**GEORGIOS MARTZELOS**

**Professor Emeritus of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki and President of the Department of Postgraduate Theological Studies of Neapolis University Pafos**

**THE CONCEPT OF INHERITED SIN IN THE ORTHODOX TRADITION**

**Abstract:**

*The Orthodox tradition, due to the ontological premises of the Greek Fathers, unanimously accepts that after the fall of Adam his descendants do not inherit his personal sin and guilt, but the morbid state of sin, decay and death, in which he fell and from which sin is born on a personal level. For this reason the deliverance of Adam’s descendants from this morbid state is only done by abolishing of decay and death through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and Ηis victory over decay and death can be appropriated by sinful man through his participation in the sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist.*

**Introduction**

The notion of inherited sin, as formulated by the Greek Fathers, differs significantly from that of the Latin Fathers and especially of St. Augustine. This is understandable, because the premises that existed in the two traditions for the theological reflection on this issue, as well as the challenges that contributed to the development and formation of this notion, were different in East and West. Apart from the fact that the Latin Fathers had legal rather than ontological premises facing this issue, there was never such a challenge in the East as the one posed by the heresy of Pelagianism, which the Latin Fathers, and mainly St. Augustine, had to deal with. Although this heresy was condemned in the East and even on ecumenical level at the Council of Ephesus (431), it did not occupy on a wide scale the theological thought of the Greek Fathers, which had been absorbed for several centuries mainly by the Christological problem.

However, the Greek Fathers were not indifferent to the essence and the consequences of inherited sin. Only they dealt with these issues not independently and systematically, but in the context of their effort to address the various heresies, such as Gnosticism, Manichaeism, Arianism, Apollinarianism, Nestorianism, Monophysitism and Monothelitism, that essentially forged the salvific teaching and experience of the Church regarding the reality of salvation and deification of man.

From this point of view, the patristic teaching on inherited sin does not constitute, in orthodox tradition, an autonomous and systematic dogmatic teaching that faces an isolated and independent soteriological challenge. It is a teaching that is inextricably and functionally linked to the core of orthodox dogma, and especially to Cosmology, Anthropology, Christology and Soteriology.

Of course, due to the variety of heretical challenges, which occur even during different periods of time, as well as the lack of systematic development of this teaching, there are often differences between the Greek Fathers in certain aspects of it. However, it should be emphasized that in the basic points of this teaching there is a *consensus patrum* in the Orthodox tradition, which is mainly due to the common theological premises of the Greek patristic Theology.

For this reason, before we go into the actual examination of our subject, let us first look as briefly as possible at these common theological premises, which have played a decisive role in the development and formation of the teaching of the individual aspects of inherited sin in the Orthodox tradition.

1. ***Theological premises***

The first basic premise is the concept in which the Greek Fathers understand the relationship between God and the world[[1]](#footnote-1). For them only God is by nature uncreated, unchangeable and immortal, while the world is created and changeable, coming into being ″out of nothing″ (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων) by God’s energies[[2]](#footnote-2). Already its origin from non-being into being constitutes a change and alteration[[3]](#footnote-3), which makes it constantly lean to zero, from which it came. For this reason, in order to remain in being, it is necessary to depend on the cohesive energy of God. Otherwise, it will return to zero and non-existence.

In other words, the created world cannot live on its own regardless of its energetic relationship with God. The interruption of its relationship and communion with God will necessarily lead to zero and death. In this sense, man as created, is in himself changeable and mortal. In order to achieve immortality, which is a natural attribute only of uncreated God, he must be in constant communion and relationship with him. Both death and immortality are two possibilities that open before him, dependent solely on his relationship with God. It is this relationship with God or its interruption that determines whether he will be led to immortality or fall to death[[4]](#footnote-4). In this context we must clarify that when the Greek Fathers speak of death and immortality, they do not perceive these situations only in biological, but also in spiritual sense. Death means for them not only the separation of the body from the soul, but also the separation of the soul from the God who is the source of life. So is immortality; it is not only understood as the survival of man as a psychosomatic entity, but also as the vitalization of the soul by the life-giving energy of the Holy Spirit[[5]](#footnote-5).

