

AN ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN VIEW OF MAN

BY

Rev. GEORGE C. PAPADEMETRIOU, Ph. D.

One of the most fundamental problems which every thinker is faced with is man's being, his destiny, his relation to the world and to God. Early Christianity was influenced by Jewish and Greek philosophical and theological understandings of man. The Greek view of man was expressed in Platonic and Neo-Platonic terms. Greek Philosophy makes a sharp distinction between body and soul, between the immaterial rational and the irrational material realms of existence. The Jewish perspective is reflected in the sharp distinction made between God and creation. Philosophical dualism is carefully avoided by the Hebrews. These two traditions were simultaneously developed in early Christian thought. These two trends complement each other. It is evident that the Christian perspective of man is that he is a «being» and a creature of God capable to become «like God», that is, able to attain theosis.

THE NATURE OF MAN

The Orthodox Christian view of man is understood in terms of the New Testament and the Church Fathers. The Patristic interpretation of man is the basis for the Orthodox Theologians to expound the doctrine of man founded on the Holy Bible, and the experience of the Fathers. The meaning of Christ's revelation is closely connected to the life of the Church. The Orthodox interpretation of man therefore is that of the New Testament as expounded by the Holy Fathers.

The creation of man is a special act of God within His creation. Creation itself is an act of God resulting from His love. Z. Rhosse, a Greek theologian, states that «the result of the creative and providential energy of God is the world, an ordered whole ordained to a definite end.¹»

1. Z. Rhosse, *Dogmatics*, page 382. Quoted in F. Gavin. *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1936), page 158.

God created the world with a definite end and purpose. The «crown» of God's creation is the «rational» being, man. There is nothing unholy in the world.

According to a Greek Orthodox theologian: «Man, consisting of body and soul, was created, between the natural and spiritual world, as the key and crown of creation.²» Rhosse agrees with him in his statement, «man is the link joining the spiritual and material orders of the world...³» The body is related to the material world and the soul to the spiritual.⁴ In the words of Rhosse, [man is] «the capstone and end of the material creation, belonging in body to the physical order, and in the soul or spirit to the spiritual order.⁵»

Creation does not mean «perfection;» it means that God made man with all the possibilities to become «perfect.» God created man and by Grace man attains immortality. It is emphasized that «only God is by nature eternal.⁶» It is also pointed out that «man at creation was innocent but not perfect. He was created with certain potentialities which had to be developed and transformed into actualities in the course of time. He had to take part in his own creation by the use of his free will. Original goodness was innocence, not matured development and fully spiritual maturity.⁷» Man is God's creation «ex nihilo» as is attested to in the first chapter of Genesis.⁸ The doctrine of Creation, *ex nihilo*; contradicts the classical Greek philosophical view that «nothing derives from nothing.⁹» Yet the Scriptures and Orthodox theology insist that man was created by God out of «nothing» to «become» like Him.

Another aspect of man is also the soul, which is part of the whole human being. The Platonic influence on St. Augustine compelled him to regard the body and the material aspect of man as evil; thus salvation

2. Chrestos Androutsos, *Dogmatics of the Orthodox Eastern Church*, (In Greek), (Athens: «Aster» Publishing House, 2nd ed., 1956), page 139.

3. *op. cit.*

4. Chr. Androutsos, *op. cit.*

5. Z. Rhosse, *op. cit.*, p. 398.

6. J. Romanides, *Original Sin*, (In Greek), (Athens: Apostoliki Diakonia, 1957), p. 57.

7. Eusebius Stephanou, «An Outline of Dogmatic Theology,» *For Better Teaching: Teacher Training Manual for Orthodox Church Schools*, (New York: Orthodox Christian Education Commission, 1959), p. 53.

