CRITICAL REVIEW ESSAY

Myk Habets
Laidlaw College

Khaled Anatolios, *Deification Through the Cross: An Eastern Christian Theology of Salvation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020. (464 pp.) [ISBN: 978-0-8028-7798-7]

As one of the foremost theologians working today, Khaled Anatolios has written another scholarly, penetrating, and profound contribution to theology. As one of a growing number of voices over the past few decades, Anatolios is unconvinced the so-called traditional theories of the atonement are biblically faithful, theologically satisfying, or existentially viable. What is needed and what is supplied is a clarion call to cut behind the atonement theories to locate the normative dogmatic criteria that lie at the foundation of an understanding of the atonement. Anatolios is convinced such a foundation exists and is centred on what he calls "doxological contrition" which is itself founded on the Trinity and Christology. The result is a vision of salvation as *theosis*.

By doxological contrition Anatolios means:

> (1) Christ saves us by fulfilling humanity's original vocation to participate, from the position of the Son, in the mutual glorification of the persons of the divine Trinity; (2) Christ saves us by vicariously repenting for humanity's sinful rejection of humanity's doxological vocation and its violation and distortion of divine glory. The coinherence of these two features of Christ's work of salvation can be designated "doxological contrition" (p. 32).

Later in the work Anatolios characterizes this as his take on what the Orthodox refer to as "bright sadness," the paradigmatic liturgical and spiritual experience of the Byzantine tradition. Precursors to the kind of doxological contrition Anatolios develops can be found in the work of Thomas F. Torrance, John McLeod Campbell (not "Joseph" as Anatolios mistakenly calls him), Matthias Scheeben, and C. S. Lewis in the West, and a host of eastern thinkers. Despite being a Byzantine theologian, Anatolios interacts with and shows his familiarity with the Western theological tradition as well. However, the most influential source for Anatolios in his soteriology is Nicholas Cabasilas, who argued that "salvific repentance makes use of suffering to transform the human will as a whole, and it is only for this redemptive reason that God allows suffering" (p. xvi).

Three criteria are stated as necessary for a comprehensive doctrine of the atonement: fidelity to the canonical Scriptures, the normativity of the dogmatic tradition, and the normativity of liturgical experience. Anatolios explores each in turn, starting with the Paschal Liturgy of the Byzantine churches through a reader-response type analysis that Anatolios calls "worshiper-response" (pp. 68–87). The liturgy inculcates a disposition of doxological contrition which in turn develops a soteriology from below. Three features stand out in the treatment of the liturgy: first, a critique of van Harnack's (et al) caricature of an Eastern Orthodox emphasis in soteriology on the ontological and the mystical as opposed to the Western

emphasis on the ethical and legal. Anatolios exposes this myth in both Western and eastern thinkers. Second, the liturgy creates an experiential momentum as it moves from, or better, synthesizes the drama of creation-fall-redemption-renewal, and thus moves from creation to glory. Third, the centrality of the exchange formula is exposed as the basis of a doctrine of deification. Anatolios deals with these in reverse order in this volume.

The doxological context of theology is a central theme of the volume, "thus, the exposition of soteriological doctrine should be at its foundation a form of liturgical theology, having liturgical experience as both its point of departure and its destination" (p. 31). This last point will be the most foreign to Western readers and for that reason, perhaps the most interesting. "The Byzantine tradition … interprets liturgical worship as an inclusion in the heavenly liturgy, in which Christ's already accomplished salvation is ceaselessly celebrated, without interruption, before the heavenly throne" (p. xiv). Anatolios masterfully guides non-Byzantine readers through the Paschal liturgy, highlighting elements of both contrition and worship in a synthetic and holistic experience (or doxological contrition!). The chapter (One) concludes with a clear statement on the mechanism by which salvation is achieved, namely: "we can at least seriously entertain the proposal that the liturgical experience of salvation as doxological contrition suggests that Christ also won our salvation within his perfect glorification of the Father in the Spirit" (p. 92–93).

