Himself and the waters became clean. Christ cleansed them through His touch.⁴⁴ AB stressed here the importance of the cosmic character of Christ’s salvation that not only humans receive, but which the whole cosmos experiences. Here we can see a continuation of the same understanding of kenosis, one that is necessary for the creation of the world, where AB began to develop the idea of the cosmic character of salvation and the greatness of matter.

The Incarnation is the moment when God clothed Himself in a human body and through Divine penetration renewed it. This body will ascend to heaven. On the day of Baptism, the “*human Jesus Christ*,” matured in the fullness of His humanity, “united with the perfect obedience to the will of the Father is going freely to fulfill the plan of the Pre-temporal Council.”⁴⁵ Christ sacrificed His body not only to the Father, but to the whole of humanity and took on the horror of human sin through the plunging into the water that became the image of all evil.⁴⁶

⁴³ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Way of the Cross*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_162.htm

⁴⁴ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy9.htm>

⁴⁵ “достигший полной меры Своей зрелости человек Иисус Христос, соединившийся совершенной любовью и совершенным послушанием с волей Отца, идет вольной волей, свободно, исполнить то, что Предвечный Совет предназначал.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_05.htm

⁴⁶ Cf. Ibid.

After the baptism, the Holy Spirit filled Him with power not only in His Divinity, but also in His humanity.⁴⁷ It is quite remarkable that AB stressed the presence of the Holy Spirit in the context of Christ's baptism, but did not talk about the presence or absence of the Holy Spirit on the cross. Because he never mentioned in his works that the Holy Spirit abandoned Christ, we can suppose that He remained with Christ also in His experience of being abandoned by the Father. Later we will see that AB strongly believed that the Holy Spirit never abandons the Church. This gives us another argument that He also remained with Christ, since the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ.

II.1.4. Temptations, Prayer to the Father and Miracles

Just after His baptism and the indwelling of His humanity by the Holy Spirit, Jesus was taken to the desert, where He fasted and was tempted by the devil. All temptations referred to Christ's use of power, which, according to AB, "would undo totally the kenosis, the emptying of self, the very act of the Incarnation."⁴⁸ To paraphrase the devil's words to Christ, "If you are the Son of God change a stone into a loaf of bread, bow before the devil, throw yourself down from the pinnacle" – the temptations of food, power and miracles. The devil tempted Christ to prove that He is God, one who can use His power for anything and above all to serve himself. Satan provoked Jesus to use His Divine power to violate human nature. Regarding this, AB indicated that, "He

⁴⁷ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Christ, True and Perfect Man*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_13.htm

⁴⁸ Ibid.

rejects to prove His divinity by working a miracle, to prove His divinity by casting Himself down from the pinnacle...”⁴⁹ AB did not use this story to point out its moral aspects in order to help people in their struggles, as did Tareev, but instead referred to the kenosis and Incarnation indicating the Chalcedonian definition of the two natures of Christ, where the character of both is preserved.

AB reflected not only on the temptations in the desert, but also on another temptation. After the talk on His coming sufferings, crucifixion and death, Peter said to Jesus: “God forbid it, Lord! This must never happen to you” (Mat 16:22). Jesus’ reply to him was the same as to the devil: “Get behind me, Satan! You are a stumbling block to me; for you are setting your mind not on divine things but on human things” (Mat 16:23). If the temptations in the desert related to His power, here the temptation was to weakness. Here AB makes a connection with God-forsakenness:

The last temptation that Christ has to overcome, because such temptation can be overcome only by facing the utmost horror, abandonment by people, loss of union (I am speaking of His humanity, his psychological state) with God: ‘My God, My God! Why have you forsaken Me?’ (Мк 15:34) – and the real death of the One, Who is Eternal Life, as if the divestment of life, itself by Him Who is Life itself. This was His ultimate and terrible temptation.⁵⁰

As we can see, AB did not exaggerate the meaning of the temptations in the desert for the redemption of the world. AB showed that Jesus was tempted to avoid

⁴⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Way of the Cross*, online, available: http://www.mitrar.ru/eng/eng_162.htm

⁵⁰ “Последнее искушение, которое Христос должен был победить, потому что такое искушение можно побеждать только перед лицом предельного ужаса, отвержения людьми, потери единства (я говорю о Его человечестве, о психологическом Его состоянии) с Богом: Боже Мой, Боже Мой! для чего Ты Меня оставил? (Мк 15:34) – и реальной смерти Того, Кто есть Жизнь Вечная, как бы совлечение самой жизни Тем, Кто есть сама Жизнь. Это было предельное и страшное Его искушение.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 565; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Way of the Cross*, online, available: http://www.mitrar.ru/eng/eng_162.htm

weakness by using His power over human nature. In the case of Peter's temptation, He was tempted to use His weakness to underestimate the Divine nature. In both cases, Jesus used the same words: Get away Satan! These two temptations are equal and victory over them both paves the way to Golgotha.

Another element of kenosis in Christ's life was His prayer to the Father. Christ prayed to His Father as a human and also as the Son of God:

And in this case Christ communicated with His Heavenly Father both as a Human being and as the Only-begotten Son. As the Only-begotten Son of God He communicated with Him with all His love, with all His selfgiving to Him, with all His readiness to fulfill on earth the plan of salvation, entrusted to Him by His Father and accepted by Him in free will in His full, royal, and Divine freedom. On the other hand, He communicated with God the Father also as a human. We know from the Gospel, when the disciples posed a question to the Savior about the end of the world, He replied that no one knows about this, but only the Father in Heaven – even the Son of Man does not know about this time (Мк 13:32).⁵¹

As a human He had limited knowledge and needed to pray to God.

In performing the miracles Christ, according to AB, also had to pray to the Father.

After performing the miracles, after expelling the demons, He manifested His Divine power through His humanity. He needed to, He had to plunge into

⁵¹ “И в данном случае Христос общался со Своим Небесным Отцом и как Человек, и как Единородный Сын Божий. Как Единородный Сын Божий Он общался с Ним всей Своей любовью, всей Своей отдачей Ему, всей Своей готовностью выполнить на земле дело спасения, порученное Ему Отцом и принятое Им на Себя вольной волей, в полной, царственной, Божественной Своей свободе. Но, с другой стороны, Он общался с Богом и Отцом и как человек. Мы знаем из Евангелия, что, когда ученики поставили перед Спасителем вопрос о конце мира, Он им ответил, что об этом никто не знает, кроме Отца Его на Небесах, – и Сын Человеческий не знает этих сроков (Мк 13:32).” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 581-582. Another example of Christ's prayer to the Father: “Как Бог, Он существовал в полноте Своего бытия, но в пределах Своего человечества Ему нужно было такое постоянное обновление молитвенного общения, приобщенности к Богу. В Своем человечестве Он нуждается в углубленной укорененности в Своем Божестве, и Он молится, общается с Отцом, углубляет Свое человеческое единство с Ним и только из глубины этого единства действует. [As God, He existed in the fullness of His being, but in the limitedness of His humanity, He needed the constant renewing of prayerful communication, to be in touch with God. In His humanity He needed a deeper rootedness in His Divinity, and He prayed, communicates with the Father, deepens His human unity with Him and only from the depth of this unity does He act.]” Ibid., 582.

communication with God the Father, not as the Only-begotten Son of God – between Him and the Father there could be no rupture, no distance – but as the Human being Jesus Christ (Rom 5:15).⁵²

These examples of Christ's prayer to the Father do not undermine His Divinity, but rather show the intimate relationship within the Trinity that continued even after the Incarnation. This supports my previous statement that in AB's kenotic theology the Son remained in His glory.

AB did not indicate from whom he borrowed these ideas, but we can see some similarities with Sergius Bulgakov's approach.⁵³ While Bulgakov explained the limitedness of Christ because of Godmanhood and His retaining of some divine attributes, AB, rather, followed the Antiochean Christological approach and insisted that Christ was switching from one nature to another in order to explain Christ's actions.

II.1.5. Transfiguration – the Greatness and the Tragedy of the Event

In the event of the Transfiguration, AB stressed the role of the conversation between Christ, Moses and Elijah about the future crucifixion. Even the revelation of glory during the Transfiguration is connected to the event of the cross. The Apostles “saw Christ in His glory. But He was revealed to them in glory at the very moment when he spoke to Moses and Elias about His crucified departure from the world, [cf. Lk 9:31].

⁵² “После совершения чудес, после того как Он изгнал бесов, проявил Божественную Свою силу через Свое человечество, Ему нужно было, Он должен был погрузиться в общение с Богом и Отцом не как Сын Божий Единородный – между Ним и Отцом не могло быть никакого разрыва, отдаления, – но как Человек Иисус Христос (Рим 5:15).” Ibid., 582.

⁵³ See first chapter, pp. 68-83.

The fullness of Divine splendor is crucified love.”⁵⁴ After the Baptism in the Jordan, when His human nature was filled with the Holy Spirit, Jesus was led to the desert to be tempted. In the same way after the Transfiguration, the revelation of the Divine glory through His humanity immediately included references to the content of suffering and death. For AB, the event of the Transfiguration was the revelation of Christ’s sacrifice as the highest level of God’s love toward the human race. “In this moment everything in Him, including His Divinity, humanity, human soul, human body, the component elements of the sacrifice, and self-sacrifice, reached the fullness of Love.”⁵⁵

Who changed on Tabor, Jesus or his disciples? According to AB, the change touched the disciples who were with Jesus. It was not Jesus who changed himself before the Apostles, but it was His disciples who became capable of seeing the Divine light. “Christ was transfigured not in the sense that He became Someone else, but the disciples, having followed Him in faith, love and purity of life and in the openness of their souls showed themselves capable to some extent, like Moses, of seeing the uncreated Divine light.”⁵⁶

⁵⁴ “видели Христа во славе. Но во славе Он им явился в момент, когда говорил с Моисеем и Илией о Своем крестном уходе из мира. Полнота Божественного сияния – это крестная любовь.” Митрополит Сурожский Антоний, “Мы Должны Нести в Мир Веру,” *Sibirskaiia Pravoslavnaia Gazeta*, 7 (2006), online, available: <http://www.ihtus.ru/072006/st08.shtml>

⁵⁵ “В этот момент все в Нем, Его Божество, Его человечество, его человеческая душа, Его человеческая плоть, составные части жертвы, самопожертвования, достигли полноты Любви.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 795.

⁵⁶ “Христос преобразился не в том смысле, что Сам стал иным, но ученики Его, верой, и любовью, и чистотой жизни, и открытостью душ своих последовавшие за Ним, оказались способны в какой-то мере, подобно Моисею, увидеть нетварный Божественный свет.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 971.

This event also revealed the greatness of Christ's humanity. It was the moment when "it is not the divinity of God that shines through in spite of the humanity. At that moment we see his humanity transfigured with Divinity and shining in all its glory."⁵⁷ The Apostles could see not only the Divine glory, but the greatness of the human nature united with God. "They saw, *what* it is to be a human being, who is inseparably to the utmost, united with God. They could see what it is to be a true human being, such as they had never known, such as they had never been able to feel themselves to be, but in Whom they could see their own calling fully expressed."⁵⁸ And again, this foretaste of being with God caused the Apostles to want to stay on Mount Tabor, as they lost contact with reality. Jesus awakened them to return to town, to the suffering of other people.⁵⁹ It was then that the father brought his spirit-possessed son to the disciples, but they could not heal him, so Jesus cured him (Mk 9:17).

AB interpreted the icon of the feast of the Transfiguration and emphasized the cosmic character of the Transfiguration:

If you look at the icon of Transfiguration written by Theophan the Greek you will see that the clothes of Christ according to the Scripture became so white that there is no launderer on earth who could bleach them thus. The radiance coming out of His body fell on all the objects which surrounded Him, on the plants, the stones, on everything. As if from the core of everything they had touched, these

⁵⁷ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Christ, True and Perfect Man*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_13.htm

⁵⁸ "они увидели, *что* представляет собой человек, который неразрывно, до конца, до предела един с Богом. Они увидели, что представляет собой истинный Человек, каким они никого не знали, какими они себя не могли чувствовать, но в Ком они увидели свое собственное призвание, выраженное до конца." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 407.

⁵⁹ Cf. Ibid., 407.

beams of light evoked the shining forth of the possibility of the eternal glory which had been placed within them.⁶⁰

As we can see above, AB extended the meaning of the Transfiguration not only for the Apostles, but also to express its cosmic character. As well, the link between the revelation of God's glory and Christ's future sufferings and death on the cross in AB's interpretation is obvious. AB also made a connection between the Transfiguration and the Incarnation in the context of the theology of divinization. The Incarnation pointed to the revelation that God is united with the materiality of the world, but the Transfiguration is the vision of "what matter can become when it is penetrated by the Divine presence."⁶¹ The practical application of such an understanding of matter we will see in the following chapters.

II.1.6. The Lord's Entry into Jerusalem – the Entrance to Holy Week

AB interpreted this event in an antinomic way. On the one hand, this is a feast because Christ entered the city as a king in the midst of His disciples, and all the people glorified Him. But from the perspective of the coming days of suffering, crucifixion and death, this feast brings sadness. People expected to see a political leader who would

⁶⁰ "Если посмотреть на икону Преображения, написанную Феофаном Греком, то увидишь, что одежда Христа, по евангельскому слову, стала бела, как ни один белильщик на земле не может убелить. Лучи, исходившие от Его плоти, падали на все предметы, которые Его окружали, на растения, на камни, на все, и как бы из недр всего, чего они касались, вызывали сияние заложенной в них возможной вечной славы." Ibid., 407; 521, 724. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании* (Moscow: Moskovskoe Podvor'e Sviato-Troitskoï Sergievoï Lavry, 1999), online, available: http://mitras.ru/h_d/hd22.htm

⁶¹ "чем может стать материя, когда она пронизана Божественным присутствием." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 846.

bring freedom to the Jews. But Jesus entered as a humble king whose kingdom is not of this world. “People were expecting from Him an earthly victory, safety, peace and stability, but Christ proposed to be cut off from the earth, to become homeless, to wander and be a preacher of the Kingdom.”⁶² The crowd was not welcoming Jesus, in fact, but an imaginary political leader. This is precisely why Christ ends up being alone during this feast.⁶³

The same people who were glorifying Christ as a king would, only a few days later, be screaming to crucify Jesus. AB explained this change in the mind of people as the result of failed hope: “These people, who recently were welcoming Christ with great celebration, now rise against Him with such indignation and hate, irreconcilable hatred, because He has betrayed their hopes.”⁶⁴ It seems that AB expressed sympathy for these people: “Nothing hardens a person so much as the loss of hope, disillusioned hope.”⁶⁵ The crowd was disillusioned because their expectations were different. They thought that He was “a leader who will free his people from oppression, from slavery, from what they consider godlessness.”⁶⁶ And in one moment, “they realized that their national,

⁶²“Люди ожидали от Него земной победы, обеспеченности, покоя, устойчивости – Христос им предлагает оторваться от земли, стать бездомными странниками, проповедниками этого Царства.” Ibid., 598.

⁶³ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Пути христианской жизни*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/pouty/crestny.htm>

⁶⁴ “И вот эти люди, которые недавно встречали Его с таким торжеством, восстают на Него с таким негодованием и ненавистью, непримиримой ненавистью, потому что Он обманул все их надежды.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 598.

⁶⁵ “Ничто так не ожесточает человека, как потерянная надежда, разочарованная надежда.” Ibid., 973.

⁶⁶ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Lord's Entry into Jerusalem, 30 March 1980*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_165.htm

political and messianic expectations (as they understood them) were betrayed. They rejected Christ and this same crowd in just a few days will be crying out: “Crucify, crucify Him! We have no king but Caesar...”⁶⁷

According to AB, the biggest tragedy of this event is not Christ’s entry into future sufferings, but rather the beginning of Christ’s utter loneliness and abandonment by the Father and by the people. The misunderstanding of the people, who put their hope in political freedom, is similar to the misunderstandings of the Apostles, who during the Mystical Supper were perplexed by His words and could not accept them.⁶⁸ Before the supper, none of the Apostles thought to wash the feet of Christ and one another, so Jesus took the initiative and through this act of humility demonstrated the role of the Master. Again, they did not understand the meaning of this gesture.

Christ’s loneliness continued with Judas’s betrayal and in Gethsemane when He called the closest apostles to keep vigil with Him and they fell asleep. Three times He came to them to find support and three times He found them asleep. Christ was looking for human support from them in the face of death, but they left Him to struggle alone. Judas betrayed Him, Peter denied Him three times and the other apostles fled. Only His mother and the beloved apostle stayed near the cross.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ “Они обнаруживают, что их национальные, политические, мессианские надежды (в том виде, в каком они их понимают) обмануты, они отвергают Христа и они, та же самая толпа, через очень мало дней будут кричать: *Распни, распни Его! Нет у нас царя, кроме кесаря.*” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy9.htm>; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 973.

⁶⁸ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды* 973.

⁶⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_73.htm#14; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Lord’s Entry into Jerusalem*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_165.htm

In Gethsemane, Christ experienced the loneliness of abandonment not only from His disciples but also from the Father. According to AB, this was the first time that Christ's prayer to the Father was not heard. "Reading the Gospel, we can see that of all prayers directed to God, only Christ's prayer to the Father in the Gethsemane struggle went unanswered (Мк 14:32-42). [...] He was abandoned because God foresaw something better for us – at the cost of His life."⁷⁰ Here we can see the direct preparation for Christ's further God-forsakenness on the cross.

AB also made a link between Gethsemane and the creation of the world, the Incarnation, and the Baptism. In Gethsemane, "Christ stood face to face with His own death, which is nothing less than the mortality of all humanity. He accepted it on the day of His Baptism. He accepted it as a human being and took it upon Himself as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Death was alien to Him in everything – as God He is immortal, as the Incarnate God, He made the very body of the Incarnation immortal and His death is our death that kills Him."⁷¹ Christ in Gethsemane was preparing to accept not only His own death, but the death of all.⁷²

⁷⁰ "Читая Евангелие, мы видим, что из всех молитв, обращенных к Богу, осталась без ответа единственно Христова молитва Отцу в Гефсиманском борении (Мк 14:32-42). [...] Он оставлен, потому что Бог предусмотрел для нас нечто лучшее – ценой Его жизни." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 886.

⁷¹ "Христос стоит пред лицом Своей смерти, которая есть не что иное, как смертность всего человечества, которую в день Крещения Он, как человек, на Себя принял и которую, как Агнец, закланный до создания мира, Он воспринял на Себя. Смерть Ему чужда во всем; как Бог, Он бессмертен; как воплощенный Бог, Он самое тело воплощения сделал бессмертным, и смерть Его – наша смерть, которая Его убивает." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/pouty/crestny.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 272.

⁷² Cf. "В Гефсиманском саду Он, в борении и ужасе, встречал не Свою, а нашу смерть." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/h_d/hd03.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 272.

Even His death on the cross did not take place in Jerusalem among the people, but outside the city, meaning outside the human community. Christ was abandoned like the scapegoat on whom Jews placed their sins and then drove out of the city to die in the desert. “Christ was abandoned by the Jewish people to die outside the city, as if outside humanity, because He did not abandon God at all. On the other hand, Christ entered the world to unite with people to such a degree, to be one with them in everything, to experience all the conditions of their life, all the conditions of the human fall.”⁷³ And finally He was abandoned by His Father, yet Christ remained faithful to both: to the Father and to the people: “Abandoned by men, rejected by the people of Israel He encounters the extreme of forsakenness and dies without God, without men, alone, with only His love for God and His love for mankind, dying for its sake and for God’s glory.”⁷⁴

⁷³ “Христос был так же отвержен еврейским народом, с тем, чтобы умереть вне града, как бы вне человечества, потому что Он от Бога ни в какой мере не отошел. Но, с другой стороны, Христос пришел в мир так соединиться с людьми, так быть с ними во всем единым, чтобы понести все условия их жизни, все условия падения человеческого.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Дом Божий: Три беседы о Церкви* (Moscow: Put’, 1995), online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/dom_bozhiy/dob3.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy8.htm>. Cf. Hebr 13:12-13. It seems that AB made reference to the Anglican hymn: “There is A Green Hill Far Away” and the original first verse is:

There is a green hill far away
without a city wall
where the dear Lord was crucified
who died to save us all.

⁷⁴ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Lord’s Entry into Jerusalem*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_165.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy9.htm>

AB did not juxtapose Gethsemane with Golgotha;⁷⁵ rather he saw the continuity of Christ's experience of loneliness in Gethsemane and the moment of physical death on the cross.⁷⁶ The prayer in Gethsemane is an illustration of the perfect harmony of the two wills in Christ. For AB, Christ experienced the fear of death and its tragedy more than any human being because He was immortal in His humanity, in unity with the Father and did not have to die. Christ, however, freely accepted the unnatural state of death. "Christ reached into the depth of horror of human death, in His genuine humanity, He appealed to the Father and begged Him: *Let this cup pass from me*, then added: *your will be done* (Mt 26:39-44). In this acceptance of the Divine will, Christ's humanity manifested its perfection, its perfect harmony with the Living God."⁷⁷

II.1.7. God-forsakenness in the Kenotic Theology of Anthony Bloom

We move now from Gethsemane to Golgotha. The kenotic theology of AB is based on his interpretation of the God-forsakenness of Christ on the cross. We will not find in his works reflections on which Divine attributes were diminished in the

⁷⁵ As we saw in Khrapovitsky's theology in the first chapter.

⁷⁶ AB, in his sermon on the storm on the Sea of Galilee, made a connection between the Incarnation, Gethsemane and Golgotha. He said: "В сердцевине бури возвышается страшная Голгофа, потому что в сердце бури находится Гефсиманский сад. В Гефсиманском саду, на смертоносной Голгофе находился воплощенный Сын Божий. [In the heart of the storm arises a terrible Golgotha, because in the heart of the storm there is the garden of Gethsemane. In the Gethsemane garden, and on the deadly Golgotha was present the incarnate Son of God.]" Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_23.htm

⁷⁷ "Измерив до глубин ужас смерти, как человек, в Своем подлинном совершенном человечестве обращается к Отцу и умоляет: *Мимонеси от Мене чашу*, затем добавляет: *Да будет воля Твоя* (Мф 26:39-44). В этом принятии Божественной воли человечество Христа проявляет свое совершенство, свою совершенную гармонию с Живым Богом." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 96.

Incarnation, nor a detailed exegesis of the kenotic hymn in Phillipians, nor an exhaustive explanation of the natures of Christ. Even the God-forsakenness of Christ is missing its Trinitarian character. AB absolutely insisted that God-forsakenness is an event between God and the human person, not an intra-Trinitarian event as most Western theologians held.⁷⁸ Regarding the presence of the Holy Trinity on the cross, AB only repeated the words about the crucifying love of the Trinity in the context of Christ's cry, and he never directly addressed abandonment by the Holy Spirit. This Divine-human event by the person of Christ represented every human being's tragedy, which is death. Death, in turn, was understood by AB as Godlessness and an illustration of God's faith in the human being. We will return in further chapters to the analysis of Godlessness and to the practical applications of AB's understanding of God-forsakenness. Now, however, we will proceed to AB's understanding of Christ's kenosis on the cross.

AB explained that Christ, who in the Incarnation accepted the human condition after the Fall, was not born as a mortal because He could not die of His own mortality. AB referred to St. Maximus the Confessor to prove his argument: "In the Incarnation Christ becomes immortal, because it is impossible to conceive of humanity united inseparably to Divinity, and remaining mortal. Yet he takes upon himself everything, including mortality."⁷⁹ This mortality, AB believed, is the human loss of God, a loss which Christ accepted for himself in order to be totally united with us.⁸⁰ Christ did not

⁷⁸ Compare with kenoticists presented in the first chapter.

⁷⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Christ, True and Perfect Man*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_13.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 659.

⁸⁰ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Christ, True and Perfect Man*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_13.htm

die His own death, because as God He could not die by our natural death;⁸¹ rather “He has loved us, has loved so much that he became one of us, and everything, all tragedy, all the horrors of human life have been laid on Him, including this terrible loss of God from which all of us wither and die.”⁸² Furthermore, “He partook of our God-forsakenness and, having lost God as we do, he died.”⁸³

For Metropolitan Anthony, Christ’s death is the greatest mystery, expressed in the words from Matins of Great Saturday, “O Life, how canst Thou die? How canst thou dwell in a tomb?”⁸⁴ He asked, how did Christ, who is the Godman, die, since “it is possible to die, only having lost God – otherwise death is not present. It is possible to die only in becoming god-less [without God], in the strictest, most literal sense of the word. It means Christ died, sharing our condition of God-forsakenness, our loss of God. [...] He faces God *together* with us, not only *for* us. He is one of us.”⁸⁵ According to St. Paul “death came through sin” (Rom 5:12), that is, through separation from God. How could

⁸¹ “Как Бог Он умереть не мог; но по любви к нам Он разделил с нами нашу судьбу. С Богом остался и был отвержен людьми; с людьми не разлучился и на Кресте – о, на Кресте Он сказал самые страшные слова истории: Боже Мой, Боже Мой, зачем Ты Меня оставил?.. И умер, умер: сама Жизнь умерла, потух свет, который Свет по существу...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_10.htm

⁸² “Он нас возлюбил, возлюбил так, что стал с нами един, и все, вся трагедия, весь ужас человеческого бытия легли на Него, включая эту страшную потерю Бога, от которой мы все увядаем и умираем.” Ibid.

⁸³ “Он приобщился нашей богооставленности и, потеряв Бога, как мы, умер.” Ibid.

⁸⁴ First Stasis from Matins of the Great Saturday in: *The Lenten Triodion*, trans. from the original Greek by Archimandrite Kallistos Ware and Mother Mary, (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1978), 623.

⁸⁵ “умереть можно, только потеряв Бога, – иначе смерти нет. Умереть можно, став в своей природе без-божным, в этимологическом смысле слова. И, значит, Христос умирает, разделяя наше состояние обезбоженности, нашу потерю Бога. [...] Он стоит перед Богом *вместе* с нами, а не только *за* нас. Он – один из нас.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd29.htm

Christ die if in His conception as a human He was immortal? He was not personally sinful and that is why He was not separated from God. He died because people rejected Him and because He wanted to be at one with the people in their tragedy of death, to be a partaker of the “[...] ontological and fundamental tragedy of humans – He lost God: My God, my God! Why have you forsaken Me? (Mk 15:34)”⁸⁶

To die a human death Christ had to be joined to the cause of death – the state of isolation from God. “It is impossible to die without having lost God, and the cry of the Savior: My God, My God! Why have you forsaken Me? (Mk 15: 34) – is the cry of the perfect Human, who freely, because of love, has joined in the main tragedy of the person – to his isolation from God, to that [state], that a human being has lost God.”⁸⁷ Christ not only agreed to the physical death, he also accepted to be abandoned by His Father.

He shared with us not only physical death. The only reason the person dies is because of the loss of God; they die in losing God, death is not just a flower withering. That is why the person dies: the price of sin is death, and sin is separation from God. Christ has shared with us this loss of God: He experienced, as no one else on earth, the measure of the loss of God and what it does mean to be without God.⁸⁸

⁸⁶ “[...] онтологической, основной трагедии человека – Он потерял Бога: *Боже Мой, Боже Мой! зачем Ты Меня оставил?* (Мк 15:34).” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 544.

⁸⁷ “Нельзя умереть, не потеряв Бога, и крик Спасителя: *Боже Мой, Боже Мой! для чего Ты Меня оставил?* (Мк 15:34) – это крик совершенного Человека, Который свободно, по любви приобщился к основной трагедии человека: к его оторванности от Бога, к тому, что человек потерял Бога.” Ibid., 927.

⁸⁸ “Он разделяет с нами не только физическую смерть. Единственно, почему человек умирает, это потеря Бога; умирают, потеряв Бога, смерть – не просто увядание цветка. Поэтому-то человек умирает: цена греха – смерть, а грех – это отделенность от Бога. И Христос разделяет с нами потерю Бога: Он измерил, как никто в тварном мире не мог измерить, что такое – потерять Бога, быть без Бога.” Ibid., 234.

AB was deeply convinced that Christ's cry on the cross (Mk 15:34) is not just a citation from Ps. 22⁸⁹ put in Christ's mouth by the evangelists Mark and Mathew, but a real experience of God-forsakenness.⁹⁰ AB strongly criticized those who considered that Jesus was rehearsing a verse of the psalm on the cross.⁹¹ "If you have seen anyone die a violent death you cannot well imagine him at the last moment rehearsing a prayer he had been taught when he was a little boy! Besides, it is an error of vision – for it is prophecy that is turned towards its fulfillment, not fulfillment that is supposed to recite words of prophecy. No, it was something real."⁹² After stating the reality of Christ's experience in His God-forsakenness, AB proceeded onto his reflection on the Person of Christ.

Christ entered into the tragedy of the cross, He remained free in His dying, "always remaining as He is,"⁹³ preserving His love for the Father and all people.⁹⁴ Christ

⁸⁹ "One does not rehearse a psalm when one is dying a violent death. The psalm is directed towards the event and not the other way round. And the descent into hell is the ultimate point of Christ's solidarity with us." (Gillian Crow, *This Holy Man*, 169) Alexander Men in his comment on the Ps. 22 also stated that for Hebrews God-forsakenness was equal to death. Cf. "On you I was cast from my birth, and since my mother bore me you have been my God. Do not be far from me, for trouble is near and there is no one to help. (Ps 22:10-11) Эти слова означали, что народ признавал себя с самого рождения неотделимым от Ягве и богооставленность для него была равносильна смерти [These words that the people thought of themselves from birth as inseparable from Yahweh, and God-forsakenness was for them was equal to death]." Aleksandr Men, *Вестники Царства Божия: Библейские Пророки от Амоса до Реставации (VIII-IV вв. до н.э.)*, vol. 5., (Moscow: SP "Slovo," 1992), online, available: http://www.gumer.info/bogoslov_Buks/History_Church/Men_IsRel_05/_15.php

⁹⁰ I am fully aware of the existence of a massive amount of Western exegetical research on every word and action described by the evangelists, but it is beyond the scope of my dissertation to refer to any of these exegetes.

⁹¹ Although AB never indicates a precise reference.

⁹² Archbishop Anthony Bloom, *God and Man* (New York: Paulist Press, 1971), 55.

⁹³ "всегда остается Самим Собой." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/soul_put/put_4.htm

⁹⁴ "Оставленный людьми, отверженный израильским народом, Он вступает в предельную оставленность и умирает как бы без Бога, без людей, один, только со Своей любовью к Богу и со Своей любовью к людям, умирая ради одних, умирая во славу Другого." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 973.

stayed faithful to both of them until the end of his life: “He has become a person, He became the crucified Christ, He was rejected by people because he stood up for God, and has taken on the God-forsakenness of the Cross because he stood up for the human being.”⁹⁵ AB cited Gregory the Theologian, who said that “whatever Christ did not assume, that He did not save,”⁹⁶ and gave an extended commentary on those words. God wanted to be so completely united with human beings that He accepted not only all our limitedness,⁹⁷ creatureliness, sufferings, and consequences of sin, but He also accepted God-forsakenness, that is, death. He entered into the most extreme experience of humans to share with them all that is in their life. As a result, we can acknowledge that “Christ *knows* it through His own human experience.”⁹⁸

AB used the words of Fr. Sophrony’s concept regarding the “metaphysical swoon,” to describe the moment when Christ “in His humanity, in his dying, he lost the sense of being at one with the Father.”⁹⁹ In another place AB referred to the same experience of Christ on the cross and presumably the same theologian, Fr. Sophrony

⁹⁵ “Он сделался человеком, стал распятым Христом, был отвергнут людьми, потому что стоял за Бога, и вынес богооставленность Креста, потому что стоял за человека.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/soul_put/put_4.htm

⁹⁶ “чему не приобщился Христос, того Он не искупил.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 460. See original text: Gregory of Nazianzus, *First Letter to Cledonius* 101.32, (PG 37:469), online, available: http://ecmarsh.com/fathers/npnf2/NPNF2-07/Npnf2-07-59.htm#P6026_2072851

⁹⁷ “Христос – все-человек, объемлющий Собой весь человеческий опыт без ограничения.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Дом Божий*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/dom_bozhiy/dob1.htm

⁹⁸ “Христос это *знает* на собственном человеческом опыте.” Ibid. It is interesting that AB cited this famous phrase as an argument for Christ’s acceptance of God-forsakenness, and not as an acceptance of full human nature or for the Incarnation.

⁹⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Christ, True and Perfect Man*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_13.htm.

Sakharov, but used different terminology. “If Christ had not participated in our break with God, in our estrangement, in what one of our theologians called a psychological eclipse which made him lose sight of the presence of God, he would not have participated fully in our mortality...”¹⁰⁰ Here we might see an inconsistency in AB’s use of the terms “metaphysical swoon” and “psychological eclipse.” I think the “metaphysical swoon” better describes the experience of Christ in AB’s understanding than the “psychological eclipse” which limits the God-forsakenness of Christ only to the psychological level, and leaves aside the question of the Divine abandonment by the Father. In the end it seems that AB used the theologically inexact term “methaphysical swoon” to express something more than just a psychological experience. AB referred to Fr. Sophrony Sakharov’s concept on “metaphysical swoon,” but I was not able to find this statement either in his works or in the research of Nicholas Sakharov and Archimandrite Zacharias. I presume AB referred to his private conversations with Fr. Sophrony.¹⁰¹

It is not Christ who lost God as a result of His sinfulness, since He has no sin, but it was our sinfulness, our God-forsakenness, that He freely accepted and from which He died.¹⁰² But if this is true, how do we understand the following statement: The experience of Christ was “not only as an absence of the sense of God, but as a positive

¹⁰⁰ Archbishop Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 96.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_03.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 735.

¹⁰² Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy7.htm>

loss of the Father.”¹⁰³ AB did not go beyond this statement and did not explain the role of the Father in the abandonment of His Son. Instead, he spoke about the state of Christ. This important distinction shows the uniqueness of how AB understood the event on the cross, which included an anthropological perspective. Christ in His kenosis accepted the human condition, including the state of the loss of God (Godlessness) and its consequence, which is death. Besides the subjective experience of being abandoned by His Father, Christ was abandoned by the people, especially His disciples: “He was rejected by God, because he wanted to be one with those who had lost God as a result of sin; and he was rejected by people, because he willed to be and was one with God – the unique and perfect Witness, God’s witness among people that had turned away from God and acknowledged no king except Caesar.”¹⁰⁴ And in another place: “He died because he faced God in full solidarity with humans. He was standing before humans in full solidarity with God and together with God, he was rejected, condemned to die on the cross.”¹⁰⁵ AB was dealing particularly with the anthropological question of being without God (=to be Godless), and not with the question of why the Father abandoned

¹⁰³ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *I Believe in God*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_04.htm

¹⁰⁴ “Он отвергнут Богом, потому что захотел быть единым с теми, кто через грех потерял Бога; и Он отвергнут людьми, потому что пожелал быть и был един с Богом, – единственный совершенный Свидетель, свидетель Божий среди рода, который отвернулся от Бога и не признавал иного царя, кроме кесаря.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd29.htm

¹⁰⁵ “Он встал перед Богом в полной солидарности с человеком – и от того умер. Он встал перед человеком в полной солидарности с Богом – и вместе с Богом Он был отвергнут, осужден умереть на Кресте.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/molitva/modern.htm>

His Son. I will return later to the question whether the Father abandoned Christ or Christ felt he was abandoned by the Father.

For AB, the cross is not an event that occurs primarily within the internal life of the Trinity, but an event between God and humans. In this explanation of God-forsakenness, the emphasis is moved from God to human beings. It is not God who abandoned His Son or His creation because he was hurt by the sin of his people and now needs some sort of restitution or satisfaction. AB understood God-forsakenness as the miserable state that all people experience, one which Christ entered into with the fullness of His divinity, entered into the place where God is not, in order to bring salvation. To enter into that condition, according to AB, means to die. Christ, therefore, died in His human nature because He had lost contact in his human nature with God and ceased to experience unity with the Father.

II.1.8. The Descent into Hades

Death entered into life due to the primal sin of Adam and Eve. AB distinguished between two aspects of death: physical death, that is, the separation of the soul from the body, and death – in the Old Testament – as separation from God. He did not consider physical death as the greatest tragedy, but instead understood the latter as the most terrible because it was a descent into Sheol,¹⁰⁶ to the place where God is not, to the place

¹⁰⁶ (=Hades, =hell, AB equated these terms)

of complete loneliness and radical absence of God. “Sheol of the Old Testament – this is the place of a radical absence of God, the place where God is not.”¹⁰⁷

AB identified Christ’s God-forsakenness with the descent into Hades and criticized, as folkloric and naïve, the interpretation of Hades as a place of terrible torments. “But what then is hell? Oh, how different it is from the hell of Dante, from all those images that we find of the Christian hell, the place of torment!”¹⁰⁸ Hades, because of the absence of God, also means a lack of unity with other people. It was the place where all the souls of the sinners and the righteous go,¹⁰⁹ because “before Christ there is no bridge between the eternity of God and the death of man.”¹¹⁰ People of the Old Testament were waiting for the Savior, who would unite “heaven and earth, God and creation,”¹¹¹ but until then, the darkness remained. Christ brought God into the place

¹⁰⁷ “Шеол Ветхого Завета – это место радикального отсутствия, место, где Бога нет.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 735; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Пастырство* (Minsk: Izdatelstvo Belorusskogo Ekzarkhata, 2005), 20.

¹⁰⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, “The Prayer of Intercession,” *Sourozh* 1 (1980), 22-33, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_10.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 735.

¹⁰⁹ AB used the metaphorical example of Lazarus, rich man and Abraham to stress the godlessness and absence of God in Hades: “[...] богач и Лазарь и Авраам находятся в этом шеоле; судьба их различна, страдание их различно, а оставленность – почти одинакова; между Богом и этим местом нет пути. И когда Христос сходит во ад, потеряв Бога в этом ужасе боголишенности, Он, как всякий человек, потерявший Бога, уходит в те глубины, из которых, как будто, нет возврата и где нет встречи с Богом. [rich man and Lazarus and Abraham are in this Sheol; their fate is different, suffering is different, but forsakenness is almost identical. There is no path between God and this place. And when Christ descends into Hades, losing God in this horror of godlessness, He, like every human being who has lost God, goes into these depths from which, it seems, there is no return and there is no encounter with God.]” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/prop/prop_31.htm

¹¹⁰ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, “The Prayer of Intercession,” online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_10.htm

¹¹¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Resurrection Victory: Sermon Delivered after the Vigil Service on Saturday, 29 May, 1971*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_21.htm

where God is not. Christ with His human soul “descended where everyone who has died in separation from God descends, into Hades – a place of eternal and radical absence of God.”¹¹² Christ’s death did not eliminate physical death, which is why we still die, but He went to the place of total absence of God. As a result:

When He entered into this horrible area, He filled everything with Himself, with His Divinity, with His eternal life, with His unfading Light. And this death is forever abolished. Now we call death a Dormition, a temporary sleep. And when we die we are not going into a chasm of despair and God-forsakenness, but to God who has loved us so much that He gave us His only-begotten Son, [...] that we might believe in His love!¹¹³

Since that time, the meaning of death has changed because God has entered the hell of complete loneliness and separation, and there is no longer a place where God is not. AB said that the prophet David foresaw this in his mystical vision and said: “Where can I go from your spirit? Or where can I flee from your presence? If I ascend to heaven, you are there; if I make my bed in Sheol, you are there.” (Ps 139:7-8) So, now for believers death is a falling asleep. “Everyone who dies now, falls asleep in Christ, he falls asleep until the day his body rises at the last trumpet, on the day of the resurrection of the dead.”¹¹⁴

¹¹² Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 88. In another place, AB said that Christ “descended into it [hell] as a man who had accepted to lose God in order to remain with man.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *On Forgiveness: July 19, 1970*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_130.htm

¹¹³ “Когда Он вошел в эту страшную область, Он Собой, Своим Божеством, Жизнью вечной, Светом неумирающим заполнил все. И эта смерть навсегда упразднена; теперь смерть мы называем успением, временным сном. И когда умираем, мы уходим не в бездну отчаяния и Богооставленности, а к Богу, возлюбившему нас так, что Он Сына Своего едиnorodного, [...] чтобы мы поверили в Его любовь!” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_10.htm; Cf. John Chrysostom, *Homilia de Coemeterio et de Cruce*, (PG 49, 393-398).

¹¹⁴ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Resurrection Victory*, online, available: http://www.mitrar.ru/eng/eng_21.htm. For more about the meaning of death for believers see the further chapters on the practical applications of God-forsakenness.

AB saw a difference between the human experience of death and Christ's. What happens with the death of a human being? The soul becomes separated from the body. "We do not choose death, it comes to us, is given to us, we choose neither the terms, nor the way that we will enter into this mystery." What happened with the death of Christ? "In Christ's death something else happened. He died even though He could not die. He died even though He is immortal in his very human nature, inseparably united with Divinity."¹¹⁵ Christ's body was incorruptible and immortal from the moment of His conception. How then can we say that He experienced death? "Christ's death was a break between His human soul and human body, but there was no separation of either his soul or body from Divinity. This body was penetrated by His Divinity. So also His human soul, descending into Hades, shone with the glory of Divinity and filled Hades with eternal light, forever dispersing the terrible darkness of God's absence."¹¹⁶

Metropolitan Anthony could have taken this explanation from the prayer before the liturgy when the deacon incenses the altar: "In the grave with the body, in Hades with the soul as God, in Paradise with the thief and on the throne with the Father and the

¹¹⁵ "Мы не выбираем смерть, – она приходит к нам, дается, мы не выбираем ни сроки, ни то, как именно мы вступим в ее тайну." What happened with the death of Christ? "В смерти Христа происходит нечто иное. Он умирает, хотя умереть не может; Он умирает, хотя бессмертен в самом Своем человеческом естестве, нераздельно соединенном с Божеством." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd29.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/soul_put/put_7.htm

¹¹⁶ "[С]мерть Христова была разрывом между человеческой Его душой и человеческим телом, но не была отделением ни души, ни тела от Божества. Это тело было пронизано Его Божеством, также как Его душа человеческая, нисходя в ад, сияла славой этого Божества и исполнила ад вечным светом, разогнав навсегда страшную тьму отсутствия Божия." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy7.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/soul_put/put_7.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 665.

Spirit were You, O Boundless One, filling all things.”¹¹⁷ Here we can see the similarity between AB’s statement and the prayer before the liturgy. Christ’s soul and body were separated, but His Divinity did not abandon either body or soul. The body was incorruptible because it was inseparably united with Divinity. His soul entered into hell. Unlike Fr. Georges Florovsky, AB identified Hades with the experience of God-forsakenness, “the ultimate tragedy of mankind is not even death, it is loss of God, which is death, because God is the only ultimate and eternal source of eternal life.”¹¹⁸ Florovsky instead, identified the Descent into Hades with the death of Christ: “This descent into Hades means first of all the entry or penetration into the reality of death, into the realm of mortality and corruption. And in this sense it is simply a synonym of death itself.”¹¹⁹ But at the same time he was opposed to identifying the Descent into Hades with God-forsakenness: “The descent of Christ into Hell is the manifestation of Life amid the hopelessness of death, it is victory over death. And by no means is it the ‘taking upon’ Himself by Christ of the ‘hellish torments of God-forsakenness.’ The Lord descended into Hell as the Victor, *Christus Victor*, as the Master of Life. He descended in His glory, not in humiliation, although through humiliation. But even death He assumed voluntarily and with authority.”¹²⁰

¹¹⁷ “Во гробе плотски, во аде же с душею яко Бог, в раи же с разбойником, и на престоле был еси, Христе, со Отцем и Духом, вся исполняяй, Неописанный.” Likewise this text is used in the hours, compline and midnight service during of Bright Week in the Byzantine Tradition, online, available: http://www.librarium.orthodoxy.ru/canon_p.htm.

¹¹⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Way of the Cross*, online, available: http://www.mitras.ru/eng/eng_162.htm

¹¹⁹ Georges Florovsky, *Creation and Redemption*, 140.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 142.

AB was influenced by Florovsky whom he knew personally and through whose suggestion he started to read the works of the Holy Fathers. But on this point AB had a different understanding of God-forsakenness than Florovsky. For the latter the event of the cross is a manifestation of “conquering death by the death” of Christ: “Yet the Church guards also against the opposite exaggeration, against all kenotic overemphasis. For the day of the shameful Crucifixion, when Our Lord was numbered among the thieves, is the day of glory. [...] For the death of Christ is itself the victory over death, the destruction of death, the abolition of mortality and corruption.”¹²¹ As we are going to see later, AB was not so quick to proceed from the cross to the Resurrection and rather stressed the self-emptying of Christ in His God-forsakenness.

II.1.9. Christ’s Resurrection

If the themes of Christ’s sufferings, God-forsakenness, and finally death have been presented here in an extended way, then the themes of the Resurrection and the Ascension can be presented briefly, and in the context of the meaning of the future goal of human life. Almost on every occasion when he was speaking about the Resurrection, AB returned to the theme of the cross, because “without the death on the cross, there is no Resurrection and its joy.”¹²² But to understand the meaning of Holy and Great Friday

¹²¹ Ibid., 137-138.

¹²² Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное нынешнее*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/soul_put/put_7.htm

“we have to comprehend the sense of the Incarnation.”¹²³ Because I present Christ’s life in the context of God-forsakenness in this chapter, I will also stress the kenotic character of the Resurrection and the Ascension.

AB expresses the kenotic character of the Resurrection by stressing the passive role of Christ in His rising from the dead. As was said earlier, AB thought that Christ, in His Incarnation, did not abandon any of His divine attributes but remained fully divine. Commenting on the Resurrection, AB acknowledges that Christ rose by His own power, but immediately adds that the Father by His love for Christ raised Him from the dead:

We say that He rose, but we also say following the apostle Paul that *God raised him from the dead* (Col 2:12). But let’s reflect on what I just said: Yes, Christ in His endless solidarity with us entered into the Old Testament death, He went there, renouncing His power to live and by the love of the Father was called to return to this life now as the victor in the Resurrection and the Ascension.¹²⁴

And in another place:

He accepted death with all its consequences and as if He had no power to raise Himself. He gave Himself to death for our salvation and God, in reply to His crucified love, called Him back to life, uniting the soul of Christ with the body of Christ and revealed Him to the world as the risen Christ.¹²⁵

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ “Мы говорим, что Он воскрес, мы говорим также, с апостолом Павлом, что *Бог Его воскресил из мертвых* (Кол 2:12). И вот если подумать о том, что я сейчас говорил: да, Христос Своей всеконечной солидарностью с нами ушел в смерть ветхозаветную, ушел, отрекшись от Своей власти жить, и любовью Отчей Он призван вернуться к этой жизни уже победителем в Воскресении и Вознесении.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 544; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 272; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, 302. In other places AB stated that Christ rose from the dead by His own power. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_68.htm

¹²⁵ “Он принял смерть со всеми ее последствиями, и у Него Самого как бы не было власти Себя воскресить: Он отдал Себя на смерть для нашего спасения, и Бог в ответ на Его крестную любовь Его вызвал обратно к жизни, соединил душу Христову с телом Христовым и явил Его миру воскресшим Христом.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 698.

Did Christ have power to raise Himself or not? If we say that He did not, then we come to the conclusion that He ceased to be Divine in nature, that is to be God. I do not believe that AB understood this in such a way and there are many examples that contradict such an understanding. This is another example of AB's inconsistency in his theology. How then are we to understand AB's words "as if" Christ did not have power to raise Himself?¹²⁶ Here we have two sides in AB's kenotic theology, because he was trying to unite the teaching on Christ's Resurrection (Christ rose by his own power) with the kenotic approach (the Father raised Christ from the dead). It can be assumed that AB subscribed to Christology from above, which is normative in Eastern Christianity. AB's inclination toward the kenotic approach is obvious from the above citation, but the question as to what happened to Christ's divine nature and why it became passive in the Resurrection if the Father raised the Son from the dead remains open. AB, speaking about the Resurrection, returned to the event on the cross, God-forsakenness and the meaning of death, with an emphasis on God's love for humans.¹²⁷ In essence, it is a function of the fact that because Christ possesses two natures, we cannot always say everything we need to say in one formulation. Thus, without giving in to Nestorianism, "one side" of the antinomy ends up being stressed in particular instances.

Another feature of AB's understanding of the Resurrection is that Christ rose in His body, and now His body and soul are united again in His human nature. Here is the

¹²⁶ If we compare AB's statements with Byzantine liturgical texts then we will see an apparent "conflict." Byzantine liturgical texts frequently refer to Christ rising by "His own power." Cf. with the Paschal hymn in Byzantine Christian Tradition: "Christ is risen from the dead, trampling death by death, and to those in the tombs giving life." Peter Galadza, ed., *The Divine Liturgy: An Anthology for Worship* (Ottawa: Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern Christian Studies, 2004), 501.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 979.

link between the Incarnation of Christ, who took human nature upon Himself, and the fact that he did not abandon His body after the Resurrection.

The human flesh that He accepted lovingly from the Virgin Mother of God, the flesh that He gave over to tortures, judgment and death on a cross – this flesh Christ did not abandon on the earth after His dying on the cross and witnessing to Divine love. He rises from the dead, alive in His flesh with wounds on His hands and legs, with the wound in his side, He rises to witness that the human body is called neither to decay, nor to death, but to eternal, immortal joyful life.¹²⁸

AB used another approach to the question of bodily Resurrection. He examines the fact that Christ ate before the disciples to prove that His body is true and real. But what kind of body was it? To answer this question AB returned to the theme of paradise. According to AB, who followed Gregory of Nyssa on this point, the bodies of the first people were transparent and light, but after sin they became “heavy and dense, as ours.”¹²⁹ Christ, during His earthly life, accepted the body after sin with all its limits and heaviness. After His Resurrection, He revealed Himself to His disciples “as human in the full sense of the word, in all human beauty, in all human glory, as a living human body, so permeated by Divinity that it is not subjected to the heaviness and gravity of the fallen world.”¹³⁰ For AB, the meaning of Christ’s Resurrection consists in exposing the greatness and potentiality of the human person, especially in its corporeality.

¹²⁸ “Плоть человеческую, принятую Им любовно от Девы Богородицы, плоть, которую Он отдал истязаниям суда и крестной смерти, – эту плоть Христос не покидает на земле после крестного Своего умирания и свидетельства о Божественной любви: Он воскресает, живой в плоти Своей, воскресает с язвами на руках и на ногах, с раной в боку, воскресает в свидетельство о том, что и тело человеческое призвано не к тлению, призвано не к смерти, а призвано к вечной, неумирающей, ликующей жизни.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_68.htm

¹²⁹ “тяжеловесная и густая, как наша.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 695.

¹³⁰ “как человек в полном смысле слова: во всей красоте, во всей славе человека, то есть с живой человеческой плотью, так пронизанной Божеством, что она уже была не подвержена тяжести, тяжеловесности падшего мира.” Ibid., 699.

Another aspect of the Resurrection is the victory over death, sin and Satan.

“Upon the Cross He overcame evil, He overcame Satan, He overcame death, He laid to waste the realm of death itself.”¹³¹ AB emphasized that the Resurrection was a victory over death not by God alone, but by the Lord Jesus Christ, the Godman, who united within Himself, in a perfect way, the two wills.

In this victory not only Divinity participates, but also mankind because the Man Jesus Christ, as He was called by the apostle Paul, took everything that the Father put on Him, and He alone could accomplish the work of our salvation. Our salvation depended on His human agreement with the will of God and the Man Jesus Christ gave this agreement. That is why the cross, the descent into Hades, the Resurrection and the Ascension directly belong to the human race because it is not only a Divine event but also a human one.¹³²

In another place, he said: “The Son of God, who became the Son of man, conquered evil as a Human by His Divine power. Through the Incarnation, God used and honored His and our humanity to participate in this battle.”¹³³ Stressing the bodily Resurrection of Christ, AB boldly underlined the meaning of matter and human nature in

¹³¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Transfiguration, and Ordination of Ian to Diaconate 19 August, 1989*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_131.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Christ, True and Perfect Man...*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_13.htm. Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow considered in his Catechism that Christ freed us from “sin, the curse, and the death.” See. Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow, *The Longer Catechism of The Orthodox, Catholic, Eastern Church*, online, available: http://www.pravoslavieto.com/docs/eng/Orthodox_Catechism_of_Philaret.htm#ii.xv.iii.i.p41

¹³² “В этой победе участвует не только Божество, но и человечество, потому что Человек Иисус Христос, как Его называет Апостол Павел, взял на себя всё, что возложил на Него Отец, и потому только мог Он совершить дело нашего спасения; наше спасение зависело от Его человеческого согласия на волю Божию, и это согласие Человек Иисус Христос дал. И поэтому то, что случилось с Ним – крестная смерть, сошествие во ад, Воскресение, Вознесение – относится непосредственно и к роду человеческому: это не только Божественное событие – это событие и человеческое.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_35.htm

¹³³ “Сын Божий, ставший Сыном Человеческим, одолел зло как Человек Своей Божественной силой. Через воплощение Бог Свое человечество, наше человечество употребил и удостоил участия в этой борьбе.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd13.htm

the act of salvation. God did not violate matter in His act of Incarnation and Resurrection, but on the contrary exposed its ability to not only cooperate with, but also to contain Divinity and ultimately to be God-bearing (Богоприимная). In the following chapters we will return to the issue of matter in AB's theology.

II.1.10. Ascension

AB interpreted the Ascension of Christ from an anthropological and trinitarian perspective and again we will see how he stressed the human nature of Christ. He believed that Christ returned to the glory of the Father that He had from the beginning of the world. Christ re-entered the life of the Trinity not just as an individual person but as a representative of all human nature and pointed humans toward their real destination.¹³⁴ Christ ascended with the material body, which He accepted in the Incarnation. "On this day of the Ascension He, in his human though glorified and risen body, ascended into heaven and with Him also our humanity entered into the mystical depths of the Holy Divine Trinity."¹³⁵

Christ is seated at the right hand of the Father as the Godman. For AB, this meant that all of humanity entered into the Trinity. "All our matter is presented in the body of Christ, all visible matter of the earth and heavens that surrounds us until the end of the

¹³⁴ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 984-985.

¹³⁵ "В этот день Вознесения Он человеческой, хотя и прославленной, воскресшей плотью Своей вознесся на Небо, и с Ним человечество наше вступило в таинственные глубины Всесвятой Божественной Троицы." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 987; Cf. *Ibid.*, 846; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy7.htm>

world is presented in this wondrous body united with Divinity. When Christ ascends into heaven, He brought into the depths of the Divine mystery, into the bosom of the Trinity, into this miraculous Divine reality, not only our humanity, but everything visible, all visible creation.”¹³⁶ Here again AB stressed the cosmic role of Christ's salvation. AB stated that all the limitations, suffering and pain that Christ accepted are brought into the inner life of the Trinity. Recalling His suffering death on the cross in the context of the Ascension once again demonstrates AB’s kenotic approach.

[...] Christ ascended with his flesh torn by our sins and in some incomprehensible way, not only the risen Christ, but also the ascended Christ, who entered into the glory of God and is seated at the right hand of God the Father, and bears in His human body the wounds inflicted by human sin. He still bears human weakness on His shoulders, and the Resurrection of Christ and the terrible Passion Week are now as it were included in the mystery of the Triune God, the incomprehensible and great Holy Trinity. All earth’s grief, all its pain and horror was laid upon Christ, and He did not renounce them either by His Resurrection, or by His Ascension into glory. Christ remained the Lamb of God who before the foundation of the world was slain for the salvation of the world.¹³⁷

This citation contains an important statement of AB’s kenotic theology. His point is that the whole Trinity is now involved in the Passion of Christ, or rather that it is the

¹³⁶ “Вся материя наша представлена в теле Христовом, вся эта окружающая нас видимая материя и земли и неба, до пределов вселенной, представлена в этом дивном теле, соединившемся с Божеством. И когда Христос возносится на небо, Он не только наше человечество, Он все видимое, всю видимую тварь вносит в глубины Божественной тайны, в недра Троичной, дивной Божественной действительности.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_68.htm

¹³⁷ “[...] Христос вознесся с изъязвленной, раненной нашим грехом плотью Своей и что каким-то непостижимым образом не только воскресший, но и вознесшийся Христос, вступивший в славу Божию, сидящий одесную Бога и Отца, несет на Своей человеческой плоти раны, которые Ему нанесены человеческим грехом. Он все еще несет на Своих плечах человеческую немощь, и Воскресение Христово, и страшная Страстная седмица сейчас как бы включены в тайну Троицкого Бога, Троицы Святой, непостижимой, великой. Вся скорбь земли, вся боль, весь ужас легли на Христа, но Он не сбросил их ни Воскресением, ни Вознесением Своим во славе. Христос остается Агнцем Божиим, до сотворения мира закланным за спасение мира.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, 136.

other way around: the Passion and Resurrection have been introduced into the life of the Triune God.

All major moments of Christ's life stress different elements of salvation. "The Crucifixion and the Resurrection *build* our salvation, in the same way as the Nativity, but the Transfiguration and the Ascension reveal to us the incredible depth of the relationship between God, the human being and the whole created world."¹³⁸ The following citation demonstrates how all the events in the life of Christ are presented in a kenotic context in AB's theology:

[In] the Gospel [...] concerning Christ there is not a single moment that speaks about glory or when His glory is presented outside the context of the cross. The first theophany – a vision of glory and witness about glory at the banks of the Jordan-river, when the Baptist testifies: Behold the Lamb of God who takes upon Himself, raises upon His shoulders the sin of the world. And then – descent of the Holy Spirit and the witness of God: *This is my Son, the Beloved* (John 1:29; Mt 3:16-17). The Lamb is the sacrifice. It is the same in the Transfiguration. The Gospel tells us that Elijah and Moses talk to Him about His future suffering, and suddenly He is shining with the uncreated light (Lk 9:29-43). The Entrance into Jerusalem and the future suffering are specifically foretold (John 12:12 and following).¹³⁹

AB emphasized the fact that the humility of Christ and the glory of God are merged together in the kenotic context of the major events in the life of Christ. The

¹³⁸ "Распятие и Воскресение *строят* наше спасение, так же как и Рождество, а Преображение и Вознесение являют нам невероятную глубину отношений между Богом и человеком, всем тварным миром." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy5.htm>

¹³⁹ "[В] Евангелии [...] по отношению ко Христу – нет ни единого момента, когда говорится о славе, является Его слава вне контекста креста. Первая теофания – видение славы и свидетельство о славе на Иордане-реке, когда Креститель свидетельствует: Вот Агнец Божий, Который берет на Себя, вздымает на Свои плечи грех мира. И тут – сошествие Святого Духа и свидетельство Божие: *Сын Мой возлюбленный* (Ин. 1,29; Мф. 3,16-17). Агнец – это жертва. То же самое в Преображении. Евангелие нам рассказывает, что Илия и Моисей говорят с Ним о грядущем Его страдании, и вдруг Он просиявает нетварным светом (Лк. 9,29-43). Вход Господень в Иерусалим – и грядущая страсть, о которой специально говорится (Ин. 12,12 и сл.)" Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом* (Moscow: Praktika, 2006), 84-85.

whole life of Christ is a revelation of the greatness of the human body. “He taught us that human dignity is so great that God can become a human, without humiliating Himself.”¹⁴⁰ At first glance, this statement seems to undercut AB’s kenoticism, but, in fact, this might explain why AB did not feel that he needed to deal with the problem of Christ having diminished Divine attributes, because for him human nature is so great that, in a sense, there is no necessity for God to limit Himself.

II.2. Persons of the New Testament in the Context of God-forsakenness

II.2.1. Kenotic Life of the Theotokos

In the theology of AB, the Theotokos plays a key role in the whole plan of salvation. Mary represents not only herself, but also the whole creation and the Church. On the one hand, her greatness is always united to Christ and is never separated from God and His salvific mission. On the other hand, she is a great example of the free response to God’s invitation in the mystery of God’s encounter with human beings. What makes AB’s thoughts on Mary special in the context of kenosis? It is AB’s references to Mary and to the Apostle John standing near the cross, especially regarding their personal faithfulness to God when the other Apostles, except John, abandoned Christ and fled from Him. AB presented the Theotokos as an example of complete trust in God. Mary, together with the Father, offered up the Son for the salvation of the world.

¹⁴⁰ “Он нас научил тому, что человеческое достоинство так велико, что Бог может стать человеком, не унизив Себя.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_11.htm

Although AB extolled the role of the Theotokos in the salvation of the human race and some statements were close to the notion of Co-Redemptrix, he never accepted this concept and did not use this title in his works.

In my research on the kenotic theology of AB, I am especially interested in the elements of Mary's life which are connected to this topic. AB gave a few talks on the Theotokos, but he also preached on several Marian feasts during the liturgical year. Using these talks and sermons, I will present his Mariology from a kenotic perspective.

AB, following the patristic Tradition, made a parallel between Adam-Christ and Eve-Mary. The name Eve (ζωή) means the one who brings life and she, like other women, brings natural life, but Mary is the one who brings to the world "eternal Life."¹⁴¹

All of history after Adam's sin served as a preparation for the Incarnation; all generations were gradually preparing the human body and soul of Christ for the Incarnation. This was a process of purification from sin. Every generation, in spite of human weakness, through the faithfulness of righteous people from the Old Testament, was purified to the level of Joachim and Anne in their sacrificial love for each other. Mary became the culminating moment of this process and the realization of all the faith of those who were longing for God in complete faith and obedience. She perfectly gave herself in all her purity and humility to God and became capable of becoming a dwelling place for Him. Mary was the final fulfillment of the purification, faithfulness and trust of entire generations.

¹⁴¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 837.

AB saw the cooperation between God and Mary as the perfect image for self-sacrifice from both sides. “This was the gift of self from God’s side and a complete self-offering on the part of the Mother of God.”¹⁴² Without the free will of both, the Incarnation wouldn’t be possible.¹⁴³ According to AB, Mary is not only the Theotokos, but she is also the human answer to God’s invitation, the realization of human freedom and the representation of the whole universe. “She is the one who is the response of the whole creation to the maker. It is God offering himself and the creation, in her person, accepting him, receiving him and worshipping him lovingly, freely and daringly.”¹⁴⁴

According to AB, the greatness of Mary lies not only in her role in the plan of salvation as the Theotokos, but the humility of her virginity. AB extended the meaning of virginity from the physical to spiritual: “Virginity is not only a psychosomatic state, virginity is a state of the spirit, and soul and body. It is as if it is given to us embryonically from birth and is preserved for some years but, at the same time, it is a task. Virginity is something into which one needs to grow; it is not only a given, it is one

¹⁴² Это был дар Себя со стороны Бога и всецелая отдача Себя со стороны Божией Матери. Ibid., 835; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Eve of Epiphany, 18 January, 1985*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_152.htm. AB’s emphasis on freedom could have come from existentialism, but it more likely came from his experience of being Orthodox.

¹⁴³ According to AB, the Incarnation wouldn’t be possible either without the Mother of God’s agreement or the positive will of the Father. This is a complete, free cooperation without any constraint. “Она не просто ‘орудие’ Воплощения. Она активно, действием совершенной веры и отдачи Себя сделала возможным для Жизни Вечной вступить в этот мир. Это – акт освящения, больший, чем что-либо, что может быть сделано человеческим действием. [She was not only an ‘instrument’ of the Incarnation. Through the act of perfect faith and self-sacrifice She actively made it possible for Eternal Life to enter in this world. This was an act of sacrifice, greater than anything that can be achieved through human activity.]” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 835, 851.

¹⁴⁴ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Mother of God: Sermon, Preached at the University Church of Great St Mary’s, Cambridge, on 19 May, 1985*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_15.htm

of the forms of sanctity.”¹⁴⁵ The goal of true virginity is to reach genuine freedom – to be completely and limitlessly open before God, to reach the purification of heart and soul.¹⁴⁶ But virginity in this sense cannot be reached without true humility,¹⁴⁷ understood as complete openness, defencelessness and vulnerability.¹⁴⁸

Christ has His Divinity from the Father, but from Mary He received humanity. Through her, God became related to all the materiality of the world, “everything beginning with the smallest atom and ending with the greatest galaxy can now recognize itself fulfilled, revealed in glory in the Body of Incarnation.”¹⁴⁹ The whole universe can recognize itself in the humanity of Christ and become a partaker of His human nature as the dwelling place of His Divinity. Through Christ’s Incarnation the greatness of matter and the human body was revealed. It is that they can contain God and can be united to

¹⁴⁵ “Девство – это не только душевно-телесное состояние, девство – это состояние и духа, и души, и тела; оно нам как бы зародышно дано при рождении и сохраняется в течение скольких-то лет; но вместе с этим, оно – задание; девство – это нечто, до чего надо дорасти; это не только данность, это одна из форм святости.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy7.htm>; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 150.

¹⁴⁶ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy7.htm>

¹⁴⁷ AB provides the following distinction of humility: “Humility is not a condition which we try to ape by saying that we are unworthy, that we are not as good as others imagine us to be - if they do. Humility is a condition of the earth, lying completely open and surrendered: the earth which is open to all actions, of mankind, of the rain, accepting the refuse and accepting the furrow and bringing fruit, surrendered, offered and given. This is the essence of humility and this is the kind of humility which we see in the Mother of God.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Mother of God*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_15.htm

¹⁴⁸ The same characteristics we can also see in the early life of Christ.

¹⁴⁹ Metropolitan Anthony Sourozh, *Nativity of Christ, 7 January, 1990*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_99.htm

Divinity, in her the realization of the words of St. Peter “to become partakers of divine nature” (2 Peter 1:14) are fulfilled.¹⁵⁰

According to AB, the Mother of God is “the perfect revelation of what the whole creation is called to be and to become.”¹⁵¹ Sometimes AB used the same words, but in reference to Christ.¹⁵² This can provoke the question of whether there is an inconsistency in the theology of AB over who is the perfect revelation: the Mother of God, Christ, or human nature in general? Since AB insisted that humanity is capable of containing God, and that Mary gave the perfect humanity to Christ, then we can conclude that humanity, given by Mary and accepted by Christ, is the perfect revelation of the potentiality of creation. Another question can also be posed: what made Mary so special that she became greater and holier than the angels?

AB’s Mariology highlighted two fundamental acts of service in Mary’s life: she sacrificed herself in body, soul, life and death, and she sacrificed her Son on Golgotha. According to AB, salvation began with the birth of Mary. “Today is the birth of the Mother of God, today is the beginning of the overcoming of division that existed between God and humans from the moment of the fall. Today is born the one who will

¹⁵⁰ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/prop/prop_14.htm

¹⁵¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Feasts of the Mother of God 7 November, 1972*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_45.htm

¹⁵² Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 151, 779; “Он для нас является в Церкви единственным до конца осуществленным видением того, что человек собой представляет, – Он и Пречистая Дева Богородица.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.mitrass.ru/besedy/besedy5.htm>

become the bridge between heaven and earth, the one who will become the door of the Incarnation, the door opening onto Heaven.”¹⁵³

The Virgin Mary was born without a shadow of human passion, without sin, “not because God used a miracle, as if acting unilaterally and purified Her from any sinfulness, but because the whole human race for millennia was being cleansed from generation to generation, preparing for God this vessel of Incarnation.”¹⁵⁴ AB did not accept the Latin teaching of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, but acknowledged her as a sinless person. Mary did not receive any special treatment from God, she was not preserved from sin because this would withdraw her from the human race. Instead, she became the fulfillment of human purification over the centuries, which was also exemplified by the pure life of her parents Joachim and Anne as an example of humanity preparing a place for God. The whole universe took part in this miracle and gave Her as a “gift of humanity to God so that He could become a human being.”¹⁵⁵

From her early years, according to Holy Tradition,¹⁵⁶ Mary grew up and matured in the Temple. AB doubted the historicity of the event of the Entrance of the Theotokos

¹⁵³ “Сегодня родилась Божия Матерь; сегодня начинается преодоление того разделения, которое существовало между Богом и человеком с момента падения; родилась Та, Которая станет Мостом между Небом и землей; Та, Которая станет Дверью Воплощения, дверью, раскрывающейся на Небо.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_31.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 800.

¹⁵⁴ “не потому, что Бог чудом, односторонне как бы действуя, Ее очистил от всякой греховности, а потому, что все человечество тысячелетиями очищалось из поколения в поколение, готовя Богу сосуд Воплощения.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 139. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 149, 990.

¹⁵⁵ “дар человечества Богу, чтобы Он мог стать человеком.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 140. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 780.

¹⁵⁶ AB referred to the Feast of Entry of the Mother of God to the Temple on Nov 21. The origin of this feast is based on the apocryphal Gospel of James, also known as the Protoevangelium of James, written about AD 150. The content of the Gospel presents Mary’s own unique birth, early years in the temple,

into the Holy of Holies, where only the High Priest could enter once a year after a ritual of purification by sacrificial blood. Since it was the place of the special presence of God, to stay there meant to be face to face with God. Mary reached “the maturity of a young child, but the maturity of one who can already worship, serve, lend an ear, be ready to respond and to obey. She chose all that and went into that depth of obedience, of listening, of attention to what was God’s will.”¹⁵⁷

AB brought a spiritual interpretation to this event, which, for him in this case, was more important than its historicity. “The Presentation of the Mother of God, apart from its historical features, is extolled by the Church because it indicates to us where she stands in the whole of Her¹⁵⁸ life, in the divine presence, in complete surrender, in complete adoration.”¹⁵⁹ Mary spiritually entered into a deeper relationship with God, in her own Holy of Holies, where she opened completely to Him.

Mary’s kenosis began with the Annunciation when Gabriel offered her the role of becoming the Mother of God. This required an examination of her faith and trust in God, because at that time if an unmarried girl had a child, she would be stoned to death. Thus in her agreement to accept God’s will one can discover her readiness to die. For

maturing, engangement with Joseph and virginal birth of Jesus. English translation, online, available:: <http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/infancyjames.html>

¹⁵⁷ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Feasts of the Mother of God 7 November, 1972*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_45.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 140.

¹⁵⁸ In this and other cases I reproduce AB’s use of capital letters for Mary.

¹⁵⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Feasts of the Mother of God 7 November, 1972*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_45.htm; Metropolitan Anthony Sourozh, *Nativity of Christ 7 January, 1990*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/inname/in_32.htm

AB, the greatness of this event lies not in God's initiative to become a human being, but in the human being agreeing to cooperate with God to such an extent.

