

MORAL DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION*

*Educational Implications of the Early Greek Patristic Anthropology
and their Relation to Modern Theories of Moral Education.*

B Y

ELIAS G. MATSAGOURAS

M.A., M.ED., Ph. D.

CHAPTER II: MAN IN HIS FALLEN STATE

I. The Problem of Evil.

Any philosophical or religious school which affirms that the primary cause of reality is both almighty and perfectly good faces the problem of the contradiction or the apparent contradiction between the existence of an almighty and perfectly good God and the reality of evil. For if evil really exists, God is either unable or unwilling to offset it. In either case one of his attributed properties, almightiness or goodness, should be denied.¹

In late antiquity the existence of evil was an indisputable fact for both pagans and Christians. They all felt the destructive presence of the evil powers waylaying in any moment. Therefore, the various philosophical and religious systems undertook the task to explain the origins of evil to their followers and, moreover, to protect them from it. Most systems, especially those of Eastern origins and affiliations, offered dualistic explanations of the problem of evil.²

1. J. L. Mackie, «Evil and Omnipotence», in *Mind* (April, 1955), p. 209.

2. In his book, *The ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin*, N. P. Williams presents the three classical answers to the problem of evil: I) The theory of «unmoral monism» characteristic of Hindu thought, according to which Good and Evil are alike appearances of an Absolute which transcends them both. II) Dualism, the view of later Madeism and Manicheism, which postulates co-eternal powers of Good and Evil. III) The theory of a «fall» and of «original sin» inherited by Christianity from Judaism, pp. 1-35. J. Hick also presents a summary of the Christian thesis to this problem, which runs as follows: Whatever exists is as such and in its proper place good; evil is essentially parasitic upon good, being disorder and perversion in a fundamentally good creation. In this sense evil is something negative but not unreal. Moreover, Christians make a distinction between moral evil, which they as-

Christianity, though it had inherited from Judaism³ the conviction that evil really exists, could not offer a solution on dualistic grounds and, therefore, ascribed it to the free will of the rational beings created by God.

Macarius, who shared with all Christian ascetics the belief that their vocation was a continuous battle with the powers of evil (XXVI. 14-15, pp. 277, 9-278,3), could not have overlooked the problem of evil. He speaks of evil's origin, nature, works and, moreover, the proper way in which a Christian should overcome it.

He relates the existence of evil to the fall of the angels and that of Adam professed by the Judaic tradition. As F. R. Tennant and N. Williams⁴ have pointed out, the author of Genesis, who describes two such «falls» in Genesis III and VI, did not intend to offer a theory of evil's origin. This is entirely absent from the pre-Exilic writings of the Old Testament, but it appears in later periods. It was then that the Jews, oppressed by the need for a final and specific event to explain the origin of evil, searched through the ancient traditions which lay before them and fixed upon the legends of the fall of the angels and of man. The latter was originally meant to narrate an act of *hybris* which brought the golden age to an end and not to convey the idea that a moral corruption is transmitted by biological heredity.⁵

In Macarius both falls are present, and they are both seen as a result of the exercise of free will on the part of the angels (XVI. 1, p. 237,6f) and of Adam (XII. 8, p. 208,23). These two falls, moreover, are closely related in the mind of Macarius, and they are seen as two phases of the emergence of evil. The first fall made the second easier, if not possible. The second fall transmitted evil to mankind and to the physical world (XLIII. 7, p. 330-24).

Thus, God is not responsible for the evil found either in the ce-

scribe to the free will of the rational beings, and non-moral evil, i.e., sufferings, pain, etc., which they usually explain by means of moral evil; see his *Philosophy of Religion*, pp. 41-43.

3. J. Hick, *Op. Cit.*, p. 41.

4. F. R. Tennant, *Sources of the Doctrine of Fall and Original Sin*, pp. 9-16; N. P. Williams, *Op. Cit.*, p. 20. Other scholars believe that though the Old Testament makes no explicit statement regarding the transmission of hereditary guilt from the first man to the entire human race, such a doctrine fits into the general atmosphere of the Old Testament and is hinted in some passages; see I. Hunt, «Original Sin», in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 10, p. 77bf.

5. N. P. Williams, *Op. Cit.*, p. 51.

lestial sphere, or in the terrestrial one. He made all the creatures good. What constitutes the evil in some of them is their free decision to break away from God and take a stand or a direction which is not the proper one. (XVI. 1, p. 237,6f). As John Damascene says, evil is a *συμβεβηκός*, *ἤτοι ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν εἰς τὸ παρὰ φύσιν ἐκούσιος παρεκτροπή*.⁶ In patristic thought the definition of everything depends upon its relation to God. Thus, Gregory of Nyssa says that, although it sounds strange, evil *ἐν τῷ μὴ εἶναι τὸ εἶναι ἔχει*.⁷ Macarius, following this line of thought, refutes the Manichean and Gnostic doctrines according to which evil has an *hypostasis*: *Οἱ λέγοντες ἐνυπόστατον τὸ κακὸν οὐδὲν ἴσασιν* (XVI. 1, p. 237,14). To God, continues Macarius, there is no substantive evil, according to his divine freedom from passion (*Ibid.* p. 237, 14-15; *Ibid.* 5, p. 239,2-5). The view that the evil is *anhypostaton* is of Neoplatonic origins and, as A. H. Armstrong argues, this view is one of the main borrowings of the Christian Fathers from the Platonists.⁸

Macarius and the other Christian Fathers by calling evil a distortion or a perversion in a fundamentally good creation do not mean that evil is unreal; on the contrary, evil works in man with full force and makes itself felt: *Ἡμῖν δὲ ἐστὶν ἐνεργοῦν ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ αἰσθησει, πάσας ἐπιθυμίας ῥυπαρὰς ὑπόβαλλον* (XVI. 1, p. 237, 15f).

II. The Fall of Adam and Eve.

Macarius, as we have seen, uses the Biblical story of Adam's fall, which he seems to accept as a historical event,⁹ to explain how evil was introduced to the terrestrial plane. Moreover, he goes on to give an account of the nature of the fall and its consequences.

Man, says Macarius, is not the inventor of sin, which is the ex-

6. John Damascene, *de Fide Orthodoxa*, IV, PG. 94, 1196C.

7. Gregory of Nyssa, *de Anima*, PG. 46, 9313.

8. A. H. Armstrong, «The Self Definition of Christianity in Relation to Later Platonism», in E. P. Sanders, *The Shaping of Christianity* (to be publ.). Athanasius writes on the nature of evil: *Τὸ κακὸν οὐ παρὰ Θεοῦ οὐδὲ ἐν Θεῷ οὔτε ἐξ ἀρχῆς γέγονεν, οὔτε οὐσία τις ἐστίν; C. Gentes VII, PG. 25, 16A: cf. Diadochus of Photice, Capita Gnostica III, (p. 86, 8): τὸ μὲν (sc. κακὸν) οὐκ ἐστίν, εἰ μὴ μόνον ἐν τῷ πράττεσθαι. Another ascetic writer, Maximus Confessor writes: *Τὸ κακὸν οὔτε ἦν, οὔτε ἐστὶ κατ' οἰκείαν φύσιν ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ, οὔτε γὰρ ἔχει καθ' ὅτιον οὐσίαν, ἢ φύσιν, ἢ ὑπόστασιν, ἢ δυνάμιν, ... οὔτε ποιότης, οὔτε ποσότης, οὔτε σχέσις... τὸ κακὸν ἐστίν· ἔλλειψις καὶ ἄλλο καθάπαξ οὐδέν; see Ad Thalassium, PG. 90, 253.**

9. Some Fathers deny the historicity of it and they see it as a symbolic story; see J. Romanides, *Op. Cit.*, p. 112 note 2.

pression of moral evil,¹⁰ but a victim of the devil (XXVII. 5, p. 284,30; I. 7, p. 149,28; II. 1, p. 153,5). Man, argues Macarius, could never have been perverted to such malice and wickedness, if the devil had not introduced into his nature the leavening of malice, i.e. sin (XXIV. 3, p. 265,36 f). Man by himself has limited abilities; he can neither reach spiritual heights nor become highly vicious without the help of the heavenly leaven or the devil's leaven respectively (*Ibid.*). The view Macarius holds on the cause of man's fall is of great importance since it conceives evil as something foreign to man, introduced into him from outside, and not as something which sprung from man's nature. Such a view allows for a more optimistic picture of man's future than that of Augustine.¹¹ According to the latter, the fall was not caused by the devil but it took place within Adam's will and turned him away from God.¹² Unlike Macarius, Augustine attributes original righteousness to man, as we have seen. For Macarius, Adam was still in the process of moral development; Augustine also allows for a degree of spiritual progress to pre-fallen Adam, but he differs from Macarius and other Eastern Fathers in that he attributes to Adam a miraculous knowledge and the gift of preservation from error.¹³ Macarius argues that Satan used ὑψηλοφροσύνη to motivate Adam's apostasy (XXVII. 5, p. 284,29). In patristic thought ὑψηλοφροσύνη, meaning arrogance, is usually understood as a offspring of *hybris*.¹⁴ As we have seen, Augustine also speaks of Adam's pride, which he views as the beginning of all sin. Pride in this case should not be understood in the modern sense of the word, i.e. as a satisfaction over one's achievements, but as an *hybris* in the Greek sense, i.e. self-elevation.¹⁵ In the Homilies ὑψηλοφροσύνη is used in the sense of *hybris*: 'Ο γὰρ αὐτός ὄφρις ὁ ἐκβαλὼν διὰ τῆς ὑψηλοφροσύνης τὸν Ἀδάμ, εἰπὼν ὅτι, 'Ὡς θεοὶ γενήσεσθε', οὗτος καὶ νῦν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑποβάλλει ὑψηλοφροσύνην λέγων· 'Τέλειος εἶ, ἀρκεῖ σοι, ἐπλούτησας, οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχεις, μακάριος εἶ'. (XXVII, 6, p. 284,39 f). In both the case of Adam

10. Evil can appear as physical evil, aesthetic evil, intellectual evil and moral evil; pain, ugliness, error and sin correspond to the four expressions of evil. In Macarius the term sin (ἁμαρτία) refers usually not to an individual act of evil, but to a principle of evil, which dominates fallen man.

11. Concerning Augustine's views see A. H. Armstrong, *St. Augustine and Christian Platonism*, pp. 24-26.

12. Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*. XIV. 10, 12-15.

13. E. Portalie, *Op. Cit.*, p. 205.

14. Basil, *Comment. Is.*, PG. 30, 216B.

15. P. Tillich, *Op. Cit.*, p. 126.

and the case of the ordinary believer described above we see an act of self-elevation: in the first case from the rank of a creature to that of God and in the second from the state of human weakness and insufficiency to that of perfection and sufficiency.

Macarius, however, does not grant amnesty to Adam by seeing him as a victim of the devil. Adam is fully responsible for his fall, because the devil's power is simply hortatory and not coercive. Sin was by no means a necessity; it was certainly within Adam's power to resist the attack (*Ibid.* 22, p. 291,24-39). The choice was left to Adam's free will (XII. 8, p. 208,23) and there is where his responsibility begins.

Adam's sin does not consist in the external act of eating the forbidden fruit; the nature of Adam's sin consists in an inner distortion which resulted in his entertaining evil intentions and thoughts (XII. 1, p. 206,4). Adam removed the centre of his life from God to himself, his life from theocentric became egocentric. He lived *τῆ ἰδίᾳ φύσει* (XII. 2 and 7, pp. 206,7 and 108,6-12). Being away from God man has given over his pure and good thoughts to evil, and these thoughts have become an idol to himself (XI. 3, p. 199, 30f).

Regarding the cause of the apostasy of both the angels and man Origen and Basil argue that they allowed themselves to be overcome by *koros* of the enjoyment they experienced within the divine presence.¹⁶ This view finds no room in Macarius' thought; for him the enjoyment of God is insatiable. The more one tastes and eats of God the more one hungers; man's ardour and passion for God is beyond restraint:

ἡ γὰρ ἀπόλαυσις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀκόρεστος ἐστὶ, καὶ ὅσον αὐτοῦ γεύεται τις καὶ ἐσθίει, τοσοῦτον ἔκπεινος γίγνεται. Καὶ τὴν καῦσιν καὶ τὸν ἔρωτα πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἔχουσιν ἀκατάσχετον οἱ τοιοῦτοι· καὶ ὅσῳ σπουδάζουσιν προκόπτειν καὶ ἐπιπορίζειν, τοσοῦτον ἑαυτοὺς ἠγοῦνται πτωχοῦς, ὡς ἐνδεεῖς καὶ μηδὲν κεκτημένους (XV. 37, p. 230,34f).

