

The Logos of Creation – a Patristic Approach of Gen 1-3

Cătălin-Petru OARGĂ

„Babeş-Bolyai” University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Abstract. *Logos and rationality of creation are two of the most fundamental concepts of Christian Orthodox cosmology, built on the foundation of Saint John’s Gospel (Jn 1,1-3) and developed by the Fathers of the Church, culminating in Saint Maxim the Confessor theological synthesis. Modern biblical exegesis strives to determine the scientific accuracy of Old Testament cosmology, along with the analogies and similarities that Gen 1-3 has with other ANE cosmologies. However, considering the revealed and inspired dimension of the Scriptures, the Holy Fathers of the Church were not so much tempted to regard the literal and scientific level of the text. Instead, their focus was on the dialogical and rational character of the creation, which Cappadocian Fathers like Saint Basil the Great and Saint John Chrysostom, consider at the heart of the biblical cosmology. The present study aims to engage in a pursue of finding the rationality of creation that the Divine Logos, as Maxim the Confessor states, has planted and integrated in every element of creation as a clue for His presence and existence.*

Keywords: *Creation, Genesis 1-3, Rationality, Logos, Cosmology.*

As Mircea Eliade stated, „the purpose of human life is to give purpose and finality to life – everything becomes purposeful in the light of revelation”¹, the entire creation as described in Gen 1-3 is not autonomous, it is not designed to be a mere contemplative and abstract work of perfection by God, but a dynamic environment that gives man the opportunity to fulfil his true nature: deification. As an expression of the natural revelation, creation is permeated by the divine *logoi*, which contain the *reason* and *finality* of each created element. As such, the biblical account of creation depicts a complex, yet simple blueprint for understanding the true vocation of the human being, created by the *image of God* (Gen 1,26-7).

Father Dumitru Stăniloae envisioned how the *reason* or *logos* of creation determines and moves the *rationality* of the human being: „the rationality of the world is only activated and fulfilled by the human *reason*. Our human *reason* grows in depth and power through discovering the divine reasons in creation”². Saint Gregory of Nazianzus considered the dynamic nature of *logos* in creation as such: „God did no create a world governed by a circular and identical movement, but a world through which He continues His dialogue with the humankind through creation for a purpose. He is not only the Artisan of this great guitar (world), but also its Artist”³.

¹ Ioan Chirilă, „The „Difficulties” of Revelation and „Limits” of Reason”, în *Transdisciplinarity in Science and Religion* 4, Bucureşti, Curtea Veche, 2008, p. 249.

² Dumitru Stăniloae, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă*, vol.1, Bucureşti, IBMO, 2004, p. 119.

³ Christos Yannaras, *Persoană și Eros*, Bucureşti, Anastasia, 2000, p. 103.

„The Logos of Creation – a Patristic Approach of Gen 1-3,” *Astra Salvensis*, IX (2021), no. 17, p. 31-41.

The latent reason of creation – Gen 1,1-2,4b

The verbal structure of Gen 1,1-2,4b is a formidable *crescendo* defined by the verbs: *to create, to make, to see, to separate, to gather, to rule, to bless* etc, which are the exclusive prerogative of Yahweh Elohim. The way the hagiographer orders and uses these verbal structures resembles liturgical overtones by concision, symmetry, and sumptuousness. The liturgical dimension of Gen 1-3 is one of the most spectacular inner dimensions implied by the notion *rationality* of creation, that comprises both spatial and temporal coordinates in Old Testament cosmology, that I developed in the analysis of Gen 2-3. Saint Gregory of Nyssa perceives a bidirectional movement through the word *beresit* (Gen 1,1): one that originates in the intelligible world and engulfs the physical creation, and the other following the ordered and perfect creation of God, in which God rests through Sabbath to reiterate or recapitulate it in the Divine Logos⁴.

The ambiguous expression *tobu wabobu* has stirred numerous controversies and hypothesis regarding a possible antagonism between God and the forces of evil often perceived as Leviathan, a marine monster that represented the forces of chaos and their strive to overrule the ordered and perfect creation God rested upon. Patristic exegesis of *tobu wabobu* primarily focuses on the *unfinished* and *imperfect* aspect of creation prior the creative utterance of the divine *fiat* (Gen 1,3). *Tobu wabobu* is rather a prophetic annunciation of the decay and desolation status of creation that follows the *fall* of humankind. In terms of *stewardship* and *ruling* over creation, the inner call and vocation of mankind is to work and keep the order and balance of creation and avoid the imminence of chaos. However, *tobu wabobu* does not contain a negative or pessimistic echo in the writings of the Holy Fathers, as it portrays anthropologic and spiritual echoes.

