

## TRENDS IN EASTERN ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY: TOWARDS A THEOLOGY OF SEXUALITY

UDC 271.2-18

**Philip Abrahamson**

Fordham University, New York, USA

**Abstract.** *Modern Eastern Orthodoxy has neglected to develop a clear and consistent theological anthropology to answer the many contemporary questions of gender and sexuality. Personhood remains remarkably undeveloped; a spirit lacking body. Three modern thinkers, Sergius Bulgakov, Vladimir Lossky, and John Zizioulas, have developed theologies that have many implications for the beginnings of an engagement with modern concerns around gender identity and human sexuality. For Bulgakov, personhood is in the image and likeness of a complex sophianic God, who is unity in diversity. For Lossky and Zizioulas the Christian life is envisioned as one which moves from individuality into personhood, from the limits of nature into loving freedom of persons in communion. Theological anthropology should take seriously the challenge posed by modern theories and philosophies of sex and gender. It should use these thinkers to articulate more clearly a consistent and thoughtful theology which fully understands its implications. A truly Orthodox anthropology would be an integration of two ways: a Bulgakovian human nature, positive and full of mysterious diversity; and the personhood of Zizioulas and Lossky, transcendent and apophatic. This paper will make initial suggestions for developing their thought in directions that can address current questions of gender and sexuality.*

**Key words:** *Eastern Orthodoxy, Theological Anthropology, Theology of Sexuality.*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The latter half of the 20th Century has seen a renewal of interest in Eastern Orthodox Theology and has produced some incredibly creative work. It has unfortunately not had the same creativity in the realm of theological anthropology. There have been few works to truly unpack what the theological anthropology of the Eastern Orthodox Church is, or what implications it has in our modern life and situation. It has largely been the domain of a kind of idealistic anthropology developed mostly in relating Jesus Christ's humanity to

---

Received August 30, 2016 / Accepted October 11, 2016

**Corresponding author:** Philip Abrahamson

Fordham University, 33 W. 60th Street, New York, NY 10023, USA

E-mail: pabrahamson@fordham.edu

our own as the method of our salvation. Jesus, the God-Man is given preeminence in Orthodox theology and is the site and possibility of Divine-Human communion. Anthropologically it has not been developed beyond this point in a particularly robust way, nor are there adequate answers to many contemporary issues in regards to human gender and sexuality. However in connection with Christology the major theologians of the 20th century have developed a sense of Personhood with parallels between the Persons of the Trinity, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and human personhood. While this connection has been made, the content of human personhood remains remarkably undeveloped; spirit lacking body. Three modern thinkers have developed theologies that have many implications for the beginnings of an engagement with modern concerns around gender identity and human sexuality, even if these implications have so far gone unnoticed. This paper will attempt to outline the trajectory of thought on theological anthropology through perhaps the three most influential Orthodox Theologians of the last hundred years: Sergius Bulgakov, Vladimir Lossky, and John Zizioulas. It will then make initial suggestions for developing their thought in directions that can address current questions of gender and sexuality.

All three of these theologians have as their central concern the possibility of Divine-Human communion. To this end each of them also see an ontological divide between God and Creation, that needs to be bridged for communion between God and human beings to be possible. The bridge that makes this possible for all of them is through the incarnation of God in the person of Jesus Christ, the God-Man. Yet each theology holds radically different views about how this is possible, why it is relevant, and how it fits into the broader theological project. Each theologian holds diverse understandings on the theology of nature (both divine and human), which has profound implications for anthropology.

## 2. SERGIUS BULGAKOV

The earliest of these esteemed thinkers is Sergius Bulgakov. He was a Russian emigre living in Paris after being exiled in the events after the Revolution for being a religious intellectual. Sergius Bulgakov has perhaps the most robust theological anthropology of the three, but is also the most controversial for his use of sophiological themes in his theology. At the turn of the century in Russian philosophical and religious thought there was a renewed and profound interest in the divine feminine, characterized as Sophia, or the Wisdom of God. This concept was first articulated by Vladimir Soloviev, whose use was in a kind of pan-religious philosophy. Bulgakov appropriated Sophianic concepts from Soloviev, and reestablished them within Orthodox thought and teaching which has always had a devotion to Sophia, being both a biblical and theological concept. However this heightened emphasis and centralization of Sophia into a theological tradition that had primarily used masculine images and language about God stirred up controversy. Sophiology was later condemned by two local councils, which put Bulgakov's entire corpus into ambiguous territory for later writers and theologians who tended to avoid direct references to his work.

