

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

Winter 2-1-1986

Justification in the Eastern Orthodox Churches (A Comparative Study)

Eshetu Abate

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_abatee@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Abate, Eshetu, "Justification in the Eastern Orthodox Churches (A Comparative Study)" (1986). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 536.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/536>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

JUSTIFICATION IN THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCHES

(A COMPARATIVE STUDY)

A thesis presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis
Department of Systematic Theology,
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by

Eshetu Abate

February 1986

Approved by

R. Nagel
Advisor

Ernst Schulz
Reader

Dedicated to my Father - Ato Abate Koyra

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE		v
Chapter		
I. INTRODUCTION		1
Definition of Terms		1
Justification		1
Eastern Orthodox Churches		2
Aim of the Study		4
A Sketch History of the Doctrine of Justification in the East and West		7
II. ANTHROPOLOGY		11
Sin and the State of Man		11
Grace and Nature in the Orthodox Teaching		12
Synergy and the Freedom of Man		18
Conclusion		26
III. COMMENTARIES OF THE EASTERN FATHERS		27
Introduction		27
Origen		28
John Chrysostom		30
Galatians		31
Romans		36
IV. THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE TUBINGEN THEOLOGIANS AND PATRIARCH JEREMIAH II OF CONSTANTINOPLE ON THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION		43
Introduction		43
Justification and Good Works		46
The Lutheran Response		51
V. THE POSITION OF RECENT ORTHODOX DOGMATICIANS		54
Introduction		54
Grace		55
Human Cooperation		57
Predestination and its Consequence on Justification		59
Justification According Orthodox Dogmaticians		62
Progress in Justification		66

Justifying Faith	68
VI. ORTHODOX CONFESSIONS AND CATECHISMS	74
Introduction	74
The Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church	75
The Confession of Dositheus	76
The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox, Catholic Graeco Russian Church	77
VII. CONCLUSION	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY	89

PREFACE

The topic of this Thesis, Justification in the Eastern Orthodox Churches, is prompted by the document which recently came out of the U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue on the doctrine of Justification by faith alone, work which took more than five years ending in September 1983. To one who comes from the East, especially from Ethiopia, a country where half of the population is Orthodox, the reading of the publicity on this dialogue and its outcome raised the question: "How do the Orthodox Churches in the East think about justification by faith alone?" The incubation of this idea yielded the present thesis as an attempt to answer the question.

On this occasion I would like to thank friends and teachers who have helped me both technically and materially during the formation of this Thesis, especially during its final stage.

Finally I have to say a few personal words. We often find thesis writers and authors dedicating their work to someone whom they have cherished or who has been of a special value in their life. I felt that to be a commendable attitude. Sometimes it happens that the value of the person to whom a work is dedicated far exceeds the work. Nevertheless, one expresses his love by what he has and not by what he

has not. Therefore I decided to dedicate this work to my father whose
immeasurable value I remember in this distant land.

Eshetu Abate
Presentation of Jesus, 1986
St. Louis.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Definition of Terms

Justification

Etymologically the English word justification is derived from the Latin noun "justificatio" and the verb "justificare." The word "justificare" has a number of related meanings. It could mean "to treat with equity, to do justice to a person" or "to try at law, to bring to justice" or "to judge, to administer justice over persons" or "to justify, represent as righteous, innocent, to forgive, absolve, to acquit." Besides in its root form it is related to words such as: jus (right, law), justificus (acting justly) and justitia (justice, fairness, equity).¹ From all this it can be deduced that the word justification is connected with the idea of law, justice, and judgment. In short it has a forensic overtone. Nevertheless the primary meaning of justification is theological rather than secular (that is, it should be seen in its theological perspective).²

The Latin West maintained such a forensic understanding of

¹ J. F. Niermeyer, Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1976), p. 569.

² Charles P. Carlson, Justification in Earlier Medieval Theology (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975), p. 40.

justification throughout, through Tertullian and Augustine and on to Anselm's Cur deus homo and then most profoundly in the Reformation.

In the East the equivalent word in Greek "δικαίωω " or "δικαίωσις" is still related to the idea of law, justice and judgment. As Schrenk puts it dikaiosis in Greek generally implies "the validation of the legal norm in punishment, defence or requirement."³ In spite of this, the East did not dwell much on the idea of understanding justification in the forensic sense. Making use of their especially endowed contemplative mind they formulated their own understanding of salvation. In fact the Eastern fathers do not use the familiar term justification as much. They use words such as "salvation," "divinization" or "deification." There is a fundamental difference that led both groups to their respective positions and the attempt to unravel this forms the main part of the thesis.

Eastern Orthodox Churches

The term "Orthodox" is often used to designate the main-line Churches in the East which are not in communion with the Roman Catholic Church or the Protestants. However, the word as it stands is vague in that it does not give the real picture of the Churches in the East and their specific peculiarity within themselves. Therefore clarification is needed as to the group on which the theme of this thesis focuses.

The Nestorian schism occurred in the year 431 A.D. after the decision of the Council of Ephesus went against them. The next major schism happened in the year 451 A.D. as the result of the decision of

³Gerhard Kittel, ed., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament 10 Vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964), 2:223.

Chalcedon. The schismatics were parts of the Churches in the East commonly known as Monophysites because of their teaching on "one incarnate nature of God the Logos."⁴

The Churches that adhered to the so-called Monophysite position were; the Syrian Jacobite Church, the Churches of Armenia, the Coptic Church in Egypt, the Ethiopian Orthodox church and the Malabar Jacobite Church of India. The Monophysites and the Nestorians are also sometimes known as the "lesser" or "separated" Eastern Churches.⁵

The next major schism came in 1054 A.D. when the Byzantine church (that is, Constantinople) excommunicated the church of Rome. The church of Constantinople and all the other Churches formed as the result of her mission work had accepted the decision of Chalcedon. Their difference with the West, however, lay in other matters, such as the extent of papal authority, filioque, the use of unleavened bread and the like. The Byzantine Church with all of its daughter Churches including the great Patriarchate of Moscow are generally known as the "Eastern Orthodox Churches." Sometimes they designate themselves as the Orthodox Catholic Church.⁶

If we enumerate, the Eastern Orthodox Church is comprised of the Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Moscow, Serbia, Rumania, and Bulgaria; the churches of Greece, Cyprus, Mount Sinai, Georgia and Finland; and a number of mission, emigrant or local

⁴Jaroslav Pelikan, The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), p. 50.

⁵Timothy Ware, The Orthodox Church (Penguin Books, Richard Clay: Bungay, Suffolk, 1963), p. 12.

⁶Ibid., p. 16.

bodies elsewhere.⁷

This study will concentrate on the enumerated churches (that is, Byzantinian) and will investigate how they have presented their teaching on the subject of Justification throughout the years and also in the last few centuries.

Aim of the Study

No contemporary theologian will deny the important place the doctrine of Justification holds in the History of Theology. It was this doctrine that sparked the light of the Reformation about four and half centuries ago, that has had a tremendous effect in the religious, cultural and social life of both the Christian church as well as in world history.

Justification by faith alone, sola fide as well as the other two mottoes of the Reformation - sola gratia and sola scriptura are the causes for the excommunication of the Lutherans (as well as some other Protestants) by the Roman Catholics. It was not the intent of Luther to create a schism from the Catholic Church. His aim was only to reveal for the public what he found out to be the correct teaching of the Word of God (that is, Justification by faith alone) and to check the church from selling indulgences and demanding other meritorious works. As a result there were confessions, gatherings and councils on both sides. There was even war to quell the Reformation. The peace of Augusburg in

⁷Donald Attwater, A List of Books About the Eastern Churches (St.Leo Shop, Newport RI. 1960), p. xvi.

1555 made a settlement with the principle cuius regio, eius religio.⁸

The Lutherans presented what they confessed in the Augsburg Confession. The doctrine of Justification was the heart of the Confession (for that matter the whole of the Reformation) as Melanchthon later stated in the Apology to the Augsburg Confession.⁹

Concerning the doctrine of Justification the Augsburg Confession stated:

Item docent, quod homines non possint justificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis aut operibus, sed gratis justificentur propter Christum per fidem, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi, et peccata remitti propter Christum, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satis fecit. Hanc fidem imputat Deus pro iustitia coram ipso.¹⁰

The Roman Church eventually stated its full and articulated position and response in the Council of Trent in 1547. Among the many Canons and Decrees formulated on the doctrine of Justification and good-works, the following two are most illustrative.

In its Canon IX the Council stated concerning Justification:

Si quis dixerit, sola fide impium justificari, ita ut intelligat nihil aliud requiri, quo ad justificationis gratiam consequendam cooperetur, et nulla ex parte necesse esse, eum suae voluntatis motu praeparari atque disponi: an. s.¹¹

In Canon XXIV concerning good-works they wrote:

Si quis dixerit, iustitiam acceptam non conservari, atque etiam non

⁸Encyclopedia Americana, 1984 ed., s.v. "Reformation," by Hans J. Hillerbrand, p. 320.

⁹See Theodore G. Tappert, The Book of Concord (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), p. 107.

¹⁰Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch Lutherischen Kirche (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), p. 56.

¹¹Henricus Denzinger, ed., Enchiridion Symbolorum (Freiburg im Breisgau: Verlag Herder, 1965), p. 378.

augeri coram Deo per bona opera, sed opera ipsa fructus solummodo et signa esse justificationis adeptae, non etiam ipsius augendae causam: an. s.¹²

This rejection of the doctrine of Justification confessed by Lutherans by the Roman Church has continued up to the present time. A good proof for this would be the recent "U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue" and its attempt to lessen the gap that exists between them on the doctrine of Justification.¹³

While the Lutheran confession of the doctrine of Justification was articulated vis-a-vis the Roman Church, what of the Eastern Orthodox Churches? How do the Eastern Orthodox Churches see and evaluate the doctrine of Justification by faith alone, as has been formulated by the Reformers, that has been the cause for the division of the church in their neighboring West? How would they deal with it if the Reformation was to start within them? These are some of the questions which this thesis is aiming to answer and investigate in the following chapters.

In doing so, in the main part of the thesis, we will first observe the underlying thoughts and ideas among the Eastern Fathers and also the views of the dogmatists after the Reformation. Before we go to the next section we need a sketch of the history of the doctrine both in the West and in the East.

¹²Ibid., p. 380.

¹³"Justification by Faith," Origins National Catholic (NC) documentary service, 6 October 1983, p. 277. The Commission that has worked for five years in this project said "differences in thought structure play a considerable role in causing tension between Catholic and Lutheran views of justification" and they added on account of some common grounds that exist, "Lutherans and Catholics can acknowledge the legitimacy of concerns that come to expression in different ways," and that theological disagreements about structures of thought, "though serious, need not be church dividing."

A Sketch of the History of the Doctrine of Justification
In the East and West

In the West the question "how is man saved?" was most acutely raised in the fifth century through the Pelagian controversy. For Pelagius grace means, on the one hand, that man is endowed with reason and, on the other, that he has been given the law. It is grace that man is able by nature to fulfill God's law. In Pelagius, therefore, grace is associated with creation, while in Augustine it is associated with redemption.¹⁴

Against Pelagius and his followers Augustine of Hippo raised his voice to defend man's need of Christ's grace and redemption. He taught that fallen man, born in sin, cannot be just except through the grace of Christ. For Augustine "all initiative in the process of justification must be said to come from God and not from man. When some remainders of the Pelagian heresy, later to be known as Semi-Pelagian heresy, suggested that at times God's grace awaits man's good move toward justification (John Cassian), Augustine retorted that the beginning of faith, including the very assent of the mind to the message of salvation, no less than any subsequent growth and maintenance or perseverance of justification, is God's gift and grace.¹⁵ This Augustinian concept of justification had a far reaching influence on subsequent Latin theology. Thus the Pelagian controversy paved the way for the Augustinian understanding of justification in the West.

¹⁴Bernhard Lohse, A Short History of Christian Doctrine (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), p. 109.

¹⁵The New Catholic Encyclopedia, 1967 ed., "Justification," by P. De. Letter, p. 83.

It is true that the Eastern emissary condemned the doctrine of Pelagius when he was excommunicated at the Council of Ephesus in 431 A.D.¹⁶ Except for that, no Augustinian doctrine of grace and merit had comparable influence in the Greek church as it did in the West.¹⁷ The reason being, besides the linguistic, cultural and political differences between the West and the East, no Pelagius and no Augustine arose in the East in the true sense of their teaching.

While the West was struggling with the question of grace and merit, the East continued its discussions and struggle with new problems arising in connection with Christology. The Monothelite, Dyotholite, and the Iconoclast and Iconophiles are just a few examples.¹⁸

The major concern of Athanasius when he objected to the Arian heresy was in fact soteriological. The idea that mere man is not able to save himself and others was inherent in Athanasius' position. We can try to draw a line that links the Christological formulas with the doctrine of Justification, but it is not the same as dealing with the doctrine per se as has been done in the West.

While commenting on the unique attitude of the Eastern theologians with regard to the doctrine of Justification the recent "U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue" paper stated:

Prominent Eastern theologians had different concerns, as is shown by the attention they gave to the cosmic dimension of salvation, the divinizing character of grace, the universality of corruptibility

¹⁶Williston Walker, A History of the Christian Church (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970), p. 170.

¹⁷P. De. Letter, p. 83.

¹⁸Pelikan., pp. 6-7.

and death, as well as freedom and responsibility.¹⁹

From this we can understand that the East did little in trying to find the answer to how a person is justified in the sight of God, that is, Coram Deo.²⁰ In short their emphasis was on how man becomes divinized and not how man receives the remission of his sins.²¹

Most of the direct Orthodox statements concerning the doctrine of Justification by faith alone come after the Reformation, when they were confronted with the Protestant position.²²

These statements, besides being produced by prominent Orthodox teachers and Patriarchs, are not received as Confessions of the Church on the level of the Ecumenical Councils but they are thought to represent the Orthodox position correctly. In this thesis we shall give attention to these statements as well.

Before we investigate their statement instigated by the position of the Reformation, we will examine what the Orthodox teach about the man to be justified. The very word Justification presupposes that there is someone to be justified - a man in sin and guilt. Or, to put it more the Orthodox way, is man rather one who has in some measure lost the image of God? We shall ask first what the Orthodox teach about sin, the state of the fallen man, free-will and so forth. And how do they think that man would be redeemed from that state? Such are the tasks

¹⁹Origins, p. 280.

²⁰Cf. Gordon Rupp, The Righteousness of God (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1953), pp. 81-101.

²¹Nicolas Zernov, Orthodox Encounter (London: James Clarke & Co.), pp. 93-94.

²²Pelikan, pp. 280-281.

which will engage us in the second chapter. In the third chapter we will see how representative Eastern Fathers expound the teaching of Justification in the letters of Saint Paul and will evaluate whether their teaching is at variance with that of the Apostle and then that of Luther.

CHAPTER II

ANTHROPOLOGY

Sin And the State of Man

One's doctrine of justification or the answer to the question "to what extent does man participate in his salvation?" is directly related to one's understanding of the state of man after and before the Fall. We can ascertain this by comparing the teachings of Pelagius on the one side and that of Augustine and Luther on the other.