8. Chr. Androutsos, *op. cit.*, p. 95; John Karmires, *Synopsis of the Dogmatic Doctrine of the Orthodox Catholic Church*, (Athens: University of Athens Press, 1957), p. 27 sq.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 95. «From nothingness nothing becomes.»

is to destroy the corporeal existence of man. Yet later he abandoned this view but could not free himself completely from his Platonism, and regarded the soul as the essence of man, as the vivifying principle.¹⁰

St. Gregory of Nyssa agrees with St. Augustine that «the soul is a life-giving principle.¹¹» St. Gregory of Nyssa insists that the soul and body were created at the same time to evolve toward perfection:

The survival cause of our constitution is neither a soul without a body, nor a body without a soul but that from animated and living bodies it is generated at the first as a living and animate being, and that our humanity takes it and cherishes it like a nursing with the resources she herself possesses and it thus grows on both sides and makes its growth manifest correspondingly in either part.¹²

This body and soul as understood in Orthodox Theology are two aspects of the same «being».

Androutsos rejects the two extremes of «spiritualism» and «materialism» as incompatible with the Orthodox Christian Faith.¹³

The definitions given by St. Augustine and St. Gregory of Nyssa express the attitudes of some Christians concerning the soul. The following definition of St. Augustine is closely related to that of Plato. He defines the soul as «to be a certain kind of substance sharing in reason, fitted to rule the body.¹⁴» The human soul is a substance which participates in reason and is adapted to govern the human body. Also, St. Gregory of Nyssa defines the soul as created essence that has a peculiar nature which is spiritual and in a sense ineffable. He states that:

«The soul is an essence created, living, and intellectual, transmitting from itself to an organized and sentient body of the power of living and grasping objects of sense, as long as there is a natural constitution capable of holding this together.¹⁵»

The definitions quoted above from the two representative thinkers tend towards the dualistic conception of man.

10. *De Quant. An.*, C. 3, 4. He also says that the soul is a substance in *Confessions* IV, C. XVI.

11. Migne, *P.G.*, XLVI, 16B; 17B.

12. St. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Making of Man*, XXIX.

13. Chr. Androutsos, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

14. *De Quantitate Animae*, C. 1,2. See also E. Gilson, *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940), pp. 174-175.

15. *De An. et Res.* 189C.

Orthodox Theologians follow the traditional conception of man as body and soul. John Papadopoulos in his *Dogmatics* argues that that man consists of body and soul; and that the body is the «dwelling place» for the soul. The soul is the vivifying power of the body. The body and soul are inseparable in that «being which is called man.¹⁶» The prominent Greek Orthodox Theologian Androutsos rejects the doctrine of the Platonizing philosophers who claim that the body is a shadow of the soul, the enslavement of the spirit.¹⁷

Some theologians conceive man as being «tri-composite», that is, to consist of three elements: body, soul and spirit. An exponent of this theory is A. Makrakis. He argues «that two natures are generated in the soul, the carnal and the spiritual, as the result of its union with the flesh and spirit; this has been proved and confirmed by the testimony of consciousness and the corroboratory testimony of reason.¹⁸» In another article, A. Makrakis goes into grammatical and logical detail to prove that the statement in Genesis 2:7 supports the doctrine of «tri-compositeness» of man.¹⁹ This position is rejected by the Orthodox theologians as being alien to the Orthodox Greek Patristic doctrine and to the true understanding of this doctrine by the Church. According to Rhosse and Androutsos (professors of Dogmatics, University of Athens), man is a unity of body and soul; not a dualistic being. They both reject the «tri-compositeness» of man, and point out that the «spirit» in man is the energy of the Holy Spirit which illuminates and sanctifies the intellectual and spiritual faculties of man.²⁰ According to Gavin, the above-mentioned theologians «regard man as a unity consisting of body and soul, the latter called spirit in its higher aspects.²¹» John Papadopoulos refers to the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon and to the Fathers to show that man consists of body and soul.²² He rejects the «tri-compositeness» of man as a misunderstanding of the terms

16. John Papadopoulos, *Dogmatics of the Orthodox Eastern Church* (in Greek), (New York: 1955, 2nd ed.), p. 66.

17. Chr. Androutsos, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

18. A. Makrakis, *A New Philosophy and the Philosophical Sciences*, (Tr. by Denver Cummings, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1940), Vol. I, p. 53.

19. A. Makrakis, «An Interpretation of the Passage in Genesis concerning the Creation of Man,» in *The Real Truth Concerning Apostolos Makrakis*, (Chicago: The Orthodox Educational Society, 1952), p. 89.

