

Eastern Orthodoxy: A Theological Analysis and Reformed Contrast

Pastor Owen Anderson

Introduction: Beauty Without Truth? The Appeal of Eastern Orthodoxy

In the late 10th century, Prince **Vladimir of Kiev** sought a religion for his people. His envoys traveled to examine **Islam, Judaism, Western Christianity, and Eastern Christianity**, and their final report played a decisive role in shaping the religious future of Kievan Rus'.

According to the **Primary Chronicle**, in the late 10th century, Prince Vladimir, ruler of Kievan Rus', was seeking a new religion for his people. To determine which faith was best, he sent envoys to observe the practices of **Islam, Judaism, Western Christianity (Latin rite), and Eastern Christianity (Byzantine rite)**.

- The envoys reportedly **disliked Islam**, practiced by the Volga Bulgars, because of its dietary restrictions and prohibition of alcohol (to which Vladimir famously responded, *"Drinking is the joy of the Rus"*).
- **Judaism** was rejected because the Jews had lost their kingdom, which the envoys saw as a sign of divine disfavor.
- The envoys found **Western Christianity** unimpressive.
- However, when they visited **Hagia Sophia in Constantinople**, they were overwhelmed by the beauty of the church and the grandeur of the **Divine Liturgy**.

What convinced them to embrace Eastern Orthodoxy was not **doctrinal precision** or **theological argumentation**, but an overwhelming **aesthetic experience**. Upon witnessing the grandeur of **Hagia Sophia's liturgy**, the envoys famously declared:

"We knew not whether we were in heaven or on earth, for on earth there is no such splendor or such beauty, and we are at a loss how to describe it. We only know that God dwells among men, and we cannot forget that beauty."

This moment is often celebrated as the turning point in the Christianization of Kievan Rus'. However, it also highlights two crucial issues that remain relevant today:

1. **The power of beauty over truth** – Eastern Orthodoxy has historically drawn converts **not primarily by doctrine, but by impression**—the mystery of its liturgy, the splendor of its cathedrals, and the sensory depth of its worship. While **aesthetics can be a pathway to truth, they are not a substitute for it**. Not only that, falsehood and evil can also use beauty to allure the unsuspecting person (Satan

appearing as an angel of light). One must ask: Is beauty alone sufficient to justify religious commitment, or must faith be grounded in doctrinal clarity? What is the relationship between beauty and truth? (Not accidentally, Keats' *Ode on a Grecian Urn*: Beauty is truth and truth beauty, this is all ye know on earth and all ye need to know.)

2. **Nominal Christianity without discipleship** – Though Vladimir's subjects were **baptized en masse**, this did not immediately transform them into a Christian people in their beliefs, ethics, or daily lives. The absence of deep catechesis and discipleship meant that while the nation was called Christian, its worldview remained largely pagan, blending Christian rituals with old customs. This raises a question: What happens when a nation adopts the form of Christianity without its substance?

Today, many who explore **Eastern Orthodoxy**—especially disillusioned Western Christians—find themselves drawn not by theological conviction, but by the beauty of its liturgy, the sense of mystery, and its historic continuity. But as the story of Vladimir's conversion suggests, a faith that is built on aesthetic experience alone is insufficient. True Christianity is not merely about entering a beautiful church, but about knowing and worshiping the living God in truth. Heretical churches can be beautiful.

This paper will explore how Eastern Orthodoxy's emphasis on aesthetics, tradition, and national identity shapes both its appeal and its limitations, particularly in contrast to the biblical model of faith rooted in both truth and discipleship. **I have two goals: 1) to help you better understand church history and 2) to help you to see the need for learning how to think.**

We must learn to exercise our minds to understand the truth. It seems that the Greek Orthodox Church got stuck at the level of beautiful impressions and mystical experiences. As humans we need more than that. As Christians we should be able to show the truth of our beliefs and demolish all arguments that raise themselves up against the knowledge of God.