Pelagius was optimistic about the ability of human beings to fulfill the commandments of God if they will only use their good will. One of the factors that made him hold this position was his denial of the original sin. Augustine, however, as a believer in the inheritance of the original sin, attributed the salvation of man altogether to the power and hand of God. Luther also, as did Augustine, taught the utter depravity of human beings. He expressed this repeatedly in the Bondage of the will in the way of the proper distinction between Law and Gospel.¹

The Orthodox Churches, however, take a position which is neither overtly optimistic nor the opposite position as in Augustine and Luther. Constantine Cavarnos affirming this point writes:

Orthodoxy takes seriously the Scriptural teaching of ancestral sin,

¹Philip S. Watson, ed., Luther's Works 55 Vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 33:247, 254. Hereafter LW .

of the fall, and teaches that as a result of the fall men are born with their natural powers in a corrupt state. However their corruption, it holds, is not extreme: it rejects the doctrine of total depravity. Man in his fallen state retains enough goodness and freedom to be able to initiate the process of his own salvation.²

Such a statement may give the impression that the Orthodox are Semi-Pelagians. This question cannot be avoided, but it would be a hasty conclusion to define the Orthodox position in such terms.

One of the reasons that keeps one from making such a hasty conclusion is the nature of the background. Had the Orthodox engaged the western concept of grace and sin, the evaluation would be legitimate. Their teaching of original state, sin, grace, human cooperation is, however, based on the reflections and deposits of the Greek fathers. On the basis of this one could say the proximity of the East to the West will be directly related to the corresponding proximity of the teachings of their respective fathers. Thus the Orthodox position should not be confused or identified with that of the western churches, to begin with, but should be looked at in its own terms, and at first separately. As a step towards this end we will examine next their teaching on Grace and Nature.

Grace and Nature in the Orthodox Teaching

Professor Alexander Schmemmann in a paper read at Loyola College, Montreal, writes, "The difference between the two spiritual worlds- the Christian East and the Christian West - is nowhere more obvious than in the difference between their approaches to grace and, consequently to

²Constantine N. Tsirpanlis, Orthodox-Unification Dialogue (New York: The Rose of Sharon Press, 1981), p. 55.

the rapport grace-nature." 3

The East generally considers grace not so much in itself but rather as related to theosis - the deification, which in Orthodox theology constitutes the real goal of Creation, Redemption, and Salvation. As Elmer O'Brien says the West tends to see Salvation as deliverance or forgiveness from sin while the East sees it as a goal or an end of course in theosis.⁴

An important clarification is necessary here. "The Orthodox Tradition." writes Professor Lossky, "ignores a 'pure nature' to which grace would be added as a supernatural gift. There does not exist any 'normal' natural state, for grace is implied in the act of creation itself." This means that the sharp opposition between nature and grace on which the whole Western theological tradition is based is alien to the Orthodox East. The real distinction is not between nature and grace but the non-created and the created.⁵

George A. Maloney, Professor of Theology at the John XXIII Center For Eastern Christian Studies at Fordham University, does not, however, accept the idea that the East "ignores a 'pure nature.'" He comes to a similar conclusion while showing the distinct character of the Eastern understanding. He writes:

Not faced with the Pelagian heresy, as was St. Augustine, who bequeathed his important and subtle distinction to Western theology to highlight the gratuity of God, in being free and independent in His bestowal of grace on man, the Greek Fathers viewed the inter-

3Quoted by Elmer O'Brien, The Convergence of Traditions (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), p. 33.

⁴Ibid., p. 36.

⁵Ibid., p. 33

relationship of nature and grace in terms of one continuous unfolding process of two different but not contradictory entities.⁶

According to Malony, the characterization of nature and grace as opposites in the Imitation of Christ (Where nature is depicted as being corrupt and tending always to vice, while grace is the elevating, infused force that allows the spiritual man to do good) would never have come from the pen of an Eastern Father. Fundamentally, nature for the Fathers is the opus Dei as it comes from the hands of God. This work of God, with all of its hidden, unactuated possibilities, as Irenaeus, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa and other Greek Fathers constantly repeat, is good. There is nothing in man's make up that is evil.⁷

Maximus the Confessor who is considered as "the real father of Byzantine theology,"⁸ also affirms the goodness of nature. While writing on the subject of the fall he states:

This defect can come only from a personal choice, originally made by Satan, and later, by man. Giving way to the serpent's temptation, Adam abandoned what was proper to his nature constantly to rise toward God - and gave himself up completely to his senses (μόνη τῆ ἀισθήσει) In consequence, Adam's sin prevented the natural relationships between man and God as well as between man and creation.⁹

As Meyendorff states, Maximus always insisted that nature remained intact in spite of sin, and clearly opposes physis (φύσις) to gnome. The direct consequence of sin was a sort of contamination of the nature's will, which until then could only will good; the contamination

⁶George A. Maloney, A Theology of "Uncreated Energies" (Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 1978), p. 21.

⁷Ibid., p. 22.

⁸Pelikan, p. 8.

⁹John Meyendorff, Christ in Eastern Christian Thought (New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1975), p. 141.

came through the gnome.¹⁰

The same lofty characterization of nature by Maximus can be observed in his explanation of sin also. For him sin is always a personal action that does not corrupt nature as such. And this explains why the Word could fully assume human nature sin excepted. Thus for him sin remains on the level of the gnome or will of personal choice.¹¹

According to the Greek Fathers supernatural grace added to man in his regeneration into the new man by the reception in Baptism of divine life, is not something superimposed, but rather it is the actualization of a potency that was there in the nature from creation. All good that can come to man must be "according to (κατά) nature." Vices or sins are only the things against nature, hence, unnatural, while the supernatural is eminently conformed to nature.¹²

Christian perfection of a virtuous life in grace does not do violence to nature, but heals it, makes it grow, divinizes it without demanding any other sacrifice than a conversion, a metanoia, the uprooting of a will that goes against the creative will of God.¹³

For the Orthodox or the Greek Fathers Creation (for that matter nature also) being Creation of God, is in itself an act of grace. One may ask whether this kind of understanding does not lead to a confusion between God and the world, between the non-created and the created.

The Orthodox answer the above question by their distinction

¹⁰Ibid., p. 149.

¹¹Ibid., p. 149.

¹²Maloney, p. 23.

¹³Ibid., p. 24.

between the essence of God and his energies. As Schmemmann argues this distinction is not an abstract philosophical speculation, nor is it a strange mystical fantasy as it is sometimes characterized.

What the Orthodox here say here of the "essence of God " and His "energies" could be comparable, according to Althaus, to what is known in Luther's teaching as Deus absconditus and Deus revelatus. For Luther God in Himself and God as He manifests Himself are antithetical in so far as man cannot approach the former in its majesty.¹⁴

While speaking on the essence of God and his energies Schmemmann writes:

Orthodox theology preserves this antinomy by a distinction in God between His nature and His energies. In His nature he is absolutely inaccessible but in his energies he enters in communion with creation and truly unites it to himself. The energies or natural operations of God are inseparable from his essence but in them God proceeds ad extra, manifests and gives himself to creation.¹⁵

Some of the Eastern Fathers use telling expressions to designate the energies or the manifestations of God. For them God's energies are "God's forth going ($\pi\rho\acute{o}\delta o\varsigma$) or manifestation of light, moved by the Father, the manifestation of God, given harmoniously, the divine illumination, or the ray of God ($\acute{\alpha}\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\gamma\alpha$) as "the super-substantial ray" and finally, the distribution ($\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta o\sigma\iota\varsigma$)."¹⁶

The Eastern understanding of salvation as deification or theosis is framed on the basis of the above distinctions. In deification man does not participate with the "essence" of God but with his energies.

¹⁴Paul Althaus, The Theology of Martin Luther Translated by Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 20.

¹⁵O'Brien., p. 35.

¹⁶Maloney., p. 66.

The energies are, we might say, "God for us." They are God in loving and creative relationship to us out of the motive of sharing His holiness and inner life with us. God in His essence is unknowable while God in His energies is knowable.

Thus theosis is the divinization process of grace whereby the Christian is brought into a loving union with God through the divine energies and still God retains His complete superessential being. Dionysius while expressing this truth wrote, "It is all the divinity completely which is participated by each participator, and by none in any part." ¹⁷

Even though divine energies are spoken of as distinct from the actual essence of the Godhead they are not "a thing" or material, that are separate from God's own being. Palamas uses the term "enhypostaton" (ἐνυπόστατον) ¹⁸ to describe the relationship that exists between the energies and the God-head. He insists that the energy which the saints see, the φῶς ἐνυπόστατον is essentially personalized and a common manifestation of the three persons of the Trinity. If this were not the case, God would not be really giving Himself to man but He would be giving man something different from His very own being, and man would be sanctified only in an extrinsic manner and not by direct contact with God's very own life.

While pressing the point, and explaining the personalized

¹⁷Divine Names 2 quoted by Maloney., p. 68.

¹⁸"enhypostaton" is a term introduced by Leontius of Byzantium in the 6th century to express what is possessed, used and manifested by a person. Cf. Friedrich Loofs, Leitfadem Zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte (Halle: Niemeyer, 1906), p. 305.

character implied in the energies Maloney writes:

We are not assimilated into the Absolute Universal Self in a Hindu non-duality sense, nor are we justified only extrinsically in Luther's sense without a completely new regeneration of our human nature. We are divinized through our participation in God's own essential energy freely given as grace.¹⁹

Synergy and the Freedom of Man

The idea of "συνεργία" or the free human co-operation with grace is an intrinsic Orthodox teaching. For the Orthodox free cooperation is not something developed after the fall of man but it was there right from the beginning. It was through it that the original man was progressing towards his theosis. John of Damascus while writing on the original creation of man says:

Man is created un sinful by nature, yet free in his will. Un sinful does not mean that man is not capable of sin: only the Divine is incapable of sin. Man, who didn't have sin in his nature, invented sin by misuse of his freedom of choice (προαίρεσις). Thus, he had the possibility (εξουσία) of remaining in harmony with the good and progressing in goodness through the cooperation of divine grace. But he also had the power (εξουσία) to turn his back on the good and place himself in evil; this God allows because of the human right of freedom of choice. For nothing forced can be virtuous.²⁰

We may note that here the final reference is to a definition of virtue. The freedom of man after the fall is also spoken of in the same way. Though it is limited and weakened (as is also the image) it is still there. Meyendorff writes:

The human race possesses a nature corrupted in so far as it descends from Adam, but each human hypostasis, that of Adam as of every one of his descendants, remains totally responsible for its actions; it

¹⁹Maloney., p. 79.

²⁰St. John of Damascus, Exposition of the Orthodox Faith, 2.12, quoted by Maximos Aghiorgoussis, "Sin in Orthodox Dogmatics," St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 21 (1977):184.

does not partake in Adam's fault, it "imitates" it; even in its fallen state it preserves its freedom, which, is the essential aspect of God's image in man. Sin simply darkened that image and limited that freedom.²¹

Gregory of Nyssa asserts "As the grace of God cannot abide in the souls which flee from their salvation, human virtue by itself is not sufficient to elevate to perfection the souls alien to grace."²² However, as Lossky shows, this grace is not a recompense for the merit of human will as Pelagianism would want it to be, nor is it the 'cause' of 'meritorious acts' of human freedom. According to Lossky the crux of the matter lies not in merits but in cooperation, of synergy of two wills, the divine and the human. For him the grace is the presence of God in us which requires on our part a constant effort. This effort, however, does not in any way determine grace, just as grace does not move our will as a force which would be alien to it.²³

Thus a saint is understood among the Orthodox, as Schmemmann explains, as a *μάρτυς* - a witness of the presence of God in the church, the one in whom divine life has manifested itself, yet not in spite of the human will but in real synergy and cooperation with human will and effort. Schmemmann contends that precisely because of this doctrine of synergy between grace and freedom, any idea of merit is totally absent from the Orthodox cult and understanding of the saints. As he explains it, Eastern asceticism is not guided by any interest in merits; it is

²¹Meyendorff., p. 117.

²²De Instituto Christiano, cited in Lossky, Theologie Mystique, p. 194. and quoted by O'Brien., p. 36.

²³Ibid., p. 36.

man's effort to make himself available for and open to divine grace.²⁴

Among the Eastern fathers besides Origen, Maximus the Confessor is the one who speaks at great length on the nature of human freedom. Maximus distinguishes between two kinds of wills namely "natural will" and "deliberate will." According to him if man is the image of the divine nature and if the divine nature is free (αὐτεξούσιος), so is the image of man.

As a result man possesses a natural will (φύσει θελητικός), and that will is a freedom of nature (ἢ κατὰ φύσιν αὐτεξουσιότης) in conformity with divine freedom and unable to lead to anything but the Good. Created in Paradise in the image and resemblance of God, man did not need to deliberate in order to acquire participation in the divine goodness and wisdom. He only had to follow the laws of his own nature, the *raison d'être* (λόγους τοῦ εἶναι) of his existence in order to have access to the "well being" for which he was destined.²⁵

This natural movement determined by God was interrupted by the revolt of man against his creator, and turned against man's proper nature. The free (αὐτεξούσιος) man preferred to become body and dust instead of being one spirit with God.

For Maximus, as for the whole patristic tradition, the fall as well as evil is the result of man's personal choice or free self-determination. Evil has no proper nature of its own. According to him

²⁴Ibid., p. 37.

²⁵Meyendorff., p. 138.

evil possesses:

neither essence, nor nature, nor hypostasis, nor power, nor actuality in beings; it is neither quality nor quantity, nor relation, nor place, nor time nor position, nor creation, nor movement, nor state, nor passion, which could be observed naturally in beings. .
 . Evil is the defect which prevents the power inherent in human nature from acting in conformity with their aims, and nothing else.²⁶

As the result of the fall, this natural will of man was contaminated and became a gnostic will. Man acquired a gnostic will which chooses, hesitates, ignores the real good, inflicts pain because its decisions are taken blindfolded; it is "a kind of desire adhering to what is, or what he thinks is, a relative good."²⁷

Maximus believes that this contaminated or gnostic will needs to be transformed into "divine and angelic gnome" for the deification to occur. Otherwise the human nature's participation in the divine nature and God's condescension are not compatible with the inner conflict introduced into nature by the devil through the gnome.

In spite of its contamination free will (γνώμη) has to cooperate with divine grace to attain salvation. The Spirit does not give birth to a stubborn will (γνώμην μὴ θέλουσαν), but if it so desires, he transforms and deifies it. It is in this connection that Maximus asserted his famous maxim, "Our salvation depends on our will."²⁸

It is now time to ask the question what is the implication of

²⁶Ibid., p. 140.

²⁷Ibid., p. 149.

2 Ἐν τῷ θελήματι ἡμῶν ἐστὶ λοιπὸν ἡ σωτηρία ἡμῶν,
 Liber Asceticus, col. 953b. quoted by Meyendorff, p. 149.

the Orthodox teaching of the "Grace-Nature" relationship, Synergy and the Freedom of the Will to the doctrine of Justification by faith alone as has been taught by Luther and earlier by Augustine. At the outset we see two different mentalities, thought patterns or points of departure.

In the East we do not find as much fear, terror, and the frightening conception of God and the divine justice as in the West (though it is not lacking). The question "Where can I find a merciful God?" would hardly have come from the mouth of an Easterner. There are a number of reasons for this.

First of all, as we have seen above, because in the East there is a more optimistic view of the human nature, even in its fallen state; the sense of guilt and divine punishment is not as strong as in the West. In fact their understanding of the Original Sin seems to confirm this view.

