





John S. Romanides

The ANCESTRAL SIN

A comparative study of the sin of our
ancestors Adam and Eve according to the
paradigms and doctrines of the first- and
second-century Church and the
Augustinian formulation of original sin.

Translation with an Introduction by
George S. Gabriel







John S. Romanides

The ANCESTRAL SIN

A comparative study of the sin of our
ancestors Adam and Eve according to the
paradigms and doctrines of the first- and
second-century Church and the
Augustinian formulation of original sin.

Translation with an Introduction by
George S. Gabriel



The ANCESTRAL SIN

John S. Romanides, Ph. D.

Translation with an Introduction by
George S. Gabriel, Ph. D.

Χριστιανικόν Ορθόδοξον

Βιβλιοπωλείον

Christian Orthodox Bookstore

432 Princess Highway

Rockdale NSW 2216

Phone - Fax: 02 - 9567 3273

ZEPHYR

Ridgewood

Also from the publisher

MARY THE UNTRODDEN PORTAL OF GOD, Dr. George S. Gabriel

A profound study of the soteriological and ontological position of the Ever-Virgin Mary in Orthodox theology. This exposition of the unique, seamless unity of the mystery and veneration of Mary with the theology and biblical methodology of the Ancient Church is presented in contrast to the legalistic mechanisms in papal Mariology which sever Mary from the condition of fallen mankind and lead to doubt about her unity of nature with the human race. (210 pp.)
ISBN 978-0-9707303-0-5

NOSTALGIA FOR PARADISE, Dr. Alexander Kalomiros

The author of *The River of Fire* draws life giving teachings from the Orthodox Church's spiritual and theological Tradition to illumine the path back to Paradise with guideposts about the experience of faith, the stillness of the heart and inner prayer, man as the image and likeness of God, the Keys of the Kingdom, repentance and remission of sins, our Sabbath in the grave and our bodily resurrection, and more. (180 pp.)
ISBN 978-0-9707303--2-9

THE ANCESTRAL SIN
John S. Romanides

English Edition Copyright © 1998, 2002, 2008 George S. Gabriel

All rights reserved.

Except for the inclusion of brief quotations in a review, book, or article, no part of this book may be reproduced in any form, or stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without written permission from the publisher or translator.

Publisher:

ZEPHYR PUBLISHING
P.O. Box 1359
Ridgewood, NJ 07451-1359

All inquiries by mail,
or email: ZephyrPublishing@aol.com

ISBN: 978-0-9707303-1-2

Library of Congress Control Number: 2002091364

Printed in the U.S.A.

CONTENTS

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION	7
AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE FIRST GREEK EDITION	13
INTRODUCTION	
A. The Importance of the Subject	
B. Theological Method	17
I. CREATION, FALL, AND SALVATION ACCORDING TO GREEK PHILOSOPHY IN GENERAL	41
II. GOD'S RELATIONS WITH THE WORLD	
A. The Creation <i>Ex Nihilo</i> and the Divine Freedom	
B. The Energy of God in the World	
1. "My Father worketh hitherto."	
2. <i>God, the Giver of Life</i>	51
III. SATAN	
A. Introduction	
B. Satan and the Omnipotence of God	
C. Satan and the Fall	
D. The War Between God and Satan	
E. Satan and the Justice of God	69
IV. THE DESTINY OF MAN	
A. Introduction	
B. Moral Perfection	
C. Perfection and the Fall	
D. Immortality	103

V. SPIRITUAL MAN IN THE IMAGE OF GOD	
A. Carnal, Animal, Spiritual	
B. Image and Likeness	133
VI. THE ANCESTRAL SIN	
A. The Original State and the Fall	
B. The Transmittal of Death	
C. "Many Were Made Sinners."	155
D. Conclusion	
EPILOGUE	171
BIBLIOGRAPHY	177
INDEX OF NAMES	185
ABOUT THE TRANSLATOR	190

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

The Ancestral Sin by Fr. John S. Romanides was first published in Greece half a century ago. It became and still remains widely acclaimed in Greece's theological schools and the Orthodox Church there. Abroad, too, in this English edition, it is recognized as the premier exposition of the Orthodox patristic tradition and the scholastic tradition in conflict.

Over the course of centuries, Roman Catholic and Protestant systems of thought, mainly through Augustinian theology, had come to exercise a significant influence on academic theology across the Orthodox world as well as in Greece and on the mind of the popular lay religious brotherhoods in Greece. The author was among the first of many 20th-century Orthodox theologians who rose up and presented studies and treatises on the Orthodox patristic tradition and the foundations of the Faith. *The Ancestral Sin* was the doctoral dissertation of Fr. John S. Romanides, which he presented in 1957 at the University of Athens, the center of the very thought world he was challenging. In such an environment, it came as no surprise when his thesis encountered formidable resistance. Nevertheless, after several months of contentious examination, heated debate, and attacks based on scholastic paradigms, the dissertation was accepted.

At the outset, *The Ancestral Sin's* Introduction states, "Without a correct understanding of the fall of mankind, an Orthodox interpretation of the dogma of redemption is impossible." Fr. John Romanides distinguishes the soteriological, anthropological, and cosmological paradigms of the Church in the first two centuries from those of Augustine, bishop of Hippo (d. 430). In the Introduction, the author lays down historical and thematic foundations essential to a proper understanding of the profound exposition in the chapters that follow. In the hope of enhancing the utility of this English edition, I offer in this Translator's Introduction the following theological summary of the most salient themes of the thesis.

The transgression of Adam and Eve was first called "original sin" (*peccato originali*) by Augustine. With its new name, the sin of Adam also received a new theology. Today the term "original sin" is known to everyone in the Western and English-speaking Christian world. It is natural, therefore, that such common use is often vague and uncritical with regard to the religious and theological uses of the term. Nevertheless, what the world generally understands about original sin results from the formulations begun by Augustine and systematized by the post-Augustinian theologians.

Predating Augustine by more than two centuries, the earliest Tradition of the Church calls our forefather Adam's sin not "original" but "ancestral," literally the "forefatherly sin," from *propatorikon amartema* (προπατορικόν ἁμάρτημα), which is also the Greek title of this book. The word *amartema* denotes a specific transgression, a concrete act. On the other hand, the classical Greek word *amartia* (ἁμαρτία), even in the plural, usually connotes sin as the generic illness and infirmities of body and soul, the fallen condition of human existence and man's failure to hit the target or achieve his destiny. These differences in the meanings of "sin" are not always taken into account by commentators and translators of patristic writings. This failure often results in erroneous moral and legalistic judgments.

The presuppositions of the Greek Fathers preclude the idea of universal, inherited guilt of original sin. The Fathers did not call Adam's transgression the original or generic sin. A God who imposes personal guilt for Adam's sin on all human beings at the moment of their conception was not in the empirical knowledge of the Fathers or even imagined by them. They imputed personal responsibility solely to Adam and Eve, the transgressors.

Original sin posed a massive dilemma for the paradigms of Augustine and the post-Augustinian theologians. After all, in Augustinian and scholastic theology, the first man's sin had disturbed the *eudaemonia* or self-contented happiness of the Unmoved Mover,¹ a philosophically conceived deity that is not

1. St. John of Damascus (8th c.) used the term "Unmoved Mover" to explain that God is self-existent, that the cause of His existence is neither prior to Himself nor other than Himself. God is also the cause that moves all things into existence from nonexistence. Unlike the scholastic theologians, however, John of Damascus did not define the Unmoved Mover as the self-centered ideal of happiness that does not move toward anyone or anything outside of its own essence. It is untenable, therefore, to call the Damascene a forerunner or early father of Scholasticism, as many Western theologians do because he used the term "Unmoved Mover."

moved by or toward things outside of itself, i.e., outside of the Divine essence. Moreover, the Latin paradigms conclude that the first man had a naturally immortal soul and was a copy of the eternal idea or archetype of man in the essence of God. Thus, Adam came into the Garden of Eden in a state of utter perfection and happiness, enjoying the beatific vision of the Divine essence. The post-Augustinian West, therefore, saw Adam's sin as a fall from the greatest possible height and as an offense of the greatest possible enormity against the Divine essence and the very honor of God. Necessity in the Divine nature itself, whose *eudaemonia* was violated, dictated certain indispensable adjudications, such as the retributive death of Adam, the imposition of inherited guilt for Adam's sin and, therefore, the penalty of death on the human race. The Incarnation of the Son of God was needed so His suffering and death may offer the infinite satisfaction of Divine justice, appease the just wrath of the Father, restore the Divine honor, and thereby enable God to forgive men's sins.

In this scheme, the expiatory nature of atonement, redemption, and spiritual life is dictated by the presuppositions of the Augustinian teaching of original sin. Most Western influences that have entered into Eastern Orthodox thought in the last four centuries spring from these soteriological, anthropological, and cosmological teachings. Fr. John Romanides analyzes their rationalistic foundations, showing how these brought in the progressive estrangement of the West from the mind and experience of the Church. He equates that mind and experience with the revelatory Spirit found in the consensus of the early Fathers on the ancestral sin, death, and salvation.

Fr. John's thesis holds that in the first two centuries, from the New Testament times to St. Irenaeus, the Apostolic and post-Apostolic Fathers had already enunciated the Church's doctrines about man and the ancestral sin at some length. The bedrock of the thesis is the *ex nihilo* creation: God created from nothing. By His uncreated energy, which is distinct from the uncreated Divine essence, He made all things from nothing preexistent. The creation *ex nihilo* precludes the idea that matter always existed and needed only to be shaped into all things by the hand of God. It also bars Augustine's teaching that eternal ideas of all things preexisted in the essence of God as archetypes before creation which He was constrained to copy and bring into existence. This Neoplatonic system was banned by the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, but Thomas Aquinas later used it and named it *analogia entis*.

The true destiny intended for Adam and mankind, however, was not the philosophers' idealism or *eudaemonia* of the Unmoved Mover but perfection as sons of God who love Him and love one another, as Christ has loved us with an outgoing love that seeks nothing in return. With one and the same love that He loves His Only-Begotten Son Who is in His bosom, God also loves the world. His love is the same uncreated energy, the same Divine life, that Adam forfeited and we are invited to participate in. God's relations with men are direct, consisting of His uncreated energies and not of created secondary powers or graces that have no relation to the Uncreated One.

Sin, corruptibility, decay, and death are evils and enemies of God as well as of men. They are neither His creation nor His punitive instruments, for God is not the author of evil. "For God made not death neither hath He pleasure in the destruction of the living."² Salvation, then, is not the saving of man from Divine wrath but from these enemies. Satan is not God's partner or agent with legal rights to judge and punish men. He is the rational, willful enemy who has the power of the fear of death, waging unceasing war against men and, through them, God.

Empirically sharing the same Divine knowledge, the Fathers and the authors of the Scriptures teach us that God is not the cause of death. The death of man fulfills no need in God for juridical satisfaction and pleasure. The first man died because he believed the deceit of the serpent and freely turned away from the Source of Life. The Fathers say that Adam and Eve were made children, which is to say they were made in a state of relative but not the highest spiritual perfection. God gave them a single, negative commandment that they may be perfected through spiritual labors and unselfish love and, with time, to attain to immortality and divinization (*theosis*) by grace.

Augustine said that the "just wrath of God" imposed death on Adam and on "all men who were under this wrath by reason of their guilt of original sin."³ St. Paul, however, says Adam died

2. Wis. 1:13

3. *Enchiridion*, ch. 33. The teaching that God is the cause of death was formalized as a Roman Catholic dogma by the Council of Trent in 1546: "If any man does not confess that the first man, Adam, through his transgression suffered the wrath and indignation of God and, because of this, death, let him be anathema." (First Canon, Fifth Session) This teaching led to the formation of the Roman Catholic Marian dogmas proclaimed in the 19th and 20th centuries. See G. S. Gabriel, *Mary the Untrodden Portal of God*, Zephyr Publishing, 2005, ch. VI.

because he sinned, and death spread to all men. Now we sin because we die (*Rm. 5:12*), for the sting of death is sin (*1Cor. 15:26*). Sinfulness is an egocentric illness contracted from the parasites we call corruptibility and death. Sin reigns in death, in our corruptibility and mortality. Death is the root; sin is the thorn that springs from it. In the end, the last enemy that shall be destroyed is the endless cycle of corruptibility and death, the seat of sin.

Ontologically, Jesus Christ has already accomplished this victory by His own death and resurrection. At the Second Coming, then, He shall terminate these enemies once and for all, freeing men from sin forever and raising us in body and soul to incorruptibility and immortal life. Without His resurrection, in the first place, there can be no salvation. His resurrection destroys Satan and sin by destroying the source of their power, which is death and corruptibility. Consequently, Dr. Romanides refutes the general opinion of Western theologians that says Augustine was first to understand St. Paul in depth and that the only possible resolutions for the problem of Adam's sin are those that Augustine and Pelagius offered.

I first met Fr. John Romanides at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School in Brookline, MA, where it was my good fortune to be his student in various courses. *Τό Προπατορικόν Ἀμάρτημα* was a required text during his tenure there from the late 1950s to the mid-1960s. He taught Dogmatic Theology at the Theological School of the University of Thessalonica from 1970 to 1984. For a number of concurrent years and beyond, he also taught at Balamand University's School of Theology, Balamand, Lebanon. Fr. John represented the Orthodox Church of Greece at Orthodox and Interfaith Conferences all over the world. He reposed in his 75th year on November 1, 2001, in Athens.

When this translation was yet a work in progress, Fr. John's guidance contributed immeasurably to the successful representation of the original Greek text. He was delighted with the final translation and gladly approved the word "ancestral" in the English title instead of "original," although in earlier years he had used the term "original sin." It was his request that Augustine of Hippo not be called Blessed or Saint in the English edition. In 1989 a second Greek edition was published, and he wrote a second preface for it. I have not included the 1989 Author's Preface here because it discussed issues largely as they related to Western European political and intellectual efforts to

reshape the national and ecclesiastical ethos of Greece in the turbulent 19th century.

French and German passages in the Greek edition have been graciously translated into English by a linguist of international renown who wished to remain anonymous. I am deeply grateful and indebted to him.

This English edition was always Fr. John's desire, but he did not live to see it finally published. Therefore, to his memory, with deepest gratitude, I dedicate my translation of his classic work. And, as he also wished, I offer it to readers of English with the hope and prayer that it will lead many to new understandings and the light of ancient and saving truths.

George S. Gabriel, Ph. D.
(*Revised on Jan. 5, 2008*)

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE FIRST GREEK EDITION

This dissertation is a continuation and expansion of my article "Original Sin According to St. Paul," which was published in 1955 in *St. Vladimir's Quarterly*. Its primary purpose is the study of the doctrinal presuppositions of the beliefs of the first Christians about the ancestral sin and a comparison of those presuppositions with the overall direction of the dogmatic and moral concepts in the Orthodox Church and in the Western Church. The relevant points of the West's departure from the teaching of the ancient Church are indicated at the end.

The study of this subject was prompted by the fact that as Orthodox in America we are confronted daily by the numerically greater Roman Catholics and Protestants. The Roman Catholics contend that Orthodoxy does not differ from Roman Catholicism at all except in certain "unimportant points," foremost among which is the primacy of the Pope. On the other hand, Protestants in general contend that the Orthodoxy of the Ecumenical Synods amounts to a corruption of the teaching of the primitive Church. Therefore, we are called to bear witness before the heterodox and to enlighten them with the facts about Orthodoxy. We are called especially to inform the Orthodox flock in the Diaspora and to protect it from heterodox influence and the intense propaganda of active proselytism.

It is unfortunate that Orthodox theologians often use Roman Catholic arguments against the Protestants and Protestant arguments against the Roman Catholics. The unavoidable result of this method of defense is an influence on Orthodox thought from both sides. The result is that some Orthodox appear to be "Roman Catholicizers" and others "Protestantizers." Thus, they are also regarded as conservative and liberal respectively.

The need to clarify the authentic Orthodox position with regard to Roman Catholics and Protestants is at last obvious to most of us.¹ The Orthodox theologian must not counter Protestantism with Roman Catholic arguments but with the authentic teaching of the Fathers of the Church. Likewise, he must not counter Roman Catholicism with Protestant arguments but with the authentic spirit of the Greek Fathers.

Perhaps the most important theological problem faced by Orthodox theologians in America is the charge by Protestants that the orthodoxy of the Ecumenical Synods amounts to a corruption of the teaching of the primitive Church. The attempt by some Orthodox to respond to this charge with Roman Catholic arguments is doomed to failure at the outset because the characteristic views of medieval Roman Catholicism regarding the topics of this study are not found in the primitive Church. This is not at all difficult to demonstrate. In refuting a charge of this kind, however, the Orthodox cannot simply bring forth the opinions of the great Church Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries. The charge, after all, alleges that the corruption of the Christian teaching took place prior to the major Fathers. Therefore, in confronting Protestantism, it must be demonstrated that the central teachings of the major Greek Fathers are essentially the same as the teachings of the primitive Church and constitute a mere continuation and explication of them. On the one hand, this study attempts to respond to this frequent charge by Protestants and, on the other, to present the basic differences between Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism regarding the topics under discussion.

The purpose and character of this study made it necessary for me to follow the historical/doctrinal method and the systematic method combined together with emphasis on the discursive manner of presenting the problems. I selected this method because I am interested much less in the differences in details among the Fathers and writers I examined than in the uniformity of their thought and direction regarding the central and essential points of the topics, and in the relationship of their

1. *Procès-Verbaux du Premier Congrès de Théologie Orthodoxe à Athènes, 1936*, Publiés par les soins du Président Prof. Hamilcar S. Alivizatos, Athens 1939, p.42f., 193-231. Also by the same author, *Αἱ Σύγχρονοι Θεολογικαὶ Τάσεις ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ Ὁρθοδοξίᾳ* in "Θεολογία," Vol. 20, Athens 1949, pp. 80-98; J. N. Karmiris, *Ἑτερόδοξοι Ἐπιδράσεις ἐπὶ τὰς ὁμολογίας τοῦ 12' αἰῶνος*, Jerusalem 1948.

teaching with later Greek patristic theology. The aim is to make perfectly clear the complete agreement in the presuppositions and directions of Orthodox patristic theology from Apostolic times, and to set forth some of the central points where the West departed from the teaching of the primitive Church and was led into its familiar delusions.

Given the extensive nature of the topics under examination in this study, it was unavoidable that some areas would be left unexamined. It is possible that some aspects of a truth were emphasized at the expense of other aspects of the same truth. Anyone who occupies himself with these topics knows how many difficulties can be encountered. I labored while knowing those difficulties well. If I have anywhere missed the mark, I hope that it will be shown to me in a spirit of love.

To the distinguished Professor, J. N. Karmiris, I express my gratitude for his suggestions and his favorable recommendation of this study to the Theological School of the University of Athens. I also express my thanks to the distinguished Dean of the Theological School, Mr. C. Bonis, whose suggestions contributed to the entire presentation of this work, and to the distinguished Professors Mr. P. Trembelas and Mr. P. Bratsiotis, whose comments contributed to the clarification of certain points. I also offer my warm thanks to all the distinguished Professors who contributed to the improvement of this study. Likewise, I owe a debt of gratitude to the equally distinguished Professor, Mr. H. Alivizatos, who, despite his many activities, bore the burden of reviewing the manuscript and confirming its agreement with certain comments of his own and offered frequent encouragement to me. I offer warm thanks to my friend Mr. S. Agourides, Professor of the University of Thessalonica, who labored to make corrections and improvements in the text.

John S. Romanides
Psihiko, Athens,
6 August 1957

CHAPTER I

CREATION, THE FALL, AND SALVATION IN GREEK PHILOSOPHY IN GENERAL

When philosophical systems try to explain the phenomena of things and the presence of evil in them on the basis of what is known about nature, it is absolutely natural for them to confuse the idea of the creation of matter with its fall.¹ If we begin with philosophical and scientific observations of the material world, it is logically impossible to arrive at a distinction between the creation of the world and its fall. Quite simply, this is because the reality before our eyes presents nature as it is now, after the fall. The absence of tangible proofs that, in principle, the world is a positive and good thing, even though corruptibility and evil are present in it after the fall,² leads to the conclusion that matter itself is something negative, evil, or nonexistent. Essentially, matter cannot be anything other than a way of demonstrating or revealing a meaning hidden either in it or outside of it.

All rationalistic efforts to solve the problem of the origin of evil and to find in man's existence a meaning that transcends the grave create the notion that reality is found either within or outside of material phenomena.³ These same phenomena, however, are the absence of reality. All material phenomena exist in birth and decay. The principle of change rules all things. If the unchangeable exists, it has to be either in matter or external to it.⁴

In philosophy, therefore, matter is a negation without eternal meaning.⁵ It differs from reality in that the changeable and cor-

1. C. Tresmontant, *Essai sur la Pensée Hébraïque*, Paris 1953, p. 20-24.

2. In the Neoplatonic systems in particular, the creation of most things is in itself a fall (*ibid.*). This is precisely what is in force in the Gnostic system of Valentinus, which was fought by St. Irenaeus. Cf. F. C. Bauer, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 521f.

3. B. C. Ioannides, 'Απόστολος Παῦλος καὶ οἱ Στωικοί Φιλόσοφοι, Thessalonica 1934, p. 41.

4. F. Copleston, *History of Philosophy*, Westminster, Md. 1946, Vol. 1, pp. 17, 20f.

5. C. Tresmontant, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

ruptible is the absence of immutability. Only the immutable and incorruptible is real. Philosophy is unable to bridge the dualism between matter and reality because it is impossible for natural man to distinguish between the wholly positive creation of the world and the fall of the world.⁶ Man cannot know this division except by revelation.

Since philosophy makes a sharp distinction between matter and reality, it follows that any true distinction between God and reality is erased. It is a basic premise of philosophy that only the ingenerate and immutable is immortal and real. Everything that has a beginning in time also has an end. Decay forever follows birth. If reality exists either within or outside of matter, of necessity it must be ingenerate and, therefore, co-beginningless and co-essential with the first principle. Hence, the preservation of the difference between God and the ingenerate is an insoluble problem which naturally leads to fate (εἰμαρμένη) as the principle of every differentiation.⁷

For the philosophers, the world is not the result of the deliberate will and creative energy of God bringing it into existence from nothing (*ex nihilo*). A basic premise of philosophers is that from nothing comes nothing.⁸ For them, creation can be a natural emanation from the essence of the One (pantheism), or a phenomenalist or fallen reflection of an ingenerate, true world of universals (idealism), or an unbroken unity of form and matter in which matter is the source (ἀρχή) of the replication of form but without independent existence and first fruits (ἀπαρχή) (Aristotle). Hence, the God of philosophy can be the very world itself, or it can be a perfect, personless,

6. *Ibid.*, p. 20f.

7. Justin writes, "That which is ingenerate is similar to, equal to, and the same as [another] which is ingenerate; neither in power nor in honor should the one be preferred to the other. Hence, there are not many things that are ingenerate. For if there were some difference among them, you would not discover the cause of the difference. You would be seeking it, but your mind would be wandering infinitely, and you would just be wearied and finally take a stand on one ingenerate thing and say that this is the cause of all." *Dialogue With Trypho*, 5, 5-6. Here Justin is speaking of the difference regarding the uncaused nature of the principle of ingenerate things, in which case it is impossible to make a distinction in their formation. If a criterion for making a distinction were to be discovered, the cause of that criterion would be higher than the ingenerate things. This argument does not prove creation *ex nihilo*; it merely points to the need for a distinction. Even though Justin does not mention it, for the philosophers this cause of predestination existed and exists.

8. F. C. Bauer, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 519.

inert entity accompanied by an ingenerate ensemble of universals and values. Or at most, it can be the One forever unmoved mover of things that are forever moved, things, i.e. the world, with which the One never comes into contact.⁹ An acute polarity exists between the revealed fact of creation *ex nihilo* and the common feature of philosophy and its erroneous premise that reality, by its nature, can only be beginningless and without end. For philosophy, the cause and source of the continuous, unending existence of reality, therefore, is not the will of God but simply the nature of reality itself. Immortality does not come from the energy of God but from the nature of ingenerate and immortal things.¹⁰

In philosophies that are based on certain premises about the nature of man and the world, naturally the prevailing concept is that the destiny of man is either pleasure (hedonism) or *eudaemonia* (happiness). And both ideas, one being altogether materialistic and the other bearing an appearance of difference from the first, accept human desire as a basic and natural fact. They differ only in the purpose and manner of its fulfillment. Hedonism is founded on the belief that man's natural urges are inescapable because they are determined by destiny and are an end in themselves, or they have the character of deliverance from baser, oppressive needs. Eudaemonism, however, is based on the view that pleasure is deceptive and only appears to satisfy man, for material things, after all, are changeable and have no permanent meaning. For this reason, the successful satisfaction of human thirst is found only in ingenerate and unchangeable things in which the soul's unstable condition of unfulfilled quests ceases.

The *eudaemonia* of philosophy is attained according to the degree to which one approaches the good and acquires it. Full happiness is achieved through the ultimate vision of, or union with, the highest good. Throughout the world of reality there is a scale of values, and through them all things are drawn to the

9. F. Copleston, *op. cit.*, p. 49. In addition to the forever unmoved mover of the forever moved, in Aristotle's system there are approximately 50 or more other independent principles of motion, all beginningless and unmoved and therefore divine. Cf. E. L. Mascall, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

10. It is within the framework of these presuppositions that the polemic of the first Christian theologians against the natural immortality of the soul must be understood. St. Irenaeus, in fact, writes that this teaching is from the devil. *Refutation*, 3, XX, 1. Theophilus of Antioch, *op. cit.*, 2, 27; Justin, *Dialogue*, 6, 1-2; Tatian, *To the Greeks*, 13.

Creation, the Fall, and Salvation in Greek Philosophy

supreme being, which is not drawn to anything itself because it is perfect. At best, there could be within it a movement only toward itself because outside of itself there exists nothing that is more perfect.¹¹ Evil, that is, change, instability, birth and decay, is infinitely distant from the unalterable simplicity of the One. The One draws ingenerate things toward itself without motion and without directing energy to anything outside of itself. Evil is the inexplicable inclination to the opposite direction, away from the One toward changeable things and matter. Salvation, therefore, is the flight from time and corruptible matter; it is a state of attachment to ingenerate things, or to the One, which are found outside of the material world, or are hidden in it. The destiny of man is dispassion and motionlessness through the acquisition of immutability. In other words, man is saved when at last he ceases to desire. Desire is the fall from reality to changeable phenomena; it is the failure of the human mind to identify itself with the unchangeable. Visible things are a delusion for anyone who does not mentally perceive the reality hidden either in them or outside of them. Aristotle's matter or Plato's forms are negative principles of replication and embodiment of the primal unchangeable ideas. Man fulfills his purpose in life when his intellect transcends the partition wall of matter or of forms and grasps the ingenerate and essential idea, the unalterable principle, the universal.

Greek philosophy's teaching of the immortality of the soul is based on the premise that the true man, in other words, the *idea* of a man, belongs to the unchangeable and beginningless reality and not to corruptible phenomena. The soul's many reincarnations are a negative aspect of its existence since the soul is a spark of the universal soul. For this reason, the soul is immortal, changeless, and ingenerate. Its existence in the body, however, is considered natural by Stoicism, even though its re-incarnations are innumerable. For Aristotle, the soul's existence in the body is natural because the soul is the ingenerate form of the human race and is inseparable from matter. And matter is a completely natural, albeit negative, principle of replication and succession of

11. Thus, having similar philosophical presuppositions regarding the subject of the divine love toward the world, Aquinas offers as the solution his opinion that God loves the archetypes within Himself: "Although creatures have not existed from eternity, except in God, yet because they have been in Him from eternity, God has known them eternally in their proper natures and, for that reason, has loved them." *Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 20, Art. 2, Rep. 2.

Creation, the Fall, and Salvation in Greek Philosophy

the race. For Plato, on the other hand, the soul's state in the body is unnatural because the body is the prison of the soul.

Accordingly, salvation or the fulfillment of the destiny of man is ascribed to the supreme being but not in the positive sense, that is, through a direct act of its will, since this being does not move outside of itself. Rather, in a completely opposite and negative way, salvation is accomplished by all things being drawn to the supreme being. For the most part, the destiny of man is attributed to fate and to a completely natural element in man, the soul, which is by nature immortal.¹² The successful finale, therefore, is either: 1) an already accomplished fact, since the soul, of a wise man at least, is identical with the universal soul or with the general form of the race, in which case *eudaemonia* consists of an intellectual display of life according to the already existing reality (a departure from which amounts to *hubris* against fate, against the immutable, and invites misfortune); or, 2) a future fact determined by fate but partially realized now by a transcending of the material phenomena through a recollection of ideas implanted in the soul, ideas that were directly known in a previous existence but are now darkened because of the soul's present embodiment.

In the framework of Greek thought, revelation of truth to man by the One, the only personal God, is foolishness. Because, first of all, the One is unmoved outside of itself; second, man has the intellectual power to penetrate to the deeper meaning of phenomena and identify his mind directly with the ingenerate reality. And, through this kind of knowledge, he is able to save himself by his own powers. For the Greek philosophers, then, man's salvation or final fulfillment is the result of an intellectual effort.¹³ This is precisely why the "Greeks seek wisdom."¹⁴

History, time, place, and individual events have no positive meaning in themselves since only the ingenerate, immutable, and universal are real for Greek philosophy and of a nature that is comprehensible to the intellectual part of man through the exercise of the mind. In contrast, the following ideas are tantamount to the greatest foolishness: God's gradual self-

12. "There are certain others who suppose the soul to be immortal and bodiless, who have committed evil and believe that neither will they pay the penalty (for that which is bodiless is impassive) nor does the soul, being immortal, have need of anything from God." Justin, *Dialogue*, 1, 5.

13. This is exactly what was taught by the Gnostics, whom St. Irenaeus fought. Cf. *Refutation*, 1, XXI, 4.

14. 1 Cor. 1:22.

Creation, the Fall, and Salvation in Greek Philosophy

revelation to the Hebrews, His chosen and special people; their gradual preparation under His active and dynamic guidance in order that they may receive (in time and in a concrete place) the truly Incarnate Hypostasis of Truth; and the making of matter, time, and history new, eternal, and incorruptible through the birth, crucifixion, and totally fleshy resurrection of the Lord. For the Greek philosophers, truth and divine saving energy are not given to the world in a gradual way. Neither are they given first only to certain persons in certain times and places, and only later universally through Jesus Christ. On the contrary, the truth is always present in the mind, and it is comprehensible everywhere as long as there exists a man who philosophizes.¹⁵

Despite the great intellectual excellence of the ancient Greek spirit, completely absent from it was the idea of unselfish love which "seeketh not its own."¹⁶ Philosophy was unable to conceive of a love altogether free of every selfishness and delivered of every necessity. The Greek philosophers' yearning for *eudaimonia*, of course, was a kind of fall, not because it seeks its own but simply because it remained unfulfilled. For the philosopher, deliverance from desire was not indispensable in the way that it was to the Christian, i.e. for the attainment of the unselfish and creative love shown freely and unceasingly to one another. On the contrary, for the philosopher freedom from desire only marked the end of all movement and activity and the final achievement of a mathematical stability delivered from all division and replication. Hence, the idea of rigid stability and

15. A. Nygren comments that while the Gnostics generally follow principles similar to Platonism, with the difference that they draw a sharper antithesis between the material and spiritual world (*Éros et Agapè*, Paris 1952, Vol. 2, p. 78), nevertheless, under the influence of Christianity, Gnosticism "teaches a descent of God for the objective purpose of the salvation of man. Salvation is no longer only the ascent of the soul toward divine life. On the contrary, it presupposes a divine energy, an intervention from above into the earthly life of man... Since the highest God is not able to abandon His throne and come down, true contact with the divine world is created by the coming of the Savior... Without a Savior and a message from above, no deliverance of man would have been possible. In their understanding, the person of the Savior had to fulfill one function virtually analogous to the teaching of Plato regarding perceived beauty. In both teachings, it was a setting into motion of those good elements that exist in a forgotten state in the human spirit and would never have been capable of realizing themselves objectively without the assistance of an external power. It could be said that the Gnostic concept of the mission of the Savior, in some way, amounts to a model and prototype in the deliverance of the human spirit that is activated by the very same human spirit." *Ibid.*, pp. 80-84.

16. 1 Cor. 13:5.

Creation, the Fall, and Salvation in Greek Philosophy

mathematical precision was divinized in an imaginary and non-existent fate.¹⁷

The immutable and inactive One of Greek philosophy is rather a projection of the human thirst for a secure understanding of the meaning of existence itself and for *eudaimonia*. It is the object of man's intellectual desire for an entirely natural certainty of salvation but without a real revelation and the gradual saving energy of God in the world. It is also a self-centered principle imaginatively constructed according to the desires of man. The One differs from man because its self-centeredness is wholly fulfilled in itself. It does not move toward anything outside of itself; it simply exists in the ultimate degree of perfection. It is precisely what man pursues, differing from him only in that man is still seeking motionlessness, while the supreme being is by nature completely motionless, content, and perfectly fulfilled.

For the Greek Fathers, God is the highest good and the pinnacle of desirability, of course, but not in the likeness of man who loves selfishly. God's love is not a necessity of the divine nature. Thus, God does not have relations with the world in His essence but only in His energy and will with no alteration in His essence. Likewise, the soul's inclination toward the highest good, of course, is the will of God and the indispensable means of attracting man but not in the philosophical sense, according to which the acquisition of the highest good refers to the fulfillment of the selfish desires of man. On the contrary, the inclination of an orthodox soul toward the ultimate good is accompanied by asceticism in order for the soul to be delivered from necessity's dominance of that love. Therefore, the real happiness of man does not consist of fulfilled selfishness but of freedom in the likeness of God. "For indeed virtue is unconstrained and voluntary and free of all fear and necessity."¹⁸

The idea of the unmoved One of philosophy depends mostly on the legitimacy and naturalness of man's desire for the fulfillment of self-centered love. If that desire, however, is the result of a fall, not from the One but in a biblical sense, and if the world (presently under the power of death and corruptibility

17. "L'Univers grec est un cosmos fini, arrêté." C. Tresmontant, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

18. John Chrysostom, quoted by Maximus the Confessor, *Theological Chapters*, P.G. 91, 721. A. Nygren attempts to introduce into Protestant theology a sharp distinction between the selfish love in Platonic philosophy and the unselfish love in Christianity. Because of his Lutheran predilections toward salvation by faith

Creation, the Fall, and Salvation in Greek Philosophy

due to the fall) is real because of the positive will and creative energy of God, then the highest unmoved mover in philosophy and the distinction between creature and reality are merely empty and nonexistent fantasy.

The dualism of matter and reality is largely based on the idea that death is both a natural and phenomenal fact since matter and the material world in general are without permanent reality, something that belongs to a different dimension. In contrast to the philosophical method, through the divine revelation given to the Prophets, the special people of God learned to distinguish clearly between the world's creation and the world's fall, as well as between the present age, which is under the sway of the devil and death, and the future age of the resurrection and the incorruptibility of matter. To the Hebrews, Hellenistic dualism was completely alien¹⁹ because the world, both the visible and the invisible, is the only real world that was made for man by God. Death is not merely phenomenal for the Hebrew but real and tragic. For him, the only way of salvation is the resurrection of

alone, however, he is unable to understand correctly the Greek patristic teaching on the subject. He correctly believes that the destiny of man is the unselfish love that "seeks not its own," but he does not acknowledge asceticism's part in the struggle to attain to such a love since he believes that man is saved by faith alone. He overlooks the fact that asceticism in the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers is not expiatory before God but is the indispensable means of trampling down the devil and acquiring unselfish freedom and love. How can man be liberated from selfishness except by faith, grace, and asceticism? It is worth noting that, from an Orthodox point of view, Nygren makes some basic errors in defining unselfish love. 1) He does not take into account the Greek Fathers' teaching about God in order to understand their teaching on the likeness of God properly. Thus, wherever he encounters the patristic teaching about the ascent of man to God through love and ascetical struggle, he superficially concludes that it is a Platonic distortion of the Christian concept. 2) Nowhere does he take into serious consideration the biblical and patristic teaching about the condition of man under the power of sin, death, and the devil. Thus, he overlooks the necessity of ascetical struggle against the devil for freedom. 3) He rejects the contribution to salvation made by man's tendency toward selfish love, and he fails to take into account the fact that, in the spiritual struggle, the Christian ascends through different stages of perfection. The sinner begins at selfishness and, through faith, grace, and ascetical struggle, progresses toward freedom. 4) He forgets that even unselfish love is a tendency toward something by an attraction. God's saving energy toward man is not an attraction of the divine nature. Nevertheless, it is an inclination toward something by will even though it absolutely lacks nothing and the element of divine compassion that attracts the sinner is not absent. See P. Bratsiotis, *Tó Nôma tîs Chriştiainikîs 'Agâpîs*, Athens 1965, pp. 16-17.

