

THE DICHOTOMOUS NATURE OF MAN, PREMISE OF HIS PRIESTLY VOCATION

Cosmin Iulian CÎRSTEA,

PhD. Student at Faculty of Orthodox Theology "Justinian the Patriarch",
University of Bucharest,
ROMANIA

Email: cosminiulian93@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The dichotomous nature of man is a prerequisite for his priestly vocation. The fact that man is at the same time a spiritual and material being shows his role as mediator between Creator and creation. His dichotomous constitution is the essential premise of his vocation to the world. He is taken from the general matter of the world, endowed with a living soul, and placed in the world as a leaven to transform it. The world cannot sanctify itself, because this process presupposes communion with the tripersonal God, and it is impersonal. But together with man, it can enter relationship with its Creator. It is man, therefore, who also transmits to it what he becomes through the sanctifying grace. Man is therefore by his very constitution the priest of creation. All that he does as an incarnate soul will also be passed on to the world. By ascending through his special relationship with the Creator to eternal life, he draws along with him the body and the material world to which he is bound, like a train.

Keywords: *soul; body; dichotomic; man; creation.*

INTRODUCTION

According to revelation, man is made up of the body, which belongs to matter, and the soul of God's breath. Man is therefore both a material and a spiritual being, made up not of two elements forcibly put together, but of two realities that form a single whole, without being confused.¹ The body is permeated by the soul and is in ontological unity with it. However, the soul transcends the materiality of the body and is the principle that gives the body the quality of personhood. Neither of the two constitutive elements of man can be understood in isolation from the other. Only together do they make up man, who by his dichotomic constitution is a conscious, free and unique subject.²

1. BODY AND SOUL, CONSTITUENT REALITIES OF MAN

In order to better understand the complexity of the dichotomous human nature, we will first refer in turn to the two constituent realities of man. With regard to the body, in the Old Testament, the main terms used to describe it are *gufa* and *basar*. The basic meaning of the first word is corpse, lifeless body, but it is also sometimes used to denote a living human body (Genesis 47:18). The second word means flesh and refers both to the body of animals that man can consume and to the human body with God's breath of life. We should note,

¹ LARS THUNBERG, *Microcosm and Mediator. The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor*, Open Court Publishing Company, Illinois, 1995, pp. 97–98.

² PR. PROF. DR. DUMITRU STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, Ed. IBM BOR, București, 2010, p. 391.

however, that the Jews did not conceive of the body, when it was a human body, as separate from the soul. Thus, when the term *basar* referred to a person, it defined man in his entirety, body and soul. When the distinction between the two constitutive elements of man was to be emphasized, the term was contrasted with *ruah* or *nefesh*, words referring to the soul.³

No New Testament understanding departs too far from this perception of the body. Thus, the Greek *sarx* refers not only to flesh, to a body without soul, but in some contexts defines the whole man, body and soul: "The Word became flesh" (John 1:14). It is clear that by incarnation the Son of God took not only the body but the whole human being. So here we see how St John uses the term *sarx* (flesh, body) implying its indissoluble link with the soul. Similarly, *soma*, the word most often used to denote the body, does not speak of a reality totally separate from the soul, even though in New Testament thought the distinction between soul and body becomes clearer than in the Old Testament.⁴

Thus, in both the Old Testament and the New Testament, the body and the soul are not considered to be two totally opposite realities that are forcibly held together, but are two realities that together make up a whole, the human person. Of course, this does not mean that body and soul are confused. There are numerous passages where Scripture shows a clear distinction between them. Thus, the flesh cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven (I Cor. 15:50), but the body is called to rise as the Lord (I Cor. 6:14).⁵ The body can hinder the soul in its pursuit of God (Gal. 5:17; II Cor. 5:6), but nevertheless, the soul does both good and evil only in union with the body (II Cor. 5:10).⁶ "New Testament somatics emphasizes that the body also expresses the person. It is not just an object of this world, but fundamentally someone, the manifestation, the language of a person. It is the breath that carries thought, it is the forward movement and rest that structures time and space. It is the one through which I am always ready to act. It is the one through which I offer myself to the gaze of the other. It refers to the whole of human existence. The experience of the *tup* is revealed to us as something that coincides directly with my presence. My body is neither thing nor instrument, but I in the world for others. And this is because it is in a reciprocal relationship with the soul."⁷ The human body is part of the material world, so it has ontological continuity with it. However, its constitution surpasses the material world in the superiority of its reasoning. Father Dumitru Stăniloae maintains that matter is plasticized rationality, but in the human body this plasticized rationality reaches its maximum complexity.⁸ This is because it is brought into existence by a special act of God and is created at the same time as the rational soul that pervades it. In other words, the body is made up in accordance with the spiritual reality of the soul; it does not merely remain in the materiality of this world, but is capable of spiritual life and not merely of biological survival.⁹

