

M A N  
IN HIS ORIGINAL STATE  
AND IN THE STATE OF SIN\*  
**According to St. Cyril of Alexandria**

B Y  
CONSTANTINE DRATSELLAS, Ph. D.

---

P A R T T W O  
  
ADAM IN THE STATE OF SIN

Although Cyril did not write any systematic work on the subject of sin, nevertheless, whenever he refers to this problem, he considers it very seriously and connects it with the whole of Theology. The seriousness of this problem lies, (i) in the gravity of sin itself and its results for Adam and the whole of mankind, (ii) in the fact that it was a simple creature who sinned against God the Creator, (iii) in the fact that God was not only Adam's Creator but also his great benefactor and (iv) in the fact that the Incarnation of the Logos would not have been necessary if man had not sinned.

In the section that follows, we shall deal with Cyril's teaching about the possibility of sinning in Adam, the formal and essential character of Adam's sin and its essence.

CHAPTER ONE  
POSSIBILITY OF SINNING IN ADAM

Here we are faced with a difficult question. How is it that Adam in the state of his holiness, his happiness, his spiritual and intellectual clear-sightedness, his intimacy with God, could possibly sin? The possibility of sinning in Adam can be understood in two ways: either (i) this possibility was in Adam's nature in the sense that he was

---

\* Συνέχεια ἐκ τῆς σελ. 556 τοῦ προηγούμενου τόμου.

bound to sin, and thus he could not do otherwise, or (ii) in Adam there was this possibility of sinning in the sense that (a) it was not compulsory for him to sin and (b) it was, also, not impossible for him to sin.

Cyril finds three reasons for such a possibility of sinning:

I. In the existence of the external temptation by the Devil. It was not Adam who first invented sin, nor did sin belong to Adam's nature, for in that case sin could not be punished<sup>1</sup>, nor even did Adam's sin consist of any act of rebellion or sinful desire because such a desire had no place in Adam before his sin. That is why Cyril calls sin *ἐπεισακτον*<sup>2</sup> and *νόθον*<sup>3</sup>. Satan<sup>4</sup>, the inventor and father of sin<sup>5</sup> existed before man sinned and fell. There existed the origin of sin<sup>6</sup>, i.e. the founder of transgression<sup>7</sup>, who first brought sin into the world<sup>8</sup>. He was the external tempter of Adam and had power to lead man to evil<sup>9</sup>.

There is no doubt that Satan was also created by God as one of His good angels<sup>10</sup>. He and all the other powers which later became evil, together with the holy rational creatures, filled the heavenly mansions, being distinguished in glory and far higher than man<sup>11</sup>. But he, although created as a good spirit, became Satan because of overweening pride<sup>12</sup>, and being the inventor<sup>13</sup> of envy for man's beatitude, did not stop tempting him<sup>14</sup>.

It was Satan who used guile and deceit, of which he was again the originator<sup>15</sup>, in order to lead Adam astray from God<sup>16</sup>. «This Satan,

1. «Οὐ φυσικὴ ἡ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐνέργεια (ἀτιμώρητος γὰρ ἂν ἦν), ἀλλ' ὅτι τὸ εὐόλισθον τῇ φύσει συγκεκλήρωται, νικᾷ δὲ ἁμῶς γνώμη καὶ πόνοις, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀνάγκη κρατεῖται διὰ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον». (In Psal. 50,7. PG 69, 1089).

2. Pasch. Hom. 6. PG 77, 512.

3. (De Trinit. IE' (Dubia) PG 77, 1152).

4. In Genes. PG 69, 20.

5. «Ἄμαρτίας εὐρετῆς καὶ πατῆρ» (De Ador. 68,148).

Also: «Κληθεῖν δ' ἂν ἁμαρτωλὸς καὶ ὁ τῆς ἁμαρτίας εὐρετῆς Σατανᾶς, ὃς δικαίῳ κρίματι συνελήφθη τοῖς ἰδίοις ἔργοις περιπεσών». (In Psal. 9,17. PG 69, 776).

6. «Ἀρχέκακος» (In Genes. PG 69, 24).

7. In Isaiam. 9,4. PG 70, 249.

8. «Πατῆρ γάρ, οἶμαι, καὶ βασιλεὺς ἁμαρτίας, ὁ πρῶτος αὐτὴν εἰς κόσμον ἐνεγκών». (De Adorat. A. PG 68, 152).

9. In Ioan. 13,29. PG 74, 149.

10. In Genes. 1,3. PG 69, 21.

11. In Genes. 3. PG 69, 24.

12. «Ἐξ ὑπεροψίας» (In Genes. 1,8. PG 69, 24).

13. De Adorat. 1. PG 68, 148.

14. In Ioan. 1,9. PG 73, 145.

15. Pasch. Hom. 6. PG 77, 513.

16. In Isaiam 25, 10. PG 70, 568.

having become tyrant over us by means of a deceit, feared that human nature, being free, would revert to its former condition. For he knew that man was always being urged by the reproofs of conscience to return to the better way, and that he hated sin as something adventitious and he was unhappy in wrong-doing, even though little pleasure could deduce him to it. But in order that man might not use his powers of self-control and be led by his tendency towards freedom to making an end of the pleasure which had become his tyrant... he (Satan) devised another means of deceit which he used as an instrument of his villainy: he suppressed the greater part of man's sorrows for sin, always using deceit in his fight against the pricks of conscience. He told them (Adam and Eve): «You are not yourselves responsible for not being able to follow the better way nor has God placed temperance within your power; He has laid upon you a yoke of necessity; fate and nature are your masters, and you cannot but do their will. By such deceits the Devil enslaved man and, leading him astray from the truth, made him more ready for sin»<sup>17</sup>. Because of this guile, man was led to what he ought not to have done<sup>18</sup>. Man was led to disobedience<sup>19</sup>, to transgression<sup>20</sup>, and sin<sup>21</sup> against God. Satan presented the forbidden tree as eatable and Adam fell<sup>22</sup>. Therefore, before man sinned and fell, the inventor of sin, the tempter of Adam,

17. «Δαίμων ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἀρχέκακος ὁ τῆς ἀμαρτίας πατήρ, παραβάτην τῆς θείας ἐντολῆς δεῖξας τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ὡσπερ τινὰ τῶν δορυκτῆτων ὑπὸ χειρας ἐλών, καὶ τύραννος ἐξ ἀπάτης ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἀναδειγμένος, ἐδεδίει τῆς ἐλευθέρας φύσεως τὴν ἐφ' ἅπερ ἦν ἀναδρομήν. Ἦδει γάρ, ἤδει τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ συνειδότητος ἐλέγχους, αἰεὶ πρὸς τὸ κρεῖττον ἀναφεύγειν ἐπειγόμενον· καὶ μισοῦντα μὲν ὡς ἐπείσακτον τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, ἐν δὲ τῷ πλημμελεῖν αἰεὶ σκυθρωπάζοντα, καὶ εἰ κλέπτοίτῳ πῶς πρὸς τοῦτο διὰ μικρᾶς ἡδονῆς. Ἄλλ' ἵνα μὴ ταῖς οἰκειαῖς αὐτονομίαις χρῆσάμενος, ἀφανίσῃ μὲν τῷ πρὸς ἐλευθερίαν ἔλκοντι τόνῳ τὴν τυραννήσασαν ἡδονὴν μακρὰν δὲ οἰμώζειν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις εἰπών, ἐπὶ τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀναβαίνοι πλεονεκτήματα, καὶ τοῖς τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἔργοις ἐμφιλοχωρῶν, ἀχείρωτος ἦδη ταῖς ἄνωθεν ἐπικουρίαις εὐρίσκοιτο· ἕτερον ἀπάτης ἐπενόησε τρόπον, ὃς ταύτην αἰεὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ κακουργίας ὄπλον ποιησάμενος, ὑποκλέπτων δὲ ὡσπερ τῆς ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις λύπης τὸ πλεόν, αἰεὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ συνειδότητος ἐλέγχους διὰ δόλου μαχόμενος, οὐκ αὐτοί, φησὶν, ἑαυτοῖς ἔστε τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι τὰ ἀμείνω πράττειν παραίτιοι· οὐδὲ τέθεικεν ὁ Θεὸς ταῖς ὑμετέρας ἐξουσίας τὸ σωφρονεῖν. Ζυγὸν ὑμῖν ἀναγκαῖον ἐπελήλακεν· εἰμαρμένη κρατεῖ καὶ γένεσις καὶ πράττειν ἀνάγκη τὸ ἐκεῖναις δοκοῦν. Ταῖς τοιαύταις ἀπάταις ὁ πονηρὸς χειροῦται τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τῶν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀποβουκολήσας δογμάτων, ἐτοιμότερον εἰς πᾶσαν ἀμαρτίαν ἀπεργάζεται». (Hom. Pasch. VI. PG 77, 512-3).

18. «Ἐφ' ἃ μὴ προσῆκε» (In Genes. 1. PG 69, 24).

19. «Πρὸς παρακοήν» (De Adorat. 1. PG 68, 148).

20. «Πρὸς παράβασιν» (In Genes. 1. PG 69, 21).

21. «Πρὸς ἀμαρτίαν» (Ibid.)

22. In Genes. 1. PG 69, 24.

external temptation had existed. Certainly this external temptation and Adam's sin must be neither confused nor identified. Adam's temptation by the Devil was not Adam's personal sin. We understand the possibility of sinning in Adam in the sense that for Adam there was this external danger. Sin was adventitious, accidental, and did not belong to man's nature.

II. Cyril sees the possibility of sinning within Adam. This could be considered as an intrinsic reason. «Man was created according to the Image of God and after His Likeness»<sup>23</sup>. His mind was superior to sin and passions<sup>24</sup>, since the power of sin was not natural<sup>25</sup>. Cyril, however, points out that Adam was not unchangeable and therefore on the one hand there was the possibility of remaining in the state of his ancient nature if he had neither sinned nor disobeyed<sup>26</sup>, and on the other hand the possibility of changing was not ruled out for him, since Adam was able to do what he would choose<sup>27</sup>. Since Adam was not incapable of changing and since this change cannot be understood except in terms of sin, the possibility of sinning existed for Adam. Adam was not unchangeable because he, being a creature, was not infinite<sup>28</sup>. Only God is infinite and therefore unchangeable.

In his work against Julian<sup>29</sup>, Cyril expresses this idea more clearly. God created man, and his nature was not unchangeable. Man should not have been unchangeable because this would have destroyed the idea of any freedom in choosing that for which he had to be either rewarded or

23. De Incarn. Unig. A.6. PG 75, 1013.

24. «Πεποιήται μὲν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἀρχαῖς ἀμαρτίας μὲν καὶ παθῶν ἀνωτέρω πως ἔτι τὴν διάνοιαν ἔχων, οὐ μὴν ἀνεπίδεκτος παντελῶς τῆς ἐφ' ὅπερ ἂν ἔλοιτο παρατροπῆς». (De Ador. PG 68, 145).

