



Theōsis
Deification in
Christian Theology

edited by

Stephen Finlan

and

Vladimir Kharlamov



Theōsis

James Clarke & Co

and

The Lutterworth Press

Click on the links above to see our full
catalogue for more excellent titles in
Hardback, Paperback, PDF and Epub!

Theosis

ISBN: 9780227903544

C

L

Would you like to join our Mailing List?

[Click here!](#)

Theōsis

Deification in Christian Theology

Edited by Stephen Finlan
and Vladimir Kharlamov



James Clarke & Co

James Clarke & Co
P.O. Box 60
Cambridge
CB1 2NT
United Kingdom

www.jamesclarke.co.uk
publishing@jamesclarke.co.uk

ISBN: 978 0 227 17322 0

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A record is available from the British Library

Copyright © Stephen Finlan and Vladimir Kharlamov, 2006

First Published, 2006

Published by arrangement with Wipf and Stock

All rights reserved. No part of this edition may be reproduced,
stored electronically or in any retrieval system,
or transmitted in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,
without prior written permission from the Publisher
(permissions@jamesclarke.co.uk).

Contents

Introduction	1
<i>Stephen Finlan and Vladimir Kharlamov</i>	
Defining the Term	1
Terminology of Theōsis	5
History of Scholarship	8
A Renewed Discussion	9
Theōsis, Judaism, and Old Testament Anthropology	16
<i>Gregory Glazov</i>	
1. Theōsis and Old Testament Biblical Theology	17
2. Theōsis and Old Testament Covenantal Anthropology	21
3. Theōsis and Old Testament Sapiential Anthropology	25
Second Peter's Notion of Divine Participation	32
<i>Stephen Finlan</i>	
Middle-Platonic Background	33
Stoic Growth in Virtue	36
Apocalyptic Judaism	40
Pauline Parallels; Petrine Disputes	43
Knowledge of Christ	45

Emergence of the Deification Theme in the Apostolic Fathers	51
<i>Vladimir Kharlamov</i>	
Didache	54
The Epistle of Barnabas	55
Clement of Rome (First Clement)	57
Second Clement	59
Ignatius of Antioch	60
Polycarp of Smyrna	65
Conclusion	65
Deification in the Apologists of the Second Century	67
<i>Vladimir Kharlamov</i>	
Justin Martyr	69
Tatian	74
Theophilus of Antioch	77
Athenagoras	80
Epistle to Diognetus	83
Conclusion	84
Irenaeus on the Christological Basis of Human Divinization	86
<i>Jeffrey Finch</i>	
Theological Anthropology: Image and Likeness Recapitulated	87
God Partakable	91
Christ the Head	97
Athanasius on the Deifying Work of the Redeemer	104
<i>Jeffrey Finch</i>	
Introduction	104
The One and the Many	107
Human Cooperation and Appropriation	110
By the Incarnation Alone?	115
Augustine's Conception of Deification, Revisited	122
<i>Robert Puchniak</i>	
The Principal Passages	123
Augustinian Polemic	126
Infrequency of Deification Imagery	131

Divinization and Spiritual Progress in Maximus the Confessor	134
<i>Elena Vishnevskaia</i>	
The Fundamentals of Divinization	134
Ascetic Practice and Contemplation	138
Purification in Love	142
Reforming Theōsis	146
<i>Myk Habets</i>	
Worlds Apart	146
Theōsis and the West	147
T. F. Torrance: A Case Study	152
Imago Dei	153
Creator-Creature Distinction	158
Reconciling Exchange	162
Conclusion	166
The Comedy of Divinization in Soloviev	168
<i>Stephen Finlan</i>	
Divinization and Comedy	171
Trinitarianism	172
Sophiology	174
Following the Christ Pattern	176
Anti-Gnostic Triumph	178
List of Contributors	185

Introduction

Stephen Finlan and Vladimir Kharlamov

Defining the Term

The closest English equivalent of theōsis is “deification.” In Christian theology, theōsis refers to the transformation of believers into the likeness of God. Of course, Christian monotheism goes against any literal “god making” of believers. Rather, the NT speaks of a transformation of mind, a metamorphosis of character, a redefinition of selfhood, and an imitation of God. Most of these passages are tantalizingly brief, and none spells out the concept in detail.