19. C. Tresmontant, *op. cit.*, pp. 49, 53-54; J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body*, London 1953, p. 13. Harnack comments, "The eschatological chain of ideas with its thesis

Creation, the Fall, and Salvation in Greek Philosophy

the dead. The present world and the future age are not two different worlds. To be saved, therefore, is to be saved not from the world but from the present evil.²⁰ Conversely, for the Greek philosophers, the natural way of salvation is the flight of the soul from the body and matter to the transcendent reality. Death itself is salvation. For the platonizing Greek philosopher, the resurrection of the body is equal to the damnation of the soul because is equal to a new imprisonment of the soul. For all philosophers, the resurrection is the overturning of fate, in other words, of the wisdom of this world. Thus, it is not difficult to understand why, "when they heard 'resurrection of the dead,' some mocked and others said, 'We will hear thee again on this matter'."²¹ The Orthodox teaching of the resurrection of the flesh was not only repulsive to Celsus and to the heretics and Gnostics who attacked it, it was also repulsive to the Gentiles. This is clearly discerned in the writings about the life of Plotinus by Porphyry: "Plotinus, who became a philosopher here, felt ashamed because he was in the body. Because of this attitude, he could not bear to talk about his clan or his parents or his country."²²

that death, evil, and sin entered humanity at a given moment in history as the demons took possession of the world, has erected a barrier that in particular points has indeed been passed but, despite that, has been respected in the end. Consequently, there is to consider here the remarkable fact that, on the one hand, the original Christian (Jewish) eschatology brought about and maintained the state of mind in which the Kingdom of God and the worldly kingdom [of the devil] were perceived as absolute opposites--practical dualism--while, on the other hand, it staved off theoretical dualism." *Lehrbuch*, Vol. 1, p. 152, fn. Cf. K. R. Hagenbach, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

20. *Jn.* 17:25.

21. *Acts* 17:32.

22. Porphyry, *On the Life of Plotinus*, 1,1.

CHAPTER II

GOD'S RELATIONS WITH THE WORLD

A. Creation Ex Nihilo and the Divine Freedom

The basic premise of the entire life and thought of the ancient Church is the biblical teaching of the creation of the world from nothing by a perfectly positive and completely free act of God.¹ "First of all, you must believe that there is one God Who created and completed all things, and made all things out of nothing and brought them into existence. He contains the whole, but He alone cannot be contained."² In essence, a correct understanding of the meaning of the ancestral sin depends on a correct understanding of the relations of God with the world. The ancient Christian teaching on the fall is inseparably bound to biblical cosmology. The key to understanding this cosmology and the relationship between God and the world is the dogma of creation *ex nihilo*. This dogma constitutes the whole premise of the Church's teaching on freedom.

The foundation of biblical and patristic faith, life, and theology is the fact that God, by His uncreated energy, created the world 1) directly, with no intermediary and 2) from nothing, out of no necessity but by His will and, therefore, 3) in a completely positive manner. It is Judaio-Christian monotheism's basic premise: "I am the Lord Who performs all things. I alone stretched forth the heavens and established the earth."³ This fact

1. L. Duncker comments that the teaching of creation from nothing by the one and only God constitutes the entire basis of St. Irenaeus' theology and his polemic against the Gnostics. *Des Heiligen Irenäus Christologie*, Göttingen 1843, p. 8f., 75. Cf. also F. C. Bauer, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 519f.

2. *Shepherd of Hermas*, Bk. 2, First Commandment; Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 4, XX, 2.

3. *Is.* 44:24.

God's Relations With the World

is equally emphasized in Judaism⁴ and Orthodox Christianity. Moreover, for the Fathers of the Church it was a fundamental argument against heretics who sought to downgrade the Son and the Spirit of God to lower forms of gods or to mere tools made for the purpose of assisting in creation.

St. Irenaeus fought against the Gnostics who believed in a Hellenistic form of supreme being that contained in its inactive essence ideas or archetypes⁵ that emanate from it. From among these, after a long series of emanations and falls, there emerged a lesser god called the demiurge.⁶ He copied the archetypes and built this world⁷ imperfectly either in ignorance⁸ or without the will⁹ of the supreme One (which is unmoved toward the world and things outside of itself, with which it is unable to have direct contact).¹⁰ To combat the heretics, Irenaeus emphasized the biblical teaching that the one and only God Who revealed Himself to the Prophets¹¹ and became incarnate through the Holy Spirit and the Virgin¹² is the same God Who made the world without the need of a creaturely intermediary.¹³ "For it is a property of God's omnipotence to have no need of other tools in order to create the things He calls into existence."¹⁴ "He is my God," writes Theophilus of Antioch, "Who alone stretched forth the heavens."¹⁵

It can be noted that, because of the nature of his opponents' teachings, Irenaeus was very emphatic that this world was created by the one and only God. Except at certain unclear points, however,¹⁶ he did not insist on the other aspect of this teaching: creatures, in general, beings lower than God, not only do not create but are unable to create since the energy of creating as well as of foreknowing and of saving belong to God alone.¹⁷

4. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Cambridge 1946, Vol. 1, p. 381.

5. *Refutation*, 1, XVII, 1-2; 2, III, 1-2; VII, 1-VIII, 1f.; XVI, 1f.

6. *Ibid.*, 1, V, 1.

7. *Ibid.*, 1, XVII, 1-2; 2, III, 1-2; XVI, 1.

8. *Ibid.*, 1, V, 1; 2, III, 1.

9. *Ibid.*, 2, II, 1; III, 1-2.

10. F. C. Bauer, *op. cit.*; F. Copleston, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 21.

11. *Refutation*, 3, VI, 1f.

12. *Ibid.*, 3, XVIII, 3; XXI, 1f.

13. *Ibid.*, 1, XXII, 1; 2, IX, 1-2; 4, VII, 4; XX, 1f.

14. *Ibid.*, 2, II, 5.

15. *Op. cit.*, I, 7.

16. *Op. cit.*, 2, II, 1; 4, XX, 1.

17. In one place where he could have emphasized this point (*Ibid.*, 2, II, 3-4), he did not. He remained with his basic argument that God did not use any other

God's Relations With the World

Even though this teaching is presupposed in the revealed fact that God alone creates, provides, and gives life, it is not as heavily emphasized as it was in the later battles with heretics during the period of the Ecumenical Synods.¹⁸

The dogma of creation *ex nihilo* is the bulwark against the erroneous teaching that the world is an emanation or reflection of the essence of the One, or the result of some other principle. It is also the most secure guarantee that God is the Creator neither by necessity nor by essence but by energy and will.¹⁹ For the Fathers of the Church, the revelation that the world, by the energy of God, has its origin²⁰ from nothing is proof that the creative energy of God is not His very essence,²¹ which is what

medium to create because He did not need any, and He simply did not use any, as He testified through the Prophets.

18. Basil the Great, for example, emphasizes that the single nature of the Holy Trinity is proved by the identity of energies of the three hypostases: "If we understand the energy of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit to be one, differing or varying in nothing, we must necessarily comprehend the unity of nature in the identity of energy...Therefore, the identity of energy in the Father and in the Son and the Spirit clearly demonstrates the sameness of nature." *Epistle 149*, edition by R. J. Deferrari, *The Letters of St. Basil*, London 1930, pp. 64-66. Proceeding from the same understandings regarding the divine energy, Athanasius the Great asks, "If, through the Logos and in the Holy Spirit, the Father creates and renews all things, what is the similarity or relation of the Creator to the creature? Or, how could a creature play a role in the creation of all things?" *First Epistle to Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis*, 24, P.G. 26, 588. Cyril of Alexandria likewise asks, "If, however, the Holy Spirit is indeed a thing made, a creature, according to the madness of the heterodox, how is it that He possesses the whole energy of God? For I believe that no one who thinks correctly would dare to go and say that the energy which the divine essence has by nature is brought forth to fulfill a purpose through certain external instruments passing over to one of the useful aids that receives it as its own. Because the Son is life by nature, the Spirit sent by Him gives life; we must confess, therefore, that the Spirit's existence is from the same essence as that of the Son and God whose every power and energy He possesses..." *The Book of Treasures on the Holy and Co-essential Trinity*, Homily 33, P.G. 75, 573.

19. G. Florovsky, *The Idea of Creation*, p. 58f.; F. C. Bauer, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 526f.; C. Tresmontant, *op. cit.*, p. 20f.; C. Androutsos, *Δογματική*, p. 94f.

20. Regarding St. Justin's expression that God created "from formless matter," cf. F. C. Bauer, *op. cit.*, C. Androutsos, *op. cit.*, p. 96, and J. C. L. Gieseler, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

21. "Though God is able to do all that He wills to do, He does not will to do all that He is able to do. To be is not the same as to will...If God creates in His being, it is by necessity that He creates whatever He creates. But if it is by will that He creates, He creates out of sovereignty. Creating out of sovereignty, then, He creates as much as He wills and whatever He wills and whenever He wills. If God creates in His being, His will serves no purpose and is altogether useless." Justin, *Christian Inquiries*, III, 2. Cf. G. Florovsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 58f., 67f.

God's Relations With the World

Origen erroneously taught.²² In His essence, God is not the creator, foreknower, judge, and savior. He is these things but only by His will and His energy.²³ Thus, the world is neither a natural emanation from the essence of God²⁴ nor a created energy of God.²⁵ On the contrary, the world is a result of His uncreated energy.²⁶ God acts in various and infinite ways but never with a change in the divine essence or with the divine

22. G. Florovsky, *op. cit.*, p. 60f.; S. Balanos, *Πατρολογία*, Athens 1930, pp. 156-157; F. C. Bauer, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 533.

23. Thomas Aquinas and the theologians and philosophers who follow him and Augustine, in confusing and identifying the energies and properties of God with His essence (*Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 3, Art. 1-8; Q. 25, Art. 1; Q. 30, Art. 2; Q. 54, Art. 1; Q. 77, Art. 1.) hold that God is creator both in essence and outside of time. F. Copleston, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 367, and the same author's *Aquinas*, London 1955, p. 138. In other words, God only creates *ex nihilo* in time but conceives of the idea of the world by necessity and in His essence. (*Ibid.*) Thus, there is no distinction between God's creative energy and His energy of prescience. There is only a distinction between the creative energy in His essence and His creative energy in time. On this, the opponent of Scholasticism, Gregory Palamas, writes, "If God's creative energy differs in nothing from His prescience, then all created things exist co-eternally in parallel, created beginninglessly as the Creator Himself is beginningless because, as He foreknows beginninglessly, those things that are foreknown, therefore, are foreknown beginninglessly. How can it be that the creatures which God made do not have existence subsequent to Him? If God's creative energy differs in nothing from His prescience, then neither is His creative energy subject to His will. If it is prescience that creates, God does not create by will but only appears to. And how can God create without His will?" (*Natural Chapters*, 102, P.G. 150, 1192.)

24. In Aquinas's system, the divine energy, will, being, etc. are identical to the divine essence. The archetypes of creatures, therefore, are also identical to the divine essence. (*Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 44, Art. 3) Thus, creation is a copy of the divine essence in that the archetypes are given a mode of being. Indeed, Thomas's chapters on creation are appropriately called "The Procession of Creatures" (Pt. 1, Q. 44) and "The Emanation of Creatures" (Pt. 1, Q. 45). Regarding archetypes, Aquinas follows the line of Augustine. F. Copleston, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 60, 323; cf. his *Aquinas*, p. 142. Androustos follows this line. *Op. cit.*, p. 101f.

25. Although the Scholastics and the West in general identify the divine essence with the divine energy, they avoid pantheism by teaching that the divine energy in the world is created. Thus, God's providential energy exists in two kinds: 1) in providence, which belongs to His essence; 2) in operative providence, which is a created energy (*Summa Theologica*, Pt. 2, Q. 91, Art. 1, 2). The identification of the divine essence with the uncreated energy and the acceptance that God's energy in the world is created led naturally to further distinctions between natural and supernatural grace, and to created grace in general. Cf. J. Pohle, *Grace*, St. Louis 1946, pp. 1, 5, 7, 271f.

26. "For there is one energy, and it belongs to the three (hypostases). He whose energy is created cannot himself be uncreated. This is why it is not the energy of God but that which receives the energy or results from it that is a creature." Gregory Palamas, *Natural Chapters*, 73, P.G. 150, 1172.

energies becoming the divine essence or hypostases.²⁷ The energies and powers of God in the world are not hypostatized essences as was thought by the Greek philosophers and the Gnostics, who personified and deified the energies of God hidden in nature.²⁸

The confusion of God's energy and essence implies that between Creator and creatures there is a kinship of essence.²⁹ Thus, the world either exists in the essence of God in the form of archetypes or, in its material form, it is co-beginningless in essence and co-eternal with God. It would follow, therefore, that in His essence God is dependent on His creatures.³⁰ The philoso-

27. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, I, IV, 5. "Not one of such energies is a mode of being, that is, a self-existent nature, according to what Basil the Great said." Gregory Palamas, (*Theophanes, regarding divinity and the incommunicable and communicable in it*), P.G. 150, 929.

28. Cf. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*; E. Schweizer, *The Spirit of Power*, in the periodical "Interpretation," New York, July 1952, p. 269.

29. Eunomius perceives the distinction between the energy and essence of God, but he understands the energy to be created. "They do not assign to the energy a distribution or movement from the essence since the followers of the Greek sophisms think it is necessary to join the energy to the essence...We, however, distinguish between the energy and the works, as was briefly said earlier, and do not regard it correct to mix it with the essence, knowing that the latter is simple, beginningless, and without end, and that the energy is not beginningless. For even if the work were beginningless, it would not be without end because if the works have ceased, it is not possible for the energy to be unceasing. Indeed it is very foolish and infantile to say that the energy is ingenerate and without end and identical with the essence, since none of the works can possibly be classified as either ingenerate or without end. Of these, one of two things takes place: either the energy of God is ineffectual, or the work is ingenerate. And if each of these is admittedly absurd, the remaining possibility is true: the works have a beginning, and the energy is not beginningless; the works cease, and the energy is not unceasing. There is certainly no need to accept unexamined the opinions of others that join the energy with the essence. It is most true and befitting of God that His will directs the energy and suffices to sustain and to save all things, according to the testimony of the prophetic voice, 'For all that He wanted He made.' It lacks nothing in executing all that He wills. For when He wills, so also is done which He wanted." *Apologia of Eunomius*, P.G. 30, 857-860.

30. Cf. Gregory Palamas, *Natural Chapters*, 96, P.G. 150, 1189; G. Florovsky, *op. cit.*, p. 70f.; J. N. Karmiris, *Σύνοψις Δογματικῆς Διδασκαλίας Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, p. 23, n2. On the same topic, of interest is the comment by F. C. Bauer on the teaching of Origen: "On the same grounds that Origen affirmed the Son's eternal witness, he also had to affirm an eternal creation of the world." *Op. cit.*, p. 533. It must be noted here that the uncreated energy of God is eternal despite the fact that it is not ingenerate and beginningless and not always without end. (And the Logos Himself is eternal, yet He is not ingenerate and beginningless, since He is begotten and co-beginningless with the Father.) "The prescience of God has no beginning, but after the things that He foreknows come

God's Relations With the World

phical doctrine of God as *actus purus* leads either to pantheism³¹ or to absolute dualism.

Contrary to the purely philosophical method, the starting point for the Fathers was always the saving energies of God in the world: "The Lord taught us that no man can know God unless he be taught of God; that is, God cannot be known without God, for this, that God should be known, is the express will of the Father. And to whomsoever the Son has revealed Him, they shall know Him."³² In this kind of revelation, the initiating force is God Himself, in a completely positive and free act of His will and energy. Thus, the relations and energies of God are not indirect but direct and real, particularly in the Incarnation of the Logos. In this case, it is not only a matter of God's relations with the world but of hypostatic union. The relations of God with the world and His energies in the world have a beginning and, therefore, cannot be of the divine essence. The creative, prescient, revelatory, and saving energy of God is one thing, and His essence another. "The Great Basil says, 'He who acts is not the same as the act's energy and neither is the recipient of the energy.' And the divine Cyril, too, forming a passage about God, theologizes, 'Thus, to create is of the energy, but to beget is of the nature, for nature and energy are not identical'."³³ Since the creative, prescient, saving, and divinizing energy of God is not a manifestation of an internal necessity

to pass, it has an end. Thus, as it is not a necessity for it to have an end, it is not a necessity to have a beginning." Basil the Great, P.G. 29, 680.

31. B. Krivoscheine, *op. cit.*, p. 24. In order to avoid the pantheistic consequences of the Roman doctrine of God as *actus purus*, Aquinas was forced to reject the real relations of God with the world. (F. Copleston, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 364; J. S. Romanides, *The Ecclesiology of St. Ignatius of Antioch*, Atlanta 1956, p. 8, n6.) Following earlier heretics, Aquinas thought that from the (created) energies of God we could know something, even if minimally, of the essence of God in this life because created grace is a copy of the uncreated grace, that is, the divine essence. Indeed, Aquinas contended that the divine essence is the first archetype of all created things. *Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 44, Art. 3. Cf. M. Schmaus, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, p. 36f. According to this, the paradox is that although the world is dependent upon the divine essence, and man's destiny is the mind's vision of the essence of the Supreme Good (*Summa Contra Gentiles*, Notre Dame 1975, Bk. 3, Ch. 51-63), nevertheless, there is no corresponding real archetype of God in relation to the world because God is essence only. "It is thus that the relation of created beings to God is real and not at all the relations of God to created beings." A. Michel, *Relation Divines*, "Dict. de Théol. Cath.," Vol. XIII2, col. 2150. Cf. *Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 45, Art. 3, Rep. I. Cf. M. Schmaus, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 402f.

32. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 4, VI, 2.

33. Gregory Palamas, *Natural Chapters*, 143, P.G. 150, 1220. Cf. C. Bonus, *op. cit.*,

God's Relations With the World

in the divine nature, and since it is not identical with the divine essence,³⁴ it follows, therefore, that it is not possible for one to know the divine essence through the energies. For similar reasons, St. Irenaeus expressed the same principle and said that through the revelatory divine energies in the world we may know the only true God but not His essence.³⁵ Basil the Great clearly says, "Indeed, the divine nature, despite the nuances of all the appellations by which it is called, remains as indiscernible as our own reason. By learning that God is benefactor and judge, that He is good and just and many other such things, we have also been taught about the differences of energies. Moreover, not even by understanding His energies are we able to know the nature of Him Who acts. For when one ascribes the meaning to each of these appellations surrounding the nature itself, he does not give the same meaning to both [the appellations and the nature]. The meaning of these words is one thing and the nature is another. Therefore, the essence is something else, and an explanatory discourse on it has yet to be discovered. Certainly the meaning of the names that refer to the essence is something other than the essence itself; it is something that arises from an energy or from the importance of the named energies."³⁶

p. 19; and J. Vryennios, *Περὶ τῆς Θείας Ἐνεργείας, Τὰ Εὐρεθέντα*, published by E. Voulgaris, Leipzig, 1768, Vol. 1, p. 115.

34. Despite the fact that he identifies the divine essence with the divine energy, K. Barth acknowledges that the freedom of God demands some kind of distinction between the essence and the energy of God. (*Op. cit.*, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, p. 426.) Likewise, he acknowledges that the incomprehensibility of God is based on the divine freedom (*ibid.*). Nevertheless, he criticizes the Orthodox Church because it does not accept the *Filioque* (*ibid.*, p. 546f.). Following the general lines of Augustine, Barth accepts a relative and analogous revelation of the divine essence, saying that the Holy Trinity as known in its energies in the world cannot differ from the Holy Trinity in itself, that is, in the divine essence. Like all Western theologians, he confuses the saving and sanctifying energy of the Holy Trinity with the divine essence and, thus, understands the Son's sending of the Holy Spirit to creatures as a manifestation of the Spirit's procession in the divine essence, *ex Patre Filioque* (from the Father and the Son). He ignores the fact that this justification presumes that the creative, prescient, saving, sanctifying, and divinizing energy of the Father through the Son and in the Holy Spirit is a necessity of the divine nature. Barth is inconsistent because he does not recognize the need to distinguish between the free energy of God and His essence.

35. *Op. cit.*, 3, XXIV, 2. Cf. C. Bonis, *op. cit.*, p. 17f.; John Chrysostom, *On the Incomprehensibility of God*, Homily 2, Ch. 5; Homily 3, Chs. 1, 3; Homily 5, Ch. 5. Edition of P. Christou. Athens 1953; Basil the Great, *Refutation of the Apology of the Impious Eunomius*, Homily 1, P.G. 29, 545.

36. J. N. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 329-330. In contrast, C. Androutsos follows the West and confuses the essence and energy of God, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

That God never revealed His essence, neither through the Son in the New Testament nor through the Prophets and the other holy men in the Old Testament, is proved by Basil the Great through examples of holy men in the Scriptures who learned of God's existence through His energies and believed and worshiped Him.³⁷ Irenaeus faced Gnostics who did not believe in the creation *ex nihilo* or in the distinction (without disjunction) between the energies of God and His incomprehensible essence. Thus, they thought the ideas of things or the imperfect copies of the archetypes by the lower demiurge are natural and universal emanations³⁸ from the essence of the One. Fighting the Gnostics, Irenaeus insisted on the revealed fact that God Who conceived the world created without any creaturely means or intermediary. God's conceiving of creation, however, is not a necessity of the divine nature but a result of the free energy of God.³⁹ In other words, creation is not an image or copy of an idea of the world that preexisted within the essence of God.⁴⁰ Moreover, God conceives the ideas regarding the world neither out of a necessity nor by His essence but by His free energy.⁴¹ This prescient energy is identical with neither the essence of God nor the will of God,⁴² and it is not a universal.⁴³

It follows from the dogma of creation *ex nihilo* by the will

37. C. Bonis, *op. cit.*, p. 21. In contrast, C. Androutos follows the West: "Whatever reveals the divine essence is part of the supernatural revelation perfected in Jesus Christ, the only interpreter and executor of the divine plans." *Δογματική*, p. 36.

38. For them every divine energy is a universal. E. Schweizer, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

39. *Op. cit.*, 2, III, 2; VII, 5.

40. J. Vryennios condemns Aquinas as a blasphemer because "he applies Platonic ideas to the divine essence." *Op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 414. Cf. J. N. Karmiris, Introduction, *Σύμμα Θεολογική*, p. 48. It was Augustine who planted the Hellenistic teaching regarding the eternal ideas in Western theology. Cf. M. Schmaus, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, p. 37.

41. Irenaeus, *ibid.* "Thus, is it not ridiculous to say that creativity is the essence, or that prescience is also the essence, or that foreknowledge is likewise, and that all energies are always simply the essence?" Basil the Great, *Refutation of the Impious Eunomius*, Homily 1, P.G. 29, 528. Commenting against Augustine and the Scholastics, V. Lossky says that, for the Greek Fathers, everything that has to do with creation belongs not to the essence of God but to the divine energy. Even the conceiving of creation belongs to the divine energy. *Op. cit.*, p. 90f.

42. "Therefore, most certainly foreknowledge differs from the divine will, and indeed from the divine essence, and each from the others." Gregory Palamas, *Natural Chapters*, 100, P.G. 150, 1192. On the contrary, C. Androutos accepts the identification of the divine essence, knowledge, will, being, energy, etc. *Op. cit.*, p. 52, 100f.

43. Cf. Gregory Palamas, *op. cit.*, 929, 945; Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 1, IV, 5.

God's Relations With the World

and energy of God that the visible and invisible world was created in an altogether positive manner. It is this very world itself and no other that was created by the will of God. Therefore, it is neither an imperfect copy of another supposedly real world nor the result of contact with matter through some kind of fall, nor an estrangement from reality, nor some emanation of ideas from the divine essence.⁴⁴ The tradition of Scripture ignores the usual philosophical distinction between matter and form or matter and reality.⁴⁵

The belief that reality is an ingenerate composition of universals, ideas, and essences is completely alien to the Holy Scriptures and the patristic tradition of the Eastern Church. For God does not also have a parallel, ingenerate, ideological world of universals.⁴⁶ On the contrary, He created this world from nothing, making it material and immaterial, visible and invisible, changeable, and with cycles of seasons, winds, currents, moons, and more.⁴⁷ The philosophical idea that changeable things and things in motion are bereft of reality is unacceptable from a spiritual point of view. "Learn, O man, of His works, of the change of seasons according to their times, and cycles of winds, and the orderly path of elements, and the orderly course of days and nights, and months and years...and of the dew that falls, and of steady rains, and of periods of abundance of sudden cloudbursts, of the multitude of movements of the heavenly bodies..."⁴⁸ This reality, however, is not what it is because the essences and universals in question are immaterial, bodiless, uncreated, and without beginning or end but simply because it is how God wants it. Nevertheless, even though time and material phenomena in general have a beginning, by the grace of God and with time, they can become everlasting.⁴⁹ God alone is immortal by nature.⁵⁰ Creatures do not become immortal⁵¹ by being lifted above matter and time but by being made incorruptible by the

44. C. Tresmontant, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

45. *Ibid.* J. A. T. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

46. "Anathema to those who, with mythical inventions of their own, both remake our creation and accept Platonic ideas as true." *Synodikon of Orthodoxy, Triodion*, Edition of Saliveris, p. 149. In comparison to God, the invisible, immaterial, and noetic world of the angels is material. Cf. J. N. Karmiris, *Δογματική Διδασκαλία τοῦ Ἀγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ*, p. 32-33.

47. *Gen.* 1-2.

48. Theophilus, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, 6.

49. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 2, XXXIV, 2, 3.

50. 1 *Tim.* 6:16; Justin, *Dialogue*, 6, 1-2; Theophilus, *op. cit.*, 1, 4; Tatian, *op. cit.*, 13.

51. *Rm.* 8:21.

God's Relations With the World

grace of God. The immortality of creatures consists in the resurrection of the world and the making of time incorruptible, as attested to by the resurrection of the full human nature of Christ.⁵² For God "shall reform our lowly body to become like His body of glory."⁵³

Evil, according to Holy Scripture, is not an inborn thing in creation even if it is in the form of the absence of good⁵⁴ because "God saw all that He had made and said it was very good."⁵⁵ Nor is evil the absence of being,⁵⁶ since God brought all things out of nonbeing into being. If evil is merely an absence of being, it follows that God made the world from evil. Holy Scripture does not find evil to be part of the nature of creatures but makes the distinction between the creation of the world and the fall of the world.⁵⁷ God is the cause of the existence of creatures which, in the beginning, were "very good,"⁵⁸ but He is not the cause of the post-creation imperfections of the world. "For in the beginning nothing was made evil by God, and all things were very good."⁵⁹ "God created everything, and it was very good. Indeed, the dissoluteness of the demons influenced those in the world to do evil. And the formation of evil is by them and not by the perfect God...The making of the world was good. It is the state of affairs in it that is debased."⁶⁰ The revealed distinction between the creation and the fall of the world renders untenable the idea that this world is by nature imperfect because, as many would argue, only God can be perfect. If the world were by nature imperfect or a bad copy of the perfect archetype, God would be the cause of its imperfection, and there would be no meaning to the evangelical teaching about saved man becoming perfect⁶¹ as

52. *Lk.* 24:39; *Jn.* 20:24-29; Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 5, VI, 1f.; VII, 1f.

53. *Phil.* 3:21.

54. Thomas Aquinas, for example, holds this definition. Cf. *Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 48.

55. *Gen.* 1:31.

56. C. Androutsos, *op. cit.*, p. 119. "Among all things, nothing exists that does not share in the Beautiful and the Good. And I dare say that even nonbeing shares in the Beautiful and the Good and is itself beautiful and good when it is spoken of God as transcendental and void of all things." Dionysius the Areopagite, *On the Divine Names*, P.G. 3, 704.

57. C. Tresmontant, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-24.

58. "For the Hebrew, the perceptible is neither bad nor faulty. Evil does not come from matter; the world is very good." *Ibid.*, p. 56f. Cf. also B. M. Vellas, "Ὁ Ἄνθρωπος κατὰ τὴν Παλαιάν Διαθήκην," Athens 1939, p. 9.

59. Theophilus, *op. cit.*, 2, 17.

60. Tatian, *op. cit.*, 17, 19.

61. *Phil.* 2:15; *Col.* 1:28; 4:12; 1 *Thes.* 4:3; *Heb.* 12:14; *Jn.* 1:4.

God's Relations With the World

God⁶² and Christ.⁶³

Therefore, because of the totally positive reason for the creation of this world by God and because God is not the cause of the evil in it,⁶⁴ man's salvation is not accomplished by a Platonic escape of the soul from the world and matter.⁶⁵ On the contrary, it consists in the destruction of the evil, an event in the world and in time, through the resurrection and renewal of all things. Salvation does not mean being saved from the world but from evil. "I ask not that Thou shouldst take them out of the world but that Thou shouldst keep them from [what is] evil."⁶⁶ "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."⁶⁷ "And this creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruptibility to the freedom of the glory of the children of God."⁶⁸ "He Who raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies."⁶⁹ The main basis for the dogma of the resurrection is the Judaio-Christian belief regarding the creation and the fall. "Indeed, [matter] was made and brought forth by none other than the Creator of all things. And for this reason, we have believed that there will be a resurrection of bodies after the end of all things."⁷⁰ Athenagoras says, "The resurrection shall not take place for the primary purpose of the judgment but for the will of the Creator and the nature of creatures."⁷¹

B. The Energy of God in the World

In their alleged efforts to protect the simplicity of the divine nature philosophically and to preserve untouched the distinction between God and the world, the Scholastics and many Protestants⁷² identify the energy of God with His essence and,

62. Mt. 5:48; Eph. 5:1; Col. 3:10; 1 Ptr. 1:44; 1 Jn. 3:2.

63. Rm. 8:29; 1 Cor. 2:16; 15:49; 2 Cor. 3:13; Gal. 2:20; 4:19; Eph. 4:13.

64. Wis. 1:13; 2:23f.

65. C. Androutsos, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

66. Jn. 17:15.

67. 1 Cor. 15:26.

68. Rm. 8:21.

69. Rm. 8:11.

70. Tatian, *op. cit.*, 5-6. Cf. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 5, III, 2; IV, 1-2; XII, 6; XV, 2-4; Athenagoras, *On the Resurrection*, 12-13.

71. *On the Resurrection*, 14.

72. C. Welch, *In This Name*, New York 1952; E. L. Mascall, *op. cit.* He identifies the divine essence with divine energy and irrationally accuses the Eastern Fathers of pantheism. Cf. pp. 131, 185.

God's Relations With the World

therefore, necessarily perceive God's prescient energy and saving grace in the world as created things.⁷³ Since for them the essence and energy of God are the same, He does not act within time through His own uncreated energy because this would mean that God has relations with creatures by His essence. And, therefore, either the world shares the divine essence and is itself beginningless or God is subject to changes in His essence.⁷⁴

"If, according to the opposing prattlers and those who believe like them, the divine energy does not differ from the divine essence, then neither would the making of things, which belongs to the energy, differ from begetting and giving procession, which belong to the essence. And if the making of things did not differ from begetting and giving procession, then things made would not differ in any way from what is begotten and proceeds. If this is how things were, then the very Son of God and the Holy Spirit would be no different than creatures. And all creatures of God would be begotten by the Father and proceed from Him. Creation, then, would be deified, and God would be counted among the creatures."⁷⁵

In order to avoid these conclusions, Western theologians are forced to subscribe to a teaching about God that is very similar to Greek philosophy and to argue that God does not have true relations with the world through His uncreated energy and grace.⁷⁶ Consequently, any uncreated energies of God that are directed toward something have to do only with relations within the divine essence, which, according to the West, are called "Persons."⁷⁷ The scholastic system is so contrary to the Gospel that it comes close to refuting the existence within time of true divine love for the world.⁷⁸ Moreover, the word *love* in the apostolic passage "The love of God is poured out into our hearts"⁷⁹ is understood to mean created grace. In other words, God's love toward Christians is regarded as a created thing.⁸⁰ All

73. *Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 22, Art. 1, Rep. 2; Art. 3, Q. 43, Art. 3, Rep. 1; Q. 103, Art. 6; Q. 110, Art. 2, Rep. 3.

74. Cf. above, n29, n30.

75. Gregory Palamas, *Natural Chapters*, 96, P.G. 150, 1189. Cf. J. N. Karmiris, *Εὐνοφίς Δογματικῆς Διδασκαλίας Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, p. 23, n2.

76. *Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 13, Art. 7; Pt. 1, Q. 45, Art. 3, Rep. 1.

77. *Ibid.*, Q. 28, Art. 1, Rep. 3; Pt. 1, Q. 45, Art. 3, Rep. 3 to Inst. 3; J. Pohle, *The Divine Trinity*, St. Louis-London 1946, p. 232f.; M. Schmaus, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 402f.; A. Michel, *op. cit.*, col. 2150.

78. *Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Ch. 20, Art. 2, Obj. and Rep. 2.

79. *Rm.* 5:5.

80. *Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 23, Art. 3, Rep. 1, 2.

God's Relations With the World

this stems from the Scholastics' insistence on identifying the divine essence with the uncreated energy, despite their efforts to avoid blatant pantheism.⁸¹

Since, as Thomas Aquinas teaches, the ingenerate, creative prescience or providence is in the divine essence and the operative power of prescience is a created one, it follows that God acts in the world through created means.⁸² This world, then, is governed by secondary causes that participate in the first cause the way an image participates in the object depicted and as occurs in the natural law.⁸³ Consequently, God does not govern in the world and time directly through His uncreated energy itself but indirectly, since all things were ordered from eternity⁸⁴ in His essence and prescience, even miracles themselves.⁸⁵

Within the framework of the scholastic presuppositions regarding the divine nature and energy, there is no place for the biblical narratives about the manifold, real, and direct energies of God in the world and in the Church. The infinitely numbered direct, uncreated energies of the Holy Spirit in the Holy Eucharist not only have no place in the scholastic scheme of ideas described above, but according to scholasticism's presuppositions about God, these energies are completely impossible. This is why Aquinas explains that the Holy Spirit dwells in the faithful because every man is by nature a temple of God, since "the rational creature by its operation of knowledge and love attains to God Himself."⁸⁶ In other words, man is the temple of God because he has a mind, and the Holy Spirit dwells in the faithful only in a special way through created grace.⁸⁷

81. While C. Androustos confuses the divine essence with the uncreated energy, he does, however, accept true relations between God and the world (*op. cit.*, p. 54f.), but he refers to the relations "of the divine essence toward the world." *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45. It is not clear how he avoids pantheism.

82. *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Bk. 3, Ch. 76, 77, 83.

83. *Ibid.*, Ch. 77; *Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 91, Art. 2.

84. *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Bk. 3, Ch. 76; *Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 1-4.

85. *Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 105, Art. 6, Rep. 3. For a typical scholastic development of the problem regarding miracles and the natural law, cf. W. Devivier's *Christian Apologetics*, New York 1924, Vol. 1, p. 379f.

86. *Ibid.*, Pt. 1, Q. 43, Art. 3.

87. *Ibid.* The causes of the disappearance of the liturgical *epiclesis* in the West during the middle ages are outside of our subject, but one may surmise them in part from the above. (The *epiclesis* existed in the West up to the 12th century. Cf. S. Salaville, *L'epiclesse d'après saint John Chrysostome et la tradition occidentale*, *Échos d'Orient*, 1908, pp. 104, 106-108.)

God's Relations With the World

1) "My Father worketh hitherto."⁸⁸

The distinction between uncreated prescience in the divine essence and created, operating or ruling prescience is completely alien to biblical thought. Between God and the world no natural law exists because God Himself rules and sustains all things.⁸⁹ If we observe a stability of natural phenomena in nature, it is not because of some natural law as a kind of fate or predestination. On the contrary, it is because of the stable will and trustworthy action of God.⁹⁰ Thus, God does not act out of necessity, that is, according to His essence but according to His free will.⁹¹ Therefore, He does not perform miracles through the intervention of the supernatural in the natural, or by the elevation of eternal laws supposedly established by Him.⁹² Since God alone governs all things by His uncreated energy and not by His essence, His miracles are not attributable to any alleged necessity created by Him. "Indeed we confess God...and bear witness that all things are ruled through prescience by Him alone."⁹³ For God neither builds nor foreknows through created means. The energy of God in the world is real and direct.⁹⁴

According to the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers, the divine prescience is the uncreated and governing energy of God in time,⁹⁵ but it is also creative.⁹⁶ "The hand which formed Adam then is the same which today and always forms those who came after him and sustains them."⁹⁷ The world was made from nothing, and in it new beings are continuously being created.⁹⁸ "My Father worketh hitherto." The sustenance, salvation, and renewal of the world are an extension⁹⁹ of the creative energy of God Who, in Christ and the Holy Spirit, perfects all things. The

88. *Jn.* 5:17.

89. G. F. Moore, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 375, 384.

90. *Ibid.*

91. *Ibid.*

92. *Ibid.*

93. Theophilus, *op. cit.*, 3, 9.

94. *Jn.* 5:17f.; *Mt.* 6:26; 10:29.

95. J. N. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 330f.

96. Gregory Palamas, *Theophanes*, P.G. 150, 956; *Natural Chapters*, P.G. 150, 1189.

97. Athanasius the Great, *Defense of the Nicene Definition*, 11, P.G. 25, 429.

98. This is a Judaic concept. C. Tresmontant, *op. cit.*, p. 28f.; G. F. Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 384.