Bulgakov however is by far the most systematic of the three theologians, having written a large dogmatics trilogy which explores nearly every major theological theme, as well as a shorter trilogy exploring devotion and liturgical practices, all in relation to his doctrine of Sophia. In the first volume of the dogmatics trilogy, *The Lamb of God*, he begins by tracing a kind of outline of dogmatic development, from St. Paul through the

Council of Chalcedon. In positing a doctrine of the Trinitarian God, first at the Councils of Nicea and Constantinople, and then on the doctrine of Christ, at Ephesus and Chalcedon, the Church tended to establish language that defended the boundaries in which proper inquiry could take place. At Chalcedon in particular, Bulgakov notes how the doctrine of Christ was formulated using negative expressions, saying that the union of the divine and human in Christ, was *without* confusion, *without* change, *without* division, and *without* separation (Bulgakov 2008, 61). This language preserved the mystery of the union without itself explaining the content of the union. Likewise the content of the doctrine of the Trinity is equally vague, in that the Councils of Nicea and Constantinople preserved the language that the three persons of the Trinity were consubstantial or homoousios, of the same essence, without defining or explaining what precisely is that essence.

Bulgakov uses this aporia to speculate about the content of the divine essence or nature as necessary for working out the full implications of Scriptural language about God. Of the three theologians he is the most well versed in Scripture, citing it more frequently than the other two. He finds in Scripture language about the Glory of God and the Wisdom (Sophia) of God as attributes of God shared by all three persons, which allows him to conclude that the divine essence is none other than Sophia (Bulgakov 1993, 33). More than just a shared attribute, or a concept associated only with the Son, Sophia becomes for Bulgakov the content and inner life of the Trinity: divinity, ousia, nature, divine glory, the inner world of the Godhead, the shared essence of the Triune Persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Here Bulgakov has the most positive and content filled notion of divine nature of the three theologians. Both Lossky and Zizioulas will tend to interpret nature in negative terms, as something to have freedom from, transcend, or move beyond. Bulgakov rather chooses to explicate deeply the inner content of the nature as a way to make sense of the workings out of Christology in union with humanity and creation as a whole. He is particularly interested in being able to explain the divine-human communion in ontological terms. To do this he needs to develop the ontological content of both divine and human realities. This union is only possible, he argues because humankind has already been created with the potential to be in communion with God, for the purpose of communion. Human beings were created in the image and likeness of God. More than just being modeled after God, this has a deeper connection to the content of Divinity. Bulgakov works out a system of the Divine Sophia, the inner life and world of God as God's essence and nature, and the Creaturely Sophia, a mirrored creaturely reality that encompasses all of existence, a kind of world soul if you will. Just as the Divine Sophia is enhypositized or personalized in a particular way by each of the three persons of the Trinity, so too do human beings personalize Creaturely Sophia. The human person is modeled uniquely after the Logos who as second person of the Trinity, is also the Divine-Humanity, the God-Man. He already contains within himself that aspect of Sophia that resembles, images, or makes possible the creation of the human being. In this way He is already the Divine-Humanity, the principal for the possibility of communion. Communion can not be achieved simply by being like something else, it must be real communion, therefore it was necessary that the Logos become a human being, and thus to enable communion as human, in the way in which humans are already potentially in communion.

Bulgakov seems to extend this kind of analogy to the way humans exist already corresponding to the way in which we are to be in communion with God. Even before human beings were created, the potential for divine-human communion was potentially in

the Logos as Divine-Humanity. The result of this for Bulgakov's anthropology seems to be that the Divine-Humanity is the parallel for the content of human nature. The Divine Nature of Sophia is thus the basis for the human nature as creaturely Sophia. Conversely because human beings were created as male and female it requires us to understand the fullness of the divine image in humanity in terms of bi-unity. He finds the parallel for human gender in the difference between the Son and the Holy Spirit. He thus has an elaborate anthropology that relates gender in human beings alternatively to the male principal which is inherent in the Logos/Son, or to the female principal which is inherent in the Holy Spirit.

