

Диссертация С. Бортника написана добротной, емкой, всесторонней. Язык изложения не загроможден сложной терминологией, что делает труд доступным широкому кругу читателей, но при этом диссертация не теряет глубины и сосредоточенности. С другой стороны, заметим, что в диссертации не так много места отводится Максиму Исповеднику. Если на каппадокийцах автор останавливается более детально, то преподобному Максиму в этом повезло намного меньше, учитывая тот фактор, что одна из двух диссертаций Зизиуласа была посвящена именно ему. Тем не менее, несмотря на большое количество затрагиваемых тем, стоит с уверенностью признать, автор справился с задачей и был верен методу, описанному в начале работы.

Андрей Кучерявый,  
Одесская богословская семинария  
Одесса, Украина  
ORCID: 0000-0001-5547-2679

*OBSHCHENIE I LICHNOST'.* BOGOSLOVIE MITROPOLITA IOANNA ZIZIULASA V SISTEMATICHESKOM RASSMOTRENII. [KOMUNION UND PERSON. DIE THEOLOGIE VON JOHN ZIZIOULAS IN SYSTEMATISCHER BETRACHTUNG] BY SERGEI MIKHAILOVICH BORTNIK. KYIV: IZDATEL'SKII OTDEL UKRAINSKOI PRAVOSLAVNOI TSERKVI. 2017. Pp. 394. ISBN 978-966-2371-47-5; 10 USD.\*

DOI: 10.29357/ISSN.2521-179X.2018.20.21

This work is the dissertation of Sergei Bortnik—Doctor of Theology and Docent of Kyiv Spiritual Academy—which he successfully defended in 2013 at the theology faculty of Heidelberg University in Germany. The book consists of five basic sections and also includes a significant introduction.

In the introduction the author outlines very important methodological contours and tasks. The first methodological contour is the *principle of analogy* (28), understood as a holistic description of the creativity of Metropolitan John Zizioulas, and not concentrating on one single theological feature. The second is the application of the contextual method, which allows the connection of the personality and context of Zizioulas (32).

In the first section the author quite consistently holds to his designated contextual method. It consists of two unequal blocks, dedicated to thematic shifts and personalities. The author notes that one of the main characteristics of the “new theology” to which he relates Zizioulas is the issue of experience (48). Referring to Karl Felmy, the author explains this “voluminous” and rather vague concept, demonstrating the distance

---

*The article received on 14.01.2018; approved for publication on 13.03.2018.*

that develops between church (liturgical) experience on the one hand, and pietistic (individual) experience, as well as the Erlangen school, on the other. Liturgical experience is largely the experience of the congregation, and in it, in the words of the author, is rooted the anchor field which crystalizes “fellowship”—an important term for Zizioulas. Among the personalities that influenced Zizioulas, the author dwells on Sergei Bulgakov with his “understanding of personality in its opposition to individualism,” which he borrowed from the Slavophiles (55); Georges Florovsky, with his “return to the fathers” and the attempt to think according to their spirit (58), and who was also Zizioulas’s academic advisor. Later Bortnik notes the influence of N. Afanasyev on Zizioulas, as well as the mediating influence of A. Khomyakov. At the end of the chapter the author gives a significant place to the “sixties generation” in Greek theology (66), a detail without which it is difficult to reconstruct a holistic theological context for the metropolitan. This movement is characterized by a departure from scholastic language, the search for its own (Greek) authenticity, “emotionally alienated from the West” (68-69), and also a return to the Greek Fathers, where at the center stood the connection of “theological thought with spiritual life.” Following M. Makridis, the author notes the critical attitude of the “sixties generation” toward the previous theological tradition and its inclusion in the general context of the contemporary understanding of the Greek Fathers, beginning in the mid-1950s (67-68).

The second part is dedicated to a survey of Zizioulas’s dissertation, “Church Unity in the Holy Eucharist and in the Bishop During the First Three Centuries” (93). The author conveys that although the dissertation was shaped historically, it betrays the Greek theologian’s inclination toward systematization. Sergei Bortnik articulates the main idea of Zizioulas’s dissertation as the role of the bishop in his relationship to the Eucharist (96). At the same time Bortnik attempts to identify the latent polemic with Protestant researchers: the idealism of the Bruno Bauer school, and the dialectic of Adolf von Harnack. The author suggests that Zizioulas attempts to correct the fixation of contemporary Orthodox thought on the aspect of the application of the holy gifts and direct attention to the participants themselves, in which “The Eucharist is... not so much a thing as it is an action, not so much a partaking of ‘holy objects,’ as it is ‘the communion of saints’” (100). As a result of the “Constantinian shift,” thanks to which the connection of the bishop to administrative functions solidified, and the role of performer and primate in the Eucharistic gathering was transferred to the presbyters. Since that time the person and role of the bishop has acquired a borderline locus, which has become more and more dominant. The author dedicates the remainder of this chapter to Zizioulas’s critical relationship to the eucharistic mainstream of Greek theology. Here we will limit ourselves to the following: “the association of medieval theology with analytic methodology” (120), where analysis proposes a breakdown into theological segments that can be examined autonomously. Zizioulas opposes that with “ontological unity,” which proposes a substantial connection between the Eucharist and the Church, and also emphasizes the eschatological and pneumological aspect of theology.