As Meyendorff writes Original Sin in the East is not a transmission of guilt. It is rather a natural mortality transmitted from generation to generation, as a consequence of the separation between God and man after the fall of Adam. It is not itself a state of sin, but a "condition" of the human nature that the Word, by his incarnation came to assume and, by his resurrection, re-established in to the grace of immortality.²⁹

Secondly as we have seen above the basis for the Orthodox doctrine of synergy or human cooperation is the divine-human relation as seen above all in the Incarnation. Since the Incarnate Word has two

²⁹Ibid., pp. 88-89.

wills, the man being divinized also should have two wills.³⁰

In fact Waclaw Hryniewicz in his article Le mystère de la divino-humanité- signification herméneutique d'une notion de l'anthropologie Orthodoxe shows that the Incarnational concept of divine-human is the hermeneutical principle for the Orthodox thinking. They use the principle not only to delineate the mystery of the human person alone but also the Church and the evolution of human history as a whole.³¹

In explaining the Eastern pattern based on the central idea of divine-human or "theandrisme" the author shows their affection to synthesize and to universalize rather than to fractionalize or fragmentalize. He writes:

C'est un trait caractéristique de la pensée Orientale de ne pas fractionner et fragmenter, mais de synthétiser et universaliser. Elle n'introduit pas des séparations, des oppositions et des divisions là où les réalités se complètent mutuellement et s'unissent sans perdre leur authenticité. L'historique et le transcendant, le terrestre et le céleste, le temporel et l'éternel, l'homme et Dieu- toutes ces réalités coexistent sans s'exclure et sans s'opposer.³²

On the other hand, Augustine and the reformers such as Luther who followed his tradition based their teaching of sola gratia, sola fide, original sin and De servo arbitro not in the collaborative and

³⁰Ibid., p. 150.

³¹Waclaw Hryniewicz, "Le mystère de la divino-humanité signification herméneutique d'une notion de l'anthropologie Orthodoxe," Istina 25 (1980):350.

³²Translation: It is a familiar trait of Oriental thinking not to fractionalize or fragmentalize but to synthesize and universalize. They do not introduce (show) the distinctions, the oppositions and divisions in a place where the realities complete themselves mutually and unite themselves without losing their identity. The historical and the transcendental; the earthly and the heavenly, the temporal and the eternal, man and God - all these realities coexist without excluding and opposing each other.
Ibid., p. 354.

reciprocal notion between the divine and human but in the explicit teaching of the Pauline epistles, especially the Epistle to the Romans.

Augustine demonstrated his doctrine of Original Sin chiefly from Romans 5:12 where Paul says "Therefore as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned". It is on this doctrine also that he bases the doctrine of grace and predestination. Concerning the position of Augustine Altaner writes:

Augustine is the first Father to have clearly established the character of guilt inherent in the sin that has passed from Adam to all mankind. Original sin is a peccatum and at the same time also poena peccati. He proves original sin chiefly from Rom 5:12, where he relates the words in quo (omnes peccaverunt) to the preceding per unum hominem i.e to Adam. Through the first sin mankind has become a massa perditionis or damnata ³³

Luther also bases his teaching on the bondage of the will and Justification on the same epistle as Augustine and on similar verses. He follows the Scriptural teaching in Romans such as "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men" and "all have sinned and fell short of the glory of God" as proof of this.³⁴

Thirdly the Orthodox have a different concept of the "law" when compared with that of the West. According to the East the "law" as has been taught in the New Testament and especially by the Apostle Paul, should not be taken in its moral or ethical dimension alone. Sin is also not the absence of the moral good alone.

³³Berthold Altaner., Patrology (Edinburgh: Herder, 1960), p. 522.

³⁴Romans 1:18; 3:23 This can be seen amply in the last portion of his treatise The Bondage of the Will where the bondage of the will is the counterpart to justification by faith alone.

For them Paul's expression of the law should be understood in the context of soteriology based on Christological foundations (and not merely on a moral theology or anthropology). This means, however, that Paul considers the alternative Law-Gospel not in the perspective of justice based on works, or justice proceeding by means of faith, but that he takes experience of Christ as his criterion.³⁵

Thus in the Orthodox thinking the idea of satisfaction, debit-credit concept of the law, sin, and retribution is minimal. In order to see the difference in the two mentalities one need only compare the Cur Deus Homo of Anselm based on Satisfaction theory and De Incarnatione Verbi of Athanasius that represents the Eastern view.

Nor do the Eastern Churches accept the Law-Gospel distinction of the Reformation which is of vital importance for the doctrine of Justification by faith alone whose centrality Luther and Melancton so strongly affirmed.³⁶

While explaining the Orthodox position Stoyiannos says:

I would like to mention. . . the absence of the alternative Law and Gospel in the sense the Reformation gave it in the West, where this alternative was the only one to predominate. This has nothing to do with the isolation of the Orthodox Church, as one would be inclined to advance, but with the quite different theological presuppositions prevailing in the East. It has already been often remarked that the Eastern Church Fathers are interested not so much in the problem of justification as in the anaplasia or metamorphosis of man through Christ and in Christ. . . Both anaplasia and metamorphosis are

³⁵Basilios Stoyiannos, "The Law in the New Testament From an Orthodox point of View," The Greek Orthodox Theological Review 24 (1979):315.

³⁶While writing on the fourth article of the Augusburg Confession Melancton in the Apology to the Confession writes "All Scripture should be divided into these two chief doctrines, the law and the promises. In some places it presents the law. In others it presents the promise of Christ...." Cf. Theodore G. Tappert, ed., The Book of Concord (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), p. 108.

more than purely ethical- they include the christification on one's every day life. Accordingly for the Orthodox, there can be no autonomy to ethics, no possibility of isolating the Law and considering it as antagonistic to the Gospel. The Law is one part of the whole Scripture. It has, therefore, no particular place in the present, remaining an eternal word of God, a part of the mystery of Divine Economy for the salvation of man in Christ.³⁷

Conclusion

Luther has explicitly argued that any teaching concerning free will on the side of man right away nullifies the doctrine of Justification by faith alone and teaches justification by works. After accusing Erasmus for seeking room for merits by means of free choice, Luther writes:

Thus my Paul, unconquerable conqueror of free choice that he is wipes out two armies with a single word. For if we are justified "apart from works," then all works are condemned, whether small or great, for he makes no exception but thunders equally against all.³⁸

If judged from this perspective it is obvious that the optimistic view of man by the Orthodox and their teaching on the free will of man will lead to the doctrine of justification by faith and good works. In fact the Orthodox admit that it is so. Now, before we go on to see how the modern Orthodox dogmaticians regard the doctrine of justification by faith we will examine what two influential Eastern fathers say in their Pauline commentaries about justification by faith and works: Origen the thinker, and Chrysostom the preacher whose influence has been felt as far as the Ethiopic tradition.

³⁷Stoyiannos, p. 322.

³⁸LW, 33:269.

CHAPTER III

COMMENTARIES OF THE EASTERN FATHERS

Introduction

Not all the Fathers interpret or even understand the Scriptures in the same way. Therefore Luther accepts their authority reservedly with the premise that even they did not understand all of the Scriptures clearly.¹

But in the Eastern Orthodox tradition the authority of the Fathers plays a great role. The Fathers are the ones through whom the Holy Spirit spoke. They were illumined by the Holy Spirit. It should be through them that one should interpret the divine Scriptures.²

In view of such an understanding of the Fathers, how do the

¹Philips Watson, ed., Luther's Works, 55 Vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 33:83. Luther regards the Fathers highly when compared to his own self. But for him the teaching of the fathers when compared to that of the Scriptures is as a brook is to the spring. While citing St. Bernard in his defense he writes: "He adds that he regards the holy fathers highly, but does not heed all their sayings, explaining why in the following parable: he would rather drink from the spring itself than from the brook, as do all men, who once they have a chance to drink from the spring forget about the brook, unless they use the brook to lead them to spring. Thus the Scripture, too must remain master and judge, for when we follow the brooks too far, they lead us too far away from the spring, and lose both their taste and nourishment, until they lose themselves in the salty sea, as happened under the papacy. (Hereafter LW.) cf. LW 41:20.

²Jaroslav Pelikan, The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), pp. 8-36.

celebrated Eastern Fathers interpret the Pauline epistles especially the epistles to the Romans and Galatians where the Apostle gives his teaching on justification. Knowing their position will help us recognize whether the Eastern Churches really follow their positions or whether there is a development which departs from or diminishes their witness. In order to help us see this John Chrysostom and Origen are selected as representative Fathers.

Origen (ca.185-ca254)

No account of the Orthodox Tradition can ignore the influence of Origen. Therefore we will sketch an account of his position before seeing the fuller position of Chrysostom. In Origen we may see the way of Greek thought and influence. That is why Origen tends to synthesize and sometimes speaks of two opposites side by side as we shall see below. In contrast, Chrysostom, the preacher, seeks to expound the teaching of the Scriptures so that we do not find in him the dominance of philosophy as in Origen, in whom this dominance is less evident when he is expounding Scripture.

Origen while commenting on Romans 3:27 states almost the Reformers teaching of sola fide. He does so by citing tangible proofs from the Gospels and other parts of Pauline epistles. Among the examples he cites to prove justification by faith alone are: the robber on the cross, the adulteress in Luke 7:36-50, the prayers of the Pharisee and tax collector in Luke 18:10-14 and the words of St. Paul in Galatians 6:14 "Far be it from me to glory except in the cross of Christ. . ." In describing this he even uses the same phrase as the

Reformer (that is, sola fide). He writes:

. . . Arbitramur enim justificari hominem per fidem sine operibus legis: et dicit sufficere solius fidei justificationem, ita ut credens quis tantummodo, justificetur, etiam si nihil ab eo operis fuerit expletum. Imminet igitur nobis qui integram esse scripturam Apostoli conamur asserere, et ordine suo cuncta constare, ut requiramus quis sine operibus sola fide justificatus sit. Quantum igitur ad exemplum pertinet, sufficere arbitror illum latronem qui cum Christo crucifixus clamavit ei de cruce: 'Domine Jesus, memento mei cum veneris in regnum tuum'. Nec aliud quidquam describitur boni operis ejus in Evangeliiis, sed pro hac sola fide ait ei Jesus: 'Amen dico tibi Hodie mecum eris in paradiso'.

After describing the woman caught in adultery he writes:

. . . Sed fortassis haec aliquis audiens resolvatur, et bene agendi negligentiam capiat, si quidem ad justificandum fides sola sufficiat. Ubi vero fides non est quae credentem justificet, etiam si opera quis habeat ex lege, tamen quia non sunt aedificata supra fundamentum fidei, quamvis videantur esse bona, tamen operatorem suum justificare non possunt, quod eis deest fides, quae est signaculum eorum qui iustifi credidit Abraham Deo, et reputatum est ei ad justitiam.³

In other writings Origen did not remain consistent with this teaching of justification by faith alone. He also spoke in other places in ways that would incline one to say that he holds to the necessity of good-works for justification. Because of the varying interpretations in his immense work one could quote him in either way.

Drewery while commenting on the attitude of Origen writes:

At times Origen speaks with Pauline assurance of "sufficient, sovereign, saving grace, meeting but far transcending our needs, creating and sustaining the very response we offer. At other times, with no sense of incongruity, he makes grace and merit so complementary as to cast an iron-curtain of human capacity, human desert, human achievement around the free Grace of the Almighty - if not actually reversing his triumphant $\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\iota\kappa\omega\varsigma$ $\omicron\upsilon\tilde{\iota}$ $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\iota\kappa\omega\varsigma$, at least opening

³J. P. Migne, Patrologiae Patrum Graecorum Vol. 14 (Origenis-Commentariorum in Epistolam S. Pauli ad Romanos Lib III), p. 953. Hereafter MG

the way for the later (and supreme) heresy of Pelagius.⁴

Because of this variation in Origen different scholars have evaluated him differently. During the Reformation era Erasmus was a great admirer of Origen. Besides writing his life, he translated some of his commentaries into Latin, thereby confirming his declaration that he "learned more Christian Philosophy from a single page of Origen than from ten of Augustine." Luther took a diametrically opposite view. Melanchthon regarded him with mixed feelings, approving of his doctrine of the Trinity, but rejecting his view of Justification.⁵

Origen unlike Augustine (like later Maximus) held that whatever of being there is in us is good, because being comes from God. Even though the taint of sin has tarnished our race there always remains in us "the germ and the faculty of good."⁶

Even though some of the teachings of Origen were rejected in later Ecumenical Councils (554 A.D) his vast writings and scholarly works had considerable influence both in the West and the East. Concerning Justification by faith, as we have seen above he is not consistent, as he is confounding faith and good works. This is then also to be found where the influence of Origen is found.

John Chrysostom (ca. 345-407)

John Chrysostom who is considered as the greatest preacher of the

⁴Benjamin Drewery, Origen and the Doctrine of Grace (London: Epworth Press, 1960), p. 260.

⁵Ibid., p. 260.

⁶Ibid., p. 253.

Greek Church has commentaries in the form of homilies on almost all of the Pauline epistles. We will hear what he had to say in his commentaries on Galatians and Romans. We will also incorporate some of his statements on the other epistles too, as they relate to our investigation.

Galatians

While explaining the meaning of Gal. 2:19, "For I through the law am dead to the law," he asserts that no one can keep the law. After observing all the possibilities he writes:

The law commands all its precepts to be performed, and punishes the transgressor; therefore we are all dead to it, for no man has fulfilled it... I am dead to the law; the meaning of which is, that, as it is impossible for a dead corpse to obey the commands of the law, so also is it for me who have perished by its curse, for by its word am I slain.⁷

The idea of Christ pro me (for me) which is essential for Luther's understanding of Justification is also found in John Chrysostom. On Gal 2:20, "of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me" he comments "How is this? why does he appropriate a general benefit, and make his own what was done for the whole world's sake? for he says not, "who loved us," but who loved me,"

He then compares this statement with John 3:16 and Romans 8:32.

Thus He then expresses Himself, feeling the desperate condition of human nature, and the ineffably tender solicitude of Christ, in what He delivered us from, and what He freely gave us. . . Moreover, this language teaches that each individual owes as great a debt of gratitude to Christ, as if He had come for his sake alone, for He would not have grudged this His condescension though for one, so that the measure of His love to each is as great as to the whole world. Truly the sacrifice offered for all mankind, and was

⁷John Chrysostom, Homilies on Galatians and Ephesians, Library of Fathers (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1840), Vol. 6, p. 44. Hereafter LF.

sufficient to save all, but those who enjoy the blessing are the believing only.⁸

For Chrysostom Christ's death is a plain proof of the inability of the law to justify us for if it does justify, then His death is needless. However, to call such an awful divine tenderness needless is a pretence. He asserts this while explaining Gal. 2:21, "For if righteousness came by the law, then Christ is dead in vain"⁹

Chrysostom also expresses a deeper understanding of the power of the cross. Man should be taken by the suffering love of Christ rather than by the law. While remarking on Gal. 3:1 he says:

These words convey both praise and blame; praise, for their implicit acceptance of the truth; blame, for that Him whom they had seen, for their sakes, stripped naked, transfixed, nailed to the cross, spit upon, mocked, fed with vinegar, upbraided by thieves pierced with a spear; (for all this is implied in the words evidently set forth, crucified) Him had they left, and untouched by these His sufferings, betaken themselves to the Law. Here observe how Paul, leaving all mention of heaven, earth and sea, every where preaches the power of Christ, bearing about His cross: for this is the sum of the Divine love toward us.¹⁰

Chrysostom echoes the Apostle Paul in affirming that faith justifies without any addition from the law. While commenting on Gal 3:5 he explains the verse "Have ye been vouchsafed, so great a gift, and achieved such wonders, because ye observed the law, or because ye adhered to faith?" saying:

Plainly on account of Faith. Seeing that they played this argument to and fro, that apart from the Law, Faith had no force, he proves the contrary, viz. that if the commandments be added, Faith no longer avails; for Faith then has efficacy when there is no addition

⁸Ibid., p. 46.