The second basic premise, connected to the previous one, is that sin in the Orthodox tradition is not understood simply as a violation of a commandment of God or much more as an insult to divine justice, but as an unhealthy psychosomatic situation that originated from the interruption of communion and relationship with God, the source of life, and therefore leads inevitably to death[[6]](#footnote-6). For this reason, sin and death are inextricably linked and often identified in the Orthodox tradition[[7]](#footnote-7). As Gregory Nyssa characteristically points out, expressing in this case the unanimous conception of the other two Cappadocian Fathers, “*Sin is nothing else than* *alienation from God, Who is the true and only life”*[[8]](#footnote-8). In other words, sin, according to the Orthodox tradition, is not simply a legal fact that disturbs the divine judicial order and therefore implies the punishment of God to the transgressive man, but above all and *par excellence* an existential event that disturbs the ontological relationship between God and man, resulting in the interruption of this relationship with God, which inevitably leads man to sickness, decay and death.

In this sense, death is not understood as a punishment imposed by God Himself, but as a natural consequence of sin which constitutes, as we have said, a breakdown of communion with God. God as the source of all good things cannot be considered the cause of death[[9]](#footnote-9). As St. Irenaeus characteristically emphasizes, *“To as many as continue in their love towards God, does He grant communion with Him. But communion with God is life and light, and the enjoyment of all the benefits which He has in store. But on as many as, according to their own choice, depart from God, He inflicts that separation from Himself which they have chosen of their own accord. But separation from God is death, and separation from light is darkness; and separation from God consists in the loss of all the benefits which He has in store”*[[10]](#footnote-10)*.* For this very reason, salvation is not understood in the Orthodox tradition as the restoration of a judicial relationship between God and man, but as a healing and deliverance from the sovereignty of decay and death.

***2. Man’s original state and fall***

Despite the different way in which the Greek Fathers sometimes describe the original state of man, there are in this case many common points among them that constitute the starting point and the basis for the Orthodox understanding and interpretation of the event of the fall.

Before his fall, man, created in the image and likeness of God, was, as they point out, in communion with the persons of the Holy Trinity. Adorned with the grace of the Holy Spirit was a sharer of divine glory and a knower of divine truths. His life was free from anxiety, calm and impassible, and he was in complete harmony with the whole creation, without running the risk of disturbing his relation to it or much more of being endangered by it. There was no fear of death and no carnal desire in him. However, being created and changeable in his nature, it was not possible for him to be immortal and utterly perfect by nature[[11]](#footnote-11). Besides, if he had been created perfect from the beginning, he would have been deprived of the most essential feature of his existence that is the freedom of his will. But such a thing would be highly contradictory to the concept of the creation of man, because according to the Greek Fathers the freedom of will or in other words the free and sovereign will (αὐτεξούσιον), which they consider as inextricably linked to reason (λογικὸν), is what constitutes the essence of man[[12]](#footnote-12).

The purpose of man's creation according to them was therefore to enable man, as a rational being with free will in communion with the Triune God, to achieve immortality and deification through his moral and spiritual perfection[[13]](#footnote-13). This is, after all, the deeper meaning of man’s creation “in the image” (κατ’ εἰκόνα) and “in the likeness” (καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν) of God in the patristic tradition. The creation of man “in the image” of God refers according to the majority of the Greek Fathers to the rational and to the free and sovereign will, which man was endowed with[[14]](#footnote-14), while man’s creation “in the likeness” of God refers to the possibility of his likeness with God, that is of his deification, after a free course of spiritual maturity and moral progress, with the contribution of the Holy Spirit[[15]](#footnote-15). Therefore, man’s fall occurred according to the orthodox tradition, during this moral and spiritual progress from the “in the image” to the “in the likeness” situation. Although it overturned God’s initial plan and definitely constitutes a tragic event for man, it is seen as nothing more than an episode in the whole history of Divine Economy[[16]](#footnote-16).

Let us see now how orthodox tradition understands the original sin as an episodic event and, above all, what its tragic consequences are for the fallen man. Besides, as Roman Catholic theologians aptly observed, the Greek Fathers insist on these ontological consequences and are more interested in them in order to develop their teaching on Christ’s salvific work[[17]](#footnote-17).