99. C. Androutsos calls it "the continuation of creation." *Op. cit.*, p. 114.

God's Relations With the World

creative prescience, however, is not the same as the saving energy of God because this would be equal to absolute predestination. In other words, this would mean either automatic salvation or automatic damnation.¹⁰⁰

2. God, the Giver of Life

The Old and New Testaments teach that God is the life-giving power in the world¹⁰¹ and that He alone is immortal by nature.¹⁰² "Accordingly," says Theophilus of Antioch, "God is changeless because He is immortal."¹⁰³ Creation lives by participation in the creative, prescient, and life-giving energies of God "the nurturing spirit, Whose breath gives life to everything. If He should withdraw the spirit to Himself, all things would disappear from existence."¹⁰⁴ For the Fathers, God alone is life-giving because He alone is self-existence.¹⁰⁵ "It was proper to no one else to replace the mortal with the immortal, except to one who is self-existence."¹⁰⁶ Therefore, the following words of Christ, "I am the resurrection and the life,"¹⁰⁷ "He who eats of My flesh and drinks of My blood has eternal life, and I shall raise him up on the last day,"¹⁰⁸ and "For as the Father raises the dead and gives life, likewise the Son also gives life to whom He wishes"¹⁰⁹ can only mean one thing: that Christ is God. "Thus saith the Lord: behold I shall open thy tombs, and I shall raise you from thy tombs, and I shall bring you into the land of Israel,

100. God desires the salvation of all, but His divine will is not a constraining energy. Because, above all, God wishes man to be free, that is to say, capable of resisting the will of God. Therefore, grace or saving energy is not irresistible (*irresistibilis*), as was imagined by Augustine and later by the Protestants. The confusion of the divine will with saving, divine energy logically leads to an absolute predestination of the Augustinian or Origenistic type.

101. E. Lewis, *God With Man*, in "Interpretation," New York, July 1953, p. 282, 286, 295; E. Schweizer, *op. cit.*, p. 276f.; R. Bultmann, *Der Lebensbegriff des A.T. und N.T.*, in "ThWB," Vol. 2, p. 876.

102. 1 Tim. 6:16.

103. *Op. cit.*, 1, 4.

104. *Ibid.*, 1, 7.

105. Justin, *Dialogue*, 6; Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, XVIII, 7; XIV, 1; XX, 1; Athanasius the Great, *First Epistle to Serapion* 23, P.G. 26, 584; J. N. Karmiris, 'Η Δογματική Διδασκαλία τοῦ Ἀγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ, p. 32-33.

106. Athanasius the Great, *On the Incarnation of the Logos*, 20, P.G. 25, 129.

107. Jn. 11:25.

108. Jn. 6:54.

109. Jn. 5:21.

God's Relations With the World

and ye shall know that I am the Lord because I opened thy tombs, and I brought my people out of the tombs..."¹¹⁰ Thus, writing against Nestorius, Cyril of Alexandria says, "We shall not receive ordinary flesh but truly life-giving flesh...for, being life by nature, God became one with His own flesh and showed it to be life-giving."¹¹¹ This is precisely why Ignatius the God Bearer can speak of the "blood of God."¹¹² In a parallel way, Athanasius the Great writes, He "is called the 'life-giving spirit' ...and the Lord is self-existence, while creatures, as it is said, through Him are 'life-given.' Indeed, how can He, Who does not share in life but dispenses it and gives life to creatures, be related to creatures?"¹¹³

It is perfectly clear that the entire basis of Orthodoxy's dogmas regarding the Holy Trinity and Christology is the revealed fact that God alone, without any created means, creates, foreknows, gives life, and saves.¹¹⁴ If these were created divine energies, in other words, if God creates, foreknows, gives life, and saves through created means, then the Arians, Macedonians, and Nestorians would be justified. The fact that God does not create, foreknow, give life, and save by created means bears witness to the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, that is, to the one nature of the Holy Trinity, and proclaims the hypostatic union in Christ. It is a basic premise of biblical and patristic theology that where the energy is uncreated, there too the essence is uncreated; where the energy is created, there too the nature is created. From the uncreated and identical energies of the three hypostases we know the sameness, identity, and simplicity of the essence of the tri-hypostatic Divinity. Likewise, from the created energies of Christ, we know His created nature, and from His uncreated energies we know His uncreated nature. Moreover, Monophysitism and Monothelitism are heresies against the basic dogma of creation *ex nihilo* and of human freedom. Therefore, they are a rejection of the salvation of the whole man and of the world because "that which is not assumed

110. Ez. 37:12-13.

111. *Epistle XVII*, P.G. 77, 113.

112. Ignatius, *Ephesians*, 1; *Romans*, 7.

113. *First Epistle to Serapion*, 23, P.G. 26, 584.

114. From this it is clear that the Old Testament constitutes the whole basis and premise of the dogmas of the New Testament and the Greek Fathers. Therefore, it is a totally erroneous argument of A. Harnack and the other liberal theologians of West who say the divinity of Christ is not based on Jewish monotheism but on Greek philosophy and especially on the teaching of the Stoics about the Logos

God's Relations With the World

is not healed."¹¹⁵ The above observations about the scholastic teaching that through created means God saves, foreknows, and acts in the world show how Latin theology merely amounts to a higher form of rejection of the basic presuppositions of biblical and patristic theology. It is a newer form of old heresies that were justly condemned by the Synods of Constantinople in 1341 and 1351.¹¹⁶

and cosmology. *Lehrbuch*, Vol. 1, p. 462f.

115. Gregory the Theologian, *op. cit.*

116. J. N. Karmiris, *Τά Δογματικά καί Συμβολικά Μνημεία*, Vol. 1, p. 294f.

CHAPTER III

SATAN

A. Introduction

A study of the ancestral sin according to the writers of the first two centuries cannot be objective and impartial if it does not take into serious consideration the views of those writers regarding the devil. Otherwise, there is a danger of interpreting the first Christians' teachings and views of the ancestral sin according to one's own criteria which did not exist in the theological thought of the writers of the period. Not unlike today, in the early years of the Church there were those who doubted the reality of the fall of certain angels and the deception of the human race by the devil. Justin writes, "Trypho, who revered the Scriptures, was somewhat vexed with me, and it was apparent in his face. He said to me, 'The things of God are holy, but your interpretations are artifices, and it is obvious from your explanations that they are indeed blasphemous, for you speak of angels becoming malefactors and departing from God.'"¹

Certainly many others must have said similar things. Despite objections brought from philosophy and rationalism, the Evangelists and the Fathers, however, did not hesitate to continuously present the devil as the cause of the evils in the world.² The human mind was unable to make the distinction (which was revealed through the prophets) between the creation

1. *Dialogue*, 79. "Athenagoras explains that there belongs to basic Christian theology not only the teaching of God the Father, the Logos-Son, and the Spirit, but also the exposition of the Angel world and its meaning." M. Werner, *op. cit.*, p. 239.

2. Cf. J. N. Karmiris, *Σύνοψις Δογματικής Διδασκαλίας 'Ορθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, p. 26f.

of the world and its fall through the deception by Satan. Consequently, man could not avoid attributing evil to God. "Poets and the fabulists wrote about the things that angels who had become demons did to men and women and to cities and nations. Not knowing, however, that it was the demons who did the things they wrote about, both the poets and fabulists ascribed these to God Himself."³

A defense of the belief in Satan's existence, of course, has no place in this study. In their usual rejection of Satan's existence, however, liberal theologians argue that he has no essential meaning in the authentic evangelical preaching. Similarly, from the point of view of Latin theology, the existence of the devil is not essential to the dogma of redemption but must be accepted because the Gospel teaches it.⁴ We will not deal with the subject here from an apologetical point of view, but we will examine the biblical and patristic testimony regarding Satan and his powers in order to draw a conclusion regarding his place in the dogmatic edifice of the ancestral sin.

Reigning throughout the patristic period of the Eastern Church was the biblical teaching that the Logos became flesh "so that, through death, he who has the power of death may be abolished, that is, the devil."⁵ "Unto this was the Son of God made manifest, that He may loosen the works of the devil."⁶ In the West after Augustine, however, the teaching prevailed that Satan and death were nothing more than instruments of the divine wrath. The dogma of redemption, as we shall see, received a different cast and ultimately evolved into the familiar forms of Western theology. Biblical and patristic theology was abandoned completely.

Only those who know but do not accept the Fathers' views regarding salvation could write the following: "All through the period of the Fathers, the purpose of redemption was the destruction of the work of the devil, and that destruction was considered accomplished through the death of Christ. Without a doubt, such a teaching is counterfeit. Today, everyone is in agreement that the interpretation given to the work of Christ

3. Justin, *2nd Apology*, 5; also *1st Apology*, 21.

4. While the Roman Church today insists on the belief in the existence of demons, it prohibits exorcisms. Cf. J. Pohle's *God the Author of Nature*, p. 347.

5. *Heb.* 2:14. We have the additional witness of the entire hymnology of the Eastern Church.

6. *1 Jn.* 3:8. Cf. G. Florovsky, *Patristics and Modern Theology*, pp. 239-240.

does not address reality, and one must find refuge in other testimonies in order to discover the authentic agenda of Jesus."⁷

On the other hand, there are others who do not know the Fathers sufficiently but have their own prejudices regarding the history of the dogma of redemption. They are shocked by what they interpret as a lack of reasonable continuity between certain passages of Holy Scripture on this subject. For example, interpreting *Hebrews* 2:14, H. T. Andrews writes, "The cause of the Incarnation now becomes apparent. Since the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He too partook of the same beside them. Only by receiving human nature can Jesus identify Himself with the race. For the author of *Hebrews*, the teaching on the Incarnation is of enormous significance because only through the Incarnation...does the Cross acquire significance and power. The 14th and 15th verses [of Ch. 2] constitute a shock. We expect the author to speak about the redemptive work of Christ...but he abruptly leaps to another line [of thought] and describes the result of the work of Christ."⁸ Obviously, Andrews cannot even imagine that the author of *Hebrews* "lays down the cause of the economy, that through death," he says, Jesus "might abolish him who has the power of death, that is, the devil..."⁹ One can clearly discern in this why Augustine is "the father of biblical critics."¹⁰ Since the devil and death are considered the instruments of divine justice, their abolition cannot be the purpose of the divine epiphany but only its result.

It is very strange, if not tragic, that contemporary critics of the New Testament are preoccupied with the inner unity of the Synoptic Gospels, and especially of *Mark*,¹¹ but they do not take seriously the fact that the abolition of Satan's power is itself the connecting link that gives unity to the Gospels. This is apparent

7. J. Turmel, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 11. Also, A. Harnack writes, without of course accepting, that "redemption was necessary in any case because humanity and the world, right at the outset, had fallen under the dominion of evil demons." *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 49. Regarding the theology of the Apologists he writes, "Quite by itself, the mythological representation of the sovereignty of the demons that was ushered in shatters the rational[istic] scheme." *Lehrbuch*, Vol. 1, p. 461. On the contrary, the Apologists' idea of the demons, however, constitutes the basis and premise of their teaching about redemption, as we shall see.

8. *Hebrews*, Abingdon Bible Commentary, New York 1929, p. 1303. A. Harnack makes a similar misinterpretation regarding the theology of St. Irenaeus, and R. Seeberg corrects him in an interesting way. *Op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 332, n1.

9. John Chrysostom, *Commentary on Hebrews*, Homily 4, Ch. 4, P.G.63, 41.

10. A. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 299.

11. A. Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, pp. 121-136, 333f.

Satan

in the *Gospel of Mark*, where we note the following brief outline:

1) Prophecy regarding baptism through the Holy Spirit (in which, even today, Satan is destroyed).

2) The fulfillment of this prophecy in Christ.

3) The direct battle and victory in the Holy Spirit by Christ over Satan.

4) As a consequence of this, the proclamation of the coming of the kingdom of God, which, in Christ, begins to displace the realm of Satan.

5) The calling of the disciples.

6) The widespread actualization of the kingdom of the heavens through the dispersion of the unclean spirits and demons, and the healing of the sick, which is completed in the raising of the dead from the graves through the death and resurrection of Christ. "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you."¹²

It is a fact that the *Gospel of John* is not occupied with the casting out of Satan and the demons in the systematic manner of the Synoptic Gospels. In the fourth Gospel, at first glance, Satan does not appear to hold the central position he has in the Synoptics. But this can be explained if O. Cullmann's conclusions¹³ regarding the character of the fourth Gospel are taken into account and related to the ancient Church's practices pertaining to catechumens.

O. Cullman clearly states that the *Gospel of John* has the mysteries as its basis and as its purpose the correlation of the historic life of Christ with the present mystical life in Christ and experience of the community. When we take into account that the Christians carefully and systematically avoided all discussions of the deeper meaning of the mysteries, not only with the hostile outside world but even with the catechumens,¹⁴ then we are able to understand the use of the Gospels in the first Church, and many of the problems raised by biblical criticism are solved. Since the baptized Christians did not discuss the mysteries even with the catechumens, it is sufficiently clear that the fourth Gospel was used in the ancient Church for completing and finishing the catechism of the recently illumined, that is,

12. Mt. 12:28; Lk. 11:20; Mk. 3:27-29.

13. *Les Sacraments dans l'Evangile Johannique, La vie de Jésus et le culte de l'église primitive*, Paris 1951.

14. "...and [Athanasius' accusers] are not ashamed to theatricize the mysteries to

newly baptized.¹⁵ It was particularly suited to this purpose and distinguished from the other Gospels mainly because of its clear dogmatic, mystical, and apologetical tone. We do not find in *John* the systematic preparation of catechumens for baptism that is found in *Matthew* and *Mark*. This is why *John* does not begin with the baptism of Christ but with "In the beginning was the Logos...and the Logos was made flesh."¹⁶ Since the newly illumined Christians defeated Satan through baptism, there was no need for this Gospel's main theme to pertain to the casting out of demons. Rather, it attends to making firm the baptized Christians and steeping them more deeply in the faith and the mysteries. This explains the difference in character of this Gospel from the others.

This view is further supported when we consider that, among the four Gospels, there is only one Gospel which has the purpose of providing a deeper understanding of the mystical actions and dogmas of the Church. The uniqueness of this Gospel proves the universal agreement of the first Christians as regards the meaning of the mysteries. The differences between the other Gospels are explained quite adequately by the various catechetical requirements that the apostolic preachers labored under. Preparation for holy baptism, as St. Irenaeus informs us,¹⁷ varied according to the religious requirements of the individual catechumens. Once the catechumens were baptized, however, the method of teaching and interpreting the mysteries and dogmas was one.¹⁸

catechumens or, worse yet, before the heathens...It is not proper to speak of the mysteries to the uninitiated lest the heathens ridicule them and the catechumens, in their curiosity, become scandalized." "Encyclical Letter of the Synod of Egypt in defense of Athanasius the Great," in *Apology Against the Arians*, 11, P.G. 25, 268. Cf. also J. N. Karmiris, *Δογματικά Μνημεία*, Vol. 1, pp. 41-42.

15. This is clear from the position it holds in our ecclesiastical year. The oldest testimony to the use of the fourth Gospel at Pascha is by Meliton of Sardis (190). G. Dix attributes its Paschal use to even earlier times. *Shape of the Liturgy*, Glasgow 1949, p. 338.

16. *Jn.* 1:1-14

17. *Op. cit.*, 4, XXIII, 2; and *Fragment 28*, Βιβλιοθήκη Ἑλλήνων Πατέρων, Athens 1955, Vol. 5, p. 180.

18. The differences between the Synoptics and the *Gospel of John*, therefore, are not disagreements as many maintain. On the contrary, they clearly pertain to a difference in depth and fulfillment of the Synoptics by the fourth Gospel in accordance with the catechetical needs of the Church. Therefore, the theory of F. Loofs regarding the existence of a distinct Asia Minor school of Church Fathers and writers founded upon the fourth Gospel and different from the rest of the theology of the ancient Church is untenable. (*Op. cit.*, pp. 98f., 102f., 127, 139-151)

Satan

It is especially significant for us that the catechesis about Satan and the demons has the same tone and place in the three Synoptic Evangelists. This clearly shows that the practice of casting out demons before baptism is deeply rooted in Christ Himself. Even though it appears that demonology does not have the same position in *John* as it has in the Synoptics, it does, however, form the indispensable premise not only of the fourth Gospel but of the life and theology of the entire ancient Church.

B. Satan and the Omnipotence of God

In biblical and patristic thought, the omnipotence of God is not a static condition of essence as if it pertains to static ideas within the divine essence that are now simply revealed in time. In such a case, God's real independence from the world and the freedom of reason-endowed beings would be replaced by a kind of Augustinian predestination, upon which not only man but even God would be dependent. On the contrary, the teaching regarding the independence of God has been protected in the Greek patristic tradition from dangerous philosophical ideas by the dogma of true creation from nothing, in which the world is not an emanation or copy of archetypes in the divine essence but the result of the divine energy and will. Reasoning creatures made by God are not copies of alleged archetypes for they would be subject to absolute predestination. Creatures are truly free and outside of the divine essence even though their existence is dependent upon the continuous and uninterrupted divine will and energy.

One such creature that is entirely free and independent of God in its will is Satan. Like all creatures, he is neither an image of some archetype in the divine essence nor evil in essence.¹⁹ He is evil and a worker of evil only in will and energy, as are evil men.²⁰ The divine omnipotence, therefore, by the very will and energy of God, does not impose itself on the freedom of reasoning creatures. Like all divine relations with the world, God's omnipotence is not the same as the divine essence. Consequently, the divine omnipotence is not diminished by the

19. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 4, XLI, 1.

20. "God made the free sovereignty of the race of angels and of men a principle, and should they transgress against it, they shall bear punishment in the eternal fire." Justin, *2nd Apology*, 7. Cf. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 5, XXVI, 2; Tatian, *op. cit.*, 7.

fact that evil shall finally be destroyed only at the general resurrection. For the present, many injustices and wrongs take place contrary to the will of God. God does not war against evil by force or by depriving creatures of freedom but by being long suffering through love and justice. The divine essence suffers no change nor are the freedom of evil and its reality diminished. If the freedom of evil were to be lifted, at that moment God would automatically become the cause of evil. Whoever would reject the freedom of evil must either abolish evil, or assume the responsibility for its existence. Thus, uneasy over the fact that the omnipotence of God might be doubted, Augustine hastened to reinforce the omnipotence of God philosophically by elevating it to the level of the divine essence. In his haste to defend the power of God, however, he eliminated the freedom of both Satan and man and ended up imputing evil to God by teaching that all men bear inherited guilt before God, even prior to their seeing the light of day.

The absolute kingdom of God is not yet a general reality. Through the prophets, it began to appear as a promise. It was made a reality in Christ through the resurrection of the souls held captive by the devil and death. It is made universal in the mystical life of the Church, and it will prevail completely in the Second Coming when all the dead shall rise bodily for the general judgment, and the present age of iniquity and injustice shall be abolished. In the meantime, two paths, death and life, are open for all to travel "with the light-bearing angels on the latter path and the angels of Satan on the former. The Lord, from the ages and unto the ages, is one path, and the ruler of the present age of iniquity is the other."²¹

C. Satan and the Fall

In the devil there is no truth.²² He is the very source itself of every form of lie.²³ "For the devil has sinned from the begin-

21. *Barnabas*, XVIII, 1, 2.

22. *Jn.* 8:44; *Irenaeus, op. cit.*, 5, XXII, 2; XXIII, 1, 2; XXIV, 1, 2.

23. *Ibid.*, *Justin, 1st Apology*, 23, 25, 54, 58, 62; *2nd Apology*, 13; *Dialogue* 7, 69-70, 82; *Homily of Counsel*, 21; *Polycarp, Epistle to the Philippians* VII, 1; *Shepherd of Hermas*, *Commandment* XI, 3; *Tatian, op. cit.*, 12, 14; *Athenagoras, Embassy*, 26; *Theophilus, op. cit.*, 2, 8; *Irenaeus, op. cit.*, 1, XLI, 3; XXI, 1; 5, XXVI, 2.

ning²⁴ and leads mankind astray into sin.²⁵ Satan is not simply a negative concept of evil but, quite the contrary, a real power.²⁶ He has free will,²⁷ "devices,"²⁸ and "wiles."²⁹ He is a personal force capable of perceiving, even before the Resurrection, that Christ is the Son of God.³⁰ Under his command he has whole legions of demons and invisible powers,³¹ and among them some are more evil than others.³² The devil and his army of demons have the same teachings.³³ Thus, there exists "demonic wisdom,"³⁴ "the wisdom of the rulers of this age."³⁵ The demons know that there is one God,³⁶ and from their assaults against Christ they perceived His divinity.³⁷ They know who Christ's true followers are.³⁸ But Christians also know the "devices"³⁹ of the devil. The demons instigated the Crucifixion of Christ.⁴⁰ They do not know the wisdom of God, however, or they would not have crucified Him.⁴¹ Satan, like God, has faithful sons and followers.⁴² The views that Satan is an instrument of the divine wrath (which is typical of post-Augustine Western theology) or

24. 1 Jn. 3:8.

25. 2 Cor. 11:3; 1 Tim. 2:14; Gen. 3; Wis. 2:23-25.

26. Tatian, *op. cit.*, 16.

27. 2 Tim. 2:26; Justin, *2nd Apology*, 7; Tatian, *op. cit.*, 7; Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 5, XXVI, 2.

28. 2 Cor. 2:11.

29. Eph. 6:11.

30. Mt. 4:1-11; Lk. 4:1-3.

31. Mt. 8:28-34; Mk. 5:1-20; Lk. 8:26-39; Eph. 6:12; Col. 2:15; 1 Tim. 4:1-4.

32. Mt. 12:43-45; Lk. 11:24-26; Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 1, XVI, 3.

33. 1 Tim. 4:1-4.

34. Jm. 3:15.

35. 1 Cor. 2:6.

36. Jm. 2:19.

37. Mk. 3:11; 1:24; Lk. 4:34; Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 4, VI, 6.

38. Acts 19:11-14.

39. 2 Cor. 2:11.

40. Lk. 22:2-4; Jn. 13:2, 27; Ignatius, *Trallians*, 11; Justin, *1st Apology*, 63.

41. The West's Tertullian, Cyprian, and Lactantius believe that the "rulers" in 1 Cor. 2:8 are human rulers and not demons. Cf. M. Werner, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-244. Werner's comment is obviously in error as regards an alleged contradiction between two different traditions, whereby one says that the devil was ignorant of the divinity of Christ, and the other says that the demons recognized Christ's identity as the Son of God (*ibid.*, p. 245f.). Werner overlooks the fact that Satan at times saw in the works of Christ the energy of God and at times human weakness, so that it was impossible for him to form a firm opinion regarding the true nature of Christ. Accordingly, Christ did not deceive the devil as Werner and others interpret the Greek Fathers on this matter (*ibid.*); rather the devil was self-deceived not knowing the wisdom of God.

42. Jn. 6:70; 8:44; Acts 13:10; 1 Jn. 3:10; Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 4, XLI, 2, 3.

that the present power and energy of the devil is only an illusion⁴³ stand squarely in opposition to biblical and patristic testimonies. According to the thought of the first Christians, Satan continues to be a powerful enemy of God.⁴⁴ Like a kind of parasite, the devil subjugated creation to death and corruption.⁴⁵ "He was the man slayer from the beginning."⁴⁶ Thus, through the instrumentality of man's fear of death, the devil became the holder of that power,⁴⁷ and through that fear drew the world into sin. In other words, "Sin reigned in death"⁴⁸ because "the sting of death is sin."⁴⁹ "There is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear because fear hath torment. He that feareth has not been made perfect in love."⁵⁰

Because of the sins that spring forth from the fear of death "the whole world lieth in wickedness."⁵¹ Through falsehood and fear, Satan, in various degrees, motivates sin. In a certain way, he is the god and ruler of this age or world.⁵² But this does not justify the devil's claim that to him has been given all authority over the kingdoms of the earth.⁵³ God has never ceased to care for the world. Through laws, prophets, and chosen leaders, He guides and chastens men.⁵⁴ "If it were possible [for the demons], they would have pulled down everything, even the heavens along with the rest of creation. But in no way are they able to do it."⁵⁵ "Certainly the God and Father and Creator of all things has not abandoned mankind but has given a Law and sent holy prophets to teach and proclaim to the human race the return to sobriety and the knowledge that God is One."⁵⁶

43. O. Cullmann attempts to prove that the Church still has a mission to the world because even the demons submitted to Christ and, thus, now have only an appearance of power. *Christ et le Temps*, pp. 137-153.

44. Mt. 13:19; 38-39; Mk. 4:15; Lk. 8:12.

45. Rm. 8:19-22; Heb. 2:14-15; Tatian, *op. cit.*, 15; Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 3, XXIII, 1, 2, 4, 7; 5, XXI, 1; John Chrysostom, *Commentary on 1st Corinthians*, Homily 39, Ch. 5, P.G. 61, 339-340.

46. Jn. 8:44.

47. Heb. 2:14-15. In general terms, this is the interpretation of Chrysostom, *Commentary on Hebrews*, Homily 4, Ch. 4, P.G. 63, 41-42.

48. Rm. 5:21.

49. 1 Cor. 15:56.

50. 1 Jn. 4:18.

51. 1 Jn. 5:19.

52. Jn. 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; 1 Cor. 2:6, 8; 2 Cor. 4:4.

53. Mt. 4:8-9; Lk. 4:5-7.

54. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 5, XXII, 2; XXIII, 1, 2; XXIV, 1, 2.

55. Tatian, *op. cit.*, 16.

56. Theophilus, *op. cit.*, II, 34

Despite the victory of the Lord and of the baptized over Satan, the evil spirit is able to move the "heart to lie to the Holy Spirit."⁵⁷ Moreover, the "god of this age" blinds "unbelievers' minds lest the light of the Gospel of Christ rise on them."⁵⁸ "For the restraint which human laws could not effect, the Divine Logos would have effected had not the demons, taking as their ally the wicked lust in every man which draws him to all manner of vice, scattered many false and profane accusations, none of which attach to us."⁵⁹ With great sincerity, Justin, a former Platonist, writes, "Therefore, we forewarn you to guard yourselves lest the demons we speak against delude you and turn you away from reading and understanding all that we have said."⁶⁰ "But I fear," writes St. Paul, "lest in any way, as the serpent deceived Eve by his craftiness, your thoughts should be corrupted from the simplicity that is toward Christ."⁶¹ The devil persistently and in every unlawful manner tries to subjugate men.⁶² To accomplish this, he has effective, powerful, and cunning ways of deception.⁶³ If indeed the wrath of God had such agents, it would be hopeless for the human race because the only way to be saved would be absolute predestination.

Athenagoras and Justin write that God "committed the care of men and of all things under heaven to angels whom He placed over them. But the angels violated this appointment and were captivated by women and begat children who are called demons."⁶⁴ "The souls of the giants are the demons that wander

57. Acts 5:3.

58. 2 Cor. 4:4.

59. Justin, *1st Apology*, 10.

60. *Ibid.*, 14.

61. 2 Cor. 11:3.

62. Ignatius, *Magnesians*, 1; *Romans* 7; Justin, *1st Apology*, 14, 58; *2nd Apology*, 1; Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 5, XXI, 3.

63. Mt. 13:19, 38-39; Mk. 4:15; Lk. 8:12; 2 Cor. 2:8-9; 1 Tim. 2:14; 3:6-7; Justin. *2nd Apology*, 5; *Dialogue*, 88, 94, 100, 103, 123, 124; *Homily of Counsel*, 21; *Barnabas*, XII, 5; Theophilus. *op. cit.*, 2, 20, 28; Tatian, *op. cit.*, 7; Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 3, XXIII, 5, 7; 4, pr. 4; XLI, 2, 3; 5, 1, 3.

64. Justin, *2nd Apology*, 5; Athenagoras, *op. cit.*, 24. Cf. also Irenaeus, *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, 18. Regarding the Jewish origins of this deluded and, therefore, inadmissible tradition, cf. L. E. Fuller, *Religious Development of the Intertestamental Period*, "Abingdon Bible Commentary," p. 205. Thus, he shares the customary view that later Jewish angelology is a product of a unilateral emphasis on the transcendence of God. The latter made necessary the introduction into strict Jewish monotheism of the existence of demigods as intermediaries between God and the world. *Ibid.*, p. 204. G. F. Moore rejects this view, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 401-413.

around the earth."⁶⁵ "And furthermore, they subjugated the human race to themselves...and sowed every manner of evil."⁶⁶ "Therefore, having believed the deceiving demon, men dared to disobey God and departed from Paradise."⁶⁷ "The devil was the cause of his own apostasy and that of others."⁶⁸ "Man disobeyed God, having been deceived by the angel who, because of God's many gifts to man, was jealous and cast a spell on him, thus ruining himself and convincing man to sin through disobedience of the commandments of God...Thus, by his falsehood, the devil was the cause of man's exile from paradise."⁶⁹

It is clear from the above that the dominant thought of the Fathers and writers in our study is the biblical view that Satan is the primary cause of transgression, sin, and death. Of course there are certain variations in statements,⁷⁰ but this in no way alters the essence of the biblical teaching regarding the devil's contribution to the fall of the human race. Thus, Justin and Athenagoras can speak about the intercourse of angels with women on earth,⁷¹ indicating in this way that the demons acted to perpetuate the fall among men after Adam (as if to say that mankind did not fall automatically with the first-made humans), and about the serpent leading Adam astray,⁷² and about the deceiving of Eve.⁷³ The Apostle Paul speaks about the fall of Adam⁷⁴ and at the same time writes, "The serpent deceived Eve by his craftiness,"⁷⁵ and "Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and fell into transgression."⁷⁶

Bodily death, as the Scriptures tell us, did not take hold immediately after the transgression of Adam and Eve. Indeed, after the disobedience they lived for many years.⁷⁷ First, "Through one man sin entered into the world, and through sin"⁷⁸ came

65. Athenagoras, *op. cit.*, 25.

66. Justin, *2nd Apology*, 5.

67. Justin, *Homily of Counsel*, 21; *Dialogue*, 88, 94, 100.

68. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 4, XLI, 2, 3.

69. Irenaeus, *Proof*, 16.

70. K. R. Hagenbach, *op. cit.*, p. 104f.

71. Justin, *2nd Apology*, 5; Irenaeus, *Proof*, 18.

72. Clement of Alexandria writes, "There is one deceiver who toppled Eve down and now takes the rest of men down to death." K. e, *op. cit.*, p. 120, n2.

73. Justin, *Dialogue*, 103; Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 3, XXIII, 5, 7; 5, 1, 3.

74. *Rm.* 5:12f.

75. 2 *Cor.* 11:3.

76. 1 *Tim.* 2:14.

77. *Gen.* 5:1f.

78. *Rm.* 5:12.

spiritual death (the loss of grace) and, after a period of time, bodily death. Theophilus writes regarding the first-made men after the transgression, "Then Satan saw that not only were Adam and his wife living but were even bearing children, and he was unable to kill them by his malice. Seeing, therefore, that Abel was pleasing to God, he acted upon his brother Cain and caused him to kill his brother Abel. And thus, the beginning of death was made in this world, and it continues up to the present in every generation of men."⁷⁹

Satan would very much have wished to kill all of mankind in one sweep, but he is not able to do this because God gives life to all things. The devil brings death only indirectly, through sin and the resulting separation of man from God, which brings death. "So he who was made in the image of God became mortal since the mightier Spirit parted from him."⁸⁰ "All those who, by their own choice, stand off from God are visited by separation from Him...and separation from God is death."⁸¹ "The wages of sin is death."⁸² Therefore, this is how the passage that says the demons "gave the laws of death over to men"⁸³ ought to be understood. St. Irenaeus' declarations that Satan is the cause of death must be interpreted in the same way.⁸⁴ The devil is the primary cause of sin, which distances man from God and results in death. According to the testimonies cited, man is both the victim of the evil one's deception and the accomplice in sin.

Writing on the expulsion of men from paradise, Justin refers strangely to yet another cause, polytheism, in addition to disobedience, "When they came out of paradise, they remembered the names of gods, being no longer taught of God that there are no other gods...Thus, having been cast out of paradise and thinking it was for the transgression alone that they were expelled, and not knowing it was also because they believed there were other gods, they passed down the names of gods to the people who came after them. This first false imagining about gods has its origin in the father of lies. God, then, knowing that

79. *Op. cit.*, 2, 29.

80. Tatian, *op. cit.*, 7.

81. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 5, XXVII, 2. "For equally as he stood apart from life, he drew nearer to death. For God is life; the loss of life is death. Thus, Adam prepared death for himself through his separation from God..." Basil the Great, *Homily that God is not the cause of evils*, 7, P.G. 31, 345.

82. *Rm.* 6:23.

83. Tatian, *op. cit.*, 15.

84. *Refutation*, 3, XXIII, 1, 2, 4, 7; 5, XXI, 1.

the false doctrine of polytheism is like a disease that plagues the souls of men, and wishing to remove it and overturn it, appeared first to Moses and said, 'I am Who is'.⁸⁵ Similarly, Tatian writes, "By means of prohibitions, God became the blocker of wickedness and the praiser of those who persist in virtues. And men attached themselves to one who, because of his being first born⁸⁶ [of the angels], was more skillful than the rest. And men and angels declared him to be God, who was a rebel against the law of God."⁸⁷ The soul that is separated from the Holy Spirit "is unable to behold things that are perfect and, while seeking after God, it fashions for itself many gods, following the sophistries of the demons."⁸⁸ So the wicked energies of Satan and the demons were not limited to the deceiving of Eve alone. On the contrary, they extend throughout the course of world history under a variety of forms. The demons have never ceased to work their deceptions in men,⁸⁹ as O. Cullmann believes,⁹⁰ even after Christ.

It would be a great mistake to think that the first Christians regarded the devil merely as a whisperer of bad suggestions in men's ears. Satanic energy is not something that is apparent only in the wicked thoughts of men. In addition to influencing men's thoughts and will, the devil acts in nature, and he acts ontologically. The spiritual and natural dimensions of the energies of Satan are not divided. On the contrary, they are inseparably coefficient.

The fall was not limited to the human race but extended to reasonless animals and reasonless nature. "The animals are named wild beasts [θηρία] because they are hunted [θηρεύεσθαι], not as if they were made evil or venomous from the first, for nothing was made evil by God, but all things were good, indeed very good; human sin, however, brought evil upon them. For when man transgressed, they also transgressed with him."⁹¹ "For creation was subjected to futility, not of its own will but

85. *Homily of Counsel*, 21.

86. *Gen.* 3:1, ἄγγελος πρωτόγονος.

87. Tatian, *op. cit.*, 7.

88. *Ibid.*, 13. Cf. also Justin, *1st Apology*, 5; Athenagoras, *Embassy*, 26; Tatian, *op. cit.*, 12, 16.

89. Cf. Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians*, 7; Theophilus, *op. cit.*, 2, 8; Justin, *1st Apology*, 23, 26, 54, 57, 62; *2nd Apology*, 13; *Dialogue*, 69-70, 82; Tatian, *op. cit.*, 14; Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 1, XVI, 3; 5, XXVI, 2.

90. *Christ et le Temps*, pp. 137-153.

91. Theophilus, *op. cit.*, 2, 17.

because of Him Who subjected it, in hope that creation itself also will be set free from its slavery to corruption into the freedom of the glory of the children of God. For we know that all of creation groaneth and travaileth together until now."⁹² So Satan is the primary cause of corruption⁹³ and temporarily has the power of death.⁹⁴ For this reason, the devil is called "the god of this age"⁹⁵ and the "ruler of matter."⁹⁶ "The demonic movements and actions proceeding from the adverse spirit produce these disorderly sallies and, moreover, move men as individuals and as nations, some in one way and some in another....Others who are of no mean reputation, therefore, have thought that this universe is constituted without any definite order, driven hither and thither by irrational chance."⁹⁷ According to Paul, the devil is also the "ruler of the power of the air."⁹⁸

Despite the fact that marvelous order and harmony prevail in the cosmos, clearly demonstrating that all things are governed by God, nevertheless, there exists in it a kind of parasite that is manifested by death and consequently by disharmony in the societal relations of men and nations. The evils that are produced by death are not from God. "For God created not death."⁹⁹ As a result, this world which is in subjection to death and corruption cannot be considered natural, if by natural we mean the world as God intended it to be. In other words, the world is abnormal, but this is not because of its own nature but because a parasitic force exists in it at present. "For it is not by God that things are moved against nature...But God is perfectly good and is eternally doing good."¹⁰⁰ The parasitic force in the world shall be completely destroyed at the Second Coming. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."¹⁰¹ "And He shall wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more."¹⁰²

According to the later testimonies of Judaism and the earliest ones of Christianity, the devil and his demons are not only the

92. *Rm.* 8:20-22.

93. Tatian, *op. cit.*, 15; Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 3, XXIII, 1, 2, 4, 7; 5, XXI.

94. *Heb.* 2:14.

95. 2 *Cor.* 4:4; *Jn.* 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; 1 *Cor.* 2, 6, 8; *Eph.* 6:11-12; *Barnabas*, XVIII, 2.

96. Athenagoras, *Embassy* 24, 25.

97. *Ibid.* 25.

98. *Eph.* 2:2.

99. *Wis.* 1:13.