⁹Ibid., p. 47.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 50.

from the Law.¹¹

After explaining the Pauline assertion that Abraham was justified by faith even before there was even the law, he emphatically teaches faith alone justifies. He does so especially in interpreting Deuteronomy 27:26. He writes:

They said that he who kept not the Law was cursed, but he proves that he who kept it was cursed, and he that kept it not blessed. Again, they said that he who adhered to Faith alone was cursed, but he shews that he who adhered to Faith alone, is blessed.¹²

Faith which is an easy (ΤΟ ΕΥΚΟΛΟΝ)¹³ way is provided by God because no one kept the law. This in itself is a strong proof that no one can be justified by the law. For Chrysostom the text in the book of Habakkuk "The just shall live by faith," not only establishes the righteousness that is of faith, but also that there is no salvation through the Law.¹⁴

Chrysostom also seems to hold the idea of "a happy exchange"-feliciter commutans nobiscum¹⁵ between the sinner and Christ. When commenting on Gal. 3:13, he writes:

But Christ exchanged this curse for the other, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. As then both he who hangeth on a tree, and

¹¹Ibid., p. 51.

¹²Ibid., p. 53.

13 . . . καὶ δικαιοσύνην οὐ σην, ἀλλὰ θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ σαφιλῆς αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ εὐκόλον ἀνιπτομενος M G .

Vol. 60, p. 409.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 54.

¹⁵"Sic feliciter commutans nobiscum suscepit nostram peccatricem et donavit nobis suam innocentem et victricem personam." D. Martin Luthers Werke, Edited by Hermann Bohlaus Nachfolger (Weimar, 1914) 40: I, 443, 23-24.

he who transgresses the law, is cursed, and as he who is about to relieve from a curse ought himself to be free from it, and to receive another instead of it, therefore Christ took upon Him such another, and thereby relieved us from the curse. It was like an innocent man's undertaking to die for another sentenced to death, and so rescuing him from punishment. For Christ took upon Him not the curse of transgression, but the other curse, in order to remove that of others.¹⁶

Chrysostom teaches what is known as the second use of the law (that is, the law as the accuser and revealer of sin). The law was given to probe the wounds of the Jews, so that they might long for a physician. According to him the law has effected two things: 1. it has schooled its followers in a certain degree of virtue 2. and has pressed on them the knowledge of their sins.¹⁷

Chrysostom clearly shows when the law is helpful and when it is not. When men were shut under it, as it was the school master, it is not the adversary but the fellow worker of grace; but if when grace is come, it continues to confine them, it becomes their adversary, and by confining those who ought to go forward to grace, then it becomes the destruction of (our) salvation.¹⁸

According to Chrysostom one should not doubt the power of grace. The one who doubts will not get any benefit from that to which he adheres hesitantly. Therefore Chrysostom speaks of complete trust in the power of grace. In fact the one who remains in the middle (that is, strives to keep the law as well) will be neither of grace nor of the law. With regards to this he writes:

¹⁶LF, Vol. 6. p. 55.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 59.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 60.

But how can he be saved who submits himself to the curse, and repels the liberty which is of Faith? If one may say what seems a paradox, such an one believes neither Christ nor the law, but stands between them, desiring to benefit both by one and the other, whereas he will reap fruit from neither.¹⁹

Chrysostom seems to favor the idea that wickedness is the manifestation of internal evil. But if the root of this evil is taken out, man will do good on account of his new life. He writes:

Who would discourse about the fruits of wickedness with him who had plucked up the root itself? . . . but now that grace is given, which not only commands us to abstain from them, but both mortifies them, and leads us to a higher rule of life, what more need is there of the Law? He who has attained and exalted excellence by an interior rule, has no occasion for a school master, nor does he who is a philosopher require a grammarian. Why then do ye so degrade yourselves, as now to listen to the Law, having previously given yourselves to the Spirit.²⁰

While interpreting Ephesians 1:8, "For by grace you are saved, through faith, and this is not of ourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works," he clarifies what he means by the human part in Justification. For him what man contributes towards Justification is only faith. However, even this faith cannot be claimed to have originated from man himself. He writes "had He not called us, how had we been able to believe? for how, saith he, shall they believe unless they hear? So that the work of faith itself is not our own." A little before this, when explaining the phrase "through faith," he writes "on the other hand, that our free-will be not impaired, he adds also our part in the work, and yet again cancels it."²¹

From the above exposition of Chrysostom on Galatians we can see

¹⁹Ibid., p. 74.

²⁰Ibid., p. 85.

²¹Ibid., p. 141.

his clear evangelical position that man is saved by grace or faith alone without any works of the law. Work for Chrysostom comes after one has been saved, as gratitude for the tremendous gift of God. A man who has been saved by grace, i.e. by faith is as a man who has set himself to a journey. Having been called by grace man is not supposed to stay idle but to continue his journey by manifesting his new life in good-works. In one of his exegetical works (that is, Romans) Chrysostom explains this as follows:

Let us then give thanks, that we belong to them that are being saved, and not having been able to save ourselves by works, were saved by the gift of God. But in giving thanks, let us not do this in words only, but in works and thanksgivings, and actions. For this is the genuine thanksgiving, when we do those things whereby God is sure to be glorified, and flee from those from which we have been set free.²²

Romans

In his exposition of Romans Chrysostom continues to teach the saving power of grace with the same force, as he taught on Galatians. He repeatedly stresses the facility, easiness, and suddenness of the righteousness of God. The use of these expressions by him shows nothing else than the inability of man to be saved by his own endeavors. While commenting on Romans 1:17 "the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith he comments:

And righteousness, not thine own, but that of God; hinting also the abundance of it and the facility. For you don't achieve it by toiling and labors, but you receive it by a gift from above, contributing one thing only from your own store, 'believing.'²³

²²Chrysostom, Homilies on Romans, LF (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1848), Vol. 5, pp. 331-332.

²³Ibid., p. 30.

Chrysostom also asserts the "seemingly incredible" character of this righteousness to men because by it an adulterer and effeminate person, robber of graves and magician are not only to be suddenly freed from punishment but to become just, and just too with the highest righteousness.²⁴

While speaking of the faith of Rahab, Chrysostom writes:

For, by faith, he says, the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not when she had received the spies, and did not say to herself, 'and how can they that are captives, and exiles, and refugees, and live the life of vagabond tribes, get the better of us who have a city and walls, and towers?' for had she said this to herself, she would have destroyed both herself and them. . . seest thou what a pit is that of unbelief! what a wall that of faith! For the one carried down endless thousands, the other not only saved a harlot, but made her the patroness of so numerous people.²⁵

Thus for Chrysostom both the just and the unjust are justified by faith and not in their deeds or works.

Chrysostom also has the sense of judgment Coram Deo. God judges not only on the basis of the outward actions of man but also on the conscience and internal secrets of man. While commenting on Rom 2:16, he explains saying:

Now let each man enter into his own conscience, and reckoning up his transgressions, let him call himself to a strict account, that we be not condemned with the world. For fearful is that court awful the tribunal, full of trembling the accounts, a river of fire rolls along. . . ²⁶

Chrysostom teaches whatever a human being does, he does not deserve any recompense or anything back. For him there is nothing in which a human being can boast as if he has accomplished it by himself.

²⁴Ibid., p. 30.

²⁵Ibid., p. 31.

²⁶Ibid., p. 67.

He asserts:

We that live continually in sins and wickedness, if we happen to do any little good, like unfeeling domestics, with what a niggardly spirit do we exact it, and how particular are we about the recompense made, if what we have done has any recompense to come of it. And yet the recompense is the greater if you do it without any hope of reward. . . . For we ought to do everything for Christ's sake, not for the reward, but for Him.²⁷

Chrysostom clearly understands and stresses the inability of the law (whether it is law of nature or the written law) to justify the sinner. As the result justification by grace became necessary.²⁸

Imputed righteousness is also confessed by John Chrysostom. This kind of righteousness depends not on the persons worthiness but on the good will and promise of God. A person has to accept this simply without wondering how it could happen. In explaining this he writes:

So also is the declaring of His righteousness not only that He is Himself righteous, but that He doth also make them that are filled with the putrefying sores of sin suddenly righteous. . . . Doubt not then: for it is not of works, but of faith: and shun not the righteousness of God, for it is a blessing in two ways; because it is easy, and also open to all men. And be not abashed and shamefaced. For if He Himself declares Himself to do so, and He, so to say, findeth a delight and a pride therein, how comest thou to be dejected and to hide thy face at what thy master glorieth in.²⁹

The law was given to prove the inability of the people to save themselves. If Christ (grace) had come before the deliverance of the law, they might have argued that they would be able to save themselves by keeping the law. But now it was given and they are proved incapable. Chrysostom explains this saying:

²⁷Ibid., p. 69.

²⁸Ibid., p. 88.

²⁹Ibid., p. 94.

For since all were convicted, He therefore saveth by grace. And this is why he is come but now, that they may not say, as they would had He come at the first, that it was possible to be saved by the law and by our own labours and well doings. To curb therefore this their effrontery He waited a long time. So that after they were by every argument clearly convicted of inability to help themselves, He then saved them by His grace.³⁰

Chrysostom speaks of good works. However he speaks of them not as the basis or foundation of justification but only as a life suited to the gift of grace already received. The life suited to the gift of grace is expressed through charity which is the mother of all good deeds.³¹

Chrysostom sometimes uses the very same expression and idea Martin Luther does. For him faith glorifies Christ. A man who completely trusts in Christ and His Word rather than his own works gives the glory to God.³² In explaining this nature of faith, he writes:

But this (faith) glorifieth God, and lieth wholly in Him. . . For reflect how great a thing that God is able on a sudden not to free a man who has lived in impiety from punishment only but even to make him just, and to count him worthy of those immortal honours. . . What then doth David say? and whom doth he pronounce blessed? is it him that has toiled in works, or him that has enjoyed grace.³³

For Chrysostom faith is stronger than labour and persuasion of words. A man who is persuaded by words may have his persuasion altered

³⁰Ibid., p. 96.

³¹Ibid., p. 99.

³²While expressing this idea of Luther, Althaus writes: "Gott kommt im Glauben des Menschen zur Ehre seiner Gottheit. Luther hat das im den kühnen Satz fassen können: "Der Glaube ist der Schöpfer der Gottheit". Cf. Paul Althaus, Die Theologie Martin Luthers (Gerd Mohn: Gutersloher Verlags haus, 1962), p. 50.

³³Chrysostom on Romans, LF, 115.

when he hears other words. On the contrary the one who has faith remains solid in his faith no matter what kind of other words he hears.³⁴

Finally, Chrysostom emphasizes the superabundance of the grace given in Christ when compared to what we owed to God in our sins. He explains this by illustrating the situation of a prisoner released on account of a friend who met the needs superabundantly. He writes:

As then if any one were to cast a person who owed ten mites into a prison, and not the man himself only, but wife and children and servants for his sake; and another were to come and not to pay down the ten mites only, but to give also ten thousand talents of gold, and to lead the prisoner into the kings' courts, and to the throne of the highest honour and every kind of magnificence, the creditor would not be able to remember the ten mites; so has our case been. For Christ has paid down far more than we owe, yea as much more as the illimitable ocean is than a little drop.³⁵

Chrysostom continues the same teaching about grace in his other commentaries. While explaining the Pauline statement "not having my own righteousness which is of the law," in Philipians 3:10, he writes:

If he who had righteousness, ran to this other righteousness because his own was nothing, how much rather ought they, who have it not, to turn to Him? Well said he, Not having mine own righteousness, not that which I gained by labour and toil, but that which I found from grace. If then he who was so excellent is saved by grace, much more are you. For since it was likely they would say that the righteousness which comes from toil is the greater, he shews that it is dung in comparison with the other. For otherwise I, who was so excellent in it, would not have cast it away, and taken refuge with the other. But what is that other? That which is from the faith of God, i.e. it too is given by God. This is the righteousness of God, it is altogether a gift, and the gifts of God far exceed those worthless good deeds which come from our own diligence.³⁶

³⁴Ibid., p. 125.

³⁵Ibid., p. 153.

³⁶Chrysostom, Homilies on Philipians, Colossians and Thessalonians, LF Vol.14, p. 131.

In the above quotation Chrysostom speaks very Lutherably. The 'other righteousness' he expounds there can be compared with justitia aliena of Luther's theology. In fact as we have seen repeatedly above there are many similar phrases as well as statements that would without doubt put him on the side of the theology of the Reformers and Paul. The facility with which God's righteousness is achieved, its sudden imputation, its incredible nature and the paradox of God's work involved in it are all of the central teachings of the Reformation.

If there is any place in which Chrysostom seems to differ from the Reformers teaching, at least in verbal expression, it is on the freedom of the will. Even there he puts his words very cautiously and one is inclined to hear what he says as in harmony with the Reformers.

While commenting on 1 Timothy 1:14 "And the grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant with faith and love which is in Christ Jesus" he writes:

He has guarded against that error of the unbelievers which takes away free-will, by adding, with faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. Thus much only, he says did we contribute, we have believed that He is able to save us.³⁷

Chrysostom repeatedly affirms man has a free-will which is expressed in believing or accepting the gift of (grace) of God. But in all the instances he mentions free-will he makes clear that man has nothing to boast or to be at pain or anxiety about as if he is contributing something towards his salvation. Even the will and faith with which man responds is instigated by God. While commenting on Philipians 2:12-16; "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. .

³⁷Ibid., p. 26.

." he writes:

He (Paul) says not, 'work', but 'work out' i.e. with much earnestness, with much diligence; but as he had said, with fear and trembling, and had thrown them into anxiety, see how he relieves their alarm: for what does he say? It is God that worketh in you. Fear not because I said, with fear and trembling. I said it not with this view, that thou shouldest give up in despair, that shouldest suppose virtue to be somewhat difficult to be attained, but that thou mightest be led to follow after it, and not spend thyself in vain pursuits; if this be the case, God will work all things.³⁸

Wherever then the influence of Chrysostom is found, there we may expect to find such a confession of sin and grace, of the forgiveness of God and justification.

³⁸Ibid., p. 92.

CHAPTER IV

THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE TUBINGEN THEOLOGIANs AND PATRIARCH JEREMIAH II OF CONSTANTINOPLE ON THE AUGUSBURG CONFESSION

Introduction

The correspondence between the Tübingen theologians and Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople created occasions through which the entire Augsburg Confession was given to the Orthodox East for judgment and scrutiny. We may expect that the responses the Orthodox gave to this cardinal confession of the Lutheran Reformation will display sufficiently their position concerning the doctrine of Justification by faith alone. Before we see their statement we will briefly trace the background of the correspondence and the status this reply of the Patriarch holds among the Orthodox Churches.