Deification was an important idea in the early church, though it took a long time for θεώσις (*theōsis*) to emerge as the standard label for the process. The term was coined by the great fourth century theologian, Gregory of Nazianzus. Theologians now use theōsis to designate all instances where any idea of taking on God’s character or being “divinized” (made divine) occurs, even when the term θεώσις is not used. And of course, different Christian authors understood deification differently.

It is difficult to define theōsis, but not difficult to cite several biblical passages that strongly suggest a process of heightened reflection of godly nature, which stimulated Christian deification discourse. The following

grouping of biblical passages is meant to bring out the logical development of the idea:

IMITATION OF GOD:

Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect. (Matt 5:48)

The one who believes in me will also do the works that I do and, in fact, will do greater works than these, because I am going to the Father. (John 14:12)

Be imitators of God, as beloved children. (Eph 5:1)

TAKING ON GOD'S NATURE:

You . . . may become participants of the divine nature. (2 Pet 1:4)

You are gods, children of the Most High, all of you. (Ps 82:6)

Is it not written in your law, 'I said, you are gods'? (John 10:34)

INDWELT BY GOD:

Truly it is the spirit in a mortal, the breath of the Almighty, that makes for understanding. (Job 32:8)

The Spirit of truth . . . abides with you, and he will be in you. (John 14:17)

It is that very Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God. (Rom 8:16)

BEING RE-FORMED BY GOD:

What is born of the Spirit is spirit. (John 3:6)

Be transformed by the renewing of your minds, so that you may discern what is the will of God—what is good and acceptable and perfect. (Rom 12:2)

Clothe yourselves with the new self, created according to the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness. (Eph 4:24)

BEING CON-FORMED TO CHRIST:

He will transform the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of his glory. (Phil 3:21)

. . . predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son. (Rom 8:29)

All of us, with unveiled faces, seeing the glory of the Lord as though reflected in a mirror, are being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another. (2 Cor 3:18)

When he [Christ] is revealed, we will be like him. (1 John 3:2)

Introduction

FINAL DIVINIZATION OF THE KOSMOS:

The earth will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. (Hab 2:14)

The effect of righteousness will be peace, and the result of righteousness, quietness and trust forever. (Isa 32:17)

When all things are subjected to him, then . . . God may be all in all. (1 Cor 15:28)

Although some of these passages concern the afterlife, or events connected with the return of Christ, all of them have implications for the present life of believers, suggesting an ongoing transformation, a progressive *engodding* of the believer, to use the endearing Old English phrase.¹

Let us look at the implications of this grouping of biblical sayings. Imitation of God leads to a reception of the character traits of God, an idea that is standard throughout most of the Bible. The idea of being indwelt by a special spirit of God is found intermittently throughout the OT, and is a central idea in the NT. This is not synonymous with theōsis, but it is an indispensable element in any theology of theōsis. Without the constant guidance of God, we humans always go astray. Without “encouragement,” the renewal of spiritual courage in our hearts, we constantly grow faint, like Peter after Jesus was arrested. But with a strong connection to inner guidance, believers “shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings like eagles” (Isa 40:31). “We do not lose heart. . . . our inner nature is being renewed day by day” (2 Cor 4:16). As Jesus said, “the kingdom of God is within² you” (Luke 17:21 NIV, KJV, TEV). This saying should not be marginalized just because it occurs in only one gospel. It is an indispensable part of the proclamation of Jesus, and is fully consistent with his teachings about an indwelling Spirit of Truth that “will be in you,”³ and of a “light in you.”⁴

¹ Pusey, *Lenten Sermon* 108, *Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989) 5: 200.

