



## The Resurrection: our Redemption

By Haralampus, Priestmonk

THE ARTICLE, “What Christ accomplished on the Cross” appeared in *The Orthodox Word*, volume 40, number 2 (235) of March-April, 2004. It was written by Hieromonk Damascene and delivered at a Lenten gathering of Serbian clergy in Jackson, CA.

Fr. Damascene’s stated purpose was to explain how our nature was redeemed, that is, how we appropriated forgiveness for our sins and subsequently returned to a primordial blessedness which mankind had lost through sin. At the beginning of his explanation, after a short description of our creation and fall, he makes this statement: “Following the words of Christ and St. Paul in the Scriptures, the Holy Fathers use a juridical or legal model to explain how Christ broke down the barrier of sin separating man from God” (pg. 64).

This assertion is startling in that we have never seen in Scripture or the Holy Fathers any such assertion or any legal formula which would “explain” our redemption, let alone “how” Christ broke down the barrier of sin. The atonement theory of Anselm, with its novel reductionism of God’s Economy to a medieval frame of transgression, retribution, wergild, propitiation, and satisfaction, was understood in both East and West to be the “juridical” model. Such a doctrine has never been accepted by the Orthodox Church; and all of Western scholarship bears witness to this fact, either in condemning the Orthodox as being heretical for not accepting it, or in condescendingly affirming that we were intellectually undeveloped and primitive and so had not “fully developed” the true doctrine of redemption.

#### THE TRUE VINE

Fr. Damascene calls Vladimir Lossky as his first witness to attest to his assertion. From Lossky's book *Orthodox Theology*, page 111, of section V in which he discusses Redemption, Fr. Damascene quotes, "The very idea of redemption assumes a plainly legal aspect: it is the atonement of the slave, the debt paid for those who remained in prison because they could not discharge it." Fr. Damascene also appends that the word "ransom" is an equivalent.

Lossky wrote for a Roman Catholic audience, or for those who had been educated in Roman Catholic schools, the same milieu in which he also was found. He often used Roman Catholic terms and quoted their theologians in his irenic apologetics. He would indicate in this manner that many Roman Catholic saints and theologians had elements similar to those of the Orthodox; therefore Orthodox doctrine was not so foreign or exotic, but more biblical and patristic and clearer, not encrusted with philosophical accretions.

In any case, the sentence from Lossky, right before Fr. Damascene's quotation, reads: "The immensity of this work of Christ, a work incomprehensible to the angels, so St. Paul tells us, cannot then be enclosed in a single explanation nor in a single metaphor." A little further on: "But these two Pauline images, stressed again by the Fathers, must not be allowed to harden, for this would be to build an indefensible relationship of rights between God and humanity. Rather must we relocate them among the almost infinite number of other images, each like a facet of an event ineffable in itself." Stressing further the limitations of an exclusively juridical model, Lossky quotes St. Maximus the Confessor: "Christ's death on the cross has been the judgement of judgement" (pg. 113). Further on, Lossky states, "It is not that the Son effects an outlandish justice by bearing an infinite satisfaction for a vengeance not less infinite than the Father" (pg. 115). Again Lossky quotes those words of St. Gregory the Theologian which have so often been repeated by the adherents of the atonement-satisfaction theories but only to ignore them: "Why should the blood of the Son be pleasing to the Father, Who did not even want to accept Isaac offered up in a burnt-

#### THE RESURRECTION: OUR REDEMPTION

offering by Abraham, but replaced this human sacrifice by that of a ram?” “Is it not obvious that the Father accepts the sacrifice, not because He demanded it or felt some need for it, but by economy? [*Oration 45, On the Holy Pascha*]” (pg. 115).

On pages 111–112, Lossky tenders many other images from the Scriptures and Fathers describing our redemption: the Good Shepherd seeking the lost sheep, “the strong man” who overcame the enemy, the woman cleaning and finding the lost drachma (the image or “imprint” of God having been made filthy with sin), the physician, the Good Samaritan, etc.

Although Fr. Damascene quotes Lossky to support the new advocates of the satisfaction theory, the full quotation proves that Lossky rejects any notion of juridical or legal satisfaction, atonement, ransom, or propitiation of sins familiar from scholastic theology; indeed all his other writings are consistent in his faithfulness to the patristic theology of the Church and his rejection of philosophy, scholastic philosophy in particular, in determining Church doctrine.

Human understanding and language fail before the immensity of the Divine Incarnation and Economy. “How” is a question that can never be asked, we can only simply confess: He became man, and all that He did to save us He did with His Divine power. It is God Who works, it is His grace which enacts our salvation. We can in measure describe His deeds of valor for us and His instruction, but His hidden divinity accomplishes our salvation as in a mystery. We only know that it is God Who is acting, not the “how”. Our salvation enacted by God can be described as a ransom or redemption or propitiation or sacrifice, for it accomplishes all that would be accomplished by the foregoing human terms. However, the infinitude of the divinity precludes the identification of salvation with these terms or any limitation of It or attribute of necessity. These terms are metaphors, not definitions. Other metaphors abound: healing, rescue, deliverance, rebirth, re-creation, finding of the lost, a return, a recall, etc. The mystery finally must be venerated in silence.

When the Holy Fathers discuss our Lord’s economy, our re-

## THE TRUE VINE

demption, it is made clear that such was His will, His free will, for God can never be under constraint or moved by any necessity. His freedom and power are absolute, unconditional, and non-contingent. It is furthermore made clear that He alone enacted our salvation and is its cause, with no intermediary. “Not an angel nor a man, but the Lord Himself hath saved us.” As the Prophet Esaias has it, “Not an ambassador nor an angel, but He Himself saved them, because He loved them and spared them: He Himself redeemed them and took them up and lifted them up all the days of eternity” (Esaias 63:9). He became incarnate, becoming man, in order to show us His supernal love and humility, that is, the way of our salvation, being Himself the pattern for us through His *kenosis*, the emptying of Himself (Phil 2:7). “Greater love hath no man than this: that a man lay down his life for his friends” (John 15:13). All the Fathers use this quotation to explain the reason for the Lord’s Crucifixion: He wished to demonstrate before all the world His great love for mankind.