In the third section the author dwells on one of the most important terms for Zizioulas—“fellowship.” In the course of reading this chapter, one gets the impression that the idea of fellowship is the prism or path according to which Zizioulas conducts

a certain revision of contemporary Orthodox theology. This is expressed in the change of language from technical-ontological to dynamic and existential. The presuppositions for this change are traced in the increasing popularity and significance of ecclesiology (beginning in the nineteenth and throughout the twentieth century) and also in the special emphasis centered on pneumatology, which Zizioulas notes: “The Church is founded by the Spirit, and not only by Christ” (129). Another presupposition for the language change is eschatology, which, in its turn, dominates historical reality for Zizioulas.

Continuing the discussion, the author dwells on Zizioulas’s understanding of ministry and apostolic succession. He highlights the following segments in the thought of the Greek theologian: if, in the Middle Ages, it was thought that only certain people possessed holiness, then, in the words of Zizioulas, pneumatology connected with Christology makes holiness the domain of the entire Body. On the other hand, he draws attention to the Greek theologian’s criticism, namely of apostolic succession as the transmission of correct teaching. Zizioulas outlines a basic shift in the area of apostolic succession from the transmission of ideas (teachings objectified by norms) to the spreading of the Spirit and “holistic life.” This shift is connected with the transfer to an eschatological platform, closely connected with the work of the Holy Spirit.

Analyzing the connection of the bishop and the congregation, the author shows that the metropolitan clearly sets up an “ecclesiology of fellowship” as over against the pyramid structure, dependence, and connection of the bishop with the congregation, expressed in the Eucharist. In Bortnik’s words, in the Eucharist Zizioulas attempts to find the golden mean between the common and the private, between the universal and the local. Remaining in the framework of the theme of fellowship, the author draws attention to the ecological problem in Zizioulas’s creativity and its connection with the Eucharist and the priesthood. The contemporary epoch is too rational and often sees man’s lordship over creation in the supremacy of the rational mind. Zizioulas, in the words of Bortnik, is categorical in this respect, seeing supremacy in something completely different: “... in the ability to relate in such a way as to create the event of fellowship” (183).

Part four is completely devoted to the formation of the concept of personality in the Greek theologian’s work. The author notes that Zizioulas himself gives no definition of personality; rather, it is defined in opposition to the individual, absorbed in himself. Bortnik makes an important observation concerning the personalistic issue that develops when Zizioulas approaches the problem of Trinitarian theology directly (since 1991). Bortnik reveals the important subtext of this issue, showing the difference in theological accents in the West and the East. While the West was characterized by Christo-monism and the search for the historical Jesus (nineteenth century), the East typically accented pneumatology and eschatology. As a result, the binary Western model of Christo-monism and history is delineated, while in the East there is pneumatology and eschatology. The author suggests that Zizioulas attempts to find a middle way and utilize the strong points of both traditions: to show the close (economic) tie of Christology and pneumatology. The result of this attempt at reconciliation is the psychology of the Greek theologian, where personality is known Christologically in close relationship to the work of the Spirit and becomes open and corporate. Corporateness is evident not only in Christ’s connection with the Father, but in all Christians’ connection to Him. “Such a pneumotological

basis for Christology... requires seeing not individuality in Christ, which affirms itself by distancing itself from others, but a Personality, whose characteristics are revealed and supported in fellowship” (207).

Making Zizioulas’s thought concrete, the author outlines the philosophical context of the problem. He correctly notes that Zizioulas uses extra-theological tools—existentialist philosophy and psychology. They are both developed not as theological streams, but as an element of secular thought. This pushes the metropolitan to crystallize his position as it relates to its philosophical foundation. The author proposes that Zizioulas speaks about the philosophical basis of theology, where theology is required to widen its borders and touch upon contemporary theological thought.