Besides the creation through word, which is specific for the first account of creation (Gen 1,1-2,4b), another creative action of God is *separation*, the purpose of which is to set boundaries to each part of creation so that it performs its design purpose and does not go beyond that⁵. *Separation (hibdil)* is of outmost importance for understanding the rationality of creation. As Saint Maxim the Confessor states, the Divine Logos⁶, spreads the *logoi* of creation as divine intentions and energies and gathers/recapitulates them in Him. Rationality or intelligibility is thus proved by the permanence and immutability of the divine *logoi* in things. Separation (*hibdil*) clearly shows that God intends the unity of creation, but He also allows *specificity* and *uniqueness* or freedom or

⁴ Vasile Răducă, *Antropologia Sfântului Grigorie de Nyssa – căderea în păcat și restaurarea omului* (București: IBMO, 1996), p. 83.

⁵ Bernard W. Anderson, *Creation in the Old Testament*, Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1984, p. 73.

⁶ Sfântul Chiril al Alexandriei, *Scrieri II* în *PSB 39*, București, IBMO, 1992, p. 10. Lucian Zenoviu Bot, "Koinonia in Bilateral Dialogues," in *Astra Salvensis*, VI (2018), no. 12, p. 412.

act⁷. In close connection with *separation* (*bibdil*) stands *dominion* or *rule* (*rada*) in Gen 1,26.28, but also in Gen 1,16.18 which refers to the celestial luminaries that rule over day and night and man's dominion over the animals (Gen 1,26.28). Stewardship over creation and the ruling of celestial bodies both suggest the rationality and order of creation⁸.

The benediction of God through Sabbath is seen in a broader context by Saint John Chrysostom, whose exegesis extends the benediction, which occurred on the seventh day, to the preceding days and entirety of creation given the recapitulative character of Sabbath in relation with the six days of creation. Saint John Chrysostom's interpretation is common among the Cappadocian Fathers who, did not only interpret Gen 1-3 as the creation of the world by God, the Father through His Son and Holy Spirit, but also emphasized the *rational* and *koinonial* nature of creature as a revelatory environment that facilitates communion with God and compels oneself to contemplation⁹.

Saint Maxim the Confessor makes a formidable analogy between the theology of logos and the cosmology of Gen 1,1-2,4b. In his view, the entire *cosmos* (Greek term for ordered world) is created by 5 polarities or divisions, all of which work together to deliver a *good* and *ordered* world, according to the will of the Holy Trinity: „The first polarity (division) separates the entire created nature from the uncreated nature. The second (division) is that according to which all beings created by God are differentiated as intelligible and sensible. The third one separates sensible (physical) beings in firmament and earth. The fourth one divides earth in Paradise and inhabited land. Finally, the fifth division separates the human being in man and woman, as the only intelligible being that mediates the above-mentioned distinctions”¹⁰.

It is Saint Maximus the Confessor's statement that summarizes the Patristic understanding of creation as a sanctuary of *repentance* and *metanoia* for humanity. Interpreting biblical cosmology by the standards of modern science does not create anything but ambiguity and mythology. The Fathers of Church, thus, perceived the creation accounts of Genesis in a spiritual fashion, seeking the truths about Adam, Eve and Eden as paradigms of deification and communion with God. Another exceptional theological statement that follows this pattern of thinking is the need and to pursue the unification of oneself and

⁷ *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol 4, Washington, Thomson Gale, 2003, p. 338.

⁸ Tom McLeish, *Faith and Wisdom in Science*, Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 2014, p. 72–73. Nicolae Muntean, "Implicații ale Apostolatului Creștin Reflectate în Activitatea Publică a Domnului Iisus Hristos," in *Astra Salvensis*, VI (2018), no. 12, p. 435. Cf.

⁹ Sfântul Ioan Gură de Aur, *Omiliile la Facere* în *PSB* 21, trad. Dumitru Fecioru, București, IBMO, 1987, p. 124.

