

Hainthaler / Mali / Emmenegger / Morozov

IMAGO DEI

Forscher aus dem Osten und Westen Europas
an den Quellen des gemeinsamen Glaubens



TYROLIA

PRO ORIENTE

PRO ORIENTE
BAND XLIII

WIENER PATRISTISCHE TAGUNGEN IX

Wiener Patristische Tagungen

Forscher aus dem Osten und Westen Europas an den Quellen des gemeinsamen Glaubens

- I. *Y. de Andia, P. L. Hofrichter* (Hgg.)
Christus bei den Vätern, *Pro Oriente* 27 (2004)
- II. *Y. de Andia, P. L. Hofrichter* (Hgg.)
Der Heilige Geist im Leben der Kirche, *Pro Oriente* 29 (2005)
- III. *Y. de Andia, P. L. Hofrichter* (Hgg.)
Gott Vater und Schöpfer, *Pro Oriente* 31 (2007)
- IV. *Th. Hainthaler, F. Mali, G. Emmenegger* (Hgg.)
Einheit und Katholizität der Kirche, *Pro Oriente* 32 (2009)
- V. *Th. Hainthaler, F. Mali, G. Emmenegger* (Hgg.)
Heiligkeit und Apostolizität der Kirche, *Pro Oriente* 35 (2010)
- VI. *Th. Hainthaler, F. Mali, G. Emmenegger* und
M. Lenkaitytė Ostermann (Hgg.)
Für uns und für unser Heil, *Pro Oriente* 37 (2014)
- VII. *Th. Hainthaler, F. Mali, G. Emmenegger* und
M. Lenkaitytė Ostermann (Hgg.)
Sophia, die Weisheit Gottes, *Pro Oriente* 40 (2017)
- VIII. *Th. Hainthaler, F. Mali, G. Emmenegger* und
M. Lenkaitytė Ostermann (Hgg.)
Pronoia, die Vorsehung Gottes, *Pro Oriente* 42 (2019)

PRO ORIENTE
BAND XLIII

WIENER PATRISTISCHE TAGUNGEN IX

IMAGO DEI

Forscher aus dem Osten und Westen Europas
an den Quellen des gemeinsamen Glaubens

Studientagung
L'viv, 12. – 14. September 2019
“Imago Dei”

Herausgegeben von
Theresia Hainthaler, Franz Mali, Gregor Emmenegger und
Alexey Morozov

TYROLIA-VERLAG · INNSBRUCK-WIEN

Mitglied der Verlagsgruppe „engagement“

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

2021

© Verlagsanstalt Tyrolia, Innsbruck

Umschlaggestaltung: Hedwig Bledl

Druck und Bindung: Alcione, Lavis (I)

ISBN 978-3-7022-3881-0

E-Mail: buchverlag@tyrolia.at

Internet: www.tyrolia-verlag.at

Inhaltsverzeichnis

<i>H. B. Sviatoslav Shevchuk</i>	
Address	9
<i>Theresia Hainthaler</i>	
Introduction	13
Early Greek Fathers	
<i>Taras Khomych</i>	
Anthropological and Ecclesiological Perspectives on <i>Imago Dei</i> in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers	29
<i>Ysabel de Andia</i>	
L'homme à l'image et à la ressemblance de Dieu chez Irénée de Lyon	44
<i>Jana Plátová</i>	
Die Lehre von der Angleichung an Gott bei Clemens von Alexan- drien und ihre Fundamente in der Schrift	66
<i>Mariya Horyacha</i>	
The Concept of Image in the Macarian Corpus	83
<i>Alexey Morozov</i>	
L'Image de Dieu comme un des arguments principaux en faveur de la résurrection charnelle dans le <i>De Resurrectione</i> de Méthode d'Olympe	101

Viacheslav V. Lytvynenko

The Image of God in Athanasius' *Contra Gentes–De Incarnatione*
and *Orationes contra Arianos* 121

Lenka Karfíková

'Let us make man after our image, as our likeness':
Origen, Marius Victorinus and Augustine on Gen 1:26f. 144

Augustine and Latin authors of the 5th century

Vittorino Grossi

L'antropologia agostiniana dell'*imago Dei* tra creazione – *concupi-*
scientia – *gratia Christi* 173

Vít Hušek

Imago Dei in Pelagius 212

Paul Mattei

Genèse 1, 26–27 dans le *De gratia* de Fauste de Riez 222

Franz Mali

„*Imaginem meam non cognosco in vobis.*“ Ist der Mensch das „Bild
Gottes“? Einige Aspekte der Anthropologie im *Opus imperfectum in*
Matthaeum 251

Cappadocian Fathers and Antiochian Theologians

Marta Przyszychowska

Is the human body part of the image of God according to Gregory
of Nyssa? 271

Karolina Kochańczyk-Bonińska

Woman—the image of God in *On the Origin of Humanity* 284

Georgiana Huian

The Human Being as Image of God according to Gregory
of Nazianzus 292

Svetoslav Ribolov

Theodore of Mopsuestia's Concept on *imago Dei* 307

Daria Morozova

'In the midst of the material and the spiritual'. Man as God's Image
in the Anthropology of Theodoret of Cyrillus 316