Developing the theme of personality, Bortnik directs attention to the place Zizioulas gives to the theology of the Cappadocians, calling this period a “revolution in ontology,” where the “face” in the Trinity is not a haphazard or newly-introduced element, but rather constant, existential, and essential. Further, the author concentrates on the opposing nature of personality in the theology of Zizioulas, where nature is connected with necessity, and personality is characterized by openness and freedom. Zizioulas sees fatal influence in the psychologization of personality from Augustine through Boethius, which became the main track for the West. In this sense he agrees with Pannenberg, who advocated the rejection of the idea of personality as self-awareness (Fichte).

Finally, the author analyzes the concept of “otherness,” specifying that otherness for Zizioulas is primarily localized in the center of Trinitarian theology, where “The Father as cause: personality generating otherness” (302). Here the author sees the development of theology in the early (horizontal) and mature (vertical) stages of the Orthodox theologian. In the early stage, Zizioulas was occupied with the theme of fellowship and *sobornost'*; in the context of *sobornost'* he works out the question of the position of the bishop, ordination, baptism. At a later stage Zizioulas is more focused on the question of hierarchy in the Trinity and the Church (otherness). In otherness there is an asymmetry of relationship; in these relationships there is always someone greater; at the same time otherness is hierarchical by definition.

The fifth part is one of the most interesting and important; here the author touches on the critical reception of Zizioulas in contemporary theology. He begins with an examination of criticism of Zizioulas in the area of Christology: the departure from the concrete (Christ as a historical personality, who died on a cross) and the movement toward the abstract (fellowship, the image of God, Christ as a “metaphysical guide”). Later the author dwells on the departure from apophysis and also the criticisms of Kallistos Ware and John Behr concerning the absence of necessary attention to issues of asceticism, the ascetic struggle. “This lack is no accident, since the elevation of fellowship carries with it a diminution of the significance of ascetic effort of the individual Christian” (323). Bortnik focuses on Zizioulas’s relationship to the patristic inheritance. The metropolitan is criticized for an overly free attitude to the ancient text: he places great emphasis on themes that are either in formation or that do not fulfill the main task, as in the case with Zizioulas. The author objects that it is incorrect to consider Zizioulas a patristics scholar or historian in the strict sense of the term; he is rather a systematizer, attempting to interpret the tradition of the eastern Church in the contemporary context. Speaking of the givens and

preconceptions of the personality and its realization in the eschaton, the author crosses over to the important methodological point of “analogy.” Examining that positive point which the principle of analogy played in contemporary theology, the Ukrainian author nevertheless notes a large number of reserved responses in its favor.

Sergei Bortnik’s dissertation is soundly written; it is succinct and well-rounded. The language is not cluttered with difficult terminology, making his work accessible to a wide circle of readers, while at the same time the dissertation loses nothing in depth and focus. On the other hand, we note that not much space is given in the dissertation to Maxim the Confessor. If the author gives more detail on the Cappadocians, he gives much less to Blessed Maxim, even considering that one of Zizioulas’s two dissertations was devoted to him. Nevertheless, in spite of the large number of themes, it must certainly be stated that the author handled his task well and was true to the method described at the beginning of the work.

*Andrei Kucheriavyi,  
Odessa Theological Seminary  
Odessa, Ukraine  
ORCID: 0000-0001-5547-2679*

НОВЫЙ ВЗГЛЯД НА ПАВЛА ГЛАЗАМИ РЕФОРМАТОРОВ. СТИВЕН ЧЕСТЕР.  
ПЕР. С АНГЛ. СЕРГЕЯ КАЛЮЖНОГО. ЧЕРКАССЫ: КОЛЛОКВИУМ, 2018,  
xvi + 515 с.; ISBN 978-966-8957-64-2 (ТВ. ПЕР.); 380 UAH.\*

DOI: 10.29357/ISSN.2521-179X.2018.20.23

Когда столь квалифицированный ученый-паулинист как Стивен Честер, берется за историко-экзегетическое исследование с целью способствовать диалогу между разными эпохами изучения Нового Завета (НЗ), результат не может быть неинтересным. Новый взгляд на Павла – это исследование герменевтики и экзегетического богословия протестантских реформаторов XVI века и их связи с важнейшими современными дискуссиями в области изучения посланий апостола Павла. Следовательно, это и исследование истории рецепции — мысли Павла реформаторами и “реформационного Павла” современным научным дискурсом, — и упражнение в экзегезисе НЗ с учетом историко-богословских данных. Книга написана новозаветником и преимущественно для новозаветников. Для первичной аудитории она окажется весьма полезной, хотя и читатели интересующиеся другими богословскими дисциплинами смогут почерпнуть из нее немало ценных идей и стоящей информации.

---

\* *Статья поступила в редакцию 07.02.2018; утверждена в печать 13.03.2018*