¹⁰ Sfântul Maxim Mărturisitorul, *Ambigua*, București, IBMO, 2010, p. 56. Cf. Iuliu-Marius Morariu, "The Spiritual Autobiography in the Eastern space in the second half of the XIXth and XXth century," in *Astra Salvensis*, III (2015), Supplement no. 1, p. 168.

„The Logos of Creation – a Patristic Approach of Gen 1-3,” *Astra Salvensis*, IX (2021), no. 17, p. 31-41.

of the entire world through *metanoia*, which primarily is a *rational, intelligible* endeavor¹¹.

The koinonial reason of creation (Gen 2,4b-25)

The second account of creation offers an Adamic-epistemic perspective on creation, through which Adam and Eve are called by God to become partners in the act of creation, namely in maintaining the order, balance, and goodness of creation by fulfilling their ontological call as *servants* and *keepers* of Eden. Gen 2,4b-25 is almost in its entirety described by the Fathers of Church as an exhortation for knowledge by contemplation and action. The contemplative life of Adam and Eve who are brought to existence by God in Paradise, *gan Eden*, that is a place of joy and contemplation, is not complete without their practical life, which is referred to as a life of virtue by Church Fathers¹². As Doru Costache states, following the patristic understanding of cosmology, Gen 1,1-2,4b and Gen 2,4b-25 are complementary and both create the complete image of the original creation of God: „The first account of creation seems to me a hieratical celebration of the mystery of encompassing the universe in man, in the symbolic architecture of this being, while the second account conveys the image of a world that is still in progress, and dependent to human choice.”¹³

Father Dumitru Stăniloae acknowledges the verbal construction of Gen 2,4b-25 about the divine reasons in creation and reaches a powerful conclusion. Contemplation is natural for Adam and Eve, but the *rationes seminales* that permeate creation in its entirety are also intended for creating a *rational, intelligible* dialogue between Creator and creature. Thus, Dumitru Stăniloae interprets the commandment in Gen 2,19-20 in this fashion. Adam acknowledges the divine imprint and rational architecture of the creation, but he also feels and urge, given his spiritual and rational being, to utter his words of doxology and awe before his Creator. In short, the *logoi* planted by the Divine Logos determine Adam bring out his *logos* (meaning word, utterance) as an act of grace¹⁴. The rational nature of human beings is the subject of rationality of creation, not vice versa. Thus, the *logoi* of creation are intended to be deciphered by the rationality in human beings and reach their purpose¹⁵.

¹¹ C. Rebecca Rine, „Interpretations of Genesis 1–2 among the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers” în *Since the beginning interpreting Genesis 1 and 2 through the Ages*, Michigan, Baker Academic, 2018, p. 123-4.

¹² Doru Costache, „Sfântul Vasile cel Mare și reprezentarea creștină a lumii” în *Cappadocian Legacy: A Critical Appraisal*, Sydney, St Andrew’s Orthodox Press, 2013, p. 30.

¹³ Doru Costache, “Microcosmos și macrocosmos”, în *Teologie și științe naturale: În continuarea dialogului*, Craiova, Ed. Mitropoliei Olteniei, 2002, p. 70-82.

¹⁴ Dumitru Stăniloae, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă*, vol.1, București, IBMO, 2004, p. 367.

¹⁵ Ioan Chirilă, „The „Difficulties” of Revelation and „Limits” of Reason”, în *Transdisciplinarity in Science and Religion 4*, București, Curtea Veche, 2008, p. 256.

Father Dumitru Stăniloae expands his digression on Gen 2,19-20 into a short biblical anthropology centered on the rationality of creation. As mentioned above, creation is fashioned as a *topos* of communion and dialogue between God and humanity. Taking part in this intelligible dialogue through his doxology, Adam gradually improves his language and perception of the rational architecture of the world in a creative use of the divine reasons. Moreover, Gen 2,19-20 expresses one of the two ontological vocations, which is that of the *servant or worker*, who consciously works for keeping the order and beauty of creation, avoiding any imbalance that might occur. Thus, Adam's *naming* animals is not really and extrinsic commandment, but one that is planted in him by creation, and is expressed, as Father Stăniloae points out, as an intrinsic urge: "God accepts the name Adam gives to animals, as an expression of His dialogue with Adam, because the names themselves belong to God Himself. By naming animals and other things, our spiritual being gradually improves and grows to be a partner in the dialogue with God"¹⁶.