A similar view is held by Thomas Aquinas who argues that whoever sees the divine essence cannot turn away from God willingly, but remains firmly rooted in his love for ever.¹⁷

16. Origen, *de Princ.* 2.8:2, VHP. 16, p. 310, 14f; Basil, *Quod Deus non est Auctor Malorum.* VI, PG. 31, 344.

17. Th. Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* I. 94.1. Aquinas' intention is to argue that Adam's contemplation of the divine essence was not complete as Augustine thought, but partial; thus his fall is easier explained.

III. The Consequences of the Fall.

Macarius, like other Church Fathers, very often refers to the fall and its consequences. The fall is the most terrible and disastrous event for man. This and Christ's coming form the two poles around which human history develops. The consequences of the fall, according to Macarius and other Fathers, are numerous and of various natures. In this chapter the writer intends to discuss them under the following subtitles:

- a) Man and God after the Fall.
- b) Man and Evil after the Fall.
- c) Man and the Physical World after the Fall.
- d) The Doctrine of Original Sin.

a) Man and God after the Fall.

God's initial plan for man was that he would make good use of all the potentialities given to him and that he would attain to the state of spiritual perfection. Man, however, with his disobedience lost the purity of his nature (cf. XI. 3, p. 199, 30f) and, therefore, he failed to obtain what God had promised him. The loss, in Macarius' own words, was double:

‘Ο Ἀδάμ τὴν ἐντολὴν παραβάς κατὰ δύο τρόπους ἀπώλετο· ἓνα μὲν ὅτι ἀπώλεσε τὸ κτῆμα τὸ καθαρὸν τῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ, τὸ ὠραῖον τὸ κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν Θεοῦ· ἕτερον δέ, ὅτι ἀπώλεσεν αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα, ἐν ἣ ἀπέκειτο αὐτῷ κατ’ ἀπαγγελίαν ἢ ἐπουράνιος πᾶσα κληρονομία. “Ὡσπερ ἐὰν ἦ νόμισμα τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ βασιλέως ἔχον καὶ τοῦτο παραχαραγῆ, ὁ χρυσὸς τε ἀπώλετο καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν οὐ χρησιμύει, τοῦτο ἔπαθε καὶ ὁ Ἀδάμ· μέγας γὰρ πλοῦτος καὶ μεγάλη κληρονομία εὐτρέπιστο αὐτῷ. (XII. 1, p. 205,29f).

In other words, by sinning Adam lost the purity of his original nature and, moreover, he lost the heavenly inheritance which was prepared for him. Thus, the divine plan for man was cancelled. The divine grace was withdrawn from him, and as a result he was deprived of all the blessings which were derived from God's grace: one of them was immortality. Man made himself subject to physical and spiritual death (*De Libertate Ment.* 26, vl. 42, p. 248,6f). Macarius and other Fathers see death as a normal sequence of his dreadful act rather than a penalty imposed on him. God, together with his angels and the physical

world, lamented man's death. Macarius describes the moment with a touch of deep emotion: *καὶ πεσόντος τοῦ Ἀδάμ καὶ ἀποθανόντος ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἔκλαυσεν αὐτὸν ὁ Ποιητής, ἄγγελοι, πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις, οὐρανοί, γῆ, καὶ πάντα τὰ κτίσματα ἐπένησαν ἐπὶ τῷ θανάτῳ καὶ τῇ πτώσει αὐτοῦ· τὸν γὰρ δοθέντα αὐτοῖς βασιλέα δοῦλον εἶδον γεγονότα ἐναντίας καὶ πονηρᾶς δυνάμεως* (XXX. 7, p. 301,17f). Adam's expulsion from paradise had, beside its penal significance, an educational meaning. It was meant to discourage similar conduct in the future and to teach him that he should depend for everything upon God (XII. 10, p. 209, 4-12).

Death, moreover, was not restricted to the protoplasts but passed on to Adam's descendants (XL. 9, 202,9). This was according to nature's law since man was by nature mortal and only by grace immortal. What was natural to him was not lost after the fall; the most important natural property retained after the fall was man's free will (cf. XV. 40, p. 231,29f).

b) Man and Evil after the Fall.

The alienation of Adam from God excluded the presence of God's grace in him and entailed the presence of the evil powers in him (cf. XII. 6-8, pp. 207, 33-208, 24; VI. 5, p. 185, 30f). The devil became man's master (XV. 34, 229, 25) and enthroned himself in the entire man: *Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ σκότους ἀπὸ τῆς παραβάσεως τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐνεκάθισαν εἰς τὴν καρδίαν καὶ εἰς τὸν νοῦν καὶ εἰς τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἀδάμ ὡς εἰς θρόνον ἴδιον* (VI. 5, p. 185,31f). Man naturally belongs to God (*Ibid.* line 30) and not to the devil; for this reason Macarius writes that the evil powers seated themselves in man as their own throne (*Ibid.*). The fact that the devil took up the whole nature of man made necessary that Christ should take up the entire nature of man, the body included: *ὁ Σατανᾶς... καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ σκότους... ἐνεκάθισαν... καὶ εἰς τὸν νοῦν καὶ εἰς τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἀδάμ ὡς εἰς θρόνον ἴδιον. Λοιπὸν οὖν διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθεν ὁ Κύριος, καὶ ἔλαβεν ἐκ Παρθένου τὸ σῶμα* (*Ibid.*, lines 32-35).

Moreover, Adam's sin, continues Macarius, made Adam a legal subject to the devil's dominion. Macarius puts in Christ's mouth a phrase which recognizes that after the fall man belongs legally to the devil: *Ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ πρώτου Ἀδάμ ἐχρεώστησέ σοι, καὶ δικαίως αὐτοῦ κατέχεις τὰ χειρόγραφα* (XI. 10 p. 202,25f; cf. I. 7, p. 149,28f). This view provides the theoretical basis for one of the main theories of redemption, namely the theory of ransom, which is discussed in the next

chapter. The new master of man, however, and his works are something foreign to man's nature, since man was created according to God's image and not the devil's image: ξένον γὰρ τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν, τὴν κακίαν τῶν παθῶν διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ πρώτου ἀνθρώπου ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐδεξάμεθα (IV. 8, p. 161, 24f). Macarius and other Fathers¹⁸ see the sinful state of man as a *παρὰ φύσιν* state (IV. 1, p. 158, 19f). However, in spite of this, evil gradually expanded its power to the whole of man (XXIV. 2, p. 265,11f), and saturated man with sin; man became a subject to sin: ἐκτραπέντος γὰρ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῆς ἐντολῆς καὶ ὑπὸ ἀπόφρασιν ὀργῆς γεγενημένου, λαβοῦσα αὐτὸν ὑποχείριον ἡ ἁμαρτία, καὶ αὐτὴ ὡσπερ ἄβυσσός τις πικρίας ἐν βαθύτητι καὶ λεπτότητι τυγχάνουσα, εἰσελθοῦσα ἔνδον, τὰς νομάς τῆς ψυχῆς κατέσχευεν ἕως τῶν βαθυτάτων αὐτῆς ταμείων (XLI. 1, p. 325,19f). Having conquered man, the powers of evil lead him to the state of *παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος* (II. 2, p. 153,23f; XLII. 3, p. 327,14f). Man in this state has a broken personality: ἄλλο τὸν ἄνθρωπον... ὁ πονηρός... κατέσπασεν (II. 2, p. 153,24f); moreover, man's original image faded out (XI. 4 and 5, p. 200,9 and 21; XII. 1, p. 205,30f), but the demolition of man was not total (XII. 2, p. 206,6f). In his new state man acquired another nature which is stained by sin (II. 1, p. 153,10f) and communicative to the powers of evil and not to God and his angels as it was originally meant to be (cf. XXVI. 13, p. 276,36f). The peak of this sinful relation is a spiritual fornication between man's soul and the devil (*Ibid.*, p. 277,4f). Moreover, man's soul, being originally full of light (XXX. 7, p. 301,16), became blind by the darkness of sin (XX. 7, p. 259, 36f). Darkness covered the soul of fallen man (XVII. 3, p. 243, 38) and became the garment of the sinful soul (XXX. 7, 301,21). Even *nous*, the most important of soul's members (VIII. 8, p. 189,5f; XL 5, p. 324,12), which functions as the eye of the soul (VII. 8, p. 189,10f), was also conquered by the devil (II.1, p. 153,12f; XXVIII. 19, p. 290,15f) and clothed with the garment of darkness (II. 1, 153,14). *Nous* could originally see God (XX. 4, p. 258,37), but now covered as it is cannot communicate with God (*On Patience*. 5, vol. 42 p. 203,23f). Away from God the *nous* became a throne for the devil (VI. 5, 185,33f), and is directed towards the present age (XXIV. 1, p. 265,1f; IV. 6, p. 161,3f). Finally, the devil conquered man's volitional faculty, which plays a

18. Cf. Nemesius, *de Natura Hominis*, PG. 40, 673BC. The Fathers speak of three states of being: Τρεῖς εἰσι νοητοὶ τρόποι οἷς ὁ νοῦς ἐκ μεταβολῆς εἰσέρχεται· κατὰ φύσιν, παρὰ φύσιν, ὑπὲρ φύσιν; see Marcus the Hermit, *Opuscula*, II, 83, PG. 65, 941C.

decisive role in man's development towards either direction (XV. 40, p. 231,31f).¹⁹

In spite of this dark description of fallen man Macarius does not believe that the destruction was as severe as Augustine holds.²⁰ There is hope for man since man's nature retained its own substance and remained distinct and different from that of evil. The soul and the sin simply co-exist; their mixture is impossible: οὐ συνεκράθη δὲ οὕτως, ὅν τρόπον τινὲς λέγουσιν τὴν μεῖζιν τοῦ οἴνου καὶ τοῦ ὕδατος, ἀλλ' ὥς ἐστὶν ἐν μιᾷ χώρᾳ ὁ οἶτος καθ' αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ ζιζάνια καθ' αὐτά· ὥς ἐστὶν ἐν οἴκῳ ὁ ληστής κατ' ἰδίαν καὶ ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης κατ' ἰδίαν (XVI. 1, p. 237,17f). This is a very important doctrine of Macarius and it comes up again in another passage (II. 2, p. 153, 37f). This view, moreover, stands against the Messianic doctrines,²¹ as we shall see below.

The impossibility of the mixture mentioned above makes man's repentance possible. There are moments when the soul comes to itself, repents for what it has done, weeps and prays and remembers God (XVI. 2, p. 237,27f). The evil, however, remains²² deeply rooted in man (XL. 1, p. 325,23f) always active throughout his life, regardless of the state of his spiritual growth. As we shall see below, evil retains its place in man's heart even in the case of those who have purified themselves and made their hearts a dwelling place for God's grace (XLI. 2, p. 325, 30f).

c) Man and the Physical World after the Fall.

The physical world fell together with Adam.²³ He had been the lord of all creatures and when he was taken up by evil the whole creation which served him and ministered to him was seized with him (XI. 5, p. 5, p. 200,19f). The world which up to then was under man's dominion revolted against Adam; after his fall, on all sides contrariety has come down to man (XXI. 2, p. 261,13f). The fall resulted in two opposing

19. For details see below chapter III.

20. Augustine, *de diversis Quaestionibus ad Simplicianum*, II. 6, PL. 40, 134; *de Correctione et Gratia*, 28, PL. 44, 933. Augustine calls the line of Adam a mass of slime, a mass of sin, a mass of death, of damnation, of offence, a mass of totally vitiated damnable; see E. Portalie, *Op. Cit.*, p. 212.