³ JEAN-CHRISTOPHE ATTIS, ESTHER BENBASSA, *Dicționar de civilizație iudaică (Dictionary of Jewish Civilization)*, (traducere în limba Română), Ed. Univers Enciclopedic, București, 1997, p. 267.

⁴ J. D. DOUGLAS, *Dicționar biblic (Bible Dictionary)*, trad. LIVIU PUP și JOHN TIPEI, Ed. Cartea creștină, Oradea, 1995, p. 1323.

⁵ VLADIMIR LOSSKY, *Introducere în Teologia Ortodoxă (Introduction to Orthodox Theology)*, trad. LIDIA și REMUS RUS, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1993, p. 125.

⁶ SFÂNTUL MAXIM MĂRTURISITORUL, *Ambigua* (PSB 80), trad. PR. PROF. DR. DUMITRU STĂNILOAE, E.I.B.M.B.O.R., București, 1983.

⁷ PR. DR. ION STOICA, *Adevărul, lumea și omul (Truth, the world and man)*, Ed. ASA, București, 2006, p. 62.

⁸ PR. PROF. DR. D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, pp. 392–393.

⁹ Pr. Prof. Dr. D. STĂNILOAE, *Chipul nemuritor al lui Dumnezeu (God's Immortal Image)*, *Opere complete V*, Basilica, București, 2013, pp. 483–484.

The human body is superior to the matter of the world and by, or especially by, the vocation it has in relation to the world. It is the exponent of all materiality and its synthesis. Through it, or rather, through the quality of subject that is given to it by its union with the soul, it represents the substrate endowed with consciousness and free reactions capable of giving voice to all creation and placing it in dialogue with the Creator.¹⁰ In union with the soul, it is called upon to spiritualize and empower all matter.¹¹ It follows from all this that the body is not just matter or just plasticized rationality as an object. It is subjectivized matter, which participates in spirit as subject. Subject and object at the same time, it is a participant in my act of feeling and thinking of all objects, but it is also an object that can be thought and felt.¹² The human body is a mystery that transcends our limited understanding and we must give it due respect. It is not the product of us, of our parents or of nature. He must be taken beyond the lower drives that conform to fallen nature. Otherwise, we may fall ourselves from the state of fully conscious and free subject to the state of subservience to nature. The destiny of the body is that by the work of the soul inserted in it, it may be transfigured¹³ and to involve the whole of nature in this movement beyond nature. Only in this way can the human body acquire the qualities of Christ's body after the resurrection, a body with which it tasted food but also entered through locked doors.¹⁴ As for the soul, it is the spiritual, living and immortal substance that pervades the body and together with it forms the human subject. It is therefore not an impersonal substance, but is a self-conscious entity, but it does not exist as pure spirit, but in an indissoluble connection with the body.¹⁵

So, the soul is not to be confused with the life-force, which is merely its power, and he its personal support.¹⁶ Life is the fundamental note of the soul, representing the very principle that initiates biological movement, but this does not mean that the soul is merely the principle that animates the human person. It is also the source of spiritual and rational movement. Its existence or non-existence means the existence or non-existence of life and of man's intellectual and spiritual functions and faculties; through it, man has the capacity to understand, to feel and to enter a relationship with God and the world.¹⁷

In Old Testament Hebrew, the most commonly used word for soul is *nefesh*¹⁸, and its meaning in most cases is that of life or breath of life (Is. 57:16), so that it is also used of animals (Acts 1:20, 24, 30; 9:12, 15-16; Ezek. 47:9). At other times, it is identified with blood, the essence of physical existence (Gen. 9:4; Lev. 17:10-14; Deut. 12, 22-24. In the

¹⁰ PR. PROF. DR. D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, pp. 392–393.