25. «Οὐ φυσικὴ ἡ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἐνέργεια (ἀτιμώρητος γὰρ ἂν ἦν)». (In Psal. 50,7. PG 69, 1089).

26. «Καὶ διέμεινεν ἂν ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τῆς φύσεως ἀγαθοῖς, εἰ μὴ τέτραπτο πρὸς ἀπόστασιν καὶ παρακοήν, ἀβουλότατα παρελθὼν τὴν διορισθεῖσαν ἐντολὴν ἄνωθεν». (In Ioan. 13, 18. PG 74, 129).

27. «Πεποιήται μὲν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἀρχαῖς, ἀμαρτίας μὲν καὶ παθῶν ἀνωτέρω πως ἔτι τὴν διάνοιαν ἔχων, οὐ μὴν ἐνεπίδεκτος παντελῶς τῆς ἐφ' ὅπερ ἂν ἔλοιτο παρατροπῆς. Ἐδόκει γὰρ ἔχειν ὀρθῶς τῷ πάντων ἀριστοτέχνῃ Θεῷ, τῶν ἰδίων θελημάτων ἀνάπτειν αὐτῷ τὰς ἡνίας καὶ ἀναθεῖναι δρᾶν τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοκελεύστοις ὁρμαῖς. Προαιρετικὴν γὰρ ἔδει, καὶ οὐχ ὡσπερ ἐξ ἀνάγκης ὀρθᾶσθαι τὴν ἀρετὴν». (De Adorat. PG 68, 145).

28. «Ἄπαντα μὲν ἀμαρτία ἐκ παρατροπῆς τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίονος ἐπὶ τὸ μὴ οὕτως ἔχον λαμβάνει τὴν γένεσιν, ἐντίκτεται δὲ τοῖς τρέπεσθαι πεφυκόσι καὶ ἀλλοιώσεως τῆς ἐφ' ἧ μὴ προσῆκε δεκτικοῖς». (In Ioan. 8,45. PG 73, 901-4).

29. C. Julian. 3. PG 76, 617.

punished. Man had to be personally responsible. Innate virtue is not real virtue and it cannot be rewarded.

Speaking of man as being changeable, Cyril says that even man's soul is changeable<sup>30</sup>, since, as we have seen, it was created by God, but not out of His own substance. Only God is unchangeable as only the Divine nature and substance is not «γεννητή»<sup>31</sup>. If Adam were unchangeable, then either he would not have simply been a creature, since only God is unchangeable by nature, or God would have been simply One similar to His creatures. Then He could not have been called Creator, since He would have had the same nature as His creatures, and would have been one of His creatures. Creatures cannot be but creatures. Their creation is their first real change from not being into being.

This subject should be further examined. Cyril presents another important point. Adam was created holy with aptitude towards good. At the beginning, this holiness was given to the nature of man and as natural, it could neither be punished nor rewarded<sup>32</sup>. Adam had this aptitude towards good by nature because God Himself had put it in Adam's nature<sup>33</sup>. This holiness was given to Adam as an aptitude and power but not as a complete activity. He was not given a complete holiness. «Πᾶσα μὲν ἐπιτηδειότης... οὐ πάντως δὲ καὶ ἐνέργεια»<sup>34</sup>. The perfection of Adam in holiness had to be considered as his activity. Adam had to realise this activity by improving and making perfect his power, his aptitude and his holiness through his personal efforts; undoubtedly not without Divine Grace.

Cyril does not speak of Adam in terms of absolute moral perfection and complete holiness. However, it must be repeated here that this imperfection in itself was neither Adam's guilt nor his sin. Imperfection and sin must neither be confused nor identified. Finally, since Adam was not perfect, as we have seen, the possibility of sinning existed for him.

30. «Τρεπτή» (De Adorat. 1. PG 68, 148).

31. «Οὐκ ἀνέχεται τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ὅτι μὴ φύσεώς ἐστι... γεννητῆς, οὐκ ἐχούσης τὸ ἀτρεπτον καὶ τὸ εἰς ἅπαν διαδιδράσκειν δύνασθαι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν» (C. Anthrop. 1. PG 76, 1096).

32. In Psalm. 58,7. PG 69, 1089.

33. «Παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ... ἔφεσιν... ἐγκατεβάλετο φυσικῶς» (C. Anthrop. II'. PG 76, 1081).

34. «Ἐν δὲ γε τῷ πρωτοπλάστῳ πᾶσα μὲν ἐπιτηδειότης ἦν, ἀποφέρουσα δύναμιν πρὸς ἀνάληψιν ἀρετῆς, οὐ πάντως δὲ καὶ ἐνέργεια. Ἀποδέδοται μὲν τῇ ἀνθρώπου φύσει τὸ ἐν Ἀδὰμ ἐν ἀρχῇ, τοῦτέστιν ὁ ἀγιασμός. Τὸ δὲ περιττόν, ὡς γε οἶμαι, φησὶ τὸ κατ' ἐνέργειαν ὁρᾶσθαι σεπτούς καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τῶν κατορθωμάτων καταφαιδρύνεσθαι. (C. Anthrop. I PG 76, 1096).

Only for God is there no possibility of sinning because He alone is by His Nature beyond any imperfection. Nor can we speak of any guilt in God because of Adam's sin. God did not wish Adam to sin and fall<sup>35</sup>. Adam himself decided and sinned<sup>36</sup>. Had man been created perfect, his holiness could not have been of any moral value.

The imperfection of Adam was not guilt for him. God wanted to create men with the possibility of making themselves perfect and worthy of reward, undoubtedly not without God's Grace. Innate holiness and awarded virtue should not be confused.

III. In examining the great problem of Adam's freedom Cyril also speaks of the possibility of sinning in Adam. God is free<sup>37</sup>, and since man was created according to the Image of God, then man is a free being as well. Cyril expresses this idea in saying that God is free and man has been modelled after Him<sup>38</sup>. There is a great difference between God's freedom, which is absolute, and man's freedom, which can only be relative, since it is the freedom of a finite creature. Freedom cannot be understood apart from the idea of self-control. God is the absolutely free Being, controlling His own Will<sup>39</sup>. As the image of God, man relatively controlled himself and his own will<sup>40</sup>. If Adam had not been a free being, he might have been holy, even perfect, but he could not have been called an Image of the free God. Cyril does not separate the two ideas: freedom and self-control<sup>41</sup>. Here Cyril considers Adam's freedom internally and externally as well. In other words, Adam could freely express and do whatever he had freely thought and wished. He had the power and possibility of controlling himself, his thoughts, his desires, his actions. He had this possibility because he was free to do so. Only free beings can control themselves. If Adam were not free, then he could not control himself. But Cyril speaks of Adam as being able to control himself. Again, if Adam could not control himself, then he could be neither free nor the image of God. But in Cyril's teaching Adam is considered as having been created free as an Image of the free God.

35. In Genes. 1. PG 69, 25.

36. «Ὁ δὲ ἠρρώστησε τὸ ποθεῖν» (Ibid.) PG 69, 25.

37. «Ἐλεύθερον τὸ Θεῖον» (In Genes. 1. PG 59, 24).

38. Ibid.

39. «Ἐπειδὴ δὲ αὐτοπροαίρετος ὢν, καὶ τὰς τῶν ἰδίων θελημάτων πεπιστευμένος ἡνίας, ἐτρέπη καὶ πέπτωκε· (μοῖρα γὰρ τῆς εἰκόνας καὶ αὐτῆ· ἐξουσιάζει γὰρ τῶν οικειῶν θελημάτων Θεός)». (In Ioan. 14,20. PG 74, 277).

40. Ibid.

41. «Αὐτοκρατῆς καὶ ἐλεύθερος» (C. Julian. 8. PG 76, 995).

Yet while Cyril connects freedom and self-control so closely, he distinguishes the latter from necessity. Possessing self-control, man is not kept by necessity<sup>42</sup>. Depending on man's freedom, self-control belongs to man's nature. Necessity, the doing of something opposed to man's will, comes from outside as an external factor. Adam could control himself not by an external necessity but by his will. If he could control himself and his actions, he could either harmonise them or not to the free Will of God. Adam had in his power the possibility of choosing either good or evil because he was the master of both<sup>43</sup>. Here Cyril distinguishes clearly between sin and the possibility of sinning in Adam. He had this possibility of choosing and doing either good or evil, and he was moreover master of his inclination in either.

It was God who gave to Adam the power to act as he would choose<sup>44</sup> because God wished that virtue should be free and not of necessity<sup>45</sup>. Virtue and necessity are two irreconcilable things. Virtue by necessity is not real virtue. We cannot speak of virtue unless it comes from a free will. The tree of virtue grows only in the fertile field of freedom, and this freedom was for Adam the real area within which he was called to struggle in order to show that he wanted, and was worthy of participating in God's beatitude. If Adam were freely able to act virtuously, it would have also been possible for him not to do so, not to do good, and therefore to do evil, to sin; otherwise he would not have been free. According to Cyril, for Adam the possibility of preferring and doing evil was not ruled out, but still existed.

Therefore, either Adam was given freedom and was capable of doing what he wanted, or he could not do so and thus was not free. But if Adam were not free, then he could not have been punished for

42. «Ὀὐκ ἀνάγκη κρατεῖται διὰ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον» (In Psalm. 50. PG 69, 1089).

43. In Ioan. Pusey 2, 123.

44. «Ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀνώλεθρον ἐποίησεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν ἀρχαῖς εὐθὺς ὁ πάντων Δημιουργός, οὐκ ἰδίας φύσεως νόμοις ἐρηρισμένον εἰς τοῦτο, καὶ ἀκλονήτως ἔχοντά ποθεν. Νοσεῖν γὰρ ἀνάγκη τοῖς ὑπὸ γένεσιν τὴν φθοράν, καὶ τὸ ἄρχειν τοῦ πεποιήσθαι λαχὸν διέρπει που πάντως εἰς τὸ καταλῆξαι δεῖν. Ἄλλ' ἐπειδήπερ ὧδε ἔχει αὐτὸν ὁ Δημιουργός ἤθελε, πρὸς τῷ ἀνώλεθρῳ, καὶ παντὸς εἶδησιν ἀγαθοῦ, καὶ μὴν καὶ ἔφεισεν τὴν εἰς ἀρετὴν ἐνεχάραττε τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ. Εἴτα δρᾶν ἐπ' ἐξουσίας ὅπερ ἂν ἔλοιτο διδοῦς, τὴν ἐλευθέρους πρέπουσαν ἐχαρίζετο δόξαν· ἔδει γάρ, ἔδει προαιρετικὴν ἐν ἡμῖν ὀρᾶσθαι τὴν ἀρετὴν. Εἴτα τοῖς τοῦ διαβόλου φανακισμοῖς ὀλιγορήσας νόμων, θανάτῳ καταδικάζετο καὶ ταῖς παραβάσεσι συνηρώστησε τὴν φθοράν». (Pasch. Hom. 15, PG 77, 744).