St. Athanasius the Great in *On the Incarnation* discusses why Christ did not die quietly someplace (Chap. 4:19–25). If He had, it would still have served the purpose of our salvation and the harrowing of Hades: human nature would have been purified and regenerated. However, because man has been endowed with free will and is a reasoning creature, he had to be taught, had to be given a striking example and pattern, had to receive some knowledge or perception of God’s providence and economy in order to consent to and believe in God’s grace. According to St. Athanasius’ explanation of Christ’s passion and crucifixion, this demonstration of such great love and sacrifice would engender the belief that we could be saved by Christ’s Resurrection. “The supreme object of His coming was to bring about the resurrection of the body” (*ibid.* 22).

Such also is the universal preaching of the Fathers, following faithfully the Church’s Scripture and tradition: God was under no necessity or constraint, but out of lovingkindness, He condescended to assume our nature, to suffer, as we suffer, all the consequences of our estrangement from Him because of sin. “Christ hath re-

#### THE RESURRECTION: OUR REDEMPTION

deemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us” (Gal. 3:13). He suffered unto death so that He could call to Himself both the living and the dead by the word of the Cross, the preaching of the Cross. Having assumed and shared all aspects of our nature—except sin—He thus renewed our nature and imparted to it the grace of Resurrection, Himself becoming the firstfruits of our nature. “But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive” (I Cor. 15:20–22).

This text from the sub-Apostolic Father, St. Irenaeus of Lyons, is especially cogent: “But the knowledge of salvation was the knowledge of the Son of God, Who is both called and actually is salvation and Saviour and salutary.... ‘God hath made known His salvation in the sight of the heathen’ (Ps. 97:3).... salvation as being flesh ‘for the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us’” (*Against Heresies* III, 10:2).

Our salvation, therefore, is the Incarnation and the depth of our knowledge about it. Knowledge here does not mean merely the rational understanding and intellect, but rather an intimate experience by the entire man according to his capacity or awareness, affecting him in every part. “Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed .... if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him: Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him. For in that He died, He died unto sin once: but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom 6:6–11).

Christ was sinless in both His divinity and the human nature in which He was incarnate. We die because sin has corrupted our nature, and we have been made prisoners of the devil because we hearkened to his tempting. Sin corrupted us, destroyed the natural harmony of our nature, and put a barrier between us and God. Not that sin was a barrier to the Almighty; the barrier was our enmity

## THE TRUE VINE

with God through disobedience since we followed the old man of our carnal nature, hearkening to the beguilements of the tempter, thereby abandoning God. As the Saints of the Old Testament have proven, man could yet follow God; but man's nature with the image of God had been darkened and was in need of healing: The inner harmony of our faculties was confused and divided, and our will was unstable. We were at war with ourselves and could hardly recognize the law of sin which worked in our members, that is, the demons who incited us to sin.

For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me to captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? (Rom. 7:18–24)

We were falling more and more under the power of Satan, with both our physical and spiritual nature becoming corrupted by our sins. As we have said, our Lord and Redeemer became man, but His human nature was pristine and sinless. Therefore, He voluntarily suffered in everything like us, even the death of the Cross, to demonstrate His great compassion and care for us; a compassion that would undeservedly suffer alongside us. Christ also was put to death by sin: not by any sin committed by Him or appertaining to His person, as it is in our case, but by an external sin, the sin of others: Judas and the rulers of the Jews. "And when He is come [the Comforter], He will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: Of sin, because they believe not on Me; of right-

#### THE RESURRECTION: OUR REDEMPTION

eousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see Me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged” (John 16:8–11).

Sin had darkened the Jews’ eyes and they did not accept Christ’s words because they were not sons of the light. “The light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not” (John 1:5). “He was in the world, ... and the world knew Him not. He came unto His own, and His own received Him not” (John 1:10–11).

The Jews were also reprov’d of righteousness because they sinned in delivering a righteous and guiltless man to be crucified. Even Pilate said, “I find in Him no fault at all” (John 18:38), and, “Behold, I bring Him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no fault in Him” (John 19:4), and again, “Take ye Him, and crucify Him: for I find no fault in Him” (John 19:6). Plainly, Christ was crucified because of the unrighteousness and sin of the leaders of the Jews. “Pilate answered [Christ], Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered Thee unto me” (John 18:35).

Finally the Jews were reprov’d of judgment: for Jesus Christ cast out demons and healed, doing the good works of His Father, and the word was preached. Although they saw only good and the works of God, the Jews nonetheless chose to deny their own perceptions and chose evil by dealing unjustly with the Lamb of God.

We die because sin has entered and corrupted our nature, driving us away from the source of life. Christ died because He humbled Himself to our weakness and accepted to be brought low by the sins of the devil and darkened men. Since Christ’s human nature “has suffered all that accordeth to us,” it has been joined to all our sufferings; therefore through them we can be joined to Christ.

When we are baptized, we die voluntarily along with Him, since we are baptized into His death. So then if we die with Him, we shall also arise with Him in His resurrection. If we, like Christ, die to sin, then the old man, the carnal man, is put to death since we have died to sin. “For he that is dead is freed from sin” (Rom. 6:7). We arise with Christ, “alive unto God through Jesus Christ” (Rom. 6:11) if we be dead in Christ. Dead to sin, alive unto God.

## THE TRUE VINE

As long as we are alive unto God and dead to sin, we are in communion with the purified and deified human nature of our Lord. This communion must be constant in order that His life be realized within us, that our sick nature be healed and purified and deified in continual communion with the divinity. In this manner, Christ's death destroys sin in us: with faith our will freely chooses to be baptized into Christ's death—our acceptance of the death of the old man—in order to arise with Christ's resurrection. "If we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him" (Rom. 6:8).