20. Frank Gavin, *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought* (London: S.P.C.K., 1936), p. 159.

21. *Ibid.*

22. John Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

«body, soul, and spirit» used by the Scriptures and the Fathers to describe the nature of man.²³ John Romanides also rejects this doctrine and quotes P. Chrestou that Origen and Apollinaris of Laodicea «probably» were the only two ancient ecclesiastical writers to advocate this doctrine.²⁴ The majority of Orthodox theologians follow the Patristic doctrine that man is a «unity» of body and soul. Man is a creature that was created by God in His «image».

Concerning the origin of the individual soul the Orthodox theologians have to choose between «traducianism» and «creationism». St. Augustine was troubled by the nature of the soul and confessed that the origin of the soul «is a profound mystery.»

There are three theories concerning the origin of the soul. The first is that the soul pre-exists in God and that the body is an enclosure and enslavement. This theory was held by Plato and by Origen in the Christian era. This theory is incompatible with Christian Orthodoxy. It was condemned by the Fifth Ecumenical Council.²⁵

The second theory, called «traducianism», is that the offspring is a generative act of the parents. This theory was defended by Athanasios, Gregory of Nyssa and Augustine with some reservations. The generation of the organism is originated in God, who creates through the cooperation (*synergy*) of man with God's Providence.²⁶

The third theory is of «creationism», that is, the soul is created by God in principle or as idea in the beginning. To put it in different words, every soul that comes into being is a special act of God.

The Orthodox theologians seem to be in disagreement as to which theory is to be accepted since there is no dogmatic pronouncement concerning the origin of the soul. Papadopoulos accepts «traducianism» because the continuation of man's relation to Adam and Eve is not interrupted.²⁷ Androutsos rejects this theory because the soul is a product of natural generation which is not compatible to the spirituality of man's soul and also leads to «determinism».²⁸ Androutsos accepts

23. *Ibid.*, p. 68.

24. John Romanides, *Original Sin*, (Athens: 1957 in Greek), p. 129; see also n. 4.

25. Chr. Androutsos, *op. cit.*, p. 134. Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 135.

27. John Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 74; also Z. Rhosse accepts it because «it seems the most reasonable.» The others are one-sided and incomplete. Frank Gavin, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

28. Chr. Androutsos, *op. cit.*, p. 136. Mesoloras inclines to «creationism.» Frank Gavin, *op. cit.*, p. 160; also, E. Stephanou, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

a combination of the two theories, «creationism» and «traducianism», that is, man is a product of the Divine and human activity. That is, the creative power of God cooperates in the creative generation of each man. He states that:

The right view of the origin of the soul lies rather in a combination of the theories of creationism and traducianism so that man would be a result of both Divine and human activity, and God's creative power be involved and exercised in the generation of each individual.²⁹

The soul has its origin in God as is obvious in the Scriptures. We must guard against the error that creation is by God in the sense that the soul is engendered from His Essence. Man being a «special creation» of God is the crown of creation, created in His image and is destined to become «like» God. The «image» and «likeness» of God was a special concern of the Church Fathers of the Orthodox Church.

The «image» of God in man is a special doctrine of the Church Fathers and this is continued with the modern Orthodox theologians. The most accepted doctrine of the «image» and «likeness» is that the «image» is the «freedom» that man was endowed with and the «likeness» is the «moral perfection of man.³⁰» According to St. Basil, the «image» is the «potential likeness».³¹ This distinction between «image» and «likeness» is attributed to St. Irenaeus, who influenced the Orthodox doctrine of man. He states that man was not from the beginning created perfect but was endowed with all the gifts that were necessary to become perfect.³²

The perfection and maturity of man is not only a moral one but also physical and intellectual as well, because this is the will of God.³³ The nature of man is his reason, his freedom and the potentiality to become perfect and participate in immortality. It is a moral perfection in doing good.³⁴

29. Chr. Androutsos, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

30. J. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, p. 29. See also John Damascene, *De Fide Orthodoxe*, II, 12.