Important to note is that Bulgakov's theory of gender seems more fluid than traditional anthropologies in that he believes each human person has both principles operative in themselves, though one tends to be dominant.

“Inwardly, in the spirit, man is defined by the polarity of the male and female principles; and even in his being, man is not only male or female, but precisely male *and* female. He is this ontological *and*, which expresses the fullness of Divine-Humanity, of the image of God in man. It corresponds not to just one of the hypostases, not to the male or female principle taken separately, but to their dyadic union (Bulgakov 2004, 322-323)”.

However, at the same time the differentiation between male and female principles is important and in its own way essential to the spirit of the human being. Humans are not androgynes, though androgynous to a degree in their spirit, but are in essence either male *or* female. This difference is manifest for Bulgakov in the twin facts of the female being created not out of the dust of the ground, but rather out of man's rib, and that man generally plays the dominant role being made in the image of the demiurgic hypostasis that is the Logos, which reveals the Father directly. Women on the other hand are made in the image of the cosmurgic image which is the Holy Spirit and reveals the Father only through or in relation to the Son (Bulgakov 2008, 140). Male and female therefore exist in two *distinct images*, which bear in their unity the fullness of the divine image.

This raises the question of whether there is a sex/gender distinction within Orthodox theological reflection? Bulgakov seems to be mostly working with a category of gender, the social and spiritual differences between men and women. This adheres to his belief that the genders within humanity are modeled after the relations between Trinitarian Persons of Son and Spirit. He does not argue that one's physical body is imaged after divinity, since this would be a materialistic reading of God. Rather the spiritual characteristics are ontologically prior to sex deference. Indeed within Orthodoxy there is the discussion whether sex difference existed prior to the Fall or is a product of it (Karras 2008). However, he still seems to argue that sex difference in bodies is directly related to the difference in dominant spiritual principles. This direction of influence attempts to avoid hermeneutical suspicion by attributing sex difference to ontology, with and subsequent suspicion of contrary epistemological evidence which is common in Orthodox thinking.<sup>1</sup> Bulgakov himself expresses doubt about the validity of this gender distinction, but appeals to common experience to reaffirm it. “We can recognize this distinction, even

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance Fr. Thomas Hopko's sweeping dismissal of the social sciences because they deal with humanity post-Fall, nor humanity as created by God, *Christian Faith and Same-Sex Attraction: Eastern Orthodox Reflections*, Conciliar Press, Ben Lomand; California, 2006.

if we cannot express it clearly in word and thought” (Bulgakov 2002, 95). He goes on to say that it is self evident that male and female voices, or personal I’s, speak with a different timbre. That is, the perspectives of men and women differ, and that it is obvious to any observer that men and women are essentially different. He appeals here to common experience to draw universal conclusions.

He does not however idolize the dominant principle in a determinative way because essentially each human being is constituted by the both male and female principles in dyadic union. To illustrate this he makes an rather unusual argument, that human beings each have a companion guardian angel who, while neither strictly male nor female, operates with the opposite gendered principle than the dominant one in the human person. This acts as a counterbalance to the dominant principle. Indeed he prefigures Jungian psychology by arguing the necessity of finding balance between these principles, instead of rationalizing particular social roles or structures based on this difference. He also does not explicitly state that this dominant principle must correspond to one’s biological gender, which holds many possibilities for theorizing about transgender or intersex theological anthropologies. However Bulgakov does not theorize along these lines himself and does seem to take for granted that men and women would have the corresponding dominant principle as one’s sexed body. Though Bulgakov still remains rife with possibilities for feminist and gender queer theologies, if for no other reason than his use of Sophia, the divine feminine, as providing a kind of balance or harmony to the principles in the Godhead, and his positive associations of male and female principles both within humanity as a kind of bi-sexuality and within divinity.