Daniel Buda

'You made him a little lower than the angels; you crowned him with
glory and honour.' Ps 8:5 in the Interpretation of the Antiochian
School. An alternative to Classic *Imago Dei* Anthropology? 323

Syriac Tradition

René Roux

Gen 1:26 in Early Syriac Literature: A Brief Survey 337

Dominique Gonnet

L'image de Dieu chez Jacques de Saroug 348

Theresia Hainthaler

East Syriac Fathers on *Imago Dei* 360

Late Greek Fathers and aftermath

Andrew Louth

The Doctrine of the Image of God in St Maximos the Confessor 379

Cyril Hovorun

Imago Dei, *imago Trinitatis*, and *imago Christi* according to Anasta-
sius Sinaita 395

Hilary Mooney

Created in the image of God: Reflections on the theological anthro-
pology of Eriugena 403

Adrian Podaru

Michael Psellos' Reading on κατ' εικόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν 418

Georgios Martzelos

Vernunft und Wille als ‚Ebenbild Gottes‘ im Menschen in der
griechischen und lateinischen Tradition 429

Fotos

Bilder der Tagung 444

Register

Biblische Schriften 450
Frühchristliche und anonyme Schriften 453
Antike und mittelalterliche Autoren und Personennamen 453
Moderne Autoren 456
Abkürzungen 460

H. B. Sviatoslav Shevchuk, Kyiv-Halych (Ukraine)

Address

Dear brothers and sisters in Christ,

The question of what it means to be created in God's image has led to numerous patristic interpretations and perspectives over the centuries. What does the concept of the 'image of God' have to say pastorally and practically about the uniqueness of the human person? When articulating what makes the human being particularly "human" in relation to the rest of the created order, the patristic tradition, not dissimilar to Jewish and Muslim traditions, has turned most often to the language of *imago Dei*. Of course, the classic text is Genesis 1:27, "So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God [*imago Dei*] he created them; male and female he created them." For people today, whether religious or not, new realities brought on by the rapid development of technology, artificial intelligence, and robotization challenge the basic values we hold as human beings, sometimes even influencing how we use technology in ways that are either helpful or harmful. Yet, Christianity offers deep insight into the profound reality of human existence, proclaiming that we are created by God in God's own image and given life by his own divine breath.

Of the many great Christian thinkers on this subject, from Boethius and Aquinas and the Cappadocian Fathers to Gregory Palamas and Martin Luther, Augustine of Hippo is considered the authoritative voice, second only to Sacred Scripture. Nowadays, people continue to discuss the *imago Dei* and often treat it as synonymous with another term that many take to be its secular counterpart—namely, *human dignity*. Indeed, today it is the rhetoric of human dignity more than the language of the image of God that is universal in daily speech as well as in legal, political, and public spheres. Pope Francis, himself, tends to employ the terms image of God and human dignity almost interchangeably, although he invokes human dignity more frequently than the image of God, both in ecclesial documents as well as in the public square.

From presidential addresses and International Criminal Court rulings to the Ukrainian Revolution of Dignity that stemmed from basic Christian values and unleashed a new force in Ukrainian civil society, "human dignity" has emerged as a key term in modern ethical-political vocabulary, raising ba-

sic questions about its sources, uses, and meanings. Today, it seems, everyone cares about human dignity, even if we mean different things and we care about those things in different ways. Paradoxically, advocates on both sides of a range of contemporary social and political issues—from abortion, euthanasia, and genetic engineering to torture, immigration policies, and vaccination—invoke the notion of human dignity to support their respective claims and positions.

It is hardly surprising, then, that the meaning of human dignity in present-day religious, social, and legal discourses varies greatly depending upon who appeals to it and the purposes for which it is employed. In light of this seemingly subjective use of the term human dignity, especially when used in the context of deeply controversial issues, how can its ill-informed and often unconditional usage be corrected to properly reflect the patristic *imago*? What are the ethical limits on or its potential for grounding human rights? The image of God does not simply translate directly as human dignity without losing some of its thrust of meaning.

This volume publishes the proceedings of the 9th International Colloquy ‘Imago Dei’ held September 12–14, 2019 at Patriarshyi Dim and at the UCU’s Faculty of Theology, Lviv, Ukraine. This gathering also saw the establishment of the Ukrainian Patristic Society, which unites Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant patristic scholars in the spirit of ecumenism. Following the Colloquy, organized by Prof. Theresia Hainthaler and co-organized by Dr. Roman Zaviyskyy with the assistance of Dr. Constantine Sigov, the newly created Ukrainian Patristic Society marks not only a new era of theological revival in Ukraine, but also the beginning of unprecedented development, new prospects and the potential for research in patristic scholarship of the Eastern Churches. As we anticipate further developments beyond patristic interpretations of *imago* in the context of contemporary understandings of human dignity, Christians, Catholic and Orthodox alike, are called to clarify the various interpretative issues surrounding historical understandings of the image of God and its translatability into the language of human dignity, highlighting ethical and theological facets of *imago* that the Church Fathers did not have to address.