31. Chr. Androutsos, *op. cit.*, p. 144. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Making of Man*, Ch. 21.

32. Z. Xintaras, «Man, the Image of God,» *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. I, No. 1, Aug., 1954, p. 51. It is an excellent article on the Patristic view.

33. J. Romanides, *Original Sin*, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

34. J. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

Man is not the «image» of the universe or only «microcosm» because the «macrocosm» is not eternal. Man is the «image of God.» A great Father of the Church speaks in the following words on this point:

«There is nothing remarkable in wishing to make of man the image and likeness of the universe, for the earth passes away, the sky changes and all that they contain is as transitory as that which contains them. People said, man is a microcosm... and thinking to elevate human nature with this grandiloquent title, they did not notice that they had honored man with the characteristics of the mosquito and the mouse.³⁵»

Man as creature of God in His image is destined to attain His likeness. This was taught by the Fathers and is held by the Church. The «image», as interpreted by some theologians, is the freedom and reason that man received at the time of his creation. According to Father Romanides, in interpreting the Church Fathers it is suggested that «immortality» is the «image» of God in man and this is what man lost in the fall.³⁶ It is not immortality of the soul as taught by the Ancient Greek philosophers, but it is the Hebrew conception of immortality of the whole man.³⁷

It seems to me that both view-points mentioned above, that is, freedom and reason on one side and immortality on the other, are a matter of emphasis. Both freedom, reason and immortality make up the «image» of God. Those who stress the rational aspect of man point to the rational faculty as the element that gives superiority to man over the other creatures. This is summarized in the following statement: «Man alone of all creatures had the capacity for thinking, knows of reality of moral nature and enjoys the ideas of truth, beauty and righteousness, that few would deny.³⁸»

The «image» of God is not located in any particular part or aspect of man, but the whole man is the «image» of God.³⁹ St. Gregory Palamas says that: «The word Man is not applied to either soul or body separately, but to both together, since they have been created in the image of God.⁴⁰»

35. Quoted by V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, (London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 1957), p. 114.

36. J. Romanides, *Original Sin*, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 37.

38. Z. Xintaras, *op. cit.*, p. 54. R. Niebuhr, a Protestant theologian, terms it «the ability to transcend himself.» (*The Nature and Destiny of Man* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, Vol. I, 1949), p. 2.

39. V. Lossky, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

40. Quoted by V. Lossky, *ibid.*, p. 116.

THE HUMAN CONDITION

The discussion of man in the «image» of God brings us to the topic of the primitive «state» of humanity. According to the Greek Fathers, the «primitive» state of man was not a «state of perfection», as was the contention of the West, but a state of innocence attributed to the first humans. «It is interesting to note that although Irenaeus believed that the image consists of man's endowment of reason and freedom, although he taught that Adam enjoyed a certain degree of blessedness in his primitive state, he did not attribute to him any degree of perfection, as did Augustine and later, (Roman) Catholic Theology.⁴¹» Man was created in a state of innocence and was destined and endowed with the potentiality to grow to maturity. This was held by the Fathers and the Orthodox theologians.⁴² Man was created «with all physical and spiritual endowments necessary for the fulfillment of the end for which God foreordained him.⁴³» An Orthodox theologian states that man was created by God «endowed with all the spiritual and physical qualities» to fulfill his destiny.⁴⁴ The following statement reflects the Orthodox view on the subject: «The original state of man was one of potential, but not completed or achieved perfection. Had man been absolutely or completely perfect, the fall would have been impossible.⁴⁵» Man is, by nature, good, and by his cooperation, (*synergy*), with God, can attain moral goodness.⁴⁶

The Orthodox theologians in discussing the original state or righteousness and holiness as «relative» and not absolute perfection, point out that the West, under the influence of Augustine, erred by accepting that man was originally given as a gift from God, «absolute holiness, righteousness and eternity.⁴⁷»

Rhosse, an Orthodox theologian, points out that «the Protestant view holds this primitive or original righteousness to be resident in the natural man, *qua* man, and independent of grace.» He further explains, «that the Roman theory would make it consist essentially and solely of the special super-added grace.⁴⁸»