45. «Προαιρετικὴν ἔδει ὀρᾶσθαι τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀνάγκης, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ φύσεως νόμοις ἀδιαπτῶτως ἐρηρισμένην» (De Adorat. I'. PG 68, 145.)

his sin since he would not have sinned willingly<sup>46</sup>. Punishment is always related to a free act because only then can we speak of personal responsibility. There is no punishment without personal responsibility and guilt, and there is no guilt without personal free will. Without freedom, even Adam's moral actions could have no moral value. There existed for Adam the possibility of sinning. Hence sin was a reality; that is why Adam went to the opposite<sup>47</sup> willingly, and therefore he himself chose punishment and its consequences<sup>48</sup>, although he could have remained in the good state of his ancient nature if he had not sinned, disobeyed and transgressed the divine Command<sup>49</sup>.

We close this chapter with a general remark. Cyril sees the possibility of sinning in Adam in the sense that Adam was not bound to sin, since God did not force him to do so, nor did sin belong to his nature. Adam, who was created relatively sinless, had to become positively perfect. But in order to achieve this perfection, he had to be extremely careful because the danger, the possibility of sinning, existed. God wanted to test Adam in his use of freedom. Being in a state of probation, man succumbed to temptation. Although Cyril teaches that real freedom is obedience to God, he does however say, as we have seen, that Adam was free to disobey God's will and did so.

---

46. De Adorat. 15. PG 68, 977.

47. «...ἀποκλίνοντες εις τὸ ἐναντίον...» (De Adorat. 6. PG 68, 453).

48. «Ἐΐλετο μᾶλλον τὰς ἐκ τοῦ κολάζεσθαι πικρίας καὶ τοῖς οὕτω δεινοῖς ἐκτρέχεσθαι κακοῖς» (In Isaiam 5,25. PG 70, 160).

49. «Διέμεινεν ἂν ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τῆς φύσεως ἀγαθοῖς, εἰ μὴ ἐτέτραπτο πρὸς ἀποστασίαν καὶ παρακοήν, ἀβουλότατα παρελθὼν τὴν διορισθεῖσαν ἐντολὴν ἄνωθεν» (In Ioan. 13,18. PG 74, 129).



## CHAPTER TWO

### CHARACTER AND RELATIONS OF ADAM'S SIN

The reconciliation between God and man inevitably presupposes the existence of a separation «owing to sin». Atonement is a real reconciliation, a real work. Therefore, we have to see sin as a reality. If sin is the obstacle for the extension of the Kingdom of God on earth, then to depreciate sin is to depreciate the greatness of the redemptive work of Christ. Christian dogmatics have to deal with both the nature and the origin of sin. The knowledge of the nature of sin is the norm for the knowledge of its origin<sup>1</sup>. In order to understand the seriousness of Adam's sin, we have to examine it by itself, in its double character, and then in its relations: first to the Devil, who, by the means he used, led man away from God; secondly, to God against Whom man sinned; and thirdly to Adam himself who committed this sin.

#### **I. Adam's Sin by itself: Its Formal and Material Character.**

##### a) The Formal Character of Adam's Sin.

By the formal character of Adam's sin, we mean the external form of the realisation of his decision to sin. Cyril sees this external form in the fact that Adam made «the forbidden fruit eatable»<sup>2</sup>. But Adam's action cannot be separated from its inward cause, in other words, from Adam's decision to do so. That is why, speaking of Adam's sin, we cannot speak of this external act of «eating of the forbidden fruit» only. This action was the external result of an inward cause. It was a real act of Adam.

##### b) The Material Character of Adam's Sin.

In order to characterize Adam's sin, Cyril uses different words and terms for his sin which can be seen from different aspects. It may be regarded either as «a missing of man's true end» and then it is ἀμαρτία

---

1. Hearing op. c. p. 451.

2. In Genes. I'. 3. PG 69,21.

or as an «inattentive hearing of God» and then it is παρακοή, or as a «transgressing of the Lord's Law» and then it is παράβασις, or as an «action contrary to the Law of God» and then it is ἀνομία or, finally, as a «negative omission of good» and then it is παράπτωμα. Cyril uses all these terms. We shall try to examine each one separately. However, as we shall see, the Cyrillian meaning of sin is to be found in all of these different notions put together.

(a) Ἀμαρτία (=Sin). Cyril uses this term very often<sup>3</sup>. The etymology of this word is not certain. Suidas derives it from the verb μάρπτω and ἀμαρτία means failing to grasp. According to Buttman, the word is derived from the verb μείρομαι which comes from the root μέρος. From that a negative intransitive verb ἀμαρτάνω was formed. Therefore ἀμαρτάνειν means to be without a share in, to miss, to fail. Thus ἀμαρτία is regarded as failing in and missing the true goal of man's being and life<sup>4</sup>, and in Adam's case it implies his failure in trying to reach and obtain what he sought. In the case of Adam's sin, the term ἀμαρτία is used to indicate both the act of sinning and sin itself, while ἀμαρτημα (because of the ending-μα) shows only the outcome and action of sin. Here Cyril presents a negative aspect of Adam's sin, the aspect of failing and missing.

(b) Παρακοή<sup>5</sup> (=disobedience). In its very strict sense, this term means not only failing to hear, but also an inattentive hearing. Apparently the word contains the notion of an active disobedience. In Adam's case, the word is used to indicate the idea of failing to listen to God, and it is inseparably connected with the idea of refusing to hear and to obey God<sup>6</sup>. The idea of disobedience presupposes the person who disobeys, the law which is transgressed and the Person whom man disobeys. In Adam's case it was God Who gave the command; it was Adam

3. In Ionam Prophet. 1, 1. PG 71, 604. In Genes. I'. PG 69, 24. In Ioan. 1, 1-2. PG 71, 601. In Is. 5,2. PG 70, 137.

4. Buttman Ph. Lexilogos. Hildesheim 1968<sup>5</sup> p. 129.

See also Grimm: Greek-English Lexicon of the N.T.<sup>3</sup> Edinburgh 1893. p. 30.

5. «Φθόνου γάρ και ἀμαρτίας εὐρετής ὄν και πατήρ, ἀπρακτεῖν οὐκ ἤθελε περὶ τὸ ἐπὶ γῆς ζῶον, τοῦτ' ἔστι, τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Εἶτα δόλω και ἀπάταις ὑπελθὼν, παρεκδύμισεν εἰς παρακοήν, πανουργίας ὀργάνω τῷ γυναιῶ χρώμενος. Ἄει γάρ πως ἡμᾶς κατασειοῦσι πρὸς τὸ ἀκαλλῆς τοῦτ' ἔστι, εἰς ἀμαρτίαν, αἱ σὺν ἡμῖν τε και ἐν ἡμῖν ἦδοναι' ἦδονῆς δὲ τύπος ἡ γυνή. Ὁμωπειαις δὲ ταῖς ἐξ ἡδονῶν καταθεῖ πολλάκις ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνεθέλητον ὁ νοῦς». (De Adorat. A'. PG 68, 148).

6. Trenschn R. Synonyma des N.T. G. J. by H. Werner, Tübingen 1907, p. 155-6.

who disobeyed God, and it was in relation to the Divine Law that man disobeyed Him. Here we can speak of a real refusal of Adam to obey God and to conform his will to God's. Hence the seriousness of man's disobedience was great. Finally, we can say that this disobedience subjectively shows Adam's own will and decision to sin; objectively, it shows the event which took place in the relations between God and man, the event of disobedience. Here Cyril presents the positive aspect of Adam's sin, a conscious action of disobedience to God.

(c) Παράβσις<sup>7</sup> (= Transgression). The word means transgressing or overpassing an aim or line, and indicates the transgressor, the law-giver, and the existence of a law. We cannot speak of transgression unless there is something to transgress. Even before Adam's fall took place, Divine Law existed. Thus we can speak of the transgression of that Divine Law by Adam. This transgression is more serious than sin (Rom. II. 23) because the transgression is a real ὕβρις against God and His Holy Will. Adam's sin was a real ὕβρις against God, a real, despicable περιφρόνησις and a great ingratitude against the great benefactor, God.

(d) Παράπτωμα<sup>8</sup> (= Fault). There is a distinction between ἁμαρτία and παράπτωμα. Παράπτωμα is the negative omission of good, while ἁμαρτία is the positive doing of evil.

(e) Ἄνομία<sup>9</sup> or Ἄνόμημα. This word means iniquity, transgression of a law. Although the adjective ἄνομος is used negatively for a person without law, the word ἄνομία is not the condition of one living without law, but the condition of one who acts contrary to, or against the law. It is in this sense that Cyril uses this term. If there is no law, there can be no ἄνομία. In Adam's case, ἄνομία is his lack of conformity to the Divine Law.

Now, we can perceive Cyril's understanding of the character of sin by uniting all the characteristics of the five terms through which sin can be expressed. Sin is a free and willful disobedience and transgression of the Divine Law and an egoistic ὕβρις against God. Through

7. «Ταύτην (ὁδὸν σωτηρίας) ἀπόλεσε, τὴν θεῖαν ἐντολὴν παραβεβηκώς». (Thesa. IΕ'. PG 75, 280).

8. In Rom. 5,20. PG 74, 972.

9. «Ἄνόμημα δὲ τὸ πλημμέλημα ὅτι διπλῆν ἔχει τοῦ νόμου παράβασιν». (In Psal. 50,1, PG 69, 1088).

this ὕβρις, Adam acted against both God's glory and his own nature<sup>10</sup>. Furthermore sin is a moral evil. As such, it is opposite to all holy θεσπισματα<sup>11</sup>. Evil can also be regarded as privation and deficiency in perfection. Adam's sin can be neither a simple physical evil as privation from physical good, since this was the result of his sin, nor merely metaphysical; rather it is a moral evil. This evil is to be found in rational human beings only. It deprives them of moral good. Adam's sin, his moral evil, is regarded as lack of conformity of his will to God's, since the morality of a human action consists in its agreement or not with God's eternal moral Law.

One could say that Cyril considers Adam's sin both negatively, as a sin of omission, i.e. failure and refusal to do his duty or that which he ought to do, and positively, as a sin of commission, i.e. as a positive act of evil, contrary to the Divine Command. That is why in Cyril's theology sin means taking man away from God<sup>12</sup>.