The theology of Bulgakov has largely been ignored since the fifties<sup>2</sup> because of his being implicated in the sophiological controversies and fears that by the introduction of the concept of Sophia into God that he was positing a fourth member of the Trinity. This is an absurd claim given Bulgakov’s explicit identification of Sophia with the common essence or nature of God, rather than another Person or hypostasis in God. By far the more influential theological voices in Eastern Orthodoxy are Vladimir Lossky and John Zizioulas. Each has worked out a theology of God that also have profound implications for theological anthropology, but vary from Bulgakov in important ways. While both Vladimir Lossky and John Zizioulas seem to pick up on the theme of Divine-Human communion from Sergius Bulgakov, they do not then take up his interest in fleshing out the implications of this union for anthropology.

---

<sup>2</sup> One exception is the work of one of his students Paul Evdokimov, who expounds upon Bulgakov’s ideas in much more traditional categories and loses some of the radical potential implications for gender and sexuality. For instance he says, “Man limits his being, makes of the cosmos the external projection of his body, fills it with his accomplishments and technical power. But woman, ‘the glory of man,’ according to St. Paul, is like a mirror which reflects the face of man, revealing him to himself and thus correcting his tendencies. She is a ‘helper.’ She assists man in deciphering intuitively *his* destiny, *his* dignity and *his* truth.” “Panagion and Panagia: The Holy Spirit and the Mother of God,” in *In the World, of the Church: A Paul Evdokimov Reader*, ed. and trans. Michael Plekon and Alexis Vinogradov. Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2001.

## 3. VLADIMIR LOSSKY AND JOHN ZIZIOULAS

Vladimir Lossky was an explicit opponent to Bulgakov and the Sophiologists. However he also seems to have divine-human communion as the central issue of his theology. Even more starkly in Lossky and Zizioulas is the belief that there is an ontological divide between creation and God, which cannot be bridged through the efforts of human beings. The ontological divide is real and can only be bridged by God's initiative and condescension. Important for Lossky is the inability of the human mind to ascend to God using human categories, reason or philosophy. While creation is undoubtedly the work of God, there is still a fundamental ontological divide that make human reason unable to bridge it or attain any real knowledge of God, apart from participation in God's energies by God's grace. Therefore the kind of *analogia entis*, or analogy of being which allows Bulgakov to posit mirrored realities in the Divine and Creaturely Sophias, is merely trying to understand God in human concepts and doomed to failure or worse, idolatry. From this perspective Lossky believes it is important to maintain the ontological distinction of divine and creaturely realms, which makes their communion in the God-Man Jesus Christ all the more mysterious and beautiful. There is no inherent potential in human beings for communion without the Incarnation. It is precisely God's condescension to humanity that establishes this communion. Whereas Bulgakov felt compelled to explore and explain the content of God, both in God's essence and God's Persons, Lossky seems reluctant to do either. Rather the logic of the Persons/Nature distinction in God was guaranteed by the Councils not to explain God, but to safeguard the antinomy of God's unity and God's diversity (Lossky 1985, 51). In this way Persons and Nature serve as conventional signs, pointing toward a reality, while not explaining it. Of utmost importance to Lossky is the mystery of God and the efforts of apophatic or negative theology. Knowledge of God is not in rational propositions, for which he accuses Bulgakov as philosophizing God. Rather it is experience of God, attainable through ascetic discipline and prayer and the apophatic discipline of negating concepts about God. True knowledge is attained not cognitively, but through participation in God's energies and transcends categories of human knowing, indeed becomes a kind of unknowing, or holy ignorance. The doctrine of the Trinity safeguards this antinomy which challenges us to abandon human concepts and rational categories which are insufficient for circumscribing God.

In terms of anthropology, Lossky seems not to follow his own logic when he posits a kind of analogy between the Persons of the Trinity and human personhood. He crafts a kind of narrative about how the Fathers of the Church transmuted language to achieve new significance in its doctrinal formulations of the Trinity. Both he and John Zizioulas argue that the concept of Personhood was first developed by the early Fathers reaching its pinnacle in the Cappadocian Fathers. They want to draw sharp distinctions between prior Greco-Roman understandings of the individual and Christian understandings of the person. Lossky focuses on the word *hypostasis*, as being given new ontological weight when applied to the Persons of the Trinity. *Hypostases* was transmuted from meaning substance to meaning 'that which is not reducible to nature' (Lossky 1985, 113). In this way it is different from Aristotle's uses of First and Second essences or substances, so not *hypostases* of the three persons are not just the particular substances of the species of divinity. That would amount to there being three gods. Rather *hypostases* means difference in unity, that which is unique and irreducible to the common nature (Lossky

1985, 114). John Zizioulas argues differently and without any clear evidence of a dependence on Lossky. He focuses rather on the conflation of the meaning of the word *prosopon* (person, mask) with hypostases. In this way too the persons were being given weightier ontological status as substances, while as having the particular qualities of a person (Zizioulas 1985, 39).