¹¹ SFÂNTUL MAXIM MĂRTURISITORUL, *Ambigua*, Io., 7, PG 91, 1073D-1076A, 1076C, 1088C, 1113B, 1137BC [trad. rom. SFÂNTUL MAXIM MĂRTURISITORUL, *Ambigua*, Io., 7, PSB 80, trad. PR. PROF. DR. D. STĂNILOAE, E.I.B.M.B.O.R., București, 1983 p. 74, 77-78, 90, 111, 136-137].

¹² PR. PROF. DR. D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, pp. 383–384.

¹³ POLYCARP SHERWOOD, *St. Maximus the confessor: The ascetic life. The four centuries on charity*, Longmans, Green and Co, Londra, 1955, p. 48.

¹⁴ PR. PROF. DR. D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, p. 385.

¹⁵ PR. PROF. DR. ISIDOR TODORAN, ARHID. PROF. DR. IOAN ZĂGREAN, *Teologia Dogmatică (Dogmatic Theology)*, Renașterea, București, 2009, pp. 132–133.

¹⁶ PR. PROF. DR. ION BRIA, *Dicționar de Teologie Ortodoxă (Dictionary of Orthodox Theology)*, E.I.B.M.B.O.R., București, 1994, p. 368.

¹⁷ OLIVER CLEMENT, *Întrebări asupra omului (Questions on man)*, trad. IOSIF POP și PR. CIPRIAN SPON, Ed. Reîntregirea, Alba Iulia, 1997, p. 95.

¹⁸ LECT. UNIV. DR. LAURENȚIU IONESCU, *Dicționar de limbă ebraică biblică (Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew)*, Editura Societății Biblice Interconfesionale din România, București, 2006, p. 209.

book of Psalms, it is frequently used to denote the principle of life, but it is not limited to this sense alone.¹⁹ The word *nefesh* did not refer only to the biological life principle, even though in the Hebrew tradition there was no clear distinction between the soul as a spiritual principle and the life force.²⁰ Sometimes it is: the source of emotions (Job 30:25; Isa. 1:14), the seat of conscience, moral action or will (Acts 49:6; Deut. 4:29; Job 7:15; Ps. 24:4; 25:1; 119, 129, 167) or the seat of desires (Num. 21:15; Deut. 12:15; Job 33:20). At other times it designates a person (Ezek. 18:4) or even a dead body (Lev. 19:28; Num. 6:6), showing us the connection that exists even after death between the body and the soul that leaves it at the moment of death (Acts 35:18). There are also other terms such as *ruah*, which means spirit, and *leb*, which translates as heart. All these terms were used interchangeably.²¹

In the specific Greek of the New Testament the corresponding term for *nefesh* is *psihi* (breath of life) and refers primarily to biological life (Mt. 10:39; Mk. 8:35; Lk. 17:33; John. 12:25). The other term used is *pnevma*²² and is broadly similar to *ruah*. Both terms define the same reality, the soul, except that in some cases the former refers to the breath of life specific to both humans and animals, and the latter refers to the spiritual function of the soul.²³ This different naming of certain faculties of the soul has led some to become advocates of a trihomist conception of man. The best-known scriptural texts which are often brought as arguments in support of this view are found in the writings of St. Paul. In the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, he says: "May the God of peace Himself sanctify you perfectly, and may your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." (I Thess. 5:23) In the Epistle to the Hebrews, too, the same apostle states, "For the word of God is living and active and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the division of soul and spirit, of the joints and marrow, and is able to judge the feelings and thoughts of the heart (...)" (Heb. 4:12). According to these verses, soul and spirit would designate two different realities, one referring to the biological life principle and the other to the generative element of spiritual movement. If we accept this reasoning as correct, we should see man, not only as a creature that unites three elements in itself, but as composed of four different principles, because we find in the last verse references not only to soul and spirit, but also to "the division...between the joints and the marrow". Thus these two elements of the body, the joints and the marrow, should logically have two different natures, which is absurd.²⁴ We saw earlier that in Holy Scripture the concepts of soul and spirit are used in place of each other, defining the same reality of human nature, and sometimes soul and spirit indicate two different aspects of the same element: on the one hand, the soul is shown as the principle of bodily life, and on the other hand, when speaking of spirit, aspects of the spiritual life are indicated. Thus, the same spiritual substance is called soul, when it relates to the bodily, performing the functions of animating the body, and spirit, when it performs functions in the spiritual sphere.²⁵