Gen 2,4b-25 uses an anthropological description of creation, and is also focused on the temporal and creatural realm. The absence of symmetrical/liturgical expressions of divine creative power *iehi – va iehi* (God said...and is was), a more descriptive language, and the use of *Yahweh Elohim* as divine name instead of *Elohim* (Gen 1,1-2,4b) all build on the image of *gan Eden* and creation in its wholeness as designed to be inhabited by mankind. The patristic understanding of Gen 2,4b-25 also points in this direction stating that God created Eden and its luxuriant beauty thinking about humanity and how mankind will relate with Him through creation by perceiving the reasons and beauty in creation¹⁷.

Gen 2,5-14 depicts the beauty of luxuriant vegetation of *gan Eden*. The present paper is not intended to summarize the literal interpretation of all these elements, but to point to the archetypal and intelligible dimension of Eden, which constitutes the *topos* of communion and dialogue between God and humanity represented by Adam and Eve. Thus, in the following paragraphs I will point out how both Jewish and Christian Patristic theology both compared the biblical account of *gan Eden* (Gen 2,4b-15) to the image of the sacred temple of God, as a place where God dwells with humanity.

Genesis 2,5-14 has numerous clues that point to the archetypal and spiritual constitution of the sacred space. Eden, thus, is paradigmatic for the understanding of the sacred place in the history of humanity. This point of view is common for both Judaic and Christian writings. The priestly writings found in the manuscripts of Qumran and apocryphal writings attest this perspective. They regard the imagery of Eden that offers precious liturgical and theological themes: the guarding and keeping of the Holy of Holies (the three of life, which is not to be trespassed), the connection between *gan Eden* and *Chariot*, the

¹⁶ Dumitru Stăniloae, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă*, vol.1, București, IBMO, 2004, p. 368.

¹⁷ Alexandru Mihăilă, „Gol și viclean” www.ziarullumina.ro – accessed 11.08.2020.

„The Logos of Creation – a Patristic Approach of Gen 1-3,” *Astra Salvensis*, IX (2021), no. 17, p. 31-41.

Edenic descendance of the Aaronite priesthood and its descendants, who took up the rituals and guard officed by angels and cherubs in the garden of Eden¹⁸.

The modern mind takes on *gan Eden* is that of a *hierotopos*, *hierotopia*, that designates an exceptional realm, different from other spaces or sites by the absence of time, decay, transformation and other contingencies. Moreover, *hierotopia* is a place of cleansing and healing, which does not allow anyone except for those who are consecrated and play a crucial role¹⁹. The Jewish spirituality developed a rich theology around the image of *gan Eden* and traced the spiritual paramount of the Jerusalem temple to its Edenic roots. The Book of Jubilees mentions Eden as created on the third day, when the waters were gathered in one place and unveiled the beauty of trees and grass. Even though its congruency with the biblical account is doubtful, there is a theological and spiritual understanding that comes to our attention: “the creation of the Eden on the third day precedes time, that is determined and linked to the creation of luminaries on the fourth day. The creation of the garden before time suggests its close connection to eschatology”²⁰.

Ezekiel 47,1-8 announces the eschatological temple of creation, which comprises cosmic elements from the garden of Eden. Josef Flavius talks about the analogy between the tripartite structure of the temple in Jerusalem and the tripartite structure of creation skies-earth-underground that can be viewed as a reflection: “The tabernacle is divided in such a fashion that it reflects the entire creation: the third part, that is made of the four pillars, where priesthood was not allowed to enter (except for the high priest, once a year), resembled heaven, consecrated to God, while the other side, made of earth and seas belonged to mankind”. Philo of Alexandria envisions the same analogy between the temple in Zion and the cosmic temple of creation in *De Specialibus Legibus*. The parallelism of Gen 1-2 and the Tabernacle of Moses (Ex 39-40) is common in the Jewish literature. Moshe Weinfeld states: “Gen 1,1-2,3 and Exod 39,1-40,33 is typologically identic. Both describe the fulfillment of God’s commandment, along with the blessing and sanctification that are related to it. Most important the expression of these ideas in those passages is overlaying”²¹. The last analogy in this series, but not the last from the Jewish literature, is that between Gen 1,1-2,4b and 1Kg 5-9, the consecration of the temple in Jerusalem in the times of king Solomon. There are some striking similarities that attest to the paradigmatic character of *gan Eden* as that of the first *sanctuary*. First, the six days of creation followed by the day in which God rested on creation (Shabbat), are

¹⁸ Emanuel Tov, *The texts from the Judaean desert: Indices and an introduction to the discoveries in the Judaean desert series*, Oxford, Brill, 2002, p. 67.