While God set, as we have said, as the purpose of man's existence from the very beginning of his creation his moral-spiritual perfection and deification, which would be achieved only through his communion with God and obedience to his commandments, man, carried away by the devil who moved out of envy towards him, wanted to reach equality with God (ἰσοθεΐα) and deification in his own way, bypassing the divine plan and violating the commandment of his creator[[18]](#footnote-18). This is how the biblical narrative about Adam and Eve's transgression of God’s commandment not to eat from the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is basically interpreted in the Orthodox tradition[[19]](#footnote-19). The only exception seems to be the view of Clement of Alexandria in this case, who, using the allegorical method of interpretation of the Holy Scripture identifies original sin with the conclusion of premature and therefore illegal carnal relationships between Adam and Eve[[20]](#footnote-20).

However, the Greek Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, obviously facing abstinential views of Platonic, Gnostic and Manichaean origin[[21]](#footnote-21), based exclusively on the biblical narrative of *Genesis*, clearly and categorically reject the identification of original sin with Adam and Eve’s connection by carnal relations[[22]](#footnote-22). Identifying the cause of the fall not only in man’s voluptuousness but also in his vanity[[23]](#footnote-23), they emphasize *par excellence* the spiritual dimension of original sin, considering it essentially as an act of disobedience and rebellion of man against the will of God. With this disobedience, the man, as they point out, broke his relationship and communion with God, and as a result of that he was deprived of the life-giving energy of the Holy Spirit and thus fall into the dominion of the devil, sin, decay and death. He lost his holiness and childlike innocence, his mind was darkened, his reason and his free and sovereign will, that is his situation “in the image” of God, was blackened, and his previous knowledge of God was driven away[[24]](#footnote-24). Creation became hostile to him, so he felt strongly from it the threat of death. Man and creation are now in a competitive and hostile relationship with each other, with the aim of neutralizing and overcoming the threat of death that came from it[[25]](#footnote-25). This is how orthodox tradition understands the fact that after the fall, not only man but also the whole of creation “*laments and suffers pain together*” with him (*Rom.* 8, 22) and “*creation was subjected to vanity, not willingly, but because of the one who subjected it”* (*Rom.* 8, 20)[[26]](#footnote-26).

At this point we must emphasize that the fall of man into decay and death for the Greek Fathers, who rely in this case on the Holy Scripture[[27]](#footnote-27) is not a punishment imposed by God, but a natural consequence of original sin by which his existential communion and relation with the source of life was cut off[[28]](#footnote-28). Moreover, the biblical passage “*on the day you eat of it you shall most surely die”* (*Gen.* 2, 17)is not understood in the Orthodox tradition as a threat of God for the punishment He would impose on Adam and Eve if they violated His will, but as a loving warning, in order to protect them from the danger of violating the divine commandment[[29]](#footnote-29). In fact, even death itself was allowed by God for reasons of charity towards man, “*so that evil does not become immortal*”[[30]](#footnote-30). Thus, the rational and possessing free will creature of God, which was created for immortality and deification, was suddenly found because of his disobedience and the misuse of his freedom under the rule of the devil, decay and death.

Although original sin, according to the Greek Fathers, was not an act of necessity on the part of Adam’s changeable nature, but an act of his free choice[[31]](#footnote-31) it did not remain limited to the level of will. It also extended to the ontological carrier of the will, which is nature. Because of original sin, human nature became ill in Adam's person, was ontologically eroded and, cut off from the source of life, unavoidably ended in decay and death[[32]](#footnote-32). It is precisely this morbid state of decay and death, into which Adam fell, that the Greek Fathers consider as a sinful state, not only because decay and death are the fruit of sin, but mainly because they constitute the source and cause for the birth of sin in Adam’s life after the fall. By his fall into decay and death, they claim, passions, carnal pleasures and sin in general have dynamically invaded his life[[33]](#footnote-33). That is why sin, decay and death are for them, as we have seen, inextricably linked to each other. Although the causal relationship between sin and the sick and mortal human nature will be discussed in more detail below, we must clearly emphasize here that the Greek Fathers consider the mortality of human nature not only as the result but also as the cause and root of sin. And this very patristic position is the key to understanding not only the concept of inherited sin in the Orthodox tradition, but also orthodox anthropology and soteriology in general.

***3. The inheritance of original sin***

Based on these facts, the answer of the Greek Fathers to the question of inherited sin, that is how sin was passed on to the whole of human race by Adam’s fall, so that all people became and are considered sinners, according to what St. Paul writes in his *Epistle to the Romans*, differs significantly from the Western and especially the Augustinian view.