The three answers of Patriarch Jeremiah II given in the correspondence are considered to be of the Symbolics of the Orthodox Church. Nevertheless, the status given to them is not on the level of the seven Ecumenical Councils which alone are accepted by the Orthodox as fully authoritative.¹

The Lutherans made their first contact with the Patriarchate of Constantinople through Melancthon who in 1559 is believed to have sent

¹George Mastrantonis., Augsburg And Constantinople (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982), p. xvii.

a personal letter to Patriarch Joasaph II (1555-1565). Later an emissary of the Patriarch Joasaph, Deacon Demetrios Mysos stayed for six months with Melanchthon. At that time the Augusburg Confession was translated into Greek rather freely by Melanchthon.² However, this translation is thought not to have reached Constantinople. This was in 1559.

The second attempt by the Lutherans to establish cordial relations with the Eastern Orthodox took place fourteen years later in 1573. The persons involved were the Lutheran theologians of the University of Tübingen headed by Jacob Andreae (1528-1590), Professor of Theology and chancellor of the university, assisted by Martin Crusius, Professor of Classics.³

The Patriarch Jeremiah received two letters sent by Andreae and Crusius and two short homilies on John 10:11 and Luke 10:9. He received the two homilies favorably. He also received the Greek translation of the Augusburg Confession which Andreae and Crusius sent on 15 September 1575. All the letters, the homilies and the translation of the confession reached the Patriarch through Stephen Gerlach who was the Chaplain in the German embassy in Constantinople. The copy of the Augusburg Confession in Greek seems to be the same translation as that of Melanchthon.⁴

²Ibid., p. 9. See also Jaroslav Pelikan, The Spirit of Eastern Christendom, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), p. 281. Melanchthon translated the Latin verb "to be justified [justificare] with the Greek "to be sanctified [$\alpha\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$].

³Ibid., p. 12.

⁴Ibid., p. 14.

The letter written 16 September 1574, by James Andreae and concurred in by Martin Crusius accompanying the Augsburg Confession was seeking the response of the Orthodox in the hope of unanimity of faith. Thus Andreae wrote:

Furthermore, I am sending you a little book that contains the main parts of our entire faith. . . I earnestly ask Your Holiness to receive it with the same good favor with which you have accepted my previous communications and if it is not too much for your wise person, to kindly express your most favorable judgment concerning these articles, if God would grant that we think alike in Christ.⁵

Again in the second letter sent on the twentieth of March, 1575, in a response to the Patriarch's letter they had already received, both Jacob Andreae and Martin Crusius urged the Patriarch saying "However, we await your most wise and most pious judgment and reply with reference to the confession which we have sent."⁶

The Patriarch, in his first answer to the theologians of Tübingen pertaining to the Augsburg Confession, answered its articles one by one. On the whole, points of disagreement and agreement between the two groups can be enumerated as the following.

It seems that both sides, Jeremiah and the theologians, were in agreement, on the whole concerning the truth and inspiration of the Scriptures; God, Holy Trinity; ancestors' sin and its transmission to all men;⁷ evil as caused by creatures and not by God; Christ's two natures in a single person; Jesus Christ as head of the Church; second

⁵Ibid., p. 27.

⁶Ibid., p. 29.

⁷However, as we have seen earlier they differ in substance concerning the extent of the original sin transmitted. According to the Orthodox the guilt of Adam is not transmitted. See above p. 22.

coming of Christ, last judgment, future life, endless reward, endless judgment; Eucharist, two species, bread and wine and the body and the blood given to the faithful, the rejection of indulgences, the excess of grace from the saints and Christ which an individual can bestow on other Christians; purgatory, and obligatory celibacy of the clergy.

Points of disagreement, on the whole or in part were the following: Sacred Tradition; the insertion of the filioque in the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed; the free will of man; the question of predestination; justification in substance and means; Sacraments, their substance and number, the propriety of pouring in baptism, chrismation, and the age at which the Eucharist may be given; the meaning of "change" in the Holy Eucharist, leavened bread, and the nature of eucharistic sacrifice; the infallibility of the Church and the Ecumenical Synods, invocation of saints, icons, relics, fasts, and other ecclesiastical traditions and customs.⁸

Having seen the above points of disagreement and agreement we will now proceed to enquire what the correspondence may say particularly about the doctrine of Justification by faith alone. In doing so we will not only consider their explicit statements on the doctrine but also other statements that may throw light upon their position.

Justification and Good Works

In his sequential (consecutive) answer to the articles of the Augsburg Confession Patriarch Jeremiah writes the following with regard to Article IV.

⁸Mastronis., pp. 22-23

In quatro capite, ubi de remissione peccatorum agitur, soli fidei proprie remissionem peccatorum dari affirmatis, ut vobis videtur, Catholica vero Ecclesia, fidem, quae vivat, requirit: quae bonis operibus testificata sit. Fides enim quae sine operibus est, mortua est, ut Paulus inquit.⁹

Even though the Patriarch mistakes James for Paul whom he quotes as saying, "Faith without works is dead," what he says is quite clear, that is, faith and good works are both needed for justification. Having said this he goes on to quote Saint Basil who said:

The grace from above does not come to the one who is not striving. But both of them, the human endeavor and the assistance descending from above through faith, must be mixed together for the perfection of virtue. . . . Therefore, the authority of forgiveness has not been given unconditionally, but only if the repentant one is obedient and in harmony with what pertains to the care of his soul. . . . He repents worthily who has adopted the intention of the one who said, "I hate and abhor unrighteousness [Ps. 119:163], and who does those things which are said in the 6th Psalm and in others concerning works, and like Zacchaios does many virtuous deeds."¹⁰

After the above statements the Patriarch continues his admonition to good-works. After restating a number of "let us" statements he rounds up saying "Let us show our faith by works. He does not ignore our deeds. Therefore we should do good works according to our ability, and not plead the excuse of human weakness."¹¹

According to Jeremiah man receives remission of his sins when

⁹Translation: In the fourth article, where the remission of sins is spoken, you affirm that on account of faith alone remission of sins is bestowed. This is what you take to be the case. In fact the Catholic Church requires that faith which lives to be testified by good works. For faith without works is dead, as Paul says. Acta et Scripta Theologorum - Wirtembergensium, ET Patriarchae Constantinopolitani D.-Hieremiae, (Wittenberg: In officina Haredm - Johannis Cratonis, 1584), p. 64.

¹⁰Mastronis., p. 37.

¹¹Ibid., p. 37.

through true repentance he returns to God and has a living faith, which is displayed through good works. The Patriarch affirms that he will never cease to declare this. Then he goes on to cite the text from the Gospel which says "Not every one who says to me, 'Lord, Lord' shall enter the Kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father." It is through these and similar acts that one becomes worthy of the Kingdom of God.¹²

In addition those to whom the promise of the kingdom of heaven is proclaimed must fulfill all things perfectly and legitimately, and without them it shall be denied. However, whoever has kept the commandments should expect to be deemed worthy of the promise. It is necessary that, in the struggle to be pleasing to God, one should not only be free from every evil, but also be unblemished and blameless in every word of God.¹³

As Jeremiah explains God helps and holds the worthy ones. Therefore one has to strive to make himself acceptable to God. There are many narrow paths which could lead one astray, and for this reason one should grasp the right hand of God. The leading is God's work, but to be worthy to be held by His hand depends on one's zealous effort. If one is unclean, the hand of God will not hold him. Thus good-works and purity are necessary in order to acquire divine help.¹⁴

According to the Orthodox, the teaching about justification in Christ is the basic element or the foundation. However, one who plans

¹²Ibid., p. 38.

¹³Ibid., p. 39.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 40.

to build a house, but quits after laying the foundation, has not yet completed the house. He must perfect the building of the house by doing good deeds. The Patriarch writes:

Let us pursue this further. One must run hard. Let us strive for perfection. Let us acquire an excellent life with true faith and have a correct life according to the commandment. If one has faith but does evil, he disgraces the teaching and evidently childish. . . . One must not always dwell on the basic elements, not merely lay a foundation, but one must also complete the rest of the building and even the roof which is the perfecting of good deeds. If one forever dwells on the basic elements, or about the foundation, there will be nothing more for him to do, neither will he complete the house nor hold fast the foundation of wisdom, nor become wise.¹⁵

As Jeremiah explains even if salvation is by grace, man also is a cause of his salvation. He participates in his salvation through his "achievements and the sweat of his brow by attracting the grace of God."¹⁶

The Patriarch does also sometimes have evangelical overtones. Even though he insists on the necessity of good works, they are not the first to come in the sequence. He says, "Faith precedes, and then the works follow and are necessary to the commandment of God." This may resemble the Lutheran understanding of good works as the inevitable fruits of a justified sinner by faith alone. In addition the Patriarch states that one should not trust in works nor be boastful in a pharisaic manner.¹⁷

In spite of such slight similarities the Patriarch repeatedly stresses the need for human cooperation and participation. According

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 40-41.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 42.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 42.

to him we should join our good works together with the mercy from above. If we excuse ourselves because of our weakness or the goodness of God and do not add something of our own, there will be no benefit. Nor can we invoke mercy for the cure of our iniquities if we do not in some way appease God. Having said this he cites the comment of Chrysostom on Psalm 129: "Out of the depths I cry to thee, O Lord. Lord, hear my voice" [verses 1-2]. Chrysostom commented on the verses saying "From this we learn two things: that one cannot simply expect something from God if nothing from us is forthcoming; because first it says, 'I cry, and then follows, 'hear my voice.'"¹⁸

The Patriarch makes quite clear that there is something which man has to contribute however small it is. This demand of God from man is not surprising when compared to the immeasurable gift given by him. While speaking on alms giving in this connection he writes:

But do not marvel that alms alone can do everything. For he who gives alms and who loves the poor for the Lord's sake is set free from the debt of infinite sins as well as from dreadful captivity among the demons. . . . He purchases for a small price the whole world, and is renewed at once, and remains immortal and he rules the heavenly kingdom. Everyone who thinks seriously about these and similar ways of beneficial giving will be praised to the end of his life because of his noble generosity, and he will be honored and saved by God.¹⁹

The Patriarch thinks that the Lutheran teaching of justification by faith is only part of the truth. It does not include the whole truth. He writes:

God is good, but He is also just. . . . Let us not then know God only in part. . . . Let us not accept His mercy in a way that it becomes a pretext for laziness. Therefore, it is not possible to

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 42-43.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 60.

be saved without doing works according to the commandment of God, nor is it safe to neglect some of the things which have been commanded.²⁰

Here justice is suum cuique, which is Law and not Gospel.

Besides the Scriptures, the Patriarch claims that his above teaching on justification by faith and good works is supported by the Church Fathers. He in fact quotes Dionysios, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil and especially John Chrysostom where they seem to speak in admonition to good works. Later interpreters must be guided by the interpretation of the Holy Fathers and not by their own interpretation. While stressing this the Patriarch writes:

All these things which we have spoken, beloved, are founded, as you very well know, upon the inspired Scriptures, according to the interpretation and the sound teaching and explanation of our wise and holy theologians [the Fathers of the Church]. For we may not rely upon our own interpretation and understand and interpret any of the words of the inspired Scripture except in accord with the theologizing Fathers who have been approved by the Holy Synods, (inspired) by the Holy Spirit for a pious purpose, lest our thought, like that of Proteus move around here and there, deviating from the correct evangelical teaching, from true wisdom and from prudence.²¹

The Lutheran Response

The Lutherans defended their teaching on justification by faith alone claiming that it is based on the final authority, which is the Holy Scripture alone. All the teachings of the Holy Synods, the canons, and the Church Fathers must be weighed on the basis of the Holy Scriptures and should be accepted only if they agree with them. Thus for the Lutherans the Word of God which has been revealed to the human race by the Prophets and Christ and the Apostles and written in the Old

²⁰Ibid., p. 87.

²¹Ibid., p. 102.

and New Testaments for the benefit and the salvation of the entire church is the standard rule for judging all dogmas, all institutions and usages of faith and human traditions and works.

On the basis of this they declared that they could not accept indiscriminantly everything and whatever either has been written by the Fathers, or decreed by the Synods. Moreover those things which were written by the Holy Fathers and which were decreed by the synods, should not be held in equal honor as the Scripture.²²

The implication of such a statement on Patriarch Jeremiah's position, that both faith and good works are indispensable for justification, is quite evident, as it depended heavily on the Fathers to prove the necessity of good works. The superior authority, that is, the Holy Scripture, the Lutherans argued, ascribes righteousness before God and everlasting salvation not to our virtues and works, but to the merit of Christ alone, which is given only through faith.

In addition, the Lutheran theologians replied, if it seems to someone that our works are indispensable for justification and salvation, this person will make all the promises of God, concerning the forgiveness of sins and everlasting life, unintelligible and uncertain. Besides no one will be able to know the extent of good works needed from him.²³ To sum up they held the view that those who do good works

²²Ibid., p. 113.

²³Ibid., p. 127.

should already previously be sons of God, that is be justified by faith. It is only then they can do good works because "a bad tree cannot bear good fruit" [Matt. 7:18].²⁴

²⁴Ibid., p.128.

CHAPTER V

THE POSITION OF RECENT ORTHODOX

DOGMATICIANS

Introduction

The Orthodox dogmaticians after the Reformation know very well the Lutheran-Roman Catholic controversy concerning the doctrine of Justification. As we have seen in the previous chapter there was direct correspondence and exchange of ideas between the two groups concerning the articles of faith presented by the Lutheran Reformation. There were also notable contacts with the Calvinist Reformation.

The Protestant Reformation in the form presented by the Reformed was able to attract and convince even the great Patriarch of the See of Constantinople, Cyril Lucar (d. 1638). Though Cyril Lucar was anathematized at the Synod held in 1638 in Constantinople, and was accused as "a thief and a Lutheran" [κλέπτης ἐστί καὶ λουτεράνος]¹ he became a catalyst to make the Orthodox rethink and formulate their own position on the doctrine of Justification.²

¹Jaroslav Pelikan, The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), p. 284.

²Lucaris Cyril (1572-1638) was the Patriarch of Constantinople. He was born in Crete and educated in Padua. In his well known work, Confessio Fidei (1631), he tried to graft Reformation teachings on Orthodox Creeds. Out of the eighteen Articles of the Confession, the

Therefore we can expect that the dogmatic works and subsequent confessions among the Orthodox present mature and well organized statements on their position. The following chapter and the next will deal with the formulation of their dogmaticians and the subsequent Orthodox Confessions respectively.

As representing the dogmaticians we have taken Panagiotis N. Trembelas's three volume work translated from the Greek into French as Dogmatique De L'Église Orthodox Catholique and Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought by Frank Gavin.

Grace

Grace is a gift granted mercifully by God to man, without the latter presenting any merit or a right to merit it. Grace is given not as a compensation, but as a gift and in liberty, and it shows the love of the giver.³

There is "natural grace" - which is the grace of creation-gifts of creation and their conservation, all of preservation and the like. But particularly grace is the supernatural gift from the divine mercy to a reasonable creature; above all it is a favor to the fallen man, to renew and render him the honor of the eternal salvation.⁴

first eight are Orthodox in spirit while the last ten show the Reformation influence. Because of the latter his Confession is not accepted in the Orthodox Churches. Lutheran Encyclopedia 1975 ed., "Eastern Orthodox Churches" by Erwin L. Lueker. Concerning Lucar's Confession on justification see the next chapter page 76.

³Panagiotis N. Trembelas, Dogmatique De L'Église Orthodoxe Catholique, trans. Pierre Dumont (Desclee de Brouwer: Editions De Chevetogne, 1967), p. 239.

⁴Ibid., p.239.