Introduction to Eastern Orthodoxy

Eastern Orthodoxy presents a vision of Christianity that differs significantly from Reformed theology in its emphasis on healing over forgiveness, its essence-energies distinction, its doctrine of theosis, its concept of the national church, and its embrace of mysticism over propositional knowledge. These differences are not merely academic but reveal fundamentally distinct understandings of who God is, how He interacts with the world, and what it means to be saved. In this essay, I will analyze these key Orthodox doctrines and contrast them with Reformed theology, demonstrating how the Reformed view better aligns with biblical revelation.

Healing vs. Forgiveness

One of the most striking differences between Eastern Orthodoxy and Reformed theology is how each tradition understands the problem of sin. Orthodoxy sees sin not as a legal offense requiring forgiveness, but primarily as a sickness requiring healing. Justification is not about a forensic declaration of righteousness but about being transformed through divine grace as one progresses toward theosis (deification). They reject total depravity and instead say the will has been weakened and is ill and needs healing. Sin is a barrier to theosis.

Orthodox theology holds that grace is not merely a gift from God but is God Himself in His active work. Unlike a created substance, grace is eternal, uncreated, and divine, manifesting as God's love, power, and sanctification within creation. Through grace, believers undergo theosis, being transformed into deeper communion with God. This understanding extends to the Orthodox veneration of saints, who are seen as filled with divine grace, which explains why they are depicted radiating holiness in icons, why their relics are believed to be miracle-working, and why mystical experiences such as Hesychast prayer are understood as direct encounters with God's uncreated energies. In this view, receiving grace is not merely receiving a spiritual favor, but encountering God Himself in a transformative way.

Reformed theology, however, emphasizes justification by faith alone (Romans 3:28, Galatians 2:16). In the Reformed tradition, sin is both a moral rebellion against God and a violation of His law, requiring forgiveness through Christ's atonement. Sanctification follows as the work of the Spirit to renew believers into Christ's image. The healing aspect of salvation is not denied, but it is the result of justification, not the means of it. The Orthodox view, by contrast, tends to merge justification and sanctification into a single process, obscuring the clear distinction between forensic pardon and spiritual renewal.

Essence and Energy Distinction vs. Knowing God by His Works

Orthodox theology makes a sharp distinction between God's essence (ousia)—which is unknowable—and His energies (energeiai), through which humans interact with Him. This distinction, developed by Gregory Palamas, is meant to preserve God's transcendence while allowing for participation in His divine life.

Orthodox theology recognizes many divine energies because God works in multiple ways. Some examples include:

- Grace – God's energy transforming believers.
- Providence – God's energy governing creation.

- Wisdom – God’s energy enlightening the mind.
- Love – God’s energy uniting humanity to Himself.
- The Uncreated Light – God’s energy manifested in divine radiance (e.g., the Transfiguration).

These are not created effects but direct encounters with God’s uncreated presence.

Reformed theology, in contrast, teaches that God is known by His works—His acts in creation and providence, and most fully in His revelation through Christ and Scripture. The Reformed tradition holds that God is not utterly unknowable in His essence but reveals Himself truly (though not exhaustively) through His works (Psalm 19:1-2, Romans 1:20). The Orthodox essence-energies distinction risks introducing an unbridgeable gap between God and man, whereas the Reformed view maintains that God’s self-revelation is sufficient for true knowledge of Him.

Theosis vs. Glorifying and Enjoying God Forever

The Orthodox doctrine of theosis teaches that believers become partakers of the divine nature (2 Peter 1:4) through participation in God’s uncreated energies. Salvation is understood as an ongoing process of deification, rather than justification followed by sanctification.

In Orthodox theology, divine energy is central to the doctrine of theosis (deification), the Orthodox understanding of salvation. Since God’s essence is utterly incomprehensible and beyond human reach, salvation does not mean union with His essence, but rather participation in His divine energies—His uncreated, active presence. This is why saints are believed to radiate divine light, having been filled with God’s uncreated energy. As Gregory Palamas argued, salvation is not merely a matter of legal justification, but a real, transformative union with God through His energies. However, this emphasis on mystical union can sometimes drift into a desire for union apart from union in the truth.