The Greek patristic tradition, in contrast to St. Augustine, unanimously emphasizes that what the descendants of Adam inherit is not his personal sin and his guilt for it, but his sick and mortal nature[[34]](#footnote-34). Adam's personal sin and guilt is only his own, not of his descendants. The fact that Adam, because of his personal sin, remarks St. John Chrysostom, became mortal and therefore also his descendants became mortal is understandable and reasonable. But to make someone else sinful because of Adam's disobedience would be unjust and unreasonable[[35]](#footnote-35). That is why the Holy Father, unanimously expressing the Greek patristic tradition, considers that submission to the sin of Adam's descendants and their characterization as sinners is understood exclusively as their submission to death[[36]](#footnote-36). This is because death, as we have seen above, is generally for the Orthodox tradition not only the result, but also the source and cause of sin. Therefore, according to Greek patristic tradition, Adam’s descendants are characterized as sinners by the apostle Paul, not because they are considered to participate in Adam’s personal sin and guilt, but because they inherit from him their sick and mortal nature, from which inevitably sin is born[[37]](#footnote-37).

It is very characteristic, as J. Meyendorff already points out, that two Greek Fathers of the 5th century, and in fact contemporaries of St. Augustine, Cyril of Alexandria and Theodore of Cyrus, although they belonged to different schools of interpretation and in opposite camps during the Christological controversies of their time, present at this point an impressive *consensus* on Adam's sin and its consequences for the entire human race[[38]](#footnote-38).

In fact, regardless of their different interpretation of the much-discussed Pauline phrase *“for that all have sinned”* (*Rom*. 5, 12), they fully agree that sin for the descendants of Adam is born from the perishable and mortal nature they inherited from their ancestor[[39]](#footnote-39). This is the theological basis, on which mainly Cyril of Alexandria explains in a thorough and detailed way how it happened so that *“by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners”* according to St. Paul (*Rom.* 5, 19). As he points out, they became sinners not as co-transgressors of Adam and heirs of his guilt, but as heirs of his sick and mortal nature, from which their personal sins are necessarily being produced. What he writes on this matter in his Explanation of the *Epistle to the Romans* is very interesting and representative of orthodox tradition: *“But one would say: yes, Adam slid away and by disregarding the divine commandment he was condemned to decay and death; and then how were the many made sinners because of him? What do his faults have to do with us? And how have the ones not yet born been wholly condemned together with him…? So what would be the way for us to be excused? ...But we have become sinners through Adam’s disobedience in such a way: he was created for incorruption and life, and his life was holy in the paradise of delight, the whole mind was always in vision of God, the body was in a state of calmness and tranquility, and all disgraceful pleasure was at rest; for in him there did not exist any disturbance of inordinate movement. But because he fell under sin and slid away into decay, henceforth pleasures and impurities ran into the nature of flesh, and the angry law in our members sprang up. So nature became ill with sin through the disobedience of one person, that is Adam; in this way the many were made sinners, not as having transgressed together with Adam, because they had not yet come into being, but as having his nature which is fallen under the law of sin”*[[40]](#footnote-40)*.*

Therefore, original sin in the Orthodox tradition, although it was the fruit of Adam’s free will, had painful and inevitable consequences for human nature. Sin, now because of Adam's disobedience, passed from the will, which is considered a “syndrome” of nature[[41]](#footnote-41), into human nature itself, not as guilt but as a morbid condition of decay and death that has infected like an epidemic the entire human race. It is precisely this morbid state of decay and death transmitted by Adam to all his descendants that constitutes the essence of the inherited sin for the Orthodox tradition.

The connection of sin with nature and not only with the will of the fallen man, not only emphasizes the ontological conditions, by which the Greek Fathers understand the meaning and significance of original sin, but also reveals the philosophical and psychoanalytic depth of their thought and their whole reflection concerning the origin of sin.