100. Athenagoras, *op. cit.*, 26.

101. 1 *Cor.* 15:26.

102. *Rev.* 21:4.

cause of death, they are also agents of illnesses.¹⁰³ Replying to the head of the synagogue, the Lord said, "Thou hypocrite, this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan has bound for eighteen years, should she not have been released from this bond on the Sabbath day?"¹⁰⁴ "He is the Lord of all...and He went about doing good and healing all who were oppressed by the devil."¹⁰⁵ The casting out of operative demons from sufferers is equal to a cure of bodily and spiritual ills.¹⁰⁶ "There are indeed diseases and disturbances of the matter that we are made of. But when such things happen, the demons take note and approach a man whenever weakness lays hold of him. And there are times when, in a wanton tempest, they themselves disturb the working of the body. But being smitten by the power of a word from God, they depart in terror, and the sick man is healed."¹⁰⁷

"In these books of the prophets, then, we found that it was foretold that Jesus would come and mature...and heal every illness and every infirmity..."¹⁰⁸ "He cast out the spirits with a word and healed all who were ill in order that what was spoken through Isaiah the prophet may be fulfilled, saying, 'He Himself took our infirmities and carried away our diseases'."¹⁰⁹ The casting out of demons through the Holy Spirit is proof that "the kingdom of God has come upon you,"¹¹⁰ and the curing of the ill is proof that Jesus is the awaited Christ. In reply to the question "Are you the expected One," the Lord said, "Go and report to John what ye have seen and heard: the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them. Blessed is he who is not offended in Me."¹¹¹ "If one is healed by matter through trusting in it, much more will he be healed by having recourse to the power of God...Even if you be healed by drugs (I grant you this out of leniency), it behooves you to attribute the cure to God."¹¹²

103. L. E. Fuller, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

104. Lk. 13:15-17.

105. Acts 13: 36, 38.

106. Mt. 8:23-34; 9: 32-37; Mk. 5: 1-20; Lk. 8: 26-39.

107. Tatian, *op. cit.*, 16.

108. Justin, *1st Apology*, 31. Cf. Mt. 4:23; 9:35.

109. Mt. 8:16-17; Is. 53:4.

110. Mt. 12:28; Lk. 11:20; Mk. 3:27-29.

111. Lk. 7: 18-23; Mt. 11:2-6.

112. Tatian, *op. cit.*, 18, 20. All healing of the ill takes place through the restoration of balance to things. Without the basic balance and order, the cause of which is God, not only cures but even the existence of the world would be impossible.

The accusation that Christ heals and "casts out demons by Beelzebul, the ruler of the demons"¹¹³ does not hold up because "no demon can open the eyes of the blind."¹¹⁴ "Demons do not cure but by cunning make men their captives."¹¹⁵ "How can Satan cast out Satan? And if a kingdom is divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand...and if Satan rises up against himself, he cannot stand, but he is finished."¹¹⁶ All of this clearly presupposes that the cause of infirmities is not God but the devil.

Precisely "for this purpose did the Son of God appear, that He might destroy the works of the devil."¹¹⁷ "But if I cast out demons by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God has come upon you."¹¹⁸ Totally baseless is the view of Western theologians that Satan is nothing but an instrument of divine wrath. "What fellowship is there between righteousness and iniquity? What communion is there of light with darkness? What harmony has Christ with Belial?"¹¹⁹ The destruction of Satan and the demons by God is planned even to the exact hour. "What have we to do with Thee, Jesus, Thou Son of God? Art Thou come here to torment us before the time?"¹²⁰ "Now judgment is upon this world; now the ruler of this world will be cast out."¹²¹ Christ did not come to teach vague ideas about a transcendental world and a sentimental love as imagined by the schools of Abelard, Schleiermacher, and Ritschl. "I came to cast fire upon the earth, and how I wish it were already kindled."¹²² Christ is the destruction of the devil, and He is the salvation of the righteous held under the devil's sway from the ages. God appeared in the flesh in order "to abolish him who has the power of death, that is, the devil."¹²³ Between God and Satan there is no compromise. On the contrary, a great war rages.

113. Lk. 11:15; Mt. 12:24; Mk. 3:22; Jn. 10:20.

114. Jn. 10:21.

115. Tatian, *op. cit.*, 18.

116. Mk. 3: 23-26; Mt. 12:28; Lk. 8:20; Justin, *Dialogue*, 85.

117. 1 Jn.3:8.

118. Mt. 12:28.

119. 2 Cor. 6:14-15.

120. Mt. 8:29.

121. Jn. 12:31.

122. Lk. 12:49.

123. Heb. 2:14.

D. The War Between God and Satan

The nature of the war between God and Satan is shown even more clearly in the first Christians' understanding of the present visible and invisible world which they saw as man's only real world made by God in a positive and free manner. On the other hand, a world of ingenerate, beginningless, and timeless universals is a nonexistent fantasy of philosophers. "The two trees, the tree of life and the tree of knowledge, the rest of the earth did not possess but paradise alone. And as for the fact that paradise is earthly and was planted on this earth, the Scripture says, 'And the Lord God planted paradise in Eden eastwards'..."¹²⁴ "The first-made men were driven...from the land but not off this earth..."¹²⁵ Even the angels are not absolute spirit, a property that does not belong to the created world, for the angels are indeed creatures. "They are called immaterial and bodiless in comparison with men, while everything compared to the incomparable God is found indeed to be coarse and material, and only the divine is truly immaterial and bodiless."¹²⁶ The Judaio-Christian tradition does not distinguish between the real world and the phenomenalistic world as the philosophers do but makes the most basic distinction between God and creation. As created by God, the visible and invisible world is very good and completely real because that is how God wanted it. This is precisely why death is the tragic outcome of man and the work of the devil,¹²⁷ for "God created not death."¹²⁸

Death, therefore, is not a natural phenomenon from God. And salvation is not simply a matter of finding refuge in man's

124. Theophilus, *op. cit.*, 2, 24. Similarly, St. John of Damascus writes, "And this divine paradise planted in Eden by God's hands is the treasury of every joy and pleasantness. For Eden means delight. It was placed in the East, higher than all the earth, possessing a mild climate and brightened all about by delicate and very pure air, adorned with evergreen plants, filled with fragrance and light, surpassing every imaginable beauty and visual brightness. Worthy of the creature made in the image of God, it was truly a divine place in which none of the unreasoning animals dwelt, except man who was made by the divine hands." *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, 2, 11, P.G. 94, 912-913.

125. Tatian, *op. cit.*, 20.

126. John of Damascus, quoted by J. N. Karmiris, *Ἡ Δογματική Διδασκαλία τοῦ Ἀγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ*, pp. 32-33.

127. *Wis.* 2: 23f.

128. *Wis.* 1:13.

supposedly immortal soul and fleeing from this phenomenalistic world to another world that is true and by nature endless. After death, both the righteous and the unrighteous descend to the same place, to Hades, "where, without exception, all the souls of the dead go down and are together,"¹²⁹ and there they anticipate the general resurrection and judgment, the only means of salvation or damnation. Death, which was initiated by the operations of Satan, constitutes a real though temporary diminishing of the divine plan for the world. Before the descent of Christ into Hades, Satan alone had the power of death. Once human nature was stricken by the disease of death, all the living and the dead became the devil's captives.¹³⁰ For the righteous of the Old Testament, however, captivity to Satan was unjust. They were to be saved in the future; their justification was realized through Christ Who imparted life to them. This is the reason why Paul emphasizes that to Abraham was given the promise of salvation but not the salvation itself. "For if a law had been given which was able to impart life, then righteousness would indeed have come from the Law."¹³¹ The Law is not capable of imparting life to the dead. "To change what is mortal to immortal belonged to no other but to Him Who is self-existence."¹³² The only way to shatter the power of the devil is the resurrection of the dead through the trampling down of death.¹³³ This was something only God could do. The renewal of the world and its creation anew is a continuation and a new phase of the creative energy, which is God's power.¹³⁴ "How could men be saved if it were not God Who worked their salvation on earth?"¹³⁵

Irenaeus exuberantly states that "the whole economy of the salvation of man took place by God's good will so that neither

129. J. N. Karmiris, *Ἡ Εἰς Ἄδου Κάθοδος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Athens 1939, p. 29.

130. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 3, XXIII, 2. This is clearly presupposed by the entire Services of both Exorcism and Holy Baptism as they have been preserved in the Orthodox Church down to our own time. Cf. J. S. Romanides, *Man and His True Life According to the Greek Orthodox Service Book*, in "The Greek Orthodox Theological Review," Brookline 1954, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 70-74. The same is espoused by Tertullian, for example (cf. R. Seeberg, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 317-318), Athanasius, and Gregory of Nyssa. Cf. D. Thomasius, *op. cit.*, p. 474f.

131. *Gal.* 3:21.

132. Athanasius the Great, *On the Incarnation of the Logos*, 20, P.G. 25, 129.

133. The patristic dogma of redemption is beautifully summarized in one of Orthodoxy's shortest hymns: "Christ is risen from the dead, trampling down death by death and granting life to those in the graves," (John of Damascus).

134. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 4, XXIV, 1.

135. *Ibid.*, 4, XXXIII, 4.

Satan

His power nor His wisdom should be shown to be deficient. For man was created by God that he might live, but he lost his life through the injury and corruptibility he suffered because of the serpent. But if he were not to return to life any longer, being abandoned to death forever, God would have been conquered, and the wickedness of the serpent would have prevailed over the will of God."¹³⁶ "But if men's bodies are to be held down in the earth, it follows that the tyranny [of the devil] remains, since these bodies would be held down, and there would be no other body by which [the devil] would be vanquished. But if that which Paul spoke of takes place, as it surely will, God's victory will appear, and it will be a glorious one because He will be able to raise again the bodies which were held by death. Since an enemy is then vanquished when one also takes the spoils and not when one leaves them in the other's possession, how can we say the enemy is vanquished unless one ventures to take what is his?"¹³⁷

If death had prevailed in the world and in man, it would have been a triumphant victory by Satan over God. Another world, a supposedly ingenerate one, where the soul after death can go to find tranquility and contentment does not exist. The field on which the battle against evil is fought is this world; it is here where the battle will end with the resurrection of the dead. The war between God and Satan is not conducted according to prescribed conventions that the combatants are obliged to follow. Satan recognizes no such rules. Through love as well as His just energy against unrighteousness or injustice, God always ensures the final victory of the righteous. There is no place in this struggle for delusive, idealistic sentiments about a vague idea of the good. Christ did not hesitate to describe His mission against Satan as the seizing of those held captive unjustly by him. "How can one enter the house of a powerful man to carry off his property unless he first tie up the powerful man and then plunder his house?"¹³⁸

In the thought of the first Christians and likewise of all the

¹³⁶. *Ibid.*, 3, XXIII, 1f.

¹³⁷. John Chrysostom, *Commentary on 1st Corinthians*, Homily 39, Ch.12, P.G. 61, 342. "Anathema to those who say that in the final and general resurrection men will be raised and judged with different bodies and not the ones they lived with in the present life which were decayed and dissolved, and to those who speak foolishly and vainly against Christ our God." *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, op. cit., p. 149.

¹³⁸. Mt. 12:29; Mk. 3:27.

Greek Fathers, the central and absolutely essential place belongs to the biblical teaching that God became a man in order to destroy the devil and to trample down death. St. Ignatius writes, "The virginity of Mary eluded the ruler of this world as did also her Child as well as the death of the Lord: three heralded mysteries that were wrought in silence by God...From that time, all things were in a state of tumult because the destruction of death was under way."¹³⁹ Justin mentions, "In accordance with the will of God the Father, [Jesus] became man and was born for the sake of the faithful unto the destruction of the demons."¹⁴⁰ "He submitted to being made flesh through the Virgin...so that, by this dispensation, the serpent that did evil from the beginning and the angels that became like it may be destroyed..."¹⁴¹ "For through this brazen serpent made by Moses...He proclaimed the mystery by which He would destroy the power of the serpent that caused the transgression of Adam."¹⁴² Through Christ, "God destroys the serpent as well as the angels and men that are like it, but for those who repent of wickedness and believe in Him, He works deliverance from death."¹⁴³ "For if man had not been victorious over the enemy of man, the enemy would not have been properly defeated. Likewise, if God had not freely given salvation, it would never have resulted in a secure gain for us."¹⁴⁴ The Logos, "in the last days, became a man among men; He refashioned the human race, destroyed and scattered the enemy of man, and granted victory over the enemy to the creature made by His hands."¹⁴⁵ "How, also, would Christ have been able to subdue him who was proved to be more powerful than men and who not only conquered man but also held him under his power? How also would He have been able to prevail against him who had dominion and deliver the whole of mankind from that power if He were not greater and more powerful than the man who had been defeated?"¹⁴⁶ "But as He is one and the same Who made us in the beginning and sent His Son at the end, the Lord was born of a woman and executed the Father's command, accomplishing both the destruction of our enemy and

139. Ignatius, *Ephesians*, 19.

140. *2nd Apology*, 6.

141. *Dialogue*, 45.

142. *Ibid.*, 94.

143. *Ibid.*, 100.

144. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 3, XVIII, 7.

145. *Ibid.*, 4, XXIV, 1.

146. *Ibid.*, 4, XXXIII, 4.

the perfecting of man in the image and likeness of God."¹⁴⁷
"When Satan is bound, man is set free."¹⁴⁸

God "became man by a virgin, according to the will of the Father, for the salvation of those who believe in Him. He endured both to be set at naught and to suffer, that by dying and rising He might conquer death."¹⁴⁹ "By no other means could we have attained to incorruptibility and immortality except by a union with Incorruptibility and Immortality."¹⁵⁰ "Now Adam had been conquered; all life had been taken away from him. Therefore, when the enemy in turn was conquered, Adam received new life, and the last enemy, death, was destroyed, which, in the beginning, had taken possession of man...[Adam's] salvation is the destruction of death. Thus, when the Lord vivifies man, that is, Adam, death is destroyed at the same time."¹⁵¹ "The wickedness of the serpent was defeated by the innocence of the dove, and those bonds by which we had been bound to death were loosened "¹⁵²

It is important to note that for the East's patristic theology the Virgin's seedless conception of Christ is of the most basic significance doctrinally with regard to the abolition of Satan and death, a significance that it could not have in the Western theological systems. In the latter systems, as long as death is a universal punishment by God, it can be abolished simply by a divine decision without the need for Satan to be destroyed. Thus, God makes this decision because of the satisfaction of the alleged offense against the divine nature. With these presuppositions, it is even possible for the West to understand the Incarnation as taking place through a natural manner of conception, as many Protestants indeed believe, who otherwise accept the divinity of Christ. For the Roman Catholics, the inheriting of original sin does not present a problem since the Virgin, according to them, was conceived immaculately. For the West, generally speaking, the conception of Christ through the virginity of Mary and the Holy Spirit has only the apologetical purpose of proving Christ's divine and different origin among men and, therefore, to protect the majesty of God which, ironically, clashes with the fact of

147. *Ibid.*, 5, XXI, 2.

148. *Ibid.*, 5, XXI, 3.

149. Justin, *1st Apology*, 63.

150. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 3, XIX, 1.

151. *Ibid.*, 3, XXIII, 7.

152. *Ibid.*, 5, XIX, 1.

God's birth in a manger. On the other hand, for those who do not believe in the immaculate conception of the Theotokos, Christ's seedless conception has soteriological significance because otherwise He would have inherited guilt of original sin.¹⁵³ Because of these theological presuppositions, the Greek Fathers' basic etiology for the conception of Christ by the Holy Spirit and the Virgin is absent from Western Christianity.

Ignatius of Antioch writes, "The virginity of Mary eluded the ruler of this age, as her Child did also."¹⁵⁴ St. Irenaeus explains, "The power of the Most High overshadowed her. Therefore, what was born of her is also a holy thing and Son of the Most High God and Father of all Who brought about that Being's Incarnation and showed foremost a new kind of generation. Since by the former generation we inherited death, by this new generation we may inherit life."¹⁵⁵ Through the natural multiplication of the race, mankind inherits the illness of death and consequently is found in varying degrees under the power of the devil and sin. The Satanic power over creation ceased first of all in Christ through His conception. "For how would men escape being born into subjection to death except through a new generation given in a wonderful and unexpected manner by God, that is, the regeneration that flows from the Virgin through faith? How can they receive adoption from God if they remain in the kind of generation that man has by nature in this world?"¹⁵⁶

The conception of Christ by the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary has essential significance for mankind's salvation, not from inherited guilt but from death and sin. In a natural conception, the Lord would have been under the sway of death, sin, and the devil, that is, under the inherited condition of sin, like all other men. This does not mean that the human nature of Christ was incorruptible and dispassionate from His birth,¹⁵⁷ as the Monophysite Julian of Halicarnassus taught, but simply that the Lord was not conceived under the sway of death. Like that of Adam and Eve before the fall,¹⁵⁸ the human nature of Christ, too,

153. M. Harrison, for example, uses all of these reasons to support the dogma of the conception of Christ by the Holy Spirit and the Virgin. He does not even imagine that there is a different basis for this belief. *Common Sense About Religion*, New York 1931, pp. 273-291.

154. *Ephesians*, 19.

155. *Refutation*, 5, 13.

156. *Ibid.*, 4, XXXIII, 4.

157. Cf. B. K. Stephanides, *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία*, Athens 1958, p. 218f.

158. Theophilus, *op. cit.*, 2, 27.

was neither incorruptible nor under the sway of death. For this reason, Christ is the Second Adam. He truly underwent suffering and death willingly without ever being overpowered by the devil and sin.¹⁵⁹ On the contrary, the divinity of Christ trampled down death and dissolved the realm of Satan by the vivification of the dead. Christ is "the High Priest to Whom was entrusted the holy of holies...and [He] is the gateway of the Father, through which passed Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the Prophets and Apostles, and the Church."¹⁶⁰

E. Satan and the Justice of God

Among the points that have been presented here about Satan's operations in the world, we can identify certain crucial hermeneutical problems regarding the West's doctrine of justification. The West's approach to these problems presents the writers of the New Testament as contradictors of one another and the Greek Fathers as misinterpreters of Paul.

It is evident that the Old and New Testaments clearly distinguish between the existence of righteous men and the salvation of righteous men. Before the death and resurrection of Christ, righteous men existed, but they had not yet seen the salvific Day of the Lord. "Behold there was a man in Jerusalem whose name was Simeon, and this man was righteous and devout."¹⁶¹ This man was righteous before the death of Christ and before he saw Him. When at last he saw Him, he thanked God: "For my eyes have seen Thy salvation which Thou hast prepared in the presence of all peoples."¹⁶² Likewise, Joseph the betrothed of the Virgin was "righteous."¹⁶³ Zacharias and Elizabeth "were both righteous before God."¹⁶⁴ The *kerygma* of

159. J. A. T. Robinson's contention, *op. cit.*, p. 38f., that Paul believed Christ's human nature to be fallen is erroneous. He errs in teaching that Christ's capability of suffering and dying precludes perfection of His human nature. Christ was perfect without being incorruptible. The fact that He was not yet incorruptible did not mean He was under the sway of death. He received from the Holy Spirit and the Virgin human nature as it was before the fall, neither incorruptible nor under the sway of death.

160. Ignatius, *Philadelphians*, 9. Cf. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 3, XIX, 3.

161. Lk. 2:25.

162. Lk. 2:30-31.

163. Lk. 1:6.

164. Mt. 1:19

Christ presupposes the existence of the righteous even before His sacrifice on the Cross: "For I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance,"¹⁶⁵ "that upon you may be all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous to the blood of Zacharias."¹⁶⁶

An objective study of these passages based on Augustinian presuppositions would automatically be brought to an impasse regarding the necessity of divine grace for salvation. Note that people are cited in the New Testament who did not need the sacrifice on the Cross in order to *become* righteous.¹⁶⁷ But if death is a punishment from God, why do the righteous die? There are two replies from the West to this question: one by Augustine and one by Pelagius. Augustine says that the righteous in the Bible, as co-sharers of the guilt of Adam, were not really righteous, and therefore they died. Or, according to Pelagius, they were truly righteous, but their death was a simple, natural phenomenon from God since, one way or another, Adam would have died.

165. Mt. 9:13; Mk. 2:17; Lk. 5:32.

166. Mt. 23:35.

167. *Shepherd*, Parable 9, XVI, 1-7. With regard to the question of how there could have been righteous men before the Crucifixion, St. Gregory Palamas writes, "No one was ever reconciled with God without the power of the Cross...How is it possible for a man to be renewed in all things and reconciled with God according to the Spirit if sin and carnal life have not been abolished? This is the Cross of the Lord, the destruction of sin...Many who were friends of God before the Law and after the Law were even acknowledged as such by God without the Cross having appeared yet. And David the king and prophet, having the certainty that there existed friends of God at that time, says, 'But to me, exceedingly honorable are Thy friends, O God.' (Ps.138:16) But how is it that there were friends of God before the Cross? I shall show you...Just as before the man of sin, the son of perdition, even comes, (I mean the Antichrist), the Theologian and beloved one of Christ says, 'Beloved, even now is the Antichrist' [here] (1 Jn. 2:18), likewise the Cross existed among those in earlier times before the Cross came to be constructed. For the great Paul, clearly teaching us that the Antichrist is in our midst without having yet come, says, 'For the mystery already worketh among us.' (2 Thes. 2:7) Likewise the Cross of Christ was amidst the forefathers even before it came to exist because the mystery was working in them. Not even mentioning Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, and Noah, and those up to Noah who were pleasing to God and those who were close after them, I will begin with Abraham who became the father of many nations--of the Jews by the flesh and of us by the faith. In order to begin with him who is our father in the Spirit and with the good beginning associated with him and the first calling from God, let me ask what are the first words that God spoke to him? 'Come out from your country and your people, and come unto the land that I shall show you.' (Gen. 12:1) This saying contains within it the mystery of the Cross because it corresponds exactly with Paul who, boasting in the Cross, says, 'the world has been crucified to me.' (Gal. 6:14) In truth, for him who left his country never to return, his homeland and

Thus, the New Testament would appear to contradict itself by declaring that death came into the world through the sin of one, that righteous people existed before Christ but died despite their righteousness, and that justification is revealed in Jesus Christ.

This seeming contradiction is resolved only when we take into account the entire scriptural and Greek patristic tradition's teaching that in the world injustice truly exists, and neither God nor the righteous are its cause. Thus, death is not from God; nor is it caused by personal sins of a newborn child¹⁶⁸ but by an inherited sinful condition and the devil. "For creation was subjected to futility, not willingly but because of Him Who subjected it in hope that the creation itself shall be freed from the bondage of corruption."¹⁶⁹

C. H. Dodd comments that, for Paul, the word *justice* has the same meaning that it has in the Old Testament. Dodd says that, unlike the Greek philosophers and Western theologians, the Jews did not understand divine justice in any way to be some divine or cosmological attribute. Rather, it is an energy of God¹⁷⁰ which presupposes the prevalence of injustice and evil in the world. Consequently, when Paul writes, "The justice of God hath appeared,"¹⁷¹ he means that God appears in Christ and destroys evil, dissolves injustice, and restores the righteous who were un-

world according to the flesh has been put to death and destroyed, and this is the Cross. Again, according to the divine Paul, the Cross is our crucifying of the flesh and passions and desires (*Gal. 5:24*)...Isaac was himself a type of Him who was affixed to [the Cross] when, like Christ, he was obedient to his father, even unto death...But to leave off from all those before the Law and during the Law, did not Christ Himself, for Whom and by Whom all things were made, say before the Cross, 'He who does not take up his Cross and follow after Me is not worthy of Me?' (*Mt. 10:38*) Do you see how even before the Cross was pitched it was the Cross that saved?...This is what it means to crucify the flesh and the passions and desires: for man to cease from doing all that is displeasing to God...Such is the word of the Cross. It is such not only in the prophets before the Cross was completed but now also, after it was done, it is a great mystery and truly divine...For the Cross is both the form which we venerate and in the form of its word." Homily 11, *On the Precious and Life-Giving Cross*. "Forty-one Homilies," Jerusalem 1857, p. 53-62.

168. *Jn.* 9:1f.

169. *Rm.* 8:20.

170. In this regard, Basil the Great writes, "By learning that God is [our] benefactor and judge, good and just and many other such things, we have also been taught about the differences of energies. Moreover, not even by understanding His energies is it possible for us to know the nature of Him Who acts." J. N. Karmiris, *Τά Δογματικά καί Συμβολικά Μνημεία*, Vol. 1., pp. 329-330.

171. *Rm.* 3:21.

justly held captive by what is evil.¹⁷² Because of his Protestant bias with regard to death, however,¹⁷³ Dodd does not complete the connection of the Hebrew concept of justice with the comprehensive soteriological thought of the Apostle Paul.

Nevertheless, although righteous people existed before the death of Christ, they were held captive by Satan unjustly and temporarily under the power of death. Even though "faith was reckoned to Abraham as righteousness,"¹⁷⁴ righteous Abraham was not saved at the time when he believed. The promise of salvation that was given to Abraham was fulfilled in Christ. To Moses was given the Law but not salvation. It is precisely for this reason that Paul insists the Law does not save. Christ alone saves: "For if a Law had been given that could impart life, then righteousness indeed should have been by the Law."¹⁷⁵ It is evident in this passage that Paul identifies righteousness with vivification. Thus, the justification of the righteous, who were held captive by death and the devil unjustly or temporarily, is the very same thing as their vivification, in other words, as the imparting to them of the uncreated and life-giving energy of the Holy Spirit through the sacrifice on the Cross.¹⁷⁶ When Paul writes that the "letter kills,"¹⁷⁷ he does not mean that the Law brings on death. "Therefore, did that which was good become a cause of death for me?"¹⁷⁸ He means it is not capable of giving life. From this point of view, it kills those who put their hope in it as if it were a Savior. "If righteousness [restoration to life]

172. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, London 1932, pp. 9-10, 51. This is the meaning of "justification," and we encounter it in a Lamentation of Great Friday (1st Session): "Thou wast counted as an evil doer among evil doers, O Christ, justifying us all against the evil doing of the ancient deceiver."

173. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

174. *Rm.* 4:9.

175. *Gal.* 3:21.

176. This concept that the righteous people who preceded Christ received only the anointing of the life-giving grace of God in order to be saved is found in the *Shepherd of Hermas*. "'Why, sir,' I asked, 'did these stones arise out of the deep [Hades] and why were they placed into the building of the tower though they bore the spirits [of perfection]?' 'It was necessary,' he answered, 'for them to rise up through water that they might be made alive, for unless they put aside the deadness of their former life, they could not otherwise enter into the kingdom of God. So these who had been asleep received the seal of the Son of God and entered into the kingdom of God...For they had slept in righteousness and great purity, only they had not this seal.'" Parable 9, XVI, 1-7.

177. *2 Cor.* 3:6.

178. *Rm.* 7:13.

comes through the Law, then Christ died needlessly."¹⁷⁹ But only the "Spirit gives life."¹⁸⁰ The giving of life by the Spirit is justification." And if Christ is in you, the body is dead unto sin, and the Spirit is life unto righteousness."¹⁸¹ When Paul writes that "God hath appeared in the flesh and was justified in the Spirit,"¹⁸² he does not mean that Jesus was a sinner and was justified or saved, but being found in death unjustly, He was vivified in the Spirit.¹⁸³ The Western interpretation is untenable which says that Paul uses the word "justification" to mean a change of the divine disposition toward man through the satisfaction of the allegedly offended divine nature.

St. Irenaeus clearly proclaims that the devil "unjustly led men into captivity."¹⁸⁴ It is important to note that, according to information provided by St. Irenaeus,¹⁸⁵ Tatian believed that the descendants of Adam were saved but Adam himself was not. It is clear from this that while Tatian believed Adam deserved eternal damnation, he did not believe Adam's guilt was inherited. This is why Adam's righteous descendants were saved. Opposing this idea, Irenaeus says that not only Adam's righteous descendants were unjustly held captive by the devil, but Adam, too, was unjustly held captive and, with the others, he was saved. Irenaeus says that it was not Adam whom God cursed but the serpent and the ground.¹⁸⁶ "It is altogether unreasonable for anyone to maintain that he who was so deeply wounded by the enemy and was first to suffer captivity was not set free by Him Who defeated the enemy, and that only his children whom he begat in the captivity itself were redeemed."¹⁸⁷ This would have indicated a lack of power and justice on the part of God. God, however, "is lacking neither in power nor in justice; He aided man and restored him to His own freedom."¹⁸⁸ It is evident that both in the theology of Paul and in the thought of Irenaeus, the justice of God is revealed in the

179. Gal. 2:21.

180. 2 Cor. 3:6.

181. Rm. 8:10

182. 1 Tim. 3:16.

183. Cf. G. Schenk, *Δικαιώω*, "ThWB," Vol. 2, p. 218.

184. *Refutation*, 5, XXI, 3.

185. *Ibid.*, 3, XXIII, 1f.

186. *Ibid.*, 3, XXIII, 3; Gen. 3:14, 17. Cf. F. Vernet, *Irénee (saint)*, "Dict. de Théol. Cath.," Vol. VII2, col. 2460.

187. *Ibid.*, 3, XXIII, 2.

188. *Ibid.*

destruction of injustice accomplished through the imparting of life to the righteous who were unjustly held captive by the devil. "The Logos bound [Satan] securely as one banished from Himself, and He seized his spoils, in other words, the people who were held by him, whom he used unjustly for his own purposes. And verily he who unjustly led men captive is justly made a captive."¹⁸⁹ "Adam was defeated and deprived of all life. Therefore, when the enemy in turn was defeated, Adam received new life. And the last enemy, death, which from the beginning took sway over man, is abolished...This could not have been accurate to say if the man over whom death had first taken sway had not been set free, for his salvation is the destruction of death. Therefore, when God imparts life to man, in other words, to Adam, death is destroyed at the same time."¹⁹⁰

Elsewhere, Irenaeus writes, "The Logos of God, Who is all powerful and is in no way lacking in His justice, justly acted against apostasy and freed His own creature from it. This was not by force--the manner by which apostasy subjugated us in the beginning when it insatiably seized those things that were not its own--but by persuasion, as is proper to the God of counsel, Who does not use force to acquire what He wishes, so that justice may not be transgressed and His creation may not be destroyed. The Lord, Who redeemed us with His own precious blood and gave His soul for our souls and His flesh for our flesh, poured forth the Spirit of the Father for the union and communion of God with man, truly imparting God to man by the Spirit and uniting man with God through His own Incarnation, and granting immortality to us permanently through His own presence and by true communion with God."¹⁹¹

It is especially strange that Anselm's theory of divine satisfaction is thought to be based on the theology of Paul. Anselm saw the requirement for punishment as much as the requirement for the salvation of man as a necessity of the divine nature. For him, God is love and justice in His essence. Thus, God is subject to certain laws of necessity, and His relations with the world are regulated by certain attributes of the divine essence, a notion that is blasphemous and untenable for Greek patristic theology. The God of the Holy Scriptures and of the

189. *Ibid.*, 5, XXI, 3. Cf. 3, XVIII, 7; XIX, 3; 4, XXII, 1; XL, 2.

190. *Ibid.*, 3, XXIII, 7.

191. *Ibid.*, 5, I, 1.

Orthodox Fathers is not subject to necessity of any kind in His essence since, as we have seen, He is free of all necessity and self-interest. Man cannot impute anthropomorphic qualities to the divine nature, and indeed qualities of the fallen psychological make up of man, such as are implicit in the heresy that the divine nature was offended and needed to be avenged. "For neither by insulting Him can a man cause injury to God nor by praising Him make Him reveal Himself more brightly. He ever abides in His own glory, neither increasing because of praises nor diminishing because of blasphemy. But when people glorify Him worthily, rather, I should say, according to their ability, since to truly glorify God worthily is not possible, they reap the benefits of that glorification themselves. And those who blaspheme and malign Him destroy their own salvation."¹⁹² Even the term "satisfaction" is itself alien to the Greek Fathers.¹⁹³ The divine essence remains incomprehensible. The justice of God and His love, as well, are divine energies and properties encompassing God, but they are not the divine essence itself.¹⁹⁴

When Paul says, "...we were enemies and were reconciled with God through the death of His Son,"¹⁹⁵ we should not think that before the Crucifixion God maintained a hostile attitude toward the world. "It was not He Who was hostile but we, for God is never hostile."¹⁹⁶ The Cross does not presuppose the hostility but the love of God, "For God so loved the world..."¹⁹⁷ The love of God and the love of Christ toward the world both before and after the Crucifixion is the same. "As My Father hath loved Me, I have loved you."¹⁹⁸ Therefore, if the Father had a hostile attitude toward mankind, the Son, of course, would have had the same enmity toward the world. But nowhere does the New Testament say that either Christ or the Father were at enmity with the world. From the beginning, the love that Christ showed toward the suffering, even before He was crucified, had the Father as its source.¹⁹⁹ Paul never says that God had enmity

192. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Incomprehensibility of God*, Homily 3, Ch. 1. Edition of P. Christou, p. 80.

193. Cf. J. N. Karmiris, *Ἑτερόδοξοι Ἐπιδράσεις Ἐπὶ Τὰς Ὁμολογίας Τοῦ ἸΖ' Αἰῶνος*, Jerusalem 1949, p. 64, n3.

194. Cf. G. Florovsky, *The Idea of Creation*, p. 67f.

195. *Rm.* 5:10.

196. John Chrysostom, *Comm. on 2nd Corinthians*, Homily 11, Ch. 3. P.G. 61, 478.

197. *Jn.* 3:16.

198. *Jn.* 15:19.

199. *Jn.* 3:16.

toward man but that through sin men were hostile toward the divine will "because the mind of the flesh is enmity against God."²⁰⁰ "And although ye were formerly alienated and hostile in mind and engaged in evil deeds, yet He hath now reconciled you in the body of His flesh through death in order to present you before Him holy and blameless and beyond reproach."²⁰¹ Nowhere does Paul say that God became conciliatory toward man, for God is always reconciling men to Himself. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself but not imputing their transgressions to them, and He hath placed among us the word of reconciliation."²⁰² "Be ye reconciled to God. It was not said, reconcile God to yourselves, since it was not He Who was hostile but we, for God is never hostile."²⁰³

It is important to note that in the Holy Scriptures and in the writers of the period under examination, divine wrath is never directed generally or indiscriminately against the whole of mankind, although this kind of wrath is clearly the premise of Augustine's theory of original sin. Rather, it is always manifested specifically to the unrepentant, the impious, the unrighteous, and particularly to the devil. Not only has divine wrath toward mankind as a whole never been seen, but even before the sacrifice on the Cross, Jesus appeared casting out demons, healing the sick, and raising the dead. These divine energies would be completely irrational if it were assumed that, because of an inherited guilt of mankind, divine justice is the cause of the same evils that the Lord warred against. How was it, then, that God's sen-tencing of men to death, to the hands of demons, and to illness was lifted even before the great satisfaction of divine justice took place on the Cross? Or is it assumed that in reality there was no need to satisfy divine justice, or that man was somehow reconciled first with the Logos and later with the Father?²⁰⁴

Regarding the term "propitiation," C. H. Dodd comments that the Septuagint translation does not contain the idea of pla-

200. *Rm.* 8:7.

201. *Col.* 1:21-22. Cf. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 5, XIV, 2.

202. *2nd Cor.* 5:19.

203. John Chrysostom, *Commentary on 2nd Corinthians*, Homily 11, Ch. 3. P.G. 61, 478. Cf. also Theodoret of Cyrus alongside P. Trembelas, *op. cit.*, p. 480.

204. "To those who believe and secretly teach that the reconciliation of human nature to the divine and blessed nature of the life-giving and all-pure Trinity was effected at different times, and decree that we were reconciled first to the Only-

cating the divine wrath,²⁰⁵ an idea held by the pagans. St. Irenaeus basically said the same thing. According to him, a theory of propitiation and satisfaction of the offended divine nature²⁰⁶ is impossible. He emphatically declares, "God had no need of the sacrifices of the Hebrews. He asked for sacrifices simply for the sake of man himself, the offerer. As we have shown, this was evidently taught by the Lord. Therefore, when Samuel saw the Hebrews neglecting righteousness and abandoning the love of God and thinking that God is placated by sacrifices and observances of all the formalistic rules, he said to them, 'Are whole burnt offerings and sacrifices pleasing to the Lord as the obedience to the words of the Lord? Behold, obedience is better than a good sacrifice, and hearkening than the fat of rams' (1 Kings 15:22), as David also says (Ps. 39:6). Then, lest it be supposed that in His anger God rejected those things, He continues emphatically repudiating the things through which sinners imagined they could propitiate God, showing that He himself has no needs...He did not reject their sacrifices because He was angry like a man, as some would say, but out of compassion for their blindness."²⁰⁷ Therefore, God's rejection of sacrifices arises from divine compassion and not from divine justice.