Chapter Two examines the theme of doxological contrition in Scripture and does so via three disclosure episodes: Exodus, Exile, and Jesus's salvific work. In the Exodus, a paradigmatic event for the entire understanding of the Old Testament/Old Covenant, we see the twin themes of glory and repentance go together. The essence of forgiveness is access to the divine glory. Anatolios defines repentance as "the recognition of estrangement from divine glory and the setting out on the path of return to that glory" (p. 95). This is important for his later work on Christ as the perfect penitent and glory of God. Israel is characterized as having the vocation to "perpetuate the obedience of Abraham among the nations" (p. 98) and as such, Israel is a representative community, first in repentance and then in glory; as such, "Israel's vocation is to perform a 'repentance' for Adam's fall" (p. 99). This is familiar territory for many theologians, like Thomas Torrance, who likewise argue for the election of Israel as representative of both rejection and salvation. One doesn't see this theology on display much in many recent textbooks, but Anatolios makes a convincing case for its inclusion. Anatolios focuses upon Exodus 3 and the theophany to Moses and the incident of the golden calf as paradigmatic accounts of the dialectic of doxology and contrition in the biblical exposition of salvation. In this later account Moses makes atonement for the people precisely through his vicarious repentance. This prefigures the work of the incarnate Son. Because sin is anti-doxological, "the essence of forgiveness," writes Anatolios, is "access to divine glory" (p. 111). As a form of summary, Anatolios writes: "whereas some construal's of penal substation identify the efficient principle of salvific restoration with punishment as such, understood as the objective expression of divine wrath, doxological contrition considers the efficient principle of salvation to be a contrite recognition of the seriousness of sin in light of the divine glory, which is always accomplished by the prayerful invocation of that glory" (p. 114).

In the Exile and subsequent restoration of Israel we see how cult and sacrifice enable repentance, to allow forgiveness, and to attain access to the divine glory. The theme of the Exodus is extended as the exiles repeat the same theme of doxological contrition. Through repeated prophetic announcements of glorious divine intervention, God promises to give a new heart and a new covenant to his people allowing a new access to the divine glory via doxological contrition. What began proleptically with Moses is continued here, by means of the cult there is a manifestation of divine glory and the means of repentance in order to gain access to that glory. The theme of expiation of sin is present in these narratives, but it is enfolded within doxology. Sin disrupts access to divine glory which then needs to be expiated, but glory is always the telos. Psalm 51 is but one example of doxological contrition at work as it conceives of "a salvific encounter with God in which the human partner in this encounter exemplifies a synthesis of repentance and glorification of God" (p. 122).

Jesus's salvific work forms the final episode examined by Anatolios, specifically Jesus's baptism, transfiguration, and the depiction of his work in the book of Hebrews. In each episode of Christ's life we see a coordinated presentation of vicarious repentance and doxological contrition by the Dominical man, Jesus. Jesus saves humanity through a solidarity of repentance for human sin, performed in light of the Divine glory such that our salvific dispassion is our participation in Christ's retrieval of his Divine glory. Christ is the perfect penitent, to use C.S. Lewis's language, and our participation in his contrition leads to our participation in glory. "What is accomplished in Christ is nothing other than what Moses asked for at the embryonic stage of Israel's covenantal relation to its God: 'Show me your glory, I pray' (Exod 33:18)" (p. 162).

Once more we see Anatolios make a consistent claim that the mechanism for salvation in these exemplary texts is doxological contrition which enables divine access or *theosis*. A consistent yet subtle theme throughout is the appeal to a form of vicarious contrition which makes efficacious the contrition of the people, as opposed merely to a form of vicarious punishment found in many of the models of atonement found today. This is a welcome addition to the narrative and much needed corrective to many of the atonement models received today. Several implications are made clear in Anatolios's analysis of these texts: first, "the biblical presentation of salvific repentance must be distinguished from later misconceptions in which repentance is understood as an entirely psychological phenomenon and a human work" (p. 138); second, "one of the key components of the soteriology of doxological contrition … is that it replaces the notion of the salvific efficacy of punishment with that of the salvific efficacy of contrition" (p. 139). As the book of Hebrews brings out so clearly, "Jesus saves humanity through a solidarity of 'repentance' for human sin, which he performed in light of the divine glory that he enjoyed as the beloved Son" (p. 165–166).