41. Z. Xintaras, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

42. *Ibid.*,

43. Chr. Androutsos, p. 136; also see Frank Gavin, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

44. John Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

45. Chr. Androutsos, quoted by Frank Gavin, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

46. Chr. Androutsos, *Dogmatics, op. cit.*, pp. 77-78.

47. John Papadopoulos, *Ibid.*, p. 79.

48. Quoted by Frank Gavin, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

Gavin describes in the following manner the Orthodox position as held by some theologians:

The Orthodox view — for example, that of both Androutsos and Rhosse — is that man's original state was potentially perfect and «original righteousness was the result of the cooperation of the Spirit of God with the natural powers implanted in the human soul in Creation.⁴⁹

It is evident that the Orthodox Church teaches that the primitive state of man was innocence and that he was endowed with the natural powers to cooperate with God to become perfect.

Man, unfortunately, did not abide in God's will and therefore perfection of Adam had need of trial and testing so as to become moral and ethical perfection, but by his own will he turned aside from his own end, at the instigation of the evil one, to serve his own will in preference to that of his Creator.⁵⁰ The subject of the fall is explained as disobedience and rebellion against the Will of God. «The fall does not lie in the evil nature of the forbidden fruit, but rather in the act of disobedience. Opposition to and transgression of the Divine Will is the essence of the fall. It is the fact of the setting of their own will against God's Will.⁵¹» Man's insubordination and disobedience of God's Will was the act of choosing evil.⁵²

Original Sin is interpreted as «egocentricity» and man's free act of disobedience of God's Will.⁵³ «Self love» is a perversion of man's primary destiny to «love God and his neighbor.» Sin is «willingly» or «unwillingly» disobeying God's «will.»⁵⁴ Original Sin is described by some as «sexual» concupiscence, a theory not accepted by the Orthodox Church. N. Berdyaev, one of the most profound modern philosophers, states that «egocentricity is, indeed, the Original Sin.»⁵⁵ Another theologian

49. *Ibid.*

50. Frank Gavin, *op. cit.*, pp. 165-166.

51. E. Stephanou, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

52. Chr. Androutsos, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

53. J. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

54. J. Romanides, *Original Sin, op. cit.*, p. 111.

55. N. Berdyaev, *Solitude and Society*, (London: Geoffrey Bless, The Centenary Press, 1947), p. 21.

N. Berdyaev is not considered a spokesman for Orthodoxy. See a review by Constantine Cavarnos of the book: *The Meaning of the Creative Act*, (Belmont, Mass.: Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1956), pp. 1, 4. He says: «It should be clear that those who are seeking an exposition of Eastern Orthodox Christianity in the

points out that it is called original (ancestral) sin, not because a sin was committed by the first parents, but because of the destructive results and man's situation in a state of sin which was a reality after the fall.⁵⁶

The perversion of human nature is the direct consequence of the «free decision of man.» The ability of man to come into communion with God was obstructed, and the way by which grace would have poured out through him into the whole of creation was removed by man himself in his disobedience of God's Will. This must not, under any circumstances, be understood as meaning that this «physical» concept of sin and its results, as held in the teaching of the Orthodox Church, excluded the other elements: «the personal moral aspect, the aspect of fault and punishment.» The Orthodox theologian V. Lossky points out that:--

The two aspects are inseparably connected because man is not only a nature, but also a person placed over against a personal God, and in a personal relationship with Him. If human nature disintegrates as a consequence of sin, if sin introduces death into the created universe, the reason for this is not only that human freedom has created a new status, a new mode of existence in evil, but also that God has placed a limit to sin, allowing it to end in death. The wages of sin is death.⁵⁷

According to Orthodox teaching, God alone has immortality; creation lives only by participation in the Divine Life.⁵⁸ It is held by the Fathers, and the Church teaches that God alone is by «nature» immortal, whereas man by grace becomes immortal.