² Heightening the social aspect of the gospel, NRSV offers “among,” but “within” or “inside” are more accurate translations of ἐντός *entos*. C. H. Dodd points out, “When Luke means ‘among’ he says ἐν μέσῳ” (*The Parables of the Kingdom* [New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1936] 84 n.1).

³ John 14:17; cf. 14:26; 17:23; 15:4.

⁴ Matt 6:23; 5:16; Luke 11:35.

What surely suggests theōsis is the notion of being transformed by God, or taking on the divine nature. In the letters of Paul, in particular, this means being transformed into the likeness of Christ, who is the embodiment of God. Believers are “conformed to” and “transformed into” the image of Christ (Rom 8:29; 2 Cor 3:18; Phil 3:21), even having the “mind of Christ” (Phil 2:5; 1 Cor 2:16). One may, perhaps, suppress the divinizing implications of these passages, but not of those that say that believers will “become the righteousness of God” (2 Cor 5:21), and after death, “will also bear the image of the man of heaven” (1 Cor 15:49). *Theōsis* is central to the theology of Paul throughout.⁵

All of this depends upon, and revolves around, Christianity’s central and unique idea: the *incarnation*—in Christ, God lived a human life. The incarnation is the definitive and unique doctrine of Christianity. Further, without the incarnation, there would be no theōsis. Christians are meant not only to learn from the life of the divine Son, but to reproduce the pattern of spiritual progress that he revealed, even to the point of taking on the character of God! A typical expression would be that of Didymus the Blind, who spoke of the soul’s process of becoming “perfect [τελειοῦσθαι *teleiousthai*], becoming like [ὁμοιωθῆναι *homoiothēnai*] God.”⁶ This is a staggering idea, and one that certainly needs to be connected with a mature and well-balanced theology.

This is more than just the longing for union with the divine, which is a central goal for most religions. Not all religions take it so far as to develop a concept of theōsis while still preserving human personal identity, as Christianity does. But it is not always well-defined. Deification played an important,⁷ but not definitive, role in early Patristic theology. Despite Patristic fascination with deification, the fathers do not develop a “doctrine” of theōsis. Nor do the doctrinal controversies and decisions of the Church Councils deal with the subject.

The popularity of the idea is matched by a lack of precise definition. The church fathers argue for, rather than spell out, deification. Theōsis

⁵ See also the deification concepts in Col 1:9, 27; 2:10; 3:10; Eph 3:19; 4:23–24; 5:1.

⁶ *Commentary on Ecclesiastes* on 3:19; from *Didymos der Blinde. Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes*, pt. 2, ed. M. Gronewald (Bonn: Habelt, 1977) 99, located using TLG 8.0 (electronic database) © 1999 Silver Mountain Software.

⁷ “Deification was the ultimate and supreme thought” (Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, tr. Neil Buchanan [New York: Dover, 1961 (1900)] 3:164 n.2).

concepts are closely related to soteriology, Christology, and anthropology. Doctrines about baptism and the Eucharist, the resurrection of the dead, eternal life, the image of God in human beings, redemption, and sanctification contain themes that relate to theōsis. But simply replacing theōsis with *sanctification* is an attempt to supplant Patristic theology with standard Reformation language. Deification was often seen as the *telos* (goal) of human existence and of salvation.

The church fathers of the late second to fourth centuries (Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzus) make theōsis a major theme, yet none of them defines the term,⁸ or discusses it at sufficient length to clear up ambiguities; they seem to assume that its content is common knowledge in the Christian community.

The first theological definition of theōsis was given in the sixth century by Pseudo-Dionysius, but it is general and inexact: “Divinization consists of being as much as possible like and in union with God.”⁹ The meaning of theōsis varies throughout Patristic theology, sometimes even within the same author.¹⁰ Some scholars project later developments of theōsis onto earlier church fathers, underestimating the role of specifically second-century themes. The articles here by Kharlamov will try to clarify how the theological concerns of the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists situate and shape their deification concepts.