Since Adam's duty was to love God, his sin, as a sin both of commission and of omission, cannot be understood except in terms, and in the sense of, man's selfishness. The word selfishness frequently means the lack of love. Quite generally, it also denotes the essence of sin in point of form, thinking of oneself, self-love, self-seeking, self-will, without which we really could not think of an opposition to the will of God at all<sup>13</sup>. Cyril finds even the cause and essence of Satan's sin and fall in his egoism, his selfishness<sup>14</sup>. Adam's sin was that he preferred to put himself over and beyond God as the supreme end and goal of his being. If love for God is the essence of man's virtue and holiness, the opposite love, love for himself, selfishness, is the essence of his sin<sup>15</sup>.

Adam's sin therefore is neither a weakness of will nor an absence of love for God, that is to say, something negative, but a positive choice and substitution of himself in God's place as the supreme end of man's being. Sin was selfwill instead of submission to God's will; it was an op-

10. «Ἵβρις δὲ τοῦτο (ἡ ἀποστασία) καὶ εἰς Θεὸν αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἀνθρώπου φύσιν, ὅτι καὶ τὴν θεῖαν λελυπήκασιν δόξαν ἀτιμοτάτην δὲ καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ἰδίαν ἀπέφηναν φύσιν». (In Is. 2,9. PG 70, 84).

11. «Πᾶσα ἁμαρτία μάχεται τῷ σκοπῷ τῶν ἱερῶν θεσπισμάτων». (In Psal. 9, 25-26 PG 69, 781).

12. «Διίστησιν ἁμαρτία καὶ ἀπομερίζει Θεοῦ τὸν ἄνθρωπον». (In Ioan. 17, 18-19. PG 74, 545).

13. Hearing Th. op. c. I' 424.

14. In Genes. 1,3. PG 69, 24.

15. Strong A., System. Theology, vol. II. 567.

position of Adam's will to God's will. And whenever, speaking of sin as an opposition of Adam's will to God's will, we place the emphasis upon the will of God, the content of the sinful volition comes manifestly before us; when we place it upon the opposition of the will we learn the form of the sinful volitions in the most manifold relations<sup>16</sup>.

## II. Adam's sin in its relation to the Devil, to God, and to Adam.

### a) Sin and the Devil.

In order to lead Adam away from God, the Devil used satanic means<sup>17</sup>, most wicked and felon<sup>18</sup>; first: guile to deceive man and second: slander against God<sup>19</sup>.

1) The Devil used satanic guile to seduce and deceive the simple and good mind<sup>20</sup> of our first parents in order that it might become inclined to sin<sup>21</sup>. We cannot be sure whether the Devil would have succeeded or not in testing and leading Adam away from God if he had tried to tell him the truth. What the Devil said to Adam was a lie. Because of this way in which the Devil acts, he is called *πονηρός*<sup>22</sup>. The Devil was able to hide his real purpose; he tested Adam, undoubtedly not without the permission of God. Man did not possess omniscience and therefore could not know all the secrets of the spirits. 2) These satanic means can also be regarded as a slander and defamation of God<sup>23</sup>. He said to the «first parents» that God had told them lies and had prevented them from eating because of envy, since He knew that, after eating, they would be able to become gods<sup>24</sup>. That is why he has been called *Διάβολος*<sup>25</sup>. As a spirit, the Devil had great, but not absolute, power. In characterising the Devil's means as «crimes»<sup>26</sup>, Cyril shows that his purpose in de-

16. Hearing, op. c. p. 423.

17. In Rom. 5,12. PG 74, 784.

18. «Τοῖς διαβόλου κακουργήμασι» (In Ioan. 1, 1-2. PG 71, 601).

19. In Ioan. 13,29. PG 74, 149.

20. C. Julian. 3. PG 76, 640.

21. «Ὁ τῆς ἀμαρτίας εὐρετῆς δράκων, ἰσχύσας ἐν Ἀδὰμ τοῖς τῆς φαυλότητος τρόποις, βατὴν εἰργασταὶ τὴν ἀνθρώπου διάνοιαν». (In Ep. ad Rom. 5,12. PG 74, 784).

22. In Psalm. 36,8. PG 69, 929.

23. C. Julian. 3. PG 76, 640.

24. «Διαβέβληκε καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ἀνωτάτω καὶ ἀπόρρητον φύσιν» (Ibid).

25. «Καὶ διάβολος μὲν ὀνόμασται αὐτῆ τοι καὶ σφόδρα εἰκότως». (Ibid.)

26. In Ioan. 1, 1-2. PG 71, 601.

ceiving Adam was to make man a transgressor of the Divine Command<sup>27</sup>. Satan did this by leading him to evil<sup>28</sup> and by leading him away from God<sup>29</sup>. Thus he became man's tyrant by deceit<sup>30</sup>. And while to love and obey God was for Adam «saving»<sup>31</sup>, on the contrary, to disobey God was really worst<sup>32</sup> and horrible<sup>33</sup>. This disobedience to God led man away from God's Love<sup>34</sup> which was the source of all his beatitude and blessedness while the Devil was pleased with man's death, misery and sufferings<sup>35</sup>. Because of egoism, the Devil's purpose was slanderous against God and therefore bad, wicked and sinful.

#### b) Sin and God.

God had imposed His command upon Adam, and their relations were, or rather, ought to have been and remained, relations between Creator and creature, Lord and servant, Father and son. It was, however, this God against whom Adam sinned; it was the Lord's command which man broke and transgressed<sup>36</sup> and the Supreme Authority that Adam insulted. Here we can see Adam's sin in two aspects: Being committed by a man, by a finite creature, sin is something finite. The same sin, however, as being committed against the perfect God and Lord, is of infinite seriousness.

#### c) Sin and Adam.

We see the seriousness of Adam's sin, when we take into consideration his responsibility and guilt in committing this sin. Adam's guilt was great because he as a rational, living being<sup>37</sup> knowingly<sup>38</sup>, and consciously transgressed the Divine Law. Only irrational beings are neither responsible, nor guilty. Without free, personal will, there can be neither guilt nor

27. Pasch. Hom. 7. PG 77, 512.

28. In Isaiam 3,11. PG 70, 112.

29. In Isaiam 25,10. PG 70, 568.

30. «Τύραννος ἐξ ἀπάτης» (Pasch. Hom. 6. PG 77, 512).

31. «Σωτήριο» (In Psalm. 30,8. PG 69, 873).

32. C. Julian. 8. PG 76, 98. Also: In Isaiam 9,9. PG 70, 261.

33. In Isaiam 30,6. PG 70, 672.

34. In Isaiam 10,11. PG 75, 285.

35. «Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐστὶ θανάτου καὶ εὐρετῆς καὶ πρόξενος ὁ δράκων ὁ ἀποστάτης, ταύτη τοι ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἤδεται σφαγαῖς». (In Oseam 13,3. PG 71, 301).

36. In Genes. I. PG 69, 24.

37. «Πίπτει πρὸς τὴν ἐσχάτην ἀλογίαν ὁ λογικὸς καὶ αὐτὸν ἀγνοήσας τὸν κτίσαντα». (In Ioan. 1, 32-33. PG 73, 205).

38. In Rom. 5,18. PG 74, 788.

reward<sup>39</sup>. There is a great difference between sinning by ignorance and sinning while man knows what he is doing<sup>40</sup>. Adam and Eve were conscious of their action as a transgression, especially as a transgression of the Divine Law. That is why they tried to justify themselves before God right after their disobedience. The Divine Law was not unknown to them<sup>41</sup>. They accepted the temptation after a long discussion with the Serpent; therefore they were conscious of what was happening. They sinned not only knowingly, but also willingly, since they had the possibility either of sinning or not, and this was dependent upon the use of their freedom and free will, which God had given them. Cyril clearly speaks of Adam's sin as being committed freely, even when he uses verbs in the passive voice to describe the fall of Adam: Adam was led to sin by the Devil<sup>42</sup>. In these cases, Cyril speaks only of the fact of Adam's fall and of its causes. The Divine Law was not difficult<sup>43</sup>, though Adam ought to have obeyed even if it had been such, since God was his Creator and the source of his happiness<sup>44</sup>. God was Adam's benefactor<sup>45</sup>. That is why, according to Cyril, Adam proved himself to be ungrateful and a scorner of his benefactor and his Creator<sup>46</sup>.

---

39. «Τοῖς ἀβουλήτως συμβαίνουσιν, οὐκ ἂν δόξειεν ἐπιτιμᾶν ὁ Νόμος» (De Adorat. 15. PG 68, 977).

40. «...τοῦ κατ' ἄγνοιαν κακοποιεῖν καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο θέλει» (In Psalm. 36,8. PG 69, 929).

41. C. Julian. 3. PG 76, 628.

42. In Ioan. 1, 1-2. PG 71, 601.

43. «Ἐλαφρὸς ἐστὶν ὁ ζυγὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ» (In Matth. 11,30. PG 72, 405).

44. In Psalm. 32,8. PG 69, 873.

45. «Ἐλύπει τὸν εὐεργέτην». (In Ioan. 1, 32-3. PG 73, 205).

46. In Genes. 1,4. PG 69, 24.

CHAPTER THREE  
ESSENCE OF ADAM'S SIN

In trying to present Cyril's doctrine of sin, we have to examine carefully the essence of Adam's sin. It has to be said that Cyril expresses the biblical teaching in saying that «in Paradise Adam enjoyed all beatitude and all glory with God»<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, Adam could have lived forever in his beatitude and unity with God if he had not transgressed the Divine Law<sup>2</sup>. But as soon as Adam transgressed God's commandment and offended Him, he had to face Divine wrath<sup>3</sup>. It is terrible for men to strike against God because of selfishness and pride and egoism<sup>4</sup>. Adam's immediate punishment was to be thrown out of Paradise<sup>5</sup>. Living out of Paradise, Adam remembered what he had lost and this memory of the «lost Paradise» was the cause of his unhappiness<sup>6</sup>. Human nature changed and became corrupted<sup>7</sup>. We shall examine this problem in detail. Cyril points out that it was through and because of sin that corruption came to Adam and to the whole of mankind<sup>8</sup>. Corruption, therefore, did not exist before sin, nor would Adam have been corrupted, had he not sinned. Since, as we have seen, Adam was guilty and responsible for his sin, he was also responsible for his corruption. In its essence, Adam's sin is to be considered and examined under

---

1. «Ἐν Παραδείσῳ... καὶ δόξῃ τῇ παρὰ Θεῶν» (In Rom. 13,18. PG 75, 129.)