After Lossky has argued that person is really a Christian concept first, which has only afterward trickled into common parlance and modern philosophies, he makes an analogy between the Christian concept of person in relationship to human beings and the members of the Trinity. The person is not the same as an individual. Individuals are merely repetitions of the same nature, divided, and unique only in a limited sense. The goal of Christian life should be moving from individuality into personhood, from the limitations imposed by nature to personal freedom in love (Lossky 1978, 58). Again for both Lossky and Zizioulas this ontological status of personhood is safeguarded in the doctrine of the monarchy of the Father. In Trinitarian terms, that means the basis of Trinity is in the person of the Father and not in the common essence of divinity. The locus of stability and unity becomes not an impersonal nature, but rather the person of the Father. This becomes paramount for both theologians. Lossky also critiques the West, and St. Augustine in particular, with starting his theological musings with an emphasis on the common essence and so robbing the Trinity of its foundation in the personal. Lossky identifies personhood as that which is irreducible to nature, but also free from the limits of nature. It is ultimate freedom, based in will and not necessity. Nature implies necessity, but if God's existence is secured by the Personal principle of the Father, then freedom can be maintained as a condition of existence. One wonders if Lossky's and Zizioulas' emphasis on freedom is a response to existential philosophy. It is interesting to note, that both think it is absolutely fundamental to ascribe to God perfect freedom in such a way that Bulgakov was not concerned about. Bulgakov would have challenged them by considering our notion of freedom can only be understood from our dependent and contingent position as created beings and loses relevance when understood in terms of God. Bulgakov is concerned to not make God into a capricious being where freedom suggests arbitrariness. He wants to understand God's freedom as expressing God's nature in such a way that freedom does not become an end in itself, because outside of right relationships it has no meaning but randomness.

So in Lossky and Zizioulas we have this ontological notion of personhood. For Zizioulas it takes on extra significance as not just irreducibility to nature, but a relational ontology. The distinctions between the three persons are made on the bases of relationship. The Father is the source of the other two persons, so only persons can cause other persons to be, not impersonal nature. More than this the Son is characterized as having been eternally begotten of the Father, while the Spirit proceeds from the Father. More than just signaling difference of origin, as in Lossky, these terms signify relationship. To be a person is to be related to other persons. Thus he emphasizes a relational ontology particularly in the Eucharist, where true communion is experienced in becoming the Body of Christ (Lossky 1985, 154). Lossky on the other hand seems to emphasize the ascetics struggle of the individual rather than the community. Personhood is achieved in becoming free from all necessity, free from nature. This is achieved in becoming more like Christ, in his freedom, who secures the possibility of divine-human communion.

Both Lossky and Zizioulas seem to identify nature with limitation and necessity. It does not seem to have much positive content in itself. Indeed it is difficult to understand what

either's working definition of nature might be when taken in isolation. Lossky does seem to think that persons transcend nature all the while being nothing more than nature. That is personhood is not a something in addition to nature, but a someone who is nature (Lossky 1985, 120). Nature then is the impersonal essence of a being, while personhood is their freedom in being more than nature. Neither Lossky nor Zizioulas seems to provide any more content to what nature is other than the principle of unity in the Trinity and human beings. This is precisely the theology that Bulgakov feared. He believed that the essence of nature of God had become no more than a philosophical placeholder for the unity of God. He felt the danger in this position was that Christian theology become functionally tritheist. To avoid this he felt it was necessary to inquire into the being of God and understand more deeply the content of the essence. His inquiry led him to posit common attributes of God as being shared by all three persons as reflecting in some way the essence. Thus he argues logically that wisdom, which would not be rationally denied as an attribute of any of the persons, must belong collectively to all three, but not merely as a common possession, but as a principle which is enhypositized uniquely in each of the Persons. Thus he argues much the same as Lossky does about the enhypositization of nature, but supplying synonyms or attributes that must pertain to the common essence as a way of fleshing out the content. There is a tension in Lossky in talking about God's nature as limitation and necessity on the one hand and arguing that God's essence is also the unknowable aspect of God which should be held in reverence. This seems to be an unintentional tension rather than another of Lossky's antinomies, and he offers no satisfactory way to resolve it.