But in the Annunciation, the joy is not only that the Lord turned to us with all His love, giving Himself with endless grace. Our joy is in this, that a human being was found, a Virgin from the people of Israel, who so loved God with her whole heart, mind, strength, and body, that She could reply to the Archangel's terrifying and wondrous good tidings: 'Here am I, the servant of the Lord; let it be with me according to your word' (Lk 1:38). In her person the whole of humanity gave itself to God, the whole of humanity opened itself to God and said: Come! Let it be to me according to Your will!¹⁶⁰

The event of the Annunciation contains joy and sadness at the same time. On the one hand, the news of God's unity with the world and on the other, this news contains the future tragedy of the cross. In the Annunciation, the self-sacrifice is not only on God's part, but also on the part of the Mother of God. Her role is not a passive acceptance of God's will, but an active readiness to live life for Christ. "Divine Love, crucified, salvific love brought the Son of God into the world of death, and the promise of the Angel to the Pure Theotokos that the Savior of the world, was being born, meant for her, at the same time, that the Divine Son born from Her, through His blood, deadly passion and through His death itself, the incomprehensible, impossible death of the incarnate Word, would save the world."¹⁶¹ This is another element of Mary's kenosis in

¹⁶⁰ "Но в Благовещении радость не только о том, что к нам обратился Господь всей Своей любовью, отдает Себя нам безграничной лаской. Радость наша о том, что нашелся человек, Дева из народа Израильского, Которая так возлюбила Бога всем сердцем, всей мыслью, всей крепостью, всей плотью Своей, что Она могла сказать Архангелу в ответ на его страшное и дивное благовестие: *се, раба Господня, да будет мне по слову твоему* (Лк 1:38). В ее лице все человечество отдало себя Богу, все человечество открылось Богу и сказало: *прииди! И да будет мне по воле Твоей!*" Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 574.

¹⁶¹ "Любовь Божественная, крестная, спасительная любовь привела Сына Божия в мир смерти, и обещание Ангела Пречистой Богородице о том, что родится Спаситель мира, значило для Нее в то же время, что рожденный от Нее Божественный Сын кровью Своей и мукой смертной и самой смертью, непостижимой, невозможной смертью воплощенного Слова, спасет мир." Metropolitan

the event of the Annunciation: Mary had to let her Son be sacrificed. Stressing the role of Mary in the plan of salvation, AB wanted to show that salvation is not a one-sided act of God, but is based on co-operation between God and the human being, represented in the Theotokos.

The events surrounding the birth of Christ are also filled with kenotic elements: no place to stay, the birth in a manger, loneliness and abandonment, fear of being killed by Herod, and the escape to Egypt. The fate of Christ became the fate of Mary and Joseph. “Loneliness – that terrible, burning, murderous loneliness that consumes the hearts of so many people, was the fate of the All Pure Theotokos, Joseph the Betrothed, and the newborn Christ. He was an alien, a stranger, unwanted by anyone, excluded and thrown away.”¹⁶² But in all the trials, God was present as sacrificial love, as a vulnerable child, dependent on His parents.

The kenosis and sacrifice of Mary become clearer in the event of the Encounter.¹⁶³ AB considered two great moments of Mary’s sacrifices. The first one is when Mary brought Jesus to the temple. It was a custom in Jewish tradition to bring the first-born male child as a sacrifice for God, to be dedicated to Him.¹⁶⁴ In the Old

Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_95.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 972.

¹⁶² “Одиночество – страшное, жгучее, убийственное одиночество, которое снедает сердца стольких людей, было долей Пречистой Девы Богородицы, Иосифа Обручника и только что родившегося Христа. Он был чужой, никем не желанный, исключенный и выброшенный.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_04.htm

¹⁶³ The feast of the Presentation in the Temple (The Encounter or Meeting of the Lord), Feb 2. Cf. Luke 2:22-39.

¹⁶⁴ This feast reminded the Jews of the escape from Egypt, when God killed all the first-born children in Egypt for the salvation of Israel, and the pharaoh let them go (Exodus 12:29-32). As the ransom for their death, every first-born male had to be brought to the temple and only God had the right over the life or

Testament, in place of their child, the parents would bring vicarious sacrifices – a sheep, or if parents were poor, turtle doves. This was the only time God accepted the actual sacrifice of her child from a woman of Israel, Mary, in the person of His Son, later on Golgotha. This was the second great moment of her sacrifice. This is where AB makes a connection between the cross of Christ, God-forsakenness, and the kenosis of Mary.

He died a redemptive death in the sense that He died at human hands, because He was standing for God against everyone and everything, and He died the human death of ordinary, common people, in the terrible moment when He cried: My God, My God! Why have you forsaken Me? (Мк 15:34). He partook and shared the tragic fate of a humanity that had lost God. He died from humanity's loss of God. And the Mother of God was standing there without a word of protest.¹⁶⁵

And:

She knew that what was taking place on the cross was what She did when She brought this child into the temple, [the sacrifice of] the first-born male child.¹⁶⁶

Mary's sacrifice was not a symbolic gesture, but a real one, because she, as a mother, gave her Son up to death on the cross. Simeon's prophecies to Mary about a

death of the child. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy8.htm>

¹⁶⁵ Он умер искупительной смертью в том смысле, что Он умер от руки человеческой, потому что Он стоял за Бога против всех и всего, и Он умер смертью людей, нормальных, обыкновенных людей, в страшное мгновение, когда Он воскликнул: Боже Мой! Боже Мой! Зачем Ты Меня оставил? (Мк 15:34), приобщаясь, разделяя трагическую судьбу человечества, потерявшего Бога. Он умер от потери Бога всем человечеством. И Матерь Божия стояла там без единого слова протеста. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 852, 577; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Lord's Entry into Jerusalem*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_63.htm

¹⁶⁶ “Она знала, что на кресте совершается то, что Она совершила, когда принесла этого ребенка в храм, первенца мужского пола. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy7.htm>; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.mitrar.ru/inname/in_34.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 461; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Пути христианской жизни*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/pouty/crestny.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 67, 416.

sword that would pierce her heart (Lk 2:35) are fulfilled and she experienced such pain and sufferings as no one else on earth.¹⁶⁷

Another important event in the life of Mary, in the context of her faith, is the wedding in Cana (Jn 2:1-11). AB treated this event in a messianic sense with a special emphasis on Mary's faith. In the dialogue between Jesus and Mary, she did not reply to His question: "Woman, what concern is that to you and to me?" but instead, with full faith in her Son as God, "the Theotokos without replying to Him, initiates the Kingdom by showing complete faith in Him, and the words that lay in Her heart from the very beginning, from the Annunciation, bear fruit in rich and sacred soil, and She sees in the Son what He really is: the Word of God."¹⁶⁸ Mary did not use her authority as mother over a son, but instead appealed to Him as God. It was Mary's same faith that allowed Him to become incarnate. "God encounters the Creature who committed herself to Him completely, who opened herself and believed in Him completely. He can act freely, not forcing nature, sovereignly because He is in His domain."¹⁶⁹ Through the act of Mary's faith in God's love for humanity, He could freely enter and act, because a human being

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 968; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.mitr.ru/lubov/lub_vse_82.htm

¹⁶⁸ "Богородица, не отвечая Ему, устанавливает Царство тем, что проявляет полную веру в Него, и слова, которые Она слагала в сердце с самого начала, с Благовещения, приносят плод на богатой и святой почве, и Она видит в Сыне то, что Он на самом деле есть: Слово Божие." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 896; Cf. Ibid., 492; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 144-145.

¹⁶⁹ "Бог встречает Создание, до конца Ему предавшееся, открывшееся, до конца верящее в Него. Он может действовать свободно, не насилуя природу, царственно, потому что Он в Своей области." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 896; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/muzhestvo.htm>

opened the door.¹⁷⁰ AB considered the wedding in Cana to be an image of the Mystical Supper opened in advance by Mary. “This Mystical Supper is like an icon and a foretaste of the sacrament of unity between God and humanity, and among human beings themselves, that will be fulfilled at the end of time. Here the Mother of God played a decisive role because she was the One whose faith made this miracle possible. Christ responded to Her faith.”¹⁷¹

The culmination of Mary’s kenosis is the crucifixion of her Son, Jesus Christ. All previous events only prepared for this one. “Silently, as she had during her whole life, She stood at a distance, participating in His tragic ascent to the cross – the Mother of God who accepted the good tidings at the Annunciation, but also accepted, in silence, the prophecies of Simeon about the sword that would pierce Her heart (Cf. Lk 2:35).”¹⁷²

God the Father and Mary both sacrificed Christ for the salvation of the people. “The Mother of God is an icon of the God and Father because both are giving their

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 942; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Воскресные проповеди* (Minsk: Minskiĭ kafedralnyi Sviato-Dukhov sobor, 1996), online, available: <http://www.mitrass.ru/sermons/serm4.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_7.htm

¹⁷¹ “Эта Тайная вечеря является как бы иконой и предначинанием таинства единства Бога и человека, людей между собой, которое совершится в конце времен. Здесь Божия Матерь сыграла решающую роль, потому что Она – Та, Чья вера сделала возможным чудо. Христос отозвался на Ее веру.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 146.

¹⁷² “Она молчаливо, как в течение всей Своей жизни, стояла поодаль, соучаствовала в Его трагическом восхождении ко Кресту – Божия Матерь, Которая приняла Благовестие, но также приняла, безмолвно, пророческое слово Симеона о том, что и Ей пройдет меч через сердце (ср. Лк 2:35).” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 974. Cf. Ibid., 968; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Lord’s Entry into Jerusalem*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_63.htm

beloved Son, their only-begotten Son over to death so that others might live.”¹⁷³ Mary’s kenosis reached the culmination point when she allowed her Son to die and she was dying with Him. AB turned to her personal experience as mother to illustrate the experience she was going through: “How can we not understand what the Mother of God could experience in the face of Judas’s betrayal, Peter’s denial, the disciples’ fleeing, the false witness against Her Son, the unjust trial, the mockery and beatings, and finally the crucifixion of the Savior Christ?”¹⁷⁴ Referring to Mary as mother, AB presented her faithfulness as an example for Christians to follow:

[T]he way in which the Mother of God stood by the Cross and said not a word in defense of her divine son who was dying there. She did not accuse those who had condemned him. She did not turn aggressively against the people who, with curiosity or indifference, were surrounding the Cross. She said nothing. She accepted the death of her son with the same perfection of faith and surrender which she had shown when she accepted the Incarnation. This applies to all of us. The Mother of God, in this respect, should be for us an image and an example.¹⁷⁵

Here we can see the greatness of the Theotokos, her faithfulness, humility, love, co-suffering and co-dying with Her Only-begotten Son. Perhaps overstating somewhat, AB distanced himself from the Western presentation of Mary: “The Mother of God was

¹⁷³ “Божия Матерь как икона Бога и Отца, Оба отдающие Своего возлюбленного, едиnorodного Сына на смерть, чтобы другие могли жить.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 143, 147.

¹⁷⁴ “Как нам не понять, что может переживать Божия Матерь перед лицом предательства Иуды, отречения Петра, бегства учеников, лжесвидетельства на Сына Ее, суда несправедного, осмеяния, избияния – и наконец, крестной смерти Спасителя Христа?” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Воскресные проповеди*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/sermons/serm2.htm>

¹⁷⁵ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Suffering and Death of Children: Talk to The Society of the Child Jesus in November 1971*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_14.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_69.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd28.htm

standing at the foot of the cross not in tears, as it is presented in Western art, but as reaching such full unity with Her Son that there was nothing for her to oppose. She was going through the crucifixion together with Christ; She was experiencing Her own death. The Mother was finishing what She began on the day when She brought Christ to the temple, when She offered Her Son.”¹⁷⁶ In AB’s understanding, co-dying with Christ did not mean separation from Christ, but rather the opposite, unity with Him.¹⁷⁷

She was burying the Son without a word of protest, in complete silence and heroic simplicity. “She stood silent, at one with the divine and human will of her son: she was fulfilling the offering which she had begun thirty-three or so years before. She was at one with the will of God, at one with the will of her divine son, renouncing her own will, her own hopes, in an act of offering.”¹⁷⁸ AB made a connection between Mary standing at the foot of the cross and the Incarnation. “Christ dies and they take him down from the cross. And now the Mother of God again takes Him in Her embrace. Again, He

¹⁷⁶ “У подножия Креста Матерь Божия стояла не в слезах, как часто изображается в западной живописи; Она достигла такой полноты единения со Своим Сыном, что Ей нечему было противиться. Она проходила через распятие вместе со Христом; Она переживала собственную смерть. Мать завершала то, что начала в день принесения Христа во храм, когда Она отдала Своего Сына.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Молитва и жизнь*, trans. from English by T. Maidanovich, (Riga: Balto-slavianskoe obshchestvo kul’turnogo razvitiia i sotrudnichestva, 1992), online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/mol_jizn/life1.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 416, 428.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Ibid., 428.

¹⁷⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Mother of God*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_15.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_88.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 779; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy7.htm>

is lying in Her lap, just as He lay as a child, foreordained to die.”¹⁷⁹ Nor did Mary know about the Resurrection. “She was burying not only Her Son, but all hope in God’s victory, all hope in eternal life.”¹⁸⁰

Christ’s aloneness and abandonment became Mary’s experience, as Christ remained faithful to the Father and to the people. Christ took care of His Mother, while hanging on the cross, by placing Mary under John’s care, while she “stood in silence and contemplated this mystery, this dual mystery of the dying Christ and the silent co-dying Mother who offered Her Son in sacrifice.”¹⁸¹ In his homilies and sermons, he referred to the *Lamentation of the Theotokos*¹⁸² and to the irmos in the 9th ode of the canon in the matins of the Holy Saturday – “Weep not for me, O Mother, as you see in the tomb the Son...”¹⁸³ It seems that AB was inspired by the liturgical texts of Holy Saturday, but interpreted these texts in his own way. In the *Lamentation of the Theotokos* and other Byzantine hymnography Mary is presented in an emotional way, but AB stressed instead

¹⁷⁹ “И Христос умирает, и Его снова снимают со креста. И Божья Матерь теперь снова Его берет в объятия, Он снова лежит у Нее на коленях, как Он лежал Младенцем, предназначенным к смерти.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 147.

¹⁸⁰ “Она хоронила не только Сына Своего, но всякую надежду на победу Божию, всякую надежду на вечную жизнь.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_95.htm

¹⁸¹ “безмолвно стоял и созерцал эту тайну, эту двойную тайну умирающего Христа и безмолвно соумирающей Матери, приносящей в жертву Своего Сына.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 416, Cf. Ibid., 67.

¹⁸² The author of the “Lamentation of the Theotokos” (written in the tenth century) is Simeon the Logothete. *The Lenten Triodion*, 617-621.

¹⁸³ “Weep not for me, O Mother, beholding in the sepulcher the Son whom thou hast conceived without seed in thy womb. For I shall rise and shall be glorified, and as God I shall exalt in everlasting glory those who magnify thee with faith and love.” Ibid., 651.

her silent and emotionless acceptance of her Son's cross. This is another example of AB's "loose" interpretation of the liturgical texts.

The same "loose" interpretation AB applied to the appearance of the risen Christ to His Mother. In the Scriptures, we do not find any passages related to the special appearing of the risen Christ to Mary, but AB affirms that Christ appeared to her. "After His Resurrection, Christ appeared to His disciples and to his Mother."¹⁸⁴ Another unusual thought for an Orthodox theologian is his interpretation of the feast and icon of Pentecost. Certainly the reason for the iconographic tradition depicting Mary among the Apostles on that day is that earlier in the text Acts refers to her presence in the upper room after the Ascension (Acts 1:14). In AB's analysis of the icon, he considered it unnecessary to present Mary in the icon with a flaming fire over her head. According to AB, Mary was not present during the descent of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles because she did not need it.

According to the teaching of the Church, the Mother of God was not there at this moment, and this was no accident. You see what seems to be so important to me, why do I mention this? She did not need the descent of the Holy Spirit to understand and accept everything. The Holy Spirit descended upon Her, the Virgin of unshakable faith, unshaken in her faithfulness when the archangel Gabriel announced to Her the Incarnation of Christ. [...] She was already filled with the Holy Spirit, while the disciples were the ones who needed this gift.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁴ "После Своего Воскресения Христос явился Своим ученикам и Матери." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 147. It is not clear what AB's particular source for this claim was, but there is a long standing tradition in East and West of the risen Christ appearing to His mother.

¹⁸⁵ "По учению Церкви Божия Матерь не была там в тот момент, и не случайно. И вот что мне кажется таким важным, почему я упоминаю об этом: Она не нуждалась в сошествии Святого Духа для того, чтобы все понять, все воспринять. Дух Святой сошел на Нее, Деву непоколебимой веры, неколеблющейся верности, когда архангел Гавриил Ей возвестил рождение Христово [...] Она уже была преисполнена Святого Духа, ученики нуждались в этом даре." *Ibid.*, 147-148.

This statement relates to the point made earlier about Mary's sinless life.

According to AB, she did not require any special or individual purification to be able to accept God in her womb, because previous generations and her parents, through their pious lives, prepared the one who became the throne for God.

The final event in Mary's life was her death. Mary, as the example of a perfect follower of Christ, had to go through all the stages that her own Son experienced. She died as He died, as all people die, but "She did not die in the way we die, in the sense that She was already filled with eternity, She was united with God, filled with the Holy Spirit."¹⁸⁶ Although she had to experience death, on the third day, according to the faith of the Orthodox Church, when the Apostles opened the tomb, because the Apostle Thomas was late, her body was not there.¹⁸⁷ She was taken up to heaven not only with the soul, but also with her body. "She had risen because the bonds of death could not hold Her, and corruption could not touch a body which had been the body of the Incarnation."¹⁸⁸ Before Christ's death, death was a loss of God and a descent into Hades; after His Resurrection, however, death is dormition, "falling asleep." She rose from the dead by the power of Her Only-begotten Son, "whom She brought into the world by

¹⁸⁶ "Она умерла не так, как мы умираем, в том смысле, что Она уже была преисполнена вечности, Она была едина с Богом, преисполнена Духа Святого." Ibid., 148; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Take-leaving: 2 September 1990*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_83.htm

¹⁸⁷ Protoevangelium of James, online, available: <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0847.htm>

¹⁸⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Dormition of the Mother of God: 28 August, 1986*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_132.htm

faith, purity and sanctity.”¹⁸⁹ Her death became the beginning of the general Resurrection.

AB compared the sacrifice of Mary at the foot of the cross with the sacrifice that a Christian community, with a priest, offers to God in the Eucharist. “Christ, the High Priest of the whole creation, and the Mother of God together with Him, bring the sacrifice by an act that I consider to be a genuine act of priestly service.”¹⁹⁰ AB distinguished between the role of the royal priesthood of the community from the service of the priests. All are called to self-sacrifice, but the role of a priest is “Christ’s ministry and, in theological terminology, the intercessory role of Christ’s sacrifice before God, bringing the redeeming act of Christ to God as the foundation for renewing the created world.”¹⁹¹ This was the role that Mary assumed in her life, as the second Eve, by which she brought to the world Eternal Life. “She [...] was the great High Priest of our salvation, together with the Lord, Jesus Christ, with Whom She was united with one will, one intention and with Whom She acknowledged one act.”¹⁹² It really points to a

¹⁸⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_35.htm

¹⁹⁰ “Христос, Первосвященник всей твари, и Матерь Божья вместе с Ним приносит жертву действием, которое мне представляется подлинно актом священнического служения.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 779.

¹⁹¹ “служение Христа и, в богословской терминологии, заступническая роль жертвы Христовой перед Богом, принесение спасительного подвига Христова Богу как основания для обновления тварного мира.” Ibid., 851.

¹⁹² “Она [...] была великим Первосвященником нашего спасения, вместе с Господом Иисусом Христом, с Которым Она была едина волей, едина намерением и с Которым Она исповедовала единое действие.” Ibid., 852. AB used this argument in the context of the role of women in the Church. AB was open to the discussion of the ordination of women to the priesthood in the Orthodox Church, but his main concern was that this topic was not well studied and neither side has enough arguments to support or contradict this idea. Cf. Ibid., 852-853.

very high Mariology, which is something that is related to both anthropology and Christology.

The practical dimension of the role Mary plays in the Church lies in prayer. AB, in sermons and talks on Mary, referred to examples of her faith, humility, hope and love, and most of these were connected to the event that took place at the cross. Christ died on the cross because of human sin and everyone is responsible for Christ's cross and death. "Everyone of us lost God, lost access to Him, lost access to one's brother, to one's neighbor. [...] For this reason the Son of God became the Son of Man, to close the abyss that sin creates between human beings and God, to close the abyss that separates person from person."¹⁹³ According to AB, Christ would have become incarnate and die even if only one person had committed a sin.¹⁹⁴

AB gave an example of intercessory prayer to Mary in her role as a mother: "Mother, through my sins, through the falsehood of my life and my separation from God, I am responsible for the death of your Son on the cross and for the terrible hours in the garden of Gethsemane, for all his mockery He endured and for all His sufferings. Mother, if you forgive me and will become my intercessor, then *no one* will condemn me and no one will reject me."¹⁹⁵ For AB this is a reason to trust and love Mary, who

¹⁹³ "каждый из нас потерял Бога, потерял доступ к Нему, потерял доступ к своему брату, к своему ближнему. [...] Для того сделался Сын Божий Сыном человеческим, чтобы закрыть эту пропасть, которую грех создает между человеком и Богом, чтобы закрыть бездну, которая отделяет человека от человека." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_71.htm

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 408.

¹⁹⁵ "Мать, я – своими грехами, неправдой своей жизни, отдаленностью своей от Бога ответственен за крестную смерть Сына Твоего, и за страшные часы Гефсиманского сада, за все поругание и за все страдание Его. Мать, если Ты простишь и Заступницей станешь моей – *никто* меня не осудит, никто меня не отвергнет." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online,

gave her Son to die without a word of complaint, in full sacrifice. AB expresses here poetically: “If the Mother asks to forgive, there is none who can refuse mercy.”¹⁹⁶

Mary plays a very important role in the kenotic theology of AB. Her personal openness to God and readiness to cooperate with Him to the end made it possible for God to become incarnate. Her greatness is not only in her role as Mother of God, but also as the perfect example of a virgin for Christians to follow. As we can see, her faith, love, humility and trust did not keep her from suffering. She had to experience everything that her Son experienced during His life. For AB, her personal co-sacrificing with the Father, and co-suffering and co-dying with Christ seems to put her on the same level with God, but AB as stated before, never acknowledged Mary as a Co-Redemptrix in the sense that her sufferings had the same value in the salvation of the world as the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ. Rather, it had value in her personal kenosis as Mother and as an example for Christians. On the other hand, AB stressed the greatness of human nature and matter as one that can receive God (Богоприимная). In stressing the role of Mary, he pointed out the great value of the human person as an active partner with God in the plan of salvation.

Mary’s personal forsakenness is united with the forsakenness of her Son dying on the cross. As Christ, who became faithful to the Father and to the people that

available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_69.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 408.

¹⁹⁶ “Потому что если Мать просит простить, то никто не имеет права отказать в помиловании.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_73.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/muzhestvo.htm>

abandoned Him, so Mary also became faithful and, in deep silence and humility, accepted the will of God. As we can see in AB's kenotic theology, Mary's whole life, beginning from the Annunciation, was directed towards the cross of Christ. The prophecy of Simeon about the sword that would pierce her side is fulfilled (cf. Lk 2:35).

II.2.2. John the Baptist

In his sermons and talks, AB referred to the life of John the Baptist in the contexts of the desert, the baptism of Christ in the Jordan, and John's imprisonment. In what follows, I will present the reflections of AB on John the Baptist's personal kenotic experience and the sense of abandonment according to AB. The kenotic life of John doesn't have a direct connection to the God-forsakenness of Christ on the cross, but AB links it to the kenotic event of the baptism of Christ and to the experience of abandonment.

According to AB, John spent thirty years in the wilderness preparing himself for the mission to be the Forerunner. He spent these years in complete solitude and emptiness, face to face with God, in order to become one with the will of God and the voice of God in the desert (Mk 1:3). "He so identified with his vocation, with who he was and what he was, that it was no longer a human being who was saying words about God, but it was God's own resounding voice."¹⁹⁷ We can see here some similarity with

¹⁹⁷ "Он настолько отождествился со своим призванием, с тем, кто он был и чем он был, что речь уже не шла о том, что человек говорит слова, относящиеся к Богу, – это был голос Божий звучащий." Ibid., 201. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_72.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Войду в дом твой*

the way AB viewed the life of Mary, who identified Herself with God and became the Mother of God. John, like Mary, sacrificed and submitted his life completely to God. John's preaching became God's voice. AB compared John's self-sacrifice with a well-tuned musical instrument, "on which the genius composer or performer can play in such a way that we notice neither the instrument, nor the composer, nor the performer, but only feel the penetrating experience to which the sounds of the melody gives birth."¹⁹⁸

The main message of John's preaching was repentance, and those who came to him and confessed their sins were baptized and liberated from their sins. The first kenotic element we can see is in his role as the Forerunner of Christ. John identified Christ in the following way: "This is the Lamb of God, Who will take upon Himself the cross of the world, the sin of the world, the weight of the world."¹⁹⁹ For his followers and disciples, it was also a tragic moment because they realized that someone more important was coming after John. "He must increase, but I must decrease" (John 3:30). So they had to leave John and follow Jesus, because of John's testimony: "It's Him."²⁰⁰

Curiously, AB omitted, from his reflections on the life of John the Baptist, the dialogue between John and Christ, a dialogue that can be considered as kenotic (see Mt 3:14-16). John humbled himself by baptizing Christ. I think that AB may have

(Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994), online, available: <http://mitras.ru/voidu/voidu2.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_31.htm

¹⁹⁸ "на котором гениальный композитор или исполнитель может играть так, что уже не замечаешь ни инструмента, ни композитора, ни исполнителя – только пронизываешься тем переживанием, какое рождает в тебе звучащая мелодия." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 555-556.

¹⁹⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Воскресные проповеди*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/sermons/serm4.htm>

²⁰⁰ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О встрече* (Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994), online, available: http://mitras.ru/sretenie/sret_vstrech.htm

deliberately chosen to omit this and rather to stress another kenotic element: the symbolic meaning of water, heavy with sins, that Christ descended into and accepted upon Himself.

To underline the kenosis of John, AB also used the words John spoke about himself: “I am the bridegroom’s friend.”

In antiquity, both Jewish and pagan, the groom had a friend who took care of everything for the marriage and, after the marriage ceremony, he led the bride and groom to the marriage chamber, and remained outside the door on guard so that no one could interrupt their deep and mysterious encounter in the wonder of marital love. He was a friend because he was able to stay outside the door, remain outside the boundary.²⁰¹

John the Baptist was able to step back and to make a place for God and did not anticipate any reward. AB used John the Baptist’s life as an example for Christians to follow. “Everyone among us is so often in some sense relating to others as the Forerunner of the Lord, the one, whom the Lord sent beforehand to bring the word and the way of life to people, the one who would prepare them to understand and accept Christ.”²⁰²

The most kenotic moment in John’s life was his imprisonment. He was aware of his coming death and he sent his disciples to ask Jesus if he was the Messiah or whether

²⁰¹ “В древности, еврейской как и языческой, у жениха был друг, который заботился обо всем для брака, и который после совершения брака приводил к брачной комнате невесту и жениха, оставался за дверью и сторожил, чтобы никто не прервал их глубокой, таинственной встречи в дивной брачной любви. Он был другом, потому что умел остаться за дверью, остаться за пределом.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_68.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_15.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 499, 556-557.

²⁰² “Каждый из нас в каком-то смысле по отношению к окружающим является так часто предтечей Господним, тем, кого Господь послал впереди Себя, чтобы принести людям слово и образ жизни, который приготовил бы их понять Христа, принять Христа.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_15.htm

we should expect another (Mt 11:2). AB did not resolve this contradiction of how it was possible for John to have witnessed to Christ on the banks of the Jordan and then to have doubts overwhelm him. “If it is really you then all the sacrifices of my youth, all the years in the wilderness, all the hatred I was surrounded by; the coming of death, my diminishing in order that you might grow, is a blessedness; but if it is not you then I have lost my life, I have lived and I shall die in vain. Here again the prophet received the reply of the prophet, but no word of consolation.”²⁰³ Christ did not reply directly to John’s question. “Christ did not take away from him the fullness of the struggle of faith and the struggle of faithfulness until the end. Christ replied to the question of his disciples: *Go and tell John what you hear and see: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, [...] and the poor have good news brought to them. And blessed is anyone who takes no offense at me [(Mt 11:5-6)].*”²⁰⁴ John had to return to his own heart, to the experience he had in the wilderness and to become faithful unto death.²⁰⁵

²⁰³ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *I Believe in God*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_04.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 469-470.

²⁰⁴ “Христос не отнимает у него полноты подвига веры и подвига верности до конца. Вопрошающим Его ученикам Христос говорит: Скажите Иоанну, что вы видите, – слепые видят, хромы ходят, нищие благовествуют; блажен тот, кто не соблазнится о Мне...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_68.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_4.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_72.htm; Ibid., http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_71.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy8.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/muzhestvo.htm>; Ibid., <http://mitras.ru/molitva/modern.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 318-319; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 894.

²⁰⁵ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_68.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 566.

AB identified some practical application for Christians facing loneliness and emptiness from the kenotic experience of John.

Sometimes it happens when those closest to us leave and emptiness surrounds us. It happens when we are touched by illness and then, even if we are surrounded with care, we feel loneliness because we are facing death. [...] Sometimes we ourselves withdraw in order to come to ourselves – and then we know how it is difficult to stay one on one with oneself, if you are not used to it. It becomes frightening. At that moment our inner emptiness is opened up to our own gaze, and it is precisely into this emptiness, this desert that we must enter. It will be lonely and empty there, it will be difficult to live, but only if we can live in that desert with God alone, can we then return to people and never lose God, and we are more capable of overcoming ourselves, overcoming everything.²⁰⁶

One might view the whole life of John as filled with self-sacrifice. According to the scriptural witness in the wilderness he spent almost his whole life preparing for the mission to be the Forerunner. The scriptures suggest that he became so close to God that through him and his preaching people heard the voice of God and repented of their sins. He manifested humility when he saw Jesus Christ, but the true kenosis he experienced was in prison, when his death was close at hand and doubts came upon him. Christ demanded unlimited faith from him and John died faithful to his vocation. Following AB's train of thought we can acknowledge John's experience as one of forsakenness by God.

²⁰⁶ “Бывает это, когда нас оставляют ближние, когда делается вокруг нас пусто. Бывает это, когда нас тронет болезнь, и тогда, как бы ни были мы окружены заботой, мы чувствуем, что мы одиноки, потому что мы стоим теперь перед лицом жизни и смерти. [...] Бывает, что мы удалимся сами, для того чтобы прийти в себя, – и тогда мы знаем, как трудно бывает остаться одному с самим собой, если к этому не привык. Делается боязно; тогда открывается перед нашим собственным взором внутренняя наша пустота, и в эту пустоту, в эту пустыню нам надлежит войти. Там будет одиноко, там будет пусто, там будет трудно жить, но только если мы сумеем жить в этой пустыне, с Богом Одним, сможем мы вернуться к людям, никогда не теряя Бога и способными, победив себя, победить все.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_yse_68.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_4.htm

II.2.3. Apostles: Both Forsaken and Forsaking the Lord

In the previous examples of Christ, Mary, and John the Forerunner, we can see forsakenness by God as the common element in AB's kenotic theology. With the Apostles the perspective will be a bit different, because according to AB's kenotic theology, they were forsaken by God, but at the same time they were the ones who had forsaken Christ. Also, I will present the betrayal by Judas as the counter-example of God-forsakenness.

AB distinguished between the experience of the Apostles before Christ's Resurrection and their experience after Pentecost when they received the Holy Spirit. Before Christ's Passion James and John asked Jesus to take their seats in His glory, but His reply was about future sufferings and the cross. "He asked them: *Are you able to drink the cup that I drink?* Are you ready to immerse yourselves in this horror in which I will be immersed? ... And when they replied: 'Yes!' – He said to them: 'You will be drinking the cup I drink, you will be the participants of my passion' (Mk 10:35-40)."²⁰⁷ It seems that their readiness to be participants in Christ's Passion was too quick and they did not understand the coming events. According to AB, only one Apostle, Thomas, was ready to die with Jesus. When Lazarus was sick and Jesus heard about this, He desired to return to Jerusalem to visit him. The Apostles answered that it was dangerous because the Jews wanted to stone Him. Only Thomas said: "Let us also go, that we may die with

²⁰⁷ "Он их спросил: Готовы ли вы пить Мою чашу? Готовы ли вы погрузиться в тот ужас, в который Я буду погружен?.. И когда они ответили; 'Да!', – Он им сказал: 'Вы будете пить Мою чашу, будете участниками Моей страсти' (Mk 10:35-40)." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/h_d/hd26.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 462, 907.

Him” (John 11:16). AB provided the following interpretation: “He [Thomas] was prepared not only to be His disciple in words, not only to follow Him as one follows a teacher, but to die with Him as one dies with a friend and, if necessary, for a friend.”²⁰⁸

Holy Friday for the Apostles was the final day of their life because all hope was buried with the death of Christ and they experienced His death as their own. “The death of Christ was for them not only the death of the Master, the death of a friend; it was the death of the One, in Whom was their life, Who contained the words of eternal life. With His death *the life* died out, and they could only continue to *survive*.”²⁰⁹ Here we can see the kenosis and God-forsakenness of the Apostles.

But the Apostles were also the ones who abandoned Christ and fled from Him. In the Garden of Gethsemane, Jesus took three Apostles and asked them to keep vigil. Three times He came to get support from them and three times He found them asleep. The Apostles did not think about Christ, but only about themselves and when Judas approached with the soldiers, they fled and left Christ alone.

²⁰⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *St. Thomas Sunday: April 30, 1995*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_167.htm. The issue of Thomas later doubting the Resurrection of Christ relates to AB’s interpretation of the change in the Apostles at the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost: “[W]hen he [Thomas] looked at them, he saw them rejoicing in what they had seen, rejoicing that Christ was not dead, rejoicing that Christ was alive, rejoicing that victory had been won. Yet, when he looked at them he saw no difference in them. These were the same men, only full of joy instead of fear. And Thomas said: Unless I see, unless I probe the Resurrection, I cannot believe you.” Ibid., online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_65.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 695-696; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 30, 328, 579; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy12.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином: Беседы* (Elektrostal: Molva, 2000), online, available: http://mitras.ru/be/be_2.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_101.htm

²⁰⁹ “[С]мерть Христа была для них не только смертью Учителя, смертью Друга; это была смерть Того, в Ком была их жизнь, Кто обладал словами вечной жизни. С Его смертью погасла на земле жизнь, и им оставалось только продолжать существовать.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy10.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/soul_put/put_7.htm

The renunciation of Peter is another example of the forsaking of Christ by an Apostle. Other Apostles fled, but Peter had openly renounced Christ. After the Resurrection, with the three questions addressed to Peter on whether he loved Him, Christ healed the wholeness that had been destroyed by the renunciation. “Peter stood there, forgiven; Christ did not judge him, He did not reject him, He did not ask him, ‘Have you repented of your denial?’ Because Peter was there, among the others, because Peter was one of His own but with a broken heart, with a searing memory of betrayal – he was received.”²¹⁰ AB thought that it was the glance of Jesus (Lk 22:61) at Peter, which saved him from the act that Judas did to himself.²¹¹

For AB the denial of St. Peter and the betrayal of Judas are on the same level, but with different consequences. Peter did not lose hope, but kept trusting in Christ. Judas, on the other hand, focused on the sin he had committed, and could not believe in forgiveness. “Judas realized what he committed; he saw that his betrayal was irreparable: Christ was condemned and died. But he did not recall what the Lord had revealed about Himself and His Eternal Father; he did not understand that God would not betray him as he had betrayed his God. He lost all hope, and went and hanged

²¹⁰ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Veneration of Saint Peter's Chains 29th January, 1989*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.org.ru/eng/eng_52.htm. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Радость покаяния*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/pokayanie/pokayanie.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy3.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/soul_put/put_3.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_30.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/h_d/hd28.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_69.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 309.

²¹¹ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_69.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Пути христианской жизни*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/pouty/crestny.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 470.

himself. His thinking focused only on his sin, upon himself, instead of on God, the father of Jesus – and his own Father...²¹² Judas was so completely obsessed with the act he had committed that he could not believe in God’s forgiveness and did not allow God to save him.

All the Apostles went with Jesus to Gethsemane, where He “accepted in His heart, took upon His shoulders all the alienation of the world, all the sorrow that is born of it, that grows out of animosity, hatred and the alienation of people from one another.”²¹³ But when Judas left to bring money to the chief priests, he “entered a different darkness. There no care about anyone existed, no one bothered him, he was in his darkness, but stayed alone, because these people, who walk in this darkness are not brothers to each other – everyone is imprisoned in his own loneliness.”²¹⁴ It seems AB was sympathetic to the forsakenness that Judas experienced and transferred some of the responsibility for his actions on to the other Apostles. “Judas is a mysterious person. He too was disappointed, he also felt cheated, and he also thought that Christ had deceived

²¹² “Иуда понял, что совершил; увидел, что его предательство непоправимо: Христос был осужден и умер. Но он не вспомнил, что Господь открыл о Себе и Своем Небесном Отце; он не понял, что Бог не предаст его, как он предал своего Бога. Он потерял всякую надежду, пошел и удавился. Мысль его сосредоточилась только на его грехе, на нем самом, а не на Боге, Отце Иисуса – и его Отце...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/soul_put/put_5.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_93.htm

²¹³ “принял в Свое сердце, взял на Свои плечи всю отверженность мира, все отчуждение мира от Бога, всю скорбь, рождающуюся от этого, вырастающую из вражды, из ненависти, из отчужденности людей друг от друга.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_68.htm

²¹⁴ “ушел в другую тьму. Там никакой заботы ни о ком не было, никто его не трогал, он был свой в этой тьме, но остался в ней один, потому что те люди, которые ходят в этой тьме, друг другу не братья, – каждый закован в свое одиночество.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_68.htm

them all – and put Him to death.”²¹⁵ It might seem that AB diminished the betrayal of Judas and shifted some responsibilities for this act onto the other Apostles. However, he also acknowledged Judas’ personal responsibility for this act.²¹⁶

The death of the Master was for the Apostles their own death, the Resurrection of Christ was for them the resurrection of their hope and faith and healing of their forsaking of Jesus, as well as healing their own experience of loneliness and forsakenness by God. “When Christ appeared to the Apostles, who in experiencing His death on the cross, experienced their own death, He gave them not only a new continuation of earthly life: within this earthly life He already gave them the presence of eternal life. [...] For the Apostles the death of Christ was their death, His Resurrection – new life.”²¹⁷

After the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles, they were able to preach the Gospel and sacrifice their lives. “[On] the fiftieth day after the crucifixion, the Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples (Act 2:1-4), and they became different people, a new creation, not in terms of courage or in terms of outward appearance, but because the life of the risen Christ was poured into them.”²¹⁸ The preaching of the Apostles became one

²¹⁵ “Иуда – таинственная личность. Он тоже разочарован, он тоже чувствует себя обманутым, он тоже думает, что Христос обманул их всех, – и предает Его на смерть.” Metropolitan Anthony Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 132.

²¹⁶ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony Sourozh, *Palm Sunday 4 April 1993*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_111.htm

²¹⁷ “Когда Христос явился апостолам, которые в переживании Его смерти на кресте пережили свою собственную смерть, Он не просто дал им новое продолжение земной жизни: внутри этой земной жизни Он дал им уже присутствие жизни вечной. [...] Для апостолов смерть Христова была их смертью, Его воскресение – новой жизнью.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy10.htm#1>

²¹⁸ “[В] пятидесятый день после распятия Дух Святой сошел на учеников (Деян 2:1-4), и они стали иными людьми, новой тварью, не по смелости, не по внешнему облику, а потому что жизнь воскресшего Христа влилась в них.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 31.

with Christ's, like the preaching of John the Forerunner who became the voice of God. All the Apostles, except for John the Theologian, died a martyr's death, they were not afraid to sacrifice their lives for God.

In examining AB's understanding of God-forsakenness as a part of kenotic theology we have seen that the whole life of Christ was linked to the event on the cross. Although we can see the God-forsakenness of Christ as central to AB's kenotic theology, AB understood Christ's kenosis comprehensively. This is in contrast to the earlier presented Protestant and some Russian kenoticists who limited Christ's kenosis to the Incarnation or other events from Christ's life.

Christ in His Incarnation accepted all of the consequences of sin, including death, which in AB's understanding is Godlessness. In addition, the personal lives of Mary, John the Baptist and the Apostles were also connected directly or indirectly to the kenotic life of Christ in the way that they also experienced the absence of God in their lives. If Christ and other people from the Bible experienced absence and abandonment by God, it means that Christians might also experience this abandonment. Thus, the example of Christ's life might inspire them in a moment of God's absence. We will see different examples and reasons for this experience in life in further chapters. For this chapter, however, it was important to look closely at the kenotic life of Christ, who is the ultimate example for His followers.

CHAPTER III

III.1. Anthony Bloom's Anthropology

As is evident in the previous chapter, the God-forsakenness of Christ became a key theme in AB's reflections on the life of Christ. The links between God-forsakenness and the creation of the world, Christ's Incarnation, the Baptism in the Jordan, temptations in the desert, the Transfiguration, the Mystical Supper, the prayer in Gethsemane, His suffering, the cross on Golgotha, the descent into Hades, the glorious Resurrection and the Ascension evidently have kenotic roots in AB's beliefs about Christ's life. Other people in the New Testament such as the Mother of God, John the Baptist and the Apostles had direct links to the kenotic life of Christ, having also experienced their own God-forsakenness. In the previous chapter, I tried to present *how* AB understood the God-forsakenness of Christ and others in the New Testament, while in the present chapter I will present AB's answer to the question of *why* Christ had to experience God-forsakenness on the cross. I see the answers in AB's anthropology which include the following:

- The main points of AB's anthropology are: dual solidarity of Christ and God's faith in the human person
- The creation of the world and the vocation of the first couple: the idea of the "total human"
- The Fall and its consequences: death as Godlessness
- Salvation in Jesus Christ the Godman
- The "Atheistic" Christ

Before I proceed to look at each of these points, I would like to give the general outlines of AB's anthropology. The goal is to establish the terminology AB used in the context of his discussion on the God-forsakenness of Christ. There are four themes he referred to in this context: "the solidarity of God with the human person," "God's faith in the human person," "atheism," and "the encounter between God and the human person." All of these themes are linked to the kenosis of God, but especially "God's faith in the human person." The themes of "the solidarity of God" and "atheism" are very connected to the God-forsakenness of Christ on the cross. In this chapter I will present the first three themes in their "theoretical" dimension, i.e., in connection with the life of Christ, especially God-forsakenness, while the "practical" dimension and the theme of encounter I will present in subsequent chapters.

III.2. Dual Solidarity of Christ

AB was asked why he used the secular, political word "solidarity" to describe a relationship of God with humans, instead of more traditional theological terminology. His reply was that he does so on purpose, because the notion behind this word is one that everybody can understand – "it is a word of current usage, it denotes a relationship with which we are quite familiar: the idea of solidarity with each other is easy for us to grasp clearly."¹

¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, "The Prayer of Intercession," *Sourozh* 1 (1980): 22-33, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_10.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды* (Moscow: Praktika, 2002), 954; Anthony Bloom, *God and Man* (New York: Paulist Press, 1971), 85.

AB used the experience of Job to explain the solidarity of God with humans in Christ. In Job 9:33, Job cries out for a mediator who would explain God to him. Job saw himself as a righteous and faithful person who never abandoned God, so why would God put him on trial? Christ, according to AB, became an answer to Job's cries, because He entered into the very center of human tragedy and brought salvation.

He Himself *became* that situation, because in Him God and man were shown to be *one*, and the tragedy in which God and Job faced each other, became concentrated in one person, in one Divine Person – in the Human free of sin, Who in an act of full limitless solidarity with the fallen human person became not only cursed and convicted but *the curse* (Gal 3:13).²

The solidarity of God with humans began with creation. God took responsibility for this act and when humans turned away, He remained faithful throughout history until the moment of the Incarnation. The act of the Incarnation is for AB the essential event of solidarity with humans. God identified Himself not with the righteous and saints, but with sinners and prostitutes, with all those who needed salvation. He humbled Himself, became vulnerable and He shared not only human limitations, but also suffering and death.³

² “Он Сам *стал* этой ситуацией, потому что в Нем Бог и человек оказались *едины*, и трагедия, в которой лицом к лицу сошлись Бог и Иов, сгустилась в одной человеческой личности и в одном Божественном Лице – в Человеке, свободном от греха, но Который в акте полной, ничем не ограниченной солидарности с падшим человеком стал не только проклятым, осужденным, но *клятвой* (Гал 3:13).” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек?* (Klin: Khristianskaia zhizn, 1999), online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/modern.htm>; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 940; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая* (Moscow: Praktika, 2007), 323.

³ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 233; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man: A University Sermon Preached in the University Church of S. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, on October 22nd, 1967*, online, available: http://www.mitrar.ru/eng/eng_03.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *On Forgiveness: July 19, 1970*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_130.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Sunday of the Cross: 18 March 1990*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_36.htm

When we speak of the solidarity of Christ with man in the Incarnation, we continually think of the minor and major expressions of this contradiction. We consider the limitations which the divine Word imposed upon Himself in entering time and becoming a prisoner of space: He is hungry, thirsty, tired: On another level, He seeks, He accepts the company of sinners.⁴

AB called this event “an act of incarnate solidarity,”⁵ because Christ is in ontological solidarity both with God and with humans. Also, the solidarity of Christ with humans did not break up His solidarity with the Father. This dual solidarity of Christ did not bring about a conflict within the Person of Christ. On the contrary, “human and God appeared to be inseparably bound by one fate,”⁶ and He remains human forever.

AB asserted that it was not enough for Christ to participate in the human tragedy, including suffering and death, in order to achieve salvation, since many people suffered far more than Christ on the cross. “The tragedy of His death is not His ultimate participation in human tragedy and human destiny.”⁷ According to AB, the dual solidarity led Christ to the cross and caused a double abandonment, first by the people because He died outside of the city, and, second, by the Father, when He cried out: “My God, My God! Why have you forsaken Me?” (Mk 15:34). But He remained faithful to

⁴ Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 95. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_03.htm

⁵ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 451.

⁶ “человек и Бог оказываются связанными одной судьбой, неразрывно.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/modern.htm>

⁷ Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 95.

both.⁸ God-forsakenness became the ultimate expression of Christ's solidarity with humans and with the Father.

If it is true that one dies from the absence of God, from the loss of God, then it is there that he accepts a solidarity – ultimate, agonizing, appalling – with us: he undertakes to share with us the only tragedy that is final and ultimate, the loss of God which is our death. And in his death, he is torn apart. His soul, dazzling with the light of the divinity, and his body, united forever with his divinity, are separated, torn from each other; the body of Christ rests incorruptible in the tomb because it is penetrated by the presence of God, and the soul of Christ; like the soul of every man, descends into hell as we proclaim in the Apostles' Creed.⁹

What makes Christ's death so special and salvific for the human race? "His death is not only a simple acceptance of the human condition; it is conditioned by the ultimate experience of the human tragedy, which consists in losing God and dying because of this."¹⁰ AB asserted that losing God is the ultimate experience of the human tragedy and, without this, salvation would not have been completed because He would not have fully participated in human mortality. For humans, mortality is relative God-forsakenness, while for Christ it is a radical one, because Christ as a result of the Incarnation had an immortal humanity, free of the necessity of death. Nevertheless, he willingly and fully accepted the human condition, that is, mortality.¹¹ AB united his usage of the term "solidarity of God" with his kenotic theology, particularly with the Descent into Hades.

⁸ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 940; 845; 357, 275-276; 233; 141; 96; Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 44. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, "The Prayer of Intercession," online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_10.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Christ, True and Perfect Man: The Address Printed below Was Delivered at the Diocesan Conference at Effingham, Surrey, in May, 1983*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_13.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом* (Moscow: Praktika, 2006), 57.

⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, "The Prayer of Intercession," online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_10.htm

¹⁰ Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 96.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 96, 114.

Christ, in solidarity with humans, went to Sheol, to the place where God is not, and He “lost God because of His solidarity with the human being – and He descended there where all people descend: in the final and complete emptiness of separation. [...] As a Human, He accepted this absence, but as God He destroyed it.”¹² This is the measure of the Divine solidarity with the human race. The solidarity that Christ had with humans AB transferred onto the Mother of God. He made mention of the solidarity of the Theotokos with humans in the context of Her death.

She [the Mother of God] also had to die, as Christ did, in total solidarity, in union with us; but She died inseparably united to the God to Whom She had given her soul and her body, her life without reserve, and indeed, as we are told in one of the Church’s prayers, the grave and death proved incapable of keeping her a prisoner. She so communed to [sic] eternal life by her total gift of self to God and for unity with Christ, that She rose alive, and She is after Christ the first fruit of all those who have lived on earth, departed this earthly life and entered into eternity; She alone, after Christ, entered it fulfilled, entered it in body and soul.¹³

As we have seen above, AB used the term “solidarity” of God with humans in several key themes in his teaching, particularly in the context of the God-forsakenness of Christ on the cross. There are some other examples where he used the term “solidarity” in discussing the practical dimensions, which I will refer to in the next chapter.

¹² “потерял Бога из солидарности с человеком – и Он сходит туда, куда сходят все люди: в окончательную и полную пустоту разлученности. [...] Как Человек, Он принял отсутствие, как Бог, Он уничтожил это отсутствие.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/modern.htm>

¹³ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *On Prayer for the Departed: September 2nd, 1989*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_192.htm

III.3. God's Faith in the Human Person

Another key concept connected to the kenotic life of Christ is God's faith in the human person. Just like he did with the term "solidarity," AB began his reflection with the creation of the human race. "God called out all of us, all mankind from non-existence [...] And He freely calls into being all of us. [...] Calling us to being, God has expressed His faith in the human person."¹⁴ Calling humans to a community of love with Him, God granted them freedom, which they abused. "God is not reckless, God would not have created us for perdition; and God would not have created us knowing that we only can destroy His creation. He created us by love and His love brought us into being."¹⁵ God did not abandon His people after their sin but remained faithful. "In His foreknowledge, in His eternal wisdom God knew everything that was going to happen, but this did not stop His love and by that His faith in us was not destroyed."¹⁶ The fulfillment of God's faith in the human being took place on the cross.

I will present a few examples of God's faith in the human person in the key events of Christ's life and the difference between God's faith and God's love in the

¹⁴ "Бог вызвал нас всех, все человечество, из небытия. [...] И Он свободно вызывает к бытию каждого из нас [...] Призывая нас к бытию, Бог изъявил Свою веру в человека." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Пути христианской жизни. Беседы* (Kyiv: Dukh i litera, 2004), 166.

¹⁵ "Бог не безумен, Бог не сотворил бы нас на погибель; и Бог не сотворил бы нас, зная, что мы только и сумеем сделать, что изуродовать Его творение. Он нас сотворил по любви; Его любовь нас родила в жизнь." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 262.

¹⁶ "В Своем предведении, в Своей предвечной мудрости Бог знал все, что будет, но и перед этим не остановилась Его любовь, но и этим не была сокрушена Его вера в нас." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 278; Cf. Ibid., 668; 748-750; 795; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 829.

human person. The Incarnation of Christ revealed to people God's faith in the human person.

The birth of Christ tells us about the love of God by which He calls us, but also about the faith of God – He knows that He did not create us in vain. He did not live, teach and die on the cross in vain. We need to give a responsible answer to such love and such faith! I would like to stress more the faith than the love, because we do not know what love is, but this faith is evident, and is terribly striking.¹⁷

The Incarnation revealed not only the faith of God in the human being, but also the greatness of the human person. If God could become a human without ceasing to be God, that reveals the greatness of matter and human nature, because it is able not only to unite with and contain the Divine, but it is also to be the God-bearer.¹⁸ In the Incarnation, Christ revealed to us “the *humility* and the love of God, the *faith* of God in the whole creation, in us sinners.”¹⁹ It is interesting that AB made a slight distinction between love and faith and changed the focus from God's love onto God's faith. If, for St. Paul love is the ultimate virtue (cf. I Cor 13:13) then, for AB God's faith in the human person seems to have a deeper value.

God knows us as we are and besides that He not only loves us, but He believes in us. It is possible to love without hope. There are many mothers who love their children, depraved, drug-addicted, murderers. This is the mother's heart

¹⁷ “Рождество Христово говорит нам о любви Божией, по которой Он нас зовет, но и о вере Божией: Он знает, что не напрасно Он нас сотворил, не напрасно Он жил, учил и умер на кресте. Как ответственно должны мы отозваться на такую любовь и на такую веру! Я хотел бы сказать: больше даже на веру, чем на любовь, потому что мы не знаем, что такое любовь, а вера бросается в глаза, до ужаса она поражает.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 288.

¹⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы* (Moscow: Libris, 1991), online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_04.htm

¹⁹ “*смирение* и любовь Божию, *веру* Божию во всю тварь, в нас, грешников.” Ibid.

speaking, but this love does not always improve or change them. To change someone, you have to prove somehow that you continue to believe in him.²⁰

As is evident from the examples above, AB preferred to speak of God's faith in the human person rather than about God's love. For him, God's faith in the human person confers certain responsibilities to humans, while the love of God is what brought about the Incarnation of Christ and His death on the cross. "I believe in you so much that I Myself became a human like you, that you might believe in My faith in the human being, in My love."²¹ God's faith in the human person, according to AB, obliges humans to believe not only in God's faith in us, but also to believe in ourselves and to believe in other people.²²

Another example of God's faith in the human person can be seen in the event of the cross. The cross of Christ revealed God's love and witnessed to God's faith in the human being.²³ AB said: "'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me' is the cry of Him who has willed to share with us everything, even our loss of God, because He wants to share all that is our life, because of love, and because of faith. Not only does He

²⁰ "Бог нас знает, какими мы являемся, какие мы есть, и вместе с этим Он не только нас любит — Он в нас верит. Любить можно даже без надежды. Сколько матерей любят своих детей развратных, наркоманов, убийц: в этом говорит их материнское сердце, но эта любовь человека не всегда облагораживает или меняет. Для того чтобы человека переменить, надо ему доказать каким-то образом, что в него продолжают верить." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 283.

²¹ "Я верую в тебя так, что Сам стал человеком, подобным тебе, чтобы ты мог поверить в Мою веру в человека, в Мою любовь." Ibid., 1001. Cf. Ibid., 582, 728.

²² Ibid., 281-288. For a practical application of AB's theology of God's faith in the human person, see the next chapter.

²³ Cf. Ibid., 986-987; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая: Проповеди, произнесенные в России* (Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994), online, available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_71.htm

love us, but He has faith in us, that all won't be in vain.”²⁴ The ultimate revelation of God's faith in the human person is the God-forsakenness of Christ on the cross.

According to AB, not only the life of Christ, but also the whole Gospel is the revelation of God's faith in the human person. “The Gospel is penetrated by faith in the human. [...] This is what the Incarnation, [Christ's - RR] life, Passion Week, the cross, the life-giving tomb, the descent into Hades and the Resurrection have to say to us in the end: about the human person, his value to God and how potentially great the human being is.”²⁵

AB applied the idea of God's faith in the human being not only to the kenotic life of Christ, but also to the life of Christians. In the last chapter of the present research we will see how this can be applied in practice.

III.4. Creation of the World and the Human Being

In this section we will take a look at AB's interpretation of the creation of the world and the first couple. AB did not consider the first chapters of the Old Testament to be historical, but rather saw them as a symbolic, metahistorical²⁶ parable. But even this

²⁴ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *On Forgiveness: July 19, 1970*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_130.htm

²⁵ “Евангелие все пронизано верой в человека. [...] Вот о чем, в конечном итоге, нам говорит воплощение, жизнь, Страстная неделя, крест, живоносный гроб, сошествие во ад и Воскресение Христово: о человеке, о том, *что* человек значит для Бога и как потенциально велик человек.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 699; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви* (Moscow: SP Interbuk, 1991), online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy12.htm>

²⁶ AB borrowed the idea of metahistory from Sergius Bulgakov. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 800; Sergius Bulgakov, *Невеста Агнца. О Богочеловечестве*, vol. III (Paris: YMCA-Press,

allows us to make certain theological conclusions, such as the fact that everything was created by the free will of God and that the first couple is the result of a special act of God. AB distinguished between human nature and the nature of God and explained how to understand the term “*ex nihilo*”:

We are not related to God in any generic way: we have no roots in Him by nature; we are not of His substance; we are not necessary for His existence, and the act of creation as it appears from the Bible is creation out of naught. [...] The naught of which the Bible speaks is a radical absence, a situation in which the creature which now exists, simply was not and could not be unless God had chosen to command it to be. Before all creation there is the unimpaired plenitude, the unimpaired fullness of the divine presence, self-sufficient and self-contained. The act of creation posits something that was not at all and would never have evolved by its own powers. This means two things: on the one hand that we depend absolutely on God and on the other hand that being or not being necessary to God we are independent of Him in a strange way.²⁷

In the beginning there was chaos (Gen 1:2). AB interpreted this as the potentiality of all creation. “Chaos is not the destruction of the harmony that already exists; from the beginning chaos was the intertwining of the as yet unrevealed possibilities that God implanted in His creation.”²⁸ Another element of creation is the personal intervention of God in the creation of human beings: “God *personally* called every creature from nothingness. He called light from the darkness; called land and seas; called living beings, and *every* being called from nothingness suddenly arose and

1945), 184. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 800; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 811.

²⁷ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, “Some Aspects of the Doctrine of Creation: An Address given at the Conference at Broadstairs, 1963,” *Sobornost* 4:10, Winter-Spring (1964), 551-557, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_01.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 659-660.

²⁸ “Хаос – не разрушение той гармонии, которая уже существует; изначально хаос был совокупностью еще не раскрывшихся возможностей, которые были заложены Богом в Свою тварь.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 775, 711; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 259, 713-715, 786-787, 871.

appeared face-to-face with God's love."²⁹ This personal intervention of God in creation exposes the depth of meaning that creatures have for Him: "None of the creatures appeared with no name, anonymously, as 'something'; every creature exists for God *personally*, every creature is clear and significant."³⁰ The Word of God brought to life all possible forms of being and granted the creatures the freedom to be themselves. The Holy Spirit through the Divine energies "penetrated all creation of God as much as the creation was capable of receiving these energies. And slowly everything is born, gradually it grows, but in full beauty, in full harmony until the moment when man's fall will destroy this beauty."³¹

With a special love God created humans, not as the product of the final progress of nature, but by a separate act. It was not just an act of God's will, but, as AB explained: "He created us in an act of the deepest self-giving and self-sacrificing love."³² The creation of the world is a kenosis and self-sacrifice of God because the world has the power to not accept Him.³³ AB also made a kenotic link between the self-sacrificial

²⁹ "[К]ажую Свою тварь Бог вызывал из небытия *лично*. Он вызывал свет из тьмы; Он вызывал сушу и моря; Он вызывал живые существа; и *каждое* существо из небытия вдруг вставало и оказывалось лицом к лицу с Божественной любовью." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy6.htm>

³⁰ "[Н]икакая тварь не возникала безымянно, анонимно, как "нечто"; каждая тварь для Бога существует *лично*, каждая тварь для Него дорога, значительна." Ibid.

³¹ "[П]рониывают все Богом сотворенное, постольку поскольку тварь способна воспринять эти энергии. И мало-помалу все рождается, постепенно возрастает, но в полной красоте, в полной гармонии, до момента, когда падение человека разрушит эту красоту." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 776.

³² "Он нас творит в акте глубочайшей самоотдающейся, самоотверженной любви." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 44; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 99.

³³ Cf. Ibid., 267.

act of creation and the self-sacrificial act on the cross: “[...] when we talk about the creation of the world, we talk about the sacrificial love of God, and when we talk about the cross and salvation we talk about the sacrificial love of the cross.”³⁴

AB accepted Paul’s tripartite understanding of the human person – body, soul and spirit. God used the dust, the same matter from which the world was created, so “that man has everything in common with everything that God has created.”³⁵ The whole created world can recognize itself in Adam, because his body, his matter have the same roots as the earth. This idea is very important in AB’s theology, because through the Incarnation, Christ accepted human nature and through this nature took on kinship with the cosmos and brought salvation to the whole universe.

What is the soul in the human person? For AB the soul is the human intellect, the emotions and all the forms of awareness that exist in the human person. The soul in the human person, according to AB, is the place of temptation and the point of impact between God and the devil. “God calls us to Himself, to perfect love, and He has proven to us that He can love us truly, to the point of giving His only-begotten Son *unto death* that we may live. And the devil, at the same time, says to us, ‘Don’t believe Him. That will come one day, it’s a promise. But what I offer you is something nice. Take it now’.

³⁴ “[К]огда мы говорим о сотворении мира, мы говорим о жертвенной Божественной любви, и когда мы говорим о кресте и о спасении, то говорим о жертвенной крестной любви.” Ibid., 255; Cf. Ibid., 257.

³⁵ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Whole Human Person: Body, Spirit, and Soul*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_09.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 776.

The devil beguiles us: God calls us. The devil makes promises, which he never fulfills:

God says, ‘Come, I love you. You will see what love can do.’”³⁶

The spirit is the last important component in the human person. “When Adam was created God breathed His life into him. It is the breath of God which is within us and makes us akin to God.”³⁷ AB explained that the “breath of life” is the uniqueness of the human person:

The human became human only because God breathed into him His own breath that is His life and joined him to what He is Himself. This means that between human beings and God there is [...] a *kinship*, a type of harmony with God initially inscribed into human existence. [...] A human can know God because between God and human there is something common. What exactly it is, we do not know in essence, but we can experience it.³⁸

AB did not specify what exactly makes a human being akin to God in this context, but in another place he mentioned the body and spirit in the human person. “The body and the spirit are two very essential factors that unite us to God and to the created world.”³⁹ Besides being akin to God, Adam, according to AB, had to fulfill two goals concerning God and the world. The first goal was “to grow from empirical humanity into beings filled with divinity.”⁴⁰ This means that Adam was not created perfect, but

³⁶ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Whole Human Person*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_09.htm

³⁷ Ibid.; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 277, 862.

³⁸ “[Ч]еловек стал человеком, потому что и постольку, поскольку Бог вдохнул в него Свое собственное дыхание, то есть Свою жизнь, приобщил его к чему-то, чем Он Сам является. Значит, между человеком и Богом есть [...] *сродство*, какая-то изначально вписанная в человеческое бытие гармония с Богом. [...] И человек Бога может познавать, потому что между Богом и человеком есть нечто общее – что именно, мы, в сущности, не знаем, но можем это испытать.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 721, 778; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 790.

³⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Whole Human Person*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_09.htm

⁴⁰ Ibid.; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 734, 785.

being innocent, was called to reach full maturity. Before sin Adam was not in a stagnant state, but in a process of growing in perfection.

The second goal related to Adam belonging to the world – to “lead the whole creation from the material into the spiritual, in other words, to communion (and this means fellowship of life, oneness) with God and the Creator.”⁴¹ God brought all animals to Adam so that he could give names to all of them, “not nicknames, but the name that expressed the very nature, the very mystery of that creature.”⁴² Adam was called to become a leader of the created world and to bring it to God. In the leadership of Adam, AB saw the image and likeness of God – “we are created according to the image of God and God commanded us to be leaders, to be the link that would unite all creation with the spiritual world.”⁴³ According to AB, Adam through his spirit had direct contact with God, while the world had access to God only through Adam.

III.4.1. Adam – a “Total Human”

In this section we will take a look at AB’s understanding of the name “Adam” as “total human.” The concept of a “total human” is widely present in Russian theology,

⁴¹ “[В]ести всю тварь от материального в духовное, иначе говоря, к приобщенности (а это означает – общность жизни, единство) с Богом и Творцом.” Ibid., 372; 390-392, 712, 776, 785. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 276, 662.

⁴² “[Н]е кличку, а то имя, которое выражало самую природу, самую тайну этого существа.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 670, Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 774; Cf. Ibid., 799-800; 821.

⁴³ “[М]ы созданы по образу Божию и Бог нам заповедал быть вождями, быть связующим звеном, которое объединит все сотворенное с духовным миром.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 392; 776.

where it is found in the works of such authors as Sergius Bulgakov,⁴⁴ Fr. Sophrony Sakharov⁴⁵ and others. AB was not unique in his understanding of a “total human.”⁴⁶ This idea was also present in the work of Vladimir Soloviev, and it might be that it was from Soloviev that AB borrowed this approach. Soloviev considered Adam not only as a separate person, but as a representation of all humankind. He said: “The first (natural) Adam was, of course, not only a separate person among other persons, but the all-one person, containing all of natural humankind.” Soloviev applied the same approach to Christ, the second Adam: “In the same way, the second Adam is not only *this* individual being, but is also a universal being, [...] spiritual humankind.”⁴⁷

In the first chapters of the book of Genesis, we have two stories regarding the creation of the world. Gen 1:27 says that God created male and female at the same time

⁴⁴ Cf. Sergius Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God*, trans. Boris Jakim, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008), 204.

⁴⁵ Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *On Prayer*, trans. Rosemary Edmonds, (Essex: 1996), 57, 150.

⁴⁶ The following quotation I borrowed from Maxim O. Krioukov’s unpublished thesis (MDiv) at Saint Tikhon’s Orthodox Theological Seminary in South Canaan, Pennsylvania in 2001. “According to Metropolitan Anthony, this idea is used by St. Ignatius the God-Bearer and St. Augustine. As usual, he provides no references. The idea of Adam’s ‘totality’ is brought up in the fourth chapter of what is known as the Epistle to Hero, the letter which is wrongly ascribed to St. Ignatius: ‘For the body of Adam was made out of the four elements, and that of Eve out of the side of Adam.’ [Epistle of Ignatius to Hero, ch. IV, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, vol. I (New York: 1908), p.114.] It is also mentioned in the following passages, taken from the works of St. Augustine: ‘How Adam extends over the whole globe, you have already heard explained, by the four Greek letters of four Greek words. For if thou write the four words, one under the other, that is, the names of the four quarters of the world, of east, west, north, and south, which is the whole globe, - whence the Lord says that He will gather His elect from the four winds when He shall come to judgment; - if, I say, you take these four Greek words, - ἀνατολή, which is east; δύσις, which is west; ἄρχτος, which is north; μεσημβρία, which is south; Anatole, Dysis, Arctos, Mesembria, - the first letters of the words make Adam’ [St. Augustine. *Homilies on the Gospel of John*. X.12, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vol. VII (Grand Rapids, MI: 1956), 73; ‘For Adam himself...signifieth in Greek the whole world’ (St. Augustine, *Exposition on the Book of Psalms. Psalm XCVII* – see: *A Select Library*, vol. III, p. 475).”

⁴⁷ Vladimir Solovyov, *Lectures on Divine Humanity*, revised and edited by Boris Jakim, (Hudson, N.Y.: Lindisfarne Press, 1995), 155.

and that they both were created in the image of God. According to Gen 2, God created Adam first and later created Eve (Gen 2:21-22). How is one to understand the idea of “total human” in AB’s theology? Is Adam the total human before the creation of Eve, or does “total human” mean Adam and Eve, together, as one person? AB could see the male and female aspects of Adam, but rejected the notion that Adam was created as a hermaphrodite. “In other words, he was not a hermaphrodite in the sense that he was neither a male nor a female – he was a union of all these possibilities which had potentiality to blossom in the fullness of both female and male states.”⁴⁸ Here he made a link with the word “chaos,” which was used in describing the beginning of the world, which AB understood as the source of potentialities.

AB did not see a contradiction between the two stories of the creation of the world but primarily focused on the second story of creation. He stated that Gen 1:27 speaks of one human being: “[I]n which the attributes or differences of gender were not yet defined, in which, just as in the original creation there were instilled all the potentialities for becoming both male and female.”⁴⁹ Adam and Eve did not each have their own gender, but rather there was one *anthropos* in two persons: “They were for each other not two individuals, but two persons presenting themselves as one God-

⁴⁸ “То есть он не был гермафродитом в том смысле, что он не был и мужчиной, и женщиной, – он был совокупностью всех тех возможностей, которые потом могли расцвести в полноте и женственности, и мужского состояния.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 525; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании* (Moscow: Moskovskoe Podvor’e Sviato-Troitskoï Sergievoï Lavry, 1999), online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/h_d/hd22.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 774.

⁴⁹ “[B] котором еще не определились свойства или различия пола, один цельный человек, в котором опять-таки, как в изначально сотворенной твари, были заложены все возможности и мужского, и женского бытия.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 781. Cf. “Человек [...] был двойцей, одним существом в двух лицах.” Ibid., 498, 527, 782, 792.

illuminated personhood.”⁵⁰ Bulgakov exhibited a very similar understanding of the first human. He said: “Male and female, differing as two distinct images of man [human being – RR], bear, in their unity, the fullness of humanity and, in this humanity, the fullness of the image of God...”⁵¹ Did AB understand the *anthropos* in the sense of androgyne? AB gave his own answer to this question.

I do not want to use the word ‘androgyne’ because in our experience, in the world as we see it, the androgyne is a developed being and a being simultaneously endowed with physical characteristics of male and female existence. In human categories it would be a monstrosity.⁵²

AB asserted that the notion of *anthropos* has to be understood in an ontological sense where there is one human being (= Adam) in two persons, but not in the sense of gender differences as after the fall.⁵³ So Gen 2:7 in AB’s theology is a continuation of Gen 1:20. When all the animals were brought to Adam to be named, they were in pairs, and Adam then realized his loneliness. For AB, this is a crucial moment in Adam’s maturing, “At a certain moment he matured and in this moment God brought to him all other beings and Adam saw that every being was a pair, while he is alone. And the moment he realized that he was alone something in him opened up – ecstasy [Gen 2:21

⁵⁰ “Они были друг для друга не двумя особями, а двумя лицами, представляющими собой одну-единственную богоосиянную личность.” Ibid., 796; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином* (Elektrostal: Molva, 2000), online, available: http://mitras.ru/be/be_10.htm

⁵¹ Sergius Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God*, 140.

⁵² “Я не хочу употреблять слово ‘андрогин’, потому что в нашем опыте, в мире, каким мы его видим, андрогин – существо развитое и одновременно наделенное физическими характеристиками мужского и женского существа. В человеческих категориях это уродство.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 799.