I pray that this volume serves as a research tool for scholars and students who wish to work further in the field.

In Christ,



Kyiv, February 26, 2021

Theresia Hainthaler, Frankfurt am Main (Germany)

Introduction

Imago Dei—εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ

I. Patristic Colloquies

The Patristic Colloquia were launched in 2001 on the initiative of the patristic scholar Ysabel de Andia and the Archbishop of Vienna, Cardinal Christoph Schönborn, under the auspices of the Vienna-based ecumenical foundation PRO ORIENTE. They gathered Orthodox and Catholic patristic scholars on a European basis. At that time, the official international Orthodox-Catholic theological dialogue was interrupted (in Baltimore in 2000, while this dialogue was resumed at the end of 2005). The characteristics of the colloquia can be briefly described as academic, ecumenical and European. In 2006, I took over the academic leadership from Ysabel de Andia. The idea is that up to two scholars from each European country are present—usually between 25 and 30 participants; new and young colleagues are invited. A network of patristics scholars from East and West has emerged that can integrate young colleagues.

The series began with Trinitarian theology (Christ in the Fathers, the Holy Spirit in the Church, God the Father and Creator), which took place in Vienna in 2001 and 2003 and in Luxembourg in 2005. We continued with the *notae ecclesiae* in Romania (Mănăstirea Brâncoveanu near Făgăraș) in 2007 on unity and catholicity of the Church and in Thessaloniki (Greece) in 2009 on holiness and apostolicity of the Church, followed by “Soteriology in East and West” in Esztergom (Hungary) in 2012, and “Sophia—The Wisdom of God” in Varna (Bulgaria) in 2015. The last colloquy before 2019 in L’viv was “Pronoia—The Providence of God in East and West”, in Warsaw (Poland) in 2017. All the colloquies have been published in the series “Wiener Patristische Studien” of the PRO ORIENTE foundation.

II. The Colloquy in L’viv

From September 12 to 14, 2019, the Patristic Colloquy on “Imago Dei” took place at the Faculty of Theology of the Ukrainian Catholic University, L’viv in Ukraine. The participants had their stay at the Patriarshy Dim on the large

compound where also the Faculty of Theology and the Seminary are located. Our colleagues Daria Morozova and Constantin Sigov explored the possibilities and paved the way for this colloquy. The Dean of the Faculty, Prof. Dr. Roman Zaviyskyy, generously helped us with the preparation and during the Conference, and introduced us to the history of the Faculty in a greeting address.

In nine sessions, 25 scholars presented their papers, coming from 12 or 15 countries, such as Ukraine, France, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, Czech Lands, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Serbia, Spain, Great Britain as well as Austria, Ireland and Russia, if we count the countries of origin. In addition, we have to mention the contribution of Prof. Martzelos from Greece resp. Cyprus, who sent his text in written form, as he was unable to come to L'viv. Some participants joined us for the first time (Jana Plátová, Mariya Horyacha, Alexey Morozov, Viacheslav Lytvynenko, Ilya Bey, Adrian Podaru, Georgiana Huian).

A public Round Table on “Image of God and dignity of man”, moderated by Constantin Sigov (Kyiv), gathered the participants Daniel Buda (Romania), Sergii Bortnyk (Kyiv), Zdravko Jovanović (Serbia), Franz Mali (Switzerland), Paul Mattei (France), and Theresia Hainthaler (Germany).

A special event at the occasion of this colloquy was the gathering of Ukrainian patristic scholars, immediately after the conclusion of the Colloquy. Among them were some who participated already for quite a number of former colloquies, like Daria Morozova, Cyril Hovorun and Taras Khomych, others listened and took part in the discussion at the Colloquy. This follow-up meeting of about 15 participants from Ukraine comprised another six lectures on the same topic and led to the founding of the Ukrainian Patristic Society; they elected Cyril Hovorun as their president. The Association Internationale d'Études Patristiques – International Association for Patristic Studies (AIEP – IAPS) supported this initiative. The leadership of AIEP – IAPS welcomed explicitly the foundation in the context of the Patristic Colloquy.

Participants could join an Oriental L'viv tour, and thus learn about the heritage of Eastern religious traditions, but also of the local Christian confessions, and they could take part in Sunday liturgical celebrations in the city. The participants not only came from different European countries, but also reflected the recent ecclesiastical development in Ukraine in their jurisdictional affiliation. A good friendly atmosphere contributed to fruitful days spent together. Overall, the three dimensions of the Patristic colloquies—academic, ecumenical, and European—found their specific expression in the Colloquy in L'viv.

III. Remarks on the topic *Imago Dei*

Biblical basis

The concept of *imago Dei* is documented in Holy Scripture in the Old Testament in the Priestly source, that is Gen 1:26f., thus belonging to the latest strata of the Pentateuch, according to modern scholarship.

Gen 1:26: Then God said, “Let us make man in our **image**, after our **likeness**. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.” 27 So God created **man in his own image, in the image of God** he created him; male and female he created them.