The barrier of sin was broken down by God when He offered a renewed and purified human nature to mankind. That nature appeared in the Word's Incarnation, i.e., His assumed human nature. He offered it to us by preaching the Gospel and with the demonstrations of His supernal love, most especially in the greater love of His crucifixion where He suffered and died along with us, in order to call both the living and dead to Him. If a man should now hearken unto Him, he will receive a renewed nature and re-establish communion with the divinity. Thus the barrier of sin is broken, for it was on mankind's part, not God's. To appropriate the gifts of God, we must consent to die and be reborn in the purification of Holy Baptism so that sin be utterly destroyed in us. "Amen, amen, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.... Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3:3-5). By dying in Christ, we join our death, i.e., the end and culmination of our life, to Christ's death; and thus completed, our whole existence is joined to Christ. Sin is destroyed in us directly by communion with God. It is not said that the "penalty" of sin is destroyed, which is what the legal, juridical model demands.

St. Peter, in his great sermon on Pentecost, speaks of Christ Who was "delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, [Whom] ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that He should be holden of it....

#### THE RESURRECTION: OUR REDEMPTION

His soul was not left in hell, neither His flesh did see corruption” (Acts 2:23–31). In similar words did St. Paul preach, “For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew Him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning Him. And though they found no cause of death in Him, yet desired they Pilate that He should be slain.... But God raised Him from the dead: ... through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses” (Acts 13:27–39).

Again in St. Paul’s speech on Mars’ hill, “And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent: Because He hath appointed a day, in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead” (Acts 17:30–31).

It is notable in the above texts that salvation and forgiveness come through faith in Christ and His resurrection. St. Paul bears witness to himself, “Having therefore obtained help of God, I confess unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: That Christ should suffer, and that He should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should shew light unto the people, and to the Gentiles” (Acts 26:22–23).

Confession of Jesus Christ as Lord with the mouth and heart and faith in the Resurrection bring salvation. This is the message of the foregoing texts, the Apostles’ own declaration of what they preached. St. Paul, who “preached Christ crucified,” proclaims in the same epistle, “For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the scriptures” (I Cor. 15:3–4). The following verses, five to eight, enumerate the witnesses of Christ’s resurrection. Then the Apostle formally declares the purport of his preaching: The Resurrection is our victory, for in Christ’s resurrection we are

also granted resurrection, “and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.... Death is swallowed up in victory.... But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ” (I Cor. 15:52–57). Slightly prior to these words, St. Paul says, “And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain” (I Cor. 15:14). And further on, “And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins” (I Cor. 15:17). This last quotation is perhaps the strongest, since it declares that there is no forgiveness of sins without the Resurrection. This declaration must certainly be a problem for the advocates of the juridical theory, who insist that the Father’s wrath or justice can be appeased only with the shedding of Christ’s blood for our sins to be remitted and forgiven.

The advocates of the juridical theory seize upon passages which state that we have been saved or redeemed through the Cross or the blood of Christ, through His sacrifice or death. They insist that these passages are the real explanation for the forgiveness of our sins. They force medieval, legalistic interpretation upon the Scriptures by ignoring the foregoing scriptures we have adduced because these do not fit their paradigm.

Holy Scripture cannot be treated in such a cavalier manner. All Scripture is the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and cannot be lightly dismissed. If there are apparent contradictions, these must be resolved by the Holy Fathers. They, however, never found any contradiction. The Cross is never ignored or devalued—that immense sign of God’s superlative love: “Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends” (John 15:13). “[The Father] hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in Whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins” (Col. 1:13–14). “But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For He is our peace, ... and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in His flesh the enmity” (Eph. 2:13–15). All the above pas-

#### THE RESURRECTION: OUR REDEMPTION

sages must stand as divinely revealed texts and cannot be ignored, just as the foregoing passages on the Resurrection cannot; and the Holy Fathers and the Church have not ignored them. For this reason, we constantly hear phrases such as these, that we have been saved through the Cross and Resurrection of Christ or forgiveness has shone forth from the grave of Christ, etc. Note that the foregoing text from Ephesians says “flesh” and not “blood.” The difference is not small: blood would imply death, but flesh implies the continuance of life. That Christ died—shed His blood, purchased us with His blood—is not of such overarching importance as is the fact that He came in the flesh and imparted that purified and reborn nature to us. Hence, it is clear that His entire incarnate economy or dispensation abolished our enmity with God and our separation from Him and brought us salvation, not only one moment or part of it.

Perhaps the preaching of our redemption through the Resurrection is so prominent and frequent because with the Resurrection, Christ had finished His work and suffering in His flesh; His victory was proclaimed and sealed by the Resurrection. By way of synecdoche, the entire economy of our salvation is understood by simple reference to its crown: the Resurrection. Certainly, a resurrection requires a prior death. Therefore, our Lord’s passion is necessarily included in the doctrine of the word of the Resurrection; the Cross is in no way dishonored or ignored. Indeed, as we have seen, it is often mentioned alone since it is the superlative proof of His love, for death was central to God’s stratagem in Christ’s glorious dispensation.

Our Saviour was victorious in His warfare against the devil; the devil could not resist when, expecting flesh, he met God. Whereupon, our Lord called all the dead to Him, pillaging the devil’s kingdom; through His sufferings, Christ became like man in all respects, thus granting us communion in His human nature and renewing us. “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power over death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death

#### THE TRUE VINE

were all their lifetime subject to bondage” (Heb. 2:14–15). By dying, Christ destroyed the devil; and by arising, He destroyed the fear of death, thus delivering us from bondage. “Now it was not written for his [Abraham’s] sake alone, that it [righteousness] was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification” (Rom. 4:23–25). Notice that justification here is tied to the Resurrection, although it can refer to the whole economy. “Christ died for the ungodly... But God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by Whom we have now received the reconciliation” (Rom. 5:6–11). “But God, Who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) and hath raised us up together ... For by grace are ye saved through faith” (Eph. 2:4–8).

Christ, by His passion, proved His great love for us; and through His death, He preached to and called both the dead and the living, all of mankind, all of human nature. In His death, we are reconciled with Him when we are baptized into His death; and then we are saved by His life, His resurrection. “Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life” (Rom. 6:4). If in Holy Baptism, we have received the Holy Spirit, we shall then arise from Christ’s death into His resurrection. “But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you” (Rom. 8:11).