2. Ibid.

3. «Ἵπεμεμένηκε τὰ ἐκ τῆς θείας ὀργῆς» (In Ioan. 5,18. PG 74, 788).

Also in Isaiam 21,5. PG 70, 488.

4. «Πάνδεινον οὖν ἄρα τὸ προσκρούειν Θεῶν». (In Is. 30,6,7. PG 70, 672). See also: PG 70, 57, 125. 261. 420.

5. «Ἀπεμπολήσασα δὴ οὖν τὴν παρὰ Θεοῦ χάριν καὶ γυμνωθεῖσα ἤδη τῶν ἐν ἀρχαῖς ἀγαθῶν, ἐξεπέμπετο μὲν τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς, μετεπλάττετο δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἀκαλλῆς εὐθὺς ἢ ἀνθρώπου φύσις, φθορᾶς δὲ εἶσω πεσοῦσα λοιπὸν ἀνεδείκνυτο». (De Adorat. I' PG 68, 149).

6. «Ἀπέναντι Ἐδὲμ κατόκισα τὸν Ἀδὰμ ἐξυβρικότα τὸν αἰδιμον χῶρον, ὅπως τῇ αὐτοψίᾳ τῆς μηκέτι συγκεχωρημένης τρυφῆς, ὑποσμύχουσαν ἀπαύστως δέξοιτο τὴν ἀνίαν». (Hom. Div. 10 PG 77, 1021).

7. Ibid.

8. «Καὶ ὁ μὲν προπάτωρ Ἀδὰμ ἁμαρτίας ὀψώνιον καὶ παραβάσεως δίκην ἐδέχετο τὴν φθοράν». (Glaiph. in Gen. 1,5. PG 69, 29). Also: In Ioan. 1,1-2 PG 70, 564.



two aspects: (a) as having created a permanent sinful state, and (b) as being a guilt. Sin is both a sinful state of corruption and also guilt. That is why Christian salvation is not only salvation from corruption and death, because in that case salvation could not come before death, but also salvation from guilt.

### I. Adam's Sin as a Sinful State of Corruption.

By the sinful state of Adam we mean the permanent state of sin and corruption in Adam after he had sinned; the state of deprivation of the first Divine Grace which sanctified him; the state in which the sinful desire, the concupiscentia, rushed into him; the state in which man was under the power, the control and the law of sin<sup>9</sup>.

(a) According to Cyril, there is no doubt that Adam's freedom after his sin did not remain the same as it had been before. Adam's nature became corrupted through sin<sup>10</sup>. His freedom was affected by the influence of sin. There is a deep inner relation between all the elements in man. If freedom is the power to bend in either direction i.e. towards good or evil, then Adam's freedom, though weakened and impaired through his sin, was not completely lost, for even now we have the power and freedom to turn towards or choose either good or evil<sup>11</sup>.

If Adam's freedom had been lost, then the power of choosing would have not existed in man. However, since man can choose either good or evil, as Cyril says, his freedom still remains as one of the spiritual elements of his nature, though most impaired and most weakened. Cyril insists that we all — not only Adam — still have the power of willing and of choosing<sup>12</sup>. It should be noted that in all these and many other instances, when speaking of man's freedom Cyril uses the present tense of the verbs «to be»<sup>13</sup> and «to go»<sup>14</sup>. Also, in many cases, Cyril uses the plural to indicate the universal application of his teaching and stresses the fact that freedom is a characteristic of man today and applies not only

9. «Φθαρτοῦ ἀπαξ γεγονότος τοῦ σώματος, τὰ τῆς φθορᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ βεβλάσθηκε πάθη, καὶ ὁ τῆς ἁμαρτίας εἰσέδου νόμος, ὁ ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι τῆς σαρκός, ὁ ἀντιστρατευόμενος καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζων τὸν νοῦν εἰς πᾶν ὁτιοῦν τῶν ἐκτόπων». (In Psal. 6,3. PG 69, 745).

10. In Ionam. 1, 1-2. PG 71, 604.

11. «Ἐφ' ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ τὸ βλέπειν πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐναντίον» (De Adorat. 6. PG 68, 453).

12. De Adorat. 6. PG 68, 453.

13. In Ioan. 6,71. PG 73, 632.

14. «Αὐθαίρετον τὸ ἐπ' ἄμφω βαδίζειν» (In Ioan. 6,71. PG. 73, 632).

to the case of Adam<sup>15</sup>. At this point, Cyril clearly states that man is personally responsible for his choice of evil because he is not bound to do so, but it is voluntary for men to go here or there, to virtue or to evil<sup>16</sup>. Thus all men are self-governing and free to do what they like<sup>17</sup>. Even people who have received a wrong education can turn their minds and will towards good<sup>18</sup>. Certainly, this could not have been possible if man had not been free to do so. It is God who has given freedom and self-control to every one, to all people, because it is God who desires that every good action should be free in order to be rewarded<sup>19</sup>. Otherwise we would neither be rewarded for good nor punished for evil. That is why Cyril insists that every man should be free to choose between good or evil<sup>20</sup>.

In all these instances, Cyril speaks not only of Adam, but of all people after Adam's sin. Freedom still exists in all men though, as we have seen, most weakened and most impaired and not as it had been before Adam sinned. However, Cyril sometimes considers the power of man's freedom as great<sup>21</sup>. No doubt, however, this power of man's freedom is only relatively great. Man is in an extremely difficult position<sup>22</sup>. This is so because man's nature is no longer as it was before sin; it is now corrupted. This power of general corruption has inevitably a strong and apparent influence upon man's freedom. However, man still wishes to do good<sup>23</sup>.

(b) Cyril has no doubt that Adam's rationality was seriously and strongly affected by sin and corruption. It lost its first power and clearness and became weakened, darkened and distorted, and very easily inclined to evil, to sin<sup>24</sup> and to lies<sup>25</sup>. The rational man was led to the su-

15. C. Julian. 8. PG 76, 937.

16. In Ioan. 6,7. PG 73, 632.

17. «Αὐτόνομος καὶ ἀφιεμένη πρὸς τὸ δοκοῦν ἢ παντὸς ἀνθρώπου διάνοια» (C. Julian. 4. PG 76, 716).

18. Ibid.

19. C. Julian. 3,79. PG 76.

20. «Ἵνα τοίνυν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ πρὸς πᾶν ὁτιοῦν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐθελοντι διαστείλωμεν, ἀκαταβίαστω γνώμῃ διαβιοῦν ἐπὶ γῆς τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐφῆκε Θεός. Καὶ οὕτω γέγονεν ἐν ἀρχαῖς. Ἀνῆπται γὰρ αὐτὸς τὰς τῶν ἑαυτοῦ θελημάτων ἡνίας, καὶ αὐτοκελεύστοις ἐπ' ἄμφω φέρεται ῥοπαῖς, εἷς γε τὸ ἀγαθὸν φημι καὶ τὸ μὴ οὕτως ἔχον». (C. Julian. 8. PG 76, 937).

21. «Βέβηκε δὲ ἤδη καὶ ἔρρωται πως ὁ νοῦς, καὶ μάλα ἐπιτηδείως ἔχει πρὸς παραδοχὴν, ὧν ἂν ἔλοιτο μαθεῖν». (De Ador. 16. PG 68, 1037).

22. In Rom. 7,18. PG 74, 813.

23. «Παραδέχεται σαφῶς τὸ παρακεῖσθαι ἡμῖν τὸ ἀγαθόν» (In Rom. 7,18. PG 74, 813).

24. In Rom. 5,12. PG 74, 784.

25. «Νοσεῖ τὸ ψεῦδος ἢ ἀνθρώπου διάνοια» (In Isaiam 6,5. PG 70, 180).

preme irrationality: the ignoring of the Creator<sup>26</sup>. Man forgets very easily and very readily creates idols and false gods, when he acts only according to his simple, human mind<sup>27</sup>. Undoubtedly, the human mind, affected by sin, lost its power to see God, as the human eye loses its power to see clearly if dust affects it or an injury damages it<sup>28</sup>. That is why, as Cyril says, the human mind produces fruits for Satan<sup>29</sup>. However, if Cyril is right in pointing out that even after sin man has the power of free choice, then man is still relatively a rational being who is capable of understanding and knowing what he is choosing, and mainly of hearing, understanding and knowing God. Thus, although man has undoubtedly lost his first perfect vision of God and his reason is now weak, darkened and impaired<sup>30</sup>, nevertheless his rationality has not been entirely lost; it has not disappeared completely. Burghard says that sin did not make man either inhuman or entirely<sup>31</sup> irrational. Man still remains a human being, though wounded, and still keeps a small light burning, so that even after the fall he may be able to hear and accept a Divine message when God speaks.

(c) Cyril reminds us that Adam was created according to the Image of the Creator and was appointed to rule over all things on earth<sup>32</sup>. But by sin «he was stripped of the kingship and the glory which he had in the beginning»<sup>33</sup>. Therefore, Adam lost his dominion over the whole of nature which no longer obeys him as it did before he sinned. The earth became cursed for him<sup>34</sup> and gave him pains, because its inhabitants had insulted God, the Creator of the whole of nature<sup>35</sup>.

(d) Cyril teaches that in his pre-fallen state Adam was in a deep and real relationship and kinship with God, the Divine Father, because of the indwelling of Divine Grace in him<sup>36</sup>. But after Adam had sinned, he lost his true and special relationship with God<sup>37</sup>. Although even after

26. In Ioan. 1,32. PG 73, 205.

27. I' Ep. ad Corinth. 2,14. PG 74, 865.

28. «...οὕτω καὶ ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς τοῖς τῆς σαρκὸς εἰ καταπαχύνητο τρυφαίς ἀναμύειν οὐ δύναται πρὸς Θεόν» (In Isaiam 5,11. PG 70, 149).

29. In Isaiam 5,5. PG 70, 141.

30. In Isaiam 5,25. PG 70, 169.

31. c. op. c. 144.

32. In Genes. 1. PG 69, 20.

33. De Adorat. 2. PG 68, 244.

34. In Isaiam 24, 5-6. PG 70, 540.

35. Ibid.

36. De S. Trinit. PG 75, 908.

37. In Isaiam 54,6. PG 70, 120.

his sin Adam could still be called the son of God by the fact of his creation<sup>38</sup>, nevertheless having lost his participation in the Holy Spirit in the full sense, he also lost his first perfect Divine sonship and, as Burgardt says, Adam «lost his supernatural relationship, his unmerited kinship, which had been given to him through the indwelling Spirit»<sup>39</sup>.