The creation of man in the image of God in Gen 1:26f. is expressed with the two Hebrew nouns *šəlēm* and *demûta*, in Greek *eikon* and *homoiosis* (LXX: κατ’ εικόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν), in Latin *imago* and *similitudo* (*ad imaginem et similitudinem nostrum*), in Syriac *šalmō / šalmā* and *dmūtō / dmūtā*. Closely connected with the creation in the image of God is the dominion “over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.” In addition, Gen 1:27 outlines, that man was created as image of God (κατ’ εικόνα θεοῦ), in fact, male and female. Gen 5:1–2 recalls the creation of man in likeness and as male and female; at the occasion of God’s covenant with Noah, Gen 9:6 mentions that man was made in God’s image.

In the New Testament, Christ is said to be the ‘image of the invisible God’ (εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου) in Col 1:15, and ‘image of God’ (εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ) in 2Cor 4:4. Statements concerning the believers refer to the perfection in the future: they are predestined to be ‘conformed to the image of the Son of God’ (συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνας τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ) in Rom 8:29, and they will bear the ‘image of the heavenly’ (εἰκὼν τοῦ ἐπουρανίου), so 1Cor 15:49. The believers who look at the glory of the Lord are ‘transformed into the same image from glory to glory’ (τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν) in 2Cor 3:18. In 1Cor 11:7, the man is said to be the ‘image and glory of God’ (εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ), while the woman is the glory of man—an argumentation which seems strange today.¹

¹ Cf. *Chr. Marksches*, Art. Gottebenbildlichkeit, in: RGG⁴ 3 (2000) 1160–1163, here 1160: „Merkwürdig mutet heute die Argumentation mit der G(ottebenbildlichkeit) in 1Kor 11,7 an.“ For the Biblical evidence, see *J. Jervell*, art. Bild Gottes, in: TRE 6 (1980), 491–498; *idem*, *Imago Dei*. Gen 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen = FRLANT 58 (Göttingen 1960); *U. Kuhli*, art. εἰκὼν, in: EWNT I (1980) 942–949.

The Biblical texts already reveal the essential Christological dimension of our topic—which had a specific impact in the patristic literature and in the Christological controversies, too—, but we can also see the clear anthropological dimension, which is also linked to Christ, in several regards.

The Biblical foundation may arise questions like, what does the image of God refer to? To Christ, to his soul, to his body? Is it allowed to make representations of Christ, the image of the invisible God? This problem became virulent in the iconoclastic controversy of the eighth and ninth centuries. When can man be spoken of as *imago Dei*, or as in the likeness of God? To what extent do the intellect or the will of man, his body—or the woman—participate in being ‘image of God’? How do people achieve this promised divine image of God, what is contrary to it?

Such themes have been dealt with by Christian authors of Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages in a theological or philosophical way, starting with early Greek authors until Byzantine scholars.² According to Henri Crouzel, the theme ‘image of God’ “dominates Christology, anthropology and spirituality of the Greek and Latin Fathers. In it, the Bible encounters Greek philosophy.”³ In connection with Col 1:15 (“He [scl. Christ] is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation”), Crouzel put the question,

is Christ then the image of God by virtue of his twofold nature or by his divinity alone? In the first case, the human nature assumed by the Word, since it is the revelation of God, would be a visible image of the divine reality. Against this, the proponents of the second view object that God, being incorporeal, cannot have a corporeal image. Authors who ascribe to the incarnate Word the quality of the image of God are Irenaeus, Tertullian, indirectly Marius Victorinus. All others reserve it for the Word in his divinity [...] Related to this controversy is the question of where the image is to be located in man, whether in soul and body or in the soul alone.⁴

² As an introduction, besides *Chr. Marksches*, Art. Gottebenbildlichkeit, in: RGG⁴ 3 (2000) 1160–1163, see *H. Crouzel*, Art. Bild Gottes, II. Alte Kirche, in: TRE 6 (1980) 499–502 (with bibliography); *L. Scheffczyk* (ed.), *Der Mensch als Bild Gottes* (Darmstadt 1969); *idem*, Art. Gottebenbildlichkeit III.–IV., in: LThK 4 (1995) 871–878; *S. Vollenweider*, *Der Menschgewordene als Ebenbild Gottes. Zum frühchristlichen Verständnis der Imago Dei*, in: *idem*, *Horizonte neutestamentlicher Christologie. Studien zu Paulus und zur frühchristlichen Theologie*, WUNT 144 (Tübingen 2002) 53–70; *Th. Pröpfer*, *Theologische Anthropologie I* (Freiburg etc. 2011) 213–224; *P. Schwanz*, *Imago Dei als christologisch-anthropologisches Problem in der Geschichte der Alten Kirche von Paulus bis Clemens von Alexandrien* (Halle 1970).

³ *H. Crouzel*, TRE 6 (1980) 499.

⁴ *Ibid.*

Raniero Cantalamessa⁵ presented a systematization of these two lines in the patristic tradition of interpretation of Col 1:15, one followed by Irenaeus of Lyons and Antiochian theologians, according to which the image of God in Col 1:15 refers to Christ the Logos made flesh, and a second line according to which the pre-existent Logos is the image of God.