After examining the liturgy and Scripture, Anatolios devotes Chapter Three to doxological contrition in conciliar doctrine. Along with a select few, Anatolios shows himself to be a master of patristic theology, thoroughly at home in the minutiae of detail and yet able to clearly and concisely represent Christological and trinitarian ideas. This chapter acts as a sort of gloss and further development of the arguments made in detail in his earlier work *Retrieving Nicaea*. In many ways, Anatolios offers a masterclass

in reading the fathers as he develops and illustrates his central thesis that the basis or foundations of the atonement have to do with doxological contrition within the soteriological framework of *theosis*.

Working through the seven ecumenical councils, Anatolios highlights and explains the trinitarian and Christological foundations of soteriology. He argues convincingly that the creeds presuppose a foundational soteriology rooted in a doctrine of *theosis* (p. 168), before developing three developments between Nicaea and Constantinople III. These three developments are, 1) pro-Nicene theology teaches and presupposes *theosis*, 2) the mutual glorification of the three divine persons, an intra-trinitarian glorification- is at the heart of soteriology, and 3) the full humanity and full divinity of Christ within the unity of the one person is essential. Why the insistence of these themes? Because "modern treatments of soteriology based on the 'models' approach tend to bypass the trinitarian and Christological norming of soteriological doctrine" (p. 167). When the conciliar tradition is closely examined, Anatolios is clear, there is a stable normative doctrine of salvation, despite protestations to the contrary: "taken both synthetically and in view of their diachronic momentum, the normative trinitarian and Christological doctrines of the first seven ecumenical councils presumed and prescribed a conception of salvation as the deification of human beings through their graced inclusion into trinitarian life" (p. 168).

A detailed account of the conciliar tradition is beyond the scope of this essay, however, a brief summary of Anatolios's argument can be offered.

Nicaea (325) focused on Alexander (and Athanasius's) reply to Arius, specifically on the *homoousion* and a soteriology of doxological adoption "in which we are assimilated by grace to the Son's natural sonship precisely through worshipping the glory of the Son, which he shares with the Father" (p. 173).

Constantinople I (381) was primarily based on the teaching of Athanasius and the Cappadocians who taught a clear doctrine of *theosis*, clarified the eternal status of the three persons of the Trinity in mutual glorification which culminated in Gregory of Nyssa's conception of a "circle of glory" into which believers are assimilated, and the full humanity of Christ was clearly defended against Marcellus and Apollinaris. Gregory Nazianzen's dictum that "what is not assumed is not healed" was central here. The asymmetrical unity of Christ's two natures was clearly posited by means of which the Son assumed human nature and transforms it, deifies, it, and includes believers within that activity. This confession places special emphasis upon Christ's psychological disposition, such that "we can now assert the positive claim that the salvific value of Christ's psychological disposition is entirely legitimated and necessitated by the doctrinal affirmation of Christ's human soul" (p. 224).

Ephesus (431) concerned Cyril's argument with Nestorius. Cyril's theology found acceptance at Ephesus, that the sole person of the incarnation is the eternal Son by means of a hypostatic union according to which each nature retains its own integrity but also by means of which the Son "transforming appropriates our condition not only in the mere fact of being born in human flesh but by overcoming our estrangement from God through his suffering obedience and submission to the Father" (p. 194). As such Ephesus "enables us to posit Christ's salvific work of doxological contrition as a manifestation of the Son's hypostatic appropriation of the human condition" (p. 224).

Chalcedon (451) accepted the theology of Leo over Eutyches and clarified the integrity of the two natures in the single unity of the person of the incarnate Son. "The distinctive soteriological rule that underlies the Chalcedonian Creed is that Christ works out our salvation by assimilating the properties of human nature to those of the divine nature" (p. 207). Chalcedon teaches us to "distinguish between Christ's divine glorification of the Father, within the trinitarian circle of glory, and his human glorification in the form of a servant" (p. 225). Jesus's active obedience can then be clearly seen as "vicarious repentance for human sin as precisely a continuation of his divine glorification of the Father in the Spirit, in the face of human sin" (p. 225).