The dichotomous constitution of the human being also follows from the moral implications that other places in Scripture attribute to the soul and spirit. Thus, man who

¹⁹ J. D. DOUGLAS, *Dicționar biblic (Bible Dictionary)*, p. 1244.

²⁰ J.-C. ATTIS, E. BENBASSA, *Dicționar de civilizație iudaică (Dictionary of Jewish Civilization)*..., p. 267.

²¹ J. D. DOUGLAS, *Dicționar biblic (Bible Dictionary)*, p. 1244.

²² MAURICE CARREZ, FRANÇOIS MOREL, *Dicționar grec-român al Noului Testament (Greek-Roman Dictionary of the New Testament)*, p. 234.

²³ J. D. DOUGLAS, *Dicționar biblic (Bible Dictionary)*, p. 1244.

²⁴ O. CLEMENT, *Întrebări asupra omului (Questions about the man)*, p. 89.

²⁵ IEROTHEOS VLACHOS, *Dogmatica empirică a Bisericii Ortodoxe Sobornicești (Empirical Dogmatics of the Sovereign Orthodox Church)*, vol. II, trad. TATIANA PETRACHE, Ed. Doxologia, Iași, 2014, p. 191.

clings to earthly things cannot rise to a deep, spiritual life, remaining a psychic, natural or bodily man. Of this type of people, Saint Jude, the relative of the Lord, writes: "In the last time they will be scoffers, walking according to their ungodly lusts. These are the divisive, natural (people), who do not have the Spirit." (Jude 1:18-19). So, these people who live according to the fallen nature cannot be called spiritual people, because they have not made room for the Holy Spirit in their heart, or rather, they are external to themselves and do not feel God who is in their heart.²⁶

2. THE INDISSOLUBLE LINK BETWEEN SOUL AND BODY

Having clarified the dichotomous nature of man, we need to look more closely at the indissoluble link between soul and body. As we have mentioned, these two realities are not dispersed elements that are forcibly put together but are made for each other. In other words, they exist only in tandem. Even death does not definitively break their bond, they remain united for eternity, for the body will be resurrected and spiritualized and will be adequate to the eschatological needs of the soul, as Holy Scripture testifies. (I Cor. 15:20-44; Phil. 3:21).²⁷

The insertion of the soul into the body is such an intimate fact that it is impossible for the human spiritual factor to be conceived for a moment as a pure spirit, but must be understood from the beginning as an incarnate soul, or as an embodied body. Thus, the soul is within the body, but the body is also within the soul.²⁸ The latter permeates the body so intimately that it forms a homogeneous composition with it, just as fire enters the being of iron and makes it incandescent.²⁹

The union between soul and body is a very deep one. It goes far beyond a simple superimposition of two principles, one material and the other spiritual. The two interdependent elements not only exist together, but they share both vital power and other faculties, such as the ability to perceive both the material world, thanks to the senses, and the spiritual world, thanks to the capacities of the soul. If in man it were merely a question of a non-homogeneous interweaving of the two realities, the soul would not be able to share fully in the sensitivities and passions of the body, and the latter would remain incapable of spiritualization.³⁰

The union between soul and body is a very deep one. It goes far beyond a simple superimposition of two principles, one material and the other spiritual. The two interdependent elements not only exist together, but they share both vital power and other faculties, such as the ability to perceive both the material world, thanks to the senses, and the spiritual world, thanks to the capacities of the soul. If in man it were only a question of an

²⁶ PR. PROF. DR. D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, pp. 394–395.