Adam did not fulfill his mission; he was unable to attain union with God and perfection of the created order. «That which he failed to realize when he used the fullness of his liberty became impossible to him from the moment in which he willingly became the slave of an external power.⁵⁹» In the thought of some reformers the human freedom is incom-

works of N. Berdyaev, particularly in *The Meaning of the Creative Act*, are looking for it in the wrong place.» p. 5. See also Sergei Levitzky, «Berdyaev's Philosophy—Heresy or Not?» in *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, (New York: St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary Quarterly, 1960. Vol. IV, No. 4), pp: 7-19.

56. J. Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

57. V. Lossky, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

58. J. Romanides, «Man and His True Life,» *op. cit.*, p. 67.

59. V. Lossky, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

patible with God's omnipotence and omniscience; thus it was that in the Reformation the concept of human freedom was restricted.⁶⁰

Personal sin is also noted in the free will of man. The first cause of sin, both original and personal, is the devil, who is working to divert the will of God,⁶¹ and in this way to push man further away from God into death. God is not the cause of death. The Fathers of the Church speak of both the «spiritual» and «corporal» death as the separation from God; the cause of this separation is the devil, who is also the cause of death.⁶² Death, according to the Eastern Fathers, is a necessary consequence of sin and the fall of the first parent, and all the descendants of the first parents enter this state of sin and death.⁶³ The Augustinian teaching that death is God's punishment, is alien to Orthodox theological thought. The reality of death is in a sense the seeming triumph of Satan over God. Orthodoxy insists that here in this world we are struggling against the devil, and here in the world the «struggle» will end with resurrection of the bodies.⁶⁴

The positive aspect of human freedom is life by grace. God had created man to «have life eternal». Man is restored to his potential by the «grace» that flows from the cross of Christ. Freedom is that characteristic which makes man a being that can construct his own future. An Orthodox thinker says the following concerning freedom:

«Only free beings can be capable of realizing moral good and other absolute values. Only free beings who willingly enter the path that leads to union with God as a living ideal of perfection deserve to be called children of God. Only free beings are capable of taking an independent part in God's work or of entering into living council with God.⁶⁵»

The devil is the cause of apostasy and the falling away from God and also he is the cause of our personal sin. This does not mean that man is not responsible for his sin because the «choice» is made by man and this freedom holds man responsible for his personal sin.⁶⁶ The Fa-

60. N. O. Lossky, *Freedom of Will*, (Tr. by Natalie Duddington, London: William and Norgate Ltd., 1932), p. 33.

61. *Hamartia* means to divert or prevent that which is intended.

62. J. Romanides, *Original Sin*, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

63. J. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

64. J. Romanides, *Original Sin*, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

65. N. O. Lossky, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

66. J. Romanides, *Original Sin*, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

thers always emphasized the sinfulness of man but also recognized the hope in Christ. God is life and separation from God means death.⁶⁷ Satan does not act only in the evil thoughts of man but also influences the human will and actions. The acts of Satan are by nature and ontologically evil.⁶⁸ After the fall, some Fathers teach that there was an eternal descent towards non-being.⁶⁹

Death is permitted by God to prevent sin from being eternal.⁷⁰ This is the teaching of the Church: that death is the consequence of sin and not guilt of concupiscence as was expounded in the West.⁷¹ Father Romanides emphatically states that: «Man in the physical multiplication of the genus inherits the weakness of death and is in degrees under the power of the devil and sin.⁷²»

St. Irenaeus points out that: «As in the first generation we inherit death, in the same manner in the new generation we are able to inherit life.⁷³»

Christ came to overcome the power of sinfulness and death, and to restore the human potential to attain perfection.

SALVATION OF MAN

Salvation in the Orthodox Church is the work of God through Christ, the Divine Logos. It is because of God's love toward His fallen creatures that the Divine Logos becomes man to restore the former position. Androutsos expresses this in the following words:

«Man, having fallen under the power of sin and the Devil, was unable to be saved and to have fellowship with God, but was under condemnation to destruction and eternal death. This destruction of the human race the Creator would not allow, and in His mercy, His love for men, and His Kindness (or by what other name His love for sinful man may be called) forced the deliverance from evil, and planned to send His Son into the world for the salvation of men. This plan of God was conceived before the foundation of the world, eternally...⁷⁴»

67. *Ibid.*, p. 71.

68. *Ibid.*, p. 72.