Constantinople II (553) affirmed and clarified Chalcedon in light of Cyril's earlier emphasis on the unity of Christ. Salvation is achieved by Christ assimilating the human condition to himself in the hypostatic union. "The 'nature-person' framework of the Chalcedonian confession thus has to be contextualized by the way it is historically framed, by Ephesus on the one side and Constantinople II on the other" (p. 210). When this is done, then "Salvation is thus understood precisely as the assimilation of the human condition to the personal existence of the Word" (p. 210). We learn from Constantinople II to "always keep in view the trinitarian basis and destination of Christ's doxological contrition" (p. 225).

Constantinople III (680) accepted the argument of Maximums and dyothelitism, the concept that within Christ there are two wills and two operations, concurring in correspondence. As such Jesus "never wills humanly what is in conflict with the divine will that he shares with he Father and the Spirit" (p. 214). This is crucial for the human will is, in the incarnation, deified such that "Jesus wills his human acts according to a mode of activity that is properly human but in harmony with the divine" (p. 215). Constantinople III "exhorts us to always keep in view the trinitarian basis and destination of Christ's doxological contrition" (p. 225). The salvific work of Christ must be seen as an "unbroken synergy of his divine and human modes of action" (p. 225).

The final ecumenical council was Nicaea II in 787. Here John of Damascus's theology of icons was endorsed, one in which icons may be venerated but not worshipped. The argument for the use of icons is based on the incarnation, "although worship is offered to God alone, the hypostatic union that makes the humanity of Christ 'equal to the Word hypostatically' renders Christ's humanity a fitting object of worship" (p. 220). Based on this, all creation has been filled with divine energy and grace and thus fit for veneration.

As a form of summary lesson from this chapter we read: "One of the most significant manifestations of the way that modern soteriological discussion unmoors itself from doctrinal norms and drifts into an unregulated sea of free-floating images and 'models' is that there is typically no attention paid to how a given image or model can be articulated in terms of a two-natures, one-person Chalcedonian framework" (p. 207). When soteriology is attuned to Christology the "cafeteria buffet of 'soteriological models'" is avoided (p. 223).

With Chapter Three Anatolios's Christology from below is complete. To be honest, if this was the end of the book it would still be a masterful piece of work. But there is more. He now takes up the task of

a Christology from above with a more systematic treatment of the themes already unveiled from below, as it were. What follows is a "reenvisioning [of] the three main acts of the Christian story of reality—creation [Chapter 5], sin [Chapter 6], and salvation [Chapter 7]—in light of the characterization of trinitarian being as a communion of mutual glorification [Chapter 4]" (p. 229). A critical summary of chapters 4-7 will be repetitive, instead the following offers some of Anatolios's prescient insights.

In elaborating the mutual glorification of the divine Trinity, Anatolios turns to several figures for stimulus, notably Dumitru Staniloae's intersubjective account of the Trinity. In incorporating Staniloae's insights, Anatolios approximates what I have elsewhere characterized as a relational Trinity. I was pleasantly surprised to see Anatolios emphasize the notion of *perichoresis* in such relational terms. He can, for instance, write:

> While each of the divine persons is a distinct "I", each "I" is "interior" and "transparent" to the others, so as to constitute "another self." We can understand this formulation as a transposition into a psychological framework of the classic pro-Nicene understanding of the coincidence of ontological self-understanding and mutual reference in the trinitarian persons, such as we find in the felicitous description of Gregory of Nazianzus: "Each of these persons possess unity, not less with that which is united to it than with itself, by reason of the identity of essence and power" (p.253).

You won't find many contemporary Trinitarian scholars affirming anything as relational as this in the ontological Trinity. It may not be unfair to aver that Anatolios might identify many contemporary trinitarian scholars as Sabellian for the way they characterize God as a single being without any interior differentiation (236). It may not be unfair to wonder what Anatolios might have to say to Stephen Holmes, for instance, who concluded his work on the Trinity with the stinging suggestion that the trinitarian renaissance of the late twentieth century was utterly ahistorical.[1] This relational ontology supports Anatolios's account of the Trinity and his application of this to the way he understands the atonement. In addition to Staniloae he draws upon the work of Matthias Scheeben: "Scheeben's trinitarian theology thus provides us with a clear conception of the three divine persons as knowing and loving subjects" (p.247). Anatolios goes as far as to say: "More than any other theologian in the Christian tradition, whether in its Eastern of Western trajectories, it is Matthias Scheeben who has the most explicit and pervasive theology of trinitarian mutual glorification" (p.249). High praise indeed.