21. A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism*, vol. II, p. 135.

22. Concerning this see also G. Quispel, *Makarius, Das Thomas Evangelium und das Lied von der Perle*, p. 10.

23. See also Basil, *In Hex Hom.* V. 6, PG. 29, 105BC. where he holds that the rose grew thorns after the fall as a sign of nature's fall.

worlds, this *aion* and the *aion* above. The Christian, therefore, must deny this world and live in accordance with the world above (XXIV. 1, p. 265,1f). Macarius, however, does not take this view to the extreme; he never loses sight of the fact that the material world, like man, is of divine origin. The world in its fallen state appears to Macarius alien rather than evil. Macarius could take such a stand on the material world because he shares with other Fathers²⁴ the belief that the cause of sin lies in the will and not in the body.

When the prefallen state of man is regained the original relationship between him and the world is restored. Ascetic literature underlines this point quite often and provides examples of ascetics who lived in harmony even with the wild beasts. In his *Vita Antonii* Athanasius writes that Antony persuaded the animals not to disturb his peace or ravage his garden.²⁵ Moreover, ascetic literature and Byzantine iconography have often as a theme wild beasts obeying and serving holy men.²⁶

d) The Doctrine of Original Sin.

In Eastern patristic thought the term *original sin* refers not so much to the personal sin of the protoplasts in paradise as to the consequences of this sin passed on to Adam's descendants. As Dositheus of Jerusalem (d. 1707), a late Eastern ecclesiastical writer, puts it, original sin is *ἕπερ ὡς ποιῆν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ διὰ τὴν παράβασιν δέδωκεν ἡ θεία δικαιοσύνη ὅλον ἰδρωτάς τῶν πόνων, θλίψεις, σωματικὰς ἀσθενείας, ὠδύνας τοῦ τίκτειν, τὸ ζῆν ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐπιπόνως καὶ τελευταῖον τὸν θάνατον.*²⁷

Western theology, however, following the Augustinian doctrine of original sin, teaches that Adam's descendants inherit not only the consequences mentioned above, but they also participate in the guilt of Adam's sin.²⁸

The Biblical foundation for the doctrine of original sin is found in the Epistles of Paul, where he writes that *διὰ τοῦτο ὡςπερ δι' ἐνός*

24. A. H. Armstrong, *St. Augustine and Christian Platonism*, p. 11.

25. Athanasius, *Vita Antonii*. L. PG. 26, 917C.

26. Cf. *Vita Johann. Hesychaste*. 212. 4-14, quoted in D. Chity, *Op. Cit.*, p. 112.

27. Dositheos of Jerusalem, *Homologia: Horos VI*, quoted by P. Demetropoulos, *Anthropologia Megalou Athanasiou*, p. 91f.

28. H. W. Robinson, *Op. Cit.*, p. 17. E. Portalie argues that Augustine was not the first Father to claim that all men share the guilt of Adam's sin; see his *Op. Cit.*, p. 207.

ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰσῆλθεν... καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἤμαρτον (Rom. V. 12). The Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists did not develop the doctrine of original sin, since they were occupied by other theological interests. Irenaeus, however, took up this doctrine and made the attempt to work out a comprehensive theory for both original sin and redemption.²⁹ The doctrine of original sin was further developed by Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria, and it is found in the writing of the Cappadocian and the Antiochian Fathers.³⁰

In the West, Augustine was the favoured teacher on original sin. His writings greatly influenced Western theology and led it to take a somehow different view on original sin than that accepted by the majority of the Eastern Fathers. According to the Western tradition, Adam's sin is inherited by his descendants who lack the freedom of choice. Adam had exercised it and sinned for the whole human race. The Eastern Church, however, understands original sin as a kind of illness which affects the whole of human nature and leads it to sin. Each individual, even in his fallen state, preserves his freedom (cf. XV. 40, p. 231,29f; XXXVII. 10, p. 319,13f) and is totally responsible for his actions. Each man repeats and imitates Adam's fault, but does not partake in its guilt.³¹ In other words, according to the Western Church, Adam has sinned on behalf of all mankind, while according to the Eastern Church every man is the 'Adam' of his soul³².

Macarius shares with the other Eastern Fathers the belief that there is a unity of mankind with its first ancestor, and, therefore, he assumes that our fall was involved in the fall of the protoplasts. This solidarity explains in Macarius' thought man's proness to sin: 'Ἄλλ' ὥσπερ ὁ Ἀδάμ

29. J. Kelly, *Op. Cit.*, p. 170.

30. F. R. Tennant, *Op. Cit.*, chapter XIII.

31. J. Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Chr. Thought*, p. 117; see also H. W. Robinson, *Op. Cit.*, p. 171.

32. J. Kelly notes that there is hardly a hint in the Greek Fathers that mankind as a whole shares in Adam's guilt. However, he points out that there are some passages which suggest that certain Greek Fathers speak of the 'transmitted' sin of Adam, which seems to them to call for purification rather than for punishment; see his *Op. Cit.*, p. 350f. Augustine stresses man's solidarity with Adam and argues that every one is co-responsible for Adam's perverse choice. In Macarius' thought, as we shall see right below, this solidarity does not imply that the entire human race shares with Adam his guilt, but it simply explains how man's nature is prone to sin; cf. J. Kelly, *Op. Cit.*, p. 364.

παραβάς ζύμην κακίας παθῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ὑπεδέξατο καὶ οὕτω κατὰ μετοχὴν οἱ ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεννηθέντες καὶ πᾶν τὸ γένος Ἀδάμ ἐκείνης τῆς ζύμης μετέσχε (XXIV. 2, p. 265,14f). As it has been indicated before, this «leaven of evil» is not an element of the original make up of man, but it is something which followed the fall and is inherited by all men (*Ibid.*). Thus, Macarius is in agreement with the main stream of the Christian tradition according to which the entire human race inherits the consequences of Adam's fall. Macarius, however, nowhere argues that Adam's descendants participate in the guilt of his sin.³³

It is noteworthy that in spite of the numerous Pauline quotations one finds in the *Homilies*, the text of Rom. V.12, which has provided the Biblical basis for the Augustinian understanding of original sin, is not found in the *Homilies*.³⁴

It seems that, according to Macarius, man inherits all the consequences of the fall Adam faced, save the guilt and the responsibility for the fall. Macarius names these consequences in his writings. In *Homily* XII. 1, as we have seen, he argues that Adam lost the image and the likeness, and explains that the loss was double, i.e. he lost the purity and the beauty of his original nature and, moreover, the heavenly inheritance, promised to him by God (p. 205,31f). Another term which Macarius seems to use interchangeably with εἰκὼν Θεοῦ is ἔνδυμα φωτός.³⁵ Thus, he associates the state of fall with darkness (XL III. 7, p. 330,23f; XLVIII. 5, p. 349,41). The word light has a central place in the Macarian vocabulary.

Immortality, moreover, which, as we have seen, was not a natural element of man's original make up, but dependent upon God's grace, was also lost after the fall (XI. 9, p. 202,6f), and, therefore, the

33. In his *Byzantine Theology*, J. Meyendorff notes that the Greek patristic understanding of man never denies the unity of mankind, but, nevertheless, it relates Adam's fall to each individual the same way salvation brought by Christ is related to each individual; neither of them, i. e., sin and salvation, can be realized in an individual, without involving his personal and free responsibility; see p. 143f. Macarius explains in detail how man participates and makes his own both sin and salvation.

34. Though Paul's Letters represent approximately 28% of the New Testament Writings, Macarius' references to Paul represent 56-58% of his New Testament references. From this it is clear that Macarius over-uses Paul; this, however, makes one wonder whether he avoided Rom, V. 12 intentionally or not.

35. G. Quispel, *Macarius, Das Thomas Evangelium und Das Lied von Der Perle*, p. 58.

whole human race became subject to death (*Ibid.*, p. 202,7). Gregory of Nyssa³⁶ explains that death does not dissolve the image but only the corporeal part of man since it was through the senses man went astray. Mortality was taken from the irrational nature of the animals and it was added to man's nature which was made for immortality.

Macarius has often been accused of Pelagianism, but on the question of death he holds a different opinion than that of the Pelagians, who believed that Adam was created mortal and would have died anyhow, whether he sinned or not.³⁷

The fall, moreover, removed Adam away from God's grace and made him the legal property of Satan (XI. 10, p. 202,23f; XV. 34, p. 229, 25) and a slave of the passions of the flesh (XXV. 3, p. 261,13f). The passions form a *παρὰ φύσιν* element (IV. 1, p. 158,19), as we have seen, which was introduced into man's pure nature after the fall; this strange element became quasi-natural to man because of the continuous persistence in it: *ξένον γὰρ τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν, τὴν κακίαν τῶν παθῶν διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ πρώτου ἀνθρώπου ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐδεξάμεθα, ἦν καὶ ὡσπερ φύσιν ἡμῶν καταστᾶσαν συνηθεία.* (IV. 8, p. 161,24f). The passions, moreover, pollute the nature of man (I. 4, p. 354,13), which originally was pure (IV. 8, p. 161,28). The devil motivates the passions and through them pollutes the entire man, i.e. body and soul (II. 2, p. 153,23f). Macarius often calls the passions *πάθη σαρκός* (XXV. 3, p. 268,26f), but he ascribes them to the soul rather than to the body: *ὁ γὰρ φαινόμενος οὗτος κόσμος καὶ ἡ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀνάπαυσις, ὅσα τῷ σῶμα δοκοῦσιν θάλλειν, τοσοῦτον τῆς ψυχῆς τὰ πάθη παροξύνουσι καὶ ἀξίουσιν αὐτῆς τὴν κάκωσιν* (XLV. 3, p. 336,33f). Therefore, this indicates that, as it has been pointed out before, the word *sarx* refers to the sinful state of man rather than to his body. In Macarius' thought man's soul and his nature in general in its fallen state is polluted, as we have seen, *τετραυματισμένη, πεπληγωμένη* (XXVII. 10, p. 283,32), *ἔρημος* and *ἀγριωθεῖσα* (XLIV. 2, p. 332,6; XXIII. 2, p. 264,1). What brings man's soul to the state of wildness is certainly the absence of the Holy Spirit; if man exposes himself to the influence of the Holy Spirit the latter can tame his soul (XXIII. 2, p. 264,7).

36. Gregory, of Nyssa, *Oratio Catechetica*, VII, PG. 45, 33CD. Gregory, however, regards immortality as a prerogative of man's nature through his being made in the image of God; cf. *Op. Cit.*, V. PG. 45, 21D; see also J. T. Muckie, *Op. Cit.*, p. 64 f, where the issue of immortality is discussed.

37. J. Kelly, *Op. Cit.*, p. 361.

In the condition described above Adam's nature passes to posterity and, therefore, each man, having inherited such a nature, finds himself, on the one hand, prone to earthly pleasures and interests which Christians are to give up, and on the other hand, man finds himself captured by the evil powers, which hinder him from loving God as much as he would like to:

Κατὰ δύο γὰρ τρόπους καὶ δεσμούς ἐδέθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος, παραβάς τὴν ἐντολὴν καὶ ἐξορισθεὶς τοῦ παραδείσου ἐν τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ, ἐν τοῖς βιοτικοῖς πράγμασι καὶ ἐν τῇ τοῦ κόσμου ἀγάπῃ, ἤγουν τῶν σαρκικῶν ἡδονῶν καὶ παθῶν, πλοῦτου καὶ δόξης καὶ κτημάτων, γυναικὸς καὶ τέκνων, συγγενείας, πατρίδων, τόπων, ἐνδυμάτων, καὶ ἀπαξιαπλῶς πάντων τῶν φαινομένων, ἀφ' ὧν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ κελεύει αὐτὸν λυθῆναι ἰδίᾳ προαιρέσει. Ἐπειδὴ εἰς πάντα τὰ φαινόμενα ἐκουσίως ἕκαστος δέδεται, ἵνα τούτων πάντων ἑαυτὸν λύσας καὶ ἐλευθερώσας δυνηθῇ τελείως τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐγκρατῆς γενέσθαι. Καὶ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ δὲ περιπετριγχῶται καὶ περιπέφρακται καὶ περιτετείχισται καὶ δέδεται ἀλύσει σκότους ἡ ψυχὴ ὑπὸ τῶν τῆς πονηρίας πνευμάτων, μὴ δυναμένη, ὡς θέλει, ἀγαπᾶν τὸν Κύριον καὶ ὡς θέλει πιστεύειν καὶ ὡς θέλει προσεύξασθαι (XXI. 2, p. 261,1f).