Often the new advocates of the discredited atonement-satisfac-

#### THE RESURRECTION: OUR REDEMPTION

tion theory—for such they are, although they ostensibly plead for a “legal or juridical model” of redemption—present quotations from the Scriptures and Fathers in which a ransom or price is mentioned, an exchange paid to liberate from sin or captivity of the devil. This is a valid metaphor; but as we read in the famous quotation from St. Gregory’s theological oration (*Oration 45*), it cannot be received in an absolute sense. Otherwise, there would be a constraint of necessity upon the divinity, and a prize would be granted to the devil for his crime and effrontery. In human terms, a ransom is paid to the captor in order to free a slave or prisoner. Since Christ did free captive humanity, He accomplished what a ransom would have accomplished in earthly terms, but the Divinity had no need to pay a price, neither did It owe anything nor would It have rewarded iniquity; It was not obligated or bound. Our Lord saved us; the “how”, the manner in which He accomplished it is in the end ineffable. We can never say that it had to be this way or that; we only know that He freely accomplished it in His own power and authority and unconditional love as described in the Holy Scriptures. To divide the Trinity into the wrathful Father and the loving and compassionate Son, or to divide God’s operations, so that His love is hindered by His justice or wrath, denies the simplicity, unity, and consubstantiality of the Holy Trinity resulting in a schizophrenic deity. It is an attempt to debase and subjugate to human criteria and logic the ineffable mind and workings of the Godhead.

To the first sermon of St. Peter on Pentecost we have appended many texts which preach in as many words of our salvation through Christ’s resurrection. This declaration or motif of the Resurrection refers, as we have seen, to His whole economy. These words from the Epistle to the Romans are characteristic and quite definite: “If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved” (10:9). And this from the Epistle which is claimed as the foundation for the doctrine of satisfaction! There is no express teaching or demonstration in Scripture that we are saved from sin through a satisfaction or atonement because of Christ’s blood.

## THE TRUE VINE

Why did not St. Peter openly proclaim it at Pentecost? In the Scriptures and preaching of the Apostles there are the models of God humbling Himself, of the great Physician, the Good Samaritan healing the victim of injustice, of the Good Shepherd seeking the lost sheep, of the King of Glory and the Sun of Righteousness descending into the pit to rescue the captives of the devil, but there is no exclusive, juridical or legal model of forgiveness for our redemption. However, the central motif of our Lord's Resurrection is continually proclaimed. "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins" (I Cor. 15:17). This statement is certainly unequivocal; no such declaration can be found to support a juridical model or the satisfaction theory.

The theory of the redemption of mankind by satisfying the Father's wrath through Christ's death, the theory invented by Anselm of Canterbury, is the only one which scholars and students of all ages have exclusively labeled as the juridical model; and the one which the West believed as the sole, true explanation and understanding of how mankind found forgiveness and redemption. The theory was fashioned out of a frame of mind which held medieval concepts of justice sacrosanct, and could only conceive of crime, guilt, retribution, and the assignment of punishment or penalties according to the rank of perpetrator and victim. This juridical method of understanding skews the whole Apostolic and Patristic teaching so that the Cross becomes a sign of God's justice instead of His love. "Greater love hath no man than this: that a man lay down his life for his friends." This is Christ declaring His love for unworthy mankind. Why is there no mention of justice or ransom? The hymnology of the Church glorifies the Cross as the sign of God's love, as do the Patristic interpretations: never is it said that the Cross is the triumph of God's justice.

Father Damascene asserts that the Fathers followed Scripture and used a juridical or legal model to explain how Christ broke down the barrier of sin separating God and man. The term "redemption" came into use from this model. Fr. Damascene appended a quotation from V. Lossky in support of his view, although the

quotation was from a work affirming the contrary. The error of all the new adherents of the atonement is that they attribute an exclusiveness to this model; for them, it is the only way to understand and explain the Cross and Christ's economy in the flesh. We have appended enough statements from Scripture, and so many more can be found in the Fathers, which disregard the exclusiveness they claim. Very certainly, such a declaration of exclusiveness has never been made, in either Scripture or the Fathers.

Continuing his advocacy of the Anselmian model, Fr. Damascene asserts "Christ died *in place* of us" (pg. 65), [Fr. D.'s italics]. He then appends a quotation from St. Athanasius the Great, in which is the phrase, "... He surrendered His body *in place* [Fr. D.'s italics] of all, and offered it to the Father" (pg. 67). The translation he used was made by an Anglican, with the standard Western theological presuppositions. The words ἀντὶ πάντων have been translated and understood by the Orthodox as "for our sake," or "for the sake of all men," which forecloses any attempt to foist on St. Athanasius some scholastic doctrine of substitutional or vicarious atonement.

Nowhere is it clearer that in spite of all the Orthodox texts Fr. Damascene offers, he presupposes the exclusive explanation of the juridical model which, however, remains unproven. As we have said, the Cross in Orthodox texts is a sign of God's love for mankind. It has never been referred to as a manifestation of God's justice. As if suddenly discovering this, Fr. Damascene declares, "Christ saved us in the way He did [i.e., the juridical model claimed by Fr. Damascene] not only to manifest His justice and righteousness, but also to manifest His love" (pg. 67). He then continues with a text from St. Isaac the Syrian, "God the Lord surrendered His own Son to death on the Cross for the fervent love of creation. *For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son* to death for our sake (cf. John 3:16). This was not, however, because He could not have redeemed us in another way, but so that His surpassing love, manifested hereby, might be a teacher unto us. And by the death of His only begotten Son, He made us near to Himself. Yea, if He had had anything more precious, He would have given it to us, so that by it

our race might be His own” (pg. 67). Indubitably, the Cross manifests God’s love, and it is proved not only by the foregoing text, but by St. Isaac’s entire book and all the texts of the Fathers. However, this text of St. Isaac, either literally or by implication, does not prove the first part of Fr. Damascene’s statement, that Christ saved us in the way He did in order to manifest His justice and righteousness. This is not stated in the aforesaid quotation of St. Isaac, nor is it even implied. It is a complete non sequitur, confirming nothing of Fr. Damascene’s juridical thesis. Nowhere in the Fathers or Scripture will a statement be found that the Cross or Christ’s death or the salvation of our nature was a manifestation of God’s justice. Proximity or contiguity does not validate or prove an assertion, else the tares interspersed in the wheat would have been good for food.