All advocates of a doctrine of *theosis* know that a fully developed theology of deification requires a particular construal of anthropology, one that clearly shows how humanity is compatible with God and is created to participate in the divine life. Anatolios deals with anthropology in Chapter 5 and unsurprisingly finds initial resources in the work of Irenaeus. Following the language of Alexander Schmemann, humans are created *homo adorans* and as such, a doxological anthropology ensues. "Humanity's glorification amounts to a participation in God's self-standing glory and thus brings about the glorification of the human being" (p.269). From the doxological anthropology of Irenaeus, Anatolios then shows how even such a Western theology such as Anselm's satisfaction theory is not, contra popular accounts, incompatible: "Irenaeus's axiomatic principle of the coincidence of humanity's glorification of God and its own glorification can

[1] Stephen R. Holmes, *The Quest for the Trinity: The Doctrine of God in Scripture, History and Modernity* (IVP Academic, 2012).

provide us with a hermeneutical key for a reading of *Cur Deus Homo* that brings out its inherent doxological logic" (p.275). At the foundation of Anselm's account of satisfaction is a doxological premise. Once again, Anatolios convincingly shows that East and West have more in common than not, despite contemporary accounts to the opposite. To complete his survey of anthropology, Anatolios turns to Gregory Palamas (but not necessarily to the essence-energies distinction) and Nicholas Cabasilas. From these Eastern sources Anatolios can make his case for the ultimate fulfillment of human existence as access to the contemplation of God's glory. Lest Anatolios is misunderstood, humans are created to participate in the life of God, and participation is always active and includes joyful obedience and doxological service to God. Here Palamas and Cabasilas have their say: the contemplation of the glory of God is emphasized by Palamas and the doxological service to God is emphasized by Cabasilas.

In any account of humanity hamartiology also has to be explicated, sadly; this is the theme of Chapter 6. Anatolios notes the relative neglect a robust doctrine of sin plays in many accounts of soteriology, and where it is included, it is misdirected. Anatolios offers his own corrective. Eschewing any false dichotomy between ontological and forensic characterizations of Eastern and Western doctrines of salvation respectively, Athanasius's synthetic perspective is appealed to. The distinctive contribution to a doctrine of sin and salvation that this synthetic perspective adds is that there is no vindictive or abstract divine justice at play. If the glory of God is the foundational principle, then sin is a corruption of that glory, it is a "misrepresentation" and "falsification" of the divine self-manifestation (p.291) and that is the problem that needs to be corrected. In this schema, justification is thus coterminous with glorification. "The essential point to be grasped is that humanity's misrepresentation of divine glory is specifically a misrepresentation of the Son's glorification of the Father in the Spirit" (p.298). Salvation consists of being united to the Son and from the position of being "in Christ," humans can again participate in the mutual glorification of the divine persons. Only the Son is the true image of the Father, and fellow humans are thus images of the Image. The Son is the image of the Father, and the Spirit is the image of the Son. As the Spirit indwells believes he unites them to Christ and forms them into his presence, acceptable to the Father and elevated to participate in the trinitarian life of love and glory. Sin represents all that stands in the way of *theosis*, it is "a violent usurpation, misrepresentation, and falsification of the self-utterance of the Father through the Word and in the Spirit" (p.303). This is the trinitarian background to understanding sin. As Anatolios says, sin is "divine identity theft" (p.297). The Christological foundations are equally clear, "The essential core of the gospel, from the perspective of a soteriology of doxological contrition, is that God marvelously accomplishes both his doxological judgement against sin and humanity's full reintegration into the intra-trinitarian glorification, through Christ's representative and inclusive doxological repentance" (p.312).