This passage of Macarius reminds one of Paul in Romans VII. 15-25 where Paul speaks of the two *nomoi*, i.e. the law of God and the law of sin, which arrays against the law of God. Man in his fallen state has lost his coherency: the λογισμοὶ of his soul are scattered away from God and mingled with material and earthly thoughts (XXIV. 2, p. 265,11f); his inner self is polluted, broken and wounded (II, 2, p. 153, 23f; XX. 4, p. 258,36f; XXVII. 3, p. 283,31f), and his sentient part has become passionated and subject to death. The bodily maladies are the result of the fall; man before it was ἀπαθὴς καὶ ἄνοσος (XLVIII. 5, p. 350,2). Spiritual and physical death also came after the fall (*De Liber. Mentis*. 23, vol. 42, p. 248,6f). In other words, the fall affected the entire nature of man (XLIII, 7. p. 330,23f), and in this passionated state human nature passes to posterity: δῆλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐξ αὐτοῦ (Ἀδάμ) γεννηθέντες τοῖς αὐτοῖς πάθεισιν ὑποπεπτῶκασιν (XLVIII. 5, p. 350,2f). The idyllic life of paradise is over for the human race (cf. *Ibid.*,); mankind is now under God's double curse: ..ἐν τῇ παρακοῇ ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος θανάτῳ δεινῷ τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ κατάραν ἐπὶ κατάραν ἐδέξατο, τριβόλους... ἀνατελεῖ σοι ἡ γῆ· καὶ αὖθις· ἐργάση τὴν γῆν καὶ οὐ προσθήσει δοῦναί σοι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς (XLVII, 6, p. 343, 10f). Thus man became a slave and

an exile in this world of hard labour and toil (XLVII. 5, p. 249,37f).

This is how Macarius sees the fallen nature of man, which all people inherit. The general picture, however, of post-Adamic man is not as dark as Macarius occasionally depicts in some passages like this: ...τελευταῖον συμπαραβλήθημεν τοῖς ἀνοήτοις κτήνεσι καὶ ὁμοιώθημεν αὐτοῖς ἀποπεπτωκότες τῆς ἀχράντου δόξης... διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς δοῦλοι τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς παθῶν γενόμενοι ἀπεκλείσαμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῆς μακαρίας χώρας τῶν ζώντων (XXV. 3, p. 268,23f). Macarius, as we have seen, believes that the corruption of human nature was not absolute, but only partial. Man's nature retains after the fall part of its original goodness; ... οἶδεν ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ βλέπει ὅτι κατ' αὐτοῦ ποιεῖ, καὶ οὐ δύναται ἐπισχεῖν τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Διατί; Ἐπειδὴ ἔχει θέλημα τοῦ βοῆσαι πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, ἔχει φυσικοὺς καρποὺς τοῦ ἀγαπᾶσαι Θεόν, τοῦ πιστεῦσαι, τοῦ ἐπιζητῆσαι καὶ προσελθεῖν (XXVI. 10, p. 275,31f). However, the abilities of fallen man have limited power and cannot restore him to his original state; man certainly needs divine help: τὰ σὰ ἀ ποιεῖς, καλὰ μὲν ἐστὶ καὶ τῷ Θεῷ εὐπρόσδεκτα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι καθαρὰ. Οἷον ἀγαπᾶς τὸν Θεόν, ἀλλ' οὐ τελείως ἔρχεται ὁ Κύριος διδοὺς σοι ἀγάπην ἄτρεπτον τὴν ἐπουράνιον (XXVI. 21, 280,3f). Concerning the role of the divine factor and the human factor more is written in the following chapter.

Macarius' last view on the natural goodness of man is in agreement with Paul's view on the matter as he expresses it in Romans VII and in other passages. Moreover, Macarius is on this point in disagreement with Augustine,³⁸ without, however, holding Pelagian views.³⁹ The latter placed much more emphasis on man's natural abilities than Macarius did.

Finally, on the basis of what has been said so far in relation to Macarius' doctrine on the fall and original sin, one may say that, although Macarius does not seem to hold that Adam's descendants partake in the guilt of his sin, he, nevertheless, seems to relate the personal sin of each individual to Adam's sin, since the latter weakened and corrupted man's nature and, therefore, made man an easy prey for the devil. The personal sins are in a way a contentment of the passions, which were introduced into man's nature after the fall.

38. Concerning Augustine's views see A. H. Armstrong, *St. Augustine and Christian Platonism*, p. 24.

39. The Pelagian views are discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

FROM RESTORATION TO PERFECTION

I. The Doctrine of Redemption.

The fourth and fifth century Fathers were mainly interested in Trinitarian and Christological questions, and they never worked out a synthesis of a soteriological doctrine, but let different theories of redemption be found side by side in their works. Therefore, Macarius, whose main interests were educational rather than theological, should not be expected to be the author of any such doctrine. He is not even a consistent partisan of a particular theory. His approach to the question is very traditional, within the premisses of orthodox Eastern Christianity and free of any Evagriian and other peculiarities. Macarius sees post-Adamic man deprived of his pre-fallen qualities, wounded and ill, a miserable subject of the devil's dominion. Every human effort to break this dominion based only on man's abilities is doomed to fail (XXV. 1, p. 267, 25f). Man's desire and effort for salvation is a *conditio sine qua non*, but it is not a sufficient cause of it. Salvation is basically a gift from God to man, which, nevertheless, is actualized after a full co-operation (συνεργία) of God and man has been reached (XXVI. 255, 38f.). In the thought of Macarius, salvation is related to restoration to the original state;¹ it is the opposite of the fall: ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος παρέβη τὴν ἐντολήν, ὁ διάβολος ὄλην τὴν ψυχὴν ἐκάλυψε καλύμματι σκοτεινῷ. Λοιπὸν οὖν ἔρχεται ἡ χάρις καὶ ἀπεκδύεται ὅλον τὸ σκέπασμα, ὥστε λοιπὸν τὴν ψυχὴν καθαρὰν γενομένην καὶ ἀπολαβοῦσαν τὴν ἰδίαν φύσιν, τὸ κτίσμα τὸ ἁμωμον καὶ καθαρὸν, πάντοτε, ... τὴν δόξαν τοῦ φωτὸς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ καθορᾶν (XVII. 3, p. 243, 38f). In another passage Macarius develops this point and argues that after Christ's coming man can reach Adam's original state through the power of baptism and, moreover, he reveals that he understands the pre-fallen condition as a state of

1. Deification, however, is, in Macarius' opinion, above the original state of Adam, as we have seen above. Some Fathers do not identify the Kingdom of God with Paradise, and they hold that the former is superior to the latter; see G. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform*, p. 65.

freedom from passions and death (*Neue Hom.* I. 2, vol. 42, p. 36, 26f). Throughout his works and especially in *Homilies* II, XVII and XXV, Macarius emphasizes again and again that Christ is the only one who can bring salvation to fallen mankind. Macarius has a strictly Christocentric understanding of salvation and declares that neither the efforts of the individual person, as we saw above, nor the assistance one may receive from holy men can secure salvation. In the Old Testament Moses,² the other prophets and the patriarchs could not cure man, seriously wounded by sin; the priests offered sacrifices and performed all the other rituals but the soul could not get cured and cleansed (XX. 5 and 6, p. 259, 10-20). God, seeing the impasse man had come to, took council with his Son and they both decided, out of their pure love for man and not out of any necessity in the Anselmian way,³ the incarnation of the Logos, so that man could be saved. (XV, 44, p. 233,6f.). Besides his Son, God has also ordered the angels to assist in man's restoration (*Ibid.*).

In order to see what Macarius says on the particular way Christ redeemed mankind, and on the character of Christ's expiation, we are going to present his views in relation to the three main theories of salvation prevailing in his period.⁴

a) *The Physical or Mystical Theory.*

According to this theory incarnation is the main event in God's saving plan. Christ assumed man, who was stained by sin and had become subject to death. With his incarnation Christ summed up the

2. Basil argues that men like Moses could not appease God even for their own sins; see *Hom. in Psalm XLVII.* 4, PG. 39, 440c.

3. According to Anselm (c. 1033-1109), fallen man is powerless to restore the order of justice which was broken by man, so God himself, in his mercy, intervenes to satisfy his own order of *Justitia* in the work of Christ the true God and perfect man. Man, by his incorporation into Christ's sinless humanity receives the benefits of Christ's atoning sacrifice. R. D. Crouse argues that in Anselm's thought *justitia* should not be understood in terms of legal justice or even of moral righteousness. The essential content of the term for him is rectitude of order, which has its source in God and embraces the whole order of creation. Crouse's thesis is against a common belief of modern scholars according to which Anselm's treatment of redemption is legalistic; see R. D. Crouse, "The Augustinian Background of St. Anselm's Concept of *justitia*", in *Canadian Journal of Theology*, vol. IV (1958), no 2, pp. 112-114.

4. An account of theories of redemption is given by the following: H. E. W. Turner, *The Patristic Doctrine of Redemption*; G. K. Mosley, *The Doctrine of Atonement*; G. Aulén, *Christus Victor*; R. S. Franks, *The Works of Christ*.

whole human race, which by coming in contact with Christ received life and grace again (cf. *Seven Hom.* I, 4, vol. 42, p. 11, 17f; *Ibid.* II. 4, p. 16, 11f).

The basis of this theory is found in Paul's Epistles (Eph. I. 10; Rom. 5.12-21; I Cor. 15.22 and 45); this was developed by Irenaeus, who related redemption to original sin, by Athanasius, the Cappadocians and other Fathers mainly in the East. This theory provided the starting point for Athanasius' Trinitarian doctrine: In order that incarnation could be an efficient means for salvation, the incarnate Christ must have been fully God. Moreover, Christ should have assumed the whole of human nature, i.e. both body and soul, and not part of it, as Apollinaris had argued.⁵ Gregory Nazianzen wrote: What had not been assumed cannot be restored; it is what is united with God that is saved.⁶

Macarius proves to be aware of the theological implications involved in this theory and argues in an anti-Apollinarian way that the incarnate Christ assumed both human body and soul: Οὕτως εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεός, ὅτι κατελθὼν ἐξ ἀγίων οὐρανῶν συμπεριέλαβεν τὴν φύσιν σου τὴν λογικὴν, τὴν σάρκα τὴν ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ συνεκέρασε τῷ θεϊκῷ αὐτοῦ Πνεύματι, ἵνα καὶ σὺ ὁ χοϊκὸς δέξῃ τὴν ἐπουράνιον ψυχὴν (XXXII. 6, p. 308, 2f; cf. IV. 10, p. 162, 13f). In another passage, speaking again against those who were reluctant to accept Christ's human nature, he points out that it was necessary for Christ to take up the entire human nature, the body included, since this had been taken up by the evil powers after the fall:

Ὅμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ σκότους ἀπὸ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐνεκάθισαν εἰς τὴν καρδίαν καὶ εἰς τὸν νοῦν καὶ εἰς τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἀδάμ ὡς εἰς θρόνον ἴδιον. Λοιπὸν οὖν διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθεν ὁ Κύριος, καὶ ἔλαβεν ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου τὸ σῶμα. Εἰ γὰρ ἠθέλησε γυμνῇ τῇ θεότητι κατελθεῖν, τίς ἠδύνατο ὑπενεγκεῖν; Ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ ὄργανου τοῦ σώματος ἐλάλει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Λοιπὸν οὖν τὰ πνεύματα τῆς πονηρίας, ἃ ἐκαθέζοντο εἰς τὸ σῶμα, καθεῖλεν ἀπὸ τῶν θρόνων τῶν νοημάτων καὶ τῶν λογισμῶν, οἷς ἐνεπολιτεύοντο καὶ ἐκαθάρισεν τὴν συνείδησιν ὁ Κύριος, καὶ ἑαυτῷ θρόνον ἐποίησε τὸν νοῦν καὶ τοὺς λογισμοὺς καὶ τὸ σῶμα (VI. 5, p. 185, 31f).

In addition to the reasons given above for the incarnation, Macarius argues also that this made the communication between Christ and man

5. J. Kelly, *Op. Cit.*, p. 292.

6. Gregory Nazianzen, *Epistula*. 101. 7.

possible; the human body of Christ became a useful instrument for this communication (*Ibid.*).