With the incarnation, the Son took on the image of man in order to restore in man the image of God. Thus, man is image of the image, created ‘in the image’ i.e. in the Son who is image. Another question is about distinguishing image and likeness. If the image of God is the Word in its divinity as most of the Church Fathers hold, then ‘image of the image’ refers to the soul alone (and not to the bodily-mental whole of man), i.e. to the *voûc*, the *mens*. Man’s participation in the image is imperfect, but dynamic, open to progress and regression. In so far as it strives to regain the perfection of the original image, it concerns the whole spiritual life of the Christian. In any case, it is the main reason for man’s greatness and dignity. All the Fathers emphasize the action of the three divine persons in the existence and unfolding of the participation in the image.⁶

IV. Ecumenical remarks on the topic Anthropology

What significance does the topic of “anthropology” have for a Catholic-Orthodox group that wants to orient itself towards ecumenical relevance from the outset? In the *Handwörterbuch Theologische Anthropologie. Römisch-katholisch – Russisch-orthodox*, we can read (in the address of Metropolitan Hilarion):

Although the teaching on man—theological anthropology—is not one of those controversial topics that divide Eastern and Western Christianity, there are also different approaches and views in this area.⁷

Addressing anthropology, then, could also be helpful for the theological dialogue between Orthodox and Catholics, a dialogue that, not least, should address and seek to explore and clarify the differences between the traditional expressions of Orthodox and Roman Catholic doctrine.

⁵ R. Cantalamessa, Cristo “immagine di Dio”. Le tradizioni patristiche su Colossesi I,15, *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* (= RSLR) 16 (1980) 181–212 and 345–380.

⁶ Cf. H. Crouzel, TRE 6 (1980) 500–501.

⁷ *Handwörterbuch Theologische Anthropologie. Römisch-katholisch – Russisch-orthodox*, ed. B. Stubenrauch, A. Lorgus (Freiburg i.B. 2013) 9.

V. Contributions in this volume

This publication offers the revised versions of papers presented at the colloquy as well as the contributions of Andrew Louth and Georgios Martzelos, both prevented to participate in L'viv.

Early Greek Fathers

Among the early Greek Fathers until the fourth century, we have contributions on the Apostolic fathers, and especially the highly influential Irenaeus of Lyons, on Clement of Alexandria, the Macarian corpus, Methodius of Olympus, Athanasius of Alexandria, and Origen (in comparison with the Latin Marius Victorinus and Augustine).

Taras Khomych analyzes the concept of *imago Dei* in the Apostolic Fathers, i.e. in 1 Clement, Barnabas, and Diognetus, and in Ignatius of Antioch. An elaborated definition of the term is lacking in these writings, two perspectives, however, can be discerned: an anthropological one (1 Clement, Barnabas, Diognetus) and a Eucharistic or ecclesiological one in Ignatius.

The starting point for Irenaeus of Lyons is that man was created in likeness to God and to the Son of God. Through sin, Adam lost the original God-likeness; through the incarnation of the Word, the likeness was restored. Ysabel de Andia's analysis of Irenaeus can be summarized as follows: Man was formed in the image and likeness of God by the two "hands" of God, namely, the Verbum and the Spirit, which did not leave him, although he had lost the likeness because of his sin. The Word became flesh and thus resembled man through his fleshly substance, which he received from the Virgin Mary, and made the image of God appear anew in man. The Spirit changed the "quality" of this fleshly substance after taking possession of the flesh (*Adv. Haer.* V, 9, 4)—in this way man becomes a spiritual man. Thus, man, consisting of a body and a soul that has received the spirit, is one and a living or spiritual man, not separated from the flesh. This is how the spiritual man is to be understood (according to Irenaeus), who is precisely the image and likeness of God.

Irenaeus makes a clear distinction between image and likeness (image is inscribed in the creature, likeness is bestowed by the Spirit who mingles with the soul). The Son is image of God (εἰκὼν Θεοῦ), man is created in the image of God (κατ' εἰκόνα), man is therefore image of the image of God. Man is not only created in the image of God, according to a "divine form" but he must become conformed (*conformatus*) to the Word of God throughout salvation history. Likeness is to be seen both dynamically and qualitatively, namely as

an assimilation (ὁμοίωσις) as well as a similarity (ὁμοιότης). Man, created in the image of God, receives this likeness in his created being, but he “becomes” in the image and likeness of God at the same time through an act of freedom and a gift of the Spirit.

Jana Plátová, a specialist on Clement of Alexandria, explains that the concept of God-likeness in Clement comes from both the philosophical (Plato) and the biblical tradition. However, in order to achieve the goal of God-likeness, Clement builds his ethical teaching on the Synoptic Gospels. Clement explains God-likeness with words from John, thus showing the way of the true Gnostic. God is not only the goal, but also the companion on the way.