There is no explicit account of gender in either Lossky or Zizioulas. Indeed the distinction of gender, I argue, has never been sufficiently located in theological anthropology. It is neither sufficiently explained as belonging to the common human nature or to the person. It seems to be an assumed third distinction that neither fits in comfortably to an understanding human nature, which should be one commonly held nature shared by all human persons, nor under the rubric of the individual hypostases, which in achieving full personhood is free from all necessity and irreducible to nature. I feel like the location of gender in theological anthropology is one of the central issues that has caused many inconsistencies and contradictions in the ways in which it has been worked out. I do not think either Lossky or Zizioulas know what to do with gender nor how to place it within their theological anthropologies. Bulgakov on the other hand followed his logic into seemingly every realm and aspect of the human person, life and every minutia of theological speculation. While he does account for gender, his account remains problematic, even if intriguing and full of potential. Even though these theologians do not adequately account for gender (much less sexuality) in their anthropologies, I think that their theologies include many possible avenues for creative reflection and engagement with profound implications for theological anthropology.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

First and foremost is the notion of personhood itself. The fact that neither Lossky nor Zizioulas accounts for gender specifically in their theologies makes the general theologizing of personhood universal for all human beings. It is not contingent on being male or female in a particular way, indeed if personhood is freedom from nature, then it implies possibilities of being free from the limitations of either male or female identity (if

the gender distinction is in the nature), biology, activity, etc. The doctrine of personhood implies a radical equality of all people. It is relational, and freedom in love. This implies profound possibilities for the interpretation of sexual ethics, which on its own cannot reduce ethical sexual behavior into paradigms based around gender. If the human person is free to love, and *not* reduced to notions of natural, biological or necessary sexual expressions, then space is opened up for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer relationships. Indeed the Orthodox notion of personhood has many affinities with queer theory, in its refusal to be naturalized, normalized, limited by necessity, and by its apophatic leanings. Bulgakov is interesting too for his account of both male and female gendered principles being active in each and every human person. To this end they seem to be constituent halves of the entire human nature, and by necessity present in every single person. Whether they can still be considered discreetly as opposite poles in his schema is questionable. Clearly they do not operate equivalently in all people and frequently become an indistinguishable confluence of activity, behaviors, personalities, abilities, virtues, etc. that cannot easily be identified as belonging to either one of the gendered principles. To this end I wonder whether Lossky's antinomies might be better here (and more queer!) than Bulgakov's sense of balanced hierarchical binaries (as I interpret the human beings having dominant gendered principles, balanced on the one hand by oppositely 'gendered' angels and on the other hand being imaged after alternately the male principle in Christ or the female principle in the Holy Spirit, which again are offset or balanced by notions of divine feminine in Sophia, and divine masculine in the Father). Understanding gender as an antinomy charges it with apophatic energy, as well as maintaining a distinction which is experienced as real. I am unsure currently whether Bulgakov or Lossky has more potential in resolving the ontological problem of gender.

Rather I think another potential might be in the epistemological problem of gender, whether we even have access to 'real knowledge' of gender. Again in Lossky I see potential for understanding nature as that which is unknowable. When thought of in human terms one could align this with a Kantian epistemological suspicion. If gender properly belongs to human nature, we do not have unmediated access to this nature, so that we can only experience it through mediated forms in relating to other human persons. We do not have direct access to our own nature. We must therefore take an apophatic approach which would be knowledge not from concepts about our nature, but from experience of its diversity as mediated in the real lives and bodies of other persons. There is some overlap here with Michel Foucault and Judith Butler in the sense that sex and gender are not natural categories that can be read freely from nature. Rather they are already interpreted and given value, and indeed participate in a kind of matrix of existing power relations. Freedom from nature, would be interpreted then not just as freedom from necessity or limitation, but freedom from the limiting concepts of human reason in trying to abstract gender from bodies. There could be huge potential to move beyond the categories of sex and gender into spaces that are truly free from the limitations of nature. Sexual ethics would be negotiated not on the basis of complimentary biology, but by Christian virtues of the mutuality and love of free persons. There would again have to be robust consideration of the roles in which the body is important in anthropology, lest personhood be spiritualized and become disembodied. The Orthodox doctrines of the resurrection of the body and the *incarnation* would be necessary for a truly bodily theology of personhood, however they would not have to do so in a biologically determinant way.