⁵³ Cf. Ibid., 774, 858.

LXX = ἐκστασις; cf. Heb. ‘deep sleep’] – and Eve was born.”⁵⁴ For AB, Adam was created, but Eve was born. The act of the creation of Eve is not God’s one-sided decision, but rather the answer to Adam’s realization of his loneliness and potential for love.⁵⁵

AB explained that the translation of the Hebrew “deep sleep,” in Greek “ἐκστασις” – means the state in which the person is going out of himself, in which he is not a closed person, but is receptive to something new.⁵⁶ The birth of Eve is not a surgical operation, but the complete openness of Adam: “Adam enters into his depths, opens up to something bigger than he was before and Eve is born.”⁵⁷ When the moment came, “God divided that unique human being into two beings, but two who were still totally one. In the Old Testament we find this moment when God divided in the primeval human, man from woman.”⁵⁸ The reason why God had chosen a rib of Adam’s to form Eve had a significant meaning for AB, because it shows the unity of the one

⁵⁴ “В какой-то момент он созрел, и в этот момент Бог привел к нему все другие существа, и Адам увидел, что у каждого существа есть пара, а он — один. И в тот момент, когда он осознал, что он один, в нем раскрылось что-то – экстаз – и родилась Ева.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 517; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/h_d/hd22.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/be/be_10.htm

⁵⁵ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 782; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 791.

⁵⁶ Cf. *Ibid.*, 801.

⁵⁷ “Адам уходит в свои глубины, раскрывается к большему, чем он был до того, – и рождается Ева.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 516; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/h_d/hd22.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 251. Cf. *Ibid.*, 775.

⁵⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Whole Human Person*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_09.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 850.

human being in two persons.⁵⁹ Eve belongs to the same entity as Adam and is equal to him. She is not an emanation of Adam's essence but is fully a person. They both were not perfect, but were called for perfection and to live in the love of God. They lived in full harmony – “Adam suddenly realizes, *sees* that Eve is *he* in the feminine gender, and Eve is looking at him and sees that it is *she* in a masculine gender and together they form the *total human*.”⁶⁰ The unity and the relationship between Adam and Eve were created in the image and likeness of the Trinity as unity in plurality. The first couple was an icon of the Trinity.⁶¹ One of the gifts that God granted to the first people was freedom.

AB explained this freedom from an etymological point of view. He accepted Aleksei Khomiakov's explanation of the word “свобода” (freedom) and its meaning “быть самим собой” (to be yourself).⁶² This was the meaning of the word “freedom” AB used in his theology:

⁵⁹ AB used an etymological explanation for this statement. The Hebrew text used the words - ish (masculin) and ishshah (feminine) to show the difference and the unity of the same being. “I am *ish*, she is *ishshah*. She is the feminine of me, I am the masculine of her.” In English *he* and *she* would express the same idea – he and she formed a single united being. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Whole Human Person*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_09.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 782. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 775, 858.

⁶⁰ “Адам вдруг осознает, *видит*, что Ева – это *он* в женском роде, а Ева смотрит на него и видит, что это – *она* в мужском, и вместе они составляют *всечеловека*.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 526; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 858.

⁶¹ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 783.

⁶² Cf. Ibid., 408. AB agreed that this explanation is disputable, but he still accepted it. The Russian word “свобода [freedom]” derives from the Sanskrit word and means “самостоятельность [independence].” The footnote in Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 703. In English and German, the word “freedom” and “Freiheit” derive from the Sanskrit root “*prija*” and means “быть приятным, любимым, нравиться”. Как существительное оно означает “милый, дорогой”, даже “любимый” [“to be nice, to be loved, to like.” As a noun it means “dear, darling” and even “beloved.”] Ibid., 703. The Latin word “*libertas*” explained the state of the free born child from the free parents. Cf. Ibid., 410, 703; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 212; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, “О свободе и Подвиге, Беседа в Москве в июне 1988,” *Chelovek* 3 (1993), online, available:

This is what God gives us as freedom: it is not a limitless self-will, not independence from our own nature, neither from our vocation nor from Him. This is an invitation to become *what we are called to be*, what He *dreamed* us to be, what He called us to be and to become.⁶³

The calling to be free, to be yourself doesn't mean self-will, but "to find within yourself that human being who is the image of God. [...] and gradually to grow into this image..."⁶⁴ This is an important point in AB's theology, because the main goal of the human being is to be free, to be himself – this is the image of God imprinted in the human person. And without freedom, true love is impossible.

The first Adam was created as a perfect human being, but AB meant this in the sense of innocence, not maturity.

The human being was created perfect in the sense that he had no stain, no vice; he was innocent, there was neither sin nor evil in him. In this sense yes, he was perfect. But he was not perfect in the sense that in the moment of the creation, the human being arrived at the sanctity, the level of communion with God which is the goal of his vocation. That moment was very important because it is not human sanctity that was undermined, but rather human innocence was deceived by evil.⁶⁵

http://mitras.ru/sretenie/sret_svobod.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 252; 256-257.

⁶³ "Вот что Бог дает нам в качестве свободы: не безграничное самоволие, не независимость от нашей собственной природы, от нашего призвания или от Него, это приглашение стать тем, *чем мы призваны быть*, чем Он *возмечтал* нас, чем Он призвал нас быть и становиться." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 712.

⁶⁴ "[Н]айти в себе того человека, который является образом Божиим. [...] и постепенно в этот образ вращать..." Ibid., 409-410.

⁶⁵ "Человек был создан совершенным в том смысле, что в нем не было тогда ни пятна, ни порока, он был невинен, греха в нем не было, зла не было в нем. В этом отношении, да, он был совершенен. Но он не был совершенен в том смысле, будто в момент своего сотворения человек дошел уже до той святости и той глубины богообщения, которая является пределом его призвания. Этот момент очень важен, потому что не святость человеческая была подорвана грехом, а его невинность была обманута злом." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 261. Cf. Ibid., 774.

Thus, AB understood Adam's perfection not as having reached the point of sanctity that would afford communion with God, but as the innocence and sinlessness of Adam. Now we will move to AB's understanding of the Fall and the link between the first sin and Godlessness.

III.4.2. The Fall

According to the Byzantine liturgical tradition, the Fall (first sin; Original sin) of Adam was as a result of his disobedience of God and as a result he was banished from Paradise.⁶⁶ AB disagreed with the belief that the root of the Fall lay in disobedience. "The question is not one of obedience or disobedience, but rather that God offered Himself fully without holding back: His being, love, wisdom and knowledge – He gave everything in this union of love [...] the sin of Adam was that he did not preserve love."⁶⁷ AB's approach to the understanding of the Fall is similar to Fr. Sophrony, who also believed that Adam's sin was in betraying God's love.

AB explained how the existence of the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, among other trees, presented two parallel possibilities in paradise. One could grow in communion with God and view creation from within God, as God

⁶⁶ "Adam was banished from Paradise through disobedience and cast out from delight..." The Sunday of Forgiveness in *The Lenten Triodion*, trans. from the original Greek by Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos Ware, (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1978), 169.

⁶⁷ "Вопрос не в послушании или прслушании, а в том, что Бог предлагал всего Себя, без остатка – Свое бытие, любовь, мудрость, ведение – все Он давал в этом союзе любви [...] грех Адама в том, что он не сохранил любовь." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 669; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy6.htm>; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 791.

perceives it. Or one could choose the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and view creation from a limited perspective, externally and outside of God. But without the possibility to choose, growth would not be possible – “to grow in the fullness of his stature, the human being needed to have the possibility at every step to make a choice [...] And this freedom, this vocation to be oneself, not under compulsion, but by one’s own choice, is also the tragedy of the human person.”⁶⁸

The Fall, according to AB, was Adam’s desire to know on his own the difference between good and evil. “To know good and evil is only possible from within communion in God. And Adam made a mistake: he decided to know what is good and what is evil in a natural creaturely way.”⁶⁹ Instead of uniting with God, the first couple united with matter, but without God. “Adam and Eve [...] are immersed in matter, in the essence of the world, but *without* God; this does not mean that matter was without God, but that they enter into it Godlessly.”⁷⁰ Adam wanted to know what was good and evil rationally and by excluding God. “You can know good and even grow beyond your

⁶⁸ “чтобы вырасти в полную меру своего возраста, человек должен был иметь возможность на каждом шагу делать выбор [...]. И эта свобода, это призвание быть самим собой, но не по принуждению, а по собственному выбору, и является трагедией человека.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 264-265.

⁶⁹ “И только изнутри приобщенности к Богу можно понимать, что такое добро и что такое зло. И Адам сделал ошибку: он решил тварным образом узнать, что такое добро и что такое зло.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 525; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.mitr.ru/h_d/hd23.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 264.

⁷⁰ “Адам и Ева [...] погружаются в материю, в сущность мира, но *без* Бога – не то чтобы материя была без Бога, но они входят в нее обезбоженными.” Ibid., 807; Cf. Ibid., 815.

limitations, but you can't know evil without being destroyed.”⁷¹ In AB's understanding, evil does not have its own being, but is the absence of good.

III.4.2.1. Disharmony between Adam and the World

Adam's act brought disharmony between Adam and the created world. The breach between Adam and the cosmos happened as a result of Adam's loss of God. “[W]e turned away from God, Who is the key to harmony between humanity and the created world and because of that we lost the very key to harmony through which we might approach the created world; we became incapable of leading it, of possessing it in a good sense of the word, to be guides, people who could lead the world to its perfection and fulfillment.”⁷² Because of sin, Adam was not able to lead the cosmos any longer.

God wanted to give Himself to the whole cosmos through Adam, but because Adam failed, the whole cosmos was unable to become a partaker of God's nature. AB stated that the world became a martyr as a result of Adam's decision. “A human being sinned, but the world did not; the world was taken captive by human sin, but by itself it

⁷¹ “Можно познать добро и вырасти свыше своей меры, но нельзя познать зло и не разрушиться.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 524; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/h_d/hd23.htm

⁷² “[М]ы отвернулись от Бога, Который – ключ гармонии человечества и тварного мира, и тем самым лишились сами ключа гармонии, с которым могли бы подходить к тварному миру, мы не способны вести его, обладать им в хорошем смысле этого слова, быть наставниками, людьми, которые вели бы его к совершенству и исполнению.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 393; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/h_d/hd27.htm

was sinless.”⁷³ Matter itself did not lose the ability to communicate with God and was able to accept God (богоприимна) in His Incarnation.

If we remember that the created world and all its matter is stained, wounded and disfigured by human sin, but by itself remained sinless, then we can understand how the Incarnation of the Son of God is possible, how it is possible that God became a human being and took upon Himself human flesh. Matter itself was not polluted, but remained pure even if it was wounded.⁷⁴

We can also find a similar understanding of the consequence of sin on matter in Sergius Bulgakov’s writings. He said: “[...] nature was destined to be deified in and through man [human being – RR]; but when man fell [...] it became the Godless, self-sufficient world...”⁷⁵ Bulgakov, in his Sophiological interpretation, considered that nature or matter became Godless as the result of Adam’s sin. We can see the same understanding in Georges Florovsky’s theology: “Consequently man’s apostasy estranges the whole creation from God, devastes it, and, as it were, deprives it of God.”⁷⁶ Here we can see a difference with AB’s approach, because he did not consider that matter became Godless, but only that Adam did. Matter, did not lose the ability to be

⁷³ “Человек согрешил, но мир не согрешил, мир в плену у человеческого греха, но сам по себе он безгрешен.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 122. “Тварь после падения человека прошла через трагедию, но она осталась мученицей и неоскверненной. [...] тварь не согрешила против Бога, она является жертвой человеческого падения. [The creation after the human’s sin went through the tragedy and remained a martyr and innocent [...]] Creation didn’t sin against God, but became a victim of human’s fall.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 777. Cf. *Ibid.*, 375; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 260, 662.

⁷⁴ “[Е]сли мы помним, что сотворенный мир, все вещество этого мира запятнано, ранено, изуродовано человеческим грехом, но само по себе осталось безгрешным, тогда мы понимаем, как возможно воплощение Сына Божия, как возможно, что Бог стал человеком, взяв на Себя человеческую плоть. Вещество было не запятнано, осталось чисто, оно только ранено.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 800.

⁷⁵ Sergius Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God*, 153.

⁷⁶ Georges Florovsky, *Creation and Redemption*, vol. 3, in *The Collected Works* (Belmont: Nordland Publishing Company, 1976), 106.

God-bearing. Matter, in AB's understanding, was not only capable of containing God, but would also unite with Him. "All creation was created by God in such a way as to be capable not only of being the temple and place of His presence, but also of *uniting* with Divinity itself."⁷⁷ If matter would have been Godless or in sin, it would not have been possible for God to be incarnated. This is why AB stated that matter was not only able to accept God, but also to unite with Him. I believe such an understanding of matter brings a new dimension to kenotic theology that has been overlooked by Western kenoticists.⁷⁸

Here, AB referred to the cosmic character of the Incarnation: "Christ's Incarnation is a cosmic event, an event which made Him kin to the whole cosmos, with everything that was created, because from the moment energy or matter begins to exist, it recognizes itself in Christ in the glory of union with Divinity."⁷⁹ Thus, the Sacraments and every kind of blessing⁸⁰ performed by the Holy Spirit through the Church recognize the sanctity of matter and are related to the Incarnation.

⁷⁷ "[Т]варь вся создана Богом так, что она может, опять-таки, быть не только храмом и местом Его пребывания, но *соединиться* с Самим Божеством." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа: Проповеди* (Moscow: Sviato-Danilov monastyr', 1993), online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/inname/in_106.htm

⁷⁸ See Conclusion.

⁷⁹ "Христово воплощение – космическое явление, то есть это явление, которое сродняет Его со всем Космосом, со всем, что создано, потому что в тот момент, когда начинает быть энергия или вещество, оно узнает во Христе себя самое в славе соединения с Божеством." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 373; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 792-793. See: Second chapter of the present research.

⁸⁰ AB referred to the blessings over the water, oil, bread, wine, bells, incense, etc. In the Eastern Christian Tradition all these blessings have a special service or prayer. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 374, 780. The role of the Sacraments in the Church will be presented in further chapters.

III.4.2.2. Disharmony within Adam

Sin caused disharmony within Adam. The spirit lost contact with God and was no longer able to know God as it had experienced Him before. As a result, the spirit of the human being was not able to guide human beings and harmony was shattered leading to a distinction between body and flesh. With sin, flesh became a corruption of the body. AB stated that the “body to a significant extent became flesh, meaning that it remained the same body but became not as spiritual, not as pure, not as harmonious. No longer do soul and spirit direct the whole human person, but a kind of mutual balance is established among the various forces and therein sometimes a conflict between them.”⁸¹ Since that time, there is a battle within the human being between body and flesh. “It is a battle for the flesh to be returned to the glory of the body given to it from the beginning.”⁸² AB quoted Fr. Sergius Bulgakov: “Kill the flesh if you wish to attain a body.”⁸³ AB gave his own reflection on flesh, “kill what is passion, kill what is corruption, kill what is death, and then you will discover that the body which you possess is the body which is akin to the whole creation and together with the whole

⁸¹ “тело в значительной мере стало плотью, то есть тем же телом, но уже не таким одухотворенным, не таким чистым, не таким гармоничным. И уже не душа и не дух правят всем человеком, а создается как бы взаимное равновесие разных сил, а порой борьба между ними.” Ibid., 787.

⁸² “Это борьба за тело, борьба за то, чтобы наша плоть была возвращена к той славе телесности, которая ей была дана изначально.” Ibid., 787

⁸³ Sergius Bulgakov, *Свет невечерний* (Moscow: Respublika, 1994), 213, 215. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 218.

creation.”⁸⁴ Flesh is biological existence that is separated from God, and body is a human, physical being, that is full of life because it is received from God.

There is also a distinction between the human spirit and soul. AB admitted the difficulty in seeing a difference between them:

We cannot say where the emotional ends and spiritual begins, but there is an area where in the most natural way a mutual inter-penetration takes place. The difficulty in identifying where anything begins and ends lies in the fact that we recognize spiritual experiences on the level of the soul: all spiritual phenomena are in one way or another reflected in our psyche. For example, reverence, joy, the fear of God (in a good sense, not in the sense of being afraid of God, but rather reverential awe) – these all are a spiritual phenomena, but they affect us emotionally and physically, and reflect in that area and become a subject of our consciousness.⁸⁵

AB claimed that among the soul, spirit and body – even after the Fall – there exists a very deep unity, and the human person exists only if these three components are united together. “We are not purely spiritual creatures, we are neither souls imprisoned in bodies, nor bound to bodies for a while, but we are incarnate spirits; the fullness of the human person is not in his spirit or soul, but in his psycho-spiritual unity with the body.”⁸⁶ For AB, a human person is not a pure spiritual creature, and is not a soul

⁸⁴ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 111.

⁸⁵ “Нельзя сказать, что где-то кончается душевное и начинается духовное: есть какая-то область, где самым нормальным образом совершается взаимное проникновение. Трудность опознать, где что начинается или кончается, в том, что духовный опыт мы сознаем в душевной плоскости: все духовные явления так или иначе отражаются в нашей психической области. Скажем, благоговение, радость, страх Божий (в хорошем смысле, не в смысле испуганности перед Богом, а благоговейный трепет) – это духовные явления, но охватывают нас душевно и физически, отражаются в этой области и делаются предметом нашего сознания”. Ibid., 112.

⁸⁶ “[М]ы – не чисто духовные существа, мы – не душа, заключенная в теле или на время связанная с телом, мы – воплощенный дух, и полнота человека не в его духе или его душе, а в его духовно-душевно-единстве с телом.” Ibid., 107, Cf. Ibid., 77, 104.

imprisoned in a body or for a time related to the body. A human person is the incarnate spirit, a spiritual plenitude of soul and spirit united with body.⁸⁷

According to AB, despite Adam's unfaithfulness, God did not abandon him and did not withdraw the gifts He had granted to Adam from the beginning: His image and likeness and the breath of life. Also, although the created world became enslaved through human sin, it remained pure. After the Fall, the human being became limited and ceased to be fully genuine as created. AB used Gregory of Nyssa's explanation of the "garments of skins" that God gave to Adam and Eve after their sin (Gen 3:21). "According to St. Gregory of Nyssa, when the human being sinned, he became limited, instead of what he had been before and what we see in Christ after His Resurrection."⁸⁸ For AB sin hurt not only the soul, but also the human body, which became dense and heavy.

Before I proceed to the disharmony between Adam and Eve that resulted from sin, it is important to present the distinction between "person" and "individual" which AB adopted from Vladimir Lossky.⁸⁹ For AB the term "individual" is the result of fragmentation and is caused by the sinful state: "We are all individuals to the extent in that we are alienated one from another, separated from God, and broken up within

⁸⁷ Ibid., 107.

⁸⁸ "Согласно святому Григорию Нисскому, человек пав, стал ограниченным, вместо того, каким был и что мы видим во Христе после Его Воскресения." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 660.

⁸⁹ Cf. Protopresbyter Nikolai Makar, "Антропология В. Н. Лосского и Митрополита Антония Сурожского," in *Пути просвещения и свидетели правды: Личность. Семья. Общество*, ed. К. Sigov, (Kiev: Dukh i litera, 2004), 177-184.

ourselves.”⁹⁰ And in another place: “I exist as an individual, as a separate entity to the extent that I am deeply different from other individuals who surround me.”⁹¹

The term ‘persona’ has a different meaning, “that is the whole human being considered as one total reality [...] which is more complex than we may imagine.”⁹² AB stated the impossibility of knowing the primary state of being a person because of the impact of sin, but we still can see a glimpse through the prism of individuals.⁹³ The task for human beings is to become a person, by overcoming individuality. “We are called to become a person, a personality is what we are called to become by overcoming individual. [...] The personhood can be discovered only in the One Who knows this person that is in God alone. [...] Our human vocation is precisely to acquire the reality of personhood and nature through the Cross of Christ, through asceticism and growth, overcoming and conquering the opposing fragmentation of individuality.”⁹⁴

Before their sin Adam and Eve were in one total unity in two persons, but after their sin, they became separated into two individuals. AB stated: “At that moment it is one undivided being in two persons, because the Fall has not yet divided mankind from

⁹⁰ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Whole Human Person*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_09.htm

⁹¹ “Как индивидуум, как особь я есмь, постольку поскольку я глубоко отличен от окружающих меня индивидуумов.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 290.

⁹² Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Whole Human Person*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_09.htm

⁹³ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 292.

⁹⁴ “Личность, персоне – это то, чем мы призваны стать, преодолев индивидуума. [...] Личность может быть раскрыта только в Том, Кто ее знает, то есть в одном Боге. [...] наше человеческое призвание именно в том, чтобы Крестом Господним, аскезой, восхождением, [...] стяжать реальность личности и природы, преодолев и победив противоположение и разделенность обособленности.” Ibid., 292, 299. More practical examples will be presented in the further chapters.

God and one human being from another. And it is only after the Fall that Adam and Eve looked at one another and saw themselves divided and different one from another.”⁹⁵

Division has entered the relationship between man and woman as a result of sin: “They are no longer two persons being one unit that is a human being. They are two persons into which individuality has entered.”⁹⁶ In another place AB compared the sinful state of Adam to a damaged icon:

The human being who was a duality, one being in two persons, suddenly became two individuals and ceased to be the meta-personal icon of the Holy Trinity. Each one of them became an individual; this was no longer the icon of the Holy Trinity, but a fractured icon. A new relationship began between Adam and Eve, they were now separate and saw each other as “not I”, as “him” and “her” and as a result new relations began between them that had not been there in the beginning.⁹⁷

AB refused to accept the view that sexual intercourse between Adam and Eve caused the sin. First of all, this view is not biblical because Adam knew Eve after the sin, and secondly, the “Physical union between man and woman is not sinful in itself. What is sinful is lust and sinful unfeeling greed.”⁹⁸ Sin caused disharmony and loss of wholeness just as it caused Adam to take power over Eve. “He controls her with force,

⁹⁵ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Whole Human Person*, online, available: http://www.metroplit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_09.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 858-859.

⁹⁶ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Whole Human Person*, online, available: http://www.metroplit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_09.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 284.

⁹⁷ “Человек, который был двоичей, одним существом в двух лицах, вдруг оказался двумя особями, перестал быть сверхличной иконой Святой Троицы. Каждый из них стал особью, это уже была не икона Святой Троицы, а разбитая икона. И между Адамом и Евой начались новые отношения, они были уже отдельны, они видели друг друга как ‘не я’, как ‘он’ и ‘она’, и в результате начались между ними отношения, которых вначале не было.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 792; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 92.

⁹⁸ “Физическое общение мужчины и женщины не греховно, греховно вожделение, греховна бесчувственная жадность.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 527; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.mitrar.ru/h_d/hd23.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 776.

but the woman longs for him because she cannot be without him, and on the other hand, she wins back authority from him through affection and persuasion.”⁹⁹ And as a result: “A mutual relationship that could be self-giving to the other without holding back, that could be an exultant love, becomes on the one hand, a possession, and on the other hand, a defense or other form of power.”¹⁰⁰ In the mutual attraction to one another, AB saw nostalgia for the restoration of unity. “So God establishes between them a mutual attraction. They are attracted to one another both psychologically and physically. They long for one another, because deep down in themselves they know that they are one and belong together, although experientially they know that something has happened to separate them.”¹⁰¹ As a remedy to the disharmony between man and woman, AB considered marriage as a place where two individuals again can become one human being – “one personhood in two persons.”¹⁰²

⁹⁹ “Он владеет силой, а женщина к нему льнет, потому что она без него не может, и с другой стороны, она завоевывает у него авторитет лаской, убеждением.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 527; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.mitras.ru/h_d/hd23.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 824.

¹⁰⁰ “И взаимное отношение, которое могло бы быть отдачей себя самого другому без оглядки, быть ликующей любовью, делается, с одной стороны, обладанием, а с другой — защитой или иным способом властвования.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 527; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.mitras.ru/h_d/hd23.htm

¹⁰¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Whole Human Person*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_09.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 859.

¹⁰² “[О]дной личностью в двух лицах.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 527; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.mitras.ru/h_d/hd23.htm. More on marriage, see further chapters.

III.4.2.3. Disharmony between Adam and God

We have seen how AB understands relationships and how sin caused disharmony in the relationship between humanity and the world, within Adam, between man and woman and now we will look at the disharmony between Adam and God. AB called Adam's sin a "loss of God."¹⁰³

And then the Fall happened: the human being lost God, lost himself and lost the vision of the beauty of the creation, a vision of harmony, and lost a vision of his way forward.¹⁰⁴

And as a consequence:

For the human being who has turned away from God and now stands with his back to Him, God does not exist. But the only source of life is God; all that is left for such a man is to die. This is what sin is, and the consequence of sin, – not as punishment, but as unavoidable consequence, is that it is impossible to tear oneself away from Life and remain alive.¹⁰⁵

From the above citation it becomes clear that sin consisted in Adam's decision to be without God. Adam turned away from life with God and became without God; the consequence of being without God is death. "Death is the consequence of sin, the consequence of the Fall, the consequence of our loss of God; death is the sign and seal

¹⁰³ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 525, 789. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 259.

¹⁰⁴ "Но потом произошло падение; человек потерял Бога, потерял себя самого и потерял видение красоты твари, видение гармонии, и потерял видение своего пути." Ibid., 90.

¹⁰⁵ "[У] человека, который отвернулся от Бога и стоит к Нему спиной, Бога нет, а единственный источник жизни – Бог, такому человеку остается только умереть. Вот в этом и грех, и последствие греха, – не как наказание, а как неизбежное последствие: нельзя оторваться от Жизни и остаться живым." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 528, Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/h_d/hd23.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 62; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 818.

of the catastrophe, emblematic of our separation from God.”¹⁰⁶ AB stated: “Sin is the state of a human being who has moved from God’s domain into a foreign land, to a land without God.”¹⁰⁷ God is the only source of life for being, and therefore *nonbeing* is to be without God, Godless. It was not God who withdrew grace from human beings, but humans who lost His grace. Thus, the Incarnation of Christ was God’s response to human God-forsakenness: “He responded to the human tragedy and the horror of Godlessness and became human *forever*.”¹⁰⁸ If we compare this with AB’s understanding of Christ’s God-forsakenness we might notice some similarities. Christ on the cross was abandoned by His Father and by the people, therefore, He became without God, Godless.

To summarize the above statements, we can conclude the following: Christ, according to AB, entered into the same state that Adam was in after sin and, because death was the consequence, He had to enter into the state of full separation from God which is death, to fill it with His Divinity and to bring salvation. Christ was sinless because He never turned away from God. Christ, according to AB, was never joined to sin but He accepted the consequence of sin – the separation from God, which is death.

As we saw in the second chapter, AB distinguished between a physical and spiritual death. The latter was the most horrible because it was a state of the loss of God.

¹⁰⁶ “Смерть – да, следствие греха, следствие падения, следствие нашей потери Бога, она знак и печать катастрофы, признак нашей отделенности от Бога.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 95.

¹⁰⁷ “[Г]рех – это состояние человека, который из Божией области перешел в чужую область, в область без Бога.” Ibid., 770.

¹⁰⁸ “[О]тозвался на человеческое горе и ужас обезбоженности и стал человеком *навсегда*.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/prop/prop_20.htm

Adam turned away from God and became Godless, so Christ also had to experience being forsaken by the Father and to enter into the same state that Adam was in order to heal it. Christ neither turned away from God nor from people: “He [Christ] stood before God and accepted upon Himself createdness, a human nature and all the consequences of human sin, including the loss of God. He accepted upon Himself all evil, except sin; He never turned away from God and never abandoned Him, never lied to Him, was never ashamed of Him, and never betrayed Him.”¹⁰⁹ Christ remained faithful to the Father and to the people and He healed the break that sin caused in paradise. “Christ died on the cross [...] with the soul He descended into Hades; he died abandoned by God and with His human soul He entered into the place where God is not [...], the Old Testament Hades [and] thus it exists no more, there is no longer a place where God is not.”¹¹⁰

We have seen in this section how AB understood the Fall and the consequences of the first sin, including death. His sin brought a Godless state to Adam and now we have to look at what God’s response was to this situation.

¹⁰⁹ “Он [Христос] стал перед Богом, приняв на Себя и тварность, и человеческое естество, и все последствия человеческого греха и отпадения от Бога. Все зло Он принял на Себя – кроме греха; от Бога Он никогда не отвернулся, никогда не отходил, никогда не лгал на Него, никогда не стыдился Его, никогда не предавал Его.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 135.

¹¹⁰ “Христос умер на кресте, [...] душой Он сошел во ад; Он умер, оставленный Богом, и душой Своей человеческой ушел туда, где Бога нет, в [...] ветхозаветный ад, [and] больше нет, не осталось места, где Бога нет.” Ibid., 135.

III.5. Salvation in Jesus Christ – the Godman

God's response to human sin is the Incarnation. God did not violate the nature or freedom He gave to creation; it remained preserved. God's creation of the world was based on a one-sided decision, but to save it He needs the agreement of creation. Salvation was not possible without humanity's free cooperation. "God does not violate His creation. He does not save by force. He hands Himself over to death so that we might believe in His love, He gives His Spirit to us so that we might be joined to Him in communion. The whole mystery of salvation is possible only with the free participation of human beings."¹¹¹

The Incarnation returned to creation the leader humanity had lost as a result of Adam's choice. Because Christ was born and lived like a human being "creation recognizes itself in Him, because Christ is born bodily, and in His corporeality, in His material existence all creation, from the smallest atom to the greatest galaxy, recognizes itself. Creation recognizes itself, but not as it is now: broken, exhausted, having lost its way, lost its mind, not as it was called to be in full Divine harmony and in full Divine love."¹¹²

¹¹¹ "Бог не насилует Свою тварь. Он не насильно спасает. Он отдает Себя на смерть для того, чтобы поверили в Его любовь, Он дает нам Своего Духа для того, чтобы мы приобщились к Нему. И все таинство спасения возможно только при свободном участии человека." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 109. Cf. *Ibid.*, 268.

¹¹² "[Т]варь в Нем себя узнает, потому что Христос рождается телесно, и в Его телесности, в Его материальном существовании вся тварь от самого малого атома до самой великой галактики узнает себя самое. Узнает себя, но не такой, какая она есть сейчас: сломанной, измученной, потерявшей свой путь, обезумевшей, но не такой, какой она призвана быть в полной Божественной гармонии и в полной Божественной любви." *Ibid.*, 260, 275.

In his talks and homilies, AB very often referred to the greatness of matter and the human person, which made it possible for God to become incarnate, as was already mentioned in the second chapter. I will now present AB's understanding of the humanity of Christ. In his numerous talks, he stressed the humanity of Christ above His Divinity: "[...] in Christ we do not discover only this Divine solidarity and incipiently, as I have tried to show, the value which God attaches to us. We discover also what man is, because he is not only Very God he is also Very Man."¹¹³ I believe that AB tried to stress humanity more than His Divinity to show listeners how closely God can be united with human beings. "This is God, the Son of God, Who became a genuine Human, while remaining fully God. [...] and the human is joined to Christ, because Christ through His Incarnation became Human. In this sense every human being is related to Him, for every human Christ is one of His own, his kin."¹¹⁴ Christ's genuine and perfect Humanity is seen not only in His human nature, but through the absence of evil in Him and his unity with the Godhead: "He is a genuine Human in the sense that He does not have any dark sides. There is no evil in Him, no self-absorption; He is full of love, compassion, and understanding."¹¹⁵

¹¹³ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *I Believe in God*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_04.htm; "[I]t is the Christ who is the Word of God made flesh, it is the Son of God who becomes the son of man..." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, "The Prayer of Intercession," online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_10.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 464.

¹¹⁴ "Это Бог, Сын Божий, Который стал поистине Человеком, оставаясь полностью Богом. [...] и человек приобщается ко Христу, потому что Христос воплощением Своим стал Человеком. И в этом отношении всякий человек Ему родной и для каждого человека Христос свой, родной." Ibid., 151.

¹¹⁵ "Он настоящий Человек в том смысле, что в Нем нет теневых сторон. В Нем нет зла, в Нем нет обращенности на Себя самого, Он весь – любовь, сострадание, понимание." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 577.

Christ as a New Adam, came to recover and to renew the image of God that the Old Adam did not preserve. Just as the Old Adam was a total man, as was presented above, Christ became a total Human, “the one who contained the whole mystery of man and woman [...]. If, in Christ, male and female are not contained together, the whole mystery of humanity, then only one part of humanity is saved and the other simply does not exist. [...] Is Christ male, or is He a total Man, *the whole of humanity* or *a male individual*? If He is the New Adam who contains in Himself the whole of humanity, then He was acting, at the same time, in the name of male and female in the full sense of the word.”¹¹⁶

AB stressed that Christ belongs to the same nature as the Old Adam: “He [Christ] is not a new creation, created in the place of the primal one; He is inscribed in the uninterrupted line of the mystical relationship between Adam and God. He came to renew the image of God in its perfection, in the total Adam, the total human being.”¹¹⁷ What kind of humanity did Christ take on? AB considers that Christ accepted not only a historical human nature but also an eschatological human nature.

¹¹⁶ “[С]одержащий всю тайну мужчины и женщины [...]. Если во Христе мужчина и женщина не составляют вместе всецелую тайну человечества, то лишь часть человечества спасена, а другой просто не существует. [...] Является ли Христос мужчиной или Он – Всечеловек, то есть в Нем *все человечество* или *мужская особь*? Если Он – Новый Адам, содержащий в Себе все человечество, тогда Он действовал одновременно от имени мужчины и женщины в полном смысле слова.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 834-835; 854. According to AB the women’s ordination to the priesthood is an open question in the Orthodox Church.

¹¹⁷ “Он [Christ] не новая тварь, созданная вместо первого, Он вписан в непрерывную линию таинственного отношения между Адамом и Богом. Он пришел обновить образ Божий в его совершенстве, всецелом Адаме, всецелом человеке.” Ibid., 323. The idea of the New Adam as a ‘total man’ was also present in the works of other theologians such as: Bulgakov and Sakharov. “Новый Адам является всечеловеком.” Sergius Bulgakov, *Тихие думы* (Moscow: Respublika, 1996), 273, online, available: <http://proroza.narod.ru/Bulgakov-7.htm>

[...] in becoming human, accepting flesh, the Word of God entered integrally in the whole reality of time, space and becoming. But along with this the Son of man was not bound by the limits of time, space and becoming, not only because He was at the same time God, but also because in His humanity He already is united with God; the humanity of Christ on earth already belongs not only to the days of His bodily existence, but also to eschatological time, that is the time, when everything will reach its fullness and fulfillment. The humanity of Christ belongs to a definite historical moment and, at the same time, to its fulfillment.¹¹⁸

If Christ's humanity belongs to the eschatological dimension, how then are we to understand His kenosis with all its limitations? Here we might see a dual action: Christ accepted human nature, but at the same time, He perfected Humanity not by any external power, but from within as a human in full unity with the Divine nature,¹¹⁹ and brought it to the higher level that Adam failed to achieve. That is why the Humanity of Christ is historical and eschatological at the same time. How then can a genuine and pure human nature correlate with the consequences of the sin that Christ accepted? In the Incarnation, Christ accepted everything that we are except sin, because sin, in AB's understanding, is the Godless state, and Christ never turned away from God. AB commented on Hebrews 4:15:

There is nothing human that would be alien to Him, except the falling away from God, the renunciation of God, the active godlessness that is, in the final sense, the root of all sins. But on the other hand, He reveals to us not only one of many people, instead, in His person, is revealed the image of what a human being can be: everything a human being can be we can find in His person. In the Church

¹¹⁸ “[...] становясь человеком, принимая плоть, Слово Божие вошло неотъемлемой частью во всю реальность времени, пространства и становления. Но вместе с тем Этот Сын человеческий не ограничен рамками времени, и пространства, и становления не только потому, что Он одновременно Бог, но потому что и в Своем человечестве Он уже соединен с Богом, и человечество Христа на земле уже принадлежит не только дням Его телесного бытия, но и эсхатологическому времени, то есть времени, когда все достигнет своей полноты, исполнения. Человечество Христово принадлежит определенному историческому моменту и одновременно завершению всего.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 487.

¹¹⁹ Cf. “He is the one and only genuine Human, because he is a partaker of the Divine nature.” “Он единственный подлинный Человек, потому что причастен Божественной природе.” *Ibid.*, 506.

too we see humanity in two forms – fallen and genuine. We see humanity as we are, and we see humanity, as it should be, because it has been revealed in Christ. We can also add that there is another person in the Church that already accomplished this marvelous humanity, and this is the Mother of God.¹²⁰

From the above citation, it becomes clear that, according to AB, only Christ and His Mother are perfect examples of the realization of the potential of true humanity and examples of cooperation with God's will. Christ is a collective example of the humanity of all people in the Church and they are called to become like Him through the sacraments: "[...] joining inseparably in the union with Christ through Baptism, through the receiving of Holy Communion, through the church's life in its totality, we become, together with Christ, the one he calls 'a total Christ' [...] and together represent the full manifestation of 'the Human being' with a capital 'H'."¹²¹ And this is a vocation for all people, not just for those who are in the Church, "to become people, human beings, like Him. [...] Until the human becomes the Human, until the world becomes God's once again through us, what continues to act and to rule in humanity, and far beyond, in the

¹²⁰ "Нет ничего человеческого, что было бы Ему чуждо, кроме отпадения от Бога, отречения от Бога, активного безбожия, которое есть в конечном итоге корень всякого греха. Но, с другой стороны, Он являет нам не просто одного из множества людей, а в Его лице является образ того, чем человек может быть: все, чем человек может быть, мы находим в Его лице. И в Церкви мы видим человечество в двух видах, падшем и истинном. Мы видим человечество, какое мы есть, и мы видим человечество, каким оно должно быть, потому что оно явлено во Христе. К этому можно добавить, что еще одно лицо в Церкви уже осуществило эту дивную человечность – это Божия Матерь." Ibid., 412.

¹²¹ "[...] соединяясь уже неразлучным единством со Христом через Крещение, через Причащение Тайн, через жизнь церковную в ее совокупности, мы делаемся вместе со Христом тем, что он называет 'всецелым Христом' [...] и вместе составляем всецелое явление Человека с большой буквы." Ibid., 413.

world, is suffering, death, cruelty and alienation from God, isolation and alienation from one another.”¹²²

All people are called to be participants in the Divine nature and in the life of the Trinity, but there is only one way – through Jesus Christ, who is both God and a human being. AB stressed the humanity of Christ because it is only through His humanity that we can access His Divinity and become participants in the life of the Trinity. AB said, “[...] in addition to humanness through Christ we recognize that He is not only the perfect Human, but also the perfect God [...]. Partaking of Christ according to his humanity, we partake inevitably [...] in His Divinity, [...] in Christ and in the Holy Spirit we enter into a completely new relationship with the God and Father.”¹²³

¹²² “[С]тать людьми, человеками, подобными Ему. [...] Пока человек не станет Человеком, пока мир не станет Божиим через нас, в человечестве и, шире, в мире продолжает действовать и властвовать страдание, смерть, жестокость, отчужденность от Бога, оторванность и отчужденность друг от друга.” Ibid., 426-427; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 680. In the other place AB said: “В Нем человечество нам явлено в Церкви во всем своем величии, во всей своей глубине, во всем своем значении. Он – единственный человек, который полностью Человек, и Он – откровение того, чем призван быть человек. А человек призван быть тем, чем был Христос: не просто человеком, отделенным своим тварным состоянием от Нетварного, но именно человеком в его единстве с Богом. [In Him humanity is revealed to be in the Church in all its greatness, in all its depth, in all its destiny. He is – the only human, who is fully a Human, and He is – the revelation of what the human being is called to be. A human is called to be what Christ was: not just a human, separated by his own created state from the Uncreated One, but precisely a human being by virtue of his unity with God.]” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy5.htm>

¹²³ “[...] кроме человечности, через Христа мы познаем, что Он есть не только Человек совершенный, но и совершенный Бог [...]. И приобщаясь ко Христу по человечеству, мы приобщаемся неизбежно [...] и Его Божеству. [...] во Христе и Духом Святым мы вступаем в совершенно новые отношения с Богом и Отцом.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 471. In another place, AB said: “Богочеловек, Он по природе Бог и по природе человек. Мы человечны по природе и должны стать по приобщению обоженными, преображенными и соединенными с Божественной природой. [Godman, according to the nature He is God and human. We are human by the nature and we have to become divinized by participation, transfigured and united with the Divine nature.]” Ibid., 506.

Through His Incarnation, Christ not only showed the greatness of matter and humanity, but also the greatness of God expressed through His kenosis and readiness to descend into the Godlessness of the human being caused as a result of sin.

III.5.1. An “Atheistic” Christ

The last consistent element of the theoretical dimension of AB’s kenotic theology, which appears in his understanding of God-forsakenness, is the theme of atheism. The word “atheism” derives from the Greek adjective “atheos” (ἄθεος, from the privative ἄ- + θεός “god”), literally “Godless,” without God,¹²⁴ and AB used this term in his theology almost always according to the original meaning. AB used the words “atheism, atheistic” without referring to aggression against God, “but to an attitude of mind and outlook in which God has no place, in which he doesn’t exist...”¹²⁵ As will be discussed below, he also linked etymological “atheism” with secularism.

¹²⁴ Walter R. Dietz, “Atheism,” in *Religion past & Present: Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*, ed. H. D. Betz, [4th ed., English ed.], (Leiden: Brill, 2007/2009), 477; Bernd Groth, “Atheism,” in *Dictionary of Fundamental Theology*, ed. René Latourelle, Rino Fisichella, English-language, (New York: Crossroad, 1994). Cf. “An atheist is a man who lives without God.” “Atheism,” in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, eds. J. P. Reid, B. Mondin, 2nd ed., (Detroit: Thomson/Gale, 2003), 822; “Atheism is a lack of belief in gods, from the original Greek meaning of ‘without gods,’” online, available: http://www.atheists.org/atheism/About_Atheism; “It’s true that atheists are by definition Godless, but it’s possible to draw a subtle distinction between the two concepts. Atheism is the absence of belief in gods; Godlessness is the absence of gods and is generally defined as not recognizing or worshipping any gods. Technically, a person could believe in the existence of gods they don’t worship. This might be rare, but the implications are important. Godlessness need not deny the existence of gods, but it does dismiss their importance,” online, available: <http://atheism.about.com/od/Godlessamericaamericans/p/Godlessness.htm>. We can see some similarities between AB’s interpretation of Godlessness and atheism. I was not able to find in AB’s theology references to philosophical atheism or to anti-religious campaigns. As we will see later, AB was not trying to persuade atheists with his understanding of sin and Christ’s experience on the cross as Godlessness. Rather he used this argument to explain to Christians the saving act of Christ.

¹²⁵ Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 50.

As already presented in the second chapter, AB understood death as the loss of God (Godlessness) and, therefore, to die, according to AB, meant to become an “atheist” in the etymological sense of the word. Christ accepted the deepest root of death, “which is the loss of God, which we can even call – using the term in its etymological sense – atheism, god-lessness.”¹²⁶ Christ through His Incarnation and Baptism accepted all that is Godless,¹²⁷ but the culminating moment was the God-forsakenness of Christ on the cross. It was “the moment when He agreed to identify Himself with us to such a degree that He experienced the full, murderous, deadly Godlessness, and He died because He shared with us our state of being left without God (обезбоженность), the loss of God.”¹²⁸ As we can see, AB identified “atheism” with “Godlessness.” This is very unusual for a contemporary person, because one usually associates the word “atheism” with disbelief in God and an aggressive, militant action against God or religion.¹²⁹

AB’s interpretation of Christ’s God-forsakenness as atheistic is a unique approach to kenotic theology. For AB, Christ became “an atheist” on the cross in the

¹²⁶ “[...] именно, потерю Бога, можно было бы сказать, употребляя слово в его этимологическом значении, – атеизм, безбожие.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 854; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 734-735.

¹²⁷ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 554; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, “The Prayer of Intercession,” online, available: http://www.mitr.ru/eng/eng_10.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 240.

¹²⁸ “[М]омент, когда Он согласился настолько полно отождествиться с нами, что опытно пережил полное, убийственное, мертвящее безбожие и умер – потому что разделил с нами нашу обезбоженность, отсутствие Бога.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 141; 854; Cf. “Jesus nailed to the Cross loses the consciousness of his union with God. He can die, because he, free of sin, becomes at that moment fully a partaker of the destiny of man, and he also is left without God, and having no God he dies.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man*, online, available: http://www.mitr.ru/eng/eng_03.htm

¹²⁹ Cf. Paul Edwards, “Atheism,” in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Donald M. Borchert, 2nd ed., (Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2006), 356

etymological sense. He also identified the terms “death,” “loss of God” and etymological “atheism”: “If you turn to Scripture you will see that death and sin, that is death and severance from God, death and the loss of God, what one can call, etymologically, atheism are inseparably linked. The fact of not having a God is at the root of death.”¹³⁰

AB always underlined, “in an etymological sense,” because it is only in this sense that Christ could become “an atheist”; in all other meanings it would be heresy from the Orthodox point of view. For instance, if Christ could have ontologically ceased to be God or could have abandoned His Divine nature, or in some way abandoned faith in God, salvation would not have been completed and Christ would remain only a moral example for Christians. AB was aware of this and he never crossed this line in his theology. In spite of this, AB’s commentary on God-forsakenness was misread and he was unjustly criticized by Vladimir Moss:

One Soviet metropolitan is reported to have said that Christ on the Cross, in uttering the cry: ‘My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?’, actually *became an atheist*. This is, of course, nonsense. But it is not nonsense – rather, it is the precise truth – to say that on the Cross, Christ took upon Himself the horror of the atheist’s condition, the accursedness of being without God (‘a’ – without, ‘theos’ – God).¹³¹

¹³⁰ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_03.htm; Cf. Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 56; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 88, 95.

¹³¹ Vladimir Moss, *The Mystery of Redemption* (St. Michael’s Press, 2007), footnote on page 55, online, available: http://www.orthodoxchristianbooks.com/downloads/163_THE_MYSTERY_Of_REDEMPTION.pdf. Moss did not even use the name of AB in his book but, by avoiding it, he exposed his own hostility to AB. Moss’ family belonged for some period of time to the parish in which AB was a pastor for almost 50 years. AB was aware of the general accusation (although, I am not sure about this particular instance of it) concerning the “atheistic Christ,” so he explained in detail his argument underlining again the etymological aspect of such an approach. “Как-то мои слова пересказали в Греции кому-то, и вышла большая передовица о том, что ‘Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh – еретик: он утверждает, что Христос был безбожником.’ [Somehow my words were retold in Greece to someone, and it got a great

In the second sentence, Moss justified the “atheistic” interpretation of God-forsakenness, but in the first sentence he pulled AB’s words out of context. AB was aware that his understanding of God-forsakenness might be misunderstood, but he felt confident in such an interpretation. We might ask why AB used such provocative phraseology in his talks. Was it to get the attention of listeners or to shock them? Perhaps it was something deeper. I think AB used these terms on purpose, but not only to get the attention of his listeners. AB also wanted to point out the tragedy of sin and that salvation lies in Christ. We will see later how AB used this concept in his theology. This is what he said about such an approach to the question of Christ’s God-forsakenness: “This is my proposal, I will introduce it to you as best I can. I can only say that people fully Orthodox, with whom I spoke about this, did not accuse me of heresy and did not refuse to commune with me. Nevertheless, it is an unusual, uncommon approach. I think we can say that in order to die our death i.e., a death which is significant to us, which has real substantive effects for us – Christ had to partake of the one and only cause of death: separation from God.”¹³² AB again explained his understanding of Christ’s God-forsakenness: “And when I talked about it, about Godlessness, I certainly did not mean to say that Christ ceased to believe in God, denied Him or, through sin, fell away from

editorial, as if ‘Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh is a heretic, because he is stating that Christ was an atheist.’]” Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 240-241.

¹³² “Это моя выкладка, я вам ее представлю, как умею; я только могу сказать, что люди вполне православные, с которыми я говорил об этом, меня в ереси не осудили и не отказываются общаться со мной, но тем не менее это непривычный, необычный подход. Мне кажется, что можно сказать, что для того, чтобы умереть нашей смертью, то есть смертью, которая для нас значима, которая для нас имеет реальные, существенные последствия, Христос должен был приобщиться к единственной причине смерти – к отрыву от Бога.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 56.

Him. Rather, at a particular point, through a providential act of His God and Father, Christ in His humanity, lost consciousness of what He is in relation to His God and Father.”¹³³

In his numerous references to Christ’s God-forsakenness as atheistic or Godless (I will call AB’s argument – ‘the atheistic Christ’), AB stated that Christ’s experience was much deeper than any atheists might experience in their lives.

The cry of the Savior: *My God, My God why have you forsaken Me?* (Mk. 15, 34) – is the cry of the perfect Human, Who freely, because of love, partook of the main tragedy of humanity: his separation from God, – to the point that He lost God. If we accept this, I think we can say that Christ experienced atheism (I am not talking about ideological atheism, but its reality), Godlessness as no atheist in the world experienced it. There is no human being, neither atheist nor believer, who in this sense can stand outside the experience of Christ. [...] ¹³⁴

And, in another place, AB was even more precise.

There is no atheist in the world who could experience the loss of God in the way Christ experienced the loss of God. There is no atheist, whether convinced and ideological, or simply Godless in terms of daily reality, who could go to the depths of this absence as Christ did.¹³⁵

¹³³ “И когда я говорил об этом, о без-божии, я, конечно, не хотел сказать, что Христос перестал верить в Бога, отрекся от Него или грехом от Него отпал, а что в какой-то момент по промыслительному действию Бога и Отца Он в Своем человечестве потерял сознание, чем Он является по отношению к Богу и Отцу.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 241.

¹³⁴ “[К]рик Спасителя: *Боже Мой, Боже Мой, зачем Ты Меня оставил?* (Мк. 15, 34) – это крик совершенного Человека, Который свободно, по любви приобщился к основной трагедии человека: к его оторванности от Бога, к тому, что он потерял Бога. Но если это принять, то, думаю, можно сказать, что Христос испытал безбожие (я говорю не об идеологическом безбожии, а о реальности его), обезбоженность, как ни один атеист на свете его не испытал, и что нет ни одного человека – ни атеиста, ни верующего, – который в этом смысле вне опыта Христа. [...]” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 57.

¹³⁵ “Нет ни одного безбожника в мире: который познал бы отсутствие Бога так, как Христос познал потерю Бога. Нет ни одного атеиста, будь он убежденный, идеологический атеист или просто житейский безбожник, кто бы так измерил глубину этого отсутствия, как ее измерил Христос.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 735; *Ibid.*, 241. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_03.htm

The same idea is present in Fr. Sophrony Sakharov's statement that "Unbelievers have no idea of what it means to be bereft of God."¹³⁶ It is difficult to find out who borrowed this idea from whom. We have already seen how AB borrowed some ideas from Fr. Sophrony. In the previous examples, however, AB referenced Fr. Sophrony, whereas in this case AB did not. Taking into account that AB did not always carefully cite the works of different authors, we can assume that this time he might not have done so with good reason. Here, the reason for the difference is contextual. Fr. Sophrony, for his part, used this idea in the context of Christians' experience of the absence of God and used the unbeliever as an example of someone who may have never experienced Christ and does not know what they have lost. Although Christians experienced God, now in the moment of His absence, Fr. Sophrony described their experience as being something similar to Christ's God-forsakenness.¹³⁷ Although AB also used this example to underline the Christian's experience of the absence of God, he mostly described the atheist's experience and Christ's God-forsakenness.

In any case, what makes the experience of Christ more horrible than that of atheists who experience God's absence? As presented earlier, Christ, according to AB, was immortal in His human nature but freely accepted the consequences of sin, including the most terrible one, which is the loss of God (Godlessness) and its result – death. AB believed the question of atheism was only capable of being resolved in Christ: "[...] the atheist issue, the issue of the godless human being, can only be resolved in

¹³⁶ Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *We Shall See Him as He Is*, trans., Rosemary Edmonds, (Essex, 2004), 128.

¹³⁷ Cf. *Ibid.*, 128.

Christ and not outside of Christ.”¹³⁸ AB was once asked if, in God-forsakenness, Christ experienced the very essence of humanity. AB replied:

No, I would not put it that way, because man, as God conceived of and created him, was not cut off from Him. Separation is the fruit of our sinfulness. But Christ did not enter into the area of our sin, that is, He did not partake of sin, only its consequences. It seems to me that Christ, on the one hand, chose absolute solidarity (if I may use such a non-theological term) with the human being and had, together with all humanity, to experience abandonment by God and the loss of God, and to die from this. And on the other hand, because he also chose uncompromising solidarity with God, He was expelled by human society, and had to die outside the walls, that is, outside the human city, on Golgotha.¹³⁹

As we can see, the loss of God (Godlessness) is not an ontological aspect of human nature, but is a consequence of Adam’s decision to turn away from God, to become god-less and finally die. Christ Himself never abandoned either His Father or the people who killed Him; He was in full solidarity with them both.¹⁴⁰ He took upon Himself humanity’s Godlessness, and as a consequence experienced abandonment by the Father and by the people. This is what makes Christ’s experience so terrible and dramatic. AB used “the atheistic Christ” as the basis for his conversations with atheists:

¹³⁸ “[...] есть тема атеиста, тема безбожника, которая разрешается во Христе, а не вне Христа.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 57.

¹³⁹ “Нет, я бы так не сказал, потому что человек, как Бог его задумал и создал, не был оторван от Него. Оторванность – плод нашей греховности. Но Христос не вступает в область нашего греха, то есть Он приобщается не греху, а его последствиям. Мне кажется, что Христос, с одной стороны, выбрал абсолютную солидарность (если можно употребить такой небогословский термин) с человеком и должен был вместе со всем человечеством испытать богооставленность и потерю Бога и от этого умереть; и, с другой стороны, потому что Он выбрал бескомпромиссную солидарность с Богом, Он был извержен человеческим обществом и должен был умереть вне стен, то есть вне града человеческого, на Голгофе.” Ibid., 57.

¹⁴⁰ What is most remarkable is AB’s silence on the following words of Christ after His God-forsakenness – “Into your hands I commend my spirit” (Lk 23:46) – which would confirm Christ’s solidarity with the Father. Instead AB referred to the words of Christ: “It is finished” (John 19:30). Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 240. This would confirm again that AB is not interested in the role of the Father in the abandonment of His Son, but the role of the Son in the act of salvation, who wanted to fulfill and complete salvation. More analysis of this will be provided in the following chapter.

“[I]f one accepts what I said earlier about Christ’s state concerning the absence of God, the loss of God, then our fundamental attitude to the atheist cannot be the attitude of an enemy, an opponent. And I believe this is very important, because the way we see another person, anybody else, already defines the possibility of encounter and mutual relationship.”¹⁴¹ AB used “the atheistic Christ” as the ultimate example to explain to Christians what atheists and agnostics might experience in their lives: “He died our death, experienced our Godlessness, and no one can estimate the tragedy of the agnostic or atheist in the way and time in which Christ experienced it.”¹⁴² In the Conclusion, I will come back to the difference between the experience of atheists and the experience of Christ.

In his reflection on atheism, AB referred not only to atheism in the etymological sense, but also to ideological atheism and the theology of “the death of God.” This latter point will be developed below. Now I will proceed to AB’s perspective on the atheism in Soviet Russia.

¹⁴¹ “Если принять то, что я сказал раньше о положении Христа в отношении отсутствия Бога, потери Бога, наше принципиальное отношение к атеисту не может быть отношением врага, противника. И я думаю, что это очень важно, потому что то, как мы рассматриваем другого человека, любого другого, уже определяет возможности встречи и взаимоотношений.” Ibid., 74.3. AB’s understanding of this kind of encounter will be presented in the following chapter.

¹⁴² Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Encounter*, trans. from Russian by Tatiana Wolff, (London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd, 2005), 24.

III.5.2. Anthony Bloom's Response to the Atheism in Russia and in the West

AB visited Soviet Russia a few times but, as Andrew Walker pointed out in his obituary: "Metropolitan Anthony's stature among the people of Soviet Russia was enhanced by the fact that he remained loyal to the Patriarchate, but maintained total political independence. This unique position of a see in the Russian Diaspora was the lynchpin of the Metropolitan's realpolitik throughout the Soviet years."¹⁴³ AB never openly criticized the Soviet government, but instead he confronted its atheistic roots, the total negation of God's existence. Also, for many years he was a voice of Orthodoxy over the BBC Radio. His talks and his books were distributed unofficially through "samizdat," and officially after 1988. AB often had services of prayer (Molebens)¹⁴⁴ for persecuted Christians and in 1974 he prayed for dissidents, especially Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn when he was expelled from the Soviet Union. AB also wrote a letter in which he upheld Solzhenitsyn and, for this act, AB was dismissed from his position as Exarch, even though he announced that he had resigned.

Some people accused AB of being a "Red bishop" because he belonged to the Moscow Patriarchate, which collaborated with the Soviet government. It might be surprising to some that he remained with the Moscow Patriarchate when his political

¹⁴³ Andrew Walker, "Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh. Charismatic head of the Russian Orthodox Church in Great Britain and Ireland," *The Independent*, 9 August 2003, online, available: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/metropolitan-anthony-of-sourozh-548558.html>

¹⁴⁴ Liturgical service in Orthodox and Eastern Christian Church in honor of Jesus Christ, the Mother of God or a particular saint. A Moleben may be occasional (served according to need), commemorative (assigned to a particular day), or may be devotional (in honor of a particular saint).

views were generally those of a Russian monarchist. In defending his faithfulness to Moscow he explained that this Church is persecuted, but did not fall into heresy. Its Apostolic faith was kept intact. He said: “You do not abandon your family when it is in trouble.”¹⁴⁵ During his visits to Soviet Russia, he preached about the Church as a place for those who are rejected and persecuted on earth, and about the place of the believer in the atheistic world of the West. “There are so many countries today where atheism has prevailed. There are so many souls in which godlessness reigns. And now, especially in some countries, the church has become a place of refuge for the persecuted God.”¹⁴⁶ AB distinguished between atheism in Soviet Russia and the atheism of the West.

So often, going to Russia and meeting atheists that are of a quite different stamp than the vague atheism one meets in the West - people who have never met God, who have no notion of God, for whom God doesn't exist – I have felt an agony about them: what about them? And then the thought came to me that when Christ died God-less on the cross, He plumbed the depth of godlessness as not one atheist has ever experienced or known it, and even an atheist is not outside the mystery of the saving God in Christ. This is something, which to me is the Way of the Cross.¹⁴⁷

Reflecting on the origins of atheism in Russia, AB used Nikolai Leskov's thesis: “Rus was baptized, but never illumined.”¹⁴⁸ To explain the lack of faith in the West, AB pointed to its forgetfulness of its Christian roots and its turning toward secularism. AB

¹⁴⁵ Gillian Crow, *This Holy Man: Impressions of Metropolitan Anthony* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2005), 103.

¹⁴⁶ “Столько есть стран сейчас, где безбожие победило. Столько есть человеческих душ, в которых безбожие царствует. И храм теперь, особенно в некоторых странах, стал местом убежища гонимого Бога.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 96.

¹⁴⁷ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Way of the Cross: Extracts from a Talk at Essex University 14 March, 1996*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_162.htm

¹⁴⁸ “Русь была крещена, но никогда не была просвещена.” N. S. Leskov, *Соборяне*, vol. 4, (Moscow: Khud. lit., 1957), 59. Nikolai Leskov (1831-1895) was a Russian novelist who wrote about different forms of popular devotion.

saw two general trends of secularism in the world. The first one consists of a loss of the sense of God. Christians lost, but not completely, the living aspect of their faith: “When we turn within ourselves and judge our own selves, we can see with tragic clarity [...] that we belong, to a large extent, to this worldly and secular society. Alas, even in us the sense of God is clouded, weak and lifeless.”¹⁴⁹ The second form of secularism consists in excessive attentiveness to the world’s desires, pressures and demands. This hypersensitivity to the world has obscured our sense of God and led to our practical denial of Him.

AB justified the unbelief of people who lost their faith because of the lack of Christian life among Christians: “[...] We should have repented of having allowed the whole world, millions of people to lose God – by the fact that we showed ourselves to be not fully Christians; that no one who meets us sees Christ in our eyes; that in our image the radiance of Divine life is not reflected. Because of this, the Church as a whole and every individual Christian needs to offer repentance before God.”¹⁵⁰ AB stated that the questions raised by atheists were “provoked not through the denial of God as He is, but

¹⁴⁹ “Когда мы оборачиваемся внутрь себя и судим себя самих, мы с трагической ясностью видим [...] что мы в большой степени принадлежим этому мирскому, секулярному обществу: ведь и в нас чувство Бога замутнено, слабо, безжизненно.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 448.

¹⁵⁰ “[...] мы должны были бы принести покаяние в том, что мы дали целому миру, миллионам людей потерять Бога – тем, что оказались не христианами до конца, что никто, встречая нас, не видит Христа в наших глазах, в нашем образе не отражается сияние божественной жизни. И в этом и Церковь в целом, и каждый христианин должен был бы принести перед Богом покаяние.” *Ibid.*, 398.

God as we represent Him. Just looking at events of Christian history is enough to cause us to recoil.”¹⁵¹ He continued in another place:

For centuries, it seems, within the Church we have tried to make our God as great as we could, by making man small. This can be seen even in works of art in which the Lord Jesus Christ is represented great and his creatures very small, indeed at his feet. The intention was to show how great God was, and yet it has resulted in the false, mistaken, almost blasphemous view that man is small or, in the denial of this, God treats men as though they were of no value. And these two reactions are equally wrong. The one belongs to people who claim to be children of God, God’s own chosen people, who are the Church. They have managed, by doing this, to make themselves as small as the image they have of men, and their communities as small and lacking in scope and greatness as their constitutive parts. The other attitude is one we find outside the Church, among the agnostics, the rationalists and the atheists; and we are responsible for these two attitudes and we shall be accountable for both in history and at the day of judgment. And yet this is not God’s vision of man.¹⁵²

The diminution of a human being for the price of increasing the role of God caused some thinkers, such as existentialists, to try to restore the value of the human being through the denial of the existence of God.

In Communist atheism, besides the fact that it turns human beings into gods, AB also criticized the idea of “the collective,” where there is a distinction between the theoretical and empirical human being. AB pointed out the lack of a personal dimension in this system.

[On] the one hand, the theoretical man is a god; at the same time the empirical man is a victim and a slave. This, I think, is explained by the fact that the theoretical man in question who is placed on the altar of atheism is not a personal man, he is not each man considered in his person, which is not only inimitable

¹⁵¹ “[P]ождено не отрицанием Бога, Какой Он есть, а Бога, Каким мы Его представляем. Если взять историю христианского мира, то можно отшатнуться.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 58.

¹⁵² Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_03.htm; Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 85.

but also unique, but it is the collective man. And this theoretical–collective man, who is unique, challenges the rights of the individual man.¹⁵³

AB illustrated the difference between the collective human being and the concept of the Church as a living body, by making a distinction between the “individual” and the “personal.”

The collective position is that in which an ideological minority becomes a *de facto* majority, having the right to impose its will on each member of the society. In the Church there is nothing of the sort. Even the will and word of God have no authority in the sense of a law which is imposed. If we respond to it, we do so because we are sensitive to the truth of what is proclaimed to us and we reach out towards this reality, which is the only means we have of becoming fully free and fully ourselves. The will of God is not a law nor an imprisonment. [...] On the other hand, in the atheistic world of the collectivity it is a will of iron that is imposed on its members: it pours scorn on the convictions and the most categorical imperatives of conscience, because the truth is expressed by the Party...¹⁵⁴

Criticizing the diminution of the role of the human person, AB underlined in his theology the value of the person that was revealed through the life and death of Jesus Christ. Christians and the Church “have grown small” because they have lost the sense of human greatness given by God through Christ.

When we try to understand the value which God himself attaches to man we see that we are bought at a high price, that the value which God attaches to man is the life and death, the tragic death, of the only begotten Son upon the Cross. [...] And this is the way in which God looks at man - in terms of the sonship offered us in the Incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ, implied in the act of creation and in our calling to become partakers of the divine nature, to become sons by adoption in the only begotten Son and in the only Son; to become, in the very words of Irenaeus of Lyons, *the* only begotten son in the total Christ. [...] We have grown small because we have made our God into an idol and ourselves into slaves. We must recapture the sense of the greatness of that God revealed in Christ and the greatness of man revealed by him. And then the world may begin

¹⁵³ Ibid., 86.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 87-88; 50-51.

to believe and we may become co-workers of God for the salvation of all things.¹⁵⁵

AB had a few open discussions with unbelievers. The most famous one was with an atheist, Margharita Laski, on BBC radio.¹⁵⁶ AB did not attempt to justify his faith, but instead he gave his testimony and stated that his faith is based on total conviction:

“[B]ecause I know that God exists, and I am puzzled how you manage not to know.”¹⁵⁷

At another time AB referred to the life of others who also experienced an encounter with God: “[I]n fact, atheism is the unwillingness to accept even witnesses of history, even of particular people who say: ‘I know’.”¹⁵⁸

It is interesting to observe the development of AB’s understanding of ideological atheism. While he always spoke within the context of ‘the atheistic Christ’ in the 1980s, he surmised that the roots of ideological atheism lay in a person’s lack of experience of God. That is why for AB,

[A]theism as ‘experiential knowledge’ is a misunderstanding. Ideological atheism, for instance, the philosophy of atheism might simply correspond to the education you received. But when someone says: ‘I know nothing about God, and therefore He cannot exist’ – this is a very primitive approach. [...] So when someone says: ‘I am an unbeliever,’ or says: ‘There is no God!’, these statements do not always have to be treated from the philosophical point of view. Instead the question might be posed: ‘Where does this come from?’ [...] In some sense Godlessness is an intellectual misunderstanding, because it is a refusal to explore

¹⁵⁵ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man*, online, available: http://www.mitras.ru/eng/eng_03.htm

¹⁵⁶ Archbishop Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 7.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 7

¹⁵⁸ “[B] сущности безбожие – это нежелание принять свидетельство хотя бы истории, хотя бы отдельных людей, которые говорят: ‘Я знаю’.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 930.

all reality, it is as unscientific as to say: Music is nothing to me, therefore it does not exist...¹⁵⁹

As we can see, for AB faith is based on the experience of God and a personal experience with Him: “Now at a certain moment this experience faded away, as does every experience of beauty, of love, of joy, and of pain. There is a moment when it is no longer actual, but the certainty of it has remained. And this is the moment when faith comes into it. But faith doesn’t mean credulity; it means that the certainty remains about something which is not our actual present experience of things.”¹⁶⁰ This experience of God can be gained outside of any previous religious context or background, but will immediately affect our attitude and love for other people.¹⁶¹ AB shared how much he had learned from his relationships with atheists, especially in their humanity, their attitude towards others. He said, “[I] understood very much in Christianity and in the Orthodox faith from reading and communicating with non-Christians, just secular people, with non-believers, who were, if I may say, ‘human beings,’ i.e., I saw in them a genuine human being who is able to love, to self-sacrifice, to be compassionate, to be

¹⁵⁹ “[A]теизм как ‘опытное знание’ – недоразумение. Идеологический атеизм, скажем, философия атеизма может просто соответствовать тому воспитанию, которое вы получили, но когда человек говорит: ‘Я о Боге ничего не знаю, и поэтому Его не может быть’, – это очень примитивный подход. [...] Так что когда человек говорит: ‘Я неверующий’, – или говорит: ‘Бога нет!’, – не всегда надо подходить с философской точки зрения, иногда можно поставить вопрос: Откуда это идет? [...] В каком-то смысле безбожие – это научное недоразумение, это отказ от исследования всей реальности, это так же ненаучно, как сказать: для меня музыка не существует, и поэтому ее нет...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 51-52; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 930.

¹⁶⁰ Archbishop Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 8. This argument AB borrowed from Macarius the Great and I will return to it in a later chapter.

¹⁶¹ Cf. *Ibid.*, 12.

merciful, and everything to which the parable about the sheep and goats refers (Mt 25:31-46).”¹⁶²

In a discussion with Paul Van Buren, a representative of the ‘death of God’ theology,¹⁶³ AB was opposed to Van Buren’s definition of a “Christian atheist”. Van Buren came to his conclusions because he had no experience of the Resurrection. He said in his conversation with AB: “I never experienced the Resurrection – I was not risen. I can believe that Christ is risen, but it did not affect me. When I think about my place – the most I can say is that I stand at that point of the trajectory where Christ seemingly lost God.”¹⁶⁴ AB concluded from this that Van Buren’s idea of a “Christian atheist” has nothing in common with the atheism of Christ on the cross. AB made a bold distinction between militant and etymological atheism: “When someone writes: ‘I am a Christian atheist’ – it suggests that he denies God, but it in no way says that he stands at

¹⁶² “[Я] очень многое понял в христианстве и в православной вере от чтения и от общения с нехристианами, просто с секуляризованными людьми, с неверующими, которые были, если можно так выразиться, ‘человеками’, то есть в которых я увидел настоящего человека, способного на любовь, на жертвенность, на сострадание, на милосердие, на все то, о чем говорит притча об овцах и козлищах (Мф 25:31-46).” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 401.

¹⁶³ The “Death of God” theological movement arose in 1960-70 in the USA. The main theologians of this movement are: Gabriel Vahanian, Paul Van Buren, William Hamilton and Thomas J. J. Altizer, and the rabbi Richard L. Rubenstein. These theologians tried to adapt the Gospel to atheistic society, eliminating from it the supernatural and divine aspects by stressing the humanist level. They were inspired by the late works of D. Bonhoeffer and used his terminology. For these thinkers even the word “God” lost its meaning and that is why for them to be a Christian means to move from the problem of faith to the practical level. Contemporary human beings are not turning to God as the Savior, but looking for help from the world. Christ became a moral example, who dedicated his life to others and who acted in love. Vahanian, Van Buren, Hamilton used the notion of the death of God in a metaphorical sense (any concept of God is meaningless), while Altizer understood it literally (God is dead).

¹⁶⁴ “Я опытно ничего не знаю о воскресении – я не воскресал. Я могу верить, что Христос воскрес, но до меня это не дошло. Когда я думаю, где мое место, – в лучшем случае я стою на том пункте траектории, где Христос как бы потерял Бога.” *Ibid.*, 926.

the tragic point where he participates in the experience of Christ on the cross.”¹⁶⁵ Christ lost contact with Someone, in Whom He believed, but atheists refute and deny the existence of God. I will return to this statement later in an analytical section of this thesis.