With his incarnation Christ set a new beginning for mankind and became the heavenly and last Adam⁷ (XVI. 8, p. 240,5; XXI. 4, p. 293,24). In contrast to the first Adam, who introduced death (XI. 10, p. 202,7) and all the other consequences of the fall, Christ came to change, alter, renew and reform the broken nature of fallen man (XLIV. 1, p. 331, 23f); thus, he became the father of a new race: that of the Christians (XVI. 8, p. 240, 4f; cf. XXX. 2, p. 299, 6f), which has been given again the original cleanness of Adam (XXVI. 1, p. 272, 24). Macarius attributes a great importance to Christ's mission and uses four verbs to describe his task, i.e. ἀλλάξει, μεταβαλεῖν, ἀνακαινίσει and ἀνακτίσει, as we saw above (XLIV. 1, p. 331, 24f). From these verbs it is clear that in Macarius, and the Christian soteriology in general, Christ works out a new man by purifying the nature of fallen man and vivifying the half-destroyed good properties of his original nature; in other words he does not make a new creature from the beginning, but he uses the old material to make the new man (*Ibid.*); cf. IX. 1, p. 191, 40f).

In his battle with Satan, Christ defeated him by his humility; he followed the way opposite to Adam's, namely pride, which became fatal for both Adam and his descendants (XVII. 5, p. 284, 28f). Thus, incarnation opened for man the way to union with God (IV. 10, p. 162,12f) and made man's deification possible. This is the reason why this theory of salvation is also called the theory of union or the mystical theory.

b) *The Realistic Theory.*

This theory lays the emphasis not on the incarnation but on the suffering of Christ, who took man's place on the cross and offered sacrifice and oblation to God.

The realistic theory attracted Macarius' attention more than the previous theory. Throughout his works Macarius refers to the redemptive role of Christ's blood and sufferings in general. His death on the cross was the completion of God's redemptive plan, which had originally started with Moses's law and the prophets (XXX. 2. 299, 2f). Christ was both the good shepherd who lays down his life for his sheep and the

7. In *Neue Hom.* XIX. vol. 42, p. 95,30 Christ is also called ὁ δεύτερος Ἀδάμ.

spotless lamb sacrificed for the benefit of mankind (XLIV. 3, p. 332, 21f). The sprinkling with his blood causes man's soul to grow wings and fly freely towards the divine (XLVII. 2, p. 342,6f). Christ's blood is also related to the sacrament of the Eucharist, which leads the faithful to immortality (XXVII. 17, p. 289, 21f; IV. 12, p. 163, 13f).

Moreover, Christ's blood is interpreted by Macarius as a ransom paid by Christ on behalf of mankind for its freedom (XXIV. 3, p. 265, 24f; XLVII. 8, p. 344, 3f). However, it is not clear whether this was paid to God the Father or to Satan, as Irenaeus and Origen had argued.⁸

A. Harnack⁹ and other Western scholars have claimed that the idea of sacrifice is essentially alien to the Greek Fathers. This is certainly not true for Macarius, nor for Athanasius¹⁰ or Basil,¹¹ who wrote that Christ offered himself to his Father once and forever as an expiatory sacrifice. It seems that Macarius and the other Fathers mentioned above were not satisfied with the idea that incarnation has exalted human nature. They also felt that man was under the sentence of death and, therefore, that the debt also had to be paid: «It still remained to pay the debt which all owed, since all, as I have explained, were doomed to death. That is why, after revealing His Godhead by His works, it remained for Him to offer the sacrifice for all».¹² The difference between the Eastern and Western Fathers on this point is on the emphasis they put on the importance of Christ's sufferings. The theory and the practice of *μίμησης Χριστοῦ* are not unknown in the Christian East. Elements of it are found in Macarius (*Neue Hom.* IX. 1, vol. 42, p. 62,9f; *Ep. Magna.* 17, vol. 42, p. 157,28f; *De Libert. Mentis.* 13, vol. 42, p. 242,19f) and other Eastern Fathers; this theory, moreover, is found at a developed stage in *The Meditations on the Cross and the Passions* written in Greek by the Syrian Abbot Isaias (d. 488).¹³

8. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* V. 1.1; Origen, *In Matth.* 16,8, VHP, 14, p. 43f; Kelly, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 185f and 375f. Basil prefers to say that Christ offered *ἑαυτὸν τῷ Θεῷ ὡς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν* see *Hom in Psalm XXVIII*, 5, PG. 29. 296B.

9. A von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, vol. II, 4. quoted in M. Orphanos, *Op. Cit.*, p. 108f.

10. Athanasius, *Contra Arianos*, II. 66, PG. 26, 288B. Similar views are also found in Origen, Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory Nazianzen; see G. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform*, p. 154.

11. Basil, *Hom. in Psalm XXVI.* 5, PG. 29, 296 B.

12. Athanasius, *Contra Arianos*. II. 59, quoted in J. Kelly, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 379-80.

13. G. Ladner, *Op. Cit.*, p. 155 note 9.

c) *The Satan's Rights Theory.*

This theory is found in writings of early Fathers in both the East and West¹⁴ and holds that after the fall man became the legal property of Satan. Macarius, following this tradition, argues that because of his obedience to the devil Adam sold himself to him (cf. I. 7, p. 149, 28). This precious captive of the devil could not be set free without a sufficient ransom. Therefore, Christ undertook to pay it and thus claimed all men to be given back to him. This last claim has been dramatically described by Macarius. Christ is presented as accepting the legality of the devil's claims on man, but arguing that since he has never sinned, he owes nothing to the devil and, therefore, is not subject to death:

ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν θάνατον καὶ διαλέγεται αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος καὶ προστάσσει τοῦ ἐκβαλεῖν ἐκ τοῦ Ἄδου τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ ἀποδοῦναι αὐτῷ. Ἴδου οὗτος πρὸς ταῦτα ταρασσόμενος εἰσέρχεται πρὸς τοὺς διακόνους αὐτοῦ καὶ συνάξει πάσας τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ προσφέρει ὁ ἄρχων τῆς πονηρίας τὰ χειρόγραφα καὶ λέγει· «Ἴδε οὗτοι ὑπήκουσαν τῷ λόγῳ μου· ἴδε ὅπου προσεκύνησαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι. Ὁ δὲ Θεός, δικαιοκρίτης ὢν, κάκει δείκνυσι τὸ δίκαιον αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ. Ὑπήκουσέ σοι ὁ Ἀδάμ καὶ κατέσχευε αὐτοῦ πάσας τὰς καρδίας· ὑπήκουσέ σε ἡ ἀνθρωπότης. Τὸ ἐμὸν σῶμα τί ποιεῖ ὄδω; Τοῦτο ἀναμάρτητόν ἐστιν. Ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ πρώτου Ἀδάμ ἐχρεώστησέ σοι, καὶ δικαίως αὐτοῦ κατέχεις τὰ χειρόγραφα. Ἐμοὶ δὲ πάντες μαρτυροῦσιν ὅτι οὐχ ἡμαρτον οὐ χρεωστῶ σοι οὐδέν... Ἐξαγοράζω οὖν τὸ σῶμα τὸ πραθέν σοι διὰ τοῦ πρώτου Ἀδάμ, παραλύω σου τὰ χειρόγραφα. Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀπέδωκα τὰ χρέη τοῦ Ἀδάμ σταυρωθεὶς καὶ κατελθὼν ἐν τῷ Ἄδῃ. Καὶ κελεύω σοι, ἕδη καὶ σκότος καὶ θάνατε, ἐκβαλε τὰς ἐγκλεισμένας ψυχὰς τοῦ Ἀδάμ». Καὶ οὕτω λοιπὸν αἱ πονηραὶ δυνάμεις τρομάξασαι ἀποδιδούσι τὸν ἐγκλεισμένον Ἀδάμ. (XI. 10, p. 202,15f).

From this passage it is clear that Macarius sees Adam as recapitulating the entire human race, which Macarius thinks inherits from Adam the sentence of death. Moreover, Macarius argues that since the law of death was established by sin and Christ is free of sin, he should not have been subject to death. His death was an act of abuse on the

14. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* V. 1, PG. 7, 1124; Origen, *Hom. in Matth.*, XII. 8; Terullian, *De Fuga in Persec.* IV.; Augustine, *De Trin.* XIII. 15. Concerning this theory see also A. Theodorou, «Peri Dikaiomaton tou Satana», in *Theologia*, vol. XXVIII (1957), p. 103f. and H. Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, pp. 243f and 303f.

part of the devil, which certainly deprived the devil of his legal dominion over man. Christ also recapitulates mankind and, therefore, could argue that his death has purchased the body of Adam, i.e. the entire human race.

The way God handles the whole case is, according to Macarius, indicative of his justice; God is a just judge and displayed this even in the case of the devil (*Ibid.*), whom Macarius regards as the prince of every malice (V. 3, p. 172,14). Other Fathers elaborating on this issue, point out that God did not deprive the devil of his dominion by force, as he could have done; this came as a legal penalty for abusing his position.¹⁵

Gregory of Nyssa¹⁶ and other Fathers argue that the devil was finally deceived by taking Christ to be a mere man. Christ, however, being God at the same time could not be kept as a captive by death. Macarius only hints at this theory in the passage quoted above and in another passage where he argues that in the incarnation Christ concealed his own Godhead: *καὶ ἀπεστάλη ὁ Λόγος καὶ σάρκα ἐνδυσάμενος καὶ κρύψας τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θεότητα, ἵνα διὰ τοῦ ὁμοίου τὸ ὅμοιον σώσῃ, ἔθηκεν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ* (XV. 44, p. 233,8f; cf. XXVI. 25, p. 282,4).

Among the Cappadocians Basil is hesitant to accept that the ransom was paid to the devil, as Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose and Augustinus argue,¹⁷ and Gregory Nazianzen opposes the idea of a deceiving God.¹⁸ Opposed to it is also John Damascene.¹⁹ This idea, however, survived in the Eastern tradition through Chrysostom's *Catechetical Homily* read at the Easter liturgy and through Christmas hymnology.²⁰

The third theory of salvation is found in the Fathers of the fourth century. In the fifth century the tendency was to emphasize the realistic theory.²¹

Finally, there are passages in Macarius suggesting that both Christ's life and teaching are also of great redemptive importance,

15. J. Kelly, *Op. Cit.*, p. 392.

16. Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio Catechetica Magna*. XXIII, PNF, vol. V, p. 493.

17. W. Moore, *Selected Writings of Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa*, PNF, vol. V, p. 493 note 14.

18. J. Kelly *Op. Cit.*, p. 383.

19. John Damascene, *De Fide Orthodoxa*. III. 27.

20. *Pentekostarion* (Athens, 1916), p. 6 and *Menaion Dekembriou* (Athens: Apost. Diakonia, 1970), p. 201.

21. J. Kelly, *Op. Cit.*, p. 395.

since they serve as a model for moral life and instruct Christians in God's will respectively (XXVI. 25-26, p. 282.1 and 24f). According to this approach redemption is seen mainly as enlightenment. This view prevails in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists. In their works Christ is depicted as lawgiver and bestower of knowledge.²² Along these lines moved also the theological school of Antioch, which underlined the ethical aspect of Christ's life and, therefore, placed great emphasis on his human nature and his moral growth.²³ His mode of life sets up a perfect example of the right way of living for Christians. Macarius shares this idea with the Antiochenes (*Neue Hom.* IX. 4, vol. 42, p. 67, 18f).

In accordance with the different ways of understanding Christ's saving role mentioned above, one finds in Macarius a number of epithets attributed to Christ. The most common ones are these: shepherd (ποιμήν), physician (ιατρός), helmsman (κυβερνήτης) and charioteer (ἡνίοχος). All these titles but the last were widely used by the early Church and their history goes back to Greco-Roman, Jewish, Manichean and Sumerian prayer formulas.²⁴

The figures of shepherd is found in Biblical, Mesopotamian and Gnostic literature.²⁵ In the thought of Macarius this figure is closely connected with sacrificial aspect of Christ's way to redemption. A basis for such a relation is certainly provided by John 10.11. Macarius connects the image of the good shepherd and the true physician and writes: 'Ο δὲ Κύριος ἔλεγε... ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ἀληθινὸς ἱατρός καὶ καλὸς ποιμήν, ὁ θεὸς τὴν ψυχὴν μου ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων, ὁ δυνάμενος θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ψυχῆς (XLIV. 3, p. 332,19f). Furthermore, Macarius associates the healing power of Christ with his sacrifice and writes: ('Ἐλεγεν ὁ Κύριος) ἐγὼ εἶμι τὸ ζῶον πρόβατον τὸ ἄπαξ προσενεχθὲν καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὶ προσερχομένους δυνάμενον θεραπεῦσαι (*Ibid.*). Thus in this passage Christ is called the good shepherd, the true physician and the spotless sheep.