Mariya Horyacha concludes that the concept of *imago* is a key concept in Makarios’ theological thought, but that it has a variety of meanings (including also soul, nature, *typos* and shadow, sign/symbol, unity with God/devil, lifestyle, sanctification, etc). Makarios builds his doctrine of Adam’s fall and deification around the *imago* concept. We have a polysemantic application of the word *imago*.

Alexey Morozov deals with the writing *De Resurrectione* of Methodius of Olympus, in which Gen 1:26–27 is one of the main arguments in favor of the resurrection of the flesh. This idea of the image of God was used as an argument for the resurrection even before Methodius. For him, the image of God consists in the immortality that man with body and soul receives through the mediation of the Son of God who is this divine Hand together with the Holy Spirit, an idea coming from Irenaeus. Thus, Methodius faithfully followed the tradition, illustrating and systematizing the thought with many images.

Viacheslav Lytvynenko examines Athanasius’ *imago Dei* conception both in the early writings (such as *Contra Gentes*, *De incarnatione*) and in the late writings (such as the *Orationes contra Arianos*), which seem to have little connection with each other. His argument is that Athanasius always uses the same anthropological framework. Uncovering this framework helps to identify Athanasius’ concept of *imago* more clearly. Thus, both continuity and development in Athanasius’ thought become apparent.

Lenka Karfíková presents a thorough study of the interpretation of Gen 1:26f by Origen, Marius Victorinus and Augustine, showing similarities and differences in the teachings of these three authors. She discovers a strong similarity between Origen’s interpretation and Marius Victorinus’ first interpretation of Gen 1:26f in *Adversus Arium IA*. Augustine’s interpretation seems to be rather different from Origen’s, but resembles Victorinus’ second inter-

pretation in *Adversus Arium IB*. Victorinus thus seems to be a link between Origen and Augustine as far as doctrine is concerned.

Augustine and Latin authors of the 5th century

Concerning the Latin tradition, we have papers on Augustine, Pelagius, Faustus of Riez and the anonymous *Opus imperfectum in Matthaëum*.

According to Vittorino Grossi, the anthropology of the *imago Dei* in Augustine matured within two main coordinates: the relation of the soul to the body in man, and the relation of the *gratia Christi* to the will of man. In Augustinian reflection, however, the main problem of the *imago Dei* was the *redemptio Christi*, i.e. the renewal of his image through the healing of lust in order to recover the *ordo amoris* destroyed by sin. Grossi notes that current research on Augustine's anthropology approaches the Augustinian texts and their context more directly, and is less attached to the theologies of the various schools.

For Pelagius, according to Vít Hušek, *imago Dei* refers to the original endowment of man in creation, especially human reason and free will. The image of God in man cannot be lost, but it can be obscured, as happened at the Fall and afterwards when sin spread through bad example and sinful habits. In baptism, Christians receive the fruit of redemption through Christ: they put off the old self, the image of Adam, and clothe themselves with the new self, the image of Christ. Thus, the original image of God is restored; reason and will are strengthened by the grace of Christ and the close personal relationship with God. Christians are called to preserve the image of God in themselves. Communion with God through Christ, which will be fulfilled eschatologically, is then the *similitudo Dei*.

Paul Mattei examines the interpretation of Gen 1:26–27 in Faustus of Riez, who is considered a Semipelagian. To do this, he analyses *De gratia* 2, 9 and the exegesis of Faustus, in order to determine precisely what is the point of the split with Augustine. Both, Augustine and Faustus, admit that through sin the image is not ruined but damaged. Both judge, though in different ways, that the will must open to grace in order to be effective. In Faustus' eyes, however, it is a remaining grace that gives access to salvation through the grace of Christ: the concept of the image remains "connected" to the concept of grace. In Augustine's eyes, the image remains free, but its free will cannot represent even the shadow of a meritorious act: The concept of the image is "separated" from the concept of grace (outside of grace, namely the presence of the Spirit, defined as existing charity, the virtues of non-Christians and, in

an even closer consideration, of non-Catholics undoubtedly exist materially, as the City of God states, but since they are not formed by charity, they have no benefit whatsoever in terms of salvation and receive from divine justice a reward according to their measure.

Franz Mali has studied the anthropology in the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaëum*, the most detailed commentary on Matthew preserved in Latin by an unknown Arian author from the first quarter of the fifth century. Here Mali, who is also preparing a new edition of this work, presents some aspects: Just as the image of the emperor on a coin can be damaged and removed, so the “image of God” in every human being can be damaged or made completely invisible by vice. Therefore, the “image of God” remains clearly visible only in a “good man”, i.e. in a virtuous man who imitates God through good works. At the same time, however, the anonymous author locates this image of God in the “nature” of man, which he has received from his Creator and which cannot be abolished. With God’s decision in Gen 1:26 to create man in his “image and likeness”, God wants to create an “equal” (*similis*) counterpart whom he loves as Father and who loves him back in freedom. Since all human beings bear the “image of God” in themselves, every believer will also love his neighbour who (like himself) is an image of the heavenly Creator.

Cappadocian Fathers and Antiochian theologians

In the section on the Cappadocians and Antiochian theologians we have papers on Gregory of Nyssa, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory Nazianzen, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Diodore of Tarsus, John Chrysostom, and Theodoret of Cyrrhus.