Though the Father and the Son are included, the source of grace is primarily the Holy Spirit.⁵

The Roman Catholic division of grace into a number of sub divisions is recounted: a. gratia increata - the eternal intention; gratia creata - in time b. gratia Dei - for the angels and first parents; gratia Christi - for the fallen man, this is also called gratia sanans or medicinalis or gratia elevans. c. gratia externa and gratia interna d. gratia gratis data - special gift of ministry; gratia gratum faciens to all believers e. gratia habitualis and gratia actualis. Then: 1. gratia actualis itself is subdivided into gratia illuminationis (intellect) and gratia inspirationis; 2. gratia praeveniens - precedes and predisposes the human will, gratia concomitans or subsequens helps man in his work. There is a third division also called gratia sufficiens and gratia efficax.⁶

The Orthodox dogmaticians though they emphasize that the nature of grace is one and simple they do not side with the throughgoing criticism of the Protestants against the above division. According to them although grace is found in all of its entirety in the one who receives it, nevertheless it does not operate constantly, but intervenes according to the need, just as the ray of the sun is always the same in its strength but brings a different effect on a different substance.⁷

The Orthodox also affirm the absolute necessity of grace following the teaching of their dominant Church Fathers. Irenaeus, Saint

⁵Ibid., p. 242.

⁶Ibid., pp. 243-245.

⁷Ibid., p. 245.

Basil, Gregory of Nyssa and John Chrysostom all affirm its absolute necessity.

Human Co-operation

In conformity with our study in the first chapter the Orthodox dogmaticians see the Reformers as having gone to the opposite extreme of Pelagius. According to them in countering Pelagius, who denied the corruption of human nature by the original sin, the Reformers hold the complete corruption of human nature and minimize the human factor in the appropriation of the redemption.⁸

Whatever one may think about the above positions, to the Orthodox dogmaticians the Scripture and the experience of virtuous men teach that the healing of the heart from the stain of sin and its renewal cannot be considered as the natural fruit of the human will. They are the fruit of grace. But when grace comes to the heart, man does not oppose it; he accepts its work and thereby collaborates.⁹

The Orthodox dogmaticians affirm that we are saved by grace. However, as we have observed in the very first chapter while dealing with the state of man, they deny that man has been corrupted completely by sin. They even assert that man has the power to accomplish to a certain point good works. The good conscience of man without grace, that works in conformity with the infused moral law, facilitates only the acceptance of the grace which is offered to him. Indeed such a conscience is a fertile ground upon which grace may accomplish its

⁸Ibid., p. 238.

⁹Ibid., p. 240.

work. It is not, nevertheless, a meritorious condition to the gift of grace, because otherwise "grace will not be grace. If it exists by works, it is not grace."¹⁰

The Orthodox dogmaticians condemn the heresy of Pelagius and the Semi-Pelagians. According to them it is not the human will that comes first but the grace of God. Then the human will cooperates with it by responding to it. Patriarch Dositheus of Jerusalem presents this position of the Orthodox when he writes:

We understand in this way the function of the free will: the divine and illuminative grace, which we call prevenient, is adjusted as a light in the darkness, by the goodness of God to all those who desire to put themselves under it; indeed, the grace is helpful not to those who do not want it, but to those who want it.¹¹

The view of Gavin Frank may well summarize the Orthodox position at this point. According to him the Orthodox Church (in contrast to the over emphasis of the West on the importance of Grace as against Pelagianism, and on works against Protestantism) has kept a middle road, teaching that man's salvation is achieved first through grace . . . and secondly through the free acceptance of it by man. The fact that the Saviour said "whosoever wills to come after me" is a proof for this. The free will of man is the determining factor and the basis for the operation of divine Grace.¹²

¹⁰Ibid., p. 253.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 253-254.

¹²Frank Gavin, Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought (New York: American Review of Eastern Orthodoxy, 1962), p. 225.

Predestination and its Consequence on Justification

Augustine especially in his later works limited the salvific will of God only to the predestined. According to the Orthodox dogmatists however, predestination is not absolute (double predestination), as Augustine points to and as Calvin after him declared to be the case, but is relative. It is based on the infallible foreknowledge of God concerning the good and right disposition of the predestined, for whom God saw beforehand that the work of grace will not be in vain and without its fruits.¹³

According to them the Holy Scripture, all the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers (Origen the leading authority) teach this relative predestination. Nevertheless there is a difference between the predestination of the just, where God collaborates positively towards their progress and perfection, and the predestination of the damned, with which God does not collaborate, but only permits and tolerates that they walk according to their own will. In neither case is the freedom of man restrained; even to those who are predestined for salvation, grace does not minimize their liberty.¹⁴

That is why even with regard to the elected, the divine grace functions never obligatorily so that the Scripture always admonishes them to watch lest they fall.

The universality of salvation - that is, the fact that God desires all men to be saved is witnessed of old by the prophets (Yahweh was God of the Gentiles too), by Jesus (other sheep and the Great

¹³Trembelas., p. 258.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 258.

Commission) and by the Apostles too.¹⁵

Augustine interpreted the text in 1 Tim. 2:4 "God wants all men to be saved," in a different sense; thereby escaping the criticism that his theory of God's particular saving will is unscriptural. According to him the three alternative ways we can understand this text are: 1. that the Apostle speaks of all the predestined, meaning that all - but only those - are saved whom God wants to be saved 2. or God wants to save men of every class (reges, privatos, ignobiles, doctos, indoctos . . ., Ench. 103) 3. or God makes us want all men to be saved.¹⁶

The Orthodox, however, disagree with the limits of the above interpretations taking the sense of the text literally, that is, that God wants all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. For them the divine exhortation addresses all men with a view to conversion.

The Orthodox dogmaticians claim that the predestination passages as are found in Romans 9 should be interpreted in the light of more clear passages.¹⁷ According to them God is not a respecter of persons, nor is He a tempter of the bad except that He desires the salvation of all.

The Orthodox teaching on relative predestination is based upon divine foreknowledge (and) including the options of the one predestined. As the Apostle says "those whom he has discerned in advance, God also predestined them." God did not simply predestine, but, knowing in

¹⁵Ibid., p. 258.

¹⁶Altaner., p. 526.

¹⁷Tremblas., p. 264.

advance, He predestined.¹⁸ The teaching of Origen concerning predestination is said to express the authentic tradition of the Church which was held by the Eastern Fathers following him and above all by John Chrysostom.

The Orthodox claim the relative predestination goes well with the Scriptural admonition: "therefore, one who thinks he is standing, let him take care lest he falls," also "in fear and trembling work out your own salvation." These admonitions do not go with the Calvinistic idea of double predestination. Besides even on the basis of Calvinistic doctrine of absolute predestination, it is clear that only God alone knows infallibly who are the predestined and the saved and that no one can have knowledge which belongs to God alone, because His ways are indiscernible.¹⁹

So now we may ask what does the Orthodox concept of 'relative predestination' imply for the doctrine of Justification as understood by the Reformers. From the above teaching of relative predestination and their teaching in the previous chapters, it seems that they are consistent in affirming the notion of human co-operation, that is, the fact that man takes some part in his salvation.

The very word "relative" connotes the idea that God does not play an absolute role, rather man has some roles to play. The relation between God and man is in this relativity and reciprocity. According to the Orthodox teachings both double predestination and the idea of

¹⁸Ibid., p. 265.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 281.

inherited guilt lead to the idea of "Sacramental determinism." 20 They reject such a kind of determinism and instead profess a vibrant and vital participation from the human side. In affirming this point Tremblas writes:

Therefore, from the beginning unto the end, in the work of conversion and sanctification of man, two lines progress parallel, i.e. the divine grace and the will of man. They meet each other frequently and attract upon one another and they coincide when the regeneration takes place for the salvation of the man predestined. At no moment or on no point in the progression of the work the one line does not find or obliterate the other. When the work [salvation] is achieved, it is God the Father who regenerated man, but the regenerated man is also crowned because voluntarily and with zeal he has fought and has collaborated with the grace to put to death the old man in him and to be created in the image of the creator.²¹

Justification According to the Orthodox Dogmaticians

The first shock or encounter which raises up the sinner from the lethargic sleep of sin is the call. This is the starting of the sinner's regeneration and the grace of God. The call, which at this stage is normally external, becomes also interior and it consists of an inclination and an illumination of the divine grace, sent in the heart of those who are called, and there it stirs a salutary interest to hear the Gospel. It is this definite call to conversion to Christ by repentance and by faith that brings in justification. 22

The Orthodox do not limit the function of the efficacious call to a certain time or place. In this they seem to agree with Melanch-

²⁰Maximos Aghiorgoussis, "Sin in Orthodox Dogmatics," St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 21 (1977):185.

²¹Trembelas., p. 280.

²²Ibid., p. 282.

thon's statement that the Holy Spirit works where and when he wills (w
und wenn er will).²³ Thus they do not imagine that the efficacious
call which brings the rising and the conversion of the sinner is an
affair of minutes or hours. They think it is an incubation of divine
grace, more or less long, according to the character of the person
stirred to come to Christ.²⁴

With regard to this calling, natural talents and exceptional
qualities do not grant for one the salutary action of the prevenient
grace. In fact these things can be insurmountable obstacles to grace.
But those who are illiterates and less cultivated through grace are
put as masters and chiefs in the kingdom of heaven.²⁵

The Orthodox accept the reality or existence of a "good dispo-
sition." However, they think that it contains nothing meritorious in
itself. Without the divine visitation good disposition will be a
figment and useless.²⁶

Human beings co-operate even during the time of the call. The
one who is predestined for salvation is not an inactive being or someone
intended to be completely passive or deprived of any efficiency. The
call buries in him a spark which gushes out with the shock of grace.
Thus even if grace comes in the front, it comes to those who wish, who

²³Augsburg Confession, Article V, Die Bekenntnisschriften der
Evangelisch Lutherischen Kirche, (Gottingen: Vandnhoeck & Ruprecht,
1959) p. 58.

²⁴Trembelas., p. 291.

²⁵Ibid., p. 292.

²⁶Ibid., p. 293.

do not oppose or who do not push it.²⁷

The Orthodox support their premise that man should co-operate however feeble his disposition by such Biblical texts as Rev. 3:20. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any one hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in to him and eat with him, and he with me."

The extent of the difference between the Orthodox and the Lutherans concerning the doctrine of Justification can also be readily demonstrated by comparing the adverbial particles they use. While the Orthodox use phrases such as; pour la plus grande part (for the greater part), a peu pres (almost), the Lutheran Confessions in describing grace and divine action customarily use phrases such as "completely," "totally," and so forth.²⁸ For example when writing on the new-birth an Orthodox dogmatician explains:

It is on grace's action that depends for the greater part the new birth and the new creation in Christ, because the human will is incapable of initiating by itself to put to death its own passions, the sin that lives in him, and as a whole to assimilate the redemp-

²⁷Ibid., p. 295. The extent of the divergence from the Lutheran position can readily be seen if we compare the above position with what is described in the Formula of Concord, Epitome, Article II, Free will. There it is written: "Some ancient and modern teachers have used expressions such as, "God draws, but draws the person who is willing" or, "Man's will is not idle in conversion, but does something." Since these expressions have been introduced to confirm the role of natural free will in conversion contrary to the doctrine of the grace of God, we hold that these expressions do not agree with the form of sound doctrine and that accordingly it is well to avoid them in a discussion of conversion to God." BS, p. 780. Theodore G. Tappert, ed., The Book of Concord (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), p. 472.

²⁸Check for example Luther's use of "altogether passively (D. Martin Luthers Werke, Edited by Hermann Bohlaus Nachfolger (Weimar, 1914) 18:697,28-29 in affirmation that man does nothing at all in conversion.

tion in Christ by justification and sanctification²⁹

They also write that "man has become almost dead to spiritual life and that it has become impossible to him to raise himself up."³⁰ The implication of such phrases, that there is something good left in man however meager, is the very idea which Luther fought against, thinking that it would inevitably lead to work righteousness. Anything that obscures justification by faith alone for Christ's sake should be done away with.

As we have seen in the first chapter, while discussing the notion of enhypostasis, the Orthodox dogmaticians do not accept the idea of external righteousness, justitia aliena. According to them justification penetrates deep into the person involving and transforming the whole personality. As the result they consider both justification and sanctification as two ways of speaking of the same phenomenon. Trembelas writes concerning justification:

One should understand it, not as an external jurisdiction (attribution) of justice that will cover simply the guilt of the sinner justified, as the Protestants claim, but as the remission of sins, which makes justification indissolubly united to sanctification and constitute with it two inseparable aspects of the only and unique concept and state. In other words, if justification in a negative sense is the obliteration of the sins of the justified, positively it is the renovation and the regeneration into an initial state of health.³¹

According to their evaluation the Protestants regard justification and sanctification as two distinct stages. While the former consists rather in an external covering, that is, in the obliteration

²⁹Trembelas., p. 283.

³⁰Ibid., p. 284.

³¹Ibid., p. 282.

of the sins and general guilt of the justified, sanctification and regeneration are the stage toward which the justified marches after his justification, by constant effort in cooperation with grace.³²

While responding to this the Orthodox dogmaticians say "God is not like a human judge who only looks at the external. But he also looks at the heart and the inside also."³³ Thus the only right conception of justification is that which holds its inseparable unity with sanctification. Therefore justification, negatively, is a true and real remission and not only a covering of the sins of the justified; positively, it is a renewal and regeneration into a state of health of the internal man, called to make himself perfect in this state, moving "to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."³⁴

Progress in Justification

The justified man is expected by constantly renewed effort and by unceasing struggle to progress in justification and to make himself always perfect in sanctification. He must never forget that the complete perfection is not fulfilled until the future. According to the Orthodox dogmaticians it is in this sense that the Fathers speak of the remission of sin accorded equally to all and also the communication of the spirit, given in the proportion of the faith of each one. In other words, the work accomplished by the grace through justification is

³²Ibid., p. 285.

³³Ibid., pp. 285-286.

³⁴Ibid., p. 286.

exercised equally among all who are justified. It depends, nevertheless, on the effort and strength of each one that there is growth and later progress in the new state of sanctification.³⁵

The justified man has a mixed feeling of certitude and incertitude. The certitude is inspired by the confidence in the faithful God who has justified him, while the incertitude is provoked by fear that he may be falling from the salvation if he ceases to cooperate with divine grace.

The Orthodox take concupiscence as natural. Nevertheless, it was not there in the first parents. But after the Fall it began taking power as "the spirit of the flesh." The carnal concupiscence of the non-justified is different in intensity and in quality from that of the justified, where it is only a vestige of a passed spiritual illness and already completely healed. Thus concupiscence and carnal thinking have lost their morbid force for the one who is justified. In fact the desire of the flesh for the saved serves as a stimulus in the victorious fighting against evil.³⁶

According to the dogmaticians the progress after justification depends upon one's achievements. In support of this the maxim of the Fathers "If you care little, you receive little, if you work much, the compensation is great"³⁷ is repeated. Thus the germ of sanctification sown at the first stage of justification brings the fruits with each one justified in proportion to their good disposition and to their more

³⁵Ibid., p. 301.

³⁶Ibid., pp. 311-312.

³⁷Ibid., p. 314.

or less great achievements, yielding in this one an hundredfold, in that one sixty and in another thirty.³⁸

One's personality and specific characteristics do not change after justification. A simple look over the history of regeneration in the Kingdom of God shows the multiplicity of the personalities and the variety of the sanctified characters. God, in the work of regeneration and renovation, does not minimize but conserves the characteristic notes of each personality to which by his creative power he has given existence and life.³⁹

Luther's simul justus et peccator cannot be found in Orthodox thinking. This is because, besides the difference in the extent of depravity, the Orthodox emphasise the mystical union or deification that renews the justified man. What could be comparable is the certitude (because of God) and the incertitude (because of human fragility) which the justified man experiences under Law and Gospel.