The image of physician, which Macarius relates to that of shepherded, is of pre-Christian origins and became a major title of Christ, especially in the Syrian tradition.²⁶ In the same passage quoted above

22. J. Kelly, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 165 and 169.

23. A. C. McGiffert, *History of Christian Thought*, vol. I, pp. 279-283.

24. R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom*, p. 159 f.

25. R. Murray, *Op. Cit.*, p. 187.

26. R. Murray, *Op. Cit.*, p. 199.

Macarius declares Christ to be the only one who can offer true healing (*Ibid.* line 25f). Macarius contrasts the efficiency of Christ's therapeutical ability to that of the priests and the teachers of the Law, who were unable to cure the soul by the oblations of gifts and sacrifices and the sprinklings of blood, and argues that they were unable to cure even themselves (*Ibid.* lines 15f). In the rest of the Homilies, Macarius very often uses the image of physician, but he does not relate it to that of the shepherd. Christ, writes Macarius, is called a physician because he offers the heavenly and divine medicine which can heal the passions of the soul (XXVI. 23, p. 281, 11f). Macarius does not make clear what Christ's medicine consists of, but, as has been pointed out, he seems to relate the curing ability of Christ to his sacrifice. This is also obvious from another passage where Macarius argues again that Moses and the people of the Law could not heal the passions of the soul. Both their rituals and sacrifices and the soul's own righteousness were unable to cure and clean the sinful thoughts of the soul; this was, however, done by Christ the true physician who gave himself a ransom for mankind (XX. 6, p. 259, 12f). His blood offered on the cross has the power of healing and changing the sinful nature of man (cf. XXV. 3, p. 268,30f; XLVII. 2, p. 342,5f).

Christ, moreover, did not only cure the incurable wounds of the soul which sin had made (cf. XX. 7, p. 259, 37; XXVI. 25, p. 282,1f; XLVIII. 3, p. 349,13f), but he also cures the illness of the body: ὁ γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν κτίσας αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ σῶμα πεποίηκε, καὶ ὁ ἐκείνην τὴν ἀθάνατον ἰώμενος αὐτὸς τὸ σῶμα δύναται ἐκ τῶν προσκαίρων παθῶν καὶ νοσημάτων θεραπεῦσαι (XLVIII. 4, p. 349,27f).

The shepherd and physician images have New Testament origins; the remaining ones, i.e. helmsman and charioteer, are not found in the New Testament, but they reminded one of Plato in *The Republic* VI. 498c, and elsewhere, and *The Phaedrus* 246b respectively. These images, however, have been used by other writers before Macarius. Christ is often called the wise helmsman of the Church or the world at large²⁷ and, moreover, the charioteer of mankind.²⁸ Macarius alters

27. Eusebius of Caesarea, *De Eccles., Theol.* I. 13, PG. 24, 852A; *De Laudibus Constantini.* XIX. PG. 20, 1389B; see also Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio* [V. 78, PG. 35, 604B; Gregory of Nyssa, *Hom. Opif.* XII. XIV, XVIII and Basil, *Leg. Lib.* Gent. IX.

28. Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus.* XII, VHP, vol. 7, p. 78. 16; In *Strom.* 2.11, ST. II, 141, 5f *nous* is called the helmsman of the soul; cf. Macarius, *Hom.* XL.

the imagery of helmsman a little and calls Christ the skilful pilot²⁹ who leads man's soul safely over the terrible storms and the wild waves of wickedness:

ἐπει δὲ τὸ πλοῖον καὶ κυβερνήτου χρῆζει καὶ εὐκράτου καὶ ἠδέος ἀνέμου πρὸς τὸ πλεῦσαι καλῶς, ταῦτα πάντα αὐτός ἐστιν Κύριος, ἐν τῇ πιστῇ ψυχῇ γινόμενος καὶ διαπερῶν αὐτὴν τοὺς δεινοὺς χειμῶνας καὶ τὰ ἄγρια τῆς πονηρίας κύματα, καὶ τὰς καταγιγίδας τῶν βιαιῶν τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀνέμων, δυνατῶς καὶ ἐμπείρως καὶ ἐπιστημόνως, ὡς αὐτός ἐπίσταται, διαλύων τὸν κλύδωνα αὐτῶν. Ἄνευ γὰρ τοῦ ἐπουρανίου κυβερνήτου Χριστοῦ ἀδύνατόν τιμι παρελθεῖν τὴν πονηρὰν θάλασσαν τῶν δυνάμεων τοῦ σκότους καὶ τῶν πικρῶν πειρασμῶν τὰ καταφυσήματα. (XLIV. 7, p. 334,8f).

The same idea is also repeated in another passage, where Christ is also called the farmer, the labourer and the lord of the soul (XXVIII. 2, p. 292,30-293,8; cf. XXXIII. 3, p. 311,1f), titles common in early Christian literature. The title of farmer (γεωργός) seems to have served as a divine and royal title;³⁰ Clement of Alexandria, Origen and the Syrian Fathers use it as a title of Christ³¹ and Macarius uses it for the Apostles as well (XXVIII. 6, p. 294,25). The imagery of Christ as labourer (ἐργάτης) is not common in Macarius and it is related to that of the farmer (*Ibid.* 2 and 7, pp. 292,34 and 294,31f). As a farmer Christ uses the cross as his main tool and tills the desolate soul and turns in into a paradise:

Χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ ἐπουράνιος καὶ ἀληθινὸς γεωργός, ἔλθὼν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐρημωθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τῆς κακίας ἀνθρωπότητα, ἐνδυσάμενος τὸ σῶμα καὶ ὡς ἐργαλεῖον τὸν σταυρὸν βαστάσας, εἰργάσατο τὴν ἐρημον ψυχὴν καὶ ἔλαβεν ἐξ αὐτῆς τὰς ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους τῶν πονηρῶν πνευμάτων καὶ τὰ ζιζάνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐξέτιλε καὶ πάντα χόρτον ἁμαρτημάτων αὐτῆς πυρὶ κατέκαυσε, καὶ οὕτως ἐργασάμενος αὐτὴν τῷ ξύλῳ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐφύτευσε ἐν αὐτῇ τὸν παγκάλλιστον παράδεισον τοῦ

5, p. 324, 12 f. Basil also expresses the ruling position of man's reason through the Platonic images of helmsman and charioteer; *Sermo de Legendis Libris Gentilium*. VII and VIII, PG. 31, 577BC and *Ibid.* IX, PG. 31, 584BC.

29. In the *Martyrdom of St. Polycarp*. XIX. Christ is called the saviour of the souls, the helmsman of the bodies and the shepherd of the universal Church; ed. H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, p. 16.

30. R. Murray, *Op. Cit.*, p. 195.

31. Clement of Alexandria, *Protrept.* 11. ST. I, 80, 29; Origen, *Contra Celsum*. V. 62, VHP. 10, p. 56,4.

Πνεύματος, πάντα καρπὸν ἡδὺν καὶ ἐπιθυμητὸν φέροντα τῷ Δεσπότη
Θεῷ (XXVIII. 3, p. 293,11f).

Macarius calls the passions thorns, thistles and tares, which indicates their parasitic nature; moreover, he calls virtues sweet and desirable fruits, since he regards them as natural products of man, which develop by God's grace (XXVI. 21, p. 279, 39f).

Similar to the imagery of helmsman is also the imagery of charioteer. In one passage Macarius calls the mind the charioteer of the soul (XL. 5, p. 324,12f), and in another he calls Christ its charioteer (XXXIII. 3, p. 311,3; I. 3, p. 147,10).

From all these it is clear in Macarian thought that Christ is not mere teacher, leader, example and helper, as Pelagius thought,³² but he is also in the real sense the redeemer for all men.

His soteriological approach compels Macarius to emphasize both the divine and the human natures of Christ. In doing so he departs from the Messalians, who, as Timothy of Constantinople reports in his *De Receptione Haereticorum* (6 and 8, PG. 86, 1, 49A), held Sabellian and Docetic views. Macarius is certainly anti-Docetic, as we have seen (VI. 5, p. 185, 31f) and anti-Sabellian, since he believes that God the Father and his Son, the divine Logos, are two separate persons (cf. XV. 44, p. 233,6f). Elsewhere we have pointed out that Macarius is also anti-Apollinarian in his Christology (cf. XXXII. 5, p. 308, 3f). Such doctrines place Macarius within the main orthodox theological stream.

II. The Conditions of Salvation.

Though Christ made salvation accessible to all people through his incarnation, teaching and sacrifice, this is obtained by each individual under certain conditions. Macarius makes plain that the spiritual blessing which Christ came to vouchsafe to those who believe in him are won by pains, and sweat, and trials and many conflicts (V. 5, p. 173, 9f). His teaching regarding the conditions of salvation is not systematic, but he certainly makes his view clear. In the passage given above Macarius points out the necessity of faith and personal efforts. Moreover, he emphasizes the importance of the divine factor by closing his argument with this: τὸ δὲ ἅλον χάριτι Θεοῦ (*Ibid.* line 14). In another passage again Macarius places faith as the cornerstone of salvation and

32. A. H. Armstrong. *St. Augustine and the Christian Platonists*, p. 28.

emphasizes the need of prayer and other personal efforts; moreover, he argues that man should persist in his cause and always seek the divine help: 'Ο βουλόμενος προσελθεῖν τῷ Κυρίῳ... οὕτως ὀφείλει ἄρξασθαι· πρῶτον πιστεύειν τῷ Κυρίῳ βεβαίως καὶ ἐπιδοῦναι ἑαυτὸν ἐξ ὅλου τοῖς λόγοις τῶν ἐντολῶν αὐτοῦ... καὶ εἰς τὴν εὐχὴν πάντοτε χρῆ αὐτὸν προσκαρτερεῖν... εἶτα βιάζεσθαι χρῆ ἑαυτὸν εἰς πᾶν ἀγαθὸν καὶ εἰς πάσας τὰς ἐντολάς τοῦ Κυρίου (XIX. 1 p. 253,10f). Salvation, as it appears in this passage, should be man's only interest; towards this man should direct all his energy and efforts. The latter should be of a wide range so that he should develop all sides of his moral personality. In the same passage Macarius points out that in order for this to be possible man should renounce the world altogether and give himself over to continuous prayer, waiting in expectant faith for the visitation and succour of the Lord (*Ibid.*). However, though he mentions the importance of the divine assistance in both passages quoted above, he does not refer to the Church and her sacraments; this should not be taken as an indication that Macarius neglects the Church and the sacraments. Elsewhere he makes clear that the faithful progress within the Church, not because of what they have done but because of what they have desired (XXXVII. 9, p. 318.38f), and, moreover, speaks of the necessity of sacraments, as it is shown below. Salvation depends totality upon God and not upon man's efforts; these form a condition for salvation and they are never regarded as an efficient means to it (*Ibid.*; V. 5, p. 173,9f).

The Church, according to Macarius, is the minister of God's grace, which she hands over to her members through the sacraments, as it is shown below. This is an interesting point not only because it completes Macarius' doctrine on redemption, but also because sacramentalism and ecclesiology form an area where, as J. Meyendorff has pointed out,³³ Macarius and Messalians are indeed in open contrast. This ascertainment proves the alleged Messalianism of Macarius to be unfounded.