For Gregory of Nyssa, according to Marta Przyszychowska, human nature as such is created in the image of God. The human body is understood by Gregory as something animal. Without the Fall, human individuals would have been in the existence of angels—whether with a body is not further elaborated by Gregory. Gregory emphasizes the identity with the resurrection body.

Is woman created in the image (εἰκών) and likeness (ὁμοίωσις) of God? Two homilies *De creatione hominis* (CPG 3215–3216) attributed to Basil of Caesarea or Gregory of Nyssa (the authorship is disputed) and devoted to the problem of creation in the image and likeness of God, are studied by Karolina Kocharczyk-Bonińska. In these homilies, the author takes the position that although man and woman differ externally, the inner human being, created in the image of God, is the same. Both sexes have a rational soul and are called to become ‘according to the likeness’ by acquiring virtues.

The anthropology of Gregory of Nazianzus, according to Georgiana Huian, who first starts from Gregory's poems and then includes his *Orationes* in retrospect, revolves around the central idea that man is the image of God. What is composed of soul and body, spirit and flesh, must recover the beauty of the "image of God" through contemplation and *theosis*. In the wake of the Platonic tradition and Origen, Gregory tends to place the human being in the soul alone, in the intelligible, but his poems testify that he does place it in the human composition of body and soul. This latter view agrees with Gregory's account of cosmology and the creation of man, who participates in the heavenly and earthly world. The path and the ascent to divinization involve the physical state of the human being.

Svetoslav Ribolov deals with Theodore of Mopsuestia from the Antiochian tradition. In Theodore, we find the idea that the term "image" (εἰκών) can be understood as a pictorial image, similar to a sculpture. Man is like an imprint of God in creation. He is also the bond (σύνδεσμος) of creation. In the creation account, God created man as potentially containing both sexes; man as a whole is God's image.

Daniel Buda examines the interpretation of Ps 8:5 ('you made him only a little lower than the angels, you crowned him with honour and glory') by authors of the Antiochian school, like Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom and Theodoret of Cyrillus. Do these interpretations develop an alternative to classic *imago Dei* anthropology? The interpretation of the Antiochian theologians to Ps 8:5 depend heavily on the Pauline interpretation from Heb 2:6–9 and do not develop an alternative anthropology. The one who was 'a little lower than the angels' is identified with Jesus as the incarnated Son of God. The Masoretic version of Ps 8:5, which speaks about human being as being 'a little lower than Elohim' was often unknown and not used as starting point for any anthropological developments.

Daria Morozova's contribution is dedicated to *imago Dei* in the works of Theodoret of Cyrillus, especially in his questions on the "Octateuch". Drawing on the interpretations of Gregory of Nyssa and Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret avoids the dangers of an overly literal, "anthropomorphic" interpretation of the image and emphasises the apophatic dimension: the image cannot be reduced to the body. At the same time, he contradicts the Origenist interpretation and argues that the image cannot be reduced to the spirit either, which itself bears too weak a resemblance to the Spirit of God. Man may thus be an inadequate image of the Creator, but his whole being is the reflection of the image of God. Therefore, *imago Dei* is defined in terms of the divine influence of the invisible on the visible: man's creativity, judgement and dominion in the visible world are seen as a reflection of God's activity.

Syriac Tradition

The Syriac tradition is reflected by papers on early Syriac literature (such as Bardesane, Aphrahat, Ephrem and the *Liber Graduum*) as well as Jacob of Sarug and East Syriac Fathers (such as Narsai, Babai, Sahdona, ʾĪṣōʾyahb II and Timothy I).

In order to highlight the specifically Syriac contribution, René Roux examines the interpretation of the term *imago Dei* in Gen 1:26 by early Syriac authors. He finds a striking variety: from mere quotation (Aphrahat) to interpretation with the help of the Pauline letters (Ephrem) or philosophical considerations (Bardesanes), but also a complete omission of the term (*Liber Graduum*), because it might have felt as problematic. Overall, the reception of the *imago Dei* in early Syriac literature reflects the multifaceted nature of this ancient tradition.

Dominique Gonnet shows how in Jacob of Sarug—the poet revered across all denominational lines in the Syrian churches—the theme of man created in the image of the Father (and the Son) is in a strong continuity between incarnation and redemption. The restoration of the image in man after the Fall has a price, the suffering of Christ. God takes on their image in Christ as he had given them his own. The theme of the image of God is like a bridge symbolizing God’s love and mercy for man, who is rich in the life given in fullness in the resurrection, in true freedom and in the unity of soul and body. In contemplation, man becomes the mirror of the image.

Theresia Hainthaler examines the interpretation of Gen 1:26 and Col 1:15 by East Syriac fathers such as Narsai († 502/3) and Babai the Great († c. 628), ʾĪṣōʾyahb II (catholicos 628–646), Sahdona and Timothy I (catholicos 780–823) to learn their understanding of *imago Dei*. For Narsai, the “image of God” in Gen 1:27 includes all human nature consisting of body and soul. The “image of the invisible God” in Col 1:15 is used by the Eastern Syrians as a Christological title for humanity united in Christ. The task of this image is to reveal the invisible God. As for the moral aspect, the *imitatio Christi* consists in recapitulating the image of God in man by imitating or conforming to Christ in his suffering in obedience to God.