According to the Orthodox teaching a regenerated man can also fall and be lost. The Orthodox do not interpret Heb. 6:4-6, "It is impossible for those who have once been enlightened. . . to be brought back to repentance. . ." as the Calvinists, who say that it was spoken of the man who was not regenerated at all. For them the stern warning is addressed to the regenerated man.

Justifying Faith

According to the Orthodox dogmaticians man is justified by faith

³⁸Ibid., p. 314.

³⁹Ibid., p. 317.

"which expresses itself in love." The passages in the Epistles of Saint Paul, where, in opposition to the inefficiency of the works of the law for justification, justification by faith is exalted, should not be interpreted in isolation but side by side with other texts, where the necessity of the work accomplished by love in Christ is underlined, and without which faith will be dead.

The faith which justifies is not a simple disposition of the spirit or a pure knowledge of reason. It is in principle tied to penitence according to the declaration of the Saviour at the beginning of his public life: "Repent and believe in the good news." This is the reason that faith is the furnace of zeal and source of light; it influences all the psychic powers of man, and stirs the interior man. Faith does not remain only the work of reason, but it assumes also the character of a moral work.⁴⁰

True faith and charity are inseparable. In fact authentic and true faith in one part and sincere charity in the other part operate one over the other in a straight reciprocal relation. The relation can be compared with that of the heart to another part of the human organism. Faith is understood as a vivifying force which feeds charity, but it is also fed and fortified by it.⁴¹

The Orthodox hold the idea of faith expressed in action, fides formata. In the measure in which a man progresses in justification and believes in sanctification, his faith is made continually more active

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 321.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 322.

by the charity and appears under a form purely active.⁴²

At the beginning faith is presented as a heavenly illumination of the intelligence. But, because all the psychological faculties are directly and inseparably linked, this faith will not leave the heart insensible and the will inactive and sleeping. An authentic faith does not distinguish itself logically and really from charity.⁴³

The Orthodox dogmaticians argue that the inseparable connection of the justifying faith with its fruit is supported by the Scriptures. They cite Scriptural texts such as Gal. 5:6 and 1 Cor. 13:2 where Paul says, "faith working through love. . ." and "if I have all faith so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing." In addition they cite 1 John 3:23 and James 1:4 where they write "And this is his commandment, that we should believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ and love one another just as he has commanded us" and "let steadfastness have its full effect, that you may be perfect and complete, lacking in nothing."

As a result for the Orthodox faith is directly linked with good works. Because of this they find salvation being presented sometimes as the fruit of faith and other times as the result of good works or charity. While the words of the Apostle and Jesus in Eph. 2:8 and Mark. 16:16 prove the former instance, the texts in James and Paul's exhortations to a worthy life prove the latter instance.⁴⁴

The Orthodox dogmaticians, like the Roman Catholics during the

⁴²Ibid., p. 323.

⁴³Ibid., p. 321.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 321.

time of Luther, regard "the law" in Paul's statements concerning Justification "without the works of the law" as referring to Jewish ceremonial laws. This of course opens the door for them to say the moral commandments are binding and should be kept in order to be saved.⁴⁵

When Paul declares "that man is not justified by the works of the law" it is not that he does not recognize the works of charity as indispensable of salvation. What he was refuting was the Jewish attempt, like Paul himself before his conversion, to attain justification by their own (unaided) works and by the observation of the Mosaic law.

The Orthodox dogmaticians see that in the same Epistle to the Galatians, where he underlines justification and salvation by faith, and not by the works of the law, he affirms that those who do the works of the flesh "will not inherit the kingdom of God." He also says "for whatever a man sows, that he will also reap. For he who sows to his own flesh will from the flesh reap corruption; but he who sows to the Spirit will from the Spirit reap eternal life." That is why he exhorts Christians saying "Let's not be complacent to do good works."⁴⁶

Therefore the Orthodox see the opposition between Paul, who underlines justification by faith, and James who affirms that "man is justified by works and not by faith alone" as only apparent.⁴⁷

⁴⁵Luther in repudiating the notion of limiting "the law" to the ceremonial law alone writes: "But since the revealing, say they, the ceremonial law killeth and brings death. Yea, so doth the law of the ten commandments also, without faith in Christ." A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1979), pp. 128, 129 & 143.

⁴⁶Gal. 6:7-8. Trembelas., p. 325.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 325.

Having brought proofs from the Scripture to show the inseparable link of justifying faith with good works, they also bring the testimonies of the Fathers to support their teaching. Cyril of Jerusalem wrote:

The kind of life agreeable to God is made up of two elements: of strict pious dogma and good actions; the dogma without good actions is not regarded by God and God doesn't welcome the good actions accomplished without dogma. What use does it give if we know the doctrines of God and conduct ourselves shamefully or disgracefully? What use is there to live with a wise moderation and to blaspheme with impiety.⁴⁸

Cyril of Alexandria also speaks of the necessity of good works when he writes:

The fact of knowing God, unique by nature and to confess Him loyally and truly, that is faith, but it will be dead, if the sweet results of works do not follow. . . For the one who wants to come, he needs absolutely faith and above all a right faith; then, a life without reproach, according to the measure of human justice.⁴⁹

The collectively authoritative Father of the Byzantine Church, John of Damascus, is said to seal the teaching of all the Fathers in this matter. He wrote:

Faith is completed by all the commandments of Christ, it is confessed or professed through works, it honours and accomplishes the order of the one who has regenerated us. The one who does not believe according to the Tradition of the Catholic Church, or who cooperates with the devil by improper actions is an unbeliever.⁵⁰

The Orthodox also do not teach an absolute merit, though sometimes they stress the recompense of good works and labours by citing verses such as Matt. 6:20; Luke 12:33; Matt. 25:34,40 and so forth. The

⁴⁸Catechetical Lectures IV, 2. MG 33:456. Trembelas, p. 328.

⁴⁹On John 9, MG, 74:125 & on Luke. 13:23 MG 72:776. Trembelas, p. 328n.

⁵⁰John of Damascus. Exposition of Orthodox Faith, 4:10; MG 94:1128. Trembelas, p. 329.

one in Luke reads "but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust consumes and where thieves do not break in and steal."

Even though they point to the compensations of good works they do not forget that these works themselves are done by divine help. Thus the merit of good works is not absolute but relative. They are made agreeable to God only because they are the fruits the Saviour produces by the grace of the Spirit as He says "without me you can do nothing."⁵¹

It is not therefore a legal right, but a paternal love of God, which is source and cause of the recompense of good works. It is only with a filial courage, coupled with extreme humility and a profound gratitude that man has the right to claim the wage promised by God in grace.⁵²

As a result the Orthodox do not accept the Roman Catholic doctrine of superabundant merit. No one can have such an over-flowing merit that can be kept together in the bank and be used by those who need it. This above all because of the fragility and limitations of human beings to claim such an achievement. In fact the Lord has said "when we have done all we have been commanded" we ought to say "we are useless servants, because we have done that which we ought to do" (Luke.17:10). Thus we cannot make satisfaction for others, nor can the saints help by their merits.⁵³

⁵¹Ibid., p. 331.

⁵²Ibid., p. 331.

⁵³Ibid., p. 332.

CHAPTER VI

ORTHODOX CONFESSIONS AND CATECHISMS

Introduction

The whole of the Eastern Orthodox Church with the exception of the Monophysites, who do not accept the Chalcedonian decision, accept the seven Ecumenical Councils. Following them there emerged several Orthodox confessions especially during the seventeenth century. With the exception of the Confession of Gennadius Scholarius, written sometime between 1453 and 1468, all the remaining symbolic books were the results entirely of the Reformation, directly or indirectly.¹

The explicit formulation of the doctrines of grace, Justification, the church and the sacraments in the Eastern Orthodox Churches, is due chiefly to the local synods and councils subsequent to the Reformation. These confessions, even though they are not considered to rank with the seven Ecumenical Councils, are formally endorsed and for an Orthodox dogmatician they have the force of dogma.²

The main confessions that are found in this group are: 1. The Orthodox Confession of the Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church, written about 1640 by P. Mogila; 2. Decrees of the Synod of

¹Frank Gavin, Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought (New York: American Review of Eastern Orthodoxy, 1962), p. 211.

²Ibid., p. 209.

Jerusalem, or Confession of Dositheus (1672), 3. Synods of Constantinople (1672, 1691). 4. Russian Catechisms 5. Answers of Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople to the Lutherans.

Out of these, we have seen the last one more particularly in a full chapter as it was a direct confrontation with the Lutherans. Now in this chapter we will take the first two and the fourth (that is, with the exception of the Synods of Constantinople) confessions and see what they have to say concerning the doctrine of Justification.

The Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church

This confession was drawn up by Peter Mogilas, Metropolitan of Kiev, the father of Russian theology (ca.1596-ca.1647). It was revised and adopted by the Graeco-Russian Synod of Jassy, 1643, signed by the Eastern Patriarchs, and approved again by the Synod of Jerusalem, 1672. It is presented in the form of a catechism. From the hundred and twenty-six questions and answers contained in the Confession the very first question and answer deal with the theme of our thesis, that is, What an Orthodox ought to hold and observe in order to attain the eternal life.

The Confession asks: "Quid tenere atque observare Orthodoxus et Catholicus homo Christianus debet, ut aeternae olim vitae heres fiat?"

The answer given was:

Rectam fidem et bona opera. Qui enim haec duo servat, ille bonus Christianus est, certamque aeternae salutis spem habet teste Sacra Scriptura (Jac 2:24): Videtis, quod ex operibus justificetur homo non autem ex fide tantum. Tum paullo post (v.26): Nam quemadmodum corpus sine spiritu mortuum est: ita et fides sine operibus mortua est. Idem alibi divinus ille Paulus adstruit (1 Tim 1:19): Habens fidem et bonam conscientiam: qua repulsa nonnulli fidei naufragium fecerunt! Et alio idem loco (1 Tim 3:9) Habentes mysterium fidei

in pura conscientia³

As we can see above the Orthodox still continue their combination of faith and good works side by side. The good Christian, the one who has a hope for eternal life, is the one who expresses his faith in works. The popular Epistle of Saint James is also cited as a proof for the necessity of works.

The Confession of Dositheus(1641-1707)

The Confession of Dositheus, or the Eighteen Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem, is a refutation of the Eighteen Articles of the Confession of Cyril Lucar who is considered by Schaff "a martyr of Protestantism within the Orthodox Greek Church."⁴

Cyril of Lucar stated the doctrine of Justification in his thirteenth article as follows:

We believe that man is justified by faith, not by works. But when we say "by faith", we understand the correlative of faith, viz., the Righteousness of Christ, which faith, fulfilling the office of the hand, apprehends and applies to us for salvation. And this we understand to be fully consistent with, and in no wise to the prejudice of, works, for the truth itself teaches us that works also are not to be neglected, and that they are necessary means and testimonies of our faith, and a confirmation of our calling. But, as human frailty bears witness, they are of themselves by no means sufficient to save man, and able to appear at the judgment-seat of Christ, so as to merit the reward of salvation. The righteousness of Christ, applied to the penitent, alone justifies and saves the believer.⁵

The above statements repudiating the power of works to save, seemed to irritate the Orthodox ear and Dositheus produced the follow-

³Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom 3 Vols. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1919), 2:275-276.

⁴Ibid., 1:54. See also page 54 above.

⁵Ibid., 1:57.

ing refutation as representing the official Orthodox position. In the Decretum XIII of his confession he writes:

Credimus non sola fide simpliciter, sed ea, quae per caritatem operatur, id est fide atque operibus hominem justificari. Quod vero fides, quasi manus adimplens munus, justitiam, quae in Christo est, apprehendat, nobisque applicet ad salutem ab omni pietate longissime esse censemus. Enim vero sic intellecta fides omnibus conveniret, unde et ad salutem nemo non perveniret; quod aperte falsum est. ...Porro certitudinis Vocationis nostrae argumenta esse hujusmodi opera nequaquam intelligimus, sed fructus ex se ipsis, per quos efficax redditur fides, eaque ex divinis promissionibus esse talia dicimus, pro quibus recipere unus quisque fidelium dignus existat, prout gessit in corpore suo, sive bonum sive malum.⁶

This Confession again gives a secure position to work as necessary for Justification. However, it should be noted that it is not works alone, but "fide per caritatem operatur" that justifies. The Orthodox do not teach that works on their own justify.

The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic
Graeco-Russian Eastern Church

The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Eastern Graeco-Russian Church composed by Philaret(1782-1867) definitely proves the above point.⁷ In the third part of the Orthodox Catechism, where it deals with "the union between Faith and Love" it states the following:
Question: What should be the effect and fruit of true faith in the Christian?

Answer: Love, and good works conformable thereto.

Then it goes on to quote Gal 5:6 where the Apostle says, "In Jesus

⁶Ibid., 2:418.

⁷The large Russian Catechism of Philaret, approved by the Holy Synod, is now the most authoritative doctrinal standard of the Orthodox Graeco-Russian Church, and has practically superseded the Older Catechism or Orthodox Confession of Mogila. Cf. Schaff, 2:445.

Christ, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love." Then comes the

Question: Is not faith alone enough for a Christian, without love and good works?

Answer: No; for faith without love and good works is inactive and dead, and so cannot lead to eternal life.

Then 1 John 3:14, and James 2:14, 26 are quoted. Then next:

Question: May not a man, on the other hand, be saved by love and good works, without faith?

Answer: It is impossible that a man who has not faith in God should really love him; besides, man, being ruined by sin, can not do really good works, unless he receive through faith in Jesus Christ spiritual strength, or grace from God.

Then comes quotation of Heb. 11:6, "without faith it is impossible to please God," Gal 5:5 and Ephesians 2:8,9, "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." Then finally comes the

Question: What is to be thought of such love as is not accompanied by good works?

Answer: Such love is not real; for true love naturally shows itself by goodworks.⁸

From the above evidence we can again see that the Orthodox clearly affirm that justification is achieved by "faith which works through love." They do not indeed say that works alone justify, nor

⁸Schaff, 2:519-520.

would they embrace statements such as "faith alone" justifies. According to them true faith is inseparably combined with good works, so that one can unhesitantly confess that "faith working through love," that is, faith and good works inseparably bound together justify.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

It seems there are both differences and similarities in the underlying ideas as well as in the actual formulations between the Orthodox and the Lutherans in the Doctrine of Justification. At times one may even wonder whether the similarity in both groups far outweighs the dissimilarity especially in points such as the relation of faith and good works. Nevertheless, there are formulations and statements made by the Orthodox which would definitely be unscriptural for an Evangelical or Lutheran ear.

As we have seen in the first chapter the Eastern Churches continued to make the Chalcedonian christological formulation as an ore from which (and on the basis of which) they will formulate other doctrines. We have seen how the ideas of two wills in the nature of Christ and the controversy between the iconoclasts and iconophiles as well as the eucharistic teachings are directly related to the christological formulation.

In the same way the idea of salvation as deification - the idea that "God became man so that man may become god" and the ensuing idea of human cooperation or *συνέργεια* and of free will are deduced from the Divine-human relation in the christological formulation.