With regard to the Church, Macarius speaks of three types of Churches:

a) The public Church on earth which stands in succession of the Apostles and, through the sacraments, ministers the Holy Spirit : Τὸ γὰρ θεῖον καὶ παράκλητον Πνεῦμα τὸ δοθὲν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τῇ μόνῃ καὶ ἀληθινῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ διακονηθὲν ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ βαπτίσματος

33. J. Meyendorff, «Messalianism or Anti-Messalianism?», in *Kyriakon*, vol. II, p. 588f.

ώρας κατὰ ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως διαφόρως καὶ πολυτρόπως σύνεστιν ἐκάστῳ (Ep. Magna, 4, vol. 42, p. 145,5f). In the public Church there is not any defect; she feeds her members spiritually: 'Ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ προσφέρεται ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος ἀντίτυπον τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος καὶ οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες ἐκ τοῦ φαινομένου ἄρτου πνευματικῶς τὴν σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσθίουσι (XXVII. 17, p. 289,24f). In the same passage Macarius also mentions baptism, which he seems to relate to the function of the Church. Macarius speaks highly of these two sacraments and enumerates them among those blessings which Christians enjoy and the righteous men, the kings and the prophets of the Old Testament, did not know. The spirit of the whole passage is free of any Messalian antisacramentalism and shows a very positive attitude towards the two basic sacraments of Christianity.

His general evaluation of the public Church is also high; he calls her the Church of the saints and affirms that Christ is her head and the faithful Christians her members: οἱ γὰρ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ πιστοὶ καὶ ἐν τῇ γῆ μένοντες ἄνω ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς διακονοῦσι τῷ Κυρίῳ... μέλη γὰρ καὶ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν ἁγίων αὐτὸς δὲ ἡ κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τυγχάνει (*Seven Hom.* II, 4, vol. 42, p. 17, 12f; cf. *Ibid.* 7, p. 19,f). b) The second type of Church is the heavenly one, which is the destination of the purified and the spiritual ones (XLIV, 4, p. 33,5f; *Neue Hom.* XIII. 2, vol. 42, p. 76,5f; *Ibid.* VIII. I, vol. 42, p. 58,31f). The ascetics also have as their destination the heavenly Church; they go naked out of the world and they dive down into the sea of evil and from those depths they bring up precious stones suitable for the crowns of Christ, for a new world and the world of angels (XV. 51, p. 236,3f). The heavenly Church is one, but it has many places of various degrees of glory for each individual (XXXII. 3, p. 306, 29f).

The members of the heavenly Church are not indifferent to the affairs of the public Church. The angelic powers assist the faithful in their effort to attain salvation (XV 44, p. 233,6f), and the whole heavenly community laments when the faithful fail to gain salvation: Καὶ λοιπὸν ἐπ' ἐκείνη τῇ ψυχῇ λύπη καὶ ὀδύνη καὶ κλαυθμὸς πᾶσιν ἁγίοις καὶ νοεροῖς πνεύμασι γίνεται· ἄγγελοι, δυνάμεις, ἀπόστολοι, προφῆται, μάρτυρες κλαίουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῇ (XV. 2, p. 217, 18f). In his writings Macarius uses a number of terms which are almost synonymous with the term ἐπουράνιος Ἐκκλησία; these are καθαρὸς αἰὼν (XXII, p. 263,4), κοινὸς αἰὼν (XV. 51, p. 237,7), πόλις φωτεινὴ (*Ibid.*), ὁ ἄλλος αἰὼν (XVI. 8, p. 240,4), in contrast to παρῶν αἰῶν, or οὗτος αἰὼν (XXIV. 1, p. 256,1f).

c) Finally, the third type of Church mentioned by Macarius is the Church of the soul. In his writings Macarius explains how he understands the concept of the Church. He argues that the term Church is used for the individual soul, as well as for the many people, since the individual soul gathers together all her faculties and thus it forms a Church to God (XII. 15, p. 211,11f). As we have seen, the faculties of the soul were all scattered after the fall (XXXI. 2, p. 303, 7f). Man by himself is unable to bring them back to their original unity; this is the work of God's grace) cf. XVII. 3, p. 244,1f). Thus, by the grace of God the faculties of the soul gathered together and united with the heavenly groom (XII. 15, p. 211,14f) meet the standards of the Church, i.e. unity and divine presence. In this way Macarius can speak of the Church of the individual soul: 'Εκκλησία οὖν λέγεται καὶ ἐπὶ πολλῶν καὶ ἐπὶ μιᾶς ψυχῆς. Αὐτὴ γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ συνάγει ὅλους τοὺς λογισμοὺς καὶ ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία τῷ Θεῷ. Ἡρμόσθη γὰρ εἰς κοινωνίαν ἡ ψυχὴ τῷ ἐπουρανίῳ νυμφίῳ καὶ κερνᾶται τῷ ἐπουρανίῳ. Τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ πολλῶν νοεῖται καὶ ἐπὶ ἐνὸς (XII. 15, p. 211. 11f). There is also another passage where it is clear that in Macarius' thought the basic characteristics of the Church are first the communion with God and secondly the recollection of the thoughts in the case of the Church of the soul, and the recollection of the faithful in the case of the institutional Church: 'Εκκλησία ἐν δυοῖς προσώποις πνευματικῶς νοεῖται, τῷ συστήματι τῶν πιστῶν καὶ τῷ συγκρίματι τῆς ψυχῆς. Ὅταν οὖν εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον λαμβάνηται, ἐκκλησία ἐστὶ ὅλον αὐτοῦ τὸ σύγκριμα (XXX VII. 8, p. 318,15f).

R. Murray has pointed out that as there is analogy between the public Church and the Church of the soul, so there is between the latter and the heavenly Church, and argues that the analogical relationship of the three types of the Church is expressed by Macarius in a way very close to the *Liber Graduum*³⁴. The notion, however, that there are two forms of the Church, the visible and the invisible is, as A. Vööbus has pointed out,³⁵ a common belief in Syrian ecclesiology.

In accordance with this type of ecclesiology Syrian tradition speaks of two forms of sacraments, i.e. of the visible baptism and the baptism by fire and spirit, the visible altar and priesthood and the spiritual altar and priesthood.³⁶ Macarius offers witness of this tradition since he speaks of the visible baptism (XV. 15, p. 22,35f) and of the

34. R. Murray, *Op. Cit.*, p. 270.

35. A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, vol. II, pp. 181-82.

36. A. Vööbus, *Op. Cit.*, p. 183.

baptism πῦρὸς καὶ πνεύματος (XXVI. 23, p. 281,4). This distinction between the 'visible' and the 'invisible' should not be understood in the Platonic manner, since both forms are inseparable, and without the 'visible', one cannot enter the 'invisible'.³⁷

Regarding the visible sacraments, Macarius mentions baptism, the eucharist and probably alludes to chrisim. Baptism betroths man to the *aion* to come (*Neue Hom.* XXVII. 6, vol. 42, p. 138,7; *Ep. Magna*, 3, vol. 42, p. 144,39f) and, moreover, entitles man to the Holy Spirit ministered by the one Church of God (*Ep. Magna* 4, vol. 42, p. 145, 5f). Grace received by the individual is regulated by the analogy of his faith (*Ibid.*). Baptism is not useless as the Messalians thought, rather it enables man to reach his original state: Οἱ ἄνθρωποι διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ βαπτίσματος φθάνουσιν εἰς τὸ πρότερον μέτρον τοῦ Ἀδάμ (*Neue Hom.* 1, 2, vol. 42, p. 36, 26f). Baptism moreover, is not magic, as Messalians might have understood it,³⁸ or a panacea against sin. Evil has the liberty to enter and argue in man's heart even after baptism: Εἰ δὲ λέγεις, ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἐλεύσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατεκρίθη ἡ ἁμαρτία καὶ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα οὐκέτι ἔχει νομὴν τὸ κακὸν τοῦ διαλογίζεσθαι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, ἀγνοεῖς ὅτι ἐκ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου μέχρι τοῦ νῦν, ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθησαν καὶ πονηρὰ ποτε ἐλογίσθησαν... Ἐχει οὖν νομὴν καὶ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα εἰσελθεῖν ὁ ληστής καὶ πράττειν ἃ θέλει (XV. 15, p. 221, 35f). This view is in agreement with Macarius' general understanding of the way God's grace and the evil powers work in man's heart. The possession of any degree of grace neither frees man from the devil's attacks (XXVI. 6, p. 274, 11f), nor suspends man's free will (XXVII. 11, p. 206,37); therefore, both the newly baptized and the advanced ones are equally in constant danger (XXVI. 23, p. 281.6f; XXVII. 11 and 17, pp. 287,6f and 289,30f). Thus, Macarius declares that full spiritual growth is not attained without constraint after baptism, but it requires much labour and patience and constant trial of man's free will (*Ep. Magna* 4, vol. 42, p. 145, 36f; XXIX. 7, p. 298.5f).

The second effective sacrament is the eucharist, which is described by Macarius in the traditional way as spiritual food: προκόπτει ἡ ψυχὴ λαβοῦσα ζῶν Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἀπογευσασμένη τοῦ ἀρνίου καὶ χρισθεῖσα τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ καὶ φαγοῦσα τὸν ἀληθινὸν ἄρτον, τὸν ζῶντα Λόγον (XLVII. 11, p. 345,6f IV. 12, p. 163,13f). In another passage, quoted

37. *Ibid.*

38. J. Meyendorff, «Messalianism or Anti-Messalianism?», in *Kyriakon*, vol. II, p. 588.

above, Macarius writes: προσφέρεται ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος ἀντίτυπον τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος (XXVII. 17, p 289, 24f) In the early Church there were offered two views to explain the identity of the consecrated bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ. The first one is the symbolical view, which stressed the distinction between the visible elements and the reality they represent. The second view explains the identity as being the result of an actual change in the bread and wine.³⁹ Macarius seems to follow the former view and calls the consecrated gifts signs (ἀντίτυπα) which however, enable the participant to eat spiritually the body of Christ (*Ibid.* line 25f). The symbolical view is found in the *Apostolic Constitutions*,⁴⁰ Tertullian, Serapio, and others.⁴¹

Regarding chrism, Macarius mentions two types. The first type is the anointing of oil found in the Old Testament. This is seen by him as a type of the second kind, the ἐπουράνιον χρῖσμα (XVII. 1, p. 243,1-16). The chrism of the Old Testament made the ones anointed kings and prophets, the heavenly chrism makes the anointed christs by grace: "Ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν προφητῶν τὸ χρῖσμα ἦν ὄλων τιμιώτερον, ἐπειδὴ εἰς βασιλεῖς καὶ προφῆτας ἐχρίοντο, οὕτω καὶ οἱ πνευματικοὶ τὸ ἐπουράνιον χρῖσμα χριόμενοι γίνονται χριστοὶ κατὰ χάριν, ὥστε εἶναι αὐτοὺς βασιλεῖς καὶ προφῆτας ἐπουρανίων μυστηρίων (*Ibid.* lines 1f). It seems that Macarius is speaking here of the invisible form of chrism, according to the distinction pointed out above, and not of the conventional chrism. A few lines below he makes clear that he speaks not about the oil which comes out of a visible tree, but about the oil of gladness, the heavenly spiritual oil which anoints the mind and the inner man (*Ibid.* lines 7f).

In the following paragraph Macarius argues that this chrism comes from the tree of life, Jesus Christ, the heavenly plant (*Ibid.* 2, p. 243, 18f). This echoes a widespread Syrian tradition which saw Christ hanging on the cross and pierced by the lance as the tree of life bearing its fruits,⁴² i.e. the sacraments. The tree of life has often been thought to have been an olive tree⁴³ and, therefore, Macarius could easily connect it with chrism.

39. J. Kelly, *Op. Cit.*, p. 440.

40. *Apost. Constit.* V. 14; VI. 23. ed. F. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, pp. 273 and 361.

41. Tertullian, *Contra Marc.* III. 19; IV. 40; Serapion, *Euchologion*, XIII. 12-14, ed. F. Funk, *Op. Cit.*, p. 174.

42. R. Murray, *Op. Cit.*, p. 320.

43. E. Segelberg, «The Benedictio Olei in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus», in *Oriens Christianus*, vol. XLVIII (1964), p. 278.