By the end of AB’s life, he started to doubt his argument that atheism is based in the lack of the experience of God and started to see some deeper roots, such as a reality of atheism again in its etymological understanding: “[...] I am beginning to understand (probably, I will understand at ninety)¹⁶⁶ that there is something real in atheism – not just misunderstanding, lack of experience, etc.”¹⁶⁷ There is a lack of clarity about what AB meant by “something real,” and this leaves the reader with an open question. Because after this statement, he proceeded to the God-forsakenness of Christ and, in this case, he linked and underlined the importance of remembering the other kenotic events that preceded the Resurrection.

In our understanding we think that the Resurrection destroyed everything that preceded it. We imagine that we live already in the Resurrection. This is not so – mostly we live on this side of Holy Week. We are *not* Christians of the post-Christian world. We are Christians who are not yet Christians at all, or Christians to only a very small extent. [...] The hands and feet of the risen Christ still bear wounds from the nails. In His side there is a wound. His brow bears the marks of the crown of thorns. [...]¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁵ “[К]огда человек пишет: ‘Я – христианский безбожник’, – это наводит на мысль, что он отрицает Бога, это вовсе не говорит, что он стоит на той трагической грани, где участвует в опыте Христа на кресте.” Ibid., 926; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 744.

¹⁶⁶ AB passed away in 2003 at the age of 89.

¹⁶⁷ “[...] я начинаю понимать (вероятно, пойму годам к девяноста), что в атеизме есть что-то очень реальное, атеизм – не просто не понимание, отсутствие опыта и т.п.” Ibid., 744.

¹⁶⁸ “В нашем представлении нам кажется, что Воскресение уничтожило все, что его предвляло. Мы воображаем, что живем уже в Воскресении. Это не так – по большей части мы живем по эту сторону Страстной седмицы. Мы *не* христиане постхристианского мира. Мы христиане, которые еще совсем не христиане или христиане в очень малой мере. [...] Руки и ноги воскресшего Христа

This is a warning AB made to those Christians who are too quick to move from the tragedy of Holy Friday to the joy of the Resurrection of Christ. That is why AB stressed so often the tragedy of the cross in his talks. AB reminded us that we all live atheistically, i.e., without God.

[We] are all *atheists* to some extent, that is, outside of God, and we should be better able to understand the horror of those who are completely without God. It seems to me that here we need a deeper understanding of some aspects of what happened to Christ: the Garden of Gethsemane, the Last Supper and its emotional sadness, the Crucifixion and the whole course of events of Passion Week. Then we would become closer to the atheist and he would understand us much better. Because when we pretend that we are resurrected, but in fact are still dead, no one is convinced and this is the whole problem. I think we could deepen our relationship, our connection with atheists, precisely by deepening and enriching our own connection with the events of Christ's life...¹⁶⁹

The remembrance of these events and especially the reality of Christ's experience is the key to understanding the state of atheists. It is a very interesting link between the kenosis of Christ, including God-forsakenness, and atheists that extends AB's understanding of kenosis to a practical level. The difference between his earlier statement concerning the atheists' lack of experience and his later view is in the underlining of the reality of being an atheist, which is, being without God.

все еще носят язвы от гвоздей. В ребрах Его рана. На челе у Него следы тернового венца. [...]” Ibid., 744.

¹⁶⁹ “[...] все мы довольно-таки *атеисты*, то есть вне Бога, и могли бы несколько лучше понимать ужас того, кто совершенно без Бога. Мне кажется, что здесь нам нужно глубже понять некоторые аспекты того, что происходило со Христом: Гефсиманский сад, Тайная вечеря и ее туга душевная, Распятие, целый ряд событий Страстной седмицы и т. д. Тогда мы стали бы гораздо ближе атеисту, и он понимал бы нас немного лучше. Потому что когда мы делаем вид, что воскресли, а на самом деле еще мертвецы, никого это не убеждает, в этом-то вся беда. Я думаю, что мы могли бы углубить свои отношения, свою связь с атеистами, именно углубляя и обогащая свою связь с событиями жизни Христа...” Ibid., 745.

AB did not consider God's existence as a prerequisite to human existence or as a "gap-filler" for our worldview. Instead, for him, God is a fact and a reality: "The point is not whether God will be useful, the point is whether it is true that He exists."¹⁷⁰ According to AB, it is not necessary to prove His existence, because He exists anyway. "I have discovered that he [God] exists and I can't help it, exactly in the same way as I have discovered facts in science. He is a fact for me..."¹⁷¹ AB's argument is built on the experience of discovering God in his own life. It seems that the main question AB was dealing with was related not to the conflict between atheism and religion, but the conflict between atheism and faith. We will not find in AB's theology thoroughly developed arguments for the existence of God against atheism. Rather, he devoted his discussions to the central question of atheism versus faith, whether or not one accepts the truth.

III.5.3. Encounter Between Christianity and Atheism

Are there any ways that Christians and atheists can find a common ground for the dialogue? AB believed that there are "places" where atheists and Christians can meet. AB never openly criticized materialistic atheism, but instead used some of their arguments, such as: (1) the understanding of the human person, (2) the concept "You are what you eat," and (3) the notion that matter might be the place of the encounter

¹⁷⁰ Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 59. Cf. Ibid., 13; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 51.

¹⁷¹ Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 13.

between Christians and atheists. He gave a Christian interpretation to these statements. I shall present AB's understanding of those points of contact.

(1) In addition to the "atheistic Christ," AB stated that the human person can be a place of encounter between atheism and Christianity. Through the Incarnation, God revealed the greatness of the human person qua fully human. Since atheists believe in humanity – even if the understanding of the person is different – they both have this same object in common. "One could almost say that the modern interpretation of St. Paul's encounter with the altar 'to the unknown God' would be to say that the unknown god is man, whom everyone is placing on the altar now. The atheistic world sets up the empirical man and the collective man. The Christian world also places a man on the altar: the man Jesus Christ."¹⁷² The person, as a common locus for the encounter between atheist and believer, was AB's response to Karl Marx's statement that "for man the root is man himself, [and] man is the highest essence for man,"¹⁷³ which makes man into a god.

So we Christians can meet the unbeliever we can meet those who search and those who do not yet search in the image of man. But we must be prepared to claim that **man is greater than the wildest imagination of the unbeliever.** [*My emphasis*] Our pride in man is greater than the pride of those who want to make man as big as possible in the two-dimensional world out of which God is excluded. And yet, it is on this point, on the vision of man, that we can meet all

¹⁷² Ibid., 86; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 55; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 272, 699, 929.

¹⁷³ S. P. Schilling, *God in an Age of Atheism* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969), 28. "Человек – вот точка встречи верующего с неверующим, потому что, если прав был Маркс, когда говорил, что пролетариату Бог не нужен, потому что его бог – человек, мы тоже говорим, что наш Бог – Человек, *Человек Иисус Христос* (Рим 5:15) со всем, что следует из того, что Он воплотился, будучи Богом Самим." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 846.

those who claim that man has a right to be great and to be worshipped, because we worship one who is man; we bow down before him; he is our God.¹⁷⁴

This statement echoes AB's previous statement that Christ experienced the state of Godlessness "in a way in which no atheist ever has or ever will know what it means to be without God and die of it."¹⁷⁵

For AB, Christians have a deeper foundation to believe in the greatness of human nature than atheists because God believes in the human race and He, Himself, became a human being. AB made a link between the faith of the atheists in man and the faith of God in the human person.

On the steps of the 'Hotel Ukraina' in Moscow, I was approached by a young officer who said: 'Are you a believer?' – 'Yes'. 'But I am an atheist.' I replied: 'I am sorry for you.' And he added: 'Yes, but what do I have in common with God that I should believe in Him?' And I asked him: 'Do you believe in anything?' – 'Yes! I believe in the human being!' – 'This is your common faith with God, because God believes in human beings in a way that you do not believe. He created us with faith that in the end we will grow into the full measure of Christ. He created us in the unshakable hope that the human being will not completely fall away from Him. He created us with the love we can see incarnate and crucified on the cross. God believes in human beings in a manner in which and to an extent to which you do not believe in human beings. You believe in your vision of what the human being should be and you are ready to break him so that he will conform to your image and likeness. God does not do this.' He looked at me and said: 'That is something I never thought about, and I have to think.'¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁴ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_03.htm

¹⁷⁵ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Church of the Councils: The Onslaught of the Intellect and the Potential of Doubt*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_08.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_03.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 46; Gillian Crow, *This Holy Man*, 158; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 845, 927; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, "The Prayer of Intercession," online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_10.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Prayer and Life*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_05.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 744; Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 97.

¹⁷⁶ "На ступеньках гостиницы 'Украина' в Москве ко мне подошел молодой офицер и говорит: 'Вы верующий?' – 'Да'. – 'А вот я безбожник'. Я ответил: 'Жалко мне вас'. И он прибавил: 'Да, но что у меня общего с Богом, чтобы я в Него верил?' И я его спросил: 'А вы во что-нибудь верите?' –

And in another place, AB summarized his teaching on the “atheistic Christ” and linked it with God’s faith in the human person, revealing again the greatness of human nature.

What I said about Christ is said not about the God of Heaven who becomes man, but about the Man, Jesus, who had such faith in us, in all of us, that he accepted to become everything we are, including our Godlessness and our death. He believed in us and was prepared to vindicate the greatness of man by showing us in his person that man is so great that when God unites Himself with him, man remains in the full sense of the word – only instead of remaining small, he becomes what God has willed him to be.¹⁷⁷

(2) Another point of contact between atheists and Christians is Ludwig Feuerbach’s expression: “You are what you eat.”¹⁷⁸ AB used this argument and transferred to it the Christian understanding of the Eucharist in the Church: “We believe that the Church – not as a sociological phenomenon, but as the body of Christ – makes us partakers of the Divine nature (cf. 2 Peter 1:4). So, here too there is a common theme. Feuerbach’s phrase: a human being is what he eats... We believe that in the Communion of the Holy Mysteries we become that which Christ is.”¹⁷⁹ This argument is also found in Alexander Schmemmann’s understanding of the world as food for humans.

‘Да! Я верю в человека!’ – ‘В этом у вас общая вера с Богом, потому что Бог верит в человека так, как вы не верите. Он нас сотворил по вере в то, что в конечном итоге мы вырастем в полную меру роста Христова. Он нас сотворил по непоколебимой надежде на то, что человек до конца не отпадет от Него. Он нас сотворил с той любовью, которую мы видим воплощенной и распятой на Кресте. Бог в человека верит так, как и в какой мере вы не верите в человека. Вы верите в свое представление о том, каким человек должен быть, и готовы его ломать, чтобы он стал по вашему образу и подобию. Бог этого не делает». Он на меня посмотрел и сказал: ‘Об этом я никогда не думал, мне надо задуматься’.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 728-729.

¹⁷⁷ Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 57.

¹⁷⁸ “Der Mensch ist, was er isst.” Ludwig Feuerbach, *Sämtliche Werke*, Bänden 10, (Leipzig: Verlag von Otto Wigand, 1866), 5.

¹⁷⁹ “Мы же верим, что Церковь – не как социологическое явление, а как Тело Христово – делает нас причастниками Божественной природы (см. 2 Пет. 1.4). Значит, тут тоже есть какая-то тема.

“Man is what he eats.” With this statement the German materialistic philosopher Feuerbach thought he had put an end to all ‘idealistic’ speculations about human nature. In fact, however, he was expressing, without knowing it, the most religious idea of man. For long before Feuerbach the same definition of man was given by the Bible. In the biblical story of creation man is presented, first of all, as a hungry being, and the whole world as his food. [...] Man must eat in order to live; he must take the world into his body and transform it into himself, into flesh and blood.¹⁸⁰

AB likely borrowed this argument from Schmemmann, paraphrased and summarized it without referring to the original author.¹⁸¹

(3) In the context of atheism, AB considered matter as another point of encounter between Christianity and atheism. Indeed, AB argued that Christianity is the only true ‘materialism.’ Atheism, according to AB, “does not believe in the fate of matter, it is a transient phenomenon.”¹⁸² AB based his argument on faith in the bodily Resurrection of Christ and His bodily Ascension to the Father. AB stated “Professor Frank [S. L. Frank], I think, in one of his book reviews said that the only genuine materialism is Christianity, because we believe in matter, i.e., we believe that it has absolute and ultimate reality, we

Фейербаховское выражение: человек делается тем, что он ест... Мы верим, что в причащении Святых Тайн мы делаемся тем, что Христос есть.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 55.

¹⁸⁰ Alexander Schmemmann, *Sacraments and Orthodoxy* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1965), 10.

¹⁸¹ AB directly referred to Schmemmann in other places: “Отец Александр Шмеман в одной из своих книг говорит: все на земле – любовь Божия; даже пища, которую мы воспринимаем, – это Божия любовь, ставшая съедобной. [Father Alexander Schmemmann in one of his books says: everything on the earth is love; even the food we eat – this is God’s love that became edible].” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 328. In another place, AB used the same argument without directly referring to Schmemmann: “[...] этот хлеб, по слову одного нашего русского молодого богослова [i.e. Schmemmann], - это Божия любовь, ставшая для нас пищей [...] this bread [Eucharist] according to one of our Russian young theologians [i.e. Schmemmann] – this is the love of God that became a food for us.” Ibid., 992. The compiler of this book in both cases referred in the footnote to Schmemmann’s book: *For the Life of the World* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1973).

¹⁸² “[Н]е верит в судьбу материи, она – явление преходящее.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 54.

believe in the Resurrection, believe in the new heaven and new earth, not in the sense that all of the present will be just completely destroyed, but that all will become new...¹⁸³ AB complained that there is a lack of theology of matter. “[...] We have not developed, or developed very little, a theology of matter. This is a theology that would completely reflect on matter, and not just history.”¹⁸⁴

Earlier, I mentioned his understanding of the role of matter in salvation, particularly in the Incarnation. AB stressed the role of matter as being able to bear God and, through this, God was not only able to unite with the world but was also able to penetrate matter, as St. Paul said, “So that God may be all in all” (I Cor 15:28). AB posited that the Sacraments in the Church, through matter, not only made present the reality of past events, but also brought matter to a new spiritual level.¹⁸⁵ AB thought that the whole world was atheistic in the etymological sense, living without God, and therefore has to be sanctified, brought into divine life, through the Sacraments. “The waters of baptism, the oil of anointing, the chrism, the bread, the wine are offered to God, brought out of the context of this world that has become *Godless*, are brought into

¹⁸³ “Профессор Франк [S. L. Frank], кажется, в одной из своих рецензий сказал, что единственный подлинный материализм – это христианство, потому что мы верим в материю, то есть мы верим, что она имеет абсолютную и окончательную реальность, верим в воскресение, верим в новое небо и новую землю, не в том смысле, что все теперешнее будет просто уничтожено до конца, а что все станет новым...” Ibid., 54. Unfortunately, I was not able to establish the location of the exact quotation in Frank’s works. S. L. Frank (1877-1950) – Russian religious philosopher. Frank followed Soloviev and developed the teaching on “всеединство” [pan-unity].

¹⁸⁴ “[...] у нас не разработано или очень мало разработано богословие материи. Это такое богословие, которое осмыслило бы до конца материю, а не только историю.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 54, 231-232. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 102-103.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Ibid., 55. For the role of the Sacraments in AB’s kenotic theology, see the next chapter.

the Kingdom of God, again regain their freedom, and are liberated by the action of man's free will and faith and by the acting of Divine love.”¹⁸⁶

The main difference in the understanding of matter by Christians and atheists, lies in the destiny of matter. Christianity sees the origin of matter as created by God for the purpose of its sanctification by the penetration of the Holy Spirit, a fact which is denied by atheism.

In this chapter I have presented AB's answer to the question of *why* Christ had to experience God-forsakenness on the cross. AB's anthropology is the answer to this question. I examined the terminology he used in the context of God-forsakenness and came to the conclusion that such concepts as “solidarity,” “God's faith in the human person,” and “atheism” are the terms he used most in this context. This could also be evidence that AB's understanding of God-forsakenness is different from the authors presented in the first chapter. The main difference would be in taking God-forsakenness out of the intra-Trinitarian context and inserting it into the Divine-human one. Even the emphasis on the Divine-human event is moved from the relationship between the Father and the Son (with one exception presented in this chapter) to focus rather on the anthropological question – the Godless state of humans. For that reason it was necessary to present AB's understanding of the human person: the difference between person and individual; the tripartite structure of the person; the notion of *anthropos* – “the total

¹⁸⁶ “Воды крещения, елей помазания, миро, хлеб, вино приносятся Богу, изымаются из контекста этого мира, который стал безбожным, они вносятся в Царство Божие и вновь обретают свободу, освобождаются действием человеческой свободной воли и веры и действием Божественной любви.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 109. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 222, 398.

human”; the vocation of the first people; and the greatness of matter. Original sin, in AB’s understanding, lay not in Adam’s disobedience, but in his decision to turn away from God. Because of that Adam became Godless, and the consequence was death. Adam’s sin did not change the original plan of God to become incarnate, although it changed the way this occurred. To bring salvation God kenotically had to accept all consequences of the sin, including Godlessness and death. Here again, we can see the link with the God-forsakenness (Godlessness) of Christ because just as Adam became Godless, so also did Christ become Godless.

I believe that AB’s understanding of God-forsakenness is unique because of the “Atheistic” Christ. AB returned to the original meaning of the word “atheism,” which is Godlessness, and he used it in its etymological sense to explain the event on the cross. AB, using this argument, pursued a dual goal:

- 1) To show the greatness of God’s kenosis, Christ became an atheist – without God – abandoned by the Father and people, but remained faithful to both. The kenosis of Christ would be extended to the faithfulness of Christ, to God’s faith in the human person, which for AB is more important than the love of God. The faith of God has some practical applications in the life of Christians, which I will be presenting in the next chapter;

- 2) Using such ideas as the “solidarity of God,” “God’s faith in the person,” and that “Christ became an atheist in the etymological sense,” AB reached out to atheists, agnostics and non-Christians. Keeping in mind that AB’s audience was not only limited to people in the USSR, but also people from Western Europe who had lost their faith in God, it should be clear why he stressed in his talks the “solidarity of God with all

people,” and especially “atheism.” His goal was to demonstrate that Christ is kin to them, because He also experienced the same Godless state as they might have experienced in their lives. He did not openly criticize materialistic atheism, but rather used their arguments to develop a Christian understanding of some of their concepts such as matter, food, and, ultimately, the Godless state.

CHAPTER IV

IV.1. Anthony Bloom's Kenotic Theology in Church Practice

In this chapter I will present AB's practical application of kenotic theology and God-forsakenness. After establishing these themes in AB's theology in the previous chapters, we might ask: How did AB come to his understanding of kenotic theology and particularly of God-forsakenness? What shaped this approach? How does AB's kenotic approach relate to the Church, Sacraments and to the life of Christians? In order to answer these questions it is necessary to examine AB's personal conversion and encounter with Christ, as well as his understanding of the Church and Sacraments where he referred to kenoticism and God-forsakenness in a practical context. My goal is not to exhaustively present his biography and ecclesiology, but only to point out the major elements of kenotic theology present in his understanding of the Church¹ and the Sacraments.

IV.1.1. Kenosis in the Encounter with God

As we already have seen in previous chapters, AB considered Christ's experience on the cross to be the ultimate abandonment, (one that even exceeds the

¹ For more on AB's ecclesiology, see: Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании* (Moscow: Moskovskoe Podvor'e Sviato-Troitskoï Sergievoï Lavry, 1999), online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd32.htm

experience of atheists) because Christ, as the innocent Godman, entered in His humanity into the place (experience) where God is not and became Godless. Although He did not cease being Divine, but rather was lost in the “metaphysical swoon” of the presence of the Father; the Father “positively” abandoned the Son.² AB did not go any further in these statements of his kenotic theology and it seems he was not even interested in any further questions.

On the other hand, we can conclude, based on AB’s understanding of the natures in Christ, that for him the Second Person of the Trinity never abandoned His Divine nature and that His death took place in His human nature. The anthropological side of this event was more important to AB than the Trinitarian one. I was not able to find in his writings any reference to the Son being abandoned by the Spirit or a more detailed exploration of the abandonment by the Father. Instead, he refers to the meaning of this event in terms of the relationship between God and humanity. In this kenotic act Christ exposed God’s faith in the human being. God-forsakenness, as a Divine-human event, relates not only to Christ’s experience on the cross, but also to the life of all humans. AB’s main argument about God-forsakenness might be compared to the beginning of John’s Gospel: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” (John 1:1). AB’s interpretation rests on the understanding of the Greek word “πρὸς” which in this case means “towards” or “with.” If one were to follow AB’s argument that Godlessness is the act of moving away, being away from God, or turning away from God, then the way the Father and the Son relate to each other would seem to

² This will be explained in the Conclusion.

be the exact opposite, because the Son is directed toward the Father. This point is missing in AB's explanation of John 1:1, although he did give a kenotic interpretation of it: "In the Greek text, the word 'was with God,' 'πρὸς τὸν Θεόν,' means 'toward God.' This is a dynamic striving as if from Himself to the Father. And this denial of oneself, forgetting of oneself, this impulse and desire toward Him who is, Who is uniquely fullness, perfection, life, beauty – this is a tragic act, because it means to forget oneself, to die to oneself in order to live by God and in God."³ As we have already seen in the second chapter, the entire life of Christ was directed towards the Father, and especially at the moment of God-forsakenness on the cross, Christ remained faithful to His Father and to all people, thus fulfilling the mission of salvation.

IV.1.2. Anthony Bloom's Personal Encounter with Christ as the Foundation for His Future Kenotic Theology

First of all I will try to establish the roots of AB's concept of God-forsakenness. As was mentioned in the first chapter of the present study, we can see some similarities with the thoughts of Sergius Bulgakov and Fr. Sophrony (Sakharov). AB used some of Fr. Sophrony's terminology, especially the phrase "metaphysical swoon," but it is not

³ "В греческом тексте слова, переведенные 'было у Бога', 'πρὸς τὸν Θεόν', означают 'к Богу'. Это динамичное устремление как бы от Себя к Отцу. И этот отказ от себя, забвение о себе и порыв, устремленность к Тому, Кто Единственный – полнота, совершенство, жизнь, красота, – трагический акт, потому что он означает забыть себя, умереть себе, чтобы жить Богом и в Боге." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая* (Moscow: Praktika, 2007), 813, 840, 860. It seems AB was confusing the meaning of the word with grammar and vocabulary. The grammatical construction which includes words that taken literally can be dissected to denote "toward God" actually means "with God."

possible to find direct influences of Fr. Sophrony on AB's thought.⁴ AB also did not refer to Bulgakov's ideas in the context of God-forsakenness, but since Bulgakov developed the whole kenotic approach in his theology together with sophiology, it is very likely that AB was familiar with the thought of Bulgakov. AB was deeply grounded in Russian theological thought; he was apparently familiar with some Russian kenoticists as well as some Western theologians who finally shaped his own approach. I assume that AB was also familiar with Gorodetzky's book, where the main kenotic outlines in Russian history were presented. However, the biggest influence on him came through the harsh life of the Russian émigrés in France characterized by his parents' separation, poverty and a hard life at school, where he was beaten.⁵ All these difficulties led AB to thoughts of suicide. But it happened that as a teenager he heard a talk by Bulgakov (a talk that annoyed him), after which he went home and started reading the Gospel according to St. Mark. In reading the Gospel AB encountered the living and risen Christ and this experience changed his life.⁶ He considered this experience to be a direct encounter with God. AB, on various occasions, referred to this encounter and came to different conclusions about this experience. I will summarize only his primary conclusions regarding it because I believe these conclusions can assist us in discovering the roots of AB's main theological statements.

⁴ In Chapter V, I will contrast the thought of Fr. Sophrony and AB.

⁵ Gillian Crow, *This Holy Man: Impressions of Metropolitan Anthony* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2005), 25.

⁶ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды* (Moscow: Praktika, 2002), 956, Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 23; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином* (Elektrostal: Molva, 2000), online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/be/be_1.htm

First of all, AB rediscovered a meaning for life and the necessity of sharing this news with others. Secondly, AB understood that God created all people, and loved all even unto His death; so there are no enemies in the world.⁷ Thirdly, AB learned about God's respect for the dignity of humans: "What I discovered was that God not only does not want us to be subservient to him, but that he stands as none other for the dignity of man. He refuses to accept us as slaves; he does not permit us to forsake our dignity of sons and of children."⁸ And about God's care: "If people are prepared to trample over each other, God never does it."⁹ This became the foundation for AB's understanding of God's faith in the human person. Fourthly, AB understood freedom as discovering Christ within oneself.¹⁰ Fifthly, his understanding of God-forsakenness:

What also astonished me at the time, and which I would probably have expressed quite differently, is that God [...] is able to love us to the last [...], to share everything with us [...], not only the physical suffering and death, but that which is the most terrible – mortality as a state of being: the deprivation and loss of God, from which Man dies. That cry of Christ's on the cross: "My God! My God! Why hast Thou forsaken me?" – this experience not only of being abandoned by God but also of being deprived of God, which kills a man, this readiness of God to share our loss of God, as if descending with us into hell, because Christ's descent into the Old Testament abyss [sic], that is to the place where God is not. This amazed me because it meant that there was no limit to God's readiness to share Man's fate, in order to find Man.¹¹

⁷ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 512-513.

⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *I Believe in God*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_04.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 539; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О всепече* (Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994), online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/sretenie/sret_mda.htm

⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Encounter*, trans. from Russian by Tatiana Wolff, (London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd, 2005), 198; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *I Believe in God*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_04.htm

¹⁰ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О всепече*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/sretenie/sret_mda.htm

¹¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Encounter*, 199.

As we can see, reflection on the God-forsakenness of Christ came later, after some deeper reflection and possibly some reading of other kenotic authors. AB came to the fourth conclusion after his own experience of abandonment by God.

When very soon after this [encounter with Christ] I entered the Church, I found that my personal experience was the experience of a whole generation of people, who before the Revolution had known the God of great cathedrals and of solemn services, who had lost everything – their motherland, their loved ones, and often their self-esteem, their sense of their place in life, that gave them the right to life – who were deeply wounded and therefore so vulnerable. They suddenly discovered that through His love for Man God wanted to become just as they were: defenceless, totally vulnerable, weak, powerless, and despised by those people who believe only in triumph of might. I then became aware of an aspect of life which means a great deal to me: that our God, the Christian God, can not only be loved, but can be respected: that one can bow down to Him, not only because He is God, but out of a feeling – and I can find no other words for it – of deep respect.¹²

This conclusion, based on personal experience, formed his further kenotic theology in an anthropological perspective. He used Phil 2:7 to interpret the harsh life of émigrés in the light of Christ's kenotic life. This is what he said:

[...] We, the people who lost the war, who lost homeland, loved ones, perhaps *honor* in some sense, the right to human admiration or respect, - we suddenly found ourselves before the face of Christ, and experienced Him as never before: Christ, as our Living God, who out of love for the human being, of his own accord, freely, without any compulsion descended into the depth of the abyss in which we were immersed in despair against our will. It turned out that God because of love for us, wanted to become helpless, vulnerable, despised, defeated; His glory became exhausted, He appeared *in the form of a slave* (Phil 2:7), lived among people in the most shameful form, died as a simple criminal, - and no human being, who goes into the depth of the human hell of defeat, vulnerability, humility, contempt, is lower than His God: even deeper than any human beings, Christ descended before him into this hell. It appears that our God is such that we don't have to be ashamed either of helplessness, or of wounds or

¹² Ibid., 199-200; Cf. Anthony Bloom, *God and Man* (New York: Paulist Press, 1971), 44-45; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом* (Moscow: Praktika, 2006), 111; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 185, 818-821, 845, 1001.

humiliation before Him – nothing, because He accepted upon Himself all of that to have the opportunity and the right to be with us, whenever we would appear: not in sin, but in all consequences of sin.¹³

AB reconsidered kenotically the solidarity of Christ with all people through his Incarnation not only through his own experience, but also through the harsh experience of the émigrés. AB witnessed that many émigrés, being in a state of misery, found Christ and His Gospel. AB added that it is not enough to be just poor, lonely or hungry to encounter God; but there must be a decision to turn towards Him – “To find God it is not enough just to be hungry, cold, lonely! It is necessary that somewhere in us there remain the ability to turn back to God.”¹⁴ AB came to the conclusion that negative circumstances could become for these émigrés an opportunity to encounter God. “The

¹³ “[...] Мы, люди, проигравшие войну, потерявшие родину, близких, может быть, честь в каком-то отношении, право на человеческое восхищение или уважение, – мы вдруг оказались перед лицом Христа, Каким Он не переживался раньше: Христа, Живого нашего Бога, Который по любви к человеку, по собственному почину, свободно, без принуждения сошел в самую глубину той бездны, в которую мы против воли, в отчаянии были погружены. Оказывается, что Бог по любви к нам захотел стать беспомощным, уязвимым, презренным, побежденным; истощена Его слава, Он явился в образе раба (Флп 2:7), пожил среди людей в самом позорном виде, умер, как простой преступник, – и ни один человек, который уходит в глубину этого человеческого ада поражения, раненности, унижения, презренности, не оказывается ниже своего Бога: еще глубже, чем он, в этот ад сошел Спаситель Христос до него. Оказывается, что наш Бог таков, что мы можем перед Ним не стыдиться ни беспомощности, ни ран, ни унижения – ничего, Он все это принял на Себя, Он всему этому приобщился, чтобы иметь возможность и право с нами быть, где бы мы ни оказались: не во грехе, но во всех последствиях греха.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 541, 821. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая: Проповеди, произнесенные в России* (Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994), online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_69.htm. For more on the harsh life of émigrés, see: Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 33-55; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/be/be_2.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви* (Moscow: SP Interbuk, 1991), online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy4.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_68.htm; Ibid., online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_73.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Who is God?: A Sermon Preached at Great St. Mary's, the University Church. Cambridge 18th November 1979*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_153.htm

¹⁴ “Но чтобы найти Бога, недостаточно быть голодным, холодным, одиноким! Надо, чтобы где-то в нас осталась способность повернуться в сторону Бога.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 186.

circumstances themselves have created for the Russian émigrés favorable conditions for a return to God. Many people, when nothing remained of their country, their family, or their social status – i.e., anything that contains human life, – when only sharp pain remained, many discovered that God was with them and that He alone did not betray, or abandon.”¹⁵ Many of those people experienced solidarity with God through their deprived condition. “When they found themselves deprived of all their possessions and only God remained for them in their total destitution, how many of them discovered what we might call the God of the underworld; that God who accepted a complete and unlimited solidarity, a total and permanent solidarity, not only with those who were bereft of everything, but also with those who, according to human views, would have been rejected from the Kingdom of God.”¹⁶ I think this view of the solidarity of God with the rejected people laid the foundation for AB’s future understanding of the God-forsakenness of Christ.

In addition, AB emphasized the self-sacrifice and faith of many Russians who, being poor refugees, kept as a priority the building of churches for God as a place of refuge for the abandoned God. “The faith of people, the faith of our Russian ancestors

¹⁵ “Так что сами обстоятельства создали для русских эмигрантов благоприятные условия для возвращения к Богу. Очень многие, когда ничего не осталось ни от Родины, ни от семьи, ни от общественного положения – ни от чего, что составляет человеческую жизнь, когда осталось только острое страдание, обнаружили что Бог с ними, что только Он их не предал, не оставил.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 186. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 40; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы* (Moscow: Libris, 1991), online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/prop/prop_28.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_68.htm; Ibid., online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_73.htm

¹⁶ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Prayer and Life*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_05.htm

built the churches for our homeless God. The king of heaven and earth wanted to be with us, homeless on the earth, as we by sin and betrayal become homeless in heaven. The Lord is among us. We are here giving shelter to Him with our love and kindness, joy and prayer; He has a place where to lay his head. What a great happiness it is for us that we are given to serve God, Who came to us to serve with life and death, with the horror of Gethsemane and the God-forsakenness of Golgotha.”¹⁷

Russian émigrés saw God as a wanderer who needed a place to stay, just as they were homeless and needed shelter. AB made a contrast between sin and faith. “The Lord scattered over the face of the earth the Russian Orthodox people. And wherever the grain fell – a family or a larger number of people – a church was built. Of course, not the same as in the native Russian homeland: these were rooms, basements; garages, any room. [...] God is a stranger all over the world. By sin God was abandoned. [...] But by the faith of people there are places where He remains undividedly the Lord. And the first place where He can reign in glory and be the subject of limitless love and worship – is the human heart. The Kingdom of God is within us.”¹⁸

¹⁷ “Вера людская, вера наших русских предков создала храмы, приют для бездомного нашего Бога. Царь неба и земли захотел быть с нами, бездомный на земле, как мы грехом и изменой делаемся бездомными на небе. Среди нас Господь. Мы здесь Ему даем приют – любовью и верой и лаской, и радостью и молитвой; Ему здесь есть, где главу преклонить. Какое счастье для нас, что нам дано так послужить Богу, Который пришел нам послужить жизнью и смертью, и гетсиманским ужасом, и голгофской богооставленностью!” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_72.htm

¹⁸ “Господь рассеял по лицу всей земли русских православных людей. И везде, где пало это зерно – семья или большее число людей – выросла церковь. Конечно, не такие храмы, как на родной Русской земле: это были комнаты, подвальные гаражи, любое помещение [...] По всей земле Бог является как бы странником. Грехом человеческим Бог был изгнан. [...] Но верой человеческой создаются места, где Он остается безраздельно Господом. И первое место, где Он может воцариться во славе, быть предметом безграничной любви и поклонения – это человеческое сердце. Царство Божие внутри нас.” Ibid., online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_82.htm

The above examples of the harsh life of the Russian émigrés shaped AB's early outlook on what would become his future kenotic theology. The humility, abandonment, loneliness and solidarity of God with people were major themes in AB's future preaching. The negative experiences of people around him and in AB's own personal life were reframed in the perspective of Christ's kenotic life, especially some key events of His life, such as Gethsemane and Golgotha. Now we will look at AB's understanding of kenosis and the Church.

IV.2. Church and Kenosis

After presenting some of the existential roots of AB's kenotic theology, we will see how he applied this approach in practice. In this chapter we will concentrate on kenotic elements in the Church and the Sacraments. For the Sacrament of Marriage I will compare AB's understanding with Monasticism.

AB considered the Church to be the ultimate Sacrament and the place for encounter with God, because it is "a place where God and the human person already have become one."¹⁹ The Church consists of individuals who are in the process of becoming fully human, fully persons. As with the person of Christ, in the Church there is an equal and full presence of both elements: Divine and human. In addition to this, the human element is further divided:

¹⁹ "[М]есто, где Бог и человек уже стали одно." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 326. Cf. Ibid., 808-809, 897; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 19, 178, 606; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Войду в дом твой* (Klin: Khristianskaia zhizn, 1993), online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/voidu/voidu2.htm>

In her [the Church] we see humanity as if in two forms: a perfect humanity in the Person of Christ, Who is the true Human, that is an *authentic* human being, a perfect human being, but there is also present our humanity – sinful, fallen, broken, imperfect. In the Church we see these two forms of the human being: oneself as a sinner *and yet* not separated from Christ; and Christ, Who is the image of what each of us should become and what we should be all together.²⁰

The human element in the Church is represented by the perfect human nature of Christ and our sinful human nature. The human nature of Christ is the example and vocation for Christians. The Church as Sacrament is the manifestation of the Divine-human unity, where the first member is Jesus Christ. AB said:

The Church is a human society not only in us sinners, but also in Christ. Christ, true God, also became a true human being, a real human being and in Him we see the first human being, the Only Human being Who fulfilled in Himself the fullness of what people are, the fullness of human holiness and unity with God.²¹

AB did not limit the example of true humanity only to Christ, but also considered Mary to be the realization of the vocation of humanity.²² As mentioned in the previous chapter, AB distinguished between two characteristics of secular society: (1) loss of the

²⁰ “В ней [Церкви] мы видим человечество в двух как бы видах: совершенное человечество в лице Христа, Который – истинный Человек, то есть человек настоящий, человек совершенный, но присутствует в ней тоже наше человечество – грешное, падшее, сломанное, несовершенное. В Церкви мы видим эти два образа человека: себя грешного и однако не разлученного со Христом, и Христа, Который является образом того, чем каждый из нас должен стать и чем мы должны стать все вместе.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 468; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd31.htm ; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/be/be_3.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy10.htm>

²¹ “Церковь является человеческим обществом не только в нас, грешных, но и во Христе. Христос, истинный Бог, стал тоже истинным человеком, реальным человеком, и в Нем мы видим первого человека, единственного Человека, Который в Себе осуществляет полноту того, что человек собой представляет, полноту человеческой святости и единства с Богом.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 208, 151, 488. Cf. Ibid., 412; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 792, 818; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/be/be_3.htm

²² Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy5.htm>

sense of God (he used to call the world Godless, безбожный)²³ and (2) excessive attentiveness to the world. When AB used such a strong term as “Godless world,” which described in his opinion the state of people who abandoned God, he encouraged his listeners not to push away those people, but on the contrary to be open to them. He used the example of Christ’s Incarnation and death, when He came to the “Godless people” and shared their state in order to bring salvation to them.²⁴ Christians are called to the same mission – to bring the Gospel that “the whole world, i.e., every person is loved by God and that God sent His Only-begotten Son to death to be able to save every human being (John 3:16-17).”²⁵ In the second chapter, we learned that AB saw the God-forsakenness of Christ as a central event in the life of the Logos. In the previous quote AB used this example of the kenotic life of Christ for a practical application.

AB believed that Christians are the continuation of God’s presence and action in the world: “The activity of a Christian has one distinguishing feature: the activity of a Christian in those situations where it turns out to be the action of God in History.”²⁶

²³ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 352-353; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd32.htm. “Есть аспект мира, характерный признак которого – как бы отсутствие, отрицание, отвержение Бога.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 730. Here AB used the word “as if.” It shows, on the one hand, an inconsistency in AB’s thought, but on the other hand, he was not convinced that people can totally eliminate God out of their lives. We might ask: “What about militant atheist?” AB’s answer was presented earlier, when he said that Christ in His forsakenness by the Father entered even in the deeper state of absence of God than people can experience.

²⁴ Cf. Ibid., 736.

²⁵ “[В]есь мир, каждый человек так Богом любим, что Бог Своего Единородного Сына послал на смерть для того, чтобы можно было спасти каждого человека (Ин 3:16-17).” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 754.

²⁶ “[Д]еятельность христианина имеет одно отличительное свойство: деятельность христианина в тех ситуациях, где он оказывается, должна быть действием Бога в Истории.” Ibid., 739; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy10.htm>

Christians are called to preach the Gospel in a Godless world. “[W]e have to [...] remember that to His disciples, who were sent into this life, into a pagan, Godless, rotting world, Christ said that He is sending them, as sheep among wolves. He sends them as the Father sent Him in order to remain not involved in unrighteousness, uncleanness, corruption or the Godlessness of the world, but to enter into this world with fiery love and with readiness for self-sacrifice...”²⁷ Again we can see the link with the Incarnation of Christ and His ultimate example of kenotic self-sacrifice and love for all people who live in a Godless state.

Talking about the Church, AB quoted Ephrem the Syrian: “The Church – is not the communion of saints, but a crowd of penitents who, in spite of their sinfulness, turned to God and directed themselves towards Him.”²⁸ The kenotic element in the Church is in its very essence. AB also used Fr. Sophrony Sakharov’s illustration of the Church as the reversed pyramid:

The Church is a communion unlike anything else. She [the Church] stands, like a pyramid, but with the sharp end down. The sharp end, on which rests the whole pyramid – is the crucified Christ, followed by the apostles, ascetics with the pyramid widening further, containing and encompassing all of us. And how marvelous to think that at the very bottom, in its very depth – love of God as if carrying on its shoulders everything. The ancient image of Christ was the image

²⁷ “[Н]адо нам [...] помнить, что Своим ученикам, посылаемым в жизнь, в языческий, безбожный, гниющий мир, Христос сказал, что Он их посылает, как овец среди волков, что Он их посылает, как Отец послал Его, для того, чтобы остаться непричастными неправде, нечистоте, оскверненности, безбожию мира, но вместе с тем в этот мир войти всей огненной любовью, всей готовностью жертвовать собой...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа: Проповеди* (Moscow: Sviato-Danilov monastery, 1993), online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_7.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/be/be_2.htm

²⁸ “Церковь – не собрание святых, а толпа кающихся грешников, которые, при всей своей греховности, повернулись к Богу и устремлены к Нему.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 359. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 158, 194, 468. Unfortunately, I was not able to find the original quote from Ephrem the Syrian.

of a shepherd, who is carrying on his shoulders his sheep: likewise God is carrying all of us, the whole world, so everyone of us is called in his place, in one's measure, on one's shoulders lovingly, sacrificially carry each, everyone, all.²⁹

Using the example of the shepherd, AB understood that the role of the Church was to take care of those who do not believe. In the analytic section of the final chapter we will review the link between AB's understanding of the vocation of the Church and his concept of the "atheistic Christ."

AB also made a connection between the kenotic life of Christians and faith in other people. He referred to the first Christians, who as the result of their faith in the world and imitating the example of Christ were able to sacrifice their lives for others. "Take the first Christians for example: they entered into the world that was for them of the same complexity and the same difficulty as our world is difficult for us. [...] But those Christians entered the world preaching, first of all – with a joy and fullness of life that no one else had. That world was in decline. That world no longer believed in life, in humanity, in history or its possibility. Christians entered it with overwhelming faith, with shining hope and with love, with an ability to love that inspired them to sacrifice their love for other people."³⁰ The main motivation that gave the first community the ability to preach the Gospel was their experience of an encounter with Christ.³¹

²⁹ "Церковь – ни на что не похожее общество. Она стоит, как пирамида, но острым концом вниз. Острый конец, на котором покоится вся пирамида, – это распятый Христос, затем идут апостолы, идут святые, идут подвижники, и все дальше, дальше, дальше ширится эта пирамида, содержа и охватывая нас всех. И как дивно думать, что именно на самом низу, в самых ее глубинах – Божественная любовь, которая все несет как бы на плечах. Древнее изображение Христа было в образе пастуха, который несет на плечах свою овцу: вот так Бог несет нас всех, весь мир, и так каждый из нас призван на своем месте, в свою меру, на своих плечах любовно, жертвенно нести каждого, всех, все." Ibid., 153, 849.

³⁰ "Если подумать о первохристианах: они вошли в мир, который для них был такой же сложный, такой же трудный, как наш мир – для нас. [...] Но те христиане вышли в мир с проповедью, в

AB criticized those members of the Church who forget the kenotic vocation of the Church – self-sacrifice of oneself in order to live for others. He pointed out two main concerns that the Church has to be aware of: “I consider that the main problem of the historical Church of our time is that it simultaneously does two things: secularization, becoming less and less the Church and at the same time is trying to escape the world, creating its own little world. As a result the world is moving away from the spiritual Church, because it is very difficult to see in us the Church with a capital ‘C.’”³² I think AB saw two extremes in the Church. On the one hand, he saw a desire to be “understood” by the world and as a result, the Church lost its “salt.” It became secularized and was not able to propose anything. On the other hand, the Church in keeping its “deposit of faith” created its own world and locked itself within it. AB did not explore in detail what he meant by these statements, but only said that the Church is in a process of formation, but has to have a clear spiritual balance of being in the world, but not of the world. AB also acknowledged that secular characteristics of society were

первую очередь – с радостью и с полнотой жизни, каких не было ни у кого другого. Тот мир был в упадке. Тот мир не верил больше в жизнь, в человека, в историю, в ее возможности. И христиане вошли в него с преизливающейся верой, с сияющей надеждой и с любовью, способностью любить, которая вдохновляла их отдавать свою жизнь за других людей.” Ibid., 743. Cf. Ibid., 755.

³¹ Cf. Ibid., 757. Later in this chapter I will explore AB’s understanding of the correlation between faith and experience.

³² “Я думаю, что беда исторической Церкви нашего времени в том, что она одновременно совершает две вещи: она обмирщается, становится все меньше Церковью и вместе с тем пытается убежать от мира, создавая свой собственный мирок. В результате мир отходит от Церкви духовной, потому что через нас очень трудно разглядеть Церковь с большой буквы.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 748.

also present in the Church and, in AB's opinion, should be a main concern of the Church.³³

AB pointed out the role of the saints in the Church and their awareness of the world as the example for Christians to follow. The way saints care for the world comes from God's relationship with the world. As AB put it: "[...] If we read the lives of saints or if we turn to the scriptures of the Old or the New Testament, we see clearly that none have such awareness of the world, both of its glory in God, in spite of sin, and of its dramatic severance from God, in spite of the Divine Presence within it, than the saints, and ultimately God Himself revealed in Christ."³⁴

This kind of relationship with the world comes from AB's faith in its sacredness, because it was God who created it: "It is sacred in the sense of belonging to God not only potentially, but in actual fact. It is God's own, and God is alive within it."³⁵ Christians, however, have more responsibility for the world than other people, because they understand the goal and sacredness of the world. "We are aware that this world has a calling, a destiny, a vocation, and that we are responsible for the fulfillment of this vocation. [...] We are all responsible, but we have a greater responsibility as Christians who know God's mind. If we are so rich in knowledge given to us by God, then we have

³³ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 449.

³⁴ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Worship in a Secular Society, November 12, 1969*, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1969-11-12-1-E-E-T-EW99-087WorshipInSecularSociety.html>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 448-449.

³⁵ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Worship in a Secular Society*, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1969-11-12-1-E-E-T-EW99-087WorshipInSecularSociety.html>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 451.

a heavier responsibility for all that is happening...”³⁶ The martyrdom of the saints, according to AB, is based on their deep faith in God and other people: “[They] were able to love God, to be so faithful to Him, such that not only their soul, but their bones lay down and bled to death for the sake of faith in God and faith in humanity...”³⁷ This is where we can see the link between kenotic life and faith in the other person put into practice. Now we will proceed to the link between God-forsakenness and the Church as how AB understood it.

IV.2.1. God-forsakenness and the Church

AB distinguished between God-forsakenness in the Church in two ways: first the Church as the Body of Christ and secondly, the Church as the communion of Christians. Concerning the first type, the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ³⁸ cannot experience God-forsakenness, because of the constant presence of the Holy Spirit. AB said: “The loss or the absence of the sense of God is alien to the Church when we speak of it with a

³⁶ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Worship in a Secular Society*, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1969-11-12-1-E-E-T-EW99-087WorshipInSecularSociety.html>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 450-451.

³⁷ ““[Они] так сумели возлюбить Бога, так были Ему преданы, что не только душой, но костями легли и кровью истекли ради веры в Бога и веры в человека...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_4.htm

³⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, “On the Church: A Catechetical Exercise,” *Sourozh* 48, (1992), 6-16, online available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1967-00-00-0-E-F-T-EM00-018Church.html>

capital 'C' ...”³⁹ The Church cannot be Godless, as God cannot be Godless. Concerning the members of the Church, they might experience Godlessness, because of their sins, which in AB’s understanding are a total denial and rejection of God.⁴⁰ He said: “[The loss of God] is not alien to many members of the Church – this is inherent in the fact that we are all in the process of becoming. [...] It is a jerky up and downhill journey in which sin is present...”⁴¹ Even if members of the Church renounce the Holy Spirit from their life, He does not abandon them. “We might lose awareness of the Holy Spirit within us. No matter how He acts within us, we can suppress His voice.”⁴² And in another place: “We can lose the gift of the Spirit. We can become alien to this Presence, given to us in our private life. Nevertheless the Holy Spirit does not leave the Church.”⁴³

It is important to admit that AB, in the context of the God-forsakenness of Christ on the cross, did not mention abandonment by the Holy Spirit, but in the context of the Church, he was not talking about the abandoning of the Church either by Christ, or by the Father, but only by the Holy Spirit. The reason for that might be in his understanding

³⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Worship in a Secular Society*, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1969-11-12-1-E-E-T-EW99-087WorshipInSecularSociety.html>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 449.

⁴⁰ Cf. *Ibid.*, 558.

⁴¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Worship in a Secular Society*, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1969-11-12-1-E-E-T-EW99-087WorshipInSecularSociety.html>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 449; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 731.

⁴² “Мы можем терять сознание Святого Духа в себе; как бы Он в нас ни действовал, мы можем заглушить Его голос.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd31.htm

⁴³ “Можно потерять дар Духа. Можно стать чуждым этому Присутствию, даруемому нам в нашей личной жизни, и тем не менее Дух Святой не оставляет Церковь.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 328-329; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd31.htm

of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ where the first member is Christ Himself. While on the cross the Holy Spirit did not abandon Christ. Also here the Holy Spirit remains forever present in the Church and in relation with the Logos.

The constant presence of the Holy Spirit points out the indefectibility of the Church. There is no sin in the world that can eliminate the Holy Spirit from the Church; believers can eliminate Him from their personal life, but not from the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church. In both cases, according to AB, God does not leave His people, he does not abandon them, so the absence of God that Christians might experience in their lives or in the Church has only a subjective character and might be caused by a sinful life. In other words, it is not God who abandons people, but the sins of Christians might cause their separation from God and bring them into a Godless state. Nevertheless, God remains faithful and continues to believe in them, so that they will return to God again.

AB considered that in their proclamation of the Gospel Christians should stress their personal experience and knowledge of God rather than the loss of God.⁴⁴ He said: “The Church can witness without hesitation, with total serenity, that those things which others do not see are real, more real than the visible world around us. The loss of the sense of God is incompatible with our belonging to the Church. Our witness is to that; it

⁴⁴ AB stated: “If we cease to see the world through faith and experience, then we have accepted to be worldly, blind, secular, that is, to desecrate what God has made sacred. And this is a very earnest problem because within the Christian or other believing communities there is a crisis of faith, because it is a crisis of experience, and this crisis of faith makes us worldly, deprives us of that participation throughout our lives of the original primeval experience of God, of man and of the world of matter.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Worship in a Secular Society*, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1969-11-12-1-E-E-T-EW99-087WorshipInSecularSociety.html>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 452-453. For more about the correlation between faith and experience, see further paragraphs.

is not the perplexities that we have to speak of, it is that certainty which is ours.”⁴⁵ AB acknowledges that there are people in the world who give shelter to the abandoned God: “People who have remained faithful to Him, who were not afraid to be on His side, who want Him to be fully the Master of life and Builder of the world, in this world they give Him shelter. Human faith gives God a place in human society and on earth.”⁴⁶

In relation to the Sacraments, as mentioned earlier, AB considered the Church as Sacrament. He was opposed to the famous concept of “Eucharistic ecclesiology” of Nicholas Afanasiev. Fr. Michael Plekon summarized Afanasiev’s concept in the following statement: “The Church makes the Eucharist, the Eucharist makes the Church.”⁴⁷ AB stated that the Church is wider than just the Eucharist, because the Church includes the Eucharist. He said: “The Church is bigger than the Eucharist, the Church is wider than the Eucharist, the Church contains the Eucharist, but the Eucharist is not the result of all that is the Church.”⁴⁸ AB repeated Khomiakov’s idea on the Church as Sacrament:

We have to remember that even the Eucharistic communion, that is the communion of the Holy Sacraments, is not *the whole fullness* of what can be given to us. Khomiakov in the past century already said that the only mystery of

⁴⁵ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Worship in a Secular Society*, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1969-11-12-1-E-E-T-EW99-087WorshipInSecularSociety.html>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 450.

⁴⁶ “Люди, которые остались Ему верны, которые не побоялись стать на Его сторону, которые хотят, чтобы Он стал полностью Хозяином жизни и Строителем мира, в этом мире Ему дают приют. Человеческая вера дает Богу место в человеческом обществе и на земле.” Ibid., 658.

⁴⁷ Michael Plekon, “*Always Everyone Together for One and the Same Thing*” – *The Ecclesial and Sacramental Vision of Nicholas Afanasiev*, online, available: <http://www.kiev-orthodox.org/site/english/1561/>

⁴⁸ “Церковь больше, чем Евхаристия, Церковь шире, чем Евхаристия, Церковь содержит Евхаристию, но Евхаристия не есть итог всего, что есть Церковь.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 507, 508.

the universe – is the very Church, because she contains in herself all the rest of the Sacraments. We enter the Church, we become a part of the Church through Baptism, not through the Eucharist. We receive the gift of the Holy Spirit through the Chrismation, not through the Eucharist. We join Christ and His humanity and His Divinity – yes, partaking of Holy Communion, but there are also other Sacraments: marriage and others, which also are contained in the Church.⁴⁹

If we follow the idea that the Church, as the Mystical Body, is a Sacrament by itself and is broader than the Eucharist, which is the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, we can broaden our understanding of what it might mean for some Christians to be active participants. For instance, there are Christians who for some reason are not allowed to receive the Eucharist. In this case, they would be able to participate in the other Sacraments of the Church.

AB also underlined the meaning of the congregational characteristic of the Church. “The Church is the place where people can express their relationship with God together, in the manner of a common faith, common prayer, in the awareness that they are one, that they consist of one organism, as if one personality in a multitude of persons.”⁵⁰ The communal element provides the opportunity for individuals to be transformed into persons, despite the difficulties that brings to relations in the Church. “But our being together is also a tragic moment, because we are all difficult with each

⁴⁹ “[М]ы должны помнить, что даже евхаристическое причащение, то есть причащение Святых Тайн, не есть вся полнота того, что нам может быть дано. Хомяков еще в прошлом столетии говорил, что единственное таинство вселенной – сама Церковь, потому что она содержит в себе все отдельные таинства. Мы входим, вступаем в Церковь, делаемся частью Церкви через Крещение, не через Евхаристию. Мы получаем дар Святого Духа через Миропомазание, не через Евхаристию. Мы приобщаемся Христу и Его человечеству и Его Божеству – да, причащением Святых Тайн, но есть и другие таинства: брак и т. д., которые тоже содержатся в самой Церкви.” Ibid., 467.

⁵⁰ “Церковь – это место, где люди могут выразить свою связь с Богом вместе, в порядке общей веры, общей молитвы, сознания, что они едины, что они составляют один живой организм, как бы одну личность во множестве лиц.” Ibid., 523.

other. We are difficult because we are not on the same spiritual level; difficult, because we are in a process of struggle and combat, which we carry on for the sake of growing in the fullness of one's personhood, that is to become completely oneself to the measure that God imagined for us and as we ourselves would wish to be. In this process we move not only from victory to victory, but very often from defeat to defeat, we have ups and downs, we have moments when we become unbearable to ourselves and to others."⁵¹

Although the Church is the place of the encounter between God and humans, there are also kenotic elements present. We see how the sinfulness of Christians and their relationships with each other in the Church need constant purification by the Holy Spirit. How then can Christians receive the purification in a practical sense? We will explore AB's understanding of the Sacraments as the place of the encounter between God and humans and the role of matter in Sacraments.

IV.2.2. Sacraments as an Encounter

AB often spoke about the role of the Sacraments in his talks. For the purpose of this research I will limit myself only to his references on the kenotic elements in the

⁵¹ “Но в нашей совместности есть трагический момент, потому что мы все друг для друга трудны. Трудны, потому что мы не одного уровня духовного, трудны, потому что мы в состоянии борения и борьбы, которую несем ради того, чтобы вырасти в полную меру своей личности, то есть стать самими собой до предела, какими Бог нас возмечтал и какими мы хотим стать. В этом процессе мы переходим не только от победы к победе, но часто от поражения к поражению, у нас бывают взлеты, у нас бывают провалы, у нас бывают моменты, когда мы себе и другим делаемся невыносимы.” Ibid., 523.

seven⁵² Sacraments. There are some general points in AB's kenotic understanding of the Sacraments. For the Eucharist and Unction he focused more on the role of transformed matter through the kenosis of Christ's Incarnation and its practical application in the life of Christians. For Baptism and Confession he emphasized sin as a state of Godlessness and the kenotic life of Christ as the ultimate example for Christians.

What are the Sacraments in AB's theology? "The Sacraments, from a Christian point of view, are the direct actions of God that through the matter of this world somehow carry, somehow bring to us some sort of spark of the life of God Himself."⁵³ The role of the Sacraments in the Church is to bring a person to an encounter with God. AB underlined this point very strongly: "But unless we come, in all our different communities, to the point where God becomes the One Who celebrates the mysteries, we will never meet anywhere. If we can make God the celebrant, the Holy Spirit the power that acts, silence the form in which we receive, in which we discover, in which we live the Divine Presence and the Divine Gifts, if we can do this at any moment, we will be able to meet, because at that depth and in that situation we are almost mature to meet."⁵⁴ The encounter with God, through receiving the Sacraments, takes place beyond psychological, intellectual and emotional levels:

⁵² AB commented mostly on the seven Sacraments, but personally he considered that there are more, up to twenty-two Sacraments in the Church. For instance, he considered the blessing of the bell as a Sacrament. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy5.htm>

⁵³ "Таинства, с точки зрения христианина, это непосредственные Божии действия, которые через материю этого мира каким-то образом до нас доносят, доводят какую-то искорку жизни Самого Бога." Ibid., online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy1.htm#1>

⁵⁴ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Worship in a Secular Society*, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1969-11-12-1-E-E-T-EW99-087WorshipInSecularSociety.html>;

Independently of any psychological reception, intellectual or emotional response, the living soul encounters the Living God, and the Sacraments of the Church are turned to this living soul, which in its perception of God does not depend on the intellect, nor consciousness, nor anything of the like. We give baptism, chrismation and communion to children on the same basis that I mentioned above: because the Living God can meet His living creature at a depth, which is far beyond any of the capacities of human communication.⁵⁵

The Sacraments are the places of encounter with God, but sometimes through receiving the Sacraments, Christians might not get this experience: “He is among us, but invisibly, He acts through the sacraments in us – but this is sometimes barely noticeable as we are blind; deafened by the visible noisy world that surrounds us.”⁵⁶

IV.2.3. Sacraments and Matter

Before we proceed to the kenotic aspects in AB’s teaching on the Sacraments, we have to first take a look at the question of matter in the Sacraments. In the previous chapters, I presented AB’s understanding on matter and its role in the salvation of the world. As was mentioned before, Christ transformed matter through the kenosis of His Incarnation, and the continuing sanctification of people takes place through the

Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 455-456, Cf. Ibid., 812, 900; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 385.

⁵⁵ “Независимо от всякого психологического восприятия, всякого интеллектуального или эмоционального отклика живая душа встречает Живого Бога, и таинства Церкви обращены к этой живой душе, которая в своем познании Бога не зависит ни от интеллекта, ни от сознания, ни от чего подобного. Мы крестим, миропомазываем и причащаем младенцев на том же основании, о котором я говорил выше: потому что Живой Бог может встретить Свое живое создание на той глубине, которая далеко за пределами любых возможностей человеческого общения.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 132, 698.

⁵⁶ “Он среди нас – но невидимо, Он таинствами действует в нас – но порой еле ощутимо, мы этого не чувствуем, мы ослеплены, оглушены видимым, окружающим нас шумным миром.” Ibid., 316-317.

Sacraments. Matter in AB's kenotic theology plays an important role, because through the body a person is able to participate in the Sacraments of the Church, and through matter God gives grace to people.

Something absolutely amazing takes place in the sacraments of the Church. Over a particle of bread, over a small amount of wine, over the waters of baptism, over the oil, which are offered to God as a gift and are sanctified, something happens now which joins this matter to the miracle of Christ's Incarnation. The waters of baptism are sanctified by the corporeality of Christ and by the grace of the Holy Spirit who descends into them and works this miracle. Bread and wine partake the corporeality and the Divinity of Christ through the descent of the Holy Spirit.⁵⁷

Matter itself, as presented earlier, is able to accept God and the Sacraments as the places of such unity: "[...] incense, fire, bread, wine, water – they all potentially are able to unite with God; to receive God, because they are sinless..."⁵⁸ Salvation has a cosmic character because it involves not only human beings, but also the whole world. Here again we can see a link with what was presented in the previous chapter:

In the sacraments what we believe happens is that the matter of this world is detached from the evil, sinful, Godless context in which it was betrayed by the faithlessness of men, brought back to God as an offering, received by God, made

⁵⁷ "[В] таинствах Церкви совершается нечто совершенно изумительное. Над частицей хлеба, над малым количеством вина, над водами крещения, над маслом, которое приносится в дар Богу и освящается, совершается нечто, что уже теперь приобщает это вещество к чуду воплощения Христова. Воды крещения освящены телесностью Христа и благодатью Всесвятого Духа, сходящего в них и совершающего это чудо. Хлеб, вино приобщаются и телесности, и Божеству Христову через сошествие Святого Духа." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 236, Cf. Ibid., 373-374, 779; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 131, 386, 427, 466, 659, 664, 798; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/be/be_3.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_72.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Prayers of the Liturgy 15 July 1990*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_127.htm

⁵⁸ "[...] ладан, пламя, хлеб, вино, вода — все это потенциально способно соединиться с Богом, воспринять Божество, потому что они без греха..." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 393; Cf. Ibid., 1007.

free, restored to its primeval freshness, and furthermore by an act divine, fulfilled and revealed as it should be and shall be.⁵⁹

In the Sacraments, matter is transformed into something eschatological. AB interpreted the term “ἔσχατον” as the fulfillment and finalization of something. Christ is the beginning and the end of all things through His Incarnation. “In the Incarnation something absolutely final took place. In Christ there came the fulfillment of everything, and though we are still on our way to the end, the end already is behind us and is present in our midst, because the end is not a point in time, the end is a Person and a particular situation. And together with this the fulfillment of all is yet to come: we simultaneously already have reached the goal with God and yet we are still directed to our fulfillment.”⁶⁰ Matter in the Sacraments is the image of its future finalization. “In the Sacraments [...] we see how matter already participates in what it is called to be at the end of time.”⁶¹

Together with this emphasis on the role of matter, AB underlined the role of the whole person in receiving the Sacraments, especially the body. This holistic approach of AB is shown here: “Every body, surrounded by love, awe, reverence, is a body called to

⁵⁹ Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 66; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 109, 509; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 134, 387-388; 662, 742; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, “Body and Matter in Spiritual Life,” in *Sacrament and Image: Essays in the Christian understanding of Man*, ed. A. M. Allchin, (London: Fellowship of St. Alban and Sergius, 1967), 33-41, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.org.ru/eng/eng_02.htm

⁶⁰ “В Воплощении произошло нечто абсолютно окончательное. Во Христе пришло завершение всего, и хотя мы еще идем к концу, конец уже остался позади и находится в нашей среде, потому что конец – не точка во времени, конец – Личность и определенная ситуация. И вместе с тем исполнение всего еще впереди: мы одновременно уже достигли цели с Богом и еще устремлены к своему исполнению.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 669.

⁶¹ В таинствах [...] мы видим, как материя уже участвует в том, чем она призвана быть в конце времен.” Ibid., 669, 742.

the resurrection. This is the body that through our entire life served the mystical communion with God through Baptism, Chrismation and Anointing with holy oil during illness. In receiving the Body and Blood of Christ, through receiving blessings – this body is, so to speak, the seed. According to the apostle Paul: ‘What is sown is perishable, what is raised is imperishable. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power’ (1 Cor 15:42-43).”⁶²

According to AB’s theology, it was important for God to take the same matter that was used to create the world and first people. As the result of sin, the Godless state of the world, matter was carrying the consequences of this, but did not lose its ability to accept God. “Our materiality is pure, through our fallen condition we bring into it the impurity of passions, greed, lust and the like.”⁶³ The ability of the body to be a partaker of Divine life comes from, in AB’s understanding, the nature of matter from the point of view of both the creation and the Incarnation and how in both cases matter is able to be God-bearing. In the case of a human being, it is through the body that we receive all the Sacraments that unite a person with God. As AB put it:

[The] grace of God penetrates words, water, oil, bread, wine in various ways and allows them to reach us in body and soul. On the other hand, if grace reaches us through material means, we have to take into account that our body actually plays its own role in the growth of our spiritual life. Our body is immersed into the waters of Baptism. We receive the Body and Blood of Christ with the lips,

⁶² “Каждое тело, окруженное любовью, благоговением, почитанием, тело, призванное к воскресению, тело, которое на протяжении всей жизни служило таинственному общению с Богом в крещении и миропомазании, в помазании святым елеем при болезни, в приобщении Телу и Крови Христовым, в получении благословения – это тело является, так сказать, семенем – и это слово апостола Павла: сеется в тлении, восстает в нетлении, сеется в унижении, восстает в славе (1 Кор 15:42-43).” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 77.

⁶³ “Наша материальность чиста, мы своим падшим состоянием вносим в нее нечистоту страстей, жадности, похоти и тому подобного.” Ibid., 393.

through the mouth. A preacher's words reach our ears, and through them the faith is awakened in our heart. The Sacrament of the forgiveness of sins or the Sacrament of marriage takes place through the mediation of words. In each case God Himself is poured into the material world and reaches us through our own materiality. And it seems to me so wonderful and great, because it underlines the fact that is so clearly revealed to us in the Incarnation: that our body is able fully to participate in divine things, the spiritual realm.⁶⁴

We can see how AB understood matter and its role in the Sacraments. He made a direct link with the Incarnation. Christians can participate in the kenotic life of Christ and they can do so through the Sacraments, where matter is sanctified.

IV.2.4. The Sacrament of Baptism and Kenosis

In the Sacrament of Baptism AB emphasized the importance of the catechumen's rejection of Satan and of a sinful life along with his acceptance of Christ. Only after that is it possible to "[...] be immersed with Christ in the death of Christ and in the eternal life of the resurrection, as well as in sonship."⁶⁵ During the Sacrament of Baptism in the

⁶⁴ "[Б]лагодать Божия проникает самыми различными способами, наполняет слова, воду, елей, хлеб, вино и дает им достичь нас телесно и душевно. С другой стороны, если благодать достигает нас при помощи материальных средств, мы должны принимать во внимание, что наше тело действительно играет свою собственную роль в возрастании нашей духовной жизни. Наше тело погружается в воды Крещения. Мы принимаем Тело и Кровь Христовы устами, через рот. Слова проповедника достигают нашего слуха, и через то вера пробуждается в нашем сердце. Таинство прощения грехов или Таинство брака совершается посредством слов. В каждом случае Сам Бог вливается в материальный мир и достигает нас через нашу собственную материальность. И это, мне кажется, так чудесно и велико, потому что подчеркивает то, что с такой ясностью открывается нам в Воплощении: что наше тело способно в полноте приобщаться вещам божественным, духовной области." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 666.

⁶⁵ "[...] погрузиться со Христом в смерть Христову и в жизнь вечную воскресения, и в сыновство." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 184. Cf. Ibid., 253. AB's argumentation for the Baptism of children: "ребенок лично безгрешен. На нем лежит тяжесть греховности всего человечества, той ограниченности, которая принадлежит всем нам. Но сам он лично не совершил ни одного греха, в котором ему надо было бы каяться, и Крещение ему дается, потому что это встреча между живой душой и Живым Богом, которые не отделены друг от друга средоточением, выбором греховным, бывающим, к сожалению, в нашей жизни. [A child is personally sinless. It is the

Byzantine Tradition, the catechumen (or his/her godparents in the name of the catechumen) proclaims three times the rejection of Satan and all his works. AB interprets this rejection of Satan as a rejection of sin and a condition for one to be able to unite with Christ. He said: “[W]e cannot expect a full reconciliation with God, because the root of irreconcilability with Him still remains in us, because, as the apostle says, sin is hostility towards God (Rom 8:7); sin is a rejection of His ways; sin is the choice of darkness against life itself, [a choice] for Satan against Christ.”⁶⁶

Death and sin in AB’s understanding belong to the category of Godlessness. For a Christian to follow Christ, one has to be immersed in the death of Christ. “We die, we take upon ourselves the death of Christ, which is His alienation from everything that constitutes separation from God, inner disorder and our separation from our neighbor.”⁶⁷ By dying in the waters of Baptism, a Christian becomes dead to sin, becomes alien to Satan and is “clothed” in the kenotic life of Christ. The Christian is united now not only with the human nature of Christ but also with His Divine nature.⁶⁸ This is where we can

weight of the sin of all humanity – that limitedness which belongs to us all that bears upon him. But he himself has not committed any sin for which he would need to repent, and Baptism is given to him because it is an encounter between a living soul and the Living God who are not separated from each other by the obstacle, a sinful choice, that, unfortunately, exists in our lives.]” Ibid., 221.

⁶⁶ “[М]ы не можем рассчитывать на полное примирение с Богом, потому что в нас остается корень непримиренности с Ним, потому что, как апостол говорит, грех – это вражда против Бога (Рим 8:7), грех – это отрицание Его путей, грех – это выбор за тьму против самой жизни, за сатану против Христа.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 351-352; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 205-207.

⁶⁷ “Мы умираем, берем на себя мертвость Христа, то есть Его отчуждение от всего того, что есть отлучение от Бога, внутренний разлад и наша разделенность с нашим ближним.” Ibid., 470. Cf. Ibid., 486.

⁶⁸ Cf. Ibid., 471.

see the link between the Sacrament of Baptism and AB's teaching on sin, which he understood as the state of Godlessness.

Another kenotic element during the Sacrament of Baptism is immersion in the water. As we saw in Chapter II, Christ during His Baptism was immersed in waters "full of sin." He accepted the cross and death. So also the Christian is called to die the death of Christ in order to enter into new life. "[...] we are called to enter the death of Christ, or rather to die to everything which contains the main sin of humanity and was the reason for His Incarnation, the reason for His crucifixion, the reason for His death, the reason for His descent into Hades."⁶⁹ The waters after Christ's Baptism became cleansed from any sins and now the catechumen is immersed in the purified waters to become clothed in Christ. "And being immersed into these waters, we are immersed as if into the purity of Christ, immersed into the newness of life, which is His life. We are immersed in these waters unclean and come out cleansed."⁷⁰ Here we can see the outcome of Christ's purifying of the waters at His Baptism by John the Baptist.

AB defined a Christian as someone who is a friend of Christ, who loves Him, who wants to be close to Him and in solidarity with Him in everything.⁷¹ The practical

⁶⁹ "[...] мы призваны к тому, чтобы уйти в смерть Христову или, вернее, умереть по отношению ко всему тому, что составляет основной грех человечества и было причиной Его воплощения, причиной Его распятия, причиной Его смерти, причиной Его сошествия во ад." Ibid., 200, 212.