Terminology of Theōsis

A great variety of terms are used to communicate the idea of deification. Ben Drewery sums up “the *content* or *attributes* of deification” as

⁸ Jules Gross, *The Divinization of the Christian According to the Greek Fathers* (Anaheim, Calif.: A & C Press, 2002) 271–72.

⁹ *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* 1.3; *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works*. The Classics of Western Spirituality (New York: Paulist Press, 1987) 198; in the original Greek: *Corpus Dionysiacum, Patristische Texte Und Studien*, Bd. 36, ed. Beate Regina Suchla (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991) 66.

¹⁰ Donald F. Winslow proposes a “six-fold dimension” for *theōsis* in Gregory of Nazianzus alone: as a spatial, visual, epistemological, social, ethical, or “progressive union” metaphor (*The Dynamics of Salvation: A Study in Gregory of Nazianzus* [Cambridge, Mass.: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979] 193–98).

“τελείωσις *teleiōsis* (ethical perfection), ἀπάθεια *apatheia* (exemption from human emotions or passions), ἀφθαρσία *afharsia*, ἀθανασία *athanasia* (exemption from mortal corruption or death).”¹¹ Among the conceptual equivalents for deification are union, participation, partaking, communion/partnership, divine filiation, adoption, recreation, intertwined with the divine, similitude with God, transformation, elevation, transmutation, commingling, assimilation, intermingling, rebirth, regeneration, transfiguration. The preferences of particular authors vary greatly.

Considering the language of theōsis, special attention should be given to vocabulary groups in all their grammatical forms, of words for union—ἔνωσις *henōsis*; participation—μετουσία *metousia* (from μετέχω *metechō*), μέθεξις *methexis*, μετάληψις *metalēpsis* (from μεταλαμβάνω *metalambanō*); partaking—μέτοχος *metochos*; and communion—κοινωνία *koinōnia* (from κοινωνέω *koinōneō*). In English, “partaking” and “sharing” suggest a distinction of the part from the whole, and connote a limited possession of the whole. In Greek, *metousia*, *methexis*, and *metalēpsis* convey the idea of “having together” or “obtaining a certain quality.” *Metalēpsis*, in addition, can imply “harmonious mutual existing” or “acting together.” *Koinōnia* and *metousia* express the idea of “communion” or “union.” Also, we need to be aware that the terms listed above are not only applicable to deification; they could refer to other issues as well.

There are five groups of Greek words that explicitly point to making into a god or deifying: 1) ἀποθεόω/ἀποθειόω—ἀποθέωσις *apothēōō/apotheiōō-apothēōsis* 2) θεοποιέω—θεοποιία—θεοποίησις—θεοποιός *theopoiēsis-theopoiios*; 3) ἐκθεόω/ἐκθειόω—ἐκθέωσις—ἐκθεωτικός *ektheōō/ektheiōō-ektheōsis-ektheōtikos*; 4) θεόω—θέωσις¹² *theōō—theōsis*; 5) ἀποθειάζω—ἐκθειάζω *apothēiazō ektheiazō*.¹³ The subject-verb sets θεὸς εἶμι *theios eimi* (“to be god”) and especially θεὸς γίγνομαι *theos gignomai* (“to become god”) were extensively used. Here, we purposefully use the word “god” with the lower case letter “g” to indicate that the deified human person never stops being human. Here we should point

¹¹ Benjamin Drewery, “Deification,” in *Christian Spirituality: Essays in Honour of Gordon Rupp*, ed. Peter Brooks (London: SCM, 1975) 38.

¹² Although coined in the fourth century, θέωσις *theōsis* did not become the standard designator for deification until after Pseudo-Dionysus in the sixth century.

¹³ See Norman Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) 333–44.

out that not all Greek words for deification connote a strong literal meaning of “becoming a god” or being “deified.” Often it is the *qualities* of Godliness that are being emphasized.