69. V. Lossky, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

70. J. Romanides, *Original Sin, op. cit.*, p. 90.

71. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

72. *Ibid.*, pp. 80-81.

73. *Elenchos*, V., Ch., 1, 3, quoted in J. Romanides, *Original Sin*, p. 80.

74. Chr. Androutsos, *op. cit.*, pp. 165-166.

Concerning our Lord's person both Sacred Scripture and the Holy Church teach that Jesus Christ is God-man (Theanthropos) or «true God and true man.» Christ became like man in every respect except «sin». Our Lord assumed human nature in its original perfection.⁷⁵ The Fourth Ecumenical Council teaches that:

«We confess one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, made known in two natures [which exist] without confusion, without change, without division, without separation; the difference of the natures having been in no wise taken away by reason of the union, but rather the properties of each being preserved, and [both] concurring into the one Person (prosopon) and one hypostasis—not parted or divided into two Persons (prosopa), but one and the same Son and Only-begotten, the divine Logos, the Lord Jesus Christ.⁷⁶»

The primary purpose of the incarnation is to destroy sin and the devil. Father Stephanou expresses it in this way:

«The death of Christ vanquished death by getting at Satan, who holds the power of death. He is the first-born of the dead opening the way for all men who seek redemption. By rising from the grave, Christ defeated Satan and abolished his sway over man. As a result, the communion of the Holy Spirit, which he lost at the fall, was restored to man.⁷⁷»

In Orthodoxy the destiny of man is not conceived as «ultimate happiness» as is the contention of Augustine and the West after him, but «perfection» and «deification» (theosis) in Christ. Eudemonistic ethics and the fulfillment of man's desire to unite man's mind with God are not accepted. Also, the theory of «satisfaction of Divine Justice» is alien to the spirit of Orthodoxy.⁷⁸

To quote St. Gregory the Theologian:

«To whom was the blood of Christ that was shed for us on the Cross offered and why was it shed? I mean the precious and glorious blood of God, the blood of the High Priest and of the Sacrifice. We were in bondage to the devil and sold under sin, hav-

75. J. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

76. J. Karmiris, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

77. E. Stephanou, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

78. J. Romanides, *Original Sin*, p. 95.

ing become corrupt through our concupiscence. Now since a ransom is paid to him who holds us in his power, I ask to whom was such a price offered and why? If to the devil, it is outrageous! The robber receives the ransom, not only from God, but a ransom consisting of God Himself. He demands so exorbitant a payment for his tyranny that it would have been right for him to have freed us altogether. But if the price is offered to the Father, I ask first of all, how? For it was not the Father who held us captive. Why, then, should the blood of His only-begotten Son please the Father, who would not even receive Isaac when he was offered as a whole burnt offering by Abraham, but replaced him with a ram? Is it not evident that the Father accepts the sacrifice by the humanity of God, and God Himself must deliver us by overcoming the tyrant through His own power, and drawing us to Himself by the mediation of the Son who effects this all for the honor of God; to whom He was obedient in everything..? What remains to be said shall be covered with a reverent silence.. We needed an incarnate God, a God put to death that we might live. Nothing can equal the miracle of my salvation: a few drops of blood recreate the whole world.⁷⁹⁾

The fact that Christ came to destroy death and the devil is expressed in the most beautiful Easter hymn: «Christ hath risen from the dead, by death trampling upon death and to those in the tombs He has bestowed life.⁸⁰⁾»

Man must struggle against evil in order to attain perfection. «...Each Christian must fight against Satan. He is free to do it, although the final victory comes from God.⁸¹ Salvation is not a personal achievement or the result of our good works, but the work of God... salvation is not a matter of doing good things by will as opposed to the necessities of nature, but rather a renewal of the natural freedom of human nature itself.⁸²⁾»

79. St. Gregory the Theologian, *In Sanctum Pascha, Oratio XLV*, 22. See V. Lossky, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

80. *Orthodox Prayer Book*, Eastern Hymns.

81. Fr. Basil Krivoshein, «Angels and Demons in the Eastern Orthodox Church,» in *Angels of Light and the Power of Darkness* (Ed. E. L. Mascall, London: Faith Press, 1955), p. 34.