Later Greek Fathers and aftermath

In the section on later Greek Fathers and their aftermath papers dealing with Maximus Confessor, Anastasius Sinaita, John Scotus Eriugena and Michael Psellus are presented.

Although the doctrine of the creation of the human in the image of God is central to patristic theology, according to Fr Andrew Louth, Maximos Confessor rarely discusses Gen 1:26–27. To explain this, Fr Andrew offers three points: First, the concept of image is important to Maximos, but it is part of his commitment to a largely Neoplatonic metaphysics inspired by Dionysius the Areopagite, in which the image is a link between the visible and invisible realms and between the created order and the Creator as well. Second, Maximos shows originality in exploring the distinction between εἰκών and ὁμοίωσις, the latter term signifying a process of likeness to God inspired both from Platonism and from the Bible. Third, the idea of the human as bond of the cosmos is very important for Maximos, and the doctrine of the image is to be understood against this background.

In the context of the monenergetism/monotheletism controversy, Anastasius Sinaita developed an *imago Dei* theology, which, according to Cyril Hovorun, can be paraphrased as follows: both the human soul and the whole of human nature are image of God as well as image of God incarnate. Anastasius refers *imago Dei* primarily to the human soul, *imago Christi* to the totality of body and soul. Human activity and will belong essentially to the nature of the human, who is thus different from animals; but they can also be regarded as the image of God and Christ.

Hilary Mooney, a specialist in Eriugena research, emphasizes in her presentation of the theological anthropology of John Scotus Eriugena (9th century) that it has to be seen from his Christocentric spirituality. On the one hand, in recourse to Gregory of Nyssa, Eriugena unfolds the meaning of human freedom, which reflects divine sovereignty, and on the other hand, he develops it independently. For his further development, Eriugena draws on Johannine passages, but also on the Platonic scheme of return (cf. Dionysius).

Adrian Podaru studies the interpretation of “in the image and likeness” (κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν) by Michael Psellos, the “first Byzantine humanist” (11th century), as he was called, in his 4th theological opusculum. Psellos rejects the ideas taken from Greek philosophy to explain the creation of man in the image and likeness of God. Nevertheless, Psellos adopts the distinction between δύναμις and ἐνέργεια taken from the Greek philosophical sources. He applies this distinction in relation to what a person is gifted to do and what someone should strive for. Psellos apparently rejects Origen and recommends Gregory of Nazianzus instead.

Georgios Martzelos examines how the Greek and Latin traditions see intellect and will as components of the “image of God” in human beings. In his opinion, the Greek Fathers emphasized the ontological unity and identity of

intellect and will, thus continuing ancient Greek philosophy. Augustine, on the other side, with the help of his psychological triads and their triadological meaning, clearly distinguished the mind or intellect from the will in order to logically establish both the unity of the persons of the Holy Trinity and, in particular, the existential otherness of the Son and the Holy Spirit.

VI. Thanks

We are grateful and give our thanks to the Thyssen Foundation, which generously supported the colloquium in L'viv. We thank the Faculty of Theology of the Ukrainian Catholic University for welcoming us to their premises and helping us in every way. We express our thanks to His Beatitude Sviatoslav Shevchuk, Supreme Archbishop of Kiev-Halych and Head of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, who honored us with an address for this publication.

Frankfurt am Main, Easter 2021

Theresia Hainthaler

“Imago Dei” was the topic of the 9th Patristic Colloquy in L’viv, Ukraine, in 2019, with Orthodox and Catholic scholars from 12 European countries. The creation of human in the image of God (Gen 1:26–27) leads to questions such as: To what extent do the intellect or the will of man, his body, man or woman participate in being image of God? How do people achieve this promised likeness of God, what stands in the way? How did Church Fathers of the Latin, Greek and Syriac tradition deal with such questions?

„Imago Dei“ – Gottebenbildlichkeit war 2019 das Thema der 9. Patrologentagung in L’viv, Ukraine, mit orthodoxen und katholischen Wissenschaftlern aus 12 europäischen Ländern. Die Erschaffung des Menschen als Bild Gottes (Gen 1,26–27) lässt fragen: Haben Intellekt, Vernunft oder Wille des Menschen, sein Körper oder seine Seele, Mann oder Frau, Anteil daran, Ebenbild Gottes zu sein? Wie kommt der Mensch zu dieser verheißenen Gottesebenbildlichkeit, was steht ihr entgegen? Wie haben Kirchenväter der lateinischen, griechischen und syrischen Tradition solche Fragen behandelt?



Titelbild:

Die Erschaffung Adams. Initiale Q in „Que in prima parte operis huius“:
Hugo de Sancto-Victore: De sacramentis I 6,1.

Quelle: Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris,
Bibliothèque Mazarine Ms 729, f. 045v (vers 1140–1150).