A favorite word of Athanasius, θεοποιέω *theopoieō*, with the element ποιέω *poieō*, “to make,” “to produce,” implies agency, something done to someone. It can be translated, “to make god.” Athanasius derives the noun θεοποίησις *theopoiēsis* and the adjective θεοποίητος *theopoiētos* from this verb. A mortal being made god is a paradox for Christian theology, where only God is without beginning or ending (ἀγένητος *agenētos*—“uncreated,” “unoriginated”). Of course, the mortal was generated or created (γεννητός *gennētos*), and so is not God. Athanasian θεοποίησις *theopoiēsis* connotes the idea of passive deification: the human is acted upon, so God retains primacy and infinity.

Gregory of Nazianzus, in his poetry, uses θεὸν τεύχω *theon teuchō* (“to make/produce god”),¹⁴ θεὸν τελέω *theon teleō* (“to complete/accomplish god”),¹⁵ and τυκτὸς θεὸς *tyktos theos* (“created god”).¹⁶

The extraordinary richness of Greek language offered Patristic writers a broad selection to choose from. Even though θεοποίησις *theopoiēsis* and later θέωσις *theōsis* became the choice expressions for Christians, other deification vocabulary was retained.

There is less diversity in deification terminology in Latin than in Greek. Some Latin writers simply transliterate Greek θέωσις *theōsis*, as we continue to do in English. Greek ἀποθέωσις *apothēōsis* was often rendered in Latin as *consecratio* or visa versa. The Latin *consecratio* was the official term used for declaring the deceased emperor, or any other figure, as *divus*.¹⁷ Reflecting this widespread pagan usage, the English term “apotheosis” usually signifies an exaltation or a metaphorical glorification, usually without any Christian content.

Some English language authors make a distinction between divinization (taking on godly qualities) and deification (become a godlike being); others do not. Of course, all Christian authors made such a distinction *conceptually*, whether or not they make it terminologically.

¹⁴ *Carm.* 1.1.3.4.

¹⁵ *Carm.* 1.2.14.92.

¹⁶ *Carm.* 1.2.9.132.

¹⁷ Russell, *Doctrine of Deification*, 22.

When Latin writers came up with the term *deificatio*, derived from the verb, *deificare*, they were not making a distinction from “divinization,” but providing another word for it. It was already obvious, from the standpoint of Christian theology, that no mortal becomes God.

History of Scholarship

The Eastern Orthodox Church has retained theōsis as a concept for theological reflection, while the Western churches—separated by time, language, and philosophy from the Greek thinkers of the early church—have dropped it. In fact, theōsis simply does not exist for most contemporary Western theologians. In lay theology the term is usually perceived as either blasphemous or absurd.¹⁸ Some Protestants try to assimilate it to familiar Western concepts such as “sanctification by grace” or “justification by faith,” trying to connect the Reformation directly to the Bible, as though the intervening centuries had no significance. We hope to show that the lines of continuity and transmission through the centuries of Christian thought are essential to Christian understanding at any one time and place. The near disappearance in Western Christendom of an idea that was widely accepted for over a thousand years (including by Latin theologians like Augustine), is a serious loss for the Christian thought and hope.

A significant line of modern scholarship adopts the thesis of Adolf Harnack about the Hellenization of early Christianity, the transformation of the living faith “into the creed to be believed,” with theōsis considered to be “creedal” rather than “living.” This is said to be the change of “the glowing hope of the Kingdom of heaven into a doctrine of immortality and deification.”¹⁹ M. Werner,²⁰ B. Drewery,²¹ and many others follow

¹⁸ E.g., Francis J. Hall, *The Incarnation* (New York: Longman, Green and Company, 1915) 192; Donald E. Gowan, *When Man Becomes God: Humanism and Hybris in the Old Testament* (Pittsburgh, 1975) 1.

¹⁹ Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, tr. Neil Buchanan (New York: Dover, 1961 [1900]) 1:45.

²⁰ M. Werner, *Formation of Christian Dogma* (New York: Harper, 1957) 168.

²¹ Drewery, “Deification,” 49–62.

the line of Harnack's thinking, categorizing theōsis with decline and with doctrinal hardening.