The theme of humanity's reintegration into trinitarian glorification is the topic of Chapter 7. Matthias Scheeben is again a key resource for Anatolios to make specific claims around what Scheeben calls the "latreutic character" (worshipful adoration) of Christ's salvific work (p.314). God's reconciling work is founded on God's mutual self-glorification. God loves creatures because God is love and "if God is truly God, the sum and summit of all perfection, then there is no other love by which God can love creatures

than his own self-love and there is no exaltation or glorification by which God can elevate creatures other than by including them in his own self-glorification" (p.315). The ultimate ground and goal of the Incarnation was not the salvation of fallen creatures but, rather, God's self-glorification. This is why Anatolios, via Scheeben, argues for a supralapsarian Christology whereby the incarnation would have happened with or without the efficient cause of sin (p.316). Salvation is thus "humanity's deifying inclusion into trinitarian life through the interactivity of Christ's divinity and humanity" (p.316). If there is a downside to Scheeben's account, argues Anatolios, it is in his under-representation of the vicarious ministry of Christ. Anatolios turns to the work of Aquinas to add this needed element. In his own constructive account, Anatolios brings both aspects together and argues for a synthesis of "the complete coinherence of doxology and contrition in Christ's soul" (p.337). Both doxology and contrition are two parts of the single reality for Christ and amount to doxological contrition. Anatolios writes, "Contrition is the form that the human glorification of God takes in the face of human sin" (p.339). Further, Christ "translates his perfect divine glorification of the Father in the Spirit into a human mode and that, in the face of human sin, he performs that glorification in and through the mode of contrition" (pp.339-40). Finally, turning to Nicholas Cabasilas, Anatolios narrates the idea that "the incarnation unites human nature to the divine nature, while the cross heals the human will" (p.345). At the cross Christ finally and fully achieves the full extent of his vicarious ministry because "the progress in salvific efficacy between the incarnation and the cross is one between the ontological union of human and divine natures effected through the incarnation and the existential and voluntary enactment of that union that achieves fruition in the cross" (p.346). Anatolios achieves, by way of Scheeben, Aquinas, and Cabasilas, a brilliant account of salvation that is centered in Christ and founded upon a trinitarian account of God's action in the world. Christ's doxological contrition is the mechanism by which humanity is saved as they are united to Christ by the Spirit and presented to the Father. "This means that Jesus's outward expressions are designed so as to include us and draw us into his doxological contrition and not merely to provide us with the opportunity to observe his doxological contrition apart from our involvement and inclusion in it" (p.379). Anatolios then provides a potted summary (p.377–382) of what I have elsewhere termed the main "Messianic kairoi" of Jesus life and ministry.[2] And what of the work of the Spirit? "The Holy Spirit, as the Spirit of adoption, 'accustoms' and conforms human beings to Jesus's perfect glorification of the Father in the Spirit and his perfect contrition for human sins" (p.382).

The final chapter, Chapter 8, brings the theme of doxological contrition into dialogue with other influential theologies of atonement, notably liberation theologies (especially Jon Sobrino), mimetic theories (Rene Girard), and penal substitutionary theory (J. I. Packer). Anatolios finds each of these alternate theologies of the atonement wanting, primarily for leaving behind the moorings in trinitarian doctrine and Christology. Anatolios is always gracious in his interactions before clarifying how a view of salvation as doxological contrition can affirm certain elements from these other perspectives, and at the same time critique other elements. Anatolios convincingly shows that the trinitarian and Christological basis for a

[2] Myk Habets, *The Anointed Son* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010), 118–187; 209.

doctrine of salvation such as he has narrated is indispensable. "A soteriology of doxological contrition offers this conclusion not merely as yet another 'model' among 'models of salvation' but as an indispensable datum that must be accommodated in any interpretation of the Christian doctrine of salvation in Christ" (p.422).