The West's juridical categories or formulations of the fall and salvation do not exist in the Greek patristic tradition. The tradition not only regarded death as just punishment only of the unrighteous and a product of the cunning of the devil, it strongly emphasized that when God permitted the death even of the righteous, it was not out of a punitive divine decision as Augustine imagined but out of divine compassion. Otherwise, the righteous would be under the rule of sin eternally. "God showed great beneficence to man because He did not leave him

Begotten Son by His receiving our nature and later with God the Father in the saving Passion of the Savior Christ, and divide the [Persons]...anathema." *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, *op. cit.*, p. 148. Because of Anselm's theory of satisfaction, in one segment of Protestantism there arose a tendency to distinguish between the energies of the Father and the energies of the Son. C. Welch, *op. cit.*, p. 65. This automatically leads to Arianism.

205. *Op. cit.*, pp. 54-55. Thus, in *Rm.* 3:25, propitiation is taught to man by God Himself as a means of forgiveness of sins and of salvation. God has no need of it, but man does. This usage of the term is even clearer in 1 *Jn.* 2:1-2; 4:10.

206. God does not prescribe and accept the means of propitiation because the divine nature is allegedly offended but because of love and compassion toward the weakness of man and for his guidance, perfection, and salvation.

207. *Refutation*, 4, XVII, 1, 2.

in sin unto the ages...For just as a vessel that has been made with a flaw is melted down or remolded to become new and whole, the same thing happens to man by death. For he is broken into pieces that he may rise whole in the resurrection; I mean spotless and righteous and immortal."²⁰⁸ "God showed mercy to the one who had been deceived. For the same reason, He also cast him out of paradise and removed him from the tree of life, not because He begrudged him the tree of life, as some maintain, but because He had compassion toward him and did not desire that he should continue to live thus in sin eternally, or that evil should be interminable and unhealed. But He set a boundary to the sin of man, interposing death²⁰⁹ and thus causing the end of sin, putting an end to it by the dissolution of the flesh in the earth so that man, ceasing to live unto sin and dying to it, might begin to live unto God."²¹⁰

Regarding the justice of God, in the words of Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory the Theologian, we may conclude: "It was for the sake of no one else that the Logos became flesh and dwelt among us since, by enduring the death of the flesh, He would triumph over principalities and powers and indeed abolish him who had the power of death, that is, Satan, lift corruptibility, and with it cast away sin, our tyrant."²¹¹ "Now it is time to examine a deed and doctrine that is overlooked by many but to me is very important to study. To whom and why was the blood offered that was shed for us? I mean the great and renowned blood of our God and High Priest and Victim. We were held in bondage by the evil one, bought and sold in sin, receiving pleasure in return for wickedness. Now, since a ransom belongs only to him who holds [others] in bondage, I ask to whom was this paid and for what purpose? If to the evil one,

208. Theophilus, *op. cit.*, 2, 26.

209. St. Irenaeus expresses himself here in a general way. Elsewhere he specifically says the cause of corruptibility is Satan (cf. *Refutation*, 3, XXIII, 1, 2, 4, 7; 5, XXI, 1), and the essence of death is man's separation by sin from God, Who does not impose even one punishment. "Those who were blinded by others or even blinded themselves are continuously denied the enjoyment of light, but it was not the light which imposed the punishment of blindness on them." *Ibid.*, 5, XXVII, 2. In many places this study stresses Irenaeus' teaching on Christ's freeing of man from captivity to death.

210. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 3, XXVII, 5-6. "Thus, God did not create death, but we brought it upon ourselves with our wicked intention. Therefore, for the aforesaid reasons, He did not prevent our dissolution so that the illness may not be maintained in us eternally." Basil the Great, P.G. 31, 345.

211. Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on Romans*, P.G. 74, 781-783.

lie upon the outrage! If the robber receives a ransom not only from God but one consisting of God Himself, one that is so excessive against his tyranny, for such a payment it would have been right for him to have left us alone altogether. But if to the Father, first I ask how? For it was not by Him that we were being oppressed. And second, why should the blood of the Only-Begotten delight the Father, Who would not receive even Isaac when he was being offered by his father but changed the sacrifice, putting a ram in place of the human victim? Is it not evident that the Father accepts Him, neither having asked for Him nor having demanded Him, but on account of the dispensation and because man needs to be sanctified by the humanity of God, that He might deliver us Himself and overcome the tyrant, and draw us to Himself by the mediation of His Son, Who also executed this to the honor of the Father, to Whom He clearly defers in all things? This is as much as we shall say of Christ; the greater portion shall be revered with silence. But that brazen serpent was hung up as a remedy for the biting serpents, not as a type of Him that suffered for us but as a contrast. And it saved those who looked upon it, not because it was believed to be alive but because it had been killed, and it killed the powers that were subject to it, being destroyed as it deserved. And what is the fitting epitaph for it from us? 'O death where is thy sting? O Hades where is thy victory?' You are overthrown by the Cross, slain by Him Who is the Giver of Life. You are without breath; dead, without motion, even though you keep the form of the serpent lifted up high on a post."²¹²

²¹². Gregory the Theologian, Homily 45, *On the Holy Pascha*, 22, P.G. 36, 653.

CHAPTER IV

THE DESTINY OF MAN

A. Introduction

It has virtually become a customary practice of Protestants to charge Orthodoxy with the allegations by Ritschl and Harnack that the patristic concept of salvation from corruptibility and death lacks any serious moral content. Moreover, they charge that the Greek Fathers interpret the dogma of redemption materialistically and give it a magical and mechanistic character.¹ For these critics, corruptibility is something that God instituted, reality is an ideal beyond matter, and the soul, supposedly immortal by nature, is the main element of man and, therefore, the only object of salvation. Thus, it is inevitable that they would not be able to discern the connection between the power of death and Christian morality or between death and sin. Consequently, for them the references in the Gospel and in the Fathers to the resurrection of the flesh, to ascetical struggles, and to warfare against the devil are remnants of materialistic and worldly Jewish eschatology.

Since all Western theological systems believe death was instituted by God, irrespective of whether or not it was a punishment for an offense committed against the divine nature, theologians who try to avoid absolute predestination are nevertheless unable to see death as an instrument of Satan and sin as the sting of death.² Since God is regarded as the cause of

1. A. Harnack, *What is Christianity?*, p. 248f. H. R. Mackintosh (*The Person of Jesus Christ*, Edinburgh 1913, p. 146) and E. Brunner, (*op. cit.*, p. 250f.) refute this idea.

2. Death, according to Chrysostom, is the weapon of the devil. *Commentary on Hebrews*, Homily 4, P.G. 63, 41. Augustine contends that the corruptibility of the body is not the seat of sin but only the punishment for sin. *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione*, Bk. III, Ch. 20 (XI).

The Destiny of Man

corruptibility and of man's captivity to the devil, He must also be regarded as the cause of sin. If the present condition of the body and the soul under the power of death and the devil is of God's making, one is then obliged either to subscribe to predestination and Manichaeism or to accept as normal the so-called "natural man's" inclination toward self-centered *eudaemonia*. Once the present condition of the psychophysical man under the power of death and the devil was accepted as natural, the parallel acceptance of mankind's eudaemonistic pursuits as primary and essential in creation was a foregone conclusion. According to this point of view, man is ruled by beneficial desires because God wills it so.

It is startling to discover in the thought of the Scholastics and the West in general the prevailing idea that not only man but God Himself is ruled by a kind of self-seeking love, since God cannot have real love for things outside of the divine essence. To love things outside the divine essence would mean He has need of those things. Consequently, God does not love things outside of the divine essence but loves their beginningless, everlasting, and changeless archetypes within the divine essence.³ God has a will, but the object willed is from eternity, an accomplished fact, since the divine essence, divine existence, and divine knowledge are one and the same thing. Any new object of the divine will would indicate a change in the divine essence and prove that God is not *eudaemon* (εὐδαίμων), perfectly content, since He has need of something new to support and fulfill His *eudaemonia*.

We have seen that the Greek Fathers remained faithful to the biblical presuppositions regarding freedom and creation, and they refused to follow the Hellenistic method of dealing with theological problems. They rejected the ingenerate, that is, beginningless, and eternal mode of being of the Platonic archetypes and held fast to the biblical concept of a genuine creation from nothing preexistent. God was not subservient to supposedly ingenerate archetypes during the creation; God has need of nothing. Moreover, even the archetypes that have no essence or substance are not conceived by God in His essence but in His energy. Moreover, such a conception is not an energy acting upon God but an energy of God. The divine essence ever

3. Cf. Chs. 1 and 2. A reading of J. Pohle's *God: His Knowability, Essence, and Attributes*, London 1946, pp. 423-437, can confirm how today's Scholastics think. The idea that any movement of God can only be toward the Persons of the Holy Trinity is the whole basis for the dogma of the *Filioque*.

The Destiny of Man

remains immutable and incomprehensible because, above all, God is free.

Completely untenable is the scholastic theory and doctrine that God loves the nonhypostatic⁴ idea of man and not the hypostatic man himself; that is to say, God loves the impersonal archetype and only indirectly the actual person. In the teaching of the Holy Scriptures and the Greek Fathers, even though God created the world from nothing, He does not need the world in any way. Nevertheless, God's love for the creatures made by His hands is real simply because it is entirely unselfish, being selflessly directed outward.⁵ This outgoing love, however, is not the same as the divine essence itself, or creation would necessarily have been beginningless in order for God to have an eternal object for His love. Creation, then, would have existed because of necessity and not because God freely willed it. God's love for the world is above every selfishness and necessity because true love "seeketh not its own."⁶ Neither is His love constrained by necessity to seek what is good for another, otherwise there would be no punishment for injustice.⁷ God never acts by essence but only by will and absolute freedom. This teaching about God by the Holy Scriptures and the ecclesiastical writers and Greek Fathers of the period under examination is of the greatest importance for a proper understanding of the doctrine of the fall. It makes readily apparent the connection between man's creation in the image and likeness of God and man's godly and, therefore, moral life through absolute free will, far from all selfishness and necessity. Thus, the

4. J. Pohle argues that the archetypes, or pure potentialities, "possess true, even though only ideal, being" in a "middle ground between nothing and actual existence...God also loves the purely possible...God delights in the infinite number of possible things which He comprehensively understands." *Op. cit.*, p. 441. The teaching that the ideas (universals) are real with their own eternal mode of being in the divine essence leads to apparent polytheism.

5. "Since love, then, is something great and invincible and not merely a word, let us manifest it in our works. He reconciled us when we were enemies. Therefore, now that we have become friends, let us remain so. He opened the way; let us then follow. He loves us not for His own gain (for He needed nothing); let us at least love Him for our own gain. For He loved us though we were His enemies. Let us at least love Him as our friend." John Chrysostom, *Commentary on John*, Homily 76, Ch. 3, P.G. 59, 413.

6. 1 Cor. 13:5.

7. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 3, XXV, 2; Theophilus, *op. cit.*, 1, 3. L. Duncker erroneously says that Irenaeus identifies the divine energy of love, which is revealed in the world, with the divine essence. *Op. cit.*, p. 75. In such an instance, the love of God would act by necessity and not by free disposition.

The Destiny of Man

charge that the theology and soteriology of the Fathers lack a moral element is overturned at its roots.

If man was created according to the image of God for the purpose of being perfected and becoming like Him, he can attain it only by spiritual exercise of the will because only through true freedom is it possible for man, in his love, to become like God. True freedom is the love that distinguishes God as free of all necessity and selfishness. "Be ye therefore perfect as your Father Who is in heaven is perfect"⁸ does not mean that man must become perfect as the self-loving, self-contented God of philosophy and of certain Scholastics of the West, but perfect as the God of Holy Scripture and the Greek Fathers, Who is free of all necessity and selfishness. The destiny of man, as imagined by Augustine, Aquinas, Calvin, Ritschl, and others of the West, is self-centered *eudaemonia*⁹ attained by supposedly identifying the mind with the reality in the essence of God. This is supposed to cause a cessation of all movement of the mind and will toward any other person or thing since there is nothing more desirable for the human intellect than the divine essence. For the Greek Fathers, however, the idea of a vision of the divine essence is blasphemous.¹⁰ Such theories of *eudaemonia* simply project and elevate to a divine level the force that rules in the world, the force of necessity and self-interest called "fate" by the ancients.¹¹ But man was not made for the purpose of finding satisfaction of the supposedly natural, self-centered longings within himself and, thus, of becoming unmoved and dispassionate. On the contrary, he was specifically made so he can love God and his fellow man with the same love that God has for the world. Love that arises out of self-interest is alien to the nature of God just as it is alien to the original destiny of man.

8. Mt. 5:48.

9. Since Harnack could never imagine that the first Christians had a different view regarding predestination, it is not difficult to understand how he could comment that their "piety oscillated between fear and hope. It did not live by faith. It taught that knowing and doing the good renders a person blessed after one has received the forgiveness of past sins in Baptism, but one did not receive beatitude." *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 232. F. Copleston says that the system of ethics of Aquinas is a combination of Aristotelian *eudaemonism* and the Christian West's teaching of the beatific vision of the divine essence. *Aquinas*, p. 193.

10. J. N. Karmiris, *Τά Δογματικά καί Συμβολικά Μνημεία*, pp. 294-349.

11. Tatian maintains that the demons "introduced fate (εἰμαρμένην), a great injustice...And are not the demons themselves, with Zeus their leader, fallen under the same passions by which men are also ruled?" *Op. cit.*, 8.

The Destiny of Man

Before the coming of the Lord, the devil appears standing before God, accusing the righteous of selfishness. Replying to the things that God said about the faith of Job, the "devil said before the Lord, 'Does Job worship the Lord for nothing? Hast Thou not made a hedge about him, and about his household, and all his possessions round about?'"¹²

Completely absent from the thought of the Fathers is the eudaemonistic teaching about destiny and the identifying of the mind with the divine essence. Before Justin became a Christian he used to argue in a Platonic manner: "Philosophy is the science of being and the clear knowledge of truth, and *eudaemonia* is more revered than science and wisdom."¹³ The elder Trypho questions Justin, "What is it in us that is akin to God? Is the soul also divine and immortal and a part of that regal Mind itself? And as the mind sees God, is it also attainable by us to comprehend the Divinity in our mind and thence become happy?"¹⁴ Justin, in the end, replies negatively. Thus, regarding his turning to Christ he writes, "I spent as much of my time as possible with a man who had recently settled in our city, an intelligent man who was prominent among the Platonists. I progressed and made the greatest possible advancement every day. And the perception of incorporeal things uplifted me, and the contemplation of the ideas gave wings to my mind. Within a short time, I thought I had become wise, and I stupidly expected forthwith to look upon God, for this is the aim of Plato's philosophy."¹⁵

Philosophy's teaching of moral perfection is not capable of transcending the idea of selfish *eudaemonia* because, for the latter, that which is perfect is unmoved toward anything outside of itself. If it is thought to move toward something, then the unmoved either moves toward that which is part of itself (pantheism), or it is not truly perfect. The moral perfection of those things that derive from the One is acquired through their union with the most high One, and then every movement and

12. *Job* 1:9-10.

13. *Dialogue*, 3. In this connection, Irenaeus' comment on the teaching of certain heretics is worth noting: "They hold that the knowledge of the unspeakable Greatness is itself redemption. Since from ignorance came both deficiency and passion, everything that was brought forth by ignorance is destroyed by knowledge. Therefore, knowledge is the redemption of the inner man." *Refutation*, 1, XXI, 4.

14. *Dialogue*, 4.

15. *Ibid.*, 2.

The Destiny of Man

desire is terminated. In other words, moral perfection consists in the fulfilling satisfaction of the selfish *eudaemonia* of man. It has nothing to do with the attainment of unselfish love but instead with the total and highest degree of fulfillment of the selfishness that rules man. According to these presuppositions, then, the fall consists of an inexplicable turning away of man's selfish love from the highest good to secondary things. Consequently, the penalty for this irrational act consists mainly of the deprivation of the only thing capable of really satisfying man's selfish inclination to *eudaemonia*. The West's great debates about whether divine grace is necessary or not for the achievement of man's destiny are based on such presuppositions.¹⁶ Accordingly, for the West the image and likeness of God in man cannot be mainly a matter of spiritual labor for the attainment of unselfish love that seeks not its own. The functioning and makeup of the soul and will that seek selfish *eudaemonia* are just as they were when God first made them; the mechanism is wholly in tact. The soul lacks only the correct object towards which it needs to be directed. For the West, therefore, it is not a matter of spiritual labor to attain the image and likeness of God in the full freedom of being perfected, as it is with Greek patristic theology,¹⁷ but merely a matter of losing or gaining the highest good.

While the post-Augustine theology of the West generally reduced God to fit the measures of man's *eudaemonistic* psychology, Greek patristic theology remained true to the Gospel's effort to elevate man to the likeness of God. According to the first theological testimonies, man now under the power of death and estranged from the life-giving energy of the Holy Spirit, is seen neither as natural nor as the likeness of God. Tatian says that the image and likeness of God in man is the Holy Spirit.¹⁸ Man is in the image and likeness of God only when he is in communion with the Holy Spirit: "Such is the nature of man's makeup, and if it be like a temple, God is pleased to dwell in

16. In the West, discussions about redemption are not based, as they are in the Greek Fathers, on the absolute need for salvation from death and corruptibility through the life-giving flesh of Christ. For the West, since man is by nature immortal and bodily death is from God, the soteriological problem is whether or not man needs divine grace in order to attain to the vision of the divine essence, since divine grace is different from the life-giving energy of God.

17. C. Androutsos, *Συμβολική*, Athens 1930, p. 160f.; *Δογματική*, p. 139f.; J. N. Karmiris, *Ὁρθόδοξία καὶ Προτεσταντισμός*, Athens 1937, p. 268, and *Σύνοψις Δογματικῆς Διδασκαλίας Καθολικῆς Ὁρθόδοξου Ἐκκλησίας*, p. 29f.

18. *Op. cit.*, 12.

The Destiny of Man

it...but if it is not such a habitation, man is superior to the wild beasts only in articulate speech. In other respects, his manner of life is like theirs, as one who is not a likeness of God."¹⁹ Man is not by nature a likeness of God because, among other things, the image of God presupposes the moral perfection of man: "Man alone is the image and likeness of God. I do not mean man who acts as the beasts do, however, but one who has advanced far beyond mere humanity to God Himself."²⁰ These teachings of Tatian are not to be associated with the views of the Protestants who perceive the loss of the image of God as the loss of free will and the total distortion of human nature.²¹ When Tatian writes, "We have lost our sovereignty; we were free and we became slaves," he does not mean that man lost his free will.²² Rather, it means that when man was free and able to become immortal, he became a slave to death and sin. "We were not created to die, but we die by our own fault...Nothing evil has been created by God. We ourselves have manifested wickedness, but we who have manifested it are able again to reject it."²³ Man has the power to leave off evil if he so wishes. This power does not belong only to a few who are supposedly fated for salvation and are bolstered by God but to all: "Moreover, it is possible through prayer for every man who has been conquered to become victorious over the condition that is death. And what this condition is can be seen easily by men who choose immortality."²⁴

The image and likeness of God in man was not seen by the writers of the period as a matter of philosophical comparison

19. *Ibid.*, 15. Cf. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 4, XXXIX, 1, 2.

20. *Ibid.*

21. We should not confuse what Tatian said about the image of God with what the West says. The Latins assign the image of God to the nature of man and distinguish between it and primordial justice. (C. Androustos, *Συμβολική*, p. 168f.) And the Protestants generally identify the image with both the nature of man and primordial justice (*Ibid.*, p. 174f.). For Tatian, however, the image of God is not human nature but a Person of the Holy Trinity (*op. cit.*, 12), with Whom the righteous who follow the path to perfection are in communion. It is likewise important to have in mind that, for the West, the fall generally means a fall from *eudaemonia*, but for Tatian man falls away from being perfected by ascetical labor and guidance under the Holy Spirit. As a result, the fall is both a loss and an acquisition: the loss of the true immortality, that is, of divine grace; and the acquisition of the corruptibility and death of the body.

22. Cf. A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch*, Vol. 1, p. 430, n4. He regards the above as contradictions in Tatian's thought and argues that Tatian abandoned his contradictory position when he became a heretic (*Ibid.*).

23. Tatian, *op. cit.*, 11.

24. *Ibid.*, 15.

The Destiny of Man

between God's reason and that of man. In their view, the loss of the image and likeness abolished neither man's reason nor his sovereignty. Despite the fact that Irenaeus most assertively places great emphasis on the reason and sovereignty of fallen man,²⁵ in certain places he shares Tatian's view that, after the fall, man lost the image and likeness of God.²⁶ Regarding the comparison between God and His creatures, he emphasizes that "not a single creature or dependent thing can ever be compared to the Logos of God."²⁷ Tatian expresses himself similarly: "For we must continue now and discuss what the image and likeness of God is. That which is incomparable is like nothing other than itself. And that which is comparable is something not totally different but something almost the same. For the perfect God is fleshless, but man is flesh. The bond of the flesh is the soul; that which encloses the soul is the flesh."²⁸ About two centuries later, Athanasius the Great wrote, "For God is not the same as man; hence, neither are men the same as God. For the former were made from matter which is subject to suffering, but God is immaterial and bodiless...Paul commanded that each man, according to his own ability, be attentive to the reading in order to discern the meanings of things written so as to neither confuse the mind by perceiving divine things as human nor to reckon human things as divine."²⁹ This is precisely the reason why the presuppositions of Augustine and the Latins regarding the *Filioque* are untenable for the Orthodox. According to the Latins, the incomprehensible mystery of the Holy Trinity can be analyzed by raising the human mind to divine heights and comparing its own operations with the three hypostases of God.³⁰ Therefore, John Chrysostom tells us, John the Evangelist "begins from the Logos and, proceeding on, declares that He is God, and, unlike Plato, he does not say that sometimes He is intellect and sometimes He is soul. For these things are far removed from that divine and unmixed nature. Nor does He have anything in common with us but is separated from communion with created things, I mean as to essence, though,

25. *Op. cit.*, 4, XXXVII, 1-7.

26. *Ibid.*, 3, XVIII, 1; 5, XVI, 2.

27. *Ibid.*, 3 VIII, 2.

28. *Op. cit.*, 15.

29. *Epistle on the Synod of Nicaea*, Ch. 10, P.G. 25, 433.

30. C. Androustos, *Δογματική*, p. 89f. Thus, he rejects the comparison, but he does not develop the relationship between this comparison and the theology of the *Filioque*.

The Destiny of Man

not as to relation."³¹

For the Greek Fathers, the divine essence remains altogether incomprehensible and unparticipable. Only the uncreated divine energies are approachable.³² Therefore, it is not possible to define God as mind in His essence as the West does. God is beyond mind and thought.³³ Not only man's flesh but his mind also cannot be compared with God. Every comparison of this kind leads to anthropomorphism. "Anything that would be compared to the incomparable God is shown to be coarse indeed and material, for only the divine is truly immaterial and bodiless."³⁴ The view was clearly stated by the Alexandrians that the image of God in man is, among other things, the mind, but the Greek Fathers did not at all perceive it in an anthropomorphic manner that would allow an actual comparison between the human mind and the divine essence.

Consequently, according to the earliest Christian theological testimonies, the image and likeness of God does not refer only to the reason and sovereignty of man.³⁵ In order to arrive at a definition of the image and likeness, however, we must examine what the ancient Church viewed as two aspects of the same reality: moral perfection and immortality. These are inseparably bound together and constitute the whole basis of understanding the image and likeness of God and the early Christian doctrine of

31. John Chrysostom, *Commentary on John*, Homily 2, Ch. 7, P.G. 59, 33-34.

32. J. N. Karmiris, *Τά Δογματικά καί Συμβολικά Μνημεία*, pp. 294-349; C. Bonis, *op. cit.*, p. 17f.

33. St. Gregory of Nyssa writes, "It is apparent indeed that the name of the Father is not descriptive of His essence but rather designates His relation to the Son." *Against Eunomius*, 2nd Homily, P.G. 45, 473. Therefore, not even the name *Father* indicates what the divine essence is. Cf. also Gregory the Theologian's *Third Theological Oration*, 16. The Greek Fathers speak of the name of the Father as indicative of the relation of the Father to the Son and of the Son to the Father, but this must not be confused with the West's teaching regarding relations within the divine essence itself. The Greek Fathers speak of relations between three real hypostases, while the West speaks of relations of the divine essence with itself. According to Roman Catholicism, the opposition of the relations of the divine essence toward itself reveals the persons within the divine essence. For example, cf. A. Michel's *Relation Divines*, *op. cit.*

34. John of Damascus, quoted by J. N. Karmiris, *Ἡ Δογματική Διδασκαλία τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ*, p. 32-33. Cf. J. C. L. Gieseler, *op. cit.*, p. 140f.

35. According to G. F. Moore, the idea that the image of God is the reasoning soul was unknown to Judaic tradition until this theory was developed by Philo the Hellenistic Jew of Alexandria. *Op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 446-449. The Alexandrians Clement and Origen followed Philo. Cf. J. C. L. Gieseler, *op. cit.*, p. 160; F. C. Bauer, *op. cit.*, p. 578.

The Destiny of Man

the fall and salvation.

B. Moral Perfection

The first theologians of the Church who dealt with the topic of the fall took the New Testament's teaching about perfection very seriously. The fall for them was not at all a juridical matter but rather the failure of man to attain to perfection and *theosis* (divinization) because he fell into the hands of him who has the power of death. Thus, salvation for them was the destruction of the power of Satan and the restoration of creation to its original destiny through the perfecting and *theosis* of man. Any attempt to understand the fall would be futile without a correct understanding of the world's original destiny which at first was lost but later was achieved in Christ. It is difficult to understand what creation fell from if we are ignorant of the original destiny of creation. That destiny is the basis of the theology of the fall and of salvation.

According to the clear witness of the New Testament, man's destiny is such a high degree of perfection and sanctification³⁶ that he is charged to become perfect as his Father is perfect³⁷ in order to be formed in the image of Christ,³⁸ not only morally but bodily also.³⁹ In this way, perfected man shall see God. The sanctification of man is the will of God,⁴⁰ and "the bond of perfection" is love.⁴¹

The relationship of man with God should not be thought of as a man's own private matter, not only because God is three hypostases, but especially because the resurrection ultimately presupposes the corporate restoration of the communion of the righteous,⁴² i.e. of the Church, which "was made first among all things...and for her the world was preserved."⁴³ Man was not made to be self-seeking and drawn by the supreme One so that, once he has been joined with it, man would cease to desire anything. If in fact the destiny of the soul is to incline toward the

36. *Phil.* 2:15; *Col.* 1:28; 4:12; 1 *Thes.* 4:3; *Heb.* 12:14; *Jm.* 1:4.

37. *Mt.* 5:48; *Eph.* 5:1; *Col.* 3:10; 1 *Pet.* 1:14; 1 *Jn.* 3:2.

38. *Rom.* 8:29; 1 *Cor.* 2:16; 15:49; 2 *Cor.* 3:13; *Gal.* 2:20; 4:19; *Eph.* 4:13.

39. *Phil.* 3:21.

40. *Heb.* 8:10-11; 12:14; 1 *Jn.* 3:2.

41. *Col.* 3:14.

42. 1 *Thes.* 4:13-18.

43. *Shepherd of Hermas*, Vision 2, 4.

The Destiny of Man

highest good and to find self-contentment in it, what kind of relationship can the soul have with secondary beings if it should ever achieve its goal? If the soul becomes totally satisfied by its union with the One, how can it also be inclined toward other beings like itself, or even lower beings, and maintain a relationship of love with them also? The eudaemonism of Western Christianity logically and pragmatically leads to a form of individualism that is alien to Orthodox Christianity's soteriological dogma of the restoration of the communion of the saints in Christ and perfection and *theosis* in the image of the Holy Trinity.

Each man's relationship with his brother in Christ ought to be an image of his relationship with God and Christ. "If God so loved us, we ought also to love one another."⁴⁴ "Be ye therefore compassionate as your Father is compassionate."⁴⁵ Each man ought to be concerned for the salvation of his brother who may be fallen or in delusion.⁴⁶ There are no numerical limits to how many times one is required to forgive his brother.⁴⁷ God forgives the falls of men only when they likewise forgive the sins of others.⁴⁸ In the New Testament, strictly individual relations with God alone do not exist, for Christians must also love one another exactly as Christ has loved them.⁴⁹ Their love for one another after the manner of Christ's love is the only real indication of their discipleship and communion with Christ.⁵⁰ "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love for one another."⁵¹ Because of this, those who truly live in Christ are able to say, "We have the mind of Christ."⁵² "Look not each man for his own interests but also for the interests of others. Have this mind in yourselves which was also in Christ Jesus."⁵³ Christians imitate the works of Christ.⁵⁴ The Apostle Paul counsels the Christians

44. 1 Jn. 4:11.

45. Lk. 6:36.

46. Mt. 18:15-20; Gal. 6:1; Jm. 5:19-20.

47. Mt. 18:21-22; Lk. 17:4.

48. Mt. 6:15; 18:23-35; Mk. 11:25-26.

49. Jn. 13:34; 15:12; 17:25; Eph. 5:2, 25; Phil. 2:5-8; Col. 3:13.

50. Jn. 17:23.

51. Jn. 13:34-35.

52. 1 Cor. 2:16.

53. Phil. 2:4-5.

54. Jn. 14:12-15, 9-10, 12-13; 1 Cor. 10:33; Phil. 2:5-8; Col. 3:13-14; 1 Thes. 1:6.

The Destiny of Man

to imitate him because he imitates Christ.⁵⁵

While the demons of the nations "demand sacrifices and services...of those who live irrationally,"⁵⁶ the worship in Spirit and truth by Christians presupposes harmonious relations of love among the brethren who offer the bloodless sacrifice.⁵⁷ Love toward God and love toward one another are two aspects of the same reality and are thus inseparable.⁵⁸ "If a man says, 'I love God,' and he hateth his brother, he is a liar."⁵⁹ Christians are known by their unity in the love of God.⁶⁰ Since the Church is the body of Christ, the actions and attitudes of Christians toward one another are identical to their attitudes toward Christ.⁶¹ The salvation of Christians is contingent upon their love and unity in Christ. The nature and meaning of this contingency is such that one who is not truly within the harmony and love of the body of Christ, that is, of the Church, "is as a gentile and publican"⁶² because whatever exists in unity in the Church militant is the same in heaven. "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."⁶³

The Protestant argument that each believer has his own private relations with God and, therefore, needs no other means of achieving the proper relationship with Christ is altogether without foundation from a purely evangelical point of view. Man was not created to live alone and have a personal or private "highest good" available to him. The God of all is One, and He made many beings and many men because "it is not good for man to be alone."⁶⁴ In the biblical and patristic tradition, the destiny of man is not a motionless *eudaemonia* or self-fulfillment but freedom and love according to the image of God. "If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."⁶⁵ When the Lord says that we need to seek "first the kingdom of God

55. 1 Cor. 10:33; 1 Thes. 1:6.

56. Justin, 1st Apology, 12, 5.

57. Mt. 5:21-26.

58. Mt. 22:37-40; Mk. 12:29-31; Lk. 10:27-28; Jn. 13:34; 15:9; 1 Jn. 4:7-8, 12-13, 16; 5:2.

59. 1 Jn. 4:20.

60. Jn. 17:20; Acts 32:42-47; 4:32-34; Rm. 14:7-9; 15:1-3, 5-7; 1 Cor. 10: 24, 29, 33; 11:1; 12:25-26; 13:1-13; 2 Cor. 5:14-15; Gal. 5:13; 6:1; Eph. 4:2, 13; 5:21; Phil. 2:2-4; 1 Thes. 5:11; Heb. 13:1-3; Jm. 5:13-16; 1 Pet. 4:8-11.

61. Mt. 10:40; 25:31-46; Lk. 10:16; Jn. 13:20; 1 Cor. 8:12-13;

62. Mt. 18:17.

63. Mt. 18:18.

64. Gen. 2:18.

65. Jn. 8:36.

The Destiny of Man

and His righteousness,"⁶⁶ He does not mean that we ought to seek only the supreme One; in the kingdom of God there are many men.

The attainment of salvation through love that is the image of Christ's love is realized only through self-denial.⁶⁷ "He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."⁶⁸ Christ presents a form of love to which the world is unaccustomed. He not only commands, "Take no thought for your life...for after all these things the gentiles seek,"⁶⁹ but in a clear manner He also says, "This is My commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you. Greater love than this hath no man, that a man lay down his life for his friends."⁷⁰ Regarding Moses' resistance to God's threat to destroy the people, Clement of Rome writes, "Moses said, 'Lord, pardon the sin of this people, else blot me also out of the book of the living.' O marvelous love! O insuperable perfection! The servant speaks freely to his Lord and asks for either forgiveness for the people or that he himself might perish along with them."⁷¹ A complete and unselfish love like this is shown by Paul when he writes, "For I could wish that I myself were accursed from Christ for the sake of my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh."⁷² Perfect love is not only above all worldly cares; it is even above our care for our own salvation when it concerns the salvation of others.

The distinctive feature of love, then, in the image of Christ's love is freedom from every necessity. Because of this, love "seeketh not its own."⁷³ "Let no man seek his own but every man another's interests."⁷⁴ "Give no offense...even as I please all men in all things, not seeking after my own interest but those of the many that they may be saved. Be imitators of me even as I also am of Christ."⁷⁵ "Look not each man for his own interests but also for the interests of others."⁷⁶ "For none of us liveth to

66. Mt. 6:33; Lk. 12:31.

67. Mt. 10:37-39; 16:24-25; Mk. 8:34-35; Lk. 9:23-24; 14:26-27, 33; 17:33; Rm. 12:2; 1 Cor. 5:10; Col. 2:20; 3:1-2; 1 Tim. 6:7-12; Heb. 13:14; Jm. 4:3-4.

68. Jn. 12:25.

69. Mt. 6:25-32.

70. Jn. 15:12-13.

71. *First Epistle to Corinthians*, 53.

72. Rm. 9:3.

73. 1 Cor. 13:5.

74. 1 Cor. 10:24.

75. 1 Cor. 10:32; 11:1.

76. Phil. 2:4.

The Destiny of Man

himself, and no man dieth to himself...For whether we live, therefore, or whether we die, we are the Lord's."⁷⁷ Christ "died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves but unto Him Who died for them and rose again."⁷⁸ "For I live not, but Christ liveth in me."⁷⁹ "Let every one of us please his neighbor for his edification to the good. For Christ pleased not Himself."⁸⁰ As Christ did, so also "we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."⁸¹

So intense was the effort of the first Christians to live unselfishly and collectively in the love of Christ that the community was truly a cenobium: "And all who believed were together and had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and distributed them among all, according to each man's need."⁸² "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul. Not one of them called any of the things his own, but they had all things common."⁸³ During the second century, although the expectation of the Lord's imminent return had waned,⁸⁴ Justin says, "We who valued above all things the acquisition of wealth and possessions now bring what we have into a common stock and dispense it to every one in need. We who hated and killed one another because of differences in customs and would not live with men of a different tribe, now, since the coming of Christ, share a common way of life with them."⁸⁵

Love that is free of self-interest and necessity fears nothing. "It is proper to virtue to be free of all fear. For virtue is without a master, and it is voluntary and free of all fear and necessity."⁸⁶ All human unrest is rooted in inherited psychological and bodily infirmities, that is, in the soul's separation from grace and in the body's corruptibility, from which springs all selfishness. Any perceived threat automatically triggers fear and uneasiness. Fear does not allow a man to be perfected in love. "There is no fear in

77. *Rm.* 14:7-8.

78. *2 Cor.* 5:15.

79. *Gal.* 2:20.

80. *Rm.* 15:2-3.

81. *1 Jn.* 3:16.

82. *Acts* 2:44-45.

83. *Acts* 4:32.

84. Justin, *1st Apology*, 28, 2; 45, 1; *2nd Apology*, 7.

85. *1st Apology*, 14, 2-3.

86. John Chrysostom, quoted by Maximus the Confessor, *Theological Chapters*, P.G. 91, 721.

The Destiny of Man

love, but perfect love casteth out fear because fear hath torment. He that feareth has not been made perfect in love."⁸⁷ Being under the sway of death and not having real and correct faith in God, man is anxious over everything and is ruled by selfish bodily and psychological motives and, thus, he is unable to love unselfishly and freely. He loves and has faith according to what he perceives to be to his own advantage. He is quite capable of creating God in his own image.⁸⁸ Thus, he is deprived of his original destiny and is off the mark spiritually. In biblical language, these failures and deviations are called sins.⁸⁹ The fountain of man's personal sins is the power of death that is in the hands of the devil and in man's own willing submission to him.⁹⁰ "Therefore, let not sin reign in your mortal body that ye should obey it in its lusts."⁹¹ "For the sting of death is sin."⁹² "Sin hath reigned unto death."⁹³ For this precise reason, God became man "that, through death, He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage."⁹⁴ "He submitted and became incarnate in order that, by this dispensation, the serpent that did evil in the beginning and the angels that became like him may be destroyed, and death may be condemned."⁹⁵ "And immediately they touched Him and believed, being convinced by both His flesh and spirit. Because of this they both scorned death and were shown to be its conquerors."⁹⁶

In the quest for freedom in Christ, the battle against fear occupies a central place in the thought of the Holy Scriptures and the first Christians. To the frightened Apostles, Christ said, "Why are ye so fearful? How is it that ye have no faith?"⁹⁷ "Be

87. 1 Jn. 4:18. Cf. Rev. 21:8.