²⁷ JEAN-CLAUDE LARCHET, *Îndumnezeirea omului la Sfântul Maxim Mărturisitorul (The deification of man to Saint Maximus the confessor)*, trad. MARINELA BOJIN, Ed. Basilica, București, 2019, p. 719.

²⁸ PR. PROF. DR. D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, p. 382.

²⁹ PR. PROF. DR. ȘTEFAN BUCHIU, *Dogmă și Teologie. Curs de teologie dogmatică și simbolică ortodoxă (Dogma and Theology. Course on Orthodox dogmatic and symbolic theology)*, vol. I, Sigma, București, 2006, pp. 250–251.

³⁰ PR. PROF. DR. D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, p. 399; E. STEPHANOU, „La coexistence initiale du corps et de l'âme dans l'homme d'après saint Grégoire de Nysse et saint Maxime l'Homologète”, *Revue des études byzantines* 31, 167 (1932), Persée-Portail des revues scientifiques en SHS, pp. 307–309.

inhomogeneous joining of the two realities, the soul could not fully share the sensitivities and passions of the body, and the latter would remain incapable of spiritualization.³¹

If things were different, and one of the two realities were pre-existing the other, then the work and their unitary existence would be affected. The body would no longer fully share in the subject quality of the soul, remaining only a shell of it, or rather a prison, as the Platonists claim. At the same time, the soul would no longer be able to be in such a strong connection with the material world and would not be able to influence it to the extent it does now.³² At the same time, if the soul were not present in the body from the very first act of its formation, the body could not develop in accordance with the spiritual needs and movements of the soul and could not have the complexity appropriate to the soul. The fact that the biblical account of creation states that God made man from the earth and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (Genesis 2:7) does not suggest a temporal primacy of the soul³³, but the fact that God relates directly to man, "breathes into his face the breath of life" and makes him a living being, not only biologically but also spiritually; he calls him to dialogue and shows his dignity as the "alter ego" of the Creator. In this way, man is not only the bearer of a body that represents the most complex plasticized rationality of the world, but he is a conscious bearer of it.³⁴

Therefore, man is subject to a whole, body and soul, showed to us by the moment of his creation.³⁵ God breaks the thread of bringing into being by uttering the words "let there be" and in the case of man, works directly. Man is created by a work that is more like a dialogue than an action on an object. God takes the body from the general matter and breathes into it a living soul.

3. THE DICHOTOMOUS NATURE OF MAN, PREMISE OF HIS PRIESTLY VOCATION

In connection with the dichotomous nature of man, one might ask: why did it take an unmediated work of the Creator to bring Adam out of the dust? Why didn't he say "you" to some animal and make him a representative of creation? Clearly, it needed someone who had more than fellowship with nature, someone who also had an element superior to matter, such as the soul. But then, why did he not give this soul to an already existing body, which would thereby become man, but needed to bring man into existence, as a dichotomous being? This act of God shows us that the soul cannot be superadded to a previously existing body, because in that case the body would not share from the beginning the character of subject, and this would have repercussions on man's entire existence and his organic relationship with nature, keeping the soul in the body as in a kind of dungeon and before the world as before a foreign existence which cannot enrich it and which it cannot transfigure.³⁶

Through the unmediated work and breath of the Creator, there emerges from the general matter a "you", which can in turn say You to God, for this you can also say I as a subject fully aware of its existence. The spiritual breath of the Creator produces a spiritual

³¹ SFÂNTUL MAXIM MĂRTURISITORUL, *Ambigua*, Io., 42, PG 91, 1341D [trad. rom. SFÂNTUL MAXIM MĂRTURISITORUL, *Ambigua*, Io., 42, p. 291].

³² PR. PROF. DR. D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, p. 395.

³³ Pr.Prof.Dr. Ș. BUCHIU, *Dogmă și Teologie... (Dogma and Theology...)*, vol. I, pp. 249–250.