The future of an Orthodox theological anthropology would be one which takes seriously the challenge posed by modern theories and philosophies of sex and gender, their distinction and relationship. It would use the various theological strands from Bulgakov, Lossky and Zizioulas as well as the wider tradition to articulate more clearly a consistent and thoughtful theology which understands the implications inherent to its content. For Bulgakov, personhood is in the image and likeness of a complex sophianic God, who is unity in diversity. For Lossky and Zizioulas the Christian life is envisioned as one which moves from individuality into personhood, from the limits of nature into loving freedom of persons in communion. A truly Orthodox anthropology would be an integration of the two ways, a Bulgakovian human nature, positive and full of mysterious diversity and the personhood of Zizioulas and Lossky, transcendent and apophatic.

#### REFERENCES

- Bulgakov, Sergius. *The Lamb of God*. Trans. Boris Jakim. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008.
- Bulgakov, Sergius. *The Comforter*. Trans. Boris Jakim. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004.
- Bulgakov, Sergius. *The Bride of the Lamb*. Trans. Boris Jakim. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002.
- Bulgakov, Sergius. *Sophia: The Wisdom of God*. Hudson: Lindisfarne Press, 1993.
- Karras, Valerie. "Orthodox Theologies of Women and Ordained Ministry." In *Thinking Through Faith: New Perspectives from Orthodox Christian Scholars*, edited by Aristotle Papanikolaou & Elizabeth H. Prodrromou. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2008.
- Lossky, Vladimir. *In The Image and Likeness of God*. St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, Crestwood: New York, 1985.
- Lossky, Vladimir. *Orthodox Theology: An Introduction*. Trans. by Ian and Chita Kesarcodi-Watson. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1978.
- Zizioulas, John. *Being and Communion*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.

### TENDENCIJA PRAVOSLAVNE TEOLOŠKE ANTROPOLOGIJE: KA TEOLOGIJI SEKSUALNOSTI

*Moderno pravoslavlje je propustilo da razvije jasnu i doslednu teološku antropologiju koja bi mogla da pruži odgovore na mnoga savremena pitanja roda i seksualnosti. Ličnost ostaje izuzetno nerazvijena; duh nema tela. Tri moderna mislioca, Sergej Bulgakov, Vladimir Loski i Jovan Zizjulas, razvili su teologije koje sadrže mnoge implikacije za početke bavljenja savremenim problemima polnog identiteta i ljudske seksualnosti. Za Bulgakova, ličnost je u obličju i liku kompleksnog softijskog Boga, koji je jedinstvo u različitosti. Za Loskog i Zizjulasa hrišćanski život je zamišljen kao onaj koji se kreće od individualnosti ka ličnosti, od ograničenja prirode ka slobodnoj ljubavi lica u zajednici.*

*Teološka antropologija treba da ozbiljno shvati izazov koji postavljaju savremene teorije i filozofija pola i roda. Trebalo bi da iskoristi ove mislioe da jasnije artikuliše konzistentnu i promišljenu teologiju koja je u potpunosti svesna svojih implikacija. Istinski pravoslavna antropologija bi bila integracija dva pristupa: Bulgakovljevog shvatanja ljudske prirode, pozitivno vrednovane i pune misteriozne različitosti, te shvatanja ličnosti Zizjulasa i Loskog, u kojima je ona transcendentna i apofatička. Ovaj rad daje početne predloge za razvoj njihove misli u pravcima koji bi mogli da pruže odgovore na aktuelna pitanja roda i seksualnosti.*

Ključne reči: *pravoslavlje, teološka antropologija, teologija seksualnosti.*