The phrase ἐπειδὴ εἰς βασιλεῖς καὶ προφῆτας ἐχρίοντο (*Ibid.* 1, p. 243,2) reminds one of a prayer used in the ritual of the consecration of oil which reads: unde unxcisti reges, secerdotes et prophetas;⁴⁴ Macarius, however, does not include in his list the priests. The phrase also οὔτοι ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ φυτοῦ τοῦ ἐπουρανίου χριόμενοι καταξιοῦνται ἐλθεῖν εἰς μέτρα τελειότητος (*Ibid.* 2, p. 243,10) recalls Celsus' testimony, denied by Origen, that Christians at the baptismal anointing said: κέχρισμαι χρίσματι λευκῷ ἐκ ξύλου ζωῆς.⁴⁵ Modern scholarship has shown that Celsus was right; E. Segelberg has indicated that a similar formula is found in the *Gospel of Philip*,⁴⁶ and R. Murray finds two other allusions to this formula in an Hippolytan prayer and in the *Acts of Judas Thomas*.⁴⁷

Summing up what has been said about Macarius' doctrine of redemption, one may say that Macarius regards Christ's incarnation and sacrifice an absolute necessity, and, moreover, he believes that Christ's saving power is ministered by his Church on earth through the sacraments to those of good faith and will (XXXVII. 9, p. 318.37f).

By making salvation Christ-centered, Macarius kept Eastern monasticism within the Church, away from the Origenistic temptation⁴⁸ represented by Evagrius and the Isochrists. Evagrius has not any use for Christ's incarnation since he thought that salvation could be reached through intellectual prayer.⁴⁹

Prayer in Macarius' system has a prominent place; it is seen both as a way to spiritual growth and as a means to supernatural experiences⁵⁰ (VIII. 1, p. 189,19f). Prayer, argues Macarius, is one of the natu-

44. Quoted in E. Segelberg, *Op. Cit.*, p. 270. E. Segelberg gives parallels of this phrase found in Greek and Latin ritual prayers, pp. 272 and 274.

45. Origen, *C. Celsum*. 6. 27, VHP. 10, p. 79, 29.

46. E. Segelberg, «The Coptic-Gnostic Gospel according to Philip», in *Numen*, vol. VII, no 2-3 (Dec. 1960), p. 193f.

47. R. Murray, *Op. Cit.*, p. 322.

48. By Origenism we mean here the views of later Origenists and not Origen's theology, which was Christ-centred; cf. J. Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. II, pp. 94-98, where the author points out that, according to Origen, man reaches perfection by imitating Christ.

49. Concerning these matters see J. Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, pp. 59 and 122-26. An extreme of Origenism was the movement of Isochrism monks, who claimed that they became «equal to Christ», by the restoration of their minds in the contemplation of God. According to them Christ was only a mind that had not fallen; see J. Meyendorff, *Op. Cit.*, p. 122.

50. A. Vööbus, *The Legacy of Ps-Macarius*, p. 12.

ral abilities of man (XXVI. 24, p. 279,40f); after the fall, however, prayer lost its purity and is mingled with wandering, doubts (*Ibid.* p. 280,6) and evil thoughts, which man's polluted nature produces (*Neue Hom.* XI. 2, vol. 42, p. 71, 9f; XV. 13, p. 221,14f). Therefore, man needs the divine assistance to overcome the evil attacks (XXI. 2, p. 261,10f); only the Spirit can teach man the true and pure prayer (XIX. 9. p. 256,35; XXVI, 24, p. 280,7). Thus, man is freed from his evil thoughts, which disturb his prayer and make it ineffective (*Seven Hom.* VI. 4, vol. 42, p. 32 4f) only when the Saviour takes him up and alters the thoughts of the soul and makes them heavenly and good and, moreover, teaches the soul true, undistracted and unwandering prayer (XXXI. 2, p. 303,17f).

Through prayer man can draw the divine grace (IV. 27, p. 170, 4f) and gain salvation and eternal life (XVII. 6, p. 250,35f). Moreover, through prayer man can attain supernatural experiences (VIII. 1, p. 189, 19f); *Seven Hom.* VI. 6, vol. 42, p. 32, 35f; *De Caritate*, 8, vol. 42, p. 226,20f). In order for prayer to be fully effective it should be continuous (XXXIII. 4, p. 311,15f), undistracted (XV. 13, p. 221,18-28) and combined with charity (XL. 6, 324,15-30), humility, benignity and simplicity (*Ep. Magna.* 25, vol. 42, p. 163,30f). Prayer without these characteristics becomes a mere $\sigma\chi\eta\mu\alpha\ \epsilon\delta\chi\eta\tilde{\nu}\varsigma$ and not a real prayer (*Ibid.*).

Prayer, adds Macarius, is one of the most basic duties of the monk (III. 3, p. 156,34f), and he includes it among the five virtues which comprehend all the others (XXXVII. 8, p. 318,22f). Moreover, Macarius argues, prayer together with the other four comprehensive virtues and man's spiritual growth in general flourishes in the Church (*Ibid.* 9). This point is of great importance since it shows that Macarius' doctrine on prayer is free of any Messalian notions. Prayer is also included among another group of virtues (XL. 1, p. 322,25f) and it is said to be the chief of all good endeavour and the topmost of right actions (*Ibid.* 2, p. 323,1f; cf. III. 3, p. 156,34f), since through it communion with God is actualized (*Ibid.*).

In both lists⁵¹ prayer is put first, and it is said to be a necessary condition for the others, since prayer is the first of the comprehensive virtues, and when this is wanting there is an end of all (XXXVIII. 9, p. 318,28f, cf. XL. 2, p. 323,2f). The practice of prayer, however, does not

51. Macarius does not make the scholastic division of virtues into moral and theological virtues.

develop the other virtues automatically, but one has to work equally hard for the cultivation of the other virtues as well: εἰ δὲ εἰς τὴν εὐχὴν μόνον βιάζεται τις ἑαυτὸν, ἕως οὗ λάβῃ χάρισμα παρὰ Θεοῦ, εἰς ταῦτα δὲ τὰ προειρημένα ὁμοίως ἑαυτὸν οὐ βιάζεται καὶ ἄγγχει καὶ ἐθίζει, οὐ δύναται ἐξ ἀληθείας καθαρῶς καὶ ἀμώμως αὐτὰ ποιῆσαι (XIX, 6, p. 255,35f). Therefore, the one seeking perfection ought to force himself to all the commandments of God (*Ibid.*) 7, p. 256,8f) and insist on prayer, and subdue his heart however unwilling it may be (*Ibid.*). Thus, as a result of this multifaceted effort one receives the grace of God; through this man obtains the Lord's petition, perceives a taste of God and becomes a partaker of the Holy Spirit. The latter teaches man true prayer, charity and meekness; in that way man receives what he cares for and becomes an heir of God's kingdom (*Ibid.* 9, p. 256,35f).

Macarius wants to help his readers to advance in the practice of prayer and, therefore, together with the importance of prayer he points out the right techniques of praying. It is important for one to start praying the right way, because however one starts he will continue in the same line to the end (VI. 2, p. 184,21f). Therefore, Macarius exhorts them not to pray with unseemly and confused outcries but with quietness and peace and great composure (*Ibid.*, p. 183,31f). The praying one should fix his mind upon the Lord (*Ibid.*) and employ all his labour upon his thoughts; he must cut away the evil thoughts, collect his thoughts when they tend to wander in any direction and, finally, distinguish the natural thoughts from the evil ones (*Ibid.* 3 pp. 184,30-185,2). In another passage Macarius argues that what matters in praying is not so much the external form of praying as the sobriety of the mind (XXXIII. 1, p. 310,8f).

This is the teaching of Macarius on the importance and the role which prayer plays in the process of spiritual regeneration. His teaching on this matter, too, adheres to the Eastern Christian tradition and offers to monasticism an alternative to gross Messalianism, which scorned the sacraments and taught that prayer alone secures salvation.⁵²

Macarius seems to have lived in an area where Messalian ideas had created a tension between monastic communities. The advanced ones devoted themselves exclusively to prayer and scorned the others who were busying themselves with the service of the community; the

52. Theodoretus, *Haer. Fabularum Conf.*, PG. 83, 469C; J. Meyendorff, «Messalianism or Anti-Messalianism?» in *Kyriakon*, vol. II, p. 587.

latter in their turn were murmuring on account of the duties loaded upon them. Thus Macarius advises both sides to take a more positive attitude towards the work of the others and consider the gain of the others as their own. The members of a monastic community, says Macarius, should co-operate like the members of the body:

Ὁφείλουσιν οὖν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ εἶ τι ποιῶσιν, ἐν ἀγάπῃ καὶ χαρᾷ εἶναι μετ' ἀλλήλων· καὶ ὁ ἐργαζόμενος περὶ τοῦ εὐχομένου οὕτω λεγέτω, ὅτι· Ὁν ὁ ἀδελφός μου κτᾶται θησαυρὸν ἐπεὶ κοινός ἐστιν, κἀγὼ ἔχω. Καὶ ὁ εὐχόμενος περὶ τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος οὕτω λεγέτω ὅτι· Ὁ ἐκεῖνος ὠφελεῖται εἰς τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν εἰς ἑμὸν κέρδος προχωρεῖ. Καὶ ὁ ἐργαζόμενος αἰθῆς τοῦτο λεγέτω, ὅτι· Τὴν διακονίαν ἦν ποιῶ, κοινή ἐστὶν ὠφέλεια. Ὡσπερ γὰρ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος πολλὰ ὄντα ἐν ἐστὶ σῶμα, καὶ βοηθοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις, καὶ ἕκαστον ἴδιον ἔργον ἐκτελεῖ, πλὴν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς ὑπὲρ ὅλου τοῦ σώματος βλέπει, καὶ ἡ χεὶρ ὑπὲρ ὅλων τῶν μελῶν ἐργάζεται, καὶ ὁ ποὺς περιπατεῖ ὅλα τὰ μέλη ἐπιφερόμενος, καὶ ἄλλο συμπάσχει, οὕτω καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ μετ' ἀλλήλων ἤτωσαν. Καὶ μήτε ὁ εὐχόμενος κρινέτω τὸν ἐργαζόμενον, διατὶ οὐκ εὐχεται· μήτε ὁ ἐργαζόμενος κρινέτω τὸν εὐχόμενον, ὅτι ἐκεῖνος παραμένει, κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι· μήτε ὁ διακονῶν κρινέτω τὸν ἕτερον. Ἄλλ' ἕκαστος εἶ τι ποιεῖ εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ. (III. 2, p. 156, 11f).

The same issue comes up again twice in the *Epistula Magna*. In the first case Macarius offers the same advice as that in the passage quoted above and argues that this should be so since all the brothers form an organic unity like that of the body⁵³ and, therefore, each one needs the others (*Ep. Magna*. 29, vol. 42, p. 168,15f; cf. III. 2, p. 156, 18f). In the other passage where the issue is discussed again Macarius asks the communities to provide the necessary conditions to the spiritual elite for an unhindered praying: Ὁ διδούς εὐχὴν τῷ εὐχομένῳ μετὰ χαρᾶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐάσθω καὶ ὡς βοηθοὶ αὐτῷ μᾶλλον συνεργεῖτωσαν καὶ προτρεπέσθωσαν, ἴδιον κέρδος ἠγούμενοι τὴν ἐπὶ τὰ κρεῖττονα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ προκοπὴν καὶ μηδὲν κατ' ἐρίθειαν ἢ ζῆλον ποιεῖτωσαν ὑπὸ τῆς κακίας ὑποφερόμενοι μηδὲν ἐμποδιζέτωσαν... τὴν ἀγαθὴν αὐτοῦ πρὸς Θεὸν ὁρμὴν (*Ibid.* 23, p. 162,22f). However, nowhere does Macarius appear to share the Messalian view that labor is something sinful.⁵⁴

53. Both in this case and in *Hom. III. 2*, p. 156, 18f, Macarius uses the Pauline simile of I Cor. XII. 12-26 applying what Paul says of the Church to each monastic community.

54. Theodoretus, *Hist. Eccles.* IV. 2, PG. 82, 229.

One, however, should accept that some ideas of Macarius, as for instance his ecclesiology, and sacramentalism sound strange in the ears of a reader accustomed to the standards of Western Christianity, but these are at home in the Eastern milieu and should not necessarily be associated with Messalianism. To this attests the positive reaction the Macarian writings found in Eastern monasticism and spirituality in general. Eastern monastic tradition became inseparable from the Macarian corpus.⁵⁵

(to be continued)

55. J. Meyendorff, *Christ in E. Chr. Thought*, p. 123.