St. John Chrysostom, specifically connecting the origin of sin to the mortality of human nature, notes suitably that together with death, which followed Adam’s fall, human nature was invaded by *“the throng of passions... For when the body had become mortal, it was henceforth a necessary thing for it to receive concupiscence, and anger, and pain, and all the other passions”.* As the Holy Father points out, these things certainly do not constitute *per se* the essence of sin, but they turn into sin because of man’s excessive and unbridled behavior[[42]](#footnote-42), which is obviously due to the fact that man, as he stresses, *“submits to all things rather than die”*[[43]](#footnote-43)*.*

Theodoret, moving a step further from St. John Chrysostom’s thought, emphasizes that human nature after the fall is governed by the instinct of self-preservation and therefore has various needs, the selfish satisfaction of which gives birth to sin on a personal level[[44]](#footnote-44). Τhis is indeed the way in which he understands how “*sin reigned in death*” according to the words of the apostle Paul in *Romans* 5:21[[45]](#footnote-45). Theodoret's thought in this case, as J. Meyendorff remarks, is strikingly connected with certain contemporary conceptions, such as those of M. Heidegger, regarding the relationship between death and the instinct of self-preservation[[46]](#footnote-46).

Besides, it is not at all by chance that in orthodox tradition the three sinful inclinations of the soul, that is love of pleasure, love of glory and love of money, which constitute the component of human sinfulness[[47]](#footnote-47), are considered as the greedy and selfish reaction of the fallen man against the threat of death[[48]](#footnote-48). The selfishness and greed that are displayed in these three sinful inclinations, are in the context of the fall the only possibility for psychological balance opposite the threat of death.

This orthodox patristic conception is, as we understand, of enormous psychoanalytic importance, because it fully enlightens and fully interprets the psychic processes of the fallen, that is the empirical, man based not only on one, but on all three basic sinful tendencies that essentially converge on his selfish satisfaction and self-determination[[49]](#footnote-49). In this respect it provides, we believe, a more complete picture of the basic psychic trends and processes and is therefore far superior to the psychoanalytic theories of S. Freud, A. Adler and C. G. Jung which are based only on one of the above psychic trends and constitute only one-sided attempts to explain the behavior of the human soul[[50]](#footnote-50).

However, we must emphasize that considering the fallen human nature as the cause of sin does not mean for the Orthodox tradition the irresponsibility of Adam's descendants for the sins they commit. This is because sin certainly springs from the perishable and mortal human nature, but it manifests itself with the free consent of the human will. Without it, there is neither sin nor responsibility for committing it on a personal level. That is why both Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrus, in their own way, unanimously emphasize that the personal death of Adam’s descendants is not directly due to the sin of their ancestor, but to their own personal sin born out of their perishable and mortal nature[[51]](#footnote-51).

***4. Liberation of man from inherited sin***

Adam’s fall into sin, decay and death, according to the Greek Fathers, led the whole human race in a vicious circle from which it could not be released: Original sin brought to mankind as a direct consequence the morbid state of decay and death, and this situation in turn gave birth to sin again, that resulted in decay and death, and so on. It is this vicious circle that constitutes for the Orthodox tradition the essence of the tragedy of the post-fall man.

The post-fall man could not achieve by his own might his freedom from sin, his moral-spiritual perfection, and the restoration of his relationship with God while he was under the rule of decay and death. Death had to be abolished so that man could be released from the cause of sin and his diseased nature could be healed. As the Greek Fathers unanimously emphasize, this is exactly what the incarnated Word of God took upon Himself with His salvific work. With His death on the cross and His resurrection He defeated and abolished death that is the source and cause of sin and of the devil’s power over mankind. The fear of death, which kept people enslaved to sin and devil, loses now its power with Christ’s resurrection[[52]](#footnote-52). In this way, man is truly liberated and saved, because, as St. John Chrysostom aptly remarks *“he that fears not death is out of reach of the devil's tyranny”*[[53]](#footnote-53). That’s why Christ’s resurrection is considered in the Orthodox tradition as the most salvific event in the history of divine Economy and is celebrated in the Orthodox Church with great pomp, as an event that achieves the liberation of man from the monocracy of death, and the provision of a new life free from the authority of sin and the devil.

In this respect, the resurrection of Christ is considered in the Orthodox tradition as the most salvific event in the history of Divine Economy. That is why it is celebrated in the Orthodox Church with great pomp, as an event that achieves the liberation of man from the monocracy of death, and the provision of a new life free from the authority of sin and the devil. “*Christ has risen from the dead, trampling upon death by death, and giving life to those who were in the graves*”[[54]](#footnote-54), “*We celebrate the death of death, the destroying of Hades, the beginning of another life, the eternal one”*[[55]](#footnote-55) the faithful chant on Easter day. In other words, it is an event, with which the passage (Hebrew: Pasha) of man from death to life takes place in Christ.