With this systematic soteriology of doxological contrition in place, Anatolios shows how the various models of the atonement miss the mark, as it were, by assuming, presuming, or ignoring the trinitarian and Christological foundations upon which such models may function. From this vantage point, the various models and theories of the atonement can be critiqued for what they are: partial contextual clues as to the more comprehensive nature of salvation as *theosis* offered in Scripture and the Great Tradition. In a summary of his final conclusions, Anatolios writes:

> Beginning with the foundational grammar of trinitarian doctrine, this approach leads us to stipulate that what we are saved from is our distortion and misrepresentation of the divine trinitarian mutual glorification and that what we are saved for is a fulness and stable fixity of participation in that communion of trinitarian glorification. With respect to its christological grammar, this conception of salvation posits Jesus Christ's glorification of the Father, through the Spirit, as the source, goal, and means of our reintegration into intra-trinitarian glorification. It also posits Jesus's human contrition as the transposition, in the mode of his human nature and in the face of human sin, of his divine eternal glorification of the Father in the Spirit (p. 230).

The book is rounded out with a brief conclusion in which Anatolios repeats the point made in the introduction that his construal of a Christian doctrine of salvation follows three criteria: 1) fidelity to the entire scriptural witness, 2) an engagement with the Christian tradition through a hermeneutic of charity that is conducted on the normative basis of dogmatic trinitarian and Christological doctrine, and 3) applicability to concrete experience (p.423).

In many ways this volume serves as a Byzantine alternative to the equally influential and profound work of Roman Catholic scholar Eleonor Stump, *Atonement* (Oxford, 2019). Stump and Anatolios provide examples of what analytic theology and Orthodox theology look like respectively. Anatolios's work answers many of the objections Stump makes of certain forms of atonement theology and negates some of her most trenchant criticisms of non-Thomistic theologies. What is now required is an equally magisterial account from a Protestant perspective, of which there is no current or obvious contender. The recent publication of Fred Sander's, *Fountain of Salvation: Trinity and Soteriology* (Eerdmans, 2021), begins to redress the lack of trinitarian foundations in soteriology that Antolios has alerted readers to. The most likely candidate for a Protestant alternative to the work of Anatolios may be the forthcoming work by Adam Johnson, *Atonement* (Baker Academic, due 2022). It is hoped, however, that such a work of Protestant theology will not be in the analytic mode of Stump's inelegant but precise prose, based as it is on the Aristotelian Thomism of the traditional dogmas of the Catholic Church. Neither, it is hoped, will it be centred on the Byzantine liturgy and its "bright sadness," and dispassionate vision of salvation mediated by Eastern luminaries such as John Cabasilas. That it would accurately explain the mechanism of salvation in clearly biblical ways, that it would be thoroughly informed by the Great Tradition, especially conciliar theology, and the commitment to a form of *theosis*, and that it would be existentially viable in today's context, are lessons it can learn from both Stump and Anatolios.

Such a contemporary atonement theology from a Protestant perspective will, it seems to me, have to commit to at least the following criteria for it to be a coherent and comprehensive soteriology.

1. It will have to clearly represent the broad range of biblical metaphors and explanations for the saving work of God and not simply privilege one or two. It will have to be a canonical theology.
2. The dogmatic foundations of soteriology, found in trinitarian theology and Christology, have to be clearly identified and act as the controlling grammar for the soteriology. This would involve a particular focus on the Spirit (a form of Third Article Theology). It will have to be a trinitarian theology.
3. It will have to show how soteriology is consistent with the conciliar tradition and how it takes its impetus of explanation from that. It will have to be a conciliar theology.
4. Both a theology from above and a theology from below will have to be adequately represented, especially the long-neglected approach from below.
5. The mechanism(s) by which salvation is accomplished and applied has to be clearly articulated to give explanatory power to the ways in which salvation is achieved by and in Christ.
6. The place of sin and free will has to be adequately explained in ways which are understandable within contemporary patterns of thought (it will interact with contemporary moral psychology, and so forth).
7. An explanation must be offered of what we are saved from and what we are saved for.
8. It is highly likely, if not imperative, that a model of *theosis* is offered.
9. Contemporary issues that are affected by the atonement have to be articulated and enlightened by an existentially viable and practically forceful theology of the atonement, rather than doing an atonement theology in strictly theoretical terms. It will be an embodied theology.

Deification Through the Cross is a *tour de force*. This is atonement theology at its best and if the lessons Anatolios is teaching can be learnt and learnt well, the future of Christian discourse on the atonement will be rich and rewarding.