The presentation of Orthodox texts is of little value if the presupposition of a juridical model and scholastic terms are the axioms used to interpret these texts. A frame of mind different from that of the Apostles and Fathers is immediately evident, namely rationalism. Choosing certain texts, and wrenching them to the support of rationalistic premises contrary to their original, contextual meaning is hardly the way of Patristic theology. The Orthodox follow the Patristic, scriptural way, the genuine revelation witnessed by the words of “holy men of God” (II Peter 1:21), for “no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation” (II Peter 1:20). The Orthodox do not follow the rationalists, “they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction” (II Peter 3:16).

A discussion by Fr. Damascene of “the saving fruits of Christ’s death” (pg. 68) is obviously a category taken from a scholastic manual of theology, a topic that is not only absent from Patristic theology, but could not have been conceived by it. The preaching and hymns have made it self-evident: Life and immortality have gushed from Christ’s tomb, from His death. He has granted us His uncreated grace, i.e., His very self. An enumeration of graces and “saving fruits” could only arise in the West where it is believed that all grace is created. Since it is created, it can be enumerated and categorized.

#### THE RESURRECTION: OUR REDEMPTION

This mentality is foreign to the Orthodox Church where grace is known to be uncreated and infinite, producing the transfiguration and deification of the worshipper and not simply adding created qualities and gifts.

One fundamental doctrine which the new advocates of the atonement refuse to take seriously is that God cannot be subject to any external necessity or constraint: He is omnipotent. Furthermore, He is transcendent and super-substantial, and therefore, incomprehensible. We can know nothing of His essence or nature. “Thy knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is mighty, I cannot attain unto it” (Ps. 138:5). Since it is so fundamental a principle of our Faith, they say they accept it. However, they then quickly contradict it by saying that our Lord had to die by shedding His blood, by being sacrificed by the Father, in order to pay our debt, to purchase us from the power of Satan. They continue in this vein, by saying God’s justice had to be satisfied, His wrath had to be appeased, the debt had to be paid, (God could not simply forgive it) in order that love and compassion could function to forgive mankind.

By asserting the foregoing, they effectively deny the fundamental principal doctrine of God’s omnipotence. Furthermore, they also refute the doctrine of God’s incomprehensibility by affirming that God’s names or operations are of His essence, which is the first of Augustine’s serious errors concerning the Godhead. Such a doctrine confutes and rejects the Scriptures and all the Apostles and great Fathers from St. Dionysius the Areopagite on. They do not realize that by attributing these operations to God’s essence and insisting that God’s justice hinders His love, they are actually dividing the one Divinity. He can no longer be transcendent and superessential if we have knowledge of His nature. If His nature be under the constraint of these differing or contradictory qualities and operations, it is divided.

One of the most vehement supporters of the satisfaction, atonement doctrine is Mr. Vladimir Moss. In *The Mystery of Redemption*, (St. Michael’s Press, England, 2004) he sums up and sets out his many distinctive arguments for the Anselmian atonement theory.

All the Fathers and Scripture are subordinated to this interpretation, even though he asserts that he denies this theory; nonetheless, his reasoning always circles back to it.

Not only Fr. Damascene and Mr. Moss, but also the other advocates of the appeasement doctrine fix on certain words and then make them absolute. They allow only one interpretation or say that since this certain word is used, it necessarily implies the Anselmian theory. When the word “redemption” is found in the Scriptures and the Fathers, they proclaim gleefully that here is proof: since redemption implies a price, therefore we had to be purchased with Christ’s blood.

Of course, this is not so. Christ gave of Himself, sacrificed Himself, to redeem us, but in no manner can it be said that a price—specifically Christ’s blood—had to be paid by God as a ransom. St. Gregory’s *Oration 45* precludes that. Whatever in human affairs would have been accomplished by a ransom is accomplished by God in His own manner and power; there can never be a one-to-one correlation between our legal words and methods and the methods of God. “But as far as the heaven is from the earth, so is My way far from your ways, and your thoughts from My mind” (Esaias 55:9).

The advocates for the juridical theory distort or ignore St. Gregory’s teaching in *Oration 45*. For the Orthodox, however, his words garner the highest respect and are definitive. He considers it a blasphemy to give the devil God’s blood as a price. Nor would God the Father be pleased in the blood of His Only-begotten Son, when He would not even accept Isaac’s blood. The price paid by our Saviour was His labours, sufferings, Passion, indeed, His entire incarnate economy that He expended for our salvation on account of His love. This “price” the Father accepted but did not require or demand it, i.e., He willed it together with the Son and the Holy Spirit. This expenditure of the Son accomplished what on earth might have been accomplished as a ransom, but the terms are as different as is the heaven from the earth. There is no question of the price being an exchange between two parties; nor is the price a penalty or

forfeit that must be paid or fulfilled. St. Gregory's statements—and those of all the Holy Fathers—cannot be comprehended by the advocates of the juridical theory because they have a distorted opinion of the Scriptural doctrines of death and the role of the devil.