(e) As we have seen, Adam was created to be immortal<sup>40</sup>. But as Cyril teaches, because of his transgression he became corrupted<sup>41</sup> and mortal<sup>42</sup>. Adam himself was responsible for this. God did not create death since He never desired the loss of His creatures, the loss of living beings<sup>43</sup>. No doubt, therefore, death came about as the fruit of sin<sup>44</sup>. Adam neglected and offended the Divine commandment<sup>45</sup>. Cyril shows the gravity of Adam's sin in saying that his death came about because of Divine wrath and the Divine curse after man had transgressed His commandment<sup>46</sup>. Although we have to speak of man only in terms of his creatureness, it is, however, certain that «man died not because he was a creature but because he was a sinner»<sup>47</sup>. Speaking of Adam's sin in relation to the guile used by the Devil, Cyril sees the Devil as the cause of death, since he desires only the destruction and loss of man<sup>48</sup>. That is why Cyril calls the Devil «Death itself»<sup>49</sup>. Thus as sin is something against God, so also is death as the result of sin «das gegenteil Gottes», Who is life<sup>50</sup>.

By death Cyril means both physical death, i.e. the separation of the body from the soul<sup>51</sup> and spiritual death, i. e. the separation of the

38. In Ioan., Pusey 2,295.

39. op. c. p. 147.

40. In Rom. 4,18. PG 74, 788. Also In Ioan. 1,9. PG 73, 145.

41. In Genes. 1,5. PG 69, 29.

42. «Λογικὸς ἐπὶ γῆς ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐν ἴσῳ μέτρῳ τοῖς ἄνω· ἐλάττων, καθ' ὃ ὑπὸ δίκην ἐστὶ θανάτου καὶ φθορᾶς καὶ τοῦτο μετὰ τὴν παράβασιν· αὕτη γὰρ εἰσήξε τὴν φθορὰν καὶ τὸν θάνατον». (In Psal. 9,6. PG 69, 760).

43. «Ὁ μὲν τῶν βίων Θεὸς θάνατον οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ τέρπεται ἐπὶ ἀπωλείᾳ ζώντων». (Glaph. Lev. PG 69, 540).

44. In Psalm. 9,6. PG 69, 760.

45. In Ioan. 14,30. PG 74, 328.

46. Adv. Nestor. 5. PG 76, 209. Also in Rom. 5,18. PG 74, 788.

47. Ed. Schlink, *Der Mensch in der Verkündigung der Kirche*, München 1936. p. 178.

48. «Ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἤδεται σφαγαῖς» (In Oseam 13,3. PG 71, 301).

49. «Αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ θάνατος» (In Psalm. 15,4. PG 69, 809.)

50. Schlink. op. c. p. 177.

51. «Θάνατός ἐστι ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος ἀναχώρησις». (De Incarn. Unig. PG 75, 1452).

soul from God<sup>51α</sup>. If God is the true life and if real life means a life in God only, then the separation from it, from God, is a real, spiritual death. This separation can be either here on earth or in the world of eternity. Speaking of death as a result of Adam's sin, Cyril insists that Adam became the archetype of being under corruption and death as Christ is the prototype «of not being under death»<sup>52</sup>. Adam became subject to corruption, i.e. to sufferings, pain and every bad thing; he did not remain in his painless and sorrowless life; so he fell to the state of sorrow<sup>53</sup>. Pain, sorrow, sweat, distress, sufferings, and chiefly death as the fruits of Adam's sin began when he neglected his painless life in Paradise. As Schlink says, «der Tod wirst also den Menschen in die Nichtigkeit, aber nicht in ein absolutes Nichts»<sup>54</sup>.

(f) In Paradise, Adam was holy both ontologically, by participation in God through the Holy Spirit, and dynamically, by his conscious imitation of God through his virtuous living.<sup>55</sup> Thus Cyril says: «The primitive period of human life in Adam... was holy»<sup>56</sup>. The Creator implanted the Holy Spirit into Adam as a seal of His own nature, through Whom he was fashioned to the archetyped beauty. And Adam had to become perfect after the Image of the Creator<sup>57</sup>. Again Adam was created in the Image of the Creator and he was in communion with God through his life of holiness. But when he was tricked by the guile of Satan, he was removed from his original state; he slipped from the hand which held him in holiness and fell down to earth from the state of virtue<sup>58</sup>.

Cyril insists that Adam was sanctified because he was a partaker of the Holy Spirit, but he cast Him away through sin<sup>59</sup> and when the Holy Spirit left the first man, he then fell down from the heights of virtue<sup>60</sup>. In this case Burghardt is right in saying that, according to Cyril,

51α. «Θάνατος κυρίως... ὁ χωρίζων ψυχὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ». (Homil. 14. PG 77, 1088).

52. In Ioan. 3. PG 73, 128.

53. «Ἰδρῶτι καὶ πόνῳ καὶ ταλαιπωρίᾳ συγκληρωθεὶς καὶ οἶδν τι χαλινῶ τῇ γηπονίᾳ καὶ κακοπαθείᾳ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις τοῦ βίου πονηρίαις παραδοθεὶς» (De Incarn. Unig. PG 75, 1424).

54. op. c. p. 180.

55. Burghardt c. op. p. 141.

56. «Καὶ ἦν ἅγιος ὁ πρῶτος χρόνος τῆς ἀνθρώπου ζωῆς». (C. Anthrop. E'. PG 76, 1085).

57. In Ioan. 9,1. Pusey 2, 485.

58. De Adorat. II'. PG 68, 244.

59. De Dogmat. solutione 2, Pusey in Ioannem 3, 554.

60. In Ioannem 11, 11. Pusey 2. 730.

Adam lost both his ontological and dynamical holiness<sup>61</sup>, if by Adam's ontological holiness he means man's participation in the nature of God by the Holy Spirit and through communication with God, and if by dynamical holiness he means man's conscious imitation of God through virtuous living<sup>62</sup>. After the Holy Spirit had left Adam, his participation in God became impossible and Adam's first holy life changed, and a sinful state began for him. Having lost his holiness, Adam was enslaved by «sinful desire»<sup>63</sup> which became innate in him and in all men who naturally come from Adam. This desire became the law of sin<sup>64</sup>, and therefore had the character of sin, since it was unknown to Adam and Eve before their fall and appeared through sin only.

This desire created a sinful state because it was rooted and innate in man<sup>65</sup> and is called natural law<sup>66</sup> by Cyril. It became not only natural but also universal and is an unclean and earthly φρόνησις<sup>67</sup>, or φρόνημα σαρκός<sup>68</sup>. Nobody is free from this sinful desire<sup>69</sup>. This φρόνησις and infection of soul<sup>70</sup>, this bad root «brings forth all passions, all sins, and is always opposed to every good, even to God, to His will and commandments<sup>71</sup> because this law enslaves man's mind to sin<sup>72</sup>. And this is opposed to man's true and spiritual good<sup>73</sup>. Man is infec-

61. C. op. p. 146.

62. Burghardt c. op. 141.

63. De Adorat. 1, PG 68, 164.

64. «Νόμος ἁμαρτίας» (C. Julian. 3. PG 74, 637).

65. «Ἐρριζωμένη και ἔμφυτος» (De Adorat. 1. PG 68, 164).

66. Pasch. Homil. 6. PG 77, 501.

67. «Ἐν ἡμῖν γεωδές τε και ἀκάθαρτον φρόνημα». (Pasch. Hom. 6. PG 77, 501).

68. «Ἔστι δέ τις και ἑτέρων ἡμῖν πολεμίων ἐσμός, τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, ὁ ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν ἀγριαίνων νόμος, τὰ πολύτροπα πάθη». (In Luk. 5,28. PG 72, 796).

69. «Οὐδεὶς ἀπὸ ρύπου καθαρὸς» (In Isaiam 1, 17. PG 70, 45).

70. «Ἡ γὰρ ἂν τῶν ἐνδεχομένων, πρὶν ὄρων ἔξω γενέσθαι κακοῦ, μέλλοντας αἰεὶ και ἀναδυομένους καταληφθῆναι τῇ δίκῃ, πρὶν ἀποκαθήρασθαι τὴν κηλῖδα, πρὶν ἀποπλύνασθαι τὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας βλάβης ἐντετηκότα τῇ ψυχῇ μολυσμόν, πρὶν ἀποφορτίσασθαι τὰ ἐγκλήματα, και ζυγὸν ὑποδραμεῖν τὸν σωτήριον, ἀναπαύσασθαι διὰ Χριστοῦ». (De Ador. PG 68, 176).

71. «Ἐξ ἀνοσίου βίζης» (C. Julian. 3, PG 74, 637).

72. In Psalm. 6,3. PG 69, 745.

73. «Ἐμπέφυκε τοίνυν τοῖς τῆς σαρκός ἡμῶν μέλεσι φυσικός τις και ὁμογενής, ἔν' οὕτως εἶπω, νόμος, ἐξοπλίζων ἡμᾶς τῷ πεποιηκότι Θεῷ και τὸ οικεῖον φρόνημα ταῖς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίαις ἀντιτιθείς. Λογισμοὶ δὲ ἡμῖν ἐνεῦθεν και ἀτάκτων ἐπιθυμιῶν οὐκ εὐαρίθμητος ἐσμός ταῖς εἰς τὸ ἄμεινον ἐλκούσας ροπαῖς ἀντεγειρόμενος, και ὡσπερ ἂν εἴ τινα πολεμίων πληθὺν ταῖς εἰς τὸ συμφέρον ὁρμαῖς ἑαυτὸν ἀντιτάττων». (Pasch. Hom. 6 PG 77, 501).

ted<sup>74</sup>. This sinful desire has the character of sin, not only for Adam but also for all of his descendants.

It is only through the Holy Sacrament of Baptism that man receives remission of all his sins, original and actual<sup>75</sup>. In other words, it loses the character of guilt in each person and this stain of sin disappears and is burnt out<sup>76</sup>. This shows the gravity of that sinful desire which stops being regarded as sin in itself, and stops having in it a sinful character after Christian Baptism. What remains after Baptism is a power which causes and pushes man to sin. This concupiscence has such power that it is now the fertile field of all sin. In man's fallen state there is no sin of which concupiscence is not the forerunner. That is why man turns to sin and evil so easily. However, through Baptism, Christ offers to man the power of the Holy Spirit and makes him stronger than the Devil<sup>77</sup> so that if the Christian fights with Christ against sin and evil, he wins.

Now, commenting on all that we have already said about Cyril's understanding of the influence of sin on Adam and on the whole of mankind, we can come to a conclusion. Cyril points out that, on the one hand, through sin, Adam lost his dominion over nature, his perfect Divine sonship, his immortality and his holiness and, on the other hand, his freedom and his rationality became darkened, weakened, obscured and impaired but neither were entirely lost.