88. Rm. 1:23.

89. For the ancients, the word sin (*ἁμαρτία*) means, among other things, missing the target, being off the mark, an aberration from truth. Cf. E. Robinson, *Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Boston, 1836, p. 37; Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, New York 1879, p. 72; J. H. Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, New York 1889, pp 30-31.

90. John Chrysostom, *Commentary on Hebrews*, Homily 4, P.G. 63, 41-42.

91. Rm. 6:12. Cf. 2 Pet. 2:19.

92. 1 Cor. 15:56.

93. Rm. 5:21.

94. Heb. 2: 14-15.

95. Justin, *Dialogue*, 45.

96. Ignatius, *Smyrnaeans*, 3.

97. Mk. 4:40; Mt. 8:26; Lk. 8:25.

The Destiny of Man

not afraid of them that kill the body but beyond that can do nothing more."⁹⁸ Regarding the persecuted, He said, "He that endureth to the end shall be saved."⁹⁹ "Whosoever, therefore, shall confess Me before men, him will I confess before My Father Who is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny Me before men, him will I also deny before My Father."¹⁰⁰ "If we endure, we shall also reign with Him; if we deny Him, He also will deny us."¹⁰¹ The communicants of the Holy Spirit do not fear: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again, and therefore ye ought not to fear, but ye have received the Spirit of adoption."¹⁰² "For God hath not given us a spirit of fear but of power and of love and of a sound mind."¹⁰³ "If God be for us, who can be against us...who shall remove us from the love of Christ?"¹⁰⁴

It is clear that any denial of Christ out of fear was regarded by the ancient Church as a real lack of unselfish faith and as a fall into the hands of him who has the power of fear and death. When St. Ignatius was taken into custody and condemned to death, he did not permit the Christians of Rome to take any action to save him: "The ruler of this age wishes to seize me and destroy my faith; therefore, let none of you here give assistance to him."¹⁰⁵ With regard to mourning for those Christians who through tortures denied Christ, St. Peter of Alexandria writes, "To co-suffer and share the pain of those who mourn and grieve for ones who, in the struggle, were vanquished by the great violence of the evil-doing devil...harms no one"¹⁰⁶

Even though "perfect love casteth out fear"¹⁰⁷ and it is delivered from all necessity, in his present condition, man is not able to attain to the likeness of God easily. Even when he begins his repentance and return to the Lord, he does not think about his salvation in a completely unselfish way because the motivation behind his efforts is often merely the avoidance of

98. Lk. 12:4; Mt. 10:28.

99. Mt. 10:22; 24:13; Mk. 13:13.

100. Mt. 10:32-33; Mk. 8:38; Lk. 9:26; 12:8-9.

101. 2 Tim. 2:12.

102. Rm. 8:14-15.

103. 2 Tim. 1:7.

104. Rm. 8:31-35.

105. Ignatius, *Romans*, 7. Cf. J. S. Romanides, *Original Sin*, p. 24, and *The Ecclesiology of St. Ignatius*, p. 7.

106. H. Alivizatos, *Oi 'Iepoi Kavóves*, Athens 1949, p. 341.

107. 1 Jn. 4:18.

The Destiny of Man

eternal damnation.¹⁰⁸ The Lord did not hesitate to speak to man's instinct of survival or self-preservation when He said, "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it. For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"¹⁰⁹ In the beginning of his steps toward perfection man ought to fear certain things. "Fear him who after he hath killed hath power to cast into gehenna. Yea, I say unto you, fear him."¹¹⁰ In other words, "Fear God."¹¹¹ This does not mean that man's destiny includes self-seeking or self-preserving fear but simply that man under the power of death has the inclination toward sin because of the illness of his nature. Thus, man proceeds from sin to perfection rather than from perfection to perfection. He will proceed from love that knows fear to the perfect love which casts out fear. Therefore, when Christ speaks to man's instinct of self-preservation, it is not in order to urge it to seek complete satisfaction of its desires but, rather, that He may receive man first and then transform him through spiritual struggle. Man cannot suddenly become a perfected, saved Christian through an emotional decision about faith and conformity to some general idea of love, as many Protestants believe. The true moral perfection of man in Christ requires struggle and trial.¹¹² "Therefore, let us not sleep as do others, but let us watch and be sober."¹¹³ "Be sober, be vigilant because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour."¹¹⁴

Perfection in Christ through unselfish love that gives no

108. "Virtue is difficult, but let us gird it with a vision of the greatness of the promise of future things. For the virtuous behold the beauty of virtue itself even without these things and, for this cause, seek after it. Therefore, they do not labor for a reward in God's eyes or pursue wisdom in order to avoid damnation but because God has commanded it. If anyone is not strong enough, however, let him keep the rewards before his mind." Chrysostom, *Commentary on John*, Homily 67, Ch. 4, P.G. 59, 418. St. Isaac the Syrian writes, "If it is possible for you, neither work [only] because of future recompense." *The Known Ascetical Works*, Leipzig 1770, p. 145.

109. Mt. 16:26; Mk. 8:36-37; Lk. 9:25.

110. Lk. 12:5; Mt. 10:28.

111. 1 Pet. 2:17.

112. "When you hear someone speaking about love, do not think that it is easily accomplished." Symeon the New Theologian, *Homily 20*, 1, transl. by D. Zagoraios, Syros 1886, p. 113.

113. 1 Thes. 5:6.

114. 1 Pet. 5:8.

The Destiny of Man

thought to itself is so far above the instinct of self-preservation that Christians must love even their enemies.¹¹⁵ Such a love, of course, is very difficult for a beginner in the faith: "For narrow is the gate and restrictive is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be who find it."¹¹⁶ "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet fail in one point, he is guilty of all."¹¹⁷ But when a man is exercised properly through struggles and self-denial in body and soul, the battle for perfection and against Satan can become easier since the personality has made a more definite turn toward unselfishness. "His commandments," then, "are not grievous. For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world."¹¹⁸ "Not everyone that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven."¹¹⁹

In essence, for the Greek Fathers the will of God, like the purpose of the Church's existence, is the salvation of men through perfection in love for God and one another. "He that loveth not his brother abideth in death."¹²⁰ "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels and have not love, I have become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal."¹²¹ For the Apostle Paul, neither faith nor works of themselves are able to save but are effectual only through love. "And though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and though I have all faith...and have not love, I am nothing. And though I give all of my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it profiteth me nothing."¹²² "Faith without works is dead"¹²³ precisely because it lacks love. "Without love, neither the works

115. *Mt.* 5:44-45; *Lk.* 6: 27-36; *Rm.* 12:14, 20. In this regard, noteworthy is the distinction that St. Symeon the New Theologian makes between love in the Old and New Testaments: "All of the law that God gave to men is love, which has two steps, first and second, according to which the law is twofold--old and new. He who ascends the first step leaves the earth below. And he who ascends to the second step has reached the heaven. For the old law says, 'Love thy neighbor as thyself.' But the new law says, 'Love your enemy.' And it says further, 'Sacrifice your life for your friend.'" *Homily* 20, 3, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

116. *Mt.* 7:14; *Lk.* 13:24.

117. *Jm.* 2:10.

118. *1 Jn.* 5:3-4.

119. *Mt.* 7:21; *Lk.* 6:46.

120. *1 Jn.* 3:14.

121. *1 Cor.* 13:1.

122. *1 Cor.* 13:2-3.

123. *Jm.* 2:26.

The Destiny of Man

of virtue are praiseworthy and profitable to those who do them nor indeed is love without works."¹²⁴ Consequently, " 'since ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to Me.' And these shall depart into eternal punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."¹²⁵

The peculiar problems of Western theology regarding salvation through either faith alone or meritorious works were unknown to the Greek Fathers because they had a clear understanding of the New Testament's teaching about the unselfish and absolutely free love of God. As a result, they did not entangle God and man in the nets of philosophy's eudaemonistic psychology. The West's two formulations about salvation are products of an eudaemonistic, self-seeking mentality that ignores the New Testament's teaching about unselfish love, the love that gives no thought to itself. Man can offer neither *solam fidem* nor meritorious works to the throne of God in order to buy salvation. "Thus, even service that is rendered to God brings no benefit to Him, and neither has God any need of human obedience."¹²⁶ Being free of all self-interests and necessity, "God has need of no one."¹²⁷ God does not save man in order to gain in some way. He saves because He loves man. And He loves him because He freely wills to love him. This is the love of God that "seeketh not its own." It follows that the relations between God and man are not of the nature of a transaction but, on the contrary, are absolutely personal and paced by love according to the capacity of each man. "Likewise, the prophets show in the clearest manner that God nowise has need of their servile obedience, but it was for their benefit that God gave them commandments in the Law."¹²⁸ God does not give commandments and instructions in order to fill some need of His own but because man has need of them. The salvation of man is dependent upon how much, under the guidance of God, he is capable of exercising himself in the cultivation of a genuine, unselfish, and unconstrained love for God and his fellow man. Therefore, both works and faith have no value as ransom before God.¹²⁹ They are, however, the indispensable means by which man is exercised in love. Since

124. Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to Xeni*, P.G. 150, 1164.

125. *Mt.* 25:45-46.

126. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 4, XIV, 1

127. *Ibid.*, 4, XVII, 2.

128. *Ibid.*, 4, XVII, 1.

129. "Wishing to show that although every commandment is obligatory, the Lord

The Destiny of Man

perfect love is unselfish, there is no question of ransom as a means of salvation. Man cannot save himself by offering faith and works to God as if God accepts bribery. Neither faith nor works save. Only God saves, but not arbitrarily without the will of man or by necessity because of man's works, but only when these are accompanied by love.¹³⁰ The love according to Christ is not a self-seeking relationship between one who desires and one who is desired. On the contrary, it is a living union between those who love one another unselfishly and in complete freedom. Therefore, God saves through the free and active love of the body of Christ.¹³¹ Spiritual labor through prayer, fasting, and good works is not undertaken for the needs of God but for the moral grounding, perfection, and *theosis* of the faithful. It is not God Who needs to change His attitude and actions but man.

C. Perfection and the Fall

The idea of moral perfection does not appear clearly in *Genesis'* narration of the creation and fall. It can be said that the fall in Chapter Two is somewhat juridical in form. Among the

says, nevertheless, it is by His blood that sonship is granted to men: 'When ye shall have done all those things that are commanded you, say, We are useless servants; we have done that which was our duty to do.' (Lk. 17:10) Thus, the kingdom of heaven is not a reward for deeds but a gift of the Master prepared for faithful servants. The servant does not demand freedom as a reward, but as a debtor gives satisfaction and awaits freedom as a gift...Some, while not doing the commandments, think they believe rightly. Others, while doing them, expect the kingdom as a reward that is due them. Both have misapprehended the truth... When you hear the words of the Scriptures say that the Lord will 'recompense everyone according to his works' (Ps. 41:12), do not think it refers to works that are either worthy of Gehenna or worthy of the Kingdom but that Christ, not as a trader of goods but as God our Creator and Redeemer, will recompense every man according to the works of his faith or lack of faith in Him. Those of us who have been granted the laver of rebirth do good works not for the sake of reward but to preserve the purity that was given to us." St. Mark the Ascetic, *To those who think they are justified by works*, 2, 3, 18, 22, 23, *Φιλοκαλία*, Athens 1957, p. 109f.

130. Cf. H. Alivizatos, 'Η 'Ελληνική 'Ορθόδοξος 'Εκκλησία, p. 79, 121.

131. The West's failure to resolve the problem of salvation by faith alone or by good works is due to a lack of understanding of the above. Representative of the West's thought is the comment by M. Werner regarding an alleged contradiction in the thought of the ancient Church: "If one takes into consideration the available facts of the situation as a whole, it becomes unambiguously manifest that long before Pelagius and Augustine, occasion for an outbreak of a Pelagian dispute had been present." *Op. cit.*, p. 419. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 413-420.

The Destiny of Man

positive commandments God gave to the first-made man and woman, there was one prohibition, and a violation of that prohibition would cause suffering and death. This view of the ancestral sin, of course, is far from the well known, later philosophical elaboration by Augustine, and it was preserved without significant alteration by later Judaism.¹³² The Hebrews regarded as sin any voluntary or involuntary transgression of the divine will.¹³³ Within Jewish tradition there also existed the teaching that the righteous are unjustly kept under the sway of death because the present time is under the rule of injustice. The just God will abolish injustice and punish the unrighteous.¹³⁴ Absent from the Jewish concept of the fall is the cosmology that is characteristic of Augustine's philosophy. For the Jews, the omnipotence and justice of God are an eschatological reality that does not destroy the present freedom even of the unrighteous. God is long suffering precisely because He is omnipotent.¹³⁵ Judaism, therefore, was not ruled by an Augustinian kind of legalism nor was it lacking the idea that man's destiny is found beyond self-interests.¹³⁶

The purely legalistic concept of the fall was definitively introduced into Western theology in a philosophical form by Augustine. His erroneous views of God and their eudaemonistic presuppositions made it impossible for him to properly bring the New Testament's teaching about moral perfection into harmony with the doctrine of the fall. Since self-seeking *eudaemonia* is thought to be the destiny of man through the acquisition of the highest good, the first man, having possession of the Good, appears perfect in every way and knows "all learning and knowledge," having "all virtue and goodness."¹³⁷

132. G. F. Moore, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 474f.

133. *Ibid.*, p. 460.

134. *Ibid.*, pp. 374-380, 474-475; C. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, pp. 9-13.

135. G. F. Moore, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 379-380.

136. *Job* 1:9-10. Indeed, Irenaeus argues that the commandments regarding perfection are the same in both the Old and New Testaments. *Op. cit.*, 4, XII, 3. Cf. A. Houssiau, *La Christologie de saint Irénée*, Louvain 1955, p. 114. G. F. Moore observes, "A Jew did not embrace Judaism or adhere to it in order to escape the perils of the soul beyond the tomb, much less the retributive justice of God. Religion, in the higher conception of Judaism, was not a means to that or any other end; it was the divinely appointed end itself. Wholehearted and whole-souled love for God was its essence. Its duties to God and man were truly accomplished only when done for God's sake, or for their own sake but not from any self-regarding motives." *Op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 320-321.

137. C. Androustos, *Δογματική*, p. 139.

The Destiny of Man

Therefore, for him the matter of acquiring spiritual perfection in order to achieve true freedom in the image of God through unselfish love does not exist. Consequently, Augustine had to approach the whole theme of the ancestral sin in the juridical framework of a negative divine prohibition, its transgression, and the punishment by God. For him, the key to the whole matter is subjugation to the eternal will of God and the eternal law which are in the divine essence. God is the source of the penal code, and man is obliged to observe it or he will incur divine wrath.¹³⁸

The Fathers and writers of the period under examination treat the subject of the fall in the customary forms of biblical tradition,¹³⁹ but they add certain essential Christian elements taken from Christ's teaching on the destiny of man. They do not interpret the work of Christ according to certain philosophical predilections of the West with regard to Adam and man. Rather, Adam is understood through Christ. The first Adam is not the key to the New Testament. The Second Adam, however, is the key to the Old Testament. The veil of the Old Testament "is abolished in Christ" only.¹⁴⁰ Thus, the prohibition given to Adam and Eve by God is transformed by the first Christians from one that is negative into one that is positive.

138. Because of his concept of the destiny and original righteousness of the first man and woman, Augustine reasons that it ought to have been easy for them to keep the commandment. And this is why the punishment that God sent was so great. According to him, the fall of Adam took place not when the serpent deceived them but secretly in man's will when he turned his attention away from the highest good. The cause of his turning away was pride. *De Civitate Dei*, XIV, 10, 12-15. Augustine does not adequately explain how a mind that was created utterly perfect could fall from the *eudaemonia* of the vision of the highest good. If man had fallen out of pride, however, then his mind could not have been made in such a way that it would truly be fulfilled by the vision of the divine essence. And in such a case, God would be the cause of the fall. Thomas Aquinas writes, "No one who sees the essence of God can willingly turn away from God, which means to sin. Hence all who see God through His essence are so firmly established in the love of God that for eternity they are not able to sin." *Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 94, Art. 1. He tried to correct Augustine by saying that Adam's vision of God was only relative. *Ibid.*

139. St. Anastasius of Sinai, who did not accept the literal interpretation and historicity of the narration of the fall in *Genesis* (J. Turmel, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 290-291), informs us that Irenaeus also understood the biblical testimony not "historically" but "spiritually." K. R. Hagenbach, *op. cit.*, p. 118, n3. But this is in conflict with Irenaeus' writings on the fall, at least to those that are extant. *Ibid.*; F. Vernet, *Irénée*, in "Dict. de Théol. Cath.," Vol. 7, col. 2457. Cf. *Ἀπόσπασμα* 13, ΒΕΠΠΕΣ, Vol. 5, p. 175f.

140. 2 Cor. 3:14.

The Destiny of Man

In this sense, St. Theophilus of Antioch skillfully correlates the teachings about the fall in *Genesis* and the moral perfection in the New Testament, and he says that God placed man in Paradise for him to be perfected and, through perfection, to attain to *theosis*.¹⁴¹ "God transferred him from the earth, out of which he had been made, into Paradise, giving him the means for advancement in order that, maturing and becoming perfect, and even being declared a god, he might thus ascend into heaven in possession of immortality. For man had been made a middle nature, neither wholly mortal nor altogether immortal but capable of either...And the order to 'till [work] it' refers to no other labor than the keeping of God's commandment."¹⁴² For Theophilus, the commandment is one of the means of the perfection and *theosis* of man. The tree of knowledge was not a negative thing that supposedly existed in order to put man to death should he eat from it and violate the penal code of God. "And the tree of knowledge itself was good, and its fruit was good. For it was not the tree, as some think, but the disobedience which had death in it. For there was nothing else in the fruit but knowledge; knowledge, however, is good when one uses it discreetly."¹⁴³ God did not forbid them to eat from the tree because it was bad in itself and fatal for man but because man was as yet unperfected and incapable of properly assimilating the knowledge gained from the tree. According to Theophilus, man was still a child who needed sufficient spiritual labor and testing in order to attain to a state in which he would be able to eat safely from the tree of knowledge: "For not as one who begrudged him, as some think, did God command him not to eat of knowledge. But He wished also to test him to see if he was obedient to His commandment."¹⁴⁴ Disobeying God's commandment regarding the way to perfection and following the way suggested by the devil, man indeed missed the mark regarding his original destiny, and instead of becoming immortal, he became mortal. Thus, "he became the cause of death to himself."¹⁴⁵ "But when a law has commanded abstinence from something and someone has not obeyed, it is obviously not the law which

141. "According to the Old Testament, man was not made perfect, but capable of becoming such." B. M. Vellas, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

142. *To Autolytus*, 2, 24.

143. *Ibid.*, 2, 25. John of Damascus teaches the same thing about the tree of knowledge. Cf. Harnack's *Lehrbuch*, Vol. 2, p. 27.

144. *Ibid.*, 2, 24.

145. *Ibid.*, 2, 27.

The Destiny of Man

causes punishment but the disobedience and transgression."¹⁴⁶ It is clear that Theophilus was not thinking about the fall as if it pertained to relations of the citizenry with the police authorities. For him, the fall consists of Satan's assault against the deceived first-made man and woman, Satan's resulting domination over men, the failure on their part to become perfect, and ultimately death and corruption.

St. Irenaeus deals with the doctrine of the fall in the same manner as St. Theophilus but in more detail. According to the bishop of Lyons, the first man and woman were not made morally perfect from the beginning because it would have meant they lacked free will, and all actions of men would in reality have no moral significance. "Thus, their goodness would have no meaning because it would be of their essence and not of their will. They would be possessors of the good automatically instead of by choice."¹⁴⁷ But neither were they made incomplete in nature for then God would be the cause of the fall. "But if some had been made naturally evil and others naturally good, the latter would not have deserved praise for their goodness since they would have been made that way...But since all men are of the same nature, they are able both to hold fast and do what is good and, again, to cast it aside and not do it."¹⁴⁸ Nevertheless, the destiny of man was for him not to remain in the state in which God made him since he was made to become perfect and, thus, to be divinized. He was made needing to acquire perfection, not because he was made flawed in nature and morally deficient but because moral perfection is achieved only in total freedom.¹⁴⁹ "In the beginning God could have granted perfection to man, but since he was only newly created, he could not possibly have received it. If he had received it, however, could he have retained it? For it was not a problem due to some impossibility for God or deficiency in Him but, rather, because the newly made man was not an uncreated being...For the Uncreated is perfect, and He is God. Now it was proper, first of all, that man should be created, and having been created, should grow; and having grown, should mature; and having matured, should increase; and having increased, should gain dominion; and having gained dominion, should be glorified; and having

146. *Ibid.* 2, 25.

147. *Refutation*, 4, XXXVII, 6.

148. *Ibid.*, 4, XXXVII, 2.

149. *Ibid.*, 4, XXXVII, 1-7.

The Destiny of Man

been glorified, should see his Master."¹⁵⁰ As God is perfect in every way and free of all necessity, for this same destiny, man was made in the image and likeness of God that he may acquire perfection but without being coerced by anyone. "From the beginning, God made man free, and just as man possesses his own soul, he possesses the power to obey the commandments of God willingly without being coerced by Him. For in God there is no coercion but only good will from Him eternally."¹⁵¹ God does not guide men by coercion but by counsels, exhortations, and commandments. "All of the [above] demonstrate the sovereignty of man and, at the same time, the counsel of God, exhorting but not coercing man to turn away from disobedience and to be obedient to Him."¹⁵²

In all of the preceding patristic views of perfection and the fall, the dilemma that Augustine created does not arise.¹⁵³ For the writers of the period the fall is not a falling away from an already acquired self-centered *eudaemonia* but from the way of perfection. In other words, man did not fall from a fully satisfied desire into an unfulfilled desire. Rather, he departed from the way of his destiny and fell under the power of death. Man's falling away from his destiny does not mean that he failed to be fulfilled but that he failed to be perfected in unselfish love, the love according to God, the love that "seeketh not its own."

D. Immortality

In the writers of the period under examination, the moral perfection of man is inseparably bound to the immortality of man. Only those who keep the commandment of *ascesis* that leads to perfection in love for one another will be capable of participating in the uncreated immortality of God and thereby live. All others are destined for eternal fire. "The world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he who doeth the will of God abideth forever."¹⁵⁴ "If a man keep My saying, he shall never see

150. *Ibid.*, 4, XXXVIII, 2-3. To "see" does not refer to the divine essence. *Ibid.*, 3, XXIV, 2. No where does Irenaeus write that the Logos reveals the divine essence to angels or to men, as R. Seeberg erroneously holds. *Op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 322.

151. *Ibid.*, 4, XXXVII, 1.

152. *Ibid.*, 4, XXXVII, 3.

153. Cf. n138 above; C. Androustos, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

154. 1 Jn. 2:17.

The Destiny of Man

death."¹⁵⁵ "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."¹⁵⁶ "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death."¹⁵⁷

According to the Apostle Paul, God is "the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, Who alone hath immortality."¹⁵⁸ Theophilus writes that God is "changeless because He is immortal."¹⁵⁹ The basic presupposition in patristic teaching on the Holy Trinity, on Christology, and on grace is the fact that God alone is self-existence and, therefore, is immortal. The souls of men and angels are immortal not by nature but by grace. According to St. John of Damascus, the angels "are not immortal by nature but by grace because everything that has a beginning has by nature an end also."¹⁶⁰ Similarly, Justin writes, "Those things that exist after God or will ever come to exist, have a corruptible nature and may disappear and cease to exist. For God alone is uncreated and incorruptible, and therefore He is God. But all other things other than God are created and corruptible."¹⁶¹ Against those who believe that the soul is ingenerate and by nature immortal, Tatian emphasizes, "O Greeks, the soul is not immortal in itself."¹⁶² St. Irenaeus argues that the teaching about the soul being immortal by nature is from the devil.¹⁶³

Some of Christianity's first theologians insisted that the soul is by nature mortal and others that the soul is immortal. At first glance, it would seem that they contradict each other. Careful study, however, shows this to be only the appearance of contradiction. Against the philosophers and Gnostics who taught that the soul is ingenerate and by nature immortal, Justin, Tatian, and Irenaeus insisted that the soul is by nature mortal. But it seems that Athenagoras had other opponents before him, and he repeatedly emphasized, together with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, the immortality of the soul.¹⁶⁴ Irenaeus,

155. *Jn.* 8:51.

156. *Jn.* 3:36.

157. 1 *Jn.* 3:14.

158. 1 *Tim.* 6:15-16

159. *Op. cit.*, 1, 4.

160. J. N. Karmiris, *Δογματική Διδασκαλία του Ἁγίου Ἰωάννου του Δαμασκηνού*, pp. 32-33.

161. *Dialogue*, 5, 4.

162. *Op. cit.*, 13.

163. *Refutation*, 3, XX, 1.

164. *Embassy*, 27; *On the Resurrection*, 15, 16, 22, 23, 24.

The Destiny of Man

however, presents both aspects of the same truth: the soul is mortal by nature¹⁶⁵ but immortal by grace.¹⁶⁶

It is apparent that these writers emphasize either the soul's mortality or its immortality according to the particular delusions of their non-Christian audiences in order to refute them. Thus, to Justin who had been a follower of Plato and had believed the soul to be uncreated, beginningless, and by nature immortal, the elderly Trypho says the following: "It does not matter to me whether Plato or Pythagoras or, in short, any other man held such views. For the truth is so, and you would perceive it hence. The soul assuredly either is life or has life. If it is life, then it would cause something else and not itself to live, even as motion would move something other than itself. Of course, no one would deny that the soul indeed lives. But if it lives, it lives not as being life but as partaking of life. But that which partakes of anything is different from that of which it partakes. Now the soul partakes of life since God wills it to live. Thus, it would not even partake if God would not will it to live, for to live is not its attribute [in the same way] as it is God's. But as a man does not live forever, neither is the soul always conjoined with the body since, when the harmony must be dissolved, the soul departs from the body, and man is no more.¹⁶⁷ And when the soul must cease to exist, the spirit of life is removed from it, and the soul is no more, and it returns to the place from which it was taken."¹⁶⁸

Such expressions might initially be taken to mean annihilation of the soul, but that is not what we have here.¹⁶⁹ These writers merely use this method to refute the Hellenistic view that everything is what it is by nature regardless of the will of God. In this view, whatever has a beginning must come to an end, and only that which is by its nature beginningless and ingenerate can be immortal and unending. For Greek philosophy, the soul can be immortal not because it is the will of God Who created it but only if there is some proof that it is uncreated, beginningless, and by nature immortal. The writers of this period meet the challenge of such philosophical concepts by using the biblical teaching

165. *Op. cit.*, 3, XX, 1.

166. *Ibid.*, 5, XIII, 3.

167. In other words, a soul without a body is not a man but part of a man. Cf. also Justin, *On the Resurrection*, VIII. Cf. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 5, VI, 1; Tatian, *op. cit.*, 15; Athenagoras, *On the Resurrection*, 15, 23, 25.

168. *Dialogue*, 6.

169. Cf. P. Christou, 'Η Περὶ Ἀνθρώπου Διδασκαλία τοῦ Θεοφίλου, Thessalonica 1957, p. 11.

The Destiny of Man

that all things are not contingent upon their nature but upon the will of God. Thus, the soul is not immortal in itself; it is immortal because it is what God wills and has ordained. "For God is not subject to creatures; rather, the creatures are subject to God, and He attends to all by His will."¹⁷⁰ The fact that the first theologians rejected the natural immortality of the soul certainly does not mean that they rejected the continued existence of the soul after death. "But I do not say that all souls die, for it would truly be good fortune for the evil doers...Thus, those who appear worthy of God will not die again. And the others are punished as long as God wants them to exist and be punished."¹⁷¹ With this, Justin the Platonist learned from the elder that the soul lives after death, and it does not live because it is naturally immortal but because it is what God wants. And when, as a catechumen, Justin read the Holy Scriptures, he also learned that God wants not only the righteous to exist immortally but also the unrighteous in hell to exist immortally. So when Tatian speaks of the death of the soul, he does not at the same time mean the annihilation of the soul. On the contrary, he clearly writes that if the soul does not know the truth, "at the end of the world, it will arise with the body, receiving death by punishment in immortality."¹⁷² He also writes, "We, to whom it is presently natural to die, hereafter shall receive either joy with immortality or suffering with immortality."¹⁷³

What these theologians persistently stress is that the immortality of both the saved and the damned depends on the will and energy of God and not on the nature of the soul itself. The existence of eternal Paradise and eternal hell does not depend on impersonal fate or on the uncreated and naturally immortal soul but entirely on the moral life of the person and the will of God. "Life does not originate from ourselves or from our own nature; it is given to us by the grace of God."¹⁷⁴ Immortality and the soul are not the same thing. "The soul in itself is not life, but it partakes of that life which God grants to it...so that the soul and the life that it has ought to be perceived as existences that differ from each other."¹⁷⁵

170. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 5, V, 2.

171. Justin, *Dialogue*, 5, 3.

172. *Op. cit.*, 13.

173. *Ibid.*, 14.

174. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 2, XXXIV, 3.

175. *Ibid.*, 2, XXXIV, 4. Cf. D. Thomasius, *op. cit.*, p. 459f.

The Destiny of Man

According to the writers of this period and the Fathers in general, those who are bereft of the grace of the uncreated light, whether they are living or dead, are dead in their souls because separation from God is death even though the soul lives immortally. "And to as many as continue in their love towards God, to these He grants communion. But communion with God is life and light and the enjoyment of all the benefits that are from Him. But on those who depart from God of their own choice, He inflicts that separation from Himself. But separation from God is death, and separation from light is darkness. And separation from God consists in the loss of all the benefits that are from Him."¹⁷⁶ "These, then, as many as they may be, who do not have that which saves and leads us to life, shall be called 'flesh and blood' for it is they who do not have the Spirit of God in themselves. For this reason, such men are spoken of by the Lord as dead when He says, 'Let the dead bury their dead' because they do not have the Spirit that quickens man."¹⁷⁷ Although they are alive, such people do not have the Holy Spirit and, in fact, they are dead in their souls. Just as the death of the body is its separation from the soul, likewise the death of the soul is its separation from the life-giving energy of the Holy Spirit. Only those who have the Spirit of God are partakers of the true immortality and life of God. "Where the Spirit of the Father is, there a living man exists."¹⁷⁸ This is why, when we speak of man's condition under the power of death, we mean not only the tyranny of the corruptibility of the body but also the separation of the soul from the life-giving energy of the Spirit.

176. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 5, XXVII, 2.

177. *Ibid.*, 5, IX, 1. Cf. John Chrysostom, *Commentary on Romans*, Homily 11, Ch. 5, P.G. 60, 489; *Commentary on Ephesians*, Homily 4, Ch. 1, P.G. 62, 31; Gregory Palamas, *Epistle to Xeni*, P.G. 150, 1049; *Natural Chapters*, 45, P.G. 150, 1152-1153.

178. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 5, IX, 3.

CHAPTER V

SPIRITUAL MAN IN THE IMAGE OF GOD

Up to this point in our study, there has been an absence of the usual philosophical distinction between the quest for carnal pleasure and the quest for a mental, self-contented *eudaemonia*. Throughout the period in our study, we found instead the distinction made between those who live according to Satan and death and those who struggle in Christ to attain to unselfish love that is free of self-interest and necessity. Instead of metaphysical dualism in which the soul is naturally immortal, we find in the writers of the first two centuries the teaching that not only the soul but the body also puts on incorruptibility by the will of God and the spiritual labor of man. Man living under the power of death is unnatural because corruptibility is not from God. Corruptibility is a kind of parasite that came into the world through sin and the devil. Christ is the only truly "natural man," if by "natural" we mean living according to the original destiny of man. This is why Paul wrote that, by God, the saved are "destined to conform to the image of His Son,"¹ "Who is the image of the invisible God."²

Because Western theologians simply do not imagine that the destiny of man is anything different from man's supposedly natural tendency toward self-centered *eudaemonia*, they generally do not see the distinction between people who live according to death and people who live according to Christ. This is why they usually give a dualistic interpretation³ to Paul's references to the fleshy man and the spiritual man, as if Paul is speaking, on the

1. *Rm.* 8:29.

2. *Col.* 1:15; 2 *Cor.* 4:4.

3. Cf. J. Kalogerou, "Ὁ Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος περί ἀνθρώπου, in "Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς" 1951, Vol. 400-401, p. 241f.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

one hand, about the carnal man who lives according to the sensual pleasures and lusts of the body, and, on the other, about the spiritual man who lives according to the desires of the naturally immortal soul that seeks *eudaemonia*.

This dualistic interpretation of Pauline theology is alien to the writers of the period in this study. Paul's spiritual man, as interpreted mainly by Irenaeus, is he who has the life-giving Spirit of God as the fruit of his spiritual labor or *ascesis*. Moreover, we shall see that, according to these Fathers and writers, the spiritual man who has the Spirit is the man who is made in the image and likeness of God. We must look at Paul's spiritual man who has the Spirit and examine him in the light of the presuppositions of Christianity's early theologians. And it must be done in conjunction with the meaning of the image and likeness of God in man. Then we shall finally be in a position to draw definite conclusions about the ancestral sin within the presuppositions of the first two centuries of Orthodox theology. In this way we shall see that contrary to what the West usually says, Augustine was not the first to understand Paul in depth but the first to fundamentally misinterpret the Apostle.

A. Carnal, Animal, Spiritual

It is incorrect to interpret *Romans* (7:13f.) on the basis of dualistic presuppositions. According to these, the term "carnal" is understood to refer only to the lowest hedonistic appetites, especially sexual desires, in contrast to the eudaemonistic desires of the alleged naturally immortal, immaterial, and good soul, which is the victim of the material body. But Paul elsewhere reminds married people that "the wife hath not power over her own body, but the husband, and likewise the husband hath not power over his own body, but the wife. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be by agreement for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer, and come together again so that Satan may not tempt you through your incontinence."⁴ The passages of *Romans* (7:13f.) cannot be interpreted as a description of carnal temptations being experienced by St. Paul. The Apostle clearly says, "I wish that all men were even as myself...It is good for them to remain even as myself...But...it is better to marry

4. 1 Cor. 7:4-5.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

than to burn."⁵

For Paul, the term "carnal" (σαρκικός) does not always signify evil desires. He reminds the reader that if the Gentiles have shared in the spiritual things of the Jews, they are obliged then "to minister unto them in carnal things."⁶ He demonstrates to the Corinthians that they are a living epistle of Christ, "written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not in tablets of stone but in fleshy tablets of the heart."⁷ "We have known Jesus Christ after the flesh,"⁸ but it does not mean that Christ was like those who "walk after the flesh."⁹ Paul asks the Corinthians, "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?"¹⁰ Paul does not use the adjective "carnal" exclusively to denote what are commonly called "carnal" desires in contrast to desires of the soul.

It appears that only in *Galatians* does the Apostle impute an operative force of sin to the "flesh" in itself. In this instance, the "flesh" has a will which "lusteth against the Spirit."¹¹ "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, licentiousness, idolatry, the use of drugs, potions or spells, enmities, strife, jealousies, fits of anger, intrigues, divisions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and things like these."¹² It is noteworthy that most of these works of the "flesh" require the active operation of the mind and indeed its initiation. This is strong proof that the meaning of "flesh" for Paul is much more than a dualistic anthropology. In *Galatians* the Apostle expresses himself sharply against the foolishness of his readers.¹³ These and other passages of Paul in which the "flesh" seems to have its own overt potential sin cannot be isolated from other passages in which he is clear that sin indwells in the flesh¹⁴ but as a parasite. Not only is the "flesh" not evil;¹⁵ rather, it is also something in which God appeared.¹⁶ Although the flesh is not in itself evil, it has become

5. 1 Cor. 7:7-9.

6. Rm. 15:27.

7. 2 Cor. 3:3.

8. 2 Cor. 5:16.

9. Rm. 8:1.

10. 1 Cor. 9:11.

11. Gal. 5:17.

12. Gal. 5:19-20.

13. Gal. 3:1.

14. Rm. 7:17-18.

15. 1 Cor. 9:11; Rm. 15:27; 2 Cor. 3:3; 4:11; 5:16.

16. 1 Tim. 3:16.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

rather infirm because of sin and indwelling enmity.¹⁷

Contrary to those who interpret *Romans* 7:14-25 dualistically as a war between the evil body and the good soul, Irenaeus identifies the carnal man of Paul as man in need of salvation from death. He writes, "The Lord Himself saved them because they were not capable of saving themselves. Therefore, when Paul describes human weakness he says, 'For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing,'¹⁸ showing that the good thing which is our salvation comes not from us but from God. And again, 'O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?'¹⁹ Then he introduces the Savior: 'The grace of Jesus Christ our Lord'..."²⁰

To understand the anthropological terms of Paul, we should not look to the dualistic anthropology of the Greek philosophers who distinguished sharply between the naturally immortal soul and the naturally mortal flesh they considered the fountain of sin. Rather, we need to look to the Hebraic way of thinking²¹ in which "flesh" and "soul" each signify the complete, vital personality of a man and not merely a part of it.²² Therefore, in the Old Testament, the expression "every flesh" refers to all living things,²³ most especially to man,²⁴ precisely as it does in the epistles of St. Paul.²⁵ The expression "every soul" is also used in the same manner denoting both anything that has life²⁶ and man.²⁷ In the New Testament, both expressions, "every flesh"²⁸ and "every soul,"²⁹ are used in absolute agreement with their use in the Old Testament. Thus, "[When John the Evangelist writes,] 'the Logos became flesh,' it is equal to saying that He became a

17. *Rm.* 7:17-18; *Eph.* 2:15.