The distinction between God’s essence (ousia) and His energies (energeiai) is a fundamental aspect of Orthodox theology. While God’s essence remains unknowable, His energies are His real, uncreated actions through which He reveals Himself and transforms creation. These energies are not separate from God but are truly God Himself as experienced in the world. One of the most central of these uncreated energies is divine grace (charis). Unlike Western Christianity, where grace is often understood as either a created supernatural gift (Catholicism) or God’s unmerited favor (Protestantism), Orthodoxy teaches that grace is God Himself in His energies—His active presence in the world.

The Reformed tradition contrasts this with the Westminster Shorter Catechism's definition of the chief end of man: "to glorify God and enjoy Him forever." Rather than seeking mystical union with divine energies, Reformed theology teaches that we glorify God by knowing Him as He reveals Himself in His works. Enjoying God is not about mystical participation in divine energies but about knowing Him rightly, loving Him, and obeying His will (John 17:3).

Mystical Light vs. Propositional Knowledge

Eastern Orthodoxy places great emphasis on mystical experience, particularly the Uncreated Light seen by Hesychast monks in deep prayer. Gregory Palamas defended this mystical vision as a true experience of God's energies, not merely a psychological phenomenon.

Reformed theology, in contrast, emphasizes propositional knowledge of God through Scripture. While acknowledging the importance of spiritual experience, the Reformed tradition teaches that true knowledge of God comes through His Word, not through mystical visions (2 Timothy 3:16-17). Scripture provides objective revelation, whereas Orthodox mysticism risks subjectivity and the elevation of personal experience over biblical truth.

The Filioque: A Key Doctrinal Divide

The Filioque controversy centers on whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone (Orthodox view) or from the Father and the Son (Reformed and Catholic view). The Reformed position affirms the Filioque because:

- John 15:26 states that the Spirit proceeds from the Father but is sent by the Son.
- John 16:7 emphasizes Christ's role in sending the Spirit.
- The unity of the Trinity suggests that the Son participates in the procession of the Spirit.

Orthodoxy rejects the Filioque, seeing it as a Western addition that disrupts the monarchy of the Father. However, the Reformed tradition holds that the Filioque preserves the biblical teaching that the Spirit's work is inseparably tied to the Son's mission.

Palamas' Defense of Mystical Monks vs. Sanctification as Growth in Knowledge, Holiness, and Righteousness

Gregory Palamas defended the Hesychast monks, who practiced deep prayer to experience the Uncreated Light. He argued that this experience was a direct participation in divine energy, essential for spiritual transformation.

In Orthodox spirituality, particularly within the Hesychast tradition, saints and monks who engage in deep prayer have reported witnessing the Uncreated Light—a mystical experience understood as a direct encounter with God’s divine energies. In the 14th century, Gregory Palamas defended these experiences, arguing that when monks pray with a pure heart, they can behold the same divine light that shone during Christ’s Transfiguration. This view was officially affirmed by the Palamite Councils (1341–1351), which declared that the Uncreated Light is not a mere vision or symbol, but a real participation in God’s presence. According to Palamas, this light is eternal, divine, and uncreated, revealing God’s energetic presence to those who seek Him through prayer, purification, and asceticism.

Reformed theology, however, sees sanctification as growth in knowledge, holiness, and righteousness, rather than mystical experience (Colossians 3:10, Hebrews 12:14). Sanctification is the Spirit applying the Word of God to believers, transforming them in heart and mind. While experience is part of Christian life, it is not the basis of sanctification—Scripture and obedience are.