At the opposite pole are theologians who build their entire theology upon a Christian concept of theōsis, including Vladimir Lossky,²² Panayiotis Nellas,²³ and C. Stavropoulos,²⁴ who create the impression that there is nothing more important in Christian theology than deification, and, further, that Eastern Orthodoxy holds a “copyright” on it. Jean Daniélou exposes the anachronism of their approach, their interpreting the early fathers in light of later fathers.²⁵

A Renewed Discussion

Between the polarized views—deification is either a pagan idea or the essential Orthodox doctrine—we find more moderate and historically oriented scholarly works. In 1938, Jules Gross published an extensive study of divinization in the Greek fathers,²⁶ providing the first comprehensive and chronological analysis of the notion, looking at Patristic, Hellenistic, mystery religion, biblical, and postbiblical sources.²⁷ More recently, new

²² Vladimir Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974); *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1976, 1998); *The Vision of God* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1983).

²³ Panayiotis Nellas, *Deification in Christ: Orthodox Perspectives on the Nature of the Human Person*, tr. Norman Russell (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987). First published in Greek in 1979.

²⁴ C. Stavropoulos, *Partakers of Divine Nature* (Minneapolis: Light of Life, 1976).

²⁵ Jean Daniélou, “Introduction,” in *La Déification de l'homme, selon la doctrine des Pères grecs*. The book is authored by Myrrha Lot-Borodine (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1970) 15.

²⁶ Jules Gross, *La divinisation du chrétien d'après les pères grecs: Contribution historique à la doctrine de la grâce* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1938). Published in English as *The Divinization of the Christian According to the Greek Fathers*, tr. Paul A. Onica (Anaheim, Calif.: A & C Press, 2002).

²⁷ See also Edouard des Places, I. H. Dalmais, and Gustave Bardy, “Divinisation” (*Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique*, original eds., M. Viller, F. Cavallera, and J. de Guibert. Continued by Charles Baumgartner. Vol. 3, Paris: Beauchesne, 1957) 1370–98 and H. Rondet, “La divinisation du chrétien,” *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 17 (1949) 449–76, 561–88.

attention to theōsis was stimulated by the work of John Meyendorff²⁸ and through ecumenical dialogue.²⁹ A number of dissertations that deal with the history of theōsis or with theōsis in the works of particular figures, were produced.³⁰ In addition, several articles and books have appeared recently.³¹ The first International Academic Conference on theōsis,

²⁸ John Meyendorff, "Theōsis in the Eastern Christian tradition," in *Christian Spirituality: Post-Reformation and Modern*, eds. Louis Dupré and Don E. Saliers (New York: Crossroad, 1989) 470–76. The theme of deification is widely scattered throughout Meyendorff's works.

²⁹ For instance, Paul R. Hinlicky, "Theological Anthropology: Toward Integrating Theōsis and Justification by Faith," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 34 (1997): 38–73; Tuomo Mannermaa, "Justification and *theōsis* in Lutheran-Orthodox perspective," in *Union with Christ* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 25–41; Jouko Martikainen, "Man's Salvation: Deification or Justification? Observation of Key-Words in the Orthodox and the Lutheran Tradition," *Sobornost* series 7, no. 3 (Summer 1976): 180–92; *Salvation in Christ: A Lutheran-Orthodox Dialogue*, eds. Robert Tobias and John Meyendorff (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1992) and Michael McDaniel, "Salvation as Justification and *Theōsis*," in the same volume.