Freedom and rationality belonged to Adam's nature, and because both were not entirely lost, Cyril says that even after sin, death and corruption because of sin did not destroy the human being entirely<sup>78</sup>. Man was not destroyed entirely, the human being did not become inhuman<sup>79</sup>. Like a vessel, man was broken through sin, and the pieces had to be united and man had to be restored and later sanctified through Christ.

This, we believe, is the mind of Cyril even when speaking of a complete disappearance of the Image of God<sup>80</sup>. In these instances, Cyril does not use the word Image in the narrow theological sense of freedom, rationali-

74. De Adorat. 15. PG 68, 1001.

75. In Isaiam 1,16. PG 70, 41.

76. In Isaiam 1, 16. PG 70, 41.

77. «'Απάτης διαβολικῆς ἀποτελεῖ κρείττονα» (In Genes. I 5. PG 69, 29).

78. «'Επενοεῖτο τοῖνυν χρησίμως ὁ τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος, οὐκ εἰς ὄλεθρον ὀλοτελῆ παραπέμπων τὸ ζῶον· εἰς καινουργίαν δὲ μᾶλλον καί, ἔν' οὕτως εἴπωμεν, εἰς ἀνασκευὴν οἷά τι σκεῦος συντεθλασμένον κατὰ καιροὺς ἐφυλάττετο». (Glaph. in Gen. 4. PG 69, 24).

79. Burghardt op. c. p. 144.

80. De Incarnat. Unig. PG 75, 1477.

ty etc., but in the sense of Adam's general, spiritual and original state, as we have seen. As the Image of God in Adam was not entirely lost, Cyril says that man, even after Adam's sin, has the power to turn towards good or evil and to choose according to his free will<sup>81</sup>. If man had lost his free will entirely, he could not have chosen what he wished. And if he can choose what he wants, his freedom is not completely lost. Furthermore, Cyril not only says that man has a strong ability to choose freely what he prefers, but also that the power of his mind is strong, as well<sup>82</sup>. Thus Cyril speaks not of an entirely and completely lost divine Image in Adam, but of an Image which through sin was scarred falsely<sup>83</sup>, and the beauty of which was destroyed<sup>84</sup> but not entirely lost. In other cases Cyril uses the word «character» instead of Image and then he says that man's character did not remain so bright as it had been before Adam sinned<sup>85</sup>; it became dimmer and darker<sup>86</sup>. The comparative adjective «dimmer» used by Cyril shows three things: The character-Image of God in Adam did not remain as it had been before his sin; it became dimmer. But this shows that Cyril does not speak of an entire loss of Adam's Image. It did not disappear entirely. Through sin, man was falsely stamped, became «ugly»<sup>87</sup>, and lost his first beauty. However the meaning of «ugly» presupposes something which exists, even though ugly, and very ill<sup>88</sup>. This

81. De Adorat. 6, PG 68, 453.

82. «Ἐρωτῶται πως ὁ νοῦς» (De Adorat. 16. PG 68, 1037).

83. «Τυραννοῦσης κατὰ πάντων τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἀνέπτυη τὸ ἐν ἀρχαῖς ἐμψυθηθὲν ἡμῖν Ἁγίον Πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ τῆς εἰκόνος παρεχαράττετο κάλλος». (In Psal. 50,13. PG 69, 1100).

84. «Ὅτε πρὸς παρατροπὴν ἢ ἀνθρώπου φύσις διώλισθε, τὸ τῆς εἰκόνος κάλλος παρεσημάνετο· κεκαιουργήμεθα δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς». (De Trin. Dial. VI PG 75, 1013).

85. «Οὐδέτι λαμπροὶ μεμενήκασι οἱ τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὁμοιώσεως χαρακτήρες» (C. Anthropol. 5. PG 76, 1085).

86. In Ioan. 2,1. Pusey 1, 183. and PG 73, 205.

87. «Ἰπρὸς παρατροπὴν ἢ ἀνθρώπου φύσις διώλισθε καὶ τὸ τῆς εἰκόνος κάλλος παρεσημάνετο». (De Trin. Dial. 6. PG 75, 1013). Also: «Ἀκαλλές» (De Adorat. 1. PG 68, 149). Also: «Ἀπεμπολήσασα δὴ οὖν τὴν παρὰ Θεοῦ χάριν καὶ γυμνωθεῖσα ἤδη τῶν ἐν ἀρχαῖς ἀγαθῶν, ἐξεπέμπετο μὲν τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς, μετεπλάττετο δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἀκαλλές εὐθὺς ἢ ἀνθρώπου φύσις, φθορᾶς δὲ εἴσω πεσοῦσα λοιπὸν ἀνεδείκνυτο». (De Adorat. I' PG 68, 149).

88. «Τὸ ἀναμορφούμενον, διαμαρτούσης αὐτῷ τῆς πρώτης ἰδέας, καὶ λελωβημένης εἰς τὸ ἀκαλλές, ἄρα οὐκ εἰς ἐκεῖνο καθηκόντως ὑπονοστήσειεν ἄν, πρὸς ὅπερ ἦν ἐν ἀρχαῖς, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πεπηρῶσθαι βλάβος ἀποπεμψάμενον, ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλώβητον τῆς φύσεως ὄψιν ἀναθρόσκει πάλιν;» (De Trin. Dial. III PG 75, 805).

Also: «Ἀρρωστήσειε δ' ἄν ἢ ἀνθρώπου φύσις καὶ μάλα βαδίως τὴν εἰς πᾶν ὄτιον τῶν ἐκτόπων παραφορᾶν, εἰ μὴ ἀνέχοι πρὸς ἀρετὴν αὐτὴν ἢ τοῦ διασώζοντος χάρις, τοῖς ἀνωθεν καὶ παρ' ἑαυτῆς ἀγαθοῖς πλουτίζουσα». (De Adorat. I. PG 68, 149).

Also: «Ἡρώστησεν ἢ ἀνθρώπου φύσις ἐν Ἀδάμ». (In Ep. ad Rom. 5, 18, PG 74, 788-9). Also: «Καὶ πολὺ νοσοῦντα τὸ ἀκαλλές» (De Trin. Dial. III. PG 75 808).



is what St. Cyril means even in saying that sin destroyed the beauty of the Divine Image in Adam<sup>89</sup>. The Image of God still exists in man but not as beautiful as it had been before sin.

The problem of the influence of sin on the Divine Image in man is a difficult and an old one. We can see a dual tradition in the early Church Fathers and writers. Irenaeus presented the tradition according to which the Image of God in man was lost through sin<sup>90</sup>. The other tradition was represented by Origen, according to whom the Image was very much obscured but not lost<sup>91</sup>, while some other Fathers, like Athanasius, seem to speak of both together, namely of an Image which was simply tarnished<sup>92</sup> and an Image which was destroyed<sup>93</sup>. Gregory of Nyssa speaks of both, i.e. on the one hand of the loss of the Image<sup>94</sup>, while, on the other hand, he speaks of the Image as being blurred and obscured but not lost<sup>95</sup>.

Cyril probably knew this double tradition. Its existence means that this problem was not finally solved by the Church in his time. And although Cyril says that sin marred the beauty of the Divine Image and Satan filled the radiant life of man with sordidness<sup>96</sup>, he still, however, insists that despite sin «we have lost none of our essential components»<sup>97</sup>. Man has not lost anything which is necessary for him to remain physically human and a rational, moral being, capable of understanding and knowing. That is why Cyril says that we have suffered no injury to our nature, for we have not, by any means, come into «not being»; we do exist, physically even without virtue<sup>98</sup>.

89. «'Αλλ' ἠφάνισεν τῆς θεοειδοῦς εἰκόνας τὸ κάλλος ἢ ἁμαρτία, καὶ ρύπου μεστὸν τὸ λαμπρὸν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος πρόσωπον ἀπέφηνεν ὁ Σατανᾶς». (C. Anthropol. I. PG 76, 1096).

Also: «'Αχρειοῖ δὲ ὀλοτρόπως τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴν τὸ ἀποφοιτῆσαι Θεοῦ καὶ ἀμοιρῆσαι παντελῶς τῆς παρ' αὐτοῦ χάριτος καὶ ἐπικουρίας». (Fragm. in Jerem. 11, 16. PG 70, 1453).

90. Adv. Haereses 5, 16, 1. ΒΕΠΕΣ (= Library of the Church Fathers, ed. by Apostoliki Diakonia of the Church of Greece), Athens 1955, vol. 5 p. 166.

91. In Genesim, Homilia 13, 4. ΒΕΠΕΣ, vol. 15, 126-7.

92. Contra Centes. 8, PG 25. 16. Also 25, 68-69.

93. De Incarnatione Verbi 6, PG 25, 105-8.

94. De Virginitate 12, PG 46, 372.

95. De Beatitudinibus 6. PG 44, 1272.

96. Resp. ad Tiberium 8. Pusey, In Ioannem 3, 590.

97. «Οὐδὲν ἀποβεβλήκαμεν τῶν ὄντων οὐσιωδῶς». (C. Anthropol. PG 76, 1084).

98. «Οὐκ ἂν ὁ λόγος ἡμῖν ἁμάρτοι τοῦ πρέποντος, ἐπεὶ τοὶ διώλισθεν μὲν τῆς πρὸς Θεὸν οικειότητος, ἀγγέλων τε οἱ μὴ τηρήσαντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν, καὶ μὴν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοί, ἡδικήμεθα δὲ εἰς τὴν φύσιν οὐδέν. Ὡχόμεθα γὰρ οὐδαμῶς εἰς τὸ μὴ ὑπάρχειν ὅλως, ἀλλ' ἐσμὲν καὶ διχὰ τοῦ κεκτῆσθαι τὴν ἀρετὴν». (De SS. Trinit. Dial. I. PG 75, 676).

Speaking of the loss of the Image<sup>99</sup>, Cyril often uses the word «Image» for the general spiritual state of Adam before sin. This general state of Adam did not remain the same after sin although that real Image of Adam in the special sense was obscured and impaired, but not entirely lost. In this sense we agree with Burghardt<sup>100</sup> who says that those aspects of the Image which are part of man's essential structure—basic rationality and psychological freedom—were not lost. Those facets of the Image which owe their existence to the Indwelling of the Spirit—holiness, incorruptibility, kinship with God—were lost.

## II. Adam's Sin as Guilt.

As we have said, sin is considered not only as a sinful state but also as guilt. Christian salvation, moreover, is a real salvation both from this sinful state of corruption and from guilt. The latter is the special characteristic of sin. Without guilt, sin is not real sin but only an imperfection or lacking, or a natural evil. Sin, however, is something more. We speak of guilt in relation to God and His righteousness. The transgressor and sinner should justify the Divine Law and re-establish the disturbed order. Sin can be considered both as one concrete, actual sinful deed or a sinful state which is the sinful cause for all actual sins. Therefore generally speaking, guilt exists in every actual sin as well as in the sinful state. The original sin had both characteristics; it was an actual sin of Adam and a sinful state which was opposite to the Divine Law and Will and was communicated to all men<sup>101</sup>, so that all men might be guilty<sup>102</sup>. Human nature became soiled before God<sup>103</sup>.