³⁴ SFÂNTUL MAXIM MĂRTURISITORUL, *Ambigua*, PG 91, 1324 [trad. rom. SFÂNTUL MAXIM MĂRTURISITORUL, *Ambigua*, pp. 276-278]. PR. PROF. DR. D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, p. 396.

³⁵ L. THUNBERG, *Microcosm and Mediator...*, pp. 100–101.

³⁶ PR. PROF. DR. D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, p. 395.

breath of the human being, namely the spiritual soul which is rooted in man. By virtue of this, he will be able to be in conscious dialogue with his fellow men and with God.³⁷ So the direct work that God has done to bring man into existence is of crucial importance. It shows the authentic connection that the Supreme Person wants to achieve with the person through participation, who is man. God does not relate to man as one with whom he can have a possessive relationship, but as a *you* with whom he can look him in the eye and with whom he can have a living relationship.³⁸ The direct bringing into existence of man also shows that he has a special position, not only in relation to God, but also within creation. The world cannot by itself be a subject and cannot enter a dialogue with God alone; that is why man is needed to represent its consciousness and its spirit.³⁹ Only in this way does the world become together subject with man and can enter through man into dialogue with God. The direct bringing into existence of man also shows that he has a special position, not only in relation to God, but also within creation. The world cannot by itself be a subject and cannot enter a dialogue with God alone; that is why man is needed to represent its consciousness and its spirit. Only in this way does the world become together subject with man and can enter through man into dialogue with God.

The soul-body unity that makes up the human person is the conscious factor embedded in creation. By means of the body, the human person is inserted into the general nature, taking it out of the monotony of its cyclical processes and channeling it towards a specific meaning. But this is only because the body is animated and not merely matter. If it were not so, it would be impossible for it to actualize nature in a spiritual direction and lead it towards overcoming its automatism. At the same time, it is not merely spirit either, for then it could not act upon the world. The spiritual growth of the soul could not be transmitted to the world. This is why the Orthodox tradition has also preferred the notion of soul to that of spirit, since the soul is bound to the body in the strongest way, whereas the spirit can also exist outside the body, the body being only an alien reality.⁴⁰ So, the fact that man is both a spiritual and material being shows his role as mediator between Creator and creation. His dichotomous constitution is the essential premise of his vocation to the world. He is taken from the general matter of the world, endowed with a living soul, and placed in the world as a leaven to transform it. The world cannot be deified on its own, since this process presupposes communion with the tripersonal God, but together with man it can enter a relationship with its Creator. It is therefore man who transmits to it what he becomes by sharing in the ennobling grace. Man is therefore by his very constitution the priest of creation. All that he does as an incarnate soul will also have an effect on the world. By ascending through his special relationship with the Creator to eternal life, he also drags along with him the body and the material world to which he is bound, like a train.⁴¹

In conclusion, we can say that without a lively subject inserted in it, the world would be condemned to the monotony of repeating narrower or wider cycles. Only the

³⁷ PR. PROF. DR. D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, pp. 409–410.

³⁸ MARTIN BUBER, *EU și TU (ME and YOU)*, trad. ȘTEFAN AUGUSTIN DOINAȘ, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1992, p. 15.

³⁹ DIAC. DANIEL GLIGORE, *Sacerdotiul omului. Omul preot al creației (Priesthood of man. Man the priest of creation)*, Ed. Dacpress, Curtea de Argeș, 2004, p. 6

⁴⁰ Pr.Prof.Dr.D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, p. 399; E. STEPHANOU, „La coexistence initiale du corps et de l'âme...”, pp. 304–309.