¹⁹ Rachel Elijor, „The Garden of Eden is the Holy of the Holies and the dwelling of the Lord” in *Studies in Spirituality*, Oxford, Brill, 2014, p. 76.

²⁰ Rachel Elijor, „The Garden of Eden is the Holy of the Holies and the dwelling of the Lord” in *Studies in Spirituality*, Oxford, Brill, 2014, p. 81.

²¹ Gregory K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission in Text and Texture*, New York: Schocken, 1979, p. 12.

paralleled by 1Kg 5-9 where the consecration of the temple took 7 years and 7 months and the ritual itself was carried out in seven days, and the king uttered seven prayers. The three of life in Eden is also paralleled by *menorab*, the seven-arm candle, which is considered a stylization of the tree of life (Ex 25,31-40). All these similarities and analogies are not to be taken as literary expressions, but theological truths that express the paradigmatic and intelligible character of *gan Eden*, as the sanctuary where Adam served as priest of creation.

The paradigmatic character of Eden (Gen 2,4b-25) is, as mentioned above, attested by the numerous references to its special and consecrated nature, but it also offers a precious detail for our present research. Eden could not be inhabited by unholy and unconsecrated, both amendments that apply to Adam and Eve, as clean and holy before their fall, and to the consecrated high priest who could carry the ritual inside the Holy of Holies before the covenant of God once a year as a reminder of the Edenic times, when Adam and Eve felt the life-giving presence of God, and also offered a clue about the eschatological times when Eden will become a reality for those who are righteous and cleansed.

The paradigmatic character of *gan Eden* is not a separate or allogenous theological development from the rationality or intelligibility of creation. As the reasons of creation originate in the Divine Logos of God, Who expands them throughout creation for completing the order and coherence of the created world, seen and unseen, so does the paradigmatic character of Eden, created by divine design and volition expand the *reasons* and *logoi* that defines the typology of the sanctuary in the Old Testament and even further, in the Christian sanctuary. The topology of Eden is made up of various elements as mentioned above: tree of life, river that splits in four branches as a source of rejuvenation and life and so on, that define the spatial model of the earthly sanctuary in later Judaism. Patristic theology recalls and points to the image of *gan Eden* as a place of joy and celebration, that defines human life before corruption and fall, and does also represent the eschatological hope for creation at Parousia. The patristic interpretations of Gen 1-3, homiletical or not, concentrate on the spiritual constitution of Edenic sanctuary, and especially on the spiritual status Adam and Eve and all humanity must achieve to live in the unmediated presence of God, in His garden. I would argue that patristic theological assertions on Gen 1-3 are aimed at the anthropological requirements and realities more than on textual analysis and geographical precision. To sum up this section, *gan Eden*, the garden of Eden that constitutes the centre of Gen 2,4b-25 can be perceived as a paradigmatic *topos* that defines the model for sanctuaries in the history of Israel and even beyond those limits. The rational and intelligible character of Eden, that has a vast geography and topology as described by the biblical account, bring out the order, coherence, beauty and comprehensibility through the divine reasons imprinted in creation, and are, as patristic theology argues, intended as a *topos* for *koinonia*. As Gen 2,4b-25 is structured around the image of the garden of God, *gan Eden* itself has a

„The Logos of Creation – a Patristic Approach of Gen 1-3,” *Astra Salvensis*, IX (2021), no. 17, p. 31-41.

tremendous importance for the literary structure of Gen 1-3, as it is the climax of divine creation, but also a landmark for the perfection of the created world, that will become, after the fall, a desired place to return to expressed in the history of mankind through the spiritual need to build sanctuaries as reflections and traces of the Edenic garden. Finally, *gan Eden* (Gen 2,4b-25) functions as the centre of creation both by geography, topology and especially by spirituality, presenting a small part of creation as a metonymy for the entire creation, permeated by *reasons* and *signs* that Adam and Eve recognized as such and organized by the divine commandment to *keep* and to *guard*, that are empowered by the inherent rationality of their own being created by God in His image.