Adam at his creation was placed in Paradise, protected by God's grace from the death and the corruption of the world (St. John Damascene, *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, 2:30, 3:1; St. Athanasius the Great, *On the Incarnation*, chap 3–7). Man was in an intermediate state, preserved innocent, but not yet immortal. Adam and Eve were given one commandment to test their obedience and resolve. God said, "Ye shall not eat of it [the tree of the knowledge of good and evil], neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die" (Gen. 3:4). And in other places, "But in whatsoever day ye shall eat of it, ye will die by death" (Gen. 2:17, cf. 3:5). When our first parents had eaten, God cast them from Paradise in order that they, since they were being protected there, not become immortal in evil as had Satan. For this reason, the Fathers teach that death was the mercy of God in order that our corruption not become permanent and was granted us to engender repentance through fear of the specter of death. God did not curse mankind, only the serpent and the earth were cursed (Gen. 3:15, 18); therefore it has been understood that death was a benefit to mankind, and not a punishment, by giving a term to sin and evil and waking mankind up from the narcosis of the passions to give a chance for return and the performance of works of repentance.

This is the patristic doctrine of death: it is a mercy of God, with an implicit hope of return. In the Scriptures, God did not threaten Adam with death as a punishment for disobedience; rather He warned Adam that death would be the consequence of disobedience. Once Adam hearkened to the devil, he had to leave the protection of Paradise for his own good and hope of return. Having chosen the flesh and pleasure (Gen. 3:7), he became trapped in its desires and became subject to the passions, i.e., the fear of death made him subject to the devil through sin since he was separated from God through his disobedience.

## THE TRUE VINE

The Scriptures present death as the consequence of man's free will; God had warned Adam of the consequence of the choice laid before him, but Adam preferred an apparent, external, and material good over the spiritual good of obedience to and love for God. The fall of man in Scripture is described in its simplest, fundamental form as a choice, separation, and captivity, no matter what other metaphors might be used to explain and illustrate it. Thus have all the Holy Fathers understood the Scriptures and have maintained this paradigm.

The juridical theory, however, has distorted the Scriptures by treating the fall, Adam's disobedience, legalistically. Adam did not keep God's arbitrary command (arbitrary, because the legalists do not attach much importance to St. John Damascene's description [*loc. cit.*] of the paths between which Adam had to choose.) In their opinion, Adam affronted God by scorning His command, whereupon God justly condemned him. Being guilty of breaking the law, Adam became a malefactor. No longer is it a bad choice made by Adam and Eve when deluded by the devil, which entails the consequence of separation from God. The legalists say rather that Adam is guilty of offending God and must be judged for the crime. Adam's fall, according to these advocates of the juridical theory, is a violation of divine law followed by divine judgment and punishment. God has judged Adam for his transgression and condemned him to death and the torment of the devil. The Scriptures portray Adam as a beloved son who strays, while the legalists view him as a condemned criminal.

One consequence of the deviation from the Scriptures by the legalists is a fundamental difference in the role and position of the devil. For St. Gregory and the Fathers, the devil is a futile and malicious spirit, fallen from God's grace, who devised man's fall with guile and subterfuge. When by his own will man separated from God's protection, the devil seized man and ruled over him tyrannically. The devil is a thief, a tyrant, a liar, and a murderer; he has no just claim upon mankind. He has what was never his but was what he stole; therefore, he has no rights because he is a criminal, a felon.

#### THE RESURRECTION: OUR REDEMPTION

Christ rescued Adam and all humanity. He Who is strong and mighty, stripped the robber of his ill-gotten goods; He freed the captives and released the prisoners. The devil was owed nothing and nothing was given him. When, by Christ's stratagem, death snatched what it perceived as another victim, death met essential life in Christ and was destroyed. The devil is only a disobedient spirit fleeing from the light, rebelling against his Creator by maliciously marring creation: misery loves company.

Legalism's distortion of the Scriptures, however, imparts an authoritative role to the devil. Since man is now judged and condemned as a malefactor, he must also be punished, paying a penalty. God appointed the devil as the executioner and prison master of man. The devil is granted power over mankind by God in order to accomplish the purpose for which he has been appointed. The devil now has a claim to mankind and has rights; he is not a tyrannical, unlawful thief but has become a ministering spirit having a certain divine legitimacy. If Christ simply rescued captive mankind with His divine power—as He did—it would violate unjustly the supposed legitimacy of the devil; and man would not have paid the penalty for his crime. Man would have illegally escaped the divine sentence, thus further angering God. In order to restore the balance of equity and justice, some penalty or ransom had to be rendered.

If these new advocates of atonement insist that the ransom is given to the devil, since they assert that some exchange or price must be paid, then this fundamental axiom of justice and the law is violated, namely, that the criminal is never rewarded for his crime: God does not reward the wrongdoer.

If, on the other hand, they understand that it is blasphemy to deliver the divine blood to the devil, as St. Gregory explains, then they, because of their insistence upon some sort of penalty or forfeit or exchange, commit the further and greater blasphemy of dividing the Trinity, either the persons, the Father from the Son, or the operations, love against justice. Their other option is to subject the Divinity to some abstract principle of necessity or of constraint. All contrary to the Sacred Scriptures, all contrary to sound reason, all a

mistaken insistence upon human justice and law, upon retribution, penalty, satisfaction, equity, rationalism, and appeasement instead of upon the unconditional righteousness of God.

It is no wonder that the later West could not understand and properly revere St. Gregory's words, let alone the Scriptures, since their perceptions had been skewed by legalistic reasoning. Our Saviour had rebuked the burgeoning legalism of the scribes and lawyers. After the veil was rent in twain and the Temple destroyed, when the grace of easy access was removed, legalism flourished and prevailed in Rabbinical Judaism. Likewise, when the West rent Christ's robe of the Church with schism, the disruption of grace veiled their understanding of the Scriptures and legalism flourished.

Another word the legalists seize upon is "atonement." According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, atonement originally means to unite, to bring into unity or harmony, to make one (at-one-ment). In theology it signifies the restoration of friendly relations between god and sinners. The dictionary also marks the use of this word in the sense of expiation as not correct. In the Authorized Version of the New Testament, the word atonement appears once in Romans 5:11. It is used for no apparent good reason to translate *καταλλαγή*, which everywhere else in the same epistle and the entire NT is translated as reconciliation. In any case, when used in the Scriptures, the word does not mean expiation or appeasement in the juridical sense.