⁴¹ PR. PROF. DR. D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă (Orthodox Dogmatic Theology)*, vol. I, pp. 380–381.

freedom of a conscious spirit overcomes repetition, making even creation cross the boundary of the natural and rise above the natural. This influence that man has over the world is due to the fact that his body is ontologically linked to its plasticized rationality, having been put into by God, like a dough that "leavened all the kneading".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] ATTIS, JEAN-CHRISTOPHE; BENBASSA, ESTHER, *Dicționar de civilizație iudaică, (traducere în limba Română)*, Ed. Univers Enciclopedic, București, 1997.
- [2] *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptură*, tipărită cu binecuvântarea P.F. Daniel, cu aprobarea Sf. Sinod, Editura IBMBOR, București, 2008.
- [3] BRIA, PR. PROF. DR. ION, *Dicționar de Teologie Ortodoxă*, Ed. IBMBOR, București, 1994.
- [4] BUBER, MARTIN, *EU și TU*, traducere de ȘTEFAN AUGUSTIN DOINAȘ, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1992.
- [5] BUCHIU, PR. PROF. DR. ȘTEFAN, *Dogmă și Teologie. Curs de teologie dogmatică și simbolică ortodoxă*, vol. I, Sigma, București, 2006.
- [6] CARREZ, MAURICE; MOREL, FRANÇOIS, *Dicționar grec-român al Noului Testament*, traducere de GHEORGHE BADEA, Societatea Biblică Interconfesională din România, București, 1998.
- [7] CLEMENT, OLIVER, *Întrebări asupra omului*, traducere de IOSIF POP și PR. CIPRIAN SPON, Ed. Reîntregirea, Alba Iulia, 1997.
- [8] *Revue des études byzantines* 29, 159 (1930), Persée-Portail des revues scientifiques en SHS, pp. 296–313.
- [9] DOUGLAS, J. D., *Dicționar biblic*, Ed. Cartea Creștină, Oradea, 1995.
- [10] HARE, R. M., *Platon*, trad. Matei Pleșu, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1997.
- [11] IONESCU, LECT. UNIV. DR. LAURENȚIU, *Dicționar de limbă ebraică biblică*, Editura Societății Biblice Interconfesionale din România, București, 2006.
- [12] LARCHET, JEAN-CLAUDE, *Îndumnezeirea omului la Sfântul Maxim Mărturisitorul*, traducere de MARINELA BOJIN, Ed. Basilica, București, 2019.
- [13] LOSSKY, VLADIMIR, *Introducere în Teologia Ortodoxă*, traducere de LIDIA și REMUS RUS, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1993.
- [14] SFÂNTUL MAXIM MĂRTURISITORUL, *Ambigua*, în PSB 80, traducere de PR. PROF. DR. DUMITRU STĂNILOAE, E.I.B.M.B.O.R., București, 1983.
- [15] SFÂNTUL MAXIM MĂRTURISITORUL, *Ambigua*, în Jacques-Paul MIGNE (ed.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series graeca*, vol. 91, 1031A-1418C.
- [16] SHERWOOD, POLYCARP, *St. Maximus the confessor: The ascetic life. The four centuries on charity*, Longmans, Green and Co, Londra, 1955.
- [17] STĂNILOAE, PR. PROF. DR. DUMITRU, *Chipul nemuritor al lui Dumnezeu (Opere complete V)*, Basilica, București, 2013.
- [18] STĂNILOAE, PR. PROF. DR. DUMITRU, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă*, vol. I, E.I.B.M.O., București, 2010.
- [19] STÉPHANOU, E., „La coexistence initiale du corps et de l’âme dans l’homme d’après saint Grégoire de Nysse et saint Maxime l’Homologète”, *Revue des études byzantines* 31, 167 (1932), Persée-Portail des revues scientifiques en SHS, pp. 304–315.
- [20] *The King James Bible*, <https://kingjames.bible>, <https://kingjames.bible>.
- [21] THUMBERG, LARS, *Microcosm and Mediator. The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor*, Open Court Publishing Company, Illinois, 1995.
- [22] TODORAN, PR. PROF. DR. ISIDOR; ZĂGREAN, ARHID. PROF. DR. IOAN, *Teologia Dogmatică*, Renașterea, București, 2009.
- [23] VLACHOS, IEROTHEOS, *Dogmatica empirică a Bisericii Ortodoxe Sobornicești*, vol. II, traducere de TATIANA PETRACHE, Ed. Doxologia, Iași, 2014.