Rationality and eschatology – Gen 3,1-24

Gen 3,1-24 presents the shift between the beauty, peace and order of *gan Eden* and the serpent's temptation, that eventually brings humanity and creation in decadence and spiritual blindness, which is suggested by a dramatic change in Adam and Eve's attitude towards God and His creation. I chose the title *rationality and eschatology* because Adam and Eve lived inside the garden of Eden in the unmediated presence of God through their cleansed and pure rational mind²² or intelligible mind that was able to discern between life and death, good and evil. After losing the dialectic and then spiritual battle with the serpent as the representant of evil powers, Adam and Eve did not lose their rational power entirely but dropped a veil that obstructed the full potential of reason as a spiritual power that keeps life in order, according to the will of God. As Adam and Eve lost the direct and personal sight of God's presence, their eyes gradually lost the ability to perceive the divine creative wisdom, that lies behind all life and creature. Moreover, as Saint Athanasius the Great suggests, after the fall of Adam and Eve, mankind was no longer able to receive the gifts of the Divine and creative wisdom of God, until the Incarnation of the Logos, Who lifted the veil that obliterated mankind's sight²³. Thus, Gen 3,1-24 opens the eschatological dimension regarding the rationality and intelligibility of creation as revelational environment of God. I think that Gen 3,15, the first Messianic prophecy that talks about the *seed* of woman that will crush the serpent's head is indicative of the restoration of creation's rationality and intelligibility as transparent ways through which God gathers His people in a doxological community.

The serpent's sophism that diabolically reinterprets the commandment of God 3,1-7 is the first example of how rationality and intelligibility can be

²² Panayotis Nellas, *Omul – animal îndumnezeit. Perspective pentru o antropologie ortodoxă*, Sibiu: Deisis, 1999, p. 69.

²³ Panayotis Nellas, *Omul – animal îndumnezeit. Perspective pentru o antropologie ortodoxă*, Sibiu: Deisis, 1999, p. 71.

lost, along with order, peace, and goodness. The goal behind the temptation of the serpent was structurally aimed at the core of the creation of God: order and beauty, both which were granted by observing the commandment of God that prohibited the access to the fruits of the tree of knowledge. In short, the serpent's malefic attempt was to overrule the commandment of God that set boundaries to creation. This pattern is then multiplied to all the sins and immoralities in the history of humankind: the abolition and trespassing of God's boundaries and limits set to creation as means of giving order and coherence, not constraint. Father Philoteus of Sinai addressed the serpent's attack on human reason and rationality as attacks to the ruling powers of Adam: "For the enemy knows that the guidance of passion is through the rational part, and therefore aiming at it, as I said before, the serpent brought doubt, envy, trickery and shameful pride to human reason, and thus subdued reason to passions and urges that cannot be contained out of reason"²⁴.

The image of the leather clothes that God give to Adam and Eve after fall as sign of care and providence for creation, has raised various interpretations in patristic and modern theology. Whether the clothes are views as an *adagio*, that is not consubstantial with human nature (Saint Gregory of Nyssa, Methodius of Olympus) or seen as symbols for post-Edenic conditions, Saint Maximums the Confessor, and other Fathers of the Church interpreted the clothes as distinct and strange from the original creation of God, and as suggesting the new imminence of mortality to human nature²⁵. By comparison, in the paradisiacal state, Adam and Eve, says Gregory the Theologian, "were clothed by the grace of God...the simplicity of Adam and Eve was through the absence of any (exterior) clothing"...by this we understand that their bodies did not have opposite qualities or elements that could create tension and chaos, and this is because of the reason imprinted by the Creator, simple and uncontradictory, perpetual and transparent by the grace of God, opened to the material creation, their bodies were not opaque or resistant to creation, nor was the creation in opposition, but willingly subdued by human nature"²⁶.

Saint Gregory the Theologian affirmed the providence of God even after the fall of humankind and decadence of human nature through mortality, that God ruled so that evil would not prevail and become eternal. The serpent's temptation was finally aimed at the destruction and disintegration of human nature. Saint Gregory continues: "Through mortality, human nature reaches the limits of the universe, decomposes into air, water, light and energy as elements of space. But the dust itself is not entirely matter. It also contains, truly and

²⁴ Filotei Sinaitul, *Capete despre trezvie* în *Filocalia*, vol 4, ediția a II-a, București, Harisma, 1994, p. 124.