⁷⁰ "И погружаясь в эти воды, мы погружаемся как бы в чистоту Христову, погружаемся в новизну жизни, которая – Его жизнь, погружаемся в эти воды не очищенными и выходим из них очищенными." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Войду в дом твой*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/voidu/voidu2.htm>; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd31.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/be/be_3.htm

⁷¹ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 194; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *On Confession: 4th Sermon*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_252.htm

dimension of life in solidarity with God is in “immersing into His death and together with Him becoming dead toward everything which is not compatible with God; which is a rejection of God not only in our thoughts, not only in our feelings, but in all our relation to God, to ourselves, to neighbor, to the universe. We rise from these waters as if rising together with Christ, entering into new life with Him. But at this moment we are clothed, as if penetrated by everything that is Christ’s humanity, itself penetrated by His Divinity.”⁷²

IV.2.5. The Sacrament of Chrismation

For the Sacrament of Chrismation I was not able to find any direct kenotic elements linked to the life of Christ, but there are elements of the kenotic role of the Holy Spirit in the Church. I will not present a comprehensive pneumatology in AB’s understanding because this goes beyond the limits of the present research, but rather I will focus on the major kenotic elements of the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church and Sacraments.

The Sacrament of Chrismation in the Byzantine and other Eastern Christian Traditions takes place immediately after Baptism. “Chrismation is accomplished with

⁷² “[П]огружаемся в Его смерть и с Ним делаемся мертвыми по отношению ко всему, что несовместимо с Богом, что является отрицанием Бога не только в мыслях наших, не только в чувствах наших, но во всем нашем отношении к Богу, к нам самим, к ближнему, ко вселенной. И поднимаемся мы из этих вод, как бы воскресая вместе со Христом, входя в новую жизнь с Ним. Но в этот момент мы облечены, как бы пронизаны всем тем, чем является Христово человечество, пронизанное Его Божеством.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 280, 667; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/prop/prop_14.htm

the words: *The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit*. When we were baptized, we were immersed into Christ, as though we were putting on the armor that will be our protection; and now our new life is sealed with this seal of the Holy Spirit.”⁷³ Through immersion in baptismal water a Christian becomes a participant in the kenotic life of Christ and through the Chrism receives the seal of the Holy Spirit.⁷⁴ With the anointing with the Chrism a Christian receives not only the seal of the Holy Spirit, but becomes a temple for His dwelling.⁷⁵ AB understood the Sacrament of Chrismation as an ordination to lay ministry in the Church. The Holy Spirit reveals to Christians the saving acts of Christ and through His action we can acquire knowledge of Him.⁷⁶

The role of the Holy Spirit in the Church comes from the names of the Spirit: Protector and Comforter.⁷⁷ The role of the Holy Spirit is to protect and strengthen Christians in their daily life. The Holy Spirit reveals Christ and “leads us to know Him as our God, as Savior and as the Son of the Father. [...] And only by following the way

⁷³ “Миропомазание совершается со словами: Печать дара Духа Святого. Когда мы крестились, мы погрузились во Христа, мы как бы надели на себя броню, которая будет нашей защитой, и теперь запечатлевается наша новая жизнь этой печатью Святого Духа.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 214.

⁷⁴ Some scholars disagree with this statement and state that the Holy Spirit is already given in Baptism and Chrismation is the seal. See Peter Galadza, “The Holy Spirit in Eastern Orthodox Worship: Historical Enfleshments and Contemporary Queries,” in *The Spirit in Worship – Worship in the Spirit*, ed. Teresa Berger, (New York: Pueblo, 2009), 115-140.

⁷⁵ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Nativity of the Mother of God, 21 September 1971*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_237.htm

⁷⁶ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 377-378.

⁷⁷ In Greek “παράκλητος” means advocate, comforter. AB was following the Russian usage of the word, which is “comforter.”

of Christ in the Holy Spirit can we come to the Father and worship Him in the Spirit and in the Son.”⁷⁸

Another example of the action of the Holy Spirit that AB used, proceeded from the title – the Comforter, which is linked to the kenotic moments of loneliness and absence of Christ in the life of Christians. He said: “The word ‘Comforter’ in Slavonic is ‘broader,’ it contains even more meaning than the Russian word ‘comfort’ (утешение). The Holy Spirit is *Comforter*, because He indeed, in the Russian meaning, comforts us throughout our earthly life...”⁷⁹ This is a particular understanding based precisely on the Slavonic meaning, which colours the Greek in a certain way.

And in another context he described the Holy Spirit “as our Comforter, as one who consoles us in the absence of Christ...”⁸⁰ One of the roles of the Spirit in the kenotic life of people is to comfort and strengthen them in their moments of loneliness and the absence of Christ. How are we to understand these words about the comforting by the Holy Spirit in the moments of the absence of Christ?

The vocation of the human person, as was mentioned earlier, is to be united in a personal relationship with Christ in the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit makes possible this

⁷⁸ “[П]риводит нас к познанию Его как Бога нашего, как Спасителя и как Сына Отчего. [...] И только пройдя Духом Святым путем Сына, мы можем подойти к Отцу и поклониться Ему в Духе и в Сыне.” Ibid., 377-378.

⁷⁹ “Слово ‘Утешитель’ на славянском языке гораздо более ‘просторно’, содержит гораздо больше понятий, чем русское слово ‘утешение’. Дух Святой – Утешитель тем, что Он действительно, в русском смысле слова, утешает нас в том, что в течение всей нашей земной жизни...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 214, 279; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Day of the Holy Spirit 19 June 1989*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_71.htm; Metropolitan Anthony Sourozh, *Sermon on Holy Spirit 15 July 1985*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_119.htm

⁸⁰ Ibid., online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1985-07-15-1-E-E-S-EM06-004OnHolySpirit.html>

unity with the human and Divine natures of Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. The imprinted “seal of the Spirit” that a Christian receives during Chrismation cannot be erased. A Christian might commit sins and bring himself to the Godless state, which is separation from Christ, but this cannot totally suppress the voice of the Holy Spirit. So the Holy Spirit will be comforting and provoking a Christian through his or her conscience to turn back to Christ. One of the roles of the Spirit is to provoke in the person a longing for God: “[W]e have to rejoice that we have a longing for God, that our heart pines away for Him, that our soul weeps over our orphaned state; and the Holy Spirit awakens this longing, this pining, this desire and that He comforts us in that He sometimes grants us moments of prayer, recollection and closeness to God.”⁸¹ AB stated that Christians cannot be fully united with Christ, but only to a certain point. He said: “We all long to be with Him, but we cannot go beyond a certain point of closeness. And Saint Paul points it out, when he says that, as long as he lives in the flesh, he is separated from Christ, and he longs for death to come, not as an end of his earthly life, but as the moment when the veil will be torn apart and, as he puts it, he will be known as he is known. He will see face to face what he can see yet only as shadows and a mirrored image.”⁸²

⁸¹ “[Н]адо радоваться тому, что у нас есть тоска по Богу, что рвется наше сердце к Нему, что плачет наша душа по нашему сиротству; и Дух Святой в нас возбуждает эту тоску, это рвение, это желание и утешает нас тем, что нам дает порой какие-то моменты молитвы, сосредоточенности, близости к Богу.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 292.

⁸² Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Comforter: Our Support and Strength for Mission*, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1999-05-29-1-E-E-T-EM04-027ConferenceTheComforter.html>

All Christians, through the receiving of the Holy Spirit, become “a royal priesthood” (1 Pet 2:9). AB understood the priestly character of lay people as the general vocation of Christians to sanctify the world: “[...] every believer in the Church is a priest, that is, a person who consecrates creation, who makes it holy, that is – consecrated to God and penetrated by Divine grace.”⁸³ The Holy Spirit motivates the Christian to live a holy life:

[...] the gift of the Holy Spirit [given] to us at the moment of Baptism, is very important. Important, because being baptized, we are not yet fully what we are called to be; we haven’t yet become saints. We have just started onto the beginning of this path and we need the strength of the Holy Spirit, His inspiration, His comfort, and the joy that He gives to us to be able to go further along this path and finally to reach that inner state, which is holiness and communion with God.⁸⁴

The Holy Spirit strengthens Christians in their life of carrying their daily cross and bringing Christ to people who do not know Him, who do not believe, who have no hope, and no sense of life. “[W]e are the society of people who must go into the world, where no one has heard about Christ; where there is no faith in God, where there is depravity, untruth, no faith, no hope, no joy, no love. We are to bring all of this in

⁸³ “[...] всякий верующий в Церкви является священником, то есть человеком, который освящает тварь, который делает ее святой, что значит – Богу посвященной и пронизанной Божественной благодатью.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 766; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd31.htm

⁸⁴ “И поэтому дар Святого Духа нам в момент Крещения чрезвычайно важен. Важен он тем, что, будучи крещены, мы однако еще не стали полностью тем, чем призваны быть, мы не стали святыми, мы только вступили в начало этого пути, и нам нужна крепость Святого Духа, нам нужно Его вдохновение, нам нужно Его утешение, нам нужна радость, которую Он дает, для того чтобы мы могли идти дальше по этому пути и наконец дойти до того внутреннего состояния, которое составляет святость и общение с Богом.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 215, 249.

ourselves and to give at the cost of one's life."⁸⁵ This mission, in AB's understanding, has an obligatory character because Christians have "a great responsibility for the unbelievers..."⁸⁶ A person through anointing with the chrism receives the mission to serve God and other people. This is another example of how AB's kenotic theology was used in a practical way.

IV.2.6. The Sacrament of the Eucharist

According to AB, Christians are called to be participants in the love of the Trinity, and by receiving the Eucharist they participate in Christ's human and Divine nature, and through His Divinity in the Holy Trinity. "Receiving the Holy Sacraments, we partake in Christ the Savior; through Him we become kin in an ineffable way with the Spirit and the Father, but at the same time we associate and become united in a new way, through grace, [...] with all creatures, with every person..."⁸⁷ Another example of a common action of the Trinity is in the consecration of the gifts. "This is not about Which Person of the Trinity performs the miracle of changing the bread into the Body of Christ and

⁸⁵ "[М]ы – общество людей, которые должны идти в мир, идти туда, где не слышали о Христе, туда, где не верят в Бога, идти туда, где разврат, где неправда, где нет веры, где нет надежды, где нет радости, где нет любви, и все это приносить туда в себе и давать ценой своей жизни." Ibid., 767; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Войду в дом твой*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/voidu/voidu2.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd31.htm

⁸⁶ "[О]громную ответственность за неверующих..." Ibid., online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd31.htm

⁸⁷ "Приобщаясь Святых Тайн, мы приобщаемся Христу Спасителю, через Него сродняемся неизреченным образом с Духом и Отцом, но одновременно приобщаемся и соединяемся по новому, по-благодатному, [...] со всей тварью, со всяким человеком..." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 377; Cf. Ibid., 424.

wine into the Blood of Christ. In every act of our salvation all Three Persons of the Trinity co-operate and co-participate.”⁸⁸ Here AB made a link between the consecration of the gifts and the plan of salvation, where all Three Persons take part, but each of the Persons has His own role: “The Divine Liturgy – is the only service which is wholly directed to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit.”⁸⁹

AB used the model of *anthropos*, presented earlier, not only in the context of unity between man and woman, but also in the mysterious unity between the human person and God in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Liturgy is the ultimate place of encounter with God:

Through the Divine Liturgy, within the Church, by the power and the grace of God, we become so united with Christ the Savior, just as the parts of the body are one with each other, with the head and each other. [...] In this body there takes place what Ignatius of Antioch called, the ‘total Christ;’ the appearance of the total Christ. [...] And this body gradually becomes total-humanity (всечеловечество), but not as naturally known to us, as we are, and each other; but humanity called to its genuine vocation – to be what Christ is in relation to God the Father.⁹⁰

All who partake of the Sacrament of the Eucharist are made one with Christ and each other as the Mystical Body of Christ. We can see that AB used the concept of the

⁸⁸ “Речь не идет о том, Которое Лицо Святой Троицы совершает это чудо изменения хлеба в Тело Христово и вина в Кровь Христову. Во всяком действии нашего спасения со-действуют, со-участвуют все Три Лица Святой Троицы.” Ibid., 379.

⁸⁹ “Божественная литургия – единственная служба, которая вся обращена к Отцу – через Сына, в Духе Святом.” Ibid., 381, 385, 471.

⁹⁰ “Через Божественную литургию, в пределах Церкви, силой и благодатью Божией мы так соединяемся с Христом Спасителем, как члены тела являются одно между собой, с главою и друг с другом [...] В этом теле совершается то, что Игнатий Богоносец называл ‘всецелый Христос’, явление всецелого Христа. [...] И это тело становится постепенно всечеловечеством, но не природным, каким мы знаем человечество, и себя, и друг друга, а человечеством, возведенным к настоящему его призванию – быть тем, что есть Христос в отношении к Богу и Отцу.” Ibid., 375, 381, 413. Cf. Ibid., 481.

“total Christ” not only as it relates to the Person of Christ, but also in the sense of His Mystical Body, which is the Church.

In the Eucharist, the Christian is fully united with Christ and manifests his/her readiness to follow Him in self-sacrificing love unto the cross and death. “There is only one way we can respond to God’s love, this crucified, sacrificial love of God and to this gift of God in the Spirit and the Blood; that is to open ourselves towards the Lord and to accept Him, letting Him freely be present in us, to be the master of this temple, which He created but which we constantly defile, which nevertheless remains sacred in its essence.”⁹¹

AB compared the Liturgy to the Transfiguration of Christ on Mount Tabor. “The Liturgy is the moment when we find ourselves on the Mount of Transfiguration. We do not simply see Christ in glory – we are able to see Him only to the extent that we are involved in this reality of Christ, in the Holy Spirit. The Apostles could see Christ as He was only because they themselves were in glory.”⁹² As was presented in the second chapter, AB saw this event in kenotic terms and emphasized the Apostles’ lack of faith which made it impossible to heal the father’s son who was spirit-possessed (Cf. Mk 9:17). The Apostles, in AB’s understanding, were not able to transform the experience

⁹¹ “Единственный способ, как мы можем ответить на Божественную любовь, на эту распятую, жертвенную любовь Бога, на этот дар Божий в Духе и Крови, это – открыться навстречу Господу и принять Его, дав Ему свободно пребывать в нас, быть Хозяином этого храма, Им созданного и беспрестанно нами оскверняемого, хотя в сущности своей остающегося священным.” Ibid., 456.

⁹² “Литургия – момент, когда мы находимся на горе Преображения. Мы не просто видим Христа во славе – мы способны Его видеть лишь в той мере, в какой сами причастны этой реальности Христа, во Святом Духе. Апостолы могли видеть Христа таким, каким Он был, лишь потому, что сами были в славе.” Ibid., 465.

of God's presence into practice. The task for Christians is to transform the experience of the Transfiguration into readiness to go to Gethsemane. He said:

The same is taking place with us during the Eucharistic Liturgy, but even on a greater scale. They saw, but for us it is given to participate in this already victorious reality amidst the twilight of the world, in an essential manner, with body and soul, spirit and will, with all our being. We must, like the Apostles, come down from the mountain and take on human history, and if necessary, to carry it on our shoulders, on the paths of our lives and the lives of other people – personal and public – into the garden of Gethsemane, where we have to encounter the mortal anguish of humanity, to take it on ourselves, raise it onto the cross, and, if necessary, to die, so the others might return to life through our death.⁹³

This is how AB made a link between the key events of Christ's kenosis and its practical application for the life of Christians. AB believed that after the encounter with God in the Holy Eucharist, Christians should be ready to accept their daily cross of life. AB warned his listeners that in receiving the Eucharist, a Christian becomes one with Christ not only spiritually, but also bodily and if the person turns away from God after the encounter with Him, "we are as if dragging the Lord forcibly, painfully on the same path on which they led him in the days of His Passion, for crucifixion, for suffering and to be mocked."⁹⁴ Now the Christian is united with Christ and is called to the kenotic way of life by following the example of Christ. As AB put it in a sermon after the liturgy:

⁹³ "То же происходит и с нами во время евхаристической Литургии, но еще в большей степени. Они – видели, нам же дано участвовать сущностно, телом и душой, духом и волей, всем нашим существом в этой уже победоносной реальности среди нашего сумеречного мира. Мы должны, подобно апостолам, сойти в долину, принять на себя человеческую историю и, если понадобится, понести ее на своих плечах, путями своей жизни и жизни других людей – личной и общественной – в Гефсиманский сад, где нам придется встретить смертную тоску человечества, принять ее на себя, вознести на крест и, если нужно, умереть, чтобы другие ожили через нашу смерть." Ibid., 465. Cf. Ibid., 492; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/prop/prop_27.htm

⁹⁴ "[М]ы как бы влечем Господа насильственно, мучительно по тому самому пути, по которому Его вели в страстные дни на распятие, на страдание, на поругание." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Bo*

Now, during the liturgy we are all joined to this banquet through prayer or through action. But then we have to leave the church to go somewhere. Where will we go? Where did the Apostles of Christ go after the Last Supper? With one exception, all went with Christ to the Garden of Gethsemane. Judas left earlier, and it was dark where he went. There are two ways before us: following Christ, in the horrible darkness of the Garden of Gethsemane, where Christ accepted into His heart, took upon His shoulders all rejection of the world, the alienation of the world from God, all sorrow born of this, growing out of hostility, out of hatred, out of alienation of people from one another. The Apostles went to a dark place, because that was the place of a struggle against evil, there was bloody sweat, there were the tears of Christ, there was horror before His approaching death. But Judas went into the other darkness, where there no care of anyone for another, where no one bothered him. He could be himself in this darkness, but he stayed in it alone, because the people who walk in that darkness are not brothers to each other – everyone is locked in his own loneliness. [...] From the darkness of the Garden of Gethsemane there rose up the priestly and sacrificial prayer of Christ – not only for those who followed Him, but for those, who in this dense, division, blinding, murderous darkness were preparing death for Him... We have before us these two ways. Rather, there is only **one** way before us – the path of Christ, the path of the Apostles, the path into Gethsemane, the path into the world with the word and life, which is worthy of this celebration of faith that we have just experienced.⁹⁵

имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_6.htm

⁹⁵ “Сейчас на литургии мы все молитвой или самым делом приобщились этому пиру. Но теперь нам надо из этого храма выйти и куда-то идти. Куда пойдем мы? Куда пошли апостолы Христовы после Тайной вечери? За исключением одного, все пошли со Христом в Гефсиманский сад. Иуда вышел раньше, и было темно там, куда он пошел. Две дороги перед каждым из нас: за Христом, в страшную тьму Гефсиманского сада, где Христос принял в Свое сердце, взял на Свои плечи всю отверженность мира, все отчуждение мира от Бога, всю скорбь, рождающуюся от этого, вырастающую из вражды, из ненависти, из отчужденности людей друг от друга. Апостолы пошли в место темное, потому что там было бореие против зла, был кровавый пот, были слезы Христовы, был ужас перед надвигающейся смертью. Но Иуда ушел в другую тьму. Там никакой заботы ни о ком не было, никто его не трогал, он был свой в этой тьме, но остался в ней один, потому что те люди, которые ходят в этой тьме, друг другу не братья, – каждый закован в свое одиночество. [...] Из тьмы Гефсиманского сада возносилась священническая, жертвенная молитва Христа – не о тех только, которые с Ним пошли, но и о тех, которые в той густой, разъединяющей, слепящей, убийственной тьме готовили Ему смерть... Перед нами эти два пути. Вернее, нет: один только путь перед нами – путь Христов, путь апостольский, путь в Гефсиманию, путь в мир со словом и жизнью, достойными того праздника веры, который мы пережили.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_68.htm

Here AB made a bold distinction between two ways of entering the darkest moments of the kenotic life: Christ, who took upon Himself the forsakenness of the world from God, and Judas as the anti-example, who entered in the other darkness of God-forsakenness and individualism. It is important to admit that in the above quotation, AB referred to Gethsemane rather than to Golgotha. We can see here some similarities with Metropolitan Anthony Khrapovitsky, who was presented earlier. It shows again that AB neither counter-posed these events nor overemphasized one event over the other; rather he saw them as complementary and the continuation of the one tragedy.

As we can see, there is a bold distinction between the God-forsakenness of Christ and the God-forsakenness of Judas. It seems that for AB, the reaction of the person to such an experience was more important than intellectual reasoning and analysis of it. Judas experienced abandonment by God and the other Apostles (we can see this negative presentation of Judas in the Gospel), but he was not able to accept it, to remain in solidarity with the other Apostles, who also abandoned Christ and left Him. He was not able to forgive himself and he felt sorry for himself and, thus, hung himself. Christ, instead, remained in solidarity with God and the people who abandoned Him. He did not close in on Himself, but rather continued, in this loneliness, to be faithful to both. Christ became the ultimate example for Christians of how to behave in the harsh moments of abandonment by God or other people – they have to remain faithful to both. Here we can see the link AB made between the God-forsakenness of Christ, God's faith in the human person and the application of kenotic theology in practice.

In another place, AB combined the Eucharist with the garden of Gethsemane and Golgotha and proposed a practical application of these events along with the Eucharist in

the life of Christians. “The breaking of the bread was the breaking of His body, the sharing of the cup was the sharing of His blood, and what was signified in the last Supper was the Garden of Gethsemane with the anguish and the horror of the coming death upon Him Who was free of evil and yet chose to share with us our destiny of dereliction and mortality, and of Calvary, the actual dying for the salvation of others, - more than this: the dying of their death so that they should share and possess His life. [...] We must so live as Christ lived for others, we must so die as Christ died, that others may live. We must so ascend from life into this sacrificial generous life-giving death as Christ did, and this lays upon us a heavy, a stern and glorious responsibility.”⁹⁶

The Eucharist is the example of the transformation of matter. The Sacrament of the Eucharist is the ultimate place of the encounter between God and the human being.

To take the central act of the Church, the blessing of the bread and the wine into the body and blood of Christ – ultimately means that we see here the matter of this world in the example of a small particle of it, of a drop of it, attain to that fulfillment which is the vocation of all things, that God should be all in all and that all things should be fulfilled by the divine presence, indeed the integration of God in them.⁹⁷

AB pointed out the kenotic element in the receiving of the Holy Eucharist by the priests and other people. He interpreted that the separate receiving of the Holy Body and Holy Blood by a priest should remind him of his participation in the crucifixion and

⁹⁶ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *On Communion and Life*, August 1971, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_134.htm

⁹⁷ Anthony Bloom, *God and Man*, 66-67; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Worship in a Secular Society*, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1969-11-12-1-E-E-T-EW99-087WorshipInSecularSociety.html>; Trudy 1, 452, 510, 547; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 85, 422.

death of Christ, and that through laypeople receiving together they partake in the Resurrection of Christ.

[T]his is Christ Himself – but this is bread; this is Christ Himself – but this is wine. They are divided – and reveal the genuine image of His death; together they expose the genuine image of His Resurrection. Here, perhaps, we have to admit that a priest separately receives the consecrated Bread and Wine; is not this a reminder for him that he *must* be a participant in the crucifixion and death of Christ, if he wishes to give to others the Resurrection. But believers receive the Blood of Christ and Body of Christ together, so they receive the fullness of life in the risen Christ, in the transfiguring victory that overwhelmed them.⁹⁸

The separate receiving of the Eucharist by a priest doesn't give him a privileged status. In AB's understanding of the priesthood, it was rather the opposite: that the priest is called to a particular way of following Christ, especially His way of the cross. AB stated:

[The] path for every person, leading to the resurrection, *is not different* from the path of Christ. [...] This is the way of the cross, the path on which the person step by step refuses everything that distracts him, everything that enslaves him, that makes him a slave, rather than a free person. [...]

Christ promised us to unite with us in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. He tells us in the Gospel: Eat this Bread, drink all of you from this Cup... But before that, He offered another cup to His disciples, or rather another condition: if you do not drink My cup, if you do not immerse yourselves *in the horror* I am going to face, then you can not be My friends...⁹⁹

⁹⁸ “[Э]то Сам Христос – но это хлеб, это Сам Христос – и это вино. Они разделены – и являют подлинный образ Его смерти; вместе они являют истинный образ Его Воскресения. Здесь, может быть, стоит заметить, что священник причащается отдельно освященных Хлеба и Вина; не напоминание ли это ему, что он должен быть участником в распятии и смерти Христовой, если он хочет передать другим Воскресение. А верующие принимают Кровь Христову и Тело Христово вместе, так что они получают жизнь воскресшего Христа в полноте, в преображающей победе, преисполняющей их.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 394; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 88. Cf. *Ibid.*, 376.

⁹⁹ “[П]уть, ведущий к воскресению, не иной, чем был путь Христов, и для каждого человека [...] Это путь крестный, путь, на котором человек шаг за шагом отказывается от всего, что его отвлекает, от всего, что его порабощает, что его делает рабом, а не свободным человеком. [...] Христос нам обещал соединиться с нами в таинстве Причащения. Он нам говорит в Евангелии: Примите сей Хлеб, пейте все от этой Чаши... Но до этого Он Своим ученикам другую чашу предлагал, вернее, иное условие ставил: если вы не будете пить Моей чаши, если вы не погрузитесь в ужас, который Мне предстоит, то вы не можете быть Моими учениками...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: <http://www.metroplit->

AB made a direct link between the receiving of the Eucharist and practical kenosis. The vocation of following the kenotic way of life is entrusted to all Christians who receive the Eucharist. They are called to humility and self-denial.

IV.2.7. Sacrament of Repentance and Confession

AB based the kenotic elements of the Sacrament of Repentance and Confession¹⁰⁰ on the idea of “metanoia,” some key kenotic events of Christ’s life, and the role of the priest in solidarity with the penitent. First of all, AB admitted that the most important element of the Sacrament of Confession is the preparation for it:

The Confession itself, might be expressed sometimes in a few words, but the preparation for it should be the deepest tilling of the soul. It has to be a penetration into the darkest depth, a brave, courageous, merciless penetration of the gaze into these depths. Into these depths we can descend only with God; it is like the descent of Christ into Hades; it is like Christ’s departure to the desert after His Baptism, led there by the Spirit to be tempted by Satan. Only because the light of Christ will be with us, can we see what is hidden in the dark recesses of our soul.¹⁰¹

anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd13.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/prop/prop_09.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy9.htm>

¹⁰⁰ More on the Sacrament of Repentance and Confession, see: Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Радость покаяния* (Moscow: Omega, 2003), online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/pokayanie/pokayanie.htm>; Ibid., online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/pokayanie/pokayanie2.htm>; Ibid., online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/pokayanie/pokayanie3.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony Sourozh, *On Confession: 1st Sermon 12th September 1999*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_244.htm

¹⁰¹ “Самая исповедь может, порой, выразиться в нескольких словах, но подготовка должна быть глубочайшей вспашкой души, это должно быть проникновение в самые ее темные глубины, смелое, мужественное, беспощадное проникновение взора в эти глубины. В эти глубины можно опуститься только с Богом; это подобно сошествию Христа во ад; подобно тому, как Христос ушел в пустыню после Своего крещения, ведомый туда Духом, с тем чтобы быть испытанным сатаной. Только потому, что свет Христов будет с нами, мы можем увидеть сокрытое в этих темных тайниках нашей души.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 250; Metropolitan

In this lies the importance of entering into the Hades of one's own soul. These kenotic examples from Christ's life encourage Christians to not be afraid of examining their soul in preparation for Confession. In the case of Christ's lonely descent into Hades, He was abandoned by His Father and by all people. The faithful will be entering their own Hades, but they won't be alone in this experience, because Christ will be their light and hope.

AB's understood repentance as the recognition of the destructive power of sin, which is the state of Godlessness, and turning back towards God. "To repent means to realize the mortal power of sin and its all alienating power, which separates us from God and from our neighbor and pulls us out from our own depths to make us shallow and empty – and to change something."¹⁰² And in another place he said: "To repent doesn't mean to weep over the past; to repent means to turn back to God, to look into His face, to listen to His words, to restore the relationship of love and mutual fidelity."¹⁰³

Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 349. AB considered the Great Lent a period when a person prepares oneself for the Sacrament of Penance. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_87.htm

¹⁰² "Покаяться – значит понять всю смертоносную силу греха, всю отчуждающую власть греха, которая нас отделяет и от Бога, и от ближнего и вырывает нас из собственных глубин, чтобы сделать поверхностными и пустыми, – и изменить что-то." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 350, 559; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_5.htm; Ibid., http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_6.htm

¹⁰³ "Покаяться не значит оплакивать прошлое; покаяться значит повернуться лицом к Богу, взглянуть Ему в лицо, вслушаться в Его слова, восстановить отношения любви и взаимной верности." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 199; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 194. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 251-252, Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 676; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_87.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/molitva/vstrecha.htm>

AB used the Greek term “μετάνοια”¹⁰⁴ to underline his argument in the understanding of sin. This term “means a turning back. Someone, who was looking in one direction, having turned away from God, turns back, comes face to face with God and begins to approach Him.”¹⁰⁵ Metanoia is closely united with the daily vocation of taking up the daily cross of life. As AB put it: “To take up our cross means exactly this: to turn away from all those things which are Christ’s death and crucifixion, from all those things which surrounded Christ with hatred and lack of understanding.”¹⁰⁶

The person who is preparing for Confession should examine himself/herself to find out what is separating him/her from God. “Therefore it is necessary to come to Confession with the question: what is separating me from Christ; how did I separate myself from Him; voluntarily or involuntarily, accidentally or intentionally.”¹⁰⁷ AB referred again to the understanding of sin as Godlessness and compared life with God and life in sin to the two banks of a river:

¹⁰⁴ Which means a change of mind, repentance. AB considered the parable of the Prodigal son to be the best examples of turning away from God, sin as a Godless state and finally of repentance and returning to the father. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие: Размышление перед Великим Постом* (Klin: Khristianskaia zhizn, 2004), online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/soul_put/put_5.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Воскресные проповеди* (Minks: Minskiĭ kafedralnyi Sviato-Dukhov sobor, 1996), online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/sermons/serm1.htm>

¹⁰⁵ “[О]значает поворот. Кто-то, кто смотрел в одном направлении, отвернувшись от Бога, поворачивается, становится лицом к Богу и начинает приближаться к Нему.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 667.

¹⁰⁶ Metropolitan Anthony Sourozh, *All Saints Sunday 25 June 1989*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_120.htm; Metropolitan Anthony Sourozh, *Sunday of the Cross 2 April 1989*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_108.htm

¹⁰⁷ “Поэтому на исповедь надо приходить с вопросом о том, что меня отделяет от Христа, чем я отделился от Него волей или неволей, случайностью или намерением.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 136. Cf. Ibid., 201; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Воскресные проповеди*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/sermons/serm2.htm>

On one side of the river is God's area; on the other side is a Godless area, an area handed over to Satan. And sin, finally consists in the crossing of the river from God's area into the dark area of sin. It can happen either accidentally, unexpectedly, through ignorance, through folly, through seduction, but not by choice. Or it can happen as the result of a conscious choice: I renounce Christ, I am not His disciple anymore, I do not believe in Him anymore, I am leaving!¹⁰⁸

The destructive character of sin relates not only to the relationship between God and a person, but also to the person within himself and to relationships with other people. "[...] Sin kills a person, not just him alone, not just even his accomplices in sin – it kills human and Divine relationship... Whatever sin we would commit, the first thing that we seek, that we want, is to close ourselves off from God. [...] And sin separates us from people."¹⁰⁹ And again AB made a link between personal sin, human death, and the death of Christ. He said: "[It is on] the Cross on which Life dies. The One Who is immortal is dying *our* death for us; Who is put to death by *my* mortality, and all my mortality is rooted in my sinfulness. No matter that there might be thousands of people who are just as sinful people. If there were at least one sinner, his sinfulness – my sinfulness, which gives rise to death, would kill the Incarnate Son of God."¹¹⁰ The fact

¹⁰⁸ "На одной стороне этой реки – Божия область, на другой стороне реки – безбожная область, область, преданная сатане. И грех, в конечном итоге, заключается в том, чтобы перейти через эту реку из Божией области в темную область греха. Но это может с нами случиться либо нечаянно, по неведению, по безумию, по соблазненности, но не по выбору. Либо может случиться по сознательному выбору: я от Христа отрекаюсь, я больше не Его ученик, я больше в Него не верю, я уйду!" Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 135. Cf. Ibid., 302-303.

¹⁰⁹ "[...] грех убивает человека, и не только его одного, даже не только его сообщников во грехе – убивает он человеческие и божеские отношения... Какой бы мы ни совершили грех, первое, чего мы ищем, чего мы хотим, это закрыться от Бога. [...] И грех нас отделяет от людей." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolitan-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_87.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/molitva/istina.htm>

¹¹⁰ "Крест, на котором умирает Жизнь. Нас ради умирает нашей смертью Тот, Который бессмертен, Который убит моей смертностью, а моя смертность вся укоренена в моей греховности. Не важно, что вокруг могут быть тысячи одинаково грешных людей. Если был бы только один грешник, его

that sin kills our relationships with God and people makes the crucifixion of Christ a continuing reality and brings the Godless state upon the sinner.

God believes in the human being, but this faith is demanding, because He expects a person to live according to the image inscribed in the soul. But God's forgiveness of sins is based on His faith in the person. "God forgives, in the sense that He does not condemn us to death, and does not destroy us; but He expects us to become capable of seeing and to recognize our sinfulness [...]." ¹¹¹ In another place, AB said that God's grace is given to a human being not because of his/her achievement in the spiritual life, but as the result of the person's longing for an encounter with God. ¹¹²

A person who sins should come to the point of understanding that sin is the state of separation from God and that true repentance begins with the realization of this and turning away from evil. The sinner needs to recognize what it means to be with God, and to be without Him. AB said: "Often we think that returning is easy for us to accomplish, that it is enough to say: 'Lord, forgive!' – and return. This is not true! We need to experience the hunger that makes us alien to the world that is alien to God, not the one where we live, but the land of sin, alienation, the region of alienation from God. It is

греховность – моя греховность, – порождающая смерть, убила бы воплощенного Сына Божия." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 660, Cf. Ibid., 676, 1012; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_87.htm

¹¹¹ "Бог прощает в том смысле, что Он нас не осуждает на смерть, не уничтожает; но Он от нас ожидает, чтобы мы стали зрячими, осознали свою греховность [...]." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 229.

¹¹² Cf. Ibid., 571

only after ripping ourselves out of this alienation that we can return home.”¹¹³ In this we can again see the link between sin as Godlessness and the Sacrament of Penance as the only way to return to oneself and to live with God and other people.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, AB understood that Adam’s decision to turn away from God brought upon the first human beings the condition of Godlessness, which was healed by Christ on the cross. “This is the path of repentance: to enter into oneself; to stand before God and to see oneself as condemned, as one who deserves neither forgiveness, nor mercy, and instead of running away from the face of God as Cain did, to turn back to Him and to say: I believe, O Lord, in Your love, I believe in the Cross of Your Son, – I believe, help my unbelief!..”¹¹⁴ There is one condition for a good repentance – a firm decision to return to God, as we can see in the parable of the prodigal son, who realized his Godless state and turned back to his father.

AB extended his understanding of Original sin as a Godless state to all other sins. He said: “In order to fight [...] *every* sin that we meet along the way, as well as our fundamental sinfulness, what is required is a renunciation of oneself.”¹¹⁵ Because

¹¹³ “Мы часто думаем, что возвращение нам дается легко, что достаточно сказать: ‘Господи, прости!’ – и вернуться. Неправда! Надо пережить голод, который нас делает чужими этой чуждой Богу земле, не той земле, на которой мы живем, а земле греха, отчужденности, области отчужденности от Бога. Только оторвавшись от нее, можем мы вернуться домой.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 656.

¹¹⁴ “Вот это путь покаяния: войти в себя, встать перед Богом, увидеть себя осужденным, не заслуживающим ни прощения, ни милости, и вместо того, чтобы, как Каин, бежать от лица Бога, обернуться к Нему и сказать: верую, Господи, в Твою любовь, верую в Крест Сына Твоего,— верую, помоги моему неверию!..” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/lub_vse_72.htm

¹¹⁵ “Но чтобы сразиться [...] с каждым грехом, который нам встретится по пути, и с основной нашей греховностью, требуется то отречение от себя.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 687. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 144; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 327; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/prop/prop_28.htm

everyone is weak and vulnerable, AB reinforced not only the need to know oneself, to encounter and to love oneself, but also to come to a clear understanding of what sin is in the self by descending into one's own Hades together with Christ and then to turn back towards God. AB, as a follower of Eastern Christian spirituality, did not distinguish between mortal and venial sin,¹¹⁶ but rather considered a sin not only to be a violation of God's will, but also a "violation of the very experience of the life which is in us. This is a crime against ourselves. It is suicide. And suicide in a very terrible, very powerful sense of this word, because it is a murdering in our own selves of eternal life; an expelling out of ourselves of the Divine life..."¹¹⁷ To fight against sin is not only to fight for life, but it is also a demonstration of human faithfulness and love for God: "[...] to fight with sin is to fight *for life*. [...] it is to fight for God, for Christ, for His victory; this is our faithfulness to Him, this is our strong love for Him, this is everything we can do *for Him*, because we are put in this world to conquer evil in it and by conquering evil in ourselves we conquer it in the world."¹¹⁸

AB understood that not only does sin put a person in the Godless state by rejecting God, but it also destroys the wholeness of the person. "Sin is at its root a

¹¹⁶ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 480-481; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/prop/prop_28.htm

¹¹⁷ "[Н]арушение самого опыта жизни, который в нас есть, это преступление против нас самих, это самоубийство. И самоубийство в очень страшном, очень сильном смысле этого слова, потому что это убийство в нас самих вечной жизни; это извержение из нас Божией жизни..." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 163; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 692. More on suicide, see: *Ibid.*, 96-98.

¹¹⁸ "[...] бороться с грехом – это бороться за жизнь. [...] борьба за Бога, за Христа, за Его победу, это наша верность Ему, это наша любовь посильная к Нему, это все, что мы можем сделать для Него, потому что мы поставлены в этот мир для того, чтобы победить в нем зло, и, побеждая его в себе, мы его побеждаем в мире." *Ibid.*, 692.

separation from God, because God is the key to our wholeness, our integrity. If we separate ourselves from Him, then we lose the very ability to be whole. We separate ourselves from Him every time when in our relationship with another person we act as Christ would not act.”¹¹⁹ The commandments are the bandages on the wounds caused by sins and our way of living: “[...] commandments are given to us for the healing of our mortally ill soul and body. We are mortally wounded. But we can be healed, which is to be whole again...”¹²⁰ AB believed that the commandments were not given to people because God felt compelled to do so, but rather He gave them as a help to avoid sin, which is the state of Godlessness.

AB also saw kenosis in the role of the priest in the Sacrament of Confession. The kenotic elements in the Sacrament of Confession are evident in the acts of the priest. AB compared the role of a priest with the role of John the Baptist as the bridegroom’s friend. “In ancient times the friend of the groom was a person who was closest to the groom and the bride, the one who led them to the wedding chamber. [...] Such is the role of the priest. He listens, yes, he listens to what the person in his Confession is saying to Christ, to Him alone, just to Him.”¹²¹ According to AB the main role of a priest is to witness to

¹¹⁹ “[В] основе грех – это отрыв от Бога, потому что Бог является как бы ключом нашей цельности, нашей целостности. Если мы от Него отрываемся, то мы теряем самую возможность быть целыми. И отрываемся мы каждый раз, когда по отношению к другому человеку поступаем так, как не поступил бы Спаситель Христос.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_103.htm

¹²⁰ “[...] заповеди даны нам во исцеление наших насмерть заболевших души и тела. Мы ранены насмерть. И мы можем исцелиться, то есть вновь стать цельными...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 163. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/prop/prop_19.htm

¹²¹ “Друг жениха – в древности это был человек, который был самым близким человеком жениху и невесте и который приводил их к брачной комнате [...] Такова роль и священника. Он стоит и слушает, да, он слушает, он слушает то, что человек в своей исповеди говорит Христу, Ему

the healing of the relationship between God and the human being. Elsewhere he acknowledged that Confession may also include conversation between the priest and the penitent.

IV.2.8. Sacrament of Unction

The Sacrament of Unction is given to a person who is sick and through the anointing of their body with oil, along with prayer, that person's suffering is sanctified and united to the suffering of Christ. In the Sacrament of Unction, AB pointed out the healing character of the Sacrament. The condition for the reception of the healing is the decision of a person to turn away from sin and turn oneself towards God.

Let us repent, or in other words turn away from death to life, from our own selves towards God, from the darkness and the gloom to the pure light of Christ. And then, during this service, with all sincerity bring a contrite heart to God, with a repentant spirit, having made the decision not to allow Christ's life and death to be for us in vain. Let us receive the anointing of the holy Oil for the healing of the soul and body; the oil of gladness, oil that restores strength, which prepares us to fight with every evil, spiritual and otherwise. It prepares us to become warriors of Christ.¹²²

одному, только Ему.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 154; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/be/be_5.htm; Metropolitan Anthony Sourozh, *On Confession 2nd Sermon 26th September 1999*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_245.htm

¹²² “Покаемся же, то есть обернемся от смерти к жизни, от самих себя к Богу, от потемок и мрака – к чистому свету Христову. И затем, со всей искренностью принеся Богу в течение этой службы сердце сокрушенное, дух кающийся, приняв решение не допустить, чтобы Христовы жизнь и смерть оказались для нас напрасными, примем помазание святым Елеем во исцеление души и тела, елеем радования, елеем, который восстанавливает силу, который приготавливает нас на борьбу со всяким злом, духовным и прочим, приготавливает нас стать воинами Христа.” Ibid., online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_93.htm

Perhaps the reason AB moved the focus from the body to the soul might lie in his pastoral intuition. In addition to individual cases of receiving the Sacrament of Unction by the sick person, there is an annual celebration of the Sacrament for all the faithful on Holy Wednesday, and some people who come to receive this Sacrament might be interested in receiving only a physical healing without realizing its spiritual benefit. Through the anointing of the body, the soul receives healing as well. He said: “Death will come to each of us and illness will affect each of us in its own time. There is an illness of body, but there is something in the gradual dying of a person that relates to his spirit: rancor, hatred, bitterness, fear, envy, and jealousy – all these feelings that are directed against our neighbor. And also the feelings, or rather lack of feelings, which alienate us from God, and destroy us in soul and body just as much as a disease would.”¹²³ We have already seen the distinction AB made between a physical and spiritual death. On the cross Christ conquered the spiritual death, which is the loss of God. The Sacrament of Unction brings healing to the physical body, but what is even more important, is that it heals the spiritual death of the soul.

¹²³ “Смерть придет на каждого из нас, болезнь поражает каждого из нас в его время. И есть болезнь тела, но есть также в постепенном умирании человека нечто, что относится к его духу: злопамятность, ненависть, горечь, страх, зависть, ревность – все чувства, которые направлены против нашего ближнего. А также чувства – или бесчувствие, – которые отчуждают нас от Бога, разрушают нас в душе и в теле так же верно, как болезнь.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_93.htm

IV.2.9. Kenosis in the Sacrament of Marriage and in Monasticism

The reason why I will present the topic of kenosis in Marriage together with monasticism lies in AB's own approach to this question – he interpreted the Sacrament of Marriage and Monasticism analogously. He considered the common goal of both, the life of a married couple and the life of a monk, to be the way of the cross, which leads to the Kingdom of Heaven. I shall not present all aspects of AB's understanding of the Sacrament of Marriage or of Monasticism, but only those issues related to the topic of the present research. First, I will proceed to the unity between Monasticism and Marriage and later to the other kenotic aspects of married life, including the difficulties. The main similarities between Marriage and Monastic life begin with making a choice and later manifest themselves in faithfulness to that choice. AB called this “the choice of love and the choice of faith.”¹²⁴ He also explained the vows of poverty, obedience and chastity.¹²⁵

The most crucial and fundamental element in the case of the monk's path is his/her faithfulness to this choice: “For a monk this stability means to stand before the face of God whatever his mood, whatever the circumstances. He will be standing before the face of God, worshiping and serving and will never turn away from the One Whom

¹²⁴ “[В]ыбор любви и выбор веры.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 209.

¹²⁵ For more on the vows, see: Ibid., 213. AB was not unique in the uniting of the Sacrament of Marriage with Monasticism. See “interiorized monasticism” of Paul Evdokimov. Cf. Paul Evdokimov, *Woman and the Salvation of the World: A Christian Anthropology on the Charisms of Women*, trans. by Anthony P. Gythiel, (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994).

he has loved and to Whom he has promised his life and his heart.”¹²⁶ A monk’s faithfulness to God lies in his decision to remain firm in moments of tribulation and not to turn away. We have already seen that AB understood sin as the decision to turn away from God and to put oneself in a Godless state. How he understood the monastic life is an application of this understanding of sin.

In Marriage the same aspect of faithfulness plays a crucial role: “When one person finds another who is the one and only, then there is a moment, when the subject of ultimate stability in the relationship is raised. [...] It is called marital fidelity, it is called the monastic steadfastness or stability, and without it there can be nothing further.”¹²⁷ The faithfulness in both cases is based on faith in the other: in Monasticism the other is God, in Marriage it is one’s spouse.

AB believed that another element common to both Marriage and Monasticism is freedom: “Free is the one who is loved and who loves, the one who is freed from his or her own self, who has moved the center of gravity of his whole self into another, whether another human being, [...] or God Himself.”¹²⁸ As was already presented in the previous chapter, AB bound up freedom with the categories of love. To become free means to free oneself of self-centeredness, to turn towards others and to live self-

¹²⁶ “Эта устойчивость для монаха значит, что он будет стоять перед лицом Божиим, каково бы ни было его настроение, каковы бы ни были обстоятельства; будет стоять перед Божиим лицом, поклоняясь и служа, никогда не отвернется от Того, Кого полюбил и Кому обещал свою жизнь и сердце.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 208.

¹²⁷ “[К]огда один человек находит другого – единственного и неповторимого, есть момент, когда начинается тема окончательной устойчивости в отношениях. [...] Это называется брачная верность, это называется монашеская устойчивость, стабильность, и без этого не может быть ничего дальнейшего.” Ibid., 208-209.

¹²⁸ “Тот свободен, кто любим и кто любит, кто освободился от себя, кто перенес центр тяжести всего себя, всей своей жизни в другого, будь то в человека, [...] будь то в Самого Бога.” Ibid., 212.

sacrificially for them. A monk is called to live for others: for God and community, whereas the husband and wife are called to live not only for God and themselves, but also for their children and the wider community. This is a way of becoming free: to live life for God and for other people.

The root of both Marriage and monastic life is love – “personal, living, specific love for the world in which we live with all awareness of its tragedy, and yet [...] in the joy that in this tragic world is love, there is unity, there is friendship and there are such human relationships that make the world not hell, but heaven made possible.”¹²⁹ AB believed that despite the presence of evil in the world, there is love among people that can transform the world. This love is based on faith in another person and can be sanctified in the Sacrament of Marriage. AB stated: “There is no genuine, truthful, mutual relationship between husband and wife, between bride and groom if there is no mutual faith, that is to say on the one hand, genuine *trust*, and on the other hand, *faithfulness*. [...] *Faith* is needed here, the kind of faith is needed that can only be born out of love, of which I have spoken in other talks: love capable of seeing, meditative love, and sincere love, which is capable of seeing the entire beauty of a person even in the moment when this beauty is shaken or when something has faded in this beauty.”¹³⁰

¹²⁹ “[Л]ичной, живой, конкретной любви к миру, в котором мы живем, в сознании его трагичности, а вместе с тем [...] в радости о том, что в этом трагическом мире есть любовь, есть единство, есть дружба, есть такие человеческие отношения, которые делают его не адом, а возможным раем.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 477. More on love in Marriage, see: *Ibid.*, 479-481.

¹³⁰ “Не может быть истинных, подлинных взаимных отношений, если нет между мужем и женой, между невестой и женихом взаимной веры, то есть, с одной стороны, настоящего доверия, с другой стороны, верности. [...] Тут нужна вера, такая вера, которая может родиться только из той любви, о какой я говорил в других беседах: любви зрячей, любви созерцательной, любви проникновенной, которая способна видеть всю красоту человека даже в тот момент, когда эта красота заколебалась или когда что-либо в этой красоте померкло.” *Ibid.*, 481, 482. Cf. *Ibid.*, 1005.

In this case, AB united love with faith in the other person, and again suggested looking into the depth of a soul to see the beauty hidden there. According to AB, “the only way to revive a person, the only way to give a person the opportunity to open up in fullness – it is to love him, to love not *for* his virtues or perfection, despite his imperfection, but just to love because he is a human being and because a human being is so great and so beautiful in himself. In this we can always believe.”¹³¹ With genuine love of the other person sees the beauty hidden within. But this is only possible through the faith and love that God has for people. Also in this case, AB referred to the love and faith of God in the person: “Only with the eyes of love can we see a person as he is in his very depths, in his very essence, and relate to him accordingly. God relates to us in the same way. God loves us not because we are good. God is merciful to us not because we deserve mercy and love. He simply loves us. [...] Therefore in marriage faith in the other person is *so* important.”¹³² An awareness of the unconditional love and faith of God in a person gives him/her the motivation to love and to believe in other human beings unconditionally and to see the inner, but hidden beauty.

¹³¹ “[Е]динственный способ возродить человека, единственный способ дать человеку возможность раскрыться в полноте – это его любить, любить не за его добродетели или совершенства, не вопреки тому, что он несовершенен, а любить просто потому, что он человек, и потому, что человек так велик и так прекрасен сам по себе. В это мы можем верить всегда.” Ibid., 483.

¹³² “Только глазами любви мы можем видеть человека таким, какой он есть в самой своей глубине, в самой своей сущности, и соответственно к нему относиться. Так относится к нам Бог. Бог нас любит не потому, что мы хороши, Бог к нам милостив не потому, что мы заслуживаем милость или любовь: Он нас просто любит. [...] И в браке это так важно, так важна эта вера в человека” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 483; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_6.htm

Another common element between marriage and monasticism is chastity.¹³³ AB said: “Chastity not only is compatible with marriage, it is the foundation of marriage, when two persons can look at each other and see the mutual beauty as a shrine, which is entrusted to them and which they have not only to preserve, but bring to full perfection.”¹³⁴ Chastity is found in the inner depth of a person, and the goal of husband and wife is to preserve it and try to bring it to its fullness, to perfection.

Chastity in AB’s theology meant to perceive the beauty of the other person and to preserve it. “Chastity is an inner state, determined not by physical categories, but by relationship: a spiritual relationship, relationship with the soul and relationship with the body.”¹³⁵ Chastity includes not only the body, but also the soul and spirit. In this teaching I see a link with the chastity of the Mother of God who preserved chastity throughout her life.

Along with the similarities between Marriage and monasticism, there are also some obvious differences.

In marriage, as Holy Scripture points it out, the exultation of triumphant love predominates; in monasticism the readiness to give up everything predominates –

¹³³ AB made a distinction between chastity and abstinence. He said: “Воздержание – другое дело. Человек может воздерживаться от всего плотского и гореть всеми страстями, которые оскверняют его ум и его сердце. Целомудрие – в другом: целомудрие не в воздержании, не в отрицании плоти, а в том, чтобы в своей плоти увидеть святость и поделиться этой святыней с другим человеком. [Abstinence – this is something else. A person can abstain from all, which is carnal, but desire it passionately, and this will be defiling his mind and heart. The chastity is something else: chastity is neither the abstinence, nor in the negation of the body, but the ability to see the holiness in the own flesh and to share this sanctity with the other person.]” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 510.

¹³⁴ “Целомудрие не только совместимо с браком, целомудрие является основой брака, когда два человека могут друг на друга смотреть и видеть взаимную красоту как святыню, которая им доверена и которую они должны не только охранить, но довести до полного совершенства.” Ibid., 489.

¹³⁵ “Целомудрие – это внутреннее состояние, определяющееся не физическими категориями, а отношением: духовным отношением, отношением души и отношением тела.” Ibid., 499, 509.

not only the evil, but also the good – this is done only for the sake of following Christ the Lamb of God. But we live in a world, in which the Divine victory has been received, but a world that has not yet reached its fulfillment. As a result, this marriage feast in the heart is marked with the cross. It is life-giving, salvific cross, on which the Old Adam in each of us has to be crucified and die. Also in monasticism, because through the Incarnation, Cross, descent into Hades, Resurrection, Ascension and through the gift of the Holy Spirit, we already have received the victory of God. There is already rejoicing over the kingdom of God which already has come which we can already taste in the Sacraments, in prayer and in the very mystery of the Church, which is the encounter of the Living God with every person and with all of us.¹³⁶

Some comparisons can be made between Marriage and the eschatological aspect of the Church. On the one hand, the Church, as the Body of Christ, is the icon of God's presence in the world and the fulfillment of unity with God. On the other hand, the Church is in a process of becoming one with Christ. We can see the same in the Sacrament of Marriage. On the one hand, there is a fulfillment of the love between a husband and wife, the realization of the icon of *anthropos*, the feast of love. On the other hand, they are in the process of becoming one; they have a vocation for carrying their cross daily and for self-sacrifice.

Sometimes people think monastic life is an escape from love for another person or an escape from the world's problems. AB considered it to be the opposite:

[A monk] does not refuse love: first of all, the love for God, secondly, the love for other human beings. Only a person who has realized and has accepted quite

¹³⁶ “В браке, как на то указывает Священное Писание, преобладает ликование о восторжествовавшей любви; в монашестве преобладает готовность от всего отказаться - не только от дурного, но и от добра – для того только, чтобы последовать за Ангцем-Христом. Но мы живем в мире, в котором уже одержана Божественная победа – и который еще не достиг своей полноты; и в результате этого брачное торжество в своей сердцевине отмечено крестом: живоносным, спасительным крестом, на котором должен быть распят и умереть Ветхий Адам в каждом из нас. А в монашестве, потому что Воплощением, и Крестом, и сошествием в ад, и Воскресением, и Вознесением, и даром Святого Духа уже одержана победа Божия, есть ликование о Царстве Божию, которое уже пришло, которое мы можем уже вкушать в таинствах, в молитве и в самой тайне Церкви, которая есть встреча Живого Бога с каждым человеком и со всеми нами, животворящая встреча...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 213-214.

deeply the tragedy of the world can become a monk; one for whom the sufferings of the world are so significant that he is ready to forget about himself completely, in order to remember the world which finds itself in the suffering, separation from God, in struggle, and to remember God Himself Who was crucified for the world for the sake of love. Therefore entering monasticism by far does not mean escape from the world.¹³⁷

The same idea of self-sacrifice that we see in Marriage is also present in monastic life and is based on the kenotic approach, just as in Marriage. The main goal in Monasticism is, on the one hand, the fulfillment of unity with God and, on the other hand, daily faithfulness to this unity. The kenotic life of Christ serves in both cases as the example in its practical application.

The relationship between husband and wife, according to the way AB understood it, should be based on the reading from St. Paul's letter to the Ephesians (5: 20-33), which is read during the Marriage ceremony in the Byzantine Christian Tradition. St. Paul in this passage compared a husband and wife to Christ and the Church. AB summarized this passage with his own interpretation of the words of St. Paul.

A husband should take the place of Christ in relation to the Church, the wife – the place of the Church in relation to Christ. Young people, young husbands very often lose sight of this, that – yes, there is some correlation of some dependence of the wife on her husband, but the precondition for this is that the husband, in relation to his wife, is called to take the position of Christ with sacrificial and entirely self-giving love. This condition, expanded onto the Church, gives us one more analogy and at the same time, of course, some difference, because the way in which the relations between husband and wife are accomplished is done

¹³⁷ “[Монах] не отказывается от любви: во-первых, от любви к Богу, во-вторых, от любви к человеку. Монахом может стать только такой человек, который осознал и воспринял достаточно глубоко трагизм мира, для которого страдание мира настолько значительно, что он готов о себе позабыть совершенно для того, чтобы помнить о мире, находящемся в страдании, в оторванности от Бога, в борении, и для того, чтобы помнить о Самом Боге, распятом по любви к миру. И поэтому уход в монашество далеко не означает бегства из мира.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 476.

according to the image of the Church and together with it the fulfillment of love in the Church is realized in the image of a family.¹³⁸

The role of a husband is to follow the kenotic life of Christ. He is called to self-sacrifice and readiness to give his life for his wife, just as Christ laid down His life for the Church. What is the sacrificial role of a wife? AB did not explain the role of a wife in this context, but I would compare the role of the wife with the role of the Mother of God. The wife, comparable to the Mother of God as the Bride of the Lamb, is called to follow her husband in everything, even going together with him to the cross, and this involves self-sacrifice as well.¹³⁹ In the case of married life, a couple is called to mutual self-sacrifice, as in monastic life, each person is called to the ultimate personal sacrifice of following Christ in His kenotic life. Here is what AB said on the occasion of the tonsuring of a monk:

You have just accepted an *impossible* task: to follow Christ wherever He would go, to follow Him in all His earthly paths; and you received a promise from Him that the cup He had to drink, He will share with you; and the trial, in which He was immersed, He will give you to be immersed in with Him. Be prepared to be led by Him into the darkness of Gethsemane [...]. And further He will lead you through everything that we read in the Gospel about the days of the Passion, that you will die with Him the death which you symbolically accepted in Baptism, and the death you have just chosen through monastic tonsure. He will lead you into Hades, because you are His priest, and you are called to go into the deepest,

¹³⁸ “[М]уж должен занять место Христа по отношению к Церкви, жена – место Церкви по отношению ко Христу. И молодые люди, молодые мужья очень часто как бы упускают из вида, что – да, есть это соотношение некоторой зависимости жены по отношению к мужу, но что предпосылка к этому та, что муж призван занять по отношению к жене то положение жертвенной, всецело себя отдающей любви, которое занял Христос. Эта посылка, расширенная на Церковь, нам дает еще одну аналогию и вместе с этим, конечно, некоторую разницу, потому что то, как совершается это взаимоотношение мужа и жены, совершается по образу Церкви, а вместе с этим осуществление этой любви в Церкви осуществляется по образу семьи.” Ibid., 502; Cf. Ibid., 491, 502, 798.

¹³⁹ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 213-214; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 491.

the darkest corners of life to release from Hades all those who have been held captive by the devil and evil.

But the fulfillment of everything is neither Gethsemane, nor the days of passion, nor the chilling cry of the soul: 'My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?' nor the descent into Hades, but the glorious Resurrection and Ascension.¹⁴⁰

These words AB addressed to a candidate during his profession of the monastic vows. In this quotation we can see the links with the key events in Christ's life starting with Baptism and monastic life. It is interesting that in this case AB referred not only to Christ's God-forsakenness in a practical application, but finished his reflection with the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ. This important addition should give to a monk who desires to follow a kenotic Christ-like life, hope and strength in the moments of despair and difficulties.

The relationship of Christ and the Church is not only an example of self-sacrifice for a married couple, but the couple should also strive to become an icon of this relationship. AB said: "[...] Christian Marriage should become an icon of the mutual relation of Christ with the Church, which is complete self-giving to each other, readiness to love the other person with all one's life and death, to completely forget about oneself

¹⁴⁰ "Ты сейчас поднял на себя невозможное дело: следовать за Христом, куда бы Он ни пошел, следовать за Ним на всех Его земных путях; и ты принял от Него обетование, что чашу, которую Ему надлежит пить, Он разделит с тобой, и в то испытание, в которое Он был погружен, Он дарует тебе погрузиться с Ним. Будь же готов к тому, что Он поведет тебя во мрак Гефсимании [...] И дальше, через все то, о чем мы читаем в Евангелии о страстных днях, поведет Он тебя, чтобы вместе с Ним ты умер смертью, которую ты символически принял в Крещении, и смертью, которую ты избрал теперь, через монашеский постриг. Поведет Он тебя и во ад, ибо ты – Его священник, и ты призван идти в самые глубокие, самые мрачные закоулки жизни, чтобы высвободить из ада тех, кто находится в плену у дьявола и у зла. Но завершение всего и не Гефсимания, и не страстные дни, не леденящий душу крик: 'Боже Мой, Боже Мой, зачем Ты Меня оставил?', и не сошествие во ад, но славное Воскресение и Вознесение." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metroplit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_6.htm

for the sake of the beloved person...”¹⁴¹ AB used kenotic vocabulary and called the love between husband and wife the “exulting love of the cross,”¹⁴² because they express a readiness to accept the other person together with his/her holiness and sinfulness. AB asserted: “You know the Russian word ‘couple’ [чета] means: husband and wife. This is a dyad that becomes a unit. And when we say: ‘I unite [сочетаюсь] to Christ,’ it means that I unite with Him; with everything that He is and I take as for my own vocation [...], everything that I am, He takes upon Himself as a cross. This is a gift of mutual trust, where each one of us brings something: one – His perfect holiness, the other – His openness, despite the all sinfulness that is in us.”¹⁴³ In this quote AB used a play on words in Russian, where the word *чета* is the root for *сочетаюсь* and it points out the interdependence of meaning between these two words.

AB understood that the goal of Marriage is the transformation of isolated individuality into a personal relationship: “They enter into Marriage in order to fulfill the life of mutual love, which is overcoming individual isolation. It is expansion of personhood...”¹⁴⁴ Two individuals are called out of their loneliness to a mature self-

¹⁴¹ “[...] христианский брак должен быть иконой взаимного отношения Христа с Церковью, то есть совершенной отдачей одного другому, готовностью всей жизнью и всей смертью любить человека, забыть себя до конца ради любимого человека...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 221.

¹⁴² “[К]рестная ликующая любовь.” Ibid., 222.

¹⁴³ “Вы знаете русское слово ‘чета’, оно значит: муж и жена. Это двоица, которая стала единицей. И когда мы говорим: ‘Я сочетаюсь Христу’, это значит, что я с Ним соединяюсь так, что все, что Он Собой представляет, я принимаю за свое призвание, [...] и все то, что я собой представляю. Он принимает на Себя как крест. Это дар взаимного доверия, где каждый из нас приносит, Один – Свою совершенную святость, другой – свою открытость, при всей греховности, которая в нас есть.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 217.

¹⁴⁴ “[В] брак вступают для того, чтобы осуществить жизнь взаимной любви, то есть преодоление индивидуальной изолированности, расширение личности...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 215. AB referred to the idea of anthropos presented in the previous chapter.

sacrificing relationship in the communion of persons to become one body. A couple in the Sacrament of Marriage may become an example of fulfillment of the unity in one *anthropos* – “And being united physically, mentally and spiritually they become [...] the total human. This is a marvelous mystery. This is the fullness of a human person, revealed in two individuals.”¹⁴⁵ However, if the kenotic element of self-sacrifice is forgotten, the couple could also become an anti-example.

Divorce, according to AB, is the biggest tragedy in the life of a couple. There are different reasons why couples get divorced, but he believed that the common root of those reasons was the lack of self-sacrifice and unwillingness to carry the daily cross. He said: “[...] Most of those who come to get married are seeking the joy of a mutual encounter, but they do not even think about carrying the cross. Therefore when they encounter difficulties in the relationship, it appears that they are not prepared for these difficulties of life together and they get divorced.”¹⁴⁶ As we can see, AB made suggestions on how to use kenotic theology in practice, and considered that a lack of awareness of the kenotic elements might cause the most dramatic consequences in a marriage.

¹⁴⁵ “И соединяясь, они и телесно, и душевно, и духовно делались [...] всечеловеком. Это изумительная тайна. Это полнота человека, являемая в двух особях.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/be/be_10.htm

¹⁴⁶ “[...] большая часть тех, кто приходит венчаться, ищут радости взаимной встречи, но и не думают о крестоношении. Поэтому, когда они сталкиваются с трудностями во взаимоотношениях, оказывается, что они не готовы к этим трудностям совместной жизни, – и они расходятся.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 221. More on the divorce, see: Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 477-480, 504-505.

In the Orthodox Church, unlike in the Catholic Church, divorce and re-marriage is permissible up to three times,¹⁴⁷ but the ceremony, except for the first one, has a penitential character to it and after a divorce a person cannot receive the Holy Eucharist for sometimes up to seven years. In the case of the divorce of a priest, this rule does not apply and AB did not deal with this question. He said: “We do not accept the divorce of a priest, because the priest is called to be an example, an image for his flock, but we with mercy, with love and with deep pain allow divorce among the laity.”¹⁴⁸ Why would the priest’s family have to be an exception and have special treatment, if they are the same kind of family as the other families? Does it mean that they have to live in misery and pretend to be a happy family? What kind of example then, would it be for the parishioners? What would happen to a priest who is divorced? How would AB’s kenotic approach be applied in such a context both to the priest and to his wife and children? Unfortunately, I was not able to find answers to these questions in AB’s works and it is difficult to make a generalization, because every case might have a different approach to resolve the problem.¹⁴⁹

At the end of his reflection on marriage and monastic life, AB referred to the Mother of God as the Intercessor for Christians. AB said: “[We] offer prayer to the Mother of God, the Virgin Theotokos, Who loved the world so much that She freely

¹⁴⁷ Permission for a second and third marriage must be given by the bishop, after examining the reasons for the breakdown of the first marriage(s).

¹⁴⁸ “Мы не принимаем развода для священника, потому что священник призван быть примером, образом для своих пасомых, но мы с милосердием, с любовью и с глубокой болью допускаем развод среди мирян.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 222; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 505. Although very rare, in some cases there might be exceptions and a priest could get married again, i.e. widowed priest with little children.

¹⁴⁹ In practice, divorced priests are often permitted to continue priestly service, but may not remarry.

released Her Son to live for the sake of humanity and to a tortured death on the cross, for the salvation of humanity. She can understand *everything*, in Her purity and sanctity She can understand both the celibate and the married person. In Her purity, She can understand the whole mystery of human nature with its struggling, together with the immeasurable beauty of the human soul and with the immeasurable dignity of the human body.”¹⁵⁰ The Mother of God is Virgin, and wife; indeed she is the Intercessor for Christians in their moments of difficulty, because she experienced everything that people might experience in marriage or monastic life.

We can see some similarities and differences in Marriage and monastic life, but there is one common idea that unites both ways of life, which is kenotic self-sacrifice, based on the life of Christ. In Marriage there are two individuals and God, where husband and wife are called to become *anthropos* (a reconstitution of a total human) but in monastic life there is only one individual, but he/she is in unity with God and is therefore called to become a total person in this way.

IV.2.10. Kenosis in the Life of a Priest's Wife

The kenotic theology of AB has a theoretical dimension, which is based on the kenotic life of Christ and other holy people as was presented in the second chapter, and

¹⁵⁰ “[М]ы приносим молитву Божией Матери, Деве Богородице, Которая так возлюбила мир, что Она Своего Сына свободно отпустила на жизнь ради человечества и на смерть крестную, мучительную ради спасения человечества. Она все может понять, Она в Своей чистоте и святости может понять и безбрачного, и женатого, Она в Своей чистоте может понять всю тайну человеческой природы с ее борением и, вместе, с неизмеримой красотой человеческой души и с неизмеримым достоинством человеческого тела.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 496.

a practical application in the life of Christians. We have already seen an application of the kenotic theology as AB understood the Church and Sacraments. There are other practical applications he presented, such as in prayer and faith in God, oneself, and in other people, which are all topics that will be presented in a later chapter. I am now going to present the kenotic life of a priest's wife. The reason why I chose the kenotic life of a priest's wife instead of the life of a 'regular' family is, first of all, to be found in AB's systematic presentation of this topic. Secondly, some kenotic elements of the role of a priest's wife are usually overlooked in a general discussion of her role in the life of a priest's family. Thirdly, there are some similarities between a priest's family and other families, with some obvious differences such as, confidentiality in Confession, in conversations, etc.

At the beginning of the conference for priests' wives in Peterborough, May 11-12, 1971 AB explained that his reflection is built on the experiences of other people. This little remark is important in AB's theology, because as we have already seen in the previous chapters, in most cases he built his kenotic approach on his personal experience. He began his reflection with the difficulties a priest's wife might have with her husband's treatment of his vocation, where the priest may have placed the work in the Church and parish above his family obligations, thus causing suffering for his wife. AB made comparisons with the sacrifice of Isaac by his father Abraham: "[W]hile Abraham brought forth his son Isaac as a sacrifice once, every clergyman feels that his duty in order to be a good priest, is to bring as a blood offering his family daily; and to add insult to injury in the case of Abraham, God provided a ram as a ransom, while God provides no ransom either for the wife or the children of the clergyman. Day after day

they are being sacrificed to what their husband or father thinks to be his duty, the building of the Kingdom of God and the functioning of the Church.”¹⁵¹ In this case AB thought that such a priest makes excuses for not taking responsibility for his wife and family and recommends that he stop doing that and place his family first. Otherwise his family will fall apart, and in the end this will affect his priesthood as well. In the end, a delicate balance needs to be found.

Secondly, AB taught that the priest’s wife needs to help her husband to differentiate between the genuine building of the Kingdom of God that involves a true sacrifice of himself and family, and any imaginary approach. But this help should be based on the wife’s complete faith and trust in her husband. “[It] requires from the wife an act of faith, of trustful faith that would allow a man to act; being trusted and being supported even when his wife has no right to understand completely. There are problems which are linked with the private life of people, into which she has no right to be introduced, there are problems which are connected with confession and further ramification of human relationships [sic] into which she may be a party, but only very little, on the fringe, and this requires a real act of faith, the kind of faith that rests on trust...”¹⁵² The solidarity of Christ with the Father and with all people, as we saw in the previous chapter, was based on faith in both.¹⁵³ Here, in the kenotic life of a priest’s

¹⁵¹ Archbishop Anthony Bloom, *Addresses Given at the “Clergy Wives” Conference in Peterborough May 11-12 1971*, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1971-05-11-1-E-E-T-EM04-024ClergyWives.html>

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ In the next chapter we will see the practical dimension of the faith in another person.

wife, we have an example of the practical application of AB's theology, where faith in the other person is the fundamental principle.¹⁵⁴

Thirdly, AB pointed out some particular kenotic elements present in the life of a priest's wife, such as loneliness and abandonment by God. As AB put it:

Everyone else can turn to God when things go wrong. A clergy wife at times may not be able to turn to God with a free and open heart because He is the cause of her distress. It is in His service, in His name, because of Him, that difficulties occur which otherwise would not be there; and this must be taken into account both by the husband and by the wife, and this must be brought to God in all frankness and truth.¹⁵⁵

AB did not mention the word "God-forsakenness," but the context describes a condition similar to the state that Jesus was in on the cross. Just as Christ was serving God, so a priest's wife is called to serve God through the vocation she received together with her husband. Because this description of feelings comes from directly serving God, as it was in the case of Christ, their experience of abandonment might be similar as well.