At this point, however, we must emphasize that the salvific significance of Christ’s resurrection is not limited only to man. It is extended through man to the whole of creation, thus restoring the relationship between them. Man and creation are now related to each other and function harmoniously, free from the destructive power of death in the light of Christ's resurrection. This fact is precisely underlined in a very brilliant way by St. John Damascene, when he proclaims in a *troparion* of his Easter *Canon*: *“Now everything is full of light, both the heavens and the earth and also the underground. Therefore, let all creation celebrate Christ’s resurrection, in which it has been established”*[[56]](#footnote-56).

Based on these facts it is now easy to understand why, despite the tragedy of the event of the fall, from the very beginning we talked about the episodic character of original sin in the Orthodox tradition. Christ as a new Adam opens with his resurrection new ontological perspectives not only for mankind, but for the whole creation. Free from the power of decay and death, man can now achieve the purpose for which he was created, i.e. to win incorruptibility, immortality and deification. All that is needed in contrast to the old Adam is to show faith and obedience to Christ, keeping his commandments and participating existentially in his death and resurrection. And this is where the special significance of the sacrament of Baptism in the Orthodox tradition is highlighted.

By Baptism, the believer is being buried with Christ, stripping off the old man of sin, decay, and death, and is being resurrected with him, dressing the new man, “who is renewed unto knowledge, according to the image of his creator”[[57]](#footnote-57). Thus participating existentially and sacramentally in the death and resurrection of Christ, he is spiritually reborn in a new life free from the fear of death and the authority of sin. Baptism is for the Christian the beginning of the new life in Christ, which is increased and maintained by the other two important sacraments of the Church, the Chrism and the Eucharist[[58]](#footnote-58).

Within the framework of these data it becomes obvious that Baptism in the Orthodox tradition is not aimed solely at the remission of sins, which is certainly one of the basic gifts of Baptism, but does not exhaust the wealth of its saving gifts. Apart from the provision of the remission of sins, the Greek Fathers unanimously emphasize that the nature of man, which is worn out by sin, is through Baptism ontologically renewed, and the Christian, becoming a shareholder of the death and resurrection of Christ, receives his new substance, becomes a participant of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and God’s son and heir by grace[[59]](#footnote-59). This is the only way to remove the consequences of original sin. In other words, the question of removing the consequences of original sin according to the Orthodox tradition is not the remission of sins but the liberation of man from the rule of the devil and death and the healing and renewal of his sick fallen nature.

More generally, the salvific work of Christ is not understood in the Orthodox tradition on the basis of the judicial scheme “sin – remission”, but on the basis of the ontological scheme “death – life” or “disease – healing”. And it is precisely this passage from death to life or from disease to healing that takes place with Baptism. This is the reason why the Church, as Theodore of Cyrus points out, accepts infant baptism, even though toddlers have not committed personal sins[[60]](#footnote-60). If the purpose of Baptism was simply the remission of sins, infant baptism should have no place in the Church. Moreover, as Nikolaos Kavasilas (14th century) points out on this matter, Baptism as a birth in the new life in Christ is a gift from God, and therefore does not presuppose the voluntary participation of man. Just as God creates us without our will, so He recreates us in Christ without our own voluntary collaboration[[61]](#footnote-61). Perhaps there is no more comprehensive and clearer patristic position in the Orthodox tradition than that which constitutes the theological background of infant baptism.

**Conclusion**

After what we have said, it becomes understandable that the Orthodox tradition, due to the ontological premises of the Greek Fathers that characterize their theology in general, unanimously accepts that after the fall of Adam his descendants do not inherit his personal sin and guilt, but the morbid state of sin, decay and death, in which he fell and from which sin is born on a personal level. This is precisely why the release of Adam’s descendants from this morbid state occurs by the abolition of decay and death that takes place with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, something that is particularly emphasized in the Hymnography of the Orthodox Church.

Therefore, what is needed to enable sinful man to personally appropriate the salvific gifts of Christ’s victory over sin, decay, and death is to participate existentially and sacramentally in the death and resurrection of Christ through the sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist. Only in this way is the human race restored to its ancient beauty and becomes capable of fulfilling the primary purpose for which it was created, i.e. its deification.
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57. See *Col.* 3, 10. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. See Nicholas Cavasilas, *De vita in Christo* 1, PG 150, 504 Α. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
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