18. *Rm.* 7:18.

19. *Rm.* 7:24.

20. *Refutation*, 3, XX, 3. St. Ignatius also writes, "Those who are carnal are not able to do spiritual things; likewise, neither can those who are spiritual do carnal things...For those things which you have done in the flesh, even these are spiritual because you have done everything in Jesus Christ." *Ephesians*, VIII, 2. Cf. F. Loofs, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

21. J. A. T. Robinson says that it is generally accepted by biblical scholars that the anthropology of Paul is Hebraic. *Op. cit.*, p. 11.

22. C. Tresmontant, *op. cit.*, 95-96, 102-106

23. *Gen.* 6:17; 7:15,21; *Ps.* 135:25.

24. *Gen.* 6:12; *Is.* 40:6; *Jer.* 12:12; 32:17; *Zach.* 2:17.

25. *1 Cor.* 15:39.

26. *Gen.* 1:21,24; 2:19; 9:10; *Lev.* 11:10.

27. *Gen.* 2:7,9; 12:15.

28. *Mt.* 24:22; *Mk.* 13:10; *Lk.* 3:6; *Rm.* 3:20; *1 Cor.* 15:39; *Gal.* 2:16.

29. *Acts* 2:43; 3:23; *Rm.* 2:0; 13:1; *Rev.* 16:3.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

man."³⁰ Later theologians, such as Apollinarius, interpreted these expressions in a Hellenistic manner and fell into serious errors. Often those who used these expressions with the Hebraic or biblical meaning were criticized for allegedly accepting a kind of Monophysitism. Thus, Theodoret of Cyrus wrote against Cyril of Alexandria: "First of all, in no way does he make mention of an intellectual faculty of the flesh, neither has he professed as perfect the man who was taken up but, following the doctrines of Apollinarius, everywhere refers to flesh."³¹ Cyril replies, "So then, do you accuse also the blessed Evangelist John of the same crimes? For he said, 'The Logos became flesh.' Shall you then falsely accuse him, too, and say that he did not mention an intellectual soul and that he said the Lord's flesh was without a soul? And what do you think when you hear Christ the Savior of all saying, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, if ye eat not the flesh of the Son of man and drink not His blood, ye have not life in you?' But if you were wise and keen witted, you would not have overlooked the fact that the single word 'flesh' denotes the living being made up of the soul and the body, that is, man. Indeed he said, 'Every flesh shall behold the salvation of the Lord'."³²

The metaphysical division of man according to the manner of Greek philosophy into a naturally immortal soul and a naturally mortal body was untenable to the Jews.³³ According to the Old Testament, man was not made from two naturally different components, one immortal by nature and the other mortal by nature. Rather, the whole man was made for immortality. Death, therefore, is ascribed to the whole man. Thus, the Old Testament presents the whole man in the grave awaiting God the Savior.³⁴ "And ye shall know that I am the Lord when I have opened your graves and brought up My people out of the graves. And I shall give My spirit to you, and ye shall live."³⁵ Justin writes, "The Lord God remembered His dead people of Israel who were asleep in the ground, and He descended to

30. Athanasius the Great, *2nd Epistle to Serapion*, P.G. 26, 620.

31. *Twelve Chapters: to those who dare to defend the doctrines of Nestorius as correct*, Anathema no. 11, P.G. 76, 445.

32. *Ibid.*, P.G. 76, 448-449.

33. G. F. Moore argues that the dualistic anthropology of Philo and *4th Maccabees* had no influence on Jewish thought overall. *Op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 295. Cf. C. Tresmontant, *op. cit.*, p. 87; J. A. T. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 13-16.

34. *Is. 14:9f.; Ezek. 31:15-18; 32:17-32.*

35. *Ezek. 37:13-14.*

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

preach His salvation to them."³⁶ Christ, therefore, came "trampling down death by death and granting life to those in the graves." "If the Lord had not become a man, we would not be redeemed from our sins and risen from the dead, but we would remain in the earth dead, and we would not be raised up to the heavens, but we would lay in Hades."³⁷ He gave life to the dead but did not raise up their bodies.³⁸ He raised up their souls just as He raises up the souls of the faithful through the divine mysteries. The catechumens "go down into the water dead and rise up living."³⁹ Likewise, the righteous who "died before Christ descended dead (into the grave) and rose up living."⁴⁰ Through the resurrection of righteous souls in Christ there came a kind of separation of soul and body that, in a manner of speaking, is unnatural; it is, however, altogether temporary.⁴¹ This separation is not metaphysical or dualistic in nature but eschatological. Man is neither soul alone nor body alone but soul and body.⁴² "For what is man but the rational animal composed of soul and body? But is not the soul itself the man? No, it is the man's soul. Is not the body called man? No, it is called the man's body. Then if neither of these alone is man but that which is interwoven of both is called man, then God has summoned man to life and resurrection. And He has not summoned only a part but the whole, which is the soul and the body."⁴³ "So intense was the early Christians' belief that man is a unique whole, composed of soul and body, that they believed the souls after death remained beside their bodies in a real way."⁴⁴

36. *Dialogue*, 72. Justin says that these words were "cut out" of *Jeremiah* by the Jews. Irenaeus also uses this passage and attributes it to *Isaiah*. Cf. M. Werner, *op. cit.*, p. 256, n58.

37. Athanasius the Great, *Against the Arians*, Homily 1, P.G. 26, 101.

38. The bodily resurrection of the saints (Mt. 27:52-53) and of Lazarus (Jn. 11:30-44) was temporary. Cf. John Chrysostom, *On the Incomprehensibility of God*, Homily 2, Ch. 6.

39. *Shepherd of Hermas*, Parable 9, XVI, 4.

40. *Ibid.*, XVI, 6.

41. During the Maccabean period, the Jews came in contact with the Greeks and obviously received the terminology of Hellenistic anthropology, for example, as in 2 *Mac.* 3:17; 6:30; 7:7,37; 14:38; 15:30. It is doubtful that this influence also included dualistic metaphysics. G. F. Moore considers 4th *Maccabees* as the only purely Hellenistic text from an anthropological point of view. *Op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 295, n2. On the Hellenistic nature of 4th *Maccabees*, cf. P. Bratsiotis, *op. cit.*, p. 322.

42. A. Phytrakis, *Αέθρα και Τάφοι Μαρτύρων*, Athens 1955, p. 136.

43. Justin, *On the Resurrection*, VIII. Cf. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 5, VI, 1; Tatian, *op. cit.*, 15; Athenagoras, *On the Resurrection*, 15:23, 25.

44. A. Phytrakis, *op. cit.*, p. 134f.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

Through His death and resurrection, Christ gave life to the souls of the dead⁴⁵ and gives life to the souls of the faithful through the mysteries. The body, however, corrupts and suffers death until the end of the world, when it shall be resurrected. To those who live righteously the Lord says, "Fear not those who are able to kill the body for they are not able to kill the soul."⁴⁶ This passage does not refer to a naturally immortal soul but to the soul of the righteous which was given life by the Lord. The souls of the unrighteous proceed with their bodies to the same place of death. Because of this, "rather, fear Him Who is able to cast the soul and the body into Gehenna."⁴⁷ Those souls which have been given life by the Lord do not undergo death, that is, separation from the life-giving energy of the Spirit. "Even though the outer man suffers corruption, the inner man is made new day by day."⁴⁸ "Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it."⁴⁹

To fully understand the words "carnal," "animal," and "spiritual" as Paul uses them, it is not sufficient to examine only the Hebraic approach to anthropology. We must also be cognizant of the eschatological distinction between those who, through the Holy Spirit, are presently participating in the Lord's victory over death unto eternal life and those who do not participate in it and are therefore on a path to eternal damnation. The granting of life to those who had fallen asleep before the resurrection of Christ and, likewise, the rendering incorruptible of the inner man through the divine mysteries constitute the first resurrection. This is the kingdom of the righteous with Christ for a thousand years, in other words, for an undefined length of time.⁵⁰ The first resurrection does not include the body. Only the

45. Justin, *On the Resurrection*, IX. "How, then, did He raise the dead? Which of the two, the souls or the bodies? Clearly both." Not clear in this text is which bodily resurrection Justin is referring to here.

46. Mt. 10:28.

47. *Ibid.*

48. 2 Cor. 4:16.

49. Lk. 17:33.

50. Justin believes in the bodily resurrection and the thousand-year kingdom before the final resurrection and general judgment. *Dialogue*, 80-81. He speaks of this, however, as a subject open to theological opinion. "Many who belong to the pure and pious faith and are true Christians think otherwise, as I had pointed out to you." There are no clear testimonies, however, that Irenaeus accepted millenarianism. "Chiliasm is explicit only in Justin." A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch*, Vol. 1, p. 451, n3. Eusebius bears witness to the millenarianism of Papias. *Church History*, 3, 39.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

souls and not the bodies "of those who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus...lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."⁵¹ Therefore, this does not refer to a thousand-year bodily kingdom of the righteous. On the contrary, the first resurrection is already an accomplished reality⁵² that those living in Christ now and those who shall be saved in the future shall appropriate to themselves. The first resurrection is the kingdom in Christ and of Christ which has already begun and awaits only the final triumph over death and the devil through the resurrection of the body. The time of the final victory is known only to God.⁵³ The Church triumphant and the militant Church in Christ, however, are already a single reality of the Spirit. "But if I cast out demons by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God has come unto you."⁵⁴ "Verily I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here who shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power."⁵⁵ In the Holy Spirit, the Church militant casts out demons through the life-giving mysteries for "then the kingdom of God has come unto you." Only in the communion of the Holy Spirit can one participate in the kingdom of heaven.⁵⁶ "For becoming a participant in the Spirit, therefore, is nothing other than becoming a participant in the kingdom of God."⁵⁷ "Even when we were dead in sins, He hath quickened us together with Christ...and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places...For through Him we both [far and near] have access by one Spirit unto the Father."⁵⁸

From what has been said up to this point, the conclusion can be drawn that a great chasm exists between the world and those who live in Christ. "I pray for them; I pray not for the world but for them which Thou hast given Me, for they are Thine."⁵⁹ Those who live in Christ belong to the realm of the Spirit of life, while

51. *Rev.* 20:4.

52. "Today Hades groans and wails, 'It were better for me had I never received Him Who was born of Mary for, by coming unto me, He dissolved my power, shattered the gates of brass, and, as God, raised up the souls I had kept before.' Glory to Thy Cross O Lord and to Thy Resurrection." *Vespers*, Great Saturday.

53. *Mt.* 24:34-36; *Mk.* 13: 30-32; *1 Thes.* 5:1-3.

54. *Mt.* 12:28.

55. *Mk.* 9:1.

56. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 5, IX, 3, 4; X, 1, 2; XI, 1.

57. Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on Matthew*, P.G. 72, 408-409. Cf. John Chrysostom, *Commentary on Matthew*, Homily 41, Ch. 2, P.G. 57, 447.

58. *Eph.* 2:5-6,18; *Col.* 2:12-13.

59. *Jn.* 17:9.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

the rest of the world belongs to the realm of death. Although the battle for perfection and immortality in Christ has been won by the triumphant saints who await only the final victory, for the militant faithful, however, the communion in the Spirit of life that leads to incorruptibility is not yet an accomplished and permanent reality. On this side of the grave, those who live in Christ have not yet permanently acquired the Spirit's life-giving energy that renders man incorruptible. The permanent gift of immortality depends on how much labor the Christian undertakes to live according to the Spirit during this life. Thus, the faithful on this side of the grave, for the present, have only the "betrothal of the Spirit."⁶⁰ "So let us not think that we are born but once in the body."⁶¹ The enslavement of a believer to the works of the flesh leads to his exclusion from the body of Christ.⁶² The Spirit is given to the faithful in order for Christ to dwell in their hearts.⁶³ "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is not one of His."⁶⁴ The communion of the Spirit is the communion of Christ, and the communion of Christ is the communion of the Spirit. Exclusion from one communion is exclusion from the other. The life-giving energy of the Holy Trinity is one. The communion of that life-giving energy, however, is not the same in all of the faithful. It ebbs and flows between mortal condemnation and the endowment of incorruptibility unto eternal life. "Indeed, according to what the great Basil said, the worthy do not each partake of the Holy Spirit in the same measure; rather, in proportion to the faith of each man, He metes out His energy, which is a simple thing in its essence but varied in its powers."⁶⁵

It is within these presuppositions about the life-giving energy of the Spirit that Paul's use of the terms "carnal," "animal," and "spiritual" must be understood. "Being animal (ψυχικοί), in Adam we all die; being spiritual (πνευματικοί), in Christ we shall live because we have put away not the creation of God but the desires of the flesh and have received the Holy

60. 1 Cor. 1:22; 2 Cor. 5:5; Eph. 1:14. Cf. Irenaeus' explanation of the betrothal of the Spirit. *Refutation*, 5, VIII, 1.

61. John Chrysostom, *Commentary on Ephesians*, Homily 3, Ch. 4, P.G. 60, 23.

62. Rm. 11:21; 1 Cor. 5:1-3; 2 Thes. 3:6,14; 2 Tim. 3:5.

63. 2 Cor. 1:22; Gal. 4:6; Eph. 3:16-17;

64. Rm. 8:9.

65. Gregory Palamas, *Natural Chapters*, 79, P.G. 150, 1196. Cf. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 5, VIII, 1.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

Spirit."⁶⁶

In many of his anthropological expressions, Paul clearly distinguishes between soul and body,⁶⁷ or between body and spirit.⁶⁸ But this should not be taken for a metaphysical distinction between a naturally immortal soul and a naturally mortal body, or as a distinction between the real man and only the appearance of a man. Rather, it must be understood eschatologically, that is, in the framework of the first and second resurrection. Within this framework, Paul, in certain places, speaks regarding the granting of life to man raised from the dead as if it is an already accomplished fact.⁶⁹ And in other places he speaks as if it is a future event with reference only to the body,⁷⁰ and elsewhere with reference to a clear conjoining of both the body and the soul.⁷¹ Nevertheless, for Paul the complete and perfect man is body, soul, and the Holy Spirit: "May your whole Spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming

66. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 5, XII, 2-3. (The term "animal" used by Irenaeus and Paul refers to the fallen flesh or man, who is a rational "animal" because he does not have the Holy Spirit. His mind, therefore, is only earthly and material. In the New Testament and the early Fathers, the term "animal" (ψυχικός) most often means "material-minded." *Trans.*)

67. 1 *Thes.* 5:23.

68. 1 *Cor.* 2:11; 5:4; 7:34; 2 *Cor.* 7:1,13. Regarding *Romans* 8:16, Chrysostom writes, "And what is the meaning of 'the Spirit beareth witness with our spirit'? [Paul] means that the Comforter dwells in the gift that is given to us." *Commentary on Romans*, Homily 14, Ch. 2, P.G. 60, 527. Failing to grasp the eschatological distinction between the first and second resurrection, J. A. T. Robinson, therefore, does not deal with the problem of interpreting these seemingly dualistic expressions in his attempt to explain the anthropological basis of Paul's ecclesiology. *Op. cit.*, p. 27.

69. *Eph.* 2:5-6; *Col.* 2:12-13; 3:1.

70. *Rm.* 8:11, 23; 1 *Cor.* 15:22, 36, 45; 2 *Cor.* 5:1-4.

71. 2 *Cor.* 4:16. M. Werner fails to understand this distinction in the presuppositions of Paul's eschatology. Thus, he concludes that the Apostle's perceptions of the time and manner of Christ's victory over evil differ from those of later theologians of the ancient Church. He believes that while Paul virtually identifies the triumph over the devil and death with the Second Coming, later Fathers separate this singular and general victory into two distinct victories, one partial and the other general—one already realized in the death and resurrection of Christ and the other to be realized in the Second Coming. This is the basic argument Werner makes for his view that the original eschatology held the Second Coming of Christ to be imminent, but as faith in that imminence faded, it was reformed into the second eschatology. *Op. cit.*, p. 248f. Werner's interpretation of Paul is in error, as shown by what has been presented up to this point. The eschatology of Paul and the later Greek Fathers amounts to the whole basis for the Church's mystical life. Werner clearly recognizes this fact. *Ibid.*, p. 249f., 389f. But since he is predisposed against the mystical life of the ancient Church, he

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

of our Lord Jesus Christ."⁷²

Despite the eschatological distinction between soul and body, Paul retains strong elements of the ancient Hebraic manner of thinking in his terminology about man. Thus, the expression "God hath appeared in the flesh"⁷³ corresponds precisely to "The Logos became flesh."⁷⁴ Here, "in the flesh" means "in the whole of human nature."⁷⁵ Thus, the term "carnal" is analogous to the term "every flesh,"⁷⁶ and "animal" (ψυχικός) is analogous to the terms "every soul"⁷⁷ and "living soul."⁷⁸ The carnal and animal man is the whole man who is bereft of the energy of the Holy Spirit that makes man incorruptible. "For whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption, but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life."⁷⁹ "The Spirit giveth life."⁸⁰ God alone is able to give life to the dead. For this reason, He became "the last Adam...a life-giving Spirit."⁸¹ Therefore, one who

attempts to show that its eschatological presuppositions are false by making this nonexistent distinction between two supposedly different eschatologies. Thus, from the point of view of Werner's position, the Johannine and patristic teaching about God's life-giving energy in the mysteries is alleged to have come about as a result of the eschatological disappointments of the first Church. *Ibid.*, pp. 420-467.

72. 1Thes. 5:23. Cf. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 5, VI, 1. "What does 'Spirit' mean here? The gift! If we keep our lamps bright, we shall enter into the bridal chamber when we depart but not if they are extinguished. This is why he says, 'your whole Spirit,' for if it remains pure, so also shall this: 'and the soul,' he says, 'and the body.'" John Chrysostom, *Commentary on 1st Thessalonians*, Homily 11, Ch. 2, P.G. 62, 463. Cf. Theodoret of Cyrus, *Interpretation of 1st Thessalonians*, P.G. 82, 656; also P. Bratsiotis, *Ὁ Ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῇ Καινῇ Διαθήκῃ*, Athens 1955, p. 11; D. E. Balanos, *Κρίσις τῆς Δογματικῆς τοῦ Χ. Ἀνδρούτσου*, Jerusalem 1907, p. 19. As for the alleged teaching of the writers and Fathers of the ancient Church regarding a three-part composition of man, P. Christou writes, "If with some reservation we exclude Origen, all other writers seem to accept only the dual composition of man; thus, Apollinarius of Laodiceia appears to be the only churchman who accepted the three-part composition of man." *Ἡ Περί Ἀνθρώπου Διδασκαλία τοῦ Θεοφίλου Ἀντιοχείας*, p. 10.

73. 1 Tim. 3:16.

74. Jn. 1:14.

75. A. E. Garvie's statement is baseless which says that Paul's use of the term "flesh" is different from John's use of it. *John*, Abingdon Bible Commentary, p. 1070. J. A. T. Robinson argues that for Paul even the term "body," for the most part, means the whole man. *Op. cit.*, p. 28.

76. Rm. 3:20; 1 Cor. 15:39; Gal. 2:16.

77. Rm. 2:9; 13:1.

78. 1 Cor. 15:45.

79. Gal. 6:7-8.

80. 2 Cor. 3:6.

81. 1 Cor. 15:45.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

has the Holy Spirit is called "spiritual," and he who does not have the Holy Spirit or does not live according to the Spirit is called by Paul "carnal" or "animal." "These are the [material-minded] animal ones who separate themselves, having not the Spirit."⁸² "Therefore, the Apostle justly called "carnal" and "animal" those who do not receive the divine Spirit because of their own unbelief and hedonism."⁸³

It is clear that for Paul the carnal and animal man is a complete, rational animal composed of a soul and body but lacking the immortalizing energy of the Spirit. This is clearly shown in 1 Cor. 2:14-3:4, in which the expressions "animal," "carnal," and "walk as men" have precisely the same meaning: "The [material-minded] animal man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God...Are ye not carnal, and walk as men?" Since the Corinthians were not yet steadfast in the life of the Spirit, Paul writes, "Brethren, I could not speak unto you as unto people who are spiritual but as unto carnal ones, even as unto babes in Christ."⁸⁴ "For this reason, Paul said to the Corinthians, 'I have fed you with milk, not with meat, for up to now ye were not able to bear it.'⁸⁵ That is, indeed you have learned of the coming of our Lord as a man; nevertheless, because of your infirmity, the Spirit of the Father has not yet rested upon you. 'For when envy and strife,' he says, 'and divisions are among you, are ye not carnal and walk as men?' That is, the Spirit of the Father was not yet with them because of their imperfection and the shortcomings of their way of life...The Apostle had the power to give them strong meat, for those upon whom the Apostles laid hands received the Holy Spirit Who is the food of life, but they were not capable of receiving it because they still had sentient faculties of the soul that were feeble and undisciplined in the practice of things pertaining to God."⁸⁶ Therefore, the life-giving energy of the Holy Spirit is not given to man in an automatic and magical manner. Required is man's cooperative effort to live by faith and love according to his original and ultimate destiny. Man is led to this in the Spirit of God.⁸⁷ But when man does not follow the Spirit, he is deprived of the life-giving energy of God, and he re-

82. *Id.* 19.

83. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 5, VIII, 4.

84. 1 Cor. 3:1.

85. 1 Cor. 3:2.

86. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 4, XXXVIII, 2.

87. Gal. 5:18.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

mains material-minded. For this reason, Paul exhorts, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption."⁸⁸ "Quench not the Spirit."⁸⁹ "Since it is impossible for us to be saved without the Spirit of God, the Apostle exhorts us to preserve the Spirit of God through faith and pure conduct, lest we lose the kingdom of the heavens by not participating in the Divine Spirit. And he exclaims that flesh in itself, and blood, cannot inherit the kingdom of God."⁹⁰ According to Irenaeus, when Paul says that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, he does not mean that the flesh cannot be saved but that it is incapable of saving itself. The flesh, then, does not inherit but is inherited by the Spirit. "If we speak in truth, we must say that the flesh does not inherit but is inherited...The members of man, which decompose in the earth...are inherited by the Spirit and translated to the kingdom of the heavens."⁹¹ "If the Spirit of Him Who raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He Who raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you."⁹²

Opposing the Gnostics who interpret Paul's anthropology and soteriology according to Hellenistic metaphysical dualism, St. Irenaeus counters with powerful arguments proving that the "spiritual" man for Paul is not one who does not have flesh but one who has the Spirit of God.⁹³ A man who does not have the Divine Spirit is called "carnal," "animal,"⁹⁴ and "flesh and blood."⁹⁵ Without the Spirit's energy to render him incorruptible, man cannot participate in the true immortality and the kingdom of God.⁹⁶

From the preceding it is clear that, in interpreting Paul's anthropology according to their own presuppositions, the writers of the period under examination do not employ the standard philosophical distinction between those who live for pleasure and those who live in pursuit of *eudaemonia*. Paul makes the distinction made by the entire ancient Church between those who "walk as men" and those who struggle in the Holy Spirit.

88. Eph. 4:30.

89. 1 Thes. 5: 19. Cf. *Shepherd of Hermas*, Comm. 5; Par. 5, VII.

90. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 5, IX, 3.

91. *Ibid.*, 5, IX, 4.

92. Rm. 8:11. Cf. Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 5, X, 2.

93. *Op. cit.*, 5, VI, 1; VIII, 1,2; IX, 2; X, 1, 2; XI, 1, 2.

94. *Ibid.*, 5, VIII, 2, 4; IX, 1; X, 1; XI, 1.

95. *Ibid.*, 5, IX, 1; X, 1, 2.

96. *Ibid.*, 5, IX, 3, 4; X, 1, 2: *Fragment 36*.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

For Paul, the destiny of man is not self-seeking *eudaemonia* but moral perfection and freedom. The possessor of the Spirit, the spiritual man, is free because "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there freedom is."⁹⁷ The Apostle is not an exception to the theology of the overall ancient Church. It is not as if he had his own teaching regarding faith, destiny, and salvation, a teaching that supposedly was only first understood by Augustine much later and better than all others. Paul, however, does not belong to the West but to the Church of the first centuries, to Orthodoxy, as the teacher not of personal theological concepts but of the teaching held by the Apostolic Church. This is clearly seen in the fact that Paul's spiritual man who has the Holy Spirit is exactly identical to the man made in the image and likeness of God as taught by the early Christian theologians.

B. Image and Likeness

On the day of Pentecost, the Apostle Peter preached, "Repent and be baptized each of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto remission of sins, and receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."⁹⁸ "An outpouring filled with the Holy Spirit was made upon all... Do we not have one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace that was poured forth upon us?"⁹⁹ "Truly I behold the Spirit poured forth upon you from the riches of the love of the Lord."¹⁰⁰ "For this conduct of the flesh pleased God because it was not defiled on the earth while it had the Holy Spirit...For every flesh that has been found without spot or defilement, in which the Holy Spirit dwelt, will receive a reward...If you defile your flesh, you will also defile the Holy Spirit. And if you defile the Spirit, you shall not live."¹⁰¹ "For the body is the abode of the soul, and the soul is the abode of the Spirit. These three, then, in all who keep a sincere hope and unquestioning faith in God will be saved."¹⁰²

The teaching that salvation depends upon the indwelling life-giving energy of the Holy Spirit in man is the common mark

97. 2 Cor. 3:17.

98. Acts 2:38.

99. Clement of Rome, *First Epistle to Corinthians*, II; XLVI.

100. Barnabas, I, 3.

101. *Shepherd of Hermas*, Par. 5, VI, VII.

102. Justin, *On the Resurrection*, X. Cf. *Dialogue*, 6; 1 Thes. 5:23; John Chrysostom, P.G. 62, 463.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

of the Holy Scriptures, of the ancient Church, and of all the Fathers of the Orthodox tradition. It is the whole basis of the mystical acts of the Orthodox Church. Moreover, the key to understanding the image and likeness of God in the thought of the writers of the period is the teaching about the Holy Spirit's energy that gives incorruptibility to man.

According to Tatian who, after the Holy Scripture itself, was first to make clear use of the terms "image and likeness," writes, "The Logos...in imitation of the Father Who begat Him, made man an image of immortality so that, as incorruption is with God, in like manner, man may receive his lot from God and have immortality."¹⁰³ "God's image and likeness" is the Holy Spirit.¹⁰⁴ The first men had two spirits--the soul and the Spirit of God. "Both existed in the first men: one because they were material, the other for their being superior to matter."¹⁰⁵ Having the Spirit of God, man shared in the immortality of God. And according to the immortality he shared, he had the image of God.¹⁰⁶ But "he who was made in the image of God became separated from the stronger Spirit and became mortal."¹⁰⁷ Since he was cut off from the energy of the Spirit that could render him incorruptible, man lost not only immortality but the image and likeness simply because God's image and likeness in man is the Holy Spirit.¹⁰⁸ Only he who is a temple of the Spirit is the image and likeness of God. "But if he be not such a habitation, man is superior to the wild beasts only in articulate speech, and in other respects his manner of life is like theirs, not being the likeness of God."¹⁰⁹

For Tatian, therefore, the image and likeness of God in man is the Holy Spirit's energy that renders him incorruptible, operating not in a magical and mechanistic way but through a man's labor for perfection. The first men received the life-giving Spirit in order to become "superior to matter"¹¹⁰ and advance "beyond mankind to God Himself."¹¹¹ For this purpose, "in the

103. *Op. cit.*, 7.

104. *Ibid.* 12.

105. *Ibid.*, 12.

106. According to J. C. L. Giesler, Tatian "saw in the divine image immortality as the destiny of humanity." *Op. cit.*, p. 160. Cf. P. Bratsiotis, *Τό Γενέσεως Α' 26 ἐν τῇ Ὁρθόδοξῳ Θεολογίᾳ*, Istanbul 1953, p. 6. D. Thomasius refers to this commentary as a general reflection of the opinion of the Fathers. *Op. cit.*, p. 465.

107. Tatian, *To the Greeks*, 7.

108. *Ibid.*, 12.

109. *Ibid.*, 15.

110. *Ibid.*, 12.

111. *Ibid.*, 15.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

beginning, therefore, the Spirit became the soul's constant companion, but the Spirit forsook the soul because it was not willing to follow,"¹¹² and "man became mortal."¹¹³ "It is needful now for us who have lost this to seek to yoke the soul with the Holy Spirit and accomplish this union with God."¹¹⁴ Man was not created perfect, but neither was he lacking in any way. He was created free and of an integral nature in order to achieve perfection and immortality. Towards this end was the Holy Spirit given to him. But since he did not follow the directions of the Holy Spirit and even abandoned Him, man became mortal. Thus, he lost the image and likeness of God, that is, the communion of the Holy Spirit and consequently immortality. But he did not lose his rationality and sovereignty.

For Tatian, then, neither the body nor the soul in themselves are the image and likeness of God. Unlike the philosophers, he refused to divide man into the main or primary man consisting of the naturally immortal soul, and the temporal and external man consisting of the naturally mortal body. "For neither could the soul ever appear by itself without the body nor the body arise without the soul. Man is not, as the squawking philosophers decree, merely a rational animal capable of understanding and receiving knowledge."¹¹⁵ The separation of the two is only a temporary condition. We may conclude from the above that Tatian, like Irenaeus, also believed that the whole man, in both body and soul, is the image and likeness of God since the whole man is the temple of the Holy Spirit. In other words, man is the temple of the image and likeness of God, and the whole man participates in immortality through moral perfection.

By studying Tatian's views¹¹⁶ about the image and likeness, one can better understand Irenaeus' point: "It was not merely a part of man that was made in the image and likeness of God. Of course the soul and the Spirit are *part* of man but not *the* man. For the whole man consists of the commingling and union of the soul that receives the Spirit of the Father, with the fleshy nature, which (commingling and union) was formed according to the

112. *Ibid.*, 13.

113. *Ibid.*, 7.

114. *Ibid.*, 15.

115. *Ibid.*, 15.

116. It is necessary to state that although we are comfortable with the views of Tatian presented here, it does not mean that we ascribe to him doctrinal authority in the Church. His views are presented here in the context of their importance for the general theological thought of his period.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

image of God."¹¹⁷ What Irenaeus says here would be completely untenable if he taught that the image and likeness of God belonged to man by nature. In such a case, it would mean that he accepts the body also as the image and likeness of God, something quite improper regarding God.¹¹⁸ It is not a matter of comparing the components of man with the divine attributes. "Not a single thing that was made and exists by dependence can ever be compared to the Logos of God, by Whom all things were made."¹¹⁹ This is why it must be added that even though Irenaeus places great emphasis on the rationality and sovereignty of man,¹²⁰ he nevertheless mentions that after the fall man lost the image as well as the likeness of God.¹²¹

While Irenaeus appears to make the same later patristic distinction between the image and likeness,¹²² this does not mean that for him the imperfect divine image remaining in man after the fall is the rational soul and sovereignty and that the likeness refers to man's moral perfection.¹²³ In one place he writes, "Being endowed with reason and, in this respect, like to (*similis*) God, and having been made free in will and sovereign, man is the cause of his becoming sometimes wheat and sometimes chaff... He was made a rational being, and he lost the true rationality."¹²⁴ Here reason and freedom are not attributed to the image but to the likeness. He does not make a clear distinction between image and likeness and says both were lost.¹²⁵ And in another place he only hints without being specific that something of the image remained.¹²⁶ Irenaeus sharply emphasizes that the whole man, soul and body, is contained in the image and likeness. Nevertheless, we must not think that he actually makes a comparison of God and man. Indeed he states that between the

117. *Refutation*, 5, VI, 1. Cf. *Proof*, 11. On this, Justin writes, "Made in the image of God, man is carnal." F.C. Bauer, *op. cit.*, p. 578.

118. C. Androustos, *Δογματική*, p. 137; Z. D. Rosis, *op. cit.*, p. 434; J. N. Karmiris, *Εὐνοίας Δογματικής*, p. 29, n2.

119. *Refutation*, 3 VIII, 2.

120. *Ibid.*, 4, XXXVII, 1-7.

121. *Ibid.*, 3, XVIII, 1.

122. *Ibid.*, 5, VI, 1; XVI, 2. First to make a clear distinction were Clement of Alexandria and Origen. K. R. Hagenbach, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

123. F. Vernet says that for Irenaeus "image" and "likeness" are at times "rigoureusement synonymes." *Irénée*, in "Dict. de Théol. Cath.," Vol. VII, col. 2452.

124. *Refutation*, 4, IV, 3.

125. *Ibid.*, 3, XVIII, 1.

126. *Ibid.*, 5, VI, 1. F. R. Tennant tries to reconcile this conflict by arguing that in

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

divine and human minds no comparison can exist.¹²⁷ For Irenaeus, if an imperfect remnant of the divine image remains in man, it could certainly be understood to be, first of all, sovereignty and, secondarily, a darkened mind.¹²⁸

There is no basis to the idea that for Irenaeus the original state of man did not include the communion of the Holy Spirit because man was made a living soul and had as the source of life only the breath of life.¹²⁹ When Irenaeus writes, "For the breath of life that rendered man an animated being is one thing, and the vivifying Spirit that also constitutes him spiritual is another," he is not speaking of the original state but of the present condition of man under the sway of death. "For the breath is temporal, but the Spirit is eternal. The breath, too, increases for a short period and continues for a certain time; after that it departs, leaving its former abode without breath. But when the Spirit pervades the man within and without, since it is permanent, it never leaves him."¹³⁰

Clearly, if God made him with only the "temporal breath," it would follow that He made man for death and not for immortality. Irenaeus, however, does not present God as the cause of death. Quite the contrary, it is Satan who is charged with

Irenaeus there are two contradictory theological traditions: one that says the first men were made perfect and another that says they were not perfect. *The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall*, pp. 284-288.

127. *Ibid.*, 2, XXVIII, 3-6.

128. Aside from the lost immortality of man, there is a similarity between the mystery of human freedom and the mystery of divine freedom. Between the human and divine minds, however, the difference is enormous. The human mind is always limited by nature as to content and ability to comprehend things outside of itself. The mind of God is completely unlimited. The reason for this is that God comprehends limitlessly in His free energy. He does not comprehend by the necessity of essence, that is, in the manner of the God of scholastic theology (cf., for example, F. Copleston, *Aquinas*, p. 138f.) that believes God contains in His essence all archetypes. The Scholastics believe it is possible for man to identify his mind with the divine mind in order to observe things of the divine essence and to know directly the archetypes that exist without beginning or end in the mind of God. (*Summa Theologica*, Pt. 1, Q. 12, Art. 1-13; Pt. 3, Q. 10, Art. 2) In this manner, for the West, there is a real similarity between the divine and human minds that permits their comparison. This is not done at all by the Orthodox Fathers who refuse to identify the essence of God with the uncreated rational energies of God that descend to the world.

129. A. Slomkowski takes this position in *L'État Primitif de l'Homme dans la Tradition de l'Eglise avant saint Augustin*, Paris 1928, p. 42. L. Duncker correctly comments that Irenaeus, "understands the partaking of the Spirit only for the fulfilling and achieving of the goal of perfection." *Op. cit.*, pp. 93-94.

130. *Refutation*, 5, XII, 2.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

causing corruptibility.¹³¹ Death is not from God. "But as many as depart from God by their choice, He imposes on them that separation from Himself which they have chosen of their own accord. Separation from God is death, and separation from light is dark-ness...It is not that the light has inflicted upon them the penalty of blindness."¹³² "They depart from the light and separate themselves from God."¹³³ The argument that charges Irenaeus with believing that the first men did not have the Holy Spirit is equal to saying that, from the beginning, God was cause of the separation between Himself and man which brought death.

For Irenaeus as well as for Tatian, the original state included the communion of the Holy Spirit.¹³⁴ "Man is rendered spiritual and perfect through the Spirit in him; he, then, is the man made in the image and likeness of God."¹³⁵ Without the life-giving Spirit, it would have been impossible for the first-made man to remain in Paradise. "For Paradise was prepared for righteous men and Spirit-bearers."¹³⁶ According to Irenaeus, the first-made men in Paradise were children on the path of perfection, "being nurtured and strengthened by the Spirit."¹³⁷ Furthermore, God gives the image to man through the Holy Spirit.¹³⁸ The Spirit that renders man incorruptible creates him in the image and likeness of God.¹³⁹ If the first-made men did not have the Holy Spirit, they would not only have been by nature under the power of death,

131. *Ibid.*, 3, XXIII, 1, 2, 4; *Proof*, 16, 17.

132. *Refutation*, 5, XXVII, 2.

133. *Ibid.*, 5, XXVIII, 1.