This feeling of loneliness and abandonment can be caused by the priest's mistaken priorities mentioned above. They might also come from the lack of acceptance by a priest's wife of her husband's sacrifice as being simultaneously her own, or through the lack of trust or faith in him. In all these cases the help of a "third" party, such as a spiritual father, friend, etc., would be important.¹⁵⁶

Fourthly, AB compared the role of the priest's wife to the role of Mary during the wedding in Cana. As we saw in the second chapter of this research, according to AB,

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Ibid.

Mary played a leading role in this event. In the context of a retreat for priests' wives, AB presented Mary as being the example to follow. Mary's complete faith in Jesus – "Do whatever he tells you." (John 2:5) – was the same faith that responded to the Archangel's invitation to become the Mother of God. This is another example of faith in the other person, in husband or wife.

The role of a priest's wife is similar to the intercessory role of the Mother of God. AB emphasized the sacrificial role of a priest's wife, but he compared it not only to the Mother of God, but also to John the Baptist.

The work of a priest's wife is very serious and important, and an analogy can be made with the mystery of the Mother of God. The position of the priest's wife is sacrificial to the very end. The husband is not allowed to share with her the very essence of his being. He cannot share with her what he hears in confidence or in Confession. He cannot share what feeds his soul, his life. And the wife has to be ready to walk in his shadow, to accept this humbly, but not in the sense 'of putting up with it,' but rather to reverently relate to this connection between a human soul and the priest. In the same way – of course, *mutatis mutandis* – as John the Baptist was the friend of the Bridegroom (John 3:29). His joy was that the bride and bridegroom are together. He led them to the encounter and guarded their encounter in a sort of silent and reverent contemplation. That is the work of a priest's wife.¹⁵⁷

As we saw in the second chapter, where the kenotic life of both Mary and John the Baptist became an example to all Christians, and here in this particular case, it is specifically for the role of the priest's wife. The role of a priest's wife, indeed, is very

¹⁵⁷ "Дело жены священника очень и очень серьезное и важное, которое можно возвести к тайне Матери Божией. Положение жены священника до конца жертвенное. Муж не имеет права поделиться с ней тем, что составляет самую суть его существа. Он не может поделиться тем, что слышит в доверительном разговоре, на исповеди, не может поделиться тем, что питает его душу, его жизнь. И жена должна быть готова настолько уходить в тень, настолько смиренно принимать – не в смысле 'вытерпеть', но с благоговением относиться к этой связи между человеческой душой и священником, так же как – разумеется, *mutatis mutandi* – Иоанн Предтеча был другом Жениха (Ин 3:29). Его радость была в том, что жених и невеста вместе, он приводил их к встрече и оберегал их встречу в своего рода молчаливом, благоговейном созерцании. Вот ее, жены священника, дело." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 782-783.

similar to the role of Mary and John the Baptist. The self-sacrificial character of both, and their humility, which are kenotic elements, should help priests' wives to endure in the moments of difficulties. The wife of a priest will always be "behind the scenes;" whereas a priest will be more visible than his wife. We might also see some similarities between a priest's family and the story about Martha and Mary, but AB did not use this example to stress the hidden and open character of the work of a priest's family.

At the end of the retreats, AB referred to the kenotic dimension of the vocation of a priest's family and mentioned the God-forsakenness of Christ. AB encouraged priests' wives to avoid the temptation to try to understand the priest's service as his private work similar to the work of a firefighter or a doctor, where the wife cannot help. In the case of a priest and his wife – the vocation is for both, not just for the priest alone.

If you only sit at the table of those who are in joy, if you only sit at the bedside of those who are in illness, if you only sit in the midst of the bereaved, of the doubting, of the distressed; if you look, listen, are attentive and learn to discern, you will at a certain moment be able to turn to the Lord and say, My Lord, here is a need, You have revealed it to me, because humanly speaking we are all too selfish, too blind, too self-centred, and secluded in ourselves [...] to have seen it. And now I believe in You, I trust You unreservedly...¹⁵⁸

I think that is why AB stressed the importance of a priest's wife being involved in her husband's work through working with people and not hiding from them; she needs to be ready for self-sacrifice and to live for others. AB mentioned the difficulties a priest's wife might experience and referred to God-forsakenness as the example in the moments of the ultimate struggles.

¹⁵⁸ Archbishop Anthony Bloom, *Addresses Given at the "Clergy Wives,"* online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1971-05-11-1-E-E-T-EM04-024ClergyWives.html>

To be sent by Christ as his Father sent him, meant all the mystery of the Incarnation. It meant all that is held for us in the notion of Passion week. It meant such a love for men that to be at one with them he accepted even that unfathomable, incomprehensible loss of God which is expressed in the words from the Cross ‘My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?’ and in the proclamation of the Creed, ‘He descended into Hell’ — into the Hebrew hell, the place of divine absence. We cannot accept these words unless we have life within ourselves. We cannot understand the words of Christ that proceed [sic] and follow, ‘Peace be with you,’ if we do not understand that we are sent for the sake of love and that love has already won its victory.¹⁵⁹

The mission of the priest’s family is based on self-sacrifice not only of the priest, but also of his wife. AB paid attention to the personal relationship between husband and wife in their priestly life and emphasized the importance of faith in the other person. This faith would be based on trust and love. The role of the priest’s wife is in following the example of the kenotic life of Mary, Christ, and John the Baptist. However, this kenotic dimension does not relate only to priests’ wives, but also to their husbands. AB reminded priests not to sacrifice their family lives for their parish, but to find a balance between family and parish responsibilities.

AB gave some practical advice to priests’ wives and again focused on the need for faith and complete trust in God and His action. He recommended that priests’ wives, during the difficult moments and routine in their lives, recall positive moments from the past:

You would have started in your life as wives of a priest, rejoicing in his priesthood, and then his priesthood has taken so much away from you, has created so many problems, that the joy is now only vaguely remembered, that the priesthood stands between him and you; and I could go on giving that kind of examples. Find time, moments stolen from the bustle of life, moments when suddenly, unexpectedly peace, stillness, serenity comes upon you, and go back to Galilee. Remember the way in which you rejoiced at the ordination of your

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

husband because he had become in a new sense, in a new way, in a new degree, a man of God, — someone whom God was sending, and hand in hand you were prepared to go on this mission.¹⁶⁰

AB discovered that it was very important to emphasize the readiness of a person to be prepared for the moments of disappointment, loneliness and discouragement. I think this is a key to AB's approach to his theology with the focus on the Passion Week rather than the Resurrection. Of course it is easier to enjoy happiness than to accept the daily cross and feelings of loneliness. I believe that is why AB made it a goal to preach God-forsakenness along with God's faith in the human person in order not to run away from this negative experience, but rather to face it openly and with a readiness to accept it all as Christ did in His life.

IV.2.11. Kenosis in the Priesthood

I will not present all the elements of the priesthood in AB's theology, but only some kenotic elements linked to the present research. In order to do this, I will mostly concentrate on the priest's service and will omit the service of a deacon and bishop.¹⁶¹

AB understood that a priest is supposed to be a person who has experienced God in his life. AB contrasted the expectations of a priest in the Orthodox and Catholic

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ For more on the deacon's service in the Church, see: Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/be/be_3.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.mitr.ru/inname/in_6.htm. For more on the bishop's role, see: Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая*, online, available: http://www.mitr.ru/lubov/lub_vse_88.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy9.htm>

Churches. According to AB, in the West (in this case Western Christian Traditions) a priest is supposed to be a well-educated person and the emphasis is put on his intellectual side, while in the East (Eastern Traditions) it is rather placed on the priest's spiritual experience. The priest can be a weak person who is struggling with his own problems, but he has to be one who has encountered God and wishes to bring God to others.¹⁶²

The understanding of the Sacrament of Priesthood was united in AB's theology with his kenotic approach. We can distinguish a few elements in AB's understanding of the role of a priest: servant, pastor and intercessor. We will look at how AB understood these elements in their practical application.

To be a servant meant to follow Jesus on His kenotic path: "To become a priest – is not an honor or a benefit, it is a ministry. It means that you become a servant, not a boss or a chief. Christ speaks about this clearly: If anyone wants to be first, he has to be a servant to all... I am among you as one who serves... Therefore if a person wants to become like Christ in His serving, then he must really believe that he is on the bottom and will be doing – if I may say so – all the dirty jobs."¹⁶³ Reinforcing his role as a servant, a priest is called to serve, but not to be served. A priest is called to sanctify the world through serving the Sacraments. Here we can see a link with the matter at hand.

¹⁶² Ibid., online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy11.htm>

¹⁶³ "[С]тать священником – это не честь и не преимущество, это служение. То есть ты делаешься слугой, а не начальником или главой. Христос об этом ясно говорит: Если кто хочет быть первым, будь всем слугой... Я среди вас, как служащий... Поэтому если человек хочет уподобиться Христу в Его служении, то должен действительно считать, что он на дне и будет делать – если можно так сказать – всю грязную работу." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd30.htm

“Every person who is ordained, whether a deacon, a priest, or a bishop, is a person who has been entrusted with sanctifying the world if necessary with the cost of one’s life, not only with word or example, but with his life to show how he relates to his own death and how he gives up his life.”¹⁶⁴ A clergyman has to be a visible icon of the self-sacrificial love of God for people.

Another kenotic element in priestly service is its pastoral character. All Christians, but particularly a priest, are called to sacrificial service just as a pastor is. “The shepherd goes before his flock to be the first one to meet a danger: a thief, a robber, a wolf, a wild beast, a flooding river – whatever might be met, he leads; *he* has to be the first one who will meet this danger face to face.”¹⁶⁵ It is the task of priesthood to go where there is danger, where there are death and sin. He must be ready to face it all together with Christ. Furthermore, a priest is not alone in this vocation because Christ will accompany him. In the case of Christ’s descent He was abandoned by the Father and other people, and he entered into complete loneliness, into the place where God is not. Christ, as a Pastor, is the ultimate example for a priest to follow. AB said: “If we are pastors, if we are priests of Christ, then we must accept the entire way of Christ. We must be ready to be united with the lost sheep, with the one who is abandoned by God, with the one who is God-forsaken and with the sinner – with every human person. If

¹⁶⁴ “[В]сякий человек рукоположенный, будь он дьякон, будь он священник или епископ, это человек, которому поручено освящать мир, если нужно, ценой своей жизни, не только словом и не только примером, но тем, как он относится к своей смерти и как он свою жизнь отдает.” Ibid., online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd30.htm; Ibid., online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd31.htm

¹⁶⁵ “Пастырь идет впереди своего стада, чтобы первым встретить опасность: вора, разбойника, волка, хищного зверя, разлившуюся реку – что бы ни пришлось им встретить, он впереди идет, он должен первый встретиться лицом к лицу с этой опасностью.” Ibid., online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/prop/prop_31.htm

necessary, we will enter into the horror of the night of Gethsemane, we will go to the horror of bodily death; we will enter the horror of the God-forsakenness of the moment when we think that death will open up to us the way to God; we will be ready to descend into a human, earthly Hades...”¹⁶⁶ Following the example and path of Christ, a priest is called to accompany a person in his/her experience of loneliness and abandonment by God.¹⁶⁷ As Christ remained faithful and in full solidarity with the Father and all people, both of whom abandoned Him, in the same way a priest might have this experience not only in his personal life, but also in the life of other people, and has to be ready to face the situation and not leave a person alone. The horrors of both Gethsemane and Golgotha should be a reminder to the priest of the kenotic life of Christ as his personal vocation.

Finally, there is the role of a priest as the intercessor in prayer for all people. “To stand before God *for* the people – this means to feel himself so united with the people that their every cry, every groan, every prayer, every cry of repentance, every joy goes *through* him like water flowing through a gutter.”¹⁶⁸ This is another example of a link

¹⁶⁶ “Если мы пастыри, если мы священники во Христе, то мы должны пройти весь путь Христов, быть готовы так быть едиными и с заблудшей овцой, и с богооставленным, и с боголишенным, и с грешником – со всяким человеком – что, если нужно, мы пойдем на ужас гефсиманской ночи, мы пойдем на ужас телесной смерти, мы пойдем на ужас боголишенности в момент, когда думаем только о том, что смерть нам откроет путь к Богу; мы будем готовы сойти в человеческий, земной ад...” Ibid., online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/prop/prop_31.htm

¹⁶⁷ In the following chapter I will return again to the question of whether a person experiences God-forsakenness or not.

¹⁶⁸ “Предстоять перед Богом за народ – это значит чувствовать себя так, настолько единым с этим народом, что каждый крик этого народа, каждый стон, каждая мольба, каждый возглас покаяния, каждая радость через него проходят, как вода течет по желобу.” Ibid.

with the intercessory role of Mary. A priest's role is to be opened for the need of the other people and like Mary to intercede for them in prayer.

Besides these three elements of servant, pastor and intercessor, AB understood that the role of a priest was in serving the Sacraments and in the proclamation of the Gospel. AB believed that the key theme in a priest's preaching should be kenotic theology: that God does not abandon a person and that God has faith in the human person.

A priest is a person whom God has called by name and charged with preaching the Gospel, the word of truth and to give new life in the Sacraments. He must preach the Gospel as good, life giving news; that a person is not abandoned by God and that God not only loves, but also believes in him/her. You can love also those in whom you no longer believe. You can love with a pain in your heart over the fact that all hope has died, that only love remains. But God not only loves us; He believes in us: He believed in us when He sent His Son to die on the cross that we might live. He believed that this death is not in vain, that it will be accepted and those, who have lost faith in themselves, will find it in the Divine faith.¹⁶⁹

As we can see, AB made a clear link between the cross of Jesus Christ and God's faith in the human person. Again AB emphasized faith in the person over love and gave a practical application of this in the life of Christians. AB addressed this in a homily during the ordination of one of his priests and stated:

Preach so that people might believe in themselves and their great vocation [...]. We are called to become partakers of the Divine nature, to become living

¹⁶⁹ “Священник – это человек, которого Бог позвал по имени и дал благовествовать Евангелие, проповедовать слово истины, давать новую жизнь в Таинствах: Евангелие как добрую, животворящую весть о том, что человек не оставлен Богом, что Бог верит в него, а не только любит. Любить можно и тех, в кого больше не веришь, любить можно и с болью сердечной о том, что всякая надежда вымерла, что осталась только любовь. А Бог не только любит нас, но верит в нас: Он поверил в нас, когда послал Своего Сына умирать на Кресте, чтобы мы жили; верил Он, что не напрасна будет эта смерть, что будет она принята, и те, кто потерял веру в себя, найдут ее в этой Божественной вере.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_6.htm

members of the living body of Christ, temples of the Holy Spirit; to become not only, according to St. Ignatius [the God-bearer Ignatius of Antioch – RR], ‘total Christ,’ but, according to the courageous and awesome words of Irenaeus of Lyons, to become an only-begotten son in the Only-Begotten Son. This vocation is impossible to fulfill by any human power, because this is a gift of God’s faith in us. [...] And it is given to us in the Church.¹⁷⁰

God’s faith in the human person will provoke in this person faith in himself and direct him in his vocation to become one with Christ, the “total Christ.” In this teaching we can see a link with the previous chapter where Christ, according to AB, is the total Adam, the total human being. I think that here AB was referring to the famous expression of St. Irenaeus of Lyons, “[God] become what we are, that He might bring us to be even what He is Himself.”¹⁷¹ A person will unite with Christ’s human nature and is called to be a son of God through grace, which is the goal of Christian life.

It is faith in oneself which should open to a person the image of God imprinted within himself. It is interesting that the emphasis in the relationship with God is placed not on the action of the person in order “to do” something for God, but rather on allowing God to act in a person. This is an act of true humility – surrender of oneself and openness to the Holy Spirit, so He will be able to act through oneself. This is the

¹⁷⁰ “Это проповедуй, чтобы люди поверили в себя и в свое великое призвание; [...] мы призваны стать причастниками Божественной природы, стать живыми членами живого Христова тела, храмами Святого Духа; стать не только, по слову святого Игнатия Богоносца, ‘всцелым Христом’, но, по смелому, страшному слову святого Иринея Лионского, в Единородном Сыне стать единородным сыном. Это призвание мы не можем исполнить никакими своими человеческими силами, это дар Божественной веры в нас. [...] И это дается нам в Церкви.” Ibid., online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_6.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/hd29.htm; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy10.htm>

¹⁷¹ Saint Irenaeus of Lyons, *Against Heresies*, book V, (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001), online available: <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/augustine/arch/irenaeus/advhaer5.txt>

vocation for all Christians, but in the case of a priest, he is called to follow the example of Christ in readiness to die on the cross.

This vocation of humility is present in the very “action” of a priest in the Sacraments. AB emphasized that there is only one High priest who presides over the Sacraments and that is Christ, but the role of a priest is to represent Christ. He said: “A human person cannot perform the Sacrament; every Sacrament is performed by the only High Priest – Christ, and only one power is acting in them alone – the power of the Holy Spirit. And yet without your priesthood none of the Sacraments could be performed...”¹⁷² This is an example of the perfect cooperation between the task of a priest to surrender of oneself, which is humility, and the power of the Holy Spirit through the action of the only High Priest, Christ. This is an example of the kenotic role of a priest in performing the Sacraments.

A priest has no power; he has no rights; there is only one terrible and marvelous, genuinely divine privilege to love unto death, death on the cross. A certain Western writer was asked what is a priest, and he answered: a priest is a crucified human person... He is a person, who has denied and denies and at all times must again deny himself, to refuse any rights; not only the false right to do evil and to be a sinner, but even the legitimate rights of humanity, of human life. He is the image of Christ, an icon, he is Christ's care, he is Christ's love, he is Christ's body that can be crucified, he is Christ's blood that can be poured out.¹⁷³

¹⁷² “Человек Таинства совершать не может; всякое Таинство совершает единственный Первосвященник – Христос, действует в них одна только сила – Духа Святого; вместе с тем без твоего священства не совершится ни одно Таинство...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_6.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/prop/prop_31.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/besedy5.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony Sourozh, *Orthodoxy (Excerpt from a Talk with Non-Orthodox)*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_106.htm

¹⁷³ “Нет власти у священника; нет прав у священника; есть только страшная и дивная, подлинно божественная привилегия – любить до смерти и смерти крестной. Кто-то из западных писателей, спрошенный, что такое священник, ответил: Священник – это распятый человек... Человек, который отрекся и отрекается, и каждый час должен заново отречься от себя, от каких бы то ни

Again we can see the kenotic theology and particularly the God-forsakenness that AB stressed in this practical application. Another practical application of kenotic theology in the service of a priest is in the Sacrament of Confession. According to AB, the priest, following the example of Christ, should enter the dark side of the penitent and enter into his/her Hades. He said:

[A] priest, who stands in Confession and represents the very God, is called to descend together with a penitent in the most secret corners of pain, darkness, sin and indeed descent into Hades [...]. And he sees there something wonderful and miraculous: into this darkness there descends not only a ray of light, not only a spark of hope; but the very Lord Jesus Christ is descending into this thick darkness, bringing the joy of salvation... This is the miracle – to stand before the Living God, and like those who died and encountered the Lord Jesus Christ, also to stand face to face with Him and to come back from death into life.¹⁷⁴

The main difference between Christ's descent into Hades and a priest's descent into the Hades of a penitent is the presence of God. The priest is not entering this dark place on his own as the way Christ did, abandoned by His Father. Rather he goes there together with the Logos, He brings His light to the soul of a penitent, and an encounter with God can take place.

было прав; не только от ложного права творить зло и быть грешником, но даже от законных прав человечности, человеческой жизни. Он – образ Христов, он – икона, он – Христова забота, он – Христова любовь; он – Христово тело, которое может быть распято; он – Христова кровь, которая может быть излита.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/prop/prop_31.htm. This is difficult to reconcile with AB's insistence on the fact that priests must pay attention first and foremost to their families.

¹⁷⁴ “[С]вященник, предстоящий на исповеди по образу Самого Бога, призванный сходить вместе с кающимся в самые потаенные закоулки боли, мрака, греха, поистине сходит во ад [...]. И видит он там нечто дивное и чудесное: в эти потемки сходит не только луч света, не только искра надежды; в этот густой мрак сходит Сам Господь Иисус Христос, исцеляя, спасая, принося утешение, подавая новую силу, принося радость спасения... Какое это диво – стоять перед Живым Богом, и как те, которые, умерев, встретили Господа Иисуса Христа, стоять лицом к лицу с Ним и от смерти возвращаться к жизни.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/in_6.htm

I consider the role of a priest in the Church as the summation of AB's kenotic theology. He not only made a link between the service of the priest with the kenotic events of Christ's life and God's faith in a human person, but also used these themes in a practical application.

In the fourth chapter of the present research, we looked at the application of AB's kenotic theology in practice. We tried to establish the roots of his unique approach and came to the conclusion that the personal experience of the harsh life of the émigrés, as well as the separation of his parents and loneliness played a most important role. The next step was his encounter with Christ that changed his life and brought sense to it. Personal encounters with Bulgakov, Florovsky, Lossky and others as well as with their writings might also have shaped AB's future kenotic theology.

In this chapter we looked at the Church and the Sacraments. The goal was to establish the kenotic elements in AB's understanding of the Church and the Sacraments. We saw that his understanding of the Church had a direct link with the kenosis of Christ and that the Mystical Body of Christ is the continuation of Christ's presence in the world. The goal of the Church is to sanctify the world and to become a place of encounter with God. The Church is in a stage of becoming. On the one hand, the Church already is the eschatological realization of God's presence, and on the other hand, the Church, because of the sinful life of its members is still in the process of becoming one with Christ in the Holy Spirit. The important element, missing in the event of the God-forsakenness of Christ, which is central in AB's kenotic theology, i.e., the Holy Spirit, becomes widely present in his understanding of the Church.

I could not find AB's reference to the role of the Holy Spirit in Christ's abandonment by the Father, but in his reflection on the Church, AB stated boldly that the Holy Spirit never abandons the Church, despite sin, which in his understanding, means separation from God. If we try to apply this understanding of the constant presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, which is the Mystical Body of Christ, to the event on the cross, we might conclude that the Holy Spirit did not abandon Christ and became the link between Christ's Divinity and the Father. Also we have to keep in mind the teaching of the Church that there are no separate acts, but only one action in the Trinity, and therefore the whole Trinity was present in the event on the cross. I think that the application of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church to the God-forsakenness of Christ can "recover" the Trinitarian aspects in the event. On the other hand, as presented earlier, AB was not interested in a debate on the detailed exploration of the role of each of the Persons in the Trinity, but was interested rather in the Divine-human side of the event, so we can assume that the whole Trinity was present on the cross in AB's understanding.

Further, I tried to present AB's kenotic elements in his understanding of the Sacraments. In some Sacraments, such as Baptism, Chrismation, Eucharist and Unction he emphasized the role of matter and how it might sanctify Christians. We saw the links with the kenotic life of Christ as well with the general understanding of matter as God-bearing. In the Sacrament of Confession there is a direct link with AB's understanding of sin as the Godless state. Christians, in order to follow Christ, must acknowledge their separation from God and turn back to Him.

The Sacrament of Marriage is joined with AB's understanding of Monasticism and reflected his practical application of his understanding of *anthropos*, where individuals are called to become persons. It is also linked to the person of Jesus Christ as the image of the *anthropos*. As a practical application of kenotic life through the Sacrament of Marriage, I used AB's example of the relationship between husband and wife in a priest's family. Finally, in the Sacrament of Priesthood, the priest is called to follow Christ in His kenotic life and to be an example of God's faith in the other person and to be ready to descend together with Christ into the Hades of the other person, bringing the opportunity of an encounter with God.

In the following chapter we will look at the practical application of AB's kenotic theology of God's faith in the human person. AB called the relationship between God and a human person as the encounter where the initiator is God. We will look at the most crucial and dramatic experience that might appear in this relationship, which is the experience of God-forsakenness. An analysis of the contribution of AB's kenotic theology will be provided in the Conclusion.

CHAPTER V

V.1. Anthony Bloom's Kenotic Theology in Personal Practice

In the final chapter of the present research we will look at the application of AB's kenotic theology in the practical life of Christians. In the previous chapter, we looked at the practical application of kenotic theology in the Church and Sacraments. We saw various practical applications of the elements of kenotic theology in the Sacraments, but there are others, such as in prayer and in the faith of God in the human person and a human being's faith in other people, that will be presented here. We will look at AB's understanding of relationships between God and the human person, which he called "an encounter" and at relationships between people, which he understood as faith in the other person. AB was famous for being a writer on spirituality and prayer, but my goal is not to exhaustively present his understanding of the spiritual life and prayer, but rather to emphasize their kenotic elements, especially the experience of absence of the God, or God-forsakenness. I will also explore some of AB's practical advice on how human beings should act if they are in the situation of God's absence. Another practical element of AB's kenotic approach which we will explore is the correlation of faith and experience. And finally we will look at the theme of death, which in AB's understanding is the final encounter with God. All these elements constitute the kenotic life of Christians. With these elements, I believe, we will see the final picture of AB's kenotic theology. The final section of this chapter will be a closer look at the theology of Fr.

Sophrony Sakharov and AB. It will contrast their differences rather than examine the common elements in each of their understandings of God-forsakenness.

V.2. Kenosis in the Encounter with God in Prayer

One of the most important elements in the relationship between God and the human being is in prayer. AB became famous because of his interpretation of prayer and its place in the spiritual life of a person. In this section we will take a look at some of the kenotic elements present in the relationship between God and a human being, especially the experience of God's absence in prayer.

AB compared the encounter with God in prayer to a relationship between individuals: there are very intense moments and there are moments with more shallow communication. In the act of prayer there are two subjects – God and a human being. AB understood prayer as a personal encounter with God. This encounter can take place either in private or in congregational prayer. He said:

In its essence prayer is an encounter with God, an encounter of the living soul with the Living God. This is not just a momentary encounter, but the kind that is unforgettable, and by God's grace it never ceases. It can be more intense, more overwhelming, deeper or more superficial, but in any case it continues in our experience of life. This occurs both in personal prayer and in public prayer.¹

¹ “В сущности своей молитва – это встреча с Богом, встреча живой души с Живым Богом, и встреча не только мгновенная, но такая, которая никогда не забывается и, по милости Божией, никогда не перестает. Она бывает более интенсивная, более потрясающая, более глубокая или более поверхностная, но так или иначе она продолжается в нашем опыте жизни. Это происходит и в частной молитве, и в общественной молитве.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды* (Moscow: Praktika, 2002), 739; Cf. Ibid., 763, 900; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек?* (Klin: Khristianskaia zhizn, 1999), online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/vstrecha.htm>. For more on private and congregational prayer, see: Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 743-763. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая* (Moscow: Praktika, 2007), 48, 339-483; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Учитесь молиться*

AB thought that communication between God and a human being should be seen in the sense of friendship: “[T]o pray [to God] is the same as talking with a friend. It is useless to talk to an imaginary friend, but it is possible to talk substantially with a real friend, with someone with whom you can stand face to face, to whom you can open your heart, who listens, and before whose judgments we stand and who will stand up *for us*, whether we are right or wrong.”² AB insisted on a “personal” relationship between God and the human being, where God is a friend. Just like relationships with people there are bright and dark moments, so the same might be experienced in a relationship with God. AB said: “In the process of searching you will have endured pain, anguish, hope, expectation – all the range of human emotions. God will have been the desired One and He will have been the frustrating One. He will have been the One you long for and the One you hate because He escapes from you. He is the One you love beyond everything, without whom you cannot live, and whom you cannot forgive, because He does not respond...”³ AB used anthropomorphic language to describe the intimate relationship

(Moscow: Moscow: Zachat’evskii monastyr, 1999), online, available: <http://mitras.ru/uchites/uchites1.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/vremia.htm>; Ibid., online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/razgovor.htm>; Ibid., online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/segodn.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony Sourozh, *Sermon on Sunday between Ascension and Pentecost 22 May 1988*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_118.htm

² “[М]олиться [Богу] – все равно что разговаривать с другом. Бесполезно разговаривать с воображаемым другом, можно содержательно говорить с реальным другом, с кем-то, с кем можно стоять лицом к лицу, кому можно открыть сердце, кто слушает, перед чьим суждением мы стоим и кто будет стоять *за нас*, независимо оттого, правы мы или неправы.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 612; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/vdali.htm>

³ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *School for Prayer* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1970), 69. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/istina.htm>

between God and a person. The above was an example of AB's practical application of theology from an anthropological perspective. We will now proceed to the possible reasons for God's absence in prayer from AB's perspective.

V.2.1. Absence of God in Prayer

It seems that AB understood the absence of God in prayer, not as forsakenness by God, but as the silence of God. "I am not speaking of a real absence – God is never really absent – but of the sense of absence which we have. We stand before God and we shout into an empty sky, out of which there is no reply. We turn in all directions and He is not to be found."⁴ AB stated that God sometimes could hide and be invisible. AB was strongly convinced that God is never absent in the lives of people, and when people experience such "absence" it is only a subjective category. "This absence is, of course, subjective in so far as God is always present with us."⁵ AB stated that God cannot abandon a person, but rather gives a person an opportunity to mature in their faith. AB encouraged his listeners to be consistent in prayer, especially in the moments of the subjective absence of God, which in this case he referred to as God-forsakenness. "We can pray in the state of God-forsakenness, knowing that God is here, but I am blind, insensitive and only by an act of His infinite mercy He is not appearing to me, while I

⁴ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *School for Prayer*, 1-2.

⁵ Anthony Bloom, Georges Lefebvre, *Courage to Pray*, trans. by D. Livingstone, (New York: Paulist Press, 1973), 22; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 235, 616, 656; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/istina.htm>

am still not ready to endure His coming.”⁶ The way AB understood it, the absence of God can be caused by a person not being ready to encounter God. This is just one of the reasons he suggested that one might experience God’s absence.

There are various reasons why a person might experience the absence of God, but I will limit my analysis to the three major ones. According to AB, these were: 1) sin as an obstacle to encountering God, 2) an opportunity for spiritual growth, and 3) a false vision of oneself.

V.2.2. Sin as an Obstacle to Encountering God

A human being has to remember that it is not only the person who is trying to reach God, but God who is trying to enter the person’s heart. The sins of the individual can prevent this. If this is the case, the task would be to examine one’s soul for such stumbling blocks. AB stated: “On the one hand, it happens we are longing for God, but on the other hand, sometimes God tries to break through to us in spite of the fact that we shut the doors of our heart, mind and life as a result of our sinfulness, when, instead of Him, we have chosen sin.”⁷ When God is silent, a person has to examine himself to find

⁶ “Мы сможем молиться в состоянии богооставленности, зная, что Бог здесь, но я слеп, бесчувственен, и лишь действием Своего бесконечного милосердия Он не является мне, пока я еще не в силах вынести Его приход.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие: Размышление перед Великим Постом* (Klin: Khristianskaia zhizn, 2004), online, available: http://www.mitras.ru/soul_put/put_2.htm

⁷ “С одной стороны, бывает, что мы рвемся к Богу, с другой стороны, порой Бог старается прорваться к нам, несмотря на то что мы затворили двери и сердца, и ума, и жизни нашей по своей греховности, потому что вместо Него выбрали грех.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 739; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/otvety.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Saint Mary of Egypt 16 April 1989*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_164.htm

out if there are any sins that might be interfering with an encounter with God. If there is sin, then a person must immediately turn away from this condition to make space for God. When a person expels God from his life through his sins, God leaves him, but not completely, because the spirit in the human being will be longing for the fulfillment, which only God can give. “But God never abandons us, unless we directly say: ‘Go away! I choose the other side!’ But even then [...] He will be knocking at the door of your heart with memories of Himself; with the impulses of your heart; with His voice; with everything that leads to Him, because we are created in such a way that we are capable of responding; He will be knocking through the circumstances of life and through people.”⁸ Just as the Holy Spirit is permanently present in the Church despite the sins of Christians, so also here, God does not completely abandon a person, but rather a person through sin leaves God. In another context AB said that sin has a damaging power because it not only destroys people, but also their relationships with others and with God. “Sin is never private [...]. Sin always kills us and deprives others of what we alone could give them. It also deprives God of something that could be His: our heart, our life...”⁹ Again this anthropomorphic explanation brings to mind a personal relationship between God and the human person. AB underlined that even when a

⁸ “Но Бог никогда не оставляет нас, разве что мы прямо скажем: ‘Уйди! Я выбрал другую сторону!’ Но даже и тогда. [...] Он будет стучаться в двери вашего сердца воспоминаниями о Себе, порывами вашего сердца, Своим голосом, всем, что ведет к Нему, потому что мы сотворены такими, что способны отозваться; Он будет стучаться через обстоятельства жизни, через людей.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 335.

⁹ “Грех частным никогда не бывает [...] Грех всегда убивает нас и лишает других того, что только мы могли бы им дать. И он отнимает у Бога нечто, что могло бы быть Его: наше сердце, нашу жизнь...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы* (Moscow: Libris, 1991), online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_28.htm

person is in a state of sin God still does not abandon them. To explain this he referred to examples from the Holy Scriptures:

We know from the Scriptures, from the lives of saints, yes, even from our own life and from the lives of friends that there are moments when we fall away from Him, leave Him, become sinners to the very depths, disgusting to ourselves and maybe also to others – and suddenly the Lord Himself comes to us. Therefore, it is not because we are unworthy of this encounter: God desires that we seek this encounter and that this encounter be for us new life, and that He might be for us joy and newness of life.¹⁰

Here we might see a parallel with the Incarnation, because God decided to become human, when the human race was in sin. God in Christ was the one who initiated the encounter with human beings in full solidarity with both God and the human race.

[...] The Lord and God became a human being, one of us. He took upon Himself the confrontation between God and a fallen humanity and resolved this conflict within Himself, bringing all to full harmony. If we understand that in a paradoxical way He with the free will became completely one both with the human being, even in his state of separation from God, and with God, Whom the human being rejects. If we understand this, then we also understand that it is precisely because of this that He could die our death and save us with His death and open for us the doors of Resurrection.¹¹

¹⁰ “Мы знаем из Священного Писания, из житий святых, да и из собственной жизни, из жизни наших друзей, что бывают моменты, когда мы отпадаем от Него, уходим от Него, делаемся грешными до самых глубин, отвратительными самим себе и, может быть, другим – и вдруг Сам Господь к нам приходит. Поэтому дело не в том, что мы недостойны этой встречи: Бог хочет, чтобы мы этой встречи искали, чтобы и эта встреча была для нас новой жизнью, и Он был для нас радостью и новизной жизни.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 743.

¹¹ “[...] Господь и Бог наш стал человеком, одним из нас, взял на Себя противостояние между Богом и падшим человеком и разрешил в Самом Себе этот конфликт, привел все к полной гармонии, если понимаем, что парадоксальным образом Он вольной волей стал до конца единым и с человеком, даже в его состоянии отчужденности от Бога, и с Богом, Которого человек отвергает, понимаем мы и то, что именно поэтому Он мог умереть нашей смертью, и спасти нас Своей смертью, и открыть нам врата воскресения.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 647.

Christ, in solidarity with humans, took upon Himself sin, which is Godlessness. He died and brought salvation to people as we have already seen in previous chapters. If He loved us when we were in sin, this shows that sins are not the main obstacle for a person to encounter God.

We might notice an inconsistency between the following two ideas: on the one hand God cannot get through to a person because of sin, but on the other hand, there are examples in Holy Scripture, when God comes to a person despite sin. An example of the latter is the Incarnation. Is this a contradiction in AB's theology? Can God come to people despite their sins? It seems that He can. Then how to explain the first statement? We can find the answer in the principle of freedom. God respects the freedom of the human being and never abuses it. A person might allow God to act in his life or he/she might not. In other words, sin is not an obstacle for God, but rather it is an obstacle for a person to open up completely to God and to allow Him to act in his life. Looking at this, we can see there is no contradiction in AB's theology, but rather a lack of clarity.

To support my point, we will review what AB said: "He [God] wishes that we would want, indeed with all our desire, to have an encounter with Him and then this encounter could take place."¹² And somewhere else he said: "The Holy Spirit comes to us quietly; at times unexpectedly, at times as the result of longing."¹³ The lack of desire to encounter God appears to be the main obstacle to God's acting. That's why the role of

¹² "Он хочет, чтобы мы действительно всем желанием своим хотели встретиться с Ним – и тогда может произойти встреча." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 742, 762.

¹³ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The Comforter: Our Support and Strength for Mission*, 29.05.1999, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1999-05-29-1-E-E-T-EM04-027ConferenceTheComforter.html>

Mary, as was presented in the previous chapters, is so important for our salvation – her free *fiat* allowed God to become Incarnate. AB taught that God wants this encounter more deeply than any human being does and that this should allow a person to develop his trust in God and not speed up the encounter: “We have to learn how to trust in God without pushing through to Him, and to know that He, more than we, wants this encounter, He wants our communion with Him...”¹⁴ Some people might experience the encounter with God in moments of despair. Here AB compared people who are experiencing despair with Christ’s descent into Hades. “[W]e encounter Him also in Hades. You know, one of the most significant things concerning Christ is in the words of the Apostle’s Creed: ‘He descended into Hades.’ Very many people encounter God either in the depth of their despair or in the heart of evil, when they are in its grip.”¹⁵

V.2.3. An Opportunity for Spiritual Growth

AB admitted that the most difficult aspect of prayer is the silence of God, but at the same time he also believed it could become an opportunity to grow deeper in our relationship with God. “An encounter with God is a free act where God is in control and it is only when we are humble, as well as beginning to love God, that we are able to

¹⁴ “Нам нужно научиться так Богу доверять, чтобы не пробиваться к Нему, а знать, что Он больше нас хочет этой встречи, больше нас хочет нашего приобщения Себе...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 64-65.

¹⁵ “[М]ы встречаем Его и в аду. Знаете, одна из самых значительных вещей относительно Христа – это слова Апостольского Символа веры: ‘Он сошел во ад.’ Очень многие люди встречают Бога в глубинах своего отчаяния или в сердцевине зла, когда они в его тисках.” Ibid., 618-619.

support his absence, to be enriched even by his absence.”¹⁶ AB reminded his readers that initiative in prayer lies not only in the decision of the person to pray, where God would have to respond immediately, but also to give initiative to God, through the reading of the Gospel and to be open to the encounter.¹⁷ AB underlined the freedom of God in the decision to reveal Himself to the person or not. In his understanding the lack of the presence of God is part of the experience of the encounter with God: “We have to learn simply *to be* before God, really to be silent and to be sure that He is here; I might not experience Him right now, but it does not mean that He is not here.”¹⁸ This kind of “absence” of God can provoke a hunger for God. Again AB used an anthropomorphic illustration:

God is free to come to us and is free to allow us to seek Him. His absence (I mean the subjective feeling of His absence) does not mean that He is not with us, but He allows us to feel what life would be like without Him. His absence is like a hunger which forces us to seek Him with greater determination and sometimes with a greater desperate effort. We are too easily satisfied with what we have, and what we are used to having: we have friendships, relatives, we have so much, but we begin to value them only when something is taken away from us.¹⁹

¹⁶ Anthony Bloom, Georges Lefebvre, *Courage to Pray*, 25. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 178.

¹⁷ Cf. Ibid., 614; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/otvety.htm>

¹⁸ “Нам надо научиться просто быть перед Богом, действительно молчать и знать, что Он тут есть; я могу Его не ощущать сейчас, но это не значит, что Его нет.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 742.

¹⁹ “Бог свободен прийти к нам и свободен дать нам искать Его, что Его отсутствие (я имею в виду субъективное чувство Его отсутствия) не означает, что Его нет с нами, но Он дает нам почуять, какова была бы жизнь без Него. И Его отсутствие – это как бы голод. Голод, который заставляет нас добиваться с большей решимостью и временами с более отчаянным усилием искать Его. Мы слишком легко довольствуемся и удовлетворены тем, что имеем, мы привыкаем иметь: у нас есть дружбы, есть родные, есть столько всего, и только когда что-то у нас отнято, мы начинаем это ценить.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 617; Cf. Ibid., 618; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/propoved.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Молитва и жизнь*, trans. by T.

In the relationship with God, it is not only the human being who has freedom to accept or to abandon God, but also God has freedom to come or to be absent in a person's life. On the other hand, it is not only God who is absent in prayer, but also the human being who might abandon God when he/she is not praying to Him: "Not to pray is to leave God out of our existence – not only God, but all that He signifies for the world He created, the world in which we live."²⁰ Also, people might abandon God when they do not respond to His love. "We can talk about the loneliness of God in the sense that God offers us all His love, but there are only a few who are open and ready to accept it!"²¹ A person, of course, cannot bring any harm to God through his Godless life or through not praying to Him or not loving Him, but through such behavior a person deprives the world and himself of the grace of God. Here we might see a link with the previous statement that sins are obstacles for a person to be open to God.

V.2.4. A False Vision of Oneself

A third reason for the absence of God in the life of a human person can be a result of pretending to be someone other than one is.

Maidanovich, (Riga: Balto-slavianskoe obshchestvo kul'turnogo razvitiia i sotrudnichestva, 1992), online, available: http://mitras.ru/mol_jizn/life8.htm

²⁰ Metropolitan Anthony Sourozh, *Prayer Today 1967, September the 2d*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_239.htm

²¹ "Можно говорить об одиночестве Бога в том смысле, что Бог предлагает нам всю Свою любовь, но как мало тех, кто открывается и готов принять ее!" Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 629.

As long as we are authentic, as long as we are ourselves, God can be present in the encounter and can do something for us. But when we are trying not to be what we really are, then nothing can be done or said for us. We become fictitious, a false front, and with such an unreal person God can do nothing.²²

A person has to be honest with himself and ask – why do I need God? What do I expect from Him? Why do I need Him? Do I need Him to fulfill my personal needs or inner emptiness, or do I need Him for the sake of Himself? All these questions point out how serious the preparation for encountering the true God is, not just in imagining Him. A person, according to AB, might be close to God, but because of a lack of patience decides to turn away from God and abandon Him.

Don't we turn away from him because we sense that He will cause a breach of peace in our lives; upset its values? In this case we cannot rely on encountering him in our prayer. I would put it even more strongly. We should thank God with all our heart that he does not offer Himself to us at this moment, because we doubt Him not like Job, but like the bad thief on the cross. An encounter would be a judgment and condemnation of us. We should learn to understand this absence and judge ourselves because we are not judged by God.²³

A person has to be insistent in prayer, and has to search first for God for His own sake and only then for feelings of His presence and support.²⁴ And again AB compared a person's relationship with God to a relationship with another human person.

[...] it happens [that] we are not ready for the encounter, because we search for God as fulfillment of our life and not in order to love Him, to trust Him and to serve Him, but to have Him fill the void within us. [...] If we relate to this

²² “Пока мы подлинны, пока мы являемся самими собой, Бог может присутствовать во встрече и может что-то для нас сделать. Но как только мы напрягаемся быть не тем, что мы есть на самом деле, то для нас ни сделать ничего нельзя, ни сказать; мы становимся фиктивным, подставным существом, а с такой нереальной личностью Бог ничего не может сделать.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Учитесь молиться*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/uchites/uchites.htm>

²³ Anthony Bloom, Georges Lefebvre, *Courage to Pray*, 24.

²⁴ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа: Проповеди* (Moscow: Sviato-Danilov monastery, 1993), online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_13.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/soul_put/put_1.htm

emptiness in such a way then, of course, we would have to wait and search, because the encounter with God in such an understanding is similar to the encounter with a person whom we search for personal interest and not because our heart is opened to this person and we would like to enter into a communion of friendship, love, mutual respect and cooperation with him.²⁵

As we have seen in the previous chapter, AB believed that the encounter between God and a human person through the Sacraments takes place beyond the intellectual, emotional and rational levels, but rather on the spiritual level. We can see the same here, the genuine encounter with God, like people's relationships, takes place beyond words. AB treated the encounter with God as a very intimate and deep one based on mutual dialog.

It seems to me that very often we cannot meet each other (I am not talking now about God, but about a human being) because we are so occupied with ourselves that we do not see the other person. We are with the person, he talks to us and we do not hear what he says. [...] Does this relate in anyway to God? Of course, because in most cases we come to Him with our own anxieties, with our own apprehensions, with our own problems. We are not coming first and foremost *to God*, but we bring to Him *ourselves*.²⁶

Like in a relationship between two people, when someone is talking and another one is listening, the same is supposed to be the case in a relationship with God, where a

²⁵ “[...] бывает [что] мы не готовы к встрече, потому что мы ищем Бога как восполнение нашей жизни – не для того, чтобы Его полюбить, Ему довериться, Ему послужить, а лишь для того, чтобы Он заполнил пустоту, которая в нас есть. [...] Если у нас такое отношение к этой пустоте, то, конечно, нам придется и ждать, и искать, потому что встреча с Богом в этом смысле подобна встрече с человеком, которого мы ищем для собственной выгоды, а не потому, что наше сердце этому человеку открыто и мы хотим войти в общение дружбы, любви, взаимного уважения, сотрудничества с ним.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 739. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 103, 169-171; 183; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_10.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Учитесь молиться*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/uchites/uchites.htm>

²⁶ “И мне кажется, что часто мы не можем встретить друг друга (я сейчас говорю не о Боге, а о человеке), потому что так заняты собой, что не видим другого. Мы находимся с человеком, он с нами говорит, и мы не слышим того, что он говорит. [...] Но относится ли это каким-то образом к Богу? Конечно же, потому что мы к Нему приходим большей частью со своими заботами, со своими тревогами, со своими проблемами. Мы не приходим в первую очередь *к Богу*, а приносим *Ему самих себя*.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 764; Cf. *Ibid.*, 766-767.

person has to “learn to be silent in order to hear.”²⁷ AB encouraged his listeners to prepare for such an encounter through the emptying of oneself. He said:

And when we talk about the encounter with God, we have to understand why we want to meet Him. Is it because He will satisfy all our needs, because He will fill some emptiness in our heart, or is it because He is so dear to us that we are going *to empty* our life, our minds and hearts that *everything* would belong to Him; that He would dwell in these mysterious depths. Only then the encounter will take place, that we have not even been dreaming about.²⁸

Here we can see an example of kenosis put into practice. AB used the word “to empty” (опустошить), which is in Greek “κενόω.” Just as Christ, who humiliated Himself and gave His life for our salvation, in the same way a person in full humility has to empty himself of anything that belongs to him/herself and only then the encounter can take place. This is a self-sacrificial act of a person and the realization of the daily carrying of the cross.

V.3. Practical Advice Regarding the Experience of God’s Absence

AB gave some practical advice on how a human being should act in the situation of God’s absence and I will consider some of them below. However, I am not planning

²⁷ “[Н]аучиться так молчать, чтобы слышать.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 63.

²⁸ “И когда мы говорим о встрече с Богом, мы должны понимать, почему мы желаем Его встретить. Потому ли, что Он удовлетворит все наши нужды, потому ли, что Он заполнит какую-то пустоту в нашем сердце, или потому, что Он так нам дорог, что мы готовы опустошить нашу жизнь, *опустошить* наши ум и сердце для того, чтобы *все* принадлежало Ему, чтобы Он мог вселиться в эти таинственные глубины, и тогда совершится такая встреча, о которой мы и мечтать не умеем.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 767.

to present all the advice AB gave to his listeners, but only those elements which are most relevant to the kenotic character of prayer.

First, he suggested examining one's soul, if there is any sin that might separate us from God. If there is no sin then a person has to humble himself in an act of total trust, surrender and openness: "Humility seems to us almost always as self-destruction, as a state in which we find ourselves when we say something bad about ourselves, knowing, however, that it is not so. In fact, humility is the state of a person, in which he has completely forgotten about himself and surrendered him/herself into the hands of God."²⁹

Secondly, "When God does not give Himself to us when we cannot feel His presence, we must be able to wait with awe and reverence."³⁰ I believe that here we can see a link with AB's teaching about solidarity, which Christ showed on the cross when He experienced abandonment by the Father and by people, but remained faithful to both. One of the consistent elements in any relationship with God is mutual freedom. This means God is also free in His actions towards humans – "we are too often astonished that our prayer is not heard. We think we have only to offer a prayer for God to be

²⁹ "Смирение нам представляется почти всегда как самоуничижение, как состояние, в котором мы находимся, когда о себе говорим дурное, зная, однако, что это не так. На самом деле смирение - состояние человека, когда он до конца про себя забыл и отдал себя в руку Божию." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом* (Moscow: Praktika, 2006), 136-137; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 864-865. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином* (Elektrostal: Molva, 2000), online, available: http://mitras.ru/be/be_6.htm; Cf. with the example of Mary's kenotic life in the second chapter.

³⁰ Anthony Bloom, Georges Lefebvre, *Courage to Pray*, 22.

obliged to answer it.”³¹ God is free to not answer someone’s prayer and the person has to remain faithful to God even if the prayer is not answered.

Third, during moments of dryness or the absence of God, AB suggested observing one’s emotions getting in touch with one’s feeling regarding personal experiences. He encouraged being honest before God with the feelings a person has:

[Do] we feel [...] that we have lost contact with Him, that in spite of His invisible presence here; His presence is insensible to us? [...] And now, do we feel ourselves as lost without Him? Do we desire to quickly restore our relationships when they are broken; or to find Him again, when we have lost Him? [...] Here is the beginning of everything. We have to ask ourselves: Do we miss God? Or is it enough for me that He exists and I can turn to Him when I need Him, in order to fulfill my demands, to use Him, when my own strength and abilities are not sufficient?³²

It seems that the answers to these questions in the moments of the absence of God are the key to how serious the human being is in relation to God. AB stated that the silence of God in response to someone’s prayer cannot last long, but rather can be an opportunity to grow to his/her capacity. God through “shorter or longer silences [...]

³¹ Ibid., 25; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 873. Cf. Anthony Bloom, Georges Lefebvre, *Courage to Pray*, 22.

³² “[Ч]увствуем ли мы [...] что мы потеряли контакт с Ним, что, хотя невидимо Он и здесь, Его присутствие для нас неощутимо? [...] И вот, чувствуем ли мы себя потерянными без Него? Жаждем ли мы скорее восстановить отношения, когда они нарушились, или найти Его вновь, когда мы Его потеряли? [...] Вот с чего все начинается. Мы должны поставить перед собой вопрос: скучаем ли мы по Богу? Или хватит с меня, что Он существует и я могу обратиться к Нему, когда Он нужен, чтобы исполнить мои требования, использовать Его, когда мне не хватает собственных сил и способностей?” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 194-195; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 57, Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Учитесь молиться*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/uchites/uchites.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/vernost.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Молитва и жизнь*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/mol_jizn/life8.htm

summons our strength and faithfulness and leads us to a deeper relationship with Him...”³³ Through patience a person can take part in the cross of Christ.

Fourth, we are not to run away from the experience of the absence of God: “Too often Christians have the habit, whenever a problem or danger arises, of turning to the Lord and crying, ‘Lord protect us, save us, fight for us.’ How often the Lord must look at us sadly and say to us in the silent language which we could understand if only our hearts were not so deafened by their fear, ‘But I sent you into this situation to fight for me...’”³⁴ For AB this is the vocation of people to represent Christ, the apostles and the saints and to be ready for self-sacrifice and the carrying of the cross. It is the moment when we are called to be faithful to God.³⁵

Fifth, we are to pray to God with honest words, which would accurately express the reality of our true convictions and desires.³⁶ The sixth point also emphasizes truthfulness and it is to read favorite prayers or scriptural texts: “We should re-read them when we feel unenthusiastic. And from them we can offer a prayer which may seem cold and dead to us, but which is at least truthful.”³⁷

³³ Anthony Bloom, Georges Lefebvre, *Courage to Pray*, 41; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 887.

³⁴ Anthony Bloom, Georges Lefebvre, *Courage to Pray*, 33; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/otvety.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Молитва и жизнь*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/mol_jizn/life6.htm

³⁵ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/otvety.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Молитва и жизнь*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/mol_jizn/life8.htm

³⁶ Cf. Anthony Bloom, Georges Lefebvre, *Courage to Pray*, 36.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 37.

Seventh, in some cases of the absence of God, AB recommended not to pray to God, but to talk to ourselves: “When God seems absent, the heavens empty and the void immense, we should direct our prayer not to Him but we should talk to ourselves. We should address each word of our prayer to our own depressed and dormant soul. We must treat our soul like a mother taking a naughty child onto her lap and telling him a story. [...] We should be able to let ourselves go, be supple, not passive but with an attitude of surrender.”³⁸ In another context AB strongly emphasized that a prayer to God is not just a monologue with oneself, but rather a conversation with one’s conscience in the presence of God.³⁹

Eighth, AB suggested that in a moment of dryness and difficulties in prayer we not lose faith in God and ourselves. “There are moments when prayer flows easily and freely, and there are other moments when we get a feeling that its source has dried up. Then we have to use prayers created by other people and which express the main lines of everything we believe in, even if at the present moment this is not enlivened by the deep response of our heart. At such times our prayer should be a double act of faith, faith not only in God, but also in ourselves; we have to believe in our faith, which at the given moment has faded, but it is a part of our very selves.”⁴⁰ This is an application of kenotic theology in practice combined with faith in oneself.

³⁸ Ibid., 39; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 884-885.

³⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви* (Moscow: SP Interbuk, 1991), online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy1.htm#1>

⁴⁰ “Бывают моменты, когда молитва льется легко и свободно, и другие моменты, когда у нас появляется чувство, что источник ее высох. Тогда нужно пользоваться молитвами, которые составлены другими людьми и где выражено в основных чертах все то, во что мы верим, даже если в данный момент это и не оживлено для нас глубоким откликом нашего сердца. В такое время

Finally, AB stated that God always listens to our prayer, and the only prayer that was not heard, was Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane.⁴¹ AB used this example for those who lost their faith in the power of prayer. He said: "When our faith is weak we say, perhaps that God could not reply through impotence or indifference. But we have nothing to say about Christ's own prayer remaining unanswered. The faith of Christ the Son of God must be perfect. We cannot doubt God's love for Him and does not Christ himself say that his Father could send twelve legions of angels to deliver Him? If Christ is abandoned, that is because God has foreseen that something better will come of it for us, as the price of His life."⁴² As we can see, AB linked the prayer in Gethsemane with the God-forsakenness of Christ and used this as an example for people who might experience their own abandonment by God.

In this section we looked at some of the practical advice AB shared with believers who experience the absence of God in their lives. In the next section I will give an overview of AB's understanding of the correlation between faith and experience and, as before, we will only be looking at kenotic elements.

наша молитва должна быть двойным актом веры, – веры не только в Бога, но и в самих себя; мы должны поверить в свою веру, которая в данный момент померкла, хотя и является частью нас сами." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Молитва и жизнь*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/mol_jizn/life8.htm; Archbishop Anthony Bloom, *Living Prayer* (London: Libra books. Darton, Longman and Todd, 1965), 120, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1966-00-00-1-E-E-B-EM02-001LivingPrayer.html>

⁴¹ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Молитва и жизнь*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/mol_jizn/life6.htm. For more on the prayer in Gethsemane, see the second chapter.

⁴² Anthony Bloom, Georges Lefebvre, *Courage to Pray*, 42.

V.4. Experience of God in an Encounter Leads to Faith

AB widely used the notion of experience to form his theology. This was partly because of his own encounter with Christ and partly due to the harsh life of Russian émigrés; all of these experiences shaped his kenotic approach. We have already seen several of these examples in the previous chapters, but now we will look at his understanding of experience in the kenotic mode.

What happens after an encounter with God? AB thought that such an experience might be short, but intense. Afterwards the moment comes when God leaves the person and this is the beginning of faith.⁴³ “A human being experiences His presence and cannot live without longing for what he just experienced. He would like to see the Face of God, but it is too early. He sees how God is leaving him and what remains? It is not a fruitless anguish, it is not bitterness that something that once was given, now is gone. No! Hunger, thirst and yearning remain to encounter again the One Who is love, Who is life, Who is truth and ultimate beauty...”⁴⁴ The longing and hunger for God will become a motivation for a person to again seek the presence of God. The most important thing, according to AB, is not the search for the experience of God, but the encounter with God: “The basic thing is to seek God and never seek any sort of ‘experience.’ The goal

⁴³ More on faith, see: Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_29.htm

⁴⁴ “Человек переживает Его присутствие, он уже не может жить без тоски о том, что пережил, он хотел бы видеть Лик Божий – но рано ему. Он видит, как удаляется от него Бог, – и что остается? Не бесплодная тоска, не горечь о том, что однажды данное теперь уходит, – нет! Остается голод и жажда, и томление по тому, чтобы снова встретить Того, Кто есть любовь, Кто есть жизнь, Кто есть истина и предельная красота...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 271.

should be God alone. [...] It is possible to look at God as a means to get an experience. Or one can say: my experience is a collateral result of my encounter with God...⁴⁵ AB made this very important statement that a person should long not for the experience of God, but for God Himself. AB warned people about using God just for the experience. Even the question – “Does God exist?” – is an acknowledgment of God’s existence. He criticized those who come to God because they are looking for an explanation of their life:

A primitive human being will ascribe to God everything that he cannot explain with his own life experience or his own human mind. [...] None of the believers who have a wise, mindful approach to their faith would use God as a plug, to use the notion of God as an explanation for what they do not understand, the inexplicable. God, on the contrary, stands out in the contemporary consciousness of the believer not as an explanation, but as an independent fact. Besides whatever He can or cannot do, despite whatever one can or cannot explain through Him about this or that – He exists.⁴⁶

There are some people who are disappointed with God, because they do not receive from Him what they expected to receive and therefore leave Him. For AB the foundation of faith is the experience of God in one’s life. If the experience of God through different encounters with Him comes prior to faith, then what about when there is a lack of these experiences? What about the absence of God? Could it also become a

⁴⁵ “Основное правило – искать Бога и никогда не искать никакого “опыта”. Целью должен быть Один Бог. [...] Можно смотреть на Бога как на обстоятельство для получения опыта. Или можно сказать: мой опыт – это побочный результат моей встречи с Богом...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/segodn.htm>

⁴⁶ “[П]римитивный человек будет приписывать Богу все то, чего он не может объяснить своим житейским опытом или своим человеческим умом. [...] Никто из верующих, у кого есть какой-то разумный, вдумчивый подход к своей вере, не станет употреблять Бога как затычку, употреблять понятие о Боге как объяснение того, чего он не понимает, необъяснимого. Бог, наоборот, выделяется в современном сознании для верующего именно не как объяснение, а как независимый факт. Помимо того, что Он может или не может, помимо того, что Им можно или нельзя объяснить то или другое, – Он существует.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 39.

place of encounter with God? Very often AB encouraged his listeners to long for the experience of God's love rather than to listen to long talks about God.⁴⁷ Most likely it was his own experience of encountering God that created his approach. On this point I would agree with Gillian Crow, who said that "[I]n many ways he [AB] felt closer to the Evangelicals than to Catholics or Anglicans. He insisted that one must have a personal, living relationship with the Living God. Nothing less would do. This had to be centered on communion with him in prayer or silence."⁴⁸ In AB's understanding of kenosis even the absence of God in the people's life can be a starting point for encountering Him, but this absence is not a desperate one, because it is based on a previous true encounter. AB built this directly on his own experience: "Faith can be found, as I found it, through a miracle; faith can be found through the reading of the Gospel; faith can be found through an encounter with a living person who is like a beacon of faith, from whom it flows and shines. Faith can be found in the depths of despair after the realization of the final, full senselessness of any human help, we can say: yes, humanly there is no hope left, but nevertheless hope is still alive."⁴⁹ We can read of the same broad understanding of the places of the encounter with God in AB's theology in Crow's biography of AB:

⁴⁷ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_5.htm

⁴⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Essential Writings: Selected and Introduced by Gillian Crow* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), 22-23.

⁴⁹ "Веру можно найти, как я ее нашел – чудом; веру можно найти чтением Евангелия, веру можно найти встречей с живым человеком, который является как бы светочем веры, из которого она льется, светится. Веру можно найти в глубинах отчаяния, когда, познав всеконечную, полную бессмысленность всякой человеческой помощи, мы можем сказать: да, по-человечески никакой надежды не остается, но все-таки не умирает надежда." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Может ли еще молиться современный человек*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/molitva/vdali.htm>; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 272; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 25.

“Metropolitan Anthony talked almost as much about God’s absence as he did about His presence; and he saw this absence not as something to be brushed under the carpet, a source of embarrassment, but as a starting point for finding God. [...] And this was exactly where many people, under his guidance, began their journey towards a living faith.”⁵⁰

Experience is the starting point and beginning of Christian life. That is why it is most important to analyze it and to try and comprehend it so that the fruit of an experience of God can be fully used.⁵¹ In his talks AB very often presumed that his listeners had already experienced an encounter with God. He said: “I do not think there is a single person in the world who has not at some time fallen on his knees before the Living God, whose presence he was suddenly aware of – or who has not met the Living God.”⁵² As was already emphasized, AB was convinced that an experience of God is the starting point for faith. He said:

We encountered Christ, we believed in Him, even if imperfectly, even if only potentially, but we lived by this faith. We have to change this faith into unshakable trust and readiness to be sent by Christ; as if to be separated from Him so that He would be with us only invisibly, not perceptibly; without always holding our hand as a mother holds a child. And when we talk about the encounter in prayer, about the encounter in spiritual life, we have to remember this: this encounter takes place once and has to fill out our heart with the desire that nothing might ever stand between us and Christ, Whom we thus encountered. And then we have to be ready either to encounter Him or not; and to seek Him, but to seek Him with hope, to seek with confidence that He is faithful and will appear to us when we will be ready for it.⁵³

⁵⁰ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Essential Writings*, 25.

⁵¹ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 869, 740.

⁵² Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Encounter* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2005), 26.

⁵³ “Мы встретили Христа, мы уверовали в Него, пусть несовершенно, пусть только посылно, мы живем этой верой, мы должны эту веру превратить в непоколебимую верность и в готовность быть

AB made a comparison between those people who encounter God in their lives with the experience of the Apostles in the meeting of Christ after His Resurrection and especially after Pentecost. After meeting Christ they became able to go and proclaim the Gospel, which is the vocation of all Christians who have met Christ: “That is why we, who believe in the Resurrection of Christ, have to become a new people, renewed, people who are different; people who believe in life and in eternal life; in whom the victory over death triumphs right now, because we, who have been joined to the death of Christ, live; we should be alive! – with the eternal life of the risen Christ, with the Divine life...”⁵⁴ And in another context AB referred to the experience of many people who had already personally experienced God in their lives. As AB put it: “But we are the most happy of all men because Christ is risen. This not only hundreds and thousands, but millions know from a direct, personal experience. Many could say: God exists because I have met Him, Christ is risen because I have met the risen Christ. And not only in spirit but also in the flesh...”⁵⁵

посланными Христом, отделиться как будто от Него, так, чтобы Он был с нами только невидимо, но не ощутимо, не постоянно держал нас за руку, как мать держит ребенка. И когда мы говорим о встрече в молитве, о встрече в духовной жизни, мы должны помнить именно это: встреча эта совершается раз и должна заполнить наше сердце желанием, чтобы никогда ничто не стало между нами и Христом, Которого мы так встретили. А дальше мы должны быть готовы Его то встречать, то не встречать, и искать Его, но искать с надеждой, искать с уверенностью, что Он верен и явится нам тогда, когда мы будем на это готовы.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 768; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 170-171, 183, 613.

⁵⁴ “И потому мы, верующие в Воскресение Христово, должны стать народом новым, обновленным, другими людьми: людьми, которые веруют в жизнь и в жизнь вечную, в которых торжествует победа над смертью уже теперь, потому что мы, приобщившись к смерти Христовой, живем – должны бы жить! – вечной жизнью воскресшего Христа, жизнью Божественной...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Неделя апостола Фомы*, online, available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/archive/100410.htm>

⁵⁵ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, “Easter Sermon,” *Sourozh* 24 (1986): 1-2, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_17.htm

We can see how AB emphasized the importance of experience as based on the Resurrection of Christ. We have already seen in the second chapter of this study how AB focused on the God-forsakenness of Christ before the Resurrection. During the Easter season AB often made references in his sermons to the events that preceded this glorious event. He said: “This is what we have to reflect upon on the day of the Resurrection of Christ. Yes, *He* is risen, but have we risen? Are we in this world as people who went through death together with Christ and are risen to His eternal life? If not, then we sing [about] the Resurrection of Christ, but remain alien to that to which we are called: to live and to die, and to rise that others might rise.”⁵⁶ This is an application of kenotic theology in practice: AB used the death and Resurrection of Christ as the ultimate example for a Christian life. Christians, in order to be an example for others, need on their own pass through the same path of life and live for others, as Christ did. Together with Christ they are called to overcome their own death and to reach the point of their own Resurrection. The correlation between death and Resurrection we can see in the following quotation:

We have to experience the joy of the Resurrection, but this is only possible if we first experience the tragedy of the Cross. In order to be reborn, we have to die; to die to the loneliness that binds us; to our fears; to die to everything that makes our world so narrow, cold, poor, cruel. To die so that our souls might live, might rejoice, might open the spring of life. In this case the Resurrection of Christ will reach us. Without the death on the Cross there is no Resurrection or its joy. [...]

⁵⁶ “Вот над чем надо задуматься в этот день Воскресения Христова. Да, *Он* воскрес, но воскресли ли мы? Находимся ли мы в этом мире, как люди, которые прошли через смерть вместе со Христом и ожили Его вечной жизнью? Если не так, то мы поем Воскресение Христово – и сами остаемся чужды тому, к чему мы призваны: жить и умирать и воскресать для того, чтобы другие воскресли.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании* (Moscow: Moskovskoe Podvor’e Sviato-Troitskoï Sergievoï Lavry, 1999), online, available: http://mitras.ru/h_d/hd13.htm. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_13.htm

Not only, with our heart, but with our entire complete experience we know the risen Christ.⁵⁷

Why did AB say that we have to experience the Resurrection and a few sentences later say that we already know this experience? In another context he went even further and said: “Of all the events in the life of the Lord, it is precisely the Resurrection of Christ that is available to our *experience*. On it is built all our faith, because, as the Apostle St. Paul says: ‘If Christ has not been raised, then our faith has been in vain and we are of all people most to be pitied’ [I Cor 15:14, 19b]”⁵⁸ How can we resolve this contradiction? Which experience for Christians is closer to them – the experience of abandonment and loneliness of Holy Friday or the experience of the encounter with the risen Christ? AB answered the question on the meaning of Great Friday not by linking it to the Resurrection, but instead by pointing to the kenotic sense of the Incarnation. He

⁵⁷ “Мы тоже должны опытно познать радость Воскресения, но это возможно, только если сначала мы познаем трагедию Креста. Для того чтобы возродиться, мы должны умереть – умереть для связывающей нас самости, для наших страхов, умереть для всего того, что делает мир столь узким, холодным, бедным, жестоким. Умереть, чтобы наши души могли жить, могли радоваться, могли открыть весну жизни. В таком случае Воскресение Христово дойдет и до нас. Но без смерти на Кресте нет Воскресения и его радости. [...] Не только сердцем, но всем целостным нашим опытом мы знаем воскресшего Христа.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/soul_put/put_7.htm. AB taught that the services of the Great and Holy Week cover the tragedy of the cross, especially the icon of the cross. He said: “Мы смотрим на иконы, изображающие распятие, но не видим Человека Иисуса Христа, умирающего на кресте. [...] Смерть красивой не бывает; она может быть величественна, но она не красива. [...] И это везде, во всем богослужении мы можем пережить. Крест, распятие, на которое мы смотрим, изображает нам жертву и победу Христа, но мы не смеем видеть в нем только победу. [We look at icons depicting the crucifixion, but we do not see the Human Jesus Christ dying on the cross [...] Death cannot be beautiful; it can be majestic, but not beautiful. [...] And we can experience this everywhere in worship. The cross, the crucifixion that we look upon at shows us the sacrifice and victory of Christ, but we dare not to see in it victory alone.]” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy9.htm>; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О встпече* (Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994), online, available: http://mitras.ru/sretenie/sret_bessilna.htm

⁵⁸ “Из всех событий жизни Господней нашему *опыту* доступно именно Воскресение Христово. На нем стоит вся наша вера, потому что, как говорит апостол Павел, если не воскрес Христос, то наша вера тщетна и мы – самые несчастные из людей.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О слышании и делании*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/h_d/hd13.htm

said: “To understand the meaning of Great Friday, the salvific death of Christ, we need to understand the meaning of the Incarnation. The birth of Christ is for Him not the beginning of life, but the beginning of death. He accepts everything that belongs to the condition of our existence, and the first day of His life on the earth is the first day of His ascending the Cross.”⁵⁹ As mentioned earlier, AB considered the God-forsakenness of Christ to be the ultimate experience, one that humans and in particular atheists cannot fully experience. He meant that all people can experience the absence of God, as we have already seen in the section on prayer, but never to the degree of Christ’s ultimate abandonment by the Father.

I believe that both experiences that of Great Friday and that of the Resurrection – are common for all people, but in the kenotic theology of AB these events are mutually intertwined. It is not of necessity that an experience of abandonment, loneliness or kenosis will lead directly to an encounter with God, but rather that they contain the potential for such an encounter. We can compare it with the “chaos” in AB’s understanding as the fullness of potentiality and finally of realization in creation or with the harsh and kenotic life of the Russian émigrés in the West that brought many people to Christ.

If we look from the opposite perspective, from the perspective of the personal encounter with Christ, could it lead back to the experience of Great Friday or Saturday? To answer this question, we need to refer to how AB understood the correlation between

⁵⁹ “Чтобы понять смысл, значение Великой пятницы, спасительной смерти Христа, мы должны постичь смысл Воплощения. Рождение Христа не является для Него началом жизни, а началом смерти. Он принимает все, что составляет условия нашего бытия, и первый день Его жизни на земле есть первый день Его восхождения на Крест.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/soul_put/put_7.htm

experience and faith. The experience in this case will be the Resurrection and the faith will be Great Friday. And of course we have to repeat that AB reserved the God-forsakenness of Christ only to Christ Himself. People on the other hand, when they experience any kind of loneliness or silence from God only have a subjective perception of abandonment by God. Experience of an encounter with God should be transformed from the faithfulness of the person into an experience of readiness to serve others. In this we could see the call for maturing in the faith, readiness for kenosis as well as preparation for the possible absence of God.