²⁵ Panayotis Nellis, *Omul – animal îndumnezeit. Perspective pentru o antropologie ortodoxă*, Sibiu: Deisis, 1999, p. 86-8.

²⁶ Vasile Răducă, *Antropologia Sfântului Grigorie de Nyssa – căderea în păcat și restaurarea omului*, București: IBMO, 1996, p. 171.

„The Logos of Creation – a Patristic Approach of Gen 1-3,” *Astra Salvensis*, IX (2021), no. 17, p. 31-41.

effectively, the *reason* and *configuration* of man”. Panayottis Nellas grasps the deterioration and decay of materiality through the darkening of human reason: “In the fall of mankind there is also a fall of matter implied. Thus, the fall made the *very good* cosmos a *doomed* one and made humanity subject to materiality through the *leather clothes* ²⁷.

Saint Siluanus the Athonite regarded the event of fall in hesychastic way, considering that in Eden and even after the fall Adam embodied the attributes of a hesychast saint who enjoys the lifegiving presence of God and the beauties of Eden but suffers a great amount of pain trespassing the commandment of God and eating the fruits of the tree of knowledge. However, Saint Siluanus the Athonite argues for the persistence of the hesychastic life in Adam after fall, through the continuous work of repentance in an eschatological active preparation for the coming of the Redeemer. In addition, Saint Siluanus sees Gen 3,19, the imminence of death, returning to the dust mankind was created out of by God, in connection with Gen 2,7, the life giving breath of God that not only empowers and brings to life but also imprints divine knowledge in the soul of Adam. While the body of Adam will return to the dust it was casted out of, his soul will persist. Saint Siluanus uses this image in order to convey the spiritual and theological significance of the breath of God, *ruah Yabwe*, as the principle of life, order and vivification²⁸.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the reasons, *logoi* of creation are bound to will of the Divine Logos, the Word of God, Jesus Christ, as shown in the theological works of the Church Fathers mentioned above. The purpose of *logoi* follows God’s providential plan to keep the unity, harmony, order and establishment of the created elements, culminating with mankind. While Gen 1,1-2,4b describes the dialogical liturgy between God and the created order, that does nothing else but echo the words of God (*iehi...va iehi*), Gen 2,4b-25 accounts for the need of mankind to take part in this rational and loving dialogue with God by the divine *logoi* imprinted in creation, and latent, awaiting for the creative and rational intervention of Adam as priest of creation in the cosmic sanctuary that *gan Eden* paradigmatically expresses²⁹. However, the divine *logoi* in creation can be overruled through the temptation of the serpent, meaning of the evil and chaotic forces that long to bring destruction and pain to the creation of God as a perverted or inversed liturgy which fiercely attempts to oppose the order and reason of God but eventually fails. The latent reasons or *logoi* in Gen 1,1-2,4b,

²⁷ Panayotis Nellas, *Omul – animal îndumnezeit. Perspective pentru o antropologie ortodoxă*, Sibiu: Deisis, 1999, p. 102-3.

²⁸ Sfântul Siluan Athonitul, *Writings 1: Yearning for God’ in Archimandrite Sophrony în Saint Silouan the Athonite*, Crestwood, New York, St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1991, p. 270-281.

²⁹ Charles Miller, *The gift of the world – an introduction to the theology of Dumitru Staniloae*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000, p. 61.

activated and potentiated by human activity in Gen 2,4b-25 seem absent or hidden in Gen 3. However, the providence of God rules evil out of power and victory through the *leather clothes* that express mortality of the decadence and also through the messianic annunciation in Gen 3,15 that opens history to its latent eschatological dimension for the coming of the Divine Logos, Who finally and ultimately restores and relegates all the *logoi* of creation through His final victory over mortality and chaotic forces of evil. To sum up in a few words, I will use Father Ioan Chirila's short note: "the transfiguring purpose of human nature and creation regards the restoration of the initial state of creation and the growth of mankind in the resemblance with God, and that of creation with its Edenic initial structure"³⁰.

³⁰ Ioan Chirilă, *Fragmentarium exegetic filonian*, Cluj-Napoca, Limes, 2002, p. 28.

„The Logos of Creation – a Patristic Approach of Gen 1-3,” *Astra Salvensis*, IX (2021),
no. 17, p. 31-41.