82. J. Romanides, «Highlights in the Debate over Theodore of Mopsuestia's Christology and some suggestions for a Fresh Approach,» *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. V, No. 2 (Winter, 1959-1960), p. 173.

The fight against the devil is described as follows: «This struggle against evil is not a mere moral one but a real spiritual fight against Satan. It is not mere abstention from sin; but an extirpation of evil at its roots.⁸³»

Perfection in Christ is attained by unselfish and unrewarded love which is greater than the desire of the instinct of self-preservation. In this type of unselfish love Christians are compelled to love even their enemies.⁸⁴ Perfection is not a moral achievement; it is a gift from God in cooperation with man. According to St. Macarius of Egypt:

«Mere abstention from evil things is not perfection. Perfection is only if you have entered into the mind and have slain the serpent that lies under the mind, beneath the surface of the thoughts, and burrows into what we call the secret chamber and storehouses of the soul and murders you — for the heart is a deep gulf — only, I say, if you killed him and cast out all the uncleanness that was in you.⁸⁵»

Evil is not external temptation, it is hidden in nature. «Man alone is not able to achieve this radical extirpation of the evil forces, which are so deeply hidden in our nature. Only Christ and the grace of the Holy Spirit, sent by Christ, give us the victory.⁸⁶» Man has the power to fore-sake evil, if he wills to do so. This power does not belong to the few «chosen» by God to be saved, but belongs to all humanity.⁸⁷

The primary purpose of man is to love God and his fellow man as God loves the world.⁸⁸ «Man's destiny is not happiness, but natural freedom and eternal life.⁸⁹» In Greek philosophical doctrine adopted by the Western eudemonistic ethics since the time of Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Calvin, Ritschel and others, the end of man is happiness. St. Thomas Aquinas makes a distinction in the ultimate end of man. First is the thing itself which is destined to be attained and the second

83. B. Krivoshein. *op. cit.*, p. 35.

84. J. Romanides, *Original Sin*, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

85. Quoted by B. Krivoshein *op. cit.*, p. 35. In this quotation it is obvious that the Holy Fathers of the desert have a doctrine about the «subconscious» or «unconscious» of which modern psychology speaks. They gave directions to free it from sin and renew it with the Grace of Christ.

86. B. Krivoshein, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-36.

87. J. Romanides, *Original Sin*, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

88. *Ibid.*, p. 95.

89. J. Romanides, «Mopsuestia's Christology», *op. cit.*, p. 173.

is the attainment or the possession of the thing desired. In the first sense, mentioned above, man's end is God, the uncreated God. In the second sense man possesses the end as created being. As Aquinas states: «If, therefore, we consider man's happiness in its cause of object, then it is something uncreated; but if we consider it as to the very essence of happiness, then it is something created.⁹⁰» St. Thomas also insists that «final happiness consists in the vision of the Divine Essence, which is the very essence of goodness.⁹¹» The Orthodox Fathers absolutely reject the creaturely communion or vision of the Divine Essence before or after death. A distinction is made by the Fathers between the Essence of God and the Energies of God. The Fathers make clear that contemplation of the Essence of God is impossible. They teach that the Divine uncreated light is accessible to man in his state of perfection.⁹² The ultimate end of man is the resurrection of the bodies and in imitation of Christ who ascended to heaven with His «body», our bodies will be resurrected and be in God's everlasting presence. This will be the eternal Kingdom of God. This state is expressed in the following words by N. Berdyaev: «The kingdom of God is not a reward but the attainment of perfection, deification, beauty and spiritual wholeness.⁹³» A Russian Orthodox thinker says that «Christianity reveals to mankind not only the ideal of absolute perfection but also the way to attain it, and therefore it is essentially progressive.⁹⁴»

90. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Iua, IIae, 3, 1.

91. *Ibid.*, 4, 4.

92. J. Romanides, *Original Sin*, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

93. N. Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, (London: Geoffrey Bless, 1954), p. 291.

94. Vladimir Solovyov, *A Solovyov Anthology*, (Tr. by Natalie Duddington, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950), p. 49.