V.5. Kenosis in a Relationship with the Other Person

In the previous section, we explored the relationship between God and the human being in its most intimate personal aspect, a relationship that AB called an encounter. In this section, we will take one step further and explore how AB understood the relationship between people. We have already seen the practical application of AB's the kenotic approach to the relationship between God and the human being. It is therefore necessary to determine if this kenotic approach could also apply to the relationship between people. My goal is not to cover all aspects of inter-personal relationships, but only those that relate to the present topic, specifically: love of oneself and faith in oneself as the way to love others and God.

V.5.1. Love of Oneself as a Way to Love God and Others

One of the main issues in relationships with others is one's encounter with the other person in the deepest meaning of the word. The true encounter with another person can only take place after an encounter with oneself and God. It appears that AB's focus in the second commandment of love: "You shall love your neighbor as yourself" (Mt 22:39), is on the second part, i.e. "love yourself." He said: "And if we do not have a particular relationship to ourselves, then we cannot have this attitude to others. Without respect for oneself we do not respect others; without love of oneself – understood properly – we cannot love others."⁶⁰ As we can see, AB taught that it is not possible to love others if one does not love oneself. How are we to properly understand the love of oneself? What is the difference between love of oneself and egoism? For AB, love of oneself is distinct from egoism because egoism is the lack of love. He even equated egocentrism and Godlessness. Godlessness in egoism is not only depriving God from the life of a person, but also the humanity from the human being. "To what measure am I an ultimate center, the beginning, the end and the goal – and by that measure also Godless and inhuman?"⁶¹ AB directed this question to his listeners in order to stress the point that

⁶⁰ "И если у нас нет определенного отношения к себе, мы не можем иметь этого отношения к другим. Без уважения к себе мы других не уважаем; без любви к себе – правильно понятой – мы не можем любить других." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 47; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/be/be_1.htm. For more on this positive approach to self-love, see: John A. Jillions, "Self-love," *Sourozh* 65, (Aug 1996), 1-13.

⁶¹ "В какой мере я – абсолютный центр, начало, конец и цель, – и этим безбожен и бесчеловечен?" Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 468.

egoism not only destroys inter-personal relationships, but also moves a human being into the Godless state.

Another difference between love of oneself and egoism is in the empirical and inner level of the human being. AB said: “We have to love ourselves, but not this empirical human being, who we are: egoistic, foolish, vain; but to love this human being who is laid in our depths as possibility and vocation.”⁶² AB felt that to love oneself means to accept the image of God inscribed in one’s soul. It seems that what a person has to love in oneself is hidden within this inscribed image. The kenotic element of the love of oneself is the process of discovering this image in oneself.

When AB reflected on the topic of self-love, he did not use only one expression, but rather used several terms as synonyms: “To love yourself,” “To be yourself,” “To find the inner ‘I’,” “To encounter oneself” and “To be free.” In AB’s teaching, however, each of these terms carried the same meaning. This is because the goal is to discover within oneself the image of God: “[...] *to be oneself* means to be according to the image of the One Who wished to be according to our image so that we might be saved and changed.”⁶³ There is only one way in which the person can genuinely know oneself, and

⁶² “Мы должны любить самого себя, но не того эмпирического человека, которым мы являемся: самолюбивого, глупого, тщеславного, а любить того человека, который заложен в глубины наши как возможность и как призвание.” Ibid., 282; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_126.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 47-48; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 634-635.

⁶³ “[...] *быть самим собой* значит быть по образу Того, Кто пожелал быть по нашему образу, чтобы мы были спасены и изменились.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 300, 691, 703. Compare with AB’s understanding of freedom presented in the third chapter. Cf. Ibid., 409; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_28.htm

this is through God and in God.⁶⁴ Moreover, the goal is not to be oneself just for the sake of knowing oneself, but eventually to encounter God through the knowledge of “I.” AB stated: “This is not about running to self-analysis; also I do not mean that we have to go into techniques of psychoanalysis or psychology. This is not a journey into the essence of **my own** “I”; it is a journey **across**, through my “I,” to emerge from its own depths, where God is and where God and we will meet.”⁶⁵ In private conversations AB also advised people to love themselves: “Learn to love yourself because God created you with His love, and certainly if He loves you, then it is a sin for you not to love yourself. This way you will learn to love others.”⁶⁶ I think AB made an important statement regarding the false understanding of the goal of love of oneself. The goal is not in self-adoration or narcissism but, rather, to encounter God.

The love of oneself is also the rediscovery of the person within oneself. “Personality, person – this is what we are called to become, overcoming the individual which empirically we can observe in ourselves. Personality can be revealed only in the One, Who knows it, which is only in God. We have a personality, which is the image of the Living God. From outside this person appears as an individual.”⁶⁷ AB linked the

⁶⁴ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/soul_put/put_1.htm

⁶⁵ “Речь не о том, чтобы прибегнуть к самоанализу; я также не имею в виду, что внутрь надо идти приемами психоанализа или психологии. Это не путешествие в сущность **моего собственного** ‘я’; это путь **через**, сквозь мое ‘я’, чтобы из собственных глубин вынырнуть там, где Бог есть, где Бог и мы встретимся.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Учитесь молиться*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/uchites/uchites.htm>

⁶⁶ Boris Khazanov, *About Metropolitan Anthony. Memory of the Heart. The Light from His Candle, August 2010*, online, available: <http://masarchive.org/>

⁶⁷ “Личность, персона - это то, чем мы призваны стать, преодолев индивидуума, которого эмпирически мы можем в самих себе наблюдать. Личность может быть раскрыта только в Том, Кто

vocation of personhood and the encounter with oneself with the transition from the individual to the personal level. “Because until the moment when the human being is not yet united inseparably, forever, to its very depths with God, he is not yet fully a human being; he is only on the way to becoming human.”⁶⁸ Individuals are called to become persons, with Christ serving as the ultimate example of the true Human, which the individual is to follow. Only where a human being believes that God loves and believes in him can an individual outgrow the “individual” within oneself and mature to the level of a “person,” in the full human-divine sense that AB understood the term “person.”

This is a link with the anthropology which was presented in the third chapter of the present research. A human being is called to outgrow the individualism in oneself in order to become a person. This statement is based on the true understanding of the love of oneself, which has nothing in common with egoism. The kenotic element in the love of oneself will be achieved through the struggle of a human being to progress beyond the empirical level, to die to oneself, and to reach one’s inner depths where an encounter with God can take place.

ее знает, то есть в одном Боге. В нас есть личность, которая есть образ Живого Бога. Извне эта личность представляется под видом индивидуума.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 110.

⁶⁸ “Потому что до того момента, пока человек не соединился неразлучно, навсегда, до самых глубин своих с Богом, он еще не в полном смысле человек; он только на пути своего очеловечения.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_27.htm

V.5.2. Faith in Oneself as Kenosis

As we have already seen in the previous chapter, AB distinguished between faith and love, and considered the faith of God in a human being, as well as the faith of a human being in oneself (or in the other person) as a prerequisite to love.⁶⁹ Oftentimes, we might see some similarities between faith in oneself and love for oneself, and indeed very often they are interwoven. Nonetheless, there is still a difference, as evidenced by AB's more frequent reference to faith in oneself than to love of oneself. In this subsection we will explore how AB understood faith in oneself with a practical kenotic application. First, however, we have to determine what constitutes a false understanding of faith in oneself.

AB first distinguished between faith in oneself and self-confidence. Self-confidence is based on the knowledge of one's strength, training of will and mind, and the confidence that one will reach the desired goal through arduous effort. According to AB, this is how most people generally understand faith in oneself. He said: "Such faith in oneself borders somewhere on self-confidence, easily moving into it, and finally it is not a faith in oneself anymore but a confidence that the surroundings will give in to our efforts; in some sense this is a confidence that I will have enough strength to break and to change people or to counter circumstances that surround me."⁷⁰ AB then made a

⁶⁹ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 288.

⁷⁰ "Такая вера в себя где-то граничит с самоуверенностью, легко в нее переходит, и, в конечном итоге, это не вера в себя, а уверенность, что окружающее поддастся нашему усилию; в каком-то отношении это уверенность в том, что во мне хватит силы переломить и изменить окружающих меня людей или встречные обстоятельства." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 31.

distinction between self-confidence and faith in oneself very clear: “Self-confidence is based on self-knowledge and maybe on some exaggerated self-appraisal. Faith does not need any self-appraisal, because its subject is the very mystery of a human being.”⁷¹ Here, AB’s use of the word “mystery” does not mean something mysterious but, rather, refers to the hidden potentiality of the person, when “[...] whole human being is a solid dynamic, solid life, solid movement and becoming...”⁷² We can see a link to the creation of the world, where AB interpreted the word “chaos” as the sum of potentiality which makes the harmony. This potentiality is also given to a human being in order to discover the imprinted image of God.

Secondly, AB noted that the obstacle to having faith in oneself is fear: “And this faith in a human being, in oneself – this is the faith that within me, within every human being there is an invincible dynamic of life and the only thing that can prevent this dynamic from coming true and growing into reality is my cowardice, my indecision, but not the circumstances that surround me.”⁷³ Circumstances, both positive and negative, merely present an opportunity for this creative chaos to reveal itself.

AB’s third point is that faith in oneself is a process. AB called his readers to examine themselves, encouraging each of them “to listen to oneself, [...] to the voice of

⁷¹ “Самоуверенность основывается на знании самого себя, может быть, на какой-то преувеличенной самооценке; вера же не нуждается ни в какой самооценке, потому что предмет ее - это именно тайна человека.” Ibid., 31.

⁷² “[...] весь человек есть сплошная динамика, сплошная жизнь, сплошное движение и становление...” Ibid., 31, 49.

⁷³ “И вот вера в человека, в самого себя – это вера в то, что во мне, в каждом человеке есть непобедимая динамика жизни и что единственное, что может помешать этой динамике осуществиться и вырасти в реальность, это моя трусость, моя нерешительность, но никак не окружающие меня обстоятельства.” Ibid., 31.

one's own conscience, to the voice of life, to what he can learn from life: the life of the individual human being next to him, the life of society, the life of the nation, the life of mankind, biological life.”⁷⁴ A confrontation with one's own conscience, with life, and with other people might help to determine whether the person has faith in oneself or not. These determinations are common among all people who believe in themselves and in human beings in general.

As we have seen in previous chapters, faith in oneself or in another person has a universal character and is not limited only to the Christian community. This is because faith in oneself is based upon the universal character of Christ's Salvation. Believers, however, have one more reason to believe in themselves: “[...] if you are a believer you can peacefully know that you are in Christ and Christ is in you [...]”⁷⁵ The presence of God in the life of a believer becomes not only an additional argument to believe in oneself or other people, but rather takes the leading role in his or her life. AB noted that “[...] a believer should certainly listen to the voice of God Himself, expressed in the Holy Scripture, which sounds louder, more truthful, more genuine than his own conscience.”⁷⁶ It bears repeating that, for AB, the primary verification for a believer is the voice of God and the Holy Scripture. But this does not mean that a person does not need the Tradition, rites and prayer and can just wait for the voice of God. AB was

⁷⁴ “[П]рислушиваться к самому себе, [...] к голосу своей совести, к голосу жизни, к тому, чему его учит жизнь: жизнь отдельного человека рядом с ним, жизнь общества, жизнь народа, жизнь человечества, биологическая жизнь.” Ibid., 32.

⁷⁵ “[...] если ты верующий, можешь спокойно знать, что ты во Христе и Христос в тебе [...]” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 39.

⁷⁶ “[...] верующий несомненно должен прислушиваться к голосу Самого Бога, выраженному в Священном Писании, звучащему громче, правдивее, истиннее, чем его собственная совесть.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 32.

grounded in the Orthodox Tradition and never said that Christians have to abandon liturgical life. On the other hand, he wanted to emphasize the personal character of a relationship with God. And this brings us to the conclusion that true faith in oneself is the encounter with God in oneself. As AB himself concluded, “The genuine faith of the human being in oneself [is] not self-confidence, but faith in the invincible dynamic of life, whose name ultimately is God.”⁷⁷ Discovering the image of God within oneself results in a person’s encounter with Him. This is similar to the love of oneself presented in the previous section.

Faith in oneself is closely tied to God’s faith in the human being. As AB put it: “We have to remember: we cannot always believe ourselves, in ourselves, but there is Someone, Who firmly believes in us. [...] We do not always trust that God believes in us; and this is why we are not always capable of believing in ourselves.”⁷⁸ AB further concluded that God’s faith in a person becomes an obligation for that person to believe in himself. “If God can believe in us, then we have to believe in ourselves, but not in our human strength, not in our own abilities. [...] If He believes in us, if He is ready to believe in us at such cost, then we have to grow in the measure of His faith in us. We have to be worthy of that faith. [...] We have to believe in ourselves, because God

⁷⁷ “[П]одлинной верой человека в себя – не самоуверенностью, но верой в непобедимую динамику жизни, имя которой, в конечном итоге, – Бог.” Ibid., 32.

⁷⁸ “Мы должны помнить: мы не всегда можем себе, в себя верить, но есть Некто, Кто неколебимо верит в нас. [...] Мы не всегда доверяем тому, что Бог в нас верит; и поэтому мы не всегда способны верить в себя.” Ibid., 262-263; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О встрече*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/sretenie/sret_segodn.htm

believes in us.”⁷⁹ God’s faith in a human being is the foundation for a person to believe in himself.

Finally, AB came to the conclusion that the “opening of oneself is the opening of God, and the opening of God is opening of oneself.”⁸⁰ Following this statement, which in AB based on the Gospel, he continued: “[...] a lot of what we call human in fact borders upon the divine. When you read the Gospel, you encounter not only the living God, but also genuinely encounter the only true Human in the person of Christ – Human in the full meaning of the word. That is why every human being, because he is a human being, is already joined to this mystery of Christ.”⁸¹ True faith in oneself will lead to an encounter both with oneself and with God. Most people, AB thought, avoid staying alone because they are afraid to encounter their own darkness within their own depths. Without encountering one’s own depths, however, it is not possible to encounter God or another person. AB believed that God’s role in this process is to enlighten the depths and darkness of the person: “God sheds inexorable light into our depths; the light, which

⁷⁹ “Если Бог так в нас мог поверить, то мы должны верить в себя, но не в свои человеческие силы, не в свои способности. [...] Если Он в нас верит, если Он такой ценой готов верить в нас, то мы должны вырасти в меру Его веры в нас. Мы должны стать достойными этой веры. [...] Мы обязаны верить в себя, потому что Бог в нас верит.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 281-282, 287, 1001-1002; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 874; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Воскресные проповеди* (Minks: Minskiĭ kafedralnyi Sviato-Dukhov sobor, 1996), online, available: <http://mitras.ru/sermons/serm6.htm>

⁸⁰ “[О]ткрытие себя самого есть открытие Бога, и открытие Бога есть открытие себя самого.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, “Уверенность в невидимом,” *Moskovskii Psikhoterapevticheskii Zhurnal* 4 (2004).

⁸¹ “[...] очень многое из того, что мы называем человеческим, на самом деле является гранью божественного. Когда вы читаете Евангелие, вы встречаете не только Живого Бога, но истинного, единственно истинного Человека в лице Христа, Человека в полном смысле этого слова. И поэтому всякий человек – тем, что он человек, – уже приобщен к этой тайне Христа.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 402.

reveals to us all that we conceal in darkness, all that we close off from ourselves.”⁸² This darkness that one might encounter is the manifestation of God’s trust in a person. AB stated: “[The] ability to see oneself worse and worse – genuinely, truly in the light of God – says that God trusts us more and more, and that He sees in us more and more the ability to fight evil and to conquer it, but of course only with His help.”⁸³ This is a link between AB’s teachings about faith in oneself and the faith of God in human beings, with the faith of God in humans being primary. The most difficult part is to believe in a person in spite of obvious sins and even evil. In such a case, AB suggested recalling the image of Christ who showed his faith in people during His Incarnation in the world. “[I]f we respond with rejection based upon imperfections, sins or even the genuine evil that can exist in ourselves or another human being, then we will be separated from God, because God does not reject any of us. God became one of us at the cost of Incarnation, at the cost of His love for us.”⁸⁴ AB taught that this is a true self-sacrifice, being ready to love the other person with a crucified love.

The theme of solidarity, which was presented in a previous chapter, also has practical applications in AB’s kenotic theology. “For a Christian worship of God and

⁸² “Бог проливает в наши глубины Свой неумолимый свет; свет, который раскрывает перед нами все то, что мы покрываем тьмой, все то, что закрываем от себя.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 95.

⁸³ “[С]пособность видеть себя все худшим и худшим - искренно, по-настоящему, в свете Божиим - говорит о том, что Бог нам все больше и больше доверяет, что Он все больше и больше видит в нас способность сразиться со злом и победить - конечно, только с Его помощью.” Ibid., 96.

⁸⁴ “[Е]сли на недостатки, на грехи, даже на подлинное зло, которое может быть в том или другом человеке, мы ответим отвержением, мы окажемся разделенными от Бога, потому что Бог не отвергает ни одного из нас. Бог стал одним из нас ценой воплощения, ценой, которую Он заплатил по любви к нам.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_7.htm

serving of a person are the same. These are two sides of one coin. We cannot worship God, Who is love, without love. We cannot profess God, Who is love, without incarnating this love in life. We cannot call ourselves disciples of Christ, Who took upon Himself tragic solidarity both with God and with people, and refuse the responsibility, refuse the solidarity both with God and people.”⁸⁵ AB did not separate service to God and neighbor, but rather understood this holistically. Here we see links between both the solidarity of Christ with the Father and people, and the application of kenotic love in practice.

It may seem as if AB was skeptical about human abilities and overemphasized the role of God’s faith in the human being at the cost of human faith in oneself. Because he was a trained doctor he understood the need for training, supervision and practice. A similar approach is necessary in a relationship with God, because a person has to be trained through prayers, fasting, and other spiritual exercises in order to make “room” for the encounter and not just rely on God’s initiative.

⁸⁵ “Для христианина поклонение Богу и служение человеку – одно и то же. Это две стороны одной медали. Мы не можем поклоняться Богу, Который есть любовь, без любви. Мы не можем исповедовать Бога, Который есть любовь, не воплощая эту любовь в жизнь. Мы не можем называться учениками Христа, Который взял на Себя трагическую солидарность и с Богом и с людьми одновременно, и отказываться от ответственности, от солидарности и с Богом и с людьми.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О встрече*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/sretenie/sret_bogosluz.htm

V.5.3. Faith in the Human Being and Kenosis in Encounter with the Other

AB believed that the fundamental prerequisite to a relationship with another person is to have faith in him or her: “When we talk about faith, we always think about faith in God. In fact, there is also faith in the human being, and this faith in human being shapes our life at least as consistently and deeply as faith in God. Besides, not all believe in God, but to live with other people without faith in the human being cannot be done.”⁸⁶ According to AB, the love of other people should be based upon faith in them.⁸⁷ AB used a broad definition for faith in another human person. For him it was not just limited to religious issues, but was also essential to family, public and political everyday relationships.

AB based his argument on the dignity of the human person. Sometimes this dignity of the person might be hidden by bad words or deeds, at which time maintaining faith in the person might become challenging. AB encouraged his readers not to be blinded by their bad behavior, but instead continue to them: “If we only would be able to believe in each other, without being blinded either by their transgressions or acts; without being deafened by their words, but silently look into the human soul and to see in it potential humanity, potential human greatness, and accordingly to propose to a

⁸⁶ “Когда мы говорим о вере, мы всегда думаем о вере в Бога. На самом деле существует также вера в человека, и эта вера в человека определяет нашу жизнь по меньшей мере столь же постоянно и глубоко, как и вера в Бога. Кроме того, в Бога веруют не все, а для того, чтобы жить с людьми, без веры в человека не обойтись.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 25.

⁸⁷ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 529.

human being a new life, to propose to him our trust and to call him to live in the fullness of one's human dignity!"⁸⁸ AB used a metaphor of an old and damaged icon to describe the way in which God sees a person who has acted badly:

When God is looking at us, damaged by sin, He sees us, as we can see an old icon that has been profaned, from which remains maybe only a little [of the original]. But if such an icon is given into our hands – how carefully we look at it; what inner feeling of horror and pain we have that the holy icon has been defiled; that such beauty could undergo this damage. How carefully we hold it, as a wounded human being, like a soldier who was injured in battle, who might be dying, but in whom remains something unforgettable of greatness and of beauty. This is how God sees us...⁸⁹

The way in which God sees us as a damaged icon helps one not only to believe in oneself, but also to believe in other people. AB expressed this point as follows: "We have to look at a human being and into the human being with faith, with confidence that the beauty in him is immortal; nothing can disfigure completely; the beauty, that we call the image of God. We can say the same about humanity in general, which also

⁸⁸ "Если бы мы только умели друг во друга поверить, не быть ослепленными ни поступками людей, ни их действиями; не быть оглушенными их словами, а молчаливо заглянуть в человеческую душу и прозреть в ней возможную человечность, возможное человеческое величие, и соответственно предложить человеку новую жизнь, предложить ему наше доверие – и призвать жить в полную меру своего человеческого достоинства!" Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 26-27. Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 171-173.

⁸⁹ "Бог, глядя на нас, изуродованных грехом, видит нас, как мы можем видеть древнюю икону, которая подвергалась осквернению, от которой осталось, может быть, очень немного; но если такая икона дается в наши руки – с какой бережностью мы на нее смотрим, как мы переживаем с внутренним чувством ужаса и боли, что святая икона могла быть осквернена, что такая красота могла подвергнуться изуродованию. Как бережно мы ее держим в руках, словно раненого человека, словно бойца, который пострадал в бою, который, может быть, и при смерти, но в котором остается нечто незабываемое по величию и по красоте. Так нас видит Бог..." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 97. Cf. Ibid., 110-111, 260-261; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 144, 473; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 220, 297, 348, 892; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_8.htm; Ibid., online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_122.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Воскресные проповеди*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/sermons/serm2.htm>; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Проповеди и беседы*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/prop/prop_28.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Быть христианином*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/be/be_4.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Sunday of the Publican and the Pharisee 1993, February 7th*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_54.htm

collectively bears in itself the image of God despite the ugliness which is evident.”⁹⁰ AB encouraged his listeners to see the beauty of the other person despite the ugliness that might hide it.

The faith of other people, especially our relatives, should help us to rediscover our faith in ourselves. AB taught that when people love us they also have faith in us. He said: “Loved by God, loved by people and loved not only for what superficially they see in us, what they can use, but also for something very deep that they feel in us. Friendship, love are born, grow and live not by those surface features that are available for all to see – beauty, intelligence, sensitivity, but by the depths from which they shine.”⁹¹ Genuine faith and love for God, as well as for other people, give the motivation, strength and confidence to a person to realize that they are not loved for what they do. Rather, they are loved simply because of who they are, and through this can begin to love themselves. Believing in oneself and having faith in another person are interdependent. AB asked his listeners: “How can he believe in me, when I cannot believe in myself?”⁹² AB combined faith in oneself, God and other persons with love and also with hope. He said: “And because God believes in us, and some people around

⁹⁰ “[Н]адо смотреть на человека и в человека с верой, с уверенностью, что в нем красота неумирающая, красота, которую ничто не может изуродовать до конца, красота, которую мы называем образом Божиим. И то же самое можно сказать о человечестве в целом, которое тоже совокупно несет в себе образ Божий, несмотря на уродство, которое бросается в глаза.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 97; Cf. Ibid., 188, 249-250, Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 654, Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 32-33.

⁹¹ “Любимы Богом, любимы людьми и любимы не только за то поверхностное, что они видят в нас, чем они могут пользоваться, но и за что-то очень глубокое, что ощущают в нас. Дружба, любовь рождаются, растут и живут не теми поверхностными признаками, которые всем доступны: красотой, умом, чуткостью, – а теми глубинами, из которых они сияют.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 263-264.

⁹² “Как он может в меня верить, тогда как я в себя не могу верить?” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 505.

us together with God believe in us, then we can *trust*. We can begin to live by their faith in us, and we can trust that finally the faith of God and the faith of other people who love us will come true.”⁹³ The faith of God in someone together with the faith of other people, brings a responsibility to the person to start to believe in himself and to discover God within. If we cannot see the image of God inscribed in the heart of the person, our own blindness is revealed. AB said: “This kind of blindness speaks not about the disfigured human being in front of us, but about the darkening of our own heart, about the walls that surround it, and that is not crystal-clear any longer. And it is this heart that we have to purify. Again, the first thing in this purification is to turn away from oneself and to seek someone other than me. Self-preoccupation and self-love close the heart for us...”⁹⁴ The remedy for selfishness, according to AB, is attention to the other person and openness of heart. An ever-present element of faith in the other human being is openness and a readiness to be vulnerable.

And when we are open in the act of faith, we have to acknowledge in advance our vulnerability and to agree with it. [...] Vulnerability might be bitter, hard: vulnerable egoism, resentment, humility also belong to the area of vulnerability. But love is not about this, it is about the capacity to be wounded in one’s heart...⁹⁵

⁹³ “И потому что в нас верит Бог и какие-то люди вокруг нас вместе с Богом в нас верят, мы можем *надеяться*. Мы можем начать жить их верой в нас, и мы можем надеяться, что в конечном итоге вера Божия и вера людей, которые нас любят, оправдается.” Ibid., 284.

⁹⁴ “Такая слепота говорит не об изуродованности человека, который перед нами, а о потемнении нашего сердца, об окружающих его стенах, о том, что оно больше не хрустально-прозрачно; и вот это сердце нам надо очищать. И опять, первое дело в этом очищении – отвернуться от себя самих и искать иного, чем себя. Сосредоточенность на себе и себялюбие нам закрывают сердце...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 250.

⁹⁵ “И когда мы открываемся в акте веры, мы должны заранее признать свою уязвимость и на нее пойти. [...] Уязвимость бывает горькая, тяжелая: уязвленное самолюбие, чувство обиды, чувство униженности тоже принадлежат к этой области уязвимости. Но не о них идет речь в любви, а о способности быть раненным в сердце...” Ibid., 49.

This does not mean that the person has to anticipate being hurt, but rather has to remember that suffering is possible. AB stressed the importance of the free and conscious choice to be vulnerable. Vulnerability for AB was this ever-present element of faith in the other person. Here we can see the link with the Incarnation of Christ, where AB used the same ideas in talking about Christ's readiness to be hurt, and even to be killed.

On the other hand, faith in another human being should be realistic and should not limit the freedom of that person. This is so that the expectations placed upon the person do not scare him/her: "We have to believe in a human being in such a way, give him such trust, give him inspiration in such a way that he finds in himself the bravery, courage, joy and creative joy to fulfill himself."⁹⁶ AB warned that a projection of one's own plans and visions onto a person would be a false and incorrect faith in another person. To illustrate this argument, AB compared the relationships between parents and children, between parents, and between society and the person: "Very often people think that such an approach is faith in a human being; that one can study a person, think about and assess him, to see in him all his possibilities, to create a project and then to force the person to correspond to it. This is a mistake and a crime that some people perpetrate in their families and in human societies, and in ideological groups of both believers and unbelievers."⁹⁷

⁹⁶ "Мы должны так верить в человека, такое ему подарить доверие, так его вдохновить, чтобы он нашел в себе храбрость, мужество, радость, творческую радость себя осуществлять." Ibid., 28.

⁹⁷ "Часто люди думают, что такой подход — это вера в человека; что можно изучить человека, продумать его, прозреть в нем все его возможности, составить проект и затем заставить человека соответствовать этому проекту. Это ошибка и преступление, которое делают и отдельные люди в

This kind of approach is the negation of faith in the other person. To avoid this, AB suggested remembering the mystery of the person, and seeing him/her with the eyes of the heart rather than the eyes of the mind: “True faith in a human being takes into account the fact that a person remains a mystery to the observer, especially to the rational observer, because the true vision of the person comes not from the mind, but from the heart. Only the heart is truly capable of seeing and can open to the mind such depths that the mind cannot grasp on its own. True faith in a human being takes into consideration the possibility of these depths, its hidden possibilities and anticipates that something unexpected, incomprehensible can happen.”⁹⁸ A true encounter with another person can only take place at this deep level.

V.5.4. Vocation of Christians to the Kenotic Way of Life

By definition, the Christian life must follow the purpose of Christ’s life – kenosis. In this section we will examine some practical elements of the kenotic life of Christians, such as self-sacrifice, a Christian as a “place” of the encounter and experience of God-forsakenness in life.

семьях, и общества человеческие, и идеологические группировки как верующих, так и неверующих людей.” Ibid., 29.

⁹⁸ “Настоящая вера в человека берет в расчет именно то, что человек остается тайной для наблюдателя, тем более для умственного наблюдателя, потому что подлинное видение человека идет не от ума, а от сердца. Только сердце по настоящему зряче и раскрывает уму такие глубины, которые тот постичь не может; настоящая вера в человека учитывает возможность этих глубин, потаенных возможностей в них, и ожидает, что неожиданное, непостижимое может случиться.” Ibid., 30.

Christians, following the ultimate example of Christ, have to die unto themselves in order to live for others. AB based his interpretation of this vocation on Christ's words regarding renouncing oneself. "Renounce yourself" means exactly this: it means, instead of living for yourself, looking at nothing else, concentrating on nothing else – turn away, see how vast life is, how deep, how rich! Turn away from yourself and look: look into human faces, look into human circumstances, into human needs, and indeed, into human joys! Look and see! Detach yourself from your own self; then you will be able to see others as they are, to see their needs, to see their hunger, their joys, their misery – and you will be able to give."⁹⁹ It is interesting to see that AB used the same reasoning in his discussion regarding Original sin. In that case, the sin was in turning away from God. Here, AB used the same idea, noting that, when one turns away from one's neighbors, the results are separation, loneliness and abandonment of the inter-personal relationship. Thus, the commandment to "Renounce yourself!" – i.e., to live for others, will bring one into a deeper relationship with God.¹⁰⁰ As AB reinforced: "We must so live as Christ lived for others, we must so die as Christ died, that others may live. We must so ascend from life into this sacrificial generous life-giving death as Christ did..."¹⁰¹ Following the example of Christ on His way to Golgotha, Christians are called, according to AB, to take the sufferings and the cross of others as their own, and be prepared to be crucified:

⁹⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Sermon on Commandments Sunday, 1st October 1989*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_85.htm

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Ibid., online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_85.htm

¹⁰¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *On Communion and Life, August 1971*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_134.htm

All sufferings that He encountered in the world, Christ accepted in Himself with full, pure and soul-tearing compassion. [...] He accepted this suffering as we can see during the days of passion, crucifixion on Golgotha, death and descent into Hades. If we want to belong to Christ, we have to learn, in the relation to the suffering of each person around us, every creature around us, all the world around us, like Christ, to let the suffering into our consciousness so that it would penetrate to the depths of our heart.¹⁰²

AB encouraged his listeners not to run away from the sufferings or problems of other people but, rather, to rid themselves of the fear that might stop them from this endeavor: “[We] are afraid to see a person in his suffering and hear the cry of his soul. And that is why we close ourselves off. And in closing ourselves off [...] we become prisoners of this closed off state.”¹⁰³ AB explained the meaning of St. Paul’s words “accept [welcome] one another” (Rom 15:7) in kenotic terms:

[...] to accept others means, using the image of Christ, to take another person, as if to take upon ones own shoulders someone else’s suffering and bringing that person to the Father’s house. But sometimes it means to take a person upon one’s own shoulders and to suddenly find out that this is not a person, but a cross, and that this cross I have to carry to Golgotha, and only if I am crucified upon it, only if I am crucified without anger, without becoming closed off, giving myself completely, then I can say: Forgive him, Father, because he does not know what he does...¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² “Все страдания, которые Он встречал в мире, Христос принял в Себя полным, чистым, душу разрывающим состраданием. [...] Он это страдание принял так, как мы видим в течение страстных дней, распятия на Голгофе, смерти и сошествия во ад. Если мы хотим быть Христовыми, мы должны научиться по отношению к страданию каждого человека вокруг нас, каждой твари вокруг нас, всего мира вокруг нас, подобно Христу, допустить это страдание во все наше сознание, чтобы оно проникло до глубин нашего сердца.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 157.

¹⁰³ “[М]ы боимся видеть человека в его страдании и слышать крик его души. И поэтому мы закрываемся. И, закрываясь, [...] делаемся пленниками этой нашей закрытости.” Ibid., 156.

¹⁰⁴ “[...] принять других значит, употребляя образ Христа, взять другого человека, чужое как будто страдание на свои плечи и этого человека донести до Отчего дома. Но порой это значит взять человека на свои плечи и вдруг обнаружить, что это не человек, а крест, и что этот крест я должен донести до Голгофы, и что только если я буду распят на нем, только если я буду распят без гнева, без закрытости, отдавая себя до конца, я смогу сказать: Прости ему, Отче, он не знает, что творит...” Ibid., 157, 99.

The commandment “to love your neighbor” is closely connected with a readiness to sacrifice one’s life. AB explained: “And ‘to give life’ does not mean at all to die, but from day to day, from hour to hour, to neglect oneself, to put aside a concern about oneself in order to think about the other. In this is the whole Gospel.”¹⁰⁵ AB kenotically interpreted the commandments of love, because he understood the love of God and neighbor as an act of total self-sacrifice: “It means that all our thoughts, all our strengths, our whole heart should be given not to ourselves, but to the other: God and neighbor.”¹⁰⁶ Another kenotic element that assists with this self-sacrifice is the risk of being abandoned by another person. AB compared this risk of abandonment with the creation of the world and the first people, where God risked His love being abandoned. “He so loves us that He calls us into being, and He takes the risk upon Himself, because He gives His love knowing that it can be rejected. And we all know what it means to open up ones heart to a human being and to be rejected.”¹⁰⁷ Another example of a practical application of AB’s kenotic approach is the goal for Christians is to become one with Christ, so that other people may be able to encounter Him through us. AB said: “[O]ur

¹⁰⁵ “А ‘отдать жизнь’ вовсе не значит умереть, это значит изо дня в день, из часа в час пренебрегать собой, отстранять свою озабоченность о себе, для того чтобы думать о другом. В этом – все Евангелие.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 223; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 908.

¹⁰⁶ “Это значит, что вся наша мысль, все наши силы, все сердце должны быть отданы не нас самим, а другому: Богу и ближнему.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Воскресные проповеди*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/sermons/serm4.htm>

¹⁰⁷ “Он так нас любит, что призывает нас к бытию, и берет на Себя риск, потому что Он отдает нам Свою любовь, зная, что она может быть отвергнута. А мы все знаем, что значит открыть свое сердце человеку – и быть отвергнутым.” Ibid., online, available: <http://mitras.ru/sermons/serm6.htm>

vocation is not only to be Christ's own, but to be united with Him, to become so united with Him so that every person who meets us encounters Christ.”¹⁰⁸

This readiness to follow the kenotic life of Christ should translate into a mind-set in the daily life of Christians of being sensitive to the needs of others. This is a fulfillment in one's life of the commandment of love: “In this is the wonderful mystery of love: that we are called to love as God loved us first, which is until self-abandonment, until the cross, until death; we are called to love each other to the point of emptying our own lives until the end, to give ourselves up until the end.”¹⁰⁹ As we can see, AB merged together the way of Christ to Golgotha with the daily life of Christians in their vocation to follow His example and also identified the other person with the cross of Christ.

Another practical task of Christians is to pray for all people, regardless of whether they believe or not, are sinners or righteous. Answering the question of who can be commemorated during the Proskomidia (Prothesis),¹¹⁰ he said: “We can pray for all, for righteous and sinners, for believers and unbelievers, we can pray *for all*, because this is Golgotha, and in this moment on Golgotha the crucified Christ was dying for all

¹⁰⁸ “[Н]аше призвание – не только быть Христовыми, но так сродниться с Ним, так с Ним быть едиными, чтобы всякий человек, встречаясь с нами, встретил бы Христа.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 674.

¹⁰⁹ “В этом удивительная тайна любви: что мы призваны так любить, как нас возлюбил Бог, то есть до самозабвения, до креста, до смерти; мы призваны так друг друга любить, чтобы свою жизнь истощать до конца, отдать до конца друг для друга.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 268; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *О встрече*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/sretenie/sret_vstrech.htm; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *On Death*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_06.htm

¹¹⁰ Proskomidia (Prothesis) is the first part of the Liturgy, during which the priest prepares the Holy gifts of bread and wine for consecration.

without exception.”¹¹¹ Again we can see that AB referred to the kenotic life of Christ to answer a practical question on prayer.

In some cases, in order to serve other people, AB suggested leaving God in the name of God. He said: “[I]t seems to me that there is a moment when God expects from us – not that we would abandon Him, but in His name leave Him. [...] John Climacus says that if you are in a prayerful ecstasy and hear that your neighbor in his cell is asking for cup of cold water, leave your prayerful ecstasy and give him some water, because your prayerful ecstasy is your private deed, but to give him a cup of cold water is a Divine deed.”¹¹² Borrowing the expression to “leave God for the sake of finding Him,”¹¹³ AB interpreted the words of John Climacus to conclude that a person must be attentive to the needs of others first, and only then be attentive to him- or herself and God. In the act of serving other people first we can see the link AB made with the kenotic service of Christ, who came “not to be served but to serve” (Mark 10:45). Very often, AB taught that God comes to the person through other people.

But very often God is knocking at our door through the other person. He wants us to respond with all of our inner compassion, care, love, joy, with something that this person needs, because in this moment this person is a messenger of God. This is a person, whom God sent, so that *we* in His, in God’s name, would take

¹¹¹ “Молиться можно о всех, о праведных и о грешниках, о верующих и неверующих, *о всех* можно молиться, потому что это Голгофа, и в этот момент на Голгофе Христос распятый умирал за всех без исключения.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 88. Not all Orthodox theologians share the same view as AB. Some believed that only Christians who belong to the Orthodox Church could be commemorated during the Proskomidia.

¹¹² “[М]не кажется, что есть момент, когда Бог ожидает от нас, что мы – не то что оставим Его, но в Его имя отойдем от Него. [...] Иоанн Лествичник говорит, что, если ты находишься в молитвенном экстазе и услышишь, что сосед по келье просит чашу студеной воды, оставь свой молитвенный экстаз и дай ему воду, потому что твой молитвенный экстаз – дело частное, а дать ему чашу студеной воды – дело божественное.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 331-332, 400.

¹¹³ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 710.

care of him. But when we think about the other, we only think that we are busy; we are not even afraid of this person, he is just unnecessary for us. And then an encounter becomes impossible.¹¹⁴

From the above quotation we can learn that, in order to encounter God, the person is called to self-sacrifice and has to be open to other people. In his talks, AB often stressed the need to be humane in how one relates with others because this is what Christ revealed through His humanity. Followers of Christ must learn and grow into a deeper relationship with Him to be able to genuinely love others.¹¹⁵ AB believed that a Christian is one who has personally encountered and experienced God – “We can believe a human being and we can believe Christ, but only when we can say: what you say sounds true... This can take place through reading of the Gospel, it can take place through an encounter with another human being who reveals to us the radiance of eternal life, but has to become our own personal experience.”¹¹⁶ As we can see, although AB broadly saw the “places” for encounters with God, he nonetheless understood that in all cases such an encounter must be transformed into personal experience. How then, can Christians become such a “place” of encounter for other people? AB saw the answer in the words of Christ: “No one takes it [life] from me, but I lay it down of my own

¹¹⁴ “Но часто Бог стучит в нашу дверь через другого человека. Он хочет, чтобы мы всем своим нутром отозвались состраданием, заботливостью, любовью, радостью, чем-то, что нужно этому человеку, потому что в этот момент этот человек – посланник Божий. Это человек, которого Бог послал для того, чтобы *мы* от Его, Божиего, имени позаботились о нем. Но мы думаем о другом, мы думаем только о том, что заняты, мы даже не боимся этого человека, он просто нам лишний. И тогда встреча делается невозможной.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 765.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_82.htm

¹¹⁶ “Мы можем поверить человеку и можем поверить Христу только тогда, когда мы можем сказать: то, что ты говоришь, звучит истиной... Это может случиться через чтение Евангелия, это может случиться через встречу с человеком, который нам являет сияние вечной жизни, но это должно стать личным опытом.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 180-181; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 174, 196.

accord” (John 10:18). In AB’s understanding, self-sacrifice is in one’s daily actions – “To give one’s own life does not mean necessarily to die – to give one’s own life – means to sacrifice all our own thoughts, all the richness of our own heart, all our strength, to give to the other what we consider to be the most precious in your experience, heart, mind and life.”¹¹⁷ Through this kind of self-sacrifice by a Christian, another person might be able to encounter God.

AB went even further in his analysis of how a Christian can be a “place” of encounter with God. He said: “A Christian should be able to measure the awareness of the loss of God more deeply than these people [who are seeking God] and to give them an answer. Then they will not need to seek a new God [because] it will be enough for them to stand before the face of the Living God, Whom there is no need to describe; Whom in some sense there is no need to open, to reveal to sight and mind. It is enough just to *commune* with Him.”¹¹⁸ How then are we to understand what AB said: “A Christian should be able to measure the awareness of the loss of God”? Who is supposed to be “responsible” for the loss of God – the human being or God? As we have seen in previous chapters, in answering these questions, AB distinguished between two types of God-forsakenness – (1) that which results from sin, i.e., when the person separates

¹¹⁷ “Отдавать свою жизнь вовсе не значит обязательно умереть, отдавать свою жизнь – это значит посвятить все свои мысли, все богатство своего сердца, всю свою крепость тому, чтобы дать другому то, что ты сам считаешь самым драгоценным в твоём опыте, сердце, уме и жизни.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 199; Cf. *Ibid.*, 506, Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 594; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy8.htm>

¹¹⁸ “Христианин должен быть в состоянии измерить потерю сознания Бога глубже, чем ее смогли измерить эти люди [которые ищут Бога], и дать им ответ. Тогда им не нужно будет искать нового Бога, им достаточно будет встать перед лицом Бога Живого, Которого нет нужды описывать, Которого, в каком-то смысле, нет нужды открывать, являть зрению и разуму, достаточно *приобщать* Ему.” *Ibid.*, 189.

himself from God; and (2) that which results from God's decision to abandon a person (eg., to the God-forsakenness of Christ on the cross or the experience of Job). Does this mean that a Christian must first experience the loss of God in order to be able to understand the other person's experience of the lack of God, or the state without God, which is Godlessness? Should a Christian then seek out such an experience of Godlessness? What if a Christian never experiences a state of Godlessness?

Unfortunately, AB did not provide more explanation to these ideas in this context. Nonetheless, we can try to give an answer based upon these two types of God-forsakenness. First, we must exclude the first type of God-forsakenness wherein God supposedly wants a Christian to commit a sin (which is Godlessness) in order to get a better understanding of the people who are searching for God or who experience abandonment by Him. However, we might accept the understanding that, by committing a sin, a Christian might experience the state of the loss of God, and that this experience might help a Christian to understand someone who is without God.

If we try to understand AB's statement that "a Christian should be able to measure the awareness of the loss of God," through the prism of the second type of God-forsakenness, where God takes the initiative and decides to abandon a person, then a Christian must recall those moments when he experienced the absence of God. This, in turn, might help a Christian understand others who are experiencing the same state. In both cases the person is experiencing loneliness and the absence of God.

What would be the difference in a Christian's experience of God-forsakenness and the experience of a person who is seeking God? The difference between God-forsakenness experienced by a Christian and the person who is seeking God lies in the

awareness of a loss. A Christian is aware of Whom he has lost, while the person who never experienced God does not have such an awareness. This might bring us to another conclusion – that the experience of Godlessness by a Christian is more tragic than for a person that never experienced God.

There is also another category of people who might never have experienced God and who are not seeking Him. For this category, AB believed, Christ experienced God-forsakenness, which is beyond the experience of all people, including atheists and those who do not seek God, and on the cross He demonstrated His faith in them. From God's perspective AB posited that: "He believes in every human being, He has hope for everyone, He loves everyone to the point of death on the cross, and that is why there is no human being, no matter how far away he might be from God in his own eyes, who is not to be infinitely close to God."¹¹⁹ Such a statement is justified by AB's teaching regarding Christ's God-forsakenness on the cross. This is because, for AB, Christ's experience was the most dramatic event in that Christ as God and as a human found Himself in a "metaphysical swoon,"¹²⁰ experienced "a positive loss of the Father,"¹²¹ and entered the place where God is not.¹²² As already presented in the previous chapters,

¹¹⁹ "Он в каждого человека верит, что Он надеется на каждого, что любит до крестной смерти каждого и поэтому нет такого человека, как бы он ни был далек от Бога в своих собственных глазах, – который не был бы бесконечно близок Богу." Ibid., 399.

¹²⁰ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Christ, True and Perfect Man: The Address Printed below Was Delivered at the Diocesan Conference at Effingham, Surrey, in May, 1983*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_13.htm

¹²¹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *I Believe in God*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_04.htm

¹²² Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Пастырство* (Minsk: Izdatelstvo Belorusskogo Ekzarkhata, 2005), 20; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 735.

Christ abolished the separation between God and humans, and gave to His followers the example of faithfulness and solidarity.

V.5.5. Kenosis in Death as the Final Encounter with God

In this section we will look at the final element in AB's kenotic theology, which is death. Earlier we saw that death, as the consequence of sin (which is Godlessness), in AB's understanding is one of the ultimate experiences in a person's life. By the death and Resurrection of Christ only spiritual death was eliminated, not physical death. AB applied his kenotic theology of death to the encounter with God. He taught that the example of Christ's Descent into Hades and His faith in human beings might help believers to experience the moment of their death as an encounter with God: "We forget that the very essence of death lies in the fact that the fetters of earth are broken, the doors of eternity are opened wide, and the living soul encounters face to face the Living God. This completion of life, this completion of the human being's destiny is not the end."¹²³ After Christ's God-forsakenness, His entering into Hades and His Resurrection, death kept its character of loneliness, but ceased to be forsakenness: "[...] God sends to the human being a lonely death, but this is not abandonment, this is loneliness in God's

¹²³ "Мы забываем, что самая сущность смерти заключается в том, что разрываются оковы земли, раскрываются широко двери вечности, и живая душа встречается лицом к лицу с Живым Богом; это завершение жизни, это завершение человеческой судьбы – не конец." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 92; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 44, 202; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 893; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/inname/in_6.htm

presence...”¹²⁴ Death has two sides, on one side there is the horror and grief of loss, but on the other side it is the future encounter with God and an entrance into eternal life.¹²⁵

The loneliness accompanying death affects not only the dying person, but also those who are closest to him or her, and they have to prepare to face this feeling: “We have to be ready to face grief, sadness, to look in the face of everything that happens within ourselves. [...] We have to be ready to acknowledge that love can be expressed through sufferings and if we state that we love indeed the one who departed from this life, we have to be ready to love this person from the depths of grief and sufferings as we loved him in a joy supporting him by this joy of the common life.”¹²⁶ At the very moment of death a human person might experience both Christ’s presence and His absence. He used Fr. Sophrony’s interpretation of Christ’s God-forsakenness and said:

If a person says: ‘I want to die only with Christ,’ we can answer him: ‘Okay, I will leave you, but I will leave with you also a handbell, in case you get terrified of being alone.’ Or (if there is no handbell): ‘I will give you a plate, so you can drop it on the floor so I would hear a call.’ Because a person in a certain moment can feel how good it is to be with Christ, but in half an hour suddenly will fear the loneliness, and will need either friendship or a prayer, or just a physical presence. And we have to give the person a chance to be alone, and also *somehow* to watch: is he still happy in his loneliness and unity with Christ, or suddenly is he afraid? Because the awareness of God’s presence does not necessarily grow. It can be, what Fr. Sophrony once called ‘metaphysical

¹²⁴ “[...] Бог посылает человеку одинокую смерть, но это – не оставленность, это одиночество в Божием присутствии...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 65; Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 889-890.

¹²⁵ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 67.

¹²⁶ “Мы должны быть готовы встретить горе, тоску, смотреть в лицо всему, что происходит внутри нас самих, [...] Мы должны быть готовы признать, что любовь может выражаться и через страдание и что, если мы утверждаем, что действительно любим того, кто ушел из этой жизни, мы должны быть готовы любить человека из глубины горя и страдания, как мы любили его в радости, утверждая его этой радостью общей жизни.” Ibid., 72, 162.

swoon': when you suddenly lose God. God is here, but it is as if you have lost Him.¹²⁷

It is very interesting to observe how AB also used the ultimate experience of Christ to describe a personal preparation for death. He did not provide a further explanation to this statement, but we might consider from the last sentence “seemed to have lost him” – that AB meant a subjective feeling of the person rather than an actual loss of God.

AB encouraged his listeners not to avoid questions concerning death, but rather to prepare for it. Death, according to AB, has a pedagogical meaning – to encourage a believer “to become the genuine person God planned us to be [...] the undistorted image of God.”¹²⁸ Another pedagogical meaning of death is in leading one to pay more careful attention to life, to other people, to the present moment.

Think what every moment of our life would be like if we would know that this could be the last one: that this moment is given to us to reach some kind of perfection, that the words we pronounce are our last ones. [...] How would we act in our mutual relationships if the present moment would be the only one available to us, and if this moment would need to express and incarnate all our love and care? We would live with a concentration and depth otherwise unattainable for us. And we are rarely aware what the present moment is.¹²⁹

¹²⁷ “Если человек скажет: ‘Я хочу умереть только со Христом’, ему можно ответить: ‘Хорошо, я тебя оставлю, но я оставлю тебе тоже колокольчик, на случай если вдруг тебе станет страшно быть одному’. Или (если колокольчика нет): ‘Я тебе дам тарелку, ты можешь ее уронить на пол, чтобы я услышал зов’. Потому что человек может в эту минуту чувствовать, что ему так хорошо быть со Христом, а через полчаса вдруг ему станет страшно одиночества, ему понадобится или дружба, или молитва, или просто физическое присутствие. И надо дать возможность человеку быть одному, и *как-то* следить за тем: он все еще счастлив в своем одиночестве и единстве со Христом, или вдруг ему стало страшно? Потому что сознание присутствия Божия не обязательно нарастает. Бывает то, что отец Софроний как-то назвал ‘метафизический обморок’: вдруг ты теряешь Бога. Бог тут, но ты Его будто потерял.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая*, 890.

¹²⁸ “[С]тать той подлинной личностью, какой мы были задуманы Богом, [...] неискаженным образом Божиим.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 58.

¹²⁹ “Подумайте, каков был бы каждый момент нашей жизни, если бы мы знали, что он может стать последним, что этот момент нам дан, чтобы достичь какого-то совершенства, что слова, которые мы произносим, – последние наши слова. [...] Как бы мы поступали в наших взаимных

The memory of death, as AB understood it, is not the measure of life, but can help to bring meaning to life and make us more humane: “The awareness of death carries with it the keen sense of life, a special sensitivity to the dynamic of life. Only ‘remembrance of death’ makes us fully humane, we grow ‘to the measure of death,’ therefore, to the measure of life.”¹³⁰ For Christians, death after the death of Christ is a dormition: “This is neither a perdition nor the end of the path after which ‘is nothing’ – only the decay of a body and disintegration of our entire being. ‘To die’ means to enter into eternal life, where – face to face – as a living soul we will stand before the face of the Living God.”¹³¹ AB compared death with the experience of falling asleep¹³² and used the example of the Mother of God and Her Dormition. He said: “In Dormition, as in every death, there is a tragedy: the human being is not born to die, but there is also a marvelous encounter, the encounter of the living soul with its God. Everyone among us, dying, will encounter God in this way.”¹³³ Christians are called to believe that the human

отношениях, если бы настоящий миг был единственным в нашем распоряжении и если бы этот миг должен был выразить, воплотить всю нашу любовь и заботу? Мы жили бы с напряженностью и с глубиной, иначе нам недоступными. И мы редко создаем, что такое настоящий миг.” Ibid., 59.

¹³⁰ “[С]ознание смерти несет с собой острое чувство жизни, особенную чуткость к динамике жизни. Только ‘память смертная’ делает нас вполне человеческими, мы вырастаем ‘в меру смерти’, а значит, в меру жизни.” Ibid., 86, Cf. Ibid., 94-95.

¹³¹ “Это не гибель, не конец пути, после которого ‘ничего нет’ — только тление тела, распад всего нашего существа. ‘Умереть’ означает войти в вечную жизнь, где лицом к лицу живой душой мы встанем перед лицом Живого Бога.” Ibid., 95; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Беседы о вере и Церкви*, online, available: <http://mitras.ru/besedy/besedy11.htm>

¹³² Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *On Death*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_06.htm

¹³³ “В Успении, как во всякой смерти, есть трагедия: человек не рожден для того, чтобы умереть, — но есть и дивная встреча, встреча живой души со своим Богом. Каждый из нас, умирая, так встретит Бога.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 991; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Любовь всепобеждающая: Проповеди, произнесенные в России* (Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994),

being's death after Christ's death is no longer a separation from God, nor is it a descent into a Godless place, but rather it is an opportunity to meet God.¹³⁴

An important act in preparation for death is the reconciliation with oneself and other people, and even with death. AB said: "[I]t is necessary to prepare for death through the harsh, but liberating process of reconciliation with all, with oneself, with our own conscience, with all circumstances, with present and past, with events and with people, and even with the future and with approaching death itself."¹³⁵ Such an approach is built on a kenotic basis, because only through humility, which is the foundation of kenosis, is it possible to reconcile with others and oneself and humbly accept death. The right preparation for death as the crowning of life should be based on the experience of eternity in a human being's life.

If death is an encounter with God, so too is the Parousia: "Finally, we are waiting for another encounter: the end of the world, when the Lord will come in His glory. The end of the world is fulfillment; the end of the world is not a moment in history; it is an encounter with the Living God, with the victorious Christ, with Christ the Savior; it is a joy... If we were really believers, we would be eager for this, we would be longing, we would be waiting both for our encounter with God in death and for the day when

online, available: http://mitras.ru/lubov/lub_vse_71.htm. More on Dormition of the Mother of God, see second chapter.

¹³⁴ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony Sourozh, *Easter Sermon, April the 11, 1999, after Reading St. John Chrysostom's Easter Message*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_112.htm

¹³⁵ "[Н]еобходимо готовиться к смерти через суровый, но освобождающий нас процесс примирения со всеми, с самим собой, с собственной совестью, со всеми обстоятельствами, с настоящим и с прошлым, с событиями и с людьми, и даже с будущим, с самой грядущей смертью." Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 74.

everything will be completed...”¹³⁶ AB clearly stated that death is not a desperate experience in human life, but rather the ultimate moment of encounter with God. And yet a human being must grow into such an understanding of death.

AB also commented on the differences and common elements in how unbelievers and believers approach death. How do unbelievers prepare for death? According to AB, both unbelievers and believers can accept death peacefully by seeing its meaning:

Experience has shown me [...] that there are two kinds of people who encounter death peacefully. These cases are relatively rare. These are true believers and sincere unbelievers. Half-believers or quarter-believers, immature people; who do not believe in life, in eternity, in God and at the same time are not sure that dying means a complete destruction are incapable of looking at death in the face. [...] Unbelievers who are truly confident in their complete annihilation, could face death, I have seen this; but also people who encounter death in a moment, in a situation that gives them a sense of meaning about their death.¹³⁷

From the above example we can conclude that AB understood that death can be a place of encounter between unbelievers and believers, and that the common element for both believers and unbelievers is the human person. In his comments on the Parousia, he used to emphasize the questions posed in the parable of the Last Judgment (Cf. Mt 25:31-46). All the questions asked by God relate to the one question: “Have you been

¹³⁶ “И наконец, мы ждем другую встречу: конец мира, когда Господь придет во славе Своей. Конец мира – это завершение; конец мира – это не мгновение в истории, это встреча с Живым Богом, с Христом победившим, с Христом-Спасителем; это радость... И если бы мы были действительно верующими людьми, как мы жаждали бы, как мы тянулись бы, как мы ждали бы и своей встречи с Богом через смерть, и того дня, когда все будет завершено...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 92; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 84-85.

¹³⁷ “Опыт показал мне [...] что два рода людей спокойно встречают смерть. Они сравнительно редки. Это истинно верующие и искренние неверующие. Не могут смотреть в лицо смерти полуверки или те, кто верит на четвертушку, люди незрелые, люди, которые не верят в жизнь, в вечность, в Бога, но в то же время не уверены, что умирание означает полное уничтожение. [...]. Люди неверующие, по-настоящему уверенные в полном своем уничтожении, могут умирать – я это видел, а также люди, которые встречаются со смертью в момент, в ситуации, которая придает смысл их смерти.” Ibid., 32-33.

humane towards other people?” AB stated: “The central idea of the parable is not in saying that some will go into everlasting fire, while others into eternal joy, but to indicate on what foundation this judgment is taking place. [...] If you have not been humane, simply a human being, do not imagine that you become divine.”¹³⁸ AB’s focus on the humane part of the relationship between people brings us back to his understanding of salvation and the Person of Christ. Christ through His life and through His death on the cross revealed God’s faith in the human being and the value of the person in God’s eyes. God’s faith consists also in an expectation that the human being responds to this act of God, and the ultimate way to respond is through humane relations with other people. The common goal for both believers and unbelievers will be tested in a question – did you believe in human beings?¹³⁹

V.6. Kenotic Theology of Anthony Bloom and Fr. Sophrony Sakharov

The purpose of this section is not to thoroughly compare the theology of these two theologians, which could be done in further research on AB’s theology, but rather I would like to show the main differences between AB and Sakharov’s understandings of the God-forsakenness of Christ. Sakharov wrote his main ideas in the book *We shall see*

¹³⁸ “Центр тяжести притчи не в том, чтобы сказать, что одни пойдут в огонь вечный, а другие – в радость вечную, а чтобы указать, на каком основании этот суд происходит. [...] если ты человеческим не был, просто – человеком не был, не воображай, что ты божественным будешь.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Человек перед Богом*, 59-60, Cf. Ibid., 119, 296-297.

¹³⁹ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 39. Probably because his main audience was Christian, AB did not develop reasons why unbelievers should be “humane,” but he rather focused on the meaning of the parable, which teaches all to be humane.

Him as He is, in which, in an autobiographical way, he presented his spiritual way of life, confession, a return to God and his understanding of God-forsakenness in the spiritual life of people.

We have already had a chance to observe the similarities between AB's and Sakharov's kenotic theology. Sakharov's main ideas, such as Christ's: "metaphysical swoon" (AB referred to this, although we will not find this notion in Sakharov works); the understanding of the Church as an "inverted pyramid;" the idea of the unity of humankind, the total Adam;¹⁴⁰ the atheistic context of the God-forsakenness of Christ; and the subjective character of abandonment by God in the experience of people are all ideas that are also present in AB's kenotic theology. We have already seen some examples where AB explicitly referred to Sakharov and somewhere he did not. Sakharov's kenotic theology is more consistent and organized than AB's was. In Sakharov's works we can see elements of kenotic theology, which are missing in AB's approach. These include the themes of: the presence of the Holy Spirit and Christ's words on the cross: "Father, into your hands I commend my spirit" (Lk 23:46).

Sakharov considered repentance to be the main message of the Gospel: "Through repentance is our divinization accomplished. [...] The Gospel ('glad tidings') both begins and ends with a call to repentance."¹⁴¹ For AB the main message of the Gospel is the encounter between God and the human being. God is the initiator and this encounter is based on God's faith in the human being. Sakharov also used the term "encounter,"

¹⁴⁰ Nicholas V. Sakharov, *I Love, Therefore I Am: The Theological Legacy of Archimandrite Sophrony* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002), 121, 123, 135, 148.

¹⁴¹ Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *We Shall See Him as He Is*, trans., Rosemary Edmonds, (Essex, 2004), 30; 41.

but not in terms of the Divine-human relationship. Instead he applied it to relationships between human beings. As we may remember, AB encountered God while he was reading the Gospel according to St. Mark and this became for him a life changing experience. AB did not know God until he encountered Him, but this was not the case for Sakharov. He also came to an encounter with God, but from a different perspective and this became the reason for his belief that repentance is the leitmotif of the Gospel. As Sakharov said in his own words, he left and abandoned God in his life, but God came to him through elder Silouan: “I remember that I felt my apostasy from Christ to have been a vile crime against His love. I had known this love in my early childhood: He had vouchsafed me to live it.”¹⁴² Before his return to Christ he became interested in Indian mysticism for almost eight years: “I was given to this delusion in my youth, swayed by books on far-eastern mysticism and encounters with people from lands that have cultivated such esoteric doctrines for thousands of years.”¹⁴³ After he returned to a Christian understanding of God as a Person, Sakharov realized that all these years he lived in sin. “As soon as I became adult [sic] I committed a great sin – on a mad impulse of ignorant pride I abandoned Him in favor of another, imaginary Supra-personal Absolute. [...]”¹⁴⁴ My straightforward ‘eastern’ experiment was on the whole an intellectual one – the asceticism of the mental divestment of all that is relative. Gradually I became convinced that I was on the wrong road – that I was abandoning

¹⁴² Ibid., 26.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 27.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 57.

true, real Being for non-being.”¹⁴⁵ When he rediscovered God, it became a turning point – a journey of repentance for having earlier abandoned God in his life. Sakharov even came to the conclusion that Christ revealed the grace of repentance for “[t]he grace of repentance reveals in us the image of the Son of the Father.”¹⁴⁶ He considered repentance to be the way towards human theosis. Kenosis for the human being would be to grow into deeper repentance and “The more profound our repentance, the more clearly do we see into our own previously hidden depths.”¹⁴⁷

Sakharov, like AB, understood that the vocation of a human being is to outgrow egoistic individualism in order to become “as *persona*, to overcome the limitation of the individual...”¹⁴⁸ I assume that the foundation for their understanding of a human being for both theologians was V. Lossky’s distinction between individualism and personhood.

Another difference between AB and Sakharov lay in the understanding of the words: “To love oneself.” We saw earlier that AB used as synonyms the words: “to love oneself,” “to know oneself,” “to be free,” while if we read Sakharov’s work, we will not find these categories, but rather that a human being has to hate oneself, to hate sin in oneself and that this is the beginning of repentance. He even believed that “to hate oneself” is the vocation of a human being in order to be one with Christ. He said: “When we hate ourselves for the evil that lives in us, then it is that the boundless horizons of the

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 27-28.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 46.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 123.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 196-197.

love commanded of us are revealed.”¹⁴⁹ Or “[...] through repentance granted to me, even to the point of hate for myself, I unexpectedly experienced a wondrous peace.”¹⁵⁰ For Sakharov these categories of hating oneself applied also to his understanding of kenotic theology. He said: “God’s love is kenotic. He revealed the secret of His Being when He commanded us to love God to the point of hating oneself (Cf. Lk 14: 26-27, 33).”¹⁵¹ This kind of approach we will not find in AB’s works.

Even the categories of kenosis for a practical application in life are different for both theologians. For Sakharov it is only through repentance that people can reach theosis and life with God: “[...] the same kind of self-emptying love that was made manifest to us in the Holy Trinity is *commanded* of mankind: through the utmost self-emptying that we can manage in our act of repentance, we become capable of apprehending the fullness both of Divine love and love for our neighbor (Cf. Mt 22: 37-40).”¹⁵² In his theology AB emphasized instead, as we have already seen, the categories of faith in the human being based on self-sacrifice and the role of all Sacraments in the Christian life, not just repentance as Sakharov did.

The understanding of God-forsakenness for Sakharov was based on his own experience of the absence of God in his own life. AB lacked this personal level of

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 145.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 148; Cf. Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *On Prayer*, trans., Rosemary Edmonds, (Essex: 1996), 31; Nicholas V. Sakharov, *I Love, Therefore I Am*, 82.

¹⁵¹ Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *We Shall See Him as He Is*, 209.

¹⁵² Ibid., 231.

sharing, (in spite of Osipov's criticism)¹⁵³ rather he based his approach on the experience of Christ and of other people. AB's understanding of God-forsakenness has a more Christological focus, and connection to the meaning of salvation, while for Sakharov the God-forsakenness of Christ has a more practical application as a part of the spiritual life of a Christian. I would say the focus for Sakharov is on a personal experience of abandonment by God, and Christ's God-forsakenness is the example of the kenotic, self-emptying love of God. In the explanation of Christ's God-forsakenness Sakharov referred to the experience of God-forsakenness in the life of Silouan and other ascetics, but later he stated that even their example couldn't explain what happened to Christ. If we look closer at Sakharov's interpretation of the God-forsakenness of Christ, we will find that he only stated that it did not happen on the ontological level, "that is, that the Father could have withdrawn from His co-eternal Son, of one substance with Himself..."¹⁵⁴ Sakharov did not apply directly the "subjective" character of God-forsakenness to the experience of Christ as he did in the presentation of the life of Silouan when he distinguished three stages of the Christian spiritual life.¹⁵⁵

AB, instead, gave more explanation to Christ's God-forsakenness, because he stated that it took place on the human level and had a subjective dimension to it. In AB's case, he did not refer to the experience of other people, but used Christ's experience as the ultimate example, so the emphasis is on Christ's God-forsakenness. He rather

¹⁵³ According to one of the official Web-sites of the Orthodox Church, Osipov is one of the best known theologians and apologists of the Eastern Christian Theology in Russia.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 135.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *St Silouan the Anthonite*, trans., Rosemary Edmonds, (New York, 1998), 188.

presupposed that a Christian would learn a practical application for life from Christ's experience. In the end they both came to the same conclusion, but from slightly different perspectives. Also in Sakharov's case, Christ revealed God's kenosis and ultimate love, while for AB, God-forsakenness is a negative experience and a consequence of the sin that Christ freely accepted. Sakharov did not consider the experience of God-forsakenness in the life of a Christian to be a negative one. For him this experience is not only a part of spiritual growth, but also a great opportunity to demonstrate one's faithfulness to God and the only way towards theosis.¹⁵⁶

Sakharov understood Christ's Descent into Hades as the ultimate kenosis of love. AB extended his understanding of Christ's Descent into Hades. He considered it to be not only a revelation of love, but first of all of faith in the human being by entering into the Godlessness of sin, and as Christ's identification with atheism.

Their different approaches to a variety of questions are perhaps as a result of their different audiences. AB was a pastor of a large parish and later of a diocese. Sakharov spent half of his life on Mount Athos and later was the abbot of a monastery in England. Sakharov's theology is more systematic than AB's was. AB's approach is more universal than Sakharov's and, as a pastor of a flock, he was able to find a unique way to preach and to be heard by a very broad audience in England and worldwide (BBC and Russia), for the Orthodox and non-Orthodox. Sakharov's monastic example of life with God and his advice would be more difficult to apply in the practical life of

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Archimandrite Sophrony, *О молитве*, online, available: http://rus-sky.com/history/library/sophrony.htm#_Toc513363479; Cf. Archimandrite Zacharias, *Christ Our Way and Our Life: A Presentation of the Theology of Archimandrite Sophrony* (South Canaan, PA: St. Tikhon's Seminary Press, 2003), 108-113.

everyday Christians. On the practical side, I think, AB was overall closer to the needs of his listeners and readers. At the same time, Sakharov's advice for the moments of God's absence and the experience of God-forsakenness is more practical than AB's. Both theologians brought a new perspective to kenotic themes in theology and enriched it with their own experience. They both believed that "to know God" meant "to experience Him," where even God's silence and absence belongs in the category of experience. In other expressions of kenotic theology very often the focus is on theoretical discourse about the kenosis of God, while the practical application is lacking. I believe Sakharov's and AB's approach brought a practical dimension into kenotic theology by making a link between the kenosis of Christ and the kenosis people experience in life. They moved from purely Christological statements to the anthropological one – AB in the life of Christians – lay especially – and Sakharov in the ascetical, monastic life.

In the last chapter of the present research I looked at the practical application of the kenotic theology of AB in the life of Christians. The relationship between God and a human being AB described as an encounter that takes place on a personal level. One of the "places" of this encounter is the prayer when God and a human being meet as friends. Using anthropomorphic language AB wanted to stress the intimacy of their relationship, and as in every relationship there are ups and downs, so the same takes place between God and a human being. One the most painful experiences for a human being is the feeling of the absence of God, which AB also called God-forsakenness. Although AB reserved the ultimate character of forsakenness to the experience of Christ on the cross, he did acknowledge that people sometimes might subjectively experience

abandonment by God. I carefully examined and presented AB's understanding of some of the reasons why someone might experience the absence of God along with the practical advice on how a person should act in this situation.

I also explored other kenotic "places" in AB's theology that relate to the practical experience of people, such as the correlation between experience and faith, which is compared with the experience of the Great Friday and Resurrection. Here we saw the link with the second chapter and an example of a practical application of AB's kenotic theology. Christ's followers in the moment of dying endure the same experience as their Master: loneliness, fear, uncertainty, sometimes abandonment by God and other people, but also His presence and peace. In death the most terrifying moment is not death itself, but the process of dying. AB encouraged his listeners to prepare for death and to be aware of death.

From the kenotic elements in the encounter with God I proceeded to some kenotic elements in the relationship with oneself and other people. In the love of oneself AB distinguished between egoism which he identified with Godlessness and true self-love which he interpreted as vocation of freedom. Further, we looked at AB's anthropological concept – "God's faith in a human being," divided into sections: faith in oneself; faith in another person and God's faith in oneself. The above-mentioned elements constitute the foundation for a Christian kenotic way of life based on the kenotic life of Christ.

As we have seen throughout the entire research, AB often referred to some of Sakharov's ideas. In the last section of this chapter and this thesis I contrasted some of the kenotic elements of kenotic in AB and Fr. Sophrony Sakharov's theology.

CONCLUSION

Anthony Bloom and Kenotic Theology

In AB's kenotic theology one finds no reference to any of the main Protestant kenoticists of the 19-20th centuries. Neither does AB's kenotic theology address the main questions raised by these kenoticists. Questions such as: the interpretation of Phil 2:5-11; the starting point for the analysis of kenosis (whether it should be the Incarnation or the intra-Trinitarian relationship); the emphasizing of one event in Christ's life over another; the restraint of Divine attributes by Christ in the Incarnation: glory, omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence; and the emphasis on the human nature of Christ. Given these apparent omissions, one might question whether or not AB should even be classified as a kenoticist. His explanation of kenosis is different not only from the classical Protestant kenoticists, but also from Russian theologians, such as Bulgakov, Lossky and Sakharov who believed that Christ's abandoning of His glory was a necessity, as we have already seen in the first chapter. AB's approach to this particular issue presented a different explanation.