³⁰ Here we list just some of the Ph.D. dissertations: Isaac Chae, "Justification and Deification in Augustine: A Study of His Doctrine of Justification," Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1999; Caren F. Calendine, "Theōsis and the Recognition of Saints in Tenth Century Byzantium," University of Wisconsin, 1998; Arkadi Choufrine, "Gnosis, Theophany, Theōsis: Studies in Clement of Alexandria's Appropriation of his Background," Princeton Theological Seminary, 2001 (published by Peter Lang in 2002); J. A. Cullen, "The Patristic Concept of the Deification of Man Examined in the Light of Contemporary Notions of the Transcendence of Man," Oxford University, 1985; Jeffrey Finch, "Sanctity as Participation in the Divine Nature According to the Ante-Nicene Eastern Fathers, Considered in the Light of Palamism," Drew University, 2001; Maurice Fred Himmerich, "Deification in John of Damascus," Marquette University, 1985; Nancy Joyce Hudson, "Theōsis in the Thought of Nicholas of Cusa: Origin, Goal, and Realized Destiny of Creation," Yale University, 1999; Keith Edward Norman, "Deification: The Content of Athanasian Soteriology," Duke University, 1980; Eric David Perl, "*Methexis*: Creation, Incarnation, Deification in Saint Maximus Confessor," Yale University, 1991; N. Russell, "The Concept of Deification in the Early Greek Fathers," Oxford University, 1988; Elena Vishnevskaya, "*Perichoresis* in a Context of Divinization: Maximus the Confessor's Vision of a 'Blessed and Most Holy Embrace,'" Drew University, 2004; Kenneth Warren Wesche, "The Defense of Chalcedon in the 6th Century of the Doctrine of 'Hypostasis' and Deification in the Christology of Leontius of Jerusalem," Fordham University, 1986; Anna Ngairé Williams, "Deification in Thomas Aquinas and Gregory Palamas," Yale University, 1995.

³¹ We mention just a few among most recent: George D. Dragas, "Exchange or Communication of Properties and Deification: Antidosis or *Communicatio Idiomatum*

“Partakers of the Divine Nature: Deification/*Theōsis* in the Christian Traditions,” held at Drew University, Madison, New Jersey, on May 21–22, 2004, reaffirmed the significant academic and interdenominational interest in this aspect of Christian theology. It is gradually becoming a more appreciated topic in Western theological discourse.

While some articles in this collection discuss pre-Christian antecedents of *theōsis*, Greek and Jewish, most focus on particular Christian understandings. The article by Gregory Glazov examines OT covenant theology, with an emphasis on divine adoption, and on bearing the fruit of knowledge or attaining the stature of a tree of righteousness in Proverbs, Isaiah, and Sirach. The article by Stephen Finlan on 2 Pet 1:4 (“You may become participants of the divine nature”) examines the epistle’s apparent borrowings from Middle Platonic spirituality, Stoic ethics, and Jewish apocalyptic expectation. The epistle stresses “knowledge of Christ,” which means cultivation of godly character and growing up into Christ.

Vladimir Kharlamov’s first article examines the emergence of the deification theme in the Apostolic Fathers with its culmination in the passion mysticism of Ignatius of Antioch, who speaks of becoming a “Christ-carrier” and emphasizes the full integrity of human nature that participates in salvation and eternal life. The second article covers Apologists such as Justin Martyr (who considers the human being worthy to become a son of god, and even “god”) and Theophilus of Antioch (for whom the human being reaches full maturity and is declared god through the therapeutic experience of death and resurrection).

Jeffrey Finch shows the integral connection between incarnational Christology and deification in the thought of two of the Church’s most important theologians. For Irenaeus, the incarnation, the Recapitulation work of Christ, and deification of the believer are closely linked. For Athanasius of

and *Theōsis*,” in *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 43, no 1–4 (1998): 377–99; Nonna Verna Harrison, “*Theōsis* as Salvation: An Orthodox Perspective,” in *Pro-Ecclesia* 6 (1997): 429–43; Steve McCormick, “*Theōsis* in Chrysostom and Wesley: An Eastern Paradigm on Faith and Love,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 26 (1991): 38–103; Frederick W. Norris, “Deification: Consensual and Cogent,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 49 (1996): 411–28; Norman Russell, *Doctrine of Deification*; Kenneth Paul Wesche, “Eastern Orthodox Spirituality: Union with God in *Theōsis*,” in *Theology Today* 56 (1999): 29–43; Anna Ngairé Williams, *The Ground of Union: Deification in Aquinas and Palamas* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).