Icons and the Core Teaching of Nicaea II

The Eastern Orthodox teach that icons must be displayed in churches, homes, and places of veneration. Honoring icons is not optional but is an essential expression of the Orthodox faith. Refusing to venerate icons is equivalent to rejecting the incarnation because Christ, as the “icon of the invisible God” (Col 1:15), made the invisible visible. They teach:

1. The Orthodox see Christ as the ultimate icon—the Word made flesh—who enables icons to be legitimate as representations of the Incarnation.
2. Eastern Orthodoxy holds that icons make the divine accessible, offering a window into heaven that allows believers to spiritually encounter Christ and the saints.

Nicaea II affirmed that:

1. Icons of Christ, the Virgin Mary, saints, and angels are to be venerated (honored), but not worshiped (adored).
2. There is a real distinction between veneration (προσκύνησις, proskynesis) and worship (λατρεία, latreia).
 - Proskynesis is a relative honor given to the image as a representation of the person depicted.
 - Latreia (which belongs to God alone) is absolute worship.
3. The honor given to an icon passes to its prototype (i.e., honoring an icon of Christ means honoring Christ Himself, not the material image).

The council decreed:

“For the more frequently they are seen in pictorial representation, the more readily are men lifted up to the memory of their prototypes, and to a longing after them.” (Acta of Nicaea II)

And:

“Whoever does not venerate the holy and venerable images, let him be anathema!”

This teaching overturned the decrees of the Council of Hieria (754 AD), which had condemned icons as idolatrous under the influence of Byzantine emperors like Leo III and Constantine V.

Why Was It Controversial?

1. The Fear of Idolatry: Iconoclasts argued that venerating images violated Exodus 20:4-5, which forbids the making and worshiping of graven images.
2. Imperial Involvement: Byzantine emperors, particularly Leo III and Constantine V, saw icons as a political and theological threat. They promoted iconoclasm as a means to purify Christian worship.
3. Christological Concerns: Iconoclasts claimed that depicting Christ in an image was either Nestorian (dividing Christ's divine and human natures) or Monophysite (confusing His natures). They argued that Christ, as the God-man, could not be truly represented in an image.
4. Western Opposition: While the Roman papacy supported Nicaea II, some in the Frankish Church (under Charlemagne) rejected it, leading to the Carolingian Libri Carolini, which accused the council of promoting idolatry.

Orthodox and Catholic Acceptance vs. Protestant Rejection

- Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism affirm Nicaea II as an ecumenical council, maintaining that icons aid devotion without violating biblical prohibitions on idolatry.

National Church vs. Evangelical Conversion

Orthodoxy has historically been intertwined with national churches, where religious identity is often a matter of cultural and ethnic heritage rather than personal conversion. The Orthodox church is often structured around national boundaries (e.g., the Russian Orthodox Church, Greek Orthodox Church), and membership is frequently tied to birth rather than a conscious decision to follow Christ.

Reformed theology, on the other hand, emphasizes personal faith and conversion. While acknowledging the covenantal aspect of the Church, the Reformed tradition insists that faith must be personal, not merely inherited (John 3:3, Acts 16:31). Evangelical conversion is essential, and the church is not defined by national identity but by faith in Christ and obedience to His Word.

Conclusion

Eastern Orthodoxy offers a mystical, nationalistic, and experiential approach to Christianity that diverges sharply from the Reformed tradition. It prioritizes healing over forgiveness, mystical experience over propositional truth, and national identity over evangelical conversion. The Reformed tradition, by contrast, holds to justification by faith, knowledge of God through His works, glorifying Him through understanding His revelation, and sanctification as growth in holiness and righteousness.

Ultimately, the Reformed position maintains that true knowledge of God comes not through mystical visions or national affiliation, but through His revelation in Scripture and His works in creation and providence. The emphasis is on knowledge vs mystical experience. .

Consequences: religion as a matter of experience, being part of a nation, merely being sick or weakened, not alienated, something done to you rather than something you come to understand, outward rituals without understanding.

Judgement: Under the control of Islam, totalitarianism, corruption, and a dead faith.