As we saw in the second chapter, AB very rarely referred to St. Paul's "kenotic hymn" and apparently never exhaustively commented on it. In addition, he stated that Christ's "birth is not the beginning of a continually evolving life, but the limitation of the fullness that He had from the beginning of the world. He possesses the eternal glory of His Father before all ages and enters into our world, into the created world where

human being brought sin, suffering, death.”¹⁵⁷ Elsewhere, in commenting on the

Incarnation, AB stated

As a result of love for us, God wanted to become helpless, vulnerable, contemptible, defeated; His glory was exhausted, He appeared in the *form of a slave* (Phil 2:7), lived among people in the most shameful way, and died as a common criminal. No human being who has entered into the depth of this human hell of defeat, woundedness, humiliation, contempt, has been lower than his God, because before him the Savior Christ descended more deeply than he has into this hell.¹⁵⁸

Still elsewhere, AB stated: “We discovered a God who, in an act of love, had chosen to be what we were, defeated, helpless, vulnerable, contemptible, hopeless, rejected, superfluous, a God who was not ashamed of being like us and indeed of whom we had no need to be ashamed. And we discovered that the glory of God, the resplendence of God, is made manifest in that.”¹⁵⁹ If we add AB’s commentary on the event on Mount Tabor, when the Apostles were granted to see Christ’s Divine glory rather than Christ changing before them,¹⁶⁰ then readers might be confused about this understanding of Christ’s glory. The question of whether or not His Divine glory was

¹⁵⁷ “рождение - не начало все возрастающей жизни; оно есть ограничение той полноты, которую Он имеет прежде начала мира. Он обладает вечной славой Отчей прежде всех веков и вступает в наш мир, в тварный мир, куда человек внес грех, страдание, смерть.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Духовное путешествие: Размышления перед Великим Постом* (Moscow: Palomnik, 1997), online, available: http://www.mitras.ru/soul_put/put_7.htm

¹⁵⁸ “Бог по любви к нам захотел стать беспомощным, уязвимым, презренным, побежденным; истощена Его слава, Он явился *в образе раба* (Флп 2:7), пожил среди людей в самом позорном виде, умер, как простой преступник, – и ни один человек, который уходит в глубину этого человеческого ада пораженности, раненности, унижения, презренности, не оказывается ниже своего Бога: еще глубже, чем он, в этот ад сошел Спаситель Христос до него.” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды* (Moscow: Praktika, 2002), 541.

¹⁵⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Who is God?: A Sermon Preached at Great St. Mary’s, the University Church, Cambridge, 18th November, 1979*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_153.htm

¹⁶⁰ See second chapter for more details.

diminished in the Incarnation might be asked. How can we resolve this contradiction? How can we answer this question? If we answer no, then how can we consider AB a kenoticist, because all kenoticists of the 19-20th centuries acknowledged that Christ gave up some Divine attributes?

As already discussed in the second chapter, it seems that, according to AB, Christ did not endure any changes to His Divine nature (including His glory) and remained God. AB did not explain his understanding of the glory of God. However, if we look to the passage where AB spoke of the “emptiness from glory,”¹⁶¹ then we see the link between Christ’s kenosis and His descent into Hades. AB made an analogy of the people who lost everything as a result of emigration and lived a harsh life in the diaspora with Christ’s descent into Hades.¹⁶² For AB, it was not important whether or not Christ was emptied of His glory. What was important, rather, was that He entered into Hades as a place of Godlessness. AB only paraphrased the words from Phil 2:5-11, but did not consider it necessary to stress the “emptying of glory” to support the humility of Christ. Rather, AB used the descent into Hades as the ultimate example of Christ’s kenosis. Christ shared a commonality with all people in their Godlessness. This example should provide AB’s readers with a practical example of the confidence required to believe in oneself, as Christ believed in Himself, even when dying on the cross.¹⁶³ In other words, AB’s kenosis emphasized Christ’s acceptance of human Godlessness,

¹⁶¹ Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*, 541, 821.

¹⁶² The context and influence of the difficult life of émigrés was presented in the third chapter.

¹⁶³ Cf. *Ibid.*, 537-547.

which is fulfilled by the descent into Hades, rather than explaining what is meant by the emptiness of glory.

AB's understanding of matter might be another reason why he did not consider Christ's abandonment of His glory in the Incarnation necessary for His kenosis. In the third chapter we saw how AB understood matter and, in the fourth chapter, its practical application.¹⁶⁴

The reason why most kenoticists focused on the kenosis of Christ was to affirm the reality of Jesus' human nature. It seems that for most kenoticists this approach was necessary in order to demonstrate the limitations that had to take place in the Divine mode of existence in order to assume human nature. Some kenoticists, such as Wolfgang Friedrich Gess or J. H. August Ebrard, even went too far in their analysis, stating that in order for Christ to be fully human, he had to cease to be Divine or to be limited in His Divinity. We saw that there were some, such as Gottfried Thomasius, who asserted that Christ gave up the use of some Divine attributes. All these statements, however, are based on the same assumption, i.e., the difference between human abilities and Divine abilities. Whereas God is omnipresent and omniscient, a human is limited by time, space and knowledge. Thus, in order for God to become a human being, it is necessary for God to become limited by the human condition.

These kenoticists focused upon the changes which had to take place in the Divine mode of existence in order for God to become human. However, they did not explain what changes had to occur within human nature or in matter, if any, in order for God to

¹⁶⁴ I will return to this question later.

become human. What is kenosis in human nature? What makeup of matter did Christ assume: “Pre- or postlapsarian”? What changes took place in that matter and in human nature after the primordial sin? What role did matter and human nature play in the entire process of God’s kenosis? What is the practical application of kenotic theology? The answers to these questions may be found in other disciplines of theology, but rarely in kenotic theology.¹⁶⁵ The Russian kenoticists tried to take a more holistic approach to the question of understanding the kenotic life of Christ and linked Christology with Anthropology. However, even in their theology, the question of how to practically apply kenotic theology to people’s lives remained only partially answered.¹⁶⁶ AB instead approached these questions in a different way, as we have seen in the present research. One of these examples is his understanding of matter.

In AB’s thought, matter plays a very important role. In many places he emphasized the teaching that matter suffered and became polluted and wounded as a result of human sin, but did not lose the ability to be God-bearing. He insisted upon use of the term “God-bearing” (Богоприимная) thereby stressing matter’s ability to be united with God. Therefore, matter which comprised the human person did not require any special purification. Rather, it was ready to accept God. As a result of its coming into union with the Divine in the Incarnation, matter was sanctified and thus, became a foundation for the Sacraments, through which a Christian can take part in the life of the

¹⁶⁵ There are some exceptions. Cf. D. T. Williams, “Praying Through Kenōsis,” *Acta Theologica* (2007:2): 221-233; D. T. Williams, *Kenōsis of God: The Self-limitation of God - Father, Son, and Holy Spirit* (New York, Bloomington: iUniverse, 2009).

¹⁶⁶ See: Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *On Prayer*, trans. Rosemary Edmonds, (Essex: 1996); Archimandrite Sophrony (Sakharov), *We Shall See Him as He Is*, trans. Rosemary Edmonds, (Essex, 2004).

Trinity. Unlike these kenoticists who dealt mostly with the Incarnation, AB made the event on the cross central to his theology, although he confidently pointed out the importance of the bodily Resurrection of Christ and the bringing of matter into the life of the Trinity through His Ascension.

In the Incarnation, Christ remained in His Divine glory while also accepting human nature as His own. So then what is kenosis in AB's understanding? Christ's kenosis did not occur through a limitation of His Divine attributes and glory, nor did it occur through His acceptance of matter. Rather Christ's kenosis occurred through the acceptance of the consequence of sin, including death, which AB understood as Godlessness. So many of these differences between kenoticists and AB relate to the fact that AB simply was not engaged in the philosophical interpretation of theology, as many others writers were.

Anthony Bloom and God-forsakenness

AB's understanding of kenosis is not primarily based upon an exploration of the limitations that God took upon himself. Instead, AB's starting point was the center of the human tragedy, which is death. The notion of death was present throughout AB's theology and was based upon his encounter with the death of other people, whether during the war, or in the hospital (where as a surgeon he saw people dying), or in the death of his family members, or later when he was a priest and he often assisted others who were on their final path. In Christology, he distinguished between spiritual and physical death, and believed that Christ accepted spiritual death and descended into the

state of Godlessness that is Hades. In AB's understanding of God-forsakenness, we can identify three elements:

1. God-forsakenness as abandonment of Christ by the Father
2. God-forsakenness as atheism (Godlessness)
3. God-forsakenness and God's faith in a human person

These themes warrant closer examination because they are the key statements in AB's kenotic theology.

1. As mentioned before, AB considered the cross to be embedded in the life of the Trinity just as the crosswise gesture of the priest with the censer before a liturgical service signifies the crucified love of the Trinity. If this is so, and truly the whole Trinity were involved in the Crucifixion, what then would be the role of each Person?

Concerning the role of the Father, AB generally spoke in two contexts:

a) Christ's experience of God-forsakenness was "not only as an absence of the sense of God, but a positive loss of the Father."¹⁶⁷

b) AB echoed Fr. Sophrony Sakharov, who stated that Christ experienced "'a metaphysical swoon', a moment when, in his humanity, in his dying, he lost that sense of being one with the Father."¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁷ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *I Believe in God*, online, available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_04.htm

¹⁶⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, Christ, *True and Perfect Man: The Address Printed below Was Delivered at the Diocesan Conference at Effingham, Surrey, in May, 1983*, online, available: http://www.mitrar.ru/eng/eng_13.htm

Who, however, is the subject of the abandonment? Is it the Father who abandons His Son or Christ who felt abandoned by the Father? If we concede that the Father is the subject of the abandonment then we might see a distortion within the Trinity, because in such a scenario the Father “left” His Son, resulting in a breach within the Divine nature. Another negative consequence of such an understanding is that it would have an adverse effect on people’s spiritual lives. Specifically, there could be a belief that the Father abandons people who have sinned against Him, and He in His anger turns away from them and their prayers.

If the subject is the Son, who experienced abandonment by the Father, then the question arises as to the role of the Father in this event. Unfortunately, AB did not answer this difficult question, except to say: “The Father who so loved the world [...] gave his only Son to die for its salvation.”¹⁶⁹ So the Father’s role in the event of the cross is hidden. Instead, AB focused his reflections on the experience of the Son. Even the term “God-forsakenness” indicates not abandonment by the Father, but rather Christ’s experience of being abandoned by the Father.

AB pushed the exploration of Christ’s God-forsakenness to its boundaries, but never crossed them. But still the question remains: how is one to understand the “positive loss of the Father” and “metaphysical swoon”? AB boldly stated that Christ’s experience of being abandoned by the Father took place within Christ’s human nature or, more specifically, in His psychological state. As I mentioned in the second chapter, the Son did not abandon the Divine glory in His Incarnation, so emphasizing the

¹⁶⁹ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, “The Prayer of Intercession,” *Sourozh* 1 (1980): 22-33, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_10.htm

separation within the human nature and not in the Divine underlines the previous statement. Using the expressions noted above: the “positive loss of the Father” and the “metaphysical swoon,” AB exposed the reality of Christ’s death with its horrible and tragic consequences – separation from God. Unfortunately, AB did not explore further what he meant exactly in his use of these expressions. However, the context of AB’s thought shows that it is appropriate to repeat that this separation took place within Christ’s human nature and by no means within His Divine nature. This does not detract from the tragedy of the death of Christ, because Christ’s human nature was perfect and immortal and He did not have to die, but He freely accepted all consequences of sin, including death. That is why the death of Christ is the most dramatic experience for all times, because it took place within the perfect human nature.

Just as the role of the Father with respect to the cross is unclear, so too the role of the Holy Spirit is unclear in AB’s God-forsakenness of Christ. He neither mentioned the abandonment by the Holy Spirit, nor did he refer to Christ as being abandoned by the Holy Spirit. AB never considered himself a theologian, so we cannot expect him to attain the same level of consistency as systematians in his theology. This does not, however, justify the lack of presence of the Holy Spirit in the event of God-forsakenness. I do not think AB’s intention was to bring a distortion to the Trinity, because as we saw in the fourth chapter, he abundantly referred to the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church and the Sacraments, as well as in the lives of people. AB went so far as to state that the Holy Spirit never abandons the Church and sinners. So we can try to privilege this statement, applying it to the event of the cross. Thus, if the Church is the

Sacramental Body of Christ¹⁷⁰ and is filled with the presence of the Holy Spirit, then we can presuppose that Christ was also filled with the Holy Spirit and that the Holy Spirit never abandoned Christ. We remember that after the Baptism of Christ in the Jordan, the Holy Spirit filled Christ with the power of both the Divine and human natures. AB never suggested that the Holy Spirit left Christ, and so we can presume that all miracles and acts of Christ were performed in the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was present in all events of Christ's life, including the God-forsakenness, but in a hidden way.

Having established a link between the Son and the Holy Spirit through the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church,¹⁷¹ AB nonetheless failed to give a satisfactory answer to the question of the role of the Holy Spirit with respect to the cross. In this case we cannot consider that the God-forsakenness of Christ had an intra-Trinitarian character, as some kenoticists have stated, but in AB's case it might have a different meaning.

We have seen how boldly AB stressed the human nature of Christ and its link with matter as well as his presentation of Christ as the perfect Human. This might bring us to another conclusion: that God-forsakenness in AB's thought has a Christocentric and almost Christomonistic quality.

In AB's works, he did define the role of each Person of the Trinity in the context of the cross. What was important for AB was to focus on Christ's experience of Godlessness and Descent into Hades. Here we can state that for AB God-forsakenness

¹⁷⁰ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, "On the Church: A Catechetical Exercise," *Sourozh* 48 (1992), 6-16, online, available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1967-00-00-0-E-F-T-EM00-018Church.html>

¹⁷¹ See the fourth chapter of the research.

was a Divine-human event. On the one hand, this event combined God's humility and self-sacrifice together with His faith and love in a human person. On the other hand, the cross revealed the horrible reality of sin with its Godless state. AB understood Godlessness as death and atheism.¹⁷² He identified the Old Testament understanding of Hades with death and believed that all people were going to this Godless place, where God is not. Death, according to AB, was not a result of Adam's disobedience, but rather of his decision to turn away from God. As a result, Adam became "Godless." This does not mean, however, that God sought revenge and turned away as well. This is a crucial point because it means that God in His love remains faithful to people and that He is not the one who abandons. Rather, it is humans who become Godless as a result of their decision to turn away from God. This is why Christ in His death had to experience Godlessness because He shared the consequences of sin. Nonetheless, even in this condition the Father did not abandon His Son.

2. AB considered Christ's experience on the cross as Godlessness. He used the Greek word "a-theism" and applied its literal meaning "without God, Godless" in his understanding of sin, death, and the God-forsakenness of Christ. The circumstances of AB's listeners provided another reason why he referred to the cross in "atheistic" terms. In Soviet Russia, the Communist Party's ideological propaganda espoused atheism, while Western Europe was propelled by secularism. This begs the question of whether AB's notion of an "atheistic Christ" is relevant today. As discussed in the third chapter,

¹⁷² The latter I will analyze below.

atheism for AB constitutes a misunderstanding, in that his argument was based upon his own experiences, the experiences of other people who encountered God and, finally, on the ultimate experience of Godlessness, i.e., the etymological “atheism of Christ” on the cross. It is interesting to note that in his public discussion with Lasski, AB did not refer to the Godlessness of Christ, but instead talked about his own faith as a fact. I presume that AB’s arguments, which were based upon Christ’s abandonment and an emphasis on its ultimate character,¹⁷³ were used in his discussions with Christians (or at least people of some faith), but not with atheists, for whom such arguments would mean nothing. Simply put, the “atheistic Christ” cannot be used as an argument against militant atheists.

There is also a difference between Christ’s experience of “atheism” and atheists’ experience of atheism. Even Christ’s words on the cross: “My God, My God...” presuppose the existence of the Personal Being with whom contact was lost. Christ did not make a choice to be against the Father, as atheists do against God, but instead, even in His experience of abandonment, remained faithful to the Father and to the people who abandoned Him. For an atheist to be “an atheist” does not mean directly to experience Godlessness, God-forsakenness etc. Although all people, believers and atheists alike, experience God-forsakenness in their lives, there is, nonetheless, a distinction between their experiences, as we have seen in this chapter. For believers, the absence of God

¹⁷³ “Нет ни одного безбожника в мире: который познал бы отсутствие Бога так, как Христос познал потерю Бога. [There is no atheist in the world who could experience the loss of God in the way Christ experienced the loss of God]...” Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды. Книга вторая* (Moscow: Praktika, 2007), 735, 241; Cf. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *The True Worth of Man: A University Sermon Preached in the University Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, on October 22nd, 1967*, online, available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_03.htm

(which they would call subjectively “God-forsakenness”) is a painful but temporary experience, which is ultimately replaced with the intense presence of God.¹⁷⁴ In the case of atheists, the experience of the absence of God is an ordinary and permanent state in which they place themselves. Still, this does not mean that God has abandoned them.¹⁷⁵

Contemporary scholars distinguish between “negative atheism,” which believes that we cannot prove the existence of God, and “positive atheism,” which believes that the non-existence of God can be proved.¹⁷⁶ This approach was summarized in Charles Bradlaugh’s *Plea for Atheism*, where he said: “The atheist does not say ‘there is no God,’ but he says ‘I know not what you mean by God; I am without idea of God; the word ‘God’ is to me a sound conveying no clear or distinct affirmation.... The Bible’s God I deny; the Christian God I disbelieve in; but I am not rash enough to say there is no God as long as you tell me you are unprepared to define God to me’.”¹⁷⁷ Here we see that the author not only experiences atheism as being Godlessness in an etymological sense, but rather denies and refutes any notion of the existence of God. This approach has nothing in common with AB’s “atheistic Christ.”

AB was sympathetic to atheists and their experiences, but did not argue with them. AB did not try to work out a systematic argument against atheism in general, and

¹⁷⁴ Although it can also be life-long, as in the case of Mother Teresa. Cf. Brian Kolodiejchuk, ed., *Mother Teresa: Come Be My Light - The Private Writings of the Saint of Calcutta* (New York: Doubleday Religion, 2007).

¹⁷⁵ Mitropolit Ilarion Alfeev, *Духовный мир преподобного Исаака Сирина*, online, available: <http://hilarion.ru/works/bookpage/russian/sirin>

¹⁷⁶ Cf. S.T. Joshi, ed., *Icons of Unbelief: Atheists, Agnostics, and Secularists* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2008), 9.

¹⁷⁷ Charles Bradlaugh, *A Plea for Atheism*, online, available: http://www.infidels.org/library/historical/charles_bradlaugh/plea_for_atheism.html

had no intention of doing so. Instead, in my opinion, his main message was directed toward the experience of people, particularly Christians, who might experience abandonment by God in their lives. AB also tried to show Christians the roots of atheism and how they must care for atheists, remembering their responsibility to be a model for atheists as well as acting humanely towards them. This is why AB reinforced Christ's Godlessness as an experience that goes even beyond the experience of atheists. On the other hand, in some cases even Christians can learn from atheists how to be humane in how they relate with other people.

I think the contribution of AB's approach in this matter serves as a reminder to Christians of the need to be humane in how they relate with other people, with the ultimate example being Christ. We have already seen how often and boldly AB emphasized the humanity of Christ. AB did not, however, focus on the humanity of Christ at the expense of the Divine nature. I think AB's contribution lies in his preservation of the balance between Divine and human in his theology, as seen in the various examples discussed above. AB also provided a strong reminder for listeners and readers to not overemphasize one aspect at the expense of the other.

3. God-forsakenness and God's faith in the human person. One of the most original concepts in AB's theology outside of the "atheistic Christ" is the link between the God-forsakenness of Christ and God's faith in the human person. In the third chapter, we saw examples of AB's terminology, including "solidarity of God" and "God's faith in the human person." AB used this terminology not only to get the attention of his listeners, but also as part of his kenotic theology, making it an expression of one of the main

principles of the Christian faith. God shared with people their Godless condition, which is death. Christ did not turn away from God, as Adam did but, being pure, took upon Himself human Godlessness, which is sin, and experienced God-forsakenness and its consequence – death. In all this He neither rejected His Father nor turned away from the people who killed Him, but instead remained faithful to both of them. Beyond this, His experience of God-forsakenness became not only the ultimate act of God’s love for the human race, but also of His faith in humanity. “‘My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me’ is the cry of Him who has willed to share with us everything, even our loss of God, because He wants to share all that is our life, because of love, and because of faith. Not only does He love us, but He has faith in us, that all won’t be in vain.”¹⁷⁸ We saw in the previous chapters that AB did not consider the God-forsakenness of Christ to be a demonstration of His genuine humanity. In order to become a human, Christ did not have to experience Godlessness, because Godlessness was not a part of human nature at creation. Rather, Godlessness became a part of the human experience as a result of sin. Christ freely and out of love accepted this experience.

As we saw earlier, AB considered the event on the cross to be a Divine-human event. Christ is the “royal road” of unity between the human being and God. In His kenotic descent, He undertook the Godless state in order to share with humans their consequence of sin, which is death. God did not wait for humans to return to Him, but became human and within Himself brought unity and salvation to all people. This act of God did not only reveal His love to humans, but also revealed His faith in humans. We

¹⁷⁸ Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *On Forgiveness: July 19, 1970*, online, available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_130.htm

saw examples of the tension between love and faith in AB's theology, but concerning the event on the cross we can see that God's faith in the human being is based upon God's love, which is the foundation for faith. AB's emphasis on faith can be explained by referring to the context of the lives of his listeners, especially, but not exclusively, those who lived in the USSR. Communist militant atheism not only tried to destroy faith in God, but also faith in the human being, replacing faith with the ideology of the Party and the individual with collectivism. That is why AB on various occasions focused on the God-forsakenness of Christ in order to show that Christ:

- Shared the same atheistic condition (in an etymological sense), so that all people who lived in the atheistic state could find in Christ a brother who, in solidarity with them, did not abandon His people in despair. Rather, He entered Hades – the place where God is not and experienced human “atheism,” and His experience became even deeper than one atheists can experience. Focusing on the example of Christ, AB showed that people who were living in the external atheistic state had to remain faithful and not allow this Godlessness to enter into their spiritual life. Here we might see a parallel between AB's distinction between physical and spiritual death. Spiritual death is the most dangerous and it was destroyed on the cross by Christ's descent into Hades;

- Did not abandon the people who killed Him. This is the ultimate example of God's love for people: He did not turn away from His creation, as Adam did in his sin, when he turned away from the Creator. God came first to the people who abandoned Him, took sin upon Himself and reunited God and human nature in One Person;

- Did not abandon His Father with Whom He lost contact, but remained faithful to Him. In this act Christ showed that humans could be faithful to God. This is a

foundation for the ascetical life, especially in moments of despair and darkness, when a person might subjectively experience abandonment by God;

- Expressed faith in the human being. This act of God is not only an example or illustration of the boundless love of God or moral example for Christians to follow, but first and foremost a way of life. Christ in His humanity showed humans their own value, what human beings are in the eyes of God, and what they are called to be. Christ's humanity is a revelation of human theosis – the process of becoming one with God. The starting point for a person on the journey of theosis is to rediscover faith in oneself. The foundation of God's faith in a human being is God's kenotic love revealed on the cross of Christ. God's faith gives a person a foundation upon which to believe in oneself and for people to believe in themselves and in others.

Contribution of Anthony Bloom

In AB's theology we rarely find references to liturgical texts, interpretation of icons or citations of the Fathers. Yet, if we look at the liturgical texts of Great Lent or the Anaphora of St. Basil the Great, we can find many references to the kenosis of Christ and other kenotic elements.

Of course there are exceptions in AB's theology, but overall in his main statements he referred most often to the Scriptures, especially the New Testament. And above all he referred to experience, his own or those of other people's. In this, AB's approach is unusual for a theologian and hierarch of the Orthodox Church. Professor

Alexei Ilych Osipov¹⁷⁹ of the Moscow Theological Academy criticized AB for his emphasis on experience in theology:

In his [theology], everything turns around himself: 'I said,' 'I was told,' 'someone came to me,' 'my advice is so-and-so,' 'I replied.' This is quite peculiar. I am certainly not a psychologist. However, I believe that there is something suspicious when 'everything is turning around myself.' Metropolitan Anthony spoke a lot about love, but how is it to be gained? And what is Christian love? He points to sacrifice. My cat, I think, is not less sacrificial. In protecting its own kittens it jumps even at dogs. Sacrifice is good, especially for people when they know: I am as strong as I am sacrificial. Nevertheless, how to gain Christian love? What is this? I was not able to find answers to these questions in the writings of Vladyka [Master] Anthony.¹⁸⁰

Despite the emotional, shallow and primitive critique of AB's thought, there is a strikingly negative and suspicious approach to personal experience as such. It is indeed rare in Eastern Christian theology to refer to experience, which is why AB repeated many times in his talks that he does not preach Orthodoxy, but the Gospel.¹⁸¹ If we compare this statement to the words of Prof. Osipov we can see their different approaches. The popularity of AB's books is based on his simple, personal and lively way of presenting different topics about Christ, salvation, and Church life. He used a

¹⁷⁹ See Osipov's Web-site, online, available: <http://www.aosipov.ru/>

¹⁸⁰ "У него все крутится вокруг себя: 'я сказал', 'мне сказали', 'ко мне пришли', 'мой совет такой-то', 'я отвечал' и все непрерывно вокруг себя. Странное дело. Я конечно не психолог, но мне кажется, что есть что-то подозрительное, когда 'все вращается вокруг меня'. Митрополит Антоний много говорит о любви, а как она приобретается? А что такое христианская любовь? Он указывает на жертвенность. Но кошка моя, я думаю, не менее жертвенна. Она набрасывается даже на собак, защищая своих котят. Жертвенность хороша, особенно на людях, когда люди узнают, какой я жертвенный, тут я силен. Как все же приобретается христианская любовь? Что это такое? Ответа на эти вопросы я у владыки Антония не нашел." Aleksei Il'ich Osipov, *О трудах архимандрита Софрония Сахарова, митрополита Антония Сурожского и протоиерея Александра Шмемана*, online, available: <http://af0n.ru/Afon-palomnichestvo.Russkaya-Nedelya.Aleksej-Ilich-Osipov-o-trudah-arhimandrita-Sofroniya-Saharova-mitropolita-Antoniya-Surozhsk>

¹⁸¹ This does not mean, of course, that AB did not hold some strong opinions about the superiority of certain Orthodox positions. In most of his talks, however, he tried to focus on the message of the Gospel rather than on confessional emphases.

contemporary idiom, so that he was well accepted and understood by his listeners. His theology is good for both seekers of God and Christians who live in the faith. Unlike Osipov, I find that the emphasis on the personal in AB's kenotic approach is the strongest aspect and the one that draws so many people to an encounter with Christ.

Another contemporary author, Archimandrite Rafail (Karelin)¹⁸² criticized AB for his broad understanding of salvation as being possible even beyond Christian faith. He was criticized also for his understanding of prayer not as "talking" to God, but as listening to God.¹⁸³ Karelin also turned to an emotional critique of AB's theology, calling him a "theosophising liberal."¹⁸⁴

In contemporary postmodern society with its relativism in human relationships; with its hedonism that locks humans into their own egoism and individualism; with its agnostic conceptions of God, many feel lost and lonely as if they are abandoned by God. I believe AB's kenotic theology has something to offer these people. First of all, a human being has to rediscover love for oneself. AB made a clear distinction between egoism and a true understanding of love for oneself as a foundation for love of God and others. This love for oneself is based on faith in oneself and again, AB made a distinction between faith in oneself and self-esteem. We saw that AB moved from the merely psychological level to the spiritual level and understood faith in a human being

¹⁸² Archimandrite Rafail Karelin is a Georgian contemporary theologian. See his web-site: <http://karelin-r.ru/>

¹⁸³ Archimandrite Rafail Karelin, *Тайна спасения: Беседы о духовной жизни* (Moscow: Moskovskoe Podvor'e Sviato-Troitskoï Sergievoï lavry, 1999), online, available: <http://lib.eparhia-saratov.ru/books/16r/rafail/secret/6.html>

¹⁸⁴ Archimandrite Rafail Karelin, *Вопросы и ответы*, online, available: <http://karelin-r.ru/faq/answer/1000/1766/index.html>

as the deepest place of encounter. Parents or other people are the first “places” of revealing such faith in a human being. With a lack of faith, a human being can turn to God, who demonstrated in Jesus Christ the unconditional love and faith. With rediscovered love and faith in oneself, a human being finds the dignity and image of God in oneself.

Second, with a rediscovered image, a human being is called “to become oneself, to be free.” In order to “become oneself,” a human being is called to become, as God wants him to be. This is a vocation to theosis, but to reach this is only possible through a kenotic way of life which, following the path of Christ, goes through moments of God’s presence and joy, but also through moments of darkness and the absence of God. The main difference between these moments of God’s absence and the moments “before” conversion, lies in the awareness of Someone. Before his conversion a human being does not know Who is lacking in his life, but now he knows that God is absent. Here we see some similarity with God-forsakenness. Christ, despite the absence of God, remained faithful to the Father. The human being in such a state has to look at one’s life and if there is a sin or something else that is not allowing God to be present, then he or she has to change and turn back to God. If the human being is not in sin, then he has to be patient and wait for God, because in this case His absence can be an opportunity to grow into a deeper relationship.

Third, in the kenotic way of life towards theosis, there are Sacraments as “places” of the encounter with God and help in the moments of tribulation. Through Christ’s Humanity, God consecrated matter and now Christians can take part in the life of the Trinity through the Sacraments.

Fourth, I believe AB's kenotic theology offers for Christians a practical tool for life with God and other people. In both cases, it is based on faith in the other person. God believes in me, so I can believe in the other person. If I believe in the other person, then the other person can believe in himself and in God. Faith in the other is based on humility and readiness to sacrifice oneself. Of course, such faith in the other person cannot be naïve and it does not mean being fully trustful. It has to be based on the conviction that despite the sins of a human being there remains the image of God.

There are some elements common to a relationship with God and one with other people, such as moments of dryness, absence, and abandonment and, as a result, loneliness. What does a human being need to do in these moments when he personally experiences or sees these experiences of other people? In both cases one needs to follow the example of Christ. In the first case, one needs to remain faithful to previously made promises and to follow other advice presented in the fourth chapter. In the second case, a human being has to be ready to descend together with Christ into the Hades of this person. Here we might see a similarity with Confession, but AB did not limit this kenotic approach only to the role of a priest during Confession, but applied it to all Christians. Christ gave an ultimate example of solidarity with God and with people, so Christians are called to be present in solidarity with other people in their difficult moments.

The purpose of this dissertation was to explain the kenotic theology of AB. My research neither pretended to exhaust this theme nor to evaluate his approach, but rather to give a first view into the rich inheritance of AB. I chose kenotic theology as the

foundation and tool for my presentation of his theology, because I believe this to be the key to his entire legacy. I used kenoticism as a hermeneutic lens to examine the theoretical and practical elements of kenotic theology.

In Chapter I, I presented a short history of kenotic theology and the main Western and Russian kenoticists of the nineteenth-twentieth centuries. I devoted more space to the Russian kenoticists and their understanding of kenosis, because I believe there are links with and influences upon AB's kenotic approach.

The next two Chapters provided the theoretical background to AB's kenotic theology. In Chapter II, using AB's kenotic "key," namely, God-forsakenness, I presented in detail the kenotic life of Christ, Mary, John the Baptist and the Apostles. Chapter III explored the main anthropological ideas in AB's kenotic theology: the solidarity of Christ and God's faith in the human person. Then, I proceeded to the creation of the first couple, the Original sin, and salvation in Christ. In that chapter, I demonstrated the originality of AB's kenotic theology – especially his understanding of Original sin and its consequence – death as Godlessness. And I finished with AB's understanding of the dialogue between Christianity and atheism.

The next two chapters aimed to consider the practical applications of the kenotic theology. Chapter IV explored the possible roots for AB's kenotic approach in theology and ecclesiology. AB extended his understanding of kenosis onto the Church and the Sacraments as the "places" to practically apply kenotic theology. In the last section of that chapter, I chose AB's understanding of the life of a priest's wife as an example of the kenotic life put into practice.

In Chapter V, I looked at the application of kenotic theology in the relationship

between God and a human person; kenosis in human relationship; God's faith in the other person; human beings' faith in each other; and, faith in oneself. I also explored the way AB saw difficulties in prayer and the experience of the absence of God with regard to his dual understanding of God-forsakenness. I also reflected upon the practical advice he offers concerning what to do in moments of Divine absence. In the final section of the last chapter I contrasted AB's kenotic theology with that of Fr. Sophrony Sakharov. I wanted the reader to see the general differences between their approaches in order to demonstrate the originality of AB.

As was mentioned in the Introduction, the intention of this research was to present the kenotic theology of AB using a thematic method. It was not my intention to do a discursive analysis and evaluation of his theology, although this will eventually have to be done. Indeed, I hope my research may contribute to this future endeavor. It is necessary to give answers not only to the questions "What?" and "Why?" but also, "Is it true?" In my research, I only touched upon certain elements that might facilitate a response to this ultimate question. A future dissertation could more systematically undertake the question of analyzing AB's "occasional utterances" discursively.

As we have seen in this dissertation, the themes of God-forsakenness and God's faith in the human person are intertwined and together constitute the foundation for his theology. AB was a great preacher and his intention was not to create a new theological system or invent new ideas, but rather to deliver to the listeners the Good News of God's love. His style reminds one of the style of great preachers (for example John Chrysostom) in the history of the Church who were able to transfer theoretical knowledge into practical advice with homily, sermon and discourse as the main methods

of communication. AB's message has the same immediacy as that which we often find in the works of the Fathers.

AB did not neglect systematic theology, and those who knew him personally often saw him reading all kinds of theological books. He knew personally many theologians and philosophers with whom he debated and discussed various topics, but first and foremost he believed that theology has to be grounded in reality and reflect the experience of real people. This is exactly what we see in his teaching of the kenotic Incarnation of Christ: God became a *human* reality, humbled Himself taking the state of sinfulness upon Himself – which AB called Godlessness – died and rose from the dead. Thus, his followers, seeing such an example of Divine humility, would follow Him in their own kenotic way of life.

I hope that the numerous quotations translated here for the first time from Russian to English will spark future translators to bring to the English-speaking world the “self-emptying” fullness of AB's “knowledge of God.” And finally, I hope as well that my work will motivate future readers toward a deeper exploration of the theology of Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh.

APPENDIX

Brief Biographical Sketch of Metropolitan Anthony Bloom

by Andrew Walker¹

Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, the senior bishop in the Russian Orthodox Patriarchal Church and the head of the Russian Church in Great Britain and Ireland, was the single most influential voice of the Orthodox tradition in the British Isles.

André Borisovich Bloom, priest: born Lausanne, Switzerland 19 June 1914; clothed a monk 1943, taking the name Anthony; ordained priest 1948; Priest, Russian Orthodox Church in Paris 1948; Chaplain to Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius, London 1948-50; Vicar, Russian Orthodox Parish in London 1950-2003; appointed hegumen 1953, archimandrite 1956; Bishop of Sergievo 1957-62; Archbishop of Sourozh and Head of the Russian Orthodox Patriarchal Church in Great Britain and Ireland 1962-2003; Metropolitan of Sourozh 1966-2003; Exarch of the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia in Western Europe 1963-74; died London 4 August 2003.

Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, the senior bishop in the Russian Orthodox Patriarchal Church and the head of the Russian Church in Great Britain and Ireland, was the single most influential voice of the Orthodox tradition in the British Isles.

¹ Obituary of Metropolitan Anthony by Andrew Walker, "Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh: Charismatic Head of the Russian Orthodox Church in Great Britain and Ireland," *The Independent*, 9 Aug. 2003, online, available: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/metropolitan-anthony-of-sourozh-548558.html?service=Print>

A charismatic figure, with a palpable spiritual presence, he was cast more in the mould of a Staretz (a holy man of great spiritual insight and wisdom) than a career bishop responsible for the administration and pastoral oversight of a diocese. With his striking dark looks, and beautifully spoken English - reprised through a French rather than a Russian accent - he would hold an audience in the palm of his hand. His gifts of communication were legendary: he never used notes or prompts, and whether he was preaching in the Russian Cathedral at Ennismore Gardens in London, giving a lecture on the Orthodox tradition at a conference, discussing Christianity with a group of students, or giving spiritual direction to an individual, he always radiated a sense of personal depth and boundless faith.

He could also be disarming. His conversation on BBC television in 1970 with the atheist Marghanita Laski would have been memorable enough for his respect of her intellectual integrity, and his undeniable charm. But it was the more remarkable for his wit, intellectual toughness, and his unconventional arguments. Instead of trying to justify his faith, for example, he told Laski that he knew that God existed, and was puzzled how she managed not to know. This unexpected turn in the conversation was typical of him and it threw her off guard.

The hallmarks of his ministry throughout his 50 years in Great Britain were pastoral sensitivity, penetrating insight as a spiritual director, and an eirenic missionary outlook. He took the view that everyone was welcome in the Church - Russian, African or indigenous Briton. And, while he was congenitally opposed to proselytising, he attracted hundreds of English converts over the years. More significantly he indelibly stamped the spirituality and theology of the Orthodox tradition upon the British religious

consciousness, influencing many thousands of British lives through personal contacts and his writings, chiefly on prayer. At the height of his fame, Gerald Priestland, the renowned BBC religious correspondent, called him “the single most powerful Christian voice in the land.”

Metropolitan Anthony had strong aversions and predilections. Despite making a significant contribution to the World Council of Churches at Delhi in 1961 he was allergic to institutional ecumenism. And while he deeply respected individual Catholics he was less than enthusiastic about Roman Catholicism. Conversely he warmed to Evangelical religion. In the early 1980s he requested a meeting with the Evangelical Alliance, and on arrival stunned them right from the start by, in the argot of Evangelicalism, “giving his personal testimony.” He told them that when he was a young teenager living in France, and a convinced atheist, he was reading St Mark’s Gospel in his room when he was aware of a personal presence which he was convinced was Christ.

This dramatic story of conversion highlights Metropolitan Anthony's existential approach to faith. He said in a published interview in 1988, “I don't know anything of metaphysical language. What we [the Orthodox] say about Christ is experiential.” While many labelled him as a mystic, he eschewed this designation, and preferred to talk of Christianity in the language of asceticism and disclosure. He genuinely believed that Eastern Orthodoxy was the simplest way to faith. The combination of simplicity in his personal life (he was completely indifferent to money and ecclesiastical *haute couture*) and his passionate commitment to the Gospel were the inner springs of his spirituality. He once said that he had never preached Russian Orthodoxy in his life, but only Christ.

This Christian for all Christians was nevertheless strongly attached to Russia. During the Soviet era, his BBC Radio talks, and his books and sermons, penetrated deep into Russian culture and were proudly accepted as the authentic voice of “Holy Russia.” When he visited the Soviet Union in person, he was overwhelmed by excited crowds eager to hear his words and just to see him. Metropolitan Anthony’s stature among the people of Soviet Russia was enhanced by the fact that he remained loyal to the Patriarchate but maintained total political independence. This unique position of a see in the Russian Diaspora was the lynchpin of the Metropolitan's realpolitik throughout the Soviet years.

The end of the Soviet empire in the early 1990s opened a new chapter in his relationship to Russia: with the easing of travel restrictions by President Boris Yeltsin, a fresh influx of émigrés found their way to his door. He welcomed them with open arms and devoted the last few years of his life trying to facilitate these post-Soviet Russians into the diocese as best he could.

One of Metropolitan Anthony’s favourite quotations was Nietzsche's aphorism that chaos gives birth to a star. It could stand as a summary of his own life. He was born André Bloom, at Lausanne in Switzerland in 1914. His father was a Russian imperial diplomat of Dutch extraction and his mother was the half-sister of the modernist composer Alexander Scriabin (and also related to Vyacheslav Molotov). While the young André admired his father, they were not really close. His mother, on the other hand, was the dominant influence in his life until her death when he was 40 years of age and already well established in Britain.

The young André missed the cataclysmic events of 1917 for at that time he was living with his parents in Persia. After sundry adventures and hardships they ended up living in Paris. His experiences as a refugee were mainly negative: his parents were living separate lives and he was the victim of bullying at school. After his dramatic conversion it was not to the priesthood he first turned but to medicine. He trained initially at the Sorbonne and then in the French Medical Corps with the outbreak of war. During the German occupation he worked as a doctor, but joined the Resistance. He took secret monastic vows and was first professed as a monk in 1943, when he adopted the name of Anthony after the founder of monasticism. And then, quite unexpectedly, he was ordained priest in 1948 and came to Britain to pastor the predominantly White Russian émigrés in London. His rise through the ecclesiastical ranks was meteoric. He became a bishop in 1957, archbishop in 1962 and the Patriarch of Moscow's exarch of Western Europe in 1963; and in 1966 was elevated to Metropolitan - the highest-ranking bishop in the Russian tradition outside the office of Patriarch.

But, like most people of genuine charisma, Metropolitan Anthony was a powerful and perplexing figure. Conservative in theology and politics, he was nevertheless totally free of sexism even to the point of daring to question the theological warrant for an exclusively male priesthood. A personalist through and through, he was an inspired visionary but had a poor grasp of administrative detail and diocesan strategy. He liked to be in control but ideologically was deeply committed to lay participation in the Church and always talked of hierarchy in terms of service rather than power. He put his money where his mouth was too, and set-up a democratically elected Assembly and

Council to run the affairs of the diocese of Sourozh in Britain which, in concert with him, it has done so until the present time.

Charismatic leaders, however, whether saints or savants, grow old and inevitably judgement falters as health and vigour fade. Towards the end of his life Metropolitan Anthony simply had more on his plate than he could manage and people expected too much of him. But one thing remains clear: he once said that no one could turn towards eternity if he has not seen in the eyes or in the face of at least one person the shining of eternal life. Metropolitan Anthony was not infallible, despite what the hagiographers will say, but he shone.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

In “Труды” [Works] of Metropolitan Anthony, Elena Maidanovich includes more than 334 items in various languages. I present here in this bibliography only the works used in this dissertation. All Online resources listed here were active at the time of submission of this dissertation.

Primary Sources:

1. Anthony, Metropolitan of Sourozh (=Bloom, Anthony). *Addresses given at the “Clergy Wives” Conference in Peterborough May 11-12 1971*. Online. Available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1971-05-11-1-E-E-T-EM04-024ClergyWives.html>
2. _____. *All Saints Sunday 25 June 1989*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_120.htm
3. _____. *After Christmas: January 13, 1985*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_151.htm
4. _____. “Body and Matter in Spiritual Life.” In *Sacrament and Image: Essays in the Christian Understanding of Man*. Ed. A. M. Allchin, London: Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. 1967. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_02.htm
5. _____. *Christ, True and Perfect Man: The Address Printed below Was Delivered at the Diocesan Conference at Effingham, Surrey, in May, 1983*. Online. Available: http://www.mitrass.ru/eng/eng_13.htm
6. _____. & Lefebvre, George, *Courage to Pray*. Translated by D. Livingstone. New York: Paulist Press, 1973.
7. _____. *Day of the Holy Spirit 19 June 1989*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_71.htm
8. _____. *Dormition of the Mother of God: 28 August, 1986*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_132.htm

9. _____. "Easter Sermon," *Souroz* 24 (1986): 1-2. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_17.htm
10. _____. *Easter Sermon, April the 11, 1999, after Reading St. John Chrysostom's Easter Message*. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_112.htm
11. _____. *Encounter*. Translated from Russian by Tatiana Wolff. London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd, 2005.
12. _____. *Essential Writings: Selected and Introduced by Gillian Crow*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 2010.
13. _____. *Eve of Epiphany 18 January, 1985*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_152.htm
14. _____. *Feasts of the Mother of God 7 November, 1972*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_45.htm
15. _____. *God and Man*. New York: Paulist Press, 1971.
16. _____. *I Believe in God*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_04.htm
17. _____. *Living Prayer*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1966. Online. Available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1966-00-00-1-E-E-B-EM02-001LivingPrayer.html>
18. _____. *Nativity of Christ, 7 January, 1990*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_99.htm
19. _____. *Nativity of the Mother of God, 21 September 1971*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_237.htm
20. _____. *On Death*. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_06.htm
21. _____. *On Forgiveness: July 19, 1970*. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_130.htm
22. _____. *On Confession: 1st sermon 12th September 1999*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_244.htm
23. _____. *On Confession: 2nd sermon 26th September 1999*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_245.htm
24. _____. *On Confession: 4th Sermon*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_252.htm

25. _____. *On Communion and Life, August 1971*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_134.htm
26. _____. *On Prayer for the Departed: September 2nd, 1989*. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_192.htm
27. _____. "On the Church: A Catechetical Exercise," *Sourozh* 48 (1992): 6-16. Online. Available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1967-00-00-0-E-F-T-EM00-018Church.html>
28. _____. *Orthodoxy (Excerpt from a Talk with Non-Orthodox)*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_106.htm
29. _____. *Palm Sunday 4 April 1993*. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_111.htm
30. _____. *Prayer and Life*. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_05.htm
31. _____. *Prayer Today 1967, September the 2d*. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_239.htm
32. _____. *Resurrection Victory: Sermon Delivered after the Vigil Service on Saturday, 29 May, 1971*. Online. Available: http://www.mitrar.ru/eng/eng_21.htm
33. _____. *Saint Mary of Egypt 16 April 1989*. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_164.htm
34. _____. *St. Thomas Sunday: April 30, 1995*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_167.htm
35. _____. *School for Prayer*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1970.
36. _____. *Sermon on Commandments, Sunday, 1st October 1989*. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_85.htm
37. _____. *Sermon on Holy Spirit 15 July 1985*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_119.htm
38. _____. *Sermon on Sunday between Ascension and Pentecost 22 May 1988*. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_118.htm
39. _____. "Some Aspects of the Doctrine of Creation: An Address Given at the Conference at Broadstairs, 1963," *Sobornost* 4:10, Winter-Spring 1964. Online. Available: http://www.mitrar.ru/eng/eng_01.htm
40. _____. *Sunday of the Cross: 18 March 1990*. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_36.htm

41. _____. *Sunday of the Cross 2 April 1989*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_108.htm
42. _____. *Sunday of the Publican and the Pharisee 1993, February 7th*. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_54.htm
43. _____. *Take-leaving: 2 September 1990*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_83.htm
44. _____. *The Church of the Councils: The Onslaught of the Intellect and the Potential of Doubt*. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/eng/eng_08.htm
45. _____. *The Comforter: Our Support and Strength for Mission*. Online. Available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1999-05-29-1-E-E-T-EM04-027ConferenceTheComforter.html>
46. _____. "The Church in the third Millennium, from an interview with Alena Maidonovich (= Elena Maidanovich)," *Russkaya Mysl'*, 8 June 2000. Online. Available: http://www.exarchate-uk.org/MA/Interview_AM.html
47. _____. *The Lord's Entry into Jerusalem, 30 March 1980*. Online. Available: http://www.mitras.ru/eng/eng_165.htm
48. _____. *The Mother of God: Sermon, preached at the University Church of Great St Mary's, Cambridge, on 19 May, 1985*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_15.htm
49. _____. "The Prayer of Intercession," *Souroz* 1 (1980): 22-33. Online. Available: http://www.mitras.ru/eng/eng_10.htm
50. _____. *The Prayers of the Liturgy 15 July 1990*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_127.htm
51. _____. *The Suffering and Death of Children: Talk to The Society of the Child Jesus in November 1971*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_14.htm
52. _____. *The True Worth of Man: A University Sermon Preached in the University Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, on October 22nd, 1967*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_03.htm
53. _____. *The Way of the Cross: Extracts from a Talk at Essex University 14 March, 1996*. Online. Available: http://www.mitras.ru/eng/eng_162.htm

54. _____. *The Whole Human Person: Body, Spirit, and Soul*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_09.htm
55. _____. *Transfiguration, and Ordination of Ian to Diakonate 19 August, 1989*, online, available: http://www.mitras.ru/eng/eng_131.htm
56. _____. *Veneration of Saint Peter's Chains 29th January, 1989*. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng/eng_52.htm
57. _____. *Who Is God?: A Sermon Preached at Great St. Mary's, the University Church, Cambridge, 18th November, 1979*. Online. Available: http://www.mitras.ru/eng/eng_153.htm
58. _____. *Worship in a Secular Society*. Online. Available: <http://web.me.com/masarchive/texts/1969-11-12-1-E-E-T-EW99-087WorshipInSecularSociety.html>
59. _____. *Беседы о вере и Церкви*. Moscow: SP Interbuk, 1991. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/besedy/a_main.htm
60. _____. *Быть православным в Англии. О Сурожской Епархии*. Online. Available: <http://www.foma.ru/article/index.php?news=2405>
61. _____. *Быть христианином*. Elektrostal: Molva, 2000. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/be/a_main.htm
62. _____. *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа: Проповеди*. Moscow: Sviato-Danilov monastyr', 1993. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/inname/a_main.htm
63. _____. *Войду в дом твой*. Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/voidu/a_main.htm
64. _____. *Воскресные проповеди*. Minks: Minskiĭ kafedralnyĭ Sviato-Dukhov sobor, 1996. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/sermons/a_main.htm
65. _____. *Дом Божий: Три беседы о Церкви*. Moscow: Put', 1995. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/dom_bozhiy/a_main.htm
66. _____. *Духовное путешествие: Размышление перед Великим Постом*. Moscow: Palomnik, 1997. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/soul_put/
67. _____. *Жизнь. Болезнь. Смерть*. Moscow: Zachatevskii monastyr', 1995.

68. ————. *Любовь всепобеждающая: Проповеди, произнесенные в России*. Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/lubov/a_main.htm
69. ————. *Может ли еще молиться современный человек?* Klin: Khristianskaia zhizn, 1999. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/molitva/a_main.htm
70. ————. *Молитва и жизнь*. Translated from English by T. Maidanovich. Riga: Balto-slavianskoe obshchestvo kul'turnogo razvitiia i sotrudnichestva, 1992. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/mol_jizn/a_main.htm
71. ————. “Мы должны нести в мир веру,” *Sibirskaiia Pravoslavnaia Gazeta* 7, 2006. Online. Available: <http://www.ihtus.ru/072006/st08.shtml>
72. ————. *Неделя апостола Фомы*. Online. Available: <http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/archive/100410.htm>
73. ————. “О свободе и Подвиге, Беседа в Москве в июне 1988,” *Chelovek* 3, 1993. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/sretenie/sret_svobod.htm
74. ————. *О встрече*. Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/sretenie/a_main.htm
75. ————. *О слышании и делании*. Moscow: Moskovskoe Podvor'e Sviato-Troitskoï Sergievoï Lavry, 1999. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/h_d/a_main.htm
76. ————. *Пастырство*. Minks: Izdatelstvo Belorusskogo Ekzarkhata, 2005.
77. ————. *Проповеди и беседы*. Moscow: Libris, 1991. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/prop/a_main.htm
78. ————. *Пути христианской жизни. Беседы*. Kyiv: Dukh i litera, 2004. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/pouty/a_main.htm
79. ————. *Радость покаяния*. Online. Available: <http://mitras.ru/pokayanie/pokayanie.htm>
80. ————. *Таинство любви: Беседа о христианском браке*. Saint-Petersburg: Satis, 1994.
81. ————. *Труды*. Moscow: Praktika, 2002. Online. Available: <http://www.practica.ru/Ma>.
82. ————. *Труды. Книга вторая*. Moscow: Praktika, 2007.

83. ————. *Учитесь молиться*. Translated from English by T. Maidanovich. Moscow: Zachat'evskii monastyr', 1999. Online. Available: http://mitras.ru/uchites/a_main.htm
84. ————. “Уверенность в невидимом,” *Moskovskii Psikhoterapevticheskii Zhurnal* 4, 2004.
85. ————. *Человек перед Богом*. Moscow: Praktika, 2006. Online. Available: http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/pered/a_main.htm
86. Official site of Metropolitan Anthony Bloom: <http://mitras.ru>
 =<http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru> and <http://mitras.ru/eng>
 =<http://www.metropolit-anthony.orc.ru/eng>

Secondary Sources

1. Alfeev, Metropolitan Hilarion. *Православное богословие на рубеже столетий*. Moscow: Krutitskoe podvor'e, 1999, online, available: <http://www.lib.eparhia-saratov.ru/books/09i/ilarion/bogoslovie/67.html#s1>
2. ————. “Богословие митрополита Сурожского Антония в свете святоотеческого Предания.” In Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, *Труды*. Moscow: Praktika, 2002, 12-23.
3. Arjakovsky, Antoine. A. *Журнал Путь (1925—1940): Поколение русских религиозных мыслителей в эмиграции*. Kiev: Feniks, 2000. English translation: Antoine Arjakovsky, *The Way: Religious Thinkers of the Russian Emigration in Paris and their Journal*. Translated by Jerry Ryan, Michael Plekon and John Jillions, eds. UND Press, forthcoming, 2012.
4. Baillie, Donald. *God Was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement*. New York: Scribner's, 1948.
5. Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *Mysterium Paschale. The Mystery of Easter*. Translated by Aidan Nichols, O.P. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1994.
6. ————. *Theo-Drama*, VIII vols. Translated by Graham Harrison. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1990.

7. Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics*, vol. IV/1: The Doctrine of Reconciliation, eds. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Edinburg: T & T Clark, 1956.
8. Bauckham, Richard "Jürgen Moltmann." In *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*. 3rd ed. Edited by David F. Ford and Rachel Muers. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005, 147-163.
9. Behr-Sigel, Elisabeth. *Discerning the Signs of the Times: The Vision of Elisabeth Behr-Sigel*. Edited by Michael Plekon and Sarah E. Hinlicky. Translated by Lyn Breck ... [et al.]. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.
10. Berdyaev, Nicolas. *The Destiny of Man*. New York: Harper Trochbooks, 1960.
11. Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *The Cost of Discipleship*. Revised and unabridged edition containing material not previously translated. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1958.
12. _____. *Ethics*. Edited by Eberhard Bethge. Translated by Neville Horton Smith. London: Collins, 1964.
13. Bradlaugh, Charles. *A Plea for Atheism*. Online. Available: http://www.infidels.org/library/historical/charles_bradlaugh/plea_for_atheism.html
14. Bruce, Alexander B. *The Humiliation of Christ*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub, 1905, 1955.
15. Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.
16. Bulgakov, Sergius. *The Comforter*. Translated by Boris Jakim. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub, 2004.
17. _____. *The Lamb of God*. Translated by Boris Jakim. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub, 2008.
18. _____. *Автобиографические заметки*. Paris, 1946.
19. _____. *Невеста Агнца. О Богочеловечестве*. Vol. III. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1945.
20. _____. *Свет не вечерний*. Moscow: Respublika, 1994.
21. _____. *Тихие думы*. Moscow: Respublika, 1996.
22. _____. *Утешитель*, Paris: YMCA, 1936.

23. Coakley, Sarah. "What Does Chalcedon Solve and What Does It Not." In Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall S. J., and Gerald O'Collins S.J. eds., *The Incarnation: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Incarnation of the Son of God*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2002, 143-163.
24. Crow, Gillian. *This Holy Man. Impressions of Metropolitan Anthony*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2005.
25. Crum, Winston F. "Sergius N. Bulgakov: From Marxism to Sophiology," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 27:3, (1983).
26. Dawe, Donald G. "A Fresh Look at the Kenotic Christologies," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 15 (1962): 343-344.
27. Dietz, Walter R. "Atheism." In *Religion Past & Present: Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*, ed. H. D. Betz, [4th ed., English ed.]. Leiden: Brill, 2007/2009.
28. Drozdov, Archbishop Theophan. The Patristic Teaching on Original Sin. *Russkoe Pravoslavie*. 3:20, (2000), 20.
29. Edwards, Paul. "Atheism." In *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Donald M. Borchert, Editor in Chief, 2nd ed., Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2006.
30. Erin, Dimitrii. "Духовно-нравственные идеалы христианской жизни по трудам митрополита Антония Сурожского (Блюма (Блума))." Unpublished thesis at Saint-Petersburg Orthodox Spiritual Academy in 2004.
31. Evans, C. Stephen. "Introduction: Understanding Jesus the Christ as Human and Divine." In *Exploring Kenotic Christology: The Self-Emptying of God*, ed., C. Stephen Evans. Oxford: University Press, 2006, 1-24.
32. Evdokimov, Paul. *Woman and the Salvation of the World: A Christian Anthropology on the Charisms of Women*. Translated by Anthony P. Gythiel. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994.
33. Gavriilyuk, Paul L. "The Kenotic Theology of Sergius Bulgakov," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 58 (3) (2005): 251-269. Online. Available: http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FSJT%2FSJT58_03%2FS0036930605001390a.pdf&code=ebb1ad992ae380d17005a5003ed21b36
34. Gorodetzky, Nadejda. *The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1938.

35. Groth, Bernd. "Atheism." In *Dictionary of Fundamental Theology*, René Latourelle, Rino Fisichella, English-language ed. New York: Crossroad, 1994.
36. Gregory of Nazianzus, *First Letter to Cledonius* 101.32, (PG 37:469). Online. Available: http://ecmarsh.com/fathers/npnf2/NPNF2-07/Npnf2-07-59.htm#P6026_2072851
37. Fedotov, George. P. *The Russian Religious Mind*. Belmont, Mass.: Nordland Pub. Co., 1975.
38. Feenstra, Ronald J. *Trinity, Incarnation, and Atonement: Philosophical and Theological Essays*, (eds.) Ronald J. Feenstra, Cornelius Jr. Plantinga, Library of Religious Philosophy, 1. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
39. Feuerbach, Ludwig. *Sämtliche Werke*. Bänden 10. Leipzig: Verlag von Otto Wigand, 1866.
40. Florovsky, Georges. *Creation and Redemption*, vol. 3., in *Collected Works*. Belmont: Nordland Publishing Company, 1976.
41. _____. "The Lamb of God." *Scottish Journal of Theology*. 4:1951.
42. Ford, David F., ed. *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology in the Twentieth Century*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1997.
43. Forsyth, Peter Taylor. *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*. London: Independent Press, 1955.
44. Frank, S. A. *Solovyev Anthology*. London, 1950.
45. Galadza, Peter., ed. *The Divine Liturgy: An Anthology for Worship*. Ottawa: Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern Christian Studies, 2004.
46. _____. "The Holy Spirit in Eastern Orthodox Worship: Historical Enfleshments and Contemporary Queries." In *The Spirit in Worship – Worship in the Spirit*, ed. Teresa Berger, New York: Pueblo, 2009, 115-140.
47. Gess, Wolfgang Friedrich. *Das Dogma von Christi Person und Werk*. Basel: C. Detloff, 1887.
48. Gusev. V, ed. *Житие протопопа Аввакума им самим написанное*. Moscow, 1960.

49. Hall, Francis J. *The Kenotic Theory*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1898.
50. Hryniewicz, Waław. *Chrystus nasza Pascha. Zarys chrześcijańskiej teologii paschalnej*. III vols. Lublin: Towarzystwo naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1982.
51. Huidekoper, Frederic. *The Belief of the First Three Centuries Concerning Christ's Mission in the Underworld*. Boston, 1954.
52. Irenaeus of Lyons, Saint. *Against Heresies*. Book V. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001. Online. Available: <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/augustine/arch/irenaeus/advhaer5.txt>
53. Iuzhakov, Roman Mikhailovich "Русское Православие в Англии: Николай Зернов и Антоний Сурожский," *Russkii Mir* 2 (2000). Online. Available: <http://www.russkymir.ru/out.php?cat=23&did=495>
54. Jillions, John A. "Self-love." *Sourozh* 65, Aug 1996, 1-13.
55. Joshi, S.T., ed. *Icons of Unbelief: Atheists, Agnostics, and Secularists*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2008.
56. Karelin, Archimandrite Rafail. *Тайна Спасения: Беседы о Духовной Жизни*. Moscow: Moskovskoe Podvor'e Sviato-Troitskoĭ Sergievoĭ lavry, 1999. Online. Available: <http://lib.eparhia-saratov.ru/books/16r/rafail/secret/6.html>
57. _____. *Вопросы и Ответы*. Online. Available: <http://karelin-r.ru/faq/answer/1000/1766/index.html>
58. Khazanov, Boris. *About Metropolitan Anthony. Memory of the Heart. The Light from His Candle, August 2010*. Online. Available: <http://masarchive.org/>
59. Khrapovitsky, Antonii. *Догмат искупления*. Sremskie Karlovtsy, 1926.
60. Kolodiejchuk, Brian., ed. *Mother Teresa: Come Be My Light - The Private Writings of the Saint of Calcutta*. New York: Doubleday Religion, 2007.
61. Kovalev, Ioann. "Проповеднические труды Митрополита Антония (Блума)." Unpublished thesis at Saint-Petersburg Orthodox Spiritual Academy in 2004.
62. Kniazeff, A. "L'Institute Saint-Serge. De l'Académie d'autrefois au rayonnement d'aujourd'hui." *Le Point Théologique* 14. Paris, 1974.

63. Krioukov, Maxim O. "The Nature and Purpose of Marriage in Metropolitan Anthony (Bloom) of Sourozh." Unpublished thesis at Saint Tikhon's Orthodox Theological Seminary in South Canaan, Pennsylvania in 2001.
64. Kyrlezhev, A. "Митрополит Антоний Сурожский – 'заезжий православный миссионер' в России." *Kontinent* 82 (1994), 220-236.
65. Leskov, N. S. *Соборяне*, vol. 4. Moscow: Khud. lit., 1957.
66. Lossky, Vladimir. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Cambridge & London, 1957, 1973.
67. _____. *Спор о Софии*. Paris: Bratstvo sv. Fotiia, 1936.
68. _____. *Orthodox Theology: An Introduction*. Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1978.
69. Makar, Protopresbiter Nikolai. "Антропология В. Н. Лосского и Митрополита Антония Сурожского." In *Пути Просвещения и Свидетели правды: Личность. Семья. Общество*, ed. K. Sigov. Kiev: Dukh i litera, 2004, 177-184.
70. Makarov, Пуа. "Пастырское служение по трудам митрополита Антония (Блума)." Unpublished thesis at Saint-Petersburg Orthodox Spiritual Academy in 2004.
71. McGrath, Alister E., ed. *The Christian Theology Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.
72. Men, Aleksandr. *Вестники Царства Божия: Библейские пророки от Амоса до Рестаuration (VIII-IV вв. до н.э.)*. Vol. 5. Moscow: SP "Slovo," 1992. Online. Available: http://www.gumer.info/bogoslov_Buks/History_Church/Men_IsRel_05/_15.php
73. Meyendorff, John, *Byzantine Theology. Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1974.
74. _____. "Theology in the Thirteenth Century: Methodological Contrasts." In *The 17th International Byzantine Congress: Major Papers*, ed. A.D. Caratzas, New Rochelle, NY, 1986, 669-682.
75. Mikhailov, Petr. *Богословский метод митрополита Антония Сурожского*. Online. Available: <http://www.bogoslov.ru/text/1246631.html>

76. Moltmann, Jürgen. "The 'Crucified God': God and the Trinity Today." In *New Questions on God*, edited by J. B. Metz. New York: Herder & Herder, 1972, 31-35.
77. Moss, Vladimir. *The Mystery of Redemption*. St. Michael's Press, 2007. Online. Available:
http://www.orthodoxchristianbooks.com/downloads/163_THE_MYSTERY_OF_REDEMPTION.pdf.
78. Norris, Richard. Translated and ed. *The Christological Controversy*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
79. Osipov, Aleksei Il'ich. *О Трудах Архимандрита Софрония Сахарова, Митрополита Антония Сурожского и Протоиерея Александра Шмемана*. Online. Available: <http://afon.ru/Afon-palomnichestvo.Russkaya-Nedelya.Aleksej-Ilich-Osipov-o-trudah-arhimandrita-Sofroniya-Saharova-mitropolita-Antoniya-Surozhsk>
80. Pain, James, and Zernov, Nicolas eds. *A Bulgakov Anthology*. London: SPCK, 1976.
81. Parenta, Milosh. *Herald of the Serbian Orthodox Patriarchate*, 1926, N II (1/14 June), 168-174 (10-34) (Original in Serbian).
82. Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, *The Longer Catechism of The Orthodox, Catholic, Eastern Church*. Online. Available:
http://www.pravoslaviето.com/docs/eng/Orthodox_Catechism_of_Philaret.htm#ii.xv.iii.i.p41
83. Plekon, Michael. "Always Everyone Together for One and the Same Thing" – *The Ecclesial and Sacramental Vision of Nicholas Afanasiev*. Online. Available: <http://www.kiev-orthodox.org/site/english/1561/>
84. Protoevangelium of James. Online. Available:
<http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0847.htm>
85. Quash, Ben. "Hans Urs von Balthasar." In *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*. 3rd ed. Edited by David F. Ford and Rachel Muers. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005, 106-125.
86. Reid, J. P., Mondin, B. eds, "Atheism." In *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Catholic Church & Catholic University of America, 2nd ed., Detroit: Thomson/Gale, 2003.
87. Richard, Lucien Joseph. *Christ: The Self-Emptying of God*. New York: Paulist Press, 1997.

88. ————. *A Kenotic Christology: In The Humanity of Jesus Christ, The Compassion of Our God*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982.
89. Robinson, J. A. T. *The Human Face of God*. Philadelphia, 1973.
90. Rytsar, Roman. Review of “Духовное наследие митрополита Антония Сурожского: Материалы первой Международной конференции 28-30 сентября 2007 г. Москва.” *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*, Vol. 51:1-2 (2010), 107-111. Online. Available: <http://www.kiev-orthodox.org/site/english/2294/>
91. ————. Review of *This Holy Man. Impressions of Metropolitan Anthony*, by Gillian Crow. *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*. 47:3-4 (2006), 134-138. Online. Available: <http://www.kiev-orthodox.org/site/english/2293/>
92. ————. Review of *Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh: Essential Writings Selected and Introduced by Gillian Crow*, by Gillian Crow. *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*. 52:1-2 (2011), 173-174. Online. Available: <http://www.kiev-orthodox.org/site/english/3197/>
93. Sakharov, Archimandrite Sophrony. *We Shall See Him As He Is*. Translated from Russian by Rosemary Edmonds. Essex: Stavropegic Monastery of St. John the Baptist, 2004.
94. ————. *On Prayer*. Translated from Russian by Rosemary Edmonds. Essex: Stavropegic Monastery of St. John the Baptist, 1996.
95. ————. *Saint Silouan the Athonite*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1999.
96. Sakharov, Nicholas V. *I Love, Therefore I Am: The Theological Legacy of Archimandrite Sophrony*. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2002.
97. Schilling, S. P. *God in an Age of Atheism*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969.
98. Schmemmann, Alexander. *Ultimate Questions: An Anthology of Modern Russian Religious Thought*. London: Mowbray, 1977.
99. ————. *For the Life of the World*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1973.
100. Shubina, Iuliya. “Миссионерское значение трудов Митрополита Антония Сурожского для формирования мотивации на уроках Основ православной культуры.” Unpublished thesis at St. Tikhon’s Orthodox University in Moscow 2003.

101. Sigov, Konstantin, ed. *Пути просвещения и свидетели правды: Личность. Семья. Общество*. Kiev: Dukh i litera, 2004.
102. Solovyov (=Soloviev), Vladimir. *Lectures on Divine Humanity*. revised and edited by Boris Jakim. Hudson, N.Y.: Lindisfarne Press, 1995.
103. Stashkiv, Iryna. "Сотеріологія Антонія, Митрополита Сурозького." Unpublished thesis at Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv 2004.
104. Tareev, Mikhail M. "Искушения Богочеловека, как единый искупительный подвиг всей земной жизни Христа, в связи с историею дохристианских религий и христианской Церкви." Th.D. diss., Moscow: Izdanie Obshchestva liubitelei dukhovnogo prosveshcheniia, 1892.
105. _____. *Основы христианства*. vol. I-IV. Moscow, 1910.
106. Thomasius, Gottfried. "Christ's Person and Work." In *God and Incarnation in Mid-Nineteenth Century German Theology*. Translated by Claude Welch. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965, 25-101.
107. Thompson, Thomas R. "Nineteenth-Century Kenotic Christology: The Waxing, Waning, and Weighing of a Quest for a Coherent Orthodoxy." In *Exploring Kenotic Christology: The Self-Emptying of God*. ed., C. Stephen Evans. Oxford: University Press, 2006, 74-111.
108. Valliere, Paul. *Modern Russian Theology: Bukharev, Soloviev, Bulgakov. Orthodox Theology in a New Key*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub, 2000.
109. _____. "M. M. Tareev: A Study in Russian Ethics and Mysticism." Th.D. diss., Columbia University, 1974.
110. Walker, Andrew. "Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh; Charismatic Head of the Russian Orthodox Church in Great Britain and Ireland," *The Independent*, 9 August 2003. Online. Available: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/metropolitan-anthony-of-sourozh-548558.html>
111. Ware, Timothy (=Kallistos). *The Orthodox Church*. London: Penguin Books, 1993.
112. _____. "Kenosis and Christ-like humility according to Saint Silouan," *Sobornost* vol. 21:2. 1999.
113. Ware, Kallistos and Mother Mary. Translated from the original Greek. *The Lenten Triodion*. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1978.

114. Williams, D. T. *Kenōsis of God: The Self-limitation of God - Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*. New York, Bloomington: iUniverse, 2009.
115. _____. "Praying Through Kenōsis." *Acta Theologica*. 2007:2, 221-233.
116. Williams, Rowan. "Eastern Orthodox Theology." In *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*. 3rd ed. Edited by David F. Ford and Rachel Muers. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005, 572-589.
117. Zacharias, Archimandrite. *Christ, Our Way and Our Life: A Presentation of the Theology of Archimandrite Sophrony*. South Canana, Pa.: St. Tikhon's Seminary Press, 2003.
118. Zander, L.A. *Бог и мир. (Созерцание отца Сергия Булгакова)*. vol. 1. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1948.
119. Zenkovsky, V. *История Русской философии*. vol. II. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1950.
120. Zernov, Nicolas M., Zernova Militsia V., ed., *За рубежом: Белград - Париж - Оксфорд: Хроника семьи Зерновых (1921-1972)*. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1973.
121. Zernov, Nicolas. *The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1963.
122. Zouboff, Peter P. *Godmanhood as the Main Idea of the Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyev*. Poughkeepsie, N.Y.: Harmon Printing House, 1944.