Another word which the juridical enthusiasts twist to a solely legalistic meaning is *ἱλασμός*, translated by the word "propitiation" in I John 2:2, 4:10 (AV). The word means God's graciousness and mercy or the favor of God obtained through prayer, to render propitious or favorable or friendly. This is the first meaning in Greek and English. Any notion of expiation or appeasement or payment is adventitious and can only be justified by a twisted perception, severely limited understanding, and restricted meaning. The word propitiation is also used in Romans 3:25 (AV) to translate the word *ἱλαστήριον*. This is the word used in the Septuagint for the Mercy

Seat, the cover of the Ark of the Covenant, where God could be entreated for His gracious judgement. Neither the word propitiation or the Greek words it translates signify by necessity that Christ had to die to propitiate God with His blood; therefore the word propitiation cannot be used as a proof for the satisfaction doctrine. Indeed, St. Cyril of Alexandria in his Commentary on St. John's Gospel states that the Lord "invokes the Father's favor upon us because He is the high priest of our souls inasmuch as He appears as man although by nature, He is God with the Father, conversing with God most fittingly, thus persuading us to believe that He is now both the propitiation for our sins and the righteous advocate, according to the words of John" (PG 74, 480C-481A).

Another mistake is made with the word *δικαιοσύνη* which the advocates of the juridical theory insist on interpreting as justice, although even the English Scripture translations almost always translate it as righteousness; so is it understood in the interpretations of the Fathers, and also as referring to blamelessness, dispassion, and virtue, and is associated with pity, compassion and love, and faithfulness and truth.

Mr. Moss takes Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky) to task for insisting upon "the strictly correct translation" of Romans 5:12, "death passed upon all men *because* all have sinned," since, he claims, all the Orthodox Latin Translations and Latin Fathers translate *ἐφ' ᾧ* as "in him" (Adam) instead of because. In addition he claims, SS. Cyril and Methodius also translate the verse into Slavonic in the latter way (Moss, pg. 111). Nevertheless, St. Photius the Great in his *Amphilochia*, question 84, at great length insists the *ἐφ' ᾧ* must be translated as "because" since this is not only how it is used in the rest of Scripture, but also how it is used in secular literature. Furthermore, he demonstrates how such a meaning agrees with the contexts. All the other Orthodox Fathers and translators in ages past, before the unfortunate imitators of Scholastic theology in the 17th century, agree with St. Photius' understanding. See also, *The Works of St. Chrysostom*, PNE, volume XI, homilies X and XI.

A most persistent logical error of Mr. Moss and other propo-

nents of the juridical theory is their distortion of texts by claiming that every mention of the word “sacrifice,” for example, means a declaration of the juridical theory (Moss, pg. 44). They appear to have forgotten that there is a “sacrifice of praise” or offerings of thanksgiving. Forcing a scholastic and juridical interpretation on the plain, straightforward reading of Scripture and the Fathers in this way is impermissible; it is as if the Apostles and the Fathers pronounced flawed and incomplete doctrines which need to be corrected and supplemented by modern scholastics and rationalists.

Much more could be said about the arguments presented in *The Mystery of Redemption*, but the texts are twisted and distorted to fit the juridical theory by specious reasoning which end up in contradicting the texts quoted or those quoted in another place. It would take too many pages to unravel it all. Anyone, however, who reads *The Dogma of Redemption*, and the accompanying resolutions and patristic quotations presented in the new edition, should have the tools to be able to read the Scriptures and Fathers with enough discernment to distinguish the Orthodox doctrines from those of the heretical West.<sup>1</sup>

However, we should like to bring forward one other quotation from Mr. Moss’ book. “Evil committed in one direction is compensated for by an equal evil committed in the other direction” (Moss, pg. 132). Apparently, for Mr. Moss, two wrongs *do* make a right.

As demonstrated by the fervent advocacy for the juridical interpretation, rationalism—and its direct offspring, Scholastic theology—is most attractive to mankind. Perhaps this is so because when man’s mind faces the incomprehensible gulf of the divinity, it quails and retreats before this mystery. There is nothing to grasp, no anchoring comprehension for a foothold. Even with the gift of the Incarnation, when the Only-begotten Son and Word declared the Father, yet the mystery at its root remains inviolable, incomprehensible, forever invulnerable to man’s penetration. Rationalism, how-

<sup>1</sup>See: The revised translation of *The Dogma of Redemption*  
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/hocna/message/381>  
 The Synodal Resolution: <http://hocna.org/defense/Resolution.pdf>  
 The reply to V. Moss: <http://hocna.org/defense/Resolution2.pdf>

#### THE RESURRECTION: OUR REDEMPTION

ever, offers the seductive promise of understanding since it claims nothing is beyond man's investigation and comprehension. There may be a formal denial of the foregoing statement, yet man, according to the rationalists, can investigate the intellectual or spiritual mystery of God's existence from the patterns and analogues He has left in creation. Here, after the first turning away from the primeval mystery, is the first comforting falsehood of rationalism: God must necessarily create in accordance with His own nature, which we can begin to search out and to understand by investigating created nature to discover the analogies with the divine nature. These analogies are used as theorems and principles to construct a rational mechanism to discover truth and plunder God's mysteries. Answers are thus given to quiet the unease of our incomprehension. Since we can find answers conformable to our way of thinking, our minds appear to be Godlike also: we are not helpless in the universe. In this manner is the humiliation of our non-comprehension assuaged, and our self-worth flattered, since we can apparently comprehend even the deepest mysteries.

Our pride is puffed up by rationalism, since it gives us ideas corresponding to our capacity, which engenders in us both the illusion of understanding and of our own subsistence. Hence, we are not helpless, we are not forlorn vessels adrift in a sea of unknowing, we are not weak instruments cowering before an unfathomable will and nature; rather everything is subject to the necessity of conforming to the capacity and measure of our intellect, comprehension and reasoning. Man is thus able "to stand on his own two feet," independent and in opposition to God. This frame of mind is preserved in secular rationalism as well, for we have seen secularism making positive religious claims, such as communism has, or Darwinism, logical positivism, and many other philosophic schools.