At the outset it may sound or seem that such teaching of

συνέργεια has nothing to do with the Lutheran teaching of justification by faith alone, sola fide, and is far removed from that conception. Yet the Orthodox do not give an autonomous or independent place to man as if he could work out his own salvation by his own might and good will. This in fact was what the Pelagians and some of the Semi-Pelagians held.

The Orthodox definitely teach that the initiative is from God whether it be in the form of prevenient grace or divine illumination. The participation of man in this calling is by responding and assenting to the call. Man in a sense has to be willing to go along in the direction of the wave of the divine grace. Such is the notion when the Eastern Fathers taught human cooperation and **συνέργεια** before the Reformation. This idea of **συνέργεια** is not related to the idea of merit that a person receives as a reward for his unaided personal achievements.

The Orthodox definitely seem to be far from agreement concerning the freedom of the will. They would rather side with the liberum arbitrium of Erasmus rather than the servum arbitrium of Luther.¹ Even here where it seems that the disagreement is complete, one could find a point of contact (at least in motive) if the two sides are carefully observed.

Luther spoke of the bondage of the will not with a view of evading any responsibility on the side of man (including the man sinning before God), but with the view of displaying the utter helplessness of man to justify himself before God. That his teaching on the bondage of

¹See above page 30 indicating the kinship between Erasmus and Origen.

the will is dictated by such a concern is amply attested. Luther while writing on John 6:44 "No one comes to me unless my father draws him" says:

What does this leave to free choice? For he says that everyone needs to hear and learn from the Father himself, and that all must be taught by God. He plainly teaches here, not only that the works and efforts of free choice are fruitless, but that even the message of the gospel itself (which is what this passage is about) is heard in vain unless the Father himself speaks, teaches, and draws inwardly. "No one can come," he says, "no one", and thus that power by which a man is able to make some endeavor toward Christ, or in other words, toward the things that pertain to salvation, is asserted to be no power to all.²

While rejecting the Erasmian notion of the "Middle Way" Luther writes:

We must therefore go all out and completely deny free choice, referring everything to God; then there will be no contradictions in Scripture, and the difficulties, if not cured, can be endured.³

The Orthodox on the other hand are concerned with presenting man as a responsible being. According to them the contrary understanding of the human nature will lead to "sacramental determinism" besides making man less than brutes and innate objects. In fact the kind of cooperation and responsibility they speak about is a filial cooperation and responsibility rather than that of a labourer and servant-master relationship which is inherent in a wage-merit conception.

Even though Luther articulated the doctrine of predestination, primarily as a consolation to the elect (propter electos), he sometimes

²Philips Watson, ed., Luther's Works, 55 Vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 33:285-286.

³Ibid., p. 245.

ridiculed the doctrine as "the devil's work pure and simple,"⁴ he did not deny human responsibility altogether. According to the Orthodox the denial of human responsibility and free choice will inevitably lead to absolute predestination as has been prompted by Augustine and taught by Calvin. This again will make God responsible for the damnation and sin of the lost, which according to them is unscriptural.

As we have seen above the Orthodox escape this dilemma by teaching what they call relative predestination, a predestination by which God foreknows what an individual willingly will do or choose.

On the other hand, even if he refers everything to God Luther does not make man void of any responsibility. Man still remains a responsible being. In pointing to the limits which Luther maintains in describing the relationship of God to man Paul Althaus writes:

Man darf bei Luthers Lehre von der Allwirksamkeit Gottes keinen Augenblick vergessen, dass sie nicht sein ganzes Wort über das Seins-Verhältnis Gottes zum Menschen ist. Luther weiss den Menschen, der ganz in Gottes Hand ist und von ihm in jedem Augenblick bewegt und gewirkt wird, zugleich im Gegenüber zu Gott, vor ihm verantwortlich und schuldig, von ihm gerichtet. Vor allem: er sieht den Menschen zugleich als Gegenstand der Liebe Gottes, die ihm zu dem Akt freier Hingabe beruft. Dadurch wird der Gedanke der Allwirksamkeit Gottes im Menschen in einer unüberschreitbaren Grenze gehalten.⁵

The place where one may find the most clear similarity between the Orthodox and the Lutherans is on the relationship between faith and good works. At the outset this may seem the point where they differ the

⁴D. Martin Luthers Werke, Edited by Hermann Bohlaus Nachfolger (Weimar, 1914) 45: 95, 32, quoted by Werner Elert, The Structure of Lutheranism, trans. Walter A. Hansen (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962), p. 121.

⁵Paul Althaus, Die Theologie Martin Luthers (Gerd Mohn: Gutersloher Verlags haus, 1962), p. 106.

most. The Orthodox repeatedly teach the necessity of good works in conjunction with faith. It is faith that "works through love" that justifies and "Faith without works is dead" are some of the maxims repeatedly raised by them.

In order to prove this they cite the ethical teachings in the Gospels, conflate Pauline exhortations with his teachings on justification by faith alone and bring in other explicit testimonies from the epistles especially James. Besides these, they bring rich and considerable citations from the patristic admonitions.

One may ask whether the Lutheran Symbols, as well as Luther himself, are less concerned about the necessity of good works? If not, where do they differ? The Augsburg Confession in its twentieth Article says with regard to good works: "It is also taught among us that good works should and must be done, not that we are to rely on them to earn grace but that we may do God's will and glorify him."⁶

Both the Augsburg Confession and its Apology often employ formulas like "Good works are necessary," "It is necessary to do good works because they necessarily follow faith and reconciliation," "We should and must of necessity do good works that God has commanded."⁷

Luther himself strongly teaches the necessity of good works. In fact while exhorting those who misuse the "liberty of spirit" given through faith in Christ Jesus as an occasion for "carnal liberty," he uses words sterner than those of all the Fathers quoted by the Orthodox.

⁶Augsburg Confession XX, 27; Theodore G. Tappert., The Book of Concord (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), p. 45.

⁷Ibid., p. 553.

While commenting on Galatians 5:13 he writes:

Moreover, seeing we obtain not salvation by our good works, why should we give anything to the poor? Thus do they most carelessly shake off the yoke and bondage of the flesh, and turn the liberty of the Spirit into wantonness and fleshly liberty . . . we tell them I say, that they be not free, brag they never so much of their liberty, but have lost Christ and Christian Liberty, are become bond slaves of the devil, and are seven times worse under the name of Christian liberty, than they were before under the tyranny of the Pope. For the devil which was driven out of them, hath taken unto him seven other friends worse than himself, and is returned into them again: therefore the end of these men is worse than the beginning.⁸

Luther laments that the Scriptural teaching of justification by faith alone is misinterpreted and misused as giving an occasion for carnal liberty. Luther found there are problems in both ways. If the Gospel is not preached in its purity, the troubled conscience suffers under the bondage of sin, the law and the devil. On the other hand when the Gospel is preached in its purity some misuse it and make it an occasion to indulge in their "carnal liberty."

Therefore Luther, following the Apostle, asserts that it is necessary for the godly preachers diligently to teach and urge the doctrine of good work and the doctrine of faith, because "Satan is a deadly enemy to both."⁹

In his preface to the Epistle to the Romans he again asserts the inseparable connection between faith and good works. He writes:

. . . Oh, faith is a living, busy, active, mighty thing, so that it is impossible for it not to be constantly doing what is good. Likewise, faith does not ask if good works are to be done, but before one can ask, faith has already done them and is constantly

⁸Martin Luther, A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker House, 1982), p. 493.

⁹Ibid., p. 495.

active, . . . This the Holy Spirit works by faith, and therefore without any coercion a man is willing and desirous to do good to everyone, to serve everyone, to suffer everything for the love of God and to his glory, who has been so gracious to him. It is therefore as impossible to separate works from faith as it is to separate heat and light from fire.¹⁰

Luther sometimes even speaks the very statement which Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople spoke in his answer to the Tubingen theologians.¹¹ For him the righteousness of Christ or justification by faith alone is the foundation of the Christian doctrine (1 Cor 3:11). The one justified builds on this foundation good works which can be summarized in the percept "Thou shall love thy neighbour as yourself."¹²

The following words of Luther on the Epistle to the Galatians speak to the heart of the matter. While commenting on Galatians 5:15 he says:

It is hard and a dangerous matter to teach that we are made righteous by faith without works, and yet to require works withal. Here except the ministers of Christ be faithful and wise disposers of the mysteries of God, rightly dividing the word of truth; faith and works are by and by confounded. Both these doctrines, as well of faith as of works, must be diligently taught and urged; and yet so that both may remain within their bounds. Otherwise if they teach works only, as they do in the Pope's kingdom, then is faith lost. If faith only be taught, then carnal men by and by dream

¹⁰Luther's Sammtliche Werke, Edited by Johann Konrad (Frankfurt a. m. und Erlangen, 1854) 63:124, 125; quoted in Solid Declaration IV, 10-12; Tappert, p. 552.

¹¹See pages 48-49 above.

¹²While commenting on Gal. 5:14 "For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, which is this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" Luther writes:

"Paul, after he hath once laid the foundation of Christian doctrine, is wont to build gold, silver, and precious stones upon it. Now there is no other foundation as he himself saith to the Corinthians, than Jesus Christ, or the righteousness of Christ (1 Cor. 3:11). Upon this foundation he buildeth now good works, yea good works indeed: all which he comprehendeth in one precept, "Thou shall love thy neighbour as thyself." Commentary on Galatians, p.494.

that works be not needful.¹³

It seems that such a kind of statement and understanding would well please an Orthodox ear. In spite of all these agreements on stressing the necessity of good works there remains a basic difference between the Orthodox and the Evangelicals. The difference lies in the boundaries assigned both to faith and good works and the role each of them plays in Justification.

The Lutherans stress and confess that a person's relation to God is based only on faith and that it alone pacifies the troubled conscience, and it alone justifies. For the Orthodox, however, faith working through love that is both faith and charity are essential for justification. Luther's response to the similar position of the Roman Catholics will make clear the extent of the difference. He wrote:

Wherefore those things which the popish schoolmen have taught concerning the justifying faith being furnished with charity are nothing else but mere dreams. For that faith which apprehendeth Christ the Son of God, and is furnished with him, is the same faith that justifieth, and not the faith which includeth charity. For a true and steadfast faith must lay hold upon nothing else but Christ alone, and in the affections and terrors of conscience it hath nothing else to lean unto, but this diamond Christ Jesus.¹⁴

One should understand that the Lutheran (as well as the Pauline) teaching of sola fide is directly related with the vicarious atonement of the crucified Christ. Sola fide is thought with the premise that Christ has carried all the sins of the world on the cross, and also that he has accomplished all that is needed for salvation, and that all this is given freely as a gift, that is by faith in the crucified and

¹³Ibid., p. 500.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 100.

resurrected Christ.

The place given by the Orthodox to the vicarious atonement of the crucified Christ is less pronounced . Instead their emphasis lies on the mystical union or the deification of the believer based on the divine-human relation in Christ. Thus while the Lutherans and the Evangelicals speak of the exchange of righteousness and sin between the crucified Christ and the sinner the Orthodox on the other hand put their emphasis on the exchange that took place between man and God on account of the incarnation, that is, the maxim "He became man in order that we may become gods." This perspective opens up to the Orthodox the possibility to formulate the idea of human cooperation which shows incongruity with the teaching of Justification by faith alone.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Altaner, Berthold. Patrology. Edinburgh: Herder, 1960.
- Althaus, Paul. Die Theologie Martin Luthers. Gerd Mohn: Gutersloher Verlags haus, 1962.
- _____. The Theology of Martin Luther. Translated by Robert C. Schultz. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Attwater, Donald. A List of Books About the Eastern Churches New York, RI: St. Leo Shop, 1960.
- Baillie, John ed., Luther and Erasmus - Library of Christian Classics. London: SCM Press, 1969.
- Carlson, Charles P. Justification in Earlier Medieval Theology. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975.
- Chrysostom, John. Homilies on Galatians and Ephesians. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1848.
- _____. Homilies on Philippians, Colossians and Thessalonians. Oxford: John Henery Parker, 1843.
- _____. Homilies on Romans. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1840.
- _____. Homilies on Timothy, Titus and Philemon. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1948.
- Drewery, Benjamin. Origen and the Doctrine of Grace. London: Epworth Press, 1960.
- Elert, Werner. The Structure of Lutheranism. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962.
- Evdokimov, Paul. L'Orthodoxie Paris: Delachaux et Niestle, 1959.
- Fairweather, William. Origen and Greek Patristic Theology Edinburgh: T & T. Clark, 1901.
- Gavin, Frank. Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought. New York: American Review of Eastern Orthodoxy, 1962.
- Luther, Martin. A Commentary on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.

Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1979.

- _____. Luther's Works. Edited by Philip S. Watson. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- _____. Luther's Sammtliche Werke. Edited by Johann Konrad. Frankfurt a. m und Erlangen, 1854.
- _____. D. Martin Luther's Werke, Edited by Hermann Bohlaus nachfolger. Weimar, 1914.
- Maloney, George A. A Theology of "Uncreated Energies". Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 1978.
- Mastrantonis, George. Augsburg and Constantinople. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982.
- Meyendorff, John. Christ in Eastern Christian Thought. New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1975.
- Migne, J. P. ed., Patrologia Patrum Graecorum. Vol. 14 & 60. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1862.
- Niermeyer, J. F. Mediae Latinitatis, Lexicon Minus, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.
- O'Brien, Elmer, ed., The Convergence of Traditions. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.
- Paul, Abp. of Karelia. The Faith We Hold. New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. The Spirit of Eastern Christendom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Philippou, A. J. The Orthodox Ethos. Oxford: Holy Well Press, 1964.
- Schaff, Philip. The Creeds of Christendom . 3 Vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1877.3Vols.
- Shipley, Joseph T. Dictionary of Word Origins. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1945.
- Tappert, Theodore G. The Book of Concord. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959.
- Trembelas, Panagiotis N. Dogmatique De L'Eglise Orthodoxe Catholique. Desclee De Brouwer: Editions De chevetogne, 1967.
- Tsirpanlis, Constantine N. Orthodox-Unification Dialogue. New York: The Rose of Sharon Press, 1981.

Walker, Williston. A History of the Christian Church. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.

Ware, Timothy. The Orthodox Church. Baltimore: Penguin edition, 1964.

Zernov, Nicolas. Orthodox Encounter. London: James Clarke & Co., 1961.

Reference Works

Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch Lutherischen Kirche, Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.

Encyclopedia Americana, 1984 ed. s.v. "Reformation" by Hans. J. Hillerbrand.

Holy Bible. The Revised Standard Version. Edited by May and Metzger. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Lutheran Cyclopedia, Lueker Erwin, ed. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1975.

New Catholic Encyclopedia, 1967 ed. s.v. "Justification" by P. de letter

Articles

Aghiorgoussis, Maximos. "Sin In Orthodox Dogmatics." St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 21 (1977): pp. 191-206.

_____. "The Theology And Experience of Salvation." Greek Orthodox Theological Review 22 (1977):405-415.

Hryniewicz Waclaw. "Le mystère de la divino-humanité signification herméneutique d'une notion de l'anthropologie Orthodoxe." Istina 25 (1980):350-364.

Stoyiannos, Basilios. "The Law in The New Testament From an Orthodox Point of View." The Greek Orthodox Theological Review 24 (1979):309-322.

Ware Kallistos. "The Orthodox Experience of Repentance." T. Sobornost No.1, (1980):18-28.

_____. "The Place of Blessed Augustine in the Orthodox Church". The Orthodox World, v.14.(1978), pp.67-86.