134. The opinion does not hold up which says that Irenaeus is the father of the "Roman Catholic theory that man in his original state was composed of a (perfect) and supernatural nature or gifts of Grace, which alone were lost with the fall." (Cf. J. Kalogerou, *op. cit.*, Vol. 400-401, p. 242, n3; cf. E. Brunner, *Der Mensch im Widerspruch*, Zurich 1941, p. 83, 522f.; F. R. Tennant, *op. cit.*, p. 284). It does not hold up because, first of all, for Irenaeus, grace is not the same as it is for the Roman Church, a supernatural created thing; on the contrary, for him, it is an uncreated energy of the Holy Spirit. And, second, the loss of the energy that renders man incorruptible resulted in the unnatural fall of man under the power of the devil, sin, and death. Regarding E. Brunner's erroneous theories about Irenaeus' teaching on man, cf. P. Bratsiotis, *op. cit.*, p. 6f., and his *'H Θεολογία του Emil Brunner*, Athens 1938, p. 17f.

135. *Refutation*, 5, VI, 1.

136. *Ibid.*, 5, V, 1.

137. *Ibid.*, 4, XXXVIII, 3.

138. *Ibid.*, 3, XVII, 3; 5, VIII, 1.

139. *Ibid.*, 5, VIII, 1.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

they would not have had the image and likeness.¹⁴⁰ God did not form man under the dominion of death, but neither did He make him by nature immortal and His likeness; immortality and the likeness are inseparably tied to moral perfection.

Irenaeus' teaching on the original destiny of man and his fall is not at all based on rationalistic and philosophical observations regarding the so-called "natural man," as some argue.¹⁴¹ Rather, it always has as its starting point Christ and the Church's experience of the life in Christ. "In past times it was said that man was made in the image of God, but it was not yet seen, for the Logos was as yet invisible, after Whose image man was made. For this reason, when the Logos of God became flesh, He confirmed both; for He both showed forth the image truly, since He became Himself what was His image, and He reestablished the likeness in a sure manner by conforming man like unto the invisible Father."¹⁴² It is Christ "Who is the image of God."¹⁴³ "Those whom [God] did foreknow, he also predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son."¹⁴⁴

Since salvation in Christ is the restoration of man to the path of perfection and immortality through the communion of the Holy Spirit, it follows that the first-made men strayed from this path of perfection and immortality, losing the Spirit's energy that gives incorruptibility. Thus, using Christ as the key to the original state of man, Irenaeus describes the course of the first-made men to perfection and immortality. Therefore, just as Christ was born an infant and subsequently grew bodily, matured, advanced, and was perfected (not from sin to perfection but from an infant's condition to a mentally and physically mature man, even through temptations), the first-made men were also made children in order to grow, mature, and become perfect in body and soul. Christ was born without sin or deficiency. Yet He advanced and was perfected. Likewise, the first men were made sinless and without deficiency in order to advance and become perfect. And just as Christ in His human nature became incorruptible and free of passion, man also, if he

140. According to F. Loofs, Irenaeus teaches that "God created the first human being with His hand...according to the image and likeness of God (*secundum imaginem et similitudinem Dei*), no doubt in the sense of partaking of immortality in order to become like God." *Op. cit.*, pp. 140-141.

141. E.g., F. R. Tennant, *op. cit.*, pp. 285-288; E. Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 523.

142. *Refutation*, 5, XVI, 2. Cf. *Proof*, 22.

143. 2 *Cor.* 4:4; *Col.* 1:15.

144. *Rm.* 8:29.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

had become perfect, would have acquired incorruptibility. "Through this order of things, and by such measures and design, man, a created being, is formed in the image and likeness of the uncreated God by the Father's good pleasure and command, with the Son carrying it out and creating, and the Spirit nurturing and increasing, and man quietly advancing and ascending to perfection, that is, approaching the Uncreated One. For the Uncreated is perfect, and He is God. Now it was proper, first of all, that man should be created; and having been created, should grow; and having grown, should mature; and having matured, should increase; and having increased, should gain dominion; and having gained dominion, should be glorified (*δοξασθῆναι*); and having been glorified, should see His Master. For God shall be seen, and the beholding of God is conducive to incorruptibility. And incorruptibility renders man close to God."¹⁴⁵ Being in infancy, the first-made men were assaulted by Satan and unjustly wounded, according to Irenaeus and Theophilus.¹⁴⁶ The capability of transgressing the divine command at the suggestion of the serpent can, in large part, be attributed to the fact that the first men had not yet been perfected.¹⁴⁷ As we have seen in all the writers of the period, the transgression has to do with genuine deception by the serpent.

For Irenaeus as well as for Tatian, the image and likeness of God in man¹⁴⁸ is not an accomplished reality belonging to human nature from the beginning but, on the contrary, a gift of the life-giving Spirit, given to man by means of his spiritual labor and growth in perfection. The communion of the Holy Spirit renders the man who labors for perfection in Christ the image and likeness of God through his becoming incorruptible and free. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there freedom is."¹⁴⁹ Just as God, above all, is free of every need and self-interest, the spiritual man who has the Spirit struggles and becomes perfected in the love according to Christ, love that is also delivered of all need and self-interest. "If the Son, then, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."¹⁵⁰ From all that has been presented to this point, it

145. *Refutation*, 4, XXXVIII, 3; *Wis.* 6:20.

146. Theophilus, *op. cit.*, 24-27; Irenaeus, *op. cit.*, 4, XXXVIII, 3; *Proof*, 12.

147. *Ibid.*

148. Regarding later patristic teaching on the image and likeness of God in man, cf. P. Bratsiotis, *Τό Γενέσεως Α' 26 ἐν τῇ Ὁρθοδόξῳ Θεολογίᾳ*, also J. N. Karmiris, *Σύνοψις Δογματικῆς*, p. 29f.

149. 2 *Cor.* 3:17.

150. *Jn.* 8:36.

Spiritual Man in the Image of God

is evident that in the Christian thought and life throughout the period covered by this study, the spiritual man in the image and likeness of God is not one who lives "naturally" in accordance with some kind of immaterial component of his own nature. Rather, the spiritual man is one who lives according to the life-giving and incorruption-giving Spirit of freedom and, thus, participates in divine immortality. These are the presuppositions, therefore, with which the ancestral sin according to the thought of the first Fathers of Orthodox theology must be understood.

CHAPTER VI

THE ANCESTRAL SIN

In our study of the cosmological and anthropological presuppositions of the ancestral sin in the period from the New Testament times to St. Irenaeus, we have rediscovered doctrinal presuppositions about God, the world, Satan, and man. These presuppositions present the ancestral sin in a manner that is extremely different from that of Augustine and the West. We shall summarize here the chief points of difference.

1. We have seen that in the thought of the theologians of the period, there is an absence of the West's eudaemonistic concepts of God, the world, and man in which God wills and acts by essence. In the theologians of the period and the Greek Fathers in general, the prevailing teaching is that the divine essence remains forever changeless and incomprehensible because God indeed has genuine relations with the world, not in His essence but only in His uncreated energies and in the hypostatic union in Christ. Accordingly, the God of the Holy Scriptures and the Greek Fathers remains absolutely free. He is in no way deficient and is free of every necessity and self-interest.

2. Man was not created perfect according to the West's model of a God Who is by nature love and enjoys absolute *eudaemonia*. On the contrary, man was created only relatively perfect in order to attain to the perfection of the God Who is free of all necessity and self-interest, the God of the Holy Scriptures and Orthodoxy.

3. Therefore, the dilemma created by Augustine does not exist in the writers of the period and in the Greek patristic tradition. The dilemma for Augustine is that the first men were capable of falling at all even though, as beholders of the divine essence, they should have been perfect in every way. Although Augustine and the West in general only consider the ancestral sin a fall or decline from a perfect state, both the early and later theologians of Orthodoxy consider the fall not only a fall from

the original condition of relative perfection but also a fall from the path to perfection and *theosis*.¹

4. Moreover, absent from the writings of the first Christians is the cosmology of Augustine and the West in general, according to which the justice of God is a prevailing presence and reality. For Augustine, mankind's fall into the hands of the devil and death is by the will and justice of God because the entire human race shares Adam's guilt. On the other hand, the writers of the first two centuries understood that justice is eschatological. God does not will the present unjust activity of Satan and man but only tolerates it so that those who would be saved can be tried and perfected through temptations. Because, above all, He desires the freedom of His rational creatures. Thus, not even as a punisher is God the cause of parasitic evil that prevails in the world. On the contrary, the causes of corruptibility and death are, first of all, the devil, and second, man's ongoing cooperation with him that brought in evil through man's departure from God. In the present world injustice rules. For this reason, "the present age and the future age are mutual enemies."²

5. Once it is an acceptable idea that corruptibility and death are God's punishment for all of mankind, a dilemma is posed regarding the transmittal of the punishment to the descendants of Adam. Presuppositions of this kind make it necessary to protect the goodness of God, and it is done by assigning the collective guilt for the fall to all men. For the writers of the period, however, such a theme never arises because, as we have seen, death is simply not from God. It was not out of a vengeful disposition of divine justice that death was permitted by God but, rather, out of divine compassion for man.³ Death is a just punishment of the unrighteous only.

1. Having eudaemonistic presuppositions regarding the destiny of man, the theologians of the West believe there is a contradiction here. E.g., A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch*, Vol. 2, p. 135; F. R. Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall*, p. 288. They would be totally justified if their eudaemonistic predilections were correct. If Adam were made perfect, for the West, then, it would mean that he had *eudaimonia* from the very beginning. If he was created to become perfect, it means that he was not in total *eudaimonia*, that is, he was not totally perfect.

2. Clement of Rome, *Second Epistle to Corinthians*, VI, 3.

3. C. Androutsos writes, "Fortunately, the teaching that man does not bear responsibility for the original sin is sufficiently clear and doubtless in the Fathers, whether stated directly or indirectly, that one may readily surmise the mind of the Fathers on this, forming one's view clearly and indisputably from within their writings on infant baptism and the fate of unbaptized infants, again from within but also from their other testimonies." *Δεύτερον Μάθημα περί του Προ-*

6. The doctrine that death is God's punishment for all men also raises the insoluble problem of the present sinful state of man. The Greek Fathers teach that the death of the soul and body, that is, the loss of divine grace, is the sinful condition⁴ from which all personal sins spring forth with the urging of the demons. If death is from God, then He must also be the cause of sin. Such a problem does not exist for the Greek Fathers, who emphasize that God did not create death. In the West, however, the disagreement between Roman Catholics and Protestants over this problem continues. The former, in order to avoid the error of absolute predestination, teach that man's nature essentially was unaffected by the fall. And the latter generally teach that the effects of the fall were so severe that man is incapable even of desiring what is good without the aid of divine grace.

Having in mind these six points, as well as all the issues touched on in this study, we can now proceed to a presentation of the ancestral sin as understood by the theologians of the period under examination.

A. *The Original State and the Fall*

God created Adam and Eve children, and He placed them in Paradise. They had as the source of life the Holy Spirit, and they were in communion with the Holy Trinity. God gave them the

πατορικού Ἀμαρτήματος, p. 37. But because Androutsos considers death a universal punishment of mankind by God, exactly as does Dositheus of Jerusalem (cf. J. N. Karmiris, *Δογματικά καὶ Συμβολικά Μνημεῖα*, Vol. 2, p. 750), he attempts to justify the inherited punishment of death by making a distinction between responsibility and guilt. He says that it is not the responsibility but the guilt of original sin that is inherited. *Op. cit.*, p. 12, 49; *Δογματική*, p. 157. Perhaps his difficulty arises from the fact that he bases himself mainly on one homily of Chrysostom, in which he wrote about death as a punishment but was not always clear about what he meant. Chrysostom writes that, from God's point of view, death is a punishment for the first men, but at the same time, it is divine beneficence for them and all of mankind because, without death, "they would have continued sinning for the rest of eternity." *Epistle to Stageirus*, Bk. 1, Ch. 3, P.G. 47, 429. He also writes, "But when Christ destroys the devil who brought in death, He shall destroy his whole work." *Commentary on 1st Corinthians*, Homily 38, Ch. 5, P.G. 61, 339. Chrysostom ties the power of death closely to the devil: "That by which the devil prevailed, by that was he also defeated, and the very thing which was his mighty weapon against the world, that is, death, by this did Christ smite him...Do you see that in casting out the tyranny of death he also overthrew the strength of the devil?" *Commentary on Hebrews*, Homily 4, Ch. 6, P.G. 63, 41-42. Through such expressions, Chrysostom makes it clear that Satan's role in the dominion of death and sin is the essence of the problem.

4. A. Harnack, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 137, 150, 158.

the commandment in order for them to be perfected gradually and, with time, to attain to immortality and *theosis*. Accordingly, though they were made having the image and likeness as their potentiality, they were required to become the image and likeness through spiritual labor and their free choice. This perfection presupposes unselfish love not only for God but also for one's neighbor.⁵

In order to protect the first men from danger and from the premature use of the tree of knowledge, "for knowledge is good when one uses it discreetly,"⁶ God commanded them not to eat from it until they had advanced in their labor for perfection and had properly matured. Through the suggestion of the devil, however, they disobeyed the commandment and fell off the path to perfection. Because they were mortally wounded by the enemy, it became impossible for them to attain to immortality and *theosis*. They lost the life-giving grace of the Holy Spirit and became dead of soul. The evil one also wished but was unable to kill them bodily.⁷ Through Cain, however, he was able to put the righteous Abel to death and, thus, bodily death came into the world. With the cooperation of unrighteous men and the other angels that fell with him, the devil expanded his operations in the world, and through him sin came to rule. Through sin, death came into the world and held dominion. God permitted death and the dissolution of man so that, on the one hand, evil would not be eternal and, on the other hand, He could create man anew in the resurrection. Moreover, with the spectacle of death, He could give man the opportunity to repent and to be tested by temptations.⁸

According to the writers of the period and all the Greek Fathers, God is life or self-existence. Man, however, is not life but only a partaker of life. Therefore, man is one thing, and the life of man is another. Man partakes of life through the creative and providential uncreated energy of God. But participation in this life-giving energy of God can become permanent only through moral perfection because only that which is perfect can become truly immortal. After the fall, the life-giving energy of God that bestows incorruptibility on man becomes permanent only through the saving energy of Christ. Despite the fact that Satan and the unrighteous shall exist forever in hell, it does not

5. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 5, VI, 1.

6. Theophilus, *op. cit.*, 2, 25.

7. *Ibid.*, 2, 29.

8. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 5, II, 3; III, 1. Cf. Gregory Palamas, *Homily* 39, Jerusalem 1857, p. 219.

mean that they are naturally immortal or that they participate in divine immortality. The punishment of the unrighteous and, therefore, their eternal existence in hell are one thing, and the immortality of the righteous is another.

The first men were made lacking nothing and having no deficiencies. By transgressing the commandment of spiritual labor, however, they were wounded by Satan and went askew as regards their original destiny. They failed to attain to perfection and immortality, in other words, to *theosis*. Through Satan's introduction of sin, injustice flourished among men. Although man's destiny was to love God and his neighbor unselfishly, by the urgings of the wicked spirits and by his own consent, he withdrew his love for God and his fellow man, exchanging unselfish love for the selfish love that inheres in fear. Thus, he became an individual and an egotist. He was deprived of communion with God in the Spirit, and his relations with his neighbor became distorted. The absence of communion with God and neighbor in unselfish love means the absence of moral perfection. The absence of moral perfection is the absence of the true immortality of the soul, and the result is the corruptibility and death of the body. Separation from God, therefore, is death. God, then, did not create death. The causes of death were, first of all, Satan and, second, man.

B. The Transmittal of Death

We have seen that the state of the righteous before Christ, who were under the power of corruptibility and death, is seen by the Fathers as an unjust and temporary captivity to the devil. Nevertheless, it is permitted by God for reasons of compassion "so that evil may not become eternal" and man may be tested and become repentant. The only exemption from this captivity was Jesus Christ, Who was born of the Virgin through the Holy Spirit. It is clear from this that the presuppositions of the period's theologians and writers regarding the fall and salvation incline strongly toward the theory of *traducianismus*. A theory of *creationismus*, however, would suggest that God is the cause of man's captivity to death and the devil, and the reasons for the birth from a Virgin would have no force. Nevertheless, it is impossible to impose a totally one-sided traducianism upon the thought of the theologians in our study.

Both theories, traducianism and creationism, have as their premise the idea that the world is independent of the direct,

uncreated energies of God and is governed by created, natural laws, which is not the view of the theologians in our study. According to these theories, there are two possibilities: either the soul comes into existence with the body, independent of any direct operation of God, or it is created immediately by God, somehow independently of the parents, and is united with the body according to the created laws of nature.⁹

If divine providence is truly an uncreated energy of God that sustains and gives life not indirectly through the created laws of nature but directly, it is sufficiently clear that not only the soul but the body also comes about through the direct, creative energy of God co-working with the parents.¹⁰ "God made you from nothing and brought you into existence. For if there was a time when neither your father nor your mother existed, much more so were you not in existence either. And He made you from the least drop of a moist and small substance that also did not exist at one time. And God brought you forth into this life."¹¹ In a more general sense Theophilus says, "And He is called God (Θεός) because He placed (τεθεικέναι) all things in the certainty afforded by Himself, and because *théein* means hastening, moving, operating, nourishing, providing, governing, and giving life to all things."¹² It is God "Who gave the Spirit that nourishes the earth and Whose breath vivifies all things; if He should withdraw His breath, everything would utterly vanish."¹³ Why, then, should the generation of the human body alone be exempted from the direct, creative, and life-giving energy of God? Therefore, in this particular case, the insistence that God could have been the cause of evil does not hold up. The body is not an evil thing; nor is the indwelling power of death and sin from God. Consequently, the preceding insistence leads to the broader problem of why divine providence permits the general existence of death as a kind of parasite in a Creation that was "very good." Whether God acts directly or indirectly, the problem of the existence of evil as a parasite in the world remains the same. It is not solved somehow by removing God from the world. It is solved only within

9. According to its physiological premises, the theory of creationism necessarily presupposes the three-part constitution of man.

10. See C. Androutsos, *Δογματική*, p. 136.

11. Theophilus, *op. cit.*, 1, 8. Similarly, Athanasius the Great writes about the first man: "He was made from the earth, as all were. And the hand that formed Adam then, now, and always, forms and constructs those who came after him also." *Defense of the Nicene Definition*, Ch. 9, P.G. 25, 429.

12. *Ibid.*, 1, 7.

13. *Ibid.*

the framework of the biblical and Greek patristic concept of freedom, of the real war between God and Satan, and of the necessity of temptations in the perfecting of man.

When we consider that, for the Fathers and writers of the period, the first-made men were created neither immortal nor mortal¹⁴ and that immortality is achieved only through moral perfection, it is apparent that even if Adam had remained sinless, his descendants would have been born neither immortal nor under the power of death. This is simply because the immortality of each man does not depend on his own nature but on his labor for perfection and on the will and divinizing energy of God. In this framework, the problem of how a naturally immortal soul could be born with the body is irrelevant. A complete man, soul and body, capable of receiving either immortality or death, could have been born from the first men if they had not sinned. If the first-made men had not sinned, there would be no notion of precluding the co-working of God and parents in the begetting of the whole man in soul and body. This is simply because there would be no danger of imputing to God the cause of evil abiding in man. Why then, after the fall, should the co-working of God and man be precluded? To be precise, after the transgression, "Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and gave birth to Cain, and she said, 'We have had a man through [the help of] God'."¹⁵

While man is born with the parasitic power of death and sin within him, this fact cannot be charged to God but to the work of Satan and the illness of the entire Creation and human nature from which God creates each new man. Since man is an inseparable part of nature, it is impossible for him to escape the corruptibility that rules within it. His existence depends on nature, with which he is continuously engaged in an exchange of constituent elements. Truly man is "earth."¹⁶ He was not made an independent being but a part and member of the whole Creation and mankind. He inherits an abundance of good and bad traits from his parents and forefathers. The interdependence among men is so close that the endangered life of one man can be saved by the blood of another. Among the inherited diseases of mankind, of course, the general basis for all illness is cor-

14. Elsewhere it is said that they were made mortal but not subject to the need to die and, therefore, to be under the power of death. Justin, *Replies to the Orthodox*, (a dubious work) Q. 32, BEPPE, Vol. 4, p. 88.

15. Gen. 4:1.

16. Gen. 3:19.

ruptibility and death,¹⁷ in which Satan and sin rule.¹⁸ Only Christ, Who was born of the Virgin through the Holy Spirit, was born outside of the tyranny of the devil.

C. "Many Were Made Sinners."¹⁹

Only by taking into serious consideration the biblical and Greek patristic concept of the original destiny or *theosis* of man can we gain a deeper understanding of how badly the West's theologians have misunderstood Eastern theology's focus on man's redemption from death and corruptibility. Having eudaemonistic conceptions of human destiny and believing death to be from God, the West is unable to grasp the moral significance of the patristic doctrine of salvation from death. This is to be expected, however, since the West's theologians view man's inclination to self-satisfaction as natural. And since death is the underpinning of that inclination, they do not understand how death could be a moral obstruction to man's living in accordance with the Western notion of his original destiny, that is, selfish *eudaemonia*.

When we take into account the fact that man was created to become perfect in freedom and love as God is perfect, that is, to love God and his neighbor in the same unselfish way that God loves the world, it becomes apparent that the death of the soul, that is, the loss of divine grace, and the corruption of the body have rendered such a life of perfection impossible. In the first place, the deprivation of divine grace impairs the mental powers of the newborn infant; thus, the mind of man has a tendency toward evil from the beginning. This tendency grows strong when the ruling force of corruption becomes perceptible in the body. Through the power of death and the devil, sin that reigns in man gives rise to fear and anxiety and to the general instinct of self-preservation or survival. Thus, Satan manipulates man's fear and his desire for self-satisfaction, raising up sin in him, in other words, transgression against the divine will regarding unselfish love, and provoking man to stray from his original destiny. Since weakness is caused in the flesh by death, Satan

17. "Because death had overrun Adam, he is like a plant that has been injured at its roots, and the whole race that sprang from him is like the shoots that sprout from it but must all wither." Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on Romans*, P.G. 74, 785.

18. John Chrysostom, *Commentary on Hebrews*, Homily 4, Ch. 6, P.G. 63, 41-42.

19. Rm. 5:19.

moves man to countless passions and leads him to devious thoughts, actions, and selfish relations with God as well as with his fellow man. Sin reigns both in death²⁰ and in the mortal body²¹ because "the sting of death is sin."²²

Because of death, man must first attend to the necessities of life in order to stay alive. In this struggle, self-interests are unavoidable. Thus, man is unable to live in accordance with his original destiny of unselfish love. This state of subjection under the reign of death is the root of man's weaknesses in which he becomes entangled in sin at the urging of the demons and by his own consent. Resting in the hands of the devil, the power of the fear of death is the root from which self-aggrandizement, egotism, hatred, envy, and other similar passions spring up. In addition to the fact that man "subjects himself to anything in order to avoid dying,"²³ he constantly fears that his life is without meaning. Thus, he strives to demonstrate to himself and to others that it has worth. He loves flatterers and hates his detractors. He seeks his own and envies the success of others. He loves those who love him and hates those who hate him. He seeks security and happiness in wealth, glory, bodily pleasures, and he may even imagine that his destiny is a self-seeking eudaemonistic and passionless enjoyment of the presence of God regardless of whether or not he has true, active, unselfish love for others. Fear and anxiety render man an individualist. And when he identifies himself with a communal or social ideology it, too, is out of individualistic, self-seeking motives because he perceives his self-satisfaction and *eudaemonia* as his destiny. Indeed, it is possible for him to be moved by ideological principles of vague love for mankind despite the fact that mortal

20. *Rm.* 5:21. "As for sin reigning in death, [Paul] says, 'Having become mortals, we have yet a greater inclination to sin.' For many fallings arise in us from the pleasures of food and drink and the outside world, and indeed from mixing with women. And in the case of each of these, many do not stand firmly for what is proper or fitting but are brought to countless sins. These things would not arise in an immortal nature. Which pleasure and what love of money, then, properly has its place in an immortal nature? But because we became mortals, and we are such by nature, from the aforementioned passions we suffer an untold disturbance, and henceforth we inherit a great inclination to sin. Therefore, [Paul] rightly said that sin reigns in death, virtually ruling us through the inclination to sin that was henceforth yoked to us." Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on Romans*, P.G. 66, 800. The widely held view that Theodore saw death as a simple phenomenon from God, therefore, is obviously inaccurate. He loudly proclaims everywhere, "We became mortals."

21. *Rm.* 6:12

22. *1 Cor.* 15:56.

23. John Chrysostom, *Commentary on Hebrews*, Homily 4, Ch. 6, P.G. 63, 41.

hatred for his neighbor nests in his heart. These are the works of the "flesh" under the sway of death and Satan.

Before revelation was given through the Mosaic law, man lived by the law of death, not knowing that death is a kind of parasite through which sin and the devil reign.²⁴ "For until the law, sin was in the world."²⁵ Of course, when the law is not known, sin is not imputed, for "sin is not imputed when there is no law."²⁶ But those who do not have the law shall be judged by the "law written in their hearts."²⁷ "For as many as have sinned without the law shall also perish without the law, and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law."²⁸

Sin is every transgression of the divine will, and consequently it is man's failure to realize his original destiny. Man's living by the law of death is not God's will. Therefore, he who lives by the law of death is a sinner even though he may not know that death is a kind of parasite in which sin dwells. Even if he is not a violator of the commandments of the law of God, he is, nevertheless, a violator of the will of God. "He who knows the will of his Lord and does not do it shall be punished greatly, but he who does not know it and does not do it shall be punished lightly."²⁹ Admittedly, then, it is better to transgress in ignorance than in the knowledge of the laws."³⁰ Man as a violator of the divine will is one thing, and quite another matter is his knowledge of transgression and his responsibility for transgressions.³¹ For example, it would be senseless to argue that cannibalism is

24. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 3, XVIII, 7.

25. *Rm.* 5:13.

26. *Ibid.*

27. *Rm.* 2:15.

28. *Rm.* 2:12.

29. *Cf. Lk.* 12:47.

30. Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on Romans*, P.G. 74, 804. Certain Fathers occasionally give the impression that they do not follow the Hebraic teaching regarding sins committed in ignorance (*cf.* G. F. Moore, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 461, 497), and for the customary purposes of preaching, they emphasize as sins exclusively those transgressions that are deliberate acts of will. A careful study of the subject, however, shows that the Fathers unanimously agree with the view expressed in the prayers of the Church, which is that sin, whether committed in knowledge or in ignorance, is a diseased condition. Thus, blessed Chrysostom says regarding sins in ignorance, "For no man ever sinned in ignorance...because if they sinned in ignorance, they would not be deserving of offering satisfaction." *Commentary on Romans*, Homily 5, P.G. 60, 508. Chrysostom could appear to be in disagreement with Cyril's passage above as well as with the following: "For we have transgressed, even if we did not know," *op. cit.*, P.G. 74, 805), in essence, however, both Fathers hold the same premise regarding sin.

31. *Cf.* C. Androutsos, *Δεύτερον Μάθημα περί Προπαιδευτικῆς Ἀμαρτήματος*, p. 11.

not a violation of the divine will when those who eat human flesh do not know the law of God. For sin is not simply and exclusively an action taken in knowledge by a responsible person. For Paul³² and the writers of the period, sin is the root cause of the condition that exists against the will of God. Precisely for this reason, as many as were born into that condition "were made sinners."³³ "All have turned aside,"³⁴ "all have sinned and are wanting for the glory of God."³⁵ In other words, because of the action of the devil through the death of the soul, that is, the loss of divine grace, and the infirmity of the flesh, men are born with a powerful inclination toward sin. And all, whether in knowledge or in ignorance, violate the will of God. All are born under captivity to the devil, death, and sin. Moreover, as a result, they fail to attain to their original destiny, that is, to moral perfection, immortality, and *theosis*, and are bereft of the glory of God.

Irenaeus writes, "But the law having come, which was given to Moses and testifies of sin and is sinful, it lifted up its dominion and revealed itself to be not a king but a thief. The law, however, added a burden to man, who had sin within himself, and it showed him to be a prisoner of death. Despite the fact that the law was spiritual, it only revealed sin, but it did not destroy it."³⁶ In other words, the law reveals the true nature of sin and death but does not destroy it. Thus, Paul says, "For, according to the inner man, I also delight in the law of God. But I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin that is in my members. O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?"³⁷ Only by the destruction of death by Christ and through the in-Christ communion of the immortality of the divine Spirit is man able to trample down sin that indwells in the

32. E. Lohmeyer offers strong arguments to prove that sin according to Paul does not mean primarily human acts of transgression but an objective, reigning principle. *Probleme Paulinischer Theologie*, Stuttgart, pp. 78-86. He does not, however, connect that principle with death as its cause, even though he comes close to this view (*ibid.*, p. 154), because he fails to consider Paul's views of the original destiny of man who was shipwrecked through sin and death. Besides, he completely overlooks such passages as *Rm.* 8:20-22, *2 Cor.* 11:3, *1 Tim.* 2:14, and argues that "nowhere is it written that the devil is the source and inventor of sin." *Ibid.*, p. 87. And not recognizing the real connection between sin and death, therefore, he attributes everything, that is, the fall, Satan, and sin, to myths.

33. *Rm.* 5:19.

34. *Rm.* 3:12.

35. *Rm.* 3:23.

36. *Refutation*, 3, XVIII, 7.

37. *Rm.* 7:22-24.

flesh and, thus, live according to the Spirit of freedom. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."³⁸

In the thought of the theologians of the period, it is evident that salvation from death equals salvation from the rule of sin. Irenaeus writes, "Because death reigned in the body, it was necessary and proper, by means also of one body, that death be abolished and man freed from its oppression. Thus, the Logos became flesh that, by means of a body through which sin had prevailed and remained and reigned, death be abolished and no longer be in us."³⁹ "God recapitulated in Himself the ancient creature in order to put sin to death, to deprive death of its power, and to give life to man."⁴⁰

If Christ had not abolished death, sin would continue to rule. "For if Christ be not risen...ye are yet in your sins."⁴¹ Irenaeus similarly emphasizes, "Those, then, who argue that Christ had only the appearance of a man without being born in the flesh and, therefore, without truly becoming man, remain under the old condemnation as co-workers of sin since, according to them, death is not abolished which reigned from Adam to Moses and even ruled over those who did not sin in the same manner as the transgression of Adam."⁴²

It is noteworthy that during this period, the interpretation of the phrase "because of which all have sinned"⁴³ never appears to be the problem that it became later. This silence is powerful proof that doubt did not exist about the meaning of this passage. If there had been a problem with this passage, the Gnostics would have exploited it easily to support their belief in the fall of souls in a previous existence. The two later interpretations, "in Adam all have sinned" and "because all have sinned," would have been tantamount to a powerful argument in support of such heretical teachings about the fall.

Nowhere does a problem arise regarding "because of which" and its meaning or regarding the fact that death was viewed as

38. *Rm.* 8:2.

39. *Proof*, 31.

40. Irenaeus, *Refutation*, 3, XVIII, 7.

41. 1 *Cor.* 15:17.

42. *Op. cit.*, 3, XVIII, 7. R. Seeberg writes, "But, in fact, what Harnack says about this does not add up: What is decisive for him is the annulling of the consequences of sin, viz., humanity's mortal destiny. For according to Irenaeus' way of thinking, sin is itself only one component of death: It is not death as a destiny that Christ abolishes but mortality, which includes sin in itself." *Op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 332, n1.

43. *Rm.* 5:12.

the root from which sin springs up. This firmly justifies the view that the passage was naturally understood by the writers of the period to mean "because of death all have sinned."⁴⁴ The case for this is made strongly by Irenaeus, who uses the phrase "because of death" (ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ) etiologically. In this vein, he speaks of "the passions that have naturally befallen us because of death; I refer to grief and cowardice and perplexity, distress and all the rest by which our nature afflicted with death and corruptibility is known."⁴⁵ "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, because of which [death] all have sinned."⁴⁶

D. Conclusion

In conclusion, we offer the following excerpts from sermons of St. Cyril of Alexandria and St. John Chrysostom about *Romans* 5:19 and *Hebrews* 2:14-15 respectively. These excerpts wonderfully summarize what we have concluded from the writings of the period of our study about the ancestral sin, Satan, death, resurrection, and freedom.

The Patriarch of Alexandria asks, "How did many become sinners because of [Adam]? What are his missteps to us? How could we, who were not yet born, all be condemned with him, even though God said, 'Neither the fathers shall be put to death

44. See J. S. Romanides, *Original Sin*, p. 22f.; S. Lyonnet, *Le sens de ἐφ' ὃ ἐν Rom. 5, 12 et l'exégèse des Pères grecs*, in "Biblica," Rome 1955, Vol. 36, Fasc. 4.

45. Fragment 52b, *BENEEZ*, Vol. 5, p. 186. Commenting on "Sold under sin" (*Rm.* 7:14), Chrysostom writes, "Because with death, he is saying, there entered in a horde of passions. For when the body became mortal, it was necessary for it also to receive concupiscence, anger, pain, and all the other passions which required much wisdom to prevent them from inundating us and drowning our reason in the depth of sin. For in themselves these were not sin, but in their uncontrolled excess this is what they work." *Op. cit.*, P.G. 60, 507. Here Chrysostom does not deny the condition from which sin springs up. He clearly says that concupiscence appeared "when the body became mortal." Therefore, death and the concupiscence that it engenders are an abnormal and diseased condition from which sins springs up. Chrysostom avoids calling this condition itself sin because for him, "No man ever sinned in ignorance." *Op. cit.*, P.G. 60, 508. Like Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom accepts corruptibility as the condition in which sin springs up. He does not call the condition itself sin, however, as Cyril does because he uses the term "sin" for actions and conditions in which man participates by his own volition. Basically, Cyril and Chrysostom say the same thing; only their terminology is different.

46. *Rm.* 5:12.

because of their children nor the children because of their fathers, but the soul which sinneth shall be put to death?'⁴⁷ Surely, the soul that sins shall die. For we became sinners through Adam's disobedience in such a manner as this. He was created for incorruption and life, and the manner of existence he had in the garden of delight was proper to holiness. His whole mind (*nous*) was continuously beholding God; his body was tranquil and calm with all base pleasures being still. For there was no tumult of alien disturbances in it. But because he fell under sin and slipped into corruptibility, pleasures and filthiness assaulted the nature of the flesh, and in our members was unveiled a savage law. Our nature, then, became diseased by sin through the disobedience of one, that is, of Adam. Thus, all were made sinners, not by being co-transgressors with Adam, something which they never were, but by being of his nature and falling under the law of sin...Human nature fell ill in Adam and subject to corruptibility through disobedience, and, therefore, the passions entered in."⁴⁸

The Patriarch of Constantinople says, "Then, having pointed out the brotherliness [of Christ] (*Heb. 2:14*), [Paul] also sets forth the purpose of the economy: 'That through death,' he says, 'He might destroy him that has the power of death, that is, the devil.' Here he presents the wonder: the thing by which the devil had prevailed, by that also was he vanquished, which was his strong weapon against the world; that [thing] is death. By this did Christ smite him. And in this [Paul] shows the greatness of the Conqueror's power. Do you see how good a thing death has achieved? And he says, 'He might deliver them who through fear of death were all their lives subject to bondage.' (v. 15) Why do you shudder, he says. Why do you fear what has been destroyed? It is no longer terrible but is abolished, utterly despised, and worthless...But what is the meaning of 'who through fear of death were all their lives subject to bondage?' What is he saying? Either that he who fears death is a slave and subjects himself to everything in order to avoid dying, or that all men were slaves of death and were held under its power because it had not yet been done away with, or that men lived in continual fear...He shows, too, that not only has death been put to an end, but also that through this he who is ever waging a relentless war against us, that is, the devil, is abolished. For he who does not fear death is outside of the tyranny of the devil.

47. Cf. *Deut. 24:18*.

48. *Commentary on Romans*, P.G. 74, 788-789.

For if indeed 'man would give skin for skin, and all things for [the sake of] his life,'⁴⁹ and if a man should decide to disregard this, whose slave is he then? He fears no one, is in terror of no one, is higher than everyone, and is freer than everyone. For he who disregards his own life disregards more so all other things. And when the devil finds such a soul, he can accomplish in it none of his works. Tell me, though, what can he threaten? The loss of money or honor? Or exile from one's country? For these are small things to him 'who counteth not even his life dear,'⁵⁰ says blessed Paul. Do you see that in casting out the tyranny of death, He has dissolved the strength of the devil? For one who has learned countless wise things concerning the resurrection, how then shall he fear death? How shall he be in terror? Therefore, you ought not be grieved and say, 'Why do we suffer such and such things?' For so the victory becomes more brilliant. It would not be brilliant if He had not destroyed death by death. And the wonder of it is this: He vanquished him through the very things in which he was strong, in every point showing the abundance of His means and His great skill. Let us not betray the gift bestowed on us. 'For,' he says, 'we have not received a spirit of fear of but a spirit of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.'⁵¹ Let us stand boldly, then, laughing death to scorn."⁵²

49. *Job* 2:4.

50. *Acts* 20:24.

51. *Rm.* 8:15; *2 Tim.* 1:7.

52. *Commentary on Hebrews*, Homily 4, Ch. 6, P.G. 63, 41-42.