The problem now is: How does Cyril understand the relation between Adam's sinful state and guilt, on the one hand, and our sinful state and guilt, on the other? How did it come about that all men are guilty

99. «Οὐκοῦν κατὰ τὸ ζῶον εἶναι λογικὸν καὶ καθ' ὃ φιλάρετον καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀρχικὸν ἐν εἰκόνι λέγεται πεποιῆσθαι Θεοῦ». (C. Anthrop. PG 76, 1069-72).

100. op. c. p. 153.

101. «Διεφθάρκασιν μὲν πάντες οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῶν μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ἀδὰμ παράβασιν». (In Ep. ad Rom. 5,20 PG 74, 789).

Also: «Σύμπαν μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἐν γενέσει πάντως δῆπου καὶ ὑποκείμεται τῇ φθορᾷ». (In Ioan. 8,35. PG 73, 865).

Also: «Πεπλάνηται μὲν ἡ σύμπασα γῆ». (C. Jul. 6 PG 76, 829).

102. «Ἐνεχόμεθα δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ταῖς τῆς παραβάσεως αἰτίαις». (De Con. Trin. 6 PG 75, 1016).

103. «Ἀκάθαρτος ἡ ἀνθρώπου φύσις πρὸς Θεόν». (Glaph. in Exod. 2. PG 69, 476).

for the sin of Adam?<sup>104</sup> This is Cyril's question. The question, how it happened that sin came to be at all, is now connected with the question, how it happened that sin came through one, Adam, to be in all men.

In order to understand Cyril and weigh his understanding of this problem, we should point out that the following answers have been given to this great question:

(a) The theory of Pelagius, who said that Adam sinned and died and that all other people sin in imitation of Adam «by example and pattern»<sup>105</sup> without inheriting any guilt from him, and that they die only for their own sins.

(b) The theory of Augustine who understood St. Paul's famous phrase «Ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον» (Rom. 5,2) in the sense of a «relative» pronoun (=in whom (Adam) all men sinned). All men sinned because all men existed in that one Adam, and his free action was at the same time the free action of all men and had the free consent of them<sup>106</sup>.

(c) The theory of Albert Pighius († 1542) and Ambrosy Catharin († 1553) who said that the original sin was an actual sin of Adam only, but God reckoned this sin externally as all men's sin<sup>107</sup>.

(d) The theory according to which Adam sinned not as a person but as the representative of the whole of mankind, as Christ acted as the representative of all men<sup>108</sup>.

As we have seen, sin is both the sinful action and the sinful state which is the cause for sinful action and which is opposed to God's law. We can say the same for the original sin. Adam's sin consisted both of a sinful action and a sinful and guilty state. That sin, however, was not committed by all men and, therefore, it does not contain any personal guilt of theirs in it, but it has been inherited by them as a sinful and guilty state. While for Adam the transgression was free and personal, for all others it is

104. «Πῶς δὲ ἁμαρτωλοὶ δι' αὐτὸν (τὸν Ἀδὰμ) κατεστάθημεν οἱ πολλοί; Τί πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὰ ἐκείνου πταίσματα; Πῶς δὲ ὅλως οἱ μήπως γεγενημένοι καταδεδικάσμεθα σὺν αὐτῷ, καίτοι Θεοῦ λέγοντος «οὐκ ἀποθανοῦνται οἱ πατέρες ὑπὲρ τέκνων, οὔτε τέκνα ὑπὲρ πατέρων, ψυχὴ δὲ ἡ ἁμαρτάνουσα αὐτῆ ἀποθανεῖται;» (In Ep. ad Rom. 5,18 PG 74, 788).

105. Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, on Rom. 5,12 (ed. by Souter, II, p. 45). Also: Cave S. The Christian Estimate of Man. London, 1957 p. 93.

106. «Omnes enim fuimus in ille uno, quando omnes fuimus ille nusus» (De Civit. Dei XIII, 14 PL 41, 386).

107. Trembelas P., Dogmatics of the Orthodox Catholic Church, Athens 1959 vol. I' p. 555.

108. Trembelas P. o. c. p. 555.

inherited and inevitable. While for Adam it was both a sinful action and a sinful state, for men it is only the sinful state in which they are born. Cyril expresses his teaching concerning our question in passages like this: «We have become sinners through the disobedience of Adam in this way: He was created in order to be incorruptable and living. His life in Paradise was holy and his mind was occupied by the vision of God; his body was calm and quiet, for no sin had disturbed him. But since he fell into sin and corruption, sin and iniquities entered into his nature and the wild Law, which is within ourselves, appeared. Thus (human) nature sinned by the disobedience of one, i.e. of Adam, and thus the many became sinners, not because they transgressed the command together with Adam, for they did not exist then, but because they are descendents of his nature which fell and came under the Law of Sin»<sup>109</sup>.

Here we can see Cyril's answer which is:

(a) opposed to the theory of Pelagius because Cyril says that all men inherit the guilt of the original sin as a sinful state.

(b) opposed to the theory of St. Augustine because Cyril says that all men have become sinful not in the sense that all men have sinned personally in Adam. If Cyril had accepted this theory of Augustine, he would have had to accept the idea that, in Adam, all men existed as persons knowing, thinking and willing the same things with him and that Adam's will was not personal but the will of the whole of mankind, so that every action of his was at the same time the action of all men. But both these ideas are rejected by Cyril in the above-mentioned passage. The will of a person is a personal one and as such the will of each man was not the personal will of Adam. This personal will of each person existed in Adam only generally, not as a real and personal one, but as

109. «Ἄμαρτωλοὶ δὲ γεγόναμεν διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ Ἀδάμ διὰ τοιόνδε τρόπον. Πειοίητο μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ ἀφθαρσία καὶ ζωῆ, ἦν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ βίος ἀγιοπρεπῆς ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τῆς τρυφῆς, ἔλος ἦν καὶ διὰ παντὸς ἐν θεοπτικαῖς ὁ νοῦς, ἐν εὐδείᾳ δὲ καὶ γαλήνῃ τὸ σῶμα κατηρημούσης ἀπάσης αἰσχροῦς ἡδονῆς. Οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἐκτόπων κινήματων θόρυβος ἐν αὐτῷ. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ πέπτωκεν ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν καὶ κατώλισθεν εἰς φθοράν, ἐντεῦθεν εἰσέδραμον τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς φύσιν ἡδοναί τε καὶ ἀκαθαρσία, ἀνέφυ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν ἀγριαίνων νόμος. Νεβόσηκεν οὖν ἡ φύσις τὴν ἁμαρτίαν διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός, τοὔτέστιν Ἀδάμ. Οὕτως ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, οὐχ ὡς τῷ Ἀδάμ συμπαραβεβηκότες, οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν πώποτε, ἀλλ' ὡς τῆς ἐκείνου φύσεως ὄντες τῆς ὑπὸ νόμον πεσοῦσης τὸν τῆς ἁμαρτίας. Ὡσπερ τοίνυν ἠρρώστησεν ἡ ἀνθρώπου φύσις ἐν Ἀδάμ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τὴν φθοράν, εἰσέδου τε οὕτως αὐτὴν τὰ πάθη, οὕτως ἀπήλλαται πάλιν ἐν Χριστῷ· γέγονε γὰρ ὑπήκοος τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἁμαρτίαν». (In Ep. ad Rom. 5,18 PG 74, 788-9).

being in the first root of mankind<sup>110</sup>. If Cyril had accepted this theory, he should have had to accept the idea that moral relations can be inherited, which seems to be impossible. Therefore Cyril understands the phrase of St. Paul «'Εφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον» not as St. Augustine did, namely not «in whom (Adam) all men sinned» but «because all men sinned».

(c) opposed to the theory of Pighius and Catharin because Cyril does see an inner relation between Adam and mankind, and therefore their guilt is not considered only externally. How could God punish all men for an actual sin of Adam?

(d) Cyril tried to approach our question and to give an answer by stating that the original sin is inherited by all men not as a personal, actual sin of theirs, but as a sinful state in which they are born, because physically all men come from the same corrupted nature of Adam<sup>111</sup>. This is the only way in which Cyril understands the inheritance of the original sin by all men. The two things, guilt and the sinful state are organically related to each other. However, we must admit that here we face a great mystery.

---

110. «Οἶόν τινα κληρον ἐκ πατρὸς εἰς ὄλον τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ διῆκον γένος τὰς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Ἄδὰμ παραβάσεως συμφορὰς ἐσχήκαμεν» (In Ioan. 14,30. PG 74, 328).

111. «Πάλαι μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας τὸ δεινὸν τοῦ θανάτου κατεθρασύνετο. Βεβασίλευκε γὰρ ἀπὸ Ἄδὰμ καὶ μέχρι Μωσέως, καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἀμαρτήσαντας, ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἄδὰμ. Καὶ πεφορέκαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοῦκοῦ, καθ' ὁμοιότητα τὴν ἐκεῖνου, τὸν ἐκ τῆς θείας ἀρᾶς ὑπομένοντες θάνατον». (In Ioan. 19, 40-41. PG 74, 681).

Also: «Ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡ ἀνθρώπων φύσις ὑπὸ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν πέπτωκεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Εὐᾶ παραβάσεως καὶ ὑπὸ κατάρᾳ ἢ γένεσις γέγονεν». (In Psal. 50,8. PG 69, 1092).

Also: «Καταδεδικάσμεθα ἐν ἐκείνῳ πρὸς θάνατον». (Glaph. in Lev. PG 69, 540).

Also: «Ὡσπερ οἶά τινα κληρον, ἐκ πατρὸς εἰς ὄλον τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ διῆκον γένος, τὰς ἐκ τῆς ἐν Ἄδὰμ παραβάσεως συμφορὰς ἐσχήκαμεν, ἀρᾶ καὶ θανάτῳ πεφορτισμένοι, οὕτω πάλιν εἰς ἅπαν τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος τὰ ἐν Χριστῷ διαδραμεῖται λαμπρά». (In Psal. 2 PG 69, 721).

Also: «Ἐπειδὴ τῆς ἐν Ἄδὰμ παραβάσεως γεγόναμεν μιμηταὶ καθ' ὃ πάντες ἥμαρτον, ταῖς ἴσαις ἐκείνῳ δίκαις ὑπεννήγγμεθα» (In Ep. ad Rom. 5,12 PG 74, 784).