Returning to the more specific field of the juridical interpretation or the Anselmian appeasement doctrine, it has obviously influenced the Western Church. The unity of doctrine in the Apostolic deposit of Faith throughout the world gave rise to a like manner of life and worship. The similarities are so congruent that many schol-

## THE TRUE VINE

ars have searched for documents of a primitive, unitary liturgy used throughout the world. Of course, the unity arose from a common faith and the work of the Apostles who went throughout the world preaching the Risen Lord and ensuring that the doctrine was in agreement, that the same Spirit inspired all the brethren. Their successors labored locally at the same task, assembling in councils for more general problems. By their number and unity in the Holy Spirit, they could promulgate and certify decisions concerning all areas of the Christian life: first preserving the deposit of the Faith, then morals, life, worship, etc. Whosoever disagreed was separated from the Church until he conformed to the voice of the Holy Spirit. Many did not; they formed conventicles in which they imposed their own different order. If it were a personal or curable difference, reconciliation was often effected. But if the division persisted because of a fundamental difference, history has recorded how these conventicles developed different doctrines and practices, so that they became identifiable as heresies separate from the Church. Different beliefs will necessarily change one's life and worship.

The evidence is unarguable that all of Christendom celebrated the Resurrection of Christ, Pascha, as its greatest feast. The West, however, under the influence of Anselmian theology, gradually abandoned the ancient customs and concentrated on the crucifixion as the great event or "moment" of our salvation. The liturgics of the Western Church reflected this understanding; so much so, that Lent ended Holy Saturday morning, after a scantily attended early morning service to light the Resurrection fire and candle, and then everyone sat down to a midday meal of roast beef. Everything after the celebration of the Passion and Holy Friday had become an anti-climax.

In the beginning of the twentieth century, the witness of the Orthodox Church and the writings of the ancient Fathers began to embarrass Roman Catholic scholars, because they could not lay claim to be keepers of the one, unchanged faith in the face of this extreme divergence of liturgical tradition. Since 1950, their liturgiologists have attempted to resurrect older forms, but they are life-

less imitations of the true Christian Pascha. A distortion of doctrine distorted the entire worship of the West.

Another proof that this doctrine of satisfaction has changed Christian life is the doctrine of Purgatory, in which one might be forgiven one's sins but yet must pay the penalty, an unheard-of teaching in Christianity. Mr. Moss also holds to this form of the absolute necessity of satisfying justice. Beginning on page 133 of his book, he relates an incident:

Thus in the life of one of the greatest of Christian hierarchs, St. Dunstan of Canterbury (+988), we read: "Once three false coiners were caught and sentenced to have their hands cut off. On that day, which was the feast of Pentecost, the Saint was going to celebrate the Divine Liturgy; but he waited, asking if the sentence had been carried out. The reply came that the sentence had been deferred to another day out of respect for the feast. 'I shall on no account go to the altar today,' he said, 'until they have suffered the appointed penalty; for I am concerned in this matter.' For the criminals were in his power. As he spoke, tears gushed down his cheeks, showing his love for the condemned men. But when they had been punished, he washed his face and went up to the altar, saying: 'Now I am confident that the Almighty will accept the Sacrifice from my hands.'"

This repulsive story attributed to St. Dunstan has no parallel or match among the Orthodox. Even Pilate wished to release a condemned prisoner to increase the joy of the feast, while the chief priests of the Jews hurried the condemnation of our Lord in order not to defile the feast. Are the pagans and old Israel more forgiving and compassionate than the Church? This insistence on the necessity of fulfilling divine justice over and against divine love creates a monstrous distortion of the spiritual life and the soul.

The modern advocates of the juridical interpretation of redemption are characterized by a general disregard for the ancient Fathers

and a concentration on only a narrow spectrum of statements in them and in the Scriptures as interpreted by recent authors grounded in and imbued with scholasticism. The quotations that have been offered from the Scriptures are plainly and simply ignored. The question arises: Why were the ancient Apostles and preachers so unclear? Why did they not pronounce this doctrine in the same way they did that of the Resurrection? Why did they not proclaim that God's justice was now satisfied?

These advocates attack anyone who declares that Christ forgives sins freely, that there is no penalty to be paid since forgiveness springs directly from God's compassion and love, that Christ's Resurrection is our victory over sin, and that the barrier of sin between God and man was on our part, not God's. As the Apostles and Fathers have continually declared to us, we parted from God, not He from us; He watched and called for our return. The Saints of the Old Testament are witnesses to this. God was hindered by our free will (His first gift to us), not by anything on His part; there is no divine justice that had to be satisfied.

They attack any who remain faithful to the Apostolic preaching—which prevailed for about a thousand years in the Latin West before the invention of the heretical juridical theory and still prevails among the Orthodox—by saying that these faithful invalidate the Cross, that they disdain it and Christ's passion. Did St. Paul disdain the Cross when in the Epistle to the Corinthians he preached "Christ crucified, ... Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God" (I Cor. 1:23–24), and also said, "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us" (I Cor. 5:7)? Yet in this same Epistle, as we have seen, he declares the purport of his message to be the Resurrection.

The Cross, to which our sins have been nailed, is undeniably the Power of God. The sufferings of our Saviour are undeniably part of our redemption, the pattern and guide for our salvation, for they manifest God's love for us, which is what saves us. Yet it is also undeniable that without the Resurrection, the Cross would have been of none effect; so say the Scriptures and Fathers, despite the objections and railings of the advocates of the juridical theory. The man-

THE RESURRECTION: OUR REDEMPTION

ner of redemption is a mystery of God's dispensation of love, which we worship and accept in its entirety, with its culmination in Christ's Resurrection.

“Thy Cross do we worship, O Master, and  
Thy Holy Resurrection do we glorify.”

Thou hast wrought salvation in the midst of the earth, O God,  
even the Cross and the Resurrection,  
whereby Thou hast saved us,  
O Thou Who art good and the Friend of man.  
O Almighty Lord, glory be to Thee.

*from the